



LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Case Division

Shelf Section

Book No.

BS1225
K27
v. 3

五
三
一
二



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

THE LIFE
OF
THE LORD JESUS CHRIST:
A COMPLETE CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE ORIGIN, CONTENTS,
AND CONNECTION OF
THE GOSPELS.

Translated from the German of

J. P. LANGE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BONN.

EDITED, WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES,

BY

THE REV. MARCUS DODS, A.M.



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

The work is divided into three Books. The First Book is introductory. In this the Author explodes the philosophical fallacies on which the negative criticism rests, and exposes its unsound and inconsistent principles of criticism, establishing, in opposition, the fundamental ideas of the Gospel History (especially that of an individual incarnation), and delivering the principles and method of a trustworthy criticism. The sources of the Life of Jesus

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

LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

[*Turn over.*

are then also discussed, and the authenticity and credibility of the Gospels are vindicated, their origin unfolded, their unity exhibited, and their peculiarities illustrated with greater detail, and in a more interesting manner, than has elsewhere been done.

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

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

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

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

From the Christian Observer.

'We notice it again as a comprehensive and masterly production. Of course we do not, nor would any upright critic, pledge ourselves to every opinion it expresses. It is a complete critical examination, as it professes to be, of the origin, contents, and connection of the Gospels. Its object is at once to refute the views of the life of the Lord which have been propagated by negative criticism, and to substitute that consistent history which a truly scientific, enlightened, and incontrovertible criticism deduces from the Gospels. It has received high praise from Bishop Ellicott in his Lectures before the University of Cambridge.'

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

MESSRS CLARK have pleasure in forwarding to their Subscribers the
FIRST ISSUE OF FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY for 1865 :—

KEIL and DELITZSCH'S COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT, Vol. III.

HENGSTENBERG'S COMMENTARY ON ST JOHN'S GOSPEL, Vol. I.

The remaining Volumes for this year will be KEIL and DELITZSCH, Vol. IV., comprising JOSHUA, JUDGES, and RUTH, and the second (completing the work) of HENGSTENBERG ON ST JOHN.

A desire has been expressed that a NEW SERIES should be commenced, and MESSRS CLARK trust this will be generally satisfactory; but in order to do so, it is necessary to include the works published in 1864: they therefore enclose new *Serial* title-pages, which any who may think it worth while may introduce.

By way of experiment, they have bound HENGSTENBERG ON ST JOHN in a different style, so as to relieve the dead uniformity which so long a range of works bound alike is apt to produce on the book-shelf; and if this is generally approved of, they will continue the system with such new works as are introduced. The works in progress are: DELITZSCH ON JOB, MARTENSEN'S SYSTEM OF DOCTRINE, HARLESS'S CHRISTIAN ETHICS, DELITZSCH ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, SCHMID'S NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

May the publishers request an early remittance of the Subscription for the year, and also a continuance of the kind recommendation by Subscribers to their friends interested in such studies, of this series of works.

*To remote parts of the country the Four Annual Volumes can be sent by Post
for an addition of 2s. 8d. to the Subscription.*

RITTER'S PALESTINE.

MESSRS CLARK beg also to intimate that they have in preparation, under the Editorship of the Rev. W. L. GAGE, that portion of CARL RITTER'S great work on ASIA which relates to

PALESTINE, SYRIA, AND THE SINAITIC PENINSULA.

All Biblical Scholars will welcome this announcement, as Ritter's immense erudition and unrivalled reputation are so fully recognised, that his work on the Holy Land will take the first place, and supply one of the great wants of our literature.

The work will be carefully edited, including references to all the more recent discoveries, and will occupy three or four volumes.

*It will be offered on favourable terms to Subscribers to
Foreign Theological Library.*

CLARK'S
FOREIGN
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

FOURTH SERIES.
VOL. VI.

Keil and Delitzsch on the Pentateuch.
VOLUME III.

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

MDCCLXV.
1865

BIBLICAL COMMENTARY

ON

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY

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

VOLUME III.

THE PENTATEUCH.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

BY THE

REV. JAMES MARTIN, B.A.,

NOTTINGHAM.

EDINBURGH:

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

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

MDCCLXV.

MURRAY AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

THE FOURTH BOOK OF MOSES (NUMBERS).

INTRODUCTION.

Contents and Arrangement of the Book of Numbers,	Page 1
--	-----------

EXPOSITION.

I. Preparations for the Departure of Israel from Sinai (Chap. i. 1-x. 10) :— Numbering of the People of Israel at Sinai (Chap. i.-iv.), Spiritual Organization of the Congregation of Israel (Chap. v. and vi.), Closing Events at Sinai (Chap. vii.-ix. 14), Signs and Signals for the March (Chap. ix. 15-x. 10),	4 28 42 52
II. Journey from Sinai to the Steppes of Moab (Chap. x. 11-xxi.), From Sinai to Kadesh (Chap. x. 11-xiv. 45) :— Removal of the Camp from the Desert of Sinai (Chap. x. 11-36), Occurrences at Tabeerah and Kibroth-Hattaavah (Chap. xi.), Rebellion of Miriam and Aaron against Moses (Chap. xii.), Spies sent out. Murmuring of the People, and their Punishment (Chap. xiii. and xiv.), Occurrences during the Thirty-seven Years of Wandering in the Wilderness (Chap. xv.-xix.), Various Laws of Sacrifice. Punishment of a Sabbath-breaker. Command to wear Tassels upon the Clothes (Chap. xv.), Rebellion of Korah's Company (Chap. xvi.-xvii. 5), Punishment of the murmuring Congregation, and Confirmation of the High-priesthood of Aaron (Chap. xvi. 41-xvii. 13 ; or, Chap. xvii. 6-28), Service and Revenues of the Priests and Levites (Chap. xviii.), The Law concerning Purification from the Uncleanliness of Death (Chap. xix.),	56 56 64 75 83 99 100 105 111 115 120

	Page
Israel's Last Journey from Kadesh to the Heights of Pisgah in the Fields of Moab (Chap. xx. and xxi.),	126
Death of Miriam. Water out of the Rock. Refusal of a Passage through Edom. Aaron's Death. Conquest over the King of Arad (Chap. xx.-xxi. 3),	127
March round the Land of Edom and Moab. Conquest of Sihon and Og, Kings of the Amorites (Chap. xxi. 4-35),	138
 III. Occurrences in the Steppes of Moab, with Instructions relating to the Conquest and Distribution of the Land of Canaan (Chap. xxii.-xxxvi.),	156
Balaam and his Prophecies (Chap. xxii. 2-xxiv. 25),	157
Whoredom of Israel, and Zeal of Phinehas (Chap. xxv.),	203
Mustering of Israel in the Steppes of Moab (Chap. xxvi.),	207
The Daughters of Zelophehad claim to Inherit. The Death of Moses foretold : Consecration of Joshua as his Successor (Chap. xxvii.),	212
Order of the Daily and Festal Offerings of the Congregation (Chap. xxviii. and xxix.),	216
Instructions as to the Force of Vows (Chap. xxx.),	223
War of Revenge against the Midianites (Chap. xxxi.),	225
Division of the Conquered Land beyond the Jordan among the Tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half-Manasseh (Chap. xxxii.),	231
List of Israel's Encampments (Chap. xxxiii. 1-49),	241
Instructions concerning the Conquest and Distribution of Canaan (Chap. xxxiii. 50-xxxvi. 13),	248
Law concerning the Marriage of Heiresses (Chap. xxxvi.),	267

THE FIFTH BOOK OF MOSES (DEUTERONOMY).

INTRODUCTION.

Contents, Arrangement, and Character of Deuteronomy,	269
--	-----

EXPOSITION.

Heading and Introduction (Chap. i. 1-5),	277
I. The First Preparatory Address (Chap. i. 6-iv. 40),	282
Review of the Divine Guidance of Israel from Horeb to Kadesh (Chap. i. 6-46),	284

Page	
Review of the Divine Guidance of Israel round Edom and Moab to the Frontier of the Amorites, and of the Gracious Assistance afforded by the Lord in the Conquest of the Kingdoms of Sihon and Og (Chap. ii. and iii.),	291
Exhortation to a Faithful Observance of the Law (Chap. iv. 1-40),	308
 II. Second Address, or Exposition of the Law (Chap. iv. 44-xxvi. 19),	318
A. The True Essence of the Law and its Fulfilment :—	
Exposition of the Decalogue, and its Promulgation (Chap. v.),	319
On Loving Jehovah, the One God, with all the Heart (Chap. vi.),	321
Command to destroy the Canaanites and their Idolatry (Chap. vii.),	326
Review of the Guidance of God, and their Humiliation in the Desert, as a Warning against Highmindedness and Forgetfulness of God (Chap. viii.),	330
Warning against Self-righteousness, founded upon the Recital of their previous Sins (Chap. ix.-x. 11),	334
Admonition to fear and love God. The Blessing or Curse consequent upon the Fulfilment or Transgression of the Law (Chap. x. 12-xi. 32),	343
B. Exposition of the Principal Laws (Chap. xii.-xxvi.),	351
The one Place for the Worship of God, and the Right Mode of worshipping Him (Chap. xii.),	352
Punishment of Idolaters, and Tempters to Idolatry (Chap. xiii.),	362
Avoidance of the Mourning Customs of the Heathen, and Unclean Food. Application of the Tithe of Fruits (Chap. xiv.),	366
On the Year of Release, the Emancipation of Hebrew Slaves, and the Sanctification of the First-born of Cattle (Chap. xv.),	369
On the Celebration of the Feasts of Passover, of Pentecost, and of Tabernacles (Chap. xvi. 1-17),	374
On the Administration of Justice and the Choice of a King (Chap. xvi. 18-xvii. 20),	378
Rights of the Priests, the Levites, and the Prophets (Chap. xviii.),	387
Laws concerning the Cities of Refuge, the Sacredness of Landmarks, and the Punishment of False Witnesses (Chap. xix.),	397

	Page
Instructions for future Wars (Chap. xx.),	400
Expiation of an uncertain Murder. Treatment of a Wife who had been taken captive. Right of the First-born. Punish- ment of a Refractory Son. Burial of a Man who had been hanged (Chap. xxi.),	404
The Duty to love one's Neighbour ; and Warning against a Violation of the Natural Order of Things. Instructions to sanctify the Marriage State (Chap. xxii.),	409
Regulations as to the Right of Citizenship in the Congregation of the Lord (Chap. xxiii.),	413
On Divorce. Warnings against Want of Affection or Injustice (Chap. xxiv.),	416
Laws relating to Corporal Punishment ; Levirate Marriages ; and Just Weights and Measures (Chap. xxv.),	421
Thanksgiving and Prayer at the Presentation of First-fruits and Tithes (Chap. xxvi.),	425
 III. Third Discourse, or Renewal of the Covenant (Chap. xxvii.-xxx.),	429
On the setting up of the Law in the Land of Canaan (Chap. xxvii.),	429
Blessing and Curse (Chap. xxviii. 1-68),	435
Conclusion of the Covenant in the Land of Moab (Chap. xxix. and xxx.),	446
 IV. Moses' Farewell and Death (Chap. xxxi.-xxxiv.),	455
Moses' Final Arrangements. Completion and handing over of the Book of the Law (Chap. xxxi.),	455
Song of Moses, and Announcement of his Death (Chap. xxxii.),	464
Moses' Blessing (Chap. xxxiii.),	492
Death and Burial of Moses (Chap. xxxiv.),	514
 Concluding Remarks on the Composition of the Pentateuch,	517

THE FOURTH BOOK OF MOSES.

(NUMBERS.)

INTRODUCTION.

CONTENTS AND ARRANGEMENT OF THE BOOK OF NUMBERS.



HE fourth book of Moses, which the Jews call either *Vayedabber* (וַיֹּאמֶר), from the opening word, *מִסְפָּרִים* (*Aριθμοί*, *Numeri*, LXX., Vulg.), or *פקודים* (*recensiones* (=liber recensionum)), and to which the heading במדבר (*in the wilderness*) is given in the Masoretic texts with a more direct reference to its general contents, narrates the guidance of Israel through the desert, from Mount Sinai to the border of Canaan by the river Jordan, and embraces the whole period from the second month of the second year after the exodus from Egypt to the tenth month of the fortieth year.

As soon as their mode of life in a spiritual point of view had been fully regulated by the laws of Leviticus, the Israelites were to enter upon their journey to Canaan, and take possession of the inheritance promised to their fathers. But just as the way from Goshen to Sinai was a preparation of the chosen people for their reception into the covenant with God, so the way from Sinai to Canaan was also a preparation for the possession of the promised land. On their journey through the wilderness the Israelites were to experience on the one hand the faithful watchfulness and gracious deliverance of their God in every season of distress and danger, as well as the stern severity of the divine judgments upon the despisers of their God, that they might learn thereby to trust entirely in the Lord, and strive after His kingdom alone; and on the other hand they were to receive during their journey the laws and ordinances relating to their civil and political constitution, and thereby to be

placed in a condition to form and maintain themselves as a consolidated nation by the side of and in opposition to the earthly kingdoms formed by the nations of the world, and to fulfil the task assigned them by God in the midst of the nations of the earth. These laws, which were given in part at Sinai, in relation to the external and internal organization of the tribes of Israel as the army and the congregation of Jehovah, and in part on various occasions during the march through the desert, as well as after their arrival in the steppes of Moab, on the other side of the Jordan opposite to Jericho, with especial reference to the conquest of Canaan and their settlement there, are not only attached externally to the history itself in the order in which they were given, but are so incorporated internally into the historical narrative, according to their peculiar character and contents, as to form a complete whole, which divides itself into three distinct parts corresponding to the chronological development of the history itself.

The FIRST part, which extends from chap. i.-x. 10, contains the preparations for departing from Sinai, arranged in four groups:—viz. (1) the outward arrangement and classification of the tribes in the camp and on their march, or the numbering and grouping of the twelve tribes around the sanctuary of their God (chap. i. and ii.), and the appointment of the Levites in the place of the first-born of the nation to act as servants of the priests in the sanctuary (chap. iii. and iv.); (2) the internal or moral and spiritual organization of the nation as the congregation of the Lord, by laws relating to the maintenance of the cleanliness of the camp, restitution for trespasses, conjugal fidelity, the fulfilment of the vow of the Nazarite, and the priestly blessing (chap. v. and vi.); (3) the closing events at Sinai, viz. the presentation of dedicatory offerings on the part of the tribe princes for the transport of the tabernacle and the altar service (chap. vii.), the consecration of the Levites (chap. viii.), and the feast of Passover, with an arrangement for a supplementary Passover (chap. ix. 1-14); (4) the appointment of signs and signals for the march in the desert (chap. ix. 5-x. 10). In the SECOND part (chap. x. 11-xxi.), the history of the journey is given in the three stages of its progress from Sinai to the heights of Pisgah, near to the Jordan, viz. (1) from their departure from the desert of Sinai (chap. x. 11-36) to their arrival at the desert of *Paran*, at Kadesh, including the occurrences at Tabeerah, at the graves of lust, and at Hazereth (chap. xi. and xii.), and the events at Kadesh which led God to

condemn the people who had revolted against Him to wander in the wilderness for forty years, until the older generation that came out of Egypt had all died (chap. xiii. and xiv.); (2) all that is related of the execution of this divine judgment, extending from the end of the second year to the reassembling of the congregation at Kadesh at the beginning of the fortieth year, is the history of the rebellion and destruction of Korah (chap. xvi.-xvii. 15), which is preceded by laws relating to the offering of sacrifices after entering Canaan, to the punishment of blasphemers, and to mementos upon the clothes (chap. xv.), and followed by the divine institution of the Aaronic priesthood (chap. xvii. 16-28), with directions as to the duties and rights of the priests and Levites (chap. xviii.), and the law concerning purification from uncleanness arising from contact with the dead (chap. xix.); (3) the journey of Israel in the fortieth year from Kadesh to Mount Hor, round Mount Seir, past Moab, and through the territory of the Amorites to the heights of Pisgah, with the defeat of the kings of the Amorites, Sihon and Og, and the conquest of their kingdoms in Gilead and Bashan (chap. xx. and xxi.). In the THIRD part (chap. xxii.-xxxvi.), the events which occurred in the steppes of Moab, on the eastern side of the plain of Jordan, are gathered into five groups, with the laws that were given there, viz. (1) the attempts of the Moabites and Midianites to destroy the people of Israel, first by the force of Balaam's curse, which was turned against his will into a blessing (chap. xxii.-xxiv.), and then by the seduction of the Israelites to idolatry (chap. xxv.); (2) the fresh numbering of the people according to their families (chap. xxvi.), together with a rule for the inheritance of landed property by daughters (chap. xxvii. 1-11), and the appointment of Joshua as the successor of Moses (chap. xxvii. 12-23); (3) laws relating to the sacrifices to be offered by the congregation on the Sabbath and feast days, and to the binding character of vows made by dependent persons (chap. xxviii.-xxx.); (4) the defeat of the Midianites (chap. xxxi.), the division of the land that had been conquered on the other side of the Jordan among the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh (chap. xxxii.), and the list of the halting-places (chap. xxxiii. 1-49); (5) directions as to the expulsion of the Canaanites, the conquest of Canaan and division of it among the tribes of Israel, the Levites and free cities, and the marriage of heiresses (chap. xxxiii. 50-xxxvi.).

EXPOSITION.

I. PREPARATIONS FOR THE DEPARTURE OF ISRAEL FROM SINAI.

CHAP. I. 1-X. 10.

NUMBERING OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL AT SINAI.—

CHAP. I.—IV.

FOUR weeks after the erection of the tabernacle (cf. chap. i. 1 and Ex. xl. 17), Moses had the number of the whole congregation taken, by the command of God, according to the families and fathers' houses of the twelve tribes, and a list made of all the males above twenty years of age for service in the army of Jehovah (chap. i. 1-3). Nine months before, the numbering of the people had taken place for the purpose of collecting atonement-money from every male of twenty years old and upwards (Ex. xxx. 11 sqq., compared with chap. xxxviii. 25, 26), and the result was 603,550, the same number as is given here as the sum of all that were mustered in the twelve tribes (chap. i. 46). This correspondence in the number of the male population after the lapse of a year is to be explained, as we have already observed at Ex. xxx. 16, simply from the fact that the result of the previous census, which was taken for the purpose of raising head-money from every one who was fit for war, was taken as the basis of the mustering of all who were fit for war, which took place after the erection of the tabernacle; so that, strictly speaking, this mustering merely consisted in the registering of those who had been numbered in the public records, according to their families and fathers' houses. It is most probable, however, that the numbering and registering took place according to the classification adopted at Jethro's suggestion for the administration of justice, viz. in thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens (Ex. xviii. 25), and that the number of men in the different tribes was reckoned in this way simply by thousands, hundreds, and tens,—a conclusion which we may draw from the fact, that there are no units given in the case of any of the tribes. On this plan the supernumerary units might be used to balance the changes that had taken place in the actual condition of the families and fathers' houses, between the numbering and the preparation of the muster-rolls, so that the few

changes that had occurred in the course of nine months among those who were fit for war were not taken any further into consideration, on account of their being so inconsiderable in relation to the total result. A fresh census was taken 38 years later in the steppes of Moab (chap. xxvi.), for the division of the land of Canaan among the tribes according to the number of their families (chap. xxxiii. 54). The number which this gave was 601,730 men of twenty years old and upwards, not a single one of whom, with the exception of Joshua and Caleb, was included among those that were mustered at Sinai, because the whole of that generation had died in the wilderness (chap. xxvi. 63 sqq.). In the historical account, instead of these exact numbers, the number of adult males is given in a round sum of 600,000 (chap. xi. 21; Ex. xii. 37). To this the Levites had to be added, of whom there were 22,000 males at the first numbering and 23,000 at the second, reckoning the whole from a month old and upwards (chap. iii. 39, xxvi. 62). Accordingly, on the precarious supposition that the results obtained from the official registration of births and deaths in our own day furnish any approximative standard for the people of Israel, who had grown up under essentially different territorial and historical circumstances, the whole number of the Israelites in the time of Moses would have been about two millions.¹

Modern critics have taken offence at these numbers, though without sufficient reason.² When David had the census taken by

¹ Statistics show that, out of 10,000 inhabitants in any country, about 5580 are over twenty years of age (cf. *Chr. Bernoulli, Hdb. der Populationistik*, 1841). This is the case in Belgium, where, out of 1000 inhabitants, 421 are under twenty years of age. According to the Danish census of 1840, out of 1000 inhabitants there were—

In Denmark, under twenty years of age,	432;	above twenty,	568
Schleswig,	"	"	436;
Holstein,	"	"	460;
Lauenburg,	"	"	458;

According to this standard, if there were 600,000 males in Israel above twenty years of age, there would be in all 1,000,000 or 1,100,000 males, and therefore, including the females, more than two millions.

² *Knobel* has raised the following objections to the historical truth or validity of the numbers given above: (1.) So large a number could not possibly have lived for any considerable time in the peninsula of Sinai, as modern travellers estimate the present population at not more than from four to seven thousand, and state that the land could never have been capable of sustaining a population of 50,000. But the books of Moses do not affirm that the Israelites lived for forty years upon the natural produce of the desert, but that they were fed mira-

Joab, in the closing years of his reign, there were 800,000 men capable of bearing arms in Israel, and 500,000 in Judah (2 Sam. xxiv. 9). Now, if we suppose the entire population of a country to be about four times the number of its fighting men, there would be

culously with manna by God (see at Ex. xvi. 31). Moreover, the peninsula of Sinai yielded much more subsistence in ancient times than is to be found there at present, as is generally admitted, and only denied by *Knobel* in the interests of rationalism. The following are *Ritter's* remarks in his *Erdkunde*, 14, pp. 926-7: "We have repeatedly referred above to the earlier state of the country, which must have been vastly different from that of the present time. The abundant vegetation, for example; the larger number of trees, and their superiority in size, the destruction of which would be followed by a decrease in the quantity of smaller shrubs, etc.; also the greater abundance of the various kinds of food of which the children of Israel could avail themselves in their season; the more general cultivation of the land, as seen in the monumental period of the earliest Egyptians, viz. the period of their mines and cities, as well as in Christian times in the wide-spread remains of monasteries, hermitages, walls, gardens, fields, and wells; and, lastly, the possibility of a better employment of the temporary flow of water in the wadys, and of the rain, which falls by no means unfrequently, but which would need to be kept with diligence and by artificial means for the unfruitful periods of the year, as is the case in other districts of the same latitude. These circumstances, which are supported by the numerous inscriptions of Sinai and Serbal, together with those in the Wady Mokattein and a hundred other valleys, as well as upon rocky and mountainous heights, which are now found scattered in wild solitude and utter neglect throughout the whole of the central group of mountains, prove that at one time a more numerous population both could and did exist there." (2.) "If the Israelites had been a nation of several millions in the Mosaic age, with their bravery at that time, they would have conquered the small land more easily and more rapidly than they seem to have done according to the accounts in the books of Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, which show that they were obliged to tolerate the Canaanites for a long time, that they were frequently oppressed by them, and that it was not till the time of David and Solomon that their supremacy was completely established." This objection of *Knobel's* is founded upon the supposition that the tribes of Canaan were very small and weak. But where has he learned that? As they had no less than 31 kings, according to Josh. xii., and dwelt in many hundreds of towns, they can hardly have been numerically weaker than the Israelites with their 600,000 men, but in all probability were considerably stronger in numbers, and by no means inferior in bravery; to say nothing of the fact that the Israelites neither conquered Canaan under Joshua by the strength of their hands, nor failed to exterminate them afterwards from want of physical strength. (3.) Of the remaining objections, viz. that so large a number could not have gone through the Arabian Gulf in a single night, or crossed the Jordan in a day, that Joshua could not have circumcised the whole of the males, etc., the first has been answered in vol. ii. (pp. 46, 47), by a proof that it was possible for the Red Sea to be crossed in the given time, and the others will be answered when we come to the particular events referred to.

about five millions of inhabitants in Palestine at that time. The area of this land, according to the boundaries given in chap. xxxiv. 2-12, the whole of which was occupied by Israel and Judah in the time of David, with the exception of a small strip of the Phœnician coast, was more than 500 square miles.¹ Accordingly there would be 10,000 inhabitants to each square mile (German); a dense though by no means unparalleled population;² so that it is certainly possible that in the time of Christ it may have been more numerous still, according to the accounts of *Josephus*, which are confirmed by *Dio Cassius* (cf. *C. v. Raumer, Palästina*, p. 93). And if Canaan could contain and support five millions of inhabitants in the flourishing period of the Israelitish kingdom, two millions or more could easily have settled and been sustained in the time of Joshua and the Judges, notwithstanding the fact that there still remained large tracts of land in the possession of the Canaanites and Philistines, and that the Israelites dwelt in the midst of the Canaanitish population which had not yet been entirely eradicated (*Judg. iii. 1-5*).

If we compare together the results of the two numberings in the second and fortieth years of their march, we shall find a considerable increase in some of the tribes, and a large decrease in others. The number of men of twenty years old and upwards in the different tribes was as follows :—

	First Numbering.	Second Numbering.
Reuben,	46,500	43,730
Simeon,	59,300	22,200
Gad,	45,650	40,500
Judah,	74,600	76,500
Issachar,	54,400	64,300
Zebulon,	57,400	60,500
Ephraim,	40,500	82,500
Manasseh,	32,200	52,700
Benjamin,	35,400	45,600
Dan,	62,700	64,400
Asher,	41,500	53,400
Naphtali,	53,400	45,400
Total,	<hr/> 603,550	<hr/> 601,730

Consequently by the second numbering Dan had increased 1700,

¹ The German mile being equal to about five English miles, this would give 12,500 square miles English.

² In the kingdom of Saxony (according to the census of the year 1855) there are 7501 persons to the square mile; in Belgium (according to the census of

Judah 1900, Zebulon 3100, Issachar 9900, Benjamin 10,200, Asher 11,900, Manasseh 20,900. This increase, which was about 19 per cent. in the case of Issachar, 29 per cent. in that of Benjamin and Asher, and 63 per cent. in that of Manasseh, is very large, no doubt; but even that of Manasseh is not unparalleled. The total population of Prussia increased from 10,349,031 to 17,139,288 between the end of 1816 and the end of 1855, that is to say, more than 65 per cent. in 39 years; whilst in England the population increased 47 per cent. between 1815 and 1849, *i.e.* in 34 years. On the other hand, there was a decrease in Reuben of 2770, in Gad of 5150, in Ephraim of 8000, in Naphtali of 8000, and in Simeon of 37,100. The cause of this diminution of 6 per cent. in the case of Reuben, 12 per cent. in Gad, 15 per cent. in Naphtali, 20 per cent. in Ephraim, and nearly 63 per cent. in Simeon, it is most natural to seek for in the different judgments which fell upon the nation. If it be true, as the earlier commentators conjectured, with great plausibility, on account of the part taken by Zimri, a prince of the tribe (chap. xxv. 6, 14), that the Simeonites were the worst of those who joined in the idolatrous worship of Baal Peor, the plague, in which 24,000 men were destroyed (chap. xxv. 9), would fall upon them with greater severity than upon the other tribes; and this would serve as the principal explanation of the circumstance, that in the census which was taken immediately afterwards, the number of men in that tribe who were capable of bearing arms had melted away to 22,200. But for all that, the total number included in the census had only been reduced by 1820 men during the forty years of their journeying through the wilderness.

The tribe of Levi appears very small in comparison with the rest of the tribes. In the second year of their journey, when the first census was taken, it only numbered 22,000 males of a month old and upwards; and in the fortieth year, when the second was taken, only 23,000 (chap. iii. 39, xxvi. 62). "Reckoning," says 1856) 8462; and in the district of Düsseldorf there are 98:32 square miles and (according to the census of 1855) 1,007,570 inhabitants, so that there must be 10,248 persons to the square mile. Consequently, not only could more than five millions have lived in Palestine, but, if we take into account on the one hand what is confirmed by both biblical and other testimonies, viz. the extraordinary fertility of the land in ancient times (cf. v. Raumer, *Pal.* pp. 92 sqq.), and on the other hand the well-known fact that the inhabitants of warm countries require less food than Europeans living in colder climates, they could also have found a sufficient supply of food.

Knobel, “that in Belgium, for example, in the rural districts, out of 10,000 males, 1074 die in the first month after their birth, and 3684 between the first month and the twentieth year, so that only 5242 are then alive, the tribe of Levi would only number about 13,000 men of 20 years old and upwards, and consequently would not be half as numerous as the smallest of the other tribes, whilst it would be hardly a sixth part the size of Judah, which was the strongest of the tribes.” But notwithstanding this, the correctness of the numbers given is not to be called in question. It is not only supported by the fact, that the number of the Levites capable of service between the ages of 30 and 50 amounted to 8580 (chap. iv. 48),—a number which bears the most perfect proportion to that of 22,000 of a month old and upwards,—but is also confirmed by the fact, that in the time of David the tribe of Levi only numbered 38,000 of thirty years old and upwards (1 Chron. xxiii. 3); so that in the interval between Moses and David their rate of increase was still below that of the other tribes, which had grown from 600,000 to 1,300,000 in the same time. Now, if we cannot discover any reason for this smaller rate of increase in the tribe of Levi, we see, at any rate, that it was not uniform in the other tribes. If Levi was not half as strong as Manasseh in the first numbering, neither Manasseh nor Benjamin was half as strong as Judah; and in the second numbering, even Ephraim had not half the number of men that Judah had.

A much greater difficulty appears to lie in the fact, that the number of all the male first-born of the twelve tribes, which was only 22,273 according to the census taken for the purpose of their redemption by the Levites (chap. iii. 43), bore no kind of proportion to the total number of men capable of bearing arms in the whole of the male population, as calculated from these. If the 603,550 men of twenty years old and upwards presuppose, according to what has been stated above, a population of more than a million males; then, on the assumption that 22,273 was the sum total of the first-born sons throughout the entire nation, there would be only one first-born to 40 or 45 males, and consequently every father of a family must have begotten, or still have had, from 39 to 44 sons; whereas the ordinary proportion of first-born sons to the whole male population is one to four. But the calculation which yields this enormous disproportion, or rather this inconceivable proportion, is founded upon the supposition that the law, which commanded the sanctification of the male first-born, had a retrospective force, and was to be understood as requiring that not only the first-

born sons, who were born from the time when the law was given, but all the first-born sons throughout the entire nation, should be offered to the Lord and redeemed with five shekels each, even though they were fathers or grandfathers, or even great-grandfathers, at that time. Now if the law is to be interpreted in this sense, as having a retrospective force, and applying to those who were born before it was issued, as it has been from the time of *J. D. Michaelis* down to that of *Knobel*, it is an unwarrantable liberty to restrict its application to the first-born sons, who had not yet become fathers themselves,—a mere subterfuge, in fact, invented for the purpose of getting rid of the disproportion, but without answering the desired end.¹ If we look more closely at the law, we cannot find in the words themselves “all the first-born, whatsoever

¹ This is evident from the different attempts which have been made to get rid of the difficulty, in accordance with this hypothesis. *J. D. Michaelis* thought that he could explain the disproportion from the prevalence of polygamy among the Israelites; but he has overlooked the fact, that polygamy never prevailed among the Israelites, or any other people, with anything like the universality which this would suppose. *Hävernick* adopted this view, but differed so far from *Michaelis*, that he understood by *first-born* only those who were so on both the father's and mother's side,—a supposition which does not remove the difficulty, but only renders it perfectly incredible. Others imagined, that only those first-born were counted who had been born as the result of marriages contracted within the last six years. *Baumgarten* supports this on the ground that, according to Lev. xxvii. 6, the redemption-fee for boys of this age was five shekels (chap. iii. 47); but this applies to vows, and proves nothing in relation to first-born, who could not have been the object of a vow (Lev. xxvii. 26). *Bunsen* comes to the same conclusion, on the ground that it was at this age that children were generally dedicated to Moloch (*sic!*). Lastly, *Kurtz* endeavours to solve the difficulty, first, by referring to the great fruitfulness of the Israelitish women; secondly, by excluding, (a) the first-born of the father, unless at the same time the first-born of the mother; (b) all the first-born who were fathers of families themselves; and thirdly, by observing, that in a population of 600,000 males above 20 years of age, we may assume that there would be about 200,000 under the age of fifteen. Now, if we deduct these 200,000 who were not yet fifteen, from the 600,000 who were above twenty, there would remain 400,000 married men. “In that case the total number of 22,273 first-born would yield this proportion, that there would be one first-born to nine male births. And on the ground assigned under No. 2 (a), this proportion would have to be reduced one-half. So that for every family we should have, on an average, four or five sons, or nine children,—a result by no means surprising, considering the fruitfulness of Hebrew marriages.” This would be undoubtedly true, and the *facit* of the calculation quite correct, as $9 \times 22,273 = 200,457$, if only the subtraction upon which it is based were reconcilable with the rules of arithmetic, or if the reduction of 600,000 men to 400,000 could in any way be justified.

openeth the womb" (Ex. xiii. 2, cf. Num. iii. 12), or in the *ratio legis*, or in the circumstances under which the law was given, either a necessity or warrant for any such explanation or extension. According to Ex. xiii. 2, after the institution of the Passover and its first commemoration, God gave the command, "Sanctify unto Me all the first-born both of man and of beast;" and added, according to vers. 11 sqq., the further explanation, that when the Israelites came into the land of Canaan, they were to set apart every first-born unto the Lord, but to redeem their first-born sons. This further definition places it beyond all doubt, that what God prescribed to His people was not a supplementary sanctification of all the male first-born who were then to be found in Israel, but simply the sanctification of all that should be born from that time forward. A confirmation of this is to be found in the explanation given in Num. iii. 13 and viii. 17: "All the first-born are Mine; for on the day that I smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt, I hallowed unto Me all the first-born in Israel, both man and beast." According to this distinct explanation, God had actually sanctified to Himself all the first-born of Israel by the fact, that through the blood of the paschal lamb He granted protection to His people from the stroke of the destroyer (Ex. xii. 22, 23), and had instituted the Passover, in order that He might therein adopt the whole nation of Israel, with all its sons, as the people of *His* possession, or induct the nation which He had chosen as His first-born son (Ex. iv. 22) into the condition of a child of God. This condition of sonship was henceforth to be practically manifested by the Israelites, not only by the yearly repetition of the feast of Passover, but also by the presentation of all the male first-born of their sons and their cattle to the Lord, the first-born of the cattle being sacrificed to Him upon the altar, and the first-born sons being redeemed from the obligation resting upon them to serve at the sanctuary of their God. Of course the reference was only to the first-born of men and cattle that should come into the world from that time forward, and not to those whom God had already sanctified to Himself, by sparing the Israelites and their cattle.¹

¹ *Vitrunga* drew the correct conclusion from Ex. xiii. 11, 12, in combination with the fact that this law was not carried out previous to the adoption of the Levites in the place of the first-born for service at the sanctuary—that the law was intended chiefly for the future: "This law," he observes (in his *Obs. ss. L.* ii. c. 2, § 13), "relates to the tabernacle to be afterwards erected, and to the regular priests to be solemnly appointed; when this law, with many others of a

This being established, it follows that the 22,273 first-born, who were exchanged for the Levites (ch. iii. 45 sqq.), consisted only of the first-born sons who had been born between the time of the exodus from Egypt and the numbering of the twelve tribes, which took place thirteen months afterwards. Now, if, in order to form an idea of the proportion which this number would bear to the whole of the male population of the twelve tribes of Israel, we avail ourselves of the results furnished by modern statistics, we may fairly assume, according to these, that in a nation comprising 603,550 males above 20 years of age, there would be 190,000 to 195,100 between the ages of 20 and 30.¹ And, supposing that this was the age at which the Israelites married, there would be from 19,000 to 19,500 marriages contracted upon an average every year; and in a nation which had grown up in a land so celebrated as Egypt was in antiquity for the extraordinary fruitfulness of its inhabitants, almost as many first-born, say at least 19,000, might be expected to come into the world. This average number would be greater if we fixed the age for marrying between 18 and 28, or reduced it to the seven years between 18 and 25.² But even without doing this, we must take into consideration the important fact that such averages, based upon a considerable length of time, only give an approximative idea of the actual state of things in any single year; and that, as a matter of fact, in years of oppression and distress the numbers may sink to half the average, whilst in other similar kind, would have to be observed. The first-born were set apart by God to be consecrated to Him, as servants of the priests and of the sacred things, either in their own persons, or in that of others who were afterwards substituted in the goodness of God. This command therefore presupposed the erection of the tabernacle, the ordination of priests, the building of an altar, and the ceremonial of the sacred service, and showed from the very nature of the case, that there could not be any application of this law of the first-born before that time."

¹ According to the census of the town of Basle, given by *Bernoulli* in his *Populationistik*, p. 42, and classified by age, out of 1000 inhabitants in the year 1837, there were 326 under 20 years of age, 224 between 20 and 30, and 450 of 30 years old and upwards. Now, if we apply this ratio to the people of Israel, out of 603,550 males of 20 years old and upwards, there would be 197,653 between the ages of 20 and 30. The statistics of the city of Vienna and its suburbs, as given by *Brachelli* (*Geographie und Statistik*, 1861), yield very nearly the same results. At the end of the year 1856 there were 88,973 male inhabitants under 20 years of age, 44,000 between 20 and 30, and 97,853 of 30 years old and upwards, not including the military and those who were in hospitals. According to this ratio, out of the 603,550 Israelites above 20 years of age, 187,209 would be between 20 and 30.

² From a comparison with the betrothals which take place every year in

years, under peculiarly favourable circumstances, they may rise again to double the amount.¹ When the Israelites were groaning under the hard lash of the Egyptian taskmasters, and then under the inhuman and cruel edict of Pharaoh, which commanded all the Hebrew boys that were born to be immediately put to death, the number of marriages no doubt diminished from year to year. But the longer this oppression continued, the greater would be the number of marriages concluded at once (especially in a nation rejoicing in the promise of numerous increase which it had received from its God), when Moses had risen up and proved himself, by the mighty signs and wonders with which he smote Egypt and its haughty king, to be the man whom the God of the fathers had sent and endowed with power to redeem His nation out of the bondage of Egypt, and lead it into Canaan, the good land that He had promised to the fathers. At that time, when the spirits of the nation revived, and the hope of a glorious future filled every heart, there might very well have been about 38,000 marriages contracted in a year, say from the time of the seventh plague, three months before the exodus, and about 37,600 children born by the second month of the second year after the exodus, 22,273 of them being boys, as the proportion of male births to female varies very remarkably, and may be shown to have risen even as high as 157 to 100, whilst among the Jews of modern times it has frequently been as high as 6 to 5, and has even risen to 3 to 2 (or more exactly 29 to 20).²

the Prussian state, it is evident that the number given in the text as the average number of marriages contracted every year is not too high, but most assuredly too low. In the year 1858 there were 167,387 betrothals in a population of 17,793,900; in 1816, on the other hand, there were 117,448 in a population of 10,402,600 (*vid. Brachelli, Geog. und Statistik von Preussen*, 1861). The first ratio, if applied to Israel with its two millions, would yield 19,000 marriages annually; the second, 22,580; whilst we have, in addition, to bear in mind how many men there are in the European states who would gladly marry, if they were not prevented from doing so by inability to find the means of supporting a house of their own.

¹ How great the variations are in the number of marriages contracted year by year, even in large states embracing different tribes, and when no unusual circumstances have disturbed the ordinary course of things, is evident from the statistics of the Austrian empire as given by *Brachelli*, from which we may see that in the year 1851, with a total population of 36½ millions, there were 361,249 betrothals, and in the year 1854, when the population had increased by half a million, only 279,802. The variations in particular districts are, as might be supposed, considerably larger.

² According to *Bernoulli* (p. 143), in the city of Geneva, there were 157 boys born to every 100 girls in the year 1832. He also observes, at p. 153: "It is

In this way the problem before us may be solved altogether independently of the question, whether the law relates to all the first-born sons on the father's side, or only to those who were first-born on both father's and mother's side, and without there having been a daughter born before. This latter view we regard as quite unfounded, as a mere subterfuge resorted to for the purpose of removing the supposed disproportion, and in support of which the expression "opening the womb" (*fissura uteri*, i.e. *qui findit uterum*) is pressed in a most unwarrantable manner. On this point, *J. D. Michaelis* has correctly observed, that "the etymology ought not to be too strongly pressed, inasmuch as it is not upon this, but upon usage chiefly, that the force of words depends." It is a fact common to all languages, that in many words the original literal signification falls more and more into the background in the course of years, and at length is gradually lost sight of altogether. Moreover, the expression "openeth the womb" is generally employed in cases in which a common term is required to designate the first-born of both man and beast (Ex. xiii. 2, 12–15, xxxiv. 19, 20; Num. iii. 12, 13, viii. 16, 17, xviii. 15; Ezek. xx. 16); but even then, wherever the two are distinguished, the term בָּכֹר is applied as a rule to the first-born sons, and פָּטָר to the first-born of animals (comp. Ex. xiii. 13b with vers. 12 and 13a; and chap. xxxiv. 20b with vers. 19 and 20a). On the other hand, where only first-born sons are referred to, as in Deut. xxi. 15–17, we look in vain for the expression *peter rechem*, "openeth the womb." Again, the Old Testament, like modern law, recognises only first-born sons, and does not apply the term first-born to daughters at all; and in relation to the inheritance, even in the case of two wives, both of whom had born sons to their husband, it recognises only *one* first-born son, so that the fact of its being the first birth on the mother's side is not taken into consideration at all (cf. Gen. xlvi. 8, xl ix. 3; Deut. xxi. 15–17). And the established rule in relation to the birth-right,—namely, that the first son of the father was called the first-born, and possessed all the rights of the first-born, independently

remarkable that, according to a very frequent observation, there are an unusual number of boys born among the Jews;" and as a proof, he cites the fact that, according to *Burdach*, the lists of births in Leghorn show 120 male children born among the Jews to 100 female, whilst, according to *Hufeland*, there were 528 male Jews and 365 female born in Berlin in the course of 16 years, the proportion therefore being 145 to 100. And, according to this same proportion, we have calculated above, that there would be 15,327 girls to 22,273 boys.

altogether of the question whether there had been daughters born before,—would no doubt be equally applicable to the sanctification of the first-born sons. Or are we really to believe, that inasmuch as the child first born is quite as often a girl as a boy, God exempted every father in Israel whose eldest child was a daughter from the obligation to manifest his own sonship by consecrating his first-born son to God, and so demanded the performance of this duty from half the nation only? We cannot for a moment believe that such an interpretation of the law as this would really be in accordance with the spirit of the Old Testament economy.

Chap. i. MUSTER OF THE TWELVE TRIBES, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THAT OF LEVI.—Vers. 1-3. Before the departure of Israel from Sinai, God commanded Moses, on the first of the second month in the second year after the exodus from Egypt, to take the number of the whole congregation of the children of Israel, “according to their families, according to their fathers’ houses (see Ex. vi. 14), in (according to) the number of their names,” i.e. each one counted singly and entered, but only “every male according to their heads of twenty years old and upwards” (see Ex. xxx. 14), viz. only בָּלְדֵי אֶתְנָא נָבָא “all who go forth of the army,” i.e. all the men capable of bearing arms, because by means of this numbering the tribes and their subdivisions were to be organized as hosts of Jehovah, that the whole congregation might fight as an army for the cause of their Lord (see at Ex. vii. 4).

Vers. 4-16. Moses and Aaron, who were commanded to number, or rather to muster, the people, were to have with them “a man of every tribe, who was head-man of his fathers’ houses,” i.e. a tribe-prince, viz. to help them to carry out the mustering. *Beth aboth* (“fathers’ houses”), in ver. 2, is a technical expression for the subdivisions in which the *mishpachoth*, or families of the tribes, were arranged, and is applied in ver. 4 according to its original usage, based upon the natural division of the tribes into *mishpachoth* and families, to the fathers’ houses which every tribe possessed in the family of its first-born. In vers. 5-15, these heads of tribes are mentioned by name, as in chap. ii. 3 sqq., vii. 12 sqq., x. 14 sqq. In ver. 16 they are designated as “called men of the congregation,” because they were called to diets of the congregation, as representatives of the tribes, to regulate the affairs of the nation; also “princes of the tribes of their fathers,” and “heads of the thousands of Israel:” “princes,” from the nobility of their birth; and

“heads,” as chiefs of the *alaphim* composing the tribes. *Alaphim* is equivalent to *mishpachoth* (cf. chap. x. 4; Josh. xxii. 14); because the number of heads of families in the *mishpachoth* of a tribe might easily amount to a thousand (see at Ex. xviii. 25). In a similar manner, the term “hundred” in the old German came to be used in several different senses (see *Grimm, deutsche Rechts-alterthümer*, p. 532).

Vers. 17–47. This command was carried out by Moses and Aaron. They took for this purpose the twelve heads of tribes who are pointed out (see at Lev. xxiv. 11) by name, and had the whole congregation gathered together by them and enrolled in genealogical tables. בְּהִלָּל, to announce themselves as born, i.e. to have themselves entered in genealogical registers (books of generations). This entry is called a מִשְׁׁמֶרֶת, mustering, in ver. 19, etc. In vers. 20–43 the number is given of those who were mustered of all the different tribes, and in vers. 44–47 the total of the whole nation, with the exception of the tribe of Levi. “*Their generations*” (vers. 20, 22, 24, etc.), i.e. those who were begotten by them, so that “*the sons of Reuben, Simeon*,” etc., are mentioned as the fathers from whom the *mishpachoth* and fathers’ houses had sprung. The בְּ before בְּנֵי שֵׁבּוּעָה in ver. 22, and the following names (in vers. 24, 26, etc.), signifies “with regard to” (as in Isa. xxxii. 1; Ps. xvii. 4, etc.).

Vers. 48–54. Moses was not to muster the tribe of Levi along with the children of Israel, i.e. with the other tribes, or take their number, but to appoint the Levites for the service of the dwelling of the testimony (Ex. xxxviii. 21), i.e. of the tabernacle, that they might encamp around it, might take it down when the camp was broken up, and set it up when Israel encamped again, and that no stranger (*zar*, non-Levite, as in Lev. xxii. 10) might come near it and be put to death (see chap. iii.). The rest of the tribes were to encamp every man in his place of encampment, and by his banner (see at chap. ii. 2), in their hosts (see chap. ii.), that wrath might not come upon the congregation, viz. through the approach of a stranger. נַפְשָׁךְ, the wrath of Jehovah, breaking in judgment upon the unholy who approached His sanctuary in opposition to His command (chap. viii. 19, xviii. 5, 22). On the expression “keep the charge” (*shamar mishmereth*), see at Gen. xxvi. 5 and Lev. viii. 35.

Chap. ii. ORDER OF THE TWELVE TRIBES IN THE CAMP AND ON THE MARCH.—Vers. 1, 2. The twelve tribes were to encamp each one by his standard, by the signs of their fathers’ houses,

opposite to the tabernacle (at some distance) round about, and, according to the more precise directions given afterwards, in such order that on every side of the tabernacle three tribes were encamped side by side and united under one banner, so that the twelve tribes formed four large camps or divisions of an army. Between these camps and the court surrounding the tabernacle, the three leading *mishpachoth* of the Levites were to be encamped on three sides, and Moses and Aaron with the sons of Aaron (*i.e.* the priests) upon the fourth, *i.e.* the front or eastern side, before the entrance (chap. iii. 21–38). נֶגֶן, a standard, banner, or flag, denotes primarily the larger *field sign*, possessed by every division composed of three tribes, which was also the banner of the tribe at the head of each division; and secondarily, in a derivative signification, it denotes the *army* united under one standard, like σημεῖα, or *vexillum*. It is used thus, for example, in vers. 17, 31, 34, and in combination with מְחֻנָה in vers. 3, 10, 18, and 25, where “standard of the camp of Judah, Reuben, Ephraim, and Dan” signifies the hosts of the tribes arranged under these banners. מְתָנָה, the *signs* (ensigns), were the smaller flags or banners which were carried at the head of the different tribes and subdivisions of the tribes (the fathers’ houses). Neither the Mosaic law, nor the Old Testament generally, gives us any intimation as to the form or character of the standard (*degel*). According to rabbinical tradition, the standard of Judah bore the figure of a lion, that of Reuben the likeness of a man or of a man’s head, that of Ephraim the figure of an ox, and that of Dan the figure of an eagle; so that the four living creatures united in the cherubic forms described by Ezekiel were represented upon these four standards.¹

¹ Jerome Prado, in his commentary upon Ezekiel (chap. i. p. 44), gives the following minute description according to rabbinical tradition: “The different leaders of the tribes had their own standards, with the crests of their ancestors depicted upon them. On the east, above the tent of *Naasson* the first-born of *Judah*, there shone a standard of a green colour, this colour having been adopted by him because it was in a green stone, viz. an emerald, that the name of his forefather *Judah* was engraved on the breastplate of the high priest (Ex. xxv. 15 sqq.), and on this standard there was depicted a lion, the crest and hieroglyphic of his ancestor *Judah*, whom Jacob had compared to a lion, saying, ‘*Judah is a lion’s whelp.*’ Towards the south, above the tent of *Elisur* the son of *Reuben*, there floated a red standard, having the colour of the sardus, on which the name of his father, viz. *Reuben*, was engraved upon the breastplate of the high priest. The symbol depicted upon this standard was a human head, because *Reuben* was the first-born, and head of the family. On the west, above the tent of *Elishamah* the son of *Ephraim*, there was a golden flag, on which the

Vers. 3–31. *Order of the tribes in the camp and on the march.*—Vers. 3–9. The standard of the tribe of Judah was to encamp in front, namely towards the east, according to its hosts; and by its side the tribes of Issachar and Zebulun, the descendants of Leah, under the command and banner of Judah: an army of 186,400 men, which was to march out first when the camp was broken up (ver. 9), so that Judah led the way as the champion of his brethren (Gen. xlix. 10).—Ver. 4. “*His host, and those that were numbered of them*” (cf. vers. 6, 8, 11, etc.), i.e. the army according to its numbered men.—Vers. 10–16. On the south side was the standard of Reuben, with which Simeon and Gad, descendants of Leah and her maid Zilpah, were associated, and to which they were subordinated. In ver. 14, *Reuel* is a mistake for *Deuel* (chap. i. 14, vii. 42, x. 20), which is the reading given here in 118 MSS. cited by Kennicott and *De Rossi*, in several of the ancient editions, and in the *Samaritan*, *Vulgate*, and *Jon. Saad.*, whereas the LXX., *Onk.*, *Syr.*, and *Pers.* read *Reuel*. This army of 151,450 men was to break up and march as the second division.—Ver. 17. The tabernacle, the camp of the Levites, was to break up after this in the midst of the camps (i.e. of the other tribes). “*As they encamp, so shall they break up,*” that is to say, with Levi in the midst of the tribes, “*every man in his place, according to his banner.*” *place*, as in Deut. xxiii. 13, Isa. lvii. 8.—Vers. 18–24. On the west the standard of Ephraim, with the tribes of Manasseh and Benjamin, that is to say, the whole of the descendants of Rachel, 108,100 men, as the third division of the army.—Vers. 25–31. Lastly, towards the north was the standard of Gad, with Asher and Naphtali, the descendants of the maids Bilhah and Zilpah, 157,600 men, who were

head of a calf was depicted, because it was through the vision of the calves or oxen that his ancestor Joseph had predicted and provided for the famine in Egypt (Gen. xli.); and hence Moses, when blessing the tribe of Joseph, i.e. Ephraim (Deut. xxxiii. 17), said, ‘his glory is that of the first-born of a bull.’ The golden splendour of the standard of Ephraim resembled that of the chrysolite, in which the name of Ephraim was engraved upon the breastplate. Towards the north, above the tent of *Ahiezer* the son of *Dan*, there floated a motley standard of white and red, like the jaspis (or, as some say, a carbuncle), in which the name of Dan was engraved upon the breastplate. The crest upon this was an eagle, the great foe to serpents, which had been chosen by the leader in the place of a serpent, because his forefather Jacob had compared Dan to a serpent, saying, ‘Dan is a serpent in the way, an adder (*cerastes*, a horned snake) in the path;’ but Ahiezer substituted the eagle, the destroyer of serpents, as he shrank from carrying an adder upon his flag.”

to be the last to break up, and formed the rear on the march.—Ver. 31. **אֶת־נְגָלוֹתֵם** (*according to their standards*) is equivalent to **אֶת־אֲנָשָׁתֵם** (*according to their hosts*) in vers. 9, 16, and 24, *i.e.* according to the hosts of which they consisted.

Vers. 32-34. In ver. 32 we have the whole number given, 603,550 men, not including the Levites (ver. 33, see at chap. i. 49); and in ver. 34 the concluding remark as to the subsequent execution of the divine command,—an anticipatory notice, as in Ex. xii. 50, xl. 16, etc.

Chap. iii. MUSTER OF THE TRIBE OF LEVI.—As Jacob had adopted the two sons of Joseph as his own sons, and thus promoted them to the rank of heads of tribes, the tribe of Levi formed, strictly speaking, the thirteenth tribe of the whole nation, and was excepted from the muster of the twelve tribes who were destined to form the army of Jehovah, because God had chosen it for the service of the sanctuary. Out of this tribe God had not only called Moses to be the deliverer, lawgiver, and leader of His people, but Moses' brother Aaron, with the sons of the latter, to be the custodians of the sanctuary. And now, lastly, the whole tribe was chosen, in the place of the first-born of all the tribes, to assist the priests in performing the duties of the sanctuary, and was numbered and mustered for this its special calling.

Vers. 1-4. In order to indicate at the very outset the position which the Levites were to occupy in relation to the priests (*viz.* Aaron and his descendants), the account of their muster commences not only with the enumeration of the sons of Aaron who were chosen as priests (vers. 2-4), but with the heading: “*These are the generations of Aaron and Moses in the day (i.e. at the time) when Jehovah spake with Moses in Mount Sinai* (ver. 1). The *toledoth* (see at Gen. ii. 4) of Moses and Aaron are not only the families which sprang from Aaron and Moses, but the Levitical families generally, which were named after Aaron and Moses, because they were both of them raised into the position of heads or spiritual fathers of the whole tribe, namely, at the time when God spoke to Moses upon Sinai. Understood in this way, the notice as to the time is neither a superfluous repetition, nor introduced with reference to the subsequent numbering of the people in the steppes of Moab (chap. xxvi. 57 sqq.). Aaron is placed before Moses here (see at Ex. vi. 26 sqq.), not merely as being the elder of the two, but because his sons received the priesthood, whilst the sons of

Moses, on the contrary, were classed among the rest of the Levitical families (cf. 1 Chron. xxiii. 14).—Vers. 2 sqq. Names of the sons of Aaron, the “*anointed priests* (see Lev. viii. 12), whose hand they filled to be priests,” i.e. who were appointed to the priesthood (see at Lev. vii. 37). On Nadab and Abihu, see Lev. x. 1, 2. As they had neither of them any children when they were put to death, Eleazar and Ithamar were the only priests “*in the sight of Aaron their father*,” i.e. during his lifetime. “*In the sight of:*” as in Gen. xi. 28.

Vers. 5–10. The Levites are placed before Aaron the priest, to be his servants.—Ver. 6. “*Bring near:*” as in Ex. xxviii. 1. The expression עַמְדֵךְ לִפְנֵי is frequently met with in connection with the position of a servant, as standing before his master to receive his commands.—Ver. 7. They were to keep the charge of Aaron and the whole congregation before the tabernacle, to attend to the service of the dwelling, i.e. to observe what Aaron (the priest) and the whole congregation were bound to perform in relation to the service at the dwelling-place of Jehovah. “*To keep the charge:*” see chap. i. 53 and Gen. xxvi. 5. In ver. 8 this is more fully explained: they were to keep the vessels of the tabernacle, and to attend to all that was binding upon the children of Israel in relation to them, i.e. to take the oversight of the furniture, to keep it safe and clean.—Ver. 9. Moses was also to give the Levites to Aaron and his sons. “*They are wholly given to him out of the children of Israel:*” the repetition of נְתָנָתֶנְךָ here and in chap. viii. 16 is emphatic, and expressive of complete surrender (*Ewald*, § 313). The Levites, however, as *nethunim*, must be distinguished from the *nethinim* of non-Israelitish descent, who were given to the Levites at a later period as temple slaves, to perform the lowest duties connected with the sanctuary (see at Josh. ix. 27).—Ver. 10. Aaron and his sons were to be appointed by Moses to take charge of the priesthood; as no stranger, no one who was not a son of Aaron, could approach the sanctuary without being put to death (cf. chap. i. 53 and Lev. xxii. 10).

Vers. 11–13. God appointed the Levites for this service, because He had decided to adopt them as His own in the place of all the first-born of Egypt. When He slew the first-born of Egypt, He sanctified to Himself all the first-born of Israel, of man and beast, for His own possession (see Ex. xiii. 1, 2). By virtue of this sanctification, which was founded upon the adoption of the whole nation as His first-born son (see vol. ii. p. 33), the nation was required to dedicate to Him its first-born sons for service at the sanc-

tuary, and sacrifice all the first-born of its cattle to Him. But now the Levites and their cattle were to be adopted in their place, and the first-born sons of Israel to be released in return (vers. 40 sqq.). By this arrangement, through which the care of the service at the sanctuary was transferred to one tribe, which would and should henceforth devote itself with undivided interest to this vocation, not only was a more orderly performance of this service secured, than could have been effected through the first-born of all the tribes ; but so far as the whole nation was concerned, the fulfilment of its obligations in relation to this service was undoubtedly facilitated. Moreover, the Levites had proved themselves to be the most suitable of all the tribes for this post, through their firm and faithful defence of the honour of the Lord at the worship of the golden calf (Ex. xxxii. 26 sqq.). It is in this spirit, which distinguished the tribe of Levi, that we may undoubtedly discover the reason why they were chosen by God for the service of the sanctuary, and not in the fact that Moses and Aaron belonged to the tribe, and desired to form a hierarchical caste of the members of their own tribe, such as was to be found among other nations : the magi, for example, among the Medes, the Chaldeans among the Persians, and the Brahmins among the Indians. יְהוָה יְהוָה, “to Me, to Me, Jehovah” (vers. 13, 41, and 45 ; cf. Ges. § 121, 3).

Vers. 14-20. The muster of the Levites included all the males from a month old and upwards, because they were to be sanctified to Jehovah in the place of the first-born ; and it was at the age of a month that the latter were either to be given up or redeemed (comp. vers. 40 and 43 with chap. xviii. 16). In vers. 17-20 the sons of Levi and their sons are enumerated, who were the founders of the *mishpachoth* among the Levites, as in Ex. vi. 16-19.

Vers. 21-26. The Gershonites were divided into two families, containing 7500 males. They were to encamp under their chief Eliasaph, behind the tabernacle, *i.e.* on the western side (vers. 23, 24), and were to take charge of the dwelling-place and the tent, the covering, the curtain at the entrance, the hangings round the court with the curtains at the door, and the cords of the tent, “*in relation to all the service thereof*” (vers. 25 sqq.) ; that is to say, according to the more precise injunctions in chap. iv. 25-27, they were to carry the tapestry of the dwelling (the inner covering, Ex. xxvi. 1 sqq.), and of the tent (*i.e.* the covering made of goats’ hair, Ex. xxvi. 7 sqq.), the covering thereof (*i.e.* the covering of rams’ skins dyed red, and the covering of sea-cow skin upon the top of

it, Ex. xxvii. 16), the hangings of the court and the curtain at the entrance (Ex. xxvii. 9, 16), which surrounded the altar (of burnt-offering) and the dwelling round about, and their cords, *i.e.* the cords of the tapestry, coverings, and curtains (Ex. xxvii. 14), and all the instruments of their service, *i.e.* the things used in connection with their service (Ex. xxvii. 19), and were to attend to everything that had to be done to them; in other words, to perform whatever was usually done with those portions of the sanctuary that are mentioned here, especially in setting up the tabernacle or taking it down. The suffix in מִתְרֵי (ver. 26) does not refer to the court mentioned immediately before; for, according to ver. 37, the Merarites were to carry the cords of the hangings of the court, but to the "dwelling and tent," which stand farther off. In the same way the words, "for all the service thereof," refer to all those portions of the sanctuary that are mentioned, and mean "everything that had to be done or attended to in connection with these things."

Vers. 27–32. The *Kohathites*, who were divided into four families, and numbered 8600, were to encamp on the south side of the tabernacle, and more especially to keep the charge of the sanctuary (ver. 28), viz. to take care of the ark of the covenant, the table (of shew-bread), the candlestick, the altars (of incense and burnt-offering), with the holy things required for the service performed in connection therewith, and the curtain (the veil before the most holy place), and to perform whatever had to be done ("all the service thereof," see at ver. 26), *i.e.* to carry the said holy things after they had been rolled up in covers by the priests (see chap. iv. 5 sqq.).—Ver. 32. As the priests also formed part of the Kohathites, their chief is mentioned as well, viz. *Eleazar* the eldest son of Aaron the high priest, who was placed over the chiefs of the three Levitical families, and called פָּקִידָה, *oversight of the keepers of the charge of the sanctuary*, *i.e.* authority, superior, of the servants of the sanctuary.

Vers. 33–37. The *Merarites*, who formed two families, comprising 6200 males, were to encamp on the north side of the tabernacle, under their prince *Zuriel*, and to observe the boards, bolts, pillars, and sockets of the dwelling-place (Ex. xxvi. 15, 26, 32, 37), together with all the vessels thereof (the plugs and tools), and all that had to be done in connection therewith, also the pillars of the court with their sockets, the plugs and the cords (Ex. xxvii. 10, 19, xxxv. 18); that is to say, they were to take charge of these when the tabernacle was taken down, to carry them on the march, and to fix them when the tabernacle was set up again (chap. iv. 31, 32).

Vers. 38, 39. Moses and Aaron, with the sons of the latter (the priests), were to encamp in front, before the tabernacle, viz. on the eastern side, “*as keepers of the charge of the sanctuary for the charge of the children of Israel*,” i.e. to attend to everything that was binding upon the children of Israel in relation to the care of the sanctuary, as no stranger was allowed to approach it on pain of death (see chap. i. 51).—Ver. 39. The number of the Levites mustered, 22,000, does not agree with the numbers assigned to the three families, as $7500 + 8600 + 6200 = 22,300$. But the total is correct; for, according to ver. 46, the number of the first-born, 22,273, exceeded the total number of the Levites by 273. The attempt made by the Rabbins and others to reconcile the two, by supposing the 300 Levites in excess to be themselves first-born, who were omitted in the general muster, because they were not qualified to represent the first-born of the other tribes, is evidently forced and unsatisfactory. The whole account is so circumstantial, that such a fact as this would never have been omitted. We must rather assume that there is a copyist’s error in the number of one of the Levitical families; possibly in ver. 28 we should read שְׁנָשׁ for שְׁשׁ (8300 for 8600). The *puncta extraordinaria* above תְּנִפְנִי are intended to indicate that this word is either suspicious or spurious (see at Gen. xxxiii. 5); and it is actually omitted in *Sam.*, *Syr.*, and 12 MSS., but without sufficient reason: for although the divine command to muster the Levites (vers. 5 and 14) was addressed to Moses alone, yet if we compare chap. iv. 1, 34, 37, 41, 45, where the Levites qualified for service are said to have been mustered by Moses and Aaron, and still more chap. iv. 46, where the elders of Israel are said to have taken part in the numbering of the Levites as well as in that of the twelve tribes (chap. i. 3, 4), there can be no reason to doubt that Aaron also took part in the mustering of the whole of the Levites, for the purpose of adoption in the place of the first-born of Israel; and no suspicion attaches to this introduction of his name in ver. 39, although it is not mentioned in vers. 5, 11, 14, 40, and 44.

Vers. 40-51. After this, Moses numbered the first-born of the children of Israel, to exchange them for the Levites according to the command of God, which is repeated in vers. 41 and 44-45 from vers. 11-13, and to adopt the latter in their stead for the service at the sanctuary (on vers. 41 and 45, cf. vers. 11-13). The number of the first-born of the twelve tribes amounted to 22,273 of a month old and upwards (ver. 43). Of this number 22,000 were exchanged

for the 22,000 Levites, and the cattle of the Levites were also set against the first-born of the cattle of the tribes of Israel, though without their being numbered and exchanged head for head. In vers. 44 and 45 the command of God concerning the adoption of the Levites is repeated, for the purpose of adding the further instructions with regard to the 273, the number by which the first-born of the tribes exceeded those of the Levites. “*And as for the redemption of the 273 (lit. the 273 to be redeemed) of the first-born of the children of Israel which are more than the Levites, thou shalt take five shekels a head,*” etc. This was the general price established by the law for the redemption of the first-born of men (see chap. xviii. 16). On the sacred shekel, see at Ex. xxx. 13. The redemption money for 273 first-born, in all 1365 shekels, was to be paid to Aaron and his sons as compensation for the persons who properly belonged to Jehovah, and had been appointed as first-born for the service of the priests.—Ver. 49. “*The redeemed of the Levites*” are the 22,000 who were redeemed by means of the Levites. In ver. 50, the *Chethibh* חֲפָרִים is the correct reading, and the *Keri* חֲפָרִים an unnecessary emendation. The number of the first-born and that of the Levites has already been noticed at pp. 8, 9.

Chap. iv. RULES OF SERVICE, AND NUMBERING OF THE LEVITES QUALIFIED FOR SERVICE.—After the adoption of the Levites for service at the sanctuary, in the place of the first-born of Israel, Moses and Aaron mustered the three families of the Levites by the command of God for the service to be performed by those who were between the ages of 30 and 50. The particulars of the service are first of all described in detail (vers. 4–33); and then the men in each family are taken, of the specified age for service (vers. 34–49). The three families are not arranged according to the relative ages of their founders, but according to the importance or sacredness of their service. The Kohathites take the lead, because the holiest parts of the tabernacle were to be carried and kept by this family, which included the priests, Aaron and his sons. The service to be performed by each of the three Levitical families is introduced in every case by a command from God to take the sum of the men from 30 years old to 50 (see vers. 1–3, 21–23, 29 and 30).

Vers. 2–20. *Service of the Kohathites, and the number qualified for service.*—Vers. 2, 3. “*Take the sum of the sons of Kohath from among the sons of Levi:*” i.e. by raising them out of the sum total

of the Levites, by numbering them first and specially, viz. the men from 30 to 50 years of age, “*every one who comes to the service,*” i.e. who has to enter upon service “*to do work at the tabernacle.*” **אֹתֶשׁ** (Angl. ‘host’) signifies military service, and is used here with special reference to the service of the Levites as the *militia sacra* of Jehovah.—Ver. 4. The service of the Kohathites at the tabernacle is (relates to) “*the most holy*” (see at Ex. xxx. 10). This term includes, as is afterwards explained, the most holy things in the tabernacle, viz. the ark of the covenant, the table of shew-bread, the candlestick, the altar of incense and altar of burnt-offering, together with all the other things belonging to these. When the camp was broken up, the priests were to roll them up in wrappers, and hand them over in this state to the Kohathites, for them to carry (vers. 5-15). First of all (vers. 5, 6), Aaron and his sons were to take down the curtain between the holy place and the most holy (see Ex. xxvi. 31), and to cover the ark of testimony with it (Ex. xxv. 10). Over this they were to place a wrapper of sea-cow skin (*tachash*, see Ex. xxv. 5), and over this again another covering of cloth made entirely of hyacinth-coloured purple (as in Ex. xxviii. 31). The sea-cow skin was to protect the inner curtain, which was covered over the ark, from storm and rain; the hyacinth purple, to distinguish the ark of the covenant as the throne of the glory of Jehovah. Lastly, they were to place the staves into the rings again, that is to say, the bearing poles, which were always left in their places on the ark (Ex. xxv. 15), but had necessarily to be taken out while it was being covered and wrapped up.—Vers. 7, 8. Over the table of shew-bread (Ex. xxv. 23) they were to spread a hyacinth cloth, to place the plates, bowls, wine-pitchers, and drink-offering bowls (Ex. xxv. 29) upon the top of this, and to lay shew-bread thereon; and then to spread a crimson cloth over these vessels and the shew-bread, and cover this with a sea-cow skin, and lastly to put the bearing poles in their places.—Vers. 9, 10. The candlestick, with its lamps, snuffers, extinguishers (Ex. xxv. 31-37), and all its oil-vessels (oil-cans), “*wherewith they serve it,*” i.e. prepare it for the holy service, were to be covered with a hyacinth cloth, and then with a wrapper of sea-cow skin, and laid upon the carriage. **בְּנֵי** (vers. 10 and 12), bearing frame, in chap. xiii. 23 bearing poles.—Vers. 11, 12. So again they were to wrap up the altar of incense (Ex. xxx. 1), to adjust its bearing poles; and having wrapped it up in such coverings, along with the vessels belonging to it, to lay it upon the frame.—Vers. 13, 14. The altar of burnt-offering was first of

all to be cleansed from the ashes ; a crimson cloth was then to be covered over it, and the whole of the furniture belonging to it to be placed upon the top ; and lastly, the whole was to be covered with a sea-cow skin. The only thing not mentioned is the copper laver (Ex. xxx. 18), probably because it was carried without any cover at all. The statement in the Septuagint and the Samaritan text, which follows ver. 14, respecting its covering and conveyance upon a frame, is no doubt a spurious interpolation.—Ver. 15. After the priests had completed the wrapping up of all these things, the Kohathites were to come up to carry them ; but they were not to touch “the holy” (the holy things), lest they should die (see chap. i. 53, xviii. 3, and comp. 2 Sam. vi. 6, 7).—Ver. 16. The oversight of the oil for the candlestick (Ex. xxvii. 20), the incense (Ex. xxx. 34), the continual meat-offering (Ex. xxix. 40), and the anointing oil (Ex. xxx. 23), belonged to Eleazar as the head of all the Levites (chap. iii. 32). He had also the oversight of the dwelling and all the holy things and furniture belonging to it ; and, as a comparison of vers. 28 and 33 clearly shows, of the services of the Kohathites also.—Vers. 17–20. In order to prevent as far as possible any calamity from befalling the Levites while carrying the most holy things, the priests are again urged by the command of God to do what has already been described in detail in vers. 5–15, lest through any carelessness on their part they should cut off the tribe of the families of the Kohathites, *i.e.* should cause their destruction ; viz. if they should approach the holy things before they had been wrapped up by Aaron and his sons in the manner prescribed and handed over to them to carry. If the Kohathites should come for only a single moment to look at the holy things, they would die. אַל־תִּכְרֹת, “cut ye not off,” *i.e.* “take care that the Kohathites are not cut off through your mistake and negligence” (*Ros.*). “*The tribe of the families of the Kohathites :*” *shebet*, the tribe, is not used here, as it frequently is, in its derivative sense of tribe (*tribus*), but in the original literal sense of *stirps*.—Ver. 19. “*This do to them :*” *sc.* what is prescribed in vers. 5–15 with reference to their service.—Ver. 20. בְּבָלֵעַ, “like a swallow, a gulp,” is probably a proverbial expression, according to the analogy of Job vii. 19, for “a single instant,” of which the Arabic also furnishes examples (see *A. Schultens* on Job vii. 19). The *Sept.* rendering, ἐξάπιντα, conveys the actual sense. A historical illustration of ver. 20 is furnished by 1 Sam. vi. 19.¹

¹ According to *Knobel*, vers. 17–20 have been interpolated by the Jehovahist into the Elohistic text. But the reasons for this assumption are weak through-

Vers. 21-28. *The service of the Gershonites* is introduced in vers. 21-23 in the same manner as that of the Kohathites in vers. 1-3; and in vers. 24-26 it is described in accordance with the brief notice and explanation already given in chap. iii. 24-26.—Ver. 27. Their service was to be performed “according to the mouth (*i.e.* according to the appointment) of Aaron and his sons, with regard to all their carrying (all that they were to carry), and all their doing.”—“And ye (the priests) shall appoint to them for attendance (in charge) all their carrying,” *i.e.* all the things they were to carry. בְּמִשְׁמֶרֶת בְּפָקַד, to give into keeping. The combination of פָּקַד with בְּ and the accusative of the object is analogous to בְּנִתְּנָהּ, to give into a person’s hand, in Gen. xxvii. 17; and there is no satisfactory reason for any such emendations of the text as Knobel proposes.—Ver. 28. “*Their charge (mishmereth) is in the hand of Ithamar,*” *i.e.* is to be carried out under his superintendence (cf. Ex. xxxviii. 21).

Vers. 29-33. *Service of the Merarites*.—Vers. 29 and 30, like vers. 22 and 23. רָאֵשׁ וְנִצְנָהּ רָאֵשׁ, to muster, *i.e.* to number, equivalent to שָׁמַר, to take the number.—Vers. 31 and 32, like chap. iii. 36 and 37. “*The charge of their burden*” (their carrying), *i.e.* the things which it was their duty to carry.—Ver. 32. מִלְבָדֵבְּלִים: with regard to all their instruments, *i.e.* all the things used for setting up, fastening, or undoing the beams, bolts, etc.; see chap. iii. 36, and Ex. xxvii. 19.

Vers. 34-49. Completion of the prescribed mustering, and statement of the number of men qualified for service in the three Levitical families: viz. 2750 Kohathites, 2630 Gershonites, and 3200 Merarites—in all, 8580 Levites fit for service: a number which bears a just proportion to the total number of male Levites of a month old and upwards, viz. 22,000 (see above, p. 9).—Ver. 49. “*According to the commandment of Jehovah, they appointed them through the hand of Moses* (*i.e.* under his direction), each one

out. Neither the peculiar use of the word *shebet*, to which there is no corresponding parallel in the whole of the Old Testament, nor the construction of נִנְשְׁתָּה with אַתְּ, which is only met with in 1 Sam. ix. 18 and xxx. 21, nor the *Hiphil* הִכְרִית, can be regarded as criteria of a Jehovahistic usage. And the assertion, that the Elohist lays the emphasis upon approaching and touching the holy things (ver. 15, chap. viii. 19, xviii. 3, 22), and not upon seeing or looking at them, rests upon an antithesis which is arbitrarily forced upon the text, since not only seeing (ver. 20), but touching also (ver. 19), is described as causing death; so that seeing and touching form no antithesis at all.

to his service, and his burden, and his mustered things (וְמִנְצָבֶה), i.e. the things assigned to him at the time of the mustering as his special charge (see Ex. xxxviii. 21).

SPIRITUAL ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGREGATION OF ISRAEL.—
CHAP. V. AND VI.

From the outward organization of the tribes of Israel as the army of Jehovah, the law proceeds to their internal moral and spiritual order, for the purpose of giving an inward support, both moral and religious, to their outward or social and political unity. This is the object of the directions concerning the removal of unclean persons from the camp (chap. v. 1–4), the restitution of anything unjustly appropriated (vers. 5–10), the course to be pursued with a wife suspected of adultery (vers. 11–31), and also of the laws relating to the Nazarite (chap. vi. 1–21), and to the priestly blessing (vers. 22–27).

Chap. v. 1–4. REMOVAL OF UNCLEAN PERSONS OUT OF THE CAMP.—As Jehovah, the Holy One, dwelt in the midst of the camp of His people, those who were affected with the uncleanness of leprosy (Lev. xiii.), of a diseased flux, or of menstruation (Lev. xv. 2 sqq., 19 sqq.), and those who had become unclean through touching a corpse (chap. xix. 11 sqq., cf. Lev. xxii. 1, xxii. 4), whether male or female, were to be removed out of the camp, that they might not defile it by their uncleanness. The command of God, to remove these persons out of the camp, was carried out at once by the nation; and even in Canaan it was so far observed, that lepers at any rate were placed in special pest-houses outside the cities (see at Lev. xiii. 45, 46).

Vers. 5–10. RESTITUTION IN CASE OF A TRESPASS.—No crime against the property of a neighbour was to remain without expiation in the congregation of Israel, which was encamped or dwelt around the sanctuary of Jehovah; and the wrong committed was not to remain without restitution, because such crimes involved unfaithfulness (*בַּגְנָעֵל*, see Lev. v. 15) towards Jehovah. “*If a man or a woman do one of the sins of men, to commit unfaithfulness against Jehovah, and the same soul has incurred guilt, they shall confess their sin which they have done, and (the doer) shall recom-*

pense his debt according to its sum" (**בָּרְאַת**, as in Lev. v. 24), etc. **הַעֲמֹדָת**, one of the sins occurring among men, not "a sin against a man" (*Luther, Ros.*, etc). The meaning is a sin, with which a **לִיעֵל** was committed against Jehovah, *i.e.* one of the acts described in Lev. v. 21, 22, by which injury was done to the property of a neighbour, whereby a man brought a debt upon himself, for the wiping out of which a material restitution of the other's property was prescribed, together with the addition of a fifth of its value, and also the presentation of a sin-offering (Lev. v. 23-26). To guard against that disturbance of fellowship and peace in the congregation, which would arise from such trespasses as these, the law already given in Lev. v. 20 is here renewed and supplemented by the additional stipulation, that if the man who had been unjustly deprived of some of his property had no *Goël*, to whom restitution could be made for the debt, the compensation should be paid to Jehovah for the priests. The *Goël* was the nearest relative, upon whom the obligation rested to redeem a person who had fallen into slavery through poverty (Lev. xxv. 25). The allusion to the *Goël* in this connection presupposes that the injured person was no longer alive. To this there are appended, in vers. 9 and 10, the directions which are substantially connected with this, viz. that every heave-offering (*terumah*, see at Lev. ii. 9) in the holy gifts of the children of Israel, which they presented to the priest, was to belong to him (the priest), and also all the holy gifts which were brought by different individuals. The reference is not to literal sacrifices, *i.e.* gifts intended for the altar, but to dedicatory offerings, first-fruits, and such like. **שֶׁאָחָת קָרְבָּנָה**, "*with regard to every man's, his holy gifts . . . to him (the priest) shall they be; what any man gives to the priest shall belong to him.*" The second clause serves to explain and confirm the first. **תְּאַזֵּן**: *as far, with regard to, quoad* (see *Ewald*, § 277, d; *Ges.* § 117, 2, note).

Vers. 11-31. SENTENCE OF GOD UPON WIVES SUSPECTED OF ADULTERY.—As any suspicion cherished by a man against his wife, that she either is or has been guilty of adultery, whether well-founded or not, is sufficient to shake the marriage connection to its very roots, and to undermine, along with marriage, the foundation of the civil commonwealth, it was of the greatest importance to guard against this moral evil, which was so utterly irreconcilable with the holiness of the people of God, by appointing a process in harmony with the spirit of the theocratical law, and adapted

to bring to light the guilt or innocence of any wife who had fallen into such suspicion, and at the same time to warn fickle wives against unfaithfulness. This serves to explain not only the introduction of the law respecting the *jealousy-offering* in this place, but also the general importance of the subject, and the reason for its being so elaborately described.

Vers. 12-15. If a man's wife went aside, and was guilty of unfaithfulness towards him (ver. 13 is an explanatory clause), through a (another) man having lain with her with *emissio seminis*, and it was hidden from the eyes of her husband, on account of her having defiled herself secretly, and there being no witness against her, and her not having been taken (in the act); but if, for all that, a spirit of jealousy came upon him, and he was jealous of his wife, and she was defiled, . . . or she was not defiled: the man was to take his wife to the priest, and bring as her sacrificial gift, on her account, the tenth of an ephah of barley meal, without putting oil or incense, “*for it is a meat-offering of jealousy, a meat-offering of memory, to bring iniquity to remembrance.*” As the woman's crime, of which her husband accused her, was naturally denied by herself, and was neither to be supported by witnesses nor proved by her being taken in the very act, the only way left to determine whether there was any foundation or not for the spirit of jealousy excited in her husband, and to prevent an unrighteous severance of the divinely appointed marriage, was to let the thing be decided by the verdict of God Himself. To this end the man was to bring his wife to the priest with a sacrificial gift, which is expressly called קָרְבָּנָה, *her offering, brought עלְּהָ* “on *her account*,” that is to say, with a meat-offering, the symbol of the fruit of her walk and conduct before God. Being the sacrificial gift of a wife who had gone aside and was suspected of adultery, this meat-offering could not possess the character of the ordinary meat-offerings, which shadowed forth the fruit of the sanctification of life in good works (vol. ii. p. 207); could not consist, that is to say, of fine wheaten flour, but only of barley meal. Barley was worth only half as much as wheat (2 Kings vii. 1, 16, 18), so that only the poorer classes, or the people generally in times of great distress, used barley meal as their daily food (Judg. vii. 13; 2 Kings iv. 42; Ezek. iv. 12; John vi. 9, 13), whilst those who were better off used it for fodder (1 Kings v. 8). Barley meal was prescribed for this sacrifice, neither as a sign that the adulteress had conducted herself like an irrational animal (*Philo, Jonathan, Talm., the Rabb., etc.*), nor “because the persons presenting the

offering were invoking the punishment of a crime, and not the favour of God" (*Cler., Ros.*): for the guilt of the woman was not yet established; nor even, taking a milder view of the matter, to indicate that the offerer might be innocent, and in that case no offering at all was required (*Knobel*), but to represent the questionable repute in which the woman stood, or the ambiguous, suspicious character of her conduct. Because such conduct as hers did not proceed from the Spirit of God, and was not carried out in prayer: oil and incense, the symbols of the Spirit of God and prayer (see vol. ii. pp. 174 and 209), were not to be added to her offering. It was an offering of jealousy (*חִזְבּוֹן*, an intensive plural), and the object was to bring the ground of that jealousy to light; and in this respect it is called the "*meat-offering of remembrance*," sc. of the woman, before Jehovah (cf. chap. x. 10, xxxi. 54; Ex. xxviii. 12, 29, xxx. 16; Lev. xxiii. 24), namely, "*the remembrance of iniquity*," bringing her crime to remembrance before the Lord, that it might be judged by Him.

Vers. 16-22. The priest was to bring her near to the altar at which he stood, and place her before Jehovah, who had declared Himself to be present at the altar, and then to take holy water, probably water out of the basin before the sanctuary, which served for holy purposes (Ex. xxx. 18), in an earthen vessel, and put dust in it from the floor of the dwelling. He was then to loosen the hair of the woman who was standing before Jehovah, and place the jealousy-offering in her hands, and holding the water in his own hand, to pronounce a solemn oath of purification before her, which she had to appropriate to herself by a confirmatory Amen, Amen. The water, which the priest had prepared for the woman to drink, was taken from the sanctuary, and the dust to be put into it from the floor of the dwelling, to impregnate this drink with the power of the Holy Spirit that dwelt in the sanctuary. The dust was strewed upon the water, not to indicate that man was formed from dust and must return to dust again, but as an allusion to the fact, that dust was eaten by the serpent (Gen. iii. 14) as the curse of sin, and therefore as the symbol of a state deserving a curse, a state of the deepest humiliation and disgrace (Micah vii. 17; Isa. xl ix. 23; Ps. lxxii. 9). On the very same ground, an earthen vessel was chosen; that is to say, one quite worthless in comparison with the copper one. The loosening of the hair of the head (see Lev. xiii. 45), in other cases a sign of mourning, is to be regarded here as a removal or loosening of the female head-dress, and a symbol of the

loss of the proper ornament of female morality and conjugal fidelity. During the administration of the oath, the offering was placed in her hands, that she might bring the fruit of her own conduct before God, and give it up to His holy judgment. The priest, as the representative of God, held the vessel in his hand, with the water in it, which was called the “*water of bitterness, the curse-bringing*,” inasmuch as, if the crime imputed to her was well-founded, it would bring upon the woman bitter suffering as the curse of God.—Ver. 19. The oath which the priest required her to take is called, in ver. 21, **הַלְלוּ שְׁבֻעָת**, “oath of cursing” (see Gen. xxvi. 28); but it first of all presupposes the possibility of the woman being innocent, and contains the assurance, that in that case the curse-water would do her no harm. “*If no (other) man has lain with thee, and thou hast not gone aside to union* (**טִמְנָה**, accus. of more precise definition, as in Lev. xv. 2, 18), *under thy husband*,” i.e. as a wife subject to thy husband (Ezek. xxiii. 5; Hos. iv. 12), “*then remain free from the water of bitterness, this curse-bringing*,” i.e. from the effects of this curse-water. The imperative is a sign of certain assurance (see Gen. xii. 2, xx. 7; cf. *Ges.* § 130, 1). “*But if thou hast gone aside under thy husband, if thou hast defiled thyself, and a man has given thee his seed beside thy husband*,” . . . (the priest shall proceed to say; this is the meaning of the repetition of **לֹא־שָׁה** . . . **לֹא־שָׁבֵע**, ver. 21), “*Jehovah shall make thee a curse and an oath among thy people, by making thy hip to fall and thy belly to swell; and this curse-bringing water shall come into thy bowels, to make the belly to vanish and the hip to fall*.” To this oath that was spoken before her the woman was to reply, “*true, true*,” or “*truly, truly*,” and thus confirm it as taken by herself (cf. Deut. xxvii. 15 sqq.; Neh. v. 13). It cannot be determined with any certainty what was the nature of the disease threatened in this curse. *Michaelis* supposes it to be dropsy of the ovary (*hydrops ovarii*), in which a tumour is formed in the place of the *ovarium*, which may even swell so as to contain 100 lbs. of fluid, and with which the patient becomes dreadfully emaciated. *Josephus* says it is ordinary dropsy (*hydrops ascites*: *Ant.* iii. 11, 6). At any rate, the idea of the curse is this: *Δι' ὃν γὰρ ή ἀμαρτία, διὰ τούτων ή τιμωρία* (“the punishment shall come from the same source as the sin,” *Theodoret*). The punishment was to answer exactly to the crime, and to fall upon those bodily organs which had been the instruments of the woman’s sin, viz. the organs of child-bearing.

Vers. 23–28. After the woman’s *Amen*, the priest was to write

“these curses,” those contained in the oath, in a book-roll, and wash them in the bitter water, *i.e.* wash the writing in the vessel with water, so that the words of the curse should pass into the water, and be imparted to it; a symbolical act, to set forth the truth, that God imparted to the water the power to act injuriously upon a guilty body, though it would do no harm to an innocent one. The remark in ver. 24, that the priest was to give her this water to drink, is anticipatory; for according to ver. 26 this did not take place till after the presentation of the sacrifice and the burning of the memorial of it upon the altar. The woman’s offering, however, was not presented to God till after the oath of purification, because it was by the oath that she first of all purified herself from the suspicion of adultery, so that the fruit of her conduct could be given up to the fire of the holiness of God. As a known adulteress, she could not have offered a meat-offering at all. But as the suspicion which rested upon her was not entirely removed by her oath, since she might have taken a false oath, the priest was to give her the curse-water to drink after the offering, that her guilt or innocence might be brought to light in the effects produced by the drink. This is given in ver. 27 as the design of the course prescribed: “*When he hath made her to drink the water, then it shall come to pass, that if she be defiled, and have done trespass against her husband, the water that causeth the curse shall come (enter) into her as bitterness* (*i.e.* producing bitter sufferings), *namely, her belly shall swell and her hip vanish: and so the woman shall become a curse in the midst of her people.*”—Ver. 28. “*But if she have not defiled herself, and is clean* (from the crime of which she was suspected), *she will remain free* (from the threatened punishment of God), *and will conceive seed,* *i.e.* be blessed with the capacity and power to conceive and bring forth children.

Vers. 29-31 bring the law of jealousy to a formal close, with the additional remark, that the man who adopted this course with a wife suspected of adultery was free from sin, but the woman would bear her guilt (see Lev. v. 1), *i.e.* in case she were guilty, would bear the punishment threatened by God. Nothing is said about what was to be done in case the woman refused to take the oath prescribed, because that would amount to a confession of her guilt, when she would have to be put to death as an adulteress, according to the law in Lev. xx. 10; and not she alone, but the adulterer also. In the law just mentioned the man is placed on an equality with the woman with reference to the sin of adultery; and thus the apparent

partiality, that a man could sue his wife for adultery, but not the wife her husband, is removed. But the law before us applied to the woman only, because the man was at liberty to marry more than one wife, or to take concubines to his own wife; so that he only violated the marriage tie, and was guilty of adultery, when he formed an illicit connection with another man's wife. In that case, the man whose marriage had been violated could proceed against his adulterous wife, and in most instances convict the adulterer also, in order that he might receive his punishment too. For a really guilty wife would not have made up her mind so easily to take the required oath of purification, as the curse of God under which she came was no easier to bear than the punishment of death. For this law prescribed no ordeal whose effects were uncertain, like the ordeals of other nations, but a judgment of God, from which the guilty could not escape, because it had been appointed by the living God.

Chap. vi. 1-21. THE NAZARITE.—The legal regulations concerning the vow of the Nazarite are appended quite appropriately to the laws intended to promote the spiritual order of the congregation of Israel. For the Nazarite brought to light the priestly character of the covenant nation in a peculiar form, which had necessarily to be incorporated into the spiritual organization of the community, so that it might become a means of furthering the sanctification of the people in covenant with the Lord.¹

Vers. 1 and 2. The words, “*if a man or woman make a separate vow, a Nazarite vow, to live consecrated to the Lord,*” with which the law is introduced, show not only that the vow of the Nazarite was a matter of free choice, but that it was a mode of practising godliness and piety already customary among the people. *Nazir*, from נזיר to separate, *lit.* the separated, is applied to the man who vowed that he would make a separation to (for) Jehovah, *i.e.* lead a separate life for the Lord and His service. The origin of this custom is involved in obscurity. There is no certain clue to indicate that it was derived from Egypt, for the so-called hair-offering vows are met with among several ancient tribes (see the proofs in *Spencer, de legg. Hebr. rit.* iv. 16, and *Knobel in loc.*), and have no special rela-

¹ The rules of the Talmud are found in the *tract. Nasir* in the *Mishnah*. See also *Lundius, jiid. Heilighümer*, B. iii. p. 53. *Bähr, Symbolik*, ii. pp. 430 sqq.; *Hengstenberg, Egypt and the Books of Moses*, pp. 190 sqq. My *Archæologie*, i. § 67; and *Herzog's Cyclopædia*.

tionship to the Nazarite, whilst vows of abstinence were common to all the religions of antiquity. The Nazarite vow was taken at first for a particular time, at the close of which the separation terminated with release from the vow. This is the only form in which it is taken into consideration, or rules are laid down for it in the law before us. In after times, however, we find life-long Nazarites among the Israelites, *e.g.* Samson, Samuel, and John the Baptist, who were vowed or dedicated to the Lord by their parents even before they were born (*Judg. xiii. 5, 14; 1 Sam. i. 11; Luke i. 15*).¹

Vers. 3-8. The vow consisted of the three following points, vers. 1-4: In the *first* place, he was to abstain from wine and intoxicating drink (*shecar*, see *Lev. x. 9*); and neither to drink vinegar of wine, strong drink, nor any juice of the grape (*lit. dissolving of grapes, i.e. fresh must pressed out*), nor to eat fresh grapes, or dried (raisins). In fact, during the whole period of his vow, he was not to eat of anything prepared from the vine, “*from the kernels even to the husk*,” *i.e.* not the smallest quantity of the fruit of the vine. The design of this prohibition can hardly have been, merely that, by abstaining from intoxicating drink, the Nazarite might preserve perfect clearness and temperance of mind, like the priests when engaged in their duties, and so conduct himself as one sanctified to the Lord (*Bähr*); but it goes much further, and embraces entire abstinence from all the *delicie carnis* by which holiness could be impaired. Vinegar, fresh and dried grapes, and food prepared from grapes and raisins, *e.g.* raisin-cakes, are not intoxicating; but grape-cakes, as being the dainties sought after by epicures and debauchees, are cited in *Hos. iii. 1* as a symbol of the sensual attractions of idolatry, a luxurious kind of food, that was not in harmony with the solemnity of the worship of Jehovah. The Nazarite was to avoid everything that proceeded from the vine, because its fruit was regarded as the sum and substance of all sensual enjoyments.—Ver. 5. *Secondly*, during the whole term of his vow of consecration, no razor was to come upon his head. Till the days were fulfilled which he had consecrated to the Lord, he was to be holy, “*to make great the free growth* (see *Lev. x. 6*) *of the hair of his head*.” The free growth of the hair is called, in

¹ This is also related by *Hegesippus* (in *Euseb. hist. eccl. ii. 23*) of James the Just, the first bishop of Jerusalem. On other cases of this kind in the Talmud, and particularly on the later form of the Nazarite vow,—for example, that of the Apostle Paul (*Acts xviii. 18*),—see *Winer, bibl. R. W.* ii. pp. 138-9, and *Oehler* in *Herzog's Cycl.*

ver. 7, “*the diadem of his God upon his head*,” like the golden diadem upon the turban of the high priest (Ex. xxix. 6), and the anointing oil upon the high priest’s head (Lev. xxi. 12). By this he sanctified his head (ver. 11) to the Lord, so that the consecration of the Nazarite culminated in his uncut hair, and expressed in the most perfect way the meaning of his vow (*Oehler*). Letting the hair grow, therefore, was not a sign of separation, because it was the Israelitish custom to go about with the hair cut; nor a practical profession of a renunciation of the world, and separation from human society (*Hengstenberg*, pp. 190–1); nor a sign of abstinence from every appearance of self-gratification (*Baur* on Amos ii. 11); nor even a kind of humiliation and self-denial (*Lightfoot, Carpzov. appar.* p. 154); still less a “sign of dependence upon *some other present power*” (*M. Baumgarten*), or “the symbol of a state of perfect liberty” (*Vitrunga, obss. ss. 1, c. 6, § 9; cf. vi. 22, 8*). The free growth of the hair, unhindered by the hand of man, was rather “the symbol of strength and abundant vitality” (cf. 2 Sam. xiv. 25, 26). It was not regarded by the Hebrews as a sign of sanctity, as *Bähr* supposes, but simply as an ornament, in which the whole strength and fulness of vitality were exhibited, and which the Nazarite wore in honour of the Lord, as a sign that he “belonged to the Lord, and dedicated himself to His service,” with all his vital powers.¹—Vers. 6–8. Because the Nazarite wore the diadem of his God upon his head in the growth of his hair, and was holy to the Lord during the whole period of his consecration, he was to approach no dead person during that time, not even to defile himself for his parents, or his brothers and sisters, when they died, according to the law laid down for the high priest in Lev. xxi. 11. Consequently, as a matter of course, he was to guard most scrupulously against other defilements, not only like ordinary Israelites, but also like the priests. Samson’s mother, too, was not allowed to eat anything unclean during the period of her pregnancy (Judg. xiii. 4, 7, 14).

Vers. 9–12. But if any one died suddenly in a moment “by him” (רֹאשׁ, in his neighbourhood), and he therefore involuntarily

¹ In support of this explanation, *Oehler* calls to mind those heathen hair-offerings of the Athenian youths, for example (*Plut. Thes.* c. 5), which were founded upon the idea, that the hair in general was a symbol of vital power, and the hair of the beard a sign of virility; and also more especially the example of Samson, whose hair was not only the symbol, but the vehicle, of the power which fitted him to be the deliverer of his people

defiled his consecrated head, he was to shave his head on the day of his purification, *i.e.* on the seventh day (see chap. xix. 11, 14, 16, and 19), not “because such uncleanness was more especially caught and retained by the hair,” as Knobel fancies, but because it was the diadem of his God (ver. 7), the ornament of his condition, which was sanctified to God. On the eighth day, that is to say, on the day after the legal purification, he was to bring to the priest at the tabernacle two turtle-doves or young pigeons, that he might make atonement for him (see at Lev. xv. 14, 15, 29 sqq., xiv. 30, 31, and xii. 8), on account of his having been defiled by a corpse, by preparing the one as a sin-offering, and the other as a burnt-offering; he was also “*to sanctify his head that same day*,” *i.e.* to consecrate it to God afresh, by the unimpeded growth of his hair.—Ver. 12. He was then “*to consecrate to Jehovah the days of his consecration*,” *i.e.* to commence afresh the time of dedication that he had vowed, and “*to bring a yearling sheep as a trespass-offering*;” and the days that were before were “*to fall*,” *i.e.* the days of consecration that had already elapsed were not to be reckoned on account of their having fallen, “*because his consecration had become unclean*.” He was therefore to commence the whole time of his consecration entirely afresh, and to observe it as required by the vow. To this end he was to bring a trespass-offering, as a payment or recompense for being reinstated in the former state of consecration, from which he had fallen through his defilement, but not as compensation “for having prolonged the days of separation through his carelessness with regard to the defilement; that is to say, for having extended the time during which he led a separate, retired, and inactive life, and suspended his duties to his own family and the congregation, thus doing an injury to them, and incurring a debt in relation to them through his neglect” (Knobel). For the time that the Nazarite vow lasted was not a lazy life, involving a withdrawal from the duties of citizenship, by which the congregation might be injured, but was perfectly reconcilable with the performance of all domestic and social duties, the burial of the dead alone excepted; and no harm could result from this, either to his own relations or the community generally, of sufficient importance to require that the omission should be repaired by a trespass-offering, from which neither his relatives nor the congregation derived any actual advantage. Nor was it a species of fine, for having deprived Jehovah of the time dedicated to Him through the breach of the vow, or for withholding the payment of his vow for so much longer a time

(*Oehler* in *Herzog*). For the position of a Nazarite was only assumed for a definite period, according to the vow; and after this had been interrupted, it had to be commenced again from the very beginning: so that the time dedicated to God was not shortened in any way by the interruption of the period of dedication, and nothing whatever was withheld from God of what had been vowed to Him, so as to need the presentation of a trespass-offering as a compensation or fine. And there is no more reason for saying that the payment of the vow was withheld, inasmuch as the vow was fulfilled or paid by the punctual observance of the three things of which it was composed; and the sacrifices to be presented after the time of consecration was over, had not in the least the character of a payment, but simply constituted a solemn conclusion, corresponding to the idea of the consecration itself, and were the means by which the Nazarite came out of his state of consecration, without involving the least allusion to satisfaction, or reparation for any wrong that had been done.

The position of the Nazarite, therefore, as *Philo*, *Maimonides*, and others clearly saw, was a condition of life consecrated to the Lord, resembling the sanctified relation in which the priests stood to Jehovah, and differing from the priesthood solely in the fact that it involved no official service at the sanctuary, and was not based upon a divine calling and institution, but was undertaken spontaneously for a certain time and through a special vow. The object was simply the realization of the idea of a priestly life, with its purity and freedom from all contamination from everything connected with death and corruption, a self-surrender to God stretching beyond the deepest earthly ties, "a spontaneous appropriation of what was imposed upon the priest by virtue of the calling connected with his descent, namely, the obligation to conduct himself as a person betrothed to God, and therefore to avoid everything that would be opposed to such surrender" (*Oehler*). In this respect the Nazarite's sanctification of life was a step towards the realization of the priestly character, which had been set before the whole nation as its goal at the time of its first calling (Ex. xix. 5); and although it was simply the performance of a vow, and therefore a work of perfect spontaneity, it was also a work of the Spirit of God which dwelt in the congregation of Israel, so that Amos could describe the raising up of Nazarites along with prophets as a special manifestation of divine grace. The offerings, with which the vow was brought to a close after the time of consecration had expired, and the Nazarite

was released from his consecration, also corresponded to the character we have described.

Vers. 13-21. The directions as to the release from consecration are called "*the law of the Nazarite*" (ver. 13), because the idea of the Nazarite's vows culminated in the sacrificial festival which terminated the consecration, and it was in this that it attained to its fullest manifestation. "*On the day of the completion of the days of his consecration*," i.e. on the day when the time of consecration expired, the Nazarite was to bring to the tabernacle, or offer as his gifts to the Lord, a sheep of a year old as a burnt-offering, and an ewe of a year old as a sin-offering; the latter as an expiation for the sins committed involuntarily during the period of consecration, the former as an embodiment of that surrender of himself, body and soul, to the Lord, upon which every act of worship should rest. In addition to this he was to bring a ram without blemish as a peace-offering, together with a basket of unleavened cakes and wafers baked, which were required, according to Lev. vii. 12, for every praise-offering, "*and their meat and drink-offerings*," i.e. the gifts of meal, oil, and wine, which belonged, according to chap. xv. 3 sqq., to the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings.—Ver. 16. The sin-offering and burnt-offering were carried out according to the general instructions.—Ver. 17. The completion of the consecration vow was concentrated in the preparation of the ram and the basket of unleavened bread for the peace-offering, along with the appropriate meat-offering and drink-offering.—Ver. 18. The Nazarite had also to shave his consecrated head, and put the hair into the altar-fire under the peace-offering that was burning, and thus hand over and sacrifice to the Lord the hair of his head which had been worn in honour of Him.—Vers. 19, 20. When this had been done, the priest took the boiled shoulder of the ram, with an unleavened cake and wafer out of the basket, and placed these pieces in the hands of the Nazarite, and waved them before Jehovah. They then became the portion of the priest, in addition to the wave-breast and heave-leg which fell to the priest in the case of every peace-offering (Lev. vii. 32-34), to set forth the participation of the Lord in the sacrificial meal (see vol. ii. pp. 329, 330). But the fact that, in addition to these, the boiled shoulder was given up symbolically to the Lord through the process of waving, together with a cake and wafer, was intended to indicate that the table-fellowship with the Lord, shadowed forth in the sacrificial meal of the peace-offering, took place here in a higher degree; inasmuch as the Lord directed a portion of the Nazarite's meal to

be handed over to His representatives and servants for them to eat, that he might thus enjoy the blessedness of having fellowship with his God, in accordance with that condition of priestly sanctity into which the Nazarite had entered through the vow that he had made.

—Ver. 20. “*After that the Nazarite may drink wine*” (again), probably at the sacrificial meal, after the Lord had received His share of the sacrifice, and his release from consecration had thus been completed.—Ver. 21. “*This is the law of the Nazarite, who vowed his sacrificial gifts to the Lord on the ground of his consecration,*” i.e. who offered his sacrifice in accordance with the state of a Nazarite into which he had entered. For the sacrifices mentioned in vers. 14 sqq. were not the object of a special vow, but contained in the vow of the Nazarite, and therefore already vowed (*Knobel*). “*Beside what his hand grasps,*” i.e. what he is otherwise able to perform (Lev. v. 11), “*according to the measure of his vow, which he vowed, so must he do according to the law of his consecration,*” i.e. he had to offer the sacrifices previously mentioned on the ground of his consecration vow. Beyond that he was free to vow anything else according to his ability, to present other sacrificial gifts to the Lord for His sanctuary and His servants, which did not necessarily belong to the vow of the Nazarite, but were frequently added. From this the custom afterwards grew up, that when poor persons took the Nazarite’s vow upon them, those who were better off defrayed the expenses of the sacrifices (Acts xxi. 24; *Josephus, Ant. xix. 6, 1; Mishnah Nasir, ii. 5 sqq.*).

Vers. 22–27. THE PRIESTLY OR AARONIC BLESSING.—The spiritual character of the congregation of Israel culminated in the blessing with which the priests were to bless the people. The directions as to this blessing, therefore, impressed the seal of perfection upon the whole order and organization of the people of God, inasmuch as Israel was first truly formed into a congregation of Jehovah by the fact that God not only bestowed His blessing upon it, but placed the communication of this blessing in the hands of the priests, the chosen and constant mediators of the blessings of His grace, and imposed it upon them as one portion of their official duty. The blessing which the priests were to impart to the people, consisted of a triple blessing of two members each, which stood related to each other thus: The second in each case contained a special application of the first to the people, and the three gradations unfolded the substance of the blessing step by step with ever

increasing emphasis.—The *first* (ver. 24), “*Jehovah bless thee and keep thee,*” conveyed the blessing in the most general form, merely describing it as coming from Jehovah, and setting forth preservation from the evil of the world as His work. “The blessing of God is the goodness of God in action, by which a supply of all good pours down to us from His good favour as from their only fountain; then follows, secondly, the prayer that He would keep the people, which signifies that He alone is the defender of the Church, and that it is He who preserves it with His guardian care” (*Calvin*).

—The *second* (ver. 25), “*Jehovah make His face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee,*” defined the blessing more closely as the manifestation of the favour and grace of God. The face of God is the personality of God as turned towards man. Fire goes out from Jehovah’s face, and consumes the enemy and the rebellious (Lev. x. 2, cf. xvii. 10, xx. 3; Ex. xiv. 24; Ps. xxxiv. 17), and also a sunlight shining with love and full of life and good (Deut. xxx. 30; Ps. xxvii. 1, xlivi. 3, xliv. 4). If “the light of the sun is sweet, and pleasant for the eyes to behold” (*Eccl. xi. 7*), “the light of the divine countenance, the everlasting light (Ps. xxxvi. 10), is the sum of all delight” (*Baumg.*). This light sends rays of mercy into a heart in need of salvation, and makes it the recipient of grace.—The *third* (ver. 26), “*Jehovah lift up His face to thee, and set (or give) thee peace*” (good, salvation), set forth the blessing of God as a manifestation of power, or a work of power upon man, the end of which is peace (*shalom*), the sum of all the good which God sets, prepares, or establishes for His people. לִשְׁאָ פָנֵים אֶל, to lift up the face to any one, is equivalent to looking at him, and does not differ from שִׁים נִשְׁאָ עִינֵּים (Gen. xlivi. 29, xliv. 21). When affirmed of God, it denotes His providential work upon man. When God looks at a man, He saves him out of his distresses (Ps. iv. 7, xxxiii. 18, xxxiv. 16).—In these three blessings most of the fathers and earlier theologians saw an allusion to the mystery of the Trinity, and rested their conclusion, (*a*) upon the triple repetition of the name *Jehovah*; (*b*) upon the *ratio prædicati*, that Jehovah, by whom the blessing is desired and imparted, is the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and (*c*) upon the *distinctorum benedictionis membrorum consideratio*, according to which *bis trina beneficia* are mentioned (cf. *Calovii Bibl. illustr. ad h. l.*). There is truth in this, though the grounds assigned seem faulty. As the threefold repetition of a word or sentence serves to express the thought as strongly as possible (cf. Jer. vii. 4, xxii. 29), the triple blessing expressed in

the most unconditional manner the thought, that God would bestow upon His congregation the whole fulness of the blessing enfolded in His Divine Being which was manifested as Jehovah. But not only does the name Jehovah denote God as the absolute Being, who revealed Himself as Father, Son, and Spirit in the historical development of His purpose of salvation for the redemption of fallen man ; but the substance of this blessing, which He caused to be pronounced upon His congregation, unfolded the grace of God in the threefold way in which it is communicated to us through the Father, Son, and Spirit.¹—Ver. 27. This blessing was not to remain merely a pious wish, however, but to be manifested in the people with all the power of a blessing from God. This assurance closes the divine command : “ *They shall put My name upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them.*”

CLOSING EVENTS AT SINAI.—CHAP. VII.—IX. 14.

Chap. vii. PRESENTATION OF DEDICATORY GIFTS BY THE PRINCES OF THE TRIBES.—Ver. 1. This presentation took place at the time (וְיָמֵי) when Moses, after having completed the erection of the tabernacle, anointed and sanctified the dwelling and the altar, together with their furniture (Lev. viii. 10, 11). Chronologically considered, this ought to have been noticed after Lev. viii. 10. But in order to avoid interrupting the connection of the Sinaitic laws, it is introduced for the first time at this point, and placed at the

¹ See the admirable elaboration of these points in *Luther's* exposition of the blessing. *Luther* refers the first blessing to “ bodily life and good.” The blessing, he says, desired for the people “ that God would give them prosperity and every good, and also guard and preserve them.” This is carried out still further, in a manner corresponding to his exposition of the first article. The second blessing he refers to “ the spiritual nature and the soul,” and observes, “ Just as the sun, when it rises and diffuses its rich glory and soft light over all the world, merely lifts up its face upon all the world ; . . . so when God gives His word, He causes His face to shine clearly and joyously upon all minds, and makes them joyful and light, and as it were new hearts and new men. For it brings forgiveness of sins, and shows God as a gracious and merciful Father, who pities and sympathizes with our grief and sorrow. The third also relates to the spiritual nature and the soul, and is a desire for consolation and final victory over the cross, death, the devil, and all the gates of hell, together with the world and the evil desires of the flesh. The desire of this blessing is, that the Lord God will lift up the light of His word upon us, and so keep it over us, that it may shine in our hearts with strength enough to overcome all the opposition of the devil, death, and sin, and all adversity, terror, or despair.”

head of the events which immediately preceded the departure of the people from Sinai, because these gifts consisted in part of materials that were indispensably necessary for the transport of the tabernacle during the march through the desert. Moreover, there was only an interval of at the most forty days between the anointing of the tabernacle, which commenced after the first day of the first month (cf. Ex. xl. 16 and Lev. viii. 10), and lasted eight days, and the departure from Sinai, on the twentieth day of the second month (chap. x. 11), and from this we have to deduct six days for the Passover, which took place before their departure (chap. ix. 1 sqq.); and it was within this period that the laws and ordinances from Lev. xi. to Num. vi. had to be published, and the dedicatory offerings to be presented. Now, as the presentation itself was distributed, according to vers. 11 sqq., over twelve or thirteen days, we may very well assume that it did not entirely precede the publication of the laws referred to, but was carried on in part contemporaneously with it. The presentation of the dedicatory gifts of one tribe-prince might possibly occupy only a few hours of the day appointed for the purpose; and the rest of the day, therefore, might very conveniently be made use of by Moses for publishing the laws. In this case the short space of a month and a few days would be amply sufficient for everything that took place.

Vers. 2-9. *The presentation of six waggons and twelve oxen* for the carriage of the materials of the tabernacle is mentioned first, and was no doubt the first thing that took place. The princes of Israel, viz. the heads of the tribe-houses (fathers' houses), or princes of the tribes (see chap. i. 4 sqq.), “*those who stood over those that were numbered*,” i.e. who were their leaders or rulers, offered as their sacrificial gift six covered waggons and twelve oxen, one ox for each prince, and a waggon for every two. צְהַלְכָלִים, ἀμάξας λαμπτηνίκας (LXX.), i.e. according to *Euseb. Emis.*, two-wheeled vehicles, though the Greek scholiasts explain λαμπτήνη as signifying ἄμαξα περιφανής, βασιλικὴ and ρέδιον περιφανὲς ὁ ἐστὶν ἄρμα σκεπαστόν (cf. Schleussner, *Lex. in LXX. s. v.*), and *Aquila*, ἄμαξαι σκεπασταῖ, i.e. *plaustra tecta* (*Vulg.* and *Rabb.*). The meaning “litters,” which *Gesenius* and *De Wette* support, can neither be defended etymologically, nor based upon צְבֵים in Isa. lxvi. 20.—Vers. 4-6. At the command of God, Moses received them to apply them to the purposes of the tabernacle, and handed them over to the Levites, “*to every one according to the measure of his service*,” i.e. to the different classes of Levites, according to the requirements of their respective

duties.—Vers. 7-9. He gave two waggons and four oxen to the Gershonites, and four waggons and eight oxen to the Merarites, as the former had less weight to carry, in the coverings and curtains of the dwelling and the hangings of the court, than the latter, who had to take charge of the beams and pillars (chap. iv. 24 sqq., 31 sqq.). “*Under the hand of Ithamar*” (ver. 8); as in chap. iv. 28, 33. The Kohathites received no waggon, because it was their place to attend to “the sanctuary” (the holy), *i.e.* the holy things, which had to be conveyed upon their shoulders, and were provided with poles for the purpose (chap. iv. 4 sqq.).

Vers. 10-88. *Presentation of dedicatory gifts for the altar.*—Ver. 10. Every prince offered “*the dedication of the altar*,” *i.e.* what served for the dedication of the altar, equivalent to his sacrificial gift for the consecration of the altar, “*on the day*,” *i.e.* at the time, “*that they anointed it*.” “*Day*” as in Gen. ii. 4. Moses was directed by God to receive the gifts from the princes on separate days, one after another; so that the presentation extended over twelve days. The reason for this regulation was not to make a greater display, as Knobel supposes, or to avoid cutting short the important ceremony of consecration, but was involved in the very nature of the gifts presented. Each prince, for example, offered, (1) a silver dish (*kearah*, Ex. xxv. 29) of 130 sacred shekels weight, *i.e.* about $4\frac{1}{2}$ lbs.; (2) a silver bowl (*mizrak*, a sacrificial bowl, not a sacrificial can, or wine-can, as in Ex. xxvii. 3) of 70 shekels weight, both filled with fine flour mixed with oil for a meat-offering; (3) a golden spoon (*caph*, as in Ex. xxv. 29) filled with incense for an incense-offering; (4) a bullock, a ram, and a sheep of a year old for a burnt-offering; (5) a shaggy goat for a sin-offering; (6) two oxen, five rams, five he-goats, and five sheep of a year old for a peace-offering. Out of these gifts the fine flour, the incense, and the sacrificial animals were intended for sacrificing upon the altar, and that not as a provision for a lengthened period, but for immediate use in the way prescribed. This could not have been carried out if more than one prince had presented his gifts, and brought them to be sacrificed on any one day. For the limited space in the court of the tabernacle would not have allowed of 252 animals being received, slaughtered, and prepared for sacrificing all at once, or on the same day; and it would have been also impossible to burn 36 whole animals (oxen, rams, and sheep), and the fat portions of 216 animals, upon the altar.—Vers. 12-83. All the princes brought the same gifts. The order in which the twelve princes, whose names

have already been given at chap. i. 5-15, made their presentation, corresponded to the order of the tribes in the camp (chap. ii.), the tribe-prince of Judah taking the lead, and the prince of Naphtali coming last. In the statements as to the weight of the silver *kearoth* and the golden *cappoth*, the word *shekel* is invariably omitted, as in Gen. xx. 16, etc.—In vers. 84-86, the dedication gifts are summed up, and the total weight given, viz. twelve silver dishes and twelve silver bowls, weighing together 2400 shekels, and twelve golden spoons, weighing 120 shekels in all. On the sacred shekel, see at Ex. xxx. 13; and on the probable value of the shekel of gold, at Ex. xxxviii. 24, 25. The sacrificial animals are added together in the same way in vers. 87, 88.

Ver. 89. Whilst the tribe-princes had thus given to the altar the consecration of a sanctuary of their God, through their sacrificial gifts, Jehovah acknowledged it as His sanctuary, by causing Moses, when he went into the tabernacle to speak to Him, and to present his own entreaties and those of the people, to hear the voice of Him that spake to him from between the two cherubim upon the ark of the covenant. The suffix in יְמִינָם points back to the name *Jehovah*, which, though not expressly mentioned before, is contained *implicite* in *ohel moëd*, “*the tent of meeting*.” For the holy tent became an *ohel moëd* first of all, from the fact that it was there that Jehovah appeared to Moses, or met with him (רָאָה, Ex. xxv. 22). בְּמִזְבֵּחַ, part. *Hithpael*, to hold conversation. On the fact itself, see the explanation in Ex. xxv. 20, 22. “This voice from the inmost sanctuary to Moses, the representative of Israel, was Jehovah’s reply to the joyfulness and readiness with which the princes of Israel responded to Him, and made the tent, so far as they were concerned, a place of holy meeting” (*Baumg.*). This was the reason for connecting the remark in ver. 89 with the account of the dedicatory gifts.

Chap. viii. CONSECRATION OF THE LEVITES.—The command of God to consecrate the Levites for their service, is introduced in vers. 1-4 by directions issued to Aaron with regard to the *lighting of the candlestick* in the dwelling of the tabernacle. Aaron was to place the seven lamps upon the candlestick in such a manner that they would shine אֶל-מִזְבֵּחַ. These directions are not a mere repetition, but also a more precise définition, of the general instructions given in Ex. xxv. 37, when the candlestick was made, to place the seven lamps upon the candlestick in such a manner that each should give light over against its front, *i.e.* should throw its

light upon the side opposite to the front of the candlestick (see vol. ii. p. 173). In itself, therefore, there is nothing at all striking in the renewal and explanation of those directions, which committed the task of lighting the lamps to Aaron; for this had not been done before, as Ex. xxvii. 21 merely assigns the daily preparation of the candlestick to Aaron and his sons; and their being placed in the connection in which we find them may be explained from the signification of the seven lamps in relation to the dwelling of God, viz. as indicating that Israel was thereby to be represented perpetually before the Lord as a people causing its light to shine in the darkness of this world (vol. ii. p. 174). And when Aaron is commanded to attend to the lighting of the candlestick, so that it may light up the dwelling, in these special instructions the entire fulfilment of his service in the dwelling is enforced upon him as a duty. In this respect the instructions themselves, coupled with the statement of the fact that Aaron had fulfilled them, stand quite appropriately between the account of what the tribe-princes had done for the consecration of the altar service as representatives of the congregation, and the account of the solemn inauguration of the Levites in their service in the sanctuary. The repetition on this occasion (ver. 4) of an allusion to the artistic character of the candlestick, which had been made according to the pattern seen by Moses in the mount (Ex. xxv. 31 sqq.), is quite in keeping with the antiquated style of narrative adopted in these books.

Vers. 5-22. *Consecration of the Levites* for their service in the sanctuary.—The choice of the Levites for service in the sanctuary, in the place of the first-born of the people generally, has been already noticed in chap. iii. 5 sqq., and the duties binding upon them in chap. iv. 4 sqq. But before entering upon their duties they were to be consecrated to the work, and then formally handed over to the priests. This consecration is commanded in vers. 7 sqq., and is not called שָׁקֵךְ, like the consecration of the priests (Ex. xxix. 1; Lev. viii. 11), but טִבָּה, *to cleanse*. It consisted in sprinkling them with sin-water, shaving off the whole of the hair from their bodies, and washing their clothes, accompanied by a sacrificial ceremony, by which they were presented symbolically to the Lord as a sacrifice for His service. The first part of this ceremony had reference to outward purification, and represented cleansing from the defilement of sin; hence the performance of it is called נִטְחָה (to cleanse from sin) in ver. 21. “*Sprinkle sin-water upon them.*” The words are addressed to Moses,

who had to officiate at the inauguration of the Levites, as he had already done at that of the priests. “*Water of sin*” is water having reference to sin, designed to remove it, just as the sacrifice offered for the expiation of sin is called חטאת (sin) in Lev. iv. 14, etc.; whilst the “water of uncleanness” in chap. xix. 9, 13, signifies water by which uncleanness was removed or wiped away. The nature of this purifying water is not explained, and cannot be determined with any certainty. We find directions for preparing sprinkling water in a peculiar manner, for the purpose of cleansing persons who were cured of leprosy, in Lev. xiv. 5 sqq., 50 sqq.; and also for cleansing both persons and houses that had been defiled by a corpse, in chap. xix. 9 sqq. Neither of these, however, was applicable to the cleansing of the Levites, as they were both of them composed of significant ingredients, which stood in the closest relation to the special cleansing to be effected by them, and had evidently no adaptation to the purification of the Levites. At the same time, the expression “sin-water” precludes our understanding it to mean simply clean water. So that nothing remains but to regard it as referring to the water in the laver of the sanctuary, which was provided for the purpose of cleansing the priests for the performance of their duties (Ex. xxx. 18 sqq.), and might therefore be regarded by virtue of this as cleansing from sin, and be called “sin-water” in consequence. “*And they shall cause the razor to pass over their whole body,*” i.e. shave off all the hair upon their body, “*and wash their clothes, and so cleanse themselves.*” העביר תער is to be distinguished from מגל. The latter signifies to make bald or shave the hair entirely off, which was required of the leper when he was cleansed (Lev. xiv. 8, 9); the former signifies merely cutting the hair, which was part of the regular mode of adorning the body. The Levites also were not required to bathe their bodies, as lepers were (Lev. xiv. 8, 9), and also the priests at their consecration (Lev. viii. 6), because they were not affected with any special uncleanness, and their duties did not require them to touch the most holy instruments of worship. The washing of the clothes, on the other hand, was a thing generally required as a preparation for acts of worship (Gen. xxxv. 2; Ex. xix. 10), and was omitted in the case of the consecration of the priests, simply because they received a holy official dress. הטהרה for גְּטָהָה, as in 2 Chron. xxx. 18. —Ver. 8. After this purification the Levites were to bring two young bullocks, one with the corresponding meat-offering for a burnt-sacrifice, the other for a sin-offering.—Ver. 9. Moses was

then to cause them to draw near before the tabernacle, *i.e.* to enter the court, and to gather together the whole congregation of Israel, viz. in the persons of their heads and representatives.—Ver. 10. After this the Levites were to come before Jehovah, *i.e.* in front of the altar; and the children of Israel, *i.e.* the tribe-princes in the name of the Israelites, were to lay their hands upon them, not merely “as a sign that they released them from the possession of the nation, and assigned them and handed them over to Jehovah” (*Knobel*), but in order that by this symbolical act they might transfer to the Levites the obligation resting upon the whole nation to serve the Lord in the persons of its first-born sons, and might present them to the Lord as representatives of the first-born of Israel, to serve Him as living sacrifices.—Ver. 11. This transfer was to be completed by Aaron’s waving the Levites as a wave-offering before Jehovah on behalf of the children of Israel, *i.e.* by his offering them symbolically to the Lord as a sacrifice presented on the part of the Israelites. The ceremony of waving consisted no doubt in his conducting the Levites solemnly up to the altar, and then back again. On the signification of the verb, see at Lev. vii. 30. The design of the waving is given in ver. 11, viz. “*that they might be to perform the service of Jehovah*” (vers. 24–26 compared with chap. iv. 4–33).—Ver. 12. The Levites were then to close this transfer of themselves to the Lord with a sin-offering and burnt-offering, in which they laid their hands upon the sacrificial animals. By this imposition of hands they made the sacrificial animals their representatives, in which they presented their own bodies to the Lord as a living sacrifice well-pleasing to Him (see vol. ii. pp. 279, 280). The signification of the dedication of the Levites, as here enjoined, is still further explained in vers. 13–19. The meaning of vers. 13 sqq. is this: According to the command already given (in vers. 6–12), thou shalt place the Levites before Aaron and his sons, and wave them as a wave-offering before the Lord, and so separate them from the midst of the children of Israel, that they may be Mine. They shall then come to serve the tabernacle. So shalt thou cleanse them and wave them. The same reason is assigned for this in vers. 16, 17, as in chap. iii. 11–13 (בְּכָנֹר בְּלִבְכָנֹר for בְּכָנֹר בְּלִי, cf. chap. iii. 13); and in vers. 18 and 19, what was commanded in chap. iii. 6–9 is described as having been carried out. On ver. 19b see chap. i. 53. —Vers. 20–22 contain an account of the execution of the divine command.

Vers. 23–26. *The Levitical period of service* is fixed here at

twenty-five years of age and upwards to the fiftieth year. “*This is what concerns the Levites,*” i.e. what follows applies to the Levites. “*From the age of twenty-five years shall he* (the Levite) *come to do service at the work of the tabernacle; and at fifty years of age shall he return from the service of the work, and not work any further, but only serve his brethren at the tabernacle in keeping charge,*” i.e. help them to look after the furniture of the tabernacle. “Charge” (*mishmereth*), as distinguished from “work,” signified the oversight of all the furniture of the tabernacle (see chap. iii. 8); “work” (service) applied to laborious service, e.g. the taking down and setting up of the tabernacle and cleaning it, carrying wood and water for the sacrificial worship, slaying the animals for the daily and festal sacrifices of the congregation, etc.—Ver. 26b. “*So shalt thou do to the Levites* (i.e. proceed with them) *in their services.*” מִשְׁמָרָה from מִשְׁמַר, attendance upon an official post. Both the heading and final clause, by which this law relating to the Levites’ period of service is bounded, and its position immediately after the induction of the Levites into their office, show unmistakeably that this law was binding for all time, and was intended to apply to the standing service of the Levites at the sanctuary; and consequently that it was not at variance with the instructions in chap. iv., to muster the Levites between thirty and fifty years of age, and organize them for the transport of the tabernacle on the journey through the wilderness (chap. iv. 3-49). The transport of the tabernacle required the strength of a full-grown man, and therefore the more advanced age of thirty years; whereas the duties connected with the tabernacle when standing were of a lighter description, and could easily be performed from the twenty-fifth year (see *Hengstenberg’s Dissertations*, vol. ii. pp. 321 sqq.). At a later period, when the sanctuary was permanently established on Mount Zion, David employed the Levites from their twentieth year (1 Chron. xxiii. 24, 25), and expressly stated that he did so because the Levites had no longer to carry the dwelling and its furniture; and this regulation continued in force from that time forward (cf. 2 Chron. xxxi. 17; Ezra iii. 8). But if the supposed discrepancy between the verses before us and chap. iv. 3, 47, is removed by this distinction, which is gathered in the most simple manner from the context, there is no ground whatever for critics to deny that the regulation before us could have proceeded from the pen of the Elohist.

FOR A SUPPLEMENTARY PASSOVER.—Vers. 1-5. On the first institution of the Passover, before the exodus from Egypt, God had appointed the observance of this feast as an everlasting statute for all future generations (Ex. xii. 14, 24, 25). In the first month of the second year after the exodus, that is to say, immediately after the erection of the tabernacle (Ex. xl. 2, 17), this command was renewed, and the people were commanded “to keep the Passover in its appointed season, according to all its statutes and rights;” not to postpone it, that is, according to an interpretation that might possibly have been put upon Ex. xii. 24, 25, until they came to Canaan, but to keep it there at Sinai. And Israel kept it in the wilderness of Sinai, in exact accordance with the commands which God had given before (Ex. xii.). There is no express command, it is true, that the blood of the paschal lambs, instead of being smeared upon the lintel and posts of the house-doors (or the entrances to the tents), was to be sprinkled upon the altar of burnt-offering; nor is it recorded that this was actually done; but it followed of itself from the altered circumstances, inasmuch as there was no destroying angel to pass through the camp at Sinai and smite the enemies of Israel, whilst there was an altar in existence now upon which all the sacrificial blood was to be poured out, and therefore the blood of the paschal sacrifice also.¹

¹ If we take into consideration still further, the fact that the law had already been issued that the blood of all the animals slain for food, whether inside or outside the camp, was to be sprinkled upon the altar (Lev. xvii. 3-6), there can be no doubt that the blood of the paschal lambs would also have to be sprinkled upon the altar, notwithstanding the difficulties referred to by *Kurtz*, arising from the small number of priests to perform the task, viz. Aaron, Eleazar, and Ithamar, as Nadab and Abihu were now dead. But (1) *Kurtz* estimates the number of paschal lambs much too high, viz. at 100,000 to 140,000; for when he reckons the whole number of the people at about two millions, and gives one lamb upon an average to every fifteen or twenty persons, he includes infants and sucklings among those who partook of the Passover. But as there were only 603,550 males of twenty years old and upwards in the twelve tribes, we cannot reckon more than about 700,000 males as participants in the paschal meal, since the children under ten or twelve years of age would not come into the calculation, even if those who were between eight and twelve partook of the meal, since there would be many adults who could not eat the Passover, because they were unclean. Now if, as *Josephus* affirms (*de bell. jud.* vi. 9, 3), there were never less than ten, and often as many as twenty, who joined together in the time of Christ (*οὐκ ἔλασσον ἀνδρῶν δίκαια . . . πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ οὐνεὶς εἰςοιτινά σθεντοτάται*), we need not assume that there were more than 50,000 lambs required for the feast of Passover at Sinai; because even if all the women who were clean took part in the feast, they would confine them-

Vers. 6-14. There were certain men who were defiled by human corpses (see Lev. xix. 28), and could not eat the Passover on the day appointed. These men came to Moses, and asked, “*Why are we diminished (prevented) from offering the sacrificial gift of Jehovah at its season in the midst of the children of Israel (i.e. in common with the rest of the Israelites)?*” The exclusion of persons defiled from offering the Passover followed from the law, that only clean persons were to participate in a sacrificial meal (Lev. vii. 21), and that no one could offer any sacrifice in an unclean state.—Ver. 8. Moses told them to wait (stand), and he would hear what the Lord, of whom he would inquire, would command.—Vers. 9 sqq. Jehovah gave these general instructions: “*Every one who is defiled by a corpse or upon a distant¹ journey, of you and your future families, shall keep the Passover in the second month on the fourteenth, between the two evenings,*” and that in all respects according to the statute of this feast, the three leading points of which—viz. eating the lamb with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, leaving nothing till the next day, and not breaking a bone (Ex. xii. 8, 10, 46)—are repeated selves as much as possible to the quantity actually needed, and one whole sheep of a year old would furnish flesh enough for one supper for fifteen males and fifteen females. (2) The slaughtering of all these lambs need not have taken place in the narrow space afforded by the court, even if it was afterwards performed in the more roomy courts of the later temple, as has been inferred from 2 Chron. xxx. 16 and xxxv. 11. Lastly, the sprinkling of the blood was no doubt the business of the priests. But the Levites assisted them, so that they sprinkled the blood upon the altar “out of the hand of the Levites” (2 Chron. xxx. 16). Moreover, we are by no means in a condition to pronounce positively whether three priests were sufficient or not at Sinai, because we have no precise information respecting the course pursued. The altar, no doubt, would appear too small for the performance of the whole within the short time of hardly three hours (from the ninth hour of the day to the eleventh). But if it was possible, in the time of the Emperor Nero, to sprinkle the blood of 256,500 paschal lambs (for that number was actually counted under *Cestius*; see *Josephus*, *l. c.*) upon the altar of the temple of that time, which was six, or eight, or even ten times larger, it must have been also possible, in Moses’ time, for the blood of 50,000 lambs to be sprinkled upon the altar of the tabernacle, which was five cubits in length, and the same in breadth.

¹ The נֶרֶךְ is marked as suspicious by *puncta extraordinaria*, probably first of all simply on the ground that the more exact definition is not found in ver. 13. The Rabbins suppose the marks to indicate that *rechokah* is not to be taken here in its literal sense, but denotes merely distance from Jerusalem, or from the threshold of the outer court of the temple. See *Mishnah Pesach* ix. 2, with the commentaries of *Bartenora* and *Maimonides*, and the conjectures of the *Pesikta* on the ten passages in the Pentateuch with *punctis extraordinariis*, in *Drusii notæ uberiiores ad h. v.*

here. But lest any one should pervert this permission, to celebrate the Passover a month later in case of insuperable difficulties, which had only been given for the purpose of enforcing the obligation to keep the covenant meal upon every member of the nation, into an excuse for postponing it without any necessity and merely from indifference, on the ground that he could make it up afterwards, the threat is held out in ver. 13, that whoever should omit to keep the feast at the legal time, if he was neither unclean nor upon a journey, should be cut off; and in ver. 14 the command is repeated with reference to foreigners, that they were also to keep the law and ordinance with the greatest minuteness when they observed the Passover: cf. Ex. xii. 48, 49, according to which the stranger was required first of all to let himself be circumcised. In ver. 14b, יְהִי stands for תְּהִלָּה, as in Ex. xii. 49; cf. *Ewald*, § 295, d. . . . et . . . et, both . . . and.

SIGNS AND SIGNALS FOR THE MARCH.—CHAP. IX. 15—X. 10.

With the mustering of the people and the internal organization of the congregation, the preparations for the march from the desert of Sinai to the promised land of Canaan were completed; and when the feast of the Passover was ended, the time for leaving Sinai had arrived. Nothing now remained to be noticed except the required instructions respecting the guidance of the people in their journey through the wilderness, to which the account of the actual departure and march is appended. The account before us describes first of all the manner in which God Himself conducted the march (chap. ix. 15—23); and secondly, instructions are given respecting the signals to be used for regulating the order of the march (chap. x. 1—10).

Chap. ix. 15—23. SIGNS FOR REMOVING AND ENCAMPING.—On their way through the desert from the border of Egypt to Sinai, Jehovah Himself had undertaken to guide His people by a cloud, as the visible sign and vehicle of His gracious presence (Ex. xiii. 21, 22). This cloud had come down upon the dwelling when the tabernacle was erected, whilst the glory of the Lord filled the holy of holies (Ex. xl. 34—38). In ver. 15 the historian refers to this fact, and then describes more fully what had been already briefly alluded to in Ex. xl. 36, 37, namely, that when the cloud rose up from the dwelling of the tabernacle it was a sign for removing, and

when it came down upon the dwelling, a sign for encamping. In ver. 15a, “*on the day of the setting up of the dwelling*,” Ex. xl. 34, 35, is resumed; and in ver. 15b the appearance of the cloud during the night, from evening till morning, is described in accordance with Ex. xl. 38. (On the fact itself, see the exposition of Ex. xiii. 21, 22.) תְּהִלָּת הַעֲדָה אֶלְעָשֵׂה מֹשֶׁה, “*the dwelling of the tent of witness*” (§ used for the genitive to avoid a double construct state: *Ewald*, § 292, a). In the place of *ohel moëd*, “tent of the meeting of Jehovah with His people,” we have here “*tent of witness*” (or “*testimony*”), i.e. of the tables with the decalogue which were laid up in the ark of the covenant (Ex. xxv. 16), because the decalogue formed the basis of the covenant of Jehovah with Israel, and the pledge of the gracious presence of the Lord in the tabernacle. In the place of “*dwellings of the tent of witness*,” we have “*dwelling of witness*” (*testimony*) in chap. x. 11, and “*tent of witness*” in chap. xviii. 2, xvii. 22, to denote the whole dwelling, as divided into the holy place and the holy of holies, and not the holy of holies alone. This is unmistakeably evident from a comparison of the verse before us with Ex. xl. 34, according to which the cloud covered not merely one portion of the tabernacle, but the whole of the tent of meeting (*ohel moëd*). The rendering, “*the cloud covered the dwelling at the tent of witness*,” i.e. at that part of it in which the witness (or “*testimony*”) was kept, viz. the holy of holies, which *Rosenmüller* and *Knobel* adopt, cannot be sustained, inasmuch as § has no such meaning, but simply conveys the idea of motion and passage into a place or condition (cf. *Ewald*, § 217, d); and the dwelling or tabernacle was not first made into the tent of witness through the cloud which covered it.—Ver. 16. The covering of the dwelling, with the cloud which shone by night as a fiery look, was constant, and not merely a phenomenon which appeared when the tabernacle was first erected, and then vanished away again.—Ver. 17. “*In accordance with the rising of the cloud from the tent, then afterwards the children of Israel broke up*,” i.e. whenever the cloud ascended up from the tent, they always broke up immediately afterwards; “*and at the place where the cloud came down, there they encamped*.” The בָּשׁוּ, or settling down of the cloud, sc. upon the tabernacle, we can only understand in the following manner, as the tabernacle was all taken to pieces during the march: viz. that the cloud visibly descended from the height at which it ordinarily soared above the ark of the covenant, as it was carried in front of the army, for a signal that the tabernacle was to be set up there; and when this

had been done, it settled down upon it.—Ver. 18. As Jehovah was with His people in the cloud, the rising and falling of the cloud was “the command of the Lord” to the Israelites to break up or to pitch the camp. As long, therefore, as the cloud rested upon the dwelling, *i.e.* remained stationary, they continued their encampment.—Vers. 19 sqq. Whether it might rest many days long (פָּגַן, to lengthen out the resting), or only a few days (Gen. xxxiv. 30), or only from evening till morning, and then rise up again in the morning, or for a day and a night, or for two days, or for a month, or for days (*yamim*), *i.e.* a space of time not precisely determined (cf. Gen. iv. 3, xl. 4), they encamped without departing. “Kept the charge of the Lord” (vers. 19 and 23), *i.e.* observed what was to be observed towards Jehovah (see Lev. viii. 35). With שָׁנְתָה, “was it that,” or “did it happen that,” two other possible cases are introduced. After ver. 20a, the apodosis, “they kept the charge of the Lord,” is to be repeated in thought from ver. 19. The elaboration of the account (vers. 15–23), which abounds with repetitions, is intended to bring out the importance of the fact, and to awaken the consciousness not only of the absolute dependence of Israel upon the guidance of Jehovah, but also of the gracious care of their God, which was thereby displayed to the Israelites throughout all their journeyings.

Chap. x. 1–10. THE SILVER SIGNAL-TRUMPETS.—Although God Himself appointed the time for removal and encampment by the movement of the cloud of His presence, signals were also requisite for ordering and conducting the march of so numerous a body, by means of which Moses, as commander-in-chief, might make known his commands to the different divisions of the camp. To this end God directed him to prepare two silver trumpets of beaten work (*mikshah*, see Ex. xxv. 18), which should serve “for the calling of the assembly, and for the breaking up of the camps,” *i.e.* which were to be used for this purpose. The form of these trumpets is not further described. No doubt they were straight, not curved, as we may infer both from the representation of these trumpets on the triumphal arch of Titus at Rome, and also from the fact, that none but straight trumpets occur on the old Egyptian monuments (see my *Arch.* ii. p. 187). With regard to the use of them for calling the congregation, the following directions are given in vers. 3, 4: “When they shall blow with them (*i.e.* with both), the whole congregation (in all its representatives) shall assemble at the

door of the tabernacle ; if they blow with only one, the princes or heads of the families of Israel shall assemble together.”—Vers. 5, 6. To give the signal for breaking up the camp, they were to blow תְּרִזֵּה, i.e. a noise or alarm. At the first blast the tribes on the east, i.e. those who were encamped in the front of the tabernacle, were to break up ; at the second, those who were encamped on the south ; and so on in the order prescribed in chap. ii., though this is not expressly mentioned here. The alarm was to be blown לְמַפְעָנֶים, with regard to their breaking up or marching.—Ver. 7. But to call the congregation together they were to *blow*, not to sound an alarm. עֲקֹד signifies blowing in short, sharp tones. תְּרִזֵּה הַרְאֵעַ, blowing in a continued peal.—Vers. 8-10. These trumpets were to be used for the holy purposes of the congregation generally, and therefore not only the making, but the manner of using them was prescribed by God Himself. They were to be blown by the priests alone, and “*to be for an eternal ordinance to the families of Israel*,” i.e. to be preserved and used by them in all future times, according to the appointment of God. The blast of these trumpets was to call Israel to remembrance before Jehovah in time of war and on their feast-days.—Ver. 9. “*If ye go to war in your land against the enemy who oppresses you, and ye blow the trumpets, ye shall bring yourselves to remembrance before Jehovah, and shall be saved (by Him) from your enemies.*” בֹּא מִלְחָמָה, to come into war, or go to war, is to be distinguished from בֹּא לִפְלִחָמָה, to make ready for war, go out to battle (chap. xxxi. 21, xxxii. 6).—Ver. 10. “*And on your joyous day, and your feasts and new moons, ye shall blow the trumpets over your burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, that they may be to you for a memorial (remembrance) before your God.*”—יּוֹם הַשְׁמִיחָה is any day on which a practical expression was given to their joy, in the form of a sacrifice. The מִזְבְּחִים are the feasts enumerated in chaps. xxviii. and xxix. and Lev. xxiii. The “beginnings of the months,” or new-moon days, were not, strictly speaking, feast-days, with the exception of the seventh new moon of the year (see at chap. xxviii. 11). On the object, viz. “*for a memorial*,” see Ex. xxviii. 29, and the explanation, vol. ii. p. 199. In accordance with this divine appointment, so full of promise, we find that in after times the trumpets were blown by the priests in war (chap. xxxi. 6 ; 2 Chron. xiii. 12, 14, xx. 21, 22, 28) as well as on joyful occasions, such as at the removal of the ark (1 Chron. xv. 24, xvi. 6), at the consecration of Solomon’s temple (2 Chron. v. 12, vii. 6), the laying of the foundation of the second temple

(Ezra iii. 10), the consecration of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii. 35, 41), and other festivities (2 Chron. xxix. 27).

II.—JOURNEY FROM SINAI TO THE STEPPES OF MOAB.

CHAP. X. 11—XXI.

THE straight and shortest way from Sinai to Kadesh, on the southern border of Canaan, was only a journey of eleven days (Deut. i. 2). By this road God led His people, whom He had received into the covenant of His grace at Sinai, and placed under the discipline of the law, to the ultimate object of their journey through the desert; so that, a few months after leaving Horeb or Sinai, the Israelites had already arrived at Kadesh, in the desert of Zin, on the southern border of the promised land, and were able to send out men as spies, to survey the inheritance of which they were to take possession. The way from Sinai to the desert of Zin forms the *first* stage in the history of the guidance of Israel through the wilderness to Canaan.

FROM SINAI TO KADEXH.—CHAP. X. 11—XIV. 45.

Removal of the Camp from the Desert of Sinai.—Chap. x. 11—36.

Vers. 11, 12. After all the preparations were completed for the journey of the Israelites from Sinai to Canaan, on the 20th day of the second month, in the second year, the cloud rose up from the tent of witness, and the children of Israel broke up out of the desert of Sinai, לְכַפֵּעַתָּהֶם, “according to their journeys” (*lit.* breakings up; see at Gen. xiii. 3 and Ex. 37), *i.e.* in the order prescribed in chap. ii. 9, 16, 24, 31, and described in vers. 14 sqq. of this chapter. “*And the cloud rested in the desert of Paran.*” In these words, the whole journey from the desert of Sinai to the desert of Paran is given summarily, or as a heading; and the more minute description follows from ver. 14 to chap. xii. 16. The “*desert of Paran*” was not the first station, but the third; and the Israelites did not arrive at it till after they had left Hazeroth (chap. xii. 16). The desert of Sinai is mentioned as the starting-point of the journey through the desert, in contrast with the desert of Paran, in the neighbourhood

of Kadesh, whence the spies were sent out to Canaan (chap. xiii. 2, 21), the goal and termination of their journey through the desert. That the words, “the cloud rested in the desert of Paran” (ver. 12b), contain a preliminary statement (like Gen. xxvii. 23, xxxvii. 5, as compared with ver. 8, and 1 Kings vi. 9 as compared with ver. 14, etc.), is unmistakeably apparent, from the fact that Moses’ negotiations with Hobab, respecting his accompanying the Israelites to Canaan, as a guide who knew the road, are noticed for the first time in vers. 29 sqq., although they took place before the departure from Sinai, and that after this the account of the breaking-up is resumed in ver. 33, and the journey itself described. Hence, although *Kurtz* (iii. 220) rejects this explanation of ver. 12b as “forced,” and regards the desert of Paran as a place of encampment between Tabeerah and Kibroth-hattaavah, even he cannot help identifying the breaking-up described in ver. 33 with that mentioned in ver. 12; that is to say, regarding ver. 12 as a summary of the events which are afterwards more fully described.

The desert of Paran is the large desert plateau which is bounded on the east by the Arabah, the deep valley running from the southern point of the Dead Sea to the Elanitic Gulf, and stretches westwards to the desert of Shur (*Jifar*; see Gen. xvi. 7; Ex. xv. 22), that separates Egypt from Philistia: it reaches southwards to Jebel et Tih, the foremost spur of the Horeb mountains, and northwards to the mountains of the Amorites, the southern border of Canaan. The origin and etymology of the name are obscure. The opinion that it was derived from **רְבָע**, to open wide, and originally denoted the broad valley of Wady Murreh, between the Hebrew Negeb and the desert of Tih, and was then transferred to the whole district, has very little probability in it (*Knobel*). All that can be regarded as certain is, that the *El-Paran* of Gen. xiv. 6 is a proof that in the very earliest times the name was applied to the whole of the desert of Tih down to the Elanitic Gulf, and that the *Paran* of the Bible had no historical connection either with the κώμη Φαράν and tribe of Φαρανῖται mentioned by *Ptol.* (v. 17, i. 3), or with the town of Φαράν, of which the remains are still to be seen in the Wady Feiran at Serbal, or with the tower of *Faran Ahrun* of *Edrisi*, the modern *Hammân Faraun*, on the Red Sea, to the south of the Wady Gharandel. By the Arabian geographers, *Isztachri*, *Kazwini*, and others, and also by the Bedouins, it is called *et Tih*, i.e. the wandering of the children of Israel, as being the ground upon which the children of Israel wandered about in the

wilderness for forty years (or more accurately, thirty-eight). This desert plateau, which is thirty German miles (150 English) long from south to north, and almost as broad, consists, according to Arabian geographers, partly of sand and partly of firm soil, and is intersected through almost its entire length by the *Wady el Arish*, which commences at a short distance from the northern extremity of the southern border mountains of *et Tih*, and runs in nearly a straight line from south to north, only turning in a north-westerly direction towards the Mediterranean Sea, on the north-east of the *Jebel el Helal*. This wady divides the desert of Paran into a western and an eastern half. The western half lies lower than the eastern, and slopes off gradually, without any perceptible natural boundary, into the flat desert of Shur (*Jifar*), on the shore of the Mediterranean Sea. The eastern half (between the Arabah and the *Wady el Arish*) consists throughout of a lofty mountainous country, intersected by larger and smaller wadys, and with extensive table-land between the loftier ranges, which slopes off somewhat in a northerly direction, its southern edge being formed by the eastern spurs of the *Jebel et Tih*. It is intersected by the *Wady el Jerafeh*, which commences at the foot of the northern slope of the mountains of *Tih*, and after proceeding at first in a northerly direction, turns higher up in a north-easterly direction towards the Arabah, but rises in its northern portion to a strong mountain fortress, which is called, from its present inhabitants, the highlands of the *Azazimeh*, and is bounded on both south and north by steep and lofty mountain ranges. The southern boundary is formed by the range which connects the *Araif en Nakba* with the *Jebel el Mukrah* on the east; the northern boundary, by the mountain barrier which stretches along the *Wady Murreh* from west to east, and rises precipitously from it, and of which the following description has been given by *Rowland* and *Williams*, the first of modern travellers to visit this district, who entered the *terra incognita* by proceeding directly south from Hebron, past *Arara* or *Aroër*, and surveyed it from the border of the *Rachmah* plateau, *i.e.* of the mountains of the Amorites (Deut. i. 7, 20, 44), or the southernmost plateau of the mountains of Judah (see at chap. xiv. 45):—“A gigantic mountain towered above us in savage grandeur, with masses of naked rock, resembling the bastions of some Cyclopean architecture, the end of which it was impossible for the eye to reach, towards either the west or the east. It extended also a long way towards the south; and with its rugged, broken, and dazzling masses of

chalk, which reflected the burning rays of the sun, it looked like an unapproachable furnace, a most fearful desert, without the slightest trace of vegetation. A broad defile, called Wady *Murreh*, ran at the foot of this bulwark, towards the east; and after a course of several miles, on reaching the strangely formed mountain of Moddera (Madurah), it is divided into two parts, the southern branch still retaining the same name, and running eastwards to the Arabah, whilst the other was called Wady *Fikreh*, and ran in a north-easterly direction to the Dead Sea. This mountain barrier proved to us beyond a doubt that we were now standing on the southern boundary of the promised land; and we were confirmed in this opinion by the statement of the guide, that *Kadesh* was only a few hours distant from the point where we were standing" (*Ritter*, xiv. p. 1084). The place of encampment in the desert of Paran is to be sought for at the north-west corner of this lofty mountain range (see at chap. xii. 16).

In vers. 13-28 the removal of the different camps is more fully described, according to the order of march established in chap. ii., the order in which the different sections of the Levites drew out and marched being particularly described in this place alone (cf. vers. 17 and 21 with chap. ii. 17). First of all (lit. "at the beginning") the banner of Judah drew out, with Issachar and Zebulun (vers. 14-16; cf. chap. ii. 3-9). The tabernacle was then taken down, and the Gershonites and Merarites broke up, carrying those portions of it which were assigned to them (ver. 17; cf. chap. iv. 24 sqq., and 31 sqq.), that they might set up the dwelling at the place to be chosen for the next encampment, before the Kohathites arrived with the sacred things (ver. 21). The banner of Reuben followed next with Simeon and Gad (vers. 18-21; cf. chap. ii. 10-16), and the Kohathites joined them bearing the sacred things (ver. 21). שְׂרֵפָה הַמִּזְבֵּחַ (= שְׂרֵפָה הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, chap. vii. 9, and שְׂרֵפָה שְׂמֵחַ, chap. iv. 4) signifies the sacred things mentioned in chap. iii. 31. In ver. 21b the subject is the Gershonites and Merarites; who had broken up before with the component parts of the dwelling, and set up the dwelling, מִשְׁעָן עַל, against their (the Kohathites') arrival, so that they might place the holy things at once within it.—Vers. 22-28. Behind the sacred things came the banners of Ephraim, with Manasseh and Benjamin (see chap. ii. 18-24), and Dan with Asher and Naphtali (chap. ii. 25-31); so that the camp of Dan was the "collector of all the camps according to their hosts," i.e. formed that division of the army which kept the hosts together.

Vers. 29–32. The conversation in which Moses persuaded *Hobab* the Midianite, the son of Reguel (see at Ex. ii. 16), and his brother-in-law, to go with the Israelites, and being well acquainted with the desert to act as their leader, preceded the departure in order of time; but it is placed between the setting out and the march itself, as being subordinate to the main events. When and why Hobab came into the camp of the Israelites,—whether he came with his father Reguel (or Jethro) when Israel first arrived at Horeb, and so remained behind when Jethro left (Ex. xviii. 27), or whether he did not come till afterwards,—was left uncertain, because it was a matter of no consequence in relation to what is narrated here.¹ The request addressed to Hobab, that he would go with them to the place which Jehovah had promised to give them, *i.e.* to Canaan, was supported by the promise that he would do good to them (Hobab and his company), as Jehovah had spoken good concerning Israel, *i.e.* had promised it prosperity in Canaan. And when Hobab declined the request, and said that he should return into his own land, *i.e.* to Midian at the south-east of Sinai (see at Ex. ii. 15 and iii. 1), and to his kindred, Moses repeated the request, “*Leave us not, forasmuch as thou knowest our encamping in the desert,*” *i.e.* knowest where we can pitch our tents; “*therefore be to us as eyes,*” *i.e.* be our leader and guide,—and promised at the same time to do him the good that Jehovah would do to them. Although Jehovah led the march of the Israelites in the pillar of cloud, not only giving the sign for them to break up and to encamp, but showing generally the direction they were to take; yet Hobab, who was well acquainted with the desert, would be able to render very important service to the Israelites, if he only pointed out, in those places where the sign to encamp was given by the cloud, the

¹ The grounds upon which *Knobel* affirms that the “Elohist” is not the author of the account in vers. 29–36, and pronounces it a Jehovahistic interpolation, are perfectly futile. The assertion that the Elohist had already given a full description of the departure in vers. 11–28, rests upon an oversight of the peculiarities of the Semitic historians. The expression “they set forward” in ver. 28 is an anticipatory remark, as *Knobel* himself admits in other places (*e.g.* Gen. vii. 12, viii. 3; Ex. vii. 6, xii. 50, xvi. 34). The other argument, that Moses’ brother-in-law is not mentioned anywhere else, involves a *petitio principii*, and is just as powerless a proof, as such peculiarities of style as “mount of the Lord,” “ark of the covenant of the Lord,” *חַדְרָבֵב* to do good (ver. 29), and others of a similar kind, of which the critics have not even attempted to prove that they are at variance with the style of the Elohist, to say nothing of their having actually done so.

springs, oases, and plots of pasture which are often buried quite out of sight in the mountains and valleys that overspread the desert. What Hobab ultimately decided to do, we are not told; but "as no further refusal is mentioned, and the departure of Israel is related immediately afterwards, he probably consented" (*Knobel*). This is raised to a certainty by the fact that, at the commencement of the period of the Judges, the sons of the brother-in-law of Moses went into the desert of Judah to the south of Arad along with the sons of Judah (Judg. i. 16), and therefore had entered Canaan with the Israelites, and that they were still living in that neighbourhood in the time of Saul (1 Sam. xv. 6, xxvii. 10, xxx. 29).

Vers. 33-36. "*And they (the Israelites) departed from the mount of Jehovah (Ex. iii. 1) three days' journey; the ark of the covenant of Jehovah going before them, to search out a resting-place for them. And the cloud of Jehovah was over them by day, when they broke up from the camp.*" Jehovah still did as He had already done on the way to Sinai (Ex. xiii. 21, 22): He went before them in the pillar of cloud, according to His promise (Ex. xxxiii. 13), on their journey from Sinai to Canaan; with this simple difference, however, that henceforth the cloud that embodied the presence of Jehovah was connected with the ark of the covenant, as the visible throne of His gracious presence which had been appointed by Jehovah Himself. To this end the ark of the covenant was carried separately from the rest of the sacred things, in front of the whole army; so that the cloud which went before them floated above the ark, leading the procession, and regulating its movements and the direction it took in such a manner that the permanent connection between the cloud and the sanctuary might be visibly manifested even during their march. It is true that, in the order observed in the camp and on the march, no mention is made of the ark of the covenant going in front of the whole army; but this omission is no more a proof of any discrepancy between this verse and chap. ii. 17, or of a difference of authorship, than the separation of the different divisions of the Levites upon the march, which is also not mentioned in chap. ii. 17, although the Gershonites and Merarites actually marched between the banners of Judah and Reuben, and the Kohathites with the holy things between the banners of Reuben and Ephraim (vers. 17 and 21).¹ The words, "the cloud was above them" (the Israelites), and so forth, can be reconciled with this supposition

¹ As the critics do not deny that vers. 11-28 are written by the "Elohist" notwithstanding this difference, they have no right to bring forward the account

without any difficulty, whether we understand them as signifying that the cloud, which appeared as a guiding column floating above the ark and moved forward along with it, also extended itself along the whole procession, and spread out as a protecting shade over the whole army (as *O. v. Gerlach* and *Baumgarten* suppose), or that “above them” (upon them) is to be regarded as expressive of the fact that it accompanied them as a protection and shade. Nor is Ps. cv. 39, which seems, so far as the words are concerned, rather to favour the first explanation, really at variance with this view; for the Psalmist’s intention is not so much to give a physical description of the phenomenon, as to describe the sheltering protection of God in poetical words as a spreading out of the cloud above the wandering people of God, in the form of a protection against both heat and rain (cf. Isa. iv. 5, 6). Moreover, vers. 33b and 34 have a poetical character, answering to the elevated nature of their subject, and are to be interpreted as follows according to the laws of a poetical *parallelism*: The one thought that the ark of the covenant, with the cloud soaring above it, led the way and sheltered those who were marching, is divided into two clauses; in ver. 33b only the ark of the covenant is mentioned as going in front of the Israelites, and in ver. 34 only the cloud as a shelter over them: whereas the carrying of the ark in front of the army could only accomplish the end proposed, viz. to search out a resting-place for them, by Jehovah going above them in the cloud, and showing the bearers of the ark both the way they were to take, and the place where they were to rest. The ark with the tables of the law is not called “the ark of testimony” here, according to its contents, as in Ex. xxv. 22, xxvi. 33, 34, xxx. 6, etc., but the ark of the covenant of Jehovah, according to its design and signification for Israel, which was the only point, or at any rate the principal point, in consideration here. The resting-place which the ark of the covenant found at the end of three days, is not mentioned in ver. 34; it was not Tabeerah, however (chap. xi. 3), but Kibroth-hattaavah (chap. xi. 34, 35; cf. chap. xxxiii. 16).

In vers. 35 and 36, the words which Moses was in the habit of uttering, both when the ark removed and when it came to rest again, are given not only as a proof of the joyous confidence of Moses, but as an encouragement to the congregation to cherish the same believing confidence. When breaking up, he said, “*Rise up*, of the ark going first as a contradiction to chap. ii., and therefore a proof that vers. 33 sqq. are not of Elohistic origin.

Jehovah! that Thine enemies may be scattered, and they that hate Thee may flee before Thy face;" and when it rested, "Return, Jehovah, to the ten thousand thousands of Israel!" Moses could speak in this way, because he knew that Jehovah and the ark of the covenant were inseparably connected, and saw in the ark of the covenant, as the throne of Jehovah, a material pledge of the gracious presence of the Almighty God. He said this, however, not merely with reference to enemies who might encounter the Israelites in the desert, but with a confident anticipation of the calling of Israel, to strive for the cause of the Lord in this hostile world, and rear His kingdom upon earth. Human power was not sufficient for this; but to accomplish this end, it was necessary that the Almighty God should go before His people, and scatter their foes. The prayer addressed to God to do this, is an expression of bold believing confidence,—a prayer sure of its answer; and to Israel it was the word with which the congregation of God was to carry on the conflict at all times against the powers and authorities of a whole hostile world. It is in this sense that in Ps. lxviii. 2, the words are held up by David before himself and his generation as a banner of victory, "to arm the Church with confidence, and fortify it against the violent attacks of its foes" (*Calvin*). שׁבָּה is construed with an accusative: return to the ten thousands of the hosts of Israel, *i.e.* after having scattered Thine enemies, turn back again to Thy people to dwell among them. The "thousands of Israel," as in chap. i. 16.¹

¹ The inverted nuns, *ן*, at the beginning and close of vers. 35, 36, which are found, according to *R. Menachem's de Lonzano Or Torah* (f. 17), in all the Spanish and German MSS., and are sanctioned by the Masorah, are said by the Talmud (*tract de sabbatho*) to be merely *signa parenthesos, quæ monerent præter historiæ seriem versum 35 et 36 ad capitum finem inseri* (cf. *Matt. Hilleri de Arcano Kethib et Keri libri duo*, pp. 158, 159). The Cabbalists, on the other hand, according to *R. Menach.* l. c., find an allusion in it to the *Shechinah*, "quæ velut obversa ad tergum facie sequentes Israelitas ex impenso amore respiceret" (see the note in *J. H. Michaelis' Bibl. hebr.*). In other MSS., however, which are supported by the *Masora Erfurt*, the inverted nun is found in the words בְּסֻעַ (ver. 35) and וַיֹּהֵי הָעָם בְּמִתְאֲגָנִים (chap. xi. 1): the first, *ad innundandum ut sic retrorsum agantur omnes hostes Israelitarum*; the second, *ut esset symbolum perpetuum perversitatis populi, inter tot illustria signa liberationis et maximorum beneficiorum Dei acerce quiritantium, ad declarandam ingratitudinem et contumaciam suam* (cf. *J. Buxtorf, Tiberias*, p. 169).

OCCURRENCES AT TABEERAH AND KIBROTH-HATTAAVAH.—

CHAP. XI.

Vers. 1–3. After a three days' march the Israelites arrived at a resting-place ; but the people began at once to be discontented with their situation.¹ *The people were like those who complain in the ears of Jehovah of something bad ; i.e. they behaved like persons who groan and murmur because of some misfortune that has happened to them.* No special occasion is mentioned for the complaint. The words are expressive, no doubt, of the general dissatisfaction and discontent of the people at the difficulties and privations connected with the journey through the wilderness, to which they gave utterance so loudly, that their complaining reached the ears of Jehovah. At this His wrath burned, inasmuch as the complaint was directed against Him and His guidance, “so that fire of Jehovah burned against them, and ate at the end of the camp.” בָּעֵר signifies here, not to burn a person (Job i. 16), but to burn against. “Fire of Jehovah :” a fire sent by Jehovah, but not proceeding directly from Him, or bursting forth from the cloud, as in Lev. x. 2. Whether it was kindled through a flash of lightning, or in some other such way, cannot be more exactly determined. There is not sufficient ground for the supposition that the fire merely seized upon the bushes about the camp and the tents of the people, but not upon human beings (*Ros., Knobel*). All that is plainly taught in the words is, that the fire did not extend over the whole camp, but merely broke out at one end of it, and sank down again, *i.e.* was extinguished very quickly, at the intercession of Moses ; so that in this judgment the Lord merely manifested His power to destroy the murmurers, that He might infuse into the whole nation a wholesome dread of His holy majesty.—Ver. 3. From this judgment the place where the fire had burned received the name of “*Tabeerah*,” *i.e.* burning, or place of burning. Now, as this spot is distinctly described as the end or outermost edge of the camp, this “place

¹ The arguments by which *Knobel* undertakes to prove, that in chaps. xi. and xii. of the original work different foreign accounts respecting the first encampments after leaving Sinai have been woven together by the “Jehovist,” are founded upon misinterpretations and arbitrary assumptions and conclusions, such as the assertion that the tabernacle stood outside the camp (chaps. xi. 25, xii. 5) ; that Miriam entered the tabernacle (chap. xii. 4, 5) ; that the original work had already reported the arrival of Israel in *Paran* in chap. x. 12 ; and that no reference is ever made to a camping-place called Tabeerah, and others of the same kind. For the proof, see the explanation of the verses referred to.

of burning" must not be regarded, as it is by *Knobel* and others, as a different station from the "graves of lust." *Tabeerah* was simply the local name given to a distant part of the whole camp, which received soon after the name of *Kibroth-Hattaavah*, on account of the greater judgment which the people brought upon themselves through their rebellion. This explains not only the omission of the name *Tabeerah* from the list of encampments in chap. xxxiii. 16, but also the circumstance, that nothing is said about any removal from *Tabeerah* to *Kibroth-Hattaavah*, and that the account of the murmuring of the people, because of the want of those supplies of food to which they had been accustomed in Egypt, is attached, without anything further, to the preceding narrative. There is nothing very surprising either, in the fact that the people should have given utterance to their wish for the luxuries of Egypt, which they had been deprived of so long, immediately after this judgment of God, if we only understand the whole affair as taking place in exact accordance with the words of the texts, viz. that the unbelieving and discontented mass did not discern the chastising hand of God at all in the conflagration which broke out at the end of the camp, because it was not declared to be a punishment from God, and was not preceded by a previous announcement; and therefore that they gave utterance in loud murmurings to the discontent of their hearts respecting the want of flesh, without any regard to what had just befallen them.

Vers. 4-9. The first impulse to this came from the mob that had come out of Egypt along with the Israelites. "*The mixed multitude:*" see at Ex. xii. 38. They felt and expressed a longing for the better food which they had enjoyed in Egypt, and which was not to be had in the desert, and urged on the Israelites to cry out for flesh again, especially for the flesh and the savoury vegetables in which Egypt abounded. The words "*they wept again*" (*בָּשָׂר* used adverbially, as in Gen. xxvi. 18, etc.) point back to the former complaints of the people respecting the absence of flesh in the desert of Sin (Ex. xvi. 2 sqq.), although there is nothing said about their weeping there. By the flesh which they missed, we are not to understand either the fish which they expressly mention in the following verse (as in Lev. xi. 11), or merely oxen, sheep, and goats; but the word *בָּשָׂר* signifies flesh generally, as being a better kind of food than the bread-like manna. It is true they possessed herds of cattle, but these would not have been sufficient to supply their wants, as cattle could not be bought for slaughtering, and it

was necessary to spare what they had. The greedy people also longed for other flesh, and said, “*We remember the fish which we ate in Egypt for nothing.*” Even if fish could not be had for nothing in Egypt, according to the extravagant assertions of the murmurers, it is certain that it could be procured for such nominal prices that even the poorest of the people could eat it. The abundance of the fish in the Nile and the neighbouring waters is attested unanimously by both classical writers (*e.g. Diod. Sic.* i. 36, 52; *Herod.* ii. 93; *Strabo,* xvii. p. 829) and modern travellers (cf. *Hengstenberg, Egypt, etc.,* p. 211 Eng. tr.). This also applies to the vegetables for which the Israelites longed in the desert. The קָנְפָאִים, or cucumbers, which are still called *katteh* or *chate* in the present day, are a species differing from the ordinary cucumbers in size and colour, and distinguished for softness and sweet flavour, and are described by *Forskal (Flor. Aeg.* p. 168), as *fructus in Ægypto omnium vulgatissimus, totis plantatus agris.* אַבְּפָתִים: water-melons, which are still called *battieh* in modern Egypt, and are both cultivated in immense quantities and sold so cheaply in the market, that the poor as well as the rich can enjoy their refreshing flesh and cooling juice (see *Sonnini in Hengstenberg, ut sup.* p. 212). צִיר does not signify grass here, but, according to the ancient versions, *chives*, from their grass-like appearance; *laudatissimus porrus in Ægypto* (*Plin. h. n.* 19, 33). בְּצָלִים: onions, which flourish better in Egypt than elsewhere, and have a mild and pleasant taste. According to *Herod.* ii. 125, they were the ordinary food of the workmen at the pyramids; and, according to *Hasselquist, Sonnini, and others*, they still form almost the only food of the poor, and are also a favourite dish with all classes, either roasted, or boiled as a vegetable, and eaten with animal food. שְׁזִיבִים: garlic, which is still called *tum, tom* in the East (*Seetzen, iii. p. 234*), and is mentioned by *Herodotus* in connection with onions, as forming a leading article of food with the Egyptian workmen. Of all these things, which had been cheap as well as refreshing, not one was to be had in the desert. Hence the people complained still further, “*and now our soul is dried away,*” *i.e.* faint for want of strong and refreshing food, and wanting in fresh vital power (cf. *Ps. xxii. 16, cii. 5*): “*we have nothing* (לֹא־הָיָה, there is nothing in existence, equivalent to nothing to be had) *except that our eye (falls) upon this manna,*” *i.e.* we see nothing else before us but the manna, *sc.* which has no juice, and supplies no vital force. Greediness longs for juicy and savoury food, and in fact, as a rule, for change of food and stimulating flavour. “*This is the perverted*

nature of man, which cannot continue in the quiet enjoyment of what is clean and unmixed, but, from its own inward discord, desires a stimulating admixture of what is sharp and sour" (*Baumgarten*). To point out this inward perversion on the part of the murmuring people, Moses once more described the nature, form, and taste of the manna, and its mode of preparation, as a pleasant food which God sent down to His people with the dew of heaven (see at Ex. xvi. 14, 15, and 31). But this sweet bread of heaven wanted "the sharp and sour, which are required to give a stimulating flavour to the food of man, on account of his sinful, restless desires, and the incessant changes of his earthly life." In this respect the manna resembled the spiritual food supplied by the word of God, of which the sinful heart of man may also speedily become weary, and turn to the more piquant productions of the spirit of the world.

Vers. 10-15. When Moses heard the people weep, "*according to their families, every one before the door of his tent;*" i.e. heard complaining in all the families in front of every tent, so that the weeping had become universal throughout the whole nation (cf. Zech. xii. 12 sqq.), and the wrath of the Lord burned on account of it, and the thing displeased Moses also, he brought his complaint to the Lord. The words "*Moses also was displeased,*" are introduced as a circumstantial clause, to explain the matter more clearly, and show the reason for the complaint which Moses poured out before the Lord, and do not refer exclusively either to the murmuring of the people or to the wrath of Jehovah, but to both together. This follows evidently from the position in which the clause stands between the two antecedent clauses in ver. 10 and the apodosis in ver. 11, and still more evidently from the complaint of Moses which follows. For "the whole attitude of Moses shows that his displeasure was excited not merely by the unrestrained rebellion of the people against Jehovah, but also by the unrestrained wrath of Jehovah against the nation" (*Kurtz*). But in what was the wrath of Jehovah manifested? It broke out against the people first of all when they had been satiated with flesh (ver. 33). There is no mention of any earlier manifestation. Hence Moses can only have discovered a sign of the burning wrath of Jehovah in the fact that, although the discontent of the people burst forth in loud cries, God did not help, but withdrew with His help, and let the whole storm of the infuriated people burst upon him.—Vers. 11 sqq. In Moses' complaint there is an unmistakeable discontent arising from the excessive burden of his office. "*Why hast Thou done evil to Thy*

servant? and why have I not found favour in Thy sight, to lay upon me the burden of all this people?" The "burden of all this people" is the expression which he uses to denote "the care of governing the people, and providing everything for it" (*C. a. Lap.*). This burden, which God imposed upon him in connection with his office, appeared to him a bad and ungracious treatment on the part of God. This is the language of the discontent of despair, which differs from the murmuring of disbelief, in the fact that it is addressed to God, for the purpose of entreating help and deliverance from Him; whereas disbelief complains of the ways of God, but while complaining of its troubles, does not pray to the Lord its God. "*Have I conceived all this people,*" Moses continues, "*or have I brought it forth, that Thou requirest me to carry it in my bosom, as a nursing father carries the suckling, into the promised land?*" He does not intend by these words to throw off entirely all care for the people, but simply to plead with God that the duty of carrying and providing for Israel rests with Him, the Creator and Father of Israel (Ex. iv. 22; Isa. lxiii. 16). Moses, a weak man, was wanting in the omnipotent power which alone could satisfy the crying of the people for flesh. בְּבָךְ עַל, "they weep unto me," i.e. they come weeping to ask me to relieve their distress. "*I am not able to carry this burden alone; it is too heavy for me.*"—Ver. 15. "*If Thou deal thus with me, then kill me quite* (הַרְחֵב inf. abs., expressive of the uninterrupted process of killing; see *Ewald*, § 280, b.), *if I have found favour in Thine eyes* (i.e. if Thou wilt show me favour), *and let me not see my misfortune.*" "*My misfortune:*" i.e. the calamity to which I must eventually succumb.

Vers. 16-23. There was good ground for his complaint. The burden of the office laid upon the shoulders of Moses was really too heavy for one man; and even the discontent which broke out in the complaint was nothing more than an outpouring of zeal for the office assigned him by God, under the burden of which his strength would eventually break down, unless he received some support. He was not tired of the office, but would stake his life for it if God did not relieve him in some way, as office and life were really one in him. Jehovah therefore relieved him in the distress of which he complained, without blaming the words of His servant, which bordered on despair. "*Gather unto Me,*" He said to Moses (vers. 16, 17), "*seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest as elders and officers (shoterim, see Ex. v. 6) of the people, and bring them unto the tabernacle, that they may place themselves there with*

thee. I will come down (see at ver. 25) and speak with thee there, and will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them, that they may bear the burden of the people with thee.”—Vers. 18 sqq. Jehovah would also relieve the complaining of the people, and that in such a way that the murmurers should experience at the same time the holiness of His judgments. The people were to sanctify themselves for the next day, and were then to eat flesh (receive flesh to eat). שְׁקָרְתִּה (as in Ex. xix. 10), to prepare themselves by purifications for the revelation of the glory of God in the miraculous gift of flesh. Jehovah would give them flesh, so that they should eat it not one day, or two, or five, or ten, or twenty, but a whole month long (of “days,” as in Gen. xxix. 14, xli. 1), “till it come out of your nostrils, and become loathsome unto you,” as a punishment for having despised Jehovah in the midst of them, in their contempt of the manna given by God, and for having shown their regret at leaving the land of Egypt in their longing for the provisions of that land.—Vers. 21 sqq. When Moses thereupon expressed his amazement at the promise of God to provide flesh for 600,000 men for a whole month long even to satiety, and said, “Shall flocks and herds be slain for them, to suffice them? or shall all the fish of the sea be gathered together for them, to suffice them?” he was answered by the words, “Is the arm of Jehovah too short (i.e. does it not reach far enough; is it too weak and powerless)? Thou shalt see now whether My word shall come to pass unto thee or not.”

Vers. 24-30. After receiving from the Lord this reply to his complaint, Moses went out (*sc.* “of the tabernacle,” where he had laid his complaint before the Lord) into the camp; and having made known to the people the will of God, gathered together seventy men of the elders of the people, and directed them to station themselves around the tabernacle. “*Around the tabernacle,*” does not signify in this passage on all four sides, but in a semicircle around the front of the tabernacle; the verb is used in this sense in chap. xxi. 4, when it is applied to the march round Edom.—Ver. 25. Jehovah then came down in the cloud, which soared on high above the tabernacle, and now came down to the door of it (chap. xii. 5; Ex. xxxiii. 9; Deut. xxxi. 15). The statement in chap. ix. 18 sqq., and Ex. xl. 37, 38, that the cloud dwelt (*בְּשַׁבֵּךְ*) above the dwelling of the tabernacle during the time of encampment, can be reconciled with this without any difficulty; since the only idea that we can form of this “dwelling upon it” is, that the cloud stood still, soaring in quietness above the tabernacle, without

moving to and fro like a cloud driven by the wind. There is no such discrepancy, therefore, as *Knobel* finds in these statements. When Jehovah had come down, He spoke to Moses, *sc.* to explain to him and to the elders what was about to be done, and then laid upon the seventy elders of the Spirit which was upon him. We are not to understand this as implying, that the fulness of the Spirit possessed by Moses was diminished in consequence; still less to regard it, with *Calvin*, as *signum indignationis*, or *nota ignominiae*, which God intended to stamp upon him. For the Spirit of God is not something material, which is diminished by being divided, but resembles a flame of fire, which does not decrease in intensity, but increases rather by extension. As *Theodoret* observed, “Just as a person who kindles a thousand flames from one, does not lessen the first, whilst he communicates light to the others, so God did not diminish the grace imparted to Moses by the fact that He communicated of it to the seventy.” God did this to show to Moses, as well as to the whole nation, that the Spirit which Moses had received was perfectly sufficient for the performance of the duties of his office, and that no supernatural increase of that Spirit was needed, but simply a strengthening of the natural powers of Moses by the support of men who, when endowed with the power of the Spirit that was taken from him, would help him to bear the burden of his office. We have no description of the way in which this transference took place; it is therefore impossible to determine whether it was effected by a sign which would strike the outward senses, or passed altogether within the sphere of the Spirit’s life, in a manner which corresponded to the nature of the Spirit itself. In any case, however, it must have been effected in such a way, that Moses and the elders received a convincing proof of the reality of the affair. When the Spirit descended upon the elders, “*they prophesied, and did not add;*” *i.e.* they did not repeat the prophesying any further. וְלֹא יִסְפֹּה is rendered correctly by the LXX., καὶ οὐκ ἔτι προσέθεντο; the rendering supported by the *Vulgate* and *Onkelos*, nec ultro cessaverunt (“and ceased not”), is incorrect. נִתְנַבֵּא, “to prophesy,” is to be understood generally, and especially here, not as the foretelling of future things, but as speaking in an ecstatic and elevated state of mind, under the impulse and inspiration of the Spirit of God, just like the “speaking with tongues,” which frequently followed the gift of the Holy Ghost in the days of the apostles. But we are not to infer from the fact, that the prophesying was not repeated, that the Spirit therefore departed

from them after this one extraordinary manifestation. This miraculous manifestation of the Spirit was intended simply to give to the whole nation the visible proof that God had endowed them with His Spirit, as helpers of Moses, and had given them the authority required for the exercise of their calling.—Ver. 26. But in order to prove to the whole congregation that the Spirit of the Lord was working there, the Spirit came not only upon the elders assembled round Moses, and in front of the tabernacle, but also upon two of the persons who had been chosen, viz. Eldad and Medad, who had remained behind in the camp, for some reason that is not reported, so that they also prophesied. “*Them that were written,*” *conscripti*, for “called,” because the calling of the elders generally took place in writing, from which we may see how thoroughly the Israelites had acquired the art of writing in Egypt.—Vers. 27, 28. This phenomenon in the camp itself produced such excitement, that a boy (*שָׁבֵן*, with the article like *טַלְמֵד* in Gen. xiv. 13) reported the thing to Moses, whereupon Joshua requested Moses to prohibit the two from prophesying. Joshua felt himself warranted in doing this, because he had been Moses’ servant from his youth up (see at Ex. xvii. 9), and in this capacity he regarded the prophesying of these men in the camp as detracting from the authority of his lord, since they had not received this gift from Moses, at least not through his mediation. Joshua was jealous for the honour of Moses, just as the disciples of Jesus, in Mark ix. 38, 39, were for the honour of their Lord; and he was reproved by Moses, as the latter afterwards were by Christ.—Ver. 29. Moses replied, “*Art thou jealous for me? Would that all the Lord’s people were prophets, that Jehovah would put His Spirit upon them!*” As a true servant of God, who sought not his own glory, but the glory of his God, and the spread of His kingdom, Moses rejoiced in this manifestation of the Spirit of God in the midst of the nation, and desired that all might become partakers of this grace.—Ver. 30. Moses returned with the elders into the camp, *sc.* from the tabernacle, which stood upon an open space in the midst of the camp, at some distance from the tents of the Levites and the rest of the tribes of Israel, which were pitched around it, so that whoever wished to go to it, had first of all to go out of his tent.¹

¹ For the purpose of overthrowing the historical character of this marvellous event, the critics, from Vater to Knobel, have identified the appointment of the seventy elders to support Moses with the judicial institute established at Sinai by the advice of Jethro (Ex. xviii.), and adduce the obvious differences

No account has been handed down of the further action of this committee of elders. It is impossible to determine, therefore, in what way they assisted Moses in bearing the burden of governing the people. All that can be regarded as following unquestionably from the purpose given here is, that they did not form a permanent body, which continued from the time of Moses to the Captivity, and after the Captivity was revived again in the Sanhedrim, as Talmudists, Rabbins, and many of the earlier theologians suppose (see *Selden de Synedriis*, l. i. c. 14, ii. c. 4; *Jo. Marckii sylloge dissertat. phil. theol. ad V. T. exercit.* 12, pp. 343 sqq.). On the opposite side *vid. Relandi Antiquitates*, ss. ii. 7, 3; *Carpz. apparat.* pp. 573 sq., etc.

Vers. 31–34. As soon as Moses had returned with the elders into the camp, God fulfilled His second promise. “*A wind arose from Jehovah, and brought quails (salvim, see Ex. xvi. 13) over from the sea, and threw them over the camp about a day's journey wide from here and there (i.e. on both sides), in the neighbourhood of the camp, and about two cubits above the surface.*” The wind was a south-east wind (Ps. lxxviii. 26), which blew from the Arabian Gulf and brought the quails—which fly northwards in the spring from the interior of Africa in very great numbers (see vol. ii. p. 67)—from the sea to the Israelites. *מִלְאָה*, which only occurs here and in the Psalm of Moses (Ps. xc. 10), signifies to drive over, in between these two entirely different institutions as arguments for the supposed diversity of documents and legends. But what ground is there for identifying things so totally different from one another? The assertion of Knobel, that in Deut. i. 9–18, Moses “evidently” refers to both events (Ex. xviii. and Num. xi.), is unfounded and untrue. Or are the same official duties and rank assigned to the elders who were chosen as judges in Ex. xviii., as to the seventy elders who were called by God, and endowed with His Spirit, that they might help Moses to govern the people who had rebelled against him and against Jehovah on account of the want of flesh, and to restore and uphold the authority of Moses as the divinely chosen leader of Israel, which had been shaken thereby? Can the judges of a land be identified without reserve with the executive of the land? The mere fact, that this executive court was chosen, like the judges, from the whole body of elders, does not warrant us in identifying the two institutions. Nor does it follow from the fact, that at Sinai seventy of the elders of Israel ascended the mountain with Moses, Aaron, and his sons, and there saw God (Ex. xxiv. 9 sqq.), that the seventy persons chosen here were the same as the seventy mentioned there. The sameness of the numbers does not prove that the persons were the same, but simply that the number seventy was the most suitable, on account of its historical and symbolical significance, to form a representation of the whole body of the people. For a further refutation of this futile objection, see Ranke, *Unters. üb. d. Pent. II.* pp. 183 sqq.

Arabic and Syriac to pass over, not “to cut off,” as the Rabbins suppose: the wind cut off the quails from the sea. שָׁבַע, to throw them scattered about (Ex. xxix. 5, xxxi. 12, xxxii. 4). The idea is not that the wind caused the flock of quails to spread itself out as much as two days’ journey over the camp, and to fly about two cubits above the surface of the ground; so that, being exhausted with their flight across the sea, they fell partly into the hands of the Israelites and partly upon the ground, as Knobel follows the *Vulgata* (*volabant in aëre duobus cubitis altitudine super terram*) and many of the Rabbins in supposing: for שָׁבַע הַפְּתַחֲנָה לְעֵד שָׁבַע does not mean to cause to fly or spread out over the camp, but to throw over or upon the camp. The words cannot therefore be understood in any other way than they are in Ps. lxxviii. 27, 28, viz. that the wind threw them about over the camp, so that they fell upon the ground a day’s journey on either side of it, and that in such numbers that they lay, of course not for the whole distance mentioned, but in places about the camp, as much as two cubits deep. It is only in this sense of the words, that the people could possibly gather quails the whole of that day, the whole night, and the whole of the next day, in such quantities that he who had gathered but little had collected ten homers. A *homer*, the largest measure of capacity among the Hebrews, which contained ten ephahs, held, according to the lower reckoning of *Thenius*, 10,143 Parisian inches, or about two bushels Dresden measure. By this enormous quantity, which so immensely surpassed the natural size of the flocks of quails, God purposed to show the people His power, to give them flesh not for one day or several days, but for a whole month, both to put to shame their unbelief, and also to punish their greediness. As they could not eat this quantity all at once, they spread them round the camp to dry in the sun, in the same manner in which the Egyptians are in the habit of drying fish (*Herod. ii. 77*).—Ver. 33. But while the flesh was still between their teeth, and before it was ground, *i.e.* masticated, the wrath of the Lord burned against them, and produced among the people a very great destruction. This catastrophe is not to be regarded as “the effect of the excessive quantity of quails that they had eaten, on account of the quails feeding upon things which are injurious to man, so that eating the flesh of quails produces convulsions and giddiness (for proofs, see *Bochart, Hieroz. ii. pp. 657 sqq.*),” as Knobel supposes, but as an extraordinary judgment inflicted by God upon the greedy people, by which a great multitude of people were suddenly swept away.

—Ver. 34. From this judgment the place of encampment received the name *Kibroth-hattaavah*, i.e. graves of greediness, because there the people found their graves while giving vent to their greedy desires.

Ver. 35. From the graves of greediness the people removed to *Hazeroth*, and there they remained (הַזְּרוֹת as in Ex. xxiv. 12). The situation of these two places of encampment is altogether unknown. *Hazeroth*, it is true, has been regarded by many since Burckhardt (Syr. p. 808) as identical with the modern *Hadhra* (in Robinson's Pal. *Ain el Hudhera*), eighteen hours to the north-east of Sinai, partly because of the resemblance in the name, and partly because there are not only low palm-trees and bushes there, but also a spring, of which Robinson says (Pal. i. p. 223) that it is the only spring in the neighbourhood, and yields tolerably good water, though somewhat brackish, the whole year round. But *Hadhra* does not answer to the Hebrew קִבְרָה, to shut in, from which *Hazeroth* (enclosures) is derived; and there are springs in many other places in the desert of *et Tih* with both drinkable and brackish water. Moreover, the situation of this well does not point to *Hadhra*, which is only two days' journey from Sinai, so that the Israelites might at any rate have pitched their tents by this well after their first journey of three days (chap. x. 33), whereas they took three days to reach the graves of lust, and then marched from thence to *Hazeroth*. Consequently they would only have come to *Hadhra* on the supposition that they had been about to take the road to the sea, and intended to march along the coast to the Arabah, and so on through the Arabah to the Dead Sea (Robinson, p. 223); in which case, however, they would not have arrived at Kadesh. The conjecture that *Kibroth-hattaavah* is the same as *Di-Sahab* (Deut. i. 1), the modern *Dahab* (*Mersa Dahab, Minna el Dahab*), to the east of Sinai, on the Elanitic Gulf, is still more untenable. For what end could be answered by such a circuitous route, which, instead of bringing the Israelites nearer to the end of their journey, would have taken them to Mecca rather than to Canaan? As the Israelites proceeded from *Hazeroth* to Kadesh in the desert of Paran (chap. xiii. 3 and 26), they must have marched from Sinai to Canaan by the most direct route, through the midst of the great desert of *et Tih*, most probably by the desert road which leads from the *Wady es Sheikh* into the *Wady ez-Zurank*, which breaks through the southern border mountains of *et Tih*, and passes on through the *Wady ez-Zalakah* over *el Ain* to *Bir-et-*

Themmed, and then due north past *Jebel Araif* to the Hebron road. By this route they could go from Horeb to Kadesh Barnea in eleven days (Deut. i. 2), and it is here that we are to seek for the two stations in question. *Hazeroth* is probably to be found, as *Fries* and *Kurtz* suppose, in *Bir-et-Themmed*, and *Kibroth-hattaavah* in the neighbourhood of the southern border mountains of *et Tih*.

REBELLION OF MIRIAM AND AARON AGAINST MOSES.—CHAP. XII.

Vers. 1-3. All the rebellions of the people hitherto had arisen from dissatisfaction with the privations of the desert march, and had been directed against Jehovah rather than against Moses. And if, in the case of the last one, at Kibroth-hattaavah, even Moses was about to lose heart under the heavy burden of his office; the faithful covenant God had given the whole nation a practical proof, in the manner in which He provided him support in the seventy elders, that He had not only laid the burden of the whole nation upon His servant Moses, but had also communicated to him the power of His Spirit, which was requisite to enable him to carry this burden. Thus not only was his heart filled with new courage when about to despair, but his official position in relation to all the Israelites was greatly exalted. This elevation of Moses excited envy on the part of his brother and sister, whom God had also richly endowed and placed so high, that Miriam was distinguished as a prophetess above all the women of Israel, whilst Aaron had been raised by his investiture with the high-priesthood into the spiritual head of the whole nation. But the pride of the natural heart was not satisfied with this. They would dispute with their brother Moses the pre-eminence of his special calling and his exclusive position, which they might possibly regard themselves as entitled to contest with him not only as his brother and sister, but also as the nearest supporters of his vocation. Miriam was the instigator of the open rebellion, as we may see both from the fact that her name stands before that of Aaron, and also from the use of the feminine verb נִזְבַּח in ver. 1. Aaron followed her, being no more able to resist the suggestions of his sister, than he had formerly been to resist the desire of the people for a golden idol (Ex. xxxii.). Miriam found an occasion for the manifestation of her discontent in the Cushite wife whom Moses had taken. This wife cannot have been Zipporah the Midianite: for even though Miriam might possibly

have called her a Cushite, whether because the Cushite tribes dwelt in Arabia, or in a contemptuous sense as a Moor or Hamite, the author would certainly not have confirmed this at all events inaccurate, if not contemptuous epithet, by adding, “*for he had taken a Cushite wife;*” to say nothing of the improbability of Miriam having made the marriage which her brother had contracted when he was a fugitive in a foreign land, long before he was called by God, the occasion of reproach so many years afterwards. It would be quite different if, a short time before, probably after the death of Zipporah, he had contracted a second marriage with a Cushite woman, who either sprang from the Cushites dwelling in Arabia, or from the foreigners who had come out of Egypt along with the Israelites. This marriage would not have been wrong in itself, as God had merely forbidden the Israelites to marry the daughters of Canaan (Ex. xxxiv. 16), even if Moses had not contracted it “with the deliberate intention of setting forth through this marriage with a Hamite woman the fellowship between Israel and the heathen, so far as it could exist under the law; and thus practically exemplifying in his own person that equality between the foreigners and Israel which the law demanded in various ways” (*Baumgarten*), or of “prefiguring by this example the future union of Israel with the most remote of the heathen,” as *O. v. Gerlach* and many of the fathers suppose. In the taunt of the brother and sister, however, we meet with that carnal exaggeration of the Israelitish nationality which forms so all-pervading a characteristic of this nation, and is the more reprehensible the more it rests upon the ground of nature rather than upon the spiritual calling of Israel (*Kurtz*).—Ver. 2. Miriam and Aaron said, “*Hath Jehovah then spoken only by Moses, and not also by us?*” Are not we—the high priest Aaron, who brings the rights of the congregation before Jehovah in the Urim and Thummim (Ex. xxviii. 30), and the prophetess Miriam (Ex. xv. 20)—also organs and mediators of divine revelation? “They are proud of the prophetic gift, which ought rather to have fostered modesty in them. But such is the depravity of human nature, that they not only abuse the gifts of God towards the brother whom they despise, but by an ungodly and sacrilegious glorification extol the gifts themselves in such a manner as to hide the Author of the gifts” (*Calvin*).—“*And Jehovah heard.*” This is stated for the purpose of preparing the way for the judicial interposition of God. When God hears what is wrong, He must proceed to stop it by punishment. Moses might

also have heard what they said, but “*the man Moses was very meek* ($\pi\tau\alpha\imath's$, LXX., *mitis*, Vulg.; not ‘plagued,’ *geplagt*, as Luther renders it), *more than all men upon the earth.*” No one approached Moses in meekness, because no one was raised so high by God as he was. The higher the position which a man occupies among his fellow-men, the harder is it for the natural man to bear attacks upon himself with meekness, especially if they are directed against his official rank and honour. This remark as to the character of Moses serves to bring out to view the position of the person attacked, and points out the reason why Moses not only abstained from all self-defence, but did not even cry to God for vengeance on account of the injury that had been done to him. Because he was the meekest of all men, he could calmly leave this attack upon himself to the all-wise and righteous Judge, who had both called and qualified him for his office. “For this is the idea of the eulogium of his meekness. It is as if Moses had said that he had swallowed the injury in silence, inasmuch as he had imposed a law of patience upon himself because of his meekness” (*Calvin*).

The self-praise on the part of Moses, which many have discovered in this description of his character, and on account of which some even of the earlier expositors regarded this verse as a later gloss, whilst more recent critics have used it as an argument against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, is not an expression of vain self-display, or a glorification of his own gifts and excellences, which he prided himself upon possessing above all others. It is simply a statement, which was indispensable to a full and correct interpretation of all the circumstances, and which was made quite objectively, with reference to the character which Moses had not given to himself but had acquired through the grace of God, and which he never falsified from the very time of his calling until the day of his death, either at the rebellion of the people at Kibroth-hattaavah (chap. xi.), or at the water of strife at Kadesh (chap. xx.). His despondency under the heavy burden of his office in the former case (chap. xi.) speaks rather for than against the meekness of his character; and the sin at Kadesh (chap. xx.) consisted simply in the fact, that he suffered himself to be brought to doubt either the omnipotence of God, or the possibility of divine help, on account of the unbelief of the people.¹

¹ There is not a word in Num. xx. 10 or Ps. cxi. 32 to the effect, that “his dissatisfaction broke out into evident passion” (*Kurtz*). And it is quite a mistake to observe, that in the case before us there was nothing at all to pro-

No doubt it was only such a man as Moses who could speak of himself in such a way,—a man who had so entirely sacrificed his own personality to the office assigned him by the Lord, that he was ready at any moment to stake his life for the cause and glory of the Lord (cf. chap. xi. 15, and Ex. xxxii. 32), and of whom *Calmet* observes with as much truth as force, “As he praises himself here without pride, so he will blame himself elsewhere with humility,” —a man of God whose character is not to be measured by the standard of ordinary men (cf. *Hengstenberg, Dissertations*, vol. ii. pp. 141 sqq.).

Vers. 4–10. Jehovah summoned the opponents of His servant to come at once before His judgment-seat. He commanded Moses, Aaron, and Miriam suddenly to come out of the camp (see at chap. xi. 30) to the tabernacle. Then He Himself came down in a pillar of cloud to the door of the tabernacle, *i.e.* to the entrance to the court, not to the dwelling itself, and called Aaron and Miriam out, *i.e.* commanded them to come out of the court,¹ and said to them (vers. 6 sqq.): “*If there is a prophet of Jehovah to you (i.e. if you have one), I make Myself known to him in a vision; I speak to him in a dream (בְּאָמֵן, lit. “in him,” inasmuch as a revelation in a dream fell within the inner sphere of the soul-life). Not so My servant Moses: he is approved in My whole house; mouth to mouth I speak to him, and as an appearance, and that not in enigmas; and he sees the form of Jehovah. Why are ye not afraid to speak against My servant, against Moses?*” נִבְיא לְכֶם = נִבְיא אֲכֶם, the suffix used with the noun instead of the separate pronoun in the dative, as in Gen. xxxix. 21, Lev. xv. 3, etc. The noun *Jehovah* is in all probability to be taken as a genitive, in connection with the word woke Moses to appeal to his meekness, since it was not his meekness that Miriam had disputed, but only his prophetic call. If such grounds as these are interpolated into the words of Moses, and it is to be held that an attack upon the prophetic calling does not involve such an attack upon the person as might have excited anger, it is certainly impossible to maintain the Mosaic authorship of this statement as to the character of Moses; for the vanity of wishing to procure the recognition of his meekness by praising it, cannot certainly be imputed to Moses the man of God.

¹ The discrepancy discovered by *Knobel*, in the fact that, according to the so-called Elohist, no one but Moses, Aaron, and the sons of Aaron were allowed to enter the sanctuary, whereas, according to the Jehovahist, others did so,—e.g. Miriam here, and Joshua in Ex. xxxiii. 11,—rests entirely upon a groundless fancy, arising from a misinterpretation, as there is not a word about entering the sanctuary, *i.e.* the dwelling itself, either in the verse before us or in Ex. xxxiii. 11.

נָבֵּי אֶתְכֶם ("a prophet to you"), as it is in the LXX. and *Vulg.*, and not to be construed with the words which follow ("I Jehovah will make Myself known"). The position of *Jehovah* at the head of the clause without a preceding אָנֹכִי (I) would be much more remarkable than the separation of the dependent noun from the governing noun by the suffix, which occurs in other cases also (*e.g.* Lev. vi. 3, xxvi. 42, etc.); moreover, it would be by no means suited to the sense, as no such emphasis is laid upon the fact that it was *Jehovah* who made Himself known, as to require or even justify such a construction. The "whole house of *Jehovah*" (ver. 7) is not "primarily His dwelling, the holy tent" (*Baumgarten*),—for, in that case, the word "whole" would be quite superfluous,—but the whole house of Israel, or the covenant nation regarded as a kingdom, to the administration and government of which Moses had been called: as a matter of fact, therefore, the whole economy of the Old Testament, having its central point in the holy tent, which *Jehovah* had caused to be built as the dwelling-place of His name. It did not terminate, however, in the service of the sanctuary, as we may see from the fact that God did not make the priests who were entrusted with the duties of the sanctuary the organs of His saving revelation, but raised up and called prophets after Moses for that purpose. Compare the expression in Heb. iii. 6, "Whose house we are." נָמָת with נָמָת does not mean to be, or become, entrusted with anything (*Baumgarten, Knobel*), but simply to be lasting, firm, constant, in a local or temporal sense (Deut. xxviii. 59; 1 Sam. ii. 35; 2 Sam. vii. 16, etc.); in a historical sense, to prove or attest one's self (Gen. xlvi. 20); and in an ethical sense, to be found proof, trustworthy, true (Ps. lxxviii. 8; 1 Sam. iii. 20, xxii. 14: see *Delitzsch* on Heb. iii. 2). In the participle, therefore, it signifies proved, faithful, πιστός (LXX.). "Mouth to mouth" answers to the "face to face" in Ex. xxxiii. 11 (cf. Deut. xxxiv. 10), *i.e.* without any mediation or reserve, but with the same closeness and freedom with which friends converse together (Ex. xxxiii. 11). This is still further strengthened and elucidated by the words in apposition, "in the form of seeing (appearance), and not in riddles," *i.e.* visibly, and not in a dark, hidden, enigmatical way. בְּרוּחַ is an accusative defining the mode, and signifies here not vision, as in ver. 6, but *adspicere*, view, sight; for it forms an antithesis to בְּרוּחַ in ver. 6. "The form (Eng. similitude) of *Jehovah*" was not the essential nature of God, His unveiled glory,—for this no mortal man can see (*vid.* Ex. xxxiii. 18 sqq.),—but a form which

manifested the invisible God to the eye of man in a clearly discernible mode, and which was essentially different, not only from the visionary sight of God in the form of a man (Ezek. i. 26; Dan. vii. 9 and 13), but also from the appearances of God in the outward world of the senses, in the person and form of the angel of Jehovah, and stood in the same relation to these two forms of revelation, so far as directness and clearness were concerned, as the sight of a person in a dream to that of the actual figure of the person himself. God talked with Moses without figure, in the clear distinctness of a spiritual communication, whereas to the prophets He only revealed Himself through the medium of ecstasy or dream.

Through this utterance on the part of Jehovah, Moses is placed above all the prophets, in relation to God and also to the whole nation. The divine revelation to the prophets is thereby restricted to the two forms of inward intuition (vision and dream). It follows from this, that it had always a visionary character, though it might vary in intensity; and therefore that it had always more or less obscurity about it, because the clearness of self-consciousness and the distinct perception of an external world, both receded before the inward intuition, in a dream as well as in a vision. The prophets were consequently simply organs, through whom Jehovah made known His counsel and will at certain times, and in relation to special circumstances and features in the development of His kingdom. It was not so with Moses. Jehovah had placed him over all His house, had called him to be the founder and organizer of the kingdom established in Israel through his mediatorial service, and had found him faithful in His service. With this servant (*θεράπων*, LXX.) of His, He spake mouth to mouth, without a figure or figurative cloak, with the distinctness of a human interchange of thought; so that at any time he could inquire of God and wait for the divine reply. Hence Moses was not a prophet of Jehovah, like many others, not even merely the first and highest prophet, *primus inter pares*, but stood above all the prophets, as the founder of the theocracy, and mediator of the Old Covenant. Upon this unparalleled relation of Moses to God and the theocracy, so clearly expressed in the verses before us, the Rabbins have justly founded their view as to the higher grade of inspiration in the *Thorah*. This view is fully confirmed through the history of the Old Testament kingdom of God, and the relation in which the writings of the prophets stand to those of Moses. The prophets subsequent to Moses simply continued to build upon the foundation

which Moses laid. And if Moses stood in this unparalleled relation to the Lord, Miriam and Aaron sinned grievously against him, when speaking as they did. Ver. 9. After this address, “*the wrath of Jehovah burned against them, and He went.*” As a judge, withdrawing from the judgment-seat when he has pronounced his sentence, so Jehovah went, by the cloud in which He had come down withdrawing from the tabernacle, and ascending up on high. And at the same moment, Miriam, the instigator of the rebellion against her brother Moses, was covered with leprosy, and became white as snow.

Vers. 11-16. When Aaron saw his sister smitten in this way, he said to Moses, “*Alas ! my lord, I beseech thee, lay not this sin upon us, for we have done foolishly,*” i.e. let us not bear its punishment. “*Let her (Miriam) not be as the dead thing, on whose coming out of its mother’s womb half its flesh is consumed;*” i.e. like a still-born child, which comes into the world half decomposed. His reason for making this comparison was, that leprosy produces decomposition in the living body.—Ver. 13. Moses, with his mildness, took compassion upon his sister, upon whom this punishment had fallen, and cried to the Lord, “*O God, I beseech Thee, heal her.*” The connection of the particle נִנְמַד with נָא is certainly unusual, but yet it is analogous to the construction with such exclamations as נִנְמַד (Jer. iv. 31, xlv. 3) and נִנְמַד (Gen. xii. 11, xvi. 2, etc.); since נָא in the vocative is to be regarded as equivalent to an exclamation; whereas the alteration into נָא, as proposed by *J. D. Michaelis* and *Knobel*, does not even give a fitting sense, apart altogether from the fact, that the repetition of נִנְמַד after the verb, with נִנְמַד לְאֵלֶּה before it, would be altogether unexampled.—Vers. 14, 15. Jehovah hearkened to His servant’s prayer, though not without inflicting deep humiliation upon Miriam. “*If her father had but spit in her face, would she not be ashamed seven days?*” i.e. keep herself hidden from Me out of pure shame. She was to be shut outside the camp, to be excluded from the congregation as a leprous person for seven days, and then to be received in again. Thus restoration and purification from her leprosy were promised to her after the endurance of seven days’ punishment. Leprosy was the just punishment for her sin. In her haughty exaggeration of the worth of her own prophetic gift, she had placed herself on a par with Moses, the divinely appointed head of the whole nation, and exalted herself above the congregation of the Lord. For this she was afflicted with a disease which shut her out of the number of the members of the people of

God, and thus actually excluded from the camp ; so that she could only be received back again after she had been healed, and by a formal purification. The latter followed as a matter of course, from Lev. xiii. and xiv., and did not need to be specially referred to here.

—Vers. 15b, 16. The people did not proceed any farther till the restoration of Miriam. After this they departed from Hazeroth, and encamped in the desert of *Paran*, namely at Kadesh, on the southern boundary of Canaan. This is evident from chap. xiii., more especially ver. 26, as compared with Deut. i. 19 sqq., where it is stated not merely that the spies, who were sent out from this place of encampment to Canaan, returned to the congregation at Kadesh, but that they set out from Kadesh-Barnea for Canaan, because there the Israelites had come to the mountains of the Amorites, which God had promised them for an inheritance.

With regard to the situation of *Kadesh*, it has already been observed at Gen. xiv. 7, that it is probably to be sought for in the neighbourhood of the fountain of *Ain Kades*, which was discovered by *Rowland*, to the south of *Bir Seba* and *Khalasa*, on the heights of *Jebel Helal*, *i.e.* at the north-west corner of the mountain land of *Azazimeh*, which is more closely described at chap. x. 12 (see pp. 57, 58), where the western slopes of this highland region sink gently down into the undulating surface of the desert, which stretches thence to *El Arish*, with a breadth of about six hours' journey, and keeps the way open between Arabia Petræa and the south of Palestine. “In the northern third of this western slope, the mountains recede so as to leave a free space for a plain of about an hour's journey in breadth, which comes towards the east, and to which access is obtained through one or more of the larger wadys that are to be seen here (such as *Retemat*, *Kusaimeh*, *el Ain*, *Muweileh*).” At the north-eastern background of this plain, which forms almost a rectangular figure of nine miles by five, or ten by six, stretching from west to east, large enough to receive the camp of a wandering people, and about twelve miles to the E.S.E. of Muweileh, there rises, like a large solitary mass, at the edge of the mountains which run on towards the north, a bare rock, at the foot of which there is a copious spring, falling in ornamental cascades into the bed of a brook, which is lost in the sand about 300 or 400 yards to the west. This place still bears the ancient name of *Kudēs*. There can be no doubt as to the identity of this *Kudēs* and the biblical Kadesh. The situation agrees with all the statements in the Bible concerning Kadesh : for example, that Israel had then reached the border of the

promised land ; also that the spies who were sent out from Kadesh returned thither by coming from Hebron to the wilderness of Paran (chap. xiii. 26) ; and lastly, according to the assertions of the Bedouins, as quoted by *Rowland*, this Kudes was ten or eleven days' journey from Sinai (in perfect harmony with Deut. i. 2), and was connected by passable wadys with Mount Hor. The Israelites proceeded, no doubt, through the wady *Retemat*, i.e. *Rithmah* (see at chap. xxxiii. 18), into the plain of Kadesh. (On the town of Kadesh, see at chap. xx. 16.)¹

SPIES SENT OUT. MURMURING OF THE PEOPLE, AND THEIR PUNISHMENT.—CHAP. XIII. AND XIV.

When they had arrived at Kadesh, in the desert of Paran (chap. xiii. 26), Moses sent out spies by the command of God, and according to the wishes of the people, to explore the way by which they could enter into Canaan, and also the nature of the land, of its cities, and of its population (chap. xiii. 1–20). The men who were sent out passed through the land, from the south to the northern frontier, and on their return reported that the land was no doubt one of pre-eminent goodness, but that it was inhabited by a strong people, who had giants among them, and were in possession of very large fortified towns (vers. 21–29) ; whereupon Caleb declared that it was quite possible to conquer it, whilst the others despaired of over coming the Canaanites, and spread an evil report among the people concerning the land (vers. 30–33). The congregation then raised a loud lamentation, and went so far in their murmuring against Moses and Aaron, as to speak without reserve or secrecy of depositing Moses, and returning to Egypt under another leader : they even wanted to stone Joshua and Caleb, who tried to calm the excited multitude, and urged them to trust in the Lord. But suddenly the glory of the Lord interposed with a special manifestation of judgment (chap. xiv. 1–10). Jehovah made known to Moses His resolution to destroy the rebellious nation, but suffered Himself to be moved by the intercession of Moses so far as to promise that He would preserve the nation, though He would exclude the murmuring multitude from the promised land (vers. 11–25). He then directed Moses and Aaron to proclaim to the people the following

¹ See *Kurtz*, History of the Old Covenant, vol. iii. p. 225, where the current notion, that Kadesh was situated on the western border of the Arabah, below the Dead Sea, by either Ain Hasb or Ain el Weibeh, is successfully refuted.

punishment for their repeated rebellion : that they should bear their iniquity for forty years in the wilderness ; that the whole nation that had come out of Egypt should die there, with the exception of Caleb and Joshua ; and that only their children should enter the promised land (vers. 26-39). The people were shocked at this announcement, and resolved to force a way into Canaan ; but, as Moses predicted, they were beaten by the Canaanites and Amalekites, and driven back to Hormah (vers. 40-45).¹

These events form a grand turning-point in the history of Israel, in which the whole of the future history of the covenant nation is typically reflected. The constantly repeated unfaithfulness of the nation could not destroy the faithfulness of God, or alter His purposes of salvation. In wrath Jehovah remembered mercy ; through judgment He carried out His plan of salvation, that all the world might know that no flesh was righteous before Him, and that the unbelief and unfaithfulness of men could not overturn the truth of God.

Chap. xiii. 1-20. DESPATCH OF THE SPIES TO CANAAN.—Vers. 1 sqq. The command of Jehovah, to send out men to spy out the land of Canaan, was occasioned, according to the account given by Moses in Deut. i. 22 sqq., by a proposal of the congregation, which pleased Moses, so that he laid the matter before the Lord, who then commanded him to send out for this purpose, “*of every tribe of their fathers a man, every one a ruler among them, i.e. none*

¹ According to Knobel, the account of these events arose from two or three documents interwoven with one another in the following manner : chap. xiii. 1-17a, 21, 25, 26, 32, and xiv. 2a, 5-7, 10b, 36-38, was written by the Elohist, the remainder by the Jehovist,—chap. xiii. 22-24, 27-31, xiv. 1b, 11-25, 39-45, being taken from his first document, and chap. xiii. 17b-20, xiv. 2b-4, 8-10a, 26-33, 35, from his second ; whilst, lastly, chap. xiii. 33, and the commencement of chap. xiv. 1, were added from his own resources, because it contains contradictory statements. “According to the Elohist,” says this critic, “the spies went through the whole land (chap. xiii. 32, xiv. 7), and penetrated even to the north of the country (chap. xiii. 21) : they took forty days to this (chap. xiii. 25, xiv. 31) ; they had among them Joshua, whose name was altered at that time (chap. xiii. 16), and who behaved as bravely as Caleb (chap. xiii. 8, xiv. 6, 38). According to the Jehovistic completion, the spies did not go through the whole land, but only entered into it (chap. xiii. 27), merely going into the neighbourhood of Hebron, in the south country (chap. xiii. 22, 23) ; there they saw the gigantic Anakites (chap. xiii. 22, 28, 33), cut off the large bunch of grapes in the valley of Eshcol (chap. xiii. 23, 24), and then came back to Moses. Caleb was the only one who showed himself courageous, and Joshua was not with them at all (chap. xiii. 30, xiv. 24).” But these discre-

but men who were princes in their tribes, who held the prominent position of princes, *i.e.* distinguished persons of rank ; or, as it is stated in ver. 3, “*heads of the children of Israel,*” *i.e.* not the tribe-princes of the twelve tribes, but those men, out of the total number of the heads of the tribes and families of Israel, who were the most suitable for such a mission, though the selection was to be made in such a manner that every tribe should be represented by one of its own chiefs. That there were none of the twelve tribe-princes among them is apparent from a comparison of their names (vers. 4-15) with the (totally different) names of the tribe-princes (chap. i. 3 sqq., vii. 12 sqq.). Caleb and Joshua are the only spies that are known. The order, in which the tribes are placed in the list of the names in vers. 4-15, differs from that in chap. i. 5-15 only in the fact that in ver. 10 Zebulun is separated from the other sons of Leah, and in ver. 11 Manasseh is separated from Ephraim. The expression “*of the tribe of Joseph,*” in ver. 11, stands for “*of the children of Joseph,*” in chap. i. 10, xxxiv. 23. At the close of the list it is still further stated, that Moses called *Hoshea* (*i.e.* help), the son of Nun, *Jehoshua*, contracted into *Joshua* (*i.e.* Jehovah-help, equivalent to, whose help is Jehovah). This statement does not present any such discrepancy, when compared with Ex. xvii. 9, 13, xxiv. 13, xxxii. 17, xxxiii. 11, and Num. xi. 28, where Joshua bears this name as the servant of Moses at a still earlier period, as to point to any diversity of authorship. As there is nothing of a genealogies do not exist in the biblical narrative ; on the contrary, they have been introduced by the critic himself, by the forcible separation of passages from their context, and by arbitrary interpolations. The words of the spies in chap. xiii. 27, “We came into the land whither thou sentest us, and surely it floweth with milk and honey,” do not imply that they *only* came into the southern portion of the land, any more than the fact that they brought a bunch of grapes from the neighbourhood of Hebron is a proof that they did not go beyond the valley of Eshcol. Moreover, it is not stated in chap. xiii. 30 that Joshua was not found among the tribes. Again, the circumstance that in chap. xiv. 11-25 and 26-35 the same thing is said twice over,—the special instructions as to the survey of the land in chap. xiii. 17b-20, which were quite unnecessary for intelligent leaders,—the swearing of God (chap. xiv. 16, 21, 23),—the forced explanation of the name *Eshcol*, in chap. xiii. 24, and other things of the same kind,—are said to furnish further proofs of the interpolation of Jchovistic clauses into the Elohistic narrative ; and lastly, a number of the words employed are supposed to place this beyond all doubt. Of these proofs, however, the first rests upon a simple misinterpretation of the passage in question, and a disregard of the peculiarities of Hebrew history ; whilst the rest are either subjective conclusions, dictated by the taste of vulgar rationalism, or inferences and assumptions, of which the tenability and force need first of all to be established.

logical character in any of these passages, so as to warrant us in expecting to find the family name of Joshua in them, the name Joshua, by which Hosea had become best known in history, could be used proleptically in them all. On the other hand, however, it is not distinctly stated in the verse before us, that this was the occasion on which Moses gave Hosea the new name of Joshua. As the *Vav consec.* frequently points out merely the order of thought, the words may be understood without hesitation in the following sense : These are the names borne by the heads of the tribes to be sent out as spies, as they stand in the family registers according to their descent ; Hosea, however, was named Joshua by Moses ; which would not by any means imply that the alteration in the name had not been made till then. It is very probable that Moses may have given him the new name either before or after the defeat of the Amalekites (*Ex. xvii. 9 sqq.*), or when he took him into his service, though it has not been mentioned before ; whilst here the circumstances themselves required that it should be stated that Hosea, as he was called in the list prepared and entered in the documentary record according to the genealogical tables of the tribes, had received from Moses the name of Joshua. In vers. 17-20 Moses gives them the necessary instructions, defining more clearly the motive which the congregation had assigned for sending them out, namely, that they might search out the way into the land and to its towns (*Deut. i. 22*). “ *Get you up there (נֶגֶב) in the south country, and go up to the mountain.*” *Negeb*, i.e. south country, lit. dryness, aridity, from נָגֵב, to be dry or arid (in *Syr.*, *Chald.*, and *Samar.*). Hence the dry, parched land, in contrast to the well-watered country (*Josh. xv. 19* ; *Judg. i. 15*), was the name given to the southern district of Canaan, which forms the transition from the desert to the strictly cultivated land, and bears for the most part the character of a steppe, in which tracts of sand and heath are intermixed with shrubs, grass, and vegetables, whilst here and there corn is also cultivated ; a district therefore which was better fitted for grazing than for agriculture, though it contained a number of towns and villages (see at *Josh. xv. 21-32*). “ *The mountain*” is the mountainous part of Palestine, which was inhabited by Hittites, Jebusites, and Amorites (ver. 29), and was called the mountains of the Amorites, on account of their being the strongest of the Canaanitish tribes (*Deut. i. 7, 19 sqq.*). It is not to be restricted, as *Knobel* supposes, to the limits of the so-called mountains of Judah (*Josh. xv. 48-62*), but included the mountains of Israel or Ephraim also

(Josh. xi. 21, xx. 7), and formed, according to Deut. i. 7, the backbone of the whole land of Canaan up to Lebanon.—Ver. 18. They were to see the land, “what it was,” *i.e.* what was its character, and the people that dwelt in it, whether they were strong, *i.e.* courageous and brave, or weak, *i.e.* spiritless and timid, and whether they were little or great, *i.e.* numerically; (ver. 19) what the land was, whether good or bad, *sc.* with regard to climate and cultivation, and whether the towns were camps, *i.e.* open villages and hamlets, or fortified places; also (ver. 20) whether the land was fat or lean, *i.e.* whether it had a fertile soil or not, and whether there were trees in it or not. All this they were to search out courageously (*בִּנְחָנָה*, to show one’s self courageous in any occupation), and to fetch (some) of the fruits of the land, as it was the time of the first-ripe grapes. In Palestine the first grapes ripen as early as August, and sometimes even in July (*vid. Robinson*, ii. 100, ii. 611), whilst the vintage takes place in September and October.

Vers. 21-33. JOURNEY OF THE SPIES; THEIR RETURN, AND REPORT.—Ver. 21. In accordance with the instructions they had received, the men who had been sent out passed through the land, from the desert of Zin to Rehob, in the neighbourhood of Hamath, *i.e.* in its entire extent from south to north. The “*Desert of Zin*” (which occurs not only here, but in chap. xx. 1, xxvii. 14, xxxiii. 36, xxxiv. 3, 4; Deut. xxxii. 51, and Josh. xv. 1, 3) was the name given to the northern edge of the great desert of Paran, viz. the broad ravine of Wady *Murreh* (see p. 59), which separates the lofty and precipitous northern border of the table-land of the Azazimeh from the southern border of the Rakhma plateau, *i.e.* of the southernmost plateau of the mountains of the Amorites (or the mountains of Judah), and runs from Jebel *Madarah* (*Moddera*) on the east, to the plain of Kadesh, which forms part of the desert of Zin (cf. chap. xxvii. 14, xxxiii. 36; Deut. xxxii. 51), on the west. The south frontier of Canaan passed through this from the southern end of the Dead Sea, along the Wady *el Murreh* to the Wady *el Arish* (chap. xxxiv. 3).—“*Rehob, to come* (coming) to Hamath,” *i.e.* where you enter the province of Hamath, on the northern boundary of Canaan, is hardly one of the two Rehobs in the tribe of Asher (Josh. xix. 28 and 30), but most likely *Beth-Rehob* in the tribe of Naphtali, which was in the neighbourhood of *Dan Lais*, the modern *Tell el Kadhy* (Judg. xviii. 28), and which *Robinson* imagined that he had identified in the ruins of the castle of *Hunin* or *Honin*, in

the village of the same name, to the south-west of *Tell el Kadhy*, on the range of mountains which bound the plain towards the west above Lake *Huleh* (Bibl. Researches, p. 371). In support of this conjecture, he laid the principal stress upon the fact that the direct road to Hamath through the Wady *et Teim* and the *Bekaa* commences here. The only circumstance which it is hard to reconcile with this conjecture is, that Beth-Rehob is never mentioned in the Old Testament, with the exception of Judg. xviii. 28, either among the fortified towns of the Canaanites or in the wars of the Israelites with the Syrians and Assyrians, and therefore does not appear to have been a place of such importance as we should naturally be led to suppose from the character of this castle, the very situation of which points to a bold, commanding fortress (see Lynch's Expedition), and where there are still remains of its original foundations built of large square stones, hewn and grooved, and reminding one of the antique and ornamental edifices of Solomon's times (cf. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv. pp. 242 sqq.).—*Hamath* is *Epiphania* on the *Orontes*, now *Hamah* (see at Gen. x. 18).

After the general statement, that the spies went through the whole land from the southern to the northern frontier, two facts are mentioned in vers. 22–24, which occurred in connection with their mission, and were of great importance to the whole congregation. These single incidents are linked on, however, in a truly Hebrew style, to what precedes, viz. by an *imperfect* with *Vav consec.*, just in the same manner in which, in 1 Kings vi. 9, 15, the detailed account of the building of the temple is linked on to the previous statement, that Solomon built the temple and finished it;¹ so that the true rendering would be, “now they ascended in the south country and came to Hebron (*אֶבְרֹן* is apparently an error in writing for *אֶנְקָן*), and there were *לִلְיָה הַעֲנָק*, the children of Anak,” three of whom are mentioned by name. These three, who were afterwards expelled by Caleb, when the land was divided and the city of Hebron was given to him for an inheritance (Josh. xv. 14;

¹ A comparison of 1 Kings vi., where we cannot possibly suppose that two accounts have been linked together or interwoven, is specially adapted to give us a clear view of the peculiar custom adopted by the Hebrew historians, of placing the end and ultimate result of the events they narrate as much as possible at the head of their narrative, and then proceeding with a minute account of the more important of the attendant circumstances, without paying any regard to the chronological order of the different incidents, or being at all afraid of repetitions, and so to prove how unwarrantable and false are the conclusions of those critics who press such passages into the support of their

Judg. i. 20), were descendants of *Arbah*, the lord of Hebron, from whom the city received its name of *Kirjath-Arbah*, or city of Arbah, and who is described in Josh. xiv. 15 as “the great (*i.e.* the greatest) man among the Anakim,” and in Josh. xv. 13 as the “father of Anak,” *i.e.* the founder of the Anakite family there. For it is evident enough that **הָעֵנָק** (*Anak*) is not the proper name of a man in these passages, but the name of a family or tribe, from the fact that in ver. 33, where Anak’s sons are spoken of in a general and indefinite manner, **בְּנֵי עֵנָק** has not the article; also from the fact that the three Anakites who lived in Hebron are almost always called **בְּנֵי הָעֵנָק** **לִיְצֵה הָעֵנָק**, Anak’s born (vers. 22, 28), and that **בְּנֵי עֵנָק** (*sons of Anak*), in Josh. xv. 14, is still further defined by the phrase **בְּנֵי יַעֲמֹד הָעֵנָק** (*children of Anak*); and lastly, from the fact that in the place of “sons of Anak,” we find “sons of the Anakim” in Deut. i. 28 and ix. 2, and the “Anakim” in Deut. ii. 10, xi. 21; Josh. xiv. 12, etc. *Anak* is supposed to signify long-necked; but this does not preclude the possibility of the founder of the tribe having borne this name. The origin of the *Anakites* is involved in obscurity. In Deut. ii. 10, 11, they are classed with the *Etim* and *Rephaim* on account of their gigantic stature, and probably reckoned as belonging to the pre-Canaanitish inhabitants of the land, of whom it is impossible to decide whether they were of Semitic origin or descendants of Ham (see vol. i. p. 203). It is also doubtful, whether the names found here in vers. 21, 28, and in Josh. xv. 14, are the names of individuals, *i.e.* of chiefs of the Anakites, or the names of Anakite tribes. The latter supposition is favoured by the circumstance, that the same names occur even after the capture of Hebron by Caleb, or at least fifty years after the event referred to here. With regard to Hebron, it is still further observed in ver. 22b, that it was built seven years before *Zoan* in Egypt. *Zoan*—the *Tanis* of the Greeks and Romans, the *San* of the Arabs, which is called *Jani*, *Jane* in Coptic writings—was situated upon the eastern side of the Tanitic arm of the Nile, not

hypotheses. We have a similar passage in Josh. iv. 11 sqq., where, after relating that when *all* the people had gone through the Jordan the priests also passed through with the ark of the covenant (ver. 11), the historian proceeds in vers. 12, 13, to describe the crossing of the two tribes and a half; and another in Judg. xx., where, at the very commencement (ver. 35), the issue of the whole is related, viz. the defeat of the Benjamites; and then after that there is a minute description in vers. 36–46 of the manner in which it was effected. This style of narrative is also common in the historical works of the Arabs.

far from its mouth (see *Ges. Thes.* p. 1177), and was the residence of Pharaoh in the time of Moses (see vol. ii. p. 27). The date of its erection is unknown; but Hebron was in existence as early as Abraham's time (Gen. xiii. 18, xxiii. 2 sqq.).—Ver. 23. The spies also came into the valley of *Eshcol*, where they gathered pomegranates and figs, and also cut down a vine-branch with grapes upon it, which two persons carried upon a pole, most likely on account of its extraordinary size. Bunches of grapes are still met with in Palestine, weighing as much as eight, ten, or twelve pounds, the grapes themselves being as large as our smaller plums (cf. *Tobler Denkblätter*, pp. 111, 112). The grapes of Hebron are especially celebrated. To the north of this city, on the way to Jerusalem, you pass through a valley with vineyards on the hills on both sides, containing the largest and finest grapes in the land, and with pomegranates, figs, and other fruits in great profusion (*Robinson, Palestine*, i. 316, compared with i. 314 and ii. 442). This valley is supposed, and not without good ground, to be the *Eshcol* of this chapter, which received its name of *Eshcol* (cluster of grapes), according to ver. 24, from the bunch of grapes which was cut down there by the spies. This statement, of course, applies to the Israelites, and would therefore still hold good, even if the conjecture were a well-founded one, that this valley received its name originally from the *Eshcol* mentioned in Gen. xiv. 13, 24, as the terebinth grove did from *Mamre* the brother of *Eshcol*.

Vers. 25 sqq. In forty days the spies returned to the camp at Kadesh (see at chap. xvi. 6), and reported the great fertility of the land ("it floweth with milk and honey," see at Ex. iii. 8), pointing, at the same time, to the fruit they had brought with them; "nevertheless," they added (כִּי מֵפָנֶיךָ, "only that"), "the people be strong that dwell in the land, and the cities are fortified, very large: and, moreover, we saw the children of Anak there." Amalekites dwelt in the south (see at Gen. xxxvi. 12); Hittites, Jebusites, and Amorites in the mountains (see at Gen. x. 15, 16); and Canaanites by the (Mediterranean) Sea and on the side of the Jordan, i.e. in the Arabah or Ghor (see at Gen. xiii. 7 and x. 15–18).—Ver. 30. As these tidings respecting the towns and inhabitants of Canaan were of a character to excite the people, Caleb calmed them before Moses by saying, "We will go up and take it; for we shall overcome it." The fact that Caleb only is mentioned, though, according to chap. xiv. 6, Joshua also stood by his side, may be explained on the simple ground, that at first Caleb was the only one to speak and

maintain the possibility of conquering Canaan.—Ver. 31. But his companions were of an opposite opinion, and declared that the people in Canaan were stronger than the Israelites, and therefore it was impossible to go up to it.—Ver. 32. Thus they spread an evil report of the land among the Israelites, by exaggerating the difficulties of the conquest in their unbelieving despair, and describing Canaan as a land which “ate up its inhabitants.” Their meaning certainly was not “that the wretched inhabitants were worn out by the laborious task of cultivating it, or that the land was pestilential on account of the inclemency of the weather, or that the cultivation of the land was difficult, and attended with many evils,” as *Calvin* maintains. Their only wish was to lay stress upon the difficulties and dangers connected with the conquest and maintenance of the land, on account of the tribes inhabiting and surrounding it: the land was an apple of discord, because of its fruitfulness and situation; and as the different nations strove for its possession, its inhabitants wasted away (*Cler., Ros., O. v. Gerlach*). The people, they added, are נְפִילִים אֶנְקִים, “men of measures,” i.e. of tall stature (cf. Isa. xlvi. 14), “and there we saw the Nephilim, i.e. primeval tyrants (see at Gen. vi. 4), *Anak’s sons, giants of Nephilim, and we seemed to ourselves and to them as small as grasshoppers.*”

Chap. xiv. 1-10. UPROAR AMONG THE PEOPLE.—Vers. 1-4. This appalling description of Canaan had so depressing an influence upon the whole congregation (cf. Deut. i. 28: they “made their heart melt,” i.e. threw them into utter despair), that they raised a loud cry, and wept in the night in consequence. The whole nation murmured against Moses and Aaron their two leaders, saying “Would that we had died in Egypt or in this wilderness! Why will Jehovah bring us into this land, to fall by the sword, that our wives and our children should become a prey (be made slaves by the enemy; cf. Deut. i. 27, 28)? Let us rather return into Egypt! We will appoint a captain, they said one to another, and go back to Egypt.”—Vers. 5-9. At this murmuring, which was growing into open rebellion, Moses and Aaron fell upon their faces before the whole of the assembled congregation, namely, to pour out their distress before the Lord, and move Him to interpose; that is to say, after they had made an unsuccessful attempt, as we may supply from Deut. i. 29-31, to cheer up the people, by pointing them to the help they had thus far received from God. “In such distress, nothing remained but to pour out their desires

before God ; offering their prayer in public, however, and in the sight of all the people, in the hope of turning their minds" (*Calvin*). Joshua and Caleb, who had gone with the others to explore the land, also rent their clothes, as a sign of their deep distress at the rebellious attitude of the people (see at Lev. x. 6), and tried to convince them of the goodness and glory of the land they had travelled through, and to incite them to trust in the Lord. "*If Jehovah take pleasure in us,*" they said, "*He will bring us into this land. Only rebel not ye against Jehovah, neither fear ye the people of the land; for they are our food;*" i.e. we can and shall swallow them up, or easily destroy them (cf. chap. xxii. 4, xxiv. 8; Deut. vii. 16; Ps. xiv. 4). "*Their shadow is departed from them, and Jehovah is with us: fear them not!*" "*Their shadow*" is the shelter and protection of God (cf. Ps. xci., cxxi. 5). The shadow, which defends from the burning heat of the sun, was a very natural figure in the sultry East, to describe defence from injury, a refuge from danger and destruction (Isa. xxx. 2). The protection of God had departed from the Canaanites, because God had determined to destroy them when the measure of their iniquity was full (Gen. xv. 16; cf. Ex. xxxiv. 24; Lev. xviii. 25, xx. 23). But the excited people resolved to stone them, when Jehovah interposed with His judgment, and His glory appeared in the tabernacle to all the Israelites ; that is to say, the majesty of God flashed out before the eyes of the people in a light which suddenly burst forth from the tabernacle (see at Ex. xvi. 10).

Vers. 11-25. INTERCESSION OF MOSES.—Vers. 11, 12. Jehovah resented the conduct of the people as base contempt of His deity, and as utter mistrust of Him, notwithstanding all the signs which He had wrought in the midst of the nation ; and declared that He would smite the rebellious people with pestilence, and destroy them, and make of Moses a greater and still mightier people. This was just what He had done before, when the rebellion took place at Sinai (Ex. xxxii. 10). But Moses, as a servant who was faithful over the whole house of God, and therefore sought not his own honour, but the honour of his God alone, stood in the breach on this occasion also (Ps. cxi. 23), with a similar intercessory prayer to that which he had presented at Horeb, except that on this occasion he pleaded the honour of God among the heathen, and the glorious revelation of the divine nature with which he had been favoured at Sinai, as a motive for sparing the rebellious nation (vers. 13-19 ;

cf. Ex. xxxii. 11-13, and xxxiv. 6, 7). The first he expressed in these words (vers. 13 sqq.): “*Not only have the Egyptians heard that Thou hast brought out this people from among them with Thy might; they have also told it to the inhabitants of this land. They (the Egyptians and the other nations) have heard that Thou, Jehovah, art in the midst of this people; that Thou, Jehovah, appearest eye to eye, and Thy cloud stands over them, and Thou goest before them in a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night. Now, if Thou shouldst slay this people as one man, the nations which have heard the tidings of Thee would say, Because Jehovah was not able to bring this people into the land which He sware to them, He has slain them in the desert.*” In that case God would be regarded by the heathen as powerless, and His honour would be impaired (cf. Deut. xxxii. 27; Josh. vii. 9). It was for the sake of His own honour that God, at a later time, did not allow the Israelites to perish in exile (cf. Isa. xlvi. 9, 11, lii. 5; Ezek. xxxvi. 22, 23).—**וְנִשְׁמַעַי אָמַרְתִּי . . .** (vers. 13, 14), *et audierunt et dixerunt;* **וְ—וְ—** *et—et—*, both—and. The inhabitants of this land (ver. 13) were not merely the Arabians, but, according to Ex. xv. 14 sqq., the tribes dwelling in and round Arabia, the Philistines, Edomites, Moabites, and Canaanites, to whom the tidings had been brought of the miracles of God in Egypt and at the Dead Sea. **שֶׁ**, in ver. 14, can neither stand for **כִּי שֶׁ** (*dixerunt se audisse*), nor for **אֲשֶׁר שֶׁ**, *qui audierunt*. They are neither of them grammatically admissible, as the relative pronoun cannot be readily omitted in prose; and neither of them would give a really suitable meaning. It is rather a rhetorical resumption of the **שֶׁ** in ver. 13, and the subject of the verb is not only “*the Egyptians*,” but also “*the inhabitants of this land*” who held communication with the Egyptians, or “*the nations*” who had heard the report of Jehovah (ver. 15), i.e. all that God had hitherto done for and among the Israelites in Egypt, and on the journey through the desert. “*Eye to eye:*” i.e. Thou hast appeared to them in the closest proximity. On the pillar of cloud and fire, see at Ex. xiii. 21, 22. “*As one man,*” equivalent to “*with a stroke*” (Judg. vi. 16).—In vers. 17, 18, Moses adduces a second argument, viz. the word in which God Himself had revealed His inmost being to him at Sinai (Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7). The words, “*Let the power be great,*” equivalent to “*show Thyself great in power,*” are not to be connected with what precedes, but with what follows; viz. “*show Thyself mighty by verifying Thy word, ‘Jehovah, long-suffering and great in mercy,’ etc.; forgive, I beseech*

Thee, this people according to the greatness of Thy mercy, and as Thou hast forgiven this people from Egypt even until now." נִשְׁלָחַ (ver. 19) = נִשְׁלָחָנָה (ver. 18).—Ver. 20. In answer to this importunate prayer, the Lord promised forgiveness, namely, the preservation of the nation, but not the remission of the well-merited punishment. At the rebellion at Sinai, He had postponed the punishment "till the day of His visitation" (Ex. xxxii. 34). And that day had now arrived, as the people had carried their continued rebellion against the Lord to the furthest extreme, even to an open declaration of their intention to depose Moses, and return to Egypt under another leader, and thus had filled up the measure of their sins. "*Nevertheless,*" added the Lord (vers. 21, 22), "*as truly as I live, and the glory of Jehovah will fill the whole earth, all the men who have seen My glory and My miracles . . . shall not see the land which I swear unto their fathers.*" The clause, "all the earth," etc., forms an apposition to "as I live." Jehovah proves Himself to be living, by the fact that His glory fills the whole earth. But this was to take place, not, as Knobel, who mistakes the true connection of the different clauses, erroneously supposes, by the destruction of the whole of that generation, which would be talked of by all the world, but rather by the fact that, notwithstanding the sin and opposition of these men, He would still carry out His work of salvation to a glorious victory. The ו in ver. 22 introduces the substance of the oath, as in Isa. xl ix. 18; 1 Sam. xiv. 39, xx. 3; and according to the ordinary form of an oath, וְ in ver. 23 signifies "*not.*"—"They have tempted Me now ten times." Ten is used as the number of completeness and full measure; and this answered to the actual fact, if we follow the Rabbins, and add to the murmuring (1) at the Red Sea, Ex. xiv. 11, 12; (2) at Marah, Ex. xv. 23; (3) in the wilderness of Sin, Ex. xvi. 2; (4) at Rephidim, Ex. xvii. 1; (5) at Horeb, Ex. xxxii.; (6) at Taberah, Num. xi. 1; (7) at the graves of lust, Num. xi. 4 sqq.; and (8) here again at Kadesh, the *twofold* rebellion of certain individuals against the commandments of God at the giving of the manna (Ex. xvi. 20 and 27). The despisers of God should none of them see the promised land.—Ver. 24. But because there was another spirit in Caleb,—*i.e.* not the unbelieving, despairing, yet proud and rebellious spirit of the great mass of the people, but the spirit of obedience and believing trust, so that "*he followed Jehovah fully*" (*lit.* "*fulfilled to walk behind Jehovah*"), followed Him with unwavering fidelity,—God would bring him into the land into which he had gone, and his seed should

possess it. (מִלְאָא אַחֲרֵי here, and at chap. xxxii. 11, 12 ; Deut. i. 36 ; Josh. xiv. 8, 9 ; 1 Kings xi. 6, is a *constructio prægnans* for מִלְאָא לְלִכְבָּת אַחֲרֵי ; cf. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 31.) According to the context, the reference is not to Hebron particularly, but to Canaan generally, which God had sworn unto the fathers (ver. 23, and Deut. i. 36, comp. with ver. 35) ; although, when the land was divided, Caleb received Hebron for his possession, because, according to his own statement in Josh. xiv. 6 sqq., Moses had sworn that he would give it to him. But this is not mentioned here ; just as Joshua also is not mentioned in this place, as he is at vers. 30 and 38, but Caleb only, who opposed the exaggerated accounts of the other spies at the very first, and endeavoured to quiet the excitement of the people by declaring that they were well able to overcome the Canaanites (chap. xiii. 30). This first revelation of God to Moses is restricted to the main fact ; the particulars are given afterwards in the sentence of God, as intended for communication to the people (vers. 26-38).—Ver. 25. The divine reply to the intercession of Moses terminated with a command to the people to turn on the morrow, and go to the wilderness to the Red Sea, as the Amalekites and Canaanites dwelt in the valley. “*The Amalekites,*” etc. : this clause furnishes the reason for the command which follows. On the Amalekites, see at Gen. xxxvi. 12, and Ex. xvii. 8 sqq. The term Canaanite is a general epithet applied to all the inhabitants of Canaan, instead of the Amorites mentioned in Deut. i. 44, who held the southern mountains of Canaan. “The valley” is no doubt the broad *Wady Murreh* (see at chap. xiii. 21), including a portion of the *Negeb*, in which the Amalekites led a nomad life, whilst the Canaanites really dwelt upon the mountains (ver. 45), close up to the *Wady Murreh*.

Vers. 26-38. SENTENCE UPON THE MURMURING CONGREGATION.—After the Lord had thus declared to Moses in general terms His resolution to punish the incorrigible people, and not suffer them to come to Canaan, He proceeded to tell him what announcement he was to make to the people.—Ver. 27. This announcement commences in a tone of anger, with an *aposiopesis*, “*How long this evil congregation*” (*sc.* “shall I forgive it,” the simplest plan being to supply נָשָׁן, as Rosenmüller suggests, from ver. 18), “*that they murmur against Me?*”—Vers. 28-31. Jehovah swore that it should happen to the murmurers as they had spoken. Their corpses should fall in the desert, even all who had been numbered, from

twenty years old and upwards: they should not see the land into which Jehovah had lifted up His hand (see at Ex. vi. 8) to lead them, with the sole exception of Caleb and Joshua. But their children, who, as they said, would be a prey (ver. 3), them Jehovah would bring, and they should learn to know the land which the others had despised.—Vers. 32, 33. “*As for you, your carcases will fall in this wilderness. But your sons will be pasturing* (i.e. will lead a restless shepherd life) *in the desert forty years, and bear your whoredom* (i.e. endure the consequences of your faithless apostasy; see Ex. xxxiv. 16), *until your corpses are finished in the desert,*” i.e. till you have all passed away.—Ver. 34. “*After the number of the forty days that ye have searched the land, shall ye bear your iniquity, (reckoning) a day for a year, and know My turning away from you,*” or פָּנִים, abalienatio, from פָּנָה (chap. xxxii. 7).—Ver. 35. As surely as Jehovah had spoken this, would He do it to that evil congregation, to those who had allied themselves against Him (רְאֵבֶן, to bind themselves together, to conspire; chap. xvi. 11, xxvii. 3). There is no ground whatever for questioning the correctness of the statement, that the spies had travelled through Canaan for forty days, or regarding this as a so-called round number—that is to say, as unhistorical. And if this number is firmly established, there is also no ground for disputing the forty years’ sojourn of the people in the wilderness, although the period during which the rebellious generation, consisting of those who were numbered at Sinai, died out, was actually thirty-eight years, reaching from the autumn of the second year after their departure from Egypt to the middle of the fortieth year of their wanderings, and terminating with the fresh numbering (chap. xxvi.) that was undertaken after the death of Aaron, and took place on the first of the fifth month of the fortieth year (chap. xx. 23 sqq., compared with chap. xxxiii. 38). Instead of these thirty-eight years, the forty years of the sojourn in the desert are placed in connection with the forty days of the spies, because the people had frequently fallen away from God, and been punished in consequence, even during the year and a half before their rejection; and in this respect the year and a half could be combined with the thirty-eight years which followed into one continuous period, during which they bore their iniquity, to set distinctly before the minds of the disobedient people the contrast between that peaceful dwelling in the promised land which they had forfeited, and the restless wandering in the desert, which had been imposed upon them as a punishment, and to impress upon them the causal connection be-

tween sin and suffering. “Every year that passed, and was deducted from the forty years of punishment, was a new and solemn exhortation to repent, as it called to mind the occasion of their rejection” (*Kurtz*). When *Knobel* observes, on the other hand, that “it is utterly improbable that all who came out of Egypt (that is to say, all who were twenty years old and upward when they came out) should have fallen in the desert, with the exception of two, and that there should have been no men found among the Israelites when they entered Canaan who were more than sixty years of age,” the express statement, that on the second numbering there was not a man among those that were numbered who had been included in the numbering at Sinai, except Joshua and Caleb (chap. xxvi. 64 sqq.), is amply sufficient to overthrow this “improbability” as an unfounded fancy. Nor is this statement rendered at all questionable by the fact, that “Aaron’s son Eleazar, who entered Canaan with Joshua” (Josh. xiv. 1, etc.), was most likely more than twenty years old at the time of his consecration at Sinai, as the Levites were not qualified for service till their thirtieth or twenty-fifth year. For, in the first place, the regulation concerning the Levites’ age of service is not to be applied without reserve to the priests also, so that we could infer from this that the sons of Aaron must have been at least twenty-five or thirty years old when they were consecrated; and besides this, the priests do not enter into the question at all, for the tribe of Levi was excepted from the numbering in chap. i., and therefore Aaron’s sons were not included among the persons numbered, who were sentenced to die in the wilderness. Still less does it follow from Josh. xxiv. 7 and Judg. ii. 7, where it is stated that, after the conquest of Canaan, there were many still alive who had been eye-witnesses of the wonders of God in Egypt, that they must have been more than twenty years old when they came out of Egypt; for youths from ten to nineteen years of age would certainly have been able to remember such miracles as these, even after the lapse of forty or fifty years.—Vers. 36-38. But for the purpose of giving to the whole congregation a practical proof of the solemnity of the divine threatening of punishment, the spies who had induced the congregation to revolt, through their evil report concerning the inhabitants of Canaan, were smitten by a “stroke before Jehovah,” *i.e.* by a sudden death, which proceeded in a visible manner from Jehovah Himself, whilst Joshua and Caleb remained alive.

Vers. 39-45 (cf. Deut. i. 41-44). The announcement of the

sentence plunged the people into deep mourning. But instead of bending penitentially under the judgment of God, they resolved to atone for their error, by preparing the next morning to go to the top of the mountain and press forward into Canaan. And they would not even suffer themselves to be dissuaded from their enterprise by the entreaties of Moses, who denounced it as a transgression of the word of God which could not succeed, and predicted their overthrow before their enemies, but went presumptuously (*עַלְיוֹן לְעָלָיוֹן*) up without the ark of the covenant and without Moses, who did not depart out of the midst of the camp, and were smitten by the Amalekites and Canaanites, who drove them back as far as Hormah. Whereas at first they had refused to enter upon the conflict with the Canaanites, through their unbelief in the might of the promise of God, now, through unbelief in the severity of the judgment of God, they resolved to engage in this conflict by their own power, and without the help of God, and to cancel the old sin of unbelieving despair through the new sin of presumptuous self-confidence,—an attempt which could never succeed, but was sure to plunge deeper and deeper into misery. Where “*the top* (or height) *of the mountain*” to which the Israelites advanced was, cannot be precisely determined, as we have no minute information concerning the nature of the ground in the neighbourhood of Kadesh. No doubt the allusion is to some plateau on the northern border of the valley mentioned in ver. 25, viz. the Wady *Murreh*, which formed the southernmost spur of the mountains of the Amorites, from which the Canaanites and Amalekites came against them, and drove them back. In Deut. i. 44, Moses mentions the Amorites instead of the Amalekites and Canaanites, using the name in a broader sense for all the Canaanites, and contenting himself with naming the leading foes with whom the Amalekites who wandered about in the *Negeb* had allied themselves, as Bedouins thirsting for booty. These tribes came down (ver. 45) from the height of the mountain to the lower plateau or saddle, which the Israelites had ascended, and smote them and יִבְתֹּהוּם (from בְּתַח, with the reduplication of the second radical anticipated in the first: see *Ewald*, § 193, c.), “discomfited them, as far as Hormah,” or as Moses expresses it in Deut. i. 44, They “chased you, as bees do” (which pursue with great ferocity any one who attacks or disturbs them), “and destroyed you in Seir, even unto Hormah.” There is not sufficient ground for altering “in Seir” into “from Seir,” as the LXX., Syriac, and Vulgate have done. But בְּשֵׁעֵר might signify “into Seir, as far as Hormah.” As the

Edomites had extended their territory at that time across the Aræbah towards the west, and taken possession of a portion of the mountainous country which bounded the desert of Paran towards the north (see at chap. xxxiv. 3), the Israelites, when driven back by them, might easily be chased into the territory of the Edomites. *Hormah* (*i.e.* the ban-place) is used here proleptically (see at chap. xxi. 3).

OCCURRENCES DURING THE THIRTY-SEVEN YEARS OF WANDERING
IN THE WILDERNESS.—CHAP. XV.—XIX.

After the unhappy issue of the attempt to penetrate into Canaan, in opposition to the will of God and the advice of Moses, the Israelites remained “many days” in Kadesh, as the Lord did not hearken to their lamentations concerning the defeat which they had suffered at the hands of the Canaanites and Amalekites. Then they turned, and took their journey, as the Lord had commanded (chap. xiv. 25), into the wilderness, in the direction towards the Red Sea (Deut. i. 45, ii. 1); and in the first month of the fortieth year they came again into the desert of Zin, to Kadesh (chap. xx. 1). All that we know respecting this journeying from Kadesh into the wilderness in the direction towards the Red Sea, and up to the time of their return to the desert of Zin, is limited to a number of names of places of encampment given in the list of journeying stages in chap. xxxiii. 19–30, out of which, as the situation of the majority of them is altogether unknown, or at all events has not yet been determined, no connected account of the journeys of Israel during this interval of thirty-seven years can possibly be drawn. The most important event related in connection with this period is the rebellion of the company of Korah against Moses and Aaron, and the re-establishment of the Aaronic priesthood and confirmation of their rights, which this occasioned (chaps. xvi.–xviii.). This rebellion probably occurred in the first portion of the period in question. In addition to this there are only a few laws recorded, which were issued during this long time of punishment, and furnished a practical proof of the continuance of the covenant which the Lord had made with the nation of Israel at Sinai. There was nothing more to record in connection with these thirty-seven years, which formed the second stage in the guidance of Israel through the desert. For, as *Baumgarten* has well observed, “the fighting men of Israel had fallen under the judgment of Jehovah, and the sacred history,

therefore, was no longer concerned with them ; whilst the youth, in whom the life and hope of Israel were preserved, had as yet no history at all." Consequently we have no reason to complain, as Ewald does (*Gesch.* ii. pp. 241, 242), that "the great interval of forty years remains a perfect void ;" and still less occasion to dispose of the gap, as this scholar has done, by supposing that the last historian left out a great deal from the history of the forty years' wanderings. The supposed "void" was completely filled up by the gradual dying out of the generation which had been rejected by God.

Various Laws of Sacrifice. Punishment of a Sabbath-breaker.

Command to wear Tassels upon the Clothes.—Chap. xv.

Vers. 1–31. REGULATIONS CONCERNING SACRIFICES.—Vers. 1–16. For the purpose of reviving the hopes of the new generation that was growing up, and directing their minds to the promised land, during the mournful and barren time when judgment was being executed upon the race that had been condemned, Jehovah communicated various laws through Moses concerning the presentation of sacrifices in the land that He would give them (vers. 1 and 2), whereby the former laws of sacrifice were supplemented and completed. The *first* of these laws had reference to the connection between meat-offerings and drink-offerings on the one hand, and burnt-offerings and slain-offerings on the other.—Vers. 3 sqq. In the land of Canaan, every burnt and slain-offering, whether prepared in fulfilment of a vow, or spontaneously, or on feast-days (cf. Lev. vii. 16, xxii. 18, and xxiii. 38), was to be associated with a meat-offering of fine flour mixed with oil, and a drink-offering of wine,—the quantity to be regulated according to the kind of animal that was slain in sacrifice. (See Lev. xxiii. 18, where this connection is already mentioned in the case of the festal sacrifices.) For a lamb (*בָּשָׂר*, *i.e.* either sheep or goat, cf. ver. 11), they were to take the tenth of an ephah of fine flour, mixed with the quarter of a hin of oil and the quarter of a hin of wine, as a drink-offering. In ver. 5, the construction changes from the third to the second person. *עֲשֵׂה*, to prepare, as in Ex. xxix. 38.—Vers. 6, 7. For a ram, they were to take two tenths of fine flour, with the third of a hin of oil and the third of a hin of wine.—Vers. 8 sqq. For an ox, three tenths of fine flour, with half a hin of oil and half a hin of wine. The **תְּקִרְבָּה** (3d person) in ver. 9, between **עֲשֵׂה** in ver. 8, and **תְּקִרְבָּה** in ver. 10, is certainly striking and unusual, but not so offensive as

to render it necessary to alter it into בְּתַקְרֵיב.—Vers. 11, 12. The quantities mentioned were to be offered with every ox, or ram, or lamb, of either sheep or goat, and therefore the number of the appointed quantities of meat and drink-offerings was to correspond to the number of sacrificial animals.—Vers. 13-16. These rules were to apply not only to the sacrifices of those that were born in Israel, but also to those of the strangers living among them. By “these things,” in ver. 13, we are to understand the meat and drink-offerings already appointed.—Ver. 15. “*As for the assembly, there shall be one law for the Israelite and the stranger, . . . an eternal ordinance . . . before Jehovah.*” תִּקְהָל, which is construed absolutely, refers to the assembling of the nation before Jehovah, or to the congregation viewed in its attitude with regard to God.

A second law (vers. 17-21) appoints, on the ground of the general regulations in Ex. xxii. 28 and xxiii. 19, the presentation of a heave-offering from the bread which they would eat in the land of Canaan, viz. a first-fruit of groat-meal (*רָאשֶׁת עֲרִיסָת*) baked as cake (*חַלָּה*). Arisoth, which is only used in connection with the gift of first-fruits, in Ezek. xliv. 30, Neh. x. 38, and the passage before us, signifies most probably groats, or meal coarsely bruised, like the talmudical עַרְבָּן, contusum, mola, far, and indeed far hordei. This cake of the groats of first-fruits they were to offer “as a heave-offering of the threshing-floor,” i.e. as a heave-offering of the bruised corn, in the same manner as this (therefore, in addition to it, and along with it); and that “according to your generations” (see Ex. xii. 14), that is to say, for all time, to consecrate a gift of first-fruits to the Lord, not only of the grains of corn, but also of the bread made from the corn, and “to cause a blessing to rest upon his house” (Ezek. xliv. 30). Like all the gifts of first-fruits, this cake also fell to the portion of the priests (see Ezek. and Neh. *ut sup.*).

To these there are added, in vers. 22, 31, laws relating to *sin-offerings*, the first of which, in vers. 22-26, is distinguished from the case referred to in Lev. iv. 13-21, by the fact that the sin is not described here, as it is there, as “doing one of the commandments of Jehovah which ought not to be done,” but as “not doing all that Jehovah had spoken through Moses.” Consequently, the allusion here is not to sins of commission, but to sins of omission, not following the law of God, “even (as is afterwards explained in ver. 23) all that the Lord hath commanded you by the hand of Moses from the day that the Lord hath commanded, and thenceforward according to your generations,” i.e. since the first beginning of

the giving of the law, and during the whole of the time following (*Knobel*). These words apparently point to a complete falling away of the congregation from the whole of the law. Only the further stipulation in ver. 24, “*if it occur away from the eyes of the congregation through error*” (in oversight), cannot be easily reconciled with this, as it seems hardly conceivable that an apostasy from the entire law should have remained hidden from the congregation. This “not doing all the commandments of Jehovah,” of which the congregation is supposed to incur the guilt without perceiving it, might consist either in the fact that, in particular instances, whether from oversight or negligence, the whole congregation omitted to fulfil the commandments of God, *i.e.* certain precepts of the law, *sc.* in the fact that they neglected the true and proper fulfilment of the whole law, either, as *Outram* supposes, “by retaining to a certain extent the national rites, and following the worship of the true God, and yet at the same time acting unconsciously in opposition to the law, through having been led astray by some common errors;” or by allowing the evil example of godless rulers to seduce them to neglect their religious duties, or to adopt and join in certain customs and usages of the heathen, which appeared to be reconcilable with the law of Jehovah, though they really led to contempt and neglect of the commandments of the Lord.¹ But as a disregard or neglect of the commandments of God had to be expiated, a burnt-offering was to be added to the sin-offering, that the separation of the congregation from the Lord, which had arisen from the sin of omission, might be entirely removed. The apodosis commences with יְהִי in ver. 24, but is interrupted by אֵם מַעַן, and resumed again with שָׁׁמֶן, “*it shall be, if . . . the whole congregation shall prepare*,” etc. The burnt-offering, being the principal sacrifice, is mentioned as usual before the sin-offering, although, when presented, it followed the latter, on account of its being necessary that

¹ Maimonides (see *Outram, ex veterum sententia*) understands this law as relating to extraneous worship; and *Outram* himself refers to the times of the wicked kings, “when the people neglected their hereditary rites, and, forgetting the sacred laws, fell by a common sin into the observance of the religious rites of other nations.” Undoubtedly, we have historical ground in 2 Chron. xxix. 21 sqq., and Ezra viii. 35, for this interpretation of our law, but further allusions are not excluded in consequence. We cannot agree with *Baumgarten*, therefore, in restricting the difference between Lev. iv. 13 sqq. and the passage before us to the fact, that the former supposes the transgression of one particular commandment on the part of the whole congregation, whilst the latter (vers. 22, 23) refers to a continued lawless condition on the part of Israel.

the sin should be expiated before the congregation could sanctify its life and efforts afresh to the Lord in the burnt-offering. “*One kid of the goats:*” see Lev. iv. 23. תְּשִׁלֵּחַ (as in Ley. v. 10, ix. 16, etc.) refers to the right established in vers. 8, 9, concerning the combination of the meat and drink-offering with the burnt-offering. The sin-offering was to be treated according to the rule laid down in Lev. iv. 14 sqq.—Ver. 26. This law was to apply not only to the children of Israel, but also to the stranger among them, “*for (sc. it has happened) to the whole nation in mistake.*” As the sin extended to the whole nation, in which the foreigners were also included, the atonement was also to apply to the whole.—Vers. 27-31. In the same way, again, there was one law for the native and the stranger, in relation to sins of omission on the part of single individuals. The law laid down in Lev. v. 6 (cf. Lev. iv. 27 sqq.) for the Israelites, is repeated here in vers. 27, 28, and in ver. 28 it is raised into general validity for foreigners also. In ver. 29, הָאֹתָה is written absolutely for הָאֹתָהּ.—Vers. 30, 31. But it was only sins committed by mistake (see at Lev. iv. 2) that could be expiated by sin-offerings. Whoever, on the other hand, whether a native or a foreigner, committed a sin “*with a high hand,*”—i.e. so that he raised his hand, as it were, against Jehovah, or acted in open rebellion against Him,—blasphemed God, and was to be cut off (see Gen. xvii. 14); for he had despised the word of Jehovah, and broken His commandment, and was to atone for it with his life. בְּעֲוֹנֶה בַּבָּה, “*its crime upon it;*” i.e. it shall come upon such a soul in the punishment which it shall endure.

Vers. 32-36. The HISTORY OF THE SABBATH-BREAKER is no doubt inserted here as a practical illustration of sinning “with a high hand.” It shows, too, at the same time, how the nation, as a whole, was impressed with the inviolable sanctity of the Lord’s day. From the words with which it is introduced, “*and the children of Israel were in the wilderness,*” all that can be gathered is, that the occurrence took place at the time when Israel was condemned to wander about in the wilderness for forty years. They found a man gathering sticks in the desert on the Sabbath, and brought him as an open transgressor of the law of the Sabbath before Moses and Aaron and the whole congregation, i.e. the college of elders, as the judicial authorities of the congregation (Ex. xviii. 25 sqq.). They kept him in custody, like the blasphemer in Lev. xxiv. 12, because it had not yet been determined what was to be done to him. It

is true that it had already been laid down in Ex. xxxi. 14, 15, and xxxv. 2, that any breach of the law of the Sabbath should be punished by death and extermination, but the mode had not yet been prescribed. This was done now, and Jehovah commanded stoning (see Lev. xx. 2), which was executed upon the criminal without delay.

Vers. 37–41 (cf. Deut. xxii. 12). The command to wear TASSELS ON THE EDGE OF THE UPPER GARMENT appears to have been occasioned by the incident just described. The Israelites were to wear תְּzִיצִית, tassels, on the wings of their upper garments, or, according to Deut. xxii. 12, at the four corners of the upper garment. בְּסָתִת, the covering in which a man wraps himself, synonymous with בְּנֵר, was the upper garment, consisting of a four-cornered cloth or piece of stuff, which was thrown over the body-coat (see my *Bibl. Archäol.* ii. pp. 36, 37), and is not to be referred, as Schultz supposes, to the bed-coverings also, although this garment was actually used as a counterpane by the poor (see Ex. xxii. 25, 26). “And upon the tassel of the wing they shall put a string of hyacinth-blue,” namely, to fasten the tassel to the edge of the garment. תְּzִיצִית (fem., from צִיצָה, the glittering, the bloom or flower) signifies something flowery or bloom-like, and is used in Ezek. viii. 3 for a lock of hair; here it is applied to a tassel, as being made of twisted threads: LXX. κράσπεδα; Matt. xxiii. 5, “borders.” The size of these tassels is not prescribed. The Pharisees liked to make them large, to exhibit openly their punctilious fulfilment of the law. For the Rabbinical directions how to make them, see Carpzov. *apparat.* pp. 197 sqq.; and Bodenschatz, *kirchliche Verfassung der heutigen Juden*, iv. pp. 11 sqq.—Ver. 39. “And it shall be to you for a tassel,” i.e. the fastening of the tassel with the dark blue thread to the corners of your garments shall be to you a tassel, “that ye, when ye see it, may remember all the commandments of Jehovah, and do them; and ye shall not stray after your hearts and your eyes, after which ye go a whoring.” The zizith on the sky-blue thread was to serve as a memorial sign to the Israelites, to remind them of the commandments of God, that they might have them constantly before their eyes and follow them, and not direct their heart and eyes to the things of this world, which turn away from the word of God, and lead astray to idolatry (cf. Prov. iv. 25, 26). Another reason for these instructions, as is afterwards added in ver. 40, was to remind Israel of all the commandments of the Lord, that they might do

them and be holy to their God, and sanctify their daily life to Him who had brought them out of Egypt, to be their God, *i.e.* to show Himself as God to them.

Rebellion of Korah's Company.—Chap. xvi.-xvii. 5.

The sedition of Korah and his company, with the renewed sanction of the Aaronic priesthood on the part of God which it occasioned, is the only important occurrence recorded in connection with the thirty-seven years' wandering in the wilderness. The time and place are not recorded. The fact that the departure from Kadesh is not mentioned in chap. xiv., whilst, according to Deut. i. 46, Israel remained there many days, is not sufficient to warrant the conclusion that it took place in Kadesh. The departure from Kadesh is not mentioned even after the rebellion of Korah; and yet we read, in chap. xx. 1, that the whole congregation came again into the desert of Zin to Kadesh at the beginning of the fortieth year, and therefore must previously have gone away. All that can be laid down as probable is, that it occurred in one of the earliest of the thirty-seven years of punishment, though we have no firm ground even for this conjecture.

Vers. 1-3. The authors of the rebellion were *Korah* the Levite, a descendant of the Kohathite Izhar, who was a brother of Amram, an ancestor (not the father) of Aaron and Moses (see at Ex. vi. 18), and three Reubenites, viz. *Dathan* and *Abiram*, sons of Eliab, of the Reubenitish family of Pallu (chap. xxvi. 8, 9), and *On*, the son of Peleth, a Reubenite, not mentioned again. The last of these (*On*) is not referred to again in the further course of this event, either because he played altogether a subordinate part in the affair, or because he had drawn back before the conspiracy came to a head. The persons named took (נָקַד), *i.e.* gained over to their plan, or persuaded to join them, 250 distinguished men of the other tribes, and rose up with them against Moses and Aaron. On the construction נִקְדָּה . . . נִקְדָּה (vers. 1 and 2), *Gesenius* correctly observes in his *Thesaurus* (p. 760), “There is an *anakolouthon* rather than an ellipsis, and not merely a copyist’s error, in these words, ‘and Korah, . . . and Dathan and Abiram, took and rose up against Moses with 250 men,’ for they took 250 men, and rose up with them against Moses,” etc. He also points to the analogous construction in 2 Sam. xviii. 18. Consequently there is no necessity either to force a meaning upon נִקְדָּה, which is altogether foreign to it, or to attempt an emendation of the text. “*They rose up*

before Moses :" this does not mean, "they stood up in front of his tent," as Knobel explains it, for the purpose of bringing ver. 2 into contradiction with ver. 3, but they created an uproar before his eyes ; and with this the expression in ver. 3, "*and they gathered themselves together against Moses and Aaron,*" may be very simply and easily combined. The 250 men of the children of Israel who joined the rebels no doubt belonged to the other tribes, as is indirectly implied in the statement in chap. xxvii. 3, that Zelophehad the Manassite was not in the company of Korah. These men were "*princes of the congregation,*" i.e. heads of the tribes, or of large divisions of the tribes, "*called men of the congregation,*" i.e. members of the council of the nation which administered the affairs of the congregation (cf. i. 16), "*men of name*" (**נִשְׂ�ים**, see Gen. vi. 4). The leader was Korah ; and the rebels are called in consequence "*Korah's company*" (vers. 5, 6, chap. xxvi. 9, xxvii. 3). He laid claim to the high-priesthood, or at least to an equality with Aaron (ver. 17). Among his associates were the Reubenites, Dathan and Abiram, who, no doubt, were unable to get over the fact that the birthright had been taken away from their ancestor, and with it the headship of the house of Israel (i.e. of the whole nation). Apparently their present intention was to seize upon the government of the nation under a self-elected high priest, and to force Moses and Aaron out of the post assigned to them by God,—that is to say, to overthrow the constitution which God had given to His people.—Ver. 3. **רַב־לְכָם**, "*enough for you !*" (**רַב**, as in Gen. xlvi. 28), they said to Moses and Aaron, i.e. "*let the past suffice you*" (Knobel) ; ye have held the priesthood and the government quite long enough. It must now come to an end ; "*for the whole congregation, all of them* (i.e. all the members of the nation), *are holy, and Jehovah is in the midst of them. Wherefore lift ye yourselves above the congregation of Jehovah ?*" The distinction between **עַדָּה** and **קָהָל** is the following : **עַדָּה** signifies *conventus*, the congregation according to its natural organization ; **קָהָל** signifies *convocatio*, the congregation according to its divine calling and theocratic purpose. The use of the two words in the same verse upsets the theory that **עַדָּה** belongs to the style of the original work, and **קָהָל** to that of the Jehovahist. The rebels appeal to the calling of all Israel to be the holy nation of Jehovah (Ex. xix. 5, 6), and infer from this the equal right of all to hold the priesthood, "*leaving entirely out of sight, as blind selfishness is accustomed to do, the transition of the universal priesthood into the special mediatorial*

office and priesthood of Moses and Aaron, which had their foundation in fact" (*Baumgarten*) ; or altogether overlooking the fact that God Himself had chosen Moses and Aaron, and appointed them as mediators between Himself and the congregation, to educate the sinful nation into a holy nation, and train it to the fulfilment of its proper vocation. The rebels, on the contrary, thought that they were holy already, because God had called them to be a holy nation, and in their carnal self-righteousness forgot the condition attached to their calling, "If ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant" (Ex. xix. 5).

Vers. 4-17. When Moses heard these words of the rebels, he fell upon his face, to complain of the matter to the Lord, as in chap. xiv. 5. He then said to Korah and his company, "*To-morrow Jehovah will show who is His and holy, and will let him come near to Him, and he whom He chooseth will draw near to Him.*" The meaning of נָאֵץ יְחִיר בָּו is evident from אֲנָשָׁה יְחִיר בָּו. He is Jehovah's, whom He chooses, so that He belongs to Him with his whole life. The reference is to the priestly rank, to which God had chosen Aaron and his sons out of the whole nation, and sanctified them by a special consecration (Ex. xxviii. 1, xxix. 1 ; Lev. viii. 12, 30), and by which they became the persons "standing near to Him" (Lev. x. 3), and were qualified to appear before Him in the sanctuary, and present to Him the sacrifices of the nation.—Ver. 6. To leave the decision of this to the Lord, Korah and his company, who laid claim to this prerogative, were to take censers, and bring lighted incense before Jehovah. He whom the Lord should choose was to be the sanctified one. This was to satisfy them. With the expression רַב־לְכָבֵד in ver. 7, Moses gives the rebels back their own words in ver. 3. The divine decision was connected with the offering of incense, because this was the holiest function of the priestly service, which brought the priest into the immediate presence of God, and in connection with which Jehovah had already shown to the whole congregation how He sanctified Himself, by a penal judgment on those who took this office upon themselves without a divine call (Lev. x. 1-3). Vers. 8 sqq. He then set before them the wickedness of their enterprise, to lead them to search themselves, and avert the judgment which threatened them. In doing this, he made a distinction between Korah the Levite, and Dathan and Abiram the Reubenites, according to the difference in the motives which prompted their rebellion, and the claims which they asserted. He first of all (vers. 8-11) reminded Korah the Levite

of the way in which God had distinguished his tribe, by separating the Levites from the rest of the congregation, to attend to the service of the sanctuary (chap. iii. 5 sqq., viii. 6 sqq.), and asked him, “*Is this too little for you? The God of Israel* (this epithet is used emphatically for Jehovah) *has brought thee near to Himself, and all thy brethren the sons of Levi with thee, and ye strive after the priesthood also. Therefore . . . thou and thy company, who have leagued themselves against Jehovah: . . . and Aaron, what is he, that ye murmur against him?*” These last words, as an expression of wrath, are elliptical, or rather an *aposiopesis*, and are to be filled up in the following manner: “Therefore, . . . as Jehovah has distinguished you in this manner, . . . what do ye want? Ye rebel against Jehovah! why do ye murmur against Aaron? He has not seized upon the priesthood of his own accord, but Jehovah has called him to it, and he is only a feeble servant of God” (cf. Ex. xvi. 7). Moses then (vers. 12–14) sent for Dathan and Abiram, who, as is tacitly assumed, had gone back to their tents during the warning given to Korah. But they replied, “*We shall not come up.*” **הָלַע**, to go up, is used either with reference to the tabernacle, as being in a spiritual sense the culminating point of the entire camp, or with reference to appearance before Moses, the head and ruler of the nation. “*Is it too little that thou hast brought us out of a land flowing with milk and honey* (they apply this expression in bitter irony to Egypt), *to kill us in the wilderness* (deliver us up to death), *that thou wilt be always playing the lord over us?*” The idea of continuance, which is implied in the *inf. abs.*, **הַשְׁתִּיר**, from **שָׁרֵךְ**, to exalt one’s self as ruler (*Ges.* § 131, 36), is here still further intensified by **כֵּן**. “*Moreover, thou hast not brought us into a land flowing with milk and honey, or given us fields and vineyards for an inheritance* (i.e. thou hast not kept thy promise, Ex. iv. 30 compared with chap. iii. 7 sqq.). *Wilt thou put out the eyes of these people?*” i.e. wilt thou blind them as to thy doings and designs?—Ver. 15. Moses was so disturbed by these scornful reproaches, that he entreated the Lord, with an assertion of his own unselfishness, not to have respect to their gift, i.e. not to accept the sacrifice which they should bring (cf. Gen. iv. 4). “*I have not taken one ass from them, nor done harm to one of them,*” i.e. I have not treated them as a ruler, who demands tribute of his subjects, and oppresses them (cf. 1 Sam. xii. 3).—Vers. 16, 17. In conclusion, he summoned Korah and his associates once more, to present themselves the following day before Jehovah with censers and incense.

Vers. 18-35. The next day the rebels presented themselves with censers before the tabernacle, along with Moses and Aaron; and the whole congregation also assembled there at the instigation of Korah. The Lord then interposed in judgment. Appearing in His glory to the whole congregation (just as in chap. xiv. 10), He said to Moses and Aaron, “*Separate yourselves from this congregation; I will destroy them in a moment.*” By assembling in front of the tabernacle, the whole congregation had made common cause with the rebels. God threatened them, therefore, with sudden destruction. But the two men of God, who were so despised by the rebellious faction, fell on their faces, interceding with God, and praying, “*God, Thou God of the spirits of all flesh! this one man (i.e. Korah, the author of the conspiracy) hath sinned, and wilt Thou be wrathful with all the congregation?*” i.e. let Thine anger fall upon the whole congregation. The Creator and Preserver of all beings, who has given and still gives life and breath to all flesh, is God of the spirits of all flesh. As the author of the spirit of life in all perishable flesh, God cannot destroy His own creatures in wrath; this would be opposed to His own paternal love and mercy. In this epithet, as applied to God, therefore, Moses appeals “to the universal blessing of creation. It is of little consequence whether these words are to be understood as relating to all the animal kingdom, or to the human race alone; because Moses simply prayed, that as God was the creator and architect of the world, He would not destroy the men whom He had created, but rather have mercy upon the works of His own hands” (*Calvin*). The intercession of the prophet Isaiah, in Isa. lxiv. 8, is similar to this, though that is founded upon the special relation in which God stood to Israel.—Vers. 23 sqq. Jehovah then instructed Moses, that the congregation was to remove away (*תַּעֲלִז*, to get up and away) from about the dwelling-place of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram; and, as we may supply from the context, the congregation fell back from Korah’s tent, whilst Dathan and Abiram, possibly at the very first appearance of the divine glory, drew back into their tents. Moses therefore betook himself to the tents of Dathan and Abiram, with the elders following him, and there also commanded the congregation to depart from the tents of these wicked men, and not touch anything they possessed, that they might not be swept away in all their sins.—Ver. 27. The congregation obeyed; but Dathan and Abiram came and placed themselves in front of the tents, along with their wives and children, to see what Moses would do. Moses

then announced the sentence : “ *By this shall ye know that Jehovah hath sent me to do all these works, that not out of my own heart (i.e. that I do not act of my own accord). If these men die like all men (i.e. if these wicked men die a natural death like other men), and the oversight of all men take place over them (i.e. if the same providence watches over them as over all other men, and preserves them from sudden death), Jehovah hath not sent me. But if Jehovah create a creation (בריאת, i.e. work an extraordinary miracle), and the earth open its mouth and swallow them up, with all that belongs to them, so that they go down alive into hell, ye shall perceive that these men have despised Jehovah.*” — Vers. 31–33. And immediately the earth clave asunder, and swallowed them up, with their families and all their possessions, and closed above them, so that they perished without a trace from the congregation. תְּחִתָּם refers to the three ringleaders. “ *Their houses;*” i.e. their families, not their tents, as in chap. xviii. 31, Ex. xii. 3. “ *All the men belonging to Korah*” were his servants; for, according to chap. xxvi. 11, his sons did not perish with him, but perpetuated his family (chap. xxvi. 58), to which the celebrated Korahite singers of David’s time belonged (1 Chron. vi. 18–22, ix. 19). — Ver. 34. This fearful destruction of the ringleaders, through which Jehovah glorified Moses afresh as His servant in a miraculous way, filled all the Israelites round about with such terror, that they fled לְקַלֵּם, “ *at their noise,*” i.e. at the commotion with which the wicked men went down into the abyss which opened beneath their feet, lest, as they said, *the earth should swallow them up also.* — Ver. 35. The other 250 rebels, who were probably still in front of the tabernacle, were then destroyed by fire which proceeded from Jehovah, as Nadab and Abihu had been before (Lev. x. 2).

Vers. 36–40 (or xvii. 1–5). After the destruction of the sinners, the Lord commanded that Eleazar should take up the censers “ *from between the burning,*” i.e. from the midst of the men that had been burned, and scatter the fire (the burning coals in the pans) far away, that it might not be used any more. “ *For they (the censers) are holy;*” that is to say, they had become holy through being brought before Jehovah (ver. 39); and therefore, when the men who brought them were slain, they fell as banned articles to the Lord (Lev. xxvii. 28). “ *The censers of these sinners against their souls*” (i.e. the men who have forfeited their lives through their sin : cf. Prov. xx. 2, Hab. ii. 10), “ *let them make into broad plates for a covering to the altar*” (of burnt-offering). Through this application of them they became a sign, or, according to ver. 39,

a memorial to all who drew near to the sanctuary, which was to remind them continually of this judgment of God, and warn the congregation of grasping at the priestly prerogatives. The words, **הִנֵּה לֹא יָחַד**, in ver. 40, introduce the predicate in the form of an apodosis to the subject, which is written absolutely, and consists of an entire sentence. **הִנֵּה** with **כְּ** signifies, “to experience the same fate as” another.

Punishment of the murmuring Congregation, and Confirmation of the High-priesthood of Aaron.—Chap. xvi. 41-xvii. 13 (or chap. xvii. 6-28).

Vers. 41-50. PUNISHMENT OF THE MURMURING CONGREGATION.—The judgment upon the company of Korah had filled the people round about with terror and dismay, but it had produced no change of heart in the congregation that had risen up against its leaders. The next morning the whole congregation began to murmur against Moses and Aaron, and to charge them with having slain the people of Jehovah. They referred to Korah and his company, but especially to the 250 chiefs of renown, whom they regarded as the kernel of the nation, and called “the people of Jehovah.” They would have made Moses and Aaron responsible for their death, because in their opinion it was they who had brought the judgment upon their leaders; whereas it was through the intercession of Moses (chap. xvi. 22) that the whole congregation was saved from the destruction which threatened it. To such an extent does the folly of the proud heart of man proceed, and the obduracy of a race already exposed to the judgment of God.—Ver. 7. When the congregation assembled together, Moses and Aaron turned to the tabernacle, and saw how the cloud covered it, and the glory of the Lord appeared. As the cloud rested continually above the tabernacle during the time of encampment (chap. ix. 18 sqq.; Ex. xl. 38), we must suppose that at this time the cloud covered it in a fuller and much more conspicuous sense, just as it had done when the tabernacle was first erected (chap. ix. 15; Ex. xl. 34), and that at the same time the glory of God burst forth from the dark cloud in a miraculous splendour.—Vers. 8 sqq. Thereupon they both went into the court of (**בְּ פִנְיָן**, as in Lev. ix. 5) the tabernacle, and God commanded them to rise up (**עֲמֹד**, Niphil of **עָמַד**=**רוּם**; see *Ges.* § 65, Anm. 5) out of this congregation, which He would immediately destroy. But they fell upon their faces in prayer, as in chap. xvi. 21, 22. This time, however, they

could not avert the bursting forth of the wrathful judgment, as they had done the day before (chap. xvi. 22). The plague had already commenced, when Moses told Aaron to take the censer quickly into the midst of the congregation, with coals and incense (*אֲשָׁנִים, imper. Hiph.*), to make expiation for it with an incense-offering. And when this was done, and Aaron placed himself between the dead and the living, the plague, which had already destroyed 14,700 men, was stayed. The plague consisted apparently of a sudden death, as in the case of a pestilence raging with extreme violence, though we cannot regard it as an actual pestilence.

The means resorted to by Moses to stay the plague showed afresh how the faithful servant of God bore the rescue of his people upon his heart. All the motives which he had hitherto pleaded, in his repeated intercession that this evil congregation might be spared, were now exhausted. He could not stake his life for the nation, as at Horeb (Ex. xxxii. 32), for the nation had rejected him. He could no longer appeal to the honour of Jehovah among the heathen, seeing that the Lord, even when sentencing the rebellious race to fall in the desert, had assured him that the whole earth should be filled with His glory (chap. xiv. 20 sqq.). Still less could he pray to God that He would not be wrathful with all for the sake of one or a few sinners, as in chap. xvi. 22, seeing that the whole congregation had taken part with the rebels. In this condition of things there was but one way left of averting the threatened destruction of the whole nation, namely, to adopt the means which the Lord Himself had given to His congregation, in the high-priestly office, to wipe away their sins, and recover the divine grace which they had forfeited through sin,—viz. the offering of incense which embodied the high-priestly prayer, and the strength and operation of which were not dependent upon the sincerity and earnestness of subjective faith, but had a firm and immovable foundation in the objective force of the divine appointment. This was the means adopted by the faithful servant of the Lord, and the judgment of wrath was averted in its course; the plague was averted.—The effectual operation of the incense-offering of the high priest also served to furnish the people with a practical proof of the power and operation of the true and divinely appointed priesthood. “The priesthood which the company of Korah had so wickedly usurped, had brought down death and destruction upon himself, through his offering of incense; but the divinely appointed priesthood of Aaron averted death and destruction from the whole congregation when

incense was offered by him, and stayed the well-merited judgment, which had broken forth upon it" (*Kurtz*).

Chap. xvii. 1-13 (or chap. xvii. 16-28). CONFIRMATION OF THE HIGH-PRIESTHOOD OF AARON.—Whilst the Lord had thus given a practical proof to the people, that Aaron was the high priest appointed by Him for His congregation, by allowing the high-priestly incense offered by Aaron to expiate His wrath, and by removing the plague; He also gave them a still further confirmation of His priesthood, by a miracle which was well adapted to put to silence all the murmuring of the congregation.—Vers. 16-20. He commanded Moses to take twelve rods of the tribe-princes of Israel, one for the fathers' house of each of their tribes, and to write upon each the name of the tribe; but upon that of the tribe of Levi he was to write Aaron's name, because each rod was to stand for the head of their fathers' houses, *i.e.* for the existing head of the tribe; and in the case of Levi, the tribe-head was Aaron. As only twelve rods were taken for all the tribes of Israel, and Levi was included among them, Ephraim and Manasseh must have been reckoned as the one tribe of Joseph, as in Deut. xxvii. 12. These rods were to be laid by Moses in the tabernacle before the testimony, or ark of the covenant (Ex. xxv. 21, xxix. 42). And there the rod of the man whom Jehovah chose, *i.e.* entrusted with the priesthood (see chap. xvi. 5), would put forth shoots, to quiet the murmuring of the people. **הַפְלִתָּה**, *Hiph.*, to cause to sink, to bring to rest, construed with **בָּרֵךְ** in a pregnant signification, to quiet in such a way that it will not rise again.—Vers. 6-9. Moses carried out this command. And when he went into the tabernacle the following morning, behold Aaron's rod of the house of Levi had sprouted, and put forth shoots, and had borne blossoms and matured almonds. And Moses brought all the rods out of the sanctuary, and gave every man his own; the rest, as we may gather from the context, being all unchanged, so that the whole nation could satisfy itself that God had chosen Aaron. Thus was the word fulfilled which Moses had spoken at the commencement of the rebellion of the company of Korah (chap. xvi. 5), and that in a way which could not fail to accredit him before the whole congregation as sent of God.

So far as the occurrence itself is concerned, there can hardly be any need to remark, that the natural interpretation which has lately been attempted by *Ewald*, viz. that Moses had laid several

almond rods in the holy place, which had just been freshly cut off, that he might see the next day which of them would flower the best during the night, is directly at variance with the words of the text, and also with the fact, that a rod even freshly cut off, when laid in a dry place, would not bear ripe fruit in a single night. The miracle which God wrought here as the Creator of nature, was at the same time a significant symbol of the nature and meaning of the priesthood. The choice of the rods had also a bearing upon the object in question. A man's rod was the sign of his position as ruler in the house and congregation ; with a prince the rod becomes a sceptre, the insignia of rule (Gen. xlix. 10). As a severed branch, the rod could not put forth shoots and blossom in a natural way. But God could impart new vital powers even to the dry rod. And so Aaron had naturally no pre-eminence above the heads of the other tribes. But the priesthood was founded not upon natural qualifications and gifts, but upon the power of the Spirit, which God communicates according to the choice of His wisdom, and which He had imparted to Aaron through his consecration with holy anointing oil. It was this which the Lord intended to show to the people, by causing Aaron's rod to put forth branches, blossom, and fruit, through a miracle of His omnipotence ; whereas the rods of the other heads of the tribes remained as barren as before. In this way, therefore, it was not without deep significance that Aaron's rod not only put forth shoots, by which the divine election might be recognised, but bore even blossom and ripe fruit. This showed that Aaron was not only qualified for his calling, but administered his office in the full power of the Spirit, and bore the fruit expected of him. The almond rod was especially adapted to exhibit this, as an almond-tree flowers and bears fruit the earliest of all the trees, and has received its name of **נָזֵן**, "awake," from this very fact (cf. Jer. i. 11).

God then commanded (vers. 10, 11) that Aaron's rod should be taken back into the sanctuary, and preserved before the testimony, "*for a sign for the rebellious, that thou putttest an end to their murmuring, and they die not.*" The preservation of the rod before the ark of the covenant, in the immediate presence of the Lord, was a pledge to Aaron of the continuance of his election, and the permanent duration of his priesthood ; though we have no need to assume, that through a perpetual miracle the staff continued green and blossoming. In this way the staff became a sign to the rebellious, which could not fail to stop their murmuring.—Vers. 12, 13. This miracle

awakened a salutary terror in all the people, so that they cried out to Moses in mortal anguish, “Behold, we die, we perish, we all perish! Every one who comes near to the dwelling of Jehovah dies; are we all to die?” Even if this fear of death was no fruit of faith, it was fitted for all that to prevent any fresh outbreaks of rebellion on the part of the rejected generation.

Service and Revenues of the Priests and Levites.—Chap. xviii.

The practical confirmation of the priesthood of Aaron and his family, on the part of God, is very appropriately followed by the legal regulations concerning the official duties of the priests and Levites (vers. 1-7), and the revenues to be assigned them for their services (vers. 8-32), as the laws hitherto given upon this subject, although they contain many isolated stipulations, have not laid down any complete and comprehensive arrangement. The instructions relating to this subject were addressed by Jehovah directly to Aaron (see vers. 1 and 8), up to the law, that out of the tenths which the Levites were to collect from the people, they were to pay a tenth again to the priests; and this was addressed to Moses (ver. 25), as the head of all Israel.

Vers. 1-7. THE OFFICIAL DUTIES AND RIGHTS OF THE PRIESTS AND LEVITES.—Ver. 1. To impress upon the minds of the priests and Levites the holiness and responsibility of their office, the service of Aaron, of his sons, and of his father’s house, *i.e.* of the family of the Kohathites, is described as “bearing the iniquity of the sanctuary,” and the service which was peculiar to the Aaronides, as “bearing the iniquity of their priesthood.” “*To bear the iniquity of the sanctuary*” signifies not only “to have to make expiation for all that offended against the laws of the priests and the holy things, *i.e.* the desecration of these” (*Knobel*), but “iniquity or transgression at the sanctuary,” *i.e.* the defilement of it by the sin of those who drew near to the sanctuary; not only of the priests and Levites, but of the whole people who defiled the sanctuary in the midst of them with its holy vessels, not only by their sins (*Lev. xvi. 6*), but even by their holy gifts (*Ex. xxviii. 38*), and thus brought guilt upon the whole congregation, which the priests were to bear, *i.e.* to take upon themselves and expunge, by virtue of the holiness and sanctifying power communicated to their office (see at *Ex. xxviii. 38*). The “iniquity of the priesthood,” however, not only embraced every offence against the priesthood, every neglect of the most

scrupulous and conscientious fulfilment of duty in connection with their office, but extended to all the sin which attached to the official acts of the priests, on account of the sinfulness of their nature. It was to wipe out these sins and defilements, that the annual expiation of the holy things on the day of atonement had been appointed (Lev. xvi. 16 sqq.). The father's house of Aaron, *i.e.* the Levitical family of Kohath, was also to join in bearing the iniquity of the sanctuary, because the oversight of the holy vessels of the sanctuary devolved upon it (chap. iv. 4 sqq.).—Vers. 2–4. Aaron was also to bring his (other) brethren (*sc.* to the sanctuary), viz. the tribe of Levi, that is to say, the Gershonites and Merarites, that they might attach themselves to him and serve him, both him (**בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן**) and his sons, before the tent of testimony, and discharge the duties that were binding upon them, according to chap. iv. 24 sqq., 31 sqq. (cf. chap. iii. 6, 7, viii. 26). Only they were not to come near to the holy vessels and the altar, for that would bring death both upon them and the priests (see at chap. iv. 15). On ver. 4, cf. chap. i. 53 and iii. 7.—Vers. 5–7. The charge of the sanctuary (*i.e.* the dwelling) and the altar (of burnt-offering) devolved upon Aaron and his sons, that the wrath of God might not come again upon the children of Israel (see chap. viii. 19),—namely, through such illegal acts as Nadab and Abihu (Lev. x. 2), and the company of Korah (chap. xvi. 35), had committed. To this end God had handed over the Levites to them as a gift, to be their assistants (see at chap. iii. 9 and viii. 16, 19). But Aaron and his sons were to attend to the priesthood “*with regard to everything of the altar and within the vail*” (*i.e.* of the most holy place, see Lev. xvi. 12). The allusion is to all the priestly duties from the altar of burnt-offering to the most holy place, including the holy place which lay between. This office, which brought them into the closest fellowship with the Lord, was a favour accorded to them by the grace of God. This is expressed in the words, “*as a service of gift* (a service with which I present you) *I give you the priesthood.*” The last words in ver. 7 are the same as in chap. i. 51; and “*stranger*” (*zar*), as in Lev. xxii. 10.

Vers. 8–20. THE REVENUES OF THE PRIESTS.—These are summed up in ver. 8 in these words, “*I give thee the keeping of My heave-offerings in all holy gifts for a portion, as an eternal statute.*” The notion of **מִשְׁמָרָה**, keeping, as in Ex. xii. 6, xvi. 23, 32, is defined in the second parallel clause as **הַחַטָּאת**, a portion (see at Lev. vii. 35).

The priests were to keep all the heave-offerings, as the portion which belonged to them, out of the sacrificial gifts that the children of Israel offered to the Lord. קָרְבָּנִים, heave-offerings (see at Ex. xxv. 2, and Lev. ii. 9), is used here in the broadest sense, as including all the holy gifts (*kodashim*, see Lev. xxi. 22) which the Israelites lifted off from their possessions and presented to the Lord (as in chap. v. 9). Among these, for example, were, *first* of all, the most holy gifts in the meat-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings (vers. 9, 10; see at Lev. ii. 3). The burnt-offerings are not mentioned, because the whole of the flesh of these was burned upon the altar, and the skin alone fell to the portion of the priest (Lev. vii. 8). “*From the fire*,” sc. of the altar. פֹּאֵל, fire, is equivalent to שָׁאֵל, firing (see Lev. i. 9). These gifts they were to eat, as most holy, in a most holy place, *i.e.* in the court of the tabernacle (see Lev. vi. 9, 19, vii. 6), which is called “*most holy*” here, to lay a stronger emphasis upon the precept. In the *second* place, these gifts included also “*the holy gifts*;” viz. (a) (ver. 11) the heave-offering of their gifts in all wave-offerings (*tenuphoth*), *i.e.* the wave-breast and heave-leg of the peace-offerings, and whatever else was waved in connection with the sacrifices (see at Lev. vii. 33): these might be eaten by both the male and female members of the priestly families, provided they were legally clean (Lev. xxii. 3 sqq.); (b) (ver. 12) the gifts of first-fruits: “*all the fat* (*i.e.* the best, as in Gen. xlvi. 18) *of oil, new wine, and corn*,” viz. בְּפַרְחָתֶם, “*the first of them*,” the first-grown fruits of the land, and that of all the fruit of the ground (Deut. xxvi. 2, 10; Prov. iii. 9; Ezek. xliv. 30), corn, wine, oil, honey, and tree-fruit (Deut. viii. 8, compared with Lev. xix. 23, 24), which were offered, according to 2 Chron. xxxi. 5, Neh. x. 36, 38, Tob. i. 6, as first-fruits every year (see *Mishnah, Bikkur*, i. 3, 10, where the first-fruits are specified according to the productions mentioned in Deut. viii. 8; the law prescribed nothing in relation to the quantity of the different first-fruits, but left this entirely to the offerer himself); (c) (ver. 14) everything placed under a ban (see at Lev. xxvii. 28); and (d) (vers. 15-18) the first-born of man and beast. The first-born of men and of unclean beasts were redeemed according to chap. iii. 47, Ex. xiii. 12, 13, and Lev. xxvii. 6, 27; but such as were fit for sacrifice were actually offered, the blood being swung against the altar, and the fat portions burned upon it, whilst the whole of the flesh fell to the portion of the priests. So far as the redemption of human beings was concerned (ver. 16), they were

"to redeem from the monthly child," i.e. the first-born child as soon as it was a month old.—Ver. 19. *"All the holy heave-offerings"* are not the thank-offerings (*Knobel*), but, as in ver. 8, all the holy gifts enumerated in vers. 9–18. Jehovah gives these to the priests as an eternal claim. *"An eternal covenant of salt is this before Jehovah,"* for Aaron and his descendants. A *"covenant of salt;"* equivalent to an indissoluble covenant, or inviolable contract (see at Lev. ii. 13).—Ver. 20. For this reason, Aaron was to receive no inheritance in the land among the children of Israel. Aaron, as the head of the priests, represents the whole priesthood; and with regard to the possession, the whole tribe of Levi is placed, in ver. 23, on an equality with the priests. The Levites were to receive no portion of the land as an inheritance in Canaan (cf. chap. xxvi. 62; Deut. xii. 12, xiv. 27; Josh. xiv. 3). Jehovah was the portion and inheritance, not only of Aaron and his sons, but of the whole tribe of Levi (cf. Deut. x. 9, xviii. 2; Josh. xiii. 33); or, as it is expressed in Josh. xviii. 7, *"the priesthood of Jehovah was their inheritance,"* though not in the sense that *Knobel* supposes, viz. *"the priesthood with its revenues,"* which would make the expression *"Jehovah, the God of Israel"* (Josh. xiii. 33), to be metonymical for *"sacrificial gifts, first-fruits, and tenths."* The possession of the priests and Levites did not consist in the revenues assigned to them by God, but in the possession of Jehovah, the God of Israel. In the same sense in which the tribe of Levi was the peculiar possession of Jehovah out of the whole of the people of possession, was Jehovah also the peculiar possession of Levi; and just as the other tribes were to live upon what was afforded by the land assigned them as a possession, Levi was to live upon what Jehovah bestowed upon it. And inasmuch as not only the whole land of the twelve tribes, with which Jehovah had enfeoffed them, but the whole earth, belonged to Jehovah (Ex. xix. 5), He was necessarily to be regarded as the greatest possession of all, beyond which nothing greater is conceivable, and in comparison with which every other possession is to be regarded as nothing. Hence it was evidently the greatest privilege and highest honour to have Him for a portion and possession (*Bähr, Symbolik*, ii. p. 44). *"For truly,"* as *Masius* writes (Com. on *Josh.*), *"he who possesses God possesses all things; and the worship (*cultus*) of Him is infinitely fuller of delight, and far more productive, than the cultivation (*cultus*) of any soil."*

Vers. 21–24. REVENUES OF THE LEVITES.—For (נְדָבָן), instead

of, for) their service at the tabernacle God assigns them “*every tenth in Israel as an inheritance.*” On the tenth, see at Lev. xxvii. 30-33. The institution and description of their service in vers. 22 and 23 is the same as that in chap. i. 53 and viii. 19. “*Lest they bear sin:*” see at Lev. xix. 17.

Vers. 25-32. *Appropriation of the Tithe.*—Vers. 26 sqq. When the Levites took (received) from the people the tithe assigned them by Jehovah, they were to lift off from it a heave-offering for Jehovah, a tithe of the tithe for Aaron the priest (*i.e.* for the priesthood; see at ver. 20). “*Your heave-offering shall be reckoned to you as the corn of the threshing-floor, and the fulness (see Ex. xxii. 28) of the wine-press,*” *i.e.* according to ver. 30, as the revenue of the threshing-floor and wine-press; that is to say, as corn and wine which they had reaped themselves.—Ver. 29. The whole of this heave-offering of Jehovah, *i.e.* the tithe of the tithe, they were to lift off from all their gifts, from all the tithes of the people which they received; “*of all the fat of it,*” *i.e.* of all the best of the heave-offering they received, they were to lift off **שְׁנִינָה אֶת**, “*its holy,*” *i.e.* the holy part, which was to be dedicated to Jehovah.—Ver. 30. They might eat it (the tithe they had received, after taking off the priests’ tithe) in any place with their families, as it was the reward for their service at the tabernacle.—Ver. 32. They would load no sin upon themselves by so doing (see Lev. xix. 17), if they only lifted off the best as tithe (for the priest), and did not desecrate the holy gifts, *sc.* by eating in all kinds of places, which was not allowed, according to ver. 10, with regard to the most holy gifts.

These regulations concerning the revenues of the priests and Levites were in perfect accordance with the true idea of the Israelitish kingdom of God. Whereas in heathen states, where there was an hereditary priestly caste, that caste was generally a rich one, and held a firm possession in the soil (in Egypt, for example; see at Gen. xlvi. 22), the Levites received no hereditary landed property in the land of Israel, but only towns to dwell in among the other tribes, with pastureage for their cattle (chap. xxxv.), because Jehovah, the God of Israel, would be their inheritance. In this way their earthly existence was based upon the spiritual ground and soil of faith, in accordance with the calling assigned them, to be the guardians and promoters of the commandments, statutes, and rights of Jehovah; and their authority and influence among the people were bound up with their unreserved surrender of themselves to the Lord, and their firm reliance upon the possession of their God. Now, whilst this

position was to be a constant incitement to the Levites to surrender themselves entirely to the Lord and His service, it was also to become to the whole nation a constant admonition, inasmuch as it was a prerogative conferred upon them by the Lord, to seek the highest of all good in the possession of the Lord, as its portion and inheritance.—The revenue itself, however, which the Lord assigned to the Levites and priests, as His servants, consisting of the tenths and first-fruits, as well as certain portions of the different sacrificial gifts that were offered to Him, appears to have been a very considerable one, especially if we adopt the computation of *J. D. Michaelis (Mos. Recht. i. § 52)* with reference to the tithes. “A tribe,” he says, “which had only 22,000 males in it (23,000 afterwards), and therefore could hardly have numbered more than 12,000 grown-up men, received the tithes of 600,000 Israelites; consequently one single Levite, without the slightest necessity for sowing, and without any of the expenses of agriculture, reaped or received from the produce of the flocks and herds as much as five of the other Israelites.” But this leaves out of sight the fact that tithes are never paid so exactly as this, and that no doubt there was as little conscientiousness in the matter then as there is at the present day, when those who are entitled to receive a tenth often receive even less than a twentieth. Moreover, the revenue of the tribe, which the Lord had chosen as His own peculiar possession, was not intended to be a miserable and beggarly one; but it was hardly equal, at any time, to the revenues which the priestly castes of other nations derived from their endowments. Again, the Levites had to give up the tenth of all the tithes they received to the priests; and the priests were to offer to Jehovah upon the altar a portion of the first-fruits, heave-offerings, and wave-offerings that were assigned to them. Consequently, as the whole nation was to make a practical acknowledgment, in the presentation of the tithe and first-fruits, that it had received its hereditary property as a fief from the Lord its God, so the Levites, by their payment of the tenth to the priests, and the priests, by presenting a portion of their revenues upon the altar, were to make a practical confession that they had received all their revenues from the Lord their God, and owed Him praise and adoration in return (see *Bähr, Symbolik*, ii. pp. 43 sqq.).

The Law concerning Purification from the Uncleanness of Death.—Chap. xix.

In order that a consciousness of the continuance of the covenant

relation might be kept alive during the dying out of the race that had fallen under the judgment of God, after the severe stroke with which the Lord had visited the whole nation in consequence of the rebellion of the company of Korah, He gave the law concerning purification from the uncleanness of death, in which first of all the preparation of a sprinkling water is commanded for the removal of this uncleanness (vers. 1-10a); and then, secondly, the use of this purifying water enjoined as an eternal statute (vers. 10b-22). The thought that death, and the putrefaction of death, as being the embodiment of sin, defiled and excluded from fellowship with the holy God, was a view of the fall and its consequences which had been handed down from the primeval age (see vol. ii. p. 357), and which was not only shared by the Israelites with many of the nations of antiquity,¹ but presupposed by the laws given on Sinai as a truth well known in Israel; and at the same time confirmed, both in the prohibition of the priests from defiling themselves with the dead, except in the case of their nearest blood-relations (Lev. xxi. 1-6, 10-12), and in the command, that every one who was defiled by a corpse should be removed out of the camp (chap. v. 2-4). Now, so long as the mortality within the congregation did not exceed the natural limits, the traditional modes of purification would be quite sufficient. But when it prevailed to a hitherto unheard-of extent, in consequence of the sentence pronounced by God, the defilements would necessarily be so crowded together, that the whole congregation would be in danger of being infected with the defilement of death, and of forfeiting its vocation to be the holy nation of Jehovah, unless God provided it with the means of cleansing itself from this uncleanness, without losing the fellowship of His covenant of grace. The law which follows furnished the means. In ver. 2 this law is called *תְּרוּמָה תְּקַנֵּן*, a “statute of instruction,” or law-statute. This combination of the two words commonly used for law and statute, which is only met with again in chap. xxxi. 21, and there, as here, in connection with a rule relating to purification from the uncleanness of death, is probably intended to give emphasis to the design of the law about to be given, to point it out as one of great importance, but not as *decretum absque ulla ratione*, a decree without any reason, as the Rabbins suppose.

Vers. 2-10a. *Preparation of the Purifying Water.*—As water is the ordinary means by which all kinds of uncleanness are removed,

¹ Vid. Bähr, *Symbolik*, ii. pp. 466 sqq.; Sommer, *bibl. Abhdll.* pp. 271 sqq.; Knobel on this chapter, and Leyrer in *Herzog's Cyclopædia*.

it was also to be employed in the removal of the uncleanness of death. But as this uncleanness was the strongest of all religious defilements, fresh water alone was not sufficient to remove it; and consequently a certain kind of sprinkling-water was appointed, which was strengthened by the ashes of a sin-offering, and thus formed into a holy alkali. The main point in the law which follows, therefore, was the preparation of the ashes, and these had to be obtained by the *sacrifice of a red heifer*.¹—Vers. 2 sqq. The sons of Israel were to bring to Moses a red heifer, entirely without blemish, and to give it to Eleazar the priest, that he might have it slaughtered in his presence outside the camp. בָרָה is not a cow generally, but a young cow, a heifer, δάμαλις (LXX.), *juvenca*, between the calf and the full-grown cow. אַדְמִתָּה, of a red colour, is not to be connected with חַטָּאת in the sense of “quite red,” as the Rabbins interpret it; but חַטָּאת, *integra*, is to be taken by itself, and the words which follow, “wherein is no blemish,” to be regarded as defining it still more precisely (see Lev. xxii. 19, 20). The slaying of this heifer is called חַטָּאת, a sin-offering, in vers. 9 and 17. To remind the congregation that death was the wages of sin, the antidote to the defilement of death was to be taken from a sin-offering. But as the object was not to remove and wipe away sin as such, but simply to cleanse the congregation from the uncleanness which proceeded from death, the curse of sin, it was necessary that the sin-offering should be modified in a peculiar manner to accord with this special design. The sacrificial animal was not to be a bullock, as in the case of the ordinary sin-offerings of the congregation (Lev. iv. 14), but a female, because the female sex is the bearer of life (Gen. iii. 20), a בָרָה, i.e. lit. the fruit-bringing; and of a red colour, not because the blood-red colour points to sin (as Hengstenberg follows the Rabbins and earlier theologians in supposing), but as the colour of the most “intensive life,” which has its seat in the blood, and shows itself in the red colour of the face (the cheeks and lips); and one “upon which no yoke had ever come,” i.e. whose vital energy had not yet been crippled by labour under the yoke. Lastly,

¹ On this sacrifice, which is so rich in symbolical allusions, but the details of which are so difficult to explain, compare the rabbinical statutes in the talmudical tractate *Para* (*Mishnah*, v. *Surenh.* vi. pp. 269 sqq.); *Maimonides de vacca rufa*; and *Lundius jüd. Heilighth.* pp. 680 sqq. Among modern treatises on this subject, are Bähr's *Symbolik*, ii. pp. 493 sqq.; Hengstenberg, *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, pp. 173 sqq.; Leyrer in *Herzog's Cycl.*; Kurtz in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1846, pp. 629 sqq. (also *Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament*, pp. 422 sqq., Eng. transl., Tr.); and my *Archäologie*, i. p. 58.

like all the sacrificial animals, it was to be uninjured, and free from faults, inasmuch as the idea of representation, which lay at the foundation of all the sacrifices, but more especially of the sin-offerings, demanded natural sinlessness and original purity, quite as much as imputed sin and transferred uncleanness. Whilst the last-mentioned prerequisite showed that the victim was well fitted for bearing sin, the other attributes indicated the fulness of life and power in their highest forms, and qualified it to form a powerful antidote to death. As thus appointed to furnish a reagent against death and mortal corruption, the sacrificial animal was to possess throughout, viz. in colour, in sex, and in the character of its body, the fulness of life in its greatest freshness and vigour.—Ver. 3. The sacrifice itself was to be superintended by Eleazar the priest, the eldest son of the high priest, and his presumptive successor in office; because Aaron, or the high priest, whose duty it was to present the sin-offerings for the congregation (Lev. iv. 16), could not, according to his official position, which required him to avoid all uncleanness of death (Lev. xxi. 11, 12), perform such an act as this, which stood in the closest relation to death and the uncleanness of death, and for that very reason had to be performed outside the camp. The subject, to “*bring her forth*” and “*slay her*,” is indefinite; since it was not the duty of the priest to slay the sacrificial animal, but of the offerer himself, or in the case before us, of the congregation, which would appoint one of its own number for the purpose. All that the priest had to do was to sprinkle the blood; at the same time the slaying was to take place ^{רְאֵל}, before him, i.e. before his eyes. Eleazar was to sprinkle some of the blood seven times “towards the opposite,” i.e. towards the front of the tabernacle (*seven times*, as in Lev. iv. 17). Through this sprinkling of the blood the slaying became a sacrifice, being brought thereby into relation to Jehovah and the sanctuary; whilst the life, which was sacrificed for the sin of the congregation, was given up to the Lord, and offered up in the only way in which a sacrifice, prepared like this, outside the sanctuary, could possibly be offered.

After this (vers. 5, 6), they were to burn the cow, with the skin, flesh, blood, and dung, before his (Eleazar’s) eyes, and he was to throw cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet wool into the fire. The burning of the sacrificial animal outside the camp took place in the case of every sin-offering for the whole congregation, for the reasons expounded in vol. ii. p. 307. But in the case before us, the whole of the sacrificial act had to be performed outside the camp,

i.e. outside the sphere of the theocracy ; because the design of this sin-offering was not that the congregation might thereby be received through the expiation of its sin into the fellowship of the God and Lord who was present at the altar and in the sanctuary, but simply that an antidote to the infection of death might be provided for the congregation, which had become infected through fellowship with death ; and consequently, the victim was to represent, not the living congregation as still associated with the God who was present in His earthly kingdom, but those members of the congregation who had fallen victims to temporal death as the wages of sin, and, as such, were separated from the earthly theocracy (see my *Archæology*, i. p. 283). In this sacrifice, the blood, which was generally poured out at the foot of the altar, was burned along with the rest, and the ashes to be obtained were impregnated with the substance thereof. But in order still further to increase the strength of these ashes, which were already well fitted to serve as a powerful antidote to the corruption of death, as being the incorruptible residuum of the sin-offering which had not been destroyed by the fire, cedar-wood was thrown into the fire, as the symbol of the incorruptible continuance of life ; and hyssop, as the symbol of purification from the corruption of death ; and scarlet wool, the deep red of which shadowed forth the strongest vital energy (see at Lev. xiv. 6),—so that the ashes might be regarded “as the quintessence of all that purified and strengthened life, refined and sublimated by the fire” (*Leyrer*).

—Vers. 7-10a, etc. The persons who took part in this—viz. the priest, the man who attended to the burning, and the clean man who gathered the ashes together, and deposited them in a clean place for subsequent use—became unclean till the evening in consequence ; not from the fact that they had officiated for unclean persons, and, in a certain sense, had participated in their uncleanness (*Knobel*), but through the uncleanness of sin and death, which had passed over to the sin-offering ; just as the man who led into the wilderness the goat which had been rendered unclean through the imposition of sin, became himself unclean in consequence (Lev. xvi. 26). Even the sprinkling water prepared from the ashes defiled every one who touched it (ver. 21). But when the ashes were regarded in relation to their appointment as the means of purification, they were to be treated as clean. Not only were they to be collected together by a clean man ; but they were to be kept for use in a clean place, just as the ashes of the sacrifices that were taken away from the altar were to be carried to a clean place out-

side the camp (Lev. vi. 4). These defilements, like every other which only lasted till the evening, were to be removed by washing (see vol. ii. pp. 373-4). The ashes thus collected were to serve the congregation נָתַת לְפָנֶיךָ, i.e. literally as water of uncleanness; in other words, as water by which uncleanness was to be removed. "Water of uncleanness" is analogous to "water of sin" in chap. viii. 7.

Vers. 10b-22. *Use of the Water of Purification.*—The words in ver. 10b, "And it shall be to the children of Israel, and to the stranger in the midst of them, for an everlasting statute," relate to the preparation and application of the sprinkling water, and connect the foregoing instructions with those which follow.—Vers. 11-13 contain the general rules for the use of the water; vers. 14-22 a more detailed description of the execution of those rules.—Vers. 11 sqq. Whoever touched a corpse, "with regard to all the souls of men," i.e. the corpse of a person, of whatever age or sex, was unclean for seven days, and on the third and seventh day he was to cleanse himself (אֲטַהַת הַמֵּת, as in chap. viii. 21) with the water (*is* refers, so far as the sense is concerned, to the water of purification). If he neglected this cleansing, he did not become clean, and he defiled the dwelling of Jehovah (see at Lev. xv. 31). Such a man was to be cut off from Israel (*vid. at Gen. xvii. 14*).—Vers. 14-16. Special instructions concerning the defilement. If a man died in a tent, every one who entered it, or who was there at the time, became unclean for seven days. So also did every "open vessel upon which there was not a covering, a string," i.e. that had not a covering fastened by a string, to prevent the smell of the corpse from penetrating it. בְּחִנָּה, a string, is in apposition to צָבֵד, a band, or binding (see *Ges.* § 113; *Ewald*, § 287, e.). This also applied to any one in the open field, who touched a man who had either been slain by the sword or had died a natural death, or even a bone (skeleton), or a grave.—Vers. 17-19. *Ceremony of purification.* They were to take for the unclean person some of the dust of the burning of the cow, i.e. some of the ashes obtained by burning the cow, and put living, i.e. fresh water (see Lev. xiv. 5), upon it in a vessel. A clean man was then to take a bunch of hyssop (see Ex. xii. 22), on account of its inherent purifying power, and dip it in the water, on the third and seventh day after the defilement had taken place, and to sprinkle the tent, with the vessels and persons in it, as well as every one who had touched a corpse, whether a person slain, or one who had died a natural death, or a grave; after

which the persons were to wash their clothes and bathe, that they might be clean in the evening. As the uncleanness in question is held up as the highest grade of uncleanness, by its duration being fixed at seven days, *i.e.* an entire week, so the appointment of a double purification with the sprinkling water shows the force of the uncleanness to be removed; whilst the selection of the third and seventh days was simply determined by the significance of the numbers themselves. In ver. 20, the threat of punishment for the neglect of purification is repeated from ver. 13, for the purpose of making it most emphatic.—Vers. 21, 22. This also was to be an everlasting statute, that he who sprinkled the water of purification, or even touched it (see at vers. 7 sqq.), and he who was touched by a person defiled (by a corpse), and also the person who touched him, should be unclean till the evening,—a rule which also applied to other forms of uncleanness.

ISRAEL'S LAST JOURNEY FROM KADESH TO THE HEIGHTS OF
PISGAH IN THE FIELDS OF MOAB.—CHAP. XX. AND XXI.

In the first month of the fortieth year, the whole congregation of Israel assembled again at Kadesh, in the desert of Zin, to commence the march to Canaan. In Kadesh, Miriam died (chap. xx. 1), and the people murmured against Moses and Aaron on account of the want of water. The Lord relieved this want, by pouring water from the rock; but Moses sinned on this occasion, so that he was not allowed to enter Canaan (vers. 2–13). From Kadesh, Moses sent messengers to the king of Edom, to ask permission for the Israelites to pass peaceably through his land; but this was refused by the king of Edom (vers. 14–21). In the meantime, the Israelites marched from Kadesh to Mount Hor, on the borders of the land of Edom; and there Aaron died, and Eleazar was invested with the high-priesthood in his stead (vers. 22–29). On this march they were attacked by the Canaanitish king of Arad; but they gained a complete victory, and laid his cities under the ban (chap. xix. 1–3). As the king of Edom opposed their passing through his land, they were compelled to go from Mount Hor to the Red Sea, and round the land of Edom. On the way the murmuring people were bitten by poisonous serpents; but the penitent among them were healed of the bite of the serpent, by looking at the brazen serpent which Moses set up at the command of God (vers. 4–9). After going round the Moabitish mountains, they

turned to the north, and went along the eastern side of the Edomitish and Moabitish territory, as far as the Arnon, on the border of the Amoritish kingdom of Sihon, with the intention of going through to the Jordan, and so entering Canaan (vers. 10-20). But as Sihon would not allow the Israelites to pass through his land, and made a hostile demonstration against them, they smote him and conquered his land, and also the northern Amoritish kingdom of Og, king of Bashan (vers. 21-35), and forced their way through the Amoritish territory to the heights of Pisgah, for the purpose of going forward thence into the steppes of Moab by the Jordan (chap. xxii. 1). These marches formed the *third stage* in the guidance of Israel through the desert to Canaan.

Death of Miriam. Water out of the Rock. Refusal of a Passage through Edom. Aaron's Death. Conquest over the King of Arad.—Chap. xx.-xxi. 3.

The events mentioned in the heading, which took place either in Kadesh or on the march thence to the mountain of Hor, are grouped together in chap. xx. 1-xxi. 3, rather in a classified order than in one that is strictly chronological. The death of Miriam took place during the time when the people were collected at Kadesh-Barnea in the desert of Zin (ver. 21). But when the whole nation assembled together in this desert there was a deficiency of water, which caused the people to murmur against Moses, until God relieved the want by a miracle (vers. 2-13). It was from Kadesh that messengers were sent to the king of Edom (vers. 14 sqq.); but instead of waiting at Kadesh till the messengers returned, Moses appears to have proceeded with the people in the meantime into the Arabah. When and where the messengers returned to Moses, we are not informed. So much is certain, however, that the Edomites did not come with an army against the Israelites (vers. 20, 21), until they approached their land with the intention of passing through. For it was in the Arabah, at Mount Hor, that? Israel first turned to go round the land of Edom (chap. xxi. 4). The attack of the Canaanites of Arad (chap. xxi. 1-3), who attempted to prevent the Israelites from advancing into the desert of Zin, occurred in the interval between the departure from Kadesh and the arrival in the Arabah at Mount Hor; so that if a chronological arrangement were adopted, this event would be placed in chap. xx. 22, between the first and second clauses of this verse. The words “*and came to Mount Hor*” (ver. 22b) are anticipatory,

and introduce the most important event of all that period, viz. the death of Aaron at Mount Hor (vers. 23-29).¹

Ver. 1. ASSEMBLING OF THE CONGREGATION AT KADESH.—In the first month the children of Israel came into the desert of Zin, *i.e.* in the fortieth year of their wanderings, at the commencement of which “the whole congregation” assembled together once more in the very same place where the sentence had been passed thirty-seven years and a half before, that they should remain in the desert for forty years, until the rebellious generation had died out. The year is not mentioned in ver. 1, but, according to chap. xiv. 32 sqq., it can only be the year with which the forty years of the sentence that they should die out in the wilderness came to an end, that is to say, the fortieth year of their wandering. This is put

¹ Even *Fries* (pp. 53, 54) has admitted that the account in Num. xxi. 1, xxxiii. 40, is to be regarded as a rehearsal of an event which took place before the arrival of the Israelites at Mount Hor, and that the conflict with the king of Arad must have occurred immediately upon the advance of Israel into the desert of Zin; and he correctly observes, that the sacred writer has arranged what stood in practical connection with the sin of Moses and Aaron, and the refusal of Edom, in the closest juxtaposition to those events: whereas, after he had once commenced his account of the tragical occurrences in chap. xx., there was no place throughout the whole of that chapter for mentioning the conflict with Arad; and consequently this battle could only find a place in the second line, after the record of the most memorable events which occurred between the death of Miriam and that of Aaron, and to which it was subordinate in actual significance. On the other hand, *Fries* objects to the arrangement we have adopted above, and supposes that Israel did not go straight from Kadesh through the Wady *Murreh* into the Arabah, and to the border of the (actual) land of Edom, and then turn back to the Red Sea; but that after the failure of the negotiations with the king of Edom, Moses turned at once from the desert of Zin and plain of Kades, and went back in a south-westerly direction to the Hebron road; and having followed this road to Jebel Araif, the south-western corner-pillar of the western Edom, turned at right angles and went by the side of Jebel Mukrah to the Arabah, where he was compelled to alter his course again through meeting with Mount Hor, the border-pillar of Edom at that point, and to go southwards to the Red Sea (pp. 88-9). But although this combination steers clear of the difficulty connected with our assumption,—viz. that when Israel advanced into the Arabah to encamp at Mount Hor, they had actually trodden upon the Edomitish territory in that part of the Arabah which connected the mountain land of Azazimeh, of which the Edomites had taken forcible possession, with their hereditary country, the mountains of Seir,—we cannot regard this view as in harmony with the biblical account. For, apart from the improbability of Moses going a second time to Mount Hor on the border of Edom, after he had been compelled to desist from his advance through the desert of Zin (Wady *Murreh*), and take a circuitous route, or rather make a

beyond all doubt by what follows. For the whole congregation proceeds from Kadesh in the desert of Zin to Mount Hor, where Aaron died, and that, according to chap. xxxiii. 38, in the fifth month of the fortieth year after the exodus from Egypt. Miriam died during the time that the people were staying (**בְּשִׁׁירָה**) in Kadesh, and there she was buried.

Vers. 2-13. SIN OF MOSES AND AARON AT THE WATER OF STRIFE AT KADEXH.—In the arid desert the congregation was in want of water, and the people quarrelled with Moses in consequence. In connection with the first stay in Kadesh there is nothing said about any deficiency of water. But as the name Kadesh embraces a large district of the desert of Zin, and is not confined to one particular spot, there might easily be a want of water in this place or retrograde movement, on the western side of the Edomitish territory of the land of Azazimeh, only to be driven back a second time, the account of the contest with the king of Arad is hard to reconcile with this combination. In that case the king of Arad must have attacked or overtaken the Israelites when they were collected together in the desert of Zin at Kadesh. But this does not tally with the words of chap. xxi. 1, “When the Canaanite heard that Israel came (was approaching) by the way of the spies;” for if Moses turned round in Kadesh to go down the Hebron road as far as Jebel Araif, in consequence of the refusal of Edom, the Israelites did not take the way of the spies at all, for their way went northwards from Kadesh to Canaan. The supposition of *Fries* (p. 54), that the words in chap. xxi. 1, “came by the way of the spies,” are a permutation of those in chap. xx. 1, “came into the desert of Zin,” and that the two perfectly coincide as to time, is forced; as the Israelites are described in chap. xx. 1 not only as coming into the desert of Zin in general, but as assembling together there at Kadesh.

Modern critics (*Knobel* and others) have also mutilated these chapters, and left only chap. xx. 1 (in part), 2, 6, 22-29, xxi. 10, 11, xxii. 1, as parts of the original work, whilst all the rest is described as a Jehovahistic addition, partly from ancient sources and partly from the invention of the Jehovah himself. But the supposed contradiction—viz. that whilst the original work describes the Israelites as going through northern Edom, and going round the Moabitish territory in the more restricted sense, the Jehovah represents them as going round the land of Edom upon the west, south, and east (chap. xx. 21, xxi. 4), and also as going round the land of the Arnon in a still larger circle, and past other places as well (chap. xxi. 12, 16, 18)—rests upon a false interpretation of the passages in question. The other arguments adduced—viz. the fact that the Jehovah gives great prominence to the hatred of the Edomites (chap. xx. 18, 20) and interweaves poetical sentences (chap. xxi. 14, 15, 17, 18, 27, 28), the miraculous rod in Moses’ hand (chap. xx. 8), and the etymology (chap. xxi. 3)—are all just arguing in a circle, since the supposition that all these things are foreign to the original work, is not a fact demonstrated, but a simple *petitio principii*.

the other. In their faithless discontent, the people wished that they had died when their brethren died before Jehovah. The allusion is not to Korah's company, as Knobel supposes, and the word יָמוּת, "to expire," would be altogether inapplicable to their destruction; but the reference is to those who had died one by one during the thirty-seven years. "Why," they murmured once more against Moses and Aaron, "*have ye brought the congregation of God into this desert, to perish there with their cattle? Why have ye brought it out of Egypt into this evil land, where there is no seed, no fig-trees and pomegranates, no vines, and no water to drink?*"—Ver. 6. Moses and Aaron then turned to the tabernacle, to ask for the help of the Lord; and the glory of the Lord immediately appeared (see at chap. xvii. 7 and xiv. 10).—Vers. 7, 8. The Lord relieved the want of water. Moses was to take the staff, and with Aaron to gather together the congregation, and speak to the rock before their eyes, when it would give forth water for the congregation and their cattle to drink.—Vers. 9–11. Moses then took the rod "from before Jehovah,"—i.e. the rod with which he had performed miracles in Egypt (Ex. xvii. 5), and which was laid up in the sanctuary, not Aaron's rod which blossomed (chap. xvii. 25),—and collected the congregation together before the rock, and said to them, "*Hear, ye rebels, shall we fetch you water out of this rock?*" He then smote the rock twice with his rod, whereupon much water came out, so that the congregation and their cattle had water to drink.—Ver. 12. The Lord then said to both of them, both Moses and Aaron, "*Because ye have not trusted firmly in Me, to sanctify Me before the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them.*" The want of belief or firm confidence in the Lord, through which both of them had sinned, was not actual unbelief or distrust in the omnipotence and grace of God, as if God could not relieve the want of water or extend His help to the murmuring people; for the Lord had promised His help to Moses, and Moses did what the Lord had commanded him. It was simply the want of full believing confidence, a momentary wavering of that immovable assurance, which the two heads of the nation ought to have shown to the congregation, but did not show. Moses did even more than God had commanded him. Instead of speaking to the rock with the rod of God in his hand, as God directed him, he spoke to the congregation, and in these inconsiderate words, "*Shall we fetch you water out of the rock?*" words which, if they did not express any doubt in the

help of the Lord, were certainly fitted to strengthen the people in their unbelief, and are therefore described in Ps. cvi. 33 as prating (speaking unadvisedly) with the lips (cf. Lev. v. 4). He then struck the rock twice with the rod, "as if it depended upon human exertion, and not upon the power of God alone," or as if the promise of God "would not have been fulfilled without all the smiting on his part" (*Knobel*). In the ill-will expressed in these words the weakness of faith was manifested, by which the faithful servant of God, worn out with the numerous temptations, allowed himself to be overcome, so that he stumbled, and did not sanctify the Lord before the eyes of the people, as he ought to have done. Aaron also wavered along with Moses, inasmuch as he did nothing to prevent Moses' fall. But their sin became a grievous one, from the fact that they acted unworthily of their office. God punished them, therefore, by withdrawing their office from them before they had finished the work entrusted to them. They were not to conduct the congregation into the promised land, and therefore were not to enter in themselves (cf. chap. xxvii. 12-14; Deut. xxxii. 48 seq.). The rock, from which water issued, is distinguished by the article יַדְעָה, not as being already known, or mentioned before, but simply as a particular rock in that neighbourhood ; though the situation is not described, so as to render it possible to search for it now.¹—Ver. 13. The account closes with the words, "*This is the water of strife, about which the children of Israel strove with Jehovah, and He sanctified Himself on them.*" This does not imply that the scene of

¹ Moses Nachmanides has given a correct interpretation of the words, "Speak to the rock before their eyes" (ver. 8) : viz. "to the first rock in front of them, and standing in their sight." The fable attributed to the Rabbins, viz. that the rock of *Rephidim* followed the Israelites all about in the desert, and supplied them with water, cannot be proved from the talmudical and rabbinical passages given by Buxtorf (*historia Petraræ in deserto*) in his *exercitatt. c. v.*, but is simply founded upon a literal interpretation of certain rabbinical statements concerning the identity of the well at Rephidim with that at Kadesh, which were evidently intended to be figurative, as Abarbanel expressly affirms (*Buxtorf, l. c. pp. 422 seq.*). "Their true meaning," he says, "was, that those waters which flowed out in Horeb were the gift of God granted to the Israelites, and continued all through the desert, just like the manna. For wherever they went, fountains of living waters were opened to them as the occasion required. And for this reason, the rock in Kadesh was the same rock as that in Horeb. Still less ground is there for supposing that the Apostle Paul alluded to any such rabbinical fable when he said, "They drank of that spiritual rock that followed them" (1 Cor. x. 4), and gave it a spiritual interpretation in the words, "and that rock was Christ."

this occurrence received the name of “strife-water,” but simply that the water which God brought out of the rock for the Israelites received that name. But God sanctified Himself on them, by the fact that, on the one hand, He put their unbelief to shame by the miraculous gift of water, and on the other hand punished Moses and Aaron for the weakness of their faith.¹

Vers. 14–21. MESSAGE OF THE ISRAELITES TO THE KING OF EDOM.—As Israel was about to start from Kadesh upon its march to Canaan, but wished to enter it from the east across the Jordan, and not from the south, where the steep and lofty mountain ranges presented obstacles which would have been difficult to overcome, if not quite insuperable, Moses sent messengers from Kadesh to the king of Edom, to solicit from the kindred nation a friendly and unimpeded passage through their land. He reminded the king of the relationship of Israel, of their being brought down to Egypt, of the oppression they had endured there, and their deliverance out of the land, and promised him that they would not pass through fields and vineyards, nor drink the water of their wells, but keep to the king’s way, without turning to the right hand or the left, and thus would do no injury whatever to the land (vers. 14–16).² By the “angel” who led Israel out of Egypt we are naturally to understand not the pillar of cloud and fire (*Knobel*), but the angel of the Lord, the visible revealer of the invisible God, whom the messengers

¹ The assumption of neological critics, that this occurrence is identical with the similar one at Rephidim (Ex. xvii.), and that this is only another saga based upon the same event, has no firm ground whatever. The want of water in the arid desert is a fact so constantly attested by travellers, that it would be a matter of great surprise if Israel had only experienced this want, and quarrelled with its God and its leaders, once in the course of forty years. As early as Ex. xv. 22 sqq. the people murmured because of the want of drinkable water, and the bitter water was turned into sweet; and immediately after the event before us, it gave utterance to the complaint again, “We have no bread and no water” (chap. xxi. 4, 5). But if the want remained the same, the relief of that want would necessarily be repeated in the same or a similar manner. Moreover, the occurrences at Rephidim (or Massah-Meribah) and at Kadesh are altogether different from each other. In Rephidim, God gave the people water out of the rock, and the murmuring of the people was stayed. In Kadesh, God no doubt relieved the distress in the same way; but the mediators of His mercy, Moses and Aaron, sinned at the time, so that God sanctified Himself upon them by a judgment, because they had not sanctified Him before the congregation. (See *Hengstenberg*, *Dissertations*, vol. ii.)

² We learn from Judg. xi. 17, that Israel sent messengers from Kadesh to the king of Moab also, and with a similar commission, and that he also refused

describe indefinitely as “an angel,” when addressing the Edomites. *Kadesh* is represented in ver. 16 as a city on the border of the Edomitish territory. The reference is to *Kadesh-Barnea* (chap. xxxii. 8, xxxiv. 4; Deut. i. 2, 19, ii. 14, ix. 23; Josh. x. 41, xiv. 6, 7, xv. 3). This city was no doubt situated quite in the neighbourhood of *Ain Kudes*, the well of *Kadesh*, discovered by *Rowland*. This well was called *En-Mishpat*, the fountain of judgment, in Abraham’s time (Gen. xiv. 7); and the name *Kadesh* occurs first of all on the first arrival of the Israelites in that region, in the account of the events which took place there, as being the central point of the place of encampment, the “desert of Paran,” or “desert of Zin” (cf. chap. xiii. 26 with ver. 21, and chap. xii. 16). And even on the second arrival of the congregation in that locality, it is not mentioned till after the desert of Zin (chap. xx. 1); whilst the full name *Kadesh-Barnea* is used by Moses for the first time in chap. xxxii. 8, when reminding the people of those mournful occurrences in *Kadesh* in chap. xiii. and xiv. The conjecture is therefore a very natural one, that the place in question received the name of *Kadesh* first of all from that tragical occurrence (chap. xiv.), or possibly from the murmuring of the congregation on account of the want of water, which led Moses and Aaron to sin, so that the Lord sanctified (^{וְיִרְאֶה}) Himself upon them by a judgment, because they had not sanctified Him before the children of Israel (vers. 12 and 13); that *Barnea* was the older or original name of the town, which was situated in the neighbourhood of the “water of strife,” and that this name was afterwards united with *Kadesh*, and formed into a composite noun. If this conjecture is a correct one, the name *Kadesh* is used proleptically, not only in Gen. xiv. 7, as a more precise definition of *En-Mishpat*, but also in Gen. xvi. 14, xx. 1; and Num. xiii. 26, and xx. 1; and there is no lack of analogies for this. It is in this too that we are probably to seek for an explanation of the fact, that in the list of stations in chap. xxxiii. the name *Kadesh* does not occur in connection with the first arrival of the congregation in the desert of Zin, but only in connection with their second arrival (ver. 36), and that the place of encampment on their first arrival is called *Rithmah*, and not *Barnea*, because

to grant the request for an unimpeded passage through his land. This message is passed over in silence here, because the refusal of the Moabites had no influence upon the further progress of the Israelites. “For if they could not pass through Edom, the permission of the Moabites would not help them at all. It was only *eventualiter* that they sought this permission.”—*Hengstenberg*, Diss.

the headquarters of the camp were in the Wady *Retemath*, not at the town of *Barnea*, which was farther on in the desert of *Zin*. The expression “*town of the end of thy territory*” is not to be understood as signifying that the town belonged to the Edomites, but simply affirms that it was situated on the border of the Edomitish territory. The supposition that *Barnea* was an Edomitish town is opposed by the circumstance that, in chap. xxxiv. 4, and Josh xv. 3, it is reckoned as part of the land of Canaan; that in Josh. x. 41 it is mentioned as the southernmost town, where Joshua smote the Canaanites and conquered their land; and lastly, that in Josh. xv. 23 it is probably classed among the towns allotted to the tribe of Judah, from which it seems to follow that it must have belonged to the Amorites. “The end of the territory” of the king of Edom is to be distinguished from “the territory of the land of Edom” in ver. 23. The land of Edom extended westwards only as far as the Arabah, the low-lying plain, which runs from the southern point of the Dead Sea to the head of the Elanitic Gulf. At that time, however, the Edomites had spread out beyond the Arabah, and taken possession of a portion of the desert of Paran belonging to the peninsula of Sinai, which was bounded on the north by the desert of *Zin* (see at chap. xxxiv. 3). By their not drinking of the water of the wells (ver. 17), we are to understand, according to ver. 19, their not making use of the wells of the Edomites either by violence or without compensation. The “king’s way” is the public high road, which was probably made at the cost of the state, and kept up for the king and his armies to travel upon, and is synonymous with the “sultan-road” (*Derb es Sultan*) or “emperor road,” as the open, broad, old military roads are still called in the East (cf. Robinson, Pal. ii. 340; Seetzen, i. pp. 61, 132, ii. pp. 336, etc.).

This military road led, no doubt, as Leake has conjectured (Burckhardt, Syr. pp. 21, 22), through the broad Wady *el Ghuweir*, which not only forms a direct and easy passage to the level country through the very steep mountains that fall down into the Arabah, but also a convenient road through the land of Edom (Robinson, ii. pp. 552, 583, 610), and is celebrated for its splendid meadows, which are traceable to its many springs (Burckhardt, pp. 688, 689); for the broad Wady *Murreh* runs from the northern border of the mountain-land of *Azazimeh*, not only as far as the mountain of *Moddera* (*Madurah*), where it is divided, but in its southern half as far as the Arabah (see p. 59). This is very likely the “great route through broad wadys,” which the Bedouins

who accompanied *Rowland* assured him “was very good, and led direct to Mount Hor, but with which no European traveller was acquainted” (*Ritter’s Erdk.* xiv. p. 1088). It probably opens into the Arabah at the Wady *el Weibeh*, opposite to the Wady *Ghuweir*. —Vers. 18, 19. The Edomites refused the visit of the Israelites in a most unbrotherly manner, and threatened to come out against them with the sword, without paying the least attention to the repeated assurance of the Israelitish messengers, that they would only march upon the high road, and would pay for water for themselves and their cattle. בְּכָל־אֶתְנָתָר־לִי, lit. “it is nothing at all; I will go through with my feet:” i.e. we want no great thing; we will only make use of the high road.—Ver. 20. To give emphasis to his refusal, Edom went against Israel “with much people and with a strong hand,” sc. when they approached its borders. This statement, as well as the one in ver. 21, that Israel turned away before Edom, anticipates the historical order; for, as a matter of course, the Edomites cannot have come at once with an army on the track of the messengers, for the purpose of blocking up the road through the Wady Murreh, which runs along the border of its territory to the west of the Arabah.

Vers. 22-29. DEATH OF AARON AT MOUNT HOR.—The Israelites left Kadesh, and passed along the road just mentioned to Mount *Hor*. This mountain, which was situated, according to chap. xxxiii. 37, on the border of the land of Edom, is placed by *Josephus* (Ant. iv. 4, 7) in the neighbourhood of *Petra*; so also by *Eusebius* and *Jerome*: “Or mons, in quo mortuus est Aaron, juxta civitatem Petram.” According to modern travellers, it is Mount *Harun*, on the north-western side of Wady *Musa* (*Petra*), which is described by *Robinson* (vol. ii. p. 508) as “a cone irregularly truncated, having three ragged points or peaks, of which that upon the north-east is the highest, and has upon it the Muhammedan Wely, or tomb of Aaron,” from which the mountain has received its name “*Harun*,” i.e. *Aaron* (vid. *Burckhardt*, Syr. pp. 715, 716; v. *Schubert, Reise*, ii. pp. 419 sqq.; *Ritter, Erdkunde*, xiv. pp. 1127 sqq.). There can be no doubt as to the general correctness of this tradition;¹ for even if the Muhammedan tradition concerning Aaron’s grave is not well accredited, the situation of this mountain

¹ There is no force whatever in the arguments by which *Knobel* has endeavoured to prove that it is incorrect. The first objection, viz. that the Hebrews reached Mount Hor from Kadesh in a single march, has no foundation

is in perfect harmony with the statement in ver. 23 and chap. xxxiii. 37, viz. that the Israelites had then reached the border of the land of Edom. The place where the people encamped is called *Mosera* in Deut. x. 6, and *Moseroth* in the list of stations in chap. xxxiii. 30, and is at all events to be sought for in the Arabah, in the neighbourhood of Mount *Hor*, though it is altogether unknown to us. The camp of 600,000 men, with their wives, children, and flocks, would certainly require a space miles wide, and might therefore easily stretch from the mouths of the Wady el Weibeh and Wady Ghuweir, in the Arabah, to the neighbourhood of Mount *Harun*. The place of encampment is called after this mountain, *Hor*, both here and in chap. xxxiii. 37 sqq., because it was there that Aaron died and was buried. The Lord foretold his death to Moses, and directed him to take off Aaron's priestly robes, and put them upon Eleazar his son, as Aaron was not to enter the promised land, because they (Aaron and Moses) had opposed the command of Jehovah at the water of strife (see at ver. 12). "Gathered to his people," like the patriarchs (Gen. xxv. 8, 17, xxxv. 29, xl ix. 33).—Vers. 27, 28. Moses executed this command, and Aaron died upon the top of the mountain, according to chap. xxxiii. 37, 38, on the first day of the fifth month, in the fortieth year after the exodus from Egypt, at the age of 123 years (which agrees with Ex. vii. 7), and was mourned by all Israel for thirty days.

in the biblical text, and cannot be inferred from the circumstance that there is no place of encampment mentioned between Kadesh and Mount Hor; for, on the one hand, we may clearly see, not only from chap. xxi. 10, but even from Ex. xvii. 1, as compared with Num. xxxiii. 41 sqq. and 12 sqq., that only those places of encampment are mentioned in the historical account where events occurred that were worthy of narrating; and, on the other hand, it is evident from chap. x. 33, that the Israelites sometimes continued marching for several days before they formed an encampment again. The *second* objection—viz. that if Hor was near Petra, it is impossible to see how the advance of the Hebrews from Kadesh to Hor could be regarded by the king of Arad, who lived more than thirty hours' journey to the north, as coming (chap. xxxiii. 40), not to mention "coming by the way of the spies" (chap. xxi. 1), and how this king could come into conflict with the Hebrews when posted at Petra—rests upon the erroneous assumption, that the attack of the king of Arad did not take place till after the death of Aaron, because it is not mentioned till afterwards. Lastly, the *third* objection—viz. that a march from Kadesh in a south-westerly direction to Wady Musa, and then northwards past Zalmona to Phunon (chap. xxxiii. 41), is much too adventurous—is overthrown by chap. xxi. 4, where the Israelites are said to have gone from Mount Hor by the way of the Red Sea. (See the notes on chap. xxi. 10.)

Chap. xxi. 1-3. VICTORY OF ISRAEL OVER THE CANAANITISH KING OF ARAD.—When this Canaanitish king, who dwelt in the Negeb, *i.e.* the south of Palestine (*vid.* chap. xiii. 17), heard that Israel was coming the way of the spies, he made war upon the Israelites, and took some of them prisoners. *Arad* is mentioned both here and in the parallel passage, chap. xxxiii. 40, and also by the side of *Hormah*, in Josh. xii. 14, as the seat of a Canaanitish king (cf. Judg. i. 16, 17). According to *Eusebius* and *Jerome* in the *Onomast.*, it was twenty Roman miles to the south of Hebron, and has been preserved in the ruins of *Tell Arad*, which *v. Schubert* (ii. pp. 457 sqq.) and *Robinson* (ii. pp. 473, 620, and 624) saw in the distance; and, according to *Roth* in *Petermann's geographische Mittheilungen* (1858, p. 269), it was situated to the south-east of Kurmul (Carmel), in an undulating plain, without trees or shrubs, with isolated hills and ranges of hills in all directions, among which was *Tell Arad*. The meaning of בְּרַךְ הָאֲתָרִים is uncertain. The LXX., *Saad.*, and others, take the word *Atharim* as the proper name of a place not mentioned again; but the *Chaldee*, *Samar.*, and *Syr.* render it with much greater probability as an appellative noun formed from תַּחַר with שׁ *prosthet.*, and synonymous with חֶרְבִּים, the spies (chap. xiv. 6). The way of the spies was the way through the desert of Zin, which the Israelitish spies had previously taken to Canaan (chap. xiii. 21). The territory of the king of Arad extended to the southern frontier of Canaan, to the desert of Zin, through which the Israelites went from Kadesh to Mount Hor. The Canaanites attacked them when upon their march, and made some of them prisoners.—Vers. 2, 3. The Israelites then vowed to the Lord, that if He would give this people into their hands, they would “ban” their cities; and the Lord hearkened to the request, and delivered up the Canaanites, so that they put them and their cities under the ban. (On the ban, see at Lev. xxvii. 28.) “And they called the place Hormah,” *i.e.* banning, ban-place. “The place” can only mean the spot where the Canaanites were defeated by the Israelites. If the town of Zephath, or the capital of Arad, had been specially intended, it would no doubt have been also mentioned, as in Judg. i. 17. As it was not the intention of Moses to press into Canaan from the south, across the steep and difficult mountains, for the purpose of effecting its conquest, the Israelites could very well content themselves for the present with the defeat inflicted upon the Canaanites, and defer the complete execution of their vow until the time when they had gained a firm footing in

Canaan. The banning of the Canaanites of Arad and its cities necessarily presupposed the immediate conquest of the whole territory, and the laying of all its cities in ashes. And so, again, the introduction of a king of *Hormah*, i.e. *Zephath*, among the kings defeated by Joshua (Josh. xii. 14), is no proof that Zephath was conquered and called Hormah in the time of Moses. Zephath may be called Hormah proleptically both there and in Josh. xix. 4, as being the southernmost border town of the kingdom of Arad, in consequence of the ban suspended by Moses over the territory of the king of Arad, and may not have received this name till after its conquest by the Judaeans and Simeonites. At the same time, it is quite conceivable that Zephath may have been captured in the time of Joshua, along with the other towns of the south, and called Hormah at that time, but that the Israelites could not hold it then; and therefore, after the departure of the Israelitish army, the old name was restored by the Canaanites, or rather only retained, until the city was retaken and permanently held by the Israelites after Joshua's death (Judg. i. 16, 17), and received the new name once for all. The allusion to Hormah here, and in chap. xiv. 45, does not warrant the opinion in any case, that it was subsequently to the death of Moses and the conquest of Canaan under Joshua that the war with the Canaanites of Arad and their overthrow occurred.

March round the land of Edom and Moab. Conquest of Sihon and Og, kings of the Amorites.—Chap. xxi. 4–35.

Vers. 4–9. MARCH OF ISRAEL THROUGH THE ARABAH.
PLAQUE OF SERPENTS, AND BRAZEN SERPENT.—Ver. 4. As the Edomites refused a passage through their land when the Israelites left Mount Hor, they were obliged to take the way to the Red Sea, in order to go round the land of Edom, that is to say, to go down the Arabah to the head of the Elanitic Gulf.—Vers. 5, 6. As they went along this road the people became impatient ("the soul of the people was much discouraged," see Ex. vi. 9), and they began once more to murmur against God and Moses, because they had neither bread nor water (cf. chap. xx. 4 sqq.), and were tired of the loose, i.e. poor, food of manna (בְּדָשׁ from בִּדְשׁ). The low-lying plain of the Arabah, which runs between steep mountain walls from the Dead Sea to the Red Sea, would be most likely to furnish the Israelites with very little food, except the manna which God gave them; for although it is not altogether destitute of vegetation, especially at the mouths of the wadys and winter torrents from

the hills, yet on the whole it is a horrible desert, with a loose sandy soil, and drifts of granite and other stones, where terrible sand-storms sometimes arise from the neighbourhood of the Red Sea (see v. Schubert, R. ii. pp. 396 sqq., and Ritter, *Erdk.* xiv. pp. 1013 sqq.) ; and the want of food might very frequently be accompanied by the absence of drinkable water. The people rebelled in consequence, and were punished by the Lord with fiery serpents, the bite of which caused many to die. נֶחָשִׁים שְׂרָפִים, *lit.* burning snakes, so called from their burning, i.e. inflammatory bite, which filled with heat and poison, just as many of the snakes were called by the Greeks, e.g. the διψάς, πρηστῆρες, and καύσωνες (*Dioscor.* vii. 13 : *Aelian. nat. anim.* vi. 51), not from the skin of these snakes with fiery red spots, which are frequently found in the Arabah, and are very poisonous.¹—Ver. 7. This punishment brought the people to reflection. They confessed their sin to Moses, and entreated him to deliver them from the plague through his intercession with the Lord. And the Lord helped them ; in such a way, however, that the reception of help was made to depend upon the faith of the people.—Vers. 8, 9. At the command of God, Moses made a *brazen serpent*, and put it upon a standard.² Whoever then of the persons bitten by the poisonous serpents looked at the brazen serpent with faith in the promise of God, lived, i.e. recovered from the serpent's bite. The serpent was to be made of brass or copper, because the colour of this metal, when the sun was shining upon it, was most like the appearance of the fiery serpents ; and thus the symbol would be more like the thing itself.

Even in the book of Wisdom (chap. xvi. 6, 7), the brazen serpent is called “a symbol of salvation ; for he that turned himself toward it was not saved by the thing that he saw, but by Thee,

¹ This is the account given by v. Schubert, R. ii. p. 406 : “ In the afternoon they brought us a very mottled snake of a large size, marked with fiery red spots and wavy stripes, which belonged to the most poisonous species, as the formation of its teeth clearly showed. According to the assertion of the Bedouins, these snakes, which they greatly dreaded, were very common in that neighbourhood.”

² For the different views held by early writers concerning the brazen serpent, see Buxtorf, *historia serp. aen.*, in his *Exercitt.* pp. 458 sqq. ; Deyling, *observatt. ss.* ii. obs. 15, pp. 156 sqq. ; Vitringa, *observ. ss.* 1, pp. 403 sqq. ; Jo. Marck, *Scripturariæ Exercitt. exerc.* 8, pp. 465 sqq. ; Iluth, *Serpens exaltatus non constrictoris sed conterendi imago*, Erl. 1758 ; Gottfr. Menken on the brazen serpent ; Sack, *Apologetik*, 2 Ausg. pp. 355 sqq. Hofmann, *Weissagung u. Erfüllung*, ii. pp. 142, 143 ; Kurtz, History of the Old Covenant, iii. 345 sqq. ; and the commentators on John iii. 14 and 15.

that art the Saviour of all." It was not merely intended, however, as *Ewald* supposes (*Gesch.* ii. p. 228), as a "sign that just as this serpent hung suspended in the air, bound and rendered harmless by the command of Jehovah, so every one who looked at this with faith in the redeeming power of Jehovah, was secured against the evil,—a figurative sign, therefore, like that of St George and the Dragon among ourselves ;" for, according to this, there would be no internal causal link between the fiery serpents and the brazen image of a serpent. It was rather intended as a figurative representation of the poisonous serpents, rendered harmless by the mercy of God. For God did not cause a real serpent to be taken, but the image of a serpent, in which the fiery serpent was stiffened, as it were, into dead brass, as a sign that the deadly poison of the fiery serpents was overcome in this brazen serpent. This is not to be regarded as a symbol of the divine healing power; nor is the selection of such a symbol to be deduced and explained, as it is by *Winer*, *Kurtz*, *Knobel*, and others, from the symbolical view that was common to all the heathen religions of antiquity, that the serpent was a beneficent and health-bringing power, which led to its being exalted into a symbol of the healing power, and a representation of the gods of healing. This heathen view is not only foreign to the Old Testament, and without any foundation in the fact that, in the time of Hezekiah, the people paid a superstitious worship to the brazen serpent erected by Moses (2 Kings xviii. 4); but it is irreconcilably opposed to the biblical view of the serpent, as the representative of evil, which was founded upon Gen. iii. 15, and is only traceable to the magical art of serpent-charming, which the Old Testament abhorred as an idolatrous abomination. To this we may add, that the thought which lies at the foundation of this explanation, viz. that poison is to be cured by poison, has no support in Hos. xiii. 4, but is altogether foreign to the Scriptures. God punishes sin, it is true, by sin; but He neither cures sin by sin, nor death by death. On the contrary, to conquer sin it was necessary that the Redeemer should be without sin; and to take away its power from death, it was requisite that Christ, the Prince of life, who had life in Himself, should rise again from death and the grave (John v. 26, xi. 25; Acts iii. 15; 2 Tim. i. 10).

The brazen serpent became a symbol of salvation on the three grounds which *Luther* pointed out. In the *first* place, the serpent which Moses was to make by the command of God was to be of brass or copper, that is to say, of a reddish colour, and (although

without poison) altogether like the persons who were red and burning with heat because of the bite of the fiery serpents. In the *second* place, the brazen serpent was to be set up upon a pole for a sign. And in the *third* place, those who desired to recover from the fiery serpent's bite and live, were to look at the brazen serpent upon the pole, otherwise they could not recover or live (*Luther's Sermon on John iii. 1-15*). It was in these three points, as *Luther* has also clearly shown, that the typical character of this symbol lay, to which Christ referred in His conversation with Nicodemus (John iii. 14). The brazen serpent had the form of a real serpent, but was "without poison, and altogether harmless." So God sent His Son in the form of sinful flesh, and yet without sin (Rom. viii. 3; 2 Cor. v. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 22-24).—2. In the lifting up of the serpent as a standard. This was a *δειγματίζειν ἐν παρηστάτῃ*, a *θριαμβεύειν* (a "showing openly," or "triumphing"), a triumphal exhibition of the poisonous serpents as put to death in the brazen image, just as the lifting up of Christ upon the cross was a public triumph over the evil principalities and powers below the sky (Col. ii. 14, 15).—3. In the cure effected through looking at the image of the serpent. Just as the Israelites had to turn their eyes to the brazen serpent in believing obedience to the word of the Lord, in order to be cured of the bite of the poisonous serpents, so must we look with faith at the Son of man lifted up upon the cross, if we would be delivered from the bite of the old serpent, from sin, death, the devil, and hell. "Christ is the antitype of the serpent, inasmuch as He took upon Himself the most pernicious of all pernicious potencies, viz. sin, and made a vicarious atonement for it" (*Hengstenberg on John iii. 14*). The brazen image of the serpent was taken by the Israelites to Canaan, and preserved till the time of Hezekiah, who had it broken in pieces, because the idolatrous people had presented incense-offerings to this holy relic (2 Kings xviii. 4).

Vers. 10-20. MARCH OF ISRAEL ROUND EDOM AND MOAB, TO THE HEIGHTS OF PISGAH IN THE FIELD OF MOAB (cf. chap. xxxiii. 41-47).—Ver. 10. From the camp in the Arabah, which is not more particularly described, where the murmuring people were punished by fiery serpents, Israel removed to *Oboth*. According to the list of stations in chap. xxxiii. 41 sqq., they went from Hor to *Zalmonah*, the situation of which has not been determined; for *C. v. Raumer's conjecture* (*der Zug der Israeliten*, p. 45), that it was the

same place as the modern *Maan*, has no firm basis in the fact that Maan is a station of the Syrian pilgrim caravans. From Zalmonah they went to *Phunon*, and only then to *Oboth*. The name *Phunon* is no doubt the same as *Phinon*, a tribe-seat of the Edomitish Phylarch (Gen. xxxvi. 41); and according to Jerome (*Onom. s. v. Fenon*), it was “a little village in the desert, where copper was dug up by condemned criminals (see at Gen. xxxvi. 41), between Petra and Zoar.” This statement suits very well, provided we imagine the situation of Phunon to have been not in a straight line between Petra and Zoar, but more to the east, between the mountains on the edge of the desert. For the Israelites unquestionably went from the southern end of the Arabah to the eastern side of Idumæa, through the Wady *el Ithm* (*Getum*), which opens into the Arabah from the east, a few hours to the north of Akaba and the ancient Ezion-geber. They had then gone round the mountains of Edom, and begun to “turn to the north” (Deut. ii. 3), so that they now proceeded farther northwards, on the eastern side of the mountains of Edom, “through the territory of the sons of Esau,” no doubt by the same road which is taken in the present day by the caravans which go from Gaza to Maan, through the Ghor. “This runs upon a grassy ridge, forming the western border of the coast of Arabia, and the eastern border of the cultivated land, which stretches from the land of Edom to the sources of the Jordan, on the eastern side of the Ghor” (*v. Raumer, Zug*, p. 45). On the western side of their mountains the Edomites had refused permission to the Israelites to pass through their land (chap. xx. 18 sqq.), as the mountains of Seir terminate towards the Ghor (the Arabah) in steep and lofty precipices, and there are only two or three narrow wadys which intersect them from west to east; and of these the Wady Ghuweir is the only one which is practicable for an army, and even this could be held so securely by a moderate army, that no enemy could force its way into the heart of the country (see *Leake in Burckhardt*, pp. 21, 22; and *Robinson*, ii. p. 583). It was different on the eastern side, where the mountains slope off into a wide extent of table-land, which is only slightly elevated above the desert of Arabia. Here, on the weaker side of their frontier, the Edomites lost the heart to make any attack upon the Israelites, who would now have been able to requite their hostilities. But the Lord had commanded Israel not to make war upon the sons of Esau; but when passing through their territory, to purchase food and water from them for money (Deut. ii. 4–6). The Edomites submitted to the necessity, and

endeavoured to take advantage of it, by selling provisions, “in the same way in which, at the present day, the caravan from Mecca is supplied with provisions by the inhabitants of the mountains along the pilgrim road” (*Leake in Burckhardt*, p. 24). The situation of *Oboth* cannot be determined.

Ver. 11. The next encampment was “*Ije-Abarim* in the desert, which lies before Moab towards the sun-rising,” i.e. on the eastern border of Moabitis (chap. xxxiii. 44). As the Wady *el Ahsy*, which runs into the Dead Sea, in a deep and narrow rocky bed, from the south-east, and is called *el Kerahy* in its lower part (*Burckhardt*, Syr. pp. 673–4), separates Idumæa from Moabitis; *Ije-Abarim* (i.e. ruins of the crossings over) must be sought for on the border of Moab to the north of this wady, but is hardly to be found, as *Knobel* supposes, on the range of hills called *el Tarfuye*, which is known by the name of *Orokarye*, still farther to the south, and terminates on the south-west of *Kerek*, whilst towards the north it is continued in the range of hills called *el Gheweithe* and the mountain range of *el Zoble*; even supposing that the term *Abarim*, “the passages or sides,” is to be understood as referring to these ranges of hills and mountains which skirt the land of the Amorites and Moabites, and form the enclosing sides. For the boundary line between the hills of *el-Tarfuye* and those of *el-Gheweithe* is so near to the Arnon, that there is not the necessary space between it and the Arnon for the encampment at the brook *Zared* (ver. 12). *Ije-Abarim* or *Jim* cannot have been far from the northern shore of the *el Ahsy*, and was probably in the neighbourhood of *Kalaat el Hassa* (Ahsa), the source of the *Ahsy*, and a station for the pilgrim caravans (*Burckhardt*, p. 1035). As the Moabites were also not to be attacked by the Israelites (Deut. ii. 9 sqq.), they passed along the eastern border of Moabitis as far as the brook *Zared* (ver. 12). This can hardly have been the Wady *el-Ahsy* (*Robinson*, ii. p. 555; *Ewald, Gesch.* ii. p. 259; *Ritter, Erdk.* xv. p. 689); for that must already have been crossed when they came to the border of Moab (ver. 11). Nor can it well have been “the brook *Zaide*, which runs from the south-east, passes between the mountain ranges of *Gheweithe* and *Tarfuye*, and enters the Arnon, of which it forms the leading source”—the view adopted by *Knobel*, on the very questionable ground that the name is a corruption of *Zared*. In all probability it was the Wady *Kerek*, in the upper part of its course, not far from *Katrane*, on the pilgrim road (*v. Raumer, Zug*, p. 47; *Kurtz*, and others).—Ver. 13. The next encampment was “*beyond*

(i.e. by the side of) *the Arnon, which is in the desert, and that cometh out of the territory of the Amorites.*" The *Arnon*, i.e. the present Wady *Mojob*, is formed by the union of the *Seyl* (i.e. brook or river) *Saïde*, which comes from the south-east, not far from Katrane, on the pilgrim road, and the *Lejum* from the north-east, which receives the small rivers *el Mekhreys* and *Balua*, the latter flowing from the pilgrim station *Kalaat Balua*, and then continues its course to the Dead Sea, through a deep and narrow valley, shut in by very steep and lofty cliffs, and covered with blocks of stone, that have been brought down from the loftier ground (*Burckhardt*, pp. 633 sqq.), so that there are only a few places where it is passable; and consequently a wandering people like the Israelites could not have crossed the *Mojob* itself to force an entrance into the territory of the hostile Amorites.¹ For the *Arnon* formed the boundary between Moab and the country of the Amorites. The spot where Israel encamped on the *Arnon* must be sought for in the upper part of its course, where it is still flowing "in the desert;" not at Wady *Zaïde*, however, although *Burckhardt* calls this the main source of the *Mojob*, but at the *Balua*, which flows into the *Lejum*. In all probability these streams, of which the *Lejum* came from the north, already bore the name of *Arnon*; as we may gather from the expression, "that cometh out of the coasts of the Amorites." The place of Israel's encampment, "beyond the *Arnon* in the desert," is to be sought for, therefore, in the neighbourhood of *Kalaat Balua*, and on the south side of the *Arnon* (*Balua*). This is evident enough from Deut. ii. 24, 26 sqq., where the Israelites are represented as entering the territory of the Amoritish king Sihon, when they crossed the *Arnon*, having first of all sent a deputation, with a peaceable request for permission to pass through his land (cf. vers. 21 sqq.). Although this took place, according to Deut. ii. 26, "out of the wilderness of *Kedemoth*," an Amoritish town, it by no means follows that the Israelites had already crossed the *Arnon* and entered the territory of the Amorites, but only that they were standing on the border of it, and in the desert which took its name from *Kedemoth*, and ran up to this, the most easterly town, as the name seems to imply, of the country of the Amorites. After the conquest of the country, *Kedemoth* was

¹ It is utterly inconceivable that a whole people, travelling with all their possessions as well as with their flocks, should have been exposed without necessity to the dangers and enormous difficulties that would attend the crossing of so dreadfully wild and so deep a valley, and that merely for the purpose of forcing an entrance into an enemy's country.—*Ritter, Erdk.* xv. p. 1207.

allotted to the *Reubenites* (Josh. xiii. 18), and made into a Levitical city (Josh. xxi. 37 ; 1 Chron. vi. 64).

The Israelites now received instructions from the Lord, to cross the river Armon, and make war upon the Amoritish king Sihon of Heshbon, and take possession of his land, with the assurance that the Lord had given Sihon into the hand of Israel, and would fill all nations before them with fear and trembling (Deut. ii. 24, 25). This summons, with its attendant promises, not only filled the Israelites with courage and strength to enter upon the conflict with the mightiest of all the tribes of the Canaanites, but inspired poets in the midst of them to commemorate in odes the wars of Jehovah, and His victories over His foes. A few verses are given here out of one of these odes (vers. 14 sqq.), not for the purpose of verifying the geographical statement, that the Arnon touches the border of Moabitis, or that the Israelites had only arrived at the border of the Moabite and Amorite territory, but as an evidence that there, on the borders of Moab, the Israelites had been inspired through the divine promises with the firm assurance that they should be able to conquer the land of the Amorites which lay before them.—Vers. 14, 15. “*Therefore*,” sc. because the Lord had thus given king Sihon, with all his land, into the hand of Israel, “*it is written in the book of the wars of the Lord: Vaheb (Jehovah takes) in storm, and the brooks of Arnon and the valley of the brooks, which turns to the dwelling of Ar, and leans upon the border of Moab.*” The book of the wars of Jehovah is neither an Amoritish book of the conflicts of Baal, in which the warlike feats performed by Sihon and other Amoritish heroes with the help of Baal were celebrated in verse, as G. Unruh fabulously asserts in his *Zug der Isr. aus Äg. nach Canaan* (p. 130), nor a work “dating from the time of Jehoshaphat, containing the early history of the Israelites, from the Hebrew patriarchs till past the time of Joshua, with the law interwoven,” which is the character that Knobel’s critical fancy would stamp upon it, but a collection of odes of the time of Moses himself, in celebration of the glorious acts of the Lord to and for the Israelites; and “the quotation bears the same relation to the history itself, as the verses of Körner would bear to the writings of any historian of the wars of freedom, who had himself taken part in these wars, and introduced the verses into his own historical work” (Hengstenberg).¹ The strophe selected

¹ “That such a book should arise in the last days of Moses, when the youthful generation began for the first time to regard and manifest itself, both vigorously and generally, as the army of Jehovah, is so far from being a surprising fact,

from the ode has neither subject nor verb in it, as the ode was well known to the contemporaries, and what had to be supplied could easily be gathered from the title, "Wars of Jehovah." *Vaheb* is no doubt the proper name of an Amoritish fortress; and בְּסָפָה, "in storm," is to be explained according to Nah. i. 3, "The Lord, in the storm is His way." "Advancing in storm, He took Vaheb and the brooks of Arnon," *i.e.* the different wadys, valleys cut by brooks, which open into the Arnon. אֲנַדְּרֵת הַגְּחִלִּים, *lit.* pouring of the brooks, from אַנְדֵּרֶת, *effusio*, the pouring, then the place where brooks pour down, the slope of mountains or hills, for which the term אַשְׁדָּה is generally used in the plural, particularly to denote the slopes of the mountains of Pisgah (Deut. iii. 17, iv. 49; Josh. xii. 3, xiii. 20), and the hilly region of Palestine, which formed the transition from the mountains to the plain (Josh. x. 40 and xii. 8). שְׁבָתָה, the dwelling, used poetically for the dwelling-place, as in 2 Sam. xxiii. 7 and Obad. 3. עַר (*Ar*), the antiquated form for יְעַר, a city, is the same as *Ar Moab* in ver. 28 and Isa. xv. 1, "the city of Moab, on the border of the Arnon, which is at the end of the (Moabitish) territory" (chap. xxii. 36). It was called Areopolis by the Greeks, and was near to Aroer (Deut. ii. 36 and Josh. xiii. 9), probably standing at the confluence of the Lejum and Mojeb, in the "fine green pasture land, in the midst of which there is a hill with some ruins," and not far away the ruin of a small castle, with a heap of broken columns (Burckhardt, Syr. p. 636). This *Ar* is not to be identified with the modern *Rabba*, in the midst of the land of the Moabites, six hours to the south of Lejum, to which the name *Areopolis* was transferred in the patristic age, probably after the destruction of *Ar*, the ancient Areopolis, by an earthquake, of which Jerome gives an account in connection with his own childhood (see his Com. on Isa. xv.), possibly the earthquake which occurred in the year A.D. 342, and by which many cities of the East were destroyed, and among others Nicomedia (cf. Hengstenberg, *Balaam*, pp. 525-528; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv. pp. 1212 sqq.; and v. Raumer, *Palästina*, pp. 270, 271, Ed. 4).

that we can scarcely imagine a more suitable time for the commencement of such a work" (Baumgarten). And if this is the case, the allusion to this collection of odes cannot be adduced as an argument against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, since Moses certainly did not write out the history of the journey from Kadesh to the Arboth Moab until after the two kings of the Amorites had been defeated, and the land to the east of the Jordan conquered, or till the Israelites had encamped in the steppes of Moab, opposite to Jericho.

Vers. 16-18. They proceeded thence to *Beer* (*a well*), a place of encampment which received its name from the fact that here God gave the people water, not as before by a miraculous supply from a rock, but by commanding wells to be dug. This is evident from the ode with which the congregation commemorated this divine gift of grace. “*Then Israel sang this song: Spring up, O well! Sing ye to it! Well which princes dug, which the nobles of the people hollowed out, with the sceptre, with their staves.*” נַעֲמָן, as in Ex. xv. 21 and xxxii. 18. פְּנִינָה, ruler’s staff, cf. Gen. xlxi. 10. *Beer*, probably the same as *Beer Elim* (Isa. xv. 8), on the north-east of Moab, was in the desert; for the Israelites proceeded thence “from the desert to Mattanah” (ver. 18), thence to Nahaliel, and thence to Bamoth. According to Eusebius (cf. Reland, *Pal. ill.* p. 495), *Mattanah* (*Μαθθαρέμ*) was by the valley of the Arnon, twelve Roman miles to the east (or more properly south-east or south) of *Medabah*, and is probably to be seen in *Tedun*, a place now lying in ruins, near the source of the *Lejum* (Burckhardt, pp. 635, 636; *Hengstenberg, Balaam*, p. 530; Knobel, and others). The name of *Nahaliel* is still retained in the form *Encheileh*. This is the name given to the *Lejum*, after it has been joined by the *Balua*, until its junction with the *Saide* (Burckhardt, p. 635). Consequently the Israelites went from *Beer* in the desert, in a north-westerly direction to *Tedun*, then westwards to the northern bank of the *Encheileh*, and then still farther in a north-westerly and northerly direction to *Bamoth*. There can be no doubt that *Bamoth* is identical with *Bamoth Baal*, i.e. heights of Baal (chap. xxii. 4). According to Josh. xiii. 17 (cf. Isa. xv. 2), *Bamoth* was near to *Dibon* (*Dibán*), between the Wady Wale and Wady Mojob, and also to *Beth-Baal Meon*, i.e. *Myun*, half a German mile ($2\frac{1}{2}$ English) to the south of Heshbon; and, according to chap. xxii. 41, you could see *Bamoth Baal* from the extremity of the Israelitish camp in the steppes of Moab. Consequently *Bamoth* cannot be the mountain to the south of Wady Wale, upon the top of which Burckhardt says there is a very beautiful plain (p. 632; see *Hengstenberg, Balaam*, p. 532); because the steppes of Moab cannot be seen at all from this plain, as they are covered by the *Jebel Attarus*. It is rather a height upon the long mountain *Attarus*, which runs along the southern shore of the *Zerka Maein*, and may possibly be a spot upon the summit of the *Jebel Attarus*, “the highest point in the neighbourhood,” upon which, according to Burckhardt (p. 630), there is “a heap of stones overshadowed by a very large

pistachio-tree." A little farther down to the south-west of this lies the fallen town *Kereijat* (called *Körriat* by *Seetzen*, ii. p. 342), i.e. *Kerieth*, *Jer.* xlvi. 24; *Amos* ii. 2.—Ver. 20. From *Bamoth* they proceeded "to the valley, which (is) in the field of Moab, upon the top of Pisgah, and looks across the face of the desert." רָאשׁ הַפִּסְגָּה, head, or height of the *Pisgah*, is in apposition to the field of Moab. The "field of Moab" was a portion of the table-land which stretches from Rabbath Ammân to the Arnon, which "is perfectly treeless for an immense distance in one part (viz. the neighbourhood of *Eleale*), but covered over with the ruins of towns that have been destroyed," and which "extends to the desert of Arabia towards the east, and slopes off to the Jordan and the Dead Sea towards the west" (*v. Raumer, Pal.* p. 71). It is identical with "the whole plain from *Medeba* to *Dibon*" (*Josh.* xiii. 9), and "the whole plain by *Medeba*" (ver. 16), in which Heshbon and its cities were situated (ver. 17; cf. ver. 21 and *Deut.* iii. 10). The valley in this table-land was upon the height of *Pisgah*, i.e. the northern part of the mountains of Abarim, and looked across the surface of the desert. *Jeshimon*, the desert, is the plain of *Ghor el Belka*, i.e. the valley of desolation on the north-eastern border of the Dead Sea, which stretches from the Wady *Menshalla* or Wady *Ghuweir* (*el Guer*) to the small brook *el Szuème* (*Wady es Suweimeh* on *Van de Velde's* map) at the Dead Sea, and narrows it more and more at the northern extremity on this side. "*Ghor el Belka* consists in part of a barren, salt, and stony soil; though there are some portions which can be cultivated. To the north of the brook *el Szuème*, the great plain of the Jordan begins, which is utterly without fertility till you reach the *Nahr Hesbán*, about two hours distant, and produces nothing but bitter, salt herbs for camels" (*Seetzen*, ii. pp. 373, 374), and which was probably reckoned as part of *Jeshimon*, since *Beth-Jeshimoth* was situated within it (see at chap. xxiii. 28). The valley in which the Israelites were encamped in the field of Moab upon the top of Pisgah, is therefore to be sought for to the west of Heshbon, on the mountain range of Abarim, which slopes off into the *Ghor el Belka*. From this the Israelites advanced into the *Arboth Moab* (see chap. xxii. 1).

If we compare the places of encampment named in vers. 11–20 with the list of stations in chap. xxxiii. 41–49, we find, instead of the seven places mentioned here between *Ijje Abarim* and the *Arboth Moab*,—viz. Brook Zared, on the other side of the Arnon in the desert, Beer, Mattana, Nahaliel, Bamoth, and the valley in the field of

Moab upon the top of Pisgah,—only three places given, viz. *Dibon* of Gad, *Almon Diblathaim*, and Mount *Abarim* before *Nebo*. That the last of these is only another name for the valley in the field of Moab upon the top of Pisgah, is undoubtely proved by the fact that, according to Deut. xxxiv. 1 (cf. chap. iii. 27), Mount Nebo was a peak of *Pisgah*, and that it was situated, according to Deut. xxxii. 49, upon the mountains of *Abarim*, from which it is evident at once that the *Pisgah* was a portion of the mountains of *Abarim*, and in fact the northern portion opposite to Jericho (see at chap. xxvii. 12). The two other differences in the names may be explained from the circumstance that the space occupied by the encampment of the Israelites, an army of 600,000 men, with their wives, children, and cattle, when once they reached the inhabited country with its towns and villages, where every spot had its own fixed name, must have extended over several places, so that the very same encampment might be called by one or other of the places upon which it touched. If *Dibon Gad* (chap. xxxiii. 45) was the *Dibon* built (*i.e.* rebuilt or fortified) by the Gadites after the conquest of the land (chap. xxxii. 3, 34), and allotted to the Reubenites (Josh. xiii. 9, 17), which is still traceable in the ruins of *Dibân*, an hour to the north of the Arnon (*v. Raumer, Pal.* p. 261), (and there is no reason to doubt it), then the place of encampment, *Nahaliel* (*Encheile*), was identical with *Dibon* of Gad, and was placed after this town in chap. xxxiii. 45, because the camp of the Israelites extended as far as *Dibon* along the northern bank of that river. *Almon Diblathaim* also stands in the same relation to *Bamoth*. The two places do not appear to have been far from one another; for *Almon Diblathaim* is probably identical with *Beth Diblathaim*, which is mentioned in Jer. xlvi. 22 along with *Dibon*, *Nebo*, and other Moabite towns, and is to be sought for to the north or north-west of *Dibon*. For, according to Jerome (*Onom. s. v. Jassa*), *Jahza* was between *Medaba* and *Deblatai*, for which *Eusebius* has written *Δηβούς* by mistake for *Διβών*; *Eusebius* having determined the relative position of *Jahza* according to a more southerly place, Jerome according to one farther north. The camp of the Israelites therefore may easily have extended from *Almon* or *Beth-Diblathaim* to *Bamoth*, and might very well take its name from either place.¹

¹ Neither this difference in the names of the places of encampment, nor the material diversity,—viz. that in the chapter before us there are four places more introduced than in chap. xxxiii., whereas in every other case the list in chap.

Vers. 21-35. DEFEAT OF THE AMORITE KINGS, SIHON OF HESHBON AND OG OF BASHAN, AND CONQUEST OF THEIR KINGDOMS.—Vers. 21-23. When the Israelites reached the eastern border of the kingdom of the Amorite king *Sihon* (see at ver. 13), they sent messengers to him, as they had previously done to the king of Edom, to ask permission to pass peaceably through his territory upon the high road (cf. ver. 22 and chap. xx. 17); and Sihon refused this request, just as the king of Edom had done, and marched with all his people against the Israelites. But whereas the Lord forbade the Israelites to make war upon their kinsmen the Edomites, He now commanded them to make war upon the Amorite king, and take possession of his land (Deut. ii. 24, 25); for the Amorites belonged to the Canaanitish tribes which were ripe for the judgment of extermination (Gen. xv. 16). And if, notwithstanding this, the Israelites sent to him with words of peace (Deut. ii. 26), this was simply done to leave the decision of his fate in his own hand (see at Deut. ii. 24). Sihon came out against the Israelites into the desert as far as *Jahza*, where a battle was fought, in which he was defeated. The accounts of the *Onom.* concerning *Jahza*, which was situated, according to *Eusebius*, between *Medamon* (*Medaba*) and *Debous* (*Dibon*, see above), and according to Jerome, between *Medaba* and *Deblatai*, may be reconciled with the statement that it was in the desert, provided we assume that it was not in a straight line between the places named, but in a more easterly direction on the edge of the desert, near to the commencement of the Wady *Wale*, a conclusion to which the juxtaposition of *Jahza*

xxxiii. contains a larger number of stations than we read of in the historical account,—at all warrants the hypothesis, that the present chapter is founded upon a different document from chap. xxxiii. For they may be explained in a very simple manner, as *Kurtz* has most conclusively demonstrated (vol. iii. pp. 383-5), from the diversity in the character of the two chapters. Chap. xxxiii. is purely statistical. The catalogue given there “contains a complete list in regular order of all the stations properly so called, that is to say, of those places of encampment where Israel made a longer stay than at other times, and therefore not only constructed an organized camp, but also set up the tabernacle.” In the historical account, on the other hand, the places mentioned are simply those which were of historical importance. For this reason there are fewer stations introduced between Mount Hor and Ijje Abarim than in chap. xxxiii., stations where nothing of importance occurred being passed over; but, on the other hand, there are a larger number mentioned between Ijje Abarim and Arboth Moab, and some of them places where no complete camp was constructed with the tabernacle set up, probably because they were memorable as starting-points for the expeditions into the two Amorite kingdoms.

and *Mephaot* in Josh. xiii. 18, xxi. 37, and Jer. xlvi. 21, also points (see at Josh. xiii. 18).—Ver. 24. Israel smote him with the edge of the sword, *i.e.* without quarter (see Gen. xxxiv. 26), and took possession of his land “*from Arnon (Mojeb) to the Jabbok, unto the children of Ammon,*” *i.e.* to the upper Jabbok, the modern *Nahr* or *Moiet Ammán*. The *Jabbok*, now called *Zerka*, *i.e.* the blue, does not take its rise, as *Seetzen* supposed, on the pilgrim-road by the castle of *Zerka*; but its source, according to *Abulfeda* (*tab. Syr.* p. 91) and *Buckingham*, is the *Nahr Ammán*, which flowed down from the ancient capital of the Ammonites, and was called the *upper Jabbok*, and formed the western border of the Ammonites towards the kingdom of Sihon, and subsequently towards Gad (Deut. ii. 37, iii. 16; Josh. xii. 2). “*For the border of the Ammonites was strong*” (firm), *i.e.* strongly fortified; “for which reason Sihon had only been able to push his conquests to the upper Jabbok, not into the territory of the Ammonites.” This explanation of *Knobel's* is perfectly correct; since the reason why the Israelites did not press forward into the country of the Ammonites, was not the strength of their frontier, but the word of the Lord, “*Make not war upon them, for I shall give thee no possession of the land of the children of Ammon*” (Deut. ii. 19). God had only promised the patriarchs, on behalf of their posterity, that He would give them the land of Canaan, which was bounded towards the east by the Jordan (chap. xxxiv. 2-12; compared with Gen. x. 19 and xv. 19-21); and the Israelites would have received no settlement at all on the eastern side of the Jordan, had not the Canaanitish branch of the Amorites extended itself to that side in the time of Moses, and conquered a large portion of the possessions of the Moabites, and also (according to Josh. xiii. 25, as compared with Judg. xi. 13) of the Ammonites, driving back the Moabites as far as the Arnon, and the Ammonites behind the *Nahr Ammán*. With the defeat of the Amorites, all the land that they had conquered passed into the possession of the Israelites, who took possession of these towns (cf. Deut. ii. 34-36). The statement in ver. 25, that Israel settled in all the towns of the Amorites, is somewhat anticipatory of the history itself, as the settlement did not occur till Moses gave the conquered land to the tribes of Reuben and Gad for a possession (chap. xxxii.). The only places mentioned here are *Heshbon* and her daughters, *i.e.* the smaller towns belonging to it (cf. Josh. xiii. 17), which are enumerated singly in chap. xxxii. 34-38, and Josh. xiii. 15-28. In explanation of the expression, “*Heshbon and her*

daughters," it is added in ver. 26, that Heshbon was the city, *i.e.* the capital of the Amorite king Sihon, who had made war upon the former king of Moab, and taken away all his land as far as the Arnon. Consequently, even down to the time of the predecessor of Balak, the king of the Moabites at that time, the land to the north of the Arnon, and probably even as far as the lower Jabbok, to which point the kingdom of Sihon extended (see Deut. iii. 12, 13; Josh. xii. 5), belonged to the Moabites. And in accordance with this, the country where the Israelites encamped opposite to Jericho, before crossing the Jordan, is reckoned as part of the land of Moab (Deut. i. 5, xxviii. 69, xxxii. 49, xxxiv. 5, 6), and called Arboth Moab (see chap. xxii. 1); whilst the women who seduced the Israelites to join in the idolatrous worship of Baal Peor are called daughters of Moab (chap. xxv. 1).

Vers. 27-30. The glorious conquest and destruction of the capital of the powerful king of the Amorites, in the might of the Lord their God, inspired certain composers of proverbs (מִשְׁלִים *denom. from* מִשָּׁל) to write songs in commemoration of the victory. Three strophes are given from a song of this kind, and introduced with the words "*therefore,*" *sc.* because Heshbon had fallen in this manner, "*the composers of proverbs say.*" The first strophe (vers. 27b and 28) runs thus: "*Come to Heshbon: Built and restored be the city of Sihon! For fire went out of Heshbon; flames from the city of Sihon. It devoured Ar Moab, the lords of the heights of Arnon.*" The summons to come to Heshbon and build this ruined city up again, was not addressed to the Israelites, but to the conquered Amorites, and is to be interpreted as ironical (*F. v. Meyer; Ewald, Gesch. ii. pp. 267, 268:*) "*Come to Heshbon, ye victorious Amorites, and build your royal city up again, which we have laid in ruins! A fire has gone out of it, and burned up Ar Moab, and the lords of the heights of the Arnon.*" The reference is to the war-fire, which the victorious Amorites kindled from Heshbon in the land of Moab under the former king of Moab; that is to say, the war in which they subjugated Ar Moab and the possessors of the heights of Arnon. *Ar Moab* (see at ver. 15) appears to have been formerly the capital of all Moabitis, or at least of that portion of it which was situated upon the northern side of the Arnon; and the prominence given to it in Deut. ii. 9, 18, 29, is in harmony with this. The heights of Arnon are mentioned as the limits to which Sihon had carried his victorious supremacy over Moab. The "*lords*" of these heights are the Moab-

ites.—Ver. 29. *Second strophe*: “*Woe to thee, Moab! Thou art lost, people of Chemosh!* He has given up his sons as fugitives, and his daughters into captivity—to Sihon, king of the Amorites.” The poet here turns to Moab, and announces its overthrow. *Chemosh* (כְּמוֹשׁ, from כָּבֵשׁ = כָּבֵשׁ, *subactor, dominator*) was the leading deity of the Moabites (Jer. xlvi. 7) as well as of the Ammonites (Judg. xi. 24), and related not only to *Milcom*, a god of the Ammonites, but also to the early Canaanitish deity *Baal* and *Moloch*. According to a statement of Jerome (on Isa. xv.), it was only another name for *Baal Peor*, probably a god of the sun, which was worshipped as the king of his nation and the god of war. He is found in this character upon the coins of *Areopolis*, standing upon a column, with a sword in his right hand and a lance and shield in the left, and with two fire-torches by his side (cf. *Ekhel doctr. numm. vet.* iii. p. 504), and was appeased by the sacrifice of children in times of great distress (2 Kings iii. 27). Further information, and to some extent a different view, are found in the article by J. G. Müller in *Herzog's Cyclopædia*. The subject to נֶתֶן is neither Moab nor Jehovah, but Chemosh. The thought is this: as Chemosh, the god of Moab, could not deliver his people from the Amorite king; so now that Israel has conquered the latter, Moab is utterly lost. In the triumph which Israel celebrated over Moab through conquering its conquerors, there is a forewarning expressed of the ultimate subjection of Moab under the sceptre of Israel.—Ver. 30. *Third strophe*, in which the woe evoked upon Moab is justified: “*We cast them down: Heshbon is lost even to Dibon; and we laid it waste even to Nophah, with fire to Medeba.*” וַיִּפְרַגְנֵם is the first pers. pl. imperf. Kal of יָרַה with the suffix מ— for מ— (as in Ex. xxix. 30). יָרַה, to cast arrows, to shoot down (Ex. xix. 13): figuratively to throw to the ground (Ex. xv. 4). נִשְׁמַם for נִשְׁמָם, first pers. pl. imperf. Hiph. of נִשְׁתַּחֲוָה, synonymous with נִצְחָה, Jer. iv. 7. The suffixes of both verbs refer to the Moabites as the inhabitants of the cities named. Accordingly *Heshbon* also is construed as a masculine, because it was not the town as such, but the inhabitants, that were referred to. *Heshbon*, the residence of king Sihon, stood pretty nearly in the centre between the Arnon and the Jabbok (according to the *Onom.* twenty Roman miles from the Jordan, opposite to Jericho), and still exists in extensive ruins with deep bricked wells, under the old name of *Hesbān* (cf. v. Raumer, Pal. p. 262). On *Dibon* in the south, not more than an hour from Armon, see p. 288. *Nophach* is probably the same as *Nobach*, Judg. viii. 11, but not the same as

Kenath, which was altered into *Nobach* (chap. xxxii. 42). According to Judg. viii. 11, it was near *Jogbeha*, not far from the eastern desert; and in all probability it still exists in the ruined place called *Nowakis* (*Burckhardt*, p. 619; *Buckingham*, ii. p. 46; *Robinson*, App. p. 188), to the north-west of *Ammán* (*Rabbath-Ammon*). *Nophach*, therefore, is referred to as a north-eastern town or fortress, and contrasted with *Dibon*, which was in the south. The words which follow, 'מִשְׁרָעֵד אֲשֶׁר', "which to *Medeba*," yield no intelligible meaning. The Seventy give πῦρ ἐπὶ Μ. (fire upon *Medeba*), and seem to have adopted the reading עַד אֲשֶׁר. In the Masoretic punctuation also, the ר in עַד אֲשֶׁר is marked as suspicious by a *punct. extraord.* Apparently, therefore, עַד אֲשֶׁר was a copyist's error of old standing for עַשֶּׂר, and is to be construed as governed by the verb נִשְׁרָאֵם, "with fire to *Medeba*." This city was about two hours to the south-east of *Heshbon*, and is still to be seen in ruins bearing the name of *Medaba*, upon the top of a hill of about half-an-hour's journey in circumference (*Burckhardt*, p. 625; *v. Raumer*, Pal. pp. 264-5).¹

Vers. 31, 32. When Israel was sitting, *i.e.* encamped, in the land of the Amorites, Moses reconnoitred *Jaezer*, after which the Israelites took "its daughters," *i.e.* the smaller places dependent upon *Jaezer*, and destroyed the Amorites who dwelt in them. It is evident from chap. xxxii. 35, that *Jaezer* was not only conquered, but destroyed. This city, which was situated, according to the *Onom.* (*s. v. Jazer*), ten Roman miles to the west of *Philadelphia* (*Rabbath-Ammon*), and fifteen Roman miles to the north of *Heshbon*, is most probably to be sought for (as *Seetzen* supposes, i. pp. 397, 406, iv. p. 216) in the ruins of *es Szir*, at the source of the *Nahr Szir*, in the neighbourhood of which *Seetzen* found some pools, which are probably the remains of "the sea of *Jazer*," mentioned in *Jer. xlvi. 32*. There is less probability in *Burckhardt's* conjecture (p. 609), that it is to be found in the ruins of *Ain Hazir*,

¹ *Ewald* and *Bleek* (*Einleitung* in d. A. T. p. 200) are both agreed that this ode was composed on the occasion of the defeat of the Amorites by the Israelites, and particularly on the capture of the capital *Heshbon*, as it depicts the fall of *Heshbon* in the most striking way; and this city was rebuilt shortly afterwards by the Reubenites, and remained ever afterwards a city of some importance. *Knobel*, on the other hand, has completely misunderstood the meaning and substance of the verses quoted, and follows some of the earliest commentators, such as *Clericus* and others, in regarding the ode as an Amoritish production, and interpreting it as relating to the conquest and fortification of *Heshbon* by *Sihon*.

near *Kherbet el Suk*, to the south-west of *es Sait*; though *v. Raumer* (Pal. p. 262) decides in its favour (see my Commentary on Josh. xiii. 25).—Vers. 33-35. The Israelites then turned towards the north, and took the road to Bashan, where king Og came against them with his people, to battle at *Edrei*. From what point it was that the Israelites entered upon the expedition against Bashan, is not stated either here or in Deut. iii. 1 sqq., where Moses recapitulates these events, and gives a more detailed account of the conquests than he does here, simply because it was of no importance in relation to the main object of the history. We have probably to picture the conquest of the kingdoms of Sihon and Og as taking place in the following manner: namely, that after Sihon had been defeated at *Jahza*, and his capital had been speedily taken in consequence of this victory, Moses sent detachments of his army from the places of encampment mentioned in vers. 16, 18-20, into the different divisions of his kingdom, for the purpose of taking possession of their towns. After the conquest of the whole of the territory of Sihon, the main army advanced to Bashan and defeated king Og in a great battle at *Edrei*, whereupon certain detachments of the army were again despatched, under courageous generals, to secure the conquest of the different parts of his kingdom (cf. chap. xxxii. 39, 41, 42). The kingdom of Og embraced the northern half of Gilead, *i.e.* the country between the *Jabbok* and the *Mandjur* (Deut. iii. 13; Josh. xii. 5), the modern *Jebel Ajlun*, and “all Bashan,” or “all the region of *Argob*” (Deut. iii. 4, 13, 14), the modern plain of *Jaulan* and *Hauran*, which extended eastwards to *Salcha*, north-eastwards to *Edrei* (Deut. iii. 10), and northwards to *Geshur* and *Maacha* (Josh. xii. 5). For further remarks, see Deut. iii. 10. There were two towns in Bashan of the name of *Edrei*. One of them, which is mentioned in Deut. i. 4 and Josh. xii. 4, along with *Ashtaroth*, as a second residence of king Og, is described in the *Onom.* (*s. v. Ashtaroth and Edrei*) as six Roman miles, *i.e.* fully two hours, from *Ashtaroth*, and twenty-four or twenty-five miles from *Bostra*, and called *Adraa* or *Adara*. This is the modern *Derà* or *Draà* (in *Burckhardt*, p. 385; *Seetzen*, i. pp. 363, 364), and *Draah*, *Idderat* (in *Buckingham*, *Syr.* ii. p. 146), a place which still exists, consisting of a number of miserable houses, built for the most part of basalt, and standing upon a small elevation in a treeless, hilly region, with the ruins of an old church and other smaller buildings, supposed to belong to the time when *Draa*, *Adraa* (*as urbs Arabiae*), was an episcopal see, on the east of the pilgrim-road

between *Remtha* and *Mezareib*, by the side of a small wady (see *Ritter, Erdk.* xv. pp. 838 sqq.). The other *Edrei*, which is mentioned in Deut. iii. 10 as the north-western frontier of Bashan, was farther towards the north, and is still to be seen in the ruins of *Zorah* or *Ethra* (see at Deut. iii. 10). In the present instance the southern town is intended, which was not far from the south-west frontier of Bashan, as Og certainly did not allow the Israelites to advance to the northern frontier of his kingdom before he gave them battle.—Vers. 34, 35. Just as in the case of Sihon, the Lord had also promised the Israelites a victory over Og, and had given him into their power, so that they smote him, with his sons and all his people, without leaving any remnant, and executed the ban, according to Deut. ii. 34, upon both the kings. (See the notes on Deut. iii.)

III.—OCCURRENCES IN THE STEPPES OF MOAB, WITH INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO THE CONQUEST AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE LAND OF CANAAN.

CHAP. XXII.—XXXVI.

Chap. xxii. 1. After the defeat of the two Amorite kings, Sihon and Og, and the conquest of their kingdoms in Gilead and Bashan, the Israelites removed from the height of Pisgah, on the mountains of Abarim before Nebo (see at chap. xxi. 20), and encamped in the “*Arboth Moab* (the steppes of Moab), on the other side of the Jordan of Jericho,” i.e. that part of the Jordan which skirted the province of Jericho. *Arboth Moab* was the name given to that portion of the Arabah, or large plain of the Jordan, the present *Ghor* (see at Deut. i. 1), which belonged to the territory of the Moabites previous to the spread of the Amorites under Sihon in the land to the east of the Jordan, and which probably reached from the Dead Sea to the mouth of the Jabbok. The site of the Israelitish camp is therefore defined with greater minuteness by the clause “beyond the Jordan of Jericho.” This place of encampment, which is frequently alluded to (chap. xxvi. 3, 63, xxxi. 12, xxxiii. 48, 50, xxxv. 1, xxxvi. 13; Josh. xiii. 32), extended, according to chap. xxxiii. 49, from *Beth-Jeshimoth* to *Abel-Shittim*. *Beth-Jeshimoth* (i.e. house of wastes), on the north-eastern desert border (*Jeshimon*, chap. xxi. 20) of the Dead Sea, a town allotted to the tribe of Reuben (Josh. xii. 3, xiii. 20), was situated, according to

the *Onom.* (*s. v. Βηθασιμούθ, Bethsimuth*), ten Roman miles, or four hours, to the south (S.E.) of Jericho, on the Dead Sea; according to *Josephus* (*bell. jud. iv. 7, 6*), it was to the south of *Julias* (*Livias*), *i.e.* *Beth-Haram*, or *Rameh*, on the northern edge of the Wady Hesban (see at chap. xxxii. 36), or in the *Ghor el Seisabán*, on the northern coast of the Dead Sea, and the southern end of the plain of the Jordan. *Abel Shittim* (אֶבֶן שִׁתִּים), *i.e.* the acacia-meadow, or, in its briefer form, *Shittim* (chap. xxv. 1), was situated, according to *Josephus* (*Ant. iv. 8, 1*), on the same spot as the later town of *Abila*, in a locality rich in date-palms, sixty stadia from the Jordan, probably by the Wady *Eshtah* to the north of the Wady Hesban; even if *Knobel's* supposition that the name is connected with אַבְלָה = אַבְלָה with נ prost. should not be a tenable one. From *Shittim* or *Sittim* the Israelites advanced, under Joshua, to the Jordan, to effect the conquest of Canaan (*Josh. iii. 1*).

In the steppes of Moab the Israelites encamped upon the border of the promised land, from which they were only separated by the Jordan. But before this boundary line could be passed, there were many preparations that had to be made. In the first place, the whole congregation was to pass through a trial of great importance to all future generations, as bearing upon the relation in which it stood to the heathen world; and in the second place, it was here that Moses, who was not to enter Canaan because of his sin at the water of strife, was to bring the work of legislation to a close before his death, and not only to issue the requisite instructions concerning the conquest of the promised inheritance, and the division of it among the tribes of Israel, but to impress once more upon the hearts of the whole congregation the essential contents of the whole law, with all that the Lord had done for Israel, that they might be confirmed in their fidelity to the Lord, and preserved from the danger of apostasy. This last work of the faithful servant of God, with which he brought his mediatorial work to a close, is described in the book of Deuteronomy; whilst the laws relating to the conquest and partition of Canaan, with the experience of Israel in the steppes of Moab, fill up the latter portion of the present book.

BALAAM AND HIS PROPHECIES.—CHAP. XXII. 2—XXIV. 25.

The rapid defeat of the two mighty kings of the Amorites filled the Moabites with such alarm at the irresistible might of Israel, that Balak their king, with the princes of Midian, sought to bring

the powers of heathen magic to bear against the nation of God ; and to this end he sent messengers with presents to BALAAM, the celebrated soothsayer, in Mesopotamia, who had the reputation of being able both to bless and curse with great success, to entreat him to come, and so to weaken the Israelites with his magical curses, that he might be able to smite them, and drive them out of his land (chap. xxii. 1-7). At first Balaam declined this invitation, in consequence of divine instructions (vers. 8-14) ; but when a second and still more imposing embassy of Moabite princes appeared before him, God gave him permission to go with them, but on this condition, that he should do nothing but what Jehovah should tell him (vers. 15-21). When on the way, he was warned again by the miraculous opposition of the angel of the Lord, to say nothing but what God should say to him (vers. 22-35). When Balak, therefore, came to meet him, on his arrival at the border of his kingdom, to give him a grand reception, Balaam explained to him, that he could only speak the word which Jehovah would put into his mouth (vers. 36-40), and then proclaimed, in *four* different utterances, what God inspired him to declare. First of all, as he stood upon the height of Bamoth-Baal, from which he could see the end of the Israelitish camp, he declared that it was impossible for him to curse this matchless, numerous, and righteous people, because they had not been cursed by their God (chap. xxii. 41-xxiii. 10). He then went to the head of Pisgah, where he could see all Israel, and announced that Jehovah would bless this people, because He saw no unrighteousness in them, and that He would dwell among them as their King, making known His word to them, and endowing them with activity and lion-like power (chap. xxiii. 11-24). And lastly, upon the top of Peor, where he could see Israel encamped according to its tribes, he predicted, in two more utterances, the spread and powerful development of Israel in its inheritance, under the blessing of God (chap. xxiii. 25-xxiv. 9), the rise of a star out of Jacob in the far distant future, and the appearance of a ruler in Israel, who would break to pieces all its foes (chap. xxiv. 10-24) ; and upon this Balak sent him away (ver. 25).

From the very earliest times opinions have been divided as to the character of Balaam.¹ Some (*e.g. Philo, Ambrose, and August-*

¹ On Balaam and his prophecies see *G. Moebius Prophetæ Bileami historia*, Lips. 1676 ; *Lüderwald, die Geschichte Bileams deutlich u. begreiflich erklärt* (Helmst. 1787) ; *B. R. de Geer, Diss. de Bileamo, ejus historia et vaticiniis* ; *Tholuck's vermischtte Schriften* (i. pp. 406 sqq.) ; *Hengstenberg, History of*

tine) have regarded him as a wizard and false prophet, devoted to the worship of idols, who was destitute of any susceptibility for the true religion, and was compelled by God, against his will, to give utterance to blessings upon Israel instead of curses. Others (*e.g.* *Tertullian* and *Jerome*) have supposed him to be a genuine and true prophet, who simply fell through covetousness and ambition. But these views are both of them untenable in this exclusive form. *Witsius* (*Miscell. ss. i. lib. i. c. 16, § 33 sqq.*), *Hengstenberg* (*Balaam and his Prophecies*), and *Kurtz* (*History of the Old Covenant*), have all of them clearly demonstrated this. The name בָּלָאָם (LXX. *Balaam*) is not to be derived, as *Gesenius* suggests, from בָּלָם and מַעַם, *non populus*, not a people, but either from יְלִבָּה and מַעַם (dropping one *ym*), devourer of the people (*Simonis* and *Hengstenberg*), or more probably from יְלִבָּה, with the terminal syllable מַעַם, devourer, destroyer (*Fürst, Dietrich*), which would lead to the conclusion, that “he bore the name as a dreaded wizard and conjurer; whether he received it at his birth, as a member of a family in which this occupation was hereditary, and then afterwards actually became in public opinion what the giving of the name expressed as an expectation and desire; or whether the name was given to him at a later period, according to Oriental custom, when the fact indicated by the name had actually made its appearance” (*Hengstenberg*). In its true meaning, the name is related to that of his father, *Beor*.¹ בֵּאֹר, from בָּאַר, to burn, eat off, destroy: so called on account of the destructive power attributed to his curses (*Hengstenberg*). It is very probable, therefore, that Balaam belonged to a family in which the mantic character, or magical art, was hereditary. These names at once warrant the conjecture that Balaam was a heathen conjurer or soothsayer. Moreover, he is never called נ֬בֶת, a prophet, or נָבָה, a seer, but בָּלָה, the soothsayer (*Josh. xiii. 22*), a title which

Balaam, etc. (Berlin, 1842, and English translation by Ryland: Clark, 1847); *Kurtz*, *History of the Old Covenant* (English translation: Clark, 1859); and *Gust. Baur*, *Gesch. der alttestl. Weissagung*, Giessen, 1861, where the literature is given more fully still.

¹ The form *Bosor*, which we find instead of *Beor* in 2 Pet. ii. 15, appears to have arisen from a peculiar mode of pronouncing the guttural *y* (see *Loescher de causis ling. ebr.* p. 246); whereas *Vitrunga* maintains (in his *obss. ss. I. iv. c. 9*), that Peter himself invented this form, “that by this sound of the word he might play upon the Hebrew בֵּשֶׁר, which signifies flesh, and thus delicately hint that *Balaam*, the false prophet, deserved to be called the son of *Bosor*, *i.e.* בֵּשֶׁר, or flesh, on account of his persuading to the indulgence of carnal lusts.”

is never used in connection with the true prophets. For סָמֵךְ, sooth-saying, is forbidden to the Israelites in Deut. xviii. 10 sqq., as an abomination in the sight of Jehovah, and is spoken of everywhere not only as a grievous sin (1 Sam. xv. 23; Ezek. xiii. 23; 2 Kings xvii. 17), but as the mark of a false prophet (Ezek. xiii. 9, xxii. 28, Jer. xiv. 14, and even in Isa. iii. 2, where סָמֵךְ forms the antithesis to נִבְאָנָה). Again, Balaam resorts to auguries, just like a heathen soothsayer (chap. xxiv. 1, compared with chap. xxiii. 3, 5), for the purpose of obtaining revelations; from which we may see that he was accustomed to adopt this as his ordinary mode of soothsaying.¹ On the other hand, Balaam was not without a certain measure of the true knowledge of God, and not without susceptibility for such revelations of the true God as he actually received; so that, without being really a prophet, he was able to give utterance to true prophecies from Jehovah. He not only knew Jehovah, but he confessed Jehovah, even in the presence of Balak, as well as of the Moabitish messengers. He asked His will, and followed it (chap. xxii. 8, 13, 18, 19, 38, xxiii. 12), and would not go with the messengers of Balak, therefore, till God had given him permission (chap. xxii. 20). If he had been altogether destitute of the fear of God, he would have complied at once with Balak's request. And again, although at the outset it is only *Elohim* who makes known His will (chap. xxii. 9, 20), and even when he first of all goes out in search of oracles, it is *Elohim* who comes to him (chap. xxiii. 4); yet not only does the angel of *Jehovah* meet him by the way (chap. xxii. 22 sqq.), but *Jehovah* also puts words into his mouth, which he announces to the king of the Moabites (chap. xxiii. 5, 12, 16), so that all his prophecies are actually uttered from a mind moved and governed by the Spirit of God, and that not from any physical constraint exerted upon him by God, but in such a manner that he enters into them with all his heart and soul, and heartily desires to die the death of these righteous, *i.e.* of the people of Israel (chap. xxiii. 10); and when he finds that it pleases Jehovah to bless Israel, he leaves off resorting any longer to auguries (chap. xxiv. 1), and eventually declares to the enraged monarch, that he cannot trans-

¹ "The fact that he made use of so extremely uncertain a method as augury, the insufficiency of which was admitted even by the heathen themselves (*vid. Nügelsbach, Homer. Theol.* pp. 154 sqq.), and which no true prophet among the Israelites ever employed, is to be attributed to the weakness of the influence exerted upon him by the Spirit of God. When the Spirit worked with power, there was no need to look round at nature for the purpose of ascertaining the will of God" (*Hengstenberg*).

gress the command of Jehovah, even if the king should give him his house full of silver and gold (chap. xxiv. 13).¹

This double-sidedness and ambiguity of the religious and prophetic character of Balaam may be explained on the supposition that, being endowed with a predisposition to divination and prophecy, he practised soothsaying and divination as a trade; and for the purpose of bringing this art to the greatest possible perfection, brought not only the traditions of the different nations, but all the phenomena of his own times, within the range of his observations. In this way he may have derived the first elements of the true knowledge of God from different echoes of the tradition of the primeval age, which was then not quite extinct, and may possibly have heard in his own native land some notes of the patriarchal revelations out of the home of the tribe-fathers of Israel. But these traditions are not sufficient of themselves to explain his attitude towards Jehovah, and his utterances concerning Israel. Balaam's peculiar knowledge of Jehovah, the God of Israel, and of all that He had done to His people, and his intimate acquaintance with the promises made to the patriarchs, which strike us in his prophecies (comp. chap. xxiii. 10 with Gen. xiii. 16, xxiii. 24; chap. xxiv. 9 with Gen. xlvi. 9; and chap. xxv. 17 with Gen. xlvi. 10), can only be explained from the fact that the report of the great things which God had done to and for Israel in Egypt and at the Dead Sea, had not only spread among all the neighbouring tribes, as was foretold in Ex. xv. 14, and is attested by Jethro, Ex. xviii. 1 sqq., and Rahab the Canaanite, Josh. ii. 9 sqq., but had even penetrated into Mesopotamia, as the countries of the Euphrates had maintained a steady commercial intercourse from the very earliest times with Hither Asia and the land of Egypt. Through these tidings Balaam

¹ The significant interchange in the use of the names of God, which is seen in the fact, that from the very outset Balaam always speaks of Jehovah (chap. xxii. 8, 13, 18, 19),—whereas, according to the historian, it is only *Elohim* who reveals Himself to him (chap. xxii. 9, 10, 12),—has been pointed out by *Hengstenberg* in his *Dissertations*; and even *Baur*, in his *Geschichte der alttestl. Weissagung* (i. p. 334), describes it as a “fine distinction;” but neither of them satisfactorily explains this diversity. For the assumption that Balaam is thereby tacitly accused of hypocrisy (*Hengstenberg*), or that the intention of the writer is to intimate that “the heathen seer did not stand at first in any connection whatever with the true God of Israel” (*Baur*), sets up a chasm between *Elohim* and *Jehovah*, with which the fact that, according to chap. xxii. 22, the wrath of *Elohim* on account of Balaam's journey was manifested in the appearance of the angel of *Jehovah*, is irreconcilable. The manifestation of God in the form of

was no doubt induced not only to procure more exact information concerning the events themselves, that he might make a profitable use of it in connection with his own occupation, but also to dedicate himself to the service of Jehovah, "in the hope of being able to participate in the new powers conferred upon the human race; so that henceforth he called Jehovah his God, and appeared as a prophet in His name" (*Hengstenberg*). In this respect Balaam resembles the Jewish exorcists, who cast out demons in the name of Jesus without following Christ (Mark ix. 38, 39; Luke ix. 49), but more especially Simon Magus, his "New Testament antitype," who was also so powerfully attracted by the new divine powers of Christianity that he became a believer, and submitted to baptism, because he saw the signs and great miracles that were done (Acts viii. 13). And from the very time when Balaam sought Jehovah, the fame of his prophetic art appears to have spread. It was no doubt the report that he stood in close connection with the God of Israel, which induced Balak, according to chap. xxii. 6, to hire him to oppose the Israelites; as the heathen king shared the belief, which was common to all the heathen, that Balaam was able to work upon the God he served, and to determine and regulate His will. God had probably given to the soothsayer a few isolated but memorable glimpses of the unseen, to prepare him for the service of His kingdom. But "Balaam's heart was not right with God," and "he loved the wages of unrighteousness" (Acts viii. 21; 2 Pet. ii. 15). His thirst for honour and wealth was not so overcome by the revelations of the true God, that he could bring himself to give up his soothsaying, and serve the living God with an undivided heart. Thus it came to pass, that through the appeal addressed to him by Balak, he was brought into a situation in which, although he did not venture to attempt anything in opposition to the will of Jehovah,

the angel of *Jehovah*, was only a higher stage of the previous manifestations of *Elohim*. And all that follows from this is, that Balaam's original attitude towards Jehovah was a very imperfect one, and not yet in harmony with the true nature of the God of Israel. In his *Jehovah* Balaam worshipped only *Elohim*, i.e. only a divine being, but not the God of Israel, who was first of all revealed to him according to His true essence, in the appearance of the angel of Jehovah, and still more clearly in the words which He put into his mouth. This is indicated by the use of *Elohim*, in chap. xxii. 9, 10, 12. In the other passages, where this name of God still occurs, it is required by the thought, viz. in chap. xxii. 22, to express the essential identity of *Elohim* and the *Maleach Jehovah*; and in chap. xxii. 38, xxiii. 27, and xxiv. 2, to show that Balaam did not speak out of his *own* mind, but from the inspiration of the Spirit of *God*.

his heart was never thoroughly changed ; so that, whilst he refused the honours and rewards that were promised him by Balak, and pronounced blessings upon Israel in the strength of the Spirit of God that came upon him, he was overcome immediately afterwards by the might of the sin of his own unbroken heart, fell back into the old heathen spirit, and advised the Midianites to entice the Israelites to join in the licentious worship of Baal Peor (chap. xxxi. 16), and was eventually put to death by the Israelites when they conquered these their foes (chap. xxxi. 8).¹

Chap. xxii. 2-21. BALAAM HIRED BY BALAK TO CURSE ISRAEL.
 —Vers. 2-4. As the Israelites passed by the eastern border of the land of Moab, the Moabites did not venture to make any attack upon them ; on the contrary, they supplied them with bread and water for money (Deut. ii. 29). At that time they no doubt cherished the hope that Sihon, their own terrible conqueror, would be able with perfect ease either to annihilate this new foe, or to drive them back into the desert from which they had come. But when they saw this hope frustrated, and the Israelites had overthrown the two kings of the Amorites with victorious power, and had conquered their kingdoms, and pressed forward through what was formerly Moabitish territory, even to the banks of the Jordan, the close proximity of so powerful a people filled Balak, their king, with terror and dismay, so that he began to think of the best means of destroying them. There was no ground for such alarm, as the Israelites, in consequence of divine instructions (Deut. ii. 9), had offered no hostilities to the Moabites, but had conscientiously spared their territory and property ; and even after the defeat of the

¹ When modern critics, such as *Knobel*, *Baur*, etc., affirm that the tradition in chap. xxxi. 8, 16, Josh. xiii. 22—viz. that Balaam was a *kosem*, or soothsayer, who advised the Midianites to seduce the Israelites to join in the worship of Baal—is irreconcilable with the account in chap. xxii.-xxiv. concerning Balaam himself, his attitude towards Jehovah, and his prophecies with regard to Israel, they simply display their own incapacity to comprehend, or form any psychological appreciation of, a religious character such as Balaam ; but they by no means prove that the account in chap. xxii.-xxiv. is interpolated by the Jchovist into the Elohistic original. And all that they adduce as a still further confirmation of this hypothesis (namely, that the weaving of prophetic announcements into the historical narrative, the interchange of the names of God, Jehovah, and Elohim, the appearance of the angel of the Lord, the talking of the ass, etc., are foreign to the Elohistic original), are simply assertions and assumptions, which do not become any more conclusive from the fact that they are invariably adduced when no better arguments can be hunted up.

Amorites, had not turned their arms against them, but had advanced to the Jordan to take possession of the land of Canaan. But the supernatural might of the people of God was a source of such discomfort to the king of the Moabites, that a horror of the Israelites came upon him. Feeling too weak to attack them with force of arms, he took counsel with the elders of Midian. With these words, "*This crowd will now lick up all our environs, as the ox licketh up the green of the field,*" i.e. entirely consume all our possessions, he called their attention to the danger which the proximity of Israel would bring upon him and his territory, to induce them to unite with him in some common measures against this dangerous foe. This intention is implied in his words, and clearly follows from the sequel of the history. According to ver. 7, the elders of Midian went to Balaam with the elders of Moab; and there is no doubt that the Midianitish elders advised Balak to send for Balaam, with whom they had become acquainted upon their trading journeys (cf. Gen. xxxvii.), to come and curse the Israelites. Another circumstance also points to an intimate connection between Balaam and the Midianites, namely, the fact that, after he had been obliged to bless the Israelites in spite of the inclination of his own natural heart, he went to the Midianites and advised them to make the Israelites harmless, by seducing them to idolatry (chap. xxxi. 16). The Midianites, who are referred to here, must be distinguished from the branch of the same tribe which dwelt in the peninsula of Sinai (chap. x. 29, 30; Ex. ii. 15, 16, iii. 1). They had been settled for a long time (cf. Gen. xxxvi. 35) on the eastern border of the Moabitish and Amoritish territory, in a grassy but treeless steppe-land, where many ruins and wells are still to be found belonging to very ancient times (*Buckingham, Syr.* ii. pp. 79 sqq., 95 sqq.), and lived by grazing (chap. xxxi. 32 sqq.) and the caravan trade. They were not very warlike, and were not only defeated by the Edomites (Gen. xxxvi. 35), but were also subdued and rendered tributary by Sihon, king of the Amorites (see at chap. xxxi. 8). In the time of the Judges, indeed, they once invaded the land of Israel in company with the Amalekites and the sons of the East, but they were beaten by Gideon, and entirely repulsed (Judg. vi. and vii.), and from that time forth they disappear entirely from history. The "*elder's of Midian*" are heads of tribes, who administered the general affairs of the people, who, like the Israelites, lived under a patriarchal constitution. The most powerful of them bore the title of "kings" (chap. xxxi. 8) or "princes" (Josh. xiii. 21). The clause, "and

Balak, the son of Zippor, was king of the Moabites at that time," is added as a supplementary note to explain the relation of Balak to the Moabites.

Vers. 5 and 6. Balak sent messengers to Balaam to *Pethor* in Mesopotamia. The town of *Pethor*, or *Pethora* ($\Phi\alpha\thetao\bar{\imath}\rho\alpha$, LXX.), is unknown. There is something very uncertain in Knobel's supposition, that it is connected with $\Phi\alpha\thetao\bar{\imath}\sigma\alpha\iota$, a place to the south of *Circessium* (*Zozim.* iii. 14), and with the *Béθarva* mentioned by *Ptolemy*, v. 18, 6, and that these are the same as *Anah*, *'Avahō*, *Anatha* (*Ammian. Marcell.* xxiv. 1, 6). And the conjecture that the name is derived from פָּתַח, to interpret dreams (Gen. xli. 8), and marks the place as a seat of the possessors of secret arts, is also more than doubtful, since פָּשַׁר corresponds to פָּתַח in Aramaean; although there can be no doubt that *Pethor* may have been a noted seat of Babylonian magi, since these wise men were accustomed to congregate in particular localities (cf. *Strabo*, xvi. 1, § 6, and *Münster Relig. der Babyl.* p. 86). Balak desired Balaam to come and curse the people of Israel, who had come out of Egypt, and were so numerous that they covered the eye of the earth (see Ex. x. 5), i.e. the whole face of the land, and sat down (were encamped) opposite to him; that he might then perhaps be able to smite them and drive them out of the land. On אָרֶה for אָרֶ, the imperative of אָרְרָה, see *Ewald*, § 228, b.—“*For I know that he whom thou blessest is blessed, and he whom thou cursest is cursed.*” Balak believed, in common with the whole of the ancient world, in the real power and operation of the curses, anathemas, and incantations pronounced by priests, soothsayers, and *goetæ*. And there was a truth at the foundation of this belief, however it may have been perverted by heathenism into phantasy and superstition. When God endows a man with supernatural powers of His word and Spirit, he also confers upon him the power of working upon others in a supernatural way. Man, in fact, by virtue of the real connection between his spirit and the higher spiritual world, is able to appropriate to himself supernatural powers, and make them subservient to the purposes of sin and wickedness, so as to practise magic and witchcraft with them, arts which we cannot pronounce either mere delusion or pure superstition, since the scriptures of both the Old and New Testaments speak of witchcraft, and condemn it as a real power of evil and of the kingdom of darkness (see vol. i. p. 476). Even in the narrative itself, the power of Balaam to bless and to curse is admitted; and, in addition to this, it is frequently celebrated as a great favour dis-

played towards Israel, that the Lord did not hearken to Balaam, but turned the curse into a blessing (Deut. xxiii. 5; Josh. xxiv. 10; Micah vi. 3; Neh. xiii. 2). This power of Balaam is not therefore traced, it is true, to the might of heathen deities, but to the might of Jehovah, whose name Balaam confessed; but yet the possibility is assumed of his curse doing actual, and not merely imaginary, harm to the Israelites. Moreover, the course of the history shows that in his heart Balaam was very much inclined to fulfil the desire of the king of the Moabites, and that this subjective inclination of his was overpowered by the objective might of the Spirit of Jehovah.

Vers. 7–14. When the elders of Moab and Midian came to him with wages of divination in their hand, he did not send them away, but told them to spend the night at his house, that he might bring them word what Jehovah would say to him. קָסְמִים, from קָסַם, soothsaying, signifies here that which has been wrought or won by soothsaying—the soothsayer's wages; just as בְּשֻׁרָה, which signifies literally glad tidings, is used in 2 Sam. iv. 10 for the wages of glad tidings; and לְעֵבֶד, פָּעָלָה, which signifies work, is frequently used for that which is wrought, the thing acquired, or the wages. If Balaam had been a true prophet and a faithful servant of Jehovah, he would at once have sent the messengers away and refused their request, as he must then have known that God would not curse His chosen people. But Balaam loved the wages of unrighteousness. This corruptness of his heart obscured his mind, so that he turned to God not as a mere form, but with the intention and in the hope of obtaining the consent of God to his undertaking. And God came to him in the night, and made known His will. Whether it was through the medium of a dream or of a vision, is not recorded, as this was of no moment in relation to the subject in hand. The question of God in ver. 9, “Who are these men with thee?” not only served to introduce the conversation (*Knobel*), but was intended to awaken “the slumbering conscience of Balaam, to lead him to reflect upon the proposal which the men had made, and to break the force of his sinful inclination” (*Hengstenberg*).—Ver. 12. God then expressly forbade him to go with the messengers to curse the Israelites, as the people was blessed; and Balaam was compelled to send back the messengers without attaining their object, because Jehovah had refused him permission to go with them. קְבַּח־לִי, ver. 11, imper. of קָבַב = נָקַב (see at Lev. xxiv. 11).

Vers. 15-21. The answer with which Balaam had sent the Moabitish messengers away, encouraged Balak to cherish the hope of gaining over the celebrated soothsayer to his purpose notwithstanding, and to send an embassy “of princes more numerous and more honourable than those,” and to make the attempt to overcome his former resistance by more splendid promises; whether he regarded it, as is very probable, “as the remains of a weakly fear of God, or simply as a *ruse* adopted for the purpose of obtaining better conditions” (*Hengstenberg*). As a genuine heathen, who saw nothing more in the God of Israel than a national god of that people, he thought that it would be possible to render not only men, but gods also, favourable to his purpose, by means of splendid honours and rich rewards.¹—Vers. 18, 19. But Balaam replied to the proposals of these ambassadors: “*If Balak gave me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot transgress the mouth (command) of Jehovah, my God, to do little or great;*” i.e. to attempt anything in opposition to the will of the Lord (cf. 1 Sam. xx. 2, xxii. 15, xxv. 36). The inability flowed from moral awe of God and dread of His punishment. “From beginning to end this fact was firmly established in Balaam’s mind, viz. that in the work to which Balak summoned him he could do nothing at all except through Jehovah. This knowledge he had acquired by virtue of his natural gifts as seer, and his previous experience. But this clear knowledge of Jehovah was completely obscured again by the love for the wages which ruled in his heart. Because he loved Balak, the enemy of Israel, for the sake of the wages, whereas Jehovah loved Israel for His own name’s sake; Balaam was opposed to Jehovah in his inmost nature and will, though he knew himself to be in unison with Him by virtue of his natural gift. Consequently he fell into the same blindness of contradiction to which Balak was in bondage” (*Baumgarten*). And in this blindness he hoped to be able to turn Jehovah round to oppose Israel, and favour the wishes of his own and Balak’s heart. He therefore told the messengers to wait again, that he might ask Jehovah a second time (ver. 19). And this

¹ Compare the following remarks of *Pliny* (*h. n. xxviii. 4*) concerning this belief among the Romans: “*Verrius Flaccus auctores ponit, quibus credat, in oppugnationibus ante omnia solitum a Romanis sacerdotibus evocari Deum, cuius in tutela id oppidum esset, promittique illi eundem aut ampliorem apud Romanos cultum. Et durat in Pontificum disciplina id sacrum, constatque ideo occultatum, in cuius Dei tutela Roma esset, ne qui hostium simili modo agerent;*”—and the further explanations of this heathen notion in *Hengstenberg’s Balaam and his Prophecies*.

time (ver. 20) God allowed him to go with them, but only on the condition that he should do nothing but what He said to him. The apparent contradiction in His first of all prohibiting Balaam from going (ver. 12), then permitting it (ver. 20), and then again, when Balaam set out in consequence of this permission, burning with anger against him (ver. 22), does not indicate any variableness in the counsels of God, but vanishes at once when we take into account the pedagogical purpose of the divine consent. When the first messengers came and Balaam asked God whether he might go with them and curse Israel, God forbade him to go and curse. But since Balaam obeyed this command with inward repugnance, when he asked a second time on the arrival of the second embassy, God permitted him to go, but on the condition already mentioned, namely, that he was forbidden to curse. God did this not merely because it was His own intention to put blessings instead of curses into the prophet's mouth,—and “the blessings of the celebrated prophet might serve as means of encouraging Israel and discouraging their foes, even though He did not actually stand in need of them” (*Knobel*),—but primarily and principally for the sake of Balaam himself, viz. to manifest to this soothsayer, who had so little susceptibility for higher influences, both His own omnipotence and true deity, and also the divine election of Israel, in a manner so powerful as to compel him to decide either for or against the God of Israel and his salvation. To this end God permitted him to go to Balak, though not without once more warning him most powerfully by the way of the danger to which his avarice and ambition would expose him. This immediate intention in the guidance of Balaam, by which God would have rescued him if possible from the way of destruction, into which he had been led by the sin which ruled in his heart, does not at all preclude the much further-reaching design of God, which was manifested in Balaam's blessings, namely, to glorify His own name among the heathen and in Israel, through the medium of this far-famed soothsayer.

Vers. 22-35. BALAAM'S SPEAKING ASS.—Ver. 22. “*And the anger of God burned, that he was going* (*אָנֹה עַל־יְהוָה*): *and the angel of Jehovah placed himself in the way, as an adversary to him.*” From the use of the participle *עַל־יְהוָה* instead of the imperfect, with which it is not interchangeable, it is evident, on the one hand, that the anger of God was not excited by the fact that Balaam went with the elders of Moab, but by his behaviour either on setting out or

upon the journey;¹ and, on the other hand, that the occurrence which followed did not take place at the commencement, but rather towards the close of, the journey. As it was a longing for wages and honour that had induced the soothsayer to undertake the journey, the nearer he came to his destination, under the guidance of the distinguished Moabitish ambassadors, the more was his mind occupied with the honours and riches in prospect; and so completely did they take possession of his heart, that he was in danger of casting to the winds the condition which had been imposed upon him by God. The wrath of God was kindled against this dangerous enemy of his soul; and as he was riding upon his ass with two attendants, the angel of the Lord stood in his way נֶשֶׁךְ, “as an adversary to him,” i.e. to restrain him from advancing farther on a road that would inevitably lead him headlong into destruction (cf. ver. 32). This visible manifestation of God (on the angel of the Lord, see vol. i. pp. 185 sqq.) was seen by the ass; but Balaam the seer was so blinded, that it was entirely hidden from his eye, darkened as it was by sinful lust; and this happened three times before Jehovah brought him to his senses by the speaking of the dumb animal, and thus opened his eyes.² The “drawn sword” in the angel’s hand was a manifestation of the wrath of God. The

¹ From a failure to observe the use of the participle in distinction from the preterite, and from a misinterpretation of the words of the angel of the Lord (ver. 32), “I have come out as an adversary, for the way leads headlong to destruction,” which have been understood as implying that the angel meant to prohibit the seer from going, whereas he only intended to warn him of the destruction towards which he was going, the critics have invented a contradiction between the account of the speaking ass (vers. 22-35) and the preceding part of the history. And in consequence of this, *A. G. Hoffmann* and others have pronounced the section from ver. 22 to ver. 35 to be a later interpolation; whilst *Baur*, on the other hand (in his *Geschichte d. alttestl. Weissagung*), regards the account of the ass as the original form of the narrative, and the preceding portion as a composition of the Jehovahist. But there is no “contradiction” or “evident incongruity,” unless we suppose that the only reason for the appearance of the angel of the Lord was, that he might once more forbid the seer to go, and then give him permission, with a certain limitation. The other differences, which *E. v. Ortenberg* adduces, are involved in the very nature of the case. The manifestation of God, in the form of the Angel of Jehovah, was necessarily different in its character from a direct spiritual revelation of the divine will. And lastly, the difference in the expressions used to signify “three times,” in chap. xxii. 28, 32, 33, and chap. xxiv. 10, etc., prove nothing more than that king Balak did not mould his style of speaking according to that of the ass.

² “To the great disgrace of the prophet, the glory of the angel was first of all apparent to the ass. . . . He had been boasting before this of extraordinary

ass turned from the road into the field before the threatening sight, and was smitten by Balaam in consequence to turn her or guide her back into the road.—Vers. 24, 25. The angel then stationed himself in a pass of the vineyards where walls (*פָּרַן*, vineyard walls, Isa. v. 5) were on both sides, so that the animal, terrified by the angel, pressed against the wall, and squeezed Balaam's foot against the wall, for which Balaam smote her again.—Vers. 26, 27. The angel moved still farther, and stationed himself in front of him, in so narrow a pass, that there was no room to move either to the right or to the left. As the ass could neither turn aside nor go past this time, she threw herself down. Balaam was still more enraged at this, and smote her with the stick (*לְבָנֶבֶת*, which he carried; see Gen. xxxviii. 18).—Vers. 28 sqq. “*Then Jehovah opened the mouth of the ass, and she said to Balaam, What have I done to thee, that thou hast smitten me now three times?*” But Balaam, enraged at the refractoriness of his ass, replied, “*Because thou hast played me ill* (*לִעֲמֹתָה*, see Ex. x. 2): *if there were only a sword in my hand, verily I should now have killed thee.*” But the ass replied, that she had been ridden by him from a long time back, and had never been accustomed to act in this way towards him. These words of the irrational beast, the truth of which Balaam was obliged to admit, made an impression upon him, and awakened him out of his blindness, so that God could now open his eyes, and he saw the angel of the Lord.

In this miraculous occurrence, which scoffers at the Bible constantly bring forward as a weapon of attack upon the truth of the word of God, the circumstance that the ass perceived the appearance of the angel of the Lord sooner than Balaam did, does not present the slightest difficulty; for it is a well-known fact, that irrational animals have a much keener instinctive presentiment of many natural phenomena, such as earthquakes, storms, etc., than man has with the five senses of his mind. And the fact is equally undeniable, that many animals, *e.g.* horses and cows, see the so-called second sight, and are terrified in consequence.¹ The rock of offence in this narrative is to be found in the rational words of an

visions, and now what was visible to the eyes of a beast was invisible to him. Whence came this blindness, but from the avarice by which he had been so stupefied, that he preferred filthy lucre to the holy calling of God?” (*Calvin.*)

¹ In support of this we will simply cite the following from the remarks made by *Martin* upon this subject, and quoted by *Hengstenberg* in his *Balaam* (p. 385), from *Passavant's* work on animal magnetism and clairvoyance: “That horses see it (the second sight), is also evident from their violent and rapid snorting,

irrational and speechless ass. It is true, that in the actual meaning of the words there is nothing beyond the sensations and feelings to which animals constantly give utterance in gestures and inarticulate sounds, when subjected to cruel treatment. But in this instance the feelings were expressed in the rational words of human language, which an animal does not possess; and hence the question arises, Are we to understand this miracle as being a purely internal fact of an ecstatic nature, or a fact that actually came under the cognizance of the senses? If we examine the arguments which *Hengstenberg* has adduced in favour of the former, and *Kurtz* in support of the latter, there is nothing at all in the circumstance, that the narrative itself says nothing about Balaam being in an ecstasy, nor in the statement that "Jehovah opened the mouth of the ass," nor lastly, in the words of 2 Pet. ii. 16, "The dumb ass, speaking with man's voice, forbade the madness of the prophet," to furnish conclusive, not to say irresistible, proofs of the assertion, that "as the ass was corporeally and externally visible, its speaking must have been externally and corporeally audible" (*Kurtz*). All that is contained in the two scriptural testimonies is, that the ass spoke in a way that was perceptible to Balaam, and that this speaking was effected by Jehovah as something altogether extraordinary. But whether Balaam heard the words of the animal with the outward, *i.e.* the bodily ear, or with an inward spiritual ear, is not decided by them. On the other hand, neither the fact that Balaam expressed no astonishment at the ass speaking, nor the circumstance that Balaam's companions—viz. his two servants (ver. 22) and the Moabitish messengers, who were also present, according to ver. 35—did not see the angel or hear the ass speaking, leads with certainty to the conclusion, that the whole affair must have been a purely internal one, which Balaam alone experienced in a state of ecstasy, since *argumenta e silentio* confessedly prove but very little. With regard to Balaam, we may say with *Augustine* (*quæst. 50 in Num.*), "he was so carried away by his cupidity, that he was not terrified by this marvellous miracle, and replied just as if he had been speaking to a man, when God, although He did not change the nature of the ass into that of a rational being, made it give utterance to whatever He pleased, for the purpose of restraining his

when their rider has had a vision of any kind either by day or night. And in the case of the horse it may also be observed, that it will refuse to go any farther in the same road until a circuitous course has been taken, and even then it is quite in a sweat."

madness." But with regard to the Moabitish messengers, it is very doubtful whether they were eye-witnesses and auditors of the affair. It is quite possible that they had gone some distance in advance, or were some distance behind, when Balaam had the vision. On the other hand, there was no necessity to mention particularly that they saw the appearance of the angel, and heard the speaking of the animal, as this circumstance was not of the least importance in connection with the main purpose of the narrative. And still less can it be said that "the ass's speaking, if transferred to the sphere of outward reality, would obviously break through the eternal boundary-line which has been drawn in Gen. i. between the human and the animal world." / The only thing that would have broken through this boundary, would have been for the words of the ass to have surpassed the feelings and sensations of an animal; that is to say, for the ass to have given utterance to truths that were essentially human, and only comprehensible by human reason. / Now that was not the case. / All that the ass said was quite within the sphere of the psychical life of an animal.

The true explanation lies between the notion that the whole occurrence was purely internal, and consisted exclusively in ecstasy brought by God upon Balaam, and the grossly realistic reduction of the whole affair into the sphere of the senses and the outward material world. The angel who met the soothsayer in the road, as he was riding upon his ass, and who was seen at once by the ass, though he was not seen by Balaam till Jehovah had opened his eyes, did really appear upon the road, in the outward world of the senses. But the form in which he appeared was not a grossly sensuous or material form, like the bodily frame of an ordinary visible being; for in that case Balaam would inevitably have seen him, when his beast became alarmed and restive again and again and refused to go forward, since it is not stated anywhere that God had smitten him with blindness, like the men of Sodom (Gen. xix. 11), or the people in 2 Kings vi. 18. It rather resembled the appearance of a spirit, which cannot be seen by every one who has healthy bodily eyes, but only by those who have their senses awakened for visions from the spirit-world. Thus, for example, the men who went to Damascus with Paul, saw no one, when the Lord appeared to him in a miraculous light from heaven, and spoke to him, although they also heard the voice¹ (Acts ix. 7). Balaam

¹ Or, strictly speaking, they saw the *light* (Acts xxii. 9), but saw *no man* (Acts ix. 7); and they heard the *sound* ($\tauῆς φωνῆς$, the voice or noise generally,

wanted the spiritual sense to discern the angel of the Lord, because his spirit's eye was blinded by his thirst for wealth and honour. This blindness increased to such an extent, with the inward excitement caused by the repeated insubordination of his beast, that he lost all self-control. As the ass had never been so restive before, if he had only been calm and thoughtful himself, he would have looked about to discover the cause of this remarkable change, and would then, no doubt, have discovered the presence of the angel. But as he lost all his thoughtfulness, God was obliged to open the mouth of the dumb and irrational animal, to show a seer by profession his own blindness. "He might have reproved him by the words of the angel; but because the rebuke would not have been sufficiently severe without some deep humiliation, He made the beast his teacher" (*Calvin*). The ass's speaking was produced by the omnipotence of God; but it is impossible to decide whether the modulation was miraculously communicated to the animal's voice, so that it actually gave utterance to the human words which fell upon Balaam's ears (*Kurtz*), or whether the cries of the animal were formed into rational discourse in Balaam's soul, by the direct operation of God, so that he alone heard and understood the speech of the animal, whereas the servants who were present heard nothing more than unintelligible cries.¹ In either case Balaam received a deeply humiliating admonition from the mouth of the irrational beast, and that not only to put him to shame, but also to call him to his senses, and render him capable of hearing the voice of God. The seer, who prided himself upon having eyes for divine revelations, was so blind, that he could not discern the appearance of the angel, which even the irrational beast had been able to see.² By this he was taught, that even a beast is more capable of discerning things from the higher world, than a man blinded by sinful desires. It was not till after this humiliation that God opened his eyes, so that

Acts ix. 7), but not the words ($\tauὴν φωνὴν τοῦ λαλοῦντος μου$, the voice or articulate words of the person speaking, Acts xxii. 9). The construction of $\alphaὐθονά$, with the genitive in the one case and the accusative in the other, is evidently intended to convey this distinct and distinctive meaning.—Tr.

¹ See the analogous case mentioned in John xii. 28, 29, of the voice which came to Jesus from the skies, when some of the people who were standing by said that it only thundered, whilst others said an angel spoke to Him.

² God made use of the voice of an ass, both because it was fitting that a brutish mind should be taught by a brute, and also, as *Nyssenus* says, to instruct and chastise the vanity of the augur (Balaam), who was accustomed to observe the meaning of the braying of the ass and the chirping of birds (*C. a. Lap.*).

he saw the angel of the Lord with a drawn sword standing in his road, and fell upon his face before this fearful sight.

Vers. 32-34. To humble him deeply and inwardly, the Lord held up before him the injustice of his cruel treatment of the ass, and told him at the same time that it had saved his life by turning out of the way. “*I have come out*,” said the angel of the Lord, “as an adversary; for the way leads headlong into destruction before me;” i.e. the way which thou art going is leading thee, in my eyes, in my view, into destruction. טר, to plunge, sc. into destruction, both here, and also in Job xvi. 11, the only other passage in which it occurs.—Ver. 33. The angel of the Lord sought to preserve Balaam from the destruction which threatened him, by standing in his way; but he did not see him, though his ass did. לאא ‘נָתַתְהָ וּנוּ, “perhaps it turned ~~out~~ before me; for otherwise I should surely have killed thee, and let her live.” The first clause is to be regarded, as Hengstenberg supposes, as an aposiopesis. The angel does not state positively what was the reason why perhaps the ass had turned out of the way: he merely hints at it lightly, and leaves it to Balaam to gather from the hint, that the faithful animal had turned away from affection to its master, with a dim foreboding of the danger which threatened him, and yet for that very reason, as it were as a reward for its service of love, had been ill-treated by him. The traditional rendering, “if the ass had not turned aside, surely,” etc., cannot be defended according to the rules of the language; and there is not sufficient ground for any such alteration of the text as Knobel suggests, viz. into לא. These words made an impression, and Balaam made this acknowledgment (ver. 34): “*I have sinned, for I knew not that thou stoodest in the way against me; and now, if it displease thee, I will get me back again.*” The angel of the Lord replied, however (ver. 35): “*Go with the men; but only the word that I shall speak unto thee, that shalt thou speak.*” This was sufficient to show him, that it was not the journey in itself that was displeasing to God, but the feelings and intentions with which he had entered upon it. The whole procedure was intended to sharpen his conscience and sober his mind, that he might pay attention to the word which the Lord would speak to him. At the same time the impression which the appearance and words of the angel of the Lord made upon his heart, enveloped in mist as it was by the thirst for gold and honour, was not a deep one, nor one that led him to a thorough knowledge of his own heart; otherwise, after such a warning, he would never have continued his journey.

Vers. 36-41. RECEPTION OF BALAAM BY THE KING OF THE MOABITES.—Vers. 36, 37. As soon as Balak heard of Balaam's coming, he went to meet him at a city on the border of the Arnon, which flowed at the extreme (north) boundary (of the Moabitish territory), viz. at *Areopolis* (see at chap. xxi. 15), probably the capital of the kingdom at one time, but now reduced to a frontier town, since Sihon the Amorite had taken all the land as far as the Arnon; whilst *Rabbah*, which was farther south, had been selected as the residence of the king. By coming as far as the frontier of his kingdom to meet the celebrated soothsayer, Balak intended to do him special honour. But he could not help receiving him with a gentle reproof for not having come at his first invitation, as if he, the king, had not been in a condition to honour him according to his merits.—Ver. 38. But Balaam, being still mindful of the warning which he had just received from God, replied, “*Lo, I am come unto thee now: have I then any power to speak anything (sc. of my own accord)? The word which God puts into my mouth, that will I speak.*” With this reply he sought, at the very outset, to soften down the expectations of Balak, inasmuch as he concluded at once that his coming was a proof of his willingness to curse (*Hengstenberg*). As a matter of fact, Balaam did not say anything different to the king from what he had explained to his messengers at the very first (cf. ver. 18). But just as he had not told them the whole truth, but had concealed the fact that Jehovah, his God, had forbidden the journey at first, on the ground that he was not to curse the nation that was blessed (ver. 12), so he could not address the king in open, unambiguous words.—Vers. 39, 40. He then went with Balak to *Kirjath-Chuzoth*, where the king had oxen and sheep slaughtered in sacrifice, and sent flesh to Balaam as well as to the princes that were with him for a sacrificial meal, to do honour to the soothsayer thereby. The sacrifices were not so much thank-offerings for Balaam's happy arrival, as supplicatory offerings for the success of the undertaking before them. “This is evident,” as *Hengstenberg* correctly observes, “from the place and time of their presentation; for the place was not that where Balak first met with Balaam, and they were only presented on the eve of the great event.” Moreover, they were offered unquestionably not to the Moabitish idols, from which Balak expected no help, but to Jehovah, whom Balak wished to draw away, in connection with Balaam, from His own people (Israel), that he might secure His favour to the Moabites. The situation of *Kirjath-Chuzoth*, which is only men-

tioned here, cannot be determined with absolute certainty. As Balak went with Balaam to Bamoth-Baal on the morning following the sacrificial meal, which was celebrated there, Kirjath-Chuzoth cannot have been very far distant. *Knobel* conjectures, with some probability, that it may have been the same as *Kerieth* (Jer. xlvi. 24), *i.e.* *Kereijat* or *Körriat*, at the foot of Jebel Attarus, at the top of which Bamoth-Baal was situated (see at chap. xxi. 19).—Ver. 41. But Balak conducted the soothsayer to *Bamoth-Baal*, not because it was consecrated to Baal, but because it was the first height on the way to the steppes of Moab, from which they could see the camp of Israel, or at all events, “the end of the people,” *i.e.* the outermost portion of the camp. For “Balak started with the supposition, that Balaam must necessarily have the Israelites in view if his curse was to take effect” (*Hengstenberg*).

Chap. xxiii. 1-24. BALAAM'S FIRST WORDS.—Vers. 1-3. *Preparations* for the first act, which was performed at Bamoth-Baal. At Balaam's command Balak built seven altars, and then selected seven bullocks and seven rams, which they immediately sacrificed, namely, one bullock and one ram upon each altar. The nations of antiquity generally accompanied all their more important undertakings with sacrifices, to make sure of the protection and help of the gods; but this was especially the case with their ceremonies of adjuration. According to *Diod. Sic.* ii. 29, the Chaldeans sought to avert calamity and secure prosperity by sacrifices and adjurations. The same thing is also related of other nations (see *Hengstenberg*, Balaam, p. 392). Accordingly, Balaam also did everything that appeared necessary, according to his own religious notions, to ensure the success of Balak's undertaking, and bring about the desired result. The erection of *seven* altars, and the sacrifice of *seven* animals of each kind, are to be explained from the sacredness acquired by this number, through the creation of the world in seven days, as being the stamp of work that was well-pleasing to God. The sacrifices were burnt-offerings, and were offered by themselves to Jehovah, whom Balaam acknowledged as his God.—Vers. 3, 4. After the offering of the sacrifices, Balaam directed the king to stand by his burnt-offering, *i.e.* by the sacrifices that had been offered for him upon the seven altars, that he might go out for auguries. The meaning of the words, “*I will go, peradventure Jehovah will come to meet me,*” is apparent from chap. xxiv. 1: and “*he went no more to meet with the auguries*” (*בַּיִשְׁרָאֵל*, see at Lev. xix.

26). Balaam went out to look for a manifestation of Jehovah in the significant phenomena of nature. The word which Jehovah should show to him, he would report to Balak. We have here what is just as characteristic in relation to Balaam's religious stand-point, as it is significant in its bearing upon the genuine historical character of the narrative, namely, an admixture of the religious ideas of both the Israelites and the heathen, inasmuch as Balaam hoped to receive or discover, in the phenomena of nature, a revelation from Jehovah. Because heathenism had no "sure word of prophecy," it sought to discover the will and counsel of God, which are displayed in the events of human history, through various signs that were discernible in natural phenomena, or, as *Chrysippus* the Stoic expresses it in *Cicero de divin.* ii. 63, "*Signa quæ a Diis hominibus portendantur.*"¹ To look for a word of Jehovah in this way, Balaam betook himself to a "bald height." This is the only meaning of 'שָׁמֶן', from *הַשְׁמֵן*, to rub, to scrape, to make bare, which is supported by the usage of the language; it is also in perfect harmony with the context, as the heathen augurs were always accustomed to select elevated places for their auspices, with an extensive prospect, especially the towering and barren summits of mountains that were rarely visited by men (see *Hengstenberg, ut sup.*). *Ewald*, however, proposes the meaning "alone," or "to spy," for which there is not the slightest grammatical foundation.—Ver. 4. "And God came to meet Balaam," who thought it necessary, as a true *hariolus*, to call the attention of God to the altars which had been built for Him, and the sacrifices that had been offered upon them. And God made known His will to him, though not in a natural sign of doubtful signification. He put a very distinct and unmistakeable word into his mouth, and commanded him to make it known to the king.

¹ See the remarks of *Nügelsbach* and *Hartung* on the nature of the heathen auspices, in *Hengstenberg's* Balaam and his Prophecies (pp. 396-7). *Hartung* observes, for example: "As the gods did not live outside the world, or separated from it, but the things of time and space were filled with their essence, it followed, as a matter of course, that the signs of their presence were sought and seen in all the visible and audible occurrences of nature, whether animate or inanimate. Hence all the phenomena which affected the senses, either in the elements or in the various creatures, whether sounds or movements, natural productions or events, of a mechanical or physical, or voluntary or involuntary kind, might serve as the media of revelation." And again (p. 397): "The sign in itself is useless, if it be not observed. It was therefore necessary that man and God should come to meet one another, and that the sign should not merely be given, but should also be received."

Vers. 7–10. Balaam's *first saying*.—Having come back to the burnt-offering, Balaam commenced his utterance before the king and the assembled princes. **לֹשׁוֹת**, *lit.* a simile, then a proverb, because the latter consists of comparisons and figures, and lastly a sentence or saying. The application of this term to the announcements made by Balaam (vers. 7, 18, xxiv. 3, 15, 20), whereas it is never used of the prophecies of the true prophets of Jehovah, but only of certain songs and similes inserted in them (cf. Isa. xiv. 4; Ezek. xvii. 2, xxiv. 3; Micah ii. 4), is to be accounted for not merely from the poetic form of Balaam's utterances, the predominance of poetical imagery, the sustained *parallelism*, the construction of the whole discourse in brief pointed sentences, and other peculiarities of poetic language (*e.g.* **יָמָם**, chap. xxiv. 3, 15), but it points at the same time to the difference which actually exists between these utterances and the predictions of the true prophets. The latter are orations addressed to the congregation, which deduce from the general and peculiar relation of Israel to the Lord and to His law, the conduct of the Lord towards His people either in their own or in future times, proclaiming judgment upon the ungodly and salvation to the righteous. “Balaam's mental eye,” on the contrary, as *Hengstenberg* correctly observes, “was simply fixed upon what he saw; and this he reproduced without any regard to the impression that it was intended to make upon those who heard it.” But the very first utterance was of such a character as to deprive Balak of all hope that his wishes would be fulfilled.—Ver. 7. “*Balak, the king of Moab, fetches me from Aram, from the mountains of the East,*” i.e. of Mesopotamia, which was described, as far back as Gen. xxix. 1, as the land of the sons of the East (cf. chap. xxii. 5). Balaam mentions the mountains of his home in contradistinction to the mountains of the land of the Moabites upon which he was then standing. “*Come, curse me Jacob, and come threaten Israel.*” Balak had sent for him for this purpose (see chap. xxii. 11, 17). **רַבְבֵּת**, for **רַבְבֵּה**, imperative (see *Ewald*, § 228, b.). **רַבֵּת**, to be angry, here to give utterance to the wrath of God, synonymous with **כִּנְצָבֵת** or **קָרְבֵּת**, to curse. *Jacob*: a poetical name for the nation, equivalent to *Israel*.—Ver. 8. “*How shall I curse whom God does not curse, and how threaten whom Jehovah does not threaten?*” Balak imagined, like all the heathen, that Balaam, as a *goetes* and magician, could distribute blessings and curses according to his own will, and put such constraint upon his God as to make Him subservient to his own will (see at chap. xxii. 6). The seer opposes this delusion:

The God of Israel does not curse His people, and therefore His servant cannot curse them. The following verses (vers. 9 and 10) give the reason why : “*For from the top of the rocks I see him, and from the hills I behold him. Lo, it is a people that dwelleth apart, and is not numbered among the heathen. Who determines the dust of Jacob, and in number the fourth part of Israel? Let my soul die the death of the righteous, and my end be like his!*” There were two reasons which rendered it impossible for Balaam to curse Israel : (1) Because they were a people both outwardly and inwardly different from other nations, and (2) because they were a people richly blessed and highly favoured by God. From the top of the mountains Balaam looked down upon the people of Israel. The outward and earthly height upon which he stood was the substratum of the spiritual height upon which the Spirit of God had placed him, and had so enlightened his mental sight, that he was able to discern all the peculiarities and the true nature of Israel. In this respect the first thing that met his view was the fact that this people dwelt alone. Dwelling alone does not denote a quiet and safe retirement, as many commentators have inferred from Deut. xxxiii. 28, Jer. xlix. 31, and Micah vii. 14 ; but, according to the parallel clause, “it is not reckoned among the nations,” it expresses the separation of Israel from the rest of the nations. This separation was manifested outwardly to the seer’s eye in the fact that “the host of Israel dwelt by itself in a separate encampment upon the plain. In this his spirit discerned the inward and essential separation of Israel from all the heathen” (*Baumgarten*). This outward “dwelling alone” was a symbol of their inward separation from the heathen world, by virtue of which Israel was not only saved from the fate of the heathen world, but could not be overcome by the heathen ; of course only so long as they themselves should inwardly maintain this separation from the heathen, and faithfully continue in covenant with the Lord their God, who had separated them from among the nations to be His own possession. As soon as Israel lost itself in heathen ways, it also lost its own external independence. This rule applies to the Israel of the New Testament as well as the Israel of the Old, to the congregation or Church of God of all ages. בְּנֵי יִהְיֶה אֱלֹהָיו, “it does not reckon itself among the heathen nations,” i.e. it does not share the lot of the other nations, because it has a different God and protector from the heathen (cf. Deut. iv. 8, xxxiii. 29). The truth of this has been so marvelously realized in the history of the Israelites, notwithstanding their

falling short of the idea of their divine calling, “ that whereas all the mightier kingdoms of the ancient world, Egypt, Assyria, Babel, etc., have perished without a trace, Israel, after being rescued from so many dangers which threatened utter destruction under the Old Testament, still flourishes in the Church of the New Testament, and continues also to exist in that part which, though rejected now, is destined one day to be restored” (*Hengstenberg*).

In this state of separation from the other nations, Israel rejoiced in the blessing of its God, which was already visible in the innumerable multitude into which it had grown. “ *Who has ever determined the dust of Jacob?*” As the dust cannot be numbered, so is the multitude of Israel innumerable. These words point back to the promise in Gen. xiii. 16, and applied quite as much to the existing state as to the future of Israel. The beginning of the miraculous fulfilment of the promise given to the patriarchs of an innumerable posterity, was already before their eyes (cf. Deut. x. 22). Even now the fourth part of Israel is not to be reckoned. Balaam speaks of the fourth part with reference to the division of the nation into four camps (chap. ii.), of which he could see only one from his point of view (chap. xxii. 41), and therefore only the fourth part of the nation. מִסְפֵּר is an accusative of definition, and the subject and verb are to be repeated from the first clause ; so that there is no necessity to alter מִסְפֵּר into מִסְפָּר.—But Israel was not only visibly blessed by God with an innumerable increase ; it was also inwardly exalted into a people of יְשִׁירִים, righteous or honourable men. The predicate יְשִׁירִים is applied to Israel on account of its divine calling, because it had a God who was just and right, a God of truth and without iniquity (Deut. xxxii. 4), or because the God of Israel was holy, and sanctified His people (Lev. xx. 7, 8 ; Ex. xxxi. 13) and made them into a *Jeshurun* (Deut. xxxii. 15, xxxiii. 5, 26). Righteousness, probity, is the idea and destination of this people, which has never entirely lost it, though it has never fully realized it. Even in times of general apostasy from the Lord, there was always an ἐκλογὴ in the nation, of which probity and righteousness could truly be predicated (cf. 1 Kings xix. 18). The righteousness of the Israelites was “ a product of the institutions which God had established among them, of the revelation of His holy will which He had given them in His law, of the forgiveness of sins which He had linked on to the offering of sacrifices, and of the communication of His Spirit, which was ever living and at work in His Church, and in it alone” (*Hengstenberg*). Such a people Balaam could not

curse ; he could only wish that the end of his own life might resemble the end of these righteous men. Death is introduced here as the end and completion of life. “Balaam desires for himself the entire, full, indestructible, and inalienable blessedness of the Israelite, of which death is both the close and completion, and also the seal and attestation” (*Kurtz*). This desire did not involve the certain hope of a blessed life beyond the grave, which the Israelites themselves did not then possess ; it simply expressed the thought that the death of a pious Israelite was a desirable good. And this it was, whether viewed in the light of the past, the present, or the future. In the hour of death the pious Israelite could look back with blessed satisfaction to a long life, rich “in traces of the benevolent, forgiving, delivering, and saving grace of God ;” he could comfort himself with the delightful hope of living on in his children and his children’s children, and in them of participating in the future fulfilment of the divine promises of grace ; and lastly, when dying in possession of the love and grace of God, he could depart hence with the joyful confidence of being gathered to his fathers in Sheol (Gen. xxv. 8).

Vers. 11-17. Balak reproached Balaam for this utterance, which announced blessings to the Israelites instead of curses. But he met his reproaches with the remark, that he was bound by the command of Jehovah. The infinitive absolute, **רָקַב**, after the finite verb, expresses the fact that Balaam had continued to give utterance to nothing but blessings. **שָׁמַר לְדִבֶּר**, to observe to speak ; **שָׁמַר**, to notice carefully, as in Deut. v. 1, 29, etc. But Balak thought that the reason might be found in the unfavourable locality ; he therefore led the seer to “*the field of the watchers, upon the top of Pisgah*,” whence he could see the whole of the people of Israel. The words **אַתָּה תְּرַא אֶת־עַם יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנִזְכַּר** (ver. 13) are to be rendered, “*whence thou wilt see it (Israel) ; thou seest only the end of it, but not the whole of it*” (*sc.* here upon Bamoth-Baal). This is required by a comparison of the verse before us with chap. xxii. 41, where it is most unquestionably stated, that upon the top of Bamoth-Baal Balaam only saw “*the end of the people*.” For this reason Balak regarded that place as unfavourable, and wished to lead the seer to a place from which he could see the people, without any limitation whatever. Consequently, notwithstanding the omission of **כִּי** (for), the words **אַפְּסֵךְ קָצָה** can only be intended to assign the reason why Balak supposed the first utterances of Balaam to have been unfavourable. **קָצָה הָעֵם** = **קָצָה**, the end of the people (chap. xxii. 41), cannot possibly signify the whole nation,

or, as *Marck, de Geer, Gesenius, and Kurtz* suppose, “the people from one end to the other,” in which case קָצַח הָעֵם (the end of the people) would signify the very opposite of קָצַח הַיּוֹם (the end of it); for קָצַח הָעֵם is not interchangeable, or to be identified, with פְּלִיחָם מִקְצָה הָעֵם (Gen. xix. 4), “the whole people, from the end or extremity of it,” or from its last man; in other words, “to the very last man.” Still less does קָצַח הָעֵם קָצַח אֶפְתָּח signify “the uttermost end of the whole people, the end of the entire people,” notwithstanding the fact that *Kurtz* regards the expression, “the end of the end of the people,” as an intolerable tautology. קָבֵן, imperative with *nun epenth.*, from קָבֵב. The “field of the watchers,” or “spies (*zophim*), upon the top of *Pisgah*,” corresponds, no doubt, to “the field of Moab, upon the top of *Pisgah*,” on the west of Heshbon (see at chap. xxi. 20). Mount *Nebo*, from which Moses surveyed the land of Canaan in all its length and breadth, was one summit, and possibly the summit of *Pisgah* (see Deut. iii. 27, xxxiv. 1). The field of the spies was very probably a tract of table-land upon Nebo; and so called either because watchers were stationed there in times of disturbance, to keep a look-out all round, or possibly because it was a place where augurs made their observations of the heavens and of birds (*Knobel*). The locality has not been thoroughly explored by travellers; but from the spot alluded to, it must have been possible to overlook a very large portion of the *Arboth Moab*. Still farther to the north, and nearer to the camp of the Israelites in these *Arboth*, was the summit of *Peor*, to which Balak afterwards conducted Balaam (ver. 28), and where he not only saw the whole of the people, but could see distinctly the camps of the different tribes (chap. xxiv. 2). —Vers. 14b–17. Upon *Pisgah*, Balak and Balaam made the same preparations for a fresh revelation from God as upon *Bamoth-Baal* (vers. 1–6). הֵנָּה in ver. 15 does not mean “here” or “yonder,” but “so” or “thus,” as in every other case. The thought is this: “Do thou stay (*sc.* as thou art), and I will go and meet thus” (*sc.* in the manner required). אָקַרְרָה (I will go and meet) is a technical term here for going out for auguries (chap. xxiv. 1), or for a divine revelation.

Vers. 18–24. The second saying.—“Up, Balak, and hear! Hearken to me, son of Zippor!” סֹקֵךְ, “stand up,” is a call to mental elevation, to the perception of the word of God; for Balak was standing by his sacrifice (ver. 17). חֲזַקְנָה with עַד, as in Job xxxii. 11, signifies a hearing which presses forward to the speaker, *i.e.* in keen and minute attention (*Hengstenberg*). בָּנֵה, with the antiquated union vowel for יָד; see at Gen. i. 24.—Ver. 19. “God

is not a man, that He should lie ; nor a son of man, that He should repent : hath He said, and should He not do it ? and spoken, and should not carry it out ?"—Ver. 20. "*Behold, I have received to bless : and He hath blessed ; and I cannot turn it.*" Balaam meets Balak's expectation that he will take back the blessing that he has uttered, with the declaration, that God does not alter His purposes like changeable and fickle men, but keeps His word unalterably, and carries it into execution. The unchangeableness of the divine purposes is a necessary consequence of the unchangeableness of the divine nature. With regard to His own counsels, God repents of nothing ; but this does not prevent the repentance of God, understood as an anthropopathic expression, denoting the pain experienced by the love of God, on account of the destruction of its creatures (see at Gen. vi. 6, and Ex. xxxii. 14). The **וְ** before **אָמַן** (ver. 19) is the interrogative **וְ** (see Ges. § 100, 4). The two clauses of ver. 19b, "*Hath He spoken," etc., taken by themselves,* are no doubt of universal application ; but taken in connection with the context, they relate specially to what God had spoken through Balaam, in his first utterance with reference to Israel, as we may see from the more precise explanation in ver. 20, "*Behold, I have received to bless*" (**חִקְלָה**, taken, accepted), etc. **בְּנֵשֶׁב**, to lead back, to make a thing retrograde (Isa. xlivi. 13). Samuel afterwards refused Saul's request in these words of Balaam (ver. 19a), when he entreated him to revoke his rejection on the part of God (1 Sam. xv. 29).—Ver. 21. After this decided reversal of Balak's expectations, Balaam carried out still more fully the blessing which had been only briefly indicated in his first utterance. "*He beholds not wickedness in Jacob, and sees not suffering in Israel : Jehovah his God is with him, and the shout (jubilation) of a king in the midst of him.*" The subject in the first sentence is God (see Hab. i. 3, 13). God sees not **לֹשֶׁן**, worthlessness, wickedness, and **לֹאֲבָדָה**, tribulation, misery, as the consequence of sin, and therefore discovers no reason for cursing the nation. That this applied to the people solely by virtue of their calling as the holy nation of Jehovah, and consequently that there is no denial of the sin of individuals, is evident from the second hemistich, which expresses the thought of the first in a positive form : so that the words, "*Jehovah his God is with him,*" correspond to the words, "*He beholds not wickedness ;*" and "*the shout of a king in the midst of it,*" to His not seeing suffering. Israel therefore rejoiced in the blessing of God only so long as it remained faithful to the idea of its divine calling, and continued in

covenant fellowship with the Lord. So long the power of the world could do it no harm. The “shout of a king” in Israel is the rejoicing of Israel at the fact that Jehovah dwells and rules as King in the midst of it (cf. Ex. xv. 18; Deut. xxxiii. 5). Jehovah had manifested Himself as King, by leading them out of Egypt.—Ver. 22. “*God brings them out of Egypt; his strength is like that of a buffalo.*” **בָּנָה** is God as the strong, or mighty one. The participle **מִצְרַיָּם** is not used for the preterite, but designates the leading out as still going on, and lasting till the introduction into Canaan. The plural suffix, **וּ-**, is used *ad sensum*, with reference to Israel as a people. Because God leads them, they go forward with the strength of a buffalo. **תִּשְׁעַלְתָּם**, from **שָׁעַל**, to weary, signifies that which causes weariness, exertion, the putting forth of power; hence the fulness of strength, ability to make or bear exertions. **בָּuffalo** is the buffalo or wild ox, an indomitable animal, which is especially fearful on account of its horns (Job xxxix. 9–11; Deut. xxxiii. 17; Ps. xxii. 22).—Ver. 23. The fellowship of its God, in which Israel rejoiced, and to which it owed its strength, was an actual truth. “*For there is no augury in Jacob, and no divination in Israel. At the time it is spoken to Jacob, and to Israel what God doeth.*” **בְּ** does not mean, “so that, as an introduction to the sequel,” as Knobel supposes, but “*for*,” as a causal particle. The fact that Israel was not directed, like other nations, to the uncertain and deceitful instrumentality of augury and divination, but enjoyed in all its concerns the immediate revelation of its God, furnished the proof that it had its God in the midst of it, and was guided and endowed with power by God Himself. **בְּנֵי־צֶדֶק** and **בְּנֵי־יְהוָה**, *οἰωνισμός* and *μαντεία*, *augurium et divinatio* (LXX., Vulg.), were the two means employed by the heathen for looking into futurity. The former (see at Lev. xix. 26) was the unfolding of the future from signs in the phenomena of nature, and inexplicable occurrences in animal and human life; the latter, prophesying from a pretended or supposed revelation of the Deity within the human mind. **בְּעֵת**, “according to the time,” i.e. at the right time, God revealed His acts, His counsel, and His will to Israel in His word, which He had spoken at first to the patriarchs, and afterwards through Moses and the prophets. In this He revealed to His people in truth, and in a way that could not deceive, what the heathen attempted in vain to discover through augury and divination (cf. Deut. xviii. 14–19).¹—Ver. 24. Through

¹ “What is here affirmed of Israel, applies to the Church of all ages, and also to every individual believer. The Church of God knows from His word what

the power of its God, Israel was invincible, and would crush all its foes. “Behold, it rises up, a people like the lioness, and lifts itself up like the lion. It lies not down till it eats dust, and drinks the blood of the slain.” What the patriarch Jacob prophesied of Judah, the ruler among his brethren, in Gen. xlix. 9, Balaam here transfers to the whole nation, to put to shame all the hopes indulged by the Moabitish king of the conquest and destruction of Israel.

Chap. xxiii. 25—xxiv. 25. BALAAM’S LAST WORDS.—Vers. 25–30. Balak was not deterred, however, from making another attempt. At first, indeed, he exclaimed in indignation at these second sayings of Balaam : “Thou shalt neither curse it, nor even bless.” The double בְּ with נֵה signifies “neither—nor;” and the rendering, “if thou do not curse it, thou shalt not bless it,” must be rejected as untenable. In his vexation at the second failure, he did not want to hear anything more from Balaam. But when he replied again, that he had told him at the very outset that he could do nothing but what God should say to him (cf. chap. xxii. 38), he altered his mind, and resolved to conduct Balaam to another place with this hope : “peradventure it will please God that thou mayest curse me them from thence.” Clericus observes upon this passage, “It was the opinion of the heathen, that what was not obtained through the first, second, or third victim, might nevertheless be secured through a fourth ;” and he adduces proofs from Suetonius, Curtius, Gellius, and others.—Ver. 29. He takes the seer “to the top of Peor, which looks over the face of the desert” (*Jeshimon*: see at chap. xxi. 20), and therefore was nearer to the camp of the Israelites. Mount Peor was one peak of the northern part of the mountains of Abarim by the town of *Beth-peor*, which afterwards belonged to the Reubenites (Josh. xiii. 20), and opposite to which the Israelites were encamped in the steppes of Moab (Deut. iii. 29, iv. 46). According to Eusebius (*Onom. s. v. Φογώρ*), Peor was above *Libias* (i.e. *Bethharam*),¹ which was situated in the valley of the Jordan ; and according to the account given under

God does, and what it has to do in consequence. The wisdom of this world resembles augury and divination. The Church of God, which is in possession of His word, has no need of it, and it only leads its followers to destruction, from inability to discern the will of God. To discover this with certainty, is the great privilege of the Church of God” (*Hengstenberg*).

¹ Τπέρχεται δὲ τῆς υῦν Λιβιάδος καλουμένης. Jerome has “in supercilio Libiados.”

*Araboth Moab,*¹ it was close by the Arboth Moab, opposite to Jericho, on the way from Libias to Heshbon. *Peor* was about seven Roman miles from Heshbon, according to the account given *s. v. Danaba*; and *Beth-peor* (*s. v. Bethphozor*) was near Mount *Peor*, opposite to Jericho, six Roman miles higher than Libias, *i.e.* to the east of it (see *Hengstenberg, Balaam*, p. 538).—Vers. 29, 30. The sacrifices offered in preparation for this fresh transaction were the same as in the former cases (ver. 14, and vers. 1, 2).

Chap. xxiv. 1–9. The *third* saying.—Vers. 1 and 2. From the two revelations which he had received before, Balaam saw, *i.e.* perceived, that it pleased Jehovah to bless Israel. This induced him not to go out for auguries, as on the previous occasions. כִּי־עַתָּה־בְּעַתָּה, “as time after time,” *i.e.* as at former times (chap. xxiii. 3 and 15). He therefore turned his face to the desert, *i.e.* to the steppes of Moab, where Israel was encamped (chap. xxii. 1). And when he lifted up his eyes, “*he saw Israel encamping according to its tribes; and the Spirit of God came over him.*” The impression made upon him by the sight of the tribes of Israel, served as the subjective preparation for the reception of the Spirit of God to inspire him. Of both the earlier utterances it is stated that “Jehovah put a word into his mouth” (chap. xxiii. 5 and 16); but of this third it is affirmed that “the Spirit of God came over him.” The former were communicated to him, when he went out for a divine revelation, without his being thrown into an ecstatic state; he heard the voice of God within him telling him what he was to say. But this time, like the prophets in their prophesying, he was placed by the Spirit of God in a state of ecstatic sight; so that, with his eyes closed as in clairvoyance, he saw the substance of the revelation from God with his inward mental eye, which had been opened by the Spirit of God. Thus not only does he himself describe his own condition in vers. 3 and 4, but his description is in harmony with the announcement itself, which is manifestly the result both in form and substance of the intuition effected within him by the Spirit of God.—Vers. 3 and 4 contain the preface to the prophecy: “*The divine saying of Balaam the son of Beor, the divine saying of the man with closed eye, the divine saying of the hearer of divine words, who sees the vision of the Almighty, falling down and with opened eyes.*” For the participial noun בָּרוּךְ the meaning divine saying (*effatum, not inspiratum, Domini*) is undoubtedly established

¹ Καὶ ἦστι τόπος εἰς δεῦρο δεικνύμενος παρὰ τῷ ὄρε Φογώρ, ὁ παράπεπται ἀνιστῶν ἀπὸ Δεβιάδος ἐπὶ Ἐσσεβοὺς (i.e. Heshbon) τῆς Ἀραβίας ἀντικρὺ Ιεριχώ.

by the expression **בְּנֵי יִהְוָה**, which recurs in chap. xiv. 28 and Gen. xxii. 16, and is of constant use in the predictions of the prophets; and this applies even to the few passages where a human author is mentioned instead of Jehovah, such as vers. 3, 4, and 15, 16; also 2 Sam. xxiii. 1; Prov. xxx. 1; and Ps. xxxvi. 2, where a **בְּנֵי** is ascribed to the personified wickedness. Hence, when Balaam calls the following prophecy a **מֹשֶׁא**, this is done for the purpose of designating it as a divine revelation received from the Spirit of God. He had received it, and now proclaimed it as a man **עַמְּתַלְשָׁתְּ**, with closed eye. **מְתַלְשָׁתְּ** does not mean to open, a meaning in support of which only one passage of the *Mishnah* can be adduced, but to close, like **מְתַפֵּס** in Dan. viii. 26, and **מְתַלְשֵׁתְּ** in Lam. iii. 8, with the **וּ** softened into **וּ** or **וְ** (see *Roediger* in *Ges. thes.*, and *Dietrich's Hebrew Lexicon*). “Balaam describes himself as the man with closed eye with reference to his state of ecstasy, in which the closing of the outer senses went hand in hand with the opening of the inner” (*Hengstenberg*). The cessation of all perception by means of the outer senses, so far as self-conscious reflection is concerned, was a feature that was common to both the vision and the dream, the two forms in which the prophetic gift manifested itself (chap. xii. 6), and followed from the very nature of the inward intuition. In the case of prophets whose spiritual life was far advanced, inspiration might take place without any closing of the outward senses. But upon men like Balaam, whose inner religious life was still very impure and undeveloped, the Spirit of God could only operate by closing their outward senses to impressions from the lower earthly world, and raising them up to visions of the higher and spiritual world.¹ What Balaam heard in this ecstatic condition was **אֱמֶת וְשִׁיר**, the sayings of God, and what he saw **בְּרוּחָה שְׁמִינִית**, the vision of the Almighty. The Spirit of God came upon him with such power that he fell down (**נִפְלַא**), like Saul in 1 Sam. xix. 24; not merely “prostrating himself with reverential awe at seeing and hearing the things of God” (*Knobel*), but thrown to the ground by the Spirit of God, who “came like an armed man upon the seer,” and that in such a way that as he fell his (spirit’s)

¹ Hence, as *Hengstenberg* observes (Balaam, p. 449), we have to picture Balaam as giving utterance to his prophecies with the eyes of his body closed; though we cannot argue from the fact of his being in this condition, that an Isaiah would be in precisely the same. Compare the instructive information concerning analogous phenomena in the sphere of natural *mantik* and ecstasy in *Hengstenberg* (pp. 449 sqq.), and *Tholuck's Propheten*, pp. 49 sqq.

eyes were opened. This introduction to his prophecy is not an utterance of boasting vanity; but, as *Calvin* correctly observes, “the whole preface has no other tendency than to prove that he was a true prophet of God, and had received the blessing which he uttered from a celestial oracle.”

The blessing itself in vers. 5 sqq. contains two thoughts: (1) the glorious prosperity of Israel, and the exaltation of its kingdom (vers. 5-7); (2) the terrible power, so fatal to all its foes, of the people which was set to be a curse or a blessing to all the nations (vers. 8, 9).—Vers. 5-7. *“How beautiful are thy tents, O Jacob! thy dwellings, O Israel! Like valleys are they spread out, like gardens by the stream, like aloes which Jehovah has planted, like cedars by the waters. Water will flow out of his buckets, and his seed is by many waters. And loftier than Agag be his king, and his kingdom will be exalted.”* What Balaam had seen before his ecstasy with his bodily eyes, formed the substratum for his inward vision, in which the dwellings of Israel came before his mental eye adorned with the richest blessing from the Lord. The description starts, it is true, from the time then present, but it embraces the whole future of Israel. In the blessed land of Canaan the dwellings of Israel will spread out like valleys. נְחָלִים does not mean brooks here, but valleys watered by brooks. נַפְתָּה, to extend oneself, to stretch or spread out far and wide. Yea, “like gardens by the stream,” which are still more lovely than the grassy and flowery valleys with brooks. This thought is carried out still further in the two following figures. אֲהַלִּים are aloe-trees, which grow in the East Indies, in Siam, in Cochin China, and upon the Moluccas, and from which the aloe-wood was obtained, that was so highly valued in the preparation of incense, on account of its fragrance. As the aloes were valued for their fragrant smell, so the cedars were valued on account of their lofty and luxuriant growth, and the durability of their wood. The predicate, “which Jehovah hath planted,” corresponds, so far as the actual meaning is concerned, to עַל מִים, “by water;” for this was “an expression used to designate trees that, on account of their peculiar excellence, were superior to ordinary trees” (*Calvin*; cf. Ps. civ. 16).—Ver. 7. And not only its dwellings, but Israel itself would also prosper abundantly. It would have an abundance of water, that leading source of all blessing and prosperity in the burning East. The nation is personified as a man carrying two pails overflowing with water. קְלִי is the dual מִלְּנִים. The dual is generally used in connection with objects

which are arranged in pairs, either naturally or artificially (Ges. § 88, 2). “*His seed*” (*i.e.* his posterity, not his sowing corn, the introduction of which, in this connection, would, to say the least, be very feeble here) “*is*,” *i.e.* grows up, “*by many waters*,” that is to say, enjoys the richest blessings (comp. Deut. viii. 7 and xi. 10 with Isa. xliv. 4, lxv. 23). מֵלֶךְ (optative), “*his king be high before* (higher than) *Agag*.” *Agag* (אֲגָג, the fiery) is not the proper name of the Amalekite king defeated by Saul (1 Sam. xv. 8), but the title (*nomen dignitatis*) of the Amalekite kings in general, just as all the Egyptian kings had the common name of *Pharaoh*, and the Philistine kings the name of *Abimelech*.¹ The reason for mentioning the king of the Amalekites was, that he was selected as the impersonation of the enmity of the world against the kingdom of God, which culminated in the kings of the heathen; the Amalekites having been the first heathen tribe that attacked the Israelites on their journey to Canaan (Ex. xvii. 8). The introduction of one particular king would have been neither in keeping with the context, nor reconcilable with the general character of Balaam’s utterances. Both before and afterward, Balaam predicts in great general outlines the good that would come to Israel; and how is it likely that he would suddenly break off in the midst to compare the kingdom of Israel with the greatness of one particular king of the Amalekites? Even his fourth and last prophecy merely announces in great general terms the destruction of the different nations that rose up in hostility against Israel, without entering into special details, which, like the conquest of the Amalekites by Saul, had no material or permanent influence upon the attitude of the heathen towards the people of God; for after the defeat inflicted upon this tribe by Saul, they very speedily invaded the Israelitish territory again, and proceeded to plunder and lay it waste in just the same

¹ See *Hengstenberg* (Dissertations, ii. 250; and *Balaam*, p. 458). Even *Gesenius* could not help expressing some doubt about there being any reference in this prophecy to the event described in 1 Sam. xv. 8 sqq., “unless,” he says, “you suppose the name *Agag* to have been a name that was common to the kings of the Amalekites” (*thes.* p. 19). He also points to the name *Abimelech*, of which he says (p. 9): “It was the name of several kings in the land of the Philistines, as of the king of Gerar in the times of Abraham (Gen. xx. 2, 3, xxi. 22, 23), and of Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 1, 2), and also of the king of Gath in the time of David (Ps. xxxiv. 1; coll. 1 Sam. xxi. 10, where the same king is called *Achish*). It seems to have been the common name and title of those kings, as *Pharaoh* was of the early kings of Egypt, and *Cæsar* and *Augustus* of the emperors of Rome.”

manner as before (cf. 1 Sam. xxvii. 8, xxx. 1 sqq.; 2 Sam. viii. 12).¹ מֶלֶךְ, his king, is not any one particular king of Israel, but quite generally the king whom the Israelites would afterwards receive. For מלֶכְתּוֹ is substantially the same as the parallel מלָכַתּוֹ, the kingdom of Israel, which had already been promised to the patriarchs (Gen. xvii. 6, xxxv. 11), and in which the Israelites were first of all to obtain that full development of power which corresponded to its divine appointment; just as, in fact, the development of any people generally culminates in an organized kingdom.—The king of Israel, whose greatness was celebrated by Balaam, was therefore neither the Messiah exclusively, nor the earthly kingdom without the Messiah, but the kingdom of Israel that was established by David, and was exalted in the Messiah into an everlasting kingdom, the enemies of which would all be made its footstool (Ps. ii. and ex.).

In vers. 8 and 9, Balaam proclaims still further: “*God leads him out of Egypt; his strength is as that of a buffalo: he will devour nations his enemies, and crush their bones, and dash them in pieces with his arrows. He has encamped, he lies down like a lion, and like a lioness: who can drive him up? Blessed be they who bless thee, and cursed they who curse thee!*” The fulness of power that dwelt in the people of Israel was apparent in the force and prowess with which their God brought them out of Egypt. This fact Balaam repeats from the previous saying (chap. xxiii. 22), for the purpose of linking on to it the still further announcement of the manner in which the power of the nation would show itself upon its foes in time to come. The words, “he will devour nations,” call up the image of a lion, which is employed in ver. 9 to depict the indomitable heroic power of Israel, in words taken from Jacob’s blessing in Gen. xlix. 9. The *Piel* גָּמַן is a *denom.* verb from גָּמַן, with the meaning to destroy, crush the bones, like שָׁרֵט, to root out (cf. *Ges.* § 52, 2; *Ewald*, § 120, e.). חִזְיָה is not the object to יִמְחַזֵּן; for מְחַזֵּן, to dash to pieces, does not apply to arrows, which may be broken in pieces, but not dashed to pieces; and the singular suffix in חִזְיָה can only apply to the singular idea in the verse, i.e. to Israel, and not to

¹ Even on the supposition (which is quite at variance with the character of all the prophecies of Balaam) that in the name of Agag, the contemporary of Saul, we have a *vaticinium ex eventu*, the allusion to this particular king would be exceedingly strange, as the Amalekites did not perform any prominent part among the enemies of Israel in the time of Saul; and the command to exterminate them was given to Saul, not because of any special harm that they had done to Israel at that time, but on account of what they had done to Israel on their way out of Egypt (comp. 1 Sam. xv. 2 with Ex. xvii. 8).

its enemies, who are spoken of in the plural. *Arrows* are singled out as representing weapons in general.¹ Balaam closes this utterance, as he had done the previous one, with a quotation from Jacob's blessing, which he introduces to show to Balak, that, according to words addressed by Jehovah to the Israelites through their own tribe-father, they were to overcome their foes so thoroughly, that none of them should venture to rise up against them again. To this he also links on the word with which Isaac had transferred to Jacob in Gen. xxvii. 29 the blessing of Abraham in Gen. xii. 3, for the purpose of warning Balak to desist from his enmity against the chosen people of God.

Vers. 10-14. This repeated blessing of Israel threw Balak into such a violent rage, that he smote his hands together, and advised Balaam to fly to his house: adding, “*I said, I will honour thee greatly* (cf. xxii. 17 and 37); *but, behold, Jehovah has kept thee back from honour.*” “Smiting the hands together” was either a sign of horror (Lam. ii. 15) or of violent rage; it is in the latter sense that it occurs both here and in Job xxvii. 33. In the words, “*Jehovah hath kept thee back from honour,*” the irony with which Balak scoffs at Balaam's confidence in Jehovah is unmistakeable.—Ver. 12. But Balaam reminds him, on the other hand, of the declaration which he made to the messengers at the very outset (chap. xxii. 18), that he could not on any account speak in opposition to the command of Jehovah, and then adds, “*And now, behold, I go to my people. Come, I will tell thee advisedly what this people will do to thy people at the end of the days.*” יְמִינָה, to advise; here it denotes an announcement, which includes advice. The announcement of what Israel would do to the Moabites in the future, contains the advice to Balak, what attitude he should assume towards Israel, if this people was to bring a blessing upon his own people and not a curse. On “*the end of the days,*” see at Gen. xlvi. 1.

Vers. 15-24. Balaam's fourth and last prophecy is distinguished from the previous ones by the fact that, according to the announcement in ver. 14, it is occupied exclusively with the future, and foretells the victorious supremacy of Israel over all its foes, and the

¹ The difficulty which many feel in connection with the word יְמִינָה cannot be removed by alterations of the text. The only possible conjecture יְמִינָה (his loins) is wrecked upon the singular suffix, for the dashing to pieces of the loins of Israel is not for a moment to be thought of. Knobel's proposal, viz. to read יְמִינָה, has no support in Deut. xxxiii. 11, and is much too violent to reckon upon any approval.

destruction of all the powers of the world. This prophecy is divided into four different prophecies by the fourfold repetition of the words, “he took up his parable” (vers. 15, 20, 21, and 23). The *first* of these refers to the two nations that were related to Israel, viz. Edom and Moab (vers. 17–19); the *second* to Amalek, the arch-enemy of Israel (ver. 20); the *third* to the Kenites, who were allied to Israel (vers. 21 and 22); and the *fourth* proclaims the overthrow of the great powers of the world (vers. 23 and 24).—The introduction in vers. 15 and 16 is the same as that of the previous prophecy in vers. 3 and 4, except that the words, “*he which knew the knowledge of the Most High,*” are added to the expression, “*he that heard the words of God,*” to show that Balaam possessed the knowledge of the Most High, *i.e.* that the word of God about to be announced had already been communicated to him, and was not made known to him now for the first time; though without implying that he had received the divine revelation about to be uttered at the same time as those which he had uttered before.—Ver. 17. The prophecy itself commences with a picture from the “end of the days,” which rises up before the mental eye of the seer. “*I see Him, yet not now; I behold Him, but not nigh. A star appears out of Jacob, and a sceptre rises out of Israel, and dashes Moab in pieces on both sides, and destroys all the sons of confusion.*” The suffixes to אֶרְאָנָה and אֶשְׁׁרָאָה refer to the star which is mentioned afterwards, and which Balaam sees in spirit, but “not now,” *i.e.* not as having already appeared, and “not nigh,” *i.e.* not to appear immediately, but to come forth out of Israel in the far distant future. “A star is so natural an image and symbol of imperial greatness and splendour, that it has been employed in this sense in almost every nation. And the fact that this figure and symbol are so natural, may serve to explain the belief of the ancient world, that the birth and accession of great kings was announced by the appearance of stars” (*Hengstenberg*, who cites *Justini hist.* xxxvii. 2; *Plinii h. n.* ii. 23; *Sueton. Jul. Cæs.* c. 78; and *Dio Cass.* xlvi. p. 273). If, however, there could be any doubt that the rising star represented the appearance of a glorious ruler or king, it would be entirely removed by the parallel, “a sceptre arises out of Israel.” The sceptre, which was introduced as a symbol of dominion even in Jacob’s blessing (Gen. xlix. 10), is employed here as the figurative representation and symbol of the future ruler in Israel. This ruler would destroy all the enemies of Israel. *Moab* and (ver. 18) *Edom* are the first of these that are mentioned, viz. the two nations

that were related to Israel by descent, but had risen up in hostility against it at that time. Moab stands in the foremost rank, not merely because Balaam was about to announce to the king of Moab what Israel would do to his people in the future, but also because the hostility of the heathen to the people of God had appeared most strongly in Balak's desire to curse the Israelites. פָּאַתִּי מוֹאָב, “the two corners or sides of Moab,” equivalent to Moab on both sides, from one end to the other. For קְרֻרֵב, the *inf.* *Pilp.* of or קְרַר, the meaning to destroy is fully established by the parallel מְחַזֵּק, and by Isa. xxii. 5, whatever may be thought of its etymology and primary meaning. And neither the Samaritan text nor the passage in Isaiah (xlviii. 45), which is based upon this prophecy, at all warrants an alteration of the reading קְרֻרֵב into קְרַלְךָ (the crown of the head), since Jeremiah almost invariably uses earlier writings in this free manner, viz. by altering the expressions employed, and substituting in the place of unusual words either more common ones, or such as are similar in sound (cf. Küper, *Jerem. librор. ss. interpres atque vindex*, pp. xiii. sqq. and p. 43).—does not mean “all the sons of Seth,” i.e. all mankind, as the human race is never called by the name of Seth; and the idea that the ruler to arise out of Israel would destroy all men, would be altogether unsuitable. It signifies rather “all the sons of confusion,” by which, according to the analogy of Jacob and Israel (ver. 17), Edom and Seir (ver. 18), the Moabites are to be understood as being men of wild, warlike confusion. שָׁתֶּה is a contraction of שָׁאַתְּ (Lam. iii. 47), and derived from שָׁאָה; and in Jer. xlvi. 45 it is correctly rendered בְּנֵי שָׁאָה.¹

In the announcement of destruction which is to fall upon the enemies of Israel through the star and sceptre out of the midst of

¹ On the other hand, the rendering, “all the sons of the drinker, i.e. of Lot,” which Hiller proposed, and v. Hofmann and Kurtz have renewed, is evidently untenable. For, in the first place, the fact related in Gen. xix. 32 sqq. does not warrant the assumption that Lot ever received the name of the “drinker,” especially as the word used in Gen. xix. is not חַשְׁבָּן, but חַשְׁבָּן. Moreover, the allusion to “all the sons of Lot,” i.e. the Moabites and Ammonites, neither suits the thoroughly synonymous parallelism in the saying of Balaam, nor corresponds to the general character of his prophecies, which announced destruction primarily only to those nations that rose up in hostility against Israel, viz. Moab, Edom, and Amalek, whereas hitherto the Ammonites had not assumed either a hostile or friendly attitude towards them. And lastly, all the nations doomed to destruction are mentioned by name. Now the Ammonites were not a branch of the Moabites by descent, nor was their territory enclosed within the Moabitish territory, so that it could be included, as Hofmann supposes, within the “four corners of Moab.”

it, Moab is followed by “its southern neighbour Edom.”—Ver. 18. “*And Edom becomes a possession, and Seir becomes a possession, its enemies ; but Israel acquires power.*” Whose possession Edom and Seir are to become, is not expressly stated ; but it is evident from the context, and from אֶנְבָּיִת (its enemies), which is not a genitive dependent upon *Seir*, but is in apposition to *Edom* and *Seir*, just as צַדְקָה in ver. 8 is in apposition to גְּזָעָה. Edom and Seir were his, i.e. Israel’s enemies ; therefore they were to be taken by the ruler who was to arise out of Israel. *Edom* is the name of the people, *Seir* of the country, just as in Gen. xxxii. 4 ; so that *Seir* is not to be understood as relating to the præ-Edomitish population of the land, which had been subjugated by the descendants of Esau, and had lost all its independence a long time before. In Moses’ days the Israelites were not allowed to fight with the Edomites, even when they refused to allow them to pass peaceably through their territory (see chap. xx. 21), but were commanded to leave them in their possessions as a brother nation (Deut. ii. 4, 5). In the future, however, their relation to one another was to be a very different one ; because the hostility of Edom, already in existence, grew more and more into obstinate and daring enmity, which broke up all the ties of affection that Israel was to regard as holy, and thus brought about the destruction of the Edomites.—The fulfilment of this prophecy commenced with the subjugation of the Edomites by David (2 Sam. viii. 14 ; 1 Kings xi. 15, 16 ; 1 Chron. xviii. 12, 13), but it will not be completed till “the end of the days,” when all the enemies of God and His Church will be made the footstool of Christ (Ps. cx. 1 sqq.). That David did not complete the subjugation of Edom is evident, on the one hand, from the fact that the Edomites revolted again under Solomon, though without success (1 Kings xi. 14 sqq.) ; that they shook off the yoke imposed upon them under Joram (2 Kings viii. 20) ; and notwithstanding their defeat by Amaziah (2 Kings xiv. 7 ; 2 Chron. xxv. 11) and Uzziah (2 Kings xiv. 22 ; 2 Chron. xxvi. 2), invaded Judah a second time under Ahaz (2 Chron. xxviii. 17), and afterwards availed themselves of every opportunity to manifest their hostility to the kingdom of Judah and the Jews generally,—as for example at the conquest of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans (Ezek. xxxv. 15, xxxvi. 5 ; Obad. 10 and 13), and in the wars between the Maccabees and the Syrians (1 Macc. v. 3, 65 ; 2 Macc. x. 15, xii. 38 sqq.),—until they were eventually conquered by John Hyrcanus in the year B.C. 129, and compelled to submit to circumcision, and incorporated in

the Jewish state (*Josephus, Ant.* xiii. 9, 1, xv. 7, 9; *Wars of the Jews*, iv. 5, 5). But notwithstanding this, they got the government over the Jews into their own hands through *Antipater* and *Herod* (*Josephus, Ant.* xiv. 8, 5), and only disappeared from the stage of history with the destruction of the Jewish state by the Romans. On the other hand, the declarations of the prophets (Amos ix. 12; Obad. 17 sqq.), which foretell, with an unmistakeable allusion to this prophecy, the possession of the remnant of Edom by the kingdom of Israel, and the announcements in Isa. xxxiv. and lxiii. 1-6, Jer. xlxi. 7 sqq., Ezek. xxv. 12 sqq. and 35, comp. with Ps. cxxxvii. 7 and Lam. iv. 21, 22, prove still more clearly that Edom, as the leading foe of the kingdom of God, will only be utterly destroyed when the victory of the latter over the hostile power of the world has been fully and finally secured.—Whilst Edom falls, Israel will acquire power. **לְעִשֵּׂה חַיָּה**, to acquire ability or power (Deut. viii. 17, 18; Ruth iv. 11), not merely to show itself brave or strong. It is rendered correctly by *Onkelos*, “prosperabitur in opibus;” and *Jonathan*, “prævalebunt in opibus et possidebunt eos.”—Ver. 19. “And a ruler shall come out of Jacob, and destroy what is left out of cities.” The subject to **לֹא** is indefinite, and to be supplied from the verb itself. We have to think of the ruler foretold as star and sceptre. The abbreviated form **וְיַהֲיֵה** is not used for the future **יְהַיֵּה**, but is jussive in its force. One out of Jacob shall rule. **כַּיְמִיר** is employed in a collected and general sense, as in Ps. lxxii. 16. Out of every city in which there is a remnant of Edom, it shall be destroyed. **שְׁרִיד** is equivalent to **שְׁאָרֶת אֶזְזָם** (Amos ix. 12). The explanation, “destroy the remnant out of the city, namely, out of the holy city of Jerusalem” (*Ewald* and *Baur*), is forced, and cannot be sustained from the parallelism.

Ver. 20. The second saying in this prophecy relates to the *Amalekites*. Balaam sees them, not with the eyes of his body, but in a state of ecstasy, like the star out of Jacob. “*Beginning of the heathen is Amalek, and its end is destruction.*” Amalek is called the beginning of the nations, not “as belonging to the most distinguished and foremost of the nations in age, power, and celebrity” (*Knobel*), —for in all these respects this Bedouin tribe, which descended from a grandson of Esau, was surpassed by many other nations,—but as the first heathen nation which opened the conflict of the heathen nations against Israel as the people of God (see at Ex. xvii. 8 sqq.). As its beginning had been enmity against Israel, its end would be “even to the perishing” (**עַד אֶבֶן**), *i.e.* reaching the position of one

who was perishing, falling into destruction, which commenced under Saul and was completed under Hezekiah (see vol. i. p. 324).

Vers. 21 and 22. The third *saying* relates to the *Kenites*, whose origin is involved in obscurity (see at Gen. xv. 19), as there are no other Kenites mentioned in the whole of the Old Testament, with the exception of Gen. xv. 19, than the Kenites who went to Canaan with Hobab the brother-in-law of Moses (chap. x. 29 sqq.: see Judg. i. 16, iv. 11; 1 Sam. xv. 6, xxvii. 10, xxx. 29); so that there are not sufficient grounds for the distinction between Canaanitish and Midianitish Kenites, as *Michælis*, *Hengstenberg*, and others suppose. The hypothesis that Balaam is speaking of Canaanitish Kenites, or of the Kenites as representatives of the Canaanites, is as unfounded as the hypothesis that by the Kenites we are to understand the Midianites, or that the Kenites mentioned here and in Gen. xv. 19 are a branch of the supposed aboriginal Amalekites (*Ewald*). The saying concerning the Kenites runs thus: “*Durable is thy dwelling-place, and thy nest laid upon the rock; for should Kain be destroyed until Asshur shall carry thee captive?*” This saying “applies to friends and not to foes of Israel” (v. *Hofmann*), so that it is perfectly applicable to the Kenites, who were friendly with Israel. The antithetical association of the Amalekites and Kenites answers perfectly to the attitude assumed at Horeb towards Israel, on the one hand by the Amalekites, and on the other hand by the Kenites, in the person of Jethro the leader of their tribe (see Ex. xvii. 8 sqq., xviii., and vol. ii. p. 83). The dwelling-place of the Kenites was of lasting duration, because its nest was laid upon a rock (שָׁבֵן) is a passive participle, as in 2 Sam. xiii. 32, and Obad. 4). This description of the dwelling-place of the Kenites cannot be taken literally, because it cannot be shown that either the Kenites or the Midianites dwelt in inaccessible mountains, as the Edomites are said to have done in Obad. 3, 4; Jer. xlix. 16. The words are to be interpreted figuratively, and in all probability the figure is taken from the rocky mountains of Horeb, in the neighbourhood of which the Kenites led a nomade life before their association with Israel (see at Ex. iii. 1). As v. *Hofmann* correctly observes: “Kain, which had left its inaccessible mountain home in Horeb, enclosed as it was by the desert, to join a people who were only wandering in search of a home, by that very act really placed its rest upon a still safer rock.” This is sustained in ver. 22 by the statement that Kain would not be given up to destruction till Asshur carried it away into captivity. בַּי אֶם does not mean “nevertheless.”

It signifies “*unless*” after a negative clause, whether the negation be expressed directly by נִכְנָה, or indirectly by a question; and “*only*” where it is not preceded by either a direct or an indirect negation, as in Gen. xl. 14; Job xlvi. 8. The latter meaning, however, is not applicable here, because it is unsuitable to the עַד־מֵתָה (until) which follows. Consequently מִנֶּה can only be understood in the sense of “is it that,” as in 1 Kings i. 27, Isa. xxix. 16, Job xxxi. 16, etc., and as introducing an indirect query in a negative sense: “For is it (the case) that Kain shall fall into destruction until . . . ?”—equivalent to “Kain shall not be exterminated until Asshur shall carry him away into captivity;” Kain will only be overthrown by the Assyrian imperial power. *Kain*, the tribe-father, is used poetically for the *Kenite*, the tribe of which he was the founder. רַבֵּבָה, to exterminate, the sense in which it frequently occurs, as in Deut. xiii. 6, xvii. 7, etc. (cf. 2 Sam. iv. 11; 1 Kings xxii. 47).—For the fulfilment of this prophecy we are not to look merely to the fact that one branch of the Kenites, which separated itself, according to Judg. iv. 11, from its comrades in the south of Judah, and settled in Naphtali near Kadesh, was probably carried away into captivity by Tiglath-Pileser along with the population of Galilee (2 Kings xv. 29); but the name Asshur, as the name of the first great kingdom of the world, which rose up from the east against the theocracy, is employed, as we may clearly see from ver. 24, to designate all the powers of the world which took their rise in Asshur, and proceeded forth from it (see also Ezra vi. 22, where the Persian king is still called king of *Asshur* or *Assyria*). Balaam did not foretell that this worldly power would oppress Israel also, and lead it into captivity, because the oppression of the Israelites was simply a transitory judgment, which served to refine the nation of God and not to destroy it, and which was even appointed according to the counsel of God to open and prepare the way for the conquest of the kingdoms of the world by the kingdom of God. To the Kenites only did the captivity become a judgment of destruction; because, although on terms of friendship with the people of Israel, and outwardly associated with them, yet, as is clearly shown by 1 Sam. xv. 6, they never entered inwardly into fellowship with Israel and Jehovah’s covenant of grace, but sought to maintain their own independence side by side with Israel, and thus forfeited the blessing of God which rested upon Israel.¹

¹ This simple but historically established interpretation completely removes the objection, “that Balaam could no more foretell destruction to the friends of

Vers. 23, 24. The fourth saying applies to Asshur, and is introduced by an exclamation of woe: “*Woe! who will live, when God sets this! And ships (come) from the side of Chittim, and press Asshur, and press Eber, and he also perishes.*” The words “Woe, who will live,” point to the fearfulness of the following judgment, which went deep to the heart of the seer, because it would fall upon the sons of his own people (see at chap. xxii. 5). The meaning is, “Who will preserve his life in the universal catastrophe that is coming?” (*Hengstenberg.*) מִתְמַשֵּׁב, either “since the setting of it,” equivalent to “from the time when God sets (determines) this” (*ὅταν θῇ ταῦτα ὁ Θεός, quando faciet ista Deus; LXX., Vulg.*), or “on account of the setting of it,” i.e. because God determines this. מִשֵּׁב, to set, applied to that which God establishes, ordains, or brings to pass, as in Isa. xliv. 7; Hab. i. 12. The suffix in מִשֵּׁב is not to be referred to Asshur, as *Knobel* supposes, because the prophecy relates not to Asshur “as the mighty power by which everything was crushed and overthrown,” but to a power that would come from the far west and crush Asshur itself. The suffix refers rather to the substance of the prophecy that follows, and is to be understood in a neuter sense. הָנֶס is “God,” and not an abbreviation of הָנֶסֶת, which is always written with the article in the Pentateuch (הָנֶסֶת, Gen. xix. 8, 25, xxvi. 3, 4; Lev. xviii. 27; Deut. iv. 42, vii. 22, xix. 11), and only occurs once without the article, viz. in 1 Chron. xx. 8. מִים, from מִם (Isa. xxxiii. 21), signifies ships, like מִים in the passage in Dan. xi. 30, which is founded upon the prophecy before us. מִן־בְּנֵי־קְύַפִּים, from the side, as in Ex. ii. 5, Deut. ii. 37, etc. בְּנֵי־קְύִפִּים is Cyprus with the capital *Citium* (see at Gen. x. 4), which is mentioned as intervening between Greece and Phœnicia, and the principal station for the maritime commerce of Phœnicia, so that all the fleets passing from the west to the east necessarily took Cyprus in their way (Isa. xxiii. 1). The nations that would come across the sea from the side of Cyprus to humble Asshur, are not mentioned by name, because this lay beyond the range of Balaam’s vision. He simply gives utterance to the thought, “A power comes from Chittim over the sea, to which Asshur and Eber, the eastern and the western Shem, will both succumb” (*v. Hofmann*). *Eber* neither refers to the Israelites merely as Hebrews (*LXX.*,

Israel than to Israel itself,” by which *Kurtz* would preclude the attempt to refer this prophecy to the Kenites, who were in alliance with Israel. His further objections to *v. Hofmann*’s view are either inconclusive, or at any rate do not affect the explanation that we have given.

Vulg.), nor to the races beyond the Euphrates, as *Onkelos* and others suppose, but, like “all the sons of Eber” in Gen. x. 21, to the posterity of Abraham who descended from Eber through Peleg, and also to the descendants of Eber through Joktan: so that *Asshur*, as the representative of the Shemites who dwelt in the far east, included Elam within itself; whilst *Eber*, on the other hand, represented the western Shemites, the peoples that sprang from Arphaxad, Lud, and Aram (Gen. x. 21). “*And he also shall perish for ever:*” these words cannot relate to Asshur and Eber, for their fate is already announced in the word *בּוּי* (afflict, press), but only to the new western power that was to come over the sea, and to which the others were to succumb. “Whatever powers might rise up in the world of peoples, the heathen prophet of Jehovah sees them all fall, one through another, and one after another; for at last he loses in the distance the power to discern whence it is that the last which he sees rise up is to receive its fatal blow” (*v. Hofmann*, p. 520). The overthrow of this ‘last power of the world, concerning which the prophet Daniel was the first to receive and proclaim new revelations, belongs to “the end of the days,” in which the star out of Jacob is to rise upon Israel as a “bright morning star” (*Rev. xxii. 16*).

Now if according to this the fact is firmly established, that in this last prophecy of Balaam, “the judgment of history even upon the imperial powers of the *West*, and the final victory of the King of the kingdom of God were proclaimed, though in fading outlines, more than a thousand years before the events themselves,” as *Tholuck* has expressed it in his *Propheten und ihre Weissagung*; the announcement of the star out of Jacob, and the sceptre out of Israel, *i.e.* of the King and Ruler of the kingdom of God, who was to dash Moab to pieces and take possession of Edom, cannot have received its complete fulfilment in the victories of David over these enemies of Israel; but will only be fully accomplished in the future overthrow of all the enemies of the kingdom of God. By the “end of days,” both here and everywhere else, we are to understand the Messianic era, and that not merely at its commencement, but in its entire development, until the final completion of the kingdom of God at the return of our Lord to judgment. In the “star out of Jacob,” Balaam beholds not David as the one king of Israel, but the Messiah, in whom the royalty of Israel promised to the patriarchs (Gen. xvii. 6, 16, xxxv. 11) attains its fullest realization. The star and sceptre are symbols not of “Israel’s royalty personified”

(*Hengstenberg*), but of the real King in a concrete form, as He was to arise out of Israel at a future day. It is true that Israel received the promised King in David, who conquered and subjugated the Moabites, Edomites, and other neighbouring nations that were hostile to Israel. But in the person of David and his rule the kingly government of Israel was only realized in its first and imperfect beginnings. Its completion was not attained till the coming of the second David (*Hos. iii. 5; Jer. xxx. 9; Ezek. xxxiv. 24, xxxvii. 24, 25*), the Messiah Himself, who breaks in pieces all the enemies of Israel, and founds an everlasting kingdom, to which all the kingdoms and powers of this world are to be brought into subjection (*2 Sam vii. 12–16; Ps. ii., lxxii., and cx.*).¹

If, however, the star out of Jacob first rose upon the world in Christ, the star which showed the wise men from the east the way to the new-born “King of the Jews,” and went before them, till it stood above the manger at Bethlehem (*Matt. ii. 1–11*), is intimately related to our prophecy. Only we must not understand the allusion as being so direct, that Balaam beheld the very star which appeared to the wise men, and made known to them the birth of the Saviour of the world. The star of the wise men was rather an embodiment of the star seen by Balaam, which announced to them the fulfilment of Balaam’s prophecy,—a visible sign by which God revealed to them the fact, that the appearance of the star which

¹ The application of the star out of Jacob to the Messiah is to be found even in *Onkelos*; and this interpretation was so widely spread among the Jews, that the pseudo-Messiah who arose under Hadrian, and whom even *R. Akiba* acknowledged, took the name of *Bar Cochba* (son of a star), in consequence of this prophecy, from which the nickname of *Bar Coziba* (son of a lie) was afterwards formed, when he had submitted to the Romans, with all his followers. In the Christian Church also the Messianic explanation was the prevalent one, from the time of *Justin* and *Irenæus* onwards (see the proofs in *Calovii Bibl. ad h. l.*), although, according to a remark of *Theodore* (*qu. 44 ad Num.*), there were some who did not adopt it. The exclusive application of the passage to David was so warmly defended, first of all by *Grotius*, and still more by *Verschuir*, that even *Hengstenberg* and *Tholuck* gave up the Messianic interpretation. But they both of them came back to it afterwards, the former in his “Balaam” and the second edition of his Christology, and the latter in his treatise on “the Prophets.” At the present time the Messianic character of the prophecy is denied by none but the supporters of the more vulgar rationalism, such as *Knobel* and others; whereas *G. Baur* (in his History of Old Testament Prophecy) has no doubt that the prediction of the star out of Jacob points to the exalted and glorious King, filled with the Holy Spirit, whom *Isaiah* (ch. ix. 5, xi. 1 sqq.) and *Micah* (v. 2) expected as the royal founder of the theocracy. *Reinke* gives a complete history of the interpretation of this passage in his *Beiträge*, iv. 186 sqq.

Balaam beheld in the far distant future had been realized at Bethlehem in the birth of Christ, the King of the Jews.—The “wise men from the east,” who had been made acquainted with the revelations of God to Israel by the Jews of the *diaspora*, might feel themselves specially attracted in their search for the salvation of the world by the predictions of Balaam, from the fact that this seer belonged to their own country, and came “out of the mountains of the east” (ch. xxiii. 7); so that they made his sayings the centre of their expectations of salvation, and were also conducted through them to the Saviour of all nations by means of supernatural illumination. “God unfolded to their minds, which were already filled with a longing for the ‘star out of Jacob’ foretold by Balaam, the meaning of the star which proclaimed the fulfilment of Balaam’s prophecy; He revealed to them, that is to say, the fact that it announced the birth of the ‘King of the Jews.’ And just as Balaam had joyously exclaimed, ‘I see Him,’ and ‘I behold Him,’ they also could say, ‘We have seen His star’” (*Hengstenberg*).

If, in conclusion, we compare Balaam’s prophecy of the star that would come out of Jacob, and the sceptre that would rise out of Israel, with the prediction of the patriarch Jacob, of the sceptre that should not depart from Judah, till the *Shiloh* came whom the nations would obey (Gen. xlix. 10), it is easy to observe that Balaam not only foretold more clearly the attitude of Israel to the nations of the world, and the victory of the kingdom of God over every hostile kingdom of the world; but that he also proclaimed the Bringer of Peace expected by Jacob at the end of the days to be a mighty ruler, whose sceptre would break in pieces and destroy all the enemies of the nation of God. The tribes of Israel stood before the mental eye of the patriarch in their full development into the nation in which all the families of the earth were to be blessed. From this point of view, the salvation that was to blossom in the future for the children of Israel culminated in the peaceful kingdom of the *Shiloh*, in whom the dominion of the victorious lion out of Judah was to attain its fullest perfection. But the eye of Balaam, the seer, which had been opened by the Spirit of God, beheld the nation of Israel encamped, according to its tribes, in the face of its foes, the nations of this world. They were endeavouring to destroy Israel; but according to the counsel of the Almighty God and Lord of the whole world, in their warfare against the nation that was blessed of Jehovah, they were to succumb one after

the other, and be destroyed by the king that was to arise out of Israel. This determinate counsel of the living God was to be proclaimed by Balaam, the heathen seer out of Mesopotamia the centre of the national development of the ancient world : and, first of all, to the existing representatives of the nations of the world that were hostile to Israel, that they might see what would at all times tend to their peace—might see, that is to say, that in their hostility to Israel they were rebelling against the Almighty God of heaven and earth, and that they would assuredly perish in the conflict, since life and salvation were only to be found with the people of Israel, whom God had blessed. And even though Balaam had to make known the purpose of the Lord concerning His people primarily, and in fact solely, to the Moabites and their neighbours, who were like-minded with them, his announcement was also intended for Israel itself, and was to be a pledge to the congregation of Israel for all time of the certain fulfilment of the promises of God ; and so to fill them with strength and courage, that in all their conflicts with the powers of this world, they should rely upon the Lord their God with the firmest confidence of faith, should strive with unwavering fidelity after the end of their divine calling, and should build up the kingdom of God on earth, which is to outlast all the kingdoms of the world.—In what manner the Israelites became acquainted with the prophecies of Balaam, so that Moses could incorporate them into the *Thorah*, we are nowhere told, but we can infer it with tolerable certainty from the subsequent fate of Balaam himself.

Ver. 25. At the close of this announcement Balaam and Balak departed from one another. “*Balaam rose up, and went and turned towards his place*” (*i.e.* set out on the way to his house); “*and king Balak also went his way.*” שָׁבַע מִצְרָיִם does not mean, “he returned to his place,” into his home beyond the Euphrates (equivalent to יְמִינֵי אֶלְכָלָמָן), but merely “he turned towards his place” (both here and in Gen. xviii. 33). That he really returned home, is not implied in the words themselves; and the question, whether he did so, must be determined from other circumstances. In the further course of the history, we learn that Balaam went to the Midianites, and advised them to seduce the Israelites to unfaithfulness to Jehovah, by tempting them to join in the worship of Peor (chap. xxxi. 16). He was still with them at the time when the Israelites engaged in the war of vengeance against that people, and was slain by the Israelites along with the five princes of Midian (chap. xxxi. 8;

Josh. xiii. 22). At the time when he fell into the hands of the Israelites, he no doubt made a full communication to the Israelitish general, or to Phinehas, who accompanied the army as priest, concerning his blessings and prophecies, probably in the hope of saving his life ; though he failed to accomplish his end.¹

WHOREDOM OF ISRAEL, AND ZEAL OF PHINEHAS.—CHAP. XXV.

Vers. 1-5. The Lord had defended His people Israel from Balaam's curse ; but the Israelites themselves, instead of keeping the covenant of their God, fell into the snares of heathen seduction (vers. 1, 2). Whilst encamped at Shittim, in the steppes of Moab; the people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab : they accepted the invitations of the latter to a sacrificial festival of their gods, took part in their sacrificial meals, and even worshipped the gods of the Moabites, and indulged in the licentious worship of *Baal-Peor*. As the princes of Midian, who were allied to Moab, had been the advisers and assistants of the Moabitish king in the attempt to destroy the Israelites by a curse of God ; so now, after the failure of that plan, they were the soul of the new undertaking to weaken Israel and render it harmless, by seducing it to idolatry, and thus leading it into apostasy from its God. But it was Balaam, as is afterwards casually observed in chap. xxxi. 16, who first of all gave this advice. This is passed over here, because the point of chief importance in relation to the object of the narrative, was not Balaam's share in the proposal, but the carrying out of the proposal itself. The daughters of Moab, however, also took part in carrying it out, by forming friendly associations with the Israelites, and then inviting them to their sacrificial festival. They only are mentioned in vers. 1, 2, as being the daughters of the land. The participation of the Midianites appears first of all in the shameless licentiousness of *Cozbi*, the daughter of the Midianitish prince, from which we not only see that the princes of Midian performed their

¹ It is possible, however, as *Hengstenberg* imagines, that after Balaam's departure from Balak, he took his way into the camp of the Israelites, and there made known his prophecies to Moses or to the elders of Israel, in the hope of obtaining from them the reward which Balak had withheld, and that it was not till after his failure to obtain full satisfaction to his ambition and covetousness here, that he went to the Midianites, to avenge himself upon the Israelites, by the proposals that he made to them. The objections made by *Kurtz* to this conjecture are not strong enough to prove that it is inadmissible, though the possibility of the thing does not involve either its probability or its certainty.

part, but obtain an explanation of the reason why the judgment upon the crafty destroyers of Israel was to be executed upon the Midianites.¹ *Shittim*, an abbreviation of *Abel-Shittim* (see at chap. xxii. 1), to which the camp of the Israelites in the steppes of Moab reached (chap. xxxiii. 49), is mentioned here instead of *Arboth-Moab*, because it was at this northern point of the camp that the Israelites came into contact with the Moabites, and that the latter invited them to take part in their sacrificial meals; and in Josh. ii. 1 and iii. 1, because it was from this spot that the Israelites commenced the journey to Canaan, as being the nearest to the place where they were to pass through the Jordan. נִנְחָה, construed with חֲשַׁבָּה, as in Ezek. xvi. 28, signifies to incline to a person, to attach one's self to him, so as to commit fornication. The word applies to carnal and spiritual whoredom. The lust of the flesh induced the Israelites to approach the daughters of Moab, and form acquaintances and friendships with them, in consequence of which they were invited by them "to the slain-offerings of their gods," i.e. to the sacrificial festivals and sacrificial meals, in connection with which they also "adored their gods," i.e. took part in the idolatrous worship connected with the sacrificial festival. These sacrificial meals were celebrated in honour of the Moabitish god *Baal-Peor*, so that the Israelites joined themselves to him. נִבְזֵץ, in the *Niphal*, to bind one's self to a person. *Baal-Peor* is the *Baal* of *Peor*, who was worshipped in the city of *Beth-Peor* (Deut. iii. 29, iv. 46; see at chap. xxiii. 28), a Moabitish *Priapus*, in honour of whom women and virgins prostituted themselves. As the god of war, he was called *Chemosh* (see at chap. xxi. 29).—Vers. 3-5. And the anger of the Lord burned against the people, so that Jehovah commanded Moses to fetch the heads of the people, i.e. to assemble them together, and to "hang up" the men who had joined themselves to Baal-Peor "before the Lord against the sun," that the anger of God might turn away from Israel. The burning of the wrath of God, which was to be turned away from the people by the punishment of the

¹ Consequently there is no discrepancy between vers. 1-5 and 6-18, to warrant the violent hypothesis of *Knobel*, that there are two different accounts mixed together in this chapter,—an Elohist account in vers. 6-18, of which the commencement has been dropped, and a Jehovahistic account in vers. 1-5, of which the latter part has been cut off. The particular points adduced in proof of this fall to the ground, when the history is correctly explained; and such assertions as these, that the name *Shittim* and the allusion to the judges in ver. 5, and to the wrath of Jehovah in vers. 3 and 4, are foreign to the Elohist, are not proofs, but empty assumptions.

guilty, as enjoined upon Moses, consisted, as we may see from vers. 8, 9, in a plague inflicted upon the nation, which carried off a great number of the people, a sudden death, as in chap. xiv. 37, xvii. 11. עִקָּרִים, from עַקְתַּה, to be torn apart or torn away (*Ges., Winer*), refers to the punishment of crucifixion, a mode of capital punishment which was adopted by most of the nations of antiquity (see *Winer, bibl. R. W.* i. p. 680), and was carried out sometimes by driving a stake into the body, and so impaling them (ἀνασκολοπίζειν), the mode practised by the Assyrians and Persians (*Herod.* iii. 159, and *Layard's Nineveh and its Remains*, vol. ii. p. 374, and plate on p. 369), at other times by fastening them to a stake or nailing them to a cross (ἀνασταυροῦν). In the instance before us, however, the idolaters were not impaled or crucified alive, but, as we may see from the word קָרְבָּנָה in ver. 5, and in accordance with the custom frequently adopted by other nations (see *Herzog's Encyclopædia*), they were first of all put to death, and then impaled upon a stake or fastened upon a cross, so that the impaling or crucifixion was only an aggravation of the capital punishment, like the burning in Lev. xx. 14, and the hanging (נֶלֶךְ) in Deut. xxi. 22. The rendering adopted by the LXX. and *Vulgate* is παραδειγματίζειν, suspendere, in this passage, and in 2 Sam. xxi. 6, 9, ἐξηλιάζειν (to expose to the sun), and crucifigere. נִתְנַדֵּן, for Jehovah, as satisfaction for Him, *i.e.* to appease His wrath. מְנֻנָּא (them) does not refer to the heads of the nation, but to the guilty persons, upon whom the heads of the nation were to pronounce sentence.—Ver. 5. The judges were to put to death every one his men, *i.e.* such of the evil-doers as belonged to his forum, according to the judicial arrangements instituted in Ex. xviii. This command of Moses to the judges was not carried out, however, because the matter took a different turn.

Vers. 6-9. Whilst the heads of the people were deliberating on the subject, and the whole congregation was assembled before the tabernacle, weeping on account of the divine wrath, there came an Israelite, a prince of the tribe of Simeon, who brought a Midianitish woman, the daughter of a Midianitish chief (ver. 14), to his brethren, *i.e.* into the camp of the Israelites, before the eyes of Moses and all the congregation, to commit adultery with her in his tent. This shameless wickedness, in which the depth of the corruption that had penetrated into the congregation came to light, inflamed the zeal of *Phinehas*, the son of Eleazar the high priest, to such an extent, that he seized a spear, and rushing into the tent of

the adulterer, pierced both of them through in the very act. הַקְבִּיבָה, lit. the arched, or arch, is applied here to the inner or hinder division of the tent, the sleeping-room and women's room in the larger tents of the upper classes.—Vers. 8, 9. Through this judgment, which was executed by Phinehas with holy zeal upon the daring sinners, the plague was restrained, so that it came to an end. The example which Phinehas had made of these sinners was an act of intercession, by which the high priest appeased the wrath of God, and averted the judgment of destruction from the whole congregation (“he was zealous for his God,” גָּזָל, ver. 13). The thought upon which this expression is founded is, that the punishment which was inflicted as a purifying chastisement served as a “covering” against the exterminating judgment (see Herzog's Cyclopædia).¹—Ver. 9. Twenty-four thousand men were killed by this plague. The Apostle Paul deviates from this statement in 1 Cor. x. 8, and gives the number of those that fell as twenty-three thousand, probably from a traditional interpretation of the schools of the scribes, according to which a thousand were deducted from the twenty-four thousand who perished, as being the number of those who were hanged by the judges, so that only twenty-three thousand would be killed by the plague; and it is to these alone that Paul refers.

Vers. 10–15. For this act of divine zeal the eternal possession of the priesthood was promised to Phinehas and his posterity as Jehovah's covenant of peace. בְּקַנְתִּי, by displaying my zeal in the midst of them (viz. the Israelites). קָנָתִי is not “zeal for me,” but “my zeal,” the zeal of Jehovah with which Phinehas was filled, and impelled to put the daring sinners to death. By doing this he had averted destruction from the Israelites, and restrained the working of Jehovah's zeal, which had manifested itself in the plague. “I gave him my covenant of peace” (the suffix is attached to the governing noun, as in Lev. vi. 3). נָתַן בְּרִית, as in Gen. xvii. 2, to give, i.e. to fulfil the covenant, to grant what was promised in the covenant. The covenant granted to Phinehas consisted in the fact, that an “eternal priesthood” (i.e. the eternal possession of the

¹ Upon this act of Phinehas, and the similar examples of Samuel (1 Sam. xv. 33) and Mattathias (1 Macc. ii. 24), the later Jews erected the so-called “zealot right,” *jus zelotarum*, according to which any one, even though not qualified by his official position, possessed the right, in cases of any daring contempt of the theocratic institutions, or any daring violation of the honour of God, to proceed with vengeance against the criminals. (See Salden, *otia theol.* pp. 609 sqq., and Buddeus, *de jure zelotarum apud Hebr.* 1699, and in Oelrich's collect. T. i. Diss. 5.) The stoning of Stephen furnishes an example of this.

priesthood) was secured to him, not for himself alone, but for his descendants also, as a covenant, *i.e.* in a covenant, or irrevocable form, since God never breaks a covenant that He has made. In accordance with this promise, the high-priesthood which passed from Eleazar to Phinehas (Judg. xx. 28) continued in his family, with the exception of a brief interruption in Eli's days (see at 1 Sam. i.-iii. and xiv. 3), until the time of the last gradual dissolution of the Jewish state through the tyranny of Herod and his successors (see my *Archäologie*, § 38).—In vers. 14, 15, the names of the two daring sinners are given. The father of Cozbi, the Midianitish princess, was named *Zur*, and is described here as “head of the tribes (*אִישׁתָּה*, see at Gen. xxv. 16) of a father's house in Midian,” *i.e.* as the head of several of the Midianitish tribes that were descended from one tribe-father; in chap. xxxi. 8, however, he is described as a king, and classed among the five kings of Midian who were slain by the Israelites.

Vers. 16–18. The Lord now commanded Moses to show hostility (*אֶנְגַּר*) to the Midianites, and smite them, on account of the stratagem which they had practised upon the Israelites by tempting them to idolatry, “in order that the practical zeal of Phinehas against sin, by which expiation had been made for the guilt, might be adopted by all the nation” (*Baumgarten*). The *inf. abs.* *אֲרוֹר*, instead of the *imperative*, as in Ex. xx. 8, etc. *עַל־דְּבָר פ'*, in consideration of *Peor*, and indeed, or especially, in consideration of *Cozbi*. The repetition is emphatic. The wickedness of the Midianites culminated in the shameless wantonness of *Cozbi* the Midianitish princess. “*Their sister*,” *i.e.* one of the members of their tribe.—The 19th verse belongs to the following chapter, and forms the introduction to chap. xxvi. 1.¹

MUSTERING OF ISRAEL IN THE STEPPES OF MOAB.—CHAP. XXVI.

Before taking vengeance upon the Midianites, as they had been commanded, the Israelites were to be mustered as the army of Jehovah, by means of a fresh numbering, since the generation that was mustered at Sinai (chap. i.-iv.) had died out in the wilderness, with the sole exception of Caleb and Joshua (vers. 64, 65). On this ground the command of God was issued, “after the plague,” for a fresh census and muster. For with the plague the last of those who came out of Egypt, and were not to enter Canaan, had

¹ In the English version this division is adopted.—TR.

been swept away, and thus the sentence had been completely executed.—The object of the fresh numbering, however, was not merely to muster Israel for the war with the Midianites, and in the approaching conquest of the promised land with the Canaanites also, but was intended to serve at the same time as a preparation for their settlement in Canaan, viz. for the division of the conquered land among the tribes and families of Israel. For this reason (chap. xxvi.) the families of the different tribes are enumerated here, which was not the case in chap. i.; and general instructions are also given in vers. 52–56, with reference to the division of Canaan.—The numbering was simply extended, as before, to the male population of the age of 20 years and upwards, and was no doubt carried out, like the previous census at Sinai, by Moses and the high priest (Eleazar), with the assistance of the heads of the tribes, although the latter are not expressly mentioned here.—The names of the families correspond—with very few exceptions, which have been already noticed in vol. i. pp. 372–3—to the grandsons and great-grandsons of Jacob mentioned in Gen. xlvi.—With regard to the total number of the people, and the number of the different tribes, compare the remarks at pp. 4 sqq.

Vers. 1–51. MUSTERING OF THE TWELVE TRIBES.—Vers. 1–4. The command of God to Moses and Eleazar is the same as in chap. i., ii., and iii., except that it does not enter so much into details.—Ver. 3. “*And Moses and Eleazar the priest spake with them*” (*רְאֵה* with the accusative, as in Gen. xxxvii. 4). The pronoun refers to “the children of Israel,” or more correctly, to the heads of the nation as the representatives of the congregation, who were to carry out the numbering. On the *Arboth-Moab*, see at chap. xxii. 1. Only the leading point in their words is mentioned, viz. “from twenty years old and upwards” (*sc.* shall ye take the number of the children of Israel), since it was very simple to supply the words “take the sum” from ver. 2.¹—The words from “the

¹ This is, at all events, easier and simpler than the alterations of the text which have been suggested for the purpose of removing the difficulty. Knobel proposes to alter וַיַּדְבֵּר into לִפְנֵי אֹמֶר, and לִפְנֵי into וַיַּדְבֵּר: “Moses and Eleazar arranged the children of Israel when they mustered them.” But הַדְבֵּר does not mean to arrange, but simply to drive in pairs, to subjugate (Ps. xviii. 48, and xlvi. 4),—an expression which, as must be immediately apparent, is altogether inapplicable to the arrangement of the people in families for the purpose of taking a census.

children of Israel" in ver. 4 onwards form the introduction to the enumeration of the different tribes (vers. 5 sqq.), and the verb יָמַד (were) must be supplied. "And the children of Israel, who went forth out of Egypt, were Reuben," etc.—Vers. 5-11. The families of *Reuben* tally with Gen. xlvi. 9, Ex. vi. 14, and 1 Chron. v. 3. The plural בָּנִים (sons), in ver. 8, where only one son is mentioned, is to be explained from the fact, that several sons of this particular son (*i.e.* grandsons) are mentioned afterwards. On *Dathan* and *Abiram*, see at chap. xvi. 1 and 32 sqq. See also the remark made here in vers. 10b and 11, viz. that those who were destroyed with the company of Korah were for a sign (פֹּה, here a warning); but that the sons of Korah were not destroyed along with their father.—Vers. 12-14. The *Simeonites* counted only five families, as *Ohad* (Gen. xlvi. 10) left no family. *Nemuel* is called *Jemuel* there, as *yod* and *nun* are often interchanged (cf. *Ges. thes.* pp. 833 and 557); and *Zerach* is another name of the same signification for *Zohar* (*Zerach*, the rising of the sun; *Zohar*, candor, splendour).—Vers. 15-18. The *Gadites* are the same as in Gen. xlvi. 16, except that *Ozni* is called *Ezbon* there.—Vers. 19-22. The sons and families of *Judah* agree with Gen. xlvi. 12 (cf. Gen. xxxviii. 6 sqq.); also with 1 Chron. ii. 3-5.—Vers. 23-25. The families of *Issachar* correspond to the sons mentioned in Gen. xlvi. 13, except that the name *Job* occurs there instead of *Jashub*. The two names have the same signification, as *Job* is derived from an Arabic word which signifies to return.—Vers. 26 and 27. The families of *Zebulun* correspond to the sons named in Gen. xlvi. 14.—Vers. 28-37. The descendants of *Joseph* were classified in two leading families, according to his two sons *Manasseh* and *Ephraim*, who were born before the removal of Israel to Egypt, and were raised into founders of tribes in consequence of the patriarch Israel having adopted them as his own sons (Gen. xlviii.).—Vers. 29-34. *Eight families descended from Manasseh*: viz. one from his son *Machir*, the second from *Machir's* son or *Manasseh's* grandson *Gilead*, and the other six from the *six sons of Gilead*. The genealogical accounts in chap. xxvii. 1, xxxvi. 1, and Josh. xvii. 1 sqq., fully harmonize with this, except that *Iezer* (ver. 30) is called *Abiezir* in Josh. xvii. 2; whereas only a part of the names mentioned here occur in the genealogical fragments in 1 Chron. ii. 21-24, and vii. 14-29. In ver. 33, a son of *Hepher*, named *Zelophehad*, is mentioned. He had no sons, but only daughters, whose names are given here to prepare the way for the legal

regulations mentioned in chap. xxvii. and xxxvi., to which this fact gave rise.—Vers. 35–37. There were four families descended from *Ephraim*; three from his sons, and one from his grandson. Of the descendants of *Sutelah* several successive links are given in 1 Chron. vii. 20 sqq.—Vers. 38–41. The children of *Benjamin* formed seven families, five of whom were founded by his sons, and two by grandsons. (On the differences which occur between the names given here and those in Gen. xlvi. 21, see vol. i. pp. 372, 373.) Some of the sons and grandsons of Benjamin mentioned here are also found in the genealogical fragments in 1 Chron. vii. 6–18, and viii. 1 sqq.—Vers. 42 and 43. The descendants of *Dan* formed only one family, named from a son of Dan, who is called *Shuham* here, but *Hushim* in Gen. xlvi. 23; though this family no doubt branched out into several smaller families, which are not named here, simply because this list contains only the leading families into which the tribes were divided.—Vers. 44–47. The families of *Asher* agree with the sons of Asher mentioned in Gen. xlvi. 17 and 1 Chron. vii. 30, except that *Ishuah* is omitted here, because he founded no family.—Vers. 48–50. The families of *Naphtali* tally with the sons of Naphtali in Gen. xlvi. 24 and 1 Chron. vii. 30.—Ver. 51. The total number of the persons mustered was 601,730.

Vers. 52–56. INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE LAND.—In vers. 53, 54, the command is given to distribute the land as an inheritance among the twelve tribes (“unto these”), according to the number of the names (chap. i. 2–18), *i.e.* of the persons counted by name in each of their families. To a numerous tribe they were to make the inheritance great; to the littleness, *i.e.* to the tribes and families that contained only a few persons, they were to make it small; to every one according to the measure of its mustered persons ([?] must be repeated before וְנָ). In vers. 55, 56, it is still further commanded that the distribution should take place by lot. “According to the names of their paternal tribes shall they (the children of Israel) receive it (the land) for an inheritance.” The meaning of these words can only be, that every tribe was to receive a province of its own for an inheritance, which should be called by its name for ever. The other regulation in ver. 56, “according to the measure of the lot shall its inheritance (the inheritance of every tribe) be divided between the numerous and the small (tribe),” is no doubt to be understood as signifying, that in

the division of the tribe territories, according to the comparative sizes of the different tribes, they were to adhere to that portion of land which fell to every tribe in the casting of the lots. The magnitude and limits of the possessions of the different tribes could not be determined by the lot according to the magnitude of the tribes themselves: all that could possibly be determined was the situation to be occupied by the tribe; so that *R. Bechai* is quite correct in observing that “the casting of the lot took place for the more convenient distribution of the different portions, whether of better or inferior condition, that there might be no occasion for strife and covetousness,” though the motive assigned is too partial in its character. The lot was to determine the portion of every tribe, not merely to prevent all occasion for dissatisfaction and complaining, but in order that every tribe might receive with gratitude the possession that fell to its lot as the inheritance assigned it by God, the result of the lot being regarded by almost all nations as determined by God Himself (cf. Prov. xvi. 33, xviii. 18). On this ground not only was the lot resorted to by the Greeks and Romans in the distribution of conquered lands (see the proofs in *Clericus*, *Rosenmüller*, and *Knobel*), but it is still employed in the division of lands. (For further remarks, see at Josh. xiv. 1 sqq.)

Vers. 57-62. MUSTERING OF THE LEVITES.—The enumeration of the different Levitical families into which the three leading families of Levi, that were founded by his three sons Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, were divided, is not complete, but is broken off in ver. 58 after the notice of five different families, for the purpose of tracing once more the descent of Moses and Aaron, the heads not of this tribe only, but of the whole nation, and also of giving the names of the sons of the latter (vers. 59-61). And after this the whole is concluded with a notice of the total number of those who were mustered of the tribe of Levi (ver. 62).—Of the different families mentioned, *Libni* belonged to Gershon (cf. chap. iii. 21), *Hebroni* to Kohath (chap. iii. 27), *Machli* and *Mushi* to Merari (chap. iii. 33), and *Korchi*, i.e. the family of Korah (according to chap. xvi. 1; cf. Ex. vi. 21 and 24), to Kohath. Moses and Aaron were descendants of Kohath (see at Ex. vi. 20 and ii. 1). Some difficulty is caused by the relative clause, “whom (one) had born to Levi in Egypt” (ver. 59), on account of the subject being left indefinite. It cannot be Levi’s wife, as *Jarchi*, *Abenezra*, and

others suppose; for *Jochebed*, the mother of Moses, was not a daughter of Levi in the strict sense of the word, but only a Levitess or descendant of Levi, who lived about 300 years after Levi; just as her husband *Amram* was not actually the son of Amram, who bore that name (Ex. vi. 18), but a later descendant of this older Amram (see vol. i. pp. 469 sqq.). The missing subject must be derived from the verb itself, viz. either תֵּדַעַת or תֵּדַעַת (her mother), as in 1 Kings i. 6, another passage in which “his mother” is to be supplied (cf. *Ewald*, § 294, b.).—Vers. 60, 61. *Sons of Aaron*: cf. chap. iii. 2 and 4; Ex. vi. 23; Lev. x. 1, 2.—Ver. 62. The Levites were not mustered along with the rest of the tribes of Israel, because the mustering took place with especial reference to the conquest of Canaan, and the Levites were not to receive any territory as a tribe (see at chap. xviii. 20).—Vers. 63–65. Concluding formula with the remark in ver. 65, that the penal sentence which God had pronounced in chap. xiv. 29 and 38 upon the generation which came out of Egypt, had been completely carried out.

THE DAUGHTERS OF ZELOPHEHAD CLAIM TO INHERIT. THE DEATH OF MOSES FORETOLD: CONSECRATION OF JOSHUA AS HIS SUCCESSOR.—CHAP. XXVII.

Vers. 1–11. CLAIMS OF ZELOPHEHAD'S DAUGHTERS TO AN INHERITANCE IN THE PROMISED LAND.—Vers. 1–4. The divine instructions which were given at the mustering of the tribes, to the effect that the land was to be divided among the tribes in proportion to the larger or smaller number of their families (chap. xxvi. 52–56), induced the daughters of *Zelophehad* the Manassite of the family of Gilead, the son of Machir, to appear before the princes of the congregation, who were assembled with Moses and Eleazar at the tabernacle, with a request that they would assign them an inheritance in the family of the father, as he had died in the desert without leaving any sons, and had not taken part in the rebellion of the company of Korah, which might have occasioned his exclusion from any participation in the promised land, but had simply died “through his (own) sin,” *i.e.* on account of such a sin as every one commits, and such as all who died in the wilderness had committed as well as he. “*Why should the name of our father be cut off (cease) from the midst of his family?*” This would have been the case, for example, if no inheritance had been assigned him in the land, because he left no son. In that case his family would have

become extinct, if his daughters had married into other families or tribes. On the other hand, if his daughters received a possession of their own among the brethren of their father, the name of their father would be preserved by it, since they could then marry husbands who would enter upon their landed property, and their father's name and possession would be perpetuated through their children. This wish on the part of the daughters was founded upon an assumption which rested no doubt upon an ancient custom, namely, that in the case of marriages where the wives had brought landed property as their dowry, the sons who inherited the maternal property were received through this inheritance into the family of their mother, *i.e.* of their grandfather on the mother's side. We have an example of this in the case of *Jarha*, who belonged to the pre-Mosaic times (1 Chron. ii. 34, 35). In all probability this took place in every instance in which daughters received a portion of the paternal possessions as their dowry, even though there might be sons alive. This would explain the introduction of *Jair* among the Manassites in chap. xxxii. 41, Deut. iii. 14. His father *Segub* was the son of *Hezron* of the tribe of Judah, but his mother was the daughter of *Machir* the Manassite (1 Chron. ii. 21, 22). We find another similar instance in Ezra ii. 61 and Neh. vii. 63, where the sons of a priest who had married one of the daughters of *Barzillai* the rich Gileadite, are called sons of *Barzillai*.—Vers. 5-7. This question of right (*mishpat*) Moses brought before God, and received instructions in reply to give the daughters of Zelophehad an inheritance among the brethren of their father, as they had spoken right. Further instructions were added afterwards in chap. xxxvi. in relation to the marriage of heiresses.—Vers. 8-11. On this occasion God issued a general law of inheritance, which was to apply to all cases as “a statute of judgment” (or right), *i.e.* a statute determining right. If any one died without leaving a son, his landed property was to pass to his daughter (or daughters); in default of daughters, to his brothers; in the absence of brothers, to his paternal uncles; and if there were none of them, to his next of kin.—On the intention of this law, see my Archæol. § 142 (ii. pp. 212, 213); and on the law of inheritance generally, see *J. Selden, de success. ad leges Hebr. in bona defunctorum, Fkft. a. O. 1695.*

Vers. 12-14. THE DEATH OF MOSES FORETOLD.—After these instructions concerning the division of the land, the Lord announced to Moses his approaching end. From the mountains of Abarim

he was to see the land which the Israelites would receive, and then like Aaron to be gathered to his people, because like him he also had sinned at the water of strife at Kadesh. This announcement was made, “that he might go forward to his death with the fullest consciousness, and might set his house in order, that is to say, might finish as much as he could while still alive, and provide as much as possible what would make up after his death for the absence of his own person, upon which the whole house of Israel was now so dependent” (*Baungarten*). The fulfilment of this announcement is described in Deut. xxxii. 48–52. The particular spot upon the mountains of Abarim from which Moses saw the land of Canaan, is also minutely described there. It was Mount *Nebo*, upon which he also died. The mountains of *Abarim* (cf. chap. xxxiii. 47) are the mountain range forming the Moabitish table-land, which slope off into the steppes of Moab. It is upon this range, the northern portion of which opposite to Jericho bore the name of *Pisgah*, that we are to look for Mount *Nebo*, which is sometimes described as one of the mountains of *Abarim* (Deut. xxxii. 49), and at other times as the top of *Pisgah* (Deut. iii. 27, xxxiv. 1; see at chap. xxi. 20). *Nebo* is not to be identified with *Jebel Attarus*, but to be sought for much farther to the north, since, according to *Eusebius* (*s. v. Αβαρίμ*), it was opposite to Jericho, between *Livias*, which was in the valley of the Jordan nearly opposite to Jericho, and *Heshbon*; consequently very near to the point which is marked as the “*Heights of Nebo*” on *Van de Velde’s* map. The prospect from the heights of *Nebo* must have been a very extensive one. According to *Burckhardt* (*Syr.* ii. pp. 106–7), “even the city of *Heshbon* (*Huzban*) itself stood upon so commanding an eminence, that the view extended at least thirty English miles in all directions, and towards the south probably as far as sixty miles.” On the expression, “gathered unto thy people,” see at Gen. xxv. 8, and on Aaron’s death see Num. xx. 28. פָּנָשׁר קְוִיַּתְמָ: “as ye transgressed My commandment.” By the double use of פָּנָשׁר (*quomodo*, “as”), the death of Aaron, and also that of Moses, are placed in a definite relation to the sin of these two heads of Israel. As they both sinned at Kadesh against the commandment of the Lord, so they were both of them to die without entering the land of Canaan. On the sin, see at chap. xx. 12, 13, and on the desert of Zin, at chap. xiii. 21.

Vers. 15–23. CONSECRATION OF JOSHUA AS THE SUCCESSOR OF MOSES.—Vers. 15–17. The announcement thus made to

Moses led him to entreat the Lord to appoint a leader of His people, that the congregation might not be like a flock without a shepherd. As “God of the spirits of all flesh,” i.e. as the giver of life and breath to all creatures (see at chap. xvi. 22), he asks Jehovah to appoint a man over the congregation, who should go out and in before them, and should lead them out and in, i.e. preside over and direct them in all their affairs. צאת וָבָא (“go out,” and “go in”) is a description of the conduct of men in every-day life (Deut. xxviii. 6, xxxi. 2; Josh. xiv. 11). הוציא וְהִבָּיא (“lead out,” and “bring in”) signifies the superintendence of the affairs of the nation, and is founded upon the figure of a shepherd.—Vers. 18-21. The Lord then appointed Joshua to this office as a man “who had spirit.” רוח (spirit) does not mean “insight and wisdom” (Knobel), but the higher power inspired by God into the soul, which quickens the moral and religious life, and determines its development; in this case, therefore, it was the spiritual endowment requisite for the office he was called to fill. Moses was to consecrate him for entering upon this office by the laying on of hands, or, as is more fully explained in vers. 19 and 20, he was to set him before Eleazar the high priest and the congregation, to command (רֹאשׁ) him, i.e. instruct him with regard to his office before their eyes, and to lay of his eminence (הָזֶה) upon him, i.e. to transfer a portion of his own dignity and majesty to him by the imposition of hands, that the whole congregation might hearken to him, or trust to his guidance. The object to שָׁמַע (hearken) must be supplied from the context, viz. אֲלֵיכֶם (to him), as Deut. xxxiv. 9 clearly shows. The מ (of) in ver. 20 is partitive, as in Gen. iv. 4, etc. The eminence and authority of Moses were not to be entirely transferred to Joshua, for they were bound up with his own person alone (cf. chap. xii. 6-8), but only so much of it as he needed for the discharge of the duties of his office. Joshua was to be neither the lawgiver nor the absolute governor of Israel, but to be placed under the judgment of the *Urim*, with which Eleazar was entrusted, so far as the supreme decision of the affairs of Israel was concerned. This is the meaning of ver. 21: “Eleazar shall ask to him (for him) the judgment of the *Urim* before Jehovah.” *Urim* is an abbreviation for *Urim and Thummim* (Ex. xxviii. 30), and denotes the means with which the high priest was entrusted of ascertaining the divine will and counsel in all the important business of the congregation. “After his mouth” (i.e. according to the decision of the high priest, by virtue of the right of *Urim and Thummim* entrusted

to him), Joshua and the whole congregation were to go out and in, *i.e.* to regulate their conduct and decide upon their undertakings. “All the congregation,” in distinction from “all the children of Israel,” denotes the whole body of heads of the people, or the college of elders, which represented the congregation and administered its affairs.—Vers. 22, 23. Execution of the divine command.

ORDER OF THE DAILY AND FESTAL OFFERINGS OF THE
CONGREGATION.—CHAP. XXVIII. AND XXIX.

When Israel was prepared for the conquest of the promised land by the fresh numbering and mustering of its men, and by the appointment of Joshua as commander, its relation to the Lord was regulated by a law which determined the sacrifices through which it was to maintain its fellowship with its God from day to day, and serve Him as His people (chap. xxviii. and xxix.). Through this order of sacrifice, the object of which was to form and sanctify the whole life of the congregation into a continuous worship, the sacrificial and festal laws already given in Ex. xxiii. 14–17, xxix. 38–42, xxxi. 12–17, Lev. xxviii., and Num. xxv. 1–12, were completed and arranged into a united and well-ordered whole. “It was very fitting that this law should be issued a short time before the advance into Canaan; for it was there first that the Israelites were in a position to carry out the sacrificial worship in all its full extent, and to observe all the sacrificial and festal laws” (*Knobel*). The law commences with the daily morning and evening burnt-offering (vers. 3–8), which was instituted at Sinai at the dedication of the altar. It is not merely for the sake of completeness that it is introduced here, or for the purpose of including all the national sacrifices that were to be offered during the whole year in one general survey; but also for an internal reason, viz. that the daily sacrifice was also to be offered on the Sabbaths and feast-days, to accompany the general and special festal sacrifices, and to form the common substratum for the whole of these. Then follow in vers. 9–15 the sacrifices to be offered on the Sabbath and at the new moon; and in ver. 16—chap. xxix. 38 the general sacrifices for the different yearly feasts, which were to be added to the sacrifices that were peculiar to each particular festival, having been appointed at the time of its first institution, and being specially adapted to give expression to its specific character, so that, at the yearly feasts, the congregation had to offer their different kinds of sacrifices: (a) the

daily morning and evening sacrifice ; (b) the general sacrifices that were offered on every feast-day ; and (c) the festal sacrifices that were peculiar to each particular feast. This cumulative arrangement is to be explained from the significance of the daily and of the festal sacrifices. In the daily burnt-offering the congregation of Israel, as a congregation of Jehovah, was to sanctify its life, body, soul, and spirit, to the Lord its God ; and on the Lord's feast-days it was to give expression to this sanctification in an intensified form. This stronger practical exhibition of the sanctification of the life was embodied in the worship by the elevation and graduation of the daily sacrifice, through the addition of a second and much more considerable burnt-offering, meat-offering, and drink-offering. The graduation was regulated by the significance of the festivals. On the Sabbaths the daily sacrifice was doubled, by the presentation of a burnt-offering consisting of two lambs. On the other feast-days it was increased by a burnt-offering composed of oxen, rams, and yearling lambs, which was always preceded by a sin-offering.—As the seventh day of the week, being a Sabbath, was distinguished above the other days of the week, as a day that was sanctified to the Lord in a higher degree than the rest, by an enlarged burnt-offering, meat-offering, and drink-offering ; so the seventh month, being a Sabbath-month, was raised above the other months of the year, and sanctified as a festal month, by the fact that, in addition to the ordinary new moon sacrifices of two bullocks, one ram, and seven yearling lambs, a special festal sacrifice was also offered, consisting of one bullock, one ram, and seven yearling lambs (chap. xxix. 2), which was also repeated on the day of atonement, and at the close of the feast of Tabernacles (chap. xxix. 8, 36) ; and also that the feast of Tabernacles, which fell in this month, was to be celebrated by a much larger number of burnt-offerings, as the largest and holiest feast of the congregation of Israel.¹

¹ Knobel's remarks as to the difference in the sacrifices are not only erroneous, but likely to mislead, and tending to obscure and distort the actual facts. "On those feast-days," he says, "which were intended as a general festival to Jehovah, viz. the sabbatical portion of the seventh new moon, the day of atonement, and the closing day of the yearly feasts, the sacrifices consisted of one bullock, one ram, and seven yearling lambs (chap. xxix. 2, 8, 36) ; whereas at the older festivals which had a reference to nature, such as the new moons, the days of unleavened bread, and the feast of Weeks, they consisted of two bullocks, one ram, and seven yearling lambs (chap. xxviii. 11, 19, 24, 27 ; xxix. 6), and at the feast of Tabernacles of even a larger number, especially of bullocks (chap. xxix. 12 sqq.). In the last, Jehovah was especially honoured, as having poured

All the feasts of the whole year, for example, formed a cycle of feast-days, arranged according to the number seven, which had its starting-point and centre in the Sabbath, and was regulated according to the division of time established at the creation, into weeks, months, years, and periods of years, ascending from the weekly Sabbath to the monthly Sabbath, the sabbatical year, and the year of jubilee. In this cycle of holy periods, regulated as it was by the number seven, and ever expanding into larger and larger circles, there was embodied the whole revolution of annually recurring festivals, established to commemorate the mighty works of the Lord for the preservation and inspiration of His people. And this was done in the following manner : in the *first* place, the number of yearly feasts amounted to exactly *seven*, of which the two leading feasts (*Mazzoth* and the feast of *Tabernacles*) lasted *seven* days ; in the *second* place, in all the feasts, some of which were of only one day's duration, whilst others lasted seven days, there were only *seven* days that were to be observed with sabbatical rest and a holy meeting ; and in the *third* place, the seven feasts were formed into two large festal circles, each of which consisted of an introductory feast, the main feast of *seven* days, and a closing feast of one day. The *first* of these festal circles was commemorative of the elevation of Israel into the nation of God, and its subsequent preservation. It commenced on the 14th Abib (Nisan) with the Passover, which was appointed to commemorate the deliverance of Israel from the destroying angel who smote the first-born of Egypt, as the introductory festival. It culminated in the *seven* days' feast of unleavened bread, as the feast of the deliverance of Israel from bondage, and its elevation into the nation of

out His blessing upon nature, and granted a plentiful harvest to the cultivation of the soil. The ox was the beast of agriculture." It was not the so-called "older festivals which had reference to nature" that were distinguished by a larger number of sacrificial animals, above those feast-days which were intended as general festivals to Jehovah, but the feasts of the seventh month alone. Thus the seventh new moon's day was celebrated by a double new moon's sacrifice, viz. with three bullocks, two rams, and fourteen yearling lambs ; the feast of atonement, as the introductory festival of the feast of Tabernacles, by a special festal sacrifice, whilst the day of Passover, which corresponded to it in the first festal cycle, as the introductory festival of the feast of unleavened bread, had no general festal sacrifices ; and, lastly, the feast of Tabernacles, not only by a very considerable increase in the number of the festal sacrifices on every one of the seven days, but also by the addition of an eighth day, as the octave of the feast, and a festal sacrifice answering to those of the first and seventh days of this month.

God; and closed with the feast of Weeks, Pentecost, or the feast of Harvest, which was kept *seven weeks* after the offering of the sheaf of first-fruits, on the second day of Mazzoth. This festal circle contained only three days that were to be kept with sabbatical rest and a holy meeting (viz. the first and seventh days of Mazzoth and the day of Pentecost). The *second* festal circle fell entirely in the seventh month, and its main object was to inspire the Israelites in their enjoyment of the blessings of their God: for this reason it was celebrated by the presentation of a large number of burnt-offerings. This festal circle opened with the day of atonement, which was appointed for the tenth day of the seventh month, as the introductory feast, culminated in the *seven days' feast of Tabernacles*, and closed with the eighth day, which was added to the seven feast-days as the octave of this festive circle, or the solemn close of all the feasts of the year. This also included only three days that were to be commemorated with sabbatical rest and a holy meeting (the 10th, 15th, and 22d of the month); but to these we have to add the day of trumpets, with which the month commenced, which was also a Sabbath of rest with a holy meeting; and this completes the seven days of rest (see my *Archæologie*, i. § 76).

Chap. xxviii. Ver. 2 contains the general instruction to offer to the Lord His sacrificial gift “at the time appointed by Him.” On *corban*, see at Lev. i. 2 (vol. ii. p. 282, comp. with p. 271); on “*the bread of Jehovah*,” at Lev. iii. 11; on the “*sacrifice made by fire*,” and “*a sweet savour*,” at Lev. i. 9; and on “*moed*,” at Lev. xxii. 2, 4.—Vers. 3–8. *The daily sacrifice*: as it had already been instituted at Sinai (Ex. xxix. 38–42).—Ver. 7. “*In the sanctuary*,” i.e. περὶ τὸν βωμόν (round about the altar), as Josephus paraphrases it (Ant. iii. 10); not “with (in) holy vessels,” as Jonathan and others interpret it. “*Pour out a drink-offering, as בְּשִׁיר for Jehovah*.” Shecar does not mean intoxicating drink here (see at Lev. x. 9), but *strong drink*, in distinction from water as simple drink. The drink-offering consisted of wine only (see at chap. xv. 5 sqq.); and hence *Onkelos* paraphrases it, “*of old wine*.”—Vers. 9, 10. *The Sabbath-offering*, which was to be added to the daily sacrifice (*בְּעֵד*, upon it), consisted of two yearling lambs as a burnt-offering, with the corresponding meat-offering and drink-offering, according to the general rule laid down in chap. xv. 3 sqq., and is appointed here for the first time; whereas the sabbatical feast had already been instituted at Ex. xx. 8–11 and Lev. xxii. 3. “*The burnt-offering of the Sabbath on its Sabbath*,” i.e. as often as the Sabbath occurred, every Sabbath.—

Vers. 11-15. At the beginnings of the month, *i.e.* at the *new moons*, a larger burnt-offering was to be added to the daily or continual burnt-offering, consisting of two bullocks (young oxen), one ram, and seven yearling lambs, with the corresponding meat and drink-offerings, as the “month’s burnt-offering in its (*i.e.* every) month with regard to the months of the year,” *i.e.* corresponding to them. To this there was also to be added a sin-offering of a shaggy goat (see at Lev. iv. 23). The custom of distinguishing the beginnings of the months or new moon’s days by a peculiar festal sacrifice, without their being, strictly speaking, festal days, with sabbatical rest and a holy meeting,¹ arose from the relation in which the month stood to the single day. “If the congregation was to sanctify its life and labour to the Lord every day by a burnt-offering, it could not well be omitted at the commencement of the larger division of time formed by the month; on the contrary, it was only right that the commencement of a new month should be sanctified by a special sacrifice. Whilst, then, a burnt-offering, in which the idea of expiation was subordinate to that of consecrating surrender to the Lord, was sufficient for the single day; for the whole month it was necessary that, in consideration of the sins that had been committed in the course of the past month, and had remained without expiation, a special sin-offering should be offered for their expiation, in order that, upon the ground of the forgiveness and reconciliation with God which had been thereby obtained, the lives of the people might be sanctified afresh to the Lord in the burnt-offering. This significance of the new moon sacrifice was still further intensified by the fact, that during the presentation of the sacrifice the priests sounded the silver trumpets, in order that it might be to the congregation for a memorial before God (chap. x. 10). The trumpet blast was intended to bring before God the prayers of the congregation embodied in the sacrifice, that God might remember them in mercy, granting them the forgiveness of their sins and power for sanctification, and quickening them again in the fellowship of His saving grace” (see my *Archæologie*, i.

¹ In later times, however, the new moon grew more and more into a feast-day, trade was suspended (Amos viii. 5), the pious Israelite sought instruction from the prophets (2 Kings iv. 23), many families and households presented yearly thank-offerings (1 Sam. xx. 6, 29), and at a still later period the most devout abstained from fasting (Judith viii. 6); consequently it is frequently referred to by the prophets as a feast resembling the Sabbath (Isa. i. 13; Hos. ii. 13; Ezek. xlvi. 1).

p. 369).—Vers. 16–25. The same number of sacrifices as at the new moon were to be offered on every one of the seven days of the feast of unleavened bread (*Mazzoth*), from the 15th to the 21st of the month, whereas there was no general festal offering on the day of the Passover, or the 14th of the month (Ex. xii. 3–14). With regard to the feast of *Mazzoth*, the rule is repeated from Ex. xii. 15–20 and Lev. xxiii. 6–8, that on the first and seventh day there was to be a Sabbath rest and holy meeting.—Vers. 23, 24. The festal sacrifices of the seven days were to be prepared “in addition to the morning burnt-offering, which served as the continual burnt-offering.” This implies that the festal sacrifices commanded were to be prepared and offered every day after the morning sacrifice.—Vers. 26–31. The same number of sacrifices is appointed for the day of the first-fruits, *i.e.* for the *feast of Weeks* or *Harvest feast* (cf. Lev. xxiii. 15–22). The festal burnt-offering and sin-offering of this one day was independent of the supplementary burnt-offering and sin-offering of the wave-loaves appointed in Lev. xxiii. 18, and was to be offered before these and after the daily morning sacrifice.

Chap. xxix. 1–6. The festal sacrifice for the *new moon of the seventh month* consisted of a burnt-offering of one bullock, one ram, and seven yearling lambs, with the corresponding meat-offerings and drink-offerings, and a sin-offering of a he-goat, “besides” (*i.e.* in addition to) the monthly and daily burnt-offering, meat-offering, and drink-offering. Consequently the sacrifices presented on the seventh new moon’s day were, (1) a yearling lamb in the morning and evening, with their meat-offering and drink-offering; (2) in the morning, after the daily sacrifice, the ordinary new moon’s sacrifice, consisting of two bullocks, one ram, and seven yearling lambs, with their corresponding meat-offerings and drink-offerings (see at ver. 11); (3) the sin-offering of the he-goat, together with the burnt-offering of one bullock, one ram, and seven yearling lambs, with their proper meat-offerings and drink-offerings, the meaning of which has been pointed out at Lev. xxiii. 23 sqq.—Vers. 7–11. On the *day of atonement*, on the tenth of the seventh month, a similar festal sacrifice was to be offered to the one presented on the seventh new moon’s day (a burnt-offering and sin-offering), in addition to the sin-offering of atonement prescribed at Lev. xvi., and the daily burnt-offerings. For a more minute description of this festival, see at Lev. xvi. and xxiii. 26–32.—Vers. 12–34. The *feast of Tabernacles*, the special regulations for the celebration of which are contained in Lev. xxiii. 34–36 and 39–43, was distin-

guished above all the other feasts of the year by the great number of burnt-offerings, which raised it into the greatest festival of joy. On the seven feast-days, the first of which was to be celebrated with sabbatical rest and a holy meeting, there were to be offered, in addition to the daily burnt-offering, every day a he-goat for a sin-offering, and seventy oxen in all for a burnt-offering during the seven days, as well as every day two rams and fourteen yearling lambs, with the requisite meat-offerings and drink-offerings. Whilst, therefore, the number of rams and lambs was double the number offered at the Passover and feast of Pentecost, the number of oxen was fivefold ; for, instead of fourteen, there were seventy offered during the seven days. This multiplication of the oxen was distributed in such a way, that instead of there being ten offered every day, there were thirteen on the first day, twelve on the second, and so on, deducting one every day, so that on the seventh day there were exactly seven offered ; the arrangement being probably made for the purpose of securing the holy number seven for this last day, and indicating at the same time, through the gradual diminution in the number of sacrificial oxen, the gradual decrease in the festal character of the seven festal days. The reason for this multiplication in the number of burnt-offerings is to be sought for in the nature of the feast itself. Their living in booths had already visibly represented to the people the defence and blessing of their God ; and the foliage of these booths pointed out the glorious advantages of the inheritance received from the Lord. But this festival followed the completion of the ingathering of the fruits of the orchard and vineyard, and therefore was still more adapted, on account of the rich harvest of splendid and costly fruits which their inheritance had yielded, and which they were about to enjoy in peace now that the labour of agriculture was over, to fill their hearts with the greatest joy and gratitude towards the Lord and Giver of them all, and to make this festival a speaking representation of the blessedness of the people of God when resting from their labours. This blessedness which the Lord had prepared for His people, was also expressed in the numerous burnt-offerings that were sacrificed on every one of the seven days, and in which the congregation presented itself soul and body to the Lord, upon the basis of a sin-offering, as a living and holy sacrifice, to be more and more sanctified, transformed, and perfected by the fire of His holy love (see my *Archäol.* i. p. 416).—Vers. 35-38. The eighth day was to be *azareth*, a closing feast, and only belonged to the feast of Tabernacles so far as the

Sabbath rest and holy meeting of the seventh feast-day were transferred to it; whilst, so far as its sacrifices were concerned, it resembled the seventh new moon's day and the day of atonement, and was thus shown to be the octave or close of the second festal circle (see at Lev. xxiii. 36).—Ver. 39. The sacrifices already mentioned were to be presented to the Lord on the part of the congregation, in addition to the burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, drink-offerings, and peace-offerings which individuals or families might desire to offer either spontaneously or in consequence of vows. On the vowed of burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, see chap. xv. 3, 8; Lev. xxii. 18, 21.—Ver. 40 forms the conclusion of the list of sacrifices in chap. xxviii. and xxix.

INSTRUCTIONS AS TO THE FORCE OF VOWS.—CHAP. XXX.

The rules by which vows were to be legally regulated, so far as their objects and their discharge were concerned, has been already laid down in Lev. xxvii.; but the chapter before us contains instructions with reference to the force of vows and renunciations. These are so far in place in connection with the general rules of sacrifice, that vows related for the most part to the presentation of sacrifices; and even vows of renunciation partook of the character of worship. The instructions in question were addressed (ver. 1) to “the heads of the tribes,” because they entered into the sphere of civil rights, namely, into that of family life.—Ver. 2. At the head there stands the general rule, “*If any one vow a vow to Jehovah, or swear an oath, to bind his soul to abstinence, he shall not break his word; he shall do according to all that has gone out of his mouth:*” i.e. he shall keep or fulfil the vow, and the promise of abstinence, in perfect accordance with his word. נָדַר is a positive vow, or promise to give or sanctify any part of one's property to the Lord. אָסֵר, from אָסֹר, to bind or fetter, the negative vow, or vow of abstinence. אָסֵר אָסֵר עַל־נְפָשָׁו, to take an abstinence upon his soul. In what such abstinence consisted is not explained, because it was well understood from traditional customs; in all probability it consisted chiefly in fasting and other similar abstinence from lawful things. The Nazarite's vow, which is generally reckoned among the vows of abstinence, is called *neder* in chap. vi. 2 sqq., not *issar*, because it consisted not merely in abstinence from the fruit of the vine, but also in the positive act of permitting the hair to grow freely in honour of the Lord. The expression “swear an oath” (ver. 2; cf.

ver. 13) shows that, as a rule, they bound themselves to abstinence by an oath. The *inf. constr.*, הַשְׁבָעַ, is used here, as in other places, for the *inf. abs.* (cf. *Ges.* § 131, 4, note 2). לֹא, from לִלְאַ, for לֹא, as in *Ezek.* xxxix. 7 (cf. *Ges.* § 67, note 8), to desecrate (his word), *i.e.* to leave it unfulfilled or break it.—Vers. 3–15 contain the rules relating to positive and negative vows made by a woman, and four different examples are given. The first case (vers. 3–5) is that of a woman in her youth, while still unmarried, and living in her father's house. If she made a vow of performance or abstinence, and her father heard of it and remained silent, it was to stand, *i.e.* to remain in force. But if her father held her back when he heard of it, *i.e.* forbade her fulfilling it, it was not to stand or remain in force, and Jehovah would forgive her because of her father's refusal. Obedience to a father stood higher than a self-imposed religious service.—The second case (vers. 6–8) was that of a vow of performance or abstinence, made by a woman before her marriage, and brought along with her (עַלְיהָ, “upon herself”) into her marriage. In such a case the husband had to decide as to its validity, in the same way as the father before her marriage. In the day when he heard of it he could hold back his wife, *i.e.* dissolve her vow; but if he did not do this at once, he could not hinder its fulfilment afterwards. מִבְטָא שְׁפָתָה, gossip of her lips, that which is uttered thoughtlessly or without reflection (cf. *Lev.* v. 4). This expression implies that vows of abstinence were often made by unmarried women without thought or reflection.—The third case (ver. 9) was that of a vow made by a widow or divorced woman. Such a vow had full force, because the woman was not dependent upon a husband.—The fourth case (vers. 10–12) was that of a vow made by a wife in her married state. Such a vow was to remain in force if her husband remained silent when he heard of it, and did not restrain her. On the other hand, it was to have no force if her husband dissolved it at once. After this there follows the general statement (vers. 13–16), that a husband could establish or dissolve every vow of performance or abstinence made by his wife. If, however, he remained silent “from day to day,” he confirmed it by his silence; and if afterwards he should declare it void, he was to bear his wife's iniquity. פָּגָע, the sin which the wife would have had to bear if she had broken the vow of her own accord. This consisted either in a sin-offering to expiate her sin (*Lev.* v. 4 sqq.); or if this was omitted, in the punishment which God suspended over the sin (*Lev.* v. 1).—Ver. 16, concluding formula.

WAR OF REVENGE AGAINST THE MIDIANITES.—CHAP. XXXI.

Vers. 1-12. The *Campaign*.—After the people of Israel had been mustered as the army of Jehovah, and their future relation to the Lord had been firmly established by the order of sacrifice that was given to them immediately afterwards, the Lord commanded Moses to carry out that hostility to the Midianites which had already been commanded in chap. xxv. 16-18. Moses was to revenge (*i.e.* to execute) the revenge of the children of Israel upon the Midianites, and then to be gathered to his people, *i.e.* to die, as had already been revealed to him (chap. xxvii. 13). “The revenge of the children of Israel” was revenge for the wickedness which the tribes of the Midianites who dwelt on the east of Moab (see at chap. xxii. 4) had practised upon the Israelites, by seducing them to the idolatrous worship of Baal Peor. This revenge is called the “revenge of Jehovah” in ver. 3, because the seduction had violated the divinity and honour of Jehovah. The daughters of Moab had also taken part in the seduction (chap. xxv. 1, 2); but they had done so at the instigation of the Midianites (see p. 203), and not of their own accord, and therefore the Midianites only were to atone for the wickedness.—Vers. 3-6. To carry out this revenge, Moses had 1000 men of each tribe delivered (*מֵשֶׁרֶת*, see at ver. 16) from the families (*alaphim*, see chap. i. 16) of the tribes, and equipped for war; and these he sent to the army (into the war) along with Phinehas the son of Eleazar the high priest, who carried the holy vessels, viz. the alarm-trumpets, in his hand. *Phinehas* was attached to the army, not as the leader of the soldiers, but as the high priest with the holy trumpets (chap. x. 9), because the war was a holy war of the congregation against the enemies of themselves and their God. *Phinehas* had so distinguished himself by the zeal which he had displayed against the idolaters (chap. xxv. 7), that it was impossible to find any other man in all the priesthood to attach to the army, who would equal him in holy zeal, or be equally qualified to inspire the army with zeal for the holy conflict. “The holy vessels” cannot mean the ark of the covenant on account of the plural, which would be inapplicable to it; nor the Urim and Thummim, because Phinehas was not yet high priest, and the expression *כִּי* would also be unsuitable to these. The allusion can only be to the trumpets mentioned immediately afterwards, the *ו* before *חַנְצָרוֹת* being the *v* *explic.*, “and in fact.” Phinehas took these in his hand, because the Lord had assigned them

to His congregation, to bring them into remembrance before Him in time of war, and to ensure His aid (chap. x. 9).—Vers. 7–10. Of the campaign itself, the results are all that is recorded. No doubt it terminated with a great battle, in which the Midianites were taken unawares and completely routed. As it was a war of vengeance of Jehovah, the victors slew all the males, *i.e.* all the adult males, as the sequel shows, without quarter; and “upon those that were slain,” *i.e.* in addition to them, the five Midianitish kings and Balaam, who first advised the Midianites, according to ver. 16, to tempt the Israelites to idolatry. The five kings were chiefs of the larger or more powerful of the Midianitish tribes, as *Zur* is expressly said to have been in chap. xxv. 15. In Josh. xiii. 21 they are called “vassals of Sihon,” because Sihon had subjugated them and made them tributary when he first conquered the land. The women and children of the Midianites were led away prisoners; and their cattle (*behemah*, beasts of draft and burden, as in Ex. xx. 10), their flocks, and their goods taken away as spoil. The towns in their dwellings, and all their villages (*tiroth*, tent-villages, as in Gen. xxv. 16), were burnt down. The expression “*towns in their dwellings*” leads to the conclusion that the towns were not the property of the Midianites themselves, who were a nomad people, but that they originally belonged in all probability to the Moabites, and had been taken possession of by the Amorites under Sihon. This is confirmed by Josh. xiii. 21, according to which these five Midianitish vassals of Sihon dwelt in the land, *i.e.* in the kingdom of Sihon. This also serves to explain why the conquest of their country is not mentioned in the account before us, although it is stated in Joshua (*l.c.*), that it was allotted to the Reubenites with the kingdom of Sihon.—Vers. 11, 12. All this booty (*shalal*, booty in goods), and all the prey in man and beast (*malkoach*), was brought by the conquerors to Moses and Eleazar and the congregation, into the camp in the steppes of Moab. In ver. 12, שָׁבֵן applies to the women and children who were taken prisoners, מְלֻקָּה to the cattle taken as booty, and לְשָׁבֵן to the rest of the prey.

Vers. 13–18. *Treatment of the Prisoners.*—When Moses went out to the front of the camp with Eleazar and the princes of the congregation to meet the returning warriors, he was angry with the commanders, because they had left all the women alive, since it was they who had been the cause, at Balaam’s instigation, of the falling away of the Israelites from Jehovah to worship Peor; and

he commanded all the male children to be slain, and every woman who had lain with a man, and only the young girls who had hitherto had no connection with a man to be left alive. פְּקֻדֵּי הַחֲלִיל, lit. the appointed persons, i.e. the officers of the army, who were then divided into princes (captains) over thousands and hundreds.—“Which came from the battle,” i.e. who had returned. The question in ver. 15, “Have ye left all the women alive?” is an expression of dissatisfaction, and reproof for their having done this. לְמַכְרָפָעַל . . . הֵן, “they have become to the Israelites to work unfaithfulness towards Jehovah,” i.e. they have induced them to commit an act of unfaithfulness towards Jehovah. The word מְסַר, which only occurs in this chapter, viz. in vers. 5 and 16, appears to be used in the sense of giving, delivering, and then, like בָּנָה, doing, making, effecting. On the fact itself, see chap. xxv. 6 sqq. The object of the command to put all the male children to death, was to exterminate the whole nation, as it could not be perpetuated in the women. Of the female sex, all were to be put to death who had known the lying with a man, and therefore might possibly have been engaged in the licentious worship of Peor (chap. xxv. 2), to preserve the congregation from all contamination from that abominable idolatry.

Vers. 19-24. *Purification of the Warriors, the Prisoners, and the Booty.*—Moses commanded the men of war to remain for seven days outside the camp of the congregation, to carry out upon the third and seventh day the legal purification of such persons and things as had been rendered unclean through contact with dead bodies. Every one who had slain a soul (person), or touched one who had been slain, was to be purified, whether he were a warrior or a prisoner. And so also were all the clothes, articles of leather, materials of goats' hair, and all wooden things.—Vers. 21-24. To this end Eleazar, whose duty it was as high priest to see that the laws of purification were properly observed, issued fuller instructions with reference to the purification of the different articles, in accordance with the law in chap. xix. הַבְאִים לְפִלְחָמָה, those who came to the war, i.e. who went into the battle (see at chap. x. 9). “The ordinance of the law:” as in chap. xix. 2. The metal (gold, silver, copper, tin, lead), all that usually comes into the fire, i.e. that will bear the fire, was to be drawn through the fire, that it might become clean, and was then to be sprinkled with water of purification (chap. xix. 9); but everything that would not bear the fire was to be drawn through water.—The washing of clothes

on the seventh day was according to the rule laid down in chap. xix. 19.

Vers. 25–47. *Distribution of the Booty.*—God directed Moses, with Eleazar and the heads of the fathers' houses ("fathers" for "fathers' houses:" see at Ex. vi. 14) of the congregation, to take the whole of the booty in men and cattle, and divide it into two halves: one for the men of war (*הפלחים מלחמה*, those who grasped at war, who engaged in war), the other for the congregation, and to levy a tribute upon it (*מִבְצָה* = *מִבְצָה*, *computatio*, a certain amount: see Ex. xii. 4) for Jehovah. Of the half that came to the warriors, one person and one head of cattle were to be handed over to Eleazar the priest out of every 500 (*i.e.* one-fifth per cent.), as a heave-offering for Jehovah; and of the other half that was set apart for the children of Israel, *i.e.* for the congregation, one out of every fifty (*i.e.* 2 per cent.) was to be taken for the Levites. *וְנַחֲזֵק*, laid hold of, *i.e.* snatched out of the whole number during the process of counting; not seized or touched by the lot, as in 1 Chron. xxiv. 6, as there was no reason for resorting to the lot in this instance. The division of the booty into two equal halves, one of which was given to the warriors, and the other to the congregation that had taken no part in the war, was perfectly reasonable and just. As the 12,000 warriors had been chosen out of the whole congregation to carry on the war on their behalf, the congregation itself could properly lay claim to its share of the booty. But as the 12,000 had had all the trouble, hardships, and dangers of the war, they could very properly reckon upon some reward for their service; and this was granted them by their receiving quite as much as the whole of the congregation which had taken no part in the war,—in fact, more, because the warriors only gave one-fifth per cent. of their share as a thank-offering for the victory that had been granted them, whilst those who remained at home had to give 2 per cent. of their share to Jehovah for the benefit of the priests and Levites. The arrangement, however, was only made for this particular case, and not as a law for all times, although it was a general rule that those who remained at home received a share of the booty brought back by the warriors (cf. Josh. xxii. 8; 1 Sam. xxx. 24, 25; 2 Macc. viii. 28, 30).—Vers. 31 sqq. The booty, viz. "the rest of the booty, which the men of war had taken," *i.e.* all the persons taken prisoners that had not been put to death, and all the cattle taken as booty that had not been consumed during the march home, amounted to 675,000 head of small cattle, 72,000 oxen, 61,000 asses, and 32,000 maidens.

Each half, therefore, consisted of 337,500 head of small cattle, 36,000 oxen, 30,500 asses, and 16,000 maidens (vers. 36 and 43-46). Of the one half the priests received 675 head of small cattle, 72 oxen, 61 asses, and 32 maidens for Jehovah; and these Moses handed over to Eleazar, in all probability for the maintenance of the priests, in the same manner as the tithes (chap. xviii. 26-28, and Lev. xxvii. 30-33), so that they might put the cattle into their own flocks (chap. xxxv. 3), and slay oxen or sheep as they required them, whilst they sold the asses, and made slaves of the girls; and not in the character of a vow, in which case the clean animals would have had to be sacrificed, and the unclean animals, as well as the human beings, to be redeemed (Lev. xxvii. 2-13). Of the other half, the Levites received the fiftieth part (vers. 43-47), that is to say, 6750 head of small cattle, 720 oxen, 610 asses, and 320 girls. The 'מִחְצֵית וּ' ("the half," etc.), in ver. 42, is resumed in ver. 47, and the enumeration of the component parts of this half in vers. 43-46 is to be regarded as parenthetical.

Vers. 48-54. *Sacred Oblations of the Officers*.—When the officers reviewed the men of war who were "in their hand," i.e. who had fought the battle under their command, and found not a single man missing, they felt constrained to give a practical expression to their gratitude for this miraculous preservation of the whole of the men, by presenting a sacrificial gift to Jehovah; they therefore brought all the golden articles that they had received as booty, and offered them to the Lord "for the expiation of their souls" (see at Lev. i. 4), namely, with the feeling that they were not worthy of any such grace, and not "because they had done wrong in failing to destroy all the enemies of Jehovah" (*Knobel*). This gift, which was offered as a heave-offering for Jehovah, consisted of the following articles of gold: אַצְבָּרָה, "arm-rings," according to 2 Sam. i. 10 (LXX. χελιδῶνα; *Suidas*: χελιδόναι κοσμοὶ περὶ τοὺς βραχίονας, καλοῦνται δὲ βραχιάλια); יְרָבֶל, bands, generally armlets (Gen. xxiv. 22, etc.); תְּכִיבָּה, signet-rings; לִינָה, hoops,—according to Ezek. xvi. 12, ear-rings; and פְּזִיר, gold balls (Ex. xxxv. 22). They amounted in all to 16,750 shekels; and the men of war had received their own booty in addition to this. This gift, presented on the part of the officers, was brought into the tabernacle "as a memorial of the children of Israel before Jehovah" (cf. Ex. xxx. 16); that is to say, it was placed in the treasury of the sanctuary.

The fact that the Israelites did not lose a single man in the battle, is certainly a striking proof of the protection of God; but it

is not so marvellous as to furnish any good ground for calling in question the correctness of the narrative.¹ The Midianites were a nomad tribe, who lived by rearing flocks and herds, and therefore were not a warlike people. Moreover, they were probably attacked quite unawares, and being unprepared, were completely routed and cut down without quarter. The quantity of booty brought home is also not so great as to appear incredible. Judging from the 32,000 females who had never lain with a man, the tribes governed by the five kings may have numbered about 130,000 or 150,000, and therefore not have contained much more than 35,000 fighting men, who might easily have been surprised by 12,000 brave warriors, and entirely destroyed. And again, there is nothing in the statement that 675,000 sheep and goats, 72,000 oxen, and 61,000 asses were taken as booty from these tribes, to astonish any one who has formed correct notions of the wealth of nomad tribes in flocks and herds. The only thing that could appear surprising is, that there are no camels mentioned. But it is questionable, in the first place, whether the Midianites were in the habit of rearing camels; and, in the second place, if they did possess them, it is still questionable whether the Israelitish army took them away, and did not rather put to death all that they found, as being of no value to the Israelites in their existing circumstances. Lastly, the quantity of jewellery seized as booty is quite in harmony with the well-known love of nomads, and even of barbarous tribes, for ornaments of this kind; and the peculiar liking of the Midianites for such things is confirmed by the account in Judg. viii. 26, according to which Gideon took as much as 1700 shekels in weight of golden rings from the Midianites alone, beside ornaments of other kinds. If we take the golden shekel at 10 thalers (30 shillings: see vol. ii. p. 250), the value of the ornaments taken by the officers under Moses would be about 167,500 thalers (L.25,125). It is quite possible that the kings and other chiefs, together with their wives, may have possessed as much as this.

¹ Rosenmüller has cited an example from *Tacitus* (Ann. xiii. 39), of the Romans having slaughtered all the foe without losing a single man on the capture of a Parthian castle; and another from *Strabo* (xvi. 1128), of a battle in which 1000 Arabs were slain, and only 2 Romans. And Hävernick mentions a similar account from the life of Saladin in his Introduction (i. 2, p. 452).

DIVISION OF THE CONQUERED LAND BEYOND THE JORDAN AMONG
THE TRIBES OF REUBEN, GAD, AND HALF-MANASSEH.—CHAP.
XXXII.¹

Vers. 1-5. The Reubenites and Gadites, who had very large flocks and herds, petitioned Moses, Eleazar, and the princes of the congregation, to give them the conquered land of Gilead for a possession, as a land that was peculiarly adapted for flocks, and not to make them pass over the Jordan. “**עֲזָזֶם מְאַרְךָ**,” “very strong,” is an apposition introduced at the close of the sentence to give emphasis to the **כֹּל**. The land which they wished for, they called the “land of *Jaézer* (see chap. xxi. 32), and the land of *Gilead*.” They put *Jaézer* first, probably because this district was especially rich in excellent pasture land. *Gilead* was the land to the south and north of the Jabbok (see at Deut. iii. 10), the modern provinces of *Belka* in the south between the Jabbok and the Arnon, and *Jebel Ajlun* to the north of the Jabbok, as far as the Mandhur. Ancient Gilead still shows numerous traces of great fertility even in its present desolation, covered over as it is with hundreds of ruins of old towns and hamlets. *Belka* is mountainous towards the north, but in the south as far as the Arnon it is for the most part table-land; and in the mountains, as *Buckingham* says, “we find on every hand a pleasant shade from fine oaks and wild pistachio-trees, whilst the whole landscape has more of a European character. The pasturage

¹ This chapter is also cut in pieces by *Knobel*: vers. 1, 2, 16-19, 24, 28-30, and 33-38, being assigned to the Elohist; and the remainder, viz. vers. 3-5, 6-15, 20-23, 25-27, 31, 32, and 39-42, to the Jehovahist. But as the supposed Elohistic portions are fragmentary, inasmuch as it is assumed, for example, in ver. 19, that the tribes of Reuben and Gad had already asked for the land of the Jordan and been promised it by Moses, whereas there is nothing of the kind stated in vers. 1 and 2, the Elohistic account is said to have been handed down in a fragmentary state. The main ground for this violent hypothesis is the fancy of the critic, that the tribes mentioned could not have been so shameless as to wish to remain on the eastern side of the Jordan, and leave the conquest of Canaan to the other tribes, and that the willingness to help their brethren to conquer Canaan which they afterwards express in vers. 16 sqq., is irreconcilable with their previous refusal to do this,—arguments which need no refutation for an unprejudiced reader of the Bible who is acquainted with the selfishness of the natural heart. The arguments founded upon the language employed are also all weak. Because there are words in vers. 1 and 29, which the critics pronounce to be Jehovahistic, they must proceed, both here and elsewhere, to remove all that offends them with their critical scissors, in order that they may uphold the full force of their *dicta*!

in *Belka* is much better than it is anywhere else throughout the whole of southern Syria, so that the Bedouins say, ‘You can find no country like Belka.’ The oxen and sheep of this district are considered the very best” (see *v. Raumer*, Pal. p. 82). The mountains of Gilead on both sides of the Jabbok are covered for the most part with glorious forests of oak. “*Jebel Ajlun*,” says *Robinson* (Pal. App. 162), “presents the most charming rural scenery that I have seen in Syria. A continued forest of noble trees, chiefly the ever-green oak (*Sindian*), covers a large part of it, while the ground beneath is covered with luxuriant grass, which we found a foot or more in height, and decked with a rich variety of flowers” (see *v. Raumer, ut sup.*). This also applies to the ancient *Basan*, which included the modern plains of *Jaulan* and *Hauran*, that were also covered over with ruins of former towns and hamlets. The plain of *Hauran*, though perfectly treeless, is for all that very fertile, rich in corn, and covered in some places with such luxuriant grass that horses have great difficulty in making their way through it; for which reason it is a favourite resort of the Bedouins (*Burckhardt*, p. 393). “The whole of *Hauran*,” says *Ritter* (*Erdkunde*, xv. pp. 988, 989), “stretches out as a splendid, boundless plain, between Hermon on the west, *Jebel Hauran* on the east, and *Jebel Ajlun* to the south; but there is not a single river in which there is water throughout the whole of the summer. It is covered, however, with a large number of villages, every one of which has its cisterns, its ponds, or its *birket*; and these are filled in the rainy season, and by the winter torrents from the snowy *Jebel Hauran*. Wherever the soil, which is everywhere black, deep, dark brown, or ochre-coloured, and remarkably fertile, is properly cultivated, you find illimitable corn-fields, and chiefly golden fields of wheat, which furnish Syria in all directions with its principal food. By far the larger part of this plain, which was a luxuriant garden in the time of the Romans, is now uncultivated, waste, and without inhabitants, and therefore furnishes the Bedouins of the neighbourhood with the desired paradise for themselves and their flocks.” On its western slope *Jebel Hauran* is covered with splendid forests of oak, and rich in meadow land for flocks (*Burckhardt*, pp. 152, 169, 170, 173, 358; *Wetstein, Reiseber.* pp. 39 sqq. and 88). On the nature of the soil of *Hauran*, see at Deut. iii. 4. The plain of *Jaulan* appears in the distance like the continuation of *Hauran* (*Robinson*, App. 162); it has much bush-land in it, but the climate is not so healthy as in *Hauran* (*Seetzen*, i. pp. 353, 130, 131). “In general, *Hauran*, *Jaulan*, el

Botthin, el Belka, and Ejlun, are the paradise of nomads, and in all their wanderings eastwards they find no pasture like it" (*Seetzen*, i. p. 364). מִקְוָה, a locality, or district. אֶרְץ מִקְנָה = מִקְנָה (ver. 4), a district adapted for grazing. In ver. 3 the country is more distinctly defined by the introduction of the names of a number of important towns, whilst the clause "the country which the Lord smote before the congregation of Israel," in which the defeat of Sihon is referred to, describes it as one that was without a ruler, and therefore could easily be taken possession of. For more minute remarks as to the towns themselves, see at vers. 34 sqq. On the construction תֵּן לְעָלָי, see at Gen. iv. 18.—The words, "*let us not go over the Jordan*," may be understood as expressing nothing more than the desire of the speakers not to receive their inheritance on the western side of the Jordan, without their having any intention of withdrawing their help from the other tribes in connection with the conquest of Canaan, according to their subsequent declaration (vers. 16 sqq.); but they may also be understood as expressing a wish to settle at once in the land to the east of the Jordan, and leave the other tribes to conquer Canaan alone. Moses understood them in the latter sense (vers. 6 sqq.), and it is probable that this was their meaning, as, when Moses reproved them, the speakers did not reply that they had not cherished the intention attributed to them, but simply restricted themselves to the promise of co-operation in the conquest of Canaan. But even in this sense their request did not manifest "a shamelessness that would hardly be historically true" (*Knobel*). It may very well be explained from the opinion which they cherished, and which is perfectly intelligible after the rapid and easy defeat of the two mighty kings of the Amorites, Sihon and Og, that the remaining tribes were quite strong enough to conquer the land of Canaan on the west of the Jordan. But for all that, the request of the Reubenites and Gadites did indicate an utter want of brotherly feeling, and complete indifference to the common interests of the whole nation, so that they thoroughly deserved the reproof which they received from Moses.

Vers. 6-15. Moses first of all blames their want of brotherly feeling: "*Shall your brethren go into the war, and ye sit here?*" He then calls their attention to the fact, that by their disinclination they would take away the courage and inclination of the other tribes to cross over the Jordan and conquer the land, and would bring the wrath of God upon Israel even more than their fathers who were sent from Kadesh to spy out the land, and who led away

the heart of the people into rebellion through their unfavourable account of the inhabitants of Canaan, and brought so severe a judgment upon the congregation. **הַנִּיאָ אֶת-לֵב כֵּן**, to hold away the heart, *i.e.* render a person averse to anything. The Keri חַנְיָאָן חַנְיָאָן, in the *Kethib* of ver. 7.—In vers. 8–13, Moses reminds them of the occurrences described in chap. xiii. and xiv. On the expression, “wholly followed Jehovah,” cf. chap. xiv. 24. The words, “*He drove them about in the desert,*” caused them to wander backwards and forwards in it for forty years, point back to chap. xiv. 33–35.—Ver. 14. “*Behold, ye rise up instead of your fathers,*” *i.e.* ye take their place, “*an increase* (**מִרְבֹּות**, from **רַבָּה**; equivalent to a brood) *of sinners, to augment yet the burning of the wrath of Jehovah against Israel.*” **לְעַכְתֵּב**, to add to, or increase.—Ver. 15. “*If ye draw back behind Him,*” *i.e.* resist the fulfilment of the will of God, to bring Israel to Canaan, “*He will leave it (Israel) still longer in the desert, and ye prepare destruction for all this nation.*”

Vers. 16–27. The persons thus reproved came near to Moses, and replied, “*We will build sheep-folds here for our flocks, and towns for our children; but we will equip ourselves hastily* (**סְמֻחָה**, part. pass. hastening) *before the children of Israel, till we bring them to their place* (*i.e.* to Canaan). **בְּנָרוֹת צָאן**, folds or pens for flocks, that were built of stones piled up one upon another (1 Sam. xxiv. 4).¹ By the building of towns, we are to understand the rebuilding and fortification of them. **נְטָרָה**, the children, including the women, and such other defenceless members of the family as were in need of protection (see at Ex. xii. 37). When their families were secured in fortified towns against the inhabitants of the land, the men who could bear arms would not return to their houses till the children of Israel, *i.e.* the rest of the tribes, had all received their inheritance: for they did not wish for an inheritance on the other side of Jordan and farther on, if (**כִּי**) their inheritance was assigned them on this side Jordan towards the east. The application of the expression **מַעֲבָר תִּירְחָן** to the land on the east of the Jordan, as well as to that on the west, points to a time when the Israelites had not

¹ According to Wetstein (*Reiseber.* p. 29), it is a regular custom with the nomads in *Leja*, to surround every place, where they pitch their tents, with a *Sira*, *i.e.* with an enclosure of stones about the height of a man, that the flocks may not be scattered in the night, and that they may know at once, from the noise made by the falling of the smaller stones which are laid at the top, if a wolf attempts to enter the enclosure during the night.

yet obtained a firm footing in Canaan. At that time the land to the west of the river could very naturally be spoken of as “*beyond the Jordan*,” from the subjective stand-point of the historian, who was then on the east of the river; whereas, according to the objective and geographical usage, the land “*beyond Jordan*” signifies the country to the east of the river. But in order to prevent misunderstanding, in this particular instance the expression עַבְרֵ הַיַּהוָה is defined more precisely as מִזְרָחָה, “*towards the east*,” when it is intended to apply to the land on the east of the Jordan.—Vers. 20-24. Upon this declaration Moses absolves them from all guilt, and promises them the desired land for a possession, on condition that they fulfil their promise; but he reminds them again of the sin that they will commit, and will have to atone for, if their promise is not fulfilled, and closes with the admonition to build towns for their families and pens for their flocks, and to do what they have promised. Upon this they promise again (vers. 25-27), through their spokesman (as the singular אָמַר in ver. 25, and the suffix in אָלַץ in ver. 27, clearly show), that they will fulfil his command. The use of the expression “*before Jehovah*,” in the words, “go armed before Jehovah to war,” in vers. 20 and 21, may be explained from the fact, that in the war which they waged at the command of their God, the Israelites were the army of Jehovah, with Jehovah in the midst. Hence the ark of the covenant was taken into the war, as the vehicle and substratum of the presence of Jehovah; whereas it remained behind in the camp, when the people wanted to press forward into Canaan of their own accord (chap. xiv. 44). But if this is the meaning of the expression “*before Jehovah*,” we may easily understand why the Reubenites and Gadites do not make use of it in ver. 17, namely, because they only promise to go equipped “*before the children of Israel*,” i.e. to help their brethren to conquer Canaan. In ver. 32 they also adopt the expression, after hearing it from the mouth of Moses (ver. 20).¹ מִקְרָב, innocent, “free from guilt before Jehovah and before Israel.” By drawing back from participation in the war against the Canaanites, they would not only sin against Jehovah, who had promised Canaan to all Israel, and commanded them to take it, but also against Israel

¹ This completely sets aside the supposed discrepancy which Knobel adduces in support of his fragmentary hypothesis, viz. that the Elohist writes “*before Israel*” in vers. 17 and 29, when the Jehovahist would write “*before Jehovah*”—a statement which is not even correct; since we find “*before Jehovah*” in ver. 29, which Knobel is obliged to erase from the text in order to establish his assertion.

itself, *i.e.* against the rest of the tribes, as is more fully stated in vers. 7–15. In ver. 22b, “before Jehovah” signifies according to the judgment of Jehovah, with divine approval. דַע שׁפְטָתֶךָם, “ye will know your sin,” which will overtake (אַתֶּם) or smite you, *i.e.* ye will have to make atonement for them.

Vers. 28–33. Moses thereupon commanded Eleazar, Joshua, and the heads of the tribes of Israel, *i.e.* the persons entrusted in chap. xxxiv. 17 sqq. with the division of the land of Canaan, to give the Gadites and Reubenites the land of Gilead for a possession, after the conquest of Canaan, if they should go along with them across the Jordan equipped for battle. But if they should not do this, they were to be made possessors (*i.e.* to be settled; נִמְנַחַת in a passive sense, whereas in Gen. xxxiv. 10, xlvi. 27, it is reflective, to fix oneself firmly, to settle) in the land of Canaan along with the other tribes. In the latter case, therefore, they were not only to receive no possession in the land to the east of the Jordan, but were to be compelled to go over the Jordan with their wives and children, and to receive an inheritance there for the purpose of preventing a schism of the nation.—Ver. 31. The Gadites and Reubenites repeated their promise once more (ver. 25), and added still further (ver. 32): “We will pass over armed before Jehovah into the land of Canaan, and let our inheritance be with us (*i.e.* remain to us) beyond the Jordan.”—Ver. 33. Moses then gave to the sons of Gad and Reuben, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, the kingdom of Sihon king of the Amorites, and Og king of Bashan, namely, “the land according to its towns, in (its) districts, (namely) the towns of the land round about,” *i.e.* the whole of the land with its towns and the districts belonging to them, or surrounding the towns. It appears strange that the half-tribe of Manasseh is included here for the first time at the close of the negotiations, whereas it is not mentioned at all in connection with the negotiations themselves. This striking fact may easily be explained, however, on the supposition that it was by the two tribes of Reuben and Gad alone that the request was made for the land of Gilead as a possession; but that when Moses granted this request, he did not overlook the fact, that some of the families of Manasseh had conquered various portions of Gilead and Bashan (ver. 39), and therefore gave these families, at the same time, the districts which they had conquered, for their inheritance, that the whole of the conquered land might be distributed at once. As *O. v. Gerlach* observes, “the participation of this half-tribe in the possession is accounted for in ver. 39.” Moses

restricted himself, however, to a general conveyance of the land that had been taken on the east of the Jordan to these two and a half tribes for their inheritance, without sharing it amongst them, or fixing the boundaries of the territory of each particular tribe. That was left to the representatives of the nation mentioned in ver. 28, and was probably not carried out till the return of the fighting men belonging to these tribes, who went with the others over the Jordan. In the verses which follow, we find only those towns mentioned which were fortified by the tribes of Gad and Reuben, and in which they constructed sheep-folds (vers. 34-38), and the districts which the families of Manasseh had taken and received as their possession (vers. 39-42).

Vers. 34-36. The *Gadites* built, *i.e.* restored and fortified, the following places. *Dibon*, also called Dibon Gad, an hour's journey to the north of the central Arnon (see p. 149). *Ataroth*, probably preserved in the extensive ruins of *Attarus*, on *Jebel Attarus*, between el Körriath (Kureyat) and Mkaur, *i.e.* Machaerus (see *Seetzen*, ii. p. 342). *Aroer*, not the Aroer before Rabbah, which was allotted to the Gadites (*Josh. xiii. 25*), as *v. Raumer* supposes; but the *Aroer of Reuben* in the centre of the valley of the Arnon (*Josh. xii. 2, xiii. 9, 16*), which is still to be seen in the ruins of *Araayr*, on the edge of the lofty rocky wall which bounds the Modjeb (*Burckhardt*, p. 633). *Atroth Shophan*: only mentioned here; situation unknown. *Jaezer*: probably to be sought for in the ruins of *es Szir*, to the west of Ammân (see at chap. xxi. 32). *Jogbehah*: only mentioned again in *Judg. viii. 11*, and preserved in the ruins of *Jebeiha*, about two hours to the north-west of Ammân (*Burckhardt*, p. 618; *Robinson*, App. p. 168). *Beth-Nimrah*, contracted into *Nimrah* (ver. 3), according to *Josh. xiii. 27*, in the valley of the Jordan, and according to the *Onomast.* (*s. v. Βηθναβράν*) *Beth-amnaram*, five Roman miles to the north of *Libias* (*Betharam*), now to be seen in the ruins of *Nimrein* or *Nemrin*, where the Wady *Shaib* enters the Jordan (*Burckhardt*, pp. 609, 661; *Robinson*, ii. p. 279), in a site abounding in water and pastureage (*Seetzen*, ii. pp. 318, 716). *Beth-Haran*, or *Beth-Haram* (*Jos. xiii. 27*): *Beth-rampitha*, according to *Josephus*, *Ant. xviii. 2, 1*, which was called *Julias*, in honour of the wife of Augustus. According to the *Onomast.* it was called *Beth-Ramtha* by the Syrians (בֵית רַמְתָה, the form of the Aramaean *stat. emphat.*), and was named *Livias* by Herod Antipas, in honour of *Livia*, the wife of Augustus. It has been preserved in the ruins of *Rameh*, not far from the mouth of the

Wady Hesbân (*Burckhardt*, p. 661, and *Robinson*, ii. 305). The words עֲמָצָר וְנוּ in ver. 36 are governed by יִבְנֵי in ver. 34: “they built them as fortified cities and folds for flocks,” i.e. they fortified them, and built folds in them.

Vers. 37 and 38. The *Reubenites* built *Heshbon*, the capital of king Sihon (see chap. xxi. 16), which was allotted to the tribe of Reuben (Josh. xiii. 17), but relinquished to the Gadites, because it was situated upon the border of their territory, and given up by them to the Levites (Josh. xxi. 39; 1 Chron. vi. 66). It stood almost in the centre between the Arnon and Jabbok, opposite to Jericho, and, according to the *Onomast.*, twenty Roman miles from the Jordan, where the ruins of a large town of about a mile in circumference are still to be seen, with deep bricked wells, and a large reservoir, bearing the ancient name of *Hesban* or *Hüsban* (*Seetzen*; *Burckhardt*, p. 623; *Robinson*, Pal. ii. 278; cf. v. *Raumer*, Pal. p. 262; and *Ritter's Erdkunde*, xv. p. 1176).—*Elealeh*: half-an-hour's journey to the north-east of Heshbon, now called *el Aal*, i.e. the height, upon the top of a hill, from which you can see the whole of southern Belka; it is now in ruins with many cisterns, pieces of wall, and foundations of houses (*Burckhardt*, p. 623).—*Kirjathaim*, probably to the south-west of Medeba, where the ruins of *el Teym* are now to be found (see at Gen. xiv. 5). *Nebo*, on Mount Nebo (see at chap. xxvii. 12). The *Onomast.* places the town eight Roman miles to the south of Heshbon, whilst the mountain is six Roman miles to the west of that town. *Baal-Meon*, called *Beon* in ver. 3, *Beth-Meon* in Jer. xlvi. 23, and more fully *Beth-Baal-Meon* in Josh. xiii. 17, is probably to be found, not in the ruins of *Maein* discovered by *Seetzen* and *Legh*, an hour's journey to the south-west of *Tueme* (*Teim*), and the same distance to the north of *Habis*, on the north-east of *Jebel Attarus*, and nine Roman miles to the south of Heshbon, as most of the modern commentators from *Rosenmüller* to *Knobel* suppose; but in the ruins of *Myun*, mentioned by *Burckhardt* (p. 624), three-quarters of an hour to the south-east of Heshbon, where we find it marked upon *Kiepert's* and *Van de Velde's* maps.¹ *Shibmah* (ver. 3, *Shebam*), which was only 500 paces from Heshbon, according to Jerome (on Isa. xiv. 8),

¹ Although *Baal-Meon* is unquestionably identified with *Maein* in the *Onom.* (see v. *Raumer*, Pal. p. 259), 1 Chron. v. 8 is decidedly at variance with this. It is stated there that “*Bela* dwelt in *Aroer*, and even unto *Nebo* and *Baal-Meon*,” a statement which places *Baal-Meon* in the neighbourhood of *Nebo*, like the passage before us, and is irreconcilable with the supposition that it was

has apparently disappeared, without leaving a trace behind.¹ Thus all the places built by the Reubenites were but a short distance from Heshbon, and surrounded this capital; whereas those built by the Gadites were some of them to the south of it, on the Arnon, and others to the north, towards Rabbath-Ammon. It is perfectly obvious from this, that the restoration of these towns took place before the distribution of the land among these tribes, without any regard to their possession afterwards. In the distribution, therefore, the southernmost of the towns built by the Gadites, viz. Aroer, Dibon, and Ataroth, fell to the tribe of Reuben; and Heshbon, which was built by the Reubenites, fell to the tribe of Gad. The words מוכחת שם, “changed of name,” are governed by בְּ: “they built the towns with an alteration of their names,” *mutatis nominibus* (for סבָּבָה, in the sense of changing, see Zech. xiv. 10). There is not sufficient ground for altering the text, שם into יאשׁ (*Knobel*), according to the περικυκλωμένας of the LXX., or the περιτετευχισμένας of *Symmachus*. The Masoretic text is to be found not only in the Chaldee, the Syriac, the Vulgate, and the Saadic versions, but also in the Samaritan. The expression itself, too, cannot be justly described as “awkward,” nor is it a valid objection that the naming is mentioned afterwards; for altering the name of a town and giving it a new name are not tautological. The insertion of the words, “their names being changed,” before Shibmah, is an indication that the latter place did not receive any other name. Moreover, the new names which the builders gave to these towns did not continue in use long, but were soon pressed out by the old ones again. “And they called by names the names of the towns:” this is a

identical with *Maein* in the neighbourhood of *Attarus*. In the case of *Seetzen*, however, the identification of *Maein* with *Baal-Meon* is connected with the supposition, which is now generally regarded as erroneous, namely, that *Nebo* is the same as the *Jebel Attarus*. (See, on the other hand, *Hengstenberg*, *Balaam*; and *Ritter's Erdkunde*, xv. pp. 1187 sqq.)

¹ The difference in the forms *Shibmah*, *Baal-Meon* (ver. 38), and *Beth-Nimrah* (ver. 36), instead of *Shebam*, *Beon*, and *Nimrah* (ver. 3), is rendered useless as a proof that ver. 3 is Jehovistic, and vers. 36–38 Elohistic, from the simple fact that *Baal-Meon* itself is a contraction of *Beth-Baal-Meon* (Josh. xiii. 17). If the Elohist could write this name fully in one place and abbreviated in another, he could just as well contract it still further, and by exchanging the labials call it *Beon*; and so also he could no doubt omit the *Beth* in the case of *Nimrah*, and use the masculine form *Shebam* in the place of *Shibmah*. The contraction of the names in ver. 3 is especially connected with the fact, that diplomatic exactness was not required for an historical account, but that the abbreviated forms in common use were quite sufficient.

roundabout way of saying, they called the towns by (other, or new) names : cf. 1 Chron. vi. 50.

Vers. 39-42. Moses gave the *Manassites* the land which was conquered by them ; in fact, the whole of the kingdom of *Bashan*, including not only the province of *Bashan*, but the northern half of Gilead (see at chap. xxi. 33, 34). Of this the *sons of Machir* received Gilead, the modern *Jebel Ajlun*, between the *Jabbok* (*Zerka*) and the *Mandhur* (*Hieromax*, *Jarmuk*), because they had taken it and driven out the Amorites and destroyed them (see Deut. iii. 13). The imperfects in ver. 39 are to be understood in the sense of pluperfects, the different parts being linked together by *consec.* according to the simple style of the Semitic historical writings explained in the note on Gen. ii. 19, and the leading thought being preceded by the clauses which explain it, instead of their being logically subordinated to it. “*The sons of Machir went to Gilead and took it . . . and Moses gave*,” etc., instead of “Moses gave Gilead to the sons of Machir, who had gone thither and taken it . . .” The words מִשְׁבַּת מָכִיר, “Machir dwelt therein (in Gilead),” do not point to a later period than the time of Moses, but simply state that the Machirites took possession of Gilead. As soon as Moses had given them the conquered land for their possession, they no doubt brought their families, like the Gadites and Reubenites, and settled them in fortified towns, that they might dwell there in safety, whilst the fighting men helped the other tribes to conquer Canaan. מִשְׁבַּת signifies not merely “to dwell,” but literally to place oneself, or settle down (*e.g.* Gen. xxxvi. 8, etc.), and is even applied to the temporary sojourn of the Israelites in particular encampments (chap. xx. 1). —*Machir* (ver. 40) : for the sons of Machir, or Machirites (chap. xxvi. 29). But as *Gilead* does not mean the whole of the land with this name, but only the northern half, so the sons of Machir are not the whole of his posterity, but simply those who formed the family of Machirites which bore its father’s name (chap. xxvi. 29), *i.e.* the seven fathers’ houses or divisions of the family, the heads of which are named in 1 Chron. v. 24. The other descendants of *Machir* through Gilead, who formed the six families of Gilead mentioned in chap. xxvi. 29-33, and Josh. xvii. 2, received their inheritance in Canaan proper (Josh. xvii.).—Ver. 41. The family of *Manasseh* named after *Machir* included “*Jair the son (i.e. descendant) of Manasseh*.” *Jair*, that is to say, was the grandson of a daughter of *Machir* the son of *Manasseh*, and therefore a great-grandson of *Manasseh* on the mother’s side. His father *Segub* was the son of

Hezron of the tribe of Judah, who had married a daughter of Manasseh (1 Chron. ii. 21, 22); so that Jair, or rather Segub, had gone over with his descendants into the maternal tribe, contrary to the ordinary rule, and probably because Machir had portioned his daughter with a rich dowry like an heiress. *Jair* took possession of the whole of the province of *Argob* in Bashan, *i.e.* in the plain of Jaulan and Hauran (Deut. iii. 4 and 14), and gave the conquered towns the name of *Havvoth Jair*, *i.e.* Jair's-lives (see at Deut. iii. 14). —Ver. 42. *Nobah*, whose family is never referred to, but who probably belonged, like Jair, to one of the families of Machirites, took the town of *Kenath* and its daughters, *i.e.* the smaller towns dependent upon it (see chap. xxi. 25), and gave it his own name *Nobah*. The name has not been preserved, and is not to be sought, as *Kurtz* supposes, in the village of *Nowa (Newe)*, in Jotan, which is mentioned by *Burckhardt* (p. 443), and was once a town of half an hour's journey in circumference. For *Kenath*, which is only mentioned again in 1 Chron. ii. 23 as having been taken from the Israelites by Gesur and Aram, is *Kávaθa*, which *Josephus (de bell. Jud. i. 19, 2)* and *Ptolemy* speak of as belonging to Cœlesyria, and *Pliny (h. n. 5, 16)* to Decapolis, and which was situated, according to *Jerome*, “in the region of Trachonitis, near to Bostra.” The ruins are very extensive even now, being no less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ or 3 miles in circumference, and containing magnificent remains of palaces from the times of Trajan and Hadrian. It is on the western slope of Jebel Hauran, and is only inhabited by a few families of Druses. The present name is *Kanuat*. (For descriptions, see *Seetzen*, i. pp. 78 sqq.; *Burckhardt*, pp. 157 sqq.; cf. *Ritter, Erdk.*)

LIST OF ISRAEL'S ENCAMPMENTS.—CHAP. XXXIII. 1-49.

As the Israelites had ended their wanderings through the desert, when they arrived in the steppes of Moab by the Jordan opposite to Jericho (chap. xxii. 1), and as they began to take possession when the conquered land beyond Jordan was portioned out (chap. xxxii.), the history of the desert wandering closes with a list of the stations which they had left behind them. This list was written out by Moses “at the command of Jehovah” (ver. 2), as a permanent memorial for after ages, as every station which Israel left behind on the journey from Egypt to Canaan “through the great and terrible desert,” was a memorial of the grace and faithfulness with which the Lord led His people safely “in the

desert land and in the waste howling wilderness, and kept him as the apple of His eye, as an eagle fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings" (Ex. xix. 4; Deut. xxxii. 10 sqq.).

Vers. 1–15. The first and second verses form the heading: "*These are the marches of the children of Israel, which they marched out,*" i.e. the marches which they made from one place to another, on going out of Egypt. מַפְעָעַ does not mean a station, but the breaking up of a camp, and then a train, or march (see at Ex. xii. 37, and Gen. xiii. 3). בֵּידָם נִצְבָּאָתָם (see Ex. vii. 4). מִזְרָחָם לְמַסְעָהָם, "their goings out (properly, their places of departure) according to their marches," is really equivalent to the clause which follows: "their marches according to their places of departure." The march of the people is not described by the stations, or places of encampment, but by the particular spots from which they set out. Hence the constant repetition of the word נִסְעָה, "and they broke up." In vers. 3–5, the departure is described according to Ex. xii. 17, 37–41. On the judgments of Jehovah upon the gods of Egypt, see at Ex. xii. 12. "With an high hand:" as in Ex. xiv. 8.—The places of encampment from *Succoth* to the *desert of Sinai* (vers. 5–15) agree with those in the historical account, except that the stations at the *Red Sea* (ver. 10) and those at *Dophkah* and *Alush* (vers. 13 and 14) are passed over there. For *Raemses*, see at Ex. xii. 37. *Succoth* and *Etham* (Ex. xiii. 20). *Pihahiroth* (Ex. xiv. 2). "The wilderness" (ver. 8) is the desert of *Shur*, according to Ex. xv. 22. *Marah*, see Ex. xv. 23. *Elim* (Ex. xv. 27). For the *Red Sea* and the *wilderness of Sin*, see Ex. xvi. 1. For *Dophkah*, *Alush*, and *Rephidim*, see Ex. xvii. 1; and for the wilderness of *Sinai*, Ex. xix. 2.

In vers. 16–36 there follow twenty-one names of places where the Israelites encamped from the time that they left the *wilderness of Sinai* till they encamped in the *wilderness of Zin*, i.e. *Kadesh*. The description of the latter as "the wilderness of Zin, which is Kadesh," which agrees almost word for word with Num. xx. 1, and still more the agreement of the places mentioned in vers. 37–49, as the encampments of Israel after leaving Kadesh till their arrival in the steppes of Moab, with the march of the people in the fortieth year as described in chap. xx. 22–xxii. 1, put it beyond all doubt that the encampment in the wilderness of Zin, i.e. Kadesh (ver. 36), is to be understood as referring to the second arrival in

Kadesh after the expiration of the thirty-eight years of wandering in the desert to which the congregation had been condemned. Consequently the twenty-one names in vers. 16-36 contain not only the places of encampment at which the Israelites encamped in the second year of their march from Sinai to the desert of *Paran* at Kadesh, whence the spies were despatched into Canaan, but also those in which they encamped for a longer period during the thirty-eight years of punishment in the wilderness. This view is still further confirmed by the fact that the two first of the stations named after the departure from the wilderness of Sinai, viz. *Kibroth-hattaavah* and *Hazeroth*, agree with those named in the historical account in chap. xi. 34 and 35. Now if, according to chap. xii. 16, when the people left *Hazeroth*, they encamped in the desert of *Paran*, and despatched the spies thence out of the desert of *Zin* (chap. xiii. 21), who returned to the congregation after forty days "into the desert of Paran to *Kadesh*" (chap. xiii. 26), it is as natural as it well can be to seek for this place of encampment in the desert of Paran or *Zin* at Kadesh under the name of *Rithmah*, which follows *Hazeroth* in the present list (ver. 18). This natural supposition reaches the highest degree of probability, from the fact that, in the historical account, the place of encampment, from which the sending out of the spies took place, is described in so indefinite a manner as the "desert of *Paran*," since this name does not belong to a small desert, just capable of holding the camp of the Israelites, but embraces the whole of the large desert plateau which stretches from the central mountains of Horeb in the south to the mountains of the Amorites, which really form part of Canaan, and contains no less than 400 (? 10,000 English) square miles (see pp. 57-8). In this desert the Israelites could only pitch their camp in one particular spot, which is called *Rithmah* in the list before us; whereas in the historical account the passage is described, according to what the Israelites performed and experienced in this encampment, as near to the southern border of Canaan, and is thus pointed out with sufficient clearness for the purpose of the historical account. To this we may add the coincidence of the name *Rithmah* with the Wady *Abu Retemat*, which is not very far to the south of Kadesh, "a wide plain with shrubs and *retem*," i.e. broom (*Robinson*, i. p. 279), in the neighbourhood of which, and behind the chalk formation which bounds it towards the east, there is a copious spring of sweet water called *Ain el Kudeirât*. This spot was well adapted for a place of en-

campment for Israel, which was so numerous that it might easily stretch into the desert of Zin, and as far as Kadesh.

The seventeen places of encampment, therefore, that are mentioned in vers. 19–36 between *Rithmah* and *Kadesh*, are the places at which Israel set up camps during the thirty-seven years of their wandering about in the desert, from their return from Kadesh into the “desert of the way to the Red Sea” (chap. xiv. 25), till the reassembling of the whole congregation in the desert of Zin at Kadesh (chap. xx. 1).¹ Of all the seventeen places not a single one is known, or can be pointed out with certainty, except *Eziongeber*. Only the four mentioned in vers. 30–33, *Moseroth*, *Bene-Jaakan*, *Hor-hagidgad*, and *Jotbathah*, are referred to again, viz. in Deut. x. 6, 7, where Moses refers to the divine protection enjoyed by the Israelites in their wandering in the desert, in these words: “And the children of Israel took their journey from *Beeroth-bene-Jaakan* to *Mosera*; there Aaron died, and there he was buried. . . . From thence they journeyed unto *Gudgodah*, and from *Gudgodah* to *Jotbathah*, a land of water-brooks.” Of the identity of the places mentioned in the two passages there can be no doubt whatever. *Bene Jaakan* is simply an abbreviation of *Beeroth-bene-Jaakan*, wells of the children of Jaakan. Now if the children of *Jaakan* were the same as the Horite family of *Jakan* mentioned in Gen.

¹ The different hypotheses for reducing the journey of the Israelites to a few years, have been refuted by *Kurtz* (iii. § 41) in the most conclusive manner possible, and in some respects more elaborately than was actually necessary. Nevertheless *Knobel* has made a fresh attempt, in the interest of his fragmentary hypothesis, to explain the twenty-one places of encampment given in vers. 16–37 as twenty-one marches made by Israel from Sinai till their first arrival at Kadesh. As the whole distance from Sinai to Kadesh by the straight road through the desert consists of only an eleven days' journey, *Knobel* endeavours to bring his twenty-one marches into harmony with this statement, by reckoning only five hours to each march, and postulating a few detours in addition, in which the people occupied about a hundred hours or more. The objection which might be raised to this, namely, that the Israelites made much longer marches than these on their way from Egypt to Sinai, he tries to set aside by supposing that the Israelites left their flocks behind them in Egypt, and procured fresh ones from the Bedouins at Sinai. But this assertion is so arbitrary and baseless an idea, that it is not worth while to waste a single word upon the subject (see Ex. xii. 38). The reduction of the places of encampment to simple marches is proved to be at variance with the text by the express statement in chap. x. 33, that when the Israelites left the wilderness of Sinai they went a three days' journey, until the cloud showed them a resting-place. For it is perfectly evident from this, that the march from one place to another cannot be understood without further ground as being simply a day's march of five hours.

xxxvi. 27,—and the reading יְמִין for יְמִינָה in 1 Chron. i. 42 seems to favour this,—the wells of *Jaakan* would have to be sought for on the mountains that bound the *Arabah* on either the east or west. *Gudgodah* is only a slightly altered and abbreviated form of *Hor-hagidgad*, the cave of *Gidgad* or *Gudgodah*; and lastly, *Moseroth* is simply the plural form of *Mosera*. But notwithstanding the identity of these four places, the two passages relate to different journeys. Deut. x. 6 and 7 refers to the march in the fortieth year, when the Israelites went from Kadesh through the Wady *Murreh* into the *Arabah* to Mount *Hor*, and encamped in the *Arabah* first of all at the wells of the children, and then at *Mosera*, where Aaron died upon Mount *Hor*, which was in the neighbourhood, and whence they travelled still farther southwards to *Gudgodah* and *Jotbathah*. In the historical account in chap. xx. and xxi. the three places of encampment, *Bene-Jaakan*, *Gudgodah*, and *Jotbathah*, are not mentioned, because nothing worthy of note occurred there. *Gudgodah* was perhaps the place of encampment mentioned in chap. xxi. 4, the name of which is not given, where the people were punished with fiery serpents; and *Jotbathah* is probably to be placed before *Zalmonah* (ver. 41). The clause, “a land of water-brooks” (Deut. x. 7), points to a spot in or near the southern part of the *Arabah*, where some wady, or valley with a stream flowing through it, opened into the *Arabah* from either the eastern or western mountains, and formed a green oasis through its copious supply of water in the midst of the arid steppe. But the Israelites had encamped at the very same places once before, namely, during their thirty-seven years of wandering, in which the people, after returning from Kadesh to the Red Sea through the centre of the great desert of *et Tih*, after wandering about for some time in the broad desert plateau, went through the Wady *el Jerafeh* into the *Arabah* as far as the eastern border of it on the slopes of Mount *Hor*, and there encamped at *Mosera* (*Moseroth*) somewhere near *Ain et Taiyibeh* (on Robinson’s map), and then crossed over to *Bene-Jaakan*, which was probably on the western border of the *Arabah*, somewhere near *Ain el Ghamr* (Robinson), and then turning southwards passed along the Wady *el Jeib* by *Hor-gidgad* (*Gudgodah*), *Jotbathah*, and *Abronah* to *Eziongeber* on the Red Sea; for there can be no doubt whatever that the *Eziongeber* in vers. 35, 36, and that in Deut. ii. 8, are one and the same town, viz. the well-known port at the northern extremity of the Elanitic Gulf, where the Israelites in the time of Solomon and

Jehoshaphat built a fleet to sail to *Ophir* (1 Kings ix. 26, xxii. 49). It was not far from *Elath* (*i.e.* *Akaba*), and is supposed to have been “the large and beautiful town of *Aszium*,” which formerly stood, according to *Makrizi*, near to *Aila*, where there were many dates, fields, and fruit-trees, though it has now long since entirely disappeared.

Consequently the Israelites passed twice through a portion of the Arabah in a southerly direction towards the Red Sea, the second time from Wady Murreh by Mount Hor, to go round the land of Edom, not quite to the head of the gulf, but only to the Wady *el Ithm*, through which they crossed to the eastern side of Edomitis (p. 142); the first time during the thirty-seven years of wandering from Wady el Jerafeh to Moseroth and Bene Jaakan, and thence to Eziongeber.—Ver. 36. “*And they removed from Eziongeber, and encamped in the desert of Zin, that is Kadesh:*” the return to Kadesh towards the end of the thirty-ninth year is referred to here. The fact that no places of encampment are given between Eziongeber and Kadesh, is not to be attributed to the “plan of the author, to avoid mentioning the same places of encampment a second time,” for any such plan is a mere conjecture; but it may be simply and perfectly explained from the fact, that on this return route—which the whole of the people, with their wives, children, and flocks, could accomplish without any very great exertion in ten or fourteen days, as the distance from Aila to Kadesh through the desert of Paran is only about a forty hours’ journey upon camels, and *Robinson* travelled from Akabah to the Wady Retemath, near Kadesh, in four days and a half—no formal camp was pitched at all, probably because the time of penal wandering came to an end at Eziongeber, and the time had arrived when the congregation was to assemble again at Kadesh, and set out thence upon its journey to Canaan.—Hence the eleven names given in vers. 19–30, between *Rithmah* and *Moseroth*, can only refer to those stations at which the congregation pitched their camp for a longer or shorter period during the thirty-seven years of punishment, on their slow return from Kadesh to the Red Sea, and previous to their entering the Arabah and encamping at Moseroth.

This number of stations, which is very small for thirty-seven years (only seventeen from Rithmah or Kadesh to Eziongeber), is a sufficient proof that the congregation of Israel was not constantly wandering about during the whole of that time, but may have remained in many of the places of encampment, probably those which furnished an abundant supply of water and pasturage, not

only for weeks and months, but even for years, the people scattering themselves in all directions round about the place where the tabernacle was set up, and making use of such means of support as the desert afforded, and assembling together again when this was all gone, for the purpose of travelling farther and seeking somewhere else a suitable spot for a fresh encampment. Moreover, the words of Deut. i. 46, "ye abode in Kadesh many days," when compared with chap. ii. 1, "then we turned, and took our journey into the wilderness of the way to the Red Sea," show most distinctly, that after the sentence passed upon the people in Kadesh (chap. xiv.), they did not begin to travel back at once, but remained for a considerable time in Kadesh before going southwards into the desert. With regard to the direction which they took, all that can be said, so long as none of the places of encampment mentioned in vers. 19-29 are discovered, is that they made their way by a very circuitous route, and with many a wide detour, to Eziongeber, on the Red Sea.¹

Vers. 37-49. The places of encampment on the journey of the fortieth year from Kadesh to Mount Hor, and round Edom and Moab into the steppes of Moab, have been discussed at chap. xx. and xxi. On Mount Hor, and Aaron's death there, see at chap. xx. 22. For the remark in ver. 40 concerning the Canaanites of Arad,

¹ We agree so far, therefore, with the view adopted by *Fries*, and followed by *Kurtz* (History of Old Covenant, iii. 306-7) and *Schultz* (Deut. pp. 153-4), that we regard the stations given in vers. 19-35, between *Rithmah* and *Eziongeber*, as referring to the journeys of Israel, after its condemnation in Kadesh, during the thirty-seven years of its wandering about in the desert. But we do not regard the view which these writers have formed of the marches themselves as being well founded, or in accordance with the text,—namely, that the people of Israel did not really come a second time in full procession from the south to Kadesh, but that they had never left Kadesh entirely, inasmuch as when the nation was rejected in Kadesh, the people divided themselves into larger and smaller groups, and that portion which was estranged from Moses, or rather from the Lord, remained in Kadesh even after the rest were scattered about; so that, in a certain sense, Kadesh formed the standing encampment and meeting-place of the congregation even during the thirty-seven years. According to this view, the removals and encampments mentioned in vers. 19-36 do not describe the marches of the whole nation, but are to be understood as the circuit made by the headquarters during the thirty-seven years, with Moses at the head and the sanctuary in the midst (*Kurtz*), or else as showing "that Moses' and Aaron, with the sanctuary and the tribe of Levi, altered their resting-place, say from year to year, thus securing to every part of the nation in turn the nearness of the sanctuary, in accordance with the signals appointed by God (Num. x. 11, 12), and thus passed over the space between Kadesh and Eziongeber within the first eighteen years, and then, by a similar change of place,

see at chap. xxi. 1. On *Zalmonah, Phunon, and Oboth*, see at chap. xxi. 10; on *Ijje Abarim*, at chap. xxi. 11; on *Dibon Gad, Almon Diblathaim*, and the mountains of *Abarim*, before *Nebo*, chap. xxi. 16–20 (see p. 149). On *Arboth Moab*, see at chap. xxii. 1.

INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING THE CONQUEST AND DISTRIBUTION OF CANAAN.—CHAP. XXXIII. 50—CHAP. XXXVI. 13.

These instructions, with which the eyes of the Israelites were directed to the end of all their wandering, viz. the possession of the promised land, are arranged in two sections by longer introductory formulas (chap. xxxiii. 50 and xxxv. 1). The former contains the divine commands (*a*) with regard to the extermination of the Canaanites and their idolatry, and the division of the land among the tribes of Israel (chap. xxxiii. 50–56); (*b*) concerning the boundaries of Canaan (chap. xxxiv. 1–15); (*c*) concerning the men who were to divide the land (chap. xxxiv. 16–29). The second contains commands (*a*) respecting the towns to be given up to the Levites (chap. xxxv. 1–8); (*b*) as to the setting apart of cities of refuge

gradually drew near to Kadesh during the remaining eighteen or nineteen years, and at length in the last year summoned the whole nation (all the congregation) to assemble together at this meeting-place.” Now we cannot admit that in this view “we find all the different and scattered statements of the Pentateuch explained and rendered intelligible.” In the first place, it does not do justice even to the list of stations; for if the constantly repeated expression, “and they (the children of Israel, ver. 1) removed . . . and encamped,” denotes the removal and encamping of the whole congregation in vers. 3–18 and 37–49, it is certainly at variance with the text to explain the same words in vers. 19–36 as signifying the removal and encamping of the headquarters only, or of Moses, with Aaron and the Levites, and the tabernacle. Again, in all the laws that were given and the events that are described as occurring between the first halt of the congregation in Kadesh (chap. xiii. and xiv.) and their return thither at the commencement of the fortieth year (chap. xx.), the presence of the whole congregation is taken for granted. The sacrificial laws in chap. xv., which Moses was to address to the children of Israel (ver. 1), were given to “the whole congregation” (cf. vers. 24, 25, 26). The man who gathered wood on the Sabbath was taken out of the camp and stoned by “all the congregation” (chap. xv. 36). “All the congregation” took part in the rebellion of the company of Korah (chap. xvi. 19, xvii. 6, 21 sqq.). It is true this occurrence is supposed by *Kurtz* to have taken place “during the halt in Kadesh,” but the reasons given are by no means conclusive (p. 105). Besides, if we assign everything that is related in chap. xv.–xix. to the time when the whole congregation abode in Kadesh, this deprives the hypothesis of its chief support in Deut. i. 46, “and ye abode in Kadesh a long time, according to the days that ye abide.” For in that case the long abode in Kadesh would include the period of the laws

for unintentional manslayers, and the course to be adopted in relation to such manslayers (chap. xxxv. 9-34); and (c) a law concerning the marrying of heiresses within their own tribes (chap. xxxvi.).—The careful dovetailing of all these legal regulations by separate introductory formulas, is a distinct proof that the section chap. xxxiii. 50-56 is not to be regarded, as *Baumgarten*, *Knobel*, and others suppose, in accordance with the traditional division of the chapters, as an appendix or admonitory conclusion to the list of stations, but as the general legal foundation for the more minute instructions in chap. xxxiv.-xxxvi.

Chap. xxxiii. 50-56. COMMAND TO EXTERMINATE THE CANANITES, AND DIVIDE THEIR LAND AMONG THE FAMILIES OF ISRAEL.—Vers. 51-53. When the Israelites passed through the Jordan into the land of Canaan, they were to exterminate all the inhabitants of the land, and to destroy all the memorials of their idolatry; to take possession of the land and dwell therein, for Jehovah had given it to them for a possession. **הַזְרִיף**, to take possession of (vers. 53, etc.), then to drive out of their possession, to and incidents recorded in chap. xv.-xix., and yet, after all, “the whole congregation” went away. In no case, in fact, can the words be understood as signifying that a portion of the nation remained there during the thirty-seven years. Nor can this be inferred in any way from the fact that their departure is not expressly mentioned; for, at all events, the statement in chap. xx. 1, “and the children of Israel, the whole congregation, came into the desert of Zin,” presupposes that they had gone away. And the “inconceivable idea, that in the last year of their wanderings, when it was their express intention to cross the Jordan and enter Canaan from the east, they should have gone up from Eziongeber to the southern boundary of Canaan, which they had left thirty-seven years before, merely to come back again to the neighbourhood of Eziongeber, after failing in their negotiations with the king of Edom, which they might have carried on from some place much farther south, and to take the road from that point to the country on the east of the Jordan after all” (*Fries*), loses all the surprising character which it apparently has, if we only give up the assumption upon which it is founded, but which has no support whatever in the biblical history, viz. that during the thirty-seven years of their wandering in the desert, Moses was acquainted with the fact that the Israelites were to enter Canaan from the east, or at any rate that he had formed this plan for some time. If, on the contrary, when the Lord rejected the murmuring nation (chap. xiv. 26), He decided nothing with reference to the way by which the generation that would grow up in the desert was to enter Canaan,—and it was not till after the return to Kadesh that Moses was informed by God that they were to advance into Canaan from the east and not from the south,—it was perfectly natural that when the time of punishment had expired, the Israelites should assemble in Kadesh again, and start from that point upon their journey onward.

exterminate (ver. 52 ; cf. chap. xiv. 12, etc.). On ver. 52, see Ex. xxxiv. 13. מִשְׁבֵּת, an idol of stone (cf. Lev. xxvi. 1). אֲלָמֹת מִזְבֵּחַ, idols cast from brass. *Massekah*, see at Ex. xxxii. 4. *Bamoth*, altars of the Canaanites upon high places (see Lev. xxvi. 30).—Ver. 54. The command to divide the land by lot among the families is partly a verbal repetition of chap. xxvi. 53–56. לְאַשֶּׁר יִצְאَ לְוָהּ אֶל־אֶשֶּׁר יִצְאָ לְוָהּ : literally, “into that, whither the lot comes out to him, shall be to him” (*i.e.* to each family) ; in other words, it is to receive that portion of land to which the lot that comes out of the urn shall point it. “According to the tribes of your fathers :” see at chap. xxvi. 55.—The command closes in vers. 55, 56, with the threat, that if they did not exterminate the Canaanites, not only would such as were left become “thorns in their eyes and stings in their sides,” *i.e.* inflict the most painful injuries upon them, and make war upon them in the land ; but Jehovah would also do the very same things to the Israelites that He had intended to do to the Canaanites, *i.e.* drive them out of the land and destroy them. This threat is repeated by Joshua in his last address to the assembled congregation (Josh. xxiii. 13).

Chap. xxxiv. 1–15. BOUNDARIES OF THE LAND OF CANAAN.
—Ver. 2. “When ye come into the land of Canaan, this shall be the land which will fall to you as an inheritance, the land of Canaan according to its boundaries :” *i.e.* ye shall receive the land of Canaan for an inheritance, within the following limits.—Vers. 3–5. The southern boundary is the same as that given in Josh. xv. 2–4 as the boundary of the territory of the tribe of Judah. We have first the general description, “The south side shall be to you from the desert of Zin on the sides of Edom onwards,” *i.e.* the land was to extend towards the south as far as the desert of Zin on the sides of Edom. עַל־יָדָיו, “on the sides,” differs in this respect from עַל־יָד, “on the side” (Ex. ii. 5 ; Josh. xv. 46 ; 2 Sam. xv. 2), that the latter is used to designate contact at a single point or along a short line ; the former, contact for a long distance or throughout the whole extent (= בְּלִיר, Deut. ii. 37). “On the sides of Edom” signifies, therefore, that the desert of Zin stretched along the side of Edom, and Canaan was separated from Edom by the desert of Zin. From this it follows still further, that Edom in this passage is not the mountains of Edom, which had their western boundary on the Arabah, but the country to the south of the desert of Zin or Wady Murreh (see p. 87), viz. the mountain land of the Azazimeh, which

still bears the name of *Seir* or *Serr* among the Arabs (see *Seetzen* and *Rowland* in *Ritter's Erdk.* xiv. pp. 840 and 1087). The statement in Josh. xv. 1 also agrees with this, viz. that Judah's inheritance was "to the territory of Edom, the desert of Zin towards the south," according to which the desert of Zin was also to divide the territory of Edom from that of the tribe of Judah (see the remarks on chap. xiv. 45). With ver. 3b the more minute description of the southern boundary line commences: "*The south border shall be from the end of the Salt Sea eastward*," i.e. start from "the tongue which turns to the south" (Josh. xv. 2), from the southern point of the Dead Sea, where there is now a salt marsh with the salt mountain at the south-west border of the lake. "*And turn to the south side* (*מִצְבָּה*) *of the ascent of Akrabbim*" (*ascensus scorpionum*), i.e. hardly "the steep pass of *es Sufah*, 1434 feet in height, which leads in a south-westerly direction from the Dead Sea along the northern side of Wady Fikreh, a wady three-quarters of an hour's journey in breadth, and over which the road from Petra to Heshbon passes,"¹ as *Knobel* maintains; for the expression *מִצְבָּה* (turn), in ver. 4, according to which the southern border turned at the height of Akrabbim, that is to say, did not go any farther in the direction from N.E. to S.W. than from the southern extremity of the Salt Sea to this point, and was then continued in a straight line from east to west, is not at all applicable to the position of this pass, since there would be no bend whatever in the boundary line at the pass of *es Sufah*, if it ran from the Arabah through Wady Fikreh, and so across to Kadesh. The "height of *Akrabbim*," from which the country round was afterwards called *Akrabattine*, *Akrabatene* (1 Macc. v. 3; *Josephus*, Ant. xii. 8, 1),² is most probably the lofty row of "white cliffs" of sixty or eighty feet in height, which run obliquely across the Arabah at a distance of about eight miles below the Dead Sea and, as seen from the south-west point of the Dead Sea, appear to shut in the Ghor, and which form the dividing line between the two sides of the great valley, which is called *el Ghor* on one side, and *el Araba* on the other (*Robinson*, ii. 489, 494, 502). Consequently it was not the Wady Fikreh, but a wady

¹ See *Robinson*, vol. ii. pp. 587, 591; and *v. Schubert*, ii. pp. 443, 447 sqq.

² It must be distinguished, however, from the *Akrabatta* mentioned by *Josephus* in his Wars of the Jews (iii. 3, 5), the modern *Akrabeh* in central Palestine (*Rob. Bibl. Res.* p. 296), and from the toparchy *Akrabattene* mentioned in *Josephus* (Wars of the Jews, ii. 12, 4; 20, 4; 22, 2), which was named after this place.

which opened into the Arabah somewhat farther to the south, possibly the southern branch of the Wady *Murreh* itself, which formed the actual boundary. “*And shall pass over to Zin*” (*i.e.* the desert of Zin, the great Wady *Murreh*, see at chap. xiv. 21), “*and its going forth shall be to the south of Kadesh-Barnea*,” at the western extremity of the desert of Zin (see at chap. xx. 16). From this point the boundary went farther out (אֶל־זִין) “*to Hazar-Addar, and over (עַל־) to Azmon*.” According to Josh. xv. 3, 4, it went to the south of Kadesh-Barnea over (עַל־) to *Hezron*, and ascended (לְהַלֵּךְ) to *Addar*, and then turned to *Karkaa*, and went over to *Azman*. Consequently *Hazar-Addar* corresponds to *Hezron* and *Addar* (in Joshua); probably the two places were so close to each other that they could be joined together. Neither of them has been discovered yet. This also applies to *Karkaa* and *Azman*. The latter name reminds us of the Bedouin tribe *Azazimeh*, inhabiting the mountains in the southern part of the desert of Zin (Robinson, i. pp. 274, 283, 287; Seetzen, iii. pp. 45, 47). *Azman* is probably to be sought for near the Wady *el Ain*, to the west of the Hebron road, and not far from its entrance into the Wady *el Arish*; for this is “*the river (brook) of Egypt*,” to which the boundary turned from *Azman*, and through which it had “*its outgoings at the sea*,” *i.e.* terminated at the Mediterranean Sea. The “*brook of Egypt*,” therefore, is frequently spoken of as the southern boundary of the land of Israel (1 Kings viii. 65, 2 Kings xxiv. 7, 2 Chron. vii. 8, and Isa. xxvii. 12, where the LXX. express the name by ‘Πινοκοπούπα’). Hence the southern boundary ran, throughout its whole length, from the Arabah on the east to the Mediterranean on the west, along valleys which form a natural division, and constitute more or less the boundary line between the desert and the cultivated land.¹

Ver. 6. The *western boundary* was to be "the great sea and its territory," i.e. the Mediterranean Sea with its territory or coast (cf Deut. iii. 16, 17; Josh. xiii. 23, 27, xv. 47).

¹ On the lofty mountains of *Madara*, where the Wady *Murreh* is divided into two wadys (*Fikreh* and *Murreh*) which run to the Arabah, v. Schubert observed "some mimosen-trees," with which, as he expresses it, "the vegetation of Arabia took leave of us, as it were, as they were the last that we saw on our road." And Dieterici (*Reisebilder*, ii. pp. 156-7) describes the mountain ridge at *Nakb es Sufah* as "the boundary line between the yellow desert and green steppes," and observes still further, that on the other side of the mountain (*i.e.* northwards) the plain spread out before him in its fresh green dress. "The desert journey was over, the empire of death now lay behind us, and a new life blew towards us from fields covered with green."—In the same way the

Vers. 7-9. The *northern boundary* cannot be determined with certainty. “*From the great sea, mark out to you* (*וְאַתָּה מְקַרֵּב תְּ*, from *מִקְרָב*, to mark or point out), i.e. fix, *Mount Hor as the boundary*”—from thence “*to come to Hamath; and let the goings forth of the boundary be to Zedad. And the boundary shall go out to Ziphron, and its goings out be at Hazar-enan.*” Of all these places, *Hamath*, the modern *Hamah*, or the *Epiphania* of the Greeks and Romans on the Orontes (see at chap. xiii. 21, and Gen. x. 18), is the only one whose situation is well known; but the geographical description of the northern boundary of the land of Israel *וְאַתָּה מְקַרֵּב תְּ* (chap. xiii. 21; Josh. xiii. 5; Judg. iii. 3; 1 Kings viii. 65; 2 Kings xiv. 25; 1 Chron. xiii. 5; 2 Chron. vii. 8; Amos vi. 14; Ezek. xlvi. 15, 20, xlviii. 1) is so indefinite, that the boundary line cannot be determined with exactness. For no proof can be needed in the present day that *וְאַתָּה מְקַרֵּב תְּ* cannot mean “*to Hamath*” (*Ges. thes.* i. p. 185; *Studer* on Judg. iii. 3, and *Baur* on Amos vi. 2), in such a sense as would make the town of *Hamath* the border town, and *אֶז* a

country between Kadesh and the Hebron road, which has become better known to us through the descriptions of travellers, is described as a natural boundary. *Seetzen*, in his account of his journey from Hebron to Sinai (iii. p. 47), observes that the mountains of *Tih* commence at the Wady *el Ain* (fountain-valley), which takes its name from a fountain that waters thirty date-palms and a few small corn-fields (i.e. *Ain el Kuderat*, in *Robinson*, i. p. 280), and describes the country to the south of the small flat Wady *el Kdeis* (*el Kideise*), in which many tamarisks grew (i.e. no doubt a wady that comes from Kadesh, from which it derives its name), as a “most dreadful wilderness, which spreads out to an immeasurable extent in all directions, without trees, shrubs, or a single spot of green” (p. 50), although the next day he “found as an unexpected rarity another small field of barley, which might have been an acre in extent” (pp. 52, 53). *Robinson* (i. pp. 280 sqq.) also found, upon the route from Sinai to Hebron, more vegetation in the desert between the Wady *el Kusaimeh* and *el Ain* than anywhere else before throughout his entire journey; and after passing the Wady *el Ain* to the west of Kadesh, he “came upon a broad tract of tolerably fertile soil, capable of tillage, and apparently once tilled.” Across the whole of this tract of land there were long ranges of low stone walls visible (called “*el Muzeiriât*,” “little plantations,” by the Arabs), which had probably served at some former time as boundary walls between the cultivated fields. A little farther to the north the Wady *es Serâm* opens into an extended plain, which looked almost like a meadow with its bushes, grass, and small patches of wheat and barley. A few Azazimeh Arabs fed their camels and flocks here. The land all round became more open, and showed broad valleys that were capable of cultivation, and were separated by low and gradually sloping hills. The grass became more frequent in the valleys, and herbs were found upon the hills. “We heard (he says at p. 283) this morning for the first time the songs of many birds, and among them the lark.”

perfectly superfluous pleonasm. In all the passages mentioned, *Hamath* refers, not to the town of that name (*Epiphania* on the Orontes), but to the kingdom of *Hamath*, which was named after its capital, as is proved beyond all doubt by 2 Chron. viii. 4, where Solomon is said to have built store cities “in Hamath.” The city of Hamath never belonged to the kingdom of Israel, not even under David and Solomon, and was not reconquered by Jeroboam II., as *Baur* supposes (see my Commentary on the Books of Kings, and *Thenius* on 2 Kings xiv. 25). How far the territory of the kingdom of Hamath extended towards the south in the time of Moses, and how much of it was conquered by Solomon (2 Chron. viii. 4), we are nowhere informed. We simply learn from 2 Kings xxv. 21, that Riblah (whether the same Riblah as is mentioned in ver. 11 as a town upon the eastern boundary, is very doubtful) was situated in the land of Hamath in the time of the Chaldeans. Now if this Riblah has been preserved in the modern *Ribleh*, a miserable village on the Orontes, in the northern part of the *Bekaa*, ten or twelve hours’ journey to the south-west of *Hums*, and fourteen hours to the north of *Baalbek* (*Robinson*, iii. p. 461, App. 176, and *Bibl. Researches*, p. 544), the land of Canaan would have reached a little farther northwards, and almost to *Hums* (*Emesa*). *Knobel* moves the boundary still farther to the north. He supposes Mount *Hor* to be *Mons Casius*, to the south-west of Antioch, on the Orontes, and agrees with *Robinson* (iii. 461) in identifying *Zedad*, in the large village of *Zedad* (*Sudud* in *Rob.*), which is inhabited exclusively by Syriac Christians, who still speak Syriac according to *Seetzen* (i. 32 and 279), a town containing about 3000 inhabitants (*Wetstein, Reiseber.* p. 88), to the south-east of *Hums*, on the east of the road from Damascus to Hunes, a short day’s journey to the north of *Nebk*, and four (or, according to *Van de Velde’s* memoir, from ten to twelve) hours’ journey to the south of *Hasya* (*Robinson*, iii. p. 461; *Ritter, Erdk.* xvii. pp. 1443–4). *Ziphron*, which was situated upon the border of the territory of Hamath and Damascus, if it is the same as the one mentioned in Ezek. xlviij. 16, is supposed by *Knobel* and *Wetstein* (p. 88) to be preserved in the ruins of *Zifran*, which in all probability have never been visited by any European, fourteen hours to the north-east of Damascus, near to the road from Palmyra. Lastly, *Hazar-enan* (equivalent to fountain-court) is supposed to be the station called *Centum Putea* (*Πούτρα* in *Ptol.* v. 15, 24), mentioned in the *Tabul. Peuting.* x. 3, on the road from *Apamia* to *Palmyra*, twenty-seven miles, or about eleven

hours, to the north-west of Palmyra.—But we may say with certainty that all these conclusions are incorrect, because they are irreconcilable with the eastern boundary described in vers. 10, 11. For example, according to vers. 10, 11, the Israelites were to draw (fix) the eastern boundary “from *Hazar-enan* to *Shepham*,” which, as Knobel observes, “cannot be determined with exactness, but was farther south than *Hazar-enan*, as it was a point on the eastern boundary which is traced here from north to south, and also farther west, as we may infer from the allusion to Riblah, probably at the northern end of Antilibanus” (?). From *Shepham* the boundary was “to go down to *Riblah*,” which Knobel finds in the *Ribleh* mentioned above. Now, if we endeavour to fix the situation of these places according to the latest and most trustworthy maps, the incorrectness of the conclusions referred to becomes at once apparent. From *Zedad (Sudad)* to *Zifran*, the line of the northern boundary would not have gone from west to east, but from north to south, or rather towards the south-west, and from *Zifran* to *Centum Putea* still more decidedly in a south-westerly direction. Consequently the northern boundary would have described a complete semicircle, commencing in the north-west and terminating in the south-east. But if even in itself this appears very incredible, it becomes perfectly impossible when we take the eastern boundary into consideration. For if this went down to the south-west from *Hazar-enan* to *Shepham* according to Knobel’s conclusions, instead of going down (ver. 11) from *Shepham* to *Riblah*, it would have gone *up* six or seven geographical miles from south to north, and then have gone down again from north to south along the eastern coast of the Lake of Gennesareth. Now it is impossible that Moses should have fixed such a boundary to the land of Israel on the north-east, and equally impossible that a later Hebrew, acquainted with the geography of his country, should have described it in this way.

If, in order to obtain a more accurate view of the extent of the land towards the north and north-east, we compare the statements of the book of Joshua concerning the conquered land with the districts which still remained to be taken at the time of the distribution; Joshua had taken the land “from the bald mountain which ascends towards Seir,” i.e. probably the northern ridge of the *Azazimel* mountains, with its white masses of chalk (*Fries, ut sup.* p. 76; see also at Josh. xi. 17), “to *Baal-Gad*, in the valley of Lebanon, below Mount *Hermon*” (Josh. xi. 17; cf. chap. xii. 7). But *Baal-Gad* in the valley (*ηύρε*) of Lebanon is not *Heliopolis* (now *Baal-*

bek in the *Bekaa*, or *Cœlesyria*), as many, from *Iken* and *J. D. Michaelis* down to *Knobel*, suppose; for “the *Bekaa* is not under the *Hermon*,” and “there is no proof, or even probability, that Joshua’s conquests reached so far, or that Baalbek was ever regarded as the northern boundary of Palestine, nor even that the adjoining portion of Anti-Lebanon was ever called *Hermon*” (*Robinson, Biblical Researches*, p. 409). *Baal-Gad*, which is called *Baal-Hermon* in Judg. iii. 3 and 1 Chron. v. 23, was the later *Paneas* or *Cæsarea Philippi*, the modern *Banias*, at the foot of the *Hermon* (cf. *v. Raumer, Pal.* p. 245; *Rob. Bibl. Res.* pp. 408–9, *Pal. iii.* pp. 347 sqq.). This is placed beyond all doubt by 1 Chron. v. 23, according to which the Manassites, who were increasing in numbers, dwelt “from Bashan to Baal-Hermon, and Senir, and the mountains of Hermon,” since this statement proves that Baal-Hermon was between Bashan and the mountains of Hermon. In harmony with this, the following places in the north of Canaan are mentioned in Josh. xiii. 4, 5, and Judg. iii. 3, as being left unconquered by Joshua:—(1.) “All the land of the Canaanites (*i.e.* of the Phoenicians who dwelt on the coast), and the cave of the Sidonians to *Aphek*;” מערָה, probably the *spelunca inexpugnabilis in territorio Sidoniensi, quæ vulgo dicitur cavae de Tyrum* (*Wilh. Tyr. xix. 11*), the present *Mughr Jezzin*, *i.e.* caves of *Jezzin*, to the east of Sidon upon Lebanon (*Ritter, Erdk. xvii.* pp. 99, 100); and *Aphek*, probably the modern *Afka*, to the north-east of Beirut (*Robinson, Bibl. Res.*). (2.) “The land of the *Giblites*,” *i.e.* the territory of *Byblos*, and “all Lebanon towards the east, from Baal-Gad below Hermon, till you come to Hamath,” *i.e.* not Antilibanus, but Lebanon, which lies to the east of the land of the Giblites. The land of the Giblites, or territory of *Gebal*, which is cited here as the northernmost district of the unconquered land, so that its northern boundary must have coincided with the northern boundary of Canaan, can hardly have extended to the latitude of Tripoli, but probably only reached to the cedar grove at *Ejerreh*, in the neighbourhood of which the highest peaks of the Lebanon are found. The territory of the tribes of Asher and Naphtali (Josh. xix. 24–39) did not reach farther up than this. From all these accounts, we must not push the northern boundary of Canaan as far as the *Eleutherus, Nahr el Kebir*, but must draw it farther to the south, across the northern portion of the Lebanon; so that we may look for *Hazar-enan* (fountain-court), which is mentioned as the end of the northern boundary, and the starting-point of the

eastern, near the fountain of *Lebweh*. This fountain forms the water-shed in the Bekaa, between the Orontes, which flows to the north, and the Leontes, which flows to the south (cf. *Robinson*, Bibl. Res. p. 531), and is not only a very large fountain of the finest clear water, springing at different points from underneath a broad piece of coarse gravel, which lies to the west of a vein of limestone, but the whole of the soil is of such a character, that "you have only to dig in the gravel, to get as many springs as you please." The quantity of water which is found here is probably even greater than that at the *Anjar*. In addition to the four principal streams, there are three or four smaller ones (*Robinson*, Bibl. Res. p. 532), so that this place might be called, with perfect justice, by the name of *fountain-court*. The probability of this conjecture is also considerably increased by the fact, that the *Ain*, mentioned in ver. 11 as a point upon the eastern boundary, can also be identified without any difficulty (see at ver. 11).

Vers. 10-12. The *Eastern Boundary*.—If we endeavour to trace the upper line of the eastern boundary from the fountain-place just mentioned, it ran from *Hazar-enan* to *Shepham*, the site of which is unknown, and "from *Shepham* it was to go down to *Riblah*, on the east of *Ain*" (the fountain). The article רִבְלָה, and still more the precise description, "to the east of *Ain*, the fountain, or fountain locality" (*Knobel*), show plainly that this *Riblah* is to be distinguished from the *Riblah* in the land of Hamath (2 Kings xxiii. 33, xxv. 21; Jer. xxxix. 9, lii. 27), with which it is mostly identified. *Ain* is supposed to be "the great fountain of *Neba Anjar*, at the foot of Antilibanus, which is often called *Birket Anjar*, on account of its taking its rise in a small reservoir or pool" (*Robinson*, Bibl. Res. p. 498), and near to which *Mej-del-Anjar* is to be seen, consisting of "the ruins of the walls and towers of a fortified town, or rather of a large citadel" (*Robinson*, p. 496; cf. *Ritter*, xvii. pp. 181 sqq.).¹ From this point the boundary went farther down, and pressed (נִיחַד) "upon the shoulder of the lake of *Chinnereth* towards the east," i.e. upon the north-east shore of the Sea of Galilee (see *Josh.* xix. 35). Hence it ran down along the Jordan to the Salt Sea (Dead Sea). According to these statements, therefore, the eastern boundary went from Bekaa along the western slopes of

¹ *Knobel* regards *Ain* as the source of the Orontes, i.e. *Neba Lebweh*, and yet, notwithstanding this, identifies *Riblah* with the village of *Ribleh* mentioned above. But can this *Ribleh*, which is at least eight hours to the north of *Neba Lebweh*, be described as on the east of *Ain*, i.e. *Neba Lebweh*?

Antilibanus, over or past *Rasbeya* and *Banyas*, at the foot of Hermon, along the edge of the mountains which bound the *Huleh* basin towards the east, down to the north-east corner of the Sea of Galilee; so that *Hermon* itself (*Jebel es Sheikh*) did not belong to the land of Israel.—Vers. 13–15. This land, according to the boundaries thus described, the Israelites were to distribute by lot (chap. xxvi. 56), to give it to the nine tribes and a half, as the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh had already received their inheritance on the other side of the Jordan (chap. xxxii. 33 sqq.).

Vers. 16–29. LIST OF THE MEN APPOINTED TO DISTRIBUTE THE LAND.—In addition to Eleazar and Joshua, the former of whom was to stand at the head as high priest, in accordance with the divine appointment in chap. xxvii. 21, and the latter to occupy the second place as commander of the army, a prince was selected from each of the ten tribes who were interested in the distribution, as Reuben and Gad had nothing to do with it. Of these princes, namely heads of fathers' houses of the tribes (Josh. xiv. 1), not heads of tribes (see at chap. xiii. 2), Caleb, who is well known from chap. xiii., is the only one whose name is known. The others are not mentioned anywhere else. The list of tribes, in the enumeration of their princes, corresponds, with some exceptions, to the situation of the territory which the tribes received in Canaan, reckoning from south to north, and deviates considerably from the order in which the lots came out for the different tribes, as described in Josh. 15–19. *לְנָגַד* in the *Kal*, in vers. 17 and 18, signifies to give for an inheritance, just as in Ex. xxxiv. 8, to put into possession. There is not sufficient ground for altering the *Kal* into *Piel*, especially as the *Piel* in ver. 29 is construed with the accusative of the person, and with the thing governed by *בָּ*; whereas in ver. 17 the *Kal* is construed with the person governed by *בָּ*, and the accusative of the thing.

Chap. xxxv. 1–8. APPOINTMENT OF TOWNS FOR THE LEVITES.—As the Levites were to receive no inheritance of their own, i.e. no separate tribe-territory, in the land of Canaan (chap. xviii. 20 and 23), Moses commanded the children of Israel, i.e. the rest of the tribes, in accordance with the divine instructions, to give (vacate) towns to the Levites to dwell in of the inheritance that fell to them for a possession, with pastureage by the cities round about them for their cattle. “Towns to dwell in,” i.e. not the whole of the towns as their own property, but as many houses in the towns as sufficed

for the necessities of the Levites as their hereditary possession, which could be redeemed, if sold at any time, and which reverted to them without compensation in the year of jubilee, even if not redeemed before (*Lev. xxv. 32, 33*) ; but any portion of the towns which was not taken possession of by them, together with the fields and villages, continued the property of those tribes to which they had been assigned by lot (cf. *Josh. xxi. 12*, and my commentary on this passage : also *Bähr, Symbolik*, ii. p. 50 ; *Ewald, Gesch.* ii. p. 403). They were also to give them מִנְחָת (from מִנְחָה, to drive, drive out), pasturage or fields, to feed their flocks upon, all round the cities ; and according to *Lev. xxv. 34*, this was not to be sold, but to remain the eternal possession of the Levites. לְבַהֲמָתֶם, for their oxen and beasts of burden, and לְכַבְשָׁתֶם, for their (remaining) possessions in flocks (sheep and goats), which are generally described in other cases as *mikneh*, in distinction from *behemah* (e.g. chap. xxxii. 26 ; *Gen. xxxiv. 23, xxxvi. 6*). כָּל־חֵיתֶם, and for all their animals, is merely a generalizing summary signifying all the animals which they possessed.—Ver. 4. The pasture lands of the different towns were to measure “*from the town wall outwards a thousand cubits round about*,” i.e. on each of the four sides. “*And measure from without the city, the east side 2000 cubits, and the south side 2000 cubits, and the west side 2000 cubits, and the north side 2000 cubits, and the city in the middle*,” i.e. so that the town stood in the middle of the measured lines, and the space which they occupied was not included in the 2000 cubits. The meaning of these instructions, which have caused great perplexity to commentators, and have latterly been explained by *Saalschütz* (*Mos. R.* pp. 100, 101) in a

FIG. a.





FIG. b.



marvellously erroneous manner, was correctly expounded by *J. D. Michaelis* in the notes to his translation. We must picture the towns

and the surrounding fields as squares, the pasturage as stretching 1000 cubits from the city wall in every direction, as the accompanying figures show, and the length of each outer side as 2000 cubits, apart from the length of the city wall: so that, if the town itself occupied a square of 1000 cubits (see fig. *a*), the outer side of the town fields would measure $2000 + 1000$ cubits in every direction; but if each side of the city wall was only 500 cubits long (see fig. *b*), the outer side of the town fields would measure $2000 + 500$ cubits in every direction.—Vers. 6-8. Of these cities which were given up to the Levites, *six* were to serve as cities of refuge (see at ver. 12) for manslayers, and in addition to these (*עַל־הָעִיר*, over upon them) the Israelites were to give of their possessions forty-two others, that is to say, forty-eight in all; and they were to do this, giving much from every tribe that had much, and little from the one which had little (chap. xxvi. 54). With the accusatives *את הַעֲרִים* and *את שְׁלֹשׁ עִיר* (ver. 6), the writer has already in his mind the verbs *פְּמִיעֵיטוּ* and *פְּרַבּוּ* of ver. 8, where he takes up the object again in the word *וְהַעֲרִים*. According to Josh. xxi., the Levites received nine cities in the territory of Judah and Simeon, four in the territory of each of the other tribes, with the exception of Naphtali, in which there were only three, that is to say, ten in the land to the east of the Jordan, and thirty-eight in Canaan proper, of which the thirteen given up by Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin were assigned to the families of the priests, and the other thirty-five to the three Levitical families. This distribution of the Levites among all the tribes—by which the curse of division and dispersion in Israel, which had been pronounced upon Levi in Jacob's blessing (Gen. xlix. 7), was changed into a blessing both for the Levites themselves and also for all Israel—was in perfect accordance with the election and destination of this tribe. Called out of the whole nation to be the peculiar possession of Jehovah, to watch over His covenant, and teach Israel His rights and His law (Deut. xxxiii. 9, 10; Lev. x. 11; Deut. xxxi. 9-13), the Levites were to form and set forth among all the tribes the *ἐκλογή* of the nation of Jehovah's possession, and by their walk as well as by their calling to remind the Israelites continually of their own divine calling; to foster and preserve the law and testimony of the Lord in Israel, and to awaken and spread the fear of God and piety among all the tribes. Whilst their distribution among all the tribes corresponded to this appointment, the fact that they were not scattered in all the towns and villages of the other tribes, but were congregated together in separate towns.

among the different tribes, preserved them from the disadvantages of standing alone, and defended them from the danger of moral and spiritual declension. Lastly, in the number forty-eight, the quadrupling of the number of the tribes (twelve) is unmistakeable. Now, as the number four is the seal of the kingdom of God in the world, the idea of the kingdom of God is also represented in the four times twelve towns (cf. *Bähr, Symbolik*, ii. pp. 50, 51).

Vers. 9-34. SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT OF CITIES OF REFUGE FOR UNPREMEDITATED MANSLAYERS.—Vers. 10, 11. When the Israelites had come into the land of Canaan, they were to choose towns conveniently situated as cities of refuge, to which the manslayer, who had slain a person (*nephesh*) by accident (בְּשִׁגְנָה: see at Lev. iv. 2), might flee. קָרַרְתָּ, from קָרַרְתָּ, to hit, occurrit, as well as *accidit*, signifies here to give or make, i.e. to choose something suitable (*Dietrich*), but not “to build or complete” (*Knobel*), in the sense of נָבַע, as the only meaning which this word has is *contignare*, to join with beams or rafters; and this is obviously unsuitable here. Through these directions, which are repeated and still further expanded in Deut. xix. 1-13, God fulfilled the promise which He gave in Ex. xxi. 13: that He would appoint a place for the man who should unintentionally slay his neighbour, to which he might flee from the avenger of blood.—**Vers. 12-15.** These towns were to serve for a refuge from the avenger of blood, that the manslayer might not die before he had taken his trial in the presence of the congregation. The number of cities was fixed at six, three on the other side of the Jordan, and three on this side in the land of Canaan, to which both the children of Israel, and also the foreigners and settlers who were dwelling among them, might flee. In Deut. xix. 3 sqq., Moses advises the congregation to prepare (הַכֵּן) the way to these cities, and to divide the territory of the land which Jehovah would give them into three parts (שְׁלִישִׁים), i.e. to set apart a free city in every third of the land, that every manslayer might flee thither, i.e. might be able to reach the free city without being detained by length of distance or badness of road, lest, as is added in ver. 6, the avenger of blood pursue the slayer while his heart is hot (מִתְּחִילָה, imperf. *Kal* of חָמַם), and overtake him because the way is long, and slay him (הַפְּתַח נֶפֶשׁ, as in Gen. xxxvii. 21), whereas he was not worthy of death (i.e. there was no just ground for putting him to death), “because he had not done it out of hatred.” The three cities of refuge on the other side were selected.

by Moses himself (Deut. iv. 41–43); the three in Canaan were not appointed till the land was distributed among the nine tribes and a half (Josh. xx. 7). Levitical or priests' towns were selected for all six, not only because it was to the priests and Levites that they would first of all look for an administration of justice (*Schultz* on Deut. xix. 3), but also on the ground that these cities were the property of Jehovah, in a higher sense than the rest of the land, and for this reason answered the idea of cities of refuge, where the manslayer, when once received, was placed under the protection of divine grace, better than any other places possibly could.

The establishment of cities of refuge presupposed the custom and right of revenge. The custom itself goes back to the very earliest times of the human race (Gen. iv. 15, 24, xxvii. 45); it prevailed among the Israelites, as well as the other nations of antiquity, and still continues among the Arabs in unlimited force (cf. *Niebuhr*, Arab. pp. 32 sqq.; *Burckhardt*, *Beduinen*, 119, 251 sqq.). “Revenge of blood prevailed almost everywhere, so long as there was no national life generated, or it was still in the first stages of its development; and consequently the expiation of any personal violation of justice was left to private revenge, and more especially to family zeal” (*Oehler* in *Herzog's B. Cycl.*, where the proofs may be seen). The warrant for this was the principle of retribution, the *jus talionis*, which lay at the foundation of the divine order of the world in general, and the Mosaic law in particular, and which was sanctioned by God, so far as murder was concerned, even in the time of Noah, by the command, “Whoso sheddeth man's blood,” etc. (Gen. ix. 5, 6). This warrant, however, or rather obligation to avenge murder, was subordinated to the essential principle of the theocracy, under the Mosaic law. Whilst God Himself would avenge the blood that was shed, not only upon men, but upon animals also (Gen. ix. 5), and commanded blood-revenge, He withdrew the execution of it from subjective caprice, and restricted it to cases of premeditated slaying or murder, by appointing cities of refuge, which were to protect the manslayer from the avenger, until he took his trial before the congregation. לְנִיאָה, redeemer, is “that particular relative whose special duty it was to restore the violated family integrity, who had to redeem not only landed property that had been alienated from the family (Lev. xxv. 25 sqq.), or a member of the family that had fallen into slavery (Lev. xxv. 47 sqq.), but also the blood that had been taken away from the family by murder” (*Oehler*). In the latter respect he was called נַצְרָל הַדָּם לְנִיאָה,

(vers. 19, 21, 24 sqq.; Deut. xix. 6, 12). From 2 Sam. xiv. 7, we may see that it was the duty of the whole family to take care that blood-revenge was carried out. The performance of the duty itself, however, was probably regulated by the closeness of the relationship, and corresponded to the duty of redeeming from bondage (Lev. xxv. 49), and to the right of inheritance (chap. xxvii. 8 sqq.). What standing before the congregation was to consist of, is defined more fully in what follows (vers. 24, 25). If we compare with this Josh. xx. 4 sqq., the manslayer, who fled from the avenger of blood into a free city, was to stand before the gates of the city, and state his cause before the elders. They were then to receive him into the city, and give him a place that he might dwell among them, and were not to deliver him up to the avenger of blood till he had stood before the congregation for judgment. Consequently, if the slayer of a man presented himself with the request to be received, the elders of the free city had to make a provisional inquiry into his case, to decide whether they should grant him protection in the city; and then if the avenger of blood appeared, they were not to deliver up the person whom they had received, but to hand him over, on the charge of the avenger of blood, to the congregation to whom he belonged, or among whom the act had taken place, that they might investigate the case, and judge whether the deed itself was wilful or accidental.

Special instructions are given in vers. 16-28, with reference to the judicial procedure. First of all (vers. 16-21), with regard to qualified slaying or murder. If any person has struck another with an *iron instrument* (an axe, hatchet, hammer, etc.), or “*with a stone of the hand, from which one dies*,” i.e. with a stone which filled the hand,—a large stone, therefore, with which it was possible to kill,—or “*with a wooden instrument of the hand, from which one dies*,” i.e. with a thick club, or a large, strong wooden instrument, and he then died (so that he died in consequence), he was a murderer, who was to be put to death. “For the suspicion would rest upon any one who had used an instrument, that endangered life and therefore was not generally used in striking, that he had intended to take life away” (*Knobel*).—Ver. 19. The avenger of blood could put him to death, when he hit upon him, i.e. whenever and wherever he met with him.—Ver. 20. And so also the man who hit another in hatred, or threw at him by lying in wait, or struck him with the hand in enmity, so that he died. And if a murderer of this kind fled into a free city, the elders of his city were to have him fetched

out and delivered up to the avenger of blood (Deut. xix. 11, 12). Then follow, in vers. 22–28, the proceedings to be taken with an unintentional manslayer, viz. if any one hit another “in the moment,” i.e. suddenly, unawares (chap. vi. 9), without enmity, or by throwing anything upon him, without lying in wait, or by letting a stone, by which a man might be killed, fall upon him without seeing him, so that he died in consequence, but without being his enemy, or watching to do him harm. In using the expression בְּכָל־אַבְתָּבֶן, the writer had probably still in his mind; but he dropped this word, and wrote בְּנֵי in the form of a fresh sentence. The thing intended is explained still more clearly in Deut. xix. 4, 5. Instead of בְּפִתְחָה, we find there בְּבָלִי רַעַת, without knowing, unintentionally. The words, “without being his enemy,” are paraphrased there by, “without hating him from yesterday and the day before yesterday” (i.e. previously), and are explained by an example taken from the life: “When a man goeth into the wood with his neighbour to hew wood, and his hand fetcheth a stroke with the axe to cut down the tree, and the iron slippeth (נִשְׁלַח Niphal of נִשְׁלַח) from the wood (handle), and lighteth upon his neighbour.”—Vers. 24, 25. In such a case as this, the congregation was to judge between the slayer and the avenger of blood, according to the judgments before them. They were to rescue the innocent man from the avenger of blood, to bring him back to his (i.e. the nearest) city of refuge to which he had fled, that he might dwell there till the death of the high priest, who had been anointed with the holy oil.—Vers. 26–28. If he left the city of refuge before this, and the avenger of blood got hold of him, and slew him outside the borders (precincts) of the city, it was not to be reckoned to him as blood (מֵדָם לֹא אָמַר, like מֵדָם לֹא אָמַר, Ex. xxii. 1). But after the death of the high priest he might return “into the land of his possession,” i.e. his hereditary possession (cf. Lev. xxvii. 22), sc. without the avenger of blood being allowed to pursue him any longer.

In these regulations “all the rigour of the divine justice is manifested in the most beautiful concord with His compassionate mercy. Through the destruction of life, even when not wilful, human blood had been shed, and demanded expiation. Yet this expiation did not consist in the death of the offender himself, because he had not sinned wilfully.” Hence an asylum was provided for him in the free city, to which he might escape, and where he would lie concealed. This sojourn in the free city was not to be regarded as banishment, although separation from house, home, and family was certainly a punishment; but it was a concealment under “the pro-

tection of the mercy of God, which opened places of escape in the cities of refuge from the carnal ardour of the avenger of blood, where the slayer remained concealed until his sin was expiated by the death of the high priest." For the fact, that the death of the high priest was hereby regarded as expiatory, as many of the Rabbins, fathers, and earlier commentators maintain (see my Comm. on Joshua, p. 448), is unmistakeably evident from the addition of the clause, "who has been anointed with the holy oil," which would appear unmeaning and superfluous on any other view. This clause points to the inward connection between the return of the slayer and the death of the high priest. "The anointing with the holy oil was a symbol of the communication of the Holy Ghost, by which the high priest was empowered to act as mediator and representative of the nation before God, so that he alone could carry out the yearly and general expiation for the whole nation, on the great day of atonement. But as his life and work acquired a representative signification through this anointing with the Holy Ghost, his death might also be regarded as a death for the sins of the people, by virtue of the Holy Ghost imparted to him, through which the unintentional manslayer received the benefits of the propitiation for his sin before God, so that he could return cleansed to his native town, without further exposure to the vengeance of the avenger of blood" (Comm. on Joshua, p. 448). But inasmuch as, according to this view, the death of the high priest had the same result in a certain sense, in relation to his time of office, as his function on the day of atonement had had every year, "the death of the earthly high priest became thereby a type of that of the heavenly One, who, through the eternal (holy) Spirit, offered Himself without spot to God, that we might be redeemed from our transgressions, and receive the promised eternal inheritance (Heb. ix. 14, 15). Just as the blood of Christ wrought out eternal redemption, only because through the eternal Spirit He offered Himself without spot to God, so the death of the high priest of the Old Testament secured the complete deliverance of the manslayer from his sin, only because he had been anointed with the holy oil, the symbol of the Holy Ghost" (p. 449).

If, therefore, the confinement of the unintentional manslayer in the city of refuge was neither an ordinary exile nor merely a means of rescuing him from the revenge of the enraged *goel*, but an appointment of the just and merciful God for the expiation of human blood even though not wilfully shed, that, whilst there was no vio-

lation of judicial righteousness, a barrier might be set to the unrighteousness of family revenge; it was necessary to guard against any such abuse of this gracious provision of the righteous God, as that into which the heathen right of asylum had degenerated.¹ The instructions which follow in vers. 29-34 were intended to secure this object. In ver. 29, there is first of all the general law, that these instructions (those given in vers. 11-28) were to be for a statute of judgment (see chap. xxvii. 11) for all future ages ("throughout your generations," see Ex. xii. 14, 20). Then, in ver. 30, a just judgment is enforced in the treatment of murder. "*Whoso killeth any person* (these words are construed absolutely), *at the mouth* (the testimony) *of witnesses shall the murderer be put to death; and one witness shall not answer* (give evidence) *against a person to die;*" i.e. if the taking of life were in question, capital punishment was not to be inflicted upon the testimony of one person only, but upon that of a plurality of witnesses. One witness could not only be more easily mistaken than several, but would be more likely to be partial than several persons who were unanimous in bearing witness to one and the same thing. The number of witnesses was afterwards fixed at two witnesses, at least, in the case of capital crimes (Deut. xvii. 6), and two or three in the case of every crime (Deut. xix. 15; cf. John viii. 17, 2 Cor. xiii. 1, Heb. x. 28).—Lastly (vers. 31 sqq.), the command is given not to take redemption money, either for the life of the murderer, who was a wicked man to die, i.e. deserving of death (such a man was to be put to death); nor "*for fleeing into the city of refuge, to return to dwell in the land till the death of the high priest:*" that is to say, they were neither to allow the wilful murderer to come to terms with the relative of the man who had been put to death, by the payment of a redemption fee, and so to save his life, as is not unfrequently the case in the East at the present day (cf. *Robinson*, Pal. i. p. 209, and *Lane's Manners and Customs*); nor even to allow the unintentional murderer to purchase permission to return home from the city of refuge

¹ On the *asyla*, in general, see *Winer's Real-Wörterbuch*, art. *Freistatt*; *Pauly*, Real-encykl. der class. Alterthums-wissenschaft, Bd. i. s. v. *Asylum*; but more especially *K. Dann*, "über den Ursprung des Asylrechts und dessen Schicksale und Ueberreste in Europa," in his *Ztschr. für deutsches Recht*, Lpz. 1840. "The asyla of the Greeks, Romans, and Germans differed altogether from those of the Hebrews; for whilst the latter were never intended to save the wilful criminal from the punishment he deserved, but were simply established for the purpose of securing a just sentence, the former actually answered the purpose of rescuing the criminal from the punishment which he legally deserved."

before the death of the high priest, by the payment of a money compensation.—Ver. 33. The Israelites were not to desecrate their land by sparing the murderer; as blood, *i.e.* bloodshed or murder, desecrated the land, and there was no expiation (*יְכַפֵּר*) to the land for the blood that was shed in it, except through the blood of the man who had shed it, *i.e.* through the execution of the murderer, by which justice would be satisfied.—Ver. 34. And they were not to desecrate the land in which they dwelt by tolerating murderers, because Jehovah, the Holy One, dwelt in it, among the children of Israel (cf. Lev. xviii. 25 sqq.).

LAW CONCERNING THE MARRIAGE OF HEIRESSES.—CHAP. XXXVI.

Vers. 1-4. The occasion for this law was a representation made to Moses and the princes of the congregation by the heads of the fathers' houses (*בִּתְהָאָבוֹת* for *הָאָבוֹת*, as in Ex. vi. 25, etc.) of the family of Gilead the Manassite, to which *Zelophehad* (chap. xxvi. 33) belonged, to the effect that, by allotting an hereditary possession to the daughters of Zelophehad, the tribe-territory assigned to the Manassites would be diminished if they should marry into another tribe. They founded their appeal upon the command of Jehovah, that the land was to be distributed by lot among the Israelites for an inheritance (ver. 2 compared with chap. xxvi. 55, 56, and xxxiii. 54); and although it is not expressly stated, yet on the ground of the promise of the everlasting possession of Canaan (Gen. xvii. 8), and the provision made by the law, that an inheritance was not to be alienated (Lev. xxv. 10, 13, 23 sqq.), they understood it as signifying that the portion assigned to each tribe was to continue unchanged to all generations. (The singular pronoun, *my Lord*, in ver. 2, refers to the speaker, as in chap. xxxii. 27.) Now, as the inheritance of their brother, *i.e.* their tribe-mate Zelophehad, had been given to his daughters (chap. xxvii. 1), if they should be chosen as wives by any of the children of the (other) tribes of Israel, *i.e.* should marry into another tribe, their inheritance would be taken away from the tribe-territory of Manasseh, and would be added to that of the tribe into which they were received. The suffix *לְךָם* (ver. 3) refers *ad sensum* to *מִצְרָיִם*, the tribe regarded according to its members.—Ver. 4. And when the year of jubilee came round (see Lev. xxv. 10), their inheritance would be entirely withdrawn from the tribe of Manasseh. Strictly speaking, the hereditary property would pass at once, when the marriage took

place, to the tribe into which an heiress married, and not merely at the year of jubilee. But up to the year of jubilee it was always possible that the hereditary property might revert to the tribe of Manasseh, either through the marriage being childless, or through the purchase of the inheritance. But in the year of jubilee all landed property that had been alienated was to return to its original proprietor or his heir (Lev. xxv. 33 sqq.). In this way the transfer of an inheritance from one tribe to another, which took place in consequence of a marriage, would be established in perpetuity. And it was in this sense that the elders of the tribe of Manasseh meant that a portion of the inheritance which had fallen to them by lot would be taken away from their tribe at the year of jubilee.—Vers. 5–9. Moses declared that what they had affirmed was right (כְּ), and then, by command of Jehovah, he told the daughters of Zelophehad that they might marry whoever pleased them (the suffix בָּם, attached to בָּנִי, for בָּן, as in Ex. i. 21, Gen. xxxi. 9, etc.), but that he must belong to the family of their father's tribe, that is to say, must be a Manassite. For (ver. 7) the inheritance was not to turn away the Israelites from one tribe to another (not to be transferred from one to another), but every Israelite was to keep to the inheritance of his father's tribe, and no one was to enter upon the possession of another tribe by marrying an heiress belonging to that tribe. This is afterwards extended, in vers. 8 and 9, into a general law for every heiress in Israel.

In vers. 10–12 it is related that, in accordance with these instructions, the five daughters of Zelophehad, whose names are repeated from chap. xxvi. 33 and xxvii. 1 (see also Josh. xvii. 3), married husbands from the families of the Manassites, namely, sons of their cousins (? uncles), and thus their inheritance remained in their father's tribe (לֹא תַּעֲזַב, to be and remain upon anything).—Ver. 13. The conclusion refers not merely to the laws and rights contained in chap. xxxiii. 50–xxxvi. 13, but includes the rest of the laws given in the steppes of Moab (chap. xxv.–xxx.), and forms the conclusion to the whole book, which places the lawgiving in the steppes of Moab by the side of the lawgiving at Mount Sinai (Lev. xxvi. 46, xlvii. 34) and brings it to a close, though without in any way implying that the explanation (רָאשׁוֹת, Deut. i. 5), further development, and hortatory enforcement of the law and its testimonies, statutes, and judgments (Deut. i. 5, iv. 44 sqq., xii. 1 sqq.), which follow in *Deuteronomy*, are not of Mosaic origin.

THE FIFTH BOOK OF MOSES.

(DEUTERONOMY.)

INTRODUCTION.

CONTENTS, ARRANGEMENT, AND CHARACTER OF DEUTERONOMY.



THE fifth book of Moses, which is headed אלה הדברים, or briefly דברים, in the Hebrew Bibles, from the opening words of the book, is called מושנה התורה (repetitio legis), or merely מושנה by the Hellenistic Jews and some of the Rabbins, with special reference to its contents as described in chap. xvii. 18. The rabbinical explanation of the latter given in *Münster* and *Fagius* is זכרון דראשונים, “memoria rerum priorum, quæ in aliis scribuntur libris.” By some of the Rabbins the book is also called ספר תזכורות, *liber redargutionum*. The first of these titles has become current in the Christian Church through the rendering given by the LXX. and Vulgate, Δευτερονόμιον, *Deuteronomium*; and although it has arisen from an incorrect rendering of chap. xvii. 18 (see the exposition of the passage), it is so far a suitable one, that it describes quite correctly the leading contents of the book itself. The book of Deuteronomy contains not so much “a recapitulation of the things commanded and done, as related in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers” (*Theod.*), as “a compendium and summary of the whole law and wisdom of the people of Israel, wherein those things which related to the priests and Levites are omitted, and only such things included as the people generally required to know” (*Luther*). Consequently it is not merely a repetition and summary of the most important laws and events contained in the previous books, still less a mere “summons to the law and testimony,” or a “fresh and independent lawgiving standing side by side with the earlier one,” a “transformation of the

old law to suit the altered circumstances," or "merely a second book of the law, intended for the people that knew not the law" (*Ewald, Riehm, etc.*); but a *hortatory description, explanation, and enforcement of the most essential contents of the covenant revelation and covenant laws, with emphatic prominence given to the spiritual principle of the law and its fulfilment, and with a further development of the ecclesiastical, judicial, political, and civil organization, which was intended as a permanent foundation for the life and well-being of the people in the land of Canaan.* There is not the slightest trace, throughout the whole book, of any intention whatever to give a new or second law. Whilst the laws as well as the divine promises and threatenings in the three middle books of the Pentateuch are all introduced as words of Jehovah to Moses, which he was to make known to the people, and even where the announcement passes over into the form of an address,—as, for example, in Ex. xxiii. 20 sqq., Lev. xxvi.,—are not spoken by Moses in his own name, but spoken by Jehovah to Israel through Moses; the book of Deuteronomy, with the exception of chap. xxxi.-xxxiv., contains nothing but words addressed by Moses to the people, with the intention, as he expressly affirms in chap. i. 5, of explaining (בְּאָרֶץ) the law to the people. Accordingly he does not quote those laws, which were given before and are merely repeated here, nor the further precepts and arrangements that were added to them, such as those concerning the one site for the worship of God, the prophetic and regal qualifications, the administration of justice and carrying on of war, in the categorical language of law; but clothes them, as well as the other commandments, in the hortatory form of a paternal address, full of solemn and affectionate admonition, with the addition of such reminiscences and motives as seemed best adapted to impress their observance upon the hearts of the people. As the repetition not only of the decalogue, which God addressed to the people directly from Sinai, but also of many other laws, which He gave through Moses at Sinai and during the journey through the desert, had no other object than this, to make the contents of the covenant legislation intelligible to all the people, and to impress them upon their hearts; so those laws which are peculiar to our book are not additions made to this legislation for the purpose of completing it, but simply furnish such explanations and illustrations of its meaning as were rendered necessary by the peculiar relations and forms of the religious, social, and political life of the nation in the promised land of Canaan. Throughout

the whole book, the law, with its commandments, statutes, and judgments, which Moses laid “this day” before the people, is never described as either new or altered; on the contrary, it is only the law of the covenant, which Jehovah had concluded with His people at Horeb (chap. v. 1 sqq.); and the commandments, statutes, and judgments of this law Moses had received from the Lord upon the Mount (Sinai), that he might teach Israel to keep them (chap. v. 31 sqq.; comp. chap. vi. 20–25). The details of the book also bear this out.

The *first* part of the book, which embraces by far the greater portion of it, viz. chap. i.—xxx., consists of three long addresses, which Moses delivered to all Israel, according to the heading of chap. i. 1–4, in the land of Moab, on the first of the eleventh month, in the fortieth year after the exodus from Egypt. The *first* of these addresses (chap. i. 6–iv. 40) is intended to prepare the way for the exposition and enforcement of the law, which follow afterwards. Moses calls to their recollection the most important facts connected with the history of their forty years’ wandering in the desert, under the protection and merciful guidance of the Lord (chap. i. 6–iii. 29); and to this he attaches the exhortation not to forget the revelation of the Lord, which they had seen at Horeb, or the words of the covenant which they had heard, but to bear in mind at all times, that Jehovah alone was God in heaven and on earth, and to keep His commandments and rights, that they might enjoy long life and prosperity in the land of Canaan (chap. iv. 1–40). This is followed by the statement in chap. iv. 41–43, that Moses set apart three cities of refuge in the land to the east of the Jordan for unintentional manslayers. The *second* address (chap. v.—xxvi.) is described in the heading in chap. iv. 44–49 as the law, which Moses set before the children of Israel, and consists of two parts, the one general and the other particular. In the *general* part (chap. v.—xi.), Moses repeats the ten words of the covenant, which Jehovah spoke to Israel from Sinai out of the midst of the fire, together with the circumstances which attended their promulgation (chap. v.), and then expounds the contents of the first two commandments of the decalogue, that Jehovah alone is the true and absolute God, and requires love from His people with all their heart and all their soul, and therefore will not tolerate the worship of any other god beside Himself (chap. vi.). For this reason the Israelites were not only to form no alliance with the Canaanites after conquering them, and taking possession of the promised land, but to exterminate them

without quarter, and destroy their altars and idols, because the Lord had chosen them to be His holy nation from love to their forefathers, and would keep the covenant of His grace, and bestow the richest blessings upon them, if they observed His commandments (chap. vii.) ; but when in possession and enjoyment of the riches of this blessed land, they were to remain for ever mindful of the temptation, humiliation, and fatherly chastisement which they had experienced at the hand of their God in the wilderness, that they might not forget the Lord and His manifestations of mercy in their self-exaltation (chap. viii.), but might constantly remember that they owed their conquest and possession of Canaan not to their own righteousness, but solely to the compassion and covenant faithfulness of the Lord, whom they had repeatedly provoked to anger in the wilderness (chap. ix. 1-x. 11), and might earnestly strive to serve the Lord in true fear and love, and to keep His commandments, that they might inherit the promised blessing, and not be exposed to the curse which would fall upon transgressors and the worshippers of idols (chap. x. 12-xi. 32). To this there is added in the more *special* part (chap. xii.-xxvi.), an account of the most important laws which all Israel was to observe in the land of its inheritance, viz. : (1.) Directions for the behaviour of Israel towards the Lord God, *e.g.* as to the presentation of sacrificial offerings and celebration of sacrificial meals at no other place than the one chosen by God for the revelation of His name (chap. xii.) ; as to the destruction of all seducers to idolatry, whether prophets who rose up with signs and wonders, or the closest blood-relations, and such towns in the land as should fall away to idolatry (chap. xiii.) ; as to abstinence from the mourning ceremonies of the heathen, and from unclean food, and the setting apart of tithes for sacrificial meals and for the poor (chap. xiv.) ; as to the observance of the year of remission, the emancipation of Hebrew slaves in the seventh year, and the dedication of the first-born of oxen and sheep (chap. xv.) , and as to the celebration of the feast of Passover, of Weeks, and of Tabernacles, by sacrificial meals at the sanctuary (chap. xvi. 1-17). (2.) Laws concerning the organization of the theocratic state, and especially as to the appointment of judges and official persons in every town, and the trial of idolaters and evil-doers in both the lower and higher forms (chap. xvi. 18-xvii. 13) ; concerning the choice of a king in the future, and his duties (chap. xvii. 14-20) ; concerning the rights of priests and Levites (chap. xviii. 1-8) ; and concerning false and true prophets (vers. 9-22). (3.) Regulations

bearing upon the sanctification of human life : viz. legal instructions as to the establishment of cities of refuge for unintentional man-slayers (chap. xix. 1-13); as to the maintenance of the sanctity of the boundaries of landed property, and abstinence from false charges against a neighbour (vers. 14-21); as to the conduct of war, with special reference to the duty of sparing their own fighting men, and also defenceless enemies and their towns (chap. xx.); as to the expiation of inexplicable murders (chap. xxi. 1-9); as to the mild treatment of women taken in war (vers. 10-14); the just use of paternal authority (vers. 15-21); and the burial of criminals that had been executed (vers. 22, 23). (4.) The duty of paying affectionate regard to the property of a neighbour, and cherishing a sacred dread of violating the moral and natural order of the world (chap. xxii. 1-12), with various precepts for the sanctification of the marriage bond (chap. xxii. 13-xxiii. 1), of the theocratic union as a congregation (chap. xxiii. 2-26), and also of domestic and social life, in all its manifold relations (chaps. xxiv. and xxv.); and lastly, the appointment of prayers of thanksgiving on the presentation of the first-fruits and tenths of the fruits of the field (chap. xxvi. 1-15); together with a closing admonition (vers. 16-19) to observe all these laws and rights with all the heart. The third address (chap. xxvii.-xxx.) has reference to the renewal of the covenant. This solemn act is introduced with a command to write the law upon large stones when Canaan should be conquered, and to set up these stones upon Mount Ebal, to build an altar there; and after presenting burnt-offerings and slain-offerings, to proclaim in the most solemn manner both the blessing and curse of the law, the former upon Gerizim, and the latter upon Ebal (chap. xxvii.). Moses takes occasion from this command to declare most fully what blessings and curses would come upon the people, according as they should or should not hearken to the voice of the Lord (chap. xxviii.). Then follows the renewal of the covenant, which consisted in the fact that Moses recited once more, in a solemn address to the whole of the national assembly, all that the Lord had done for them and to them; and after pointing again to the blessings and curses of the law, called upon them and adjured them to enter into the covenant of Jehovah their God, which He had that day concluded with them, and having before them blessing and cursing, life and death, to make the choice of life.—The second and much shorter portion of the book (chap. xxxi.-xxxiv.) contains the close of Moses' life and labours : (a) the appointment of Joshua to be the leader of Israel

into Canaan, and the handing over of the book of the law, when completed, to the priests, for them to keep and read to the people at the feast of Tabernacles in the year of jubilee (chap. xxxi.) ; (b) the song of Moses (chap. xxxii. 1-47), and the announcement of his death (vers. 48-52); (c) the blessing of Moses (chap. xxxiii.) ; and (d) the account of his death (chap. xxxiv.).

From this general survey of the contents, it is sufficiently evident that the exposition of the commandments, statutes, and rights of the law had no other object than this, to pledge the nation in the most solemn manner to an inviolable observance, in the land of Canaan, of the covenant which Jehovah had made with Israel at Horeb (chap. xxviii. 69). To this end Moses not only repeats the fundamental law of this covenant, the decalogue, but many of the separate commandments, statutes, and rights of the more expanded Sinaitic law. These are rarely given *in extenso* (e.g. the laws of food in chap. xiv.), but for the most part simply in brief hints, bringing out by way of example a few of the more important rules, for the purpose of linking on some further explanations of the law in its application to the peculiar circumstances of the land of Canaan. And throughout, as *F. W. Schultz* correctly observes, the intention of the book is, “by means of certain supplementary and auxiliary rules, to ensure the realization of the laws or institutions of the earlier books, the full validity of which it presupposes; and that not merely in some fashion or other, but in its true essence, and according to its higher object and idea, notwithstanding all the difficulties that might present themselves in Canaan or elsewhere.” Not only are the instructions relating to the building of the sanctuary, the service of the priests and Levites, and the laws of sacrifice and purification, passed over without mention as being already known; but of the festivals and festive celebrations, only the three annual feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles are referred to, and that but briefly, for the purpose of commanding the observance of the sacrificial meals which were to be held at the sanctuary in connection with these feasts (chap. xvi.). The tithes and first-fruits are noticed several times, but only so far as they were to be applied to common sacrificial meals before the Lord. The appointment of judges is commanded in all the towns of the land, and rules are given by which the judicial form of procedure is determined more minutely; but no rule is laid down as to the election of the judges, simply because this had been done before. On the other hand, instructions are given concerning the king whom the people would one day

desire to set over themselves; concerning the prophets whom the Lord would raise up; and also concerning any wars that might be waged with other nations than the Canaanites, the extermination of the latter being enforced once more; and several things besides.—And if this selection of materials indicates an intention, not so much to complete the legislation of the earlier books by the addition of new laws, as to promote its observance and introduction into the national life, and secure its permanent force; this intention becomes still more apparent when we consider how Moses, after repeating the decalogue, not only sums up the essential contents of all the commandments, statutes, and rights which Jehovah has commanded, in the one command to love God with all the heart, etc., and sets forth this commandment as the sum of the whole law, but in all his expositions of the law, all his exhortations to obedience, and all threats and promises, aims ever at this one object, to awaken in the hearts of the people a proper state of mind for the observance of the commandments of God, viz. a feeling of humility and love and willing obedience, and to destroy that love for merely outward legality and pharisaic self-righteousness which is inherent in the natural man, that the people may circumcise the foreskin of their heart, and enter heartily into the covenant of their God, and maintain that covenant with true fidelity.

It is in this peculiar characteristic and design of the legislative addresses which the book contains, and not in the purpose attributed to it, of appending a general law for the nation to the legislation of the previous books, which had reference chiefly to the priests and Levites,¹ that we are to seek for that completion of the law which the book of *Deuteronomy* supplies. And in this we may find the strongest proof of the Mosaic origin of this concluding part of the Thorah. What the heading distinctly states (chap. i. 1-4),—viz.

¹ In opposition to this view of *Ed. Riehm, Schultz* justly argues that the book of Deuteronomy is very far from containing everything that concerned the people and was of great importance to them. It does not even repeat those laws of the first book of the covenant in Ex. xx.-xxiii., which affected most closely the social every-day life of the people. It contains nothing about circumcision, which certainly could not have been omitted from the national law-book; no further details as to the Passover, Pentecost, and the feast of Tabernacles; it does not even mention the great day of atonement, on which every Israelite had to fast on pain of death, nor the feast of trumpets and year of jubilee; and the Sabbath command is simply introduced quite briefly in and with the decalogue. Of all the defilements and washings, which were of the greatest moment, according to the Old Testament view, to every individual, there is not a single word.

that Moses delivered this address to all Israel a short time before his death in the land of Moab, on the other side of the Jordan, and therefore on the threshold of the promised land,—is confirmed by both the form and contents of the book. As *Hengstenberg* has well observed (*Ev. K. Z.* 1862, No. 5, pp. 49 sqq.), “the address of Moses is in perfect harmony with his situation. He speaks like a dying father to his children. The words are earnest, inspired, impressive. He looks back over the whole of the forty years of their wandering in the desert, reminds the people of all the blessings they have received, of the ingratitude with which they have so often repaid them, and of the judgments of God, and the love that continually broke forth behind them; he explains the laws again and again, and adds what is necessary to complete them, and is never weary of urging obedience to them in the warmest and most emphatic words, because the very life of the nation was bound up with this; he surveys all the storms and conflicts which they have passed through, and, beholding the future in the past, takes a survey also of the future history of the nation, and sees, with mingled sorrow and joy, how the three great features of the past—viz. apostasy, punishment, and pardon—continue to repeat themselves in the future also.—The situation throughout is the time when Israel was standing on the border of the promised land, and preparing to cross the Jordan; and there is never any allusion to what formed the centre of the national life in future times—to Jerusalem and its temple, or to the Davidic monarchy. The approaching conquest of the land is merely taken for granted as a whole; the land is dressed throughout in all the charms of a desired good, and no reference is ever made to the special circumstances of Israel in the land about to be conquered.” To this there is to be added what makes its appearance on every hand—the most lively remembrance of Egypt, and the condition of the people when living there (cf. chap. v. 15, vii. 15, xi. 10, xv. 15, xvi. 12, xxiv. 18, xxviii. 27, 35, 60), and an accurate acquaintance with the very earliest circumstances of the different nations with which the Israelites came into either friendly or hostile contact in the Mosaic age (chap. ii.); together with many other things that were entirely changed a short time after the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites.

And just as these addresses, which complete the giving of the law and bring it to a close, form an integral part of the *Thorah*, so the historical account of the finishing of the book of the law, and its being handed over to the priests, together with the song and blessing

of Moses (chap. xxxi.-xxxiii.), form a fitting conclusion to the work of Moses, the lawgiver and mediator of the old covenant; and to this the account of his death, with which the Pentateuch closes (chap. xxxiv.), is very appropriately appended.

EXPOSITION.

HEADING AND INTRODUCTION.

CHAP. I. 1-5.

VERSES 1-4 contain the heading to the whole book; and to this the introduction to the first address is appended in ver. 5. By the expression, “*These be the words,*” etc., Deuteronomy is attached to the previous books; the word “*these,*” which refers to the addresses that follow, connects what follows with what goes before, just as in Gen. ii. 4, vi. 9, etc. The geographical data in ver. 1 present no little difficulty; for whilst the general statement as to the place where Moses delivered the addresses in this book, viz. *beyond Jordan*, is particularized in the introduction to the second address (chap. iv. 46), as “*in the valley over against Beth-Peor,*” here it is described as “*in the wilderness, in the Arabah,*” etc. This contrast between the verse before us and chap. iv. 45, 46, and still more the introduction of the very general and loose expression, “*in the desert,*” which is so little adapted for a geographical definition of the locality, that it has to be defined itself by the additional words “*in the Arabah,*” suggest the conclusion that the particular names introduced are not intended to furnish as exact a geographical account as possible of the spot where Moses explained the law to all Israel, but to call up to view the scene of the addresses which follow, and point out the situation of all Israel at that time. Israel was “*in the desert,*” not yet in Canaan the promised inheritance, and in fact “*in the Arabah.*” This is the name given to the deep low-lying plain on both sides of the Jordan, which runs from the Lake of Gennesaret to the Dead Sea, and stretches southwards from the Dead Sea to *Aila*, at the northern extremity of the Red Sea, as we may see very clearly from chap. ii. 8, where the way which the Israelites took past Edom to *Aila* is called the “*way of the Arabah,*” and also from the fact that the Dead Sea is called “*the sea of the*

Arabah" in chap. iii. 17 and iv. 49. At present the name *Arabah* is simply attached to the southern half of this valley, between the Dead Sea and the Red Sea; whilst the northern part, between the Dead Sea and the Sea of Galilee, is called *el Ghor*; though *Abulfeda*, *Ibn Haukal*, and other Arabic geographers, extend the name *Ghor* from the Lake of Gennesaret to Aila (cf. *Ges. thes.* p. 1166; *Hengstenberg*, *Balaam*, p. 520; *Robinson*, *Pal.* ii. p. 596).—^{רָאשׁ סְמִךְנָה}, "over against *Suph*" (^{לִזְבֵּחַ} for ^{לִזְבֵּחַ}, chap. ii. 19, iii. 29, etc., for the sake of euphony, to avoid the close connection of the two *u*-sounds). *Suph* is probably a contraction of ^{תְּהִימָה} ^{תְּהִימָה}, "the Red Sea" (see at Ex. x. 19). This name is given not only to the Gulf of *Suez* (Ex. xiii. 18, xv. 4, 22, etc.), but to that of *Akabah* also (Num. xiv. 25, xxi. 4, etc.). There is no other *Suph* that would be at all suitable here. The LXX. have rendered it *πλήσιον τῆς ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης*; and *Onkelos* and others adopt the same rendering. This description cannot serve as a more precise definition of the *Arabah*, in which case ^{רָאשׁ} ^{סְמִיךְנָה} (which) would have to be supplied before ^{לִזְבֵּחַ}, since "the *Arabah* actually touches the Red Sea." Nor does it point out the particular spot in the *Arabah* where the addresses were delivered, as *Knobel* supposes; or indicate the connection between the Arboth Moab and the continuation of the *Arabah* on the other side of the Dead Sea, and point out the *Arabah* in all this extent as the heart of the country over which the Israelites had moved during the whole of their forty years' wandering (*Hengstenberg*). For although the Israelites passed twice through the *Arabah* (see p. 246), it formed by no means the heart of the country in which they continued for forty years. The words "opposite to *Suph*," when taken in connection with the following names, cannot have any other object than to define with greater exactness the desert in which the Israelites had moved during the forty years. Moses spoke to all Israel on the other side of the Jordan, when it was still in the desert, in the *Arabah*, still opposite to the Red Sea, after crossing which it had entered the wilderness (Ex. xv. 22), "between *Paran*, and *Tophel*, and *Laban*, and *Hazereth*, and *Di-Sahab*." *Paran* is at all events not the desert of this name in all its extent (see vol. ii. pp. 58, 59), but the place of encampment in the "desert of *Paran*" (Num. x. 12, xii. 16), i.e. the district of *Kadesh* in the desert of *Zin* (Num. xiii. 21, 26); and *Hazereth* is most probably the place of encampment of that name mentioned in Num. xi. 35, xii. 16, from which Israel entered the desert of *Paran*. Both places had been very eventful to the Israelites. At *Hazereth*, Miriam the pro-

phetess and Aaron the high priest had stumbled through rebellion against Moses (Num. xii.). In the desert of *Paran* by *Kadesh* the older generation had been rejected, and sentenced to die in the wilderness on account of its repeated rebellion against the Lord (Num. xiv.) ; and when the younger generation that had grown up in the wilderness assembled once more in *Kadesh* to set out for Canaan, even Moses and Aaron, the two heads of the nation, sinned there at the water of strife, so that they two were not permitted to enter Canaan, whilst Miriam died there at that time (Num. xx.). But if *Paran* and *Hazeroth* are mentioned on account of the tragical events connected with these places, it is natural to conclude that there were similar reasons for mentioning the other three names as well. *Tophel* is supposed by *Hengstenberg* (*Balaam*, p. 517) and *Robinson* (Pal. ii. p. 570) and all the more modern writers, to be the large village of *Tafyleh*, with six hundred inhabitants, the chief place in *Jebal*, on the western side of the Edomitish mountains, in a well-watered valley of the wady of the same name, with large plantations of fruit-trees (*Burckhardt*, *Syr.* pp. 677, 678). The Israelites may have come upon this place in the neighbourhood of *Oboth* (Num. xxi. 10, 11) ; and as its inhabitants, according to *Burckhardt*, p. 680, supply the Syrian caravans with a considerable quantity of provisions, which they sell to them in the castle of *el Ahsa*, *Schultz* conjectures that it may have been here that the people of Israel purchased food and drink of the Edomites for money (chap. ii. 29), and that *Tafyleh* is mentioned as a place of refreshment, where the Israelites partook for the first time of different food from the desert supply. There is a great deal to be said in favour of this conjecture : for even if the Israelites did not obtain different food for the first time at this place, the situation of *Tophel* does warrant the supposition that it was here that they passed for the first time from the wilderness to an inhabited land ; on which account the place was so memorable for them, that it might very well be mentioned as being the extreme east of their wanderings in the desert, as the opposite point to the encampment at *Paran*, where they first arrived on the western side of their wandering, at the southern border of Canaan. *Laban* is generally identified with *Libnah*, the second place of encampment on the return journey from *Kadesh* (Num. xxxiii. 22), and may perhaps have been the place referred to in Num. xvi., but not more precisely defined, where the rebellion of the company of Korah occurred. Lastly, *Di-Sahab* has been identified by modern commentators with *Mersa Dahab* or *Mina Dahab*, i.e. gold-harbour,

a place upon a tongue of land in the Elanitic Gulf, about the same latitude as Sinai, where there is nothing to be seen now except a quantity of date-trees, a few sand-hills, and about a dozen heaps of stones piled up irregularly, but all showing signs of having once been joined together (cf. *Burckhardt*, pp. 847-8; and *Ritter, Erdk.* xiv. pp. 226 sqq.). But this is hardly correct. As *Roediger* has observed (on *Wellsted's Reisen*, ii. p. 127), "the conjecture has been based exclusively upon the similarity of name, and there is not the slightest exegetical tradition to favour it." But similarity of names cannot prove anything by itself, as the number of places of the same name, but in different localities, that we meet with in the Bible, is very considerable. Moreover, the further assumption which is founded upon this conjecture, namely, that the Israelites went from Sinai past *Dahab*, not only appears untenable for the reasons given above (p. 230), but is actually rendered impossible by the locality itself. The approach to this tongue of land, which projects between two steep lines of coast, with lofty mountain ranges of from 800 to 2000 feet in height on both north and south, leads from Sinai through far too narrow and impracticable a valley for the Israelites to be able to march thither and fix an encampment there.¹ And if Israel cannot have touched *Dahab* on its march, every probability vanishes that Moses should have mentioned this place here, and the name *Di-Sahab* remains at present undeterminable. But in spite of our ignorance of this place, and notwithstanding the fact that even the conjecture expressed with regard to *Laban* is very uncertain, there can be no well-founded doubt that the words "*between Paran and Tophel*" are to be understood as embracing the whole period of the thirty-seven years of mourning, at the commencement of which Israel was in *Paran*, whilst at the end they sought to enter Canaan by *Tophel* (the Edomitish *Tafyleh*), and that the expression "*opposite to Suph*" points back to their first entrance into the desert.—Looking from the steppes of Moab over the ground that the Israelites had traversed, *Suph*, where they first entered the desert of Arabia, would lie between *Paran*, where the congregation arrived at the borders of Canaan towards the west, and *Tophel*, where they first ended their desert wanderings thirty-seven years later on the east.

¹ From the mouth of the valley through the masses of the primary mountains to the sea-coast, there is a fan-like surface of drifts of primary rock, the radius of which is thirty-five minutes long, the progressive work of the inundations of an indefinable course of thousands of years" (*Rüppell, Nubien*, p. 206).

In ver. 2 also the retrospective glance at the guidance through the desert is unmistakeable. “*Eleven days is the way from Horeb to the mountains of Seir as far as Kadesh-Barnea.*” With these words, which were unquestionably intended to be something more than a geographical notice of the distance of Horeb from Kadesh-Barnea, Moses reminded the people that they had completed the journey from Horeb, the scene of the establishment of the covenant, to Kadesh, the border of the promised land, in eleven days (see pp. 246-7), that he might lead them to lay to heart the events which took place at Kadesh itself. The “way of the mountains of Seir” is not the way along the side of these mountains, *i.e.* the way through the Arabah, which is bounded by the mountains of Seir on the east, but the way which leads to the mountains of Seir, just as in chap. ii. 1 the way of the Red Sea is the way that leads to this sea. From these words, therefore, it by no means follows that *Kadesh-Barnea* is to be sought for in the Arabah, and that Israel passed through the Arabah from Horeb to Kades. According to ver. 19, they departed from Horeb, went through the great and terrible wilderness by the way to the mountains of the Amorites, and came to Kadesh-Barnea. Hence the way to the mountains of the Amorites, *i.e.* the southern part of what were afterwards the mountains of Judah (see at Num. xiii. 17), is the same as the way to the mountains of Seir; consequently the *Seir* referred to here is not the range on the eastern side of the Arabah, but *Seir* by *Hormah* (ver. 44), *i.e.* the border plateau by Wady Murreh, opposite to the mountains of the Amorites (Josh xi. 17, xii. 7 : see at Num. xxxiv. 3).

Vers. 3, 4. To the description of the ground to which the following addresses refer, there is appended an allusion to the not less significant time when Moses delivered them, viz. “*on the first of the eleventh month in the fortieth year,*” consequently towards the end of his life, after the conclusion of the divine lawgiving; so that he was able to speak “*according to all that Jehovah had given him in commandment unto them*” (the Israelites), namely, in the legislation of the former books, which is always referred to in this way (chap. iv. 5, 23, v. 29, 30, vi. 1). The time was also significant, from the fact that Silon and Og, the kings of the Amorites, had then been slain. By giving a victory over these mighty kings, the Lord had begun to fulfil His promises (see chap. ii. 25), and had thereby laid Israel under the obligation to love, gratitude, and obedience (see Num. xxi. 21-35). The suffix in יְהוָה refers to

Moses, who had smitten the Amorites at the command and by the power of Jehovah. According to Josh. xii. 4, xiii. 12, 31, *Edrei* was the second capital of Og, and it is as such that it is mentioned, and not as the place where Og was defeated (chap. iii. 1; Num. xxi. 33). The omission of the copula הִנֵּה before בְּאֶדְרָעַ is to be accounted for from the oratorical character of the introduction to the addresses which follow. *Edrei* is the present *Draâ* (see at Num. xxi. 33).—In ver. 5, the description of the locality is again resumed in the words “*beyond the Jordan*,” and still further defined by the expression “*in the land of Moab*;” and the address itself is introduced by the clause, “*Moses took in hand to expound this law*,” which explains more fully the נִפְרֵךְ (spake) of ver. 3. “*In the land of Moab*” is a rhetorical and general expression for “*in the Arboth Moab*.” לֹא does not mean to begin, but to undertake, to take in hand, with the subordinate idea sometimes of venturing, or daring (Gen. xviii. 27), sometimes of a bold resolution: here it denotes an undertaking prompted by internal impulse. Instead of being construed with the infinitive, it is construed rhetorically here with the finite verb without the copula (cf. *Ges.* § 143, 3, b.). נִשְׁאַר probably signified to dig in the *Kal*; but this is not used. In the *Piel* it means to *explain* (*διασαφῆσαι*, *explanare*, LXX. *Vulg.*), never to engrave, or stamp, not even here nor in chap. xxvii. 8 and Hab. ii. 2. Here it signifies “*to expound this law clearly*,” although the exposition was connected with an earnest admonition to preserve and obey it. “*This*” no doubt refers to the law expounded in what follows; but substantially it is no other than the law already given in the earlier books. “*Substantially there is throughout but one law*” (*Schultz*). That the book of Deuteronomy was not intended to furnish a new or second law, is as evident as possible from the word נִשְׁאַר.

I.—THE FIRST PREPARATORY ADDRESS.

CHAP. I. 6–IV. 40.

FOR the purpose of enforcing upon the people the obligation to true fidelity to the covenant, Moses commenced his address with a retrospective glance at the events that had taken place during the forty years of their journey from Sinai to the steppes of Moab, and

showed in striking outlines how, when the Lord had called upon the Israelites in Horeb to arise and take possession of the land of Canaan, that had been promised to the patriarchs for their descendants (chap. i. 6-8), they had greatly increased, and were well organized by chiefs and judges (vers. 9-18); how they had proceeded to Kadesh-Barnea on the border of this land (ver. 19), and there refused to enter in, notwithstanding the report of the spies who were sent out as to the goodness of the land (vers. 20-25), but were alarmed at the might and strength of the Canaanites from a want of confidence in the assistance of the Lord, and had rebelled against their God, and been shut out in consequence from the promised land (vers. 26-46). It was true that at the expiration of this period of punishment the Lord had not permitted them to make war upon Edom and Moab, and drive out these nations from the possessions which they had received from God; but after they had gone round the mountains of Edom and the land of Moab (chap. ii. 1-23), He had given Sihon and Og, the kings of the Amorites, into the power of the Israelites, that they might take possession of their kingdoms in Gilead and Bashan (chap. ii. 24-iii. 17); and after the conquest of these, He had imposed upon the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh, who received the conquered land for their inheritance, the obligation to go with their brethren across the Jordan and help them to conquer Canaan, and had also appointed Joshua as their commander, who would divide the land among them, since he (Moses) himself was not to be allowed to cross the Jordan with them because of the anger of God which he had drawn upon himself on their account (chap. iii. 18-29). He therefore appealed to Israel to hearken to the commandments of the Lord, to preserve and fulfil them without addition or diminution; to continue mindful of the covenant which the Lord had made with them; to make themselves no image or likeness of Jehovah, that they might not draw His wrath upon themselves and be scattered among the heathen, but might ever remain in the land, of which they were now about to take possession (chap. iv.).—In this address, therefore, Moses reminded the whole congregation how the Lord had fulfilled His promise from Horeb to the steppes of Moab, but how they had sinned against their God through unbelief and rebellion, and had brought upon themselves their long wanderings in the desert, that he might append to this the pressing warning not to forfeit the permanent possession of the land they were about to conquer, through a continued and fresh transgression of the cove-

nant.—Certainly a very fitting preparation for the exposition of the law which follows.

REVIEW OF THE DIVINE GUIDANCE OF ISRAEL FROM HOREB TO
KADESH.—CHAP. I. 6-46.

Vers. 6-18. Moses commenced with the summons issued by the Lord to Israel at Horeb, to rise and go to Canaan.—Ver. 6. As the epithet applied to God, “*Jehovah our God*,” presupposes the reception of Israel into covenant with Jehovah, which took place at Sinai, so the words, “*ye have dwelt long enough at this mountain*,” imply that the purpose for which Israel was taken to Horeb had been answered, *i.e.* that they had been furnished with the laws and ordinances requisite for the fulfilment of the covenant, and could now remove to Canaan to take possession of the promised land. The word of Jehovah mentioned here is not found in this form in the previous history; but as a matter of fact it is contained in the divine instructions that were preparatory to their removal (Num. i.-iv. and ix. 15-x. 10), and the rising of the cloud from the tabernacle, which followed immediately afterwards (Num. x. 11). The fixed use of the name *Horeb* to designate the mountain group in general, instead of the special name *Sinai*, which is given to the particular mountain upon which the law was given (see vol. ii. p. 90), is in keeping with the rhetorical style of the book.—Ver. 7. “*Go to the mount of the Amorites, and to all who dwell near.*” The mount of the Amorites is the mountainous country inhabited by this tribe, the leading feature in the land of Canaan, and is synonymous with the “land of the Canaanites” which follows; the Amorites being mentioned *instar omnium* as being the most powerful of all the tribes in Canaan, just as in Gen. xv. 16 (see at Gen. x. 16). שָׁבֵנִים, “*those who dwell by it*,” are the inhabitants of the whole of Canaan, as is shown by the enumeration of the different parts of the land, which follows immediately afterwards. Canaan was naturally divided, according to the character of the ground, into the *Arabah*, the modern *Ghor* (see at ver. 1); the *mountain*, the subsequent mountains of Judah and Ephraim (see at Num. xiii. 17); the *lowland (shephelah)*, *i.e.* the low flat country lying between the mountains of Judah and the Mediterranean Sea, and stretching from the promontory of Carmel down to Gaza, which is intersected by only small undulations and ranges of hills, and generally includes the hill country which formed the transition from the mountains to the plain, though the two are

distinguished in Josh. x. 40 and xii. 8 (see at Josh. xv. 33 sqq.) ; the *south land* (*negeb* : see at Num. xiii. 17) ; and the *sea-shore*, i.e. the generally narrow strip of coast running along by the Mediterranean Sea from Joppa to the Tyrian ladder, or *Rás el Abiad*, just below Tyre (*vid. v. Raumer, Pal. p. 49*).—The special mention of *Lebanon* in connection with the land of the Canaanites, and the enumeration of the separate parts of the land, as well as the extension of the eastern frontier as far as the Euphrates (see at Gen. xv. 18), are to be attributed to the rhetorical fulness of the style. The reference, however, is not to Antilibanus, but to Lebanon proper, which was within the northern border of the land of Israel, as fixed in Num. xxxiv. 7-9.—Ver. 8. This land the Lord had placed at the disposal of the Israelites for them to take possession of, as He had sworn to the fathers (patriarchs) that He would give it to their posterity (cf. Gen. xii. 7, xiii. 15, xv. 18 sqq., etc.). The “swearing” on the part of God points back to Gen. xxii. 16. The expression “*to them and to their seed*” is the same as “*to thee and to thy seed*” in Gen. xiii. 15, xvii. 8, and is not to be understood as signifying that the patriarchs themselves ought to have taken actual possession of Canaan ; but “*to their seed*” is in apposition, and also a more precise definition (comp. Gen. xv. 7 with ver. 18, where the simple statement “*to thee*” is explained by the fuller statement “*to thy seed*”). **נָתַן** has grown into an interjection = **הָנָתֵן** : to give before a person, equivalent to give up to a person, or place at his free disposal (for the use of the word in this sense, see Gen. xiii. 9, xxxiv. 10). Jehovah (this is the idea of vers. 6-8), when He concluded the covenant with the Israelites at Horeb, had intended to fulfil at once the promise which He gave to the patriarchs, and to put them into possession of the promised land ; and Moses had also done what was required on his part, as he explained in vers. 9-18, to bring the people safely to Canaan (cf. Ex. xviii. 23). As the nation had multiplied as the stars of heaven, in accordance with the promise of the Lord, and he felt unable to bear the burden alone and settle all disputes, he had placed over them at that time wise and intelligent men from the heads of the tribes to act as judges, and had instructed them to adjudicate upon the smaller matters of dispute righteously and without respect of person. For further particulars concerning the appointment of the judges, see at Ex. xviii. 13-26, where it is related how Moses adopted this plan at the advice of Jethro, even before the giving of the law at Sinai. The expression “*at that time*,” in ver. 9, is not at variance with this. The imperfect

בְּמִצְרָיִם with *vav rel.*, expresses the order of thought and not of time. For Moses did not intend to recall the different circumstances to the recollection of the people in their chronological order, but arranged them according to their relative importance in connection with the main object of his address. And this required that he should begin with what God had done for the fulfilment of His promise, and then proceed afterwards to notice what he, the servant of God, had done in his office, as an altogether subordinate matter. So far as this object was concerned, it was also perfectly indifferent who had advised him to adopt this plan, whilst it was very important to allude to the fact that it was the great increase in the number of the Israelites which had rendered it necessary, that he might remind the congregation how the Lord, even at that time, had fulfilled the promise which He gave to the patriarchs, and in that fulfilment had given a practical guarantee of the certain fulfilment of the other promises as well. Moses accomplished this by describing the increase of the nation in such a way that his hearers would be involuntarily reminded of the covenant promise in Gen. xv. 5 sqq. (cf. Gen. xii. 2, xviii. 18, xxii. 17, xxvi. 4).—Ver. 11. But in order to guard against any misinterpretation of his words, “I cannot bear you myself alone,” Moses added, “May the Lord fulfil the promise of numerous increase to the nation a thousand-fold.” “*Jehovah, the God of your fathers (i.e. who manifested Himself as God to your fathers), add to you a thousand times, פְּכֹלֶת, as many as ye are, and bless you as He has said.*” The “blessing” after “multiplying” points back to Gen. xii. 2. Consequently, it is not to be restricted to “strengthening, rendering fruitful, and multiplying,” but must be understood as including the spiritual blessing promised to Abraham.—Ver. 12. “*How can I myself alone bear your cumbrance, and your burden, and your strife?*” The burden and cumbrance of the nation are the nation itself, with all its affairs and transactions, which pressed upon the shoulders of Moses.—Vers. 13 sqq. הַבּוּ לְכֶם, give here, provide for yourselves. The congregation was to nominate, according to its tribes, wise, intelligent, and well-known men, whom Moses would appoint as heads, *i.e.* as judges, over the nation. At their installation he gave them the requisite instructions (ver. 16): “*Ye shall hear between your brethren,*” *i.e.* hear both parties as mediators, “*and judge righteously, without respect of person.*” הַבּיר בְּנֵים, to look at the face, equivalent to נִשְׁאָר קָנִים (Lev. xix. 15), *i.e.* to act partially (cf. Ex. xxiii. 2, 3). “*The judgment is God’s,*” *i.e.* appointed by God, and to be administered in the name of God, or in

accordance with His justice ; hence the expression “to bring before God” (Ex. xxi. 6, xxii. 7, etc.). On the difficult cases which the judges were to bring before Moses, see at Ex. xviii. 26.

Vers. 19-46. Everything had been done on the part of God and Moses to bring Israel speedily and safely to Canaan. The reason for their being compelled to remain in the desert for forty years was to be found exclusively in their resistance to the commandments of God. The discontent of the people with the guidance of God was manifested at the very first places of encampment in the desert (Num. xi. and xii.); but Moses passed over this, and simply reminded them of the rebellion at Kadesh (Num. xiii. and xiv.), because it was this which was followed by the condemnation of the rebellious generation to die out in the wilderness.—Ver. 19. “*When we departed from Horeb, we passed through the great and dreadful wilderness, which ye have seen,*” i.e. become acquainted with, viz. the desert of *et Tih* (see p. 57), “*of the way to the mountains of the Amorites, and came to Kadesh-Barnea*” (see at Num. xii. 16). פָּלַן, with an accusative, to pass through a country (cf. chap. ii. 7; Isa. l. 10, etc.). Moses had there explained to the Israelites, that they had reached the mountainous country of the Amorites, which Jehovah was about to give them ; that the land lay before them, and they might take possession of it without fear (vers. 20, 21). But they proposed to send out men to survey the land, with its towns, and the way into it. Moses approved of this proposal, and sent out twelve men, one from each tribe, who went through the land, etc. (as is more fully related in Num. xiii., and has been expounded in connection with that passage, vers. 22-25). Moses’ summons to them to take the land (vers. 20, 21) is not expressly mentioned there, but it is contained *implicite* in the fact that spies were sent out ; as the only possible reason for doing this must have been, that they might force a way into the land, and take possession of it. In ver. 25, Moses simply mentions so much of the report of the spies as had reference to the nature of the land, viz. that it was good, that he may place in immediate contrast with this the refusal of the people to enter in.—Vers. 26, 27. “*But ye would not go up, and were rebellious against the mouth (i.e. the express will) of Jehovah your God, and murmured in your tents, and said, Because Jehovah hated us, He hath brought us forth out of the land of Egypt, to give us into the hand of the Amorites to destroy us.*” נְשִׁׁיּוֹת, either an infinitive with a feminine termination, or a verbal noun construed with an accusative (see *Ges.* § 133; *Ewald*, § 238, a.).—By the allusion to the

murmuring in the tents, Moses points them to Num. xiv. 1, and then proceeds to describe the rebellion of the congregation related there (vers. 2–4), in such a manner that the state of mind manifested on that occasion presents the appearance of the basest ingratitude, inasmuch as the people declared the greatest blessing conferred upon them by God, viz. their deliverance from Egypt, to have been an act of hatred on His part. At the same time, by addressing the existing members of the nation, as if they themselves had spoken so, whereas the whole congregation that rebelled at Kadesh had fallen in the desert, and a fresh generation was now gathered round him, Moses points to the fact, that the sinful corruption which broke out at that time, and bore such bitter fruit, had not died out with the older generation, but was germinating still in the existing Israel, and even though it might be deeply hidden in their hearts, would be sure to break forth again.—Ver. 28. “*Whither shall we go up? Our brethren (the spies) have quite discouraged our heart*” (*הַמִּלְחָמָה*, lit. to cause to flow away; cf. Josh. ii. 9), viz. through their report (Num. xiii. 28, 29, 31–33), the substance of which is repeated here. The expression *מִלְחָמָה*, “in heaven,” towering up into heaven, which is added to “*towns great and fortified*,” is not an exaggeration, but, as Moses also uses it in chap. ix. 1, a rhetorical description of the impression actually received with regard to the size of the towns.¹ “*The sons of the Anakims:*” see at Num. xiii. 22.—Vers. 29–31. The attempt made by Moses to inspire the despondent people with courage, when they were ready to despair of ever conquering the Canaanites, by pointing them to the help of the Lord, which they had experienced in so mighty and visible a manner in Egypt and the desert, and to urge them to renewed confidence in this their almighty Helper and Guide, was altogether without success. And just because the appeal of Moses was unsuccessful, it is passed over in the historical account in Num. xiv.; all that is mentioned there (vers. 6–9) being the effort made by Joshua and Caleb to stir up the people, and that on account of the effects which followed the courageous bearing of these two men, so far as their own future history was concerned. The words “*goeth before you*,” in ver. 30, are resumed in ver. 33, and carried out still further. “*Jehovah, . . .*

¹ “The eyes of weak faith or unbelief saw the towns really towering up to heaven. Nor did the height appear less, even to the eyes of faith, in relation, that is to say, to its own power. Faith does not hide the difficulties from itself, that it may not rob the Lord, who helps it over them, of any of the praise that is justly His due” (*Schultz*).

He shall fight for you according to all (כָּל) that," i.e. in exactly the same manner as, "*He did for you in Egypt;*" especially at the crossing of the Red Sea (Ex. xiv.), "*and in the wilderness, which thou hast seen* (רְאִיתָ, as in ver. 19), where (אֲשֶׁר without הִ) is in a loose connection; see Ewald, § 331, c. and 333, a.) *Jehovah thy God bore thee as a man beareth his son;*" i.e. supported, tended, and provided for thee in the most fatherly way (see the similar figure in Num. xi. 12, and expanded still more fully in Ps. xxiii.).—Vers. 32, 33. "*And even at this word ye remained unbelieving towards the Lord;*" i.e. notwithstanding the fact that I reminded you of all the gracious help that ye had experienced from your God, ye persisted in your unbelief. The participle אַיִן כְּבָסָמִים כֹּאמַנִּים, "*ye were not believing,*" is intended to describe their unbelief as a permanent condition. This unbelief was all the more grievous a sin, because the Lord their God went before them all the way in the pillar of cloud and fire, to guide and to defend them. On the fact itself, comp. Num. ix. 15 sqq., x. 33, with Ex. xiii. 21, 22.—Vers. 34-36. Jehovah was angry, therefore, when He heard these loud words, and swore that He would not let any one of those men, that evil generation, enter the promised land, with the exception of Caleb, because he had followed the Lord faithfully (cf. Num. xiv. 21-24). The *yod* in זֶלַח is the antiquated connecting vowel of the construct state.

But in order that he might impress upon the people the judgment of the holy God in all its stern severity, Moses added in ver. 37: "*also Jehovah was angry with me for your sakes, saying, Thou also shalt not go in thither;*" and he did this before mentioning Joshua, who was excepted from the judgment as well as Caleb, because his ultimate intention was to impress also upon the minds of the people the fact, that even in wrath the Lord had been mindful of His covenant, and when pronouncing the sentence upon His servant Moses, had given the people a leader in the person of Joshua, who was to bring them into the promised inheritance. We are not to infer from the close connection in which this event, which did not take place according to Num. xx. 1-13 till the second arrival of the congregation at Kadesh, is placed with the earlier judgment of God at Kadesh, that the two were contemporaneous, and so supply, after "*the Lord was angry with me,*" the words "*on that occasion.*" For Moses did not intend to teach the people history and chronology, but to set before them the holiness of the judgments of the Lord. By using the expression "*for your sakes,*" Moses did not wish to free himself from guilt. Even in this book

his sin at the water of strife is not passed over in silence (cf. chap. xxxii. 51). But on the present occasion, if he had given prominence to his own fault, he would have weakened the object for which he referred to this event, viz. to stimulate the consciences of the people, and instil into them a wholesome dread of sin, by holding up before them the magnitude of their guilt. But in order that he might give no encouragement to false security respecting their own sin, on the ground that even highly gifted men of God fall into sin as well, Moses simply pointed out the fact, that the quarrelling of the people with him occasioned the wrath of God to fall upon him also.—Ver. 38. “Who standeth before thee,” equivalent to “in thy service” (Ex. xxiv. 13, xxxiii. 11: for this meaning, see chap. x. 8, xviii. 7; 1 Kings i. 28). “Strengthen him:” comp. chap. xxxi. 7; and with regard to the installation of Joshua as the leader of Israel, see Num. xxvii. 18, 19. The suffix in יְנִיחַלְתָּה points back to יְמִינְתָּךְ in ver. 35. Joshua would divide the land among the Israelites for an inheritance, viz. (ver. 39) among the young Israelites, the children of the condemned generation, whom Moses, when making a further communication of the judicial sentence of God (Num. xiv. 31), had described as having no share in the sins of their parents, by adding, “who know not to-day what is good and evil.” This expression is used to denote a condition of spiritual infancy and moral responsibility (Isa. vii. 15, 16). It is different in 2 Sam. xix. 36.—In vers. 40–45 he proceeds to describe still further, according to Num. xiv. 39–45, how the people, by resisting the command of God to go back into the desert (ver. 41, compared with Num. xiv. 25), had simply brought still greater calamities upon themselves, and had had to atone for the presumptuous attempt to force a way into Canaan, in opposition to the express will of the Lord, by enduring a miserable defeat. Instead of “they acted presumptuously to go up” (Num. xiv. 44), Moses says here, in ver. 41, “ye acted frivolously to go up;” and in ver. 43, “ye acted rashly, and went up.” בָּזֶבֶל, from בָּזֵבֶל, to boil, or boil over (Gen. xxv. 29), signifies to act thoughtlessly, haughtily, or rashly. On the particular fact mentioned in ver. 44, see at Num. 14, 45.—Vers. 45, 46. “Then ye returned and wept before Jehovah,” i.e. before the sanctuary; “but Jehovah did not hearken to your voice.” בָּשָׁבֵעַ does not refer to the return to Kadesh, but to an inward turning, not indeed true conversion to repentance, but simply the giving up of their rash enterprise, which they had undertaken in opposition to the commandment of God,—the return from a defiant

attitude to unbelieving complaining on account of the misfortune that had come upon them. Such complaining God never hears. “*And ye sat (remained) in Kadesh many days, that ye remained,*” i.e. not “as many days as ye had been there already before the return of the spies,” or “as long as ye remained in all the other stations together, viz. the half of thirty-eight years” (as *Seder Olam* and many of the Rabbins interpret); but “just as long as ye did remain there,” as we may see from a comparison of chap. ix. 25. It seemed superfluous to mention more precisely the time they spent in Kadesh, because that was well known to the people, whom Moses was addressing. He therefore contented himself with fixing it by simply referring to its duration, which was known to them all. It is no doubt impossible for us to determine the time they remained in Kadesh, because the expression “many days” is simply a relative one, and may signify many years, just as well as many months or weeks. But it by no means warrants the assumption of *Fries* and others, that no absolute departure of the whole of the people from Kadesh ever took place. Such an assumption is at variance with chap. ii. 1. The change of subjects, “*ye sat,*” etc. (ver. 46), and “*we turned and removed*” (chap. ii. 1), by no means proves that Moses only went away with that part of the congregation which attached itself to him, whilst the other portion, which was most thoroughly estranged from him, or rather from the Lord, remained there still. The change of subject is rather to be explained from the fact that Moses was passing from the consideration of the events in Kadesh, which he held up before the people as a warning, to a description of the further guidance of Israel. The reference to those events had led him involuntarily, from ver. 22 onwards, to distinguish between himself and the people, and to address his words to them for the purpose of bringing out their rebellion against God. And now that he had finished with this, he returned to the communicative mode of address with which he set out in ver. 6, but which he had suspended again until ver. 19.

REVIEW OF THE DIVINE GUIDANCE OF ISRAEL ROUND EDOM
AND MOAB TO THE FRONTIER OF THE AMORITES, AND OF THE
GRACIOUS ASSISTANCE AFFORDED BY THE LORD IN THE CON-
QUEST OF THE KINGDOMS OF SIHON AND OG.—CHAP. II. AND III.

Vers. 1-23. MARCH FROM KADEXH TO THE FRONTIER OF THE AMORITES.—Ver. 1. After a long stay in Kadesh, they commenced

their return into the desert. The words, “*We departed . . . by the way to the Red Sea,*” point back to Num. xiv. 25. This departure is expressly designated as an act of obedience to the divine command recorded there, by the expression “*as Jehovah spake to me.*” Consequently Moses is not speaking here of the second departure of the congregation from Kadesh to go to Mount Hor (Num. xx. 22), but of the first departure after the condemnation of the generation that came out of Egypt. “*And we went round Mount Seir many days.*” This going round Mount Seir includes the thirty-eight years’ wanderings, though we are not therefore to picture it as “going backwards and forwards, and then entering the Arabah again” (*Schultz*). Just as Moses passed over the reassembling of the congregation at Kadesh (Num. xx. 1), so he also overlooked the going to and fro in the desert, and fixed his eye more closely upon the last journey from Kadesh to Mount Hor, that he might recall to the memory of the congregation how the Lord had led them to the end of all their wandering.—Vers. 2 sqq. When they had gone through the Arabah to the southern extremity, the Lord commanded them to turn northwards, *i.e.* to go round the southern end of Mount Seir, and proceed northwards on the eastern side of it (see at Num. xxi. 10), without going to war with the Edomites (הַגְּרָה, to stir oneself up against a person to conflict, מִלְחָמָה), as He would not give them a foot-breadth of their land; for He had given Esau (the Edomites) Mount Seir for a possession. For this reason they were to buy victuals and water of them for money (בָּרָה, to dig, to dig water, *i.e.* procure water, as it was often necessary to dig wells, and not merely to draw it, Gen. xxvi. 25. The verb בָּרָה does not signify to buy).—Ver. 7. And this they were able to do, because the Lord had blessed them in all the work of their hand, *i.e.* not merely in the rearing of flocks and herds, which they had carried on in the desert (Ex. xix. 13, xxxiv. 3; Num. xx. 19, xxxii. 1 sqq.), but in all that they did for a living; whether, for example, when stopping for a long time in the same place of encampment, they sowed in suitable spots and reaped, or whether they sold the produce of their toil and skill to the Arabs of the desert. “*He hath observed thy going through this great desert*” (יְדָה, to know, then to trouble oneself, Gen. xxxix. 6; to observe carefully, Prov. xxvii. 23, Ps. i. 6); and He has not suffered thee to want anything for forty years, but as often as want has occurred, He has miraculously provided for every necessity.—Ver. 8. In accordance with this divine command, they went past the Edomites by the side of their

mountains, “*from the way of the Arabah, from Elath* (see at Gen. xiv. 6) and *Eziongeber*” (see at Num. xxxiii. 35), *sc.* into the steppes of Moab, where they were encamped at that time.

God commanded them to behave in the same manner towards the Moabites, when they approached their frontier (ver. 9). They were not to touch their land, because the Lord had given *Ar* to the descendants of Lot for a possession. In ver. 9 the Moabites are mentioned, and in ver. 19 the Amorites also. The Moabites are designated as “sons of Lot,” for the same reason for which the Edomites are called “brethren of Israel” in ver. 4. The Israelites were to uphold the bond of blood-relationship with these tribes in the most sacred manner. *Ar*, the capital of Moabitis (see at Num. xxi. 15), is used here for the land itself, which was named after the capital, and governed by it.—Vers. 11, 12. To confirm the fact that the Moabites and also the Edomites had received from God the land which they inhabited as a possession, Moses interpolates into the words of Jehovah certain ethnographical notices concerning the earlier inhabitants of these lands, from which it is obvious that Edom and Moab had not destroyed them by their own power, but that Jehovah had destroyed them before them, as is expressly stated in vers. 21, 22. “*The Emim dwelt formerly therein,*” *sc.* in Ar and its territory, in Moabitis, “*a high (i.e. strong) and numerous people, of gigantic stature, which were also reckoned among the Rephaites, like the Enakites (Anakim).*” *Emim*, *i.e.* frightful, terrible, was the name given to them by the Moabites. Whether this earlier or original population of Moabitis was of Hamitic or Semitic descent cannot be determined, any more than the connection between the *Emim* and the *Rephaim* can be ascertained. On the *Rephaim*, see vol. i. p. 203; and on the Anakites, at Num. xiii. 22.—Ver. 12. The origin of the *Horites* (*i.e.* the dwellers in caves) of Mount *Seir*, who were driven out of their possessions by the descendants of Esau, and completely exterminated (see at Gen. xiv. 6, and xxxvi. 20), is altogether involved in obscurity. The words, “*as Israel has done to the land of his possession, which Jehovah has given them,*” do not presuppose the conquest of the land of Canaan or a post-Mosaic authorship; but “*the land of his possession*” is the land to the east of the Jordan (Gilead and Bashan), which was conquered by the Israelites under Moses, and divided among the two tribes and a half, and which is also described in chap. iii. 20 as the “possession” which Jehovah had given to these tribes.—Vers. 13-15. For this reason Israel was to remove from the desert of Moab (*i.e.* the desert

which bounded Moabitis on the east), and to cross over the brook Zered, to advance against the country of the Amorites (see at Num. xxi. 12, 13). This occurred thirty-eight years after the condemnation of the people at Kadesh (Num. xiv. 23, 29), when the generation rejected by God had entirely died out (**מִתְנַחַת**, to be all gone, to disappear), so that not one of them saw the promised land. They did not all die a natural death, however, but "*the hand of the Lord was against them to destroy them*" (**מִתְנַחַת**, lit. to throw into confusion, then used with special reference to the terrors with which Jehovah destroyed His enemies; Ex. xiv. 24, xxiii. 27, etc.), sc. by extraordinary judgments (as in Num. xvi. 35, xvii. 14, xxi. 6, xxv. 9).—Vers. 16–19. When this generation had quite died out, the Lord made known to Moses, and through him to the people, that they were to cross over the boundary of Moab (*i.e.* the Arnon, ver. 24; see at Num. xxi. 13), *the land of Ar* (see at ver. 9), "*to come nigh over against the children of Ammon*," *i.e.* to advance into the neighbourhood of the Ammonites, who lived to the east of Moab; but they were not to meddle with these descendants of Lot, because He would give them nothing of the land that was given them for a possession (ver. 19, as at vers. 5 and 9).—To confirm this, ethnographical notices are introduced again in vers. 20–22 into the words of God (as in vers. 10, 11), concerning the earlier population of the country of the Ammonites. Ammonitis was also regarded as a land of the Rephaites, because Rephaites dwelt therein, whom the Ammonites called *Zamzummim*. "*Zamzummim*," from **מִזְמָה**, to hum, then to muse, equivalent to the humming or roaring people, probably the same people as the *Zuzim* mentioned in Gen. xiv. 5. This giant tribe Jehovah had destroyed before the Ammonites (ver. 22), just as He had done for the sons of Esau dwelling upon Mount Seir, namely, destroyed the Horites before them, so that the Edomites "*dwell in their stead, even unto this day*."—Ver. 23. As the Horites had been exterminated by the Edomites, so were the *Avvæans* (*Avvim*), who dwelt in farms (villages) at the south-west corner of Canaan, as far as Gaza, driven out of their possessions and exterminated by the *Caphtorites*, who sprang from *Caphtor* (see at Gen. x. 14), although, according to Josh. xiii. 3, some remnants of them were to be found among the Philistines even at that time. This notice appears to be attached to the foregoing remarks simply on account of the substantial analogy between them, without there being any intention to imply that the Israelites were to assume the same attitude towards the Caphtorites, who afterwards rose up in

the persons of the Philistines, as towards the descendants of Esau and Lot.

Vers. 24-37. THE HELP OF GOD IN THE CONQUEST OF THE KINGDOM OF SIHON.—Vers. 24 sqq. Whereas the Israelites were not to make war upon the kindred tribes of Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites, or drive them out of the possessions given to them by God; the Lord had given the Amorites, who had forced a way into Gilead and Bashan, into their hands.—Vers. 24, 25. While they were encamped on the Arnon, the border of the Amoritish king of Sihon, He directed them to cross this frontier and take possession of the land of Sihon, and promised that He would give this king with all his territory into their hands, and that henceforward (“*this day*,” the day on which Israel crossed the Arnon) He would put fear and terror of Israel upon all nations under the whole heaven, so that as soon as they heard the report of Israel they would tremble and writhe before them. שְׁחַנָּה, “begin, take,” an oratorical expression for “begin to take” (שׁ in pause for שׁנָה, chap. i. 21). The expression, “*all nations under the whole heaven*,” is hyperbolical; it is not to be restricted, however, to the Canaanites and other neighbouring tribes, but, according to what follows, to be understood as referring to all nations to whom the report of the great deeds of the Lord upon and on behalf of Israel should reach (cf. chap. xi. 25 and Ex. xxiii. 27). שְׁנָא, so that (as in Gen. xi. 7, xiii. 16, xxii. 14). שְׁלֹטָה, with the accent upon the last syllable, on account of the consec. (*Ewald*, § 234, a.), from שְׁלַט, to twist, or writhe with pain, here with anxiety.—Vers. 26-29. If Moses, notwithstanding this, sent messengers to king Sihon with words of peace (vers. 26 sqq.; cf. Num. xxi. 21 sqq.), this was done to show the king of the Amorites, that it was through his own fault that his kingdom and lands and life were lost. The wish to pass through his land in a peaceable manner was quite seriously expressed; although Moses foresaw, in consequence of the divine communication, that he would reject his proposal, and meet Israel with hostilities. For Sihon’s kingdom did not form part of the land of Canaan, which God had promised to the patriarchs for their descendants; and the divine foreknowledge of the hardness of Sihon no more destroyed the freedom of his will to resolve, or the freedom of his actions, than the circumstance that in ver. 30 the unwillingness of Sihon is described as the effect of his being hardened by God Himself. The hardening was quite as much the production

of human freedom and guilt, as the consequence of the divine decree; just as in the case of Pharaoh (see the discussion in vol. i. pp. 453 sqq.). On *Kedemoth*, see p. 144. בְּדַרְךָ בְּדַרְךָ, equivalent to “upon the way, and always upon the way,” *i.e.* upon the high road alone, as in Num. xx. 19. On the behaviour of the Edomites towards Israel, mentioned in ver. 29, see p. 142. In the same way the Moabites also supplied Israel with provisions for money. This statement is not at variance with the unbrotherly conduct for which the Moabites are blamed in chap. xxiii. 4, viz. that they did not meet the Israelites with bread and water. For מִקְרָב, to meet and anticipate, signifies a hospitable reception, the offering of food and drink without reward, which is essentially different from selling for money. “*In Ar*” (ver. 29), as in ver. 18. The suffix in כֵּן (ver. 30) refers to the king, who is mentioned as the lord of the land, in the place of the land itself, just as in Num. xx. 18.—Ver. 31. The refusal of Sihon was suspended over him by God as a judgment of hardening, which led to his destruction. “*As this day*,” an abbreviation of “as it has happened this day,” *i.e.* as experience has now shown (cf. chap. iv. 20, etc.).—Vers. 32–37. Defeat of Sihon, as already described in the main in Num. xxi. 23–26. The war was a war of extermination, in which all the towns were laid under the ban (see Lev. xxvii. 29), *i.e.* the whole of the population of men, women, and children were put to death, and only the flocks and herds and material possessions were taken by the conquerors as prey.—Ver. 34. עִיר מִתְחָם (city of men) is the town population of men.—Ver. 36. They proceeded this way with the whole of the kingdom of Sihon. “*From Aroër on the edge of the Arnon valley* (see at Num. xxxii. 34), *and, in fact, from the city which is in the valley*,” *i.e.* Ar, or Areopolis (see at Num. xxi. 15),—Aroër being mentioned as the inclusive *terminus a quo* of the land that was taken, and the Moabitish capital Ar as the exclusive *terminus*, as in Josh. xiii. 9 and 16; “*and as far as Gilead*,” which rises on the north, near the Jabbok (or Zerka, see at chap. iii. 4), “*there was no town too high for us*,” *i.e.* so strong that we could not take it.—Ver. 37. Only along the land of the Ammonites the Israelites did not come, namely, along the whole of the side of the brook Jabbok, or the country of the Ammonites, which was situated upon the eastern side of the upper Jabbok, and the towns of the mountain, *i.e.* of the Ammonitish highlands, and “*to all that the Lord had commanded*,” *sc.* commanded them not to remove. The statement, in Josh xiii. 25, that the half of the country of the Ammonites was given to the

tribe of Gad, is not at variance with this; for the allusion there is to that portion of the land of the Ammonites which was between the Arnon and the Jabbok, and which had already been taken from the Ammonites by the Amorites under Sihon (cf. Judg. xi. 13 sqq.).

Chap. iii. 1-11. THE HELP OF GOD IN THE CONQUEST OF THE KINGDOM OF OG OF BASHAN.—Vers. 1 sqq. After the defeat of king Sihon and the conquest of his land, the Israelites were able to advance to the Jordan. But as the powerful Amoritish king Og still held the northern half of Gilead and all Bashan, they proceeded northwards at once and took the road to Bashan, that they might also defeat this king, whom the Lord had likewise given into their hand, and conquer his country (cf. Num. xxi. 33, 34). They smote him at *Edrei*, the modern *Draâ* (see p. 155), without leaving him even a remnant; and took all his towns, i.e., as is here more fully stated in vers. 4 sqq., “*sixty towns, the whole region of Argob, the kingdom of Og in Bashan.*” These three definitions refer to one and the same country. The whole region of *Argob* included the sixty towns which formed the kingdom of Og in Bashan, i.e. all the towns of the land of Bashan, viz. (according to ver. 5) all the fortified towns, besides the unfortified and open country towns of Bashan. **לְכָבֶשׁ**, the chain for measuring, then the land or country measured with the chain. The name “*région of Argob*,” which is given to the country of Bashan here, and in vers. 4, 13, 14, and also in 1 Kings iv. 13, is probably derived from **רגּוֹב**, stone-heaps, related to **רַגְבָּה**, a clump or clod of earth (Job xxi. 33, xxxviii. 38). The Targumists have rendered it correctly **תְּרַכּוֹנָה** (*Trachona*), from *τραχών*, a rough, uneven, stony district, so called from the basaltic hills of Hauran; just as the plain to the east of Jebel Hauran, which resembles Hauran itself, is sometimes called *Tellul*, from its tells or hills (*Burckhardt*, Syr. p. 173).¹ This district has also received the name of *Bashan*, from the character of its soil; for **בָּשָׂן** signifies a soft and level soil. From the name given to it by the Arabic translators, the Greek name *Batavaia*, *Batanæa*, and possibly also the modern name of the country on the north-eastern slope of Hauran at the back of Mount Hauran, viz. *Bethenije*, are derived.—The name *Argob* probably originated in the north-eastern part of the country of Bashan, viz. the modern

¹ The derivation is a much more improbable one, “from the town of *Argob*, *πόλις Γέρασας πόλιν Ἀροβίας*, according to the *Onomast.*, fifteen Roman miles to the west of *Gerasa*, which is called *Παγαζᾶ* by *Josephus* (Ant. xiii. 15, 5). ”

Leja, with its stony soil covered with heaps of large blocks of stone (*Burckhardt*, p. 196), or rather in the extensive volcanic region to the east of Hauran, which was first of all brought to distinct notice in *Wetzstein's* travels, and of which he says that the “southern portion, bearing the name *Harra*, is thickly covered with loose volcanic stones, with a few conical hills among them, that have been evidently caused by eruptions” (*Wetzstein*, p. 6). The central point of the whole is *Safa*, “a mountain nearly seven hours’ journey in length and about the same in breadth,” in which “the black mass streaming from the craters piled itself up wave upon wave, so that the centre attained to the height of a mountain, without acquiring the smoothness of form observable in mountains generally”—“the black flood of lava being full of innumerable streams of stony waves, often of a bright red colour, bridged over with thin arches, which rolled down the slopes out of the craters and across the high plateau” (*Wetzstein*, pp. 6 and 7). At a later period this name was transferred to the whole of the district of Hauran (= Bashan), because not only is the Jebel Hauran entirely of volcanic formation, but the plain consists throughout of a reddish brown soil produced by the action of the weather upon volcanic stones, and even “the *Leja* plain has been poured out from the craters of the Hauran mountains” (*Wetzstein*, p. 23). Through this volcanic character of the soil, Hauran differs essentially from Belka, Jebel *Ajlun*, and the plain of *Jaulan*, which is situated between the Sea of Galilee and the upper Jordan on the one side, and the plain of Hauran on the other, and reaches up to the southern slope of the Hermon. In these districts the limestone and chalk formations prevail, which present the same contrast to the basaltic formation of the Hauran as white does to black (cf. *v. Raumer*, Pal. pp. 75 sqq.).—The land of the limestone and chalk formation abounds in caves, which are not altogether wanting indeed in Hauran (as *v. Raumer* supposes), though they are only found in eastern and south-eastern Hauran, where most of the volcanic elevations have been perforated by troglodytes (see *Wetzstein*, pp. 92 and 44 sqq.). But the true land of caves on the east of the Jordan is northern Gilead, viz. *Erbed* and *Suēt* (*Wetzst.* p. 92). Here the troglodyte dwellings predominate, whereas in Hauran you find for the most part towns and villages with houses of one or more stories built above the surface of the ground, although even on the eastern slope of the Hauran mountains there are hamlets to be seen, in which the style of building forms a

transition from actual caves to dwellings built upon the ground. An excavation is first of all made in the rocky plateau, of the breadth and depth of a room, and this is afterwards arched over with a solid stone roof. The dwellings made in this manner have all the appearance of cellars or tunnels. This style of building, such as *Wetzstein* found in *Hibbiké* for example, belongs to the most remote antiquity. In some cases, hamlets of this kind were even surrounded by a wall. Those villages of Hauran which are built above the surface of the ground, attract the eye and stimulate the imagination, when seen from a distance, in various ways. "In the first place, the black colour of the building materials presents the greatest contrast to the green around them, and to the transparent atmosphere also. In the second place, the height of the walls and the compactness of the houses, which always form a connected whole, are very imposing. In the third place, they are surmounted by strong towers. And in the fourth place, they are in such a good state of preservation, that you involuntarily yield to the delusion that they must of necessity be inhabited, and expect to see people going out and in" (*Wetzstein*, p. 49). The larger towns are surrounded by walls; but the smaller ones as a rule have none: "the backs of the houses might serve as walls." The material of which the houses are built is a grey dolerite, impregnated with glittering particles of olivine. "The stones are rarely cemented, but the fine and for the most part large squares lie one upon another as if they were fused together." "Most of the doors of the houses which lead into the streets or open fields are so low, that it is impossible to enter them without stooping; but the large buildings and the ends of the streets have lofty gateways, which are always tastefully constructed, and often decorated with sculptures and Greek inscriptions." The "larger gates have either simple or (what are most common) double doors. They consist of a slab of dolerite. There are certainly no doors of any other kind." These stone doors turn upon pegs, deeply inserted into the threshold and lintel. "Even a man can only shut and open doors of this kind, by pressing with the back or feet against the wall, and pushing the door with both hands" (*Wetzstein*, pp. 50 sqq.; compare with this the testimony of *Buckingham*, *Burckhardt*, *Seetzen*, and others, in *v. Raumer's Palestine*, pp. 78 sqq.).

Now, even if the existing ruins of Hauran date for the most part from a later period, and are probably of a Nabataean origin belonging to the times of Trajan and the Antonines, yet consider-

ing the stability of the East, and the peculiar nature of the soil of Hauran, they give a tolerably correct idea of the sixty towns of the kingdom of Og of Bashan, all of which were fortified with high walls, gates, and bars, or, as it is stated in 1 Kings iv. 13, “with walls and brazen bars.”¹ The brazen bars were no doubt, like the gates themselves, of basalt or dolerite, which might easily be mistaken for brass. Besides the sixty fortified towns, the Israelites took a very large number of עֲרָבִי הַפְּרִזִּים, “towns of the inhabitants of the flat country,” i.e. unfortified open hamlets and villages in Bashan, and put them under the ban, like the towns of king Sihon (vers. 6, 7; cf. chap. ii. 34, 35). The infinitive, הַחֲרָם, is to be construed as a gerund (cf. *Ges.* § 131; 2; *Ewald*, § 280, a.). The expression, “kingdom of Og in Bashan,” implies that the kingdom of Og was not limited to the land of Bashan, but included the northern half of Gilead as well.

In vers. 8–11, Moses takes a retrospective view of the whole of the land that had been taken on the other side of the Jordan; first of all (ver. 9) in its whole extent from the Arnon to Hermon, then (ver. 10) in its separate parts, to bring out in all its grandeur what the Lord had done for Israel. The notices of the different names of Hermon (ver. 9), and of the bed of king Og (ver. 11), are also subservient to this end. *Hermon* is the southernmost spur of Anti-libanus, the present *Jebel es Sheikh*, or *Jebel et Telj*. The Hebrew name is not connected with בָּרָם, *anathema*, as *Hengstenberg* supposes (Diss. pp. 197–8); nor was it first given by the Israelites to this mountain, which formed part of the northern boundary of the land which they had taken; but it is to be traced to an Arabic word signifying *prominens montis vertex*, and was a name which had long been current at that time, for which the Israelites used the Hebrew name שִׁיאֵן (*Sion* = נִשְׁיאֵן, the high, eminent: chap. iv. 48), though this name did not supplant the traditional name of *Hermon*. The Sidonians called it *Sirion*, a modified form of שִׁירִין (1 Sam. xvii. 5), or סִירִין (Jer. xlvi. 4), a “coat of mail;” the Amorites called it *Senir*, probably a word with the same meaning. In Ps. xxix. 6, *Sirion* is used

¹ It is also by no means impossible, that many of the oldest dwellings in the ruined towers of Hauran date from a time anterior to the conquest of the land by the Israelites. “Simple, built of heavy blocks of basalt roughly hewn, and as hard as iron, with very thick walls, very strong stone gates and doors, many of which were about eighteen inches thick, and were formerly fastened with immense bolts, and of which traces still remain; such houses as these may have been the work of the old giant tribe of Rephaim, whose king, Og, was defeated by the Israelites 3000 years ago” (*C. v. Raumer*, Pal. p. 80, after *Porter’s Five Years in Damascus*).

poetically for *Hermon*; and Ezekiel (xxvii. 4) uses *Senir*, in a mournful dirge over Tyre, as synonymous with *Lebanon*; whilst *Senir* is mentioned in 1 Chron. v. 23, and *Shenir* in Cant. iv. 8, in connection with Hermon, as a part of Antilibanus, as it might very naturally happen that the Amoritish name continued attached to one or other of the peaks of the mountain, just as we find that even Arabian geographers, such as *Abulfeda* and *Marasjid*, call that portion of Antilibanus which stretches from Baalbek to Emesa (Homs, Heliopolis) by the name of *Sanir*.—Ver. 10. The different portions of the conquered land were the following: *שָׂןְתָן*, *the plain*, i.e. the Amoritish table-land, stretching from the Arnon to Heshbon, and in a north-easterly direction nearly as far as Rabbath-Ammon, with the towns of *Heshbon*, *Bezer*, *Medeba*, *Jahza*, and *Dibon* (chap. iv. 43; Josh. xiii. 9, 16, 17, 21, xx. 8; Jer. xlvi. 21 sqq.), which originally belonged to the Moabites, and is therefore called “the field of Moab” in Num. xxi. 20 (see p. 148). “*The whole of Gilead*,” i.e. the mountainous region on the southern and northern sides of the Jabbok, which was divided into two halves by this river. The southern half, which reached to Heshbon, belonged to the kingdom of Sihon (Josh. xii. 2), and was assigned by Moses to the Reubenites and Gadites (ver. 12); whilst the northern half, which is called “the rest of Gilead” in ver. 13, the modern *Jebel Ajlun*, extending as far as the land of Bashan (Hauran and Jaulan), belonged to the kingdom of Og (Josh. xii. 5), and was assigned to the Manassite family of Machir (ver. 15, and Josh. xiii. 31; cf. v. *Raumer*, Pal. pp. 229, 230). “*And all Bashan unto Salcah and Edrei*.” All Bashan included not only the country of Hauran (the plain and mountain), but unquestionably also the district of *Jedur* and *Jaulan*, to the west of the sea of Galilee and the upper Jordan, or the ancient *Gaulonitis* (*Jos. Ant.* xviii. 4, 6, etc.), as the kingdom of Og extended to the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi (see at ver. 14). Og had not conquered the whole of the land of Hauran, however, but only the greater part of it. His territory extended eastwards to *Salcah*, i.e. the present *Szalchat* or *Szarchad*, about six hours to the east of *Bozrah*, south of *Jebel Hauran*, a town with 800 houses, and a castle upon a basaltic rock, but uninhabited (cf. v. *Raumer*, Pal. p. 255); and northwards to *Edrei*, i.e. the northern *Edrei* (see at Num. xxi. 33), a considerable ruin on the northwest of *Bozrah*, three or four English miles in extent, in the old buildings of which there are 200 families living at present (Turks, Druses, and Christians). By the Arabian geographers (*Abulfeda*,

Ibn Batuta) it is called *Sora*, by modern travellers *Adra* or *Edra* (*v. Richter*), or *Oezraa* (*Seetzen*), or *Ezra* (*Burckhardt*), and *Edhra* (*Robinson*, App. 155). Consequently nearly the whole of Jebel Hauran, and the northern portion of the plain, viz. the *Leja*, were outside the kingdom of Og and the land of Bashan, of which the Israelites took possession, although *Burckhardt* reckons Ezra as part of the *Leja*.—Ver. 11. Even in Abraham's time, the giant tribe of *Rephaim* was living in Bashan (Gen. xiv. 5). But out of the remnant of these, king Og, whom the Israelites defeated and slew, was the only one left. For the purpose of recalling the greatness of the grace of God that had been manifested in that victory, and not merely to establish the credibility of the statements concerning the size of Og ("just as things belonging to an age that has long passed away are shown to be credible by their remains," *Spinoza*, etc.), Moses points to the iron bed of this king, which was still in Rabbath-Ammon, and was nine cubits long and four broad, "after the cubit of a man," *i.e.* the ordinary cubit in common use (see the analogous expression, "a man's pen," Isa. viii. 1). תְּלִקָּה, for תְּלִקָּה, synonymous with תְּלִקָּה. There is nothing to amaze us in the size of the bed or bedstead given here. The ordinary Hebrew cubit was only a foot and a half, probably only eighteen Dresden inches (see my *Archäologie*, ii. p. 126, Anm. 4). Now a bed is always larger than the man who sleeps in it. But in this case *Clericus* fancies that Og "intentionally exceeded the necessary size, in order that posterity might be led to draw more magnificent conclusions from the size of the bed, as to the stature of the man who was accustomed to sleep in it." He also refers to the analogous case of Alexander the Great, of whom *Diod. Sic.* (xvii. 95) affirms, that whenever he was obliged to halt on his march to India, he made colossal arrangements of all kinds, causing, among other things, two couches to be prepared in the tents for every foot-soldier, each five cubits long, and two stalls for every horseman, twice as large as the ordinary size, "to represent a camp of heroes, and leave striking memorials behind for the inhabitants of the land, of gigantic men and their supernatural strength." With a similar intention Og may also have left behind him a gigantic bed as a memorial of his superhuman greatness, on the occasion of some expedition of his against the Ammonites; and this bed may have been preserved in their capital as a proof of the greatness of their foe.¹ Moses might then refer

¹ "It will often be found, that very tall people are disposed to make themselves appear even taller than they actually are" (*Hengstenberg*, Diss. ii. p. 201).

to this gigantic bed of Og, which was known to the Israelites ; and there is no reason for resorting to the improbable conjecture, that the Ammonites had taken possession of a bed of king Og upon some expedition against the Amorites, and had carried it off as a trophy into their capital.¹ “ *Rabbath* of the sons of Ammon,” or briefly *Rabbah*, *i.e.* the great (Josh. xiii. 25; 2 Sam. xi. 1), was the capital of the Ammonites, afterwards called *Philadelphia*, probably from Ptolemæus *Philadelphus*; by *Polybius*, ‘*Ραββατάμανα*; by *Abulfeda*, *Ammân*, which is the name still given to the uninhabited ruins on the *Nahr Ammân*, *i.e.* the upper Jabbok (see *Burckhardt*, pp. 612 sqq., and *v. Raumer*, Pal. p. 268).

Vers. 12-20. REVIEW OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONQUERED LAND.—The land which the Israelites had taken belonging to these two kingdoms was given by Moses to the two tribes and a half for their possession, viz. the southern portion from Aroer in the Arnon valley (see at Num. xxxii. 34), and half Gilead (as far as the Jabbok : see at ver. 10) with its towns, which are enumerated in Josh. xiii. 15-20 and 24-28, to the Reubenites and Gadites; and the northern half of Gilead, with the whole of Bashan (*i.e.* all the region of Argob : see at ver. 4, and Num. xxxii. 33), to the half-tribe of Manasseh. בָּשָׁן־הַגּוֹבֵךְ, “as for all Bashan,” is in apposition to “all the region of Argob,” and the ה simply serves to connect it; for “all the region of Argob” was not merely one portion of Bashan, but was identical with “all Bashan,” so far as it belonged to the kingdom of Og (see at ver. 4). All this region passed for a land of giants. נִקְרָא, to be called, *i.e.* to be, and to be recognised as being.—Ver. 14. The region of Argob, or the country of Bashan, was given to *Jair* (see Num. xxxii. 41), as far as the territory of the Geshurites and Maachathites (cf. Josh. xii. 5, xiii. 11). “ *Unto*,” as far as, is to be understood as inclusive. This is evident from

Moreover, there are still giants who are eight feet high and upwards. “ According to the *N. Preuss. Zeit.* of 1857, there came a man to Berlin 8 feet 4 inches high, and possibly still growing, as he was only twenty years old ; and he was said to have a great-uncle who was nine inches taller” (*Schultz*).

¹ There is still less probability in the conjecture of *J. D. Michaelis*, *Vater*, *Winer*, and others, that Og’s iron bed was a sarcophagus of basalt, such as are still frequently met with in those regions, as much as 9 feet long and 3½ feet broad, or even as much as 12 feet long and 6 feet in breadth and height (*vid. Burckhardt*, pp. 220, 246; *Robinson*, iii. p. 385; *Seetzen*, i. pp. 355, 360); and the still further assumption, that the corpse of the fallen king was taken to Rabbah, and there interred in a royal way, is altogether improbable.

the statement in Josh. xiii. 13: “*The children of Israel expelled not the Geshurites nor the Maachathites; but the Geshurites and the Maachathites dwell among the Israelites until this day.*” Consequently Moses allotted the territory of these two tribes to the Manassites, because it formed part of the kingdom of Og. “*Geshuri and Maachathi*” are the inhabitants of *Geshur* and *Maachah*, two provinces which formed small independent kingdoms even in David’s time (2 Sam. iii. 3, xiii. 37, and x. 6). *Geshur* bordered on Aram. The Geshurites and Aramæans afterwards took from the Israelites the *Jair*-towns and *Kenath*, with their daughter towns (1 Chron. ii. 23). In David’s time *Geshur* had a king *Thalmai*, whose daughter David married. This daughter was the mother of Absalom; and it was in *Geshur* that Absalom lived for a time in exile (2 Sam. iii. 3, xiii. 37, xiv. 23, xv. 8). The exact situation of *Geshur* has not yet been determined. It was certainly somewhere near Hermon, on the eastern side of the upper Jordan, and by a *bridge* over the Jordan, as *Geshur* signifies bridge in all the Semitic dialects. *Maachah*, which is referred to in 1 Chron. xix. 6 as a kingdom under the name of *Aram-Maachah* (Eng. V. Syria-Maachah), is probably to be sought for to the north-east of *Geshur*. According to the *Onomast.* (*s. v. Maachaθi*), it was in the neighbourhood of the Hermon. “*And he called them (the towns of the region of Argob) after his own name; Bashan (sc. he called) Havvoth Jair unto this day*” (cf. Num. xxxii. 41). The word **הַבּוֹתָה** (*Havvoth*), which only occurs in connection with the *Jair*-towns, does not mean towns or camps of a particular kind, viz. tent villages, as some suppose, but is the plural of **הַבּוֹתָה**, life (*Leben*, a common German termination, e.g. *Eisleben*), for which afterwards the word **הַבּוֹתָה** was used (comp. 2 Sam. xxiii. 13 with 1 Chron. xi. 15). It applies to any kind of dwelling-place, being used in the passages just mentioned to denote even a warlike encampment. The *Jair’s-lives* (*Jairsleben*) were not a particular class of towns, therefore, in the district of Argob, but *Jair* gave this collective name to all the sixty fortified towns, as is perfectly evident from the verse before us when compared with ver. 5 and Num. xxxii. 41, and expressly confirmed by Josh. xiii. 30 and 1 Kings iv. 13, where the sixty fortified towns of the district of Argob are called *Havvoth Jair*.—The statement in 1 Chron. ii. 22, 23, that “*Jair had twenty-three towns in Gilead* (which is used here as in chap. xxxiv. 1, Josh. xxii. 9, xiii. 15, Judg. v. 17, xx. 1, to denote the whole of Palestine to the east of the Jordan), *and Geshur and Aram took the Havvoth Jair from them*, (and) *Kenath and its*

daughters, sixty towns (sc. in all)," is by no means at variance with this, but, on the contrary, in the most perfect harmony with it. For it is evident from this passage, that the twenty-three *Havvoth Jair*, with *Kenath* and its daughters, formed sixty towns altogether. The distinction between the twenty-three *Havvoth Jair* and the other thirty-seven towns, viz. *Kenath* and its daughters, is to be explained from the simple fact that, according to Num. xxxii. 42, *Nobah*, no doubt a family of sons of Machir related to *Jair*, conquered *Kenath* and its daughters, and called the conquered towns by his name, namely, when they had been allotted to him by Moses. Consequently Bashan, or the region of Argob, with its sixty fortified towns, was divided between two of the leading families of Machir the Manassite, viz. the families of *Jair* and *Nobah*, each family receiving the districts which it had conquered, together with their towns; namely, the family of *Nobah*, *Kenath* and its daughter towns, or the eastern portion of Bashan; and the family of *Jair*, twenty-three towns in the west, which are called *Havvoth Jair* in 1 Chron. ii. 23, in harmony with Num. xxxii. 41, where *Jair* is said to have given this name to the towns which were conquered by him. In the address before us, however, in which Moses had no intention to enter into historical details, all the (sixty) towns of the whole district of Argob, or the whole of Bashan, are comprehended under the name of *Havvoth Jair*, probably because *Nobah* was a subordinate branch of the family of *Jair*, and the towns conquered by him were under the supremacy of *Jair*. The expression "unto this day" certainly does not point to a later period than the Mosaic age. This definition of time is simply a relative one. It does not necessarily presuppose a very long duration, and here it merely serves to bring out the marvellous change which was due to the divine grace, viz. that the sixty fortified towns of the giant king Og of Bashan had now become *Jair's* lives.¹—Ver. 15. Machir received Gilead (see Num. xxxii. 40).—In vers. 16 and 17 the possession of the tribes of Reuben and Gad is described more fully according to its boundaries. They received the land of Gilead (to the south of the Jabbor) as far as the brook Arnon, the middle of the valley and its territory. בְּמִזְרָחַ הַנֶּחֶל is a more precise definition of נֹחַ אֲרָנוֹן, ex-

¹ The conquest of these towns, in fact, does not seem to have been of long duration, and the possession of them by the Israelites was a very disputed one (cf. 1 Chron. ii. 22, 23). In the time of the judges we find thirty in the possession of the judge *Jair* (Judg. x. 4), which caused the old name *Havvoth Jair* to be revived.

pressive of the fact that the territory of these tribes was not to reach merely to the northern edge of the Arnon valley, but into the middle of it, viz. to the river Arnon, which flowed through the middle of the valley; and נֶבֶת (and the border) is an explanatory apposition to what goes before, as in Num. xxxiv. 6, signifying, “*viz. the border of the Arnon valley as far as the river.*” On the east, “*even unto Jabbok the brook, the (western) border of the Ammonites*” (*i.e.* as far as the upper Jabbok, the *Nahr Amnán*: see at Num. xxi. 24); and on the west “*the Arabah (the Ghor: see chap. i. 1) and the Jordan with territory*” (*i.e.* with its eastern bank), “*from Chinnereth*” (*i.e.* the town from which the Sea of Galilee received the name of Sea of Chinnereth: Num. xxxiv. 11; see at Josh. xix. 35) “*to the sea of the Arabah, the Salt Sea under the slopes of Pisgah* (see at Num. xxi. 15 and xxvii. 12) *eastward*” (*i.e.* merely the eastern side of the Arabah and Jordan).—In vers. 18–20 Moses reminds them of the conditions upon which he had given the two tribes and a half the land referred to for their inheritance (*cf.* Num. xxxii. 20–32).

Vers. 21–29. NOMINATION OF JOSHUA AS HIS SUCCESSOR.—This reminiscence also recalls the goodness of God in the appointment of Joshua (Num. xxvii. 12 sqq.), which took place “*at that time,*” *i.e.* after the conquest of the land on the east of the Jordan. In accordance with the object of his address, which was to hold up to view what the Lord had done for Israel, he here relates how, at the very outset, he pointed Joshua to the things which he had seen with his eyes (*עִינֵיךְ חָרְאַת*, thine eyes were seeing; *cf. Ewald*, § 335, b.), namely, to the defeat of the two kings of the Amorites, in which the pledge was contained, that the faithful covenant God would complete the work He had begun, and would do the same to all kingdoms whither Joshua would go over (*i.e.* across the Jordan).—Ver. 22. For this reason they were not to be afraid; for Jehovah Himself would fight for them. “*He*” is emphatic, and adds force to the subject.—Vers. 23 sqq. Moses then describes how, notwithstanding his prayer, the Lord had refused him permission to cross over into Canaan and see the glorious land. This prayer is not mentioned in the historical account given in the fourth book; but it must have preceded the prayer for the appointment of a shepherd over the congregation in Num. xxvii. 16, as the Lord directs him in His reply (ver. 28) to appoint Joshua as the leader of the people. In his prayer, Moses appealed to the manifestations of divine grace

/ which he had already received. As the Lord had already begun to show him His greatness and His mighty hand, so might He also show him the completion of His work. The expression, “begun to show Thy greatness,” relates not so much to the mighty acts of the Lord in Egypt and at the Red Sea (as in Ex. xxxii. 11, 12, and Num. xiv. 13 sqq.), as to the manifestation of the divine omnipotence in the defeat of the Amorites, by which the Lord had begun to bring His people into the possession of the promised land, and had made Himself known as God, to whom there was no equal in heaven or on earth. שַׁאֲלֵנִי before מִן־אֱלֹהִים (ver. 24) is an explanatory and causal relative : because (*quod, quia*), or for. “*For what God is there in heaven and on earth,*” etc. These words recall Ex. xv. 11, and are echoed in many of the Psalms—in Ps. lxxxvi. 8 almost *verbatim*. The contrast drawn between Jehovah and other gods does not involve the reality of the heathen deities, but simply presupposes a belief in the existence of other gods, without deciding as to the truth of that belief. בְּבוֹלָת, manifestations of בְּבוֹרָה, mighty deeds.—Ver. 25. “*I pray Thee, let me go over.*” אַעֲבֹרֶת נָאָזָן, a form of desire, used as a petition, as in chap. ii. 27, Num. xxi. 22, etc. “*That goodly mountain*” is not one particular portion of the land of Canaan, such as the mountains of Judah, or the temple mountain (according to Ex. xv. 17), but the whole of Canaan regarded as a mountainous country, Lebanon being specially mentioned as the boundary wall towards the north. As Moses stood on the lower level of the Arabah, the promised land presented itself not only to his eyes, but also to his soul, as a long mountain range; and that not merely as suggestive of the lower contrast, that “whereas the plains in the East are for the most part sterile, on account of the want of springs or rain, the mountainous regions, which are well watered by springs and streams, are very fertile and pleasant” (*Rosenmüller*), but also on a much higher ground, viz. as a high and lofty land, which would stand by the side of Horeb, “where he had spent the best and holiest days of his life, and where he had seen the commencement of the covenant between God and His people” (*Schultz*).—Ver. 26. But the Lord would not grant his request. “*Let it suffice thee*” (*satis sit tibi*, as in chap. i. 6), substantially equivalent to 2 Cor. xii. 8, “*My grace is sufficient for thee*” (*Schultz*). בְּמִבְּרֵב, to speak about a thing (as in chap. vi. 7, xi. 19, etc.).—Ver. 27 is a rhetorical paraphrase of Num. xxvii. 12, where the mountains of Abarim are mentioned in the place of Pisgah, which was the northern portion of Abarim. (On ver. 28, cf. chap. i. 38 and Num. xxvii. 23.)

—Ver. 29. “*So we abode in the valley over against Beth-Peòr*,” i.e. in the Arboth Moab (Num. xxii. 1), *sc.* where we still are. The pret. **וְיָשַׁבְתִּים** is used, because Moses fixes his eye upon the past, and looks back upon the events already described in Num. xxviii.—xxxiv. as having taken place there. On *Beth-Peor*, see at Num. xxiii. 28.

EXHORTATION TO A FAITHFUL OBSERVANCE OF THE LAW.—

CHAP. IV. 1–40.

With the word **וְהַיָּה**, “*and now*,” Moses passes from a contemplation of what the Lord had done for Israel, to an exhortation to keep the law of the Lord. The divine manifestations of grace laid Israel under the obligation, to a conscientious observance of the law, that they might continue to enjoy the blessings of the covenant. The exhortation commences with the appeal, to hear and keep the commandments and rights of the Lord, without adding to them or taking from them; for not only were life and death suspended upon their observance, but it was in this that the wisdom and greatness of Israel before all the nations consisted (vers. 1–8). It then proceeds to a warning, not to forget the events at Horeb (vers. 9–14) and so fall into idolatry, the worship of images or idol deities (vers. 15–24); and it closes with a threat of dispersion among the heathen as the punishment of apostasy, and with a promise of restoration as the consequence of repentance and sincere conversion (vers. 25–31), and also with a reason for this threat and promise drawn from the history of the immediate past (vers. 32–34), for the purpose of fortifying the nation in its fidelity to its God, the sole author of its salvation (vers. 35–40).

Vers. 1–8. The Israelites were to hearken to the laws and rights which Moses taught to do (that they were to do), that they might live and attain to the possession of the land which the Lord would give them. “Hearkening” involves laying to heart and observing. The words “*statutes and judgments*” (as in Lev. xix. 37) denote the whole of the law of the covenant in its two leading features. **מִקְרָבִים**, *statutes*, includes the moral commandments and statutory covenant laws, for which **מִנְחָה** and **מִקְדָּשָׁה** are mostly used in the earlier books, that is to say, all that the people were bound to observe; **מִשְׁפָטִים**, *rights*, all that was due to them, whether in relation to God or to their fellow-men (cf. chap. xxvi. 17). Sometimes **הַמִּצְוָה**, the *commandment*, is connected with it, either placed first in

the singular, as a general comprehensive notion (chap. v. 28, vi. 1, vii. 11), or in the plural (chap. viii. 11, xi. 1, xxx. 16); or הַעֲדָה, the *testimonies*, the commandments as a manifestation of the will of God (ver. 45, vi. 17, 20).—Life itself depended upon the fulfilment, or long life in the promised land (Ex. xx. 12), as Moses repeatedly impressed upon them (cf. ver. 40, chap. v. 30, vi. 2, viii. 1, xi. 21, xvi. 20, xxv. 15, xxx. 6, 15 sqq., xxxii. 47). יְרַשּׁתָם, for יְרַשּׁתָם (as in ver. 22, Josh. i. 16; cf. Ges. § 44, 2, *Anm.* 2).—Ver. 2. The observance of the law, however, required that it should be kept as it was given, that nothing should be added to it or taken from it, but that men should submit to it as to the inviolable word of God. Not by omissions only, but by additions also, was the commandment weakened, and the word of God turned into ordinances of men, as Pharisaism sufficiently proved. This precept is repeated in chap. xiii. 1; it is then revived by the prophets (Jer. xxvi. 2; Prov. xxx. 6), and enforced again at the close of the whole revelation (Rev. xxii. 18, 19). In the same sense Christ also said that He had not come to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil (Matt. v. 17); and the old covenant was not abrogated, but only glorified and perfected, by the new.—Vers. 3, 4. The Israelites had just experienced how a faithful observance of the law gave life, in what the Lord had done on account of Baal-Peor, when He destroyed those who worshipped this idol (Num. xxv. 3, 9), whereas the faithful followers of the Lord still remained alive. בְּקִבֻּרָה, to cleave to any one, to hold fast to him. This example was adduced by Moses, because the congregation had passed through all this only a very short time before; and the results of faithfulness towards the Lord on the one hand, and of the unfaithfulness of apostasy from Him on the other, had been made thoroughly apparent to it. “*Your eyes the seeing,*” as in chap. iii. 21.—Vers. 5, 6. But the laws which Moses taught were commandments of the Lord. Keeping and doing them were to be the wisdom and understanding of Israel in the eyes of the nations, who, when they heard all these laws, would say, “*Certainly (פֶלְךָ, only, no other than) a wise and understanding people is this great nation.*” History has confirmed this. Not only did the wisdom of a Solomon astonish the queen of Sheba (1 Kings x. 4 sqq.), but the divine truth which Israel possessed in the law of Moses attracted all the more earnest minds of the heathen world to seek the satisfaction of the inmost necessities of their heart and the salvation of their souls in Israel’s knowledge of God, when, after a short period of bloom, the inward self-dis-

solution of the heathen religions had set in; and at last, in Christianity, it has brought one heathen nation after another to the knowledge of the true God, and to eternal salvation, notwithstanding the fact that the divine truth was and still is regarded as folly by the proud philosophers and self-righteous Epicureans and Stoics of ancient and modern times.—Vers. 7, 8. This mighty and attractive force of the wisdom of Israel consisted in the fact, that in Jehovah they possessed a God who was at hand with His help when they called upon Him (cf. chap. xxxiii. 29; Ps. xxxiv. 19, cxlv. 18; 1 Kings ii. 7), as none of the gods of the other nations had ever been; and that in the law of God they possessed such statutes and rights as the heathen never had. True right has its roots in God; and with the obscuration of the knowledge of God, law and right, with their divinely established foundations, are also shaken and obscured (cf. Rom. i. 26-32).

Vers. 9-14. Israel was therefore not to forget the things which it had seen at Horeb with its own eyes.—Ver. 9. “*Only beware and take care of thyself.*” To “keep the soul,” i.e. to take care of the soul as the seat of life, to defend one’s life from danger and injury (Prov. xiii. 3, xix. 16). “*That thou do not forget* אֲתִידְזַבְּרִים (the facts described in Ex. xix.-xxiv.), *and that they do not depart from thy heart all the days of thy life,*” i.e. are not forgotten as long as thou livest, “*and thou makest them known to thy children and thy children’s children.*” These acts of God formed the foundation of the true religion, the real basis of the covenant legislation, and the firm guarantee of the objective truth and divinity of all the laws and ordinances which Moses gave to the people. And it was this which constituted the essential distinction between the religion of the Old Testament and all heathen religions, whose founders, it is true, professed to derive their doctrines and statutes from divine inspiration, but without giving any practical guarantee that their origin was truly divine.—Vers. 10-12. In the words, “*The day* יוֹם (adverbial accusative) “*that thou stoodest before Jehovah thy God at Horeb,*” etc., Moses reminds the people of the leading features of those grand events: first of all of the fact that God directed him to gather the people together, that He might make known His words to them (Ex. xix. 9 sqq.), that they were to learn to fear Him all their life long, and to teach their children also (לִמְדָה, inf., like נִצְחָה, chap. i. 27); and secondly (ver. 11), that they came near to the mountain which burned in fire (cf. Ex. xix. 17 sqq.). The expression, burning in fire “*even to the heart of heaven,*” i.e. quite into

the sky, is a rhetorical description of the awful majesty of the pillar of fire, in which the glory of the Lord appeared upon Sinai, intended to impress deeply upon the minds of the people the remembrance of this manifestation of God. And the expression, “*darkness, clouds, and thick darkness*,” which is equivalent to the smoking of the great mountain (Ex. xix. 18), is employed with the same object. And lastly (vers. 12, 13), he reminds them that the Lord spoke out of the midst of the fire, and adds this important remark, to prepare the way for what is to follow, “*Ye heard the sound of the words, but ye did not see a shape*,” which not only agrees most fully with Ex. xxiv., where it is stated that the sight of the glory of Jehovah upon the mountain appeared to the people as they stood at the foot of the mountain “like devouring fire” (ver. 17), and that even the elders who “saw God” upon the mountain at the conclusion of the covenant saw no form of God (ver. 11), but also with Ex. xxxiii. 20, 23, according to which no man can see the face (**מֹשֶׁה**) of God. Even the similitude (*temunah*) of Jehovah, which Moses saw when the Lord spoke to him mouth to mouth (Num. xii. 8), was not the form of the essential being of God which was visible to his bodily eyes, but simply a manifestation of the glory of God answering to his own intuition and perceptive faculty, which is not to be regarded as a form of God which was an adequate representation of the divine nature. The true God has no such form which is visible to the human eye.—Ver. 13. The Israelites, therefore, could not see a form of God, but could only hear the voice of His words, when the Lord proclaimed His covenant to them, and gave utterance to the ten words, which He afterwards gave to Moses written upon two tables of stone (Ex. xx. 1-14 (17), and xxxi. 18, compared with chap. xxiv. 12). On the “tables of stone,” see at Ex. xxxiv. 1.—Ver. 14. When the Lord Himself had made known to the people in the ten words the covenant which He commanded them to do, He directed Moses to teach them laws and rights which they were to observe in Canaan, viz. the rights and statutes of the Sinaitic legislation, from Ex. xxi. onwards.

Vers. 15-24. As the Israelites had seen no shape of God at Horeb, they were to beware for their souls’ sake (for their lives) of acting corruptly, and making to themselves any kind of image of Jehovah their God, namely, as the context shows, to worship God in it. (On *pesel*, see at Ex. xx. 4.) The words which follow, viz. “*a form of any kind of sculpture*,” and “*a representation of male or female*” (for *tabnith*, see at Ex. xxv. 9), are in apposition to “*graven*

image," and serve to explain and emphasize the prohibition.—Vers. 17, 18. They were also not to make an image of any kind of beast; a caution against imitating the animal worship of Egypt.—Ver. 19. They were not to allow themselves to be torn away (**נִפְלָא**) to worship the stars of heaven, namely, by the seductive influence exerted upon the senses by the sight of the heavenly bodies as they shone in their glorious splendour. The reason for this prohibition is given in the relative clause, "*which Jehovah thy God hath allotted to all nations under the whole heaven.*" The thought is not, "God has given the heathen the sun, moon, and stars for service, *i.e.* to serve them with their light," as *Onkelos*, the *Rabbins*, *Jerome*, and others, suppose, but He has allotted them to them for worship, *i.e.* permitted them to choose them as the objects of their worship, which is the view adopted by *Justin Martyr*, *Clemens Alex.*, and others. According to the scriptural view, even the idolatry of the heathen existed by divine permission and arrangement. God gave up the heathen to idolatry and shameful lusts, because, although they knew Him from His works, they did not praise Him as God (Rom. i. 21, 24, 26).—Ver. 20. The Israelites were not to imitate the heathen in this respect, because Jehovah, who brought them out of the iron furnace of Egypt, had taken them (**נִקְרָא**) to Himself, *i.e.* had drawn them out or separated them from the rest of the nations, to be a people of inheritance. They were therefore not to seek God and pray to Him in any kind of creature, but to worship Him without image and form, in a manner corresponding to His own nature, which had been manifested in no form, and therefore could not be imitated. **בָּרוֹל**, an iron furnace, or furnace for smelting iron, is a significant figure descriptive of the terrible sufferings endured by Israel in Egypt. **עַם נְחִילָה** (*a people of inheritance*) is synonymous with **סָגֵלָה עַם** (*a special people*, chap. vii. 6 : see at Ex. xix. 5, "a peculiar treasure"). "*This day :*" as in chap. ii. 30.—Vers. 21 sqq. The bringing of Israel out of Egypt reminds Moses of the end, viz. Canaan, and leads him to mention again how the Lord had refused him permission to enter into this good land; and to this he adds the renewed warning not to forget the covenant or make any image of God, since Jehovah, as a jealous God, would never tolerate this. The swearing attributed to God in ver. 21 is neither mentioned in Num. xx. nor at the announcement of Moses' death in Num. xxvii. 12 sqq.; but it is not to be called in question on that account, as *Knobel* supposes. It is perfectly obvious from chap. iii. 23 sqq. that all the details are not given in the historical

account of the event referred to. פֶּסֶל תְּמִינַת כָּל, “image of a form of all that Jehovah has commanded,” sc. not to be made (vers. 16-18). “A consuming fire” (ver. 24) : this epithet is applied to God with special reference to the manifestation of His glory in burning fire (Ex. xxiv. 17). On the symbolical meaning of this mode of revelation, see at Ex. iii. 2 (vol. i. pp. 438-9). “A jealous God :” see at Ex. xx. 5.

Vers. 25-31. To give emphasis to this warning, Moses holds up the future dispersion of the nation among the heathen as the punishment of apostasy from the Lord.—Vers. 25, 26. If the Israelites should beget children and children’s children, and grow old in the land, and then should make images of God, and do that which was displeasing to God to provoke Him ; in that case Moses called upon heaven and earth as witnesses against them, that they should be quickly destroyed out of the land. “Growing old in the land” involved forgetfulness of the former manifestations of grace on the part of the Lord, but not necessarily becoming voluptuous through the enjoyment of the riches of the land, although this might also lead to forgetfulness of God and the manifestations of His grace (cf. chap. vi. 10 sqq., xxxii. 15). The apodosis commences with ver. 26. יְהֻנֵּן, with בָּ and the accusative, to take or summon as a witness against a person. Heaven and earth do not stand here for the rational beings dwelling in them, but are personified, represented as living, and capable of sensation and speech, and mentioned as witnesses who would rise up against Israel, not to proclaim its guilt, but to bear witness that God, the Lord of heaven and earth, had warned the people, and, as it is described in the parallel passage in chap. xxx. 19, had set before them the choice of life and death, and therefore was just in punishing them for their unfaithfulness (cf. Ps. l. 6, li. 6). “Prolong days,” as in Ex. xx. 12.—Ver. 27. Jehovah would scatter them among the nations, where they would perish through want and suffering, and only a few (מִתְיַמְּדָר, Gen. xxxiv. 30) would be left. “Whither” refers to the nations whose land is thought of (cf. chap. xii. 29, xxx. 3). For the thing intended, see Lev. xxvi. 33, 36, 38, 39, and Deut. xxviii. 64 sqq., from which it is evident that the author had not “the fate of the nation in the time of the Assyrians in his mind” (Knobel), but rather all the dispersions which would come upon the rebellious nation in future times, even down to the dispersion under the Romans, which continues still ; so that Moses contemplated the punishment in its fullest extent.—Ver. 28. There

among the heathen they would be obliged to serve gods that were the work of men's hands, gods of wood and stone, that could neither hear, nor eat, nor smell, *i.e.* possessed no senses, showed no sign of life. What Moses threatens here, follows from the eternal laws of the divine government. The more refined idolatry of image-worship leads to coarser and coarser forms, in which the whole nature of idol-worship is manifested in all its pitiableness. “When once the God of revelation is forsaken, the God of reason and imagination must also soon be given up and make way for still lower powers, that perfectly accord with the *I* exalted upon the throne, and in the time of pretended ‘illumination’ to atheism and materialism also” (*Schultz*).—Ver. 29. From thence Israel would come to itself again in the time of deepest misery, like the prodigal son in the gospel (Luke xv. 17), would seek the Lord its God, and would also find Him if it sought with all its heart and soul (cf. chap. vi. 5, x. 12).—Ver. 30. “*In tribulation to thee (in thy trouble), all these things (the threatened punishments and sufferings) will befall thee; at the end of the days* (see at Gen. xlix. 1) *thou wilt turn to Jehovah thy God, and hearken to His voice.*” With this comprehensive thought Moses brings his picture of the future to a close. (On the subject-matter, *vid.* Lev. xxvi. 39, 40.) Returning to the Lord and hearkening to His voice presuppose that the Lord will be found by those who earnestly seek Him; “*for (ver. 31) He is a merciful God, who does not let His people go, nor destroy them, and who does not forget the covenant with the fathers*” (cf. Lev. xxvi. 42 and 45). פָּרַגְנָה, to let loose, to withdraw the hand from a person (Josh. x. 6).

Vers. 32–40. But in order to accomplish something more than merely preserving the people from apostasy by the threat of punishment, namely, to secure a more faithful attachment and continued obedience to His commands by awakening the feeling of cordial love, Moses reminds them again of the glorious miracles of divine grace performed in connection with the election and deliverance of Israel, such as had never been heard of from the beginning of the world; and with this strong practical proof of the love of the true God, he brings his first address to a close. This closing thought in ver. 32 is connected by ‘*for*’ with the leading idea in ver. 31, “Jehovah thy God is a merciful God,” to show that the sole ground for the election and redemption of Israel was the compassion of God towards the human race. “*For ask now of the days that are past, from the day that God created man upon the*

earth, and from one end of the heaven unto the other, whether so great a thing has ever happened, or anything of the kind has been heard of:" i.e. the history of all times since the creation of man, and of all places under the whole heaven, can relate no such events as those which have happened to Israel, viz. at Sinai (ver. 33; cf. ver. 12). From this awfully glorious manifestation of God, Moses goes back in ver. 34 to the miracles with which God effected the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt. "*Or has a god attempted (made the attempt) to come and take to himself people from people (i.e. to fetch the people of Israel out of the midst of the Egyptian nation), with temptations (the events in Egypt by which Pharaoh's relation to the Lord was put to the test; cf. chap. vi. 22 and vii. 18, 19), with signs and wonders (the Egyptian plagues, see Ex. vii. 3), and with conflict (at the Red Sea : Ex. xiv. 14, xv. 3), and with a strong hand and outstretched arm (see Ex. vi. 6), and with great terrors?*" In the three points mentioned last, all the acts of God in Egypt are comprehended, according to both cause and effect. They were revelations of the omnipotence of the Lord, and produced great terrors (cf. Ex. xii. 30-36).—Ver. 35. Israel was made to see all this, that it might know that Jehovah was God (יהָה, the God, to whom the name of *Elohim* rightfully belonged), and there was none else beside Him (cf. ver. 39, xxxii. 39; Isa. xlvi. 5, 6).—Ver. 36. But the Lord had spoken to Israel chiefly down from heaven (cf. Ex. xx. 19 (22)), and that out of the great fire, in which He had come down upon Sinai, to chastise it. יְהִי does not mean "to instruct the people with regard to His truth and sovereignty," as *Schultz* thinks, but "to take them under holy discipline" (*Knobel*), to inspire them with a salutary fear of the holiness of His ways and of His judgments by the awful phenomena which accompanied His descent, and shadowed forth the sublime and holy majesty of His nature.—Vers. 37-40. All this He did from love to the fathers of Israel (the patriarchs): "*and indeed because He loved thy fathers, He chose his seed (the seed of Abraham, the first of the patriarchs) after him, and brought thee (Israel) out of Egypt by His face with great power, to drive out . . . and to bring thee, to give thee their land . . . so that thou mightest know and take to heart . . . and keep His laws,*" etc. With regard to the construction of these verses, the clause וַיְתַחַת בָּי (and because) in ver. 37 is not to be regarded as dependent upon what precedes, as *Schultz* supposes; nor are vers. 37 and 38 to be taken as the protasis, and vers. 39, 40 as the apodosis (as *Knobel* maintains). Both forms of construction are

forced and unnatural. The verses form an independent thought; and the most important point, which was to bind Israel to faithfulness towards Jehovah, is given as the sum and substance of the whole address, and placed as a protasis at the head of the period. The only thing that admits of dispute, is whether the apodosis commences with ויבחר ("He chose," ver. 37), or only with ויבאך ("brought thee out"). Either is possible; and it makes no difference, so far as the main thought is concerned, whether we regard the choice of Israel, or simply the deliverance from Egypt, in which that choice was carried into practical effect, as the consequence of the love of Jehovah to the patriarchs.—The copula **תְּהִית** is specially emphatic, "and truly," and indicates that the sum and substance of the whole discourse is about to follow, or the one thought in which the whole appeal culminates. It was the love of God to the fathers, not the righteousness of Israel (chap. ix. 5), which lay at the foundation of the election of their posterity to be the nation of Jehovah's possession, and also of all the miracles of grace which were performed in connection with their deliverance out of Egypt. Moses returns to this thought again at chap. x. 15, for the purpose of impressing it upon the minds of the people as the one motive which laid them under the strongest obligation to circumcise the foreskin of their heart, and walk in the fear and love of the Lord their God (chap. x. 12 sqq.).—The singular suffixes in **וּרְשָׁע** (his seed) and **אַחֲרֵי** (after him) refer to Abraham, whom Moses had especially in his mind when speaking of "thy fathers," because he was pre-eminently the lover of God (Isa. xli. 8; 2 Chron. xx. 7), and also the beloved or friend of God (Jas. ii. 23; cf. Gen. xviii. 17 sqq.). "By His face" points back to Ex. xxxiii. 14. The face of Jehovah was Jehovah in His personal presence, in His own person, who brought Israel out of Egypt, to root out great and mighty nations before it, and give it their land for an inheritance. "As this day" (clearly shows), viz. by the destruction of Sihon and Og, which gave to the Israelites a practical pledge that the Canaanites in like manner would be rooted out before them. The expression "as this day" does not imply, therefore, that the Canaanites were already rooted out from their land.—Vers. 39, 40. By this the Israelites were to know and lay it to heart, that Jehovah alone was God in heaven and on earth, and were to keep His commandments, in order that (**שֶׁ**) it might be well with them and their descendants, and they might have long life in Canaan. **בְּלִהְיוֹנִים**, "all time," for all the future (cf. Ex. xx. 12).

Vers. 41-43. SELECTION OF THREE CITIES OF REFUGE FOR UNINTENTIONAL MANSLAYERS ON THE EAST OF THE JORDAN.

—The account of this appointment of the cities of refuge in the conquered land on the east of the Jordan is inserted between the first and second addresses of Moses, in all probability for no other reason than because Moses set apart the cities at that time according to the command of God in Num. xxxv. 6, 14, not only to give the land on that side its full consecration, and thoroughly confirm the possession of the two Amoritish kingdoms on the other side of the Jordan, but also to give the people in this punctual observance of the duty devolving upon it an example for their imitation in the conscientious observance of the commandments of the Lord, which he was now about to lay before the nation. The assertion that this section neither stood after Num. xxxiv.-xxxvi., nor really belongs there, has as little foundation as the statement that its contents are at variance with the precepts in chap. xix. “Toward the sunrising” is introduced as a more precise definition; *מִזְרָחָה עַבֶּר הַיַּרְדֵּן*, like in Num. xxxii. 19 and xxxiv. 15. On the contents of ver. 42, comp. Num. xxxv. 15 sqq. The three towns that were set apart were *Bezer*, *Ramoth*, and *Golan*. “*Bezer in the steppe, (namely) in the land of the level*” (the Amoritish table-land: chap. iii. 10). The situation of this Levitical town and city of refuge, which is only mentioned again in Josh. xx. 8, xxi. 36, and 1 Chron. vi. 63, has not yet been discovered. *Bezer* was probably the same as *Bosor* (1 Macc. v. 36), and is possibly to be seen in the *Berza* mentioned by Robinson (Pal. App. p. 170). *Ramoth* in Gilead, i.e. *Ramoth-Mizpeh* (comp. Josh. xx. 8 with xiii. 26), was situated, according to the *Onom.*, fifteen Roman miles, or six hours, to the west of *Philadelphia* (*Rabbath-Ammon*); probably, therefore, on the site of the modern *Salt*, which is six hours' journey from *Ammán* (cf. v. Raumer, Pal. pp. 265, 266).—*Golan*, in *Bashan*, according to Eusebius (*s. v. Gaulon* or *Golan*), was still a very large village in Batanæa even in his day, from which the district generally received the name of *Gaulonitis* or *Jolan*; but it has not yet been discovered again.

II.—SECOND ADDRESS, OR EXPOSITION OF THE LAW.

CHAP. IV. 44—XXVI. 19.

THIS address, which is described in the heading as the law which Moses set before the Israelites, commences with a repetition of the decalogue, and a notice of the powerful impression which was made, through the proclamation of it by God Himself, upon the people who were assembled round Him at Horeb (chap. v.). In the first and more general part, it shows that the true essence of the law, and of that righteousness which the Israelites were to strive after, consisted in loving Jehovah their God with all their heart (chap. vi.); that the people were bound, by virtue of their election as the Lord's people of possession, to exterminate the Canaanites with their idolatrous worship, in order to rejoice in the blessing of God (chap. vii.); but more especially that, having regard on the one hand to the divine chastisement and humiliation which they had experienced in the desert (chap. viii.), and on the other hand to the frequency with which they had rebelled against their God (chap. ix. 1—x. 11), they were to beware of self-exaltation and self-righteousness, that in the land of Canaan, of which they were about to take possession, they might not forget their God when enjoying the rich productions of the land, but might retain the blessings of their God for ever by a faithful observance of the covenant (chap. x. 12—xi. 32). Then after this there follows an exposition of the different commandments of the law (chap. xii.—xxvi.).

Chap. iv. 44—49. ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE DISCOURSE UPON THE LAW.—First of all, in ver. 44, we have the general notice in the form of a heading: “*This is the Thorah which Moses set before the children of Israel;*” and then, in vers. 45, 46, a fuller description of the *Thorah* according to its leading features, “*testimonies, statutes, and rights*” (see at ver. 1), together with a notice of the place and time at which Moses delivered this address. “*On their coming out of Egypt,*” i.e. not “after they had come out,” but during the march, before they had reached the goal of their journeyings, viz. (ver. 46) when they were still on the other side of the Jordan. “*In the valley,*” as in chap. iii. 29. “*In the land of Sihon,*” and therefore already upon ground which the Lord had given them for a possession. The importance of this possession as the first-fruit and pledge

of the fulfilment of the further promises of God, led Moses to mention again, though briefly, the defeat of the two kings of the Amorites, together with the conquest of their land, just as he had done before in chap. ii. 32-36 and iii. 1-17. On ver. 48, cf. chap. iii. 9, 12-17. *Sion*, for Hermon (see at chap. iii. 9).

A. THE TRUE ESSENCE OF THE LAW AND ITS FULFILMENT.

Exposition of the Decalogue, and its Promulgation.—Chap. v.

The exposition of the law commences with a repetition of the ten words of the covenant, which were spoken to all Israel directly by the Lord Himself.—Vers. 1-5 form the introduction, and point out the importance and great significance of the exposition which follows. Hence, instead of the simple sentence “*And Moses said,*” we have the more formal statement “*And Moses called all Israel, and said to them.*” The great significance of the laws and rights about to be set before them, consisted in the fact that they contained the covenant of Jehovah with Israel.—Vers. 2, 3. “*Jehovah our God made a covenant with us in Horeb; not with our fathers, but with ourselves, who are all of us here alive this day.*” The “fathers” are neither those who died in the wilderness, as *Augustine* supposed, nor the forefathers in Egypt, as *Calvin* imagined; but the patriarchs, as in chap. iv. 37. Moses refers to the conclusion of the covenant at Sinai, which was essentially distinct from the covenant made with Abraham (Gen. xv. 18), though the latter laid the foundation for the Sinaitic covenant. But Moses passed over this, as it was not his intention to trace the historical development of the covenant relation, but simply to impress upon the hearts of the existing generation the significance of its entrance into covenant with the Lord. The generation, it is true, with which God made the covenant at Horeb, had all died out by that time, with the exception of Moses, Joshua, and Caleb, and only lived in the children, who, though in part born in Egypt, were all under twenty years of age at the conclusion of the covenant at Sinai, and therefore were not among the persons with whom the Lord concluded the covenant. But the covenant was made not with the particular individuals who were then alive, but rather with the nation as an organic whole. Hence Moses could with perfect justice identify those who constituted the nation at that time, with those who had entered into covenant with the Lord at Sinai. The separate

pronoun (*we*) is added to the pronominal suffix for the sake of emphasis, just as in Gen. iv. 26, etc.; and אלהּ again is so connected with אנחנוּ, as to include the relative in itself.—Ver. 4. “*Jehovah talked with you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire,*” i.e. He came as near to you as one person to another. פָנִים בְפָנִים is not perfectly synonymous with פָנִים אֶל פָנִים, which is used in Ex. xxxiii. 11 with reference to God’s speaking to Moses (cf. chap. xxxiv. 10, and Gen. xxxii. 31), and expresses the very confidential relation in which the Lord spoke to Moses as one friend to another; whereas the former simply denotes the directness with which Jehovah spoke to the people.—Before repeating the ten words which the Lord addressed directly to the people, Moses introduces the following remark in ver. 5—“*I stood between Jehovah and you at that time, to announce to you the word of Jehovah; because ye were afraid of the fire, and went not up into the mount*”—for the purpose of showing the mediatorial position which he occupied between the Lord and the people, not so much at the proclamation of the ten words of the covenant, as in connection with the conclusion of the covenant generally, which alone in fact rendered the conclusion of the covenant possible at all, on account of the alarm of the people at the awful manifestation of the majesty of the Lord. The word of Jehovah, which Moses as mediator had to announce to the people, had reference not to the instructions which preceded the promulgation of the decalogue (Ex. xix. 11 sqq.), but, as is evident from vers. 22–31, primarily to the further communications which the Lord was about to address to the nation in connection with the conclusion of the covenant, besides the ten words (viz. Ex. xx. 18, 22–xxiii. 33), to which in fact the whole of the Sinaitic legislation really belongs, as being the further development of the covenant laws. The alarm of the people at the fire is more fully described in vers. 25 sqq. The word “*saying*” at the end of ver. 5 is dependent upon the word “*talked*” in ver. 4; ver. 5 simply containing a parenthetical remark.

In vers. 6–21, the ten covenant words are repeated from Ex. xx., with only a few variations, which have already been discussed in connection with the exposition of the decalogue at Ex. xx. 1–14.—In vers. 22–33, Moses expounds still further the short account in Ex. xx. 18–21, viz. that after the people had heard the ten covenant words, in their alarm at the awful phenomena in which the Lord revealed His glory, they entreated him to stand between as mediator, that God Himself might not speak to them any further, and that

they might not die, and then promised that they would hearken to all that the Lord should speak to him (vers. 23-31). His purpose in doing so was to link on the exhortation in vers. 32, 33, to keep all the commandments of the Lord and do them, which paves the way for passing to the exposition of the law which follows. “*A great voice*” (ver. 22) is an adverbial accusative, signifying “*with a great voice*” (cf. *Ges.* § 118, 3). “*And He added no more:*” as in Num. xi. 25. God spoke the ten words directly to the people, and then no more; *i.e.* everything further He addressed to Moses alone, and through his mediation to the people. As mediator He gave him the two tables of stone, upon which He had written the decalogue (cf. Ex. xxxi. 18). This statement somewhat forestalls the historical course; and in chap. ix. 10, 11, it is repeated again in its proper historical connection.—Vers. 24-27 contain a rhetorical, and at the same time really a more exact, account of the events described in Ex. xx. 18-20 (15-17), and already expounded in vol. ii. p. 125. פָּנִים (ver. 24), a contraction of פָּנִים פָּנִים, as in Num. xi. 15 (cf. *Ewald*, § 184, a.). Jehovah’s reply to the words of the people (vers. 28-31) is passed over in Ex. xx. God approved of what the people said, because it sprang from a consciousness of the unworthiness of any sinner to come into the presence of the holy God; and He added, “Would that there were always this heart in them to fear Me,” *i.e.* would that they were always of the same mind to fear Me and keep all My commandments, that it might be well with them and their children for ever. He then directed the people to return to their tents, and appointed Moses as the mediator, to whom He would address all the law, that he might teach it to the people (cf. chap. iv. 5). Having been thus entreated by the people to take the office of mediator, and appointed to that office by the Lord, Moses could very well bring his account of these events to a close (vers. 32, 33), by exhorting them to observe carefully all the commandments of the Lord, and not to turn aside to the right hand or to the left, *i.e.* not to depart in any way from the mode of life pointed out in the commandments (cf. chap. xvii. 11, 20, xxviii. 14; Josh. i. 7, etc.), that it might be well with them, etc. (cf. chap. iv. 40). בְּטוּ, perfect with ; rel. instead of the imperfect.

On loving Jehovah, the one God, with all the Heart.—Chap. vi.

Vers. 1-3. Announcement of the commandments which follow, with a statement of the reason for communicating them, and the beneficent results of their observance. הַיְמֹתָה, that which is com-

manded, *i.e.* the substance of all that Jehovah had commanded, synonymous therefore with the *Thorah* (chap. iv. 44). The words, “*the statutes and the rights,*” are explanatory of and in apposition to “*the commandment.*” These commandments Moses was to teach the Israelites to keep in the land which they were preparing to possess (cf. chap. iv. 1).—Ver. 2. The reason for communicating the law was to awaken the fear of God (cf. chap. iv. 10, v. 26), and, in fact, such fear of Jehovah as would show itself at all times in the observance of every commandment. “*Thou and thy son:*” this forms the subject to “*thou mightest fear,*” and is placed at the end for the sake of emphasis. The *Hiphil* קָרַא has not the transitive meaning, “to make long,” as in chap. v. 30, but the intransitive, to *last long*, as in chap. v. 16, Ex. xx. 12, etc.—Ver. 3. The maintenance of the fear of God would bring prosperity, and the increase of the nation promised to the fathers. In form this thought is not connected with ver. 3 as the apodosis, but it is appended to the leading thought in ver. 1 by the words, “*Hear therefore, O Isræl!*” which correspond to the expression “*to teach you*” in ver. 1. שֵׁנִי, *that, in order that* (as in chap. ii. 25, iv. 10, etc.). The increase of the nation had been promised to the patriarchs from the very first (Gen. xii. 1; see vol. i. p. 193; cf. Lev. xxvi. 9).—On “*milk and honey,*” see at Ex. iii. 8. ✓

Vers. 4–9. With ver. 4 the burden of the law commences, which is not a new law added to the ten commandments, but simply the development and unfolding of the covenant laws and rights enclosed as a germ in the decalogue, simply an exposition of the law, as had already been announced in chap. i. 5. The exposition commences with an explanation and enforcing of the first commandment. There are two things contained in it: (1) that Jehovah is the one absolute God; (2) that He requires love with all the heart, all the soul, and all the strength. “*Jehovah our God is one Jehovah.*”¹ This does not mean Jehovah is one God, Jehovah alone (*Abenezra*), for in that case יְהֹוָה בָּבֶן would be used instead of יְהֹוָה אֶחָד; still less Jehovah our God, namely, Jehovah is one (*J. H. Michaelis*).

¹ On the *majuscula* י and ו in יְהֹוָה and יְהֹוָה בָּבֶן, *R. Bochin* has this remark: “It is possible to confess one God with the mouth, although the heart is far from Him. For this reason י and ו are *majuscula*, from which with *tsere* subscribed the word עֵזֶל, ‘a witness,’ is formed, that every one may know, when he professes the unity of God, that his heart ought to be engaged, and free from every other thought, because God is a *witness* and knows all things” (*J. H. Mich. Bibl. Hebr.*).

הָאֱלֹהִים יְהוָה אֶחָד together form the predicate of the sentence. The idea is not, Jehovah our God is one (the only) God, but “one (or the only) Jehovah :” not in this sense, however, that “He has not adopted one mode of revelation or appearance here and another there, but one mode only, viz. the revelation which Israel had received” (*Schultz*) ; for *Jehovah* never denotes merely a mode in which the true God is revealed or appears, but God as the absolute, unconditioned, or God according to the absolute independence and constancy of His actions (see vol. i. pp. 72-5). Hence what is predicated here of Jehovah (*Jehovah one*) does not relate to the unity of God, but simply states that it is to Him alone that the name *Jehovah* rightfully belongs, that He is the one absolute God, to whom no other *Elohim* can be compared. This is also the meaning of the same expression in Zech. xiv. 9, where the words added, “and His name one,” can only signify that in the future Jehovah would be acknowledged as the one absolute God, as King over all the earth. This clause not merely precludes polytheism, but also syncretism, which reduces the one absolute God to a national deity, a Baal (*Hos. ii. 18*), and in fact every form of theism and deism, which creates for itself a supreme God according to philosophical abstractions and ideas. For Jehovah, although the absolute One, is not an abstract notion like “absolute being” or “the absolute idea,” but the absolutely living God, as He made Himself known in His deeds in Israel for the salvation of the whole world.—Ver. 5. As the one God, therefore, Israel was to love Jehovah its God with all its heart, with all its soul, and with all its strength. The motive for this is to be found in the words “thy God,” in the fact that Jehovah was Israel’s God, and had manifested Himself to it as one God. The demand “with all the heart” excludes all half-heartedness, all division of the heart in its love. The heart is mentioned first, as the seat of the emotions generally and of love in particular; then follows the soul (*nephesh*) as the centre of personality in man, to depict the love as pervading the entire self-consciousness; and to this is added, “with all the strength,” *sc.* of body and soul. Loving the Lord with all the heart and soul and strength is placed at the head, as the spiritual principle from which the observance of the commandments was to flow (see also chap. xi. 1, xxx. 6). It was in love that the fear of the Lord (chap. x. 12), hearkening to His commandments (chap. xi. 13), and the observance of the whole law (chap. xi. 22), were to be manifested; but love itself was to be shown by walking in all the ways of the Lord (chap. xi. 22, xix.).

9, xxx. 16). Christ therefore calls the command to love God with all the heart “the first and great commandment,” and places on a par with this the commandment contained in Lev. xix. 8 to love one’s neighbour as oneself, and then observes that on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets (Matt. xxii. 37-40; Mark xii. 29-31; Luke x. 27).¹ Even the gospel knows no higher commandment than this. The distinction between the new covenant and the old consists simply in this, that the love of God which the gospel demands of its professors, is more intensive and cordial than that which the law of Moses demanded of the Israelites, according to the gradual unfolding of the love of God Himself, which was displayed in a much grander and more glorious form in the gift of His only begotten Son for our redemption, than in the redemption of Israel out of the bondage of Egypt.—Vers. 6 sqq. But for the love of God to be of the right kind, the commandments of God must be laid to heart, and be the constant subject of thought and conversation. “*Upon thine heart:*” i.e. the commandments of God were to be an affair of the heart, and not merely of the memory (cf. chap. xi. 18). They were to be enforced upon the children, talked of at home and by the way, in the evening on lying down and in the morning on rising up, i.e. everywhere and at all times; they were to be bound upon the hand for a sign, and worn as bands (frontlets) between the eyes (see at Ex. xiii. 16). As these words are figurative, and denote an undeviating observance of the divine commands, so also the commandment which follows, viz. to write the words upon the door-posts of the house, and also upon the gates, are to be understood spiritually; and the literal fulfilment of such a command could only be a praiseworthy custom or well-pleasing to God when resorted to as the means of keeping the commandments of God constantly before the eye. The precept itself, however, presupposes the existence of this custom, which is not only met with in the Mahometan countries of the East at the

¹ In quoting this commandment, Matthew (xxii. 37) has substituted *διάνοια*, “thy mind,” for “thy strength,” as being of especial importance to spiritual love, whereas in the LXX. the mind (*διάνοια*) is substituted for the heart. Mark (xii. 30) gives the triad of Deuteronomy (*heart, soul, and strength*); but he has inserted “mind” (*διάνοια*) before strength (*ἰσχὺς*), whilst in ver. 33 the *understanding* (*σύνεσις*) is mentioned between the heart and the soul. Lastly, Luke has given the three ideas of the original passage quite correctly, but has added at the end, “and with all thy mind” (*διάνοια*). Although the term *διάνοια* (mind) originated with the Septuagint, not one of the Evangelists has adhered strictly to this version.

present day (cf. *A. Russell, Naturgesch. v. Aleppo*, i. p. 36; *Lane, Sitten u. Gebr.* i. pp. 6, 13, ii. p. 71), but was also a common custom in ancient Egypt (cf. *Wilkinson, Manners and Customs*, vol. ii. p. 102).¹

Vers. 10-19. To the positive statement of the command there is attached, in the next place, the negative side, or a warning against the danger to which prosperity and an abundance of earthly goods so certainly expose, viz. of forgetting the Lord and His manifestations of mercy. The Israelites were all the more exposed to this danger, as their entrance into Canaan brought them into the possession of all the things conducive to well-being, in which the land abounded, without being under the necessity of procuring these things by the labour of their own hands;—into the possession, namely, of great and beautiful towns which they had not built, of houses full of all kinds of good things which they had not filled, of wells ready made which they had not dug, of vineyards and olive-plantations which they had not planted.—The nouns מִזְבֵּחַ, etc. are formally dependent upon לְתָהֹל, and serve as a detailed description of the land into which the Lord was about to lead His people.—Ver. 12. “House of bondage,” as in Ex. xiii. 3. “Not forgetting” is described from a positive point of view, as fearing God, serving Him, and swearing by His name. Fear is placed first, as the fundamental characteristic of the Israelitish worship of God; it was no slavish fear, but simply the holy awe of a sinner before the holy God, which includes love rather than excludes it. “Fearing” is a matter of the heart; “serving,” a matter of working and striving; and “swearing in His name,” the practical manifestation of the worship of God in word and conversation. It refers not merely to a solemn oath before a judicial court, but rather to asseverations on oath in the ordinary intercourse of life, by which the religious attitude of a man involuntarily reveals itself.—Vers. 14 sqq. The worship of Jehovah not only precludes all idolatry, which the Lord, as a jealous God, will not endure (see at Ex. xx. 5), but will punish with destruction from the earth (“the face of the ground,” as in Ex. xxxii. 12); but it also excludes tempting the Lord by an

¹ The Jewish custom of the *Medusah* is nothing but a formal and outward observance founded upon this command. It consists in writing the words of Deut. vi. 4-9 and xi. 13-20 upon a piece of parchment, which is then placed upon the top of the doorway of houses and rooms, enclosed in a wooden box; this box they touch with the finger and then kiss the finger on going either out or in. *S. Buxtorf, Synag. Jud.* pp. 582 sqq.; and *Bodenschatz, Kirchl. Verfassung der Juden*, iv. pp. 19 sqq.

unbelieving murmuring against God, if He does not remove any kind of distress immediately, as the people had already sinned at Massah, *i.e.* at Rephidim (Ex. xvii. 1-7).—Vers. 17-19. They were rather to observe all His commandments diligently, and do what was right and good in His eyes. The infinitive **לְהַדֵּךְ וְיָמַר** contains the further development of **לִמְעַן יִטְבֶּל וְ**: “so that He (Jehovah) thrust out all thine enemies before thee, as He hath spoken” (viz. Ex. xxiii. 27 sqq., xxxiv. 11).

In vers. 20-25, the teaching to the children, which is only briefly hinted at in ver. 7, is more fully explained. The Israelites were to instruct their children and descendants as to the nature, meaning, and object of the commandments of the Lord; and in reply to the inquiries of their sons, to teach them what the Lord had done for the redemption of Israel out of the bondage of Egypt, and how He had brought them into the promised land, and thus to awaken in the younger generation love to the Lord and to His commandments. The “great and sore miracles” (ver. 22) were the Egyptian plagues, like **מִפְתָּחִים**, in chap. iv. 34.—“To fear,” etc., *i.e.* that we might fear the Lord.—Ver. 25. “And righteousness will be to us, if we observe to do:” *i.e.* our righteousness will consist in the observance of the law; we shall be regarded and treated by God as righteous, if we are diligent in the observance of the law. “Before Jehovah” refers primarily, no doubt, to the expression, “to do all these commandments;” but, as we may see from chap. xxiv. 13, this does not prevent the further reference to the “righteousness” also. This righteousness before Jehovah, it is true, is not really the gospel “righteousness of faith;” but there is no opposition between the two, as the righteousness mentioned here is not founded upon the outward (pharisaic) righteousness of works, but upon an earnest striving after the fulfilment of the law, to love God with all the heart; and this love is altogether impossible without living faith.

Command to destroy the Canaanites and their Idolatry.—Chap. vii.

Vers. 1-11. As the Israelites were warned against idolatry in chap. vi. 14, so here are they exhorted to beware of the false tolerance of sparing the Canaanites and enduring their idolatry.—Vers. 1-5. When the Lord drove out the tribes of Canaan before the Israelites, and gave them up to them and smote them, they were to put them under the ban (see at Lev. xxvii. 28), to make no treaty with them, and to contract no marriage with them. **לְשַׁנְתָּם**, to draw out, to cast away, *e.g.* the sandals (Ex. iii. 5); here and ver. 22 it

signifies to draw out, or drive out a nation from its country and possessions: it occurs in this sense in the *Piel* in 2 Kings xvi. 6. On the Canaanitish tribes, see at Gen. x. 15 sqq. and xv. 20, 21. There are seven of them mentioned here, as in Josh. iii. 10 and xxiv. 11; on the other hand, there are only six in chap. xx. 17, as in Ex. iii. 8, 17, xxiii. 23, and xxxiii. 2, the Gergashites being omitted. The prohibition against making a covenant, as in Ex. xxiii. 32 and xxxiv. 12, and that against marrying, as in Ex. xxxiv. 16, where the danger of the Israelites being drawn away to idolatry is mentioned as a still further reason for these commands. בַּיִסְרָר, “*for he (the Canaanite) will cause thy son to turn away from behind me,*” i.e. tempt him away from following me, “*to serve other gods.*” Moses says “from following *me*,” because he is speaking in the name of Jehovah. The consequences of idolatry, as in chap. vi. 15, iv. 26, etc.—Ver. 5. The Israelites were rather to destroy the altars and idols of the Canaanites, according to the command in Ex. xxxiv. 13, xxiii. 24.—Vers. 6-8. They were bound to do this by virtue of their election as a holy nation, the nation of possession, which Jehovah had singled out from all other nations, and brought out of the bondage of Egypt, not because of its greatness, but from love to them, and for the sake of the oath given to the fathers. This exalted honour Israel was not to cast away by apostasy from the Lord. It was founded upon the word of the Lord in Ex. xix. 5, 6, which Moses brought to the recollection of the people, and expressly and emphatically developed. “*Not because of your multitude before all nations* (because ye were more numerous than all other nations) *hath Jehovah turned to you in love* (בְּשִׁנְנָה, to bind oneself with, to hang upon a person, out of love), *for ye are the littleness of all nations*” (the least numerous). Moses could say this to Israel with reference to its descent from Abraham, whom God chose as the one man out of all the world, whilst nations, states, and kingdoms had already been formed all around (*Baumgarten*). “*But because Jehovah loved you, and kept His oath which He had sworn to the fathers, He hath brought you out,*” etc. Instead of saying, He hath chosen you out of love to your fathers, as in chap. iv. 37, Moses brings out in this place love to the people of Israel as the divine motive, not for choosing Israel, but for leading it out and delivering it from the slave-house of Egypt, by which God had practically carried out the election of the people, that He might thereby allure the Israelites to a reciprocity of love.—Vers. 9-11. By this was Israel to know that Jehovah their God was the true

God, the faithful God, who keeps His covenant, showing mercy to those who love Him, even to the thousandth generation, but repaying those who hate Him to the face. This development of the nature of God Moses introduces from Ex. xx. 5, 6, as a light warning not to forfeit the mercy of God, or draw upon themselves His holy wrath by falling into idolatry. To this end He emphatically carries out still further the thought of retribution, by adding לְהַאֲבִידוּ, “to destroy him” (the hater), and נֹאֲמֵר וְנֹאֲמֵר, “He delays not to His hater (sc. to repay him); *He will repay him to his face.*” “To the face of every one of them,” i.e. that they may see and feel that they are smitten by God (*Rosenmüller*).—Ver. 11. This energy of the grace and holiness of the faithful covenant God was a powerful admonition to keep the divine commandments.

Vers. 12–26. The observance of these commandments would also bring great blessings (vers. 12–16). “*If ye hearken to these demands of right*” (*mishpatim*) of the covenant Lord upon His covenant people, and keep them and do them, “*Jehovah will keep unto thee the covenant and the mercy which He hath sworn to thy fathers.*” In עַקְבָּשׂ, for אַשְׁר עַקְבָּשׂ (Gen. xxii. 18), there is involved not only the idea of reciprocity, but everywhere also an allusion to reward or punishment (cf. chap. viii. 20; Num. xiv. 24). חֶסֶד was the favour displayed in the promises given to the patriarchs on oath (Gen. xxii. 16).—Ver. 13. This mercy flowed from the love of God to Israel, and the love was manifested in blessing and multiplying the people. The blessing is then particularized, by a further expansion of Ex. xxiii. 25–27, as a blessing upon the fruit of the body, the fruits of the field and soil, and the rearing of cattle. שָׁבֵן, see Ex. xiii. 12. צָמֵת only occurs again in Deut. xxviii. 4, 18, 51, and certainly signifies the young increase of the flocks. It is probably a Canaanitish word, derived from Ashtoreth (*Astharte*), the female deity of the Canaanites, which was regarded as the conceiving and birth-giving principle of nature, literally *Veneres*, i.e. *amores gregis*, hence *soboles* (*Ges.*); just as the Latin poets employ the name *Ceres* to signify the corn, *Venus* for love and sexual intercourse, and *Lucina* for birth. On vers. 14 and 15, see Ex. xxiii. 26. In ver. 15, the promise of the preservation of Israel from all diseases (Ex. xv. 26, and xxiii. 25) is strengthened by the addition of the clause, “*all the evil diseases of Egypt*,” by which, according to chap. xxviii. 27, we are probably to understand chiefly the malignant species of leprosy called elephantiasis, and possibly also the plague and other malignant forms of disease. In Egypt,

diseases for the most part readily assume a very dangerous character. *Pliny* (*h. n.* xxvi. 1) calls Egypt the *genitrix* of contagious pestilence, and modern naturalists have confirmed this (see *Hengstenberg*, Egypt and the Books of Moses, p. 215; and *Pruner*, *Krankheiten des Orients*, pp. 460 sqq.). Diseases of this kind the Lord would rather bring upon the enemies of Israel. The Israelites; on the other hand, should be so strong and vigorous, that they would devour, *i.e.* exterminate, all the nations which their God would give into their hands (cf. Num. xiv. 9). With this thought Moses reverts with emphasis to the command to root out the Canaanites without reserve, and not to serve their gods, because they would become a snare to them (see Ex. x. 7); and then in vers. 17-26 he carries out still further the promise in Ex. xxiii. 27-30 of the successful subjugation of the Canaanites through the assistance of the Lord, and sweeps away all the objections that a weak faith might raise to the execution of the divine command.—Vers. 17-26. To suppress the thought that was rising up in their heart, how could it be possible for them to destroy these nations which were more numerous than they, the Israelites were to remember what the Lord had done in Egypt and to Pharaoh, namely, the great temptations, signs, and wonders connected with their deliverance from Egypt (cf. chap. iv. 34 and vi. 22). He would do just the same to the Canaanites.—Ver. 20. He would also send hornets against them, as He had already promised in Ex. xxiii. 28 (see the passage), until all that were left and had hidden themselves should have utterly perished.—Vers. 21 sqq. Israel had no need to be afraid of them, as Jehovah was in the midst of it a mighty God and terrible. He would drive out the nations, but only gradually, as He had already declared to Moses in Ex. xxiii. 30, 31, and would smite them with great confusion, till they were destroyed, as was the case for example at Gibeon (Josh. x. 10; cf. Ex. xxiii. 27, where the form **הַמְּבָנִים** is used instead of **הַיָּם**), and would also deliver their kings into the hand of Israel, so that their names should vanish under the heaven (cf. chap. ix. 14, xxv. 19; and for the fulfilment, Josh. x. 22 sqq., xi. 12, xii. 7-24). No one would be able to stand before Israel.—Ver. 24. “*To stand before thee:*” *lit.* to put oneself in the face of a person, so as to withstand him. **הַשְׁמִיד** for **הַשְׁמִיר**, as in Lev. xiv. 43, etc.—Vers. 25, 26. Trusting to this promise, the Israelites were to burn up the idols of the Canaanites, and not to desire the silver and gold upon them (with which the statues were overlaid: see vol. ii. p. 222), or take it to themselves, lest they should be snared in it, *i.e.* lest the silver and

gold should become a snare to them. It would become so, not from any danger lest they should practise idolatry with it, but because silver and gold which had been used in connection with idolatrous worship was an abomination to Jehovah, which the Israelites were not to bring into their houses, lest they themselves should fall under the ban, to which all the objects connected with idolatry were devoted, as the history of Achan in Josh. vii. clearly proves. For this reason, any such abomination was to be abhorred, and destroyed by burning or grinding to powder (cf. Ex. xxxii. 20; 2 Kings xxiii. 4, 5; 2 Chron. xv. 16).

*Review of the Guidance of God, and their Humiliation in the Desert,
as a Warning against Highmindedness and Forgetfulness of God.*
—Chap. viii.

Vers. 1–6. In addition to the danger of being drawn aside to transgress the covenant, by sparing the Canaanites and their idols out of pusillanimous compassion and false tolerance, the Israelites would be especially in danger, after their settlement in Canaan, of falling into pride and forgetfulness of God, when enjoying the abundant productions of that land. To guard against this danger, Moses set before them how the Lord had sought to lead and train them to obedience by temptations and humiliations during their journey through the desert. In order that his purpose in doing this might be clearly seen, he commenced (ver. 1) with the renewed admonition to keep the whole law which he commanded them that day, that they might live and multiply and attain to the possession of the promised land (cf. chap. iv. 1, vi. 3).—Ver. 2. To this end they were to remember the forty years' guidance through the wilderness (chap. i. 31, ii. 7), by which God desired to humble them, and to prove the state of their heart and their obedience. Humiliation was the way to prove their attitude towards God. נִזְבָּה, to humble, *i.e.* to bring them by means of distress and privations to feel their need of help and their dependence upon God. נִזְבָּה, to prove, by placing them in such positions in life as would drive them to reveal what was in their heart, *viz.* whether they believed in the omnipotence, love, and righteousness of God, or not.—Ver. 3. The humiliation in the desert consisted not merely in the fact that God let the people hunger, *i.e.* be in want of bread and their ordinary food, but also in the fact that He fed them with manna, which was unknown to them and their fathers (cf. Ex. xvi. 16 sqq.). Feeding with manna is called a humiliation, inasmuch as God intended to

show to the people through this food, which had previously been altogether unknown to them, that man does not live by bread alone, that the power to sustain life does not rest upon bread only (Isa. xxxviii. 16; Gen. xxvii. 40), or belong simply to it, but to all that goeth forth out of the mouth of Jehovah. That which “proceedeth out of the mouth of Jehovah” is not the word of the law, as the Rabbins suppose, but, as the word הָיָה (all, every) shows, “the word” generally, the revealed will of God to preserve the life of man in whatever way (*Schultz*): hence all means designed and appointed by the Lord for the sustenance of life. In this sense Christ quotes these words in reply to the tempter (Matt. iv. 4), not to say to him, The Messiah lives not by (material) bread only, but by the fulfilment of the will of God (*Usteri, Ullmann*), or by trusting in the sustaining word of God (*Olshausen*); but that He left it to God to care for the sustenance of His life, as God could sustain His life in extraordinary ways, even without the common supplies of food, by the power of His almighty word and will.—Ver. 4. As the Lord provided for their nourishment, so did He also in a marvellous way for the clothing of His people during these forty years. “*Thy garment did not fall off thee through age, and thy foot did not swell.*” נִלְבַּד with נִזְבַּת, to fall off from age. נִזְבַּת only occurs again in Neh. ix. 21, where this passage is repeated. The meaning is doubtful. The word is certainly connected with נִזְבַּת (dough), and probably signifies to become soft or to swell, although נִזְבַּת is also used for unleavened dough. The Septuagint rendering here is ἐτυλάθησαν, to get hard skin; on the other hand, in Neh. ix. 21, we find the rendering ὑποδήματα αὐτῶν οὐ διερράγησαν, “their sandals were not worn out,” from the parallel passage in Deut. xxix. 5. These words affirm something more than “clothes and shoes never failed you,” inasmuch as ye always had wool, hides, leather, and other kinds of material in sufficient quantities for clothes and shoes, as not only *J. D. Michaelis* and others suppose, but *Calmet*, and even *Kurtz*. *Knobel* is quite correct in observing, that “this would be altogether too trivial a matter by the side of the miraculous supply of manna, and moreover that it is not involved in the expression itself, which rather affirms that their clothes did not wear out upon them, or fall in tatters from their backs, because God gave them a miraculous durability” (*Luther, Calvin, Baumgarten, Schultz, etc.*). At the same time, there is no necessity to follow some of the *Rabbins* and *Justin Martyr* (*dial. c. Tryph.* c. 131), who so magnify the miracle of divine providence,

as to maintain not only that the clothes of the Israelites did not get old, but that as the younger generation grew up their clothes also grew upon their backs, like the shells of snails. Nor is it necessary to shut out the different natural resources which the people had at their command for providing clothes and sandals, any more than the gift of manna precluded the use of such ordinary provisions as they were able to procure.—Ver. 5. In this way Jehovah humbled and tempted His people, that they might learn in their heart, *i.e.* convince themselves by experience, that their God was educating them as a father does his son. **נִזְכָּר**, to admonish, chasten, educate; like *παιδεύειν*. “It includes everything belonging to a proper education” (*Calvin*).—Ver. 6. The design of this education was to train them to keep His commandments, that they might walk in His ways and fear Him (chap. vi. 24).

Vers. 7–20. The Israelites were to continue mindful of this paternal discipline on the part of their God, when the Lord should bring them into the good land of Canaan. This land Moses describes in vers. 8, 9, in contrast with the dry unfruitful desert, as a well-watered and very fruitful land, which yielded abundance of support to its inhabitants; a land of water-brooks, fountains, and floods (**מֵרַיִן**, see Gen. i. 2), which had their source (took their rise) in valleys and on mountains; a land of wheat and barley, of the vine, fig, and pomegranate, and full of oil and honey (see at Ex. iii. 8); lastly, a land “*in which thou shalt not eat (support thyself) in scarcity, and shalt not be in want of anything; a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose mountains thou hewest brass.*” The stones are iron, *i.e.* ferruginous. This statement is confirmed by modern travellers, although the Israelites did not carry on mining, and do not appear to have obtained either iron or brass from their own land. The iron and brass of which David collected such quantities for the building of the temple (1 Chron. xxii. 3, 14), he procured from *Betach* and *Berotai* (2 Sam. viii. 8), or *Tibchat* and *Kun* (1 Chron. xviii. 8), towns of Hadadezer, that is to say, from Syria. According to Ezek. xxvii. 19, however, the Danites brought iron-work to the market of Tyre. Not only do the springs near Tiberias contain iron (*v. Schubert, R. iii. p. 239*), whilst the soil at Hasbeya and the springs in the neighbourhood are also strongly impregnated with iron (*Burckhardt, Syrien*, p. 83), but in the southern mountains as well there are probably strata of iron between Jerusalem and Jericho (*Russegger, R. iii. p. 250*). But Lebanon especially abounds in iron-stone; iron mines and smelting

furnaces being found there in many places (*Volney, Travels*; *Burckhardt*, p. 73; *Seetzen*, i. pp. 145, 187 sqq., 237 sqq.). The basalt also, which occurs in great masses in northern Canaan by the side of the limestone, from the plain of Jezreel onwards (*Robinson*, iii. p. 313), and is very predominant in Bashan, is a ferruginous stone. Traces of extinct copper-works are also found upon Lebanon (*Volney, Travels*; *Ritter's Erdkunde*, xvii. p. 1063).—Vers. 10-18. But if the Israelites were to eat there and be satisfied, *i.e.* to live in the midst of plenty, they were to beware of forgetting their God; that when their prosperity—their possessions, in the form of lofty houses, cattle, gold and silver, and other good things—increased, their heart might not be lifted up, *i.e.* they might not become proud, and, forgetting their deliverance from Egypt and their miraculous preservation and guidance in the desert, ascribe the property they had acquired to their own strength and the work of their own hands. To keep the people from this danger of forgetting God, which follows so easily from the pride of wealth, Moses once more enumerates in vers. 14b-16 the manifestations of divine grace, their deliverance from Egypt the slave-house, their being led through the great and terrible desert, whose terrors he depicts by mentioning a series of noxious and even fatal things, such as snakes, burning snakes (*saraph*, see at Num. xxi. 6), scorpions, and the thirsty land where there was no water. The words from וְהַנִּ, onwards, are attached rhetorically to what precedes by simple apposition, without any logically connecting particle; though it will not do to overlook entirely the rhetorical form of the enumeration, and supply the preposition בְּ before וְהַנִּ and the words which follow, to say nothing of the fact that it would be quite out of character before these nouns in the singular, as a whole people could not go through one serpent, etc. In this parched land the Lord brought the people water out of the flinty rock, the hardest stone, and fed them with manna, to humble them and tempt them (cf. ver. 2), in order (this was the ultimate intention of all the humiliation and trial) “*to do thee good at thy latter end.*” The “latter end” of any one is “the time which follows some distinct point in his life, particularly an important epoch-making point, and which may be regarded as the end by contrast, the time before that epoch being considered as the beginning” (*Schultz*). In this instance Moses refers to the period of their life in Canaan, in contrast with which the period of their sojourn in Egypt and their wandering in the desert is regarded as the beginning; consequently the expression does not relate to

death as the end of life, as in Num. xxiii. 10, although this allusion is not to be altogether excluded, as a blessed death is only the completion of a blessed life.—Like all the guidance of Israel by the Lord, what is stated here is applicable to all believers. It is through humiliations and trials that the Lord leads His people to blessedness. Through the desert of tribulation, anxiety, distress, and merciful interposition, He conducts them to Canaan, into the land of rest, where they are refreshed and satisfied in the full enjoyment of the blessings of His grace and salvation ; but those alone who continue humble, not attributing the good fortune and prosperity to which they attain at last, to their own exertion, strength, perseverance, and wisdom, but gratefully enjoying this good as a gift of the grace of God. **לִפְנֵי נָשַׁׂעֲנָה**, to create property, to prosper in wealth (as in Num. xxiv. 18). God gave strength for this (ver. 18), not because of Israel's merit and worthiness, but to fulfil His promises which He had made on oath to the patriarchs. “*As this day*,” as was quite evident then, when the establishment of the covenant had already commenced, and Israel had come through the desert to the border of Canaan (see chap. iv. 20).—Vers. 19, 20. To strengthen his admonition, Moses pointed again in conclusion, as he had already done in chap. vi. 14 (cf. chap. iv. 25 sqq.), to the destruction which would come upon Israel through apostasy from its God.

*Warning against Self-righteousness, founded upon the recital of
their previous Sins.—Chap. ix.-x. 11.*

Besides the more vulgar pride which entirely forgets God, and attributes success and prosperity to its own power and exertion, there is one of a more refined character, which very easily spreads—namely, pride which acknowledges the blessings of God ; but instead of receiving them gratefully, as unmerited gifts of the grace of the Lord, sees in them nothing but proofs of its own righteousness and virtue. Moses therefore warned the Israelites more particularly of this dangerous enemy of the soul, by first of all declaring without reserve, that the Lord was not about to give them Canaan because of their own righteousness, but that He would exterminate the Canaanites for their own wickedness (vers. 1-6) ; and then showing them for their humiliation, by proofs drawn from the immediate past, how they had brought upon themselves the anger of the Lord, by their apostasy and rebellion against their God, directly after the conclusion of the covenant at Sinai ; and that in such a way, that it was only by his earnest intercession that he had been able to prevent

the destruction of the people (vers. 7-24), and to secure a further renewal of the pledges of the covenant (ver. 25-chap. x. 11).

Vers. 1-6. Warning against a conceit of righteousness, with the occasion for the warning. As the Israelites were now about to cross over the Jordan ("this day," to indicate that the time was close at hand), to take possession of nations that were superior to them in size and strength (the tribes of Canaan mentioned in chap. vii. 1), and great fortified cities reaching to the heavens (cf. chap. i. 28), namely, the great and tall nation of the Enakites (chap. i. 28), before which, as was well known, no one could stand (*הַתִּיצְבָּא*, as in chap. vii. 24); and as they also knew that Jehovah their God was going before them to destroy and humble these nations, they were not to say in their heart, when this was done, *For my righteousness Jehovah hath brought me in to possess this land*. In ver. 3, *וְיָרֻעֵת הַיּוֹם* is not to be taken in an imperative sense, but as expressive of the actual fact, and corresponding to ver. 1, "thou art to pass." Israel now knew for certain—namely, by the fact, which spoke so powerfully, of its having been successful against foes which it could never have conquered by itself, especially against Sihon and Og—that the Lord was going before it, as the leader and captain of His people (*Schultz*: see chap. i. 30). The threefold repetition of *הַזֶּה* in ver. 3. is peculiarly emphatic. "*A consuming fire:*" as in chap. iv. 24. *הַזֶּה יְשִׁמְרֵד* is more particularly defined by *וְהַזֶּה בְּנֵיכֶם וְ*, which follows: not, however, as implying that *הַשִּׁמְרֵד* does not signify complete destruction in this passage, but rather as explaining how the destruction would take place. Jehovah would destroy the Canaanites, by bringing them down, humbling them before Israel, so that they would be able to drive them out and destroy them quickly. "*כַּהֲרֵךְ*, quickly, is no more opposed to chap. vii. 22, 'thou mayest not destroy them quickly,' than God's not delaying to requite (chap. vii. 10) is opposed to His long-suffering" (*Schultz*). So far as the almighty assistance of God was concerned, the Israelites would quickly overthrow the Canaanites; but for the sake of the well-being of Israel, the destruction would only take place by degrees. "*As Jehovah hath said unto thee:*" viz. Ex. xxiii. 23, 27 sqq., and at the beginning of the conflict, chap. ii. 24 sqq.—Ver. 4. When therefore Jehovah thrust out these nations before them (*פָּרַג*, as in chap. vi. 19), the Israelites were not to say within themselves, "*By (for, on account of) my righteousness Jehovah hath brought me (led me hither) to possess this land.*" The following word, *וְבִלְשָׁעַת*, is adversative: "*but because of the wickedness of these nations,*" etc.

—To impress this truth deeply upon the people, Moses repeats the thought once more in ver. 5. At the same time he mentions, in addition to righteousness, straightness or uprightness of heart, to indicate briefly that outward works do not constitute true righteousness, but that an upright state of heart is indispensable, and then enters more fully into the positive reasons. The wickedness of the Canaanites was no doubt a sufficient reason for destroying *them*, but not for giving their land to the people of Israel, since they could lay no claim to it on account of their own righteousness. The reason for giving Canaan to the Israelites was simply the promise of God, the word which the Lord had spoken to the patriarchs on oath (cf. chap. vii. 8), and therefore nothing but the free grace of God,—not any merit on the part of the Israelites who were then living, for they were a people “of a hard neck,” *i.e.* a stubborn, untractable generation. With these words, which the Lord Himself had applied to Israel in Ex. xxxii. 9, xxxiii. 3, 5, Moses prepares the way for passing to the reasons for his warning against self-righteous pride, namely, the grievous sins of the Israelites against the Lord.

Vers. 7–24. He reminded the people how they had provoked the Lord in the desert, and had shown themselves rebellious against God, from the day of their departure from Egypt till their arrival in the steppes of Moab. תַּשְׁפַּח אֶת־אָשֵׁר, for אָשֵׁר, is the object to תַּשְׁפַּח (Ewald, § 333, a.) : “*how thou hast provoked.*” הַמְּרָה, generally with אֶת־דְּבָרִי (cf. chap. i. 26), to be rebellious against the commandment of the Lord: here with בְּעֵל, construed with a person, to deal rebelliously *with God*, to act rebelliously in relation to Him (cf. chap. xxxi. 27). The words, “*from the day that thou camest out,*” etc., are not to be pressed. It is to be observed, however, that the rebellion against the guidance of God commenced before they passed through the Red Sea (Ex. xiv. 11). This general statement Moses then followed up with facts, first of all describing the worship of the calf at Horeb, according to its leading features (vers. 8–21), and then briefly pointing to the other rebellions of the people in the desert (vers. 22, 23).—Ver. 8. “*And indeed even in Horeb ye provoked Jehovah to wrath.*” By the *vav explie.* this sin is brought into prominence, as having been a specially grievous one. It was so because of the circumstances under which it was committed.—Vers. 9–12. When Moses went up the mountain, and stayed there forty days, entirely occupied with the holiest things, so that he neither ate nor drank, having gone up to receive the tables of the law, upon which the words were written with the finger of God,

just as the Lord had spoken them directly to the people out of the midst of the fire,—at a time, therefore, when the Israelites should also have been meditating deeply upon the words of the Lord which they had but just heard,—they acted so corruptly, as to depart at once from the way that had been pointed out, and make themselves a molten image (comp. Ex. xxxi. 18—xxxii. 6, with chaps. xxiv. 12—xxxii. 17). “*The day of the assembly*,” i.e. the day on which Moses gathered the people together before God (chap. iv. 10), calling them out of the camp, and bringing them to the Lord to the foot of Sinai (Ex. xix. 17). The construction of the sentence is this: the apodosis to “*when I was gone up*” commences with “*the Lord delivered unto me*,” in ver. 10; and the clause, “*then I abode*,” etc., in ver. 9, is a parenthesis.—The words of God in vers. 12—14 are taken almost word for word from Ex. xxxii. 7—10. רֹאשׁ (ver. 14), the imperative Hiphil of רָפַח, desist from me, that I may destroy them, for לִפְנֵי חֶתֶת, in Ex. xxxii. 10. But notwithstanding the apostasy of the people, the Lord gave Moses the tables of the covenant, not only that they might be a testimony of His holiness before the faithless nation, but still more as a testimony that, in spite of His resolution to destroy the rebellious nation, without leaving a trace behind, He would still uphold His covenant, and make of Moses a greater people. There is nothing at all to favour the opinion, that handing over the tables (ver. 11) was the first beginning of the manifestations of divine wrath (*Schultz*); and this is also at variance with the preterite, בָּנָה, in ver. 11, from which it is very evident that the Lord had already given the tables to Moses, when He commanded him to go down quickly, not only to declare to the people the holiness of God, but to stop the apostasy, and by his mediatorial intervention to avert from the people the execution of the divine purpose. It is true, that when Moses came down and saw the idolatrous conduct of the people, he threw the two tables from his hands, and broke them in pieces before the eyes of the people (vers. 15—17; comp. with Ex. xxxii. 15—19), as a practical declaration that the covenant of the Lord was broken by their apostasy. But this act of Moses furnishes no proof that the Lord had given him the tables to declare His holy wrath in the sight of the people. And even if the tables of the covenant were “in a certain sense the indictments in Moses’ hands, accusing them of a capital crime” (*Schultz*), this was not the purpose for which God had given them to him. For if it had been, Moses would not have broken them in pieces, destroying, as it were, the indictments themselves, before

the people had been tried. Moses passed over the fact, that even before coming down from the mountain he endeavoured to mitigate the wrath of the Lord by his intercession (Ex. xxxii. 11-14), and simply mentioned (in vers. 15-17) how, as soon as he came down, he charged the people with their great sin ; and then, in vers. 18, 19, how he spent another forty days upon the mountain fasting before God, on account of this sin, until he had averted the destructive wrath of the Lord from Israel, through his earnest intercession. The forty days that Moses spent upon the mountain, "*as at the first*," in prayer before the Lord, are the days mentioned in Ex. xxxiv. 28 as having been passed upon Sinai for the perfect restoration of the covenant, and for the purpose of procuring the second tables (cf. chap. x. 1 sqq.).—Ver. 20. It was not from the people only, but from Aaron also, that Moses averted the wrath of God through his intercession, when it was about to destroy him. In the historical account in Ex. xxxii., there is no special reference to this intercession, as it is included in the intercession for the whole nation. On the present occasion, however, Moses gave especial prominence to this particular feature, not only that he might make the people thoroughly aware that at that time Israel could not even boast of the righteousness of its eminent men (cf. Isa. xlivi. 27), but also to bring out the fact, which is described still more fully in chap. x. 6 sqq., that Aaron's investiture with the priesthood, and the maintenance of this institution, was purely a work of divine grace. It is true that at that time Aaron was not yet high priest; but he had been placed at the head of the nation in connection with *Hur*, as the representative of Moses (Ex. xxiv. 14), and was already designated by God for the high-priesthood (Ex. xxviii. 1). The fact, however, that Aaron had drawn upon himself the wrath of God in a very high degree, was intimated plainly enough in what Moses told him in Ex. xxxii. 21.—In ver. 21, Moses mentions again how he destroyed that manifested sin of the nation, namely, the molten calf (see at Ex. xxxii. 20).—Vers. 22-24. And it was not on this occasion only, viz. at Horeb, that Israel aroused the anger of the Lord its God by its sin, but it did so again and again at other places : at Tabeerah, by discontent at the guidance of God (Num. xi. 1-3); at Massah, by murmuring on account of the want of water (Ex. xvii. 1 sqq.); at the graves of lust, by longing for flesh (Num. xi. 4 sqq.); and at Kadesh-Barnea by unbelief, of which they had already been reminded at chap. i. 26 sqq. The list is not arranged chronologically, but advances gradually from the smaller

to the more serious forms of guilt. For Moses was seeking to sharpen the consciences of the people, and to impress upon them the fact that they had been rebellious against the Lord (see at ver. 7) from the very beginning, “from the day that I knew you.”

Vers. 25-29. After vindicating in this way the thought expressed in ver. 7, by enumerating the principal rebellions of the people against their God, Moses returns in vers. 25 sqq. to the apostasy at Sinai, for the purpose of showing still further how Israel had no righteousness or ground for boasting before God, and owed its preservation, with all the saving blessings of the covenant, solely to the mercy of God and His covenant faithfulness. To this end he repeats in vers. 26-29 the essential points in his intercession for the people after their sin at Sinai, and then proceeds to explain still further, in chap. x. 1-11, how the Lord had not only renewed the tables of the covenant in consequence of this intercession (vers. 1-5), but had also established the gracious institution of the priesthood for the time to come by appointing Eleazar in Aaron’s stead as soon as his father died, and setting apart the tribe of Levi to carry the ark of the covenant and attend to the holy service, and had commanded them to continue their march to Canaan, and take possession of the land promised to the fathers (vers. 6-11). With the words “thus I fell down,” in ver. 25, Moses returns to the intercession already briefly mentioned in ver. 18, and recalls to the recollection of the people the essential features of his plea at that time. For the words “*the forty days and nights that I fell down*,” see at chap. i. 46. The substance of the intercession in vers. 26-29 is essentially the same as that in Ex. xxxii. 11-13; but given with such freedom as any other than Moses would hardly have allowed himself (*Schultz*), and in such a manner as to bring it into the most obvious relation to the words of God in vers. 12, 13. **אֱלֹהִים תַּמְתִּיכָה**, “*Destroy not Thy people and Thine inheritance*,” says Moses, with reference to the words of the Lord to him: “*thy people have corrupted themselves*” (ver. 12). Israel was not Moses’ nation, but the nation and inheritance of Jehovah; it was not Moses, but Jehovah, who had brought it out of Egypt. True, the people were stiffnecked (cf. ver. 13); but let the Lord remember the fathers, the oath given to Abraham, which is expressly mentioned in Ex. xxxii. 13 (see at chap. vii. 8), and not turn to the stiffneckedness of the people (**שָׁׁמֶן** equivalent to **עֲזֵז**, vers. 13 and 6), and to their wickedness and sin (*i.e.* not regard them and punish them). The honour of the Lord before the nations was concerned in this

(ver. 28). The land whence Israel came out ("the land" = the people of the land, as in Gen. x. 25, etc., viz. the Egyptians: the word is construed as a collective with a plural verb) must not have occasion to say, that Jehovah had not led His people into the promised land from incapacity or hatred. **כַּפְלֵי יִכְלֶה** recalls Num. xiv. 16. Just as "inability" would be opposed to the nature of the absolute God, so "hatred" would be opposed to the choice of Israel as the inheritance of Jehovah, which He had brought out of Egypt by His divine and almighty power (cf. Ex. vi. 6).

Chap. x. 1–11. In vers. 1–5 Moses briefly relates the success of his earnest intercession. "*At that time*," of his intercession, God commanded him to hew out new tables, and prepare an ark in which to keep them (cf. Ex. xxxiv. 1 sqq.). Here again Moses links together such things as were substantially connected, without strictly confining himself to the chronological order, which was already well known from the historical account, inasmuch as this was not required by the general object of his address. God had already given directions for the preparation of the ark of the covenant, before the apostasy of the nation (Ex. xxv. 10 sqq.); but it was not made till after the tabernacle had been built, and the tables were only deposited in the ark when the tabernacle was consecrated (Ex. xl. 20).—Vers. 6 and 7. And the Israelites owed to the grace of their God, which was turned towards them once more, through the intercession of Moses, not only the restoration of the tables of the covenant as a pledge that the covenant itself was restored, but also the institution and maintenance of the high-priesthood and priesthood generally for the purpose of mediation between them and the Lord.¹ Moses reminds the people of this

¹ Even *Clericus* pointed out this connection, and paraphrased vers. 6 and 7 as follows: "But when, as I have said, God forgave the Hebrew people, He pardoned my brother Aaron also, who did not die till the fortieth year after we had come out of Egypt, and when we were coming round the borders of the Edomites to come hither. God also showed that He was reconciled towards him by conferring the priesthood upon him, which is now borne by his son Eleazar according to the will of God." *Clericus* has also correctly brought out the fact that Moses referred to what he had stated in chap. ix. 20 as to the wrath of God against Aaron and his intercession on his behalf, or rather that he mentioned his intercession on behalf of Aaron in that passage, because he intended to call more particular attention to the successful result of it in this. *Hengstenberg* (Dissertations, vol. ii. pp. 351–2) has since pointed out briefly, but very conclusively, the connection of thought between vers. 6, 7, and what goes before and follows after. "Moses," he says, "points out to the people how the Lord had continued unchangeable in His mercy notwithstanding all their sins."

gracious gift on the part of their God, by recalling to their memory the time when Aaron died and his son Eleazar was invested with the high-priesthood in his stead. That he may transport his hearers the more distinctly to the period in question, he lets the history itself speak, and quotes from the account of their journeys the passage which supplied the practical proof of what he desires to say. Instead of saying: And the high-priesthood also, with which Aaron was invested by the grace of God notwithstanding his sin at Sinai, the Lord has still preserved to you; for when Aaron died, He invested his son with the same honour,¹ and also directed you to continue your journey,—he proceeds in the following historical style: “*And the children of Israel took their journey from the wells of the sons of Jaakan to Mosera: there Aaron died, and there he was buried; and Eleazar his son became priest in his stead. And from thence they journeyed unto Gudgodah, and from Gudgodah to Jotbath, a land of water-brooks.*” The allusion to these marches, together with the events which had taken place at Mosera, taught in very few words “not only that Aaron was forgiven at the intercession of Moses, and even honoured with the high-priesthood, the medium of grace and blessing to the people of God (e.g. at the wells of Bene-Jaakan) until the time of his death; but also that through this same intercession the high-priesthood was maintained in perpetuity, so that when Aaron had to die in the wilderness in consequence of a fresh sin (Num. xx. 12), it continued notwithstanding

Although they had rendered themselves unworthy of such goodness by their worship of the calf, He gave them the ark of the covenant with the new tables of the law in it (chap. x. 1-5). He followed up this gift of His grace by instituting the high-priesthood, and when Aaron died He caused it to be transferred to his son Eleazar (vers. 6, 7). He set apart the tribe of Levi to serve Him and bless the people in His name, and thus to be the mediators of His mercy (vers. 8, 9). In short, He omitted nothing that was requisite to place Israel in full possession of the dignity of a people of God.” There is no ground for regarding vers. 6, 7, as a gloss, as *Capellus*, *Dathe*, and *Rosenmüller* do, or vers. 6-9 as “an interpolation of a historical statement concerning the bearers of the ark of the covenant and the holy persons generally, which has no connection with Moses’ address,” as *Knobel* maintains. The want of any formal connection is quite in keeping with the spirit of simplicity which characterizes the early Hebrew diction and historical writings. “The style of the Hebrews is not to be tried by the rules of rhetoricians” (*Clericus*).

¹ “In the death of Aaron they might discern the punishment of their rebellion. But the fact that Eleazar was appointed in his place, was a sign of the paternal grace of God, who did not suffer them to be forsaken on that account” (*Calvin*).

standing, and by no means diminished in strength, as might have been feared, since it led the way from the wells to water-brooks, helped on the journey to Canaan, which was now the object of their immediate aim, and still sustained their courage and their faith" (*Schultz*). The earlier commentators observed the inward connection between the continuation of the high-priesthood and the water-brooks. *J. Gerhard*, for example, observes: "God generally associates material blessings with spiritual; as long as the ministry of the word and the observance of divine worship flourish among us, God will also provide for our temporal necessities." On the places mentioned, see pp. 244-5.

In ver. 8, Moses returns to the form of an address again, and refers to the separation of the tribe of Levi for the holy service, as a manifestation of mercy on the part of the Lord towards Israel. The expression "*at that time*" is not to be understood as relating to the time of Aaron's death in the fortieth year of the march, in which *Knobel* finds a contradiction to the other books. It refers quite generally, as in chap. ix. 20 and x. 1, to the time of which Moses is speaking here, viz. the time when the covenant was restored at Sinai. The appointment of the tribe of Levi for service at the sanctuary took place in connection with the election of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood (Ex. xxviii. and xxix.), although their call to this service, instead of the first-born of Israel, was not carried out till the numbering and mustering of the people (Num. i. 49 sqq., iv. 17 sqq., viii. 6 sqq.). Moses is speaking here of the election of the whole of the tribe of Levi, including the priests (Aaron and his sons), as is very evident from the account of their service. It is true that the carrying of the ark upon the march through the desert was the business of the (non-priestly) Levites, viz. the Kohathites (Num. iv. 4 sqq.); but on solemn occasions the priests had to carry it (cf. Josh. iii. 3, 6, 8, vi. 6; 1 Kings viii. 3 sqq.). "Standing before the Lord, to serve Him, and to bless in His name," was exclusively the business of the priests (cf. chap. xviii. 5, xxi. 5, and Num. vi. 23 sqq.), whereas the Levites were only assistants of the priests in their service (see at chap. xviii. 7). This tribe therefore received no share and possession with the other tribes, as was already laid down in Num. xviii. 20 with reference to the priests, and in ver. 24 with regard to all the Levites; to which passages the words "as the Lord thy God promised him" refer.—Lastly, in vers. 10, 11, Moses sums up the result of his intercession in the words, "And I stood

upon the mount as the first days, forty days (a resumption of chap. ix. 18 and 25); *and the Lord hearkened to me this time also* (word for word, as in chap. ix. 19). *Jehovah would not destroy thee (Israel).*" Therefore He commanded Moses to arise to depart before the people, *i.e.* as leader of the people to command and superintend their removal and march. In form, this command is connected with Ex. xxxiv. 1; but Moses refers here not only to that word of the Lord with the limitation added there in ver. 2, but to the ultimate, full, and unconditional assurance of God, in which the Lord Himself promised to go with His people and bring them to Canaan (Ex. xxxiv. 14 sqq.).

Admonition to fear and love God. The Blessing or Curse consequent upon the Fulfilment or Transgression of the Law.—Chap. x. 12-xi. 32.

Vers. 12-15. The proof that Israel had no righteousness before God is followed on the positive side by an expansion of the main law laid down in chap. vi. 4 sqq., to love God with all the heart, which is introduced by the words, "and now Israel," *sc.* now that thou hast everything without desert or worthiness, purely from forgiving grace. "*What doth the Lord thy God require of thee?*" Nothing further than that thou fearest Him, "to walk in all His ways, and to love Him, and to serve Him with all the heart and all the soul." סֵבֶב, unless, or except that, presupposes a negative clause (cf. Gen. xxxix. 9), which is implied here in the previous question, or else to be supplied as the answer. The demand for fear, love, and reverence towards the Lord, is no doubt very hard for the natural man to fulfil, and all the harder the deeper it goes into the heart; but after such manifestations of the love and grace of God, it only follows as a matter of course. "Fear, love, and obedience would naturally have taken root of themselves within the heart, if man had not corrupted his own heart." Love, which is the only thing demanded in chap. vi. 5, is here preceded by fear, which is the only thing mentioned in chap. v. 26 and vi. 24.¹ The fear of the Lord, which springs from the knowledge of one's own unholiness in the presence of the holy God, ought to form the one leading emotion in the heart prompting to walk in all the ways of the Lord, and to maintain morality of conduct in its strictest form.

¹ The fear of God is to be united with the love of God; for love without fear makes men remiss, and fear without love makes them servile and desperate (*J. Gerhard*).

This fear, which first enables us to comprehend the mercy of God, awakens love, the fruit of which is manifested in serving God with all the heart and all the soul (see chap. vi. 5). “*For thy good,*” as in chap. v. 30 and vi. 24.—Vers. 14, 15. This obligation the Lord had laid upon Israel by the love with which He, to whom all the heavens and the earth, with everything upon it, belong, had chosen the patriarchs and their seed out of all nations. By “the heavens of the heavens,” the idea of heaven is perfectly exhausted. This God, who might have chosen any other nation as well as Israel, or in fact all nations together, had directed His special love to Israel alone.

Vers. 16–22. Above all, therefore, they were to circumcise the foreskin of their hearts, *i.e.* to lay aside all insensibility of heart to impressions from the love of God (cf. Lev. xxvi. 41; and on the spiritual signification of circumcision, see vol. i. p. 227), and not stiffen their necks any more, *i.e.* not persist in their obstinacy, or obstinate resistance to God (cf. chap. ix. 6, 13). Without circumcision of heart, true fear of God and true love of God are both impossible. As a reason for this admonition, Moses adduces in vers. 17 sqq. the nature and acts of God. Jehovah as the absolute God and Lord is mighty and terrible towards all, without respect of person, and at the same time a just Judge and loving Protector of the helpless and oppressed. From this it follows that the true God will not tolerate haughtiness and stiffness of neck either towards Himself or towards other men, but will punish it without reserve. To set forth emphatically the infinite greatness and might of God, Moses describes Jehovah the God of Israel as the “*God of gods,*” *i.e.* the supreme God, the essence of all that is divine, of all divine power and might (cf. Ps. cxxxvi. 2),—and as the “*Lord of lords,*” *i.e.* the supreme, unrestricted Ruler (“the only Potentate,” 1 Tim. vi. 15), above all powers in heaven and on earth, “*a great King above all gods*” (Ps. xciv. 3). Compare Rev. xvii. 14 and xix. 16, where these predicates are transferred to the exalted Son of God, as the Judge and Conqueror of all dominions and powers that are hostile to God. The predicates which follow describe the unfolding of the omnipotence of God in the government of the world, in which Jehovah manifests Himself as the great, mighty, and terrible God (Ps. lxxxix. 8), who does not regard the person (cf. Lev. xix. 15), or accept presents (cf. chap. xvi. 19), like a human judge.—Vers. 18, 19. As such, Jehovah does justice to the defenceless (orphan and widow), and exercises a loving care towards the stranger

in his oppression. For this reason the Israelites were not to close their hearts egotistically against the stranger (cf. Ex. xxii. 20). This would show whether they possessed any love to God, and had circumcised their hearts (cf. 1 John iii. 10, 17).—Vers. 20 sqq. After laying down the fundamental condition of a proper relation towards God, Moses describes the fear of God, *i.e.* true reverence of God, in its threefold manifestation, in deed (serving God), in heart (cleaving to Him; cf. chap. iv. 4), and with the mouth (swearing by His name; cf. chap. vi. 13). Such reverence as this Israel owed to its God; for “*He is thy praise, and He is thy God*” (ver. 21). He has given thee strong inducements to praise. By the great and terrible things which thine eyes have seen, He has manifested Himself as God to thee. “*Terrible things*” are those acts of divine omnipotence, which fill men with fear and trembling at the majesty of the Almighty (cf. Ex. xv. 11). **נָשַׁלְחָה עֲלֶיךָ**, “done with thee,” *i.e.* shown to thee (**תִּשְׁאַל** in the sense of practical help).—Ver. 22. One marvel among these great and terrible acts of the Lord was to be seen in Israel itself, which had gone down to Egypt in the persons of its fathers as a family consisting of seventy souls, and now, notwithstanding the oppression it suffered there, had grown into an innumerable nation. So marvellously had the Lord fulfilled His promise in Gen. xv. 5. By referring to this promise, Moses intended no doubt to recall to the recollection of the people the fact that the bondage of Israel in a foreign land for 400 years had also been foretold (Gen. xv. 13 sqq.). On the seventy souls, see at Gen. xlvi. 26, 27.

Chap. xi. In vers. 1-12 the other feature in the divine requirements (chap. x. 12), viz. love to the Lord their God, is still more fully developed. Love was to show itself in the distinct perception of what had to be observed towards Jehovah (to “*keep His charge*,” see at Lev. viii. 35), *i.e.* in the perpetual observance of His commandments and rights. The words, “*and His statutes*,” etc., serve to explain the general notion, “*His charge*.” “*All days*,” as in chap. iv. 10.—Vers. 2 sqq. To awaken this love they were now to know, *i.e.* to ponder and lay to heart, the discipline of the Lord their God. The words from “*for (I speak) not*” to “*have not seen*” are a parenthetical clause, by which Moses would impress his words most strongly upon the hearts of the older generation, which had witnessed the acts of the Lord. The clause is without any verb or predicate, but this can easily be supplied from the sense. The best suggestion is that of *Schultz*, viz. **הַדָּבָר הַהִיא**, “*for it is not with your*

children that I have to do," not to them that this admonition applies. Moses refers to the children who had been born in the desert, as distinguished from those who, though not twenty years old when the Israelites came out of Egypt, had nevertheless seen with their own eyes the plagues inflicted upon Egypt, and who were now of mature age, viz. between forty and sixty years old, and formed, as the older and more experienced generation, the stock and kernel of the congregation assembled round him now. To the words, "*which have not known and have not seen,*" it is easy to supply from the context, "*what ye have known and seen.*" The accusatives from "*the chastisement*" onwards belong to the verb of the principal sentence, "*know ye this day.*" The accusatives which follow show what we are to understand by "*the chastisement of the Lord,*" viz. the mighty acts of the Lord to Egypt and to Israel in the desert. The object of them all was to *educate* Israel in the fear and love of God. In this sense Moses calls them מִסְרָר (Eng. Ver. *chastisement*), παιδεία, i.e. not punishment only, but education by the manifestation of love as well as punishment (like בִּירָר in chap. iv. 36; cf. Prov. i. 2, 8, iv. 1, etc.). "*His greatness,*" etc., as in chap. iii. 24 and iv. 34. On the signs and acts in Egypt, see at chap. iv. 34, vi. 22; and on those at the Red Sea, at Ex. xiv. אֲשֶׁר הַצִּיר—עַל פְּנֵיכֶם, "*over whose face He made the waters of the Red Sea to flow;*" cf. Ex. xiv. 26 sqq.—By the acts of God in the desert (ver. 5) we are not to understand the chastenings in Num. xi.—xv. either solely or pre-eminently, but all the manifestations of the omnipotence of God in the guidance of Israel, proofs of love as well as the penal wonders. Of the latter, the miraculous destruction of the company of Korah is specially mentioned in ver. 6 (cf. Num. xvi. 31–33). Here Moses only mentions Dathan and Abiram, the followers of Korah, and not Korah himself, probably from regard to his sons, who were not swallowed up by the earth along with their father, but had lived to perpetuate the family of Korah. "*Everything existing, which was in their following*" (see Ex. xi. 8), does not mean their possessions, but their servants, and corresponds to "*all the men who belonged to Korah*" in Num. xvi. 32, whereas the possessions mentioned there are included here in the "*tents.*" תְּהֻקִים is only applied to living beings, as in Gen. vii. 4 and 23.—In ver. 7 the reason is given for the admonition in ver. 2: the elders were to know (discern) the educational purpose of God in those mighty acts of the Lord, because they had seen them with their own eyes.—Vers. 8, 9. And this knowledge was to impel them to keep the law, that they

might be strong, *i.e.* spiritually strong (chap. i. 38), and not only go into the promised land, but also live long therein (cf. chap. iv. 26, vi. 3).—In vers. 10-12 Moses adduces a fresh motive for his admonition to keep the law with fidelity, founded upon the peculiar nature of the land. Canaan was a land the fertility of which was not dependent, like that of Egypt, upon its being watered by the hand of man, but was kept up by the rain of heaven which was sent down by God the Lord, so that it depended entirely upon the Lord how long its inhabitants should live therein. Egypt is described by Moses as a land which Israel sowed with seed, and watered with its foot like a garden of herbs. In Egypt there is hardly any rain at all (cf. *Herod.* ii. 4, *Diod. Sic.* i. 41, and other evidence in *Hengstenberg's Egypt and the Books of Moses*, pp. 217 sqq.). The watering of the land, which produces its fertility, is dependent upon the annual overflowing of the Nile, and, as this only lasts for about 100 days, upon the way in which this is made available for the whole year; namely, by the construction of canals and ponds throughout the land, to which the water is conducted from the Nile by forcing machines, or by actually carrying it in vessels up to the fields and plantations.¹ The expression, “with thy foot,” probably refers to the large pumping wheels still in use there, which are worked by the feet, and over which a long endless rope passes with pails attached, for drawing up the water (cf. *Niebuhr, Reise*, i. 149), the identity of which with the ἔλιξ described by *Philo* as ὑδρηλὸν ὅργανον (*de confus. ling.* i. 410) cannot possibly be called in question; provided, that is to say, we do not confound this ἔλιξ with the Archimedean water-screw mentioned by *Diod. Sic.* i. 34, and described more minutely at v. 37, the construction of which was entirely different (see my *Archæology*, ii. pp. 111-2).—The Egyptians, as genuine heathen, were so thoroughly conscious of this peculiar characteristic of their land, which made its fertility far more dependent upon the labour of human hands than upon the rain of heaven or divine providence, that *Herodotus* (ii. 13) represents them as saying, “The Greeks, with their dependence upon the gods, might be disappointed in their brightest hopes and

¹ Upon the ancient monuments we find not only the draw-well with the long rope, which is now called *Shaduf*, depicted in various ways (see *Wilkinson*, i. p. 35, ii. 4); but at *Beni-Hassan* there is a representation of two men carrying a water-vessel upon a pole on their shoulders, which they fill from a draw-well or pond, and then carry to the field (cf. *Hengstenberg, Egypt and the Books of Moses*, pp. 220-1).

suffer dreadfully from famine." The land of Canaan yielded no support to such godless self-exaltation, for it was "a land of mountains and valleys, and drank water of the rain of heaven" (^q before מַטָּר, to denote the external cause; see *Ewald*, § 217, d.); i.e. it received its watering, the main condition of all fertility, from the rain, by the way of the rain, and therefore through the providential care of God.—Ver. 12. It was a land which Jehovah inquired after, i.e. for which He cared (^{שְׁנִיר}, as in Prov. xxxi. 13, Job iii. 4); His eyes were always directed towards it from the beginning of the year to the end; a land, therefore, which was dependent upon God, and in this dependence upon God peculiarly adapted to Israel, which was to live entirely to its God, and upon His grace alone.

Vers. 13–32. This peculiarity in the land of Canaan led Moses to close the first part of his discourse on the law, his exhortation to fear and love the Lord, with a reference to the blessing that would follow the faithful fulfilment of the law, and a threat of the curse which would attend apostasy to idolatry.—Vers. 13–15. If Israel would serve its God in love and faithfulness, He would give the land early and latter rain in its season, and therewith a plentiful supply of food for man and beast (see Lev. xxvi. 3 and 5; and for the further expansion of this blessing, chap. xxviii. 1–12).—Vers. 16 and 17. But if, on the other hand, their heart was foolish to turn away from the Lord and serve other gods, the wrath of the Lord would burn against them, and God would shut up the heaven, that no rain should fall and the earth should yield no produce, and they would speedily perish (cf. Lev. xxvi. 19, 20, and Deut. xxviii. 23, 24). Let them therefore impress the words now set before them very deeply upon themselves and their children (vers. 18–21, in which there is in part a verbal repetition of chap. vi. 6–9). The words, "*as the days of the heaven above the earth*," i.e. as long as the heaven continues above the earth,—in other words, to all eternity (cf. Ps. lxxxix. 30; Job xiv. 12),—belong to the main sentence, "*that your days may be multiplied*," etc. (ver. 21). "The promise to give the land to Israel for ever was not made unconditionally; an unconditional promise is precluded by the words, 'that your days may be multiplied'" (*Schultz*). (For further remarks, see at chap. xxx. 3–5.) For (vers. 22–25) if they adhered faithfully to the Lord, He would drive out before them all the nations that dwelt in the land, and would give them the land upon which they trod in all its length and breadth, and so fill the Canaanites with fear and

terror before them, that no one should be able to stand against them. (On ver. 23, cf. chap. vii. 1, 2, ix. 1, and i. 28.) The words, “every place whereon the soles of your feet shall tread shall be yours,” are defined more precisely, and restricted to the land of Canaan on both sides of the Jordan by the boundaries which follow: “*from the desert (of Arabia on the south), and Lebanon (on the north), and from the river Euphrates (on the east) to the hinder sea*” (the Mediterranean on the west; see Num. xxxiv. 6). The Euphrates is given as the eastern boundary, as in chap. i. 7, according to the promise in Gen. xv. 18. (On ver. 25, cf. chap. vii. 24, ii. 25, and Ex. xxiii. 27.)—Vers. 26-28. Concluding summary. “*I set before you this day the blessing and the curse.*” The blessing, if (*שָׁמַע, שְׁמַע*, *shema*, as in Lev. iv. 22) ye hearken to the commandments of your God; the curse, if ye do not give heed to them, but turn aside from the way pointed out to you, to go after other gods. To this there are added instructions in vers. 29 and 30, that when they took possession of the land they should *give* the blessing upon Mount Gerizim and the curse upon Mount Ebal, *i.e.* should give utterance to them there, and as it were transfer them to the land to be apportioned to its inhabitants according to their attitude towards the Lord their God. (For further comment, see at chap. xxvii. 14.) The two mountains mentioned were selected for this act, no doubt because they were opposite to one another, and stood, each about 2500 feet high, in the very centre of the land not only from west to east, but also from north to south. Ebal stands upon the north side, Gerizim upon the south; between the two is *Sichem*, the present *Nabulus*, in a tolerably elevated valley, fertile, attractive, and watered by many springs, which runs from the south-east to the north-west from the foot of Gerizim to that of Ebal, and is about 1600 feet in breadth. The blessing was to be uttered upon Gerizim, and the curse upon Ebal; though not, as the earlier commentators supposed, because the peculiarities of these mountains, viz. the fertility of Gerizim and the barrenness of Ebal, appeared to accord with this arrangement: for when seen from the valley between, “the sides of both these mountains are equally naked and sterile;” and “the only exception in favour of the former is a small ravine coming down, opposite the west end of the town, which is indeed full of fountains and trees” (*Rob. Pal.* iii. 96, 97). The reason for selecting Gerizim for the blessings was probably, as *Schultz* supposes, the fact that it was situated on the south, towards the region of the light. “Light and blessing are essentially one. From

the light-giving face of God there come blessing and life (Ps. xvi. 11).—In ver. 30 the situation of these mountains is more clearly defined: they were “*on the other side of the Jordan*,” i.e. in the land to the west of the Jordan, “*behind the way of the sunset*,” i.e. on the other side of the road of the west, which runs through the land on the west of the Jordan, just as another such road runs through the land on the east (*Knobel*). The reference is to the main road which ran from Upper Asia through Canaan to Egypt, as was shown by the journeys of Abraham and Jacob (Gen. xii. 6, xxxiii. 17, 18). Even at the present day the main road leads from Beisan to Jerusalem round the east side of Ebal into the valley of Sichem, and then again eastwards from Gerizim through the Mukra valley on towards the south (cf. *Rob.* iii. 94; *Ritter, Erdkunde*, xvi. pp. 658–9). “*In the land of the Canaanite who dwells in the Arabah*.” By the *Arabah*, *Knobel* understands the plain of *Nabulus*, which is not much less than four hours’ journey long, and on an average from a half to three-quarters broad, “the largest of all upon the elevated tract of land between the western plain and the valley of the Jordan” (*Rob.* iii. p. 101). This is decidedly wrong, however, as it is opposed to the fixed use of the word, and irreconcilable with the character of this plain, which, *Robinson* says, “is cultivated throughout and covered with the rich green of millet intermingled with the yellow of the ripe corn, which the country people were just reaping” (*Pal.* iii. 93). The *Arabah* is the western portion of the *Ghor* (see at chap. i. 1), and is mentioned here as that portion of the land on the west of the Jordan which lay stretched out before the eyes of the Israelites who were encamped in the steppes of Moab. “*Over against Gilgal*,” i.e. not the southern *Gilgal* between Jericho and the Jordan, which received its name for the first time in *Josh.* iv. 20 and v. 9; but probably the *Gilgal* mentioned in *Josh.* ix. 6, x. 6 sqq., and very frequently in the history of Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha, which is only about twelve and a half miles from Gerizim in a southern direction, and has been preserved in the large village of *Jiljilia* to the south-west of Sinjal, and which stands in such an elevated position, “close to the western brow of the high mountain tract,” that you “have here a very extensive prospect over the great lower plain, and also over the sea, whilst the mountains of Gilead are seen in the east” (*Rob. Pal.* iii. 81). Judging from this description of the situation, Mount Gerizim must be visible from this *Gilgal*, so that Gerizim and Ebal might very well be described as over against

Gilgal.¹ The last definition, “*beside the terebinths of Moreh*,” is intended no doubt to call to mind the consecration of that locality even from the times of the patriarchs (*Schultz*: see at Gen. xii. 6, and xxxv. 4).—Vers. 31–2 contain the reason for these instructions, founded upon the assurance that the Israelites were going over the Jordan and would take possession of the promised land, and should therefore take care to keep the commandments of the Lord (cf. chap. iv. 5, 6).

B. EXPOSITION OF THE PRINCIPAL LAWS.—CHAP. XII.—XXVI.

The statutes and rights which follow in the second or special half of this address, and which consist in part of rules having regard to circumstances not contemplated by the Sinaitic laws, and partly of repetitions of laws already given, were designed as a whole to regulate the ecclesiastical, civil, and domestic life of Israel in the land of Canaan, in harmony with its calling to be the holy nation of the Lord. Moses first of all describes the religious and ecclesiastical life of the nation, in its various relations to the Lord (chap. xii.–xvi. 17); and then the political organization of the congregation, or the rights and duties of the civil and spiritual leaders of the nation (chap. xvi. 18–xviii. 22); and lastly, seeks to establish upon a permanent basis the civil and domestic well-being of the whole congregation and its individual members, by a multiplicity of precepts, intended to set before the people, as a conscientious obligation on their part, reverence and holy awe in relation to human life, to property, and to personal rights; a pious regard for the fundamental laws of the world; sanctification of domestic life and of the social bond; practical brotherly love towards the poor, the oppressed, and the needy; and righteousness of walk and conversation (chap. xix.–xxvi.).—So far as the arrangement of this address is concerned, the first two series of these laws may be easily regarded

¹ There is much less ground for the opinion of *Winer*, *Knobel*, and *Schultz*, that *Gilgal* is the *Jiljule* mentioned by *Robinson* (*Pal.* iii. 47; and *Bibl. Researches*, p. 138), which evidently corresponds to the *Galgula* placed by *Eusebius* and *Jerome* six Roman miles from *Antipatris*, and is situated to the south-east of *Kefr Saba* (*Antipatris*), on the road from Egypt to Damascus. For this place is not only farther from *Gerizim* and *Ebal*, viz. about seventeen miles, but from its position in the lowland by the sea-shore it presents no salient point for determining the situation of the mountains of *Gerizim* and *Ebal*. Still less can we agree with *Knobel*, who speaks of the village of *Kilkilia*, to the north-east of *Kefr Saba*, as the name itself has nothing in common with *Gilgal*.

as expositions, expansions, and completions of the commandments in the decalogue in relation to the Sabbath, and to the duty of honouring parents ; and in the third series also there are unquestionably many allusions to the commandments in the second table of the decalogue. But the order in which the different laws and precepts in this last series are arranged, does not follow the order of the decalogue, so as to warrant us in looking there for the leading principle of the arrangement, as *Schultz* has done. Moses allows himself to be guided much more by analogies and the free association of ideas than by any strict regard to the decalogue ; although, no doubt, the whole of the book of Deuteronomy may be described, as *Luther* says, as “ a very copious and lucid explanation of the decalogue, an acquaintance with which will supply all that is requisite to a full understanding of the ten commandments.”

The one Place for the Worship of God, and the right Mode of worshipping Him.—Chap. xii.

The laws relating to the worship of the Israelites commence with a command to destroy and annihilate all places and memorials of the Canaanitish worship (vers. 2-4), and then lay it down as an established rule, that the Israelites were to worship the Lord their God with sacrifices and gifts, only in the place which He Himself should choose (vers. 5-14). On the other hand, in the land of Canaan cattle might be slain for eating and the flesh itself be consumed in any place ; though sacrificial meals could only be celebrated in the place of the sanctuary appointed by the Lord (vers. 15-19). Moreover, on the extension of the borders of the land, oxen, and sheep, and goats could be slaughtered for food in any place ; but the blood was not to be eaten, and consecrated gifts and votive sacrifices were not to be prepared as meals anywhere, except at the altar of the Lord (vers. 20-28). Lastly, the Israelites were not to be drawn aside by the Canaanites, to imitate them in their worship (vers. 29-31).

Vers. 1-14. On the heading in ver. 1, see chaps. vi. 1 and iv. 1. “ *All the days that ye live*” relates to the more distant clause, “ which ye shall observe,” etc. (cf. chap. iv. 10).—Vers. 2, 3. Ye shall destroy all the places where the Canaanites worship their gods, upon the high mountains, upon the hills, and under every green tree (cf. Jer. ii. 20, iii. 6, xvii. 2 ; 2 Kings xvi. 4, xvii. 10). The choice of mountains and hills for places of worship by most of the heathen nations, had its origin in the wide-spread belief, that men were

nearer to the Deity and to heaven there. The green trees are connected with the holy groves, of which the heathen nations were so fond, and the shady gloom of which filled the soul with holy awe at the nearness of the Deity. In the absence of groves, they chose green trees with thick foliage (Ezek. vi. 13, xx. 28), such as the vigorous oak, which attains a great age, the evergreen terebinth (Isa. i. 29, 30, lvii. 5), and the poplar or osier, which continues green even in the heat of summer (Hos. iv. 13), and whose deep shade is adapted to dispose the mind to devotion.—Ver. 3. Beside the places of worship, they were also to destroy all the idols of the Canaanitish worship, as had already been commanded in chap. vii. 5, and to blot out even their names, *i.e.* every trace of their existence (cf. chap. vii. 24).—Ver. 4. “*Ye shall not do so to Jehovah your God,*” *i.e.* not build altars and offer sacrifices to Him in any place you choose, but (vers. 5 sqq.) shall only keep yourselves (**לֹא תַּעֲשֵׂה**) to the place “*which He shall choose out of all the tribes to put His name there for His dwelling.*” Whereas the heathen seeks and worships his nature-gods, wherever he thinks he can discern in nature any trace of Divinity, the true God has not only revealed His eternal power and Godhead in the works of creation, but His personal being, which unfolds itself to the world in love and holiness, in grace and righteousness, He has made known to man, who was created in His image, in the words and works of salvation; and in these testimonies of His saving presence He has fixed for Himself a name, in which He dwells among His people. This name presents His personality, as comprehended in the word *Jehovah*, in a visible sign, the tangible pledge of His essential presence. During the journeying of the Israelites this was effected by the pillar of cloud and fire; and after the erection of the tabernacle, by the cloud in the most holy place, above the ark of the covenant, with the cherubim upon it, in which Jehovah had promised to appear to the high priest as the representative of the covenant nation. Through this, the tabernacle, and afterwards Solomon’s temple, which took its place, became the dwelling-place of the name of the Lord. But if the knowledge of the true God rested upon direct manifestations of the divine nature,—and the Lord God had for that very reason made Himself known to His people in words and deeds as their God,—then as a matter of course the mode of His worship could not be dependent upon any appointment of men, but must be determined exclusively by God Himself. The place of His worship depended upon the choice which God Himself should make, and which would be made

known by the fact that He “put His name,” *i.e.* actually manifested His own immediate presence, in one definite spot. By the building of the tabernacle, which the Lord Himself prescribed as the true spot for the revelation of His presence among His people, the place where His name was to dwell among the Israelites was already so far determined, that only the particular town or locality among the tribes of Israel where the tabernacle was to be set up after the conquest of Canaan remained to be decided. At the same time, Moses not only speaks of the Lord choosing the place among all the tribes for the erection of His sanctuary, but also of His choosing the place where He would put His name, that He might dwell there (לְשָׁבֵן from שָׁבֵן, for שָׁבַן from שָׁבָן). For the presence of the Lord was not, and was not intended, to be exclusively confined to the tabernacle (or the temple). As God of the whole earth, wherever it might be necessary, for the preservation and promotion of His kingdom, He could make known His presence, and accept the sacrifices of His people in other places, independently of this sanctuary; and there were times when this was really done. The unity of the worship, therefore, which Moses here enjoined, was not to consist in the fact that the people of Israel brought all their sacrificial offerings to the tabernacle, but in their offering them only in the spot where the Lord made His name (that is to say, His presence) known.

What Moses commanded here, was only an explanation and more emphatic repetition of the divine command in Ex. xx. 23, 24 (21 and 22); and to understand “the place which Jehovah would choose” as relating exclusively to Jerusalem or the temple-hill, is a perfectly arbitrary assumption. Shiloh, the place where the tabernacle was set up after the conquest of the land (Josh. xviii. 1), and where it stood during the whole of the times of the judges, was also chosen by the Lord (cf. Jer. vii. 12). It was not till after David had set up a tent for the ark of the covenant upon Zion, in the city of Jerusalem, which he had chosen as the capital of his kingdom, and had erected an altar for sacrifice there (2 Sam. vi. 17; 1 Chron. xvi.), that the will of the Lord was made known to him by the prophet Gad, that he should build an altar upon the threshing-floor of Araunah, where the angel of the Lord had appeared to him; and through this command the place was fixed for the future temple (2 Sam. xxiv. 18; 1 Chron. xxi. 18). דָּרַשׁ with אֶל, to turn in a certain direction, to inquire or to seek. שָׁם אֲתִ-שְׁמֹן, “to put His name,” *i.e.* to make known His presence, is still further defined by the following word לְשָׁבֵן, as signifying that His presence was to be

of permanent duration. It is true that this word is separated by an *athnach* from the previous clause; but it certainly cannot be connected with the *הדרשוּ* (*ye shall seek*), not only because of the standing phrase, *שָׁמָן שְׁכִינַת שְׁמוֹ בָּהּ* (“*to cause His name to dwell there*,” ver. 11, chap. xiv. 23, xvi. 2, 6, etc.), but also because this connection would give no fitting sense, as the infinitive *בָּהּ* does not mean “*a dwelling-place*.”—Vers. 6, 7. Thither they were to take all their sacrificial gifts, and there they were to celebrate their sacrificial meals. The gifts are classified in four pairs: (1) the sacrifices intended for the altar, burnt-offerings and slain-offerings being particularly mentioned as the two principal kinds, with which, according to Num. xv. 4 sqq., meat-offerings and drink-offerings were to be associated; (2) “*your tithes and every heave-offering of your hand*.” By the tithes we are to understand the tithes of field-produce and cattle, commanded in Lev. xxvii. 30-33 and Num. xviii. 21-24, which were to be brought to the sanctuary because they were to be offered to the Lord, as was the case under Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxxi. 5-7). That the tithes mentioned here should be restricted to vegetable tithes (of corn, new wine, and oil), is neither allowed by the general character of the expression, nor required by the context. For instance, although, according to vers. 7 and 11, 12, as compared with ver. 17, a portion of the vegetable tithe was to be applied to the sacrificial meals, there is no ground whatever for supposing that all the sacrifices and consecrated gifts mentioned in ver. 6 were offerings of this kind, and either served as sacrificial meals, or had such meals connected with them. Burnt-offerings, for example, were not associated in any way with the sacrificial meals. The difficulty, or as some suppose “*the impossibility*,” of delivering all the tithes from every part of the land at the place of the sanctuary, does not warrant us in departing from the simple meaning of Moses’ words in the verse before us. The arrangement permitted in chap. xiv. 24, 25, with reference to the so-called second tithe,—viz. that if the sanctuary was too far off, the tithe might be sold at home, and whatever was required for the sacrificial meals might be bought at the place of the sanctuary with the money so obtained,—might possibly have been also adopted in the case of the other tithe. At all events, the fact that no reference is made to such cases as these does not warrant us in assuming the opposite. As the institution of tithes generally did not originate with the law of Moses, but is presupposed as a traditional and well-known custom,—all that is done being to define them more precisely, and regulate

the way in which they should be applied (cf. vol. ii. p. 485),—Moses does not enter here into any details as to the course to be adopted in delivering them, but merely lays down the law that all the gifts intended for the Lord were to be brought to Him at His sanctuary, and connects with this the further injunction that the Israelites were to rejoice there before the Lord, that is to say, were to celebrate their sacrificial meals at the place of His presence which He had chosen.—The gifts, from which the sacrificial meals were prepared, are not particularized here, but are supposed to be already known either from the earlier laws or from tradition. From the earlier laws we learn that the whole of the flesh of the burnt-offerings was to be consumed upon the altar, but that the flesh of the slain-offerings, except in the case of the peace-offerings, was to be applied to the sacrificial meals, with the exception of the fat pieces, and the wave-breast and heave-shoulder. With regard to the tithes, it is stated in Num. xviii. 21-24 that Jehovah had given them to the Levites as their inheritance, and that they were to give the tenth part of them to the priests. In the laws contained in the earlier books, nothing is said about the appropriation of any portion of the tithes to sacrificial meals. Yet in Deuteronomy this is simply assumed as a customary thing, and not introduced as a new commandment, when the law is laid down (in ver. 17, chap. xiv. 22 sqq., xxvi. 12 sqq.), that they were not to eat the tithe of corn, new wine, and oil within their gates (in the towns of the land), any more than the first-born of oxen and sheep, but only at the place of the sanctuary chosen by the Lord; and that if the distance was too great for the whole to be transported thither, they were to sell the tithes and firstlings at home, and then purchase at the sanctuary whatever might be required for the sacrificial meals. From these instructions it is very apparent that sacrificial meals were associated with the delivery of the tithes and firstlings to the Lord, to which a tenth part of the corn, must, and oil was applied, as well as the flesh of the first-born of edible cattle. This tenth formed the so-called second tithe (*δευτέραν δεκάτην*, Tob. i. 7), which is mentioned here for the first time, but not introduced as a new rule or an appendix to the former laws. It is rather taken for granted as a custom founded upon tradition, and brought into harmony with the law relating to the oneness of the sanctuary and worship.¹ “*The heave-offerings of your hand,*” which are mentioned

¹ The arguments employed by *De Wette* and *Vater* against this arrangement with regard to the vegetable tithe, which is established beyond all question by

again in Mal. iii. 8 along with the tithes, are not to be restricted to the first-fruits, as we may see from Ezek. xx. 40, where the *terumoth* are mentioned along with the first-fruits. We should rather understand them as being free gifts of love, which were consecrated to the Lord in addition to the legal first-fruits and tithes without being actual sacrifices, and which were then applied to sacrificial meals.—The other gifts were (3) נְדָבֹת and נְדָרִים, sacrifices which were offered partly in consequence of vows and partly of their own free will (see at Lev. xxiii. 38, compared with Lev. vii. 16, xxii. 21, and Num. xv. 3, xxix. 39); and lastly (4), “firstlings of your herds and of your flocks,” viz. those commanded in Ex. xiii. 2, 12 sqq., and Num. xviii. 15 sqq.

According to Ex. xiii. 15, the Israelites were to sacrifice the firstlings to the Lord; and according to Num. xviii. 8 sqq. they belonged to the holy gifts, which the Lord assigned to the priests for their maintenance, with the more precise instructions in vers. 17, 18, that the first-born of oxen, sheep, and goats were not to be redeemed, but being holy were to be burned upon the altar in the same manner as the *shelamim*, and that the flesh was to belong to the priests, like the wave-breast and right leg of the *shelamim*. These last words, it is true, are not to be understood as signifying that the only portions of the flesh of the firstlings which were to be given to the priest were the wave-breast and heave-leg, and that the remainder of the flesh was to be left to the offerer to be applied the custom of the Jews themselves, have been so fully met by *Hengstenberg* (*Dissertations*, ii. 334 sqq.), that *Riehm* has nothing to adduce in reply, except the assertion that in Deut. xviii., where the revenues of the priests and Levites are given, there is nothing said about the tithe, and the tithe of the tithe, and also that the people would have been overburdened by a second tithe. But, apart from the fact that *argumenta e silentio* generally do not prove much, the first assertion rests upon the erroneous assumption that in Deut. xviii. all the revenues of the priests are given separately; whereas Moses confines himself to this general summary of the revenues of the priests and Levites enumerated singly in Num. xviii., “The firings of Jehovah shall be the inheritance of the tribe of Levi, these they shall eat,” and then urges upon the people in vers. 3-5 an addition to the revenues already established. The second objection is refuted by history. For if in later times, when the people of Israel had to pay very considerable taxes to the foreign kings under whose rule they were living, they could give a second tenth of the fruits of the ground in addition to the priests’ tithe, as we may see from Tobit i. 7, such a tax could not have been too grievous a burden for the nation in the time of its independence; to say nothing of the fact that this second tenth belonged in great part to the donors themselves, since it was consumed in sacrificial meals, to which only poor and needy persons were invited, and therefore could not be regarded as an actual tax.

to a sacrificial meal (*Hengstenberg*) ; but they state most unequivocally that the priest was to apply the flesh to a sacrificial meal, like the wave-breast and heave-leg of all the peace-offerings, which the priest was not even allowed to consume with his own family at home, like ordinary flesh, but to which the instructions given for all the sacrificial meals were applicable, namely, that “whoever was clean in the priest’s family” might eat of it (Num. xviii. 11), and that the flesh was to be eaten on the day when the sacrifice was offered (Lev. vii. 15), or at the latest on the following morning, as in the case of the votive offering (Lev. vii. 16), and that whatever was left was to be burnt. These instructions concerning the flesh of the firstlings to be offered to the Lord no more prohibit the priest from allowing the persons who presented the firstlings to take part in the sacrificial meals, or handing over to them some portion of the flesh which belonged to himself to hold a sacrificial meal, than any other law does ; on the contrary, the duty of doing this was made very plain by the fact that the presentation of firstlings is described as בְּבָרֶךְ לִיהְיוֹן וּבְבָרֶךְ in Ex. xiii. 15, in the very first of the general instructions for their sanctification, since even in the patriarchal times the בְּבָרֶךְ was always connected with a sacrificial meal in which the offerer participated. Consequently it cannot be shown that there is any contradiction between Deuteronomy and the earlier laws with regard to the appropriation of the first-born. The command to bring the firstlings of the sacrificial animal, like all the rest of the sacrifices, to the place of His sanctuary which the Lord would choose, and to hold sacrificial meals there with the tithes of corn, new wine, and oil, and also with the firstlings of the flocks and herds, is given not merely to the laity of Israel, but to the whole of the people, including the priests and Levites, without the distinction between the tribe of Levi and the other tribes, established in the earlier laws, being even altered, much less abrogated. The Israelites were to bring all their sacrificial gifts to the place of the sanctuary to be chosen by the Lord, and there, not in all their towns, they were to eat their votive and free-will offerings in sacrificial meals. This, and only this, is what Moses commands the people both here in vers. 7 and 17, 18, and also in chap. xiv. 22 sqq. and xv. 19 sqq.¹ “Rejoice in all that your hand has acquired.”

¹ If, therefore, the supposed discrepancies between the law of Deuteronomy and that of Exodus and Leviticus concerning the tithes and firstlings vanish into mere appearance when the passages in Deuteronomy are correctly explained, the conclusions to which *Riehm* comes (pp. 43 sqq.)—viz. that in Deuteronomy

The phrase **מֵשֶׁלֶךְ יָד** (cf. ver. 18, chap. xv. 10, xxiii. 21, xxviii. 8, 20) signifies that to which the hand is stretched out, that which a man undertakes (synonymous with **נִשְׁעַנְתָּה**), and also what a man acquires by his activity: hence Isa. xi. 14, **מֵשֶׁלֶךְ יָד**, what a man appropriates to himself with his hand, or takes possession of. **אֲשֶׁר** before **בָּרְכָה** is dependent upon **מֵשֶׁלֶךְ יָדֶךָ**, and **בָּרָךְ** is construed with a double accusative, as in Gen. xl ix. 25. The reason for these instructions is given in vers. 8, 9, namely, that this had not hitherto taken place, but that up to this day every one had done what he thought right, because they had not yet come to the rest and to the inheritance which the Lord was about to give them. The phrase, "whatsoever is right in his own eyes," is applied to actions performed according to a man's own judgment, rather than according to the standard of objective right and the law of God (cf. Judg. xvii. 6, xxi. 25). The reference is probably not so much to open idolatry, which was actually practised, according to Lev. xvii. 7, Num. xxv., Ezek. xx. 16, 17, Amos v. 25, 26, as to acts of illegality, for which some excuse might be found in the circumstances in which they were placed when wandering through the desert,—such, for example, as the omission of the daily sacrifice when the tabernacle was not set up, and others of a similar kind.—Vers. 10-14. But when the Israelites had crossed over the Jordan, and dwelt peaceably in Canaan, secured against their enemies round about, these irregularities were not to occur any more; but all the sacrifices were to be offered at the place chosen by the Lord for the dwelling-place of His name, and there the sacrificial meals were to be held with joy before the Lord. "The choice of your vows," equivalent to your chosen vows, inasmuch as every vow was something special, as the standing phrase **נָדָר פְּלִימָנָה** (Lev. xxii. 21, and Num. xv. 3, 8) distinctly shows.—"Rejoicing before the Lord," which is the phrase applied in Lev. xxiii. 40 to the celebration of the feast of Tabernacles, was to be the distinctive feature of all the sacrificial meals held by the people at the sanctuary, as is repeatedly affirmed (chap. xiv. 26, xvi. 11, xxvi. 11, xxvii. 7). This holy joy in the participation of the blessing bestowed by the Lord was to be shared not only by sons and daughters, but also by slaves (men-

the tithes and firstlings are no longer the property of the priests and Levites, and that all the laws concerning the redemption and sale of them are abrogated there—are groundless assertions, founded upon the unproved and unfounded assumption, that Deuteronomy was intended to contain a repetition of the whole of the earlier law.

servants and maid-servants), that they too might taste the friendliness of their God, and also by “*the Levite that is in your gates*” (*i.e.* your towns and hamlets; see at Ex. xx. 10). This frequently recurring description of the Levites (cf. ver. 18, chap. xiv. 27, xvi. 11, 14, xviii. 6, xxvi. 12) does not assume that they were homeless, which would be at variance with the allotment of towns for them to dwell in (Num. xxxv.); but simply implies what is frequently added in explanation, that the Levites had “no part nor inheritance,” no share of the land as their hereditary property, and in this respect resembled strangers (chap. xiv. 21, 29, xvi. 11, etc.).¹ And the repeated injunction to invite the Levites to the sacrificial meals is not at variance with Num. xviii. 21, where the tithes are assigned to the tribe of Levi for their maintenance. For however ample this revenue may have been according to the law, it was so entirely dependent, as we have observed at p. 120, upon the honesty and conscientiousness of the people, that the Levites might very easily be brought into a straitened condition, if indifference towards the Lord and His servants should prevail throughout the nation.—In vers. 13, 14, Moses concludes by once more summing up these instructions in the admonition to beware of offering sacrifices in every place that they might choose, the burnt-offering, as the leading sacrifice, being mentioned *instar omnium*.

Vers. 15–19. But if these instructions were really to be observed by the people in Canaan, it was necessary that the law which had been given with reference to the journey through the wilderness, viz. that no animal should be slain anywhere else than at the tabernacle in the same manner as a slain-offering (Lev. xvii. 3–6), should be abolished. This is done in ver. 15, where Moses, in direct connection with what goes before, allows the people, as an exception (¶, only) to the rules laid down in vers. 4–14, to kill and eat flesh for their own food according to all their soul’s desire. Flesh that was slaughtered for food could be eaten by both clean and unclean, such for example as the roebuck and the hart, animals which could not be offered in sacrifice, and in which, therefore, the distinction between clean and unclean on the part of the eaters did not come into consideration at all.—Ver. 16. But blood was forbidden to be

¹ The explanation given by *De Wette*, and adopted by *Riehm*, of the expression, “*the Levite that is within thy gates*,” is perfectly arbitrary and unfounded: viz. that “*the Levites did not live any longer in the towns assigned them by the earlier laws, but were scattered about in the different towns of the other tribes.*”

eaten (see at Lev. xvii. 10 sqq.). The blood was to be poured out upon the earth like water, that it might suck it in, receive it into its bosom (see vol. ii. p. 410).—Vers. 17 sqq. Sacrificial meals could only be held at the sanctuary; and the Levite was not to be forgotten or neglected in connection with them (see at vers. 6, 7, and 12). **אַל תִּקְרֹב לְעֵדָה**, “thou must not,” as in chap. vii. 22.

Vers. 20-31. These rules were still to remain in force, even when God should extend the borders of the land in accordance with His promise. This extension relates partly to the gradual but complete extermination of the Canaanites (chap. vii. 22, comp. with Ex. xxiii. 27-33), and partly to the extension of the territory of the Israelites beyond the limits of Canaan Proper, in accordance with the divine promise in Gen. xv. 18. The words “as He hath spoken to thee” refer primarily to Ex. xxiii. 27-33. (On ver. 20b, see ver. 15.)—In ver. 21a, “if the place . . . be too far from thee,” supplies the reason for the repeal of the law in Lev. xvii. 3, which restricted all slaughtering to the place of the sanctuary. The words “kill . . . as I have commanded thee” refer back to ver. 15.—Ver. 22. Only the flesh that was slaughtered was to be eaten as the hart and the roebuck (cf. ver. 15), i.e. was not to be made into a sacrifice. **וְנַעֲמָן**, together, i.e. the one just the same as the other, as in Isa. x. 8, without the clean necessarily eating along with the unclean.—Vers. 23, 24. The law relating to the blood, as in ver. 16.—“Be strong not to eat the blood,” i.e. stedfastly resist the temptation to eat it.—Ver. 25. On the promise for doing what was right in the eyes of the Lord, see chap. vi. 18.—In vers. 26, 27, the command to offer all the holy gifts at the place chosen by the Lord is enforced once more, as in vers. 6, 11, 17, 18; also to prepare the sacrifices at His altar. **מִקְרָבֶים**, the holy offerings prescribed in the law, as in Num. xviii. 8; see at Lev. xxi. 22. The “votive offerings” are mentioned in connection with these, because vows proceeded from a spontaneous impulse. **לְפָנֵיךְ שְׁבָרִים**, “which are to thee,” are binding upon thee. In ver. 27, “the flesh and the blood” are in opposition to “thy burnt-offerings:” “thy burnt-offerings, namely the flesh and blood of them,” thou shalt prepare at the altar of Jehovah; i.e. the flesh and blood of the burnt-offerings were to be placed upon and against the altar (see at Lev. i. 5-9). Of the slain-offerings, i.e. the *shelamim*, the blood was to be poured out against the altar (Lev. iii. 2, 8, 13); “the flesh thou canst eat” (cf. Lev. vii. 11 sqq.). There is no ground for seeking an antithesis in **שְׁבָרִים**, as Knobel does, to the **מִקְרָבֶים** in the sacrificial ritual.

The indefinite expression may be explained from the retrospective allusion to ver. 24 and the purely suggestive character of the whole passage, the thing itself being supposed to be sufficiently known from the previous laws.—Ver. 28. The closing admonition is a further expansion of ver. 25 (see at ch. xi. 21).—In vers. 29–31, the exhortation goes back to the beginning again, viz. to a warning against the Canaanitish idolatry (cf. vers. 2 sqq.). When the Lord had cut off the nations of Canaan from before the Israelites, they were to take heed that they did not get into the snare behind them, *i.e.* into the sin of idolatry, which had plunged the Canaanites into destruction (cf. chap. vii. 16, 25). The clause “*after they be destroyed from before thee*” is not mere tautology, but serves to depict the danger of the snare most vividly before their eyes. The second clause, “*that thou inquire not after them*” (their gods), etc., explains more fully to the Israelites the danger which threatened them. This danger was so far a pressing one, that the whole of the heathen world was animated with the conviction, that to neglect the gods of a land would be sure to bring misfortune (cf. 2 Kings xvii. 26).—Ver. 31a, like ver. 4, with the reason assigned in ver. 31b: “for the Canaanites prepare (*תַּשׁׁוּ*, as in ver. 27) all kinds of abominations for their gods,” *i.e.* present offerings to these, which Jehovah hates and abhors; they even burn their children to their idols—for example, to Moloch (see at Lev. xviii. 21).

Punishment of Idolaters, and Tempters to Idolatry.—Chap. xiii.

Ver. 1. (chap. xii. 32). The admonition to observe the whole law, without adding to it or taking from it (cf. chap. iv. 2), is regarded by many commentators as the conclusion of the previous chapter. But it is more correct to understand it as an intermediate link, closing what goes before, and introductory to what follows. Strictly speaking, the warning against inclining to the idolatry of the Canaanites (chap. xii. 29–31) forms a transition from the enforcement of the true mode of worshipping Jehovah to the laws relating to tempters to idolatry and worshippers of idols (chap. xiii.). The Israelites were to cut off not only the tempters to idolatry, but those who had been led astray to idolatry also. Three different cases are mentioned.

Vers. 2–6 (1–5). The *first* case. If a prophet, or one who had dreams, should rise up to summon to the worship of other gods, with signs and wonders which came to pass, the Israelites were not to hearken to his words, but to put him to death. The introduction

of חֲלֹם חָלָם, “*a dreamer of dreams*,” along with the prophet, answers to the two media of divine revelation, the vision and the dream, by which, according to Num. xii. 6, God made known His will. With regard to the signs and wonders (*mopheth*, see at Ex. iv. 21) with which such a prophet might seek to accredit his higher mission, it is taken for granted that they come to pass (*בָּאֵן*) ; yet for all that, the Israelites were to give no heed to such a prophet, to walk after other gods. It follows from this, that the person had not been sent by God, but was a false prophet, and that the signs and wonders which he gave were not wonders effected by God, but σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ψεύδοντος (“lying signs and wonders,” 2 Thess. ii. 9) ; i.e. not merely seeming miracles, but miracles wrought in the power of the wicked one, Satan, the possibility and reality of which even Christ attests (Matt. xxiv. 24).—The word אמר, *saying*, is dependent upon the principal verb of the sentence : “if a prophet rise up saying, We will go after other gods.”—Ver. 4. God permitted false prophets to rise up with such wonders, to try the Israelites, whether they loved Him, the Lord their God, with all their heart. (נִפְתַּח as in Gen. xxii. 1.) הַיְשַׁבְתֶּם אֶתְכֶם, whether ye are loving, i.e. faithfully maintain your love to the Lord. It is evident from this, “that however great the importance attached to signs and wonders, they were not to be regarded among the Israelites, either as the highest test, or as absolutely decisive, but that there was a certainty in Israel, which was so much the more certain and firm than any proof from miracles could be, that it might be most decidedly opposed to it” (*Baumgarten*). This certainty, however, was not “the knowledge of Jehovah,” as *B.* supposes ; but as *Luther* correctly observes, “the word of God, which had already been received, and confirmed by its own signs,” and which the Israelites were to preserve and hold fast, without adding or subtracting anything. “In opposition to such a word, no prophets were to be received, although they rained signs and wonders ; not even an angel from heaven, as Paul says in Gal. i. 8.” The command to hearken to the prophets whom the Lord would send at a future time (chap. xviii. 18 sqq.), is not at variance with this : for even their announcements were to be judged according to the standard of the fixed word of God that had been already given ; and so far as they proclaimed anything new, the fact that what they announced did not occur was to be the criterion that they had not spoken in the name of the Lord, but in that of other gods (chap. xviii. 21, 22), so that even there the signs and wonders of the prophets are not made the criteria of their divine

mission.—Vers. 5, 6. Israel was to adhere firmly to the Lord its God (cf. chap. iv. 4), and to put to death the prophet who preached apostasy from Jehovah, the Redeemer of Israel out of the slave-house of Egypt. לְחַדֵּךְ, “to force thee from the way in which Jehovah hath commanded thee to walk.” The execution of seducers to idolatry is enjoined upon the *people*, i.e. the whole community, not upon single individuals, but upon the authorities who had to maintain and administer justice. “*So shalt thou put the evil away from the midst of thee.*” הַרְעָם is neuter, as we may see from chap. xvii. 7, as comp. with ver. 2. The formula, “so shalt thou put the evil away from the midst of thee,” which occurs again in chap. xvii. 7, 12, xix. 19, xxi. 21, xxii. 21, 22, 24, and xxiv. 7 (cf. chap. xix. 13 and xxi. 9), belongs to the hortatory character of Deuteronomy, in accordance with which a reason is given for all the commandments, and the observance of them is urged upon the congregation as a holy affair of the heart, which could not be expected in the objective legislation of the earlier books.

Vers. 7-12 (6-11). The *second* case was when the temptation to idolatry proceeded from the nearest blood-relations and friends. The clause, “son of thy mother,” is not intended to describe the brother as a step-brother, but simply to bring out the closeness of the fraternal relation; like the description of the wife as the wife of thy bosom, who lies in thy bosom, rests upon thy breast (as in chap. xxviii. 54; Micah vii. 5), and of the friend as “thy friend which is as thine own soul,” i.e. whom thou lovest as much as thy life (cf. 1 Sam. xviii. 1, 3). בְּבִנְתֶּךְ belongs to יְהֹוָה: if the temptation occurred in secret, and therefore the fact might be hidden from others. The power of love and relationship, which flesh and blood find it hard to resist, is placed here in contrast with the supposed higher or divine authority of the seducers. As the persuasion was already very seductive, from the fact that it proceeded from the nearest blood-relations and most intimate friends, and was offered in secret, it might become still more so from the fact that it recommended the worship of a deity that had nothing in common with the forbidden idols of Canaan, and the worship of which, therefore, might appear of less consequence, or commend itself by the charm of peculiarity and novelty. To prevent this deceptive influence of sin, it is expressly added in ver. 8 (7), “*of the gods nigh unto thee or far off from thee, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth,*” i.e. whatever gods there might be upon the whole circuit of the earth.—Vers. 9 (8) sqq. To such persuasion Israel was not to

yield, nor were they to spare the tempters. The accumulation of synonyms (pity, spare, conceal) serves to make the passage more emphatic. **נִטְבָּה**, to cover, *i.e.* to keep secret, conceal. They were to put him to death without pity, viz. to stone him (cf. Lev. xx. 2). That the execution even in this case was to be carried out by the regular authorities, is evident from the words, “thy hand shall be first against him to put him to death, and the hand of all the people afterwards,” which presuppose the judicial procedure prescribed in chap. xvii. 7, that the witnesses were to cast the first stones at the person condemned.—Ver. 12. This was to be done, and all Israel was to hear it and fear, that no such wickedness should be performed any more in the congregation. The fear of punishment, which is given here as the ultimate end of the punishment itself, is not to be regarded as the principle lying at the foundation of the law, but simply, as *Calvin* expresses it, as “the utility and fruit of severity,” one reason for carrying out the law, which is not to be confounded with the so-called deterrent theory, *i.e.* the attempt to deter from crime by the mode of punishing (see my *Archäologie*, ii. p. 262).

Vers. 13-19 (12-18). The *third* case is that of a town that had been led away to idolatry. “*If thou shalt hear in one of thy cities*” **בְּאֶחָת**, not *de una*, of one, which **עַמֵּשׁ** with **בְּ** never can mean, and does not mean even in Job xxvi. 14. The thought is not that they would hear in one city about another, as though one city had the oversight over another; but there is an inversion in the sentence, “*if thou hear, that in one of thy cities . . . worthless men have risen up, and led the inhabitants astray to serve strange gods.*” **לֹא** introduces the substance of what is heard, which follows in ver. 14. **אָז**, merely signifies to rise up, to go forth. **מִקְרָבֶךָ**, out of the midst of the people.—Ver. 15 (14). Upon this report the people as a whole, of course through their rulers, were to examine closely into the affair (**הַיְצָבֵב**, an adverb, as in chap. ix. 21), whether the word was established as truth, *i.e.* the thing was founded in truth (cf. chap. xvii. 4, xxii. 20); and if it really were so, they were to smite the inhabitants of that town with the edge of the sword (cf. Gen. xxxiv. 26), putting the town and all that was in it under the ban. “*All that is in it*” relates to men, cattle, and the material property of the town, and not to men alone (*Schultz*). The clause from “destroying” to “therein” is a more minute definition of the punishment introduced as a parenthesis; for “the cattle thereof,” which follows, is also governed by “thou shalt smite.” The ban was to be executed in all its severity as upon an idolatrous city: man and beast were to be

put to death without reserve ; and its booty, *i.e.* whatever was to be found in it as booty—all material goods, therefore—were to be heaped together in the market, and burned along with the city itself. בָּלְלַת לִיהוָה (*Eng. Ver.* “every whit, for the Lord thy God”) signifies “*as a whole offering for the Lord*” (see Lev. vi. 15, 16), *i.e.* it was to be sanctified to Him entirely by being destroyed. The town was to continue an eternal hill (or heap of ruins), never to be built up again.—Ver. 18 (17). To enforce this command still more strongly, it is expressly stated, that of all that was burned, nothing whatever was to cleave or remain hanging to the hand of Israel, that the Lord might turn from His wrath and have compassion upon the nation, *i.e.* not punish the sin of one town upon the nation as a whole, but have mercy upon it and multiply it,—make up the diminution consequent upon the destruction of the inhabitants of that town, and so fulfil the promise given to the fathers of the multiplication of their seed.—Ver. 19 (18). Jehovah would do this if Israel hearkened to His voice, to do what was right in His eyes. In what way the appropriation of property laid under the ban brought the wrath of God upon the whole congregation, is shown by the example of Achan (Josh. vii.).

Avoidance of the Mourning Customs of the Heathen, and Unclean Food. Application of the Tithe of Fruits.—Chap. xiv.

Vers. 1–21. The Israelites were not only to suffer no idolatry to rise up in their midst, but in all their walk of life to show themselves as a holy nation of the Lord ; and neither to disfigure their bodies by passionate expressions of sorrow for the dead (vers. 1 and 2), nor to defile themselves by unclean food (vers. 3–21). Both of these were opposed to their calling. To bring this to their mind, Moses introduces the laws which follow with the words, “ye are children to the Lord your God.” The divine sonship of Israel was founded upon its election and calling as the holy nation of Jehovah, which is regarded in the Old Testament not as generation by the Spirit of God, but simply as an adoption springing out of the free love of God, as the manifestation of paternal love on the part of Jehovah to Israel, which binds the son to obedience, reverence, and childlike trust towards a Creator and Father, who would train it up into a holy people (see vol. i. p. 457). The laws in ver. 1b are simply a repetition of Lev. xix. 28 and xxi. 5. נֶפֶת, with reference to, or on account of, a dead person, is more expressive than נֶפֶשׁ (for a soul) in Lev. xix. 28. The reason assigned for this command in ver. 2 (as in chap. vii. 6) is simply an emphatic elucidation of the

tion of the first clause of ver. 1. (On the substance of the verse, see Ex. xix. 5, 6.) — Vers. 3-20. With reference to food, the Israelites were to eat nothing whatever that was abominable. In explanation of this prohibition, the laws of Lev. xi. relating to clean and unclean animals are repeated in all essential points in vers. 4-20 (for the exposition, see at Lev. xi.); also in ver. 21 the prohibition against eating any animal that had fallen down dead (as in Ex. xxxii. 30 and Lev. xvii. 15), and against boiling a kid in its mother's milk (as in Ex. xxiii. 19).

Vers. 22-29. As the Israelites were to sanctify their food, on the one hand, positively by abstinence from everything unclean, so were they, on the other hand, to do so negatively by delivering the tithes and firstlings at the place where the Lord would cause His name to dwell, and by holding festal meals on the occasion, and rejoicing there before Jehovah their God. This law is introduced with the general precept, “*Thou shalt tithe all the produce of thy seed which groweth out of the field* (**נָתַן** construes with an accusative, as in Gen. ix. 10, etc.) *year by year*” (**בָּשָׂר בָּשָׂר**, i.e. every year; cf. Ewald, § 313, a.), which recalls the earlier laws concerning the tithe (Lev. xxvii. 30, and Num. xviii. 21, 26 sqq.), without repeating them one by one, for the purpose of linking on the injunction to celebrate sacrificial meals at the sanctuary from the tithes and firstlings. Moses had already directed (chap. xii. 6 sqq.) that all the sacrificial meals should take place at the sanctuary, and had then alluded to the sacrificial meals to be prepared from the tithes, though only casually, because he intended to speak of them more fully afterwards. This he does here, and includes the firstlings also, inasmuch as the presentation of them was generally associated with that of the tithes, though only casually, as he intends to revert to the firstlings again, which he does in chap. xv. 19 sqq. The connection between the tithes of the fruits of the ground and the firstlings of the cattle which were devoted to the sacrificial meals, and the tithes and first-fruits which were to be delivered to the Levites and priests, we have already discussed at chap. xii. (p. 356). The sacrificial meals were to be held before the Lord, in the place where He caused His name to dwell (see at chap. xii. 5), that Israel might learn to fear Jehovah its God always; not, however, as Schultz supposes, that by the confession of its dependence upon Him it might accustom itself more and more to the feeling of dependence. For the fear of the Lord is not merely a feeling of dependence upon Him, but also includes the notion of divine

blessedness, which is the predominant idea here, as the sacrificial meals were to furnish the occasion and object of the rejoicing before the Lord. The true meaning therefore is, that Israel might rejoice with holy reverence in the fellowship of its God.—Vers. 24 sqq. In the land of Canaan, however, where the people would be scattered over a great extent of country, there would be many for whom the fulfilment of this command would be very difficult—would, in fact, appear almost impossible. To meet this difficulty, permission was given for those who lived at a great distance from the sanctuary to sell the tithes at home, provided they could not convey them in kind, and then to spend the money so obtained in the purchase of the things required for the sacrificial meals at the place of the sanctuary. פִּי יְרֵבָה מִפְּקָד, “if the way be too great (too far) for thee,” etc., sc. for the delivery of the tithe. The parenthetical clause, “if Jehovah thy God shall bless thee,” hardly means “if He shall extend thy territory” (*Knobel*), but if He shall bless thee by plentiful produce from the field and the cattle.—Ver. 25. “Turn it into money,” lit. “give it up for silver,” sc. the produce of the tithe; “and bind the silver in thy hand,” *const. prægnans* for “bind it in a purse and take it in thy hand and give the silver for all that thy soul desireth, for oxen and small cattle, for wine and strong drink,” to hold a joyous meal, to which the Levite was also to be invited (as in chap. xii. 12, 18, and 19).—Vers. 28 and 29. Every third year, on the other hand, they were to separate the whole of the tithe from the year’s produce (“bring forth,” sc. from the granary), and leave it in their gates (*i.e.* their towns), and feed the Levites, the strangers, and the widows and orphans with it. They were not to take it to the sanctuary, therefore; but according to chap. xxvi. 12 sqq., after bringing it out, were to make confession to the Lord of what they had done, and pray for His blessing. “At the end of three years:” *i.e.* when the third year, namely the civil year, which closed with the harvest (see at Ex. xxiii. 16), had come to an end. This regulation as to the time was founded upon the observance of the sabbatical year, as we may see from chap. xv. 1, where the seventh year is no other than the sabbatical year. Twice, therefore, within the period of a sabbatical year, namely in the third and sixth years, the tithe set apart for a sacrificial meal was not to be eaten at the sanctuary, but to be used in the different towns of the land in providing festal meals for those who had no possessions, viz. the Levites, strangers, widows, and orphans. Consequently this tithe cannot properly be

called the “third tithe,” as it is by many of the Rabbins, but rather the “poor tithe,” as it was simply in the way of applying it that it differed from the “second” (see Hottinger, *de decimis, exerc.* viii. pp. 182 sqq., and my *Archäol.* i. p. 339). As an encouragement to carry out these instructions, Moses closes in ver. 29 with an allusion to the divine blessing which would follow their observance.

On the Year of Release, the Emancipation of Hebrew Slaves, and the Sanctification of the First-born of Cattle.—Chap. xv.

Vers. 1-11. ON THE YEAR OF RELEASE.—The first two regulations in this chapter, viz. vers. 1-11 and 12-18, follow simply upon the law concerning the poor tithe in chap. xiv. 28, 29. The Israelites were not only to cause those who had no possessions (Levites, strangers, widows, and orphans) to refresh themselves with the produce of their inheritance, but they were not to force and oppress the poor. Debtors especially were not to be deprived of the blessings of the sabbatical year (vers. 1-6). “*At the end of seven years thou shalt make a release.*” The expression, “at the end of seven years,” is to be understood in the same way as the corresponding phrase, “at the end of three years,” in chap. xiv. 28. The end of seven years, *i.e.* of the seven years’ cycle formed by the sabbatical year, is mentioned as the time when debts that had been contracted were usually wiped off or demanded, after the year’s harvest had been gathered in (cf. chap. xxxi. 10, according to which the feast of Tabernacles occurred at the end of the year). **נָשַׂטֵּךְ**, from **נָשַׂטֵּה**, to let lie, to let go (cf. Ex. xxiii. 11), does not signify a remission of the debt, the relinquishing of all claim for payment, as Philo and the Talmudists affirm, but simply lengthening the term, not pressing for payment. This is the explanation in ver. 2: “*This is the manner of the release*” (*shemittah*): cf. chap. xix. 4; 1 Kings ix. 15. “*Every owner of a loan of his hand shall release (leave) what he has lent to his neighbour; he shall not press his neighbour, and indeed his brother; for they have proclaimed release for Jehovah.*” As **נָשַׂטֵּךְ** (release) points unmistakeably back to Ex. xxiii. 11, it must be interpreted in the same manner here as there. And as it is not used there to denote the entire renunciation of a field or possession, so here it cannot mean the entire renunciation of what had been lent, but simply leaving it, *i.e.* not pressing for it during the seventh year. This is favoured by what follows, “*thou shalt not press thy neighbour,*” which simply forbids an unreserved demand, but does not require that the debt should be remitted or presented to the

debtor (see also *Bähr, Symbolik*, ii. pp. 570–1). “The loan of the hand :” what the hand has lent to another. “The master of the loan of the hand :” i.e. the owner of a loan, the lender. “His brother” defines with greater precision the idea of “a neighbour.” Calling a release, presupposes that the sabbatical year was publicly proclaimed, like the year of jubilee (Lev. xxv. 9). נָשָׁר is impersonal (“they call”), as in Gen. xi. 9 and xvi. 14. “*For Jehovah :*” i.e. in honour of Jehovah, sanctified to Him, as in Ex. xii. 42.—This law points back to the institution of the sabbatical year in Ex. xxiii. 10, Lev. xxv. 2–7, though it is not to be regarded as an appendix to the law of the sabbatical year, or an expansion of it, but simply as an exposition of what was already implied in the main provision of that law, viz. that the cultivation of the land should be suspended in the sabbatical year. If no harvest was gathered in, and even such produce as had grown without sowing was to be left to the poor and the beasts of the field, the landowner could have no income from which to pay his debts. The fact that the “*sabbatical year*” is not expressly mentioned, may be accounted for on the ground, that even in the principal law itself this name does not occur; and it is simply commanded that every seventh year there was to be a sabbath of rest to the land (Lev. xxv. 4). In the subsequent passages in which it is referred to (ver. 9 and chap. xxxi. 10), it is still not called a sabbatical year, but simply the “year of release,” and that not merely with reference to debtors, but also with reference to the release (*shemittah*) to be allowed to the field (Ex. xxiii. 11).—Ver. 3. The foreigner thou mayest press, but what thou hast with thy brother shall thy hand let go. נַכְרִי is a stranger of another nation, standing in no inward relation to Israel at all, and is to be distinguished from גֵּדֹלֶת, the foreigner who lived among the Israelites, who had a claim upon their protection and pity. This rule breathes no hatred of foreigners, but simply allows the Israelites the right of every creditor to demand his debts, and enforce the demand upon foreigners, even in the sabbatical year. There was no severity in this, because foreigners could get their ordinary income in the seventh year as well as in any other.—Ver. 4. “*Only that there shall be no poor with thee.*” יְהִי is jussive, like the foregoing imperfects. The meaning in this connection is, “Thou needest not to remit a debt to foreigners in the seventh year; thou hast only to take care that there is no poor man with or among thee, that thou dost not cause or increase their poverty, by oppressing the brethren who have borrowed of thee.” Understood in this way, the sentence

is not at all at variance with ver. 11, where it is stated that the poor would never cease out of the land. The following clause, “for Jehovah will bless thee,” etc., gives a reason for the main thought, that they were not to press the Israelitish debtor. The creditor, therefore, had no need to fear that he would suffer want, if he refrained from exacting his debt from his brother in the seventh year.—Vers. 5, 6. This blessing would not fail, if the Israelites would only hearken to the voice of the Lord; “*for Jehovah blesseth thee*” (by the perfect בָרַךְ, the blessing is represented not as a possible and future one only, but as one already bestowed according to the counsel of God, and, so far as the commencement was concerned, already fulfilled), “*as He hath spoken*” (see at chap. i. 11). “*And thou wilt lend on pledge to many nations, but thou thyself wilt not borrow upon pledge.*” עֲבֹת, a denom. verb, from עַבֵּת, a pledge, signifies in *Kal* to give a pledge for the purpose of borrowing; in *Hiphil*, to cause a person to give a pledge, or furnish occasion for giving a pledge, *i.e.* to lend upon pledge. “*And thou wilt rule over many nations,*” etc. Ruling is mentioned here as the result of superiority in wealth (cf. chap. xxviii. 1: *Schultz*).—Vers. 7-11. And in general Israel was to be ready to lend to the poor among its brethren, not to harden its heart, to be hard-hearted, but to lend to the poor brother מִחְטָה יְהוָה, “the sufficiency of his need,” whatever he might need to relieve his wants.—Vers. 9, 10. Thus they were also to beware “*that there was not a word in the heart, worthlessness,*” *i.e.* that a worthless thought did not arise in their hearts (כְלִילָה is the predicate of the sentence, as the more precise definition of the word that was in the heart); so that one should say, “*The seventh year is at hand, the year of release,*” sc. when I shall not be able to demand what I have lent, and “*that thine eye be evil towards thy poor brother,*” *i.e.* that thou cherishest ill-will towards him (cf. chap. xxviii. 54, 56), “*and givest him not, and he appeals to Jehovah against thee, and it becomes sin to thee,*” sc. which brings down upon thee the wrath of God.—Ver. 10. Thou shalt give him, and thy heart shall not become evil, *i.e.* discontented thereat (cf. 2 Cor. ix. 7), for Jehovah will bless thee for it (cf. Prov. xxii. 9, xxviii. 27; Ps. xli. 2; Matt. vi. 4).—Ver. 11. For the poor will never cease in the land, even the land that is richly blessed, because poverty is not only the penalty of sin, but is ordained by God for punishment and discipline.

Vers. 12-18. These provisions in favour of the poor are followed very naturally by the rules which the Israelites were to be urged to observe with reference to the *manumission of Hebrew*

slaves. It is not the reference to the sabbatical year in the foregoing precepts which forms the introduction to the laws which follow respecting the manumission of Hebrews who had become slaves, but the poverty and want which compelled Hebrew men and women to sell themselves as slaves. The seventh year, in which they were to be set free, is not the same as the sabbatical year, therefore, but the seventh year of bondage. Manumission in the seventh year of service had already been commanded in Ex. xxi. 2-6, in the rights laid down for the nation, with special reference to the conclusion of the covenant. This command is not repeated here for the purpose of extending the law to Hebrew women, who are not expressly mentioned in Ex. xxi.; for that would follow as a matter of course, in the case of a law which was quite as applicable to women as to men, and was given without any reserve to the whole congregation. It is rather repeated here as a law which already existed as a right, for the purpose of explaining the true mode of fulfilling it, viz. that it was not sufficient to give a man-servant and maid-servant their liberty after six years of service, which would not be sufficient relief to those who had been obliged to enter into slavery on account of poverty, if they had nothing with which to set up a home of their own; but love to the poor was required to do more than this, namely, to make some provision for the continued prosperity of those who were set at liberty. "*If thou let him go free from thee, thou shalt not let him go (send him away) empty:*" this was the new feature which Moses added here to the previous law. "*Thou shalt load (פִּזְבַּח, lit. put upon the neck) of thy flock, and of thy floor (corn), and of thy press (oil and wine); wherewith thy God hath blessed thee, of that thou shalt give to him.*"—Ver. 15. They were to be induced to do this by the recollection of their own redemption out of the bondage of Egypt,—the same motive that is urged for the laws and exhortations enjoining compassion towards foreigners, servants, maids, widows, orphans, and the poor, not only in chap. v. 15, x. 19, xvi. 12, xxiv. 18, 22, but also in Ex. xxii. 20, xxiii. 9, and Lev. xix. 34.—Vers. 16, 17. But if the man-servant and the maid-servant should not wish for liberty in the sixth year, because it was well with them in the house of their master, they were not to be compelled to go, but were to be bound to eternal, i.e. lifelong bondage, in the manner prescribed in Ex. xxi. 5, 6.¹ This is repeated from

¹ Knobel's assertion, that the judicial process enjoined in Ex. xxi. 6 does not seem to have been usual in the author's own time, is a worthless *argumentum e silentio*.

Ex. xxi., to guard against such an application of the law as might be really cruelty under the circumstances rather than love. Manumission was only an act of love, when the person to be set free had some hope of success and of getting a living for himself; and where there was no such prospect, compelling him to accept of freedom might be equivalent to thrusting him away.—Ver. 18. If, on the other hand, the servant (or maid) wished to be set free, the master was not to think it hard; “*for the double of the wages of a day-labourer he has earned for thee for six years,*” i.e. not “twice the time of a day-labourer, so that he had really deserved twice the wages” (*Vatablius, Ad. Osiander, J. Gerhard*), for it cannot be proved from Isa. xvi. 14, that a day-labourer generally hired himself out for three years; nor yet, “he has been obliged to work much harder than a day-labourer, very often by night as well as day” (*Clericus, J. H. Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Baumgarten*); but simply, “he has earned and produced so much, that if you had been obliged to keep a day-labourer in his place, it would have cost you twice as much” (*Schultz, Knobel*).

Vers. 19-23. APPLICATION OF THE FIRST-BORN OF CATTLE.

—From the laws respecting the poor and slaves, to which the instructions concerning the tithes (chap. xiv. 22-29) had given occasion, Moses returns to appropriation of the first-born of the herd and flock to sacrificial meals, which he had already touched upon in chap. xii. 6, 17, and xiv. 23, and concludes by an explanation upon this point. The command, which the Lord had given when first they came out of Egypt (Ex. xiii. 2, 12), that all the first-born of the herd and flock should be sanctified to Him, is repeated here by Moses, with the express injunction that they were not to work with the first-born of cattle (by yoking them to the plough or waggon), and not to shear the first-born of sheep; that is to say, they were not to use the first-born animals which were sanctified to the Lord for their own earthly purposes, but to offer them year by year as sacrifices to the Lord, and consume them in sacrificial meals, in the manner explained at p. 357. To this he adds (vers. 21, 22) the further provision, that first-born animals, which were blind or lame, or had any other bad fault, were not to be offered in sacrifice to the Lord, but, like ordinary animals used for food, could be eaten in all the towns of the land. Although the first part of this law was involved in the general laws as to the kind of animal that could be offered in sacrifice (Lev. xxii. 19 sqq.), it was by no means unim-

portant to point out distinctly their applicability to the first-born, and add some instructions with regard to the way in which they were to be applied. (On vers. 22 and 23, see chap. xii. 15 and 16.)

On the Celebration of the Feasts of Passover, of Pentecost, and of Tabernacles.—Chap. xvi. 1–17.

The annual feasts appointed by the law were to be celebrated, like the sacrificial meals, at the place which the Lord would choose for the revelation of His name; and there Israel was to rejoice before the Lord with the presentation of sacrifices. From this point of view Moses discusses the feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, assuming the laws previously given concerning these festivals (Ex. xii., Lev. xxiii., and Num. xxviii. and xxix.) as already known, and simply repeating those points which related to the sacrificial meals held at these festivals. This serves to explain the reason why only those three festivals are mentioned, at which Israel had already been commanded to appear before the Lord in Ex. xxiii. 14–17, and xxxiv. 18, 24, 25, and not the feast of trumpets or day of atonement: viz. because the people were not required to assemble at the sanctuary out of the whole land on the occasion of these two festivals.¹

Vers. 1–8. Israel was to make ready the Passover to the Lord in the earing month (see at Ex. xii. 2). The precise day is supposed to be known from Ex. xii., as in Ex. xxiii. 15. **חֲזַבְתָּה שְׁנִי** (*to prepare the Passover*), which is used primarily to denote the preparation of the paschal lamb for a festal meal, is employed here in a wider signification, viz. “*to keep the Passover*.” At this feast they were to slay sheep and oxen to the Lord for a Passover, at the place, etc. In ver. 2, as in ver. 1, the word “Passover” is employed in a broader sense, and includes not only the paschal lamb, but the paschal sacrifices generally, which the Rabbins embrace under the

¹ That the assembling of the people at the central sanctuary is the leading point of view under which the feasts are regarded here, has been already pointed out by *Bachmann* (*die Feste*, p. 143), who has called attention to the fact that “the place which Jehovah thy God will choose” occurs six times (vers. 2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16); and “before the face of Jehovah” three times (vers. 11 and 16 twice); and that the celebration of the feast at any other place is expressly declared to be null and void. At the same time, he has once more thoroughly exploded the contradictions which are said to exist between this chapter and the earlier festal laws, and which *Hupfeld* has revived in his comments upon the feasts, without troubling himself to notice the careful discussion of the subject by *Hävernick* in his Introduction, and *Hengstenberg* in his Dissertations.

common name of *chagiga*; not the burnt-offerings and sin-offerings, however, prescribed in Num. xxviii. 19-26, but all the sacrifices that were slain at the feast of the Passover (*i.e.* during the seven days of the *Mazzoth*, which are included under the name of *pascha*) for the purpose of holding sacrificial meals. This is evident from the expression “*of the flock and the herd;*” as it was expressly laid down, that only a *נְבָשׂ*, *i.e.* a yearling animal of the sheep or goats, was to be slain for the paschal meal on the fourteenth of the month in the evening, and an ox was never slaughtered in the place of the lamb. But if any doubt could exist upon this point, it would be completely set aside by ver. 3: “*Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it: seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith.*” As the word “*therewith*” cannot possibly refer to anything else than the “Passover” in ver. 2, it is distinctly stated that the slaughtering and eating of the Passover was to last seven days, whereas the Passover lamb was to be slain and consumed in the evening of the fourteenth Abib (Ex. xii. 10). Moses called the unleavened bread “*the bread of affliction,*” because the Israelites had to leave Egypt in anxious flight (Ex. xii. 11) and were therefore unable to leaven the dough (Ex. xii. 39), for the purpose of reminding the congregation of the oppression endured in Egypt, and to stir them up to gratitude towards the Lord their deliverer, that they might remember that day as long as they lived. (On the meaning of the *Mazzoth*, see at Ex. xii. 8 and 15.)—On account of the importance of the unleavened bread as a symbolical shadowing forth of the significance of the Passover, as the feast of the renewal and sanctification of the life of Israel (see vol. ii. p. 21), Moses repeats in ver. 4 two of the points in the law of the feast: first of all the one laid down in Ex. xiii. 7, that no leaven was to be seen in the land during the seven days; and secondly, the one in Ex. xxiii. 18 and xxxiv. 25, that none of the flesh of the paschal lamb was to be left till the next morning, in order that all corruption might be kept at a distance from the paschal food. Leaven, for example, sets the dough in fermentation, from which putrefaction ensues (see vol. ii. p. 15); and in the East, if flesh is kept, it very quickly decomposes. He then once more fixes the time and place for keeping the Passover (the former according to Ex. xii. 6 and Lev. xxiii. 5, etc.), and adds in ver. 7 the express regulation, that not only the slaughtering and sacrificing, but the roasting (see at Ex. xii. 9) and eating of the paschal lamb were to take place at the sanctuary, and that the next morning they could turn and go back home.

This rule contains a new feature, which Moses prescribes with reference to the keeping of the Passover in the land of Canaan, and by which he modifies the instructions for the first Passover in Egypt, to suit the altered circumstances. In Egypt, when Israel was not yet raised into the nation of Jehovah, and had as yet no sanctuary and no common altar, the different houses necessarily served as altars. But when this necessity was at an end, the slaying and eating of the Passover in the different houses were to cease, and they were both to take place at the sanctuary before the Lord, as was the case with the feast of Passover at Sinai (Num. ix. 1-5). Thus the smearing of the door-posts with the blood was tacitly abolished, since the blood was to be sprinkled upon the altar as sacrificial blood, as it had already been at Sinai (see vol. ii. p. 50). —The expression “*to thy tents*,” for going “home,” points to the time when Israel was still dwelling in tents, and had not as yet secured any fixed abodes and houses in Canaan, although this expression was retained at a still later time (*e.g.* 1 Sam. xiii. 2; 2 Sam. xix. 9, etc.). The going home in the morning after the paschal meal, is not to be understood as signifying a return to their homes in the different towns of the land, but simply, as even *Ridlm* admits, to their homes or lodgings at the place of the sanctuary. How very far Moses was from intending to release the Israelites from the duty of keeping the feast for seven days, is evident from the fact that in ver. 8 he once more enforces the observance of the seven days’ feast. The two clauses, “six days thou shalt eat *mazzoth*,” and “on the seventh day shall be *azereh* (Eng. Ver. ‘a solemn assembly’) to the Lord thy God,” are not placed in antithesis to each other, so as to imply (in contradiction to vers. 3 and 4; Ex. xii. 18, 19, xiii. 6, 7, Lev. xxiii. 6; Num. xxviii. 17) that the feast of *Mazzoth* was to last only six days instead of seven; but the seventh day is brought into especial prominence as the *azereh* of the feast (see at Lev. xxiii. 36), simply because, in addition to the eating of *mazzoth*, there was to be an entire abstinence from work, and this particular feature might easily have fallen into neglect at the close of the feast. But just as the eating of *mazzoth* for seven days is not abolished by the first clause, so the suspension of work on the first day is not abolished by the second clause, any more than in Ex. xiii. 6 the first day is represented as a working day by the fact that the seventh day is called “a feast to Jehovah.”

Vers. 9-12. With regard to the FEAST OF WEEKS (see at Ex. xxiii. 16), it is stated that the time for its observance was to be

reckoned from the Passover. Seven weeks shall they count “*from the beginning of the sickle to the corn*,” i.e. from the time when the sickle began to be applied to the corn, or from the commencement of the corn-harvest. As the corn-harvest was opened with the presentation of the sheaf of first-fruits on the second day of the Passover, this regulation as to time coincides with the rule laid down in Lev. xxiii. 15. “*Thou shalt keep the feast to the Lord thy God according to the measure of the free gift of thy hand, which thou givest as Jehovah thy God blesseth thee.*” The ἀπ. λεγ. נְסָמָה is the standing rendering in the Chaldee for נְסָמָה, sufficiency, need; it probably signifies abundance, from מִסָּה = מִסָּה, to flow, to overflow, to derive. The idea is this: Israel was to keep this feast with sacrificial gifts, which every one was able to bring, according to the extent to which the Lord had blessed him, and (ver. 11) to rejoice before the Lord at the place where His name dwelt with sacrificial meals, to which the needy were to be invited (cf. xiv. 29), in remembrance of the fact that they also were bondmen in Egypt (cf. xv. 15). The “*free-will offering of the hand*,” which the Israelites were to bring with them to this feast, and with which they were to rejoice before the Lord, belonged to the free-will gifts of burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, drink-offerings, and thank-offerings, which might be offered, according to Num. xxix. 39 (cf. Lev. xxiii. 38), at every feast, along with the festal sacrifices enjoined upon the congregation. The latter were binding upon the priests and congregation, and are fully described in Num. xxviii. and xxix., so that there was no necessity for Moses to say anything further with reference to them.

Vers. 13-17. In connection with the FEAST OF TABERNACLES also, he simply enforces the observance of it at the central sanctuary, and exhorts the people to rejoice at this festival, and not only to allow their sons and daughters to participate in this joy, but also the man-servant and maid-servant, and the portionless Levites, strangers, widows, and orphans. After what had already been stated, Moses did not consider it necessary to mention expressly that this festal rejoicing was also to be manifested in joyous sacrificial meals; it was enough for him to point to the blessing which God had bestowed upon their cultivation of the corn, the olive, and the vine, and upon all the works of their hands, i.e. upon their labour generally (vers. 13-15), as there was nothing further to remark after the instructions which had already been given with reference to this feast also (Lev. xxiii. 34-36, 39-43; Num. xxix. 12-38).—Vers. 16, 17. In conclusion, the law is repeated, that the

men were to appear before the Lord three times a year at the three feasts just mentioned (compare Ex. xxiii. 17 with ver. 15, and chap. xxxiv. 23), with the additional clause, “*at the place which the Lord shall choose,*” and the following explanation of the words “not empty:” “*every man according to the gift of his hand, according to the blessing of Jehovah his God, which He hath given thee,*” i.e. with sacrificial gifts, as much as every one could offer, according to the blessing which he had received from God.

On the Administration of Justice and the Choice of a King.—
Chap. xvi. 18–xvii. 20.

Just as in its religious worship the Israelitish nation was to show itself to be the holy nation of Jehovah, so was it in its political relations also. This thought forms the link between the laws already given and those which follow. Civil order—that indispensable condition of the stability and prosperity of nations and states—rests upon a conscientious maintenance of right by means of a well-ordered judicial constitution and an impartial administration of justice.—For the purpose of settling the disputes of the people, Moses had already provided them with judges at Sinai, and had given the judges themselves the necessary instructions for the fulfilment of their duties (Ex. xviii.). This arrangement might suffice as long as the people were united in one camp and had Moses for a leader, who could lay before God any difficult cases that were brought to him, and give an absolute decision with divine authority. But for future times, when Israel would no longer possess a prophet and mediator like Moses, and after the conquest of Canaan would live scattered about in the towns and villages of the whole land, certain modifications and supplementary additions were necessary to adapt this judicial constitution to the altered circumstances of the people. Moses anticipates this want in the following provisions, in which he *first* of all commands the appointment of judges and officials in every town, and gives certain precise injunctions as to their judicial proceedings (chap. xvi. 18–xvii. 7); and *secondly*, appoints a higher judicial court at the place of the sanctuary for the more difficult cases (chap. xvii. 8–13); and *thirdly*, gives them a law for the future with reference to the choice of a king (vers. 14–20).

Chap. xvi. 18–xvii. 7. APPOINTMENT AND INSTRUCTION OF THE JUDGES.—Ver. 18. “*Judges and officers thou shalt appoint thee in all thy gates* (places, see at Ex. xx. 10), *which Jehovah thy God*

shall give thee, according to thy tribes." The nation is addressed as a whole, and directed to appoint for itself judges and officers, *i.e.* to choose them, and have them appointed by its rulers, just as was done at Sinai, where the people chose the judges, and Moses inducted into office the persons so chosen (cf. chap. i. 12–18). That the same course was to be adopted in future, is evident from the expression, "throughout thy tribes," *i.e.* according to thy tribes, which points back to chap. i. 13. Election by majorities was unknown to the Mosaic law. The *shoterim*, officers (*lit.* writers, see at Ex. v. 6), who were associated with the judges, according to chap. i. 15, even under the previous arrangement, were not merely messengers and servants of the courts, but secretaries and advisers of the judges, who derived their title from the fact that they had to draw up and keep the genealogical lists, and who are mentioned as already existing in Egypt as overseers of the people and of their work (see at Ex. v. 6; and for the different opinions concerning their official position, see *Selden, de Synedriis*, i. pp. 342–3). The new features, which Moses introduces here, consist simply in the fact that every place was to have its own judges and officers, whereas hitherto they had only been appointed for the larger and smaller divisions of the nation, according to their genealogical organization. Moses lays down no rule as to the number of judges and *shoterim* to be appointed in each place, because this would depend upon the number of the inhabitants; and the existing arrangement of judges over tens, hundreds, etc. (Ex. xviii. 21), would still furnish the necessary standard. The statements made by *Josephus* and the *Rabbins* with regard to the number of judges in each place are contradictory, or at all events are founded upon the circumstances of much later times (see my *Archäologie*, ii. pp. 257–8).—These judges were to judge the people with just judgment. The admonition in ver. 19 corresponds to the instructions in Ex. xxiii. 6 and 8. "Respect persons:" as in chap. i. 17. To this there is added, in ver. 20, an emphatic admonition to strive zealously to maintain justice. The repetition of the word justice is emphatic: justice, and nothing but justice, as in Gen. xiv. 10, etc. But in order to give the people and the judges appointed by them a brief practical admonition, as to the things they were more especially to observe in their administration of justice, Moses notices by way of example a few crimes that were deserving of punishment (vers. 21, 22, and chap. xvii. 1), and then proceeds in chap. xvii. 2–7 to describe more fully the judicial proceedings in the case of

idolaters.—Ver. 21. “*Thou shalt not plant thee as asherah any wood beside the altar of Jehovah.*” יָמַת, to plant, used figuratively, to plant up or erect, as in Eccles. xii. 11, Dan. xi. 25; cf. Isa. li. 16. *Asherah*, the symbol of *Astarte* (see at Ex. xxxiv. 13), cannot mean either a green tree or a grove (as *Movers, Relig. der Phönizier*, p. 572, supposes), for the simple reason that in other passages we find the words שְׁפֵעַ, make (1 Kings xiv. 15, xvi. 33; 2 Kings xvii. 16, xxi. 3; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 3), or הִצְבֵּא, set up (2 Kings xvii. 10), הִעֲמִידֵי, stand up (2 Chron. xxxiii. 19), and בָּנֵא, build (1 Kings xiv. 23), used to denote the erection of an *asherah*, not one of which is at all suitable to a tree or grove. But what is quite decisive is the fact that in 1 Kings xiv. 23, 2 Kings xvii. 10, Jer. xvii. 2, the *asherah* is spoken of as being set up under, or by the side of, the green tree. This idol generally consisted of a wooden column; and a favourite place for setting it up was by the side of the altars of Baal.—Ver. 22. They were also to abstain from setting up any *mazzebah*, i.e. any memorial stone, or stone pillar dedicated to Baal (see at Ex. xxiii. 24).

Chap. xvii. 1. Not only did the inclination to nature-worship, such as the setting up of the idols of *Ashera* and *Baal*, belong to the crimes which merited punishment, but also a manifest transgression of the laws concerning the worship of Jehovah, such as the offering of an ox or sheep that had some fault, which was an abomination in the sight of Jehovah (see at Lev. xxii. 20 sqq.). “*Any evil thing*,” i.e. any of the faults enumerated in Lev. xxii. 22–24.—Vers. 2–7. If such a case should occur, as that a man or woman transgressed the covenant of the Lord and went after other gods and worshipped them; when it was made known, the facts were to be carefully inquired into; and if the charge were substantiated, the criminal was to be led out to the gate and stoned. On the testimony of two or three witnesses, not of one only, he was to be put to death (see at Num. xxxv. 30); and the hand of the witnesses was to be against him first to put him to death, i.e. to throw the first stones at him, and all the people were to follow. With regard to the different kinds of idolatry in ver. 3, see chap. iv. 19. (On ver. 4, see chap. xiii. 15.) “*Bring him out to thy gates*,” i.e. to one of the gates of the town in which the crime was committed. By the gates we are to understand the open space near the gates, where the judicial proceedings took place (cf. Neh. viii. 1, 3; Job xxix. 7), the sentence itself being executed outside the town (cf. chap. xxii. 24; Acts vii. 58; Heb. xiii. 12), just as it had been out-

side the camp during the journey through the wilderness (Lev. xxiv. 14; Num. xv. 36), to indicate the exclusion of the criminal from the congregation, and from fellowship with God. The infliction of punishment in vers. 5 sqq. is like that prescribed in chap. xiii. 10, 11, for those who tempted others to idolatry; with this exception, that the testimony of more than one witness was required before the sentence could be executed, and the witnesses were to be the first to lift up their hands against the criminal to stone him, that they might thereby give a practical proof of the truth of their statement, and their own firm conviction that the condemned was deserving of death,—“a rule which would naturally lead to the supposition that no man would come forward as a witness without the fullest certainty or the greatest depravity” (*Schnell, das isr. Recht*).¹ נִמְתָּן (ver. 6), the man exposed to death, who was therefore really *ipso facto* already dead. “So shalt thou put the evil away,” etc.: cf. chap. xiii. 6.

Vers. 8-13. THE HIGHER JUDICIAL COURT AT THE PLACE OF THE SANCTUARY.—Just as the judges appointed at Sinai were to bring to Moses whatever cases were too difficult for them to decide, that he might judge them according to the decision of God (Ex. xviii. 26 and 19); so in the future the judges of the different towns were to bring all difficult cases, which they were unable to decide, before the Levitical priests and judges at the place of the sanctuary, that a final decision might be given there.—Vers. 8 sqq. “If there is to thee a matter too marvellous for judgment (נַדֵּן) with נַדֵּן, too wonderful, incomprehensible, or beyond carrying out, Gen. xviii. 14, i.e. too difficult to give a judicial decision upon), between blood and blood, plea and plea, stroke and stroke (i.e. too hard for you to decide according to what legal provisions a fatal blow, or dispute on some civil matter, or a bodily injury, is to be settled), disputes in thy gates (a loosely arranged apposition in this sense, disputes of different kinds, such as shall arise in thy towns); arise, and get thee to the place which Jehovah thy God shall choose; and go to the Levitical priests and the judge that shall be in those days, and in-

¹ “He assigned this part to the witnesses, chiefly because there are so many whose tongue is so slippery, not to say good for nothing, that they would boldly strangle a man with their words, when they would not dare to touch him with one of their fingers. It was the best remedy, therefore, that could be tried for restraining such levity, to refuse to admit the testimony of any man who was not ready to execute judgment with his own hand” (*Calvin*).

quire." Israel is addressed here as a nation, but the words are not to be supposed to be directed "first of all to the local courts (chap. xvi. 18), and lastly to the contending parties" (*Knobel*), nor "directly to the parties to the suit" (*Schultz*), but simply to the persons whose duty it was to administer justice in the nation, *i.e.* to the regular judges in the different towns and districts of the land. This is evident from the general fact, that the Mosaic law never recognises any appeal to higher courts by the different parties to a lawsuit, and that in this case also it is not assumed, since all that is enjoined is, that if the matter should be too difficult for the local judges to decide, they themselves were to carry it to the superior court. As *Oehler* has quite correctly observed in *Herzog's Cyclopædia*, "this superior court was not a court of appeal; for it did not adjudicate after the local court had already given a verdict, but in cases in which the latter would not trust itself to give a verdict at all." And this is more especially evident from what is stated in ver. 10, with regard to the decisions of the superior court, namely, that they were to do whatever the superior judges taught, without deviating to the right hand or to the left. This is unquestionably far more applicable to the judges of the different towns, who were to carry out exactly the sentence of the higher tribunal, than to the parties to the suit, inasmuch as the latter, at all events those who were condemned for blood (*i.e.* for murder), could not possibly be in a position to alter the decision of the court at pleasure, since it did not rest with them, but with the authorities of their town, to carry out the sentence.

Moses did not directly institute a superior tribunal at the place of the sanctuary on this occasion, but rather assumed its existence; not however its existence at that time (as *Riehm* and other modern critics suppose), but its establishment and existence in the future. Just as he gives no minute directions concerning the organization of the different local courts, but leaves this to the natural development of the judicial institutions already in existence, so he also restricts himself, so far as the higher court is concerned, to general allusions, which might serve as a guide to the national rulers of a future day, to organize it according to the existing models. He had no disorganized mob before him, but a well-ordered nation, already in possession of civil institutions, with fruitful germs for further expansion and organization. In addition to its civil classification into tribes, families, fathers' houses, and family groups, which possessed at once their rulers in their own heads, the nation had

received in the priesthood, with the high priest at the head, and the Levites as their assistants, a spiritual class, which mediated between the congregation and the Lord, and not only kept up the knowledge of right in the people as the guardian of the law, but by virtue of the high priest's office was able to lay the rights of the people before God, and in difficult cases could ask for His decision. Moreover, a leader had already been appointed for the nation, for the time immediately succeeding Moses' death ; and in this nomination of Joshua, a pledge had been given that the Lord would never leave it without a supreme ruler of its civil affairs, but, along with the high priest, would also appoint a judge at the place of the central sanctuary, who would administer justice in the highest court in association with the priests. On the ground of these facts, it was enough for the future to mention the Levitical priests and the judge who would be at the place of the sanctuary, as constituting the court by which the difficult questions were to be decided.¹ For instance, the words themselves show distinctly enough, that by "the judge" we are not to understand the high priest, but the temporal judge or president of the superior court ; and it is evident from the singular, "*the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord*" (ver. 12), that the high priest is included among the priests. The expression "*the priests the Levites*" (Levitical priests), which also occurs in ver. 18, chap. xviii. 1, xxi. 5, xxiv. 8, xxvii. 9, xxxi. 9, instead of "sons of Aaron," which we find in the middle books, is quite in harmony with the time and character of the book before us. As long as Aaron was living with his sons, the priesthood consisted only of himself and his sons, that is to say, of one family. Hence all the instructions in the middle books are addressed to them, and for the most part to Aaron personally (*vid. Ex. xxviii. and xxix.; Lev. viii.-x.; Num. xviii., etc.*). This was all changed when Aaron died ; henceforth the priesthood consisted simply of the descendants of Aaron and his sons, who were no longer one family, but formed a distinct class in the nation, the legitimacy of which arose from its connection with the tribe of Levi, to which Aaron himself had belonged. It was evidently more appropriate, therefore, to describe them as sons of

¹ The simple fact, that the judicial court at the place of the national sanctuary is described in such general terms, furnishes a convincing proof that we have here the words of Moses, and not those of some later prophetic writer who had copied the superior court at Jerusalem of the times of the kings, as *Riehm* and the critics assume.

Levi than as sons of Aaron, which had been the title formerly given to the priests, with the exception of the high priest, viz. Aaron himself.—In connection with the superior court, however, the priests are introduced rather as knowing and teaching the law (Lev. x. 11), than as actual judges. For this reason appeal was to be made not only to them, but also to the judge, whose duty it was in any case to make the judicial inquiry and pronounce the sentence.—The object of the verb “*inquire*” (ver. 9) follows after “they shall show thee,” viz. “*the word of right*,” the judicial sentence which is sought (2 Chron. xix. 6).—Vers. 10, 11. They shall do “*according to the sound of the word which they utter*” (follow their decision exactly), and that “*according to the sound of the law which they teach*,” and “*according to the right which they shall speak*.” The sentence was to be founded upon the *Thorah*, upon the law which the priests had to teach.—Ver. 12. No one was to resist in pride, to refuse to listen to the priest or to the judge. Resistance to the priest took place when any one was dissatisfied with his interpretation of the law; to the judge, when any one was discontented with the sentence that was passed on the basis of the law. Such refractory conduct was to be punished with death, as rebellion against God, in whose name the right had been spoken (chap. i. 17). (On ver. 13, see chap. xiii. 12.)

Vers. 14–20. CHOICE AND RIGHT OF THE KING.—Vers. 14, 15. If Israel, when dwelling in the land which was given it by the Lord for a possession, should wish to appoint a king, like all the nations round about, it was to appoint the man whom Jehovah its God should choose, and that from among its brethren, *i.e.* from its own people, not a foreigner or non-Israelite. The earthly kingdom in Israel was not opposed to the theocracy, *i.e.* to the rule of Jehovah as king over the people of His possession, provided no one was made king but the person whom Jehovah should choose. The appointment of a king is not *commanded*, like the institution of judges (chap. xvi. 18), because Israel could exist under the government of Jehovah, even without an earthly king; it is simply *permitted*, in case the need should arise for a regal government. There was no necessity to describe more minutely the course to be adopted, as the people possessed the natural provision for the administration of their national affairs in their well-organized tribes, by whom this point could be decided. Moses also omits to state more particularly in what way Jehovah would make known the choice of

the king to be appointed. The congregation, no doubt, possessed one means of asking the will of the Lord in the Urim and Thummim of the high priest, provided the Lord did not reveal His will in a different manner, namely through a prophet, as He did in the election of Saul and David (1 Sam. viii., ix., and xvi.). The command not to choose a foreigner, acknowledged the right of the nation to choose. Consequently the choice on the part of the Lord may have consisted simply in His pointing out to the people, in a very evident manner, the person they were to elect, or in His confirming the choice by word and act, as in accordance with His will.—Three rules are laid down for the king himself in vers. 16-20. In the first place, he was not to keep many horses, or lead back the people to Egypt, to multiply horses, because Jehovah had forbidden the people to return thither by that way. The notion of modern critics, that there is an allusion in this prohibition to the constitution of the kingdom under Solomon, is so far from having any foundation, that the reason assigned—namely, the fear lest the king should lead back the people to Egypt from his love of horses, “to the end that he should multiply horses”—really precludes the time of Solomon, inasmuch as the time had then long gone by when any thought could have been entertained of leading back the people to Egypt. But such a reason would be quite in its place in Moses' time, and only then, “when it would not seem impossible to reunite the broken band, and when the people were ready to express their longing, and even their intention, to return to Egypt on the very slightest occasion; whereas the reason assigned for the prohibition might have furnished Solomon with an excuse for regarding the prohibition itself as merely a temporary one, which was no longer binding” (*Oehler in Herzog's Cyclopædia: vid. Hengstenberg's Dissertations*).¹

The second admonition also, that the king was not to take to himself many wives, and turn away his heart (*sc. from the Lord*), nor

¹ When *Riehm* objects to this, that if such a prohibition had been unnecessary in a future age, in which the people had reached the full consciousness of its national independence, and every thought of the possibility of a reunion with the Egyptians had disappeared, Moses would never have issued it, since he must have foreseen the national independence of the people; the force of this objection rests simply upon his confounding foreseeing with assuming, and upon a thoroughly mistaken view of the prophet's vision of the future. Even if Moses, as “a great prophet,” did foresee the future national independence of Israel, he had also had such experience of the fickle character of the people, that he could not regard the thought of returning to Egypt as absolutely an impossible one, even after the conquest of Canaan, or reject it as inconceivable. Moreover, the

greatly multiply to himself silver and gold, can be explained without the hypothesis that there is an allusion to Solomon's reign, although this king did transgress both commands (1 Kings x. 14 sqq., xi. 1 sqq.). A richly furnished harem, and the accumulation of silver and gold, were inseparably connected with the luxury of Oriental monarchs generally; so that the fear was a very natural one, that the future king of Israel might follow the general customs of the heathen in these respects.—Vers. 18 sqq. And *thirdly*, Instead of hanging his heart upon these earthly things, when he sat upon his royal throne he was to have a copy of the law written out by the Levitical priests, that he might keep the law by him, and read therein all the days of his life. מִשְׁנֶה תַּהֲנֵה הַזָּהָב does not involve writing with his own hand (*Philo*), but simply having it written. מִשְׁנֶה תַּהֲנֵה הַזָּהָב does not mean τὸ δευτερονόμιον τοῦτο (LXX.), “this repetition of the law,” as חַתָּה cannot stand for חַדָּה; but a copy of this law, as most of the Rabbins correctly explain it in accordance with the Chaldee version, though they make *mishneh* to signify *duplum*, two copies (see *Hävernick*, Introduction).—Every copy of a book is really a repetition of it. “*From before the priests*,” i.e. of the law which lies before the priests or is kept by them. The object of the daily reading in the law (vers. 19b and 20) was “*to learn the fear of the Lord, and to keep His commandments*” (cf. v. 25, vi. 2, xiv. 23),

prophetic foresight of Moses was not, as *Riehm* imagines it, a foreknowledge of all the separate points in the historical development of the nation, much less a foreknowledge of the thoughts and desires of the heart, which might arise in the course of time amidst the changes that would take place in the nation. A foresight of the development of Israel into national independence, so far as we may attribute it to Moses as a prophet, was founded not upon the character of the people, but upon the divine choice and destination of Israel, which by no means precluded the possibility of their desiring to return to Egypt, even at some future time, since God Himself had threatened the people with dispersion among the heathen as the punishment for continued transgression of His covenant, and yet, notwithstanding this dispersion, had predicted the ultimate realization of His covenant of grace. And when *Riehm* still further observes, that the taste for horses, which lay at the foundation of this fear, evidently points to a later time, when the old repugnance to cavalry which existed in the nation in the days of the judges, and even under David, had disappeared; this supposed repugnance to cavalry is a fiction of the critic himself, without any historical foundation. For nothing more is related in the history, than that before the time of Solomon the Israelites had not cultivated the rearing of horses, and that David only kept 100 of the war-horses taken from the Syrians for himself, and had the others put to death (2 Sam. viii. 4). And so long as horses were neither reared nor possessed by the Israelites, there can be no ground for speaking of the old repugnance to cavalry. On the other hand, the impossibility of tracing this

that his heart might not be lifted up above his brethren, that he might not become proud (chap. viii. 14), and might not turn aside from the commandments to the right hand or to the left, that he and his descendants might live long upon the throne.

Rights of the Priests, the Levites, and the Prophets.—Chap. xviii.

In addition to the judicial order and the future king, it was necessary that the position of the priests and Levites, whose duties and rights had been regulated by previous laws, should at least be mentioned briefly and finally established (vers. 1-8), and also that the prophetic order should be fully accredited by the side of the other state authorities, and its operations regulated by a definite law (vers. 9-22).

Vers. 1-8. THE RIGHTS OF THE PRIESTS AND LEVITES.—With reference to these, Moses repeats *verbatim* from Num. xviii. 20, 23, 24, the essential part of the rule laid down in Num. xviii. : “*The priests the Levites, the whole tribe of Levi, shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel.*” “All the tribe of Levi” includes the priests and Levites. They were to eat the “firings of Jehovah and His inheritance,” as described in detail in Num. xviii. The inheritance of Jehovah consisted of the holy gifts as well as the sacrifices,

prohibition to the historical circumstances of the time of Solomon, or even a later age, is manifest in the desperate subterfuge to which *Riehm* has recourse, when he connects this passage with the threat in chap. xxviii. 68, that if all the punishments suspended over them should be ineffectual, God would carry them back in ships to Egypt, and that they should there be sold to their enemies as men-servants and maid-servants, and then discovers a proof in this, that the Egyptian king Psammetichus, who sought out foreign soldiers and employed them, had left king Manasseh some horses, solely on the condition that he sent him some Israelitish infantry, and placed them at his disposal. But this is not expounding Scripture ; it is putting hypotheses into it. As *Oehler* has already observed, this hypothesis has no foundation whatever in the Old Testament, nor (we may add) in the accounts of Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus concerning Psammetichus. According to *Diod.* (i. 66), Psammetichus hired soldiers from Arabia, Caria, and Ionia ; and according to *Herodotus* (i. 152), he hired Ionians and Carians armed with brass, that he might conquer his rival kings with their assistance. But neither of these historians says anything at all about Israelitish infantry. And even if it were conceivable that any king of Israel or Judah could carry on such traffic in men, as to sell his own subjects to the Egyptians for horses, it is very certain that the prophets, who condemned every alliance with foreign kings, and were not silent with regard to Manasseh’s idolatry, would not have passed over such an abomination as this without remark or without reproof.

i.e. the tithes, firstlings, and first-fruits. Moses felt it to be superfluous to enumerate these gifts one by one from the previous laws, and also to describe the mode of their application, or define how much belonged to the priests and how much to the Levites. However true it may be that the author assigns all these gifts to the Levites generally, the conclusion drawn from this, viz. that he was not acquainted with any distinction between priests and Levites, but placed the Levites entirely on a par with the priests, is quite a false one. For, apart from the evident distinction between the priests and Levites in ver. 1, where there would be no meaning in the clause, "all the tribe of Levi," if the Levites were identical with the priests, the distinction is recognised and asserted as clearly as possible in what follows, when a portion of the slain-offerings is allotted to the priests in vers. 3-5, whilst in vers. 6-8 the Levite is allowed to join in eating the altar gifts, if he come to the place of the sanctuary and perform service there. The repetition in ver. 2 is an emphatic confirmation : "As He hath said unto them :" as in chap. x. 9.—Vers. 3-5. "This shall be the right of the priests on the part of the people, on the part of those who slaughter slain-offerings, whether ox or sheep ; he (the offerer) shall give the priest the shoulder, the cheek, and the stomach." עֲרֵבָה, the shoulder, i.e. the front leg; see Num. vi. 19. קְרַבָּה, the rough stomach, τὸ ἡμιστρον (LXX.), i.e. the fourth stomach of ruminant animals, in which the digestion of the food is completed ; Lat. *omasus* or *abomasus*, though the Vulgate has *ventriculus* here. On the choice of these three pieces in particular, *Münster* and *Fagius* observe that "the sheep possesses three principal parts, the head, the feet, and the trunk ; and of each of these some portion was to be given to the priest who officiated" (?). "Of each of these three principal parts of the animal," says *Schultz*, "some valuable piece was to be presented : the shoulder at least, and the stomach, which was regarded as particularly fat, are seen at once to have been especially good." That this arrangement is not at variance with the command in Lev. vii. 32 sqq., to give the wave-breast and heave-leg of the peace-offerings to the Lord for the priests, but simply enjoins a further gift to the priests on the part of the people, in addition to those portions which were to be given to the Lord for His servants, is sufficiently evident from the context, since the heave-leg and wave-breast belonged to the firings of Jehovah mentioned in ver. 1, which the priests had received as an inheritance from the Lord, that is to say, to the *tenuphoth* of the children of Israel, which the priests might eat with their sons and

daughters, though only with such members of their house as were levitically clean (Num. xviii. 11); and also from the words of the present command, viz. that the portions mentioned were to be a right of the priests *on the part of the people*, on the part of those who slaughtered slain-offerings, *i.e.* to be paid to the priest as a right that was due to him on the part of the people. טַבְשׁוּן was what the priest could justly claim. This right was probably accorded to the priests as a compensation for the falling off which would take place in their incomes in consequence of the repeal of the law that every animal was to be slaughtered at the sanctuary as a sacrifice (Lev. xvii.; *vid.* chap. xii. 15 sqq.).

The only thing that admits of dispute is, whether this gift was to be presented from every animal that was slaughtered at home for private use, or only from those which were slaughtered for sacrificial meals, and therefore at the place of the sanctuary. Against the former view, for which appeal is made to *Philo, Josephus* (Ant. iv. 4, 4), and the Talmud, we may adduce not only "the difficulty of carrying out such a plan" (was every Israelite who slaughtered an ox, a sheep, or a goat to carry the pieces mentioned to the priests' town, which might be many miles away, or were the priests to appoint persons to collect them?), but the general use of the words זָבֵחַ. The noun זָבֵחַ always signifies either slaughtering for a sacrificial meal or a slain sacrifice, and the verb זָבֵחַ is never applied to ordinary slaughtering (for which טַחַנָּה is the verb used), except in chap. xii. 15 and 21 in connection with the repeal of the law that every slaughtering was to be a זָבֵחַ שְׂלָמִים (Lev. xvii. 5); and there the use of the word זָבֵחַ, instead of טַחַנָּה, may be accounted for from the allusion to this particular law. At the same time, the Jewish tradition is probably right, when it understands by the זָבֵחַ in this verse, κατ' οἴκον θύειν εὐωχίας ἔνεκα (*Josephus*), or ἔξω τοῦ βωμοῦ θυομένοις ἔνεκα κρεωφαγίας (*Philo*), or, as in the *Mishnah Chol.* (x. 1), refers the gift prescribed in this passage to the גְּזִילָה, *profana*, and not to the מִקְרָשָׁה, *consecrata*, that is to say, places it in the same category with the first-fruits, the tithe of tithes, and other less holy gifts, which might be consumed outside the court of the temple and the holy city (compare *Reland, Antiqq. ss.* P. ii. c. 4, § 11, with P. ii. c. 8, § 10). In all probability, the reference is to the slaughtering of oxen, sheep, or goats which were not intended for *shelamim* in the more limited sense, *i.e.* for one of the three species of peace-offerings (Lev. vii. 15, 16), but for festal meals in the broader sense, which were held in connection with the

sacrificial meals prepared from the *shelamim*. For it is evident that the meals held by the people at the annual feasts when they had to appear before the Lord were not all *shelamim* meals, but that other festal meals were held in connection with these, in which the priests and Levites were to share, from the laws laid down with reference to the so-called second tithe, which could not only be turned into money by those who lived at a great distance from the sanctuary, such money to be applied to the purchase of the things required for the sacrificial meals at the place of the sanctuary, but which might also be appropriated every third year to the preparation of love-feasts for the poor in the different towns of the land (chap. xiv. 22-29). For in this case the animals were not slaughtered or sacrificed as *shelamim*, at all events not in the latter instance, because the slaughtering did not take place at the sanctuary. If therefore we restrict the gift prescribed here to the slaughtering of oxen and sheep or goats for such sacrificial meals in the wider sense, not only are the difficulties connected with the execution of this command removed, but also the objection, which arises out of the general use of the expression זבח זבח, to the application of this expression to every slaughtering that took place for domestic use. And beside this, the passage in 1 Sam. ii. 13-16, to which *Calvin* calls attention, furnishes a historical proof that the priests could claim a portion of the flesh of the slain-offerings in addition to the heave-leg and wave-breast, since it is there charged as a sin on the part of the sons of Eli, not only that they took out of the cauldrons as much of the flesh which was boiling as they could take up with three-pronged forks, but that before the fat was burned upon the altar they asked for the pieces which belonged to the priest, to be given to them not cooked, but raw. From this *Michaelis* has drawn the correct conclusion, that even at that time the priests had a right to claim that, in addition to the portions of the sacrifices appointed by Moses in Lev. vii. 34, a further portion of the thank-offerings should be given to them; though he does not regard the passage as referring to the law before us, since he supposes this to relate to every slaughtered animal which was not placed upon the altar.

In ver. 4, Moses repeats the law concerning the first-fruits in Num. xviii. 12, 13 (cf. Ex. xxii. 28), for the purpose of extending it to the first produce of the sheep-shearing.—Ver. 5. The reason for the right accorded to the priests was the choice of them for the office of standing “to minister in the name of Jehovah,” sc. for all the tribes. “*In the name of Jehovah*,” not merely by the appoint-

ment, but also in the power of the Lord, as mediators of His grace. The words “*he and his sons*” point back quite to the Mosaic times, in which Aaron and his sons held the priest’s office.—Vers. 6-8. As the priests were to be remembered for their service on the part of the people (vers. 3-5), so the Levite also, who came from one of the towns of the land with all the desire of his soul to the place of the sanctuary, to minister there in the name of the Lord, was to eat a similar portion to all his Levitical brethren who stood there in service before the Lord. The verb נָסַע (sojourned) does not presuppose that the Levites were houseless, but simply that they had no hereditary possession in the land as the other tribes had, and merely lived like sojourners among the Israelites in the towns which were given up to them by the other tribes (see at chap. xii. 12). “*All his brethren the Levites*” are the priests and those Levites who officiated at the sanctuary as assistants to the priests. It is assumed, therefore, that only a part of the Levites were engaged at the sanctuary, and the others lived in their towns. The apodosis follows in ver. 8, “*part like part shall they eat*,” sc. the new-comer and those already there. The former was to have the same share to eat as the latter, and to be maintained from the revenues of the sanctuary. These revenues are supposed to be already apportioned by the previous laws, so that they by no means abolish the distinction between priests and Levites. We are not to think of those portions of the sacrifices and first-fruits only which fell to the lot of the priests, nor of the tithe alone, or of the property which flowed into the sanctuary through vows or free-will offerings, or in any other way, and was kept in the treasury and storehouse, but of tithes, sacrificial portions, and free-will offerings generally, which were not set apart exclusively for the priests. “*לְבֵד מִמְּפִרְיוֹ וּנו'*,” “*beside his sold with the fathers*,” i.e. independently of what he receives from the sale of his patrimony. מִמְּפִרְיוֹ, the sale, then the thing sold, and the price or produce of what is sold, like קָנֵר in Num. xx. 19. לְבֵד is unusual without וּ, and Knobel would read מִמְּפִרְיוֹ, from עַל בֵּית־אֲבוֹת and מִן, in consequence. עַל בֵּית־אֲבוֹת stands for לְלַחְזָה אֲבוֹת (see at Ex. vi. 25; κατὰ τὴν πατρίαν, LXX.), according to or with the fathers’ houses, i.e. the produce of the property which he possesses according to his family descent, or which is with his kindred. Whether עַל in this passage signifies “according to the measure of,” or “with,” in the sense of keeping or administering, cannot be decided. As the law in Lev. xxv. 33, 34, simply forbids the sale of the pasture grounds belonging to the Levites, but permits the sale

of their houses, a Levite who went to the sanctuary might either let his property in the Levitical town, and draw the yearly rent, or sell the house which belonged to him there. In any case, these words furnish a convincing proof that there is no foundation for the assertion that the book of Deuteronomy assumes or affirms that the Levites were absolutely without possessions.

Vers. 9-22. THE GIFT OF PROPHECY.—The Levitical priests, as the stated guardians and promoters of the law, had to conduct all the affairs of Israel with the Lord, not only instructing the people out of the law concerning the will of God, but sustaining and promoting the living fellowship with the Lord both of individuals and of the whole congregation, by the offering of sacrifices and service at the altar. But if the covenant fellowship with Himself and His grace, in which Jehovah had placed Israel as His people of possession, was to be manifested and preserved as a living reality amidst all changes in the political development of the nation and in the circumstances of private life, it would not do for the revelations from God to cease with the giving of the law and the death of Moses. For, as *Schultz* observes, “however the revelation of the law might aim at completeness, and even have regard to the more remote circumstances of the future, as, for example, where the king is referred to; yet in the transition from extraordinary circumstances into a more settled condition, which it foretells in chap. xvii. 14, and which actually took place under Samuel when the nation grew older (chap. iv. 25), and in the decline and apostasy which certainly awaited it according to chap. xxxi. 16-29, when false prophets should arise, by whom they were in danger of being led astray (chap. xiii. 2 and xviii. 20), as well as in the restoration which would follow after the infliction of punishment (chap. iv. 29, 30, xxx. 1 sqq); in all these great changes which awaited Israel from inward necessity, the revelation of the will of the Lord which they possessed in the law would nevertheless be insufficient.” The priesthood, with its ordinances, would not suffice for that. As the promise of direct communications from God through the Urim and Thummim of the high priest was restricted to the single circumstance of the right of the whole congregation being endangered, and did not extend to the satisfaction of the religious necessities of individuals, it could afford no godly satisfaction to that desire for supernatural knowledge which arose at times in the hearts of individuals, and for which the heathen oracles made such ample.

provision in ungodly ways. If Israel therefore was to be preserved in faithfulness towards God, and attain the end of its calling as the congregation of the Lord, it was necessary that the Lord should make known His counsel and will at the proper time through the medium of prophets, and bestow upon it in sure prophetic words what the heathen nations endeavoured to discover and secure by means of augury and soothsaying. This is the point of view from which Moses promises the sending of prophets in vers. 15-18, and lays down in vers. 19-22 the criteria for distinguishing between true and false prophets, as we may clearly see from the fact that in vers. 9-14 he introduces this promise with a warning against resorting to heathen augury, soothsaying, and witchcraft.

Vers. 9 sqq. When Israel came into the land of Canaan, it was “*not to learn to do like the abominations of these nations*” (the Canaanites or heathen). There was not to be found in it any who caused his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, *i.e.* any worshipper of Moloch (see at Lev. xviii. 21), or one who practised soothsaying (see at Num. xxiii. 23), or a wizard (see at Lev. xix. 26), or a snake-charmer (see at Lev. xix. 26), or a conjurer, or one who pronounced a ban (נָזֵר נָזֶר, probably referring to the custom of binding or banning by magical knots), a necromancer and wise man (see at Lev. xix. 31), or one who asked the dead, *i.e.* who sought oracles from the dead. Moses groups together all the words which the language contained for the different modes of exploring the future and discovering the will of God, for the purpose of forbidding every description of soothsaying, and places the prohibition of Moloch-worship at the head, to show the inward connection between soothsaying and idolatry, possibly because februation, or passing children through the fire in the worship of Moloch, was more intimately connected with soothsaying and magic than any other description of idolatry.—Ver. 12. Whoever did this was an abomination to the Lord, and it was because of this abomination that He rooted out the Canaanites before Israel (cf. Lev. xviii. 24 sqq.).—Vers. 13 and 14. Israel, on the other hand, was to be *blameless* with Jehovah (עַמְלֵךְ, in its intercourse with the Lord). Though the heathen whom they exterminated before them hearkened to conjurers and soothsayers, Jehovah their God had not allowed anything of the kind to them. נִתְּנָה! is placed first as a nominative absolute, for the sake of emphasis: “*but thou, so far as thou art concerned, not so.*” וְ, *thus, just so,* such things (cf. Ex. x. 14). נְתַתִּי, to grant, to allow (as in Gen. xx. 6, etc.).—Ver. 15. “*A*

prophet out of the midst of thee, out of thy brethren, as I am, will Jehovah thy God raise up to thee; to him shall ye hearken." When Moses thus attaches to the prohibition against hearkening to soothsayers and practising soothsaying, the promise that Jehovah would raise up a prophet, etc., and contrasts what the Lord would do for His people with what He did not allow, it is perfectly evident from this simple connection alone, apart from the further context of the passage, in which Moses treats of the temporal and spiritual rulers of Israel (chap. xvii. and xviii.), that the promise neither relates to one particular prophet, nor directly and exclusively to the Messiah, but treats of the sending of prophets generally. And this is also confirmed by what follows with reference to true and false prophets, which presupposes the rise of a plurality of prophets, and shows most incontrovertibly that it is not one prophet only, nor the Messiah exclusively, who is promised here. It by no means follows from the use of the singular, "a prophet," that Moses is speaking of one particular prophet only; but the idea expressed is this, that at any time when the people stood in need of a mediator with God like Moses, God would invariably send a prophet. The words, "out of the midst of thee, of thy brethren," imply that there would be no necessity for Israel to turn to heathen soothsayers or prophets, but that it would find the men within itself who would make known the word of the Lord. The expression, "like unto me," is explained by what follows in vers. 16-18 with regard to the circumstances, under which the Lord had given the promise that He would send a prophet. It was at Sinai; when the people were filled with mortal alarm, after hearing the ten words which God addressed to them out of the fire, and entreated Moses to act as mediator between the Lord and themselves, that God might not speak directly to them any more. At that time the Lord gave the promise that He would raise up a prophet, and put His words into his mouth, that he might speak to the people all that the Lord commanded (cf. chap. v. 20 sqq.). The promised prophet, therefore, was to resemble Moses in this respect, that he would act as mediator between Jehovah and the people, and make known the words or the will of the Lord. Consequently the meaning contained in the expression "like unto me" was not that the future prophet would resemble Moses in all respects,—a meaning which has been introduced into it through an unwarrantable use of Num. xii. 6-8, Deut. xxxiv. 10, and Heb. iii. 2, 5; for the purpose of proving the direct application of the promise to the Messiah alone, to the exclusion of the prophets of the Old Testament.

If the resemblance of the future prophet to Moses, expressed in the words “like unto me,” be understood as indicating the precise form in which God revealed Himself to Moses, speaking with him mouth to mouth, and not in a dream or vision, a discrepancy is introduced between this expression and the words which follow in ver. 18, “I will put My words in his mouth;” since this expresses not the particular mode in which Moses received the revelations from God, in contrast with the rest of the prophets, but simply that form of divine communication or inspiration which was common to all the prophets (*vid. Jer. i. 9, v. 14*).

But whilst we are obliged to give up the direct and exclusive reference of this promise to the Messiah, which was the prevailing opinion in the early Church, and has been revived by *Kurtz*, *Auberlen*, and *Tholuck*, as not in accordance with the context or the words themselves, we cannot, on the other hand, agree with *v. Hofmann*, *Baur*, and *Knobel*, in restricting the passage to the Old Testament prophets, to the exclusion of the Messiah. There is no warrant for this limitation of the word “prophet,” since the expectation of the Messiah was not unknown to Moses and the Israel of his time, but was actually expressed in the promise of the seed of the woman, and Jacob’s prophecy concerning *Shiloh*; so that *O. v. Gerlach* is perfectly right in observing, that “this is a prediction of Christ as the true Prophet, precisely like that of the seed of the woman in Gen. iii. 15.” The occasion, also, on which Moses received the promise of the “prophet” from the Lord, which he here communicated to the people,—namely, when the people desired a mediator between themselves and the Lord at Sinai, and this desire on their part was pleasing to the Lord,—shows that the promise should be understood in the full sense of the words, without any limitation whatever; that is to say, that Christ, in whom the prophetic character culminated and was completed, is to be included. Even *Ewald* admits, that “the prophet like unto Moses, whom God would raise up out of Israel and for Israel, can only be the true prophet generally;” and *Baur* also allows, that “historical exposition will not mistake the anticipatory reference of this expression to Christ, which is involved in the expectation that, in the future completion of the plan of salvation, the prophetic gift would form an essential element.” And lastly, the comparison instituted between the promised prophet and Moses, compels us to regard the words as referring to the Messiah. The words, “like unto me,” “like unto thee,” no more warrant us in excluding the Messiah on

the one hand, than in excluding the Old Testament prophets on the other, since it is unquestionably affirmed that the prophet of the future would be as perfectly equal to his calling as Moses was to his,¹—that He would carry out the mediation between the Lord and the people in the manner and the power of Moses. In this respect not one of the Old Testament prophets was fully equal to Moses, as is distinctly stated in chap. xxxiv. 10. All the prophets of the Old Testament stood within the sphere of the economy of the law, which was founded through the mediatorial office of Moses; and even in their predictions of the future, they simply continued to build upon the foundation which was laid by Moses, and therefore prophesied of the coming of the servant of the Lord, who, as the Prophet of all prophets, would restore Jacob, and carry out the law and right of the Lord to the nations, even to the end of the world (Isa. xlii., xlix., l., lxi.). This prophecy, therefore, is very properly referred to Jesus Christ in the New Testament, as having been fulfilled in Him. Not only had Philip this passage in his mind when he said to Nathanael, “We have found Him of whom Moses in the law did write, Jesus of Nazareth,” whilst Stephen saw the promise of the prophet like unto Moses fulfilled in Christ (Acts vii. 37); but Peter also expressly quotes it in Acts iii. 22, 23, as referring to Christ; and even the Lord applies it to Himself in John v. 45–47, when He says to the Jews, “Moses, in whom ye trust, will accuse you; for if ye believed Moses, ye would also believe Me: for Moses wrote of Me.” In John xii. 48–50, again, the reference to vers. 18 and 19 of this chapter is quite unmistakeable; and in the words, “hear ye Him,” which were uttered from the cloud at the transfiguration of Jesus (Matt. xvii. 5), the expression in ver. 15, “unto Him shall ye hearken,” is used *verbatim* with reference to Christ. Even the Samaritans founded their expectation of the Messiah (John iv. 25) upon these words of Moses.²

Vers. 16–22. With this assurance the Lord had fully granted the request of the people, “according to all that thou desiredst of the Lord thy God;” and Israel, therefore, was all the more bound to hearken to the prophets, whom God would raise up from the midst of itself, and not to resort to heathen soothsayers. (On the

¹ Let any one paraphrase the passage thus: “A prophet inferior indeed to me, but yet the channel of divine revelations,” and he will soon feel how unsuitable it is” (*Hengstenberg*).

² On the history of the exposition of this passage, see *Hengstenberg's Christology*.

fact itself, comp. chap. v. 20 sqq. with Ex. xx. 15-17.) “*In the day of the assembly,*” as in chap. ix. 10, x. 4.—The instructions as to their behaviour towards the prophets are given by Moses (vers. 19, 20) in the name of the Lord, for the purpose of enforcing obedience with all the greater emphasis. *Whoever did not hearken to the words of the prophet who spoke in the name of the Lord, of him the Lord would require it, i.e. visit the disobedience with punishment* (cf. Ps. x. 4, 13). On the other hand, the prophet who spoke in the name of the Lord what the Lord had not commanded him, *i.e.* proclaimed the thoughts of his own heart as divine revelations (cf. Num. xvi. 28), should die, like the prophet who spoke in the name of other gods. With נָבִי, the predicate is introduced in the form of an apodosis.—Vers. 21, 22. The false prophet was to be discovered by the fact, that the word proclaimed by him did not follow or come to pass, *i.e.* that his prophecy was not fulfilled. Of him they were not to be afraid. By this injunction the occurrence of what had been predicted is made the criterion of true prophecy, and not signs and wonders, which false prophets could also perform (cf. chap. xiii. 2 sqq.).

Laws concerning the Cities of Refuge, the Sacredness of Landmarks, and the Punishment of False Witnesses.—Chap. xix.

After laying down the most important features in the national constitution, Moses glances at the manifold circumstances of civil and family life, and notices in this and the two following chapters the different ways in which the lives of individuals might be endangered, for the purpose of awakening in the minds of the people a holy reverence for human life.

Vers. 1-13. The laws concerning the CITIES OF REFUGE FOR UNINTENTIONAL MANSLAYERS are not a mere repetition of the laws given in Num. xxxv. 9-34, but rather an admonition to carry out those laws, with special reference to the future extension of the boundaries of the land.—Vers. 1-7. As Moses had already set apart the cities of refuge for the land on the east of the Jordan (chap. iv. 41 sqq.), he is speaking here simply of the land on the west, which Israel was to take possession of before long; and supplements the instructions in Num. xxxv. 14, with directions to maintain the roads to the cities of refuge which were to be set apart in Canaan itself, and to divide the land into three parts, viz. for the purpose of setting apart these cities, so that one city might be chosen for the purpose in every third of the land. For further remarks upon

this point, as well as with regard to the use of these cities (vers. 4-7), see at Num. xxxv. 11 sqq.—In vers. 8-10 there follow the fresh instructions, that if the Lord should extend the borders of Israel, according to His promise given to the patriarchs, and should give them the whole land from the Nile to the Euphrates, according to Gen. xv. 18, they were to add three other cities of refuge to these three, for the purpose of preventing the shedding of innocent blood. The three new cities of refuge cannot be the three appointed in Num. xxxv. 14 for the land on this side of the Jordan, nor the three mentioned in ver. 7 on the other side of Jordan, as *Knobel* and others suppose. Nor can we adopt *Hengstenberg's* view, that the three new ones are the same as the three mentioned in vers. 2 and 7, since they are expressly distinguished from “these three.” The meaning is altogether a different one. The circumstances supposed by Moses never existed, since the Israelites did not fulfil the conditions laid down in ver. 9, viz. that they should keep the law faithfully, and love the Lord their God (cf. chap. iv. 6, vi. 5, etc.). The extension of the power of Israel to the Euphrates under David and Solomon, did not bring the land as far as this river into their actual possession, since the conquered kingdoms of Aram were still inhabited by the Aramaeans, who, though conquered, were only rendered tributary. And the Tyrians and Phoenicians, who belonged to the Canaanitish population, were not even attacked by David.—Ver. 10. Innocent blood would be shed if the unintentional manslayer was not protected against the avenger of blood, by the erection of cities of refuge in every part of the land. If Israel neglected this duty, it would bring blood-guiltiness upon itself (“*and so blood be upon thee*”), because it had not done what was requisite to prevent the shedding of innocent blood.—Vers. 11-13. But whatever care was to be taken by means of free cities to prevent the shedding of blood, the cities of refuge were not to be asyla for criminals who were deserving of death, nor to afford protection to those who had slain a neighbour out of hatred. If such murderers should flee to the free city, the elders (magistrates) of his own town were to fetch him out, and deliver him up to the avenger of blood, that he might die. The law laid down in Num. xxxv. 16-21 is here still more minutely defined; but this does not transfer to the elders the duty of instituting a judicial inquiry, and deciding the matter, as *Riehm* follows *Vater* and *De Wette* in maintaining, for the purpose of proving that there is a discrepancy between Deuteronomy and the previous legislation. They are simply commanded to perform the

duty devolving upon them as magistrates and administrators of local affairs. (On ver. 13, see chap. xiii. 8 and 5.)

Ver. 14. The prohibition against REMOVING A NEIGHBOUR'S LANDMARK, which his ancestors had placed, is inserted here, not because landmarks were of special importance in relation to the free cities, and the removal of them might possibly be fatal to the unintentional manslayer (as *Clericus* and *Rosenmüller* assume), for the general terms of the prohibition are at variance with this, viz. "thy neighbour's landmark," and "in thine inheritance which thou shalt inherit in the land;" but on account of the close connection in which a man's possession as the means of his support stood to the life of the man himself, "because property by which life is supported participates in the sacredness of life itself, just as in chap. xx. 19, 20, sparing the fruit-trees is mentioned in connection with the men who were to be spared" (*Schultz*). A curse was to be pronounced upon the remover of landmarks, according to chap. xxvii. 17, just as upon one who cursed his father, who led a blind man astray, or perverted the rights of orphans and widows (cf. Hos. v. 10; Prov. xxii. 28, xxiii. 10). Landmarks were regarded as sacred among other nations also; by the Romans, for example, they were held to be so sacred, that whoever removed them was to be put to death.

Vers. 15-21. THE PUNISHMENT OF A FALSE WITNESS.—To secure life and property against false accusations, Moses lays down the law in ver. 15, that one witness only was not "to rise up against any one with reference to any crime or sin, with every sin that one commits" (*i.e.* to appear before a court of justice, or be accepted as sufficient), but everything was to be established upon the testimony of two or three witnesses. The rule laid down in chap. xvii. 6 and Num. xxxv. 30 for capital crimes, is raised hereby into a law of general application (see at Num. xxxv. 30). מִקָּם (in ver. 15b), to stand, *i.e.* to acquire legal force.—But as it was not always possible to bring forward two or three witnesses, and the statement of one witness could not well be disregarded, in vers. 16-18 Moses refers accusations of this kind to the higher tribunal at the sanctuary for investigation and decision, and appoints the same punishment for a false witness, which would have fallen upon the person accused, if he had been convicted of the crime with which he was charged. הַלְעֵנֹת בְּסֶרֶת, "to testify against his departure," sc. from the law of God, not merely falling away into idolatry (chap. xiii. 6), but any

kind of crime, as we may gather from ver. 19, which would be visited with capital punishment.—Ver. 17. The two men between whom the dispute lay, the accused and the witness, were to come before Jehovah, viz. before the priests and judges who should be in those days,—namely, at the place of the sanctuary, where Jehovah dwelt among His people (cf. chap. xvii. 9), and not before the local courts, as Knobel supposes. These judges were to investigate the case most thoroughly (cf. chap. xiii. 15); and if the witness had spoken lies, they were to do to him as he thought to do to his brother. The words from “*behold*” to “*his brother*” are parenthetical circumstantial clauses: “*And, behold, is the witness a false witness, has he spoken a lie against his brother? Ye shall do,*” etc. בְּאֵלֹת, generally to meditate evil. On ver. 20, see chap. xiii. 12.—Ver. 21. The *lex talionis* was to be applied without reserve (see at Ex. xxi. 23; Lev. xxiv. 20). According to *Diod. Sic.* (i. 77), the same law existed in Egypt with reference to false accusers.

Instructions for future Wars.—Chap. xx.

The instructions in this chapter have reference to the wars which Israel might wage in future against non-Canaanitish nations (vers. 15 sqq.), and enjoin it as a duty upon the people of God to spare as much as possible the lives of their own soldiers and also of their enemies. All wars against their enemies, even though they were superior to them in resources, were to be entered upon by them without fear in reliance upon the might of their God; and they were therefore to exempt from military service not only those who had just entered into new social relations, and had not enjoyed the pleasures of them, but also the timid and fainthearted (vers. 1-9). Moreover, whenever they besieged hostile towns, they were to offer peace to their enemies, excepting only the Canaanites; and even if it were not accepted, they were to let the defenceless (viz. women and children) live, and not to destroy the fruit-trees before the fortifications (vers. 10-20).

Vers. 1-9. INSTRUCTIONS RELATING TO MILITARY SERVICE.—If the Israelites went out to battle against their foes, and saw horses and chariots, a people more numerous than they were, they were not to be afraid, because Jehovah their God was with them. Horses and chariots constituted the principal strength of the enemies round about Israel; not of the Egyptians only (Ex. xiv. 7), and of the Canaanites and Philistines (Josh. xvii. 16; Judg. iv. 3,

1 Sam. xiii. 5), but of the Syrians also (2 Sam. viii. 4; 1 Chron. xviii. 4, xix. 18; cf. Ps. xx. 8).—Vers. 2-4. If they were thus drawing near to war, *i.e.* arranging themselves for war for the purpose of being mustered and marching in order into the battle (not just as the battle was commencing), the priest was to address the warriors, and infuse courage into them by pointing to the help of the Lord. “*The priest*” is not the high priest, but the priest who accompanied the army, like Phinehas in the war against the Midianites (Num. xxxi. 6; cf. 1 Sam. iv. 4, 11, 2 Chron. xiii. 12), whom the Rabbins call *מַשְׁתֵּת הַמִּלְחָמָה* (the anointed of the battle), and raise to the highest dignity next to the high priest, no doubt simply upon the ground of Num. xxxi. 6 (see *Lundius, jüd. Heiligh.* p. 523).—Vers. 5-9. Moreover, the *shoterim*, whose duty it was, as the keepers of the genealogical tables, to appoint the men who were bound to serve, were to release such of the men who had been summoned to the war as had entered into domestic relations, which would make it a harder thing for them to be exposed to death than for any of the others: for example, any man who had built a new house and had not yet consecrated it, or had planted a vineyard and not yet eaten any of the fruit of it, or was betrothed to a wife and had not yet married her,—that such persons might not die before they had enjoyed the fruits of what they had done. “*Who is the man, who,*” *i.e.* whoever, every man who. “*Consecrated the house,*” viz. by taking possession and dwelling in it; entrance into the house was probably connected with a hospitable entertainment. According to *Josephus* (Ant. iv. 8, 41), the enjoyment of them was to last a year (according to the analogy of chap. xxiv. 5). The Rabbins elaborated special ceremonies, among which *Jonathan* in his Targum describes the fastening of slips with sentences out of the law written upon them to the door-posts, as being the most important (see at chap. vi. 9: for further details, see *Selden, de Synedriis* l. iii. c. 14, 15). *Cerem* is hardly to be restricted to vineyards, but applied to olive-plantations as well (see at Lev. xix. 10). *לְקֹרֶן*, to make common, is to be explained from the fact, that when fruit-trees were planted (Lev. xix. 23 sqq.), or vines set (Judg. xix. 24), the fruit was not to be eaten for the first three years, and that of the fourth year was to be consecrated to the Lord; and it was only the fruit that was gathered in the fifth year which could be applied by the owner to his own use,—in other words, could be made common. The command to send away from the army to his own home a man who was betrothed but had not yet

taken his wife, is extended still further in chap. xxiv. 5, where it is stated that a newly married man was to be exempt for a whole year from military service and other public burdens. The intention of these instructions was neither to send away all persons who were unwilling to go into the war, and thus avoid the danger of their interfering with the readiness and courage of the rest of the army in prospect of the battle, nor to spare the lives of those persons to whom life was especially dear; but rather to avoid depriving any member of the covenant nation of his enjoyment of the good things of this life bestowed upon him by the Lord.—Ver. 8. The first intention only existed in the case of the timid (the soft-hearted or despondent). פָּנַי נְלִי, that the heart of thy brethren “*may not flow away*,” i.e. may not become despondent (as in Gen. xvii. 15, etc.).—Ver. 9. When this was finished, the *shoterim* were to appoint captains at the head of the people (of war). רְאֵבֶת, to inspect, to muster, then to give the oversight, to set a person over anything (Num. iii. 10, iv. 27). The meaning “to lead the command” (*Schultz*) cannot be sustained; and if “captains of the armies” were the subject, and reference were made to the commanders in the war, the article would not be omitted. If the *shoterim* had to raise men for the war and organize the army, the division of the men into hosts (*zebaoth*) and the appointment of the leaders would also form part of the duties of their office.

Vers. 10–20. INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING SIEGES.—Vers. 10, 11. On advancing against a town to attack it, they were “*to call to it for peace*,” i.e. to summon it to make a peaceable surrender and submission (cf. Judg. xxi. 13). “*If it answered peace*,” i.e. returned an answer conduced to peace, and “*opened*” (sc. its gates), the whole of its inhabitants were to become tributary to Israel, and serve it; consequently even those who were armed were not to be put to death, for Israel was not to shed blood unnecessarily. פָּנַי does not mean feudal *service*, but a feudal slave (see at Ex. i. 11).—Vers. 12, 13. If the hostile town, however, did not make peace, but prepared for war, the Israelites were to besiege it; and if Jehovah gave it into their hands, they were to slay all the men in it without reserve (“with the edge of the sword,” see at Gen. xxxiv. 26); but the women and children and all that was in the city, all its spoil, they were to take as prey for themselves, and to consume (eat) the spoil, i.e. to make use of it for their own maintenance.—Vers. 15–18. It was in this way that Israel was to

act with towns that were far off; but not with the towns of the Canaanites ("these nations"), which Jehovah gave them for an inheritance. In these no soul was to be left alive; but these nations were to be laid under the ban, *i.e.* altogether exterminated, that they might not teach the Israelites their abominations and sins (cf. chap. vii. 1-4, xii. 31). בְּלִי נִשְׁמָה, *lit.* every breath, *i.e.* everything living, by which, however, human beings alone are to be understood (comp. Josh. x. 40, xi. 11, with chap. xi. 14).—Vers. 19, 20. When they besieged a town a long time to conquer it, they were not to destroy its trees, to swing the axe upon them. That we are to understand by בַּצְעַם the fruit-trees in the environs and gardens of the town, is evident from the motive appended: "for of them (כִּפְנֵי) refers to אֶת as a collective) thou eatest, and thou shalt not hew them down." The meaning is: thou mayest suppress and destroy the men, but not the trees which supply thee with food. "*For is the tree of the field a man, that it should come into siege before thee?*" This is evidently the only suitable interpretation of the difficult words בְּנֵי הָאָדָם עַז תִּשְׂרֹה, and the one which has been expressed by all the older commentators, though in different ways. But it is one which can only be sustained grammatically by adopting the view propounded by *Clericus* and others: viz. by pointing the noun הָאָדָם with ה interrog., instead of הָאָדָם, and taking בְּנֵי as the object, which its position in the sentence fully warrants (cf. *Ewald*, § 324, b. and 306, b.). The Masoretic punctuation is founded upon the explanation given by *Aben Ezra*, "Man is a tree of the field, *i.e.* lives upon and is fed by the fruits of the trees," which *Schultz* expresses in this way, "Man is bound up with the tree of the field, *i.e.* has his life in, or from, the tree of the field,"—an explanation, however, which cannot be defended by appealing to chap. xxiv. 6, Eccl. xii. 13, Ezek. xii. 10, as these three passages are of a different kind. In no way whatever can הָאָדָם be taken as the subject of the sentence, as this would not give any rational meaning. And if it were rendered as the object, in such sense as this, The tree of the field is a thing or affair of man, it would hardly have the article.—Ver. 20. "*Only the trees which thou knowest that they are not trees of eating (i.e. do not bear edible fruits), mayest thou hew down, and build a rampart against the town till it come down;*" *i.e.* fall down from its eminence. For יַדְעַ as applied to the falling or sinking of lofty fortifications, see chap. xxviii. 52, Isa. xxxii. 19. מִצְרָה, compressing or forcing down; hence, as applied to towns, בָּוֹא בְּמִצְרָה, to come into siege, *i.e.* to be besieged (ver. 19; 2 Kings

xxiv. 10, xxv. 2). In ver. 20 it is used to denote the object, viz. the means of hemming in a town, *i.e.* the besieging rampart (cf. Ezek. iv. 2).

Expiation of an uncertain Murder. Treatment of a Wife who had been taken captive. Right of the First-born. Punishment of a refractory Son. Burial of a Man who had been hanged.—Chap. xxi.

The reason for grouping together these five laws, which are apparently so different from one another, as well as for attaching them to the previous regulations, is to be found in the desire to bring out distinctly the sacredness of life and of personal rights from every point of view, and impress it upon the covenant nation.

Vers. 1-9. EXPIATION OF A MURDER COMMITTED BY AN UNKNOWN HAND.—Vers. 1 and 2. If any one was found lying in a field in the land of Israel (**נִפְלָא** fallen, then lying, Judg. iii. 25, iv. 22), having been put to death without its being known who had killed him (**וַיַּעֲשֵׂה נָגָר אֶת**, a circumstantial clause, attached without a copula, see *Ewald*, § 341, b. 3), the elders and judges, *sc.* of the neighbouring towns,—the former as representatives of the communities, the latter as administrators of right,—were to go out and measure to the towns which lay round about the slain man, *i.e.* measure the distance of the body from the towns that were lying round about, to ascertain first of all which was the nearest town.—Vers. 3, 4. This nearest town was then required to expiate the blood-guiltiness, not only because the suspicion of the crime or of participation in the crime fell soonest upon it, but because the guilt connected with the shedding of innocent blood rested as a burden upon it before all others. To this end the elders were to take a heifer (young cow), with which no work had ever been done, and which had not yet drawn in the yoke, *i.e.* whose vital force had not been diminished by labour (see at Num. xix. 2), and bring it down into a brook-valley with water constantly flowing, and there break its neck. The expression, “*it shall be that the city,*” is more fully defined by “*the elders of the city shall take.*” The elders were to perform the act of expiation in the name of the city. As the murderer was not to be found, an animal was to be put to death in his stead, and suffer the punishment of the murderer. The slaying of the animal was not an expiatory sacrifice, and consequently there was no slaughtering and sprinkling of the blood; but, as the mode of death, viz. breaking the neck (*vid.* Ex. xiii. 13), clearly

shows, it was a symbolical infliction of the punishment that should have been borne by the murderer, upon the animal which was substituted for him. To be able to take the guilt upon itself and bear it, the animal was to be in the full and undiminished possession of its vital powers. The slaying was to take place in a נַחַל אִירָן, a valley with water constantly flowing through it, which was not worked (cultivated) and sown. This regulation as to the locality in which the act of expiation was to be performed was probably founded upon the idea, that the water of the brook-valley would suck in the blood and clean it away, and that the blood sucked in by the earth would not be brought to light again by the ploughing and working of the soil.—Ver. 5. The priests were to come near during this transaction; *i.e.* some priests from the nearest Levitical town were to be present at it, not to conduct the affair, but as those whom Jehovah had chosen to serve Him and to bless in His name (cf. chap. xviii. 5), and according to whose mouth (words) every dispute and every stroke happened (cf. chap. xvii. 8), *i.e.* simply as those who were authorized by the Lord, and as the representatives of the divine right, to receive the explanation and petition of the elders, and acknowledge the legal validity of the act.—Vers. 6-8. The elders of the town were to wash their hands over the slain heifer, *i.e.* to cleanse themselves by this symbolical act from the suspicion of any guilt on the part of the inhabitants of the town in the murder that had been committed (cf. Ps. xxvi. 6, lxxviii. 13; Matt. xxvii. 24), and then answer (to the charge involved in what had taken place), and say, “*Our hands have not shed this blood* (on the singular שְׁבֵכָה, see *Ewald*, § 317, *a.*), *and our eyes have not seen*” (*sc.* the shedding of blood), *i.e.* we have neither any part in the crime nor any knowledge of it: “*grant forgiveness* (*lit.* ‘cover up,’ *viz.* the blood-guiltiness) *to Thy people . . . and give not innocent blood in the midst of Thy people Israel,*” *i.e.* lay not upon us the innocent blood that has been shed by imputation and punishment. “*And the blood shall be forgiven them,*” *i.e.* the bloodshed or murder shall not be imputed to them. On נִכְפֵּר, a mixed form from the Niphal and Hithpael, see *Ges.* § 55, and *Ewald*, § 132, *c.*—Ver. 9. In this way Israel was to wipe away the innocent blood (the bloodshed) from its midst (cf. Num. xxxv. 33). If the murderer were discovered afterwards, of course the punishment of death which had been inflicted vicariously upon the animal, simply because the criminal himself could not be found, would still fall upon him.

Vers. 10-14. TREATMENT OF A WIFE WHO HAD BEEN A PRISONER OF WAR.—If an Israelite saw among the captives, who had been brought away in a war against foreign nations, a woman of beautiful figure, and loved her, and took her as his wife, he was to allow her a month's time in his house, to bewail her separation from her home and kindred, and accustom herself to her new condition of life, before he married her. What is said here does not apply to the wars with the Canaanites, who were to be cut off (*vid. chap. vii. 3*), but, as a comparison of the introductory words in ver. 1 with chap. xx. 1 clearly shows, to the wars which Israel would carry on with surrounding nations after the conquest of Canaan. שִׁבְיָה and שִׁבְיָה, the captivity, for the captives.—Vers. 12, 13. When the woman was taken home to the house of the man who had loved her, she was to shave her head, and make, *i.e.* cut, her nails (cf. 2 Sam. xix. 25),—both customary signs of purification (on this significance of the cutting of the hair, see Lev. xiv. 8 and Num. viii. 7),—as symbols of her passing out of the state of a slave, and of her reception into the fellowship of the covenant nation. This is perfectly obvious in her laying aside her prisoner's clothes. After putting off the signs of captivity, she was to sit (dwell) in the house, and bewail her father and mother for a month, *i.e.* console herself for her separation from her parents, whom she had lost, that she might be able to forget her people and her father's house (Ps. xlv. 11), and give herself up henceforth in love to her husband with an undivided heart. The intention of these laws was not to protect the woman against any outbreak of rude passion on the part of the man, but rather to give her time and leisure to loosen herself inwardly from the natural fellowship of her nation and kindred, and to acquire affection towards the fellowship of the people of God, into which she had entered against her will, that her heart might cherish love to the God of Israel, who had given her favour in the eyes of her master, and had taken from her the misery and reproach of slavery. By her master becoming her husband, she entered into the rights of a daughter of Israel, who had been sold by her father to a man to be his wife (Ex. xxi. 7 sqq.). If after this her husband should find no pleasure in her, he was to let her go לְפָנֶיךָ, *i.e.* at her free will, and not sell her for money (cf. Ex. xxi. 8). “*Thou shalt not put constraint upon her, because thou hast humbled her.*” חַרְצֵנָה, which only occurs again in chap. xxiv. 7, probably signifies to throw oneself upon a person, to practise violence towards him (cf. *Ges. thes.* p. 1046).

Vers. 15-17. THE RIGHT OF THE FIRST-BORN.—Whilst the previous law was intended to protect the slave taken in war against the caprice of her Israelitish master, the law which follows is directed against the abuse of paternal authority in favour of a favourite wife. If a man had two wives, of whom one was beloved and the other hated, —as was the case, for example, with Jacob,—and had sons by both his wives, but the first-born by the wife he hated, he was not, when dividing his property as their inheritance, to make the son of the wife he loved the first-born, *i.e.* was not to give him the inheritance of the first-born, but was to treat the son of the hated wife, who was really the first-born son, as such, and to give him a double share of all his possession. בְּפָנֵי פָּנָו, over (by) the face of, *i.e.* opposite to the first-born son of the hated, when he was present; in other words, “during his lifetime” (cf. Gen. xi. 28). יִפְרַח, to regard as that which he is, the rightful first-born. The inheritance of the first-born consisted in “*a mouth of two*” (*i.e.* a mouthful, portion, share of two) of all that was by him, all that he possessed. Consequently the first-born inherited twice as much as any of the other sons. “*Beginning of his strength*” (as in Gen. xl ix. 3). This right of primogeniture did not originate with Moses, but was simply secured by him against arbitrary invasion. It was founded, no doubt, upon hereditary tradition; just as we find in many other nations, that certain privileges are secured to the first-born sons above those born afterwards.

Vers. 18-21. PUNISHMENT OF A REFRACtORY SON.—The laws upon this point aim not only at the defence, but also at the limitation, of parental authority. If any one’s son was unmanageable and refractory, not hearkening to the voice of his parents, even when they chastised him, his father and mother were to take him and lead him out to the elders of the town into the gate of the place. The elders are not regarded here as judges in the strict sense of the word, but as magistrates, who had to uphold the parental authority, and administer the local police. The gate of the town was the forum, where the public affairs of the place were discussed (cf. chap. xxii. 15, xxv. 7); as it is in the present day in Syria (*Seetzen*, R. ii. p. 88), and among the Moors (*Höst*, Nachrichten v. Marokkos, p. 239). —Ver. 20. Here they were to accuse the son as being unmanageable, refractory, disobedient, as “a glutton and a drunkard.” These last accusations show the reason for the unmanageableness and refractoriness.—Ver. 21. In consequence of this accusation, all the

men of the town were to stone him, so that he died. By this the right was taken away from the parents of putting an incorrigible son to death (cf. Prov. xix. 18), whilst at the same time the parental authority was fully preserved. Nothing is said about any evidence of the charge brought by the parents, or about any judicial inquiry generally. "In such a case the charge was a proof in itself. For if the heart of a father and mother could be brought to such a point as to give up their child to the judge before the community of the nation, everything would have been done that a judge would need to know" (*Schnell, d. isr. Recht*, p. 11).—On ver. 21b, cf. chap. xiii. 6 and 12.

Vers. 22 and 23. BURIAL OF THOSE WHO HAD BEEN HANGED.—If there was a sin upon a man, מִשְׁפָט כֹּהֵן, *lit.* a right of death, *i.e.* a capital crime (cf. chap. xix. 6 and xxii. 26), and he was put to death, and they hanged him upon a tree (wood), his body was not to remain upon the wood over night, but they were to bury him on the same day upon which he was hanged; "*for the hanged man is a curse of God,*" and they were not to defile the land which Jehovah gave for an inheritance. The hanging, not of criminals who were to be put to death, but of those who had been executed with the sword, was an intensification of the punishment of death (see at Num. xxv. 4), inasmuch as the body was thereby exposed to peculiar kinds of abominations. Moses commanded the burial of those who had been hanged upon the day of their execution,—that is to say, as we may see from the application of this law in Josh. viii. 29, x. 26, 27, before sunset,—because the hanged man, being a curse of God, defiled the land. The land was defiled not only by vices and crimes (cf. Lev. xviii. 24, 28; Num. xxxv. 34), but also by the exposure to view of criminals who had been punished with death, and thus had been smitten by the curse of God, inasmuch as their shameful deeds were thereby publicly exposed to view. We are not to think of any bodily defilement of the land through the decomposition consequent upon death, as *J. D. Mich.* and *Sommer* suppose; so that there is no ground for speaking of any discrepancy between this and the old law.—(On the application of this law to Christ, see Gal. iii. 13.)—This regulation is appended very loosely to what precedes. The link of connection is contained in the thought, that with the punishment of the wicked the recollection of their crimes was also to be removed.

The Duty to love one's Neighbour ; and Warning against a Violation of the Natural Order of Things. Instructions to sanctify the Marriage State.—Chap. xxii.

Going deeper and deeper into the manifold relations of the national life, Moses first of all explains in vers. 1-12 the attitude of an Israelite, on the one hand, towards a neighbour ; and, on the other hand, towards the natural classification and arrangement of things, and shows how love should rule in the midst of all these relations. The different relations brought under consideration are selected rather by way of examples, and therefore follow one another without any link of connection, for the purpose of exhibiting the truth in certain concrete cases, and showing how the covenant people were to hold all the arrangements of God sacred, whether in nature or in social life.

Vers. 1-12. In vers. 1-4 Moses shows, by a still further expansion of Ex. xxiii. 4, 5, how the property of a neighbour was to be regarded and preserved. If any man saw an ox or a sheep of his brother's (fellow-countryman) going astray, he was not to draw back from it, but to bring it back to his brother ; and if the owner lived at a distance, or was unknown, he was to take it into his own house or farm, till he came to seek it. He was also to do the same with an ass or any other property that another had lost.—Ver. 4. A fallen animal belonging to another he was also to help up (as in Ex. xxiii. 5 : except that in this case, instead of a brother generally, an enemy or hater is mentioned).—Ver. 5. As the property of a neighbour was to be sacred in the estimation of an Israelite, so also the divine distinction of the sexes, which was kept sacred in civil life by the clothing peculiar to each sex, was to be not less but even more sacredly observed. “*There shall not be man's things upon a woman, and a man shall not put on a woman's clothes.*” בַּל does not signify clothing merely, nor arms only, but includes every kind of domestic and other utensils (as in Ex. xxii. 6 ; Lev. xi. 32, xiii. 49). The immediate design of this prohibition was not to prevent licentiousness, or to oppose idolatrous practices (the proofs which Spencer has adduced of the existence of such usages among heathen nations are very far-fetched) ; but to maintain the sanctity of that distinction of the sexes which was established by the creation of man and woman, and in relation to which Israel was not to sin. Every violation or wiping out of this distinction—such even, for example, as the emancipation of a woman—was unnatural, and therefore an abomi-

nation in the sight of God.—Vers. 6, 7. The affectionate relation of parents to their young, which God had established even in the animal world, was also to be kept just as sacred. If any one found a bird's nest by the road upon a tree, or upon the ground, with young ones or eggs, and the mother sitting upon them, he was not to take the mother with the young ones, but to let the mother fly, and only take the young. נָקַנְתִּי for נָקַנְתָּ, as in Ex. v. 3. The command is related to the one in Lev. xxii. 28 and Ex. xxiii. 19, and is placed upon a par with the commandment relating to parents, by the fact that obedience is urged upon the people by the same promise in both instances (*vid. chap. v. 16; Ex. xx. 12*).—Ver. 8. Still less were they to expose human life to danger through carelessness. “*If thou build a new house, make a rim (maakeh)—i.e. a balustrade—to thy roof, that thou bring not blood-guiltiness upon thy house, if any one fall from it.*” The roofs of the Israelitish houses were flat, as they mostly are in the East, so that the inhabitants often lived upon them (Josh. ii. 6; 2 Sam. xi. 2; Matt. x. 27).—In vers. 9–11, there follow several prohibitions against mixing together the things which are separated in God's creation, consisting partly of a verbal repetition of Lev. xix. 19 (see the explanation of this passage).—To this there is appended in ver. 12 the law concerning the tassels upon the hem of the upper garment (Num. xv. 37 sqq.), which were to remind the Israelites of their calling, to walk before the Lord in faithful fulfilment of the commandments of God (see the commentary upon this passage).

Vers. 13–29. LAWS OF CHASTITY AND MARRIAGE.—Higher and still holier than the order of nature stands the moral order of marriage, upon which the well-being not only of domestic life, but also of the civil commonwealth of nations, depends. Marriage must be founded upon fidelity and chastity on the part of those who are married. To foster this, and secure it against outbreaks of malice and evil lust, was the design and object of the laws which follow. The first (vers. 13–21) relates to the chastity of a woman on entering into the married state, which might be called in question by her husband, either from malice or with justice. The former case is that which Moses treats of first of all. If a man took a wife, and came to her, and hated her, *i.e.* turned against her after gratifying his carnal desires (like Amnon, for example, 2 Sam. xiii. 15), and in order to get rid of her again, attributed “deeds or things of words” to her, *i.e.* things which give occasion for words or talk, and

so brought an evil name upon her, saying, that on coming to her he did not find virginity in her. בְּתוֹלִים, virginity, here the signs of it, viz., according to ver. 17, the marks of a first intercourse upon the bed-clothes or dress.—Vers. 15 sqq. In such a case the parents of the young woman (הַנָּשָׁרָה for הַנָּשָׁרָה, as in Gen. xxiv. 14, 28, according to the earliest usage of the books of Moses, a virgin, then also a young woman, e.g. Ruth ii. 6, iv. 12) were to bring the matter before the elders of the town into the gate (the judicial forum; see chap. xxi. 19), and establish the chastity and innocence of their daughter by spreading the bed-clothes before them. It was not necessary to this end that the parents should have taken possession of the spotted bed-clothes directly after the marriage night, as is customarily done by the Bedouins and the lower classes of the Moslem in Egypt and Syria (cf. Niebuhr, *Beschr. v. Arab.* pp. 35 sqq.; Arvieux, *merkw. Nachr.* iii. p. 258; Burckhardt, *Beduinen*, p. 214, etc.). It was sufficient that the cloth should be kept, in case such a proof might be required.—Vers. 18 sqq. The elders, as the magistrates of the place, were then to send for the man who had so calumniated his young wife, and to chastise him (רָפֵג), as in chap. xxi. 18, used to denote bodily chastisement, though the limitation of the number of strokes to forty save one, may have been a later institution of the schools); and in addition to this they were to impose a fine upon him of 100 shekels of silver, which he was to pay to the father of the young wife for his malicious calumnyation of an Israelitish maiden,—twice as much as the seducer of a virgin was to pay to her father for the reproach brought upon him by the humiliation of his daughter (ver. 29); and lastly, they were to deprive the man of the right of divorce from his wife.—Vers. 20, 21. In the other case, however, if the man's words were true, and the girl had not been found to be a virgin, the elders were to bring her out before the door of her father's house, and the men of the town were to stone her to death, because she had committed a folly in Israel (cf. Gen. xxxiv. 7), to commit fornication in her father's house. The punishment of death was to be inflicted upon her, not so much because she had committed fornication, as because notwithstanding this she had allowed a man to marry her as a spotless virgin, and possibly even after her betrothal had gone with another man (cf. vers. 23, 24). There is no ground for thinking of unnatural wantonness, as Knobel does.—Ver. 22. If any one lay with a married woman, they were both of them to be put to death as adulterers (cf. Lev. xx. 10).

Vers. 23–29. In connection with the seduction of a virgin (**שָׁעַרְתָּה**, *puella*, a marriageable girl; **בָּתָלָה**, *virgo immaculata*, a virgin), two, or really three, cases are distinguished; viz. (1) whether she was betrothed (vers. 23–27), or not betrothed (vers. 28, 29); (2) if she were betrothed, whether it was (*a*) in the town (vers. 23, 24) or (*b*) in the open field (vers. 25–27) that she had been violated by a man.—Vers. 23, 24. If a betrothed virgin had allowed a man to have intercourse with her (*i.e.* one who was not her bridegroom), they were both of them, the man and the girl, to be led out to the gate of the town, and stoned that they might die: the girl, because she had not cried in the city, *i.e.* had not called for help, and consequently was to be regarded as consenting to the deed; the man, because he had humbled his neighbour's wife. The betrothed woman was placed in this respect upon a par with a married woman, and in fact is expressly called a wife in ver. 24. Betrothal was the first step towards marriage, even if it was not a solemn act attested by witnesses. Written agreements of marriage were not introduced till a later period (*Tobit vii. 14*; *Tr. Ketuboth i. 2*).—Vers. 25–27. If, on the other hand, a man met a betrothed girl in the field, and laid hold of her and lay with her, the man alone was to die, and nothing was to be done to the girl. “*There is in the damsel no death-sin (i.e. no sin to be punished with death); but as when a man riseth against his neighbour and slayeth him, even so is this matter.*” In the open field the girl had called for help, but no one had helped her. It was therefore a forcible rape.—Vers. 28, 29. The last case: if a virgin was not betrothed, and a man seized her and lay with her, and they were found, *i.e.* discovered or convicted of their deed, the man was to pay the father of the girl fifty shekels of silver, for the reproach brought upon him and his house, and to marry the girl whom he had humbled, without ever being able to divorce her. This case is similar to the one mentioned in Ex. xxii. 15, 16. The omission to mention the possibility of the father refusing to give him his daughter for a wife, makes no essential difference. It is assumed as self-evident here, that such a right was possessed by the father.

Ver. 30 (or chap. xxiii. 1). This verse, in which the prohibition of incest is renewed by a repetition of the first provision in the earlier law (*Lev. xviii. 7, 8*), is no doubt much better adapted to form the close of the laws of chastity and marriage, than the introduction to the laws which follow concerning the right of citizenship in the congregation of the Lord.

Regulations as to the Right of Citizenship in the Congregation of the Lord.—Chap. xxiii.

From the sanctification of the house and the domestic relation, to which the laws of marriage and chastity in the previous chapter pointed, Moses proceeds to instructions concerning the sanctification of their union as a congregation : he gives directions as to the exclusion of certain persons from the congregation of the Lord, and the reception of others into it (vers. 1-8) ; as to the preservation of the purity of the camp in time of war (vers. 9-14) ; as to the reception of foreign slaves into the land, and the removal of licentious persons out of it (vers. 15-18) ; and lastly, as to certain duties of citizenship (19-25).

Vers. 1-8. THE RIGHT OF CITIZENSHIP IN THE CONGREGATION OF THE LORD.—Ver. 1. Into the congregation of the Lord there was not to come, *i.e.* not to be received, any person who was mutilated in his sexual member. פְּצַוָּעַ דִּבֶּה, literally wounded by crushing, *i.e.* mutilated in this way ; *Vulg.* *eunuchus attritus vel amputatis testiculis.* Not only animals (see at Lev. xxii. 24), but men also, were castrated in this way. בְּרוֹת שְׁפֵכָה was one whose sexual member was cut off ; *Vulg.* *abscisso veretro.* According to *Mishnah Jebam.* vi. 2, “*contusus דִּבֶּה est omnis, cuius testiculi vulnerati sunt, vel certe unus eorum; exsectus (ברות), cuius membrum virile præcisum est.*” In the modern East, emasculation is generally performed in this way (see *Tournefort, Reise.* ii. p. 259, and *Burckhardt, Nubien*, pp. 450, 451). The reason for the exclusion of emasculated persons from the congregation of Jehovah, *i.e.* not merely from office (*officio et publico magistratu, Luth.*) and from marriage with an Israelitish woman (*Fag., C. a Lap.*, and others), but from admission into the covenant fellowship of Israel with the Lord, is to be found in the mutilation of the nature of man as created by God, which was irreconcilable with the character of the people of God. Nature is not destroyed by grace, but sanctified and transformed. This law, however, was one of the ordinances intended for the period of infancy, and has lost its significance with the spread of the kingdom of God over all the nations of the earth (Isa. lvi. 4).—Ver. 2. So also with the מִמְּנִיר, *i.e.* not persons begotten out of wedlock, illegitimate children generally (*LXX., Vulg.*), but, according to the *Talmud* and the *Rabbins*, those who were begotten in incest or adultery (cf. *Ges. thes.* p. 781). The etymology

of the word is obscure. The only other place in which it occurs is Zech. ix. 6; and it is neither contracted from מָם and זָר (according to the *Talmud*, and *Hitzig* on Zech. ix. 6), nor from בְּעֵם זָר (*Geiger Urschr.* p. 52), but in all probability is to be derived from a root מַזֵּר, synonymous with the Arabic word “to be corrupt, or foul.” The additional clause, “*not even in the tenth generation*,” precludes all possibility of their ever being received. Ten is the number of complete exclusion. In ver. 3, therefore, “*for ever*” is added. The reason is the same as in the case of mutilated persons, namely, their springing from a connection opposed to the divine order of the creation.—Vers. 3–6. Also no Ammonite or Moabite was to be received, not even in the tenth generation; not, however, because their fore-fathers were begotten in incest (Gen. xix. 30 sqq.), as *Knobel* supposes, but on account of the hostility they had manifested to the establishment of the kingdom of God. Not only had they failed to give Israel a hospitable reception on its journey (see at chap. ii. 29), but they (viz. the king of the Moabites) had even hired Balaam to curse Israel. In this way they had brought upon themselves the curse which falls upon all those who curse Israel, according to the infallible word of God (Gen. xii. 3), the truth of which even Balaam was obliged to attest in the presence of Balak (Num. xxiv. 9); although out of love to Israel the Lord turned the curse of Balaam into a blessing (cf. Num. xxii.–xxiv.). For this reason Israel was never to seek their welfare and prosperity, *i.e.* to make this an object of its care (“to seek,” as in Jer. xxix. 7); not indeed from personal hatred, for the purpose of repaying evil with evil, since this neither induced Moses to publish the prohibition, nor instigated Ezra when he put the law in force, by compelling the separation of all Ammonitish, Moabitish, and Canaanitish wives from the newly established congregation in Jerusalem (Ezra ix. 12). How far Moses was from being influenced by such motives of personal or national revenge is evident, apart from the prohibition in chap. ii. 9 and 19 against making war upon the Moabites and Ammonites, from the command which follows in vers. 8 and 9 with reference to the Edomites and Egyptians. These nations had also manifested hostility to the Israelites. Edom had come against them when they desired to march peaceably through his land (Num. xx. 18 sqq.), and the Pharaohs of Egypt had heavily oppressed them. Nevertheless, Israel was to keep the bond of kindred sacred (“he is thy brother”), and not to forget in the case of the Egyptians the benefits derived from their sojourn in their land. Their children

might come into the congregation of the Lord in the third generation, *i.e.* the great-grandchildren of Edomites or Egyptians, who had lived as strangers in Israel (see at Ex. xx. 5). Such persons might be incorporated into the covenant nation by circumcision.

Vers. 9-14. PRESERVATION OF THE PURITY OF THE CAMP IN TIME OF WAR.—The bodily appearance of the people was also to correspond to the sacredness of Israel as the congregation of the Lord, especially when they gathered in hosts around their God. “*When thou marchest out as a camp against thine enemies, beware of every evil thing.*” What is meant by an “evil thing” is stated in vers. 10-13, viz. uncleanness, and uncleanliness of the body.—Vers. 10, 11. The person who had become unclean through a nightly occurrence, was to go out of the camp and remain there till he had cleansed himself in the evening. On the journey through the desert, none but those who were affected with uncleanness of a longer duration were to be removed from the camp (Num. v. 2); but when they were encamped, this law was to apply to even lighter defilements.—Vers. 12, 13. The camp of war was also not to be defiled with the dirt of excrements. Outside the camp there was to be a space or place (*תְּמִימָה*, as in Num. ii. 17) for the necessities of nature, and among their implements they were to have a spade, with which they were to dig when they sate down, and then cover it up again. *תְּמִימָה*, generally a plug, here a tool for sticking in, *i.e.* for digging into the ground.—Ver. 14. For the camp was to be (to be kept) holy, because Jehovah walked in the midst of it, in order that He might not see “*nakedness of a thing,*” *i.e.* anything to be ashamed of (see at chap. xxiv. 1) in the people, “*and turn away from thee.*” There was nothing shameful in the excrement itself; but the want of reverence, which the people would display through not removing it, would offend the Lord and drive Him out of the camp of Israel.

Vers. 15-18. TOLERATION AND NON-TOLERATION IN THE CONGREGATION OF THE LORD.—Vers. 15, 16. A slave who had escaped from his master to Israel was not to be given up, but to be allowed to dwell in the land, wherever he might choose, and not to be oppressed. The reference is to a slave who had fled to them from a foreign country, on account of the harsh treatment which he had received from his heathen master. The plural *אֲלֹנִים* denotes the rule.—Vers. 17, 18. On the other hand, male and female prostitutes of Israelitish descent were not to be tolerated; *i.e.* it was

not to be allowed, that either a male or female among the Israelites should give himself up to prostitution as an act of religious worship. The exclusion of foreign prostitutes was involved in the command to root out the Canaanites. קָרְנָשָׁה and קָרְנָשָׁה were persons who prostituted themselves in the worship of the Canaanitish Astarte (see at Gen. xxxviii. 21).—“*The wages of a prostitute and the money of dogs shall not come into the house of the Lord on account of* (בַּ, for the more remote cause, Ewald, § 217) *any vow; for even both these* (viz. even the prostitute and dog, not merely their dishonourable gains) *are abomination unto the Lord thy God.*” “The hire of a whore” is what the *kedeshah* was paid for giving herself up. “The price of a dog” is not the price paid for the sale of a dog (*Bochart, Spencer, Iken, Baumgarten, etc.*), but is a figurative expression used to denote the gains of the *kadesh*, who was called κίναιδος by the Greeks, and received his name from the dog-like manner in which the male *kadesh* debased himself (see Rev. xxii. 15, where the unclean are distinctly called “dogs”).

Vers. 19–25. DIFFERENT THEOCRATIC RIGHTS OF CITIZENSHIP.—Vers. 19, 20. Of his brother (*i.e.* his countryman), the Israelite was not to take interest for money, food, or anything else that he lent to him; but only of strangers (non-Israelites: cf. Ex. xxii. 24 and Lev. xxv. 36, 37).—Vers. 21–23. Vows vowed to the Lord were to be fulfilled without delay; but omitting to vow was not a sin. (On vows themselves, see at Lev. xxvii. and Num. xxx. 2 sqq.) יִגְבַּחַת is an accusative defining the meaning more fully: in free will, spontaneously.—Vers. 24, 25. In the vineyard and corn-field of a neighbour they might eat at pleasure to still their hunger, but they were not to put anything into a vessel, or swing a sickle upon another’s corn, that is to say, carry away any store of grapes or ears of corn. בְּנֵפֶשׁ, according to thy desire, or appetite (cf. chap. xiv. 26). “*Pluck the ears:*” cf. Matt. xii. 1; Luke vi. 1.—The right of hungry persons, when passing through a field, to pluck ears of corn, and rub out the grains and eat, is still recognised among the Arabs (*vid. Rob. Pal. ii. 192*).

On Divorce. Warnings against want of Affection or Injustice.—Chap. xxiv.

Vers. 1–5 contain two laws concerning the relation of a man to his wife. The first (vers. 1–4) has reference to divorce. In these verses, however, divorce is not established as a right; all that is

done is, that in case of a divorce a reunion with the divorced wife is forbidden, if in the meantime she had married another man, even though the second husband had also put her away, or had died. The four verses form a period, in which vers. 1-3 are the clauses of the protasis, which describe the matter treated about; and ver. 4 contains the apodosis, with the law concerning the point in question. If a man married a wife, and he put her away with a letter of divorce, because she did not please him any longer, and the divorced woman married another man, and he either put her away in the same manner or died, the first husband could not take her as his wife again. The putting away (divorce) of a wife with a letter of divorce, which the husband gave to the wife whom he put away, is assumed as a custom founded upon tradition. This tradition left the question of divorce entirely at the will of the husband: “*if the wife does not find favour in his eyes (i.e. does not please him), because he has found in her something shameful*” (chap. xxiii. 15). עָרָה, nakedness, shame, disgrace (Isa. xx. 4; 1 Sam. xx. 30); in connection with דבר, the shame of a thing, i.e. a shameful thing (LXX. ἀσχημον πρᾶγμα; *Vulg. aliquam fætiditatem*). The meaning of this expression as a ground of divorce was disputed even among the Rabbins. *Hillel's* school interpret it in the widest and most lax manner possible, according to the explanation of the Pharisees in Matt. xix. 3, “for every cause.” They no doubt followed the rendering of *Onkelos*, פְתִינָם בְּבִירָת, the transgression of a thing; but this is contrary to the use of the word עָרָה, to which the interpretation given by *Shammai* adhered more strictly. His explanation of דבר is “*rem impudicam, libidinem, lasciviam, impudicitiam*.” Adultery, to which some of the Rabbins would restrict the expression, is certainly not to be thought of, because this was to be punished with death.¹ סֵפֶר בְּרִיתָה, βιβλίον ἀποστασίου, a letter of divorce; בְּרִיתָה, hewing off, cutting off, sc. from the man, with whom the wife was to be one flesh (Gen. ii. 24). The custom of giving letters of divorce was probably adopted by the Israelites in Egypt, where the practice of writing had already found its way into all the relations of life.² The law that the first husband could not take his divorced wife back again, if she had

¹ For the different views of the Rabbins upon this subject, see *Mishnah tract. Gittin* ix. 10; *Buxtorf, de sponsal. et divorc.* pp. 88 sqq.; *Selden, uxor ebr.* l. iii. c. 18 and 20; and *Lightfoot, horæ ebr. et talm.* ad *Matth.* v. 31 sq.

² The rabbinical rules on the grounds of divorce and the letter of divorce, according to *Maimonides*, have been collected by *Surenhusius, ad Mishn. tr.*

married another husband in the meantime, even supposing that the second husband was dead, would necessarily put a check upon frivolous divorces. Moses could not entirely abolish the traditional custom, if only “because of the hardness of the people’s hearts” (Matt. xix. 8). The thought, therefore, of the impossibility of reunion with the first husband, after the wife had contracted a second marriage, would put some restraint upon a frivolous rupture of the marriage tie: it would have this effect, that whilst, on the one hand, the man would reflect when inducements to divorce his wife presented themselves, and would recall a rash act if it had been performed, before the wife he had put away had married another husband; on the other hand, the wife would yield more readily to the will of her husband, and seek to avoid furnishing him with an inducement for divorce. But this effect would be still more readily produced by the reason assigned by Moses, namely, that the divorced woman was defiled (**הַזָּבֵל**, *Hothpael*, as in Num. i. 47) by her marriage with a second husband. The second marriage of a woman who had been divorced is designated by Moses a defilement of the woman, primarily no doubt with reference to the fact that the *emissio seminis* in sexual intercourse rendered unclean, though not merely in the sense of such a defilement as was removed in the evening by simple washing, but as a moral defilement, *i.e.* blemishing, desecration of the sexual communion which was sanctified by marriage, in the same sense in which adultery is called a defilement in Lev. xviii. 20 and Num. v. 13, 14. Thus the second marriage of a divorced woman was placed *implicite* upon a par with adultery, and some approach made towards the teaching of Christ concerning marriage: “Whoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery” (Matt. v. 32).—But if the second marriage of a divorced woman was a moral defilement, of course the wife could not marry the first again even after the death of her second husband, not only because such a reunion would lower the dignity of the woman, and the woman would appear too much like property, which could be disposed of at one time and reclaimed at another (*Schultz*), but because the defilement of the wife would be thereby repeated, and even increased, as the moral defilement which the divorced wife acquired through the second marriage was not removed by a divorce from the second husband, nor yet by his death. Such defilement was *Gittin*, c. 1 (T. iii. pp. 322 sq. of the *Mishnah of Sur.*), where different specimens of letters of divorce are given; the latter also in *Lightfoot, l.c.*

an abomination before Jehovah, by which they would cause the land to sin, *i.e.* stain it with sin, as much as by the sins of incest and unnatural licentiousness (*Lev. xviii. 25*).

Attached to this law, which is intended to prevent a frivolous severance of the marriage tie, there is another in ver. 5, which was of a more positive character, and adapted to fortify the marriage bond. The newly married man was not required to perform military service for a whole year; “*and there shall not come (anything) upon him with regard to any matter.*” The meaning of this last clause is to be found in what follows: “*Free shall he be for his house for a year,*” *i.e.* they shall put no public burdens upon him, that he may devote himself entirely to his newly established domestic relations, and be able to gladden his wife (compare chap. xx. 7).

Vers. 6-9. *Various Prohibitions.*—Ver. 6. “*No man shall take in pledge the handmill and millstone, for he (who does this) is pawning life.*” **תְּמִימָה**, the handmill; **רַכֶּב**, lit. the runner, *i.e.* the upper millstone. Neither the whole mill nor the upper millstone was to be asked for as a pledge, by which the mill would be rendered useless, since the handmill was indispensable for preparing the daily food for the house; so that whoever took them away injured life itself, by withdrawing what was indispensable to the preservation of life. The mill is mentioned as one specimen of articles of this kind, like the clothing in *Ex. xxii. 25, 26*, which served the poor man as bed-clothes also. Breaches of this commandment are reproved in *Amos ii. 8*; *Job xxii. 6*; *Prov. xx. 16, xxii. 27, xxvii. 13*.—Ver. 7. Repetition of the law against man-stealing (*Ex. xxi. 16*).—Vers. 8, 9. The command, “*Take heed by the plague of leprosy to observe diligently and to do according to all that the priests teach thee,*” etc., does not mean, that when they saw signs of leprosy they were to be upon their guard, to observe everything that the priests directed them, as *Knobel* and many others suppose. For, in the first place, the reference to the punishment of Miriam with leprosy is by no means appropriate to such a thought as this, since Miriam did not act in opposition to the priests after she had been smitten with leprosy, but brought leprosy upon herself as a punishment, by her rebellion against Moses (*Num. xii. 10 sqq.*). And in the second place, this view cannot be reconciled with **הַשְׁמֵר בְּנֵנֹעַ**, since **הַשְׁמֵר** with **בְּ**, either to be upon one’s guard against (before) anything (*2 Sam. xx. 10*), or when taken in connection with **בְּנֵפֶת**, to beware by the soul, *i.e.* for the

sake of the worth of the soul (*Jer. xvii. 21*). The thought here, therefore, is, “Be on thy guard because of the plague of leprosy,” *i.e.* that thou dost not get it, have to bear it, as the reward for thy rebellion against what the priests teach according to the commandment of the Lord. “Watch diligently, that thou do not incur the plague of leprosy” (*Vulgate*); or, “that thou do not sin, so as to be punished with leprosy” (*J. H. Michaelis*).

Vers. 10–15. *Warning against oppressing the Poor*.—Vers. 10, 11. If a loan of any kind was lent to a neighbour, the lender was not to go into his house to pledge (take) a pledge, but was to let the borrower bring the pledge out. The meaning is, that they were to leave it to the borrower to give a pledge, and not compel him to give up something as a pledge that might be indispensable to him. —Vers. 12, 13. And if the man was in distress (*וּבָד*), the lender was not to lie (sleep) upon his pledge, since the poor man had very often nothing but his upper garment, in which he slept, to give as a pledge. This was to be returned to him in the evening. (A repetition of *Ex. xxii. 25, 26*.) On the expression, “it shall be righteousness unto thee,” see chap. vi. 25.—Vers. 14, 15. They were not to oppress a poor and distressed labourer, by withholding his wages. This command is repeated here from *Lev. xix. 13*, with special reference to the distress of the poor man. “*And to it* (his wages) *he lifts up his soul:*” *i.e.* he feels a longing for it. “*Lifts up his soul:*” as in *Ps. xxiv. 4*; *Hos. iv. 8*; *Jer. xxii. 27*. On ver. 15b, see chap. xv. 9 and *Jas. v. 4*.

Vers. 16–18. *Warning against Injustice*.—Ver. 16. Fathers were not to be put to death upon (along with) their sons, nor sons upon (along with) their fathers, *i.e.* they were not to suffer the punishment of death with them for crimes in which they had no share; but every one was to be punished simply for his own sin. This command was important, to prevent an unwarrantable and abusive application of the law which is manifest in the movements of divine justice to the criminal jurisprudence of the land (*Ex. xx. 5*), since it was a common thing among heathen nations—*e.g.* the Persians, Macedonians, and others—for the children and families of criminals to be also put to death (cf. *Esther ix. 13, 14*; *Herod. iii. 19*; *Ammian Marcell. xxiii. 6*; *Curtius, vi. 11, 20*, etc.). An example of the carrying out of this law is to be found in *2 Kings xiv. 6*, *2 Chron. xxv. 4*. In vers. 17, 18, the law against perverting the right of strangers, orphans, and widows, is repeated from *Ex. xxii. 20, 21*, and *xxiii. 9*; and an addition is made, namely, that they were not

to take a widow's raiment in pledge (cf. Lev. xix. 33, 34).—Vers. 19-22. Directions to allow strangers, widows, and orphans to glean in time of harvest (as in Lev. xix. 9, 10, and xxiii. 22). The reason is given in ver. 22, viz. the same as in ver. 18 and chap. xv. 15.

Laws relating to Corporal Punishment; Levirate Marriages; and Just Weights and Measures.—Chap. xxv.

Vers. 1-3. **CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.**—The rule respecting the corporal punishment to be inflicted upon a guilty man is introduced in ver. 1 with the general law, that in a dispute between two men the court was to give right to the man who was right, and to pronounce the guilty man guilty (cf. Ex. xxii. 8 and xxiii. 7).—Ver. 2. If the guilty man was sentenced to stripes, he was to receive his punishment in the presence of the judge, and not more than forty stripes, that he might not become contemptible in the eyes of the people. נִזְבֵּן, son of stripes, i.e. a man liable to stripes, like son (child) of death, in 1 Sam. xx. 31. “According to the need of his crime in number,” i.e. as many stripes as his crime deserved.—Ver. 3. “Forty shall ye beat him, and not add,” i.e. at most forty stripes, and not more. The strokes were administered with a stick upon the back (Prov. x. 13, xix. 29, xxvi. 3, etc.). This was the Egyptian mode of whipping, as we may see depicted upon the monuments, when the culprits lie flat upon the ground, and being held fast by the hands and feet, receive their strokes in the presence of the judge (*vid. Wilkinson*, ii. p. 11, and *Rosellini*, ii. 3, p. 274, 78). The number forty was not to be exceeded, because a larger number of strokes with a stick would not only endanger health and life, but disgrace the man: “that thy brother do not become contemptible in thine eyes.” If he had deserved a severer punishment, he was to be executed. In Turkey the punishments inflicted are much more severe, viz. from fifty to a hundred lashes with a whip; and they are at the same time inhuman (see *v. Tornauw, Moslem. Recht*, p. 234). The number, forty, was probably chosen with reference to its symbolical significance, which it had derived from Gen. vii. 12 onwards, as the full measure of judgment. The Rabbins fixed the number at forty save one (*vid. 2 Cor. xi. 24*), from a scrupulous fear of transgressing the letter of the law, in case a mistake should be made in the counting; yet they felt no conscientious scruples about using a whip of twisted thongs instead of a stick (*vid. tract. Macc.* iii. 12; *Buxtorf, Synag. Jud.* pp. 522-3; and *Lundius, Jüd. Heiligh.* p. 472).—Ver. 4. The command not to put a muzzle upon the ox when threshing, is

no doubt proverbial in its nature, and even in the context before us is not intended to apply merely literally to an ox employed in threshing, but to be understood in the general sense in which the Apostle Paul uses it in 1 Cor. ix. 9 and 1 Tim. v. 18, viz. that a labourer was not to be deprived of his wages. As the mode of threshing presupposed here—namely, with oxen yoked together, and driven to and fro over the corn that had been strewn upon the floor, that they might kick out the grains with their hoofs—has been retained to the present day in the East, so has also the custom of leaving the animals employed in threshing without a muzzle (*vid. Hoest, Marokos*, p. 129; *Wellst. Arabien*, i. p. 194; *Robinson*, Pal. ii. pp. 206–7, iii. p. 6), although the Mosaic injunctions are not so strictly observed by the Christians as by the Mohammedans (*Robinson*, ii. p. 207).

Vers. 5–10. ON LEVIRATE MARRIAGES.—Vers. 5, 6. If brothers lived together, and one of them died childless, the wife of the deceased was not to be married outside (*i.e.* away from the family) to a strange man (one not belonging to her kindred); her brother-in-law was to come to her and take her for his wife, and perform the duty of a brother-in-law to her. בָּבֵן, *denom.* from בָּבֵן, a brother-in-law, husband's brother, *lit.* to act the brother-in-law, *i.e.* perform the duty of a brother-in-law, which consisted in his marrying his deceased brother's widow, and begetting a son or children with her, the first-born of whom was “to stand upon the name of his deceased brother,” *i.e.* be placed in the family of the deceased, and be recognised as the heir of his property, that his name (the name of the man who had died childless) might not be wiped out or vanish out of Israel. The provision, “without having a son” (*ben*), has been correctly interpreted by the LXX., *Vulg.*, *Josephus* (Ant. iv. 8, 23), and the *Rabbins*, as signifying childless (having no seed, Matt. xxii. 25); for if the deceased had simply a daughter, according to Num. xxvii. 4 sqq., the perpetuation of his house and name was to be ensured through her. The obligation of a brother-in-law's marriage only existed in cases where the brothers had lived together, *i.e.* in one and the same place, not necessarily in one house or with a common domestic establishment and home (*vid. Gen. xiii. 6, xxxvi. 7*).—This custom of a brother-in-law's (Levirate) marriage, which is met with in different nations, and was an old traditional custom among the Israelites (see at Gen. xxxviii. 8 sqq.), had its natural roots in the desire inherent in man,

who is formed for immortality, and connected with the hitherto undeveloped belief in an eternal life, to secure a continued personal existence for himself and immortality for his name, through the perpetuation of his family and in the life of the son who took his place. This desire was not suppressed in Israel by divine revelation, but rather increased, inasmuch as the promises given to the patriarchs were bound up with the preservation and propagation of their seed and name. The promise given to Abraham for his seed would of necessity not only raise the begetting of children in the religious views of the Israelites into a work desired by God and well-pleasing to Him, but would also give this significance to the traditional custom of preserving the name and family by the substitution of a marriage of duty, that they would thereby secure to themselves and their family a share in the blessing of promise. Moses therefore recognised this custom as perfectly justifiable; but he sought to restrain it within such limits, that it should not present any impediment to the sanctification of marriage aimed at by the law. He took away the compulsory character, which it hitherto possessed, by prescribing in vers. 7 sqq., that if the surviving brother refused to marry his widowed sister-in-law, she was to bring the matter into the gate before the elders of the town (*vid. chap. xxi. 19*), *i.e.* before the magistrates; and if the brother-in-law still persisted in his refusal, she was to take his shoe from off his foot and spit in his face, with these words: “*So let it be done to the man who does not build up his brother's house.*” The taking off of the shoe was an ancient custom in Israel, adopted, according to Ruth iv. 7, in cases of redemption and exchange, for the purpose of confirming commercial transactions. The usage arose from the fact, that when any one took possession of landed property he did so by treading upon the soil, and asserting his right of possession by standing upon it in his shoes. In this way the taking off of the shoe and handing it to another became a symbol of the renunciation of a man's position and property,—a symbol which was also common among the Indians and the ancient Germans (see my *Archäologie*, ii. p. 66). But the custom was an ignominious one in such a case as this, when the shoe was publicly taken off the foot of the brother-in-law by the widow whom he refused to marry. He was thus deprived of the position which he ought to have occupied in relation to her and to his deceased brother, or to his paternal house; and the disgrace involved in this was still further heightened by the fact that his sister-in-law spat in his face. This

is the meaning of the words (cf. Num. xii. 14), and not merely spit on the ground before his eyes, as *Saalschütz* and others as well as the Talmudists (*tr. Jebam.* xii. 6) render it, for the purpose of diminishing the disgrace. “*Build up his brother’s house,*” i.e. lay the foundation of a family or posterity for him (cf. Gen. xvi. 2).—In addition to this, the unwilling brother-in-law was to receive a name of ridicule in Israel: “*House of the shoe taken off*” (*לְבַדֵּן נִשְׁאָר*, taken off as to his shoe; cf. *Ewald*, § 288, b.), i.e. of the barefooted man, equivalent to “the miserable fellow;” for it was only in miserable circumstances that the Hebrews went barefoot (*vid.* Isa. xx. 2, 3; Micah i. 8; 2 Sam. xv. 30). If the brother-in-law bore this reproach upon himself and his house, he was released from his duty as a brother-in-law. By these regulations the brother-in-law’s marriage was no doubt recognised as a duty of affection towards his deceased brother, but it was not made a command, the neglect of which would involve guilt and punishment. Within these limits the brother-in-law’s marriage might co-exist with the prohibition of marriage with a brother’s wife; “whereas, if the deceased brother had a son or children, such a marriage was forbidden as prejudicial to the fraternal relation. In cases where the deceased was childless, it was commanded as a duty of affection for the building up of the brother’s house, and the preservation of his family and name. By the former prohibition, the house (family) of the brother was kept in its integrity, whilst by the latter command its permanent duration was secured. In both cases the deceased brother was honoured, and the fraternal affection preserved as the moral foundation of his house” (*vid. my Archäologie*, pp. 64, 65).

Vers. 11 and 12. “But in order that the great independence which is here accorded to a childless widow in relation to her brother-in-law, might not be interpreted as a false freedom granted to the female sex” (*Baumgarten*), the law is added immediately afterwards, that a woman whose husband was quarrelling with another, and who should come to his assistance by laying hold of the secret parts of the man who was striking her husband, should have her hand cut off.

Vers. 13–19. The duty of integrity in trade is once more enforced in vers. 13–16 (as in Lev. xix. 35, 36). “*Stone and stone,*” i.e. two kinds of stones for weighing (cf. Ps. xii. 3), viz. large ones for buying and small ones for selling. On the promise in ver. 15b, see chap. iv. 26, v. 16; ver. 16a, as in chap. xxii. 5, xviii. 12, etc. In the concluding words, ver. 16b, “*all that do unrighteously,*” Moses

sums up all breaches of the law.—Vers. 17-19. But whilst the Israelites were to make love the guiding principle of their conduct in their dealings with a neighbour, and even with strangers and foes, this love was not to degenerate into weakness or indifference towards open ungodliness. To impress this truth upon the people, Moses concludes the discourse on the law by reminding them of the crafty enmity manifested towards them by Amalek on their march out of Egypt, and with the command to root out the Amalekites (cf. Ex. xvii. 9-16). This heathen nation had come against Israel on its journey, viz. at Rephidim in Horeb, and had attacked its rear: “*All the enfeebled behind thee, whilst thou wast faint and weary, without fearing God.*” בְּגַיִל, lit. to tail, hence to attack or destroy the rear of an army or of a travelling people (cf. Josh. x. 19). For this reason, when the Lord should have given Israel rest in the land of its inheritance, it was to root out the remembrance of Amalek under heaven. (On the execution of this command, see 1 Sam. xv.) “*Thou shalt not forget it:*” an emphatic enforcement of the “remember” in ver. 17.

Thanksgiving and Prayer at the Presentation of First-fruits and Tithes.—Chap. xxvi.

To the exposition of the commandments and rights of Israel Moses adds, in closing, another ordinance respecting those gifts, which were most intimately connected with social and domestic life, viz. the first-fruits and second tithes, for the purpose of giving the proper consecration to the attitude of the nation towards its Lord and God.

Vers. 1-11. Of the first of the fruit of the ground, which was presented from the land received from the Lord, the Israelite was to take a portion (*מִן־אָשֵׁת* with *מִן* partitive), and bring it in a basket to the place of the sanctuary, and give it to the priest who should be there, with the words, “*I have made known to-day to the Lord thy God, that I have come into the land which the Lord swore to our fathers to give us,*” upon which the priest should take the basket and put it down before the altar of Jehovah (vers. 1-4). From the partitive *מִן־אָשֵׁת* we cannot infer, as *Schultz* supposes, that the first-fruits were not to be all delivered at the sanctuary, any more than this can be inferred from Ex. xxiii. 19 (see the explanation of this passage). All that is implied is, that, for the purpose described afterwards, it was not necessary to put all the offerings of first-fruits into a basket and set them down before the altar. נִנְצָבֶת

(vers. 2, 4, and chap. xxviii. 5, 17) is a basket of wicker-work, and not, as Knobel maintains, the Deuteronomist's word for צנצנת (Ex. xvi. 33). “*The priest*” is not the high priest, but the priest who had to attend to the altar-service and receive the sacrificial gifts.—The words, “I have to-day made known to the Lord thy God,” refer to the practical confession which was made by the presentation of the first-fruits. The fruit was the tangible proof that they were in possession of the land, and the presentation of the first of this fruit the practical confession that they were indebted to the Lord for the land. This confession the offerer was also to embody in a prayer of thanksgiving, after the basket had been received by the priest, in which he confessed that he and his people owed their existence and welfare to the grace of God, manifested in the miraculous redemption of Israel out of the oppression of Egypt and their guidance into Canaan.—Ver. 5, “אֶרְפָּא אָבִד אָבִי,” *a lost (perishing) Aramaean was my father* (not the Aramaean, *Laban*, wanted to destroy my father, *Jacob*, as the *Chald.*, *Arab.*, *Luther*, and others render it). בָּבֵד signifies not only going astray, wandering, but perishing, in danger of perishing, as in Job xxix. 13, Prov. xxxi. 6, etc. Jacob is referred to, for it was he who went down to Egypt in few men. He is mentioned as the tribe-father of the nation, because the nation was directly descended from his sons, and also derived its name of *Israel* from him. Jacob is called an Aramaean, not only because of his long sojourn in Aramæa (Gen. xxix.–xxxii.), but also because he got his wives and children there (cf. Hos. xii. 13); and the relatives of the patriarchs had accompanied Abraham from Chaldæa to Mesopotamia (Aram; see Gen. xi. 30). בָּמִתְיַהַ מַעַם, consisting of few men (בָּ, the so-called *beth essent.*, as in chap. x. 22, Ex. vi. 3, etc.; *vid. Ewald*, § 299, q.). Compare Gen. xxxiv. 30, where Jacob himself describes his family as “few in number.” On the number in the family that migrated into Egypt, reckoned at seventy souls, see the explanation at Gen. xlvi. 27. On the multiplication in Egypt into a great and strong people, see Ex. i. 7, 9; and on the oppression endured there, Ex. i. 11–22, and ii. 23 sqq.—The guidance out of Egypt amidst great signs (ver. 8), as in chap. iv. 34.—Ver. 10. “*So shalt thou set it down (the basket with the first-fruits) before Jehovah.*” These words are not to be understood, as *Clericus*, *Knobel*, and others suppose, in direct opposition to vers. 4 and 5, as implying that the offerer had held the basket in his hand during the prayer, but simply as a remark which closes the instructions.—Ver. 11. Rejoicing in

all the good, etc., points to the joy connected with the sacrificial meal, which followed the act of worship (as in chap. xii. 12). The presentation of the first-fruits took place, no doubt, on their pilgrimages to the sanctuary at the three yearly festivals (chap. xvi.) ; but it is quite without ground that *Riehm* restricts these words to the sacrificial meals to be prepared from the tithes, as if they had been the only sacrificial meals (see at chap. xviii. 3).

Vers. 12-15. The delivery of the tithes, like the presentation of the first-fruits, was also to be sanctified by prayer before the Lord. It is true that only a prayer after taking the second tithe in the third year is commanded here ; but that is simply because this tithe was appropriated everywhere throughout the land to festal meals for the poor and destitute (chap. xiv. 28), when prayer before the Lord would not follow *per analogiam* from the previous injunction concerning the presentation of first-fruits, as it would in the case of the tithes with which sacrificial meals were prepared at the sanctuary (chap. xiv. 22 sqq.). **רִשְׁעַל** is the infinitive Hiphil for **רִשְׁעָלֵךְ**, as in Neh. x. 39 (on this form, *vid. Ges.* § 53, 3 Anm. 2 and 7, and *Ew.* § 131, b. and 244, b.). “Saying before the Lord” does not denote prayer in the sanctuary (at the tabernacle), but, as in Gen. xxvii. 7, simply prayer before God the omnipresent One, who is enthroned in heaven (ver. 15), and blesses His people from above from His holy habitation. The declaration of having fulfilled the commandments of God refers primarily to the directions concerning the tithes, and was such a rendering of an account as springs from the consciousness that a man very easily transgresses the commandments of God, and has nothing in common with the blindness of pharisaic self-righteousness. “*I have cleaned out the holy out of my house :*” the holy is that which is sanctified to God, that which belongs to the Lord and His servants, as in Lev. xxi. 22. **בָּעֵר** signifies not only to remove, but to clean out, wipe out. That which was sanctified to God appeared as a debt, which was to be wiped out of a man’s house (*Schultz*).—Ver. 14. “*I have not eaten thereof in my sorrow.*” **בָּשָׂר**, from **בָּשָׂר**, tribulation, distress, signifies here in all probability mourning, and judging from what follows, mourning for the dead, equivalent to “in a mourning condition,” i.e. in a state of legal (Levitical) uncleanness ; so that **בָּאֲנִי** really corresponded to the **בְּטַהֲרָה** which follows, except that **בְּטַהֲרָה** includes every kind of legal uncleanness. “*I have removed nothing thereof as unclean,*” i.e. while in the state of an unclean person. Not only not eaten of any, but not removed any of it from the house, carried

it away in an unclean state, in which they were forbidden to touch the holy gifts (Lev. xxii. 3). “*And not given (any) of it on account of the dead.*” This most probably refers to the custom of sending provisions into a house of mourning, to prepare meals for the mourners (2 Sam. iii. 25; Jer. xvi. 7; Hos. ix. 4; Tobit iv. 17). A house of mourning, with its inhabitants, was regarded as unclean; consequently nothing could be carried into it of that which was sanctified. There is no good ground for thinking of idolatrous customs, or of any special superstition attached to the bread of mourning; nor is there any ground for understanding the words as referring to the later Jewish custom of putting provisions into the grave along with the corpse, to which the Septuagint rendering, *οὐκ ἔδωκα ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῷ τεθνηκότι*, points. (On ver. 15, see Isa. lixiii. 15.)

Vers. 16–19. At the close of his discourse, Moses sums up the whole in the earnest admonition that Israel would give the Lord its God occasion to fulfil the promised glorification of His people, by keeping His commandments with all their heart and soul.—Ver. 16. On this day the Lord commanded Israel to keep these laws and rights with all the heart and all the soul (cf. chap. vi. 5, x. 12 sqq.). There are two important points contained in this (vers. 17 sqq.). The acceptance of the laws laid before them on the part of the Israelites involved a practical declaration that the nation would accept Jehovah as its God, and walk in His way (ver. 17); and the giving of the law on the part of the Lord was a practical confirmation of His promise that Israel should be His people of possession, which He would glorify above all nations (vers. 18, 19). “*Thou hast let the Lord say to-day to be thy God,*” i.e. hast given Him occasion to say to thee that He will be thy God, manifest Himself to thee as thy God. “*And to walk in His ways, and to keep His laws,*” etc., for “and that thou wouldest walk in His ways, and keep His laws.” The acceptance of Jehovah as its God involved *eo ipso* a willingness to walk in His ways.—Vers. 18, 19. At the same time, Jehovah had caused the people to be told that they were His treasured people of possession, as He had said in Ex. xix. 5, 6; and that if they kept all His commandments, He would set them highest above all nations whom He had created, “for praise, and for a name, and for glory,” i.e. make them an object of praise, and renown, and glorification of God, the Lord and Creator of Israel, among all nations (*vid. Jer. xxxiii. 9 and xiii. 11; Zeph. iii. 19, 20.*) “*And that it should become a holy people unto the Lord,*” as He had already said in Ex. xix. 6. The sanctification of Israel was the

design and end of its divine election, and would be accomplished in the glory to which the people of God were to be exalted (see the commentary on Ex. xix. 5, 6). The *Hiphil* הַמִּיר, which is only found here, has no other meaning than this, “to cause a person to say,” or “give him occasion to say;” and this is perfectly appropriate here, whereas the other meaning suggested, “to exalt,” has no tenable support either in the paraphrastic rendering of these verses in the ancient versions, or in the Hithpael in Ps. xciv. 4, and moreover is altogether unsuitable in ver. 17.

III.—THIRD DISCOURSE, OR RENEWAL OF THE COVENANT.

CHAP. XXVII.—XXX.

THE conclusion of the covenant in the land of Moab, as the last address in this section (chap. xxix. and xxx.) is called in the heading (chap. xxviii. 69) and in the introduction (chap. xxix. 9 sqq.), *i.e.* the renewal of the covenant concluded at Horeb, commences with instructions to set up the law in a solemn manner in the land of Canaan after crossing over the Jordan (chap. xxvii.). After this there follows an elaborate exposition of the blessings and curses which would come upon the people according to their attitude towards the law (chap. xxviii.). And lastly, Moses places the whole nation with a solemn address before the face of the Lord, and sets before it once more the blessing and the curse in powerful and alarming words, with the exhortation to choose the blessing and life (chap. xxix. and xxx.).

ON THE SETTING UP OF THE LAW IN THE LAND OF CANAAN.—

CHAP. XXVII.

The instructions upon this point are divisible into two: viz. (*a*) to set up large stones covered with lime upon Mount Ebal, after crossing into Canaan, and to build an altar there for the presentation of burnt-offerings and slain-offerings, and to write the law upon these stones (vers. 1–8); and (*b*) to proclaim the blessing and curse of the law upon Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal (vers. 11–26). These two instructions are bound together by the command to observe the law (vers. 9 and 10), in which the internal or essential connection of the two is manifested externally also. The fulfilment

of these directions after the entrance of Israel into Canaan is described in Josh. viii. 30–35. The act itself had a symbolical meaning. The writing of the law upon stones, which were erected on a mountain in the midst of the land, with the solemn proclamation of blessings and curses, was a practical acknowledgment of the law of the Lord on the part of Israel,—a substantial declaration that they would make the law the rule and standard of their life and conduct in the land which the Lord had given them for an inheritance.

Vers. 1–10. The command in ver. 1 to keep the whole law (*שְׁמַר*, *inf. abs.* for the imperative, as in Ex. xiii. 3, etc.), with which the instructions that follow are introduced, indicates at the very outset the purpose for which the law written upon stones was to be set up in Canaan, namely, as a public testimony that the Israelites who were entering into Canaan possessed in the law their rule and source of life. The command itself is given by Moses, together with the elders, because the latter had to see to the execution of it after Moses' death; on the other hand, the priests are mentioned along with Moses in ver. 9, because it was their special duty to superintend the fulfilment of the commands of God.—Vers. 2 and 3 contain the general instructions; vers. 4–8, more minute details. In the appointment of the time, “*on the day when ye shall pass over Jordan into the land*,” etc., the word “*day*” must not be pressed, but is to be understood in a broader sense, as signifying the time when Israel should have entered the land and taken possession of it. The stones to be set up were to be covered with lime, or gypsum (whether *sid* signifies lime or gypsum cannot be determined), and all the words of the law were to be written upon them. The writing, therefore, was not to be cut into the stones and then covered with lime (as *J. D. Mich., Ros.*), but to be inscribed upon the plastered stones, as was the custom in Egypt, where the walls of buildings, and even monumental stones, which they were about to paint with figures and hieroglyphics, were first of all covered with a coating of lime or gypsum, and then the figures painted upon this (see the testimonies of *Minutoli, Heeren, Prokesch* in *Hengstenberg's Dissertations*, i. 433, and *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, p. 90). The object of this writing was not to hand down the law in this manner to posterity without alteration, but, as has already been stated, simply to set forth a public acknowledgment of the law on the part of the people, first of all for the sake of the generation which took possession of the land, and for posterity, only so far as this act was recorded in the book of Joshua and thus trans-

mitted to future generations.—Ver. 3. Upon the stones there were to be written “*all the words of this law:*” obviously, therefore, not only the blessings and curses in vers. 15-26 (as *Josephus, Ant.* iv. 8, 44, *Masius, Clericus*, and others maintain), nor only Deuteronomy (*J. Gerhard, A. Osiander, Vater*, etc.), since this contained no independent “second law,” but the whole of the Mosaic law; not, indeed, the entire Pentateuch, with its historical narratives, its geographical, ethnographical, and other notices, but simply the legal part of it,—the commandments, statutes, and rights of the *Thorah*. But whether all the 613 commandments contained in the Pentateuch, according to the Jewish reckoning (vid. *Bertheau, die 7 Gruppen Mos. Ges.* p. 12), or only the quintessence of them, with the omission of the numerous repetitions of different commands, cannot be decided, and is of no importance to the matter in hand. The object aimed at would be attained by writing the essential kernel of the whole law; though the possibility of all the commandments being written, of course without the reasons and exhortations connected with them, cannot be denied, since it is not stated how many stones were set up, but simply that large stones were to be taken, which would therefore contain a great deal. In the clause, “*that thou mayest come into the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee*,” etc., the coming involves the permanent possession of the land. Not only the treading or conquest of Canaan, but the maintenance of the conquered land as a permanent hereditary possession, was promised to Israel; but it would only permanently rejoice in the fulfilment of this promise, if it set up the law of its God in the land, and observed it.—Vers. 4-8. In the further expansion of this command, Moses first of all fixes the place where the stones were to be set up, namely, upon Mount Ebal (see at chap. xi. 29),—not upon Gerizim, according to the reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch; for since the discussion of the question by *Verschuir (dissertt. phil. exeg. diss. 3)* and *Gesenius (de Pent. Samar. p. 61)*, it may be regarded as an established fact, that this reading is an arbitrary alteration. The following clause, “*thou shalt plaister*,” etc., is a repetition in the earliest form of historical writing among the Hebrews. To this there are appended in vers. 5-7 the new and further instructions, that an altar was to be built upon Ebal, and burnt-offerings and slain-offerings to be sacrificed upon it. The notion that this altar was to be built of the stones with the law written upon them, or even with a portion of them, needs no refutation, as it has not the slightest support in the words

of the text. For according to these the altar was to be built of unhewn stones (therefore not of the stones covered with cement), in obedience to the law in Ex. xx. 22 (see the exposition of this passage, where the reason for this is discussed). The spot selected for the setting up of the stones with the law written upon it, as well as for the altar and the offering of sacrifice, was Ebal, the mountain upon which the curses were to be proclaimed; not Gerizim, which was appointed for the publication of the blessings, for the very same reason for which only the curses to be proclaimed are given in vers. 14 sqq. and not the blessings,—not, as *Schultz* supposes, because the law in connection with the curse speaks more forcibly to sinful man than in connection with the blessing, or because the curse, which manifests itself on every hand in human life, sounds more credible than the promise; but, as the *Berleburger Bible* expresses it, “to show how the law and economy of the Old Testament would denounce the curse which rests upon the whole human race because of sin, to awaken a desire for the Messiah, who was to take away the curse and bring the true blessing instead.” For however remote the allusion to the Messiah may be here, the truth is unquestionably pointed out in these instructions, that the law primarily and chiefly brings a curse upon man because of the sinfulness of his nature, as Moses himself announces to the people in chap. xxxi. 16, 17. And for this very reason the book of the law was to be laid by the side of the ark of the covenant as a “testimony against Israel” (chap. xxxi. 26). But the altar was built for the offering of sacrifices, to mould and consecrate the setting up of the law upon the stones into a renewal of the covenant. In the burnt-offerings Israel gave itself up to the Lord with all its life and labour, and in the sacrificial meal it entered into the enjoyment of the blessings of divine grace, to taste of the blessedness of vital communion with its God. By connecting the sacrificial ceremony with the setting up of the law, Israel gave a practical testimony to the fact that its life and blessedness were founded upon its observance of the law. The sacrifices and the sacrificial meal have the same signification here as at the conclusion of the covenant at Sinai (Ex. xxiv. 11).—In ver. 8 the writing of the law upon the stones is commanded once more, and the further injunction is added, “*very plainly.*”—The writing of the law is mentioned last, as being the most important, and not because it was to take place after the sacrificial ceremony. The different instructions are arranged according to their character, and not in chronological order.

The words of Moses which follow in vers. 9 and 10, “*Be silent, and hearken, O Israel; To-day thou hast become the people of the Lord thy God,*” show the significance of the act enjoined ; although primarily they simply summon the Israelites to listen attentively to the still further commands. When Israel renewed the covenant with the Lord, by solemnly setting up the law in Canaan, it became thereby the nation of God, and bound itself, at the same time, to hearken to the voice of the Lord and keep His commandments, as it had already done (cf. chap. xxvi. 17, 18).

Vers. 11-26. With the solemn erection of the stones with the law written upon them, Israel was to transfer to the land the blessing and curse of the law, as was already commanded in chap. xi. 29 ; that is to say, according to the more minute explanation of the command which is given here, the people themselves were solemnly to give expression to the blessing and the curse : to the former upon Mount Gerizim, and to the latter upon Ebal. On the situation of these mountains, see at chap. xi. 29. To this end six tribes were to station themselves upon the top or side of Gerizim, and six upon the top or side of Ebal. The blessing was to be uttered by the tribes of Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Joseph, and Benjamin, who sprang from the two wives of Jacob ; and the curse by Reuben, with the two sons of Leah’s maid Zilpah, and by Zebulun, with Dan and Naphtali, the sons of Rachel’s maid Bilhah. It was natural that the utterance of the blessing should be assigned to the tribes which sprang from Jacob’s proper wives, since the sons of the wives occupied a higher position than the sons of the maids,—just as the blessing had pre-eminence over the curse. But in order to secure the division into two sixes, it was necessary that two of the eight sons of the wives should be associated with those who pronounced the curses. The choice fell upon Reuben, because he had forfeited his right of primogeniture by his incest (Gen. xlix. 4), and upon Zebulun; as the youngest son of Leah. “*They shall stand there upon the curse :*” i.e. to pronounce the curse.—Ver. 14. “*And the Levites shall lift up and speak to all the men of Israel with a high (loud) voice :*” i.e. they shall pronounce the different formularies of blessing and cursing, turning towards the tribes to whom these utterances apply ; and all the men of Israel shall answer “*Amen,*” to take to themselves the blessing and the curse, as uttered by them ; just as in the case of the priestly blessing in Num. v. 22, and in connection with every oath, in which the person swearing took upon himself the oath that was pronounced, by reply-

ing “Amen.” “*The Levites*” are not all the members of the tribe of Levi, but those “in whom the spiritual character of Levi was most decidedly manifested” (*Baumgarten*), i.e. the Levitical priests, as the guardians and teachers of the law, and those who carried the ark of the covenant (Josh. viii. 33). From the passage in Joshua, where the fulfilment of the Mosaic injunctions is recorded, we learn that the Levitical priests stationed themselves in the centre between the two mountains, with the ark of the covenant, and that the people took up their position, on both sides, opposite to the ark, viz. six tribes on Gerizim, and six on Ebal. The priests, who stood in the midst, by the ark of the covenant, then pronounced the different formulaires of blessing and cursing, to which the six tribes answered “Amen.” From the expression “all the men of Israel,” it is perfectly evident that in this particular ceremony the people were not represented by their elders or heads, but were present in the persons of all their adult men who were over twenty years of age; and with this Josh. viii. 33, when rightly interpreted, fully harmonizes.

In vers. 15–26 there follow *twelve* curses, answering to the number of the tribes of Israel. The *first* is directed against those who make graven or molten images of Jehovah, and set them up in secret, that is to say, against secret breaches of the second commandment (Ex. xx. 4); the *second* against contempt of, or want of reverence towards, parents (Ex. xxi. 17); the *third* against those who remove boundaries (chap. xix. 14); the *fourth* against the man who leads the blind astray (Lev. xix. 14); the *fifth* against those who pervert the right of orphans and widows (chap. xxiv. 17); the *sixth* against incest with a mother (chap. xxiii. 1; Lev. xviii. 8); the *seventh* against unnatural vices (Lev. xviii. 23); the *eighth* and *ninth* against incest with a sister or a mother-in-law (Lev. xviii. 9 and 17); the *tenth* against secret murder (Ex. xx. 13; Num. xxxv. 16 sqq.); the *eleventh* against judicial murder (“he that taketh reward to slay a soul, *namely*, innocent blood:” Ex. xxiii. 7, 8); the *twelfth* against the man who does not set up the words of this law to do them, who does not make the laws the model and standard of his life and conduct. From this last curse, which applied to every breach of the law, it evidently follows, that the different sins and transgressions already mentioned were only selected by way of example, and for the most part were such as could easily be concealed from the judicial authorities. At the same time, “the office of the law is shown in this last utterance,

the summing up of all the rest, to have been pre-eminently to proclaim condemnation. Every conscious act of transgression subjects the sinner to the curse of God, from which none but He who has become a curse for us can possibly deliver us" (Gal. iii. 10, 13. *O. v. Gerlach*).—On the reason why the blessings are not given, see the remarks on ver. 4. As the curses against particular transgressions of the law simply mention some peculiarly grievous sins by way of example, it would be easy to single out corresponding blessings from the general contents of the law: *e.g.* "Blessed be he who faithfully follows the Lord his God, or loves Him with the heart, who honours his father and his mother," etc.; and lastly, all the blessings of the law could be summed up in the words, "Blessed be he who setteth up the words of this law, to do them."

BLESSING AND CURSE.—CHAP. XXVIII. 1-68.

For the purpose of impressing upon the hearts of all the people in the most emphatic manner both the blessing which Israel was to proclaim upon Gerizim, and the curse which it was to proclaim upon Ebal, Moses now unfolds the blessing of fidelity to the law and the curse of transgression in a longer address, in which he once more resumes, sums up, and expands still further the promises and threats of the law in Ex. xxiii. 20-33, and Lev. xxvi.

Vers. 1-14. THE BLESSING.—Ver. 1. If Israel would hearken to the voice of the Lord its God, the Lord would make it the highest of all the nations of the earth. This thought, with which the discourse on the law in chap. xxvi. 19 terminated, forms the theme, and in a certain sense the heading, of the following description of the blessing, through which the Lord, according to the more distinct declaration in ver. 2, would glorify His people above all the nations of the earth. The indispensable condition for obtaining this blessing, was obedience to the word of the Lord, or keeping His commandments. To impress this *conditio sine qua non* thoroughly upon the people, Moses not only repeats it at the commencement (ver. 2), and in the middle (ver. 9), but also at the close (vers. 13, 14), in both a positive and a negative form. In ver. 2, "the way in which Israel was to be exalted is pointed out" (*Schultz*); and thus the theme is more precisely indicated, and the elaboration of it is introduced. "All these blessings (those mentioned singly in what follows) will come upon thee and reach thee." The blessings are represented as actual powers, which follow the footsteps of the nation, and over-

take it. In vers. 3–6, the fulness of the blessing of God in all the relations of life is depicted in a sixfold repetition of the word “blessed.” Israel will be blessed in the town and in the field, the two spheres in which its life moves (ver. 3); blessed will be the fruit of the body, of the earth, and of the cattle, *i.e.* in all its productions (ver. 4; for each one, see chap. vii. 13, 14); blessed will be the basket (chap. xxvi. 2) in which the fruits are kept, and the kneading-trough (Ex. xii. 34) in which the daily bread is prepared (ver. 5); blessed will the nation be in all its undertakings (“coming in and going out;” *vid.* Num. xxvii. 17).—Vers. 7–14 describe the influence and effect of the blessing upon all the circumstances and situations in which the nation might be placed: in vers. 7–10, with reference (*a*) to the attitude of Israel towards its enemies (ver. 7); (*b*) to its trade and handicraft (ver. 8); (*c*) to its attitude towards all the nations of the earth (vers. 9, 10). The optative forms, **יְמַלֵּךְ** and **יְמַלֵּךְ** (in vers. 7 and 8), are worthy of notice. They show that Moses not only proclaimed the blessing to the people, but desired it for them, because he knew that Israel would not always or perfectly fulfil the condition upon which it was to be bestowed. “*May the Lord be pleased to give thine enemies . . . smitten before thee,*” *i.e.* give them up to thee as smitten (**יִנְתַּחֲרֶה בְּעָלָמָךְ**, to give up before a person, to deliver up to him: cf. chap. i. 8), so that they shall come out against thee by one way, and flee from thee by seven ways, *i.e.* in wild dispersion (cf. Lev. xxvi. 7, 8).—Ver. 8. “*May the Lord command the blessing with thee* (put it at thy disposal) *in thy barns* (granaries, store-rooms) *and in all thy business*” (“to set the hand;” see chap. xii. 7).—Vers. 9, 10. “*The Lord will exalt thee for a holy nation to Himself, . . . so that all the nations of the earth shall see that the name of Jehovah is named upon thee, and shall fear before thee.*” The Lord had called Israel as a holy nation, when He concluded the covenant with it (Ex. xix. 5, 6). This promise, to which the words “as He hath sworn unto thee” point back, and which is called an oath, because it was founded upon the promises given to the patriarchs on oath (Gen. xxii. 16), and was given *implicite* in them, the Lord would fulfil to His people, and cause the holiness and glory of Israel to be so clearly manifested, that all nations should perceive or see “*that the name of the Lord is named upon Israel.*” The name of the Lord is the revelation of His glorious nature. It is named upon Israel, when Israel is transformed into the glory of the divine nature (cf. Isa. lxiii. 19; Jer. xiv. 9). It was only in feeble commencement that this blessing was fulfilled upon Israel under the Old Tes-

tament ; and it is not till the restoration of Israel, which is to take place in the future according to Rom. xi. 25 sqq., that its complete fulfilment will be attained. In vers. 11 and 12, Moses returns to the earthly blessing, for the purpose of unfolding this still further. "*Superabundance will the Lord give thee for good* (*i.e.* for happiness and prosperity ; *vid. chap. xxx. 9*), *in fruit of thy body*," etc. (*cf. ver. 4*). He would open His good treasure-house, the heaven, to give rain to the land in its season (*cf. chap. xi. 14*; *Lev. xxvi. 4, 5*), and bless the work of the hands, *i.e.* the cultivation of the soil, so that Israel would be able to lend to many, according to the prospect already set before it in chap. xv. 6.—Vers. 13, 14. By such blessings He would "*make Israel the head, and not the tail*,"—a figure taken from life (*vid. Isa. ix. 13*), the meaning of which is obvious, and is given literally in the next sentence, "*thou wilt be above only, and not beneath*," *i.e.* thou wilt rise more and more, and increase in wealth, power, and dignity. With this the discourse returns to its commencement ; and the promise of blessing closes with another emphatic repetition of the condition on which the fulfilment depended (vers. 13b and 14. On ver. 14, see chap. v. 29, xi. 28).

Vers. 15-68. THE CURSE, in case Israel should not hearken to the voice of its God, to keep His commandments. After the announcement that all these (the following) curses would come upon the disobedient nation (ver. 15), the curse is proclaimed in all its extent, as covering all the relations of life, in a sixfold repetition of the word "cursed" (vers. 16-19, as above in vers. 3-6) ; and the fulfilment of this threat in plagues and diseases, drought and famine, war, devastation of the land, and captivity of the people, is so depicted, that the infliction of these punishments stands out to view in ever increasing extent and fearfulness. We are not to record this, however, as a gradual heightening of the judgments of God, in proportion to the increasing rebellion of Israel, as in *Lev. xxvi. 14* sqq., although it is obvious that the punishments threatened did not fall upon the nation all at once.—Vers. 16-19 correspond precisely to vers. 3-6, so as to set forth the curse as the counterpart of the blessing, except that the basket and kneading-trough are mentioned before the fruit of the body.

Vers. 20-26. The *first* view, in which the bursting of the threatened curse upon the disobedient people is proclaimed in all its forms. First of all, quite generally in ver. 20. "*The Lord will send the curse against thee, consternation and threatening in every undertaking*

of thy hand which thou carriest out (see chap. xii. 7), till thou be destroyed, till thou perish quickly, because of the wickedness of thy doings, because thou hast forsaken Me." The three words, בְּאַרְתָּה, מוֹתָה, and מִגְנְעָרָת, are synonymous, and are connected together to strengthen the thought. בְּאַרְתָּה, curse or malediction; הַמִּתְהָוֵם, the consternation produced by the curse of God, namely, the confusion with which God smites His foes (see at chap. vii. 23); חַמְשָׁרָת is the threatening word of the divine wrath.—Then vers. 21 sqq. in detail. "The Lord will make the pestilence fasten upon (cleave to) thee, till He hath destroyed thee out of the land . . . to smite thee with giddiness and fever (cf. Lev. xxvi. 16), inflammation, burning, and sword, blasting of corn, and mildew (of the seed);" seven diseases therefore (seven as the stamp of the works of God), whilst pestilence in particular is mentioned first, as the most terrible enemy of life. פְּלַקְתָּה, from פְּלֻקָּה to burn, and חַרְבָּה, from חַרְבָּה to glow, signify inflammatory diseases, burning fevers; the distinction between these and קַפְתָּה cannot be determined. Instead of בְּרַבָּה, the sword as the instrument of death, used to designate slaughter and death, the *Vulgate*, *Arabic*, and *Samaritan* have adopted the reading בְּרַבָּה, *aestus*, heat (Gen. xxxi. 40), or drought, according to which there would be four evils mentioned by which human life is attacked, and three which are injurious to the corn. But as the LXX., *Jon.*, *Syr.*, and others read בְּרַבָּה, this alteration is very questionable, especially as the reading can be fully defended in this connection; and one objection to the alteration is, that drought is threatened for the first time in vers. 23, 24. נַפְתָּשָׁה, from נַפְתָּשָׁה to singe or blacken, and רַקְנָה, from רַקְנָה to be yellowish, refer to two diseases which attack the corn: the former to the withering or burning of the ears, caused by the east wind (Gen. xli. 23); the other to the effect produced by a warm wind in Arabia, by which the green ears are turned yellow, so that they bear no grains of corn.—Vers. 23, 24. To this should be added terrible drought, without a drop of rain from heaven (cf. Lev. xxvi. 19). Instead of rain, dust and ashes should fall from heaven. נַפְתָּשָׁה construed with a double accusative: to make the rain of the land into dust and ashes, to give it in the form of dust and ashes. When the heat is very great, the air in Palestine is often full of dust and sand, the wind assuming the form of a burning sirocco, so that the air resembles the glowing heat at the mouth of a furnace (*Robinson*, ii. 504).—Vers. 25, 26. Defeat in battle, the very opposite of the blessing promised in ver. 7. Israel should become נַיְלָה, "a moving to and fro," i.e. so to speak, "a ball for

all the kingdoms of the earth to play with" (*Schultz*). עַזְבָּן, here and at Ezek. xxiii. 46, is not a transposed and later form of עַזְבָּן, which has a different meaning in Isa. xxviii. 19, but the original, uncontracted form, which was afterwards condensed into עַזְבָּן; for this, and not עַזְבָּן, is the way in which the *Chethib* should be read in Jer. xv. 4, xxiv. 9, xxix. 18, xxxiv. 17, and 2 Chron. xxix. 8, where this threat is repeated (*vid. Ewald*, § 53, b.). The corpses of those who were slain by the foe should serve as food for the birds of prey and wild beasts—the greatest ignominy that could fall upon the dead, and therefore frequently held out as a threat against the ungodly (Jer. vii. 33, xvi. 4; 1 Kings xiv. 11, etc.).

Vers. 27-34. The second view depicts still further the visitation of God both by diseases of body and soul, and also by plunder and oppression on the part of their enemies.—In ver. 27 four incurable diseases of the body are threatened: the ulcer of Egypt (see at Ex. ix. 9), i.e. the form of leprosy peculiar to Egypt, *elephantiasis (Aegypti peculiare malum: Plin. xxvi. c. 1, s. 5)*, which differed from *lepra tuberosa*, however, or tubercular leprosy (ver. 35; cf. Job ii. 7), in degree only, and not in its essential characteristics (see Tobler, *mediz. Topogr. v. Jerus.* p. 51). עַפְלִים, from עַפְלָה, a swelling, rising, signifies a tumour, and according to the Rabbins a disease of the anus: in men, *tumor in posticis partibus*; in women, *durius quoddam oedema in utero*. It was with this disease that the Philistines were smitten (1 Sam. v.). נָרָב (see Lev. xxi. 20) and חָרֵם, from חָרַם, to scrape or scratch, also a kind of itch, of which there are several forms in Syria and Egypt.—Vers. 28, 29. In addition to this, there would come idiocy, blindness, and confusion of mind,—three psychical maladies; for although עַרְמָה signifies primarily bodily blindness, the position of the word between idiocy and confusion of heart, i.e. of the understanding, points to mental blindness here.—Ver. 29 leads to the same conclusion, where it is stated that Israel would grope in the bright noon-day, like a blind man in the dark, and not make his ways prosper, i.e. not hit upon the right road which led to the goal and to salvation, would have no good fortune or success in its undertakings (cf. Ps. xxxvii. 7). Being thus smitten in body and soul, it would be *only* (אֶת as in chap. xvi. 15), i.e. utterly, oppressed and spoiled evermore. These words introduce the picture of the other calamity, viz. the plundering of the nation and the land by enemies (vers. 30-33). Wife, house, vineyard, ox, ass, and sheep would be taken away by the foe; sons and daughters would be carried away into captivity

before the eyes of the people, who would see it and pine after the children, *i.e.* with sorrow and longing after them; “*and thy hand shall not be to thee towards God,*” *i.e.* all power and help will fail thee. (On this proverbial expression, see Gen. xxxi. 29; and on בְּנָן, in ver. 30, see at chap. xx. 6.)—In vers. 33, 34, this threat is summed up in the following manner: the fruit of the field and all their productions would be devoured by a strange nation, and Israel would be only oppressed and crushed to pieces all its days, and become mad on account of what its eyes would be compelled to see.

Vers. 35–46. The *third view*.—With the words, “*the Lord will smite thee,*” Moses resumes in ver. 35 the threat of ver. 27, to set forth the calamities already threatened under a new aspect, namely, as signs of the rejection of Israel from covenant fellowship with the Lord.—Ver. 35. The Lord would smite the people with grievous abscesses in the knees and thighs, that should be incurable, even from the sole of the foot to the crown of the head. יְלִבְנָה is the so-called joint-leprosy, a form of the *lepra tuberosa* (*vid. Pruner*, p. 167). From the clause, however, “*from the sole of thy foot unto the top of thy head,*” it is evident that the threat is not to be restricted to this species of leprosy, since “*the upper parts of the body often remain in a perfectly normal state in cases of leprosy in the joints;* and after the diseased parts have fallen off, the patients recover their previous health to a certain degree” (*Pruner*). Moses mentions this as being a disease of such a nature, that it would render it utterly impossible for those who were afflicted with it either to stand or walk, and then heightens the threat by adding the words, “*from the sole of the foot to the top of the head.*” Leprosy excluded from fellowship with the Lord, and deprived the nation of the character of a nation of God.—Vers. 36, 37. The loss of their spiritual character would be followed by the dissolution of the covenant fellowship. This thought connects ver. 36 with ver. 35, and not the thought that Israel being afflicted with leprosy would be obliged to go into captivity, and in this state would become an object of abhorrence to the heathen (*Schultz*). The Lord would bring the nation and its king to a foreign nation that it did not know, and thrust them into bondage, so that it would be obliged to serve other gods,—wood and stone (*vid. chap. iv. 28*),—and would become an object of disgust, a proverb, and a byword to all nations whither God should drive it (*vid. 1 Kings ix. 7; Jer. xxiv. 9*).—Vers. 38 sqq. Even in their own land the curse would fall upon every kind of labour and enterprise. Much

seed would give little to reap, because the locust would devour the seed; the planting and dressing of the vineyard would furnish no wine to drink, because the worm would devour the vine. נַעֲלֵה is probably the ῥψ or ῥξ of the Greeks, the *convolvulus* of the Romans, our vine-weevil.—Ver. 40. They would have many olive-trees in the land, but not anoint themselves with oil, because the olive-tree would be rooted out or plundered (לָשׁוּ, Niphal of לִשׁוּ, as in chap. xix. 5, not the Kal of לִשׁוּ, which cannot be shown to have the intransitive meaning *elabi*).—Ver. 41. Sons and daughters would they beget, but not keep, because they would have to go into captivity.—Ver. 42. All the trees and fruits of the land would the buzzer take possession of. לְלֹאֶלֶף, from לְלֹאֶלֶף to *buzz*, a rhetorical epithet applied to locusts, not the grasshopper, which does not injure the fruits of the tree or ground sufficiently for the term לְלֹאֶלֶף, “to take possession of,” to be applicable to it.—Ver. 43. Israel would be utterly impoverished, and would sink lower and lower, whilst the stranger in the midst of it would, on the contrary, get above it very high; not indeed “because he had no possession, but was dependent upon resources of other kinds” (*Schultz*), but rather because he would be exempted with all his possessions from the curse of God, just as the Israelites had been exempted from the plagues which came upon the Egyptians (Ex. ix. 6, 7, 26).—Ver. 44. The opposite of vers. 12 and 13 would come to pass.—In ver. 46 the address returns to its commencement in ver. 15, with the terrible threat, “*These curses shall be upon thee for a sign and for a wonder, and upon thy seed for ever*,” for the purpose of making a pause, if not of bringing the whole to a close. The curses were for a sign and wonder (מִזְבֵּחַ, that which excites astonishment and terror), inasmuch as their magnitude and terrible character manifested most clearly the supernatural interposition of God (*vid. chap. xxix. 23*). “*For ever*” applies to the generation smitten by the curse, which would remain for ever rejected, though without involving the perpetual rejection of the whole nation, or the impossibility of the conversion and restoration of a remnant, or of a holy seed (Isa. x. 22, vi. 13; Rom. ix. 27, xi. 5).

Vers. 47-57. The *fourth* view.—Although in what precedes every side of the national life has been brought under the curse, yet love to his people, and the desire to preserve them from the curse, by holding up before them the dreadful severity of the wrath of God, impel the faithful servant of the Lord to go still further, and depict more minutely still the dreadful horrors consequent upon

Israel being given up to the power of the heathen, and first of all in vers. 47–57 the horrible calamities which would burst upon Israel on the conquest of the land and its fortresses by its foes.—Vers. 47, 48. Because it had not served the Lord its God with joy and gladness of heart, “*for the abundance of all*,” i.e. for the abundance of all the blessings bestowed upon it by its God, it would serve its enemies in hunger, and thirst, and nakedness, and want of everything, and wear an iron yoke, i.e. be obliged to perform the hardest tributary service till it was destroyed (*השׁפֵר* for *השְׁמִיר*, as in chap. vii. 24).—Vers. 49, 50. The Lord would bring against it from afar a barbarous, hardhearted nation, which knew no pity. “*From afar*” is still further strengthened by the addition of the words, “*from the end of the earth*.” The greater the distance off, the more terrible does the foe appear. He flies thence like an eagle, which plunges with violence upon its prey, and carries it off with its claws; and Israel does not understand its language, so as to be able to soften its barbarity, or come to any terms. A people “*firm, hard of face*,” i.e. upon whom nothing makes an impression (*vid. Isa. l. 7*),—a description of the audacity and shamelessness of its appearance (*Dan. viii. 23*; cf. *Prov. vii. 13, xxi. 29*), which spares neither old men nor boys. This description no doubt applies to the Chaldeans, who are described as flying eagles in *Hab. i. 6 sqq.*, *Jer. xlvi. 40, xlix. 22, Ezek. xvii. 3, 7*, as in the verses before us; but it applies to other enemies of Israel beside these, namely to the great imperial powers generally, the Assyrians, Chaldeans, and Romans, whom the Lord raised up as the executors of His curse upon His rebellious people. Isaiah therefore depicts the Assyrians in a similar manner, namely, as a people with an unintelligible language (*chap. v. 26, xxviii. 11, xxxiii. 19*), and describes the cruelty of the Medes in *chap. xiii. 17, 18*, with an unmistakeable allusion to ver. 50 of the present threat.—Vers. 51 sqq. This foe would consume all the fruit of the cattle and the land, i.e. everything which the nation had acquired through agriculture and the breeding of stock, without leaving it anything, until it was utterly destroyed (see *chap. vii. 13*), and would oppress, i.e. besiege it in all its gates (towns, *vid. chap. xii. 12*), till the lofty and strong walls upon which they relied should fall (*תַּל*, as in *chap. xx. 20*).—Ver. 53. It would so distress Israel, that in their distress and siege they would be driven to eat the fruit of their body, and the flesh of their own children (with regard to the fulfilment of this, see the remarks on *Lev. xxvi. 29*).—This horrible distress is depicted still more fully

in vers. 54-57, where the words, “*in the siege and in the straitness*,” etc. (ver. 53b), are repeated as a *refrain*, with their appalling sound, in vers. 55 and 57.—Vers. 54, 55. The effeminate and luxurious man would look with ill-favour upon his brother, the wife of his bosom, and his remaining children, “*to give*” (so that he would not give) to one of them of the flesh of his children which he was consuming, because there was nothing left to him in the siege. “*His eye shall be evil*,” i.e. look with envy or ill-favour (cf. chap. xv. 9). מִבְּלַי הָשָׁאֵר, on account of there not being anything left for himself. בְּלֹ with בְּלִי signifies literally “*all not*,” i.e. nothing at all. הָשָׁאֵר, an infinitive, as in chap. iii. 3 (see at ver. 48).—Vers. 56, 57. The delicate and luxurious woman, who had not attempted to put her feet to the ground (had always been carried therefore either upon a litter or an ass: cf. Judg. v. 10, and *Arvieux, Sitten der Beduinen Ar.* p. 143), from tenderness and delicacy—her eye would look with envy upon the husband of her bosom and her children, and that (*vav expl.*) because of (for) her after-birth, which cometh out from between her feet, and because of her children which she bears (*sc.* during the siege); “*for she will eat them secretly in the want of everything*,” that is to say, first of all attempt to appease her hunger with the after-birth, and then, when there was no more left, with her own children. To such an awful height would the famine rise!

Vers. 58-68. The *fifth* and last view.—And yet these horrible calamities would not be the end of the distress. The full measure of the divine curse would be poured out upon Israel, when its disobedience had become hardened into disregard of the glorious and fearful name of the Lord its God. To point this out, Moses describes the resistance of the people in ver. 58; not, as in vers. 15 and 45, as not hearkening to the voice of the Lord to keep all His commandments, which he (Moses) had commanded this day, or which Jehovah had commanded (ver. 45), but as “not observing to do all the words which are written in this book, to fear the glorified and fearful name,” (viz.) Jehovah its God. “*This book*” is not Deuteronomy, even if we should assume that Moses had not first of all delivered the discourses in this book to the people and then written them down, but had first of all written them down and then read them to the people (see at chap. xxxi. 9), but the book of the law, i.e. the Pentateuch, so far as it was already written. This is evident from vers. 60, 61, according to which the grievous diseases of Egypt were written in this book of the law, which points to the book of Exodus, where grievous diseases occur among the Egyptian

plagues. In fact, Moses could not have thought of merely laying the people under the obligation to keep the laws of the book of Deuteronomy, since this book does not contain all the essential laws of the covenant, and was never intended to form an independent book of the law. The infinitive clause, “*to fear*,” etc., serves to explain the previous clause, “*to do*,” etc., whether we regard the two clauses as co-ordinate, or the second as subordinate to the first. Doing all the commandments of the law must show and prove itself in fearing the revealed name of the Lord. Where this fear is wanting, the outward observance of the commandments can only be a pharisaic work-righteousness, which is equivalent to a transgression of the law. But the object of this fear was not to be a God, according to human ideas of the nature and working of God; it was to be “*this glorified and fearful name*,” i.e. Jehovah the absolute God, as He glorifies Himself and shows Himself to be fearful in His doings upon earth. “*The name*,” as in Lev. xxiv. 11. נִכְבָּר in a reflective sense, as in Ex. xiv. 4, 17, 18; Lev. x. 3.—Ver. 59. If Israel should not do this, the Lord would make its strokes and the strokes of its seed wonderful, i.e. would visit the people and their descendants with extraordinary strokes, with great and lasting strokes, and with evil and lasting diseases (ver. 60), and would bring all the pestilences of Egypt upon it. הַשִּׁיבָה, to turn back, inasmuch as Israel was set free from them by the deliverance out of Egypt. מִרְאֹתָה is construed with the plural as a collective noun.—Ver. 61. Also every disease and every stroke that was not written in this book of the law,—not only those that were written in the book of the law, but those also that did not stand therein. The diseases of Egypt that were written in the book of the law include the murrain of cattle, the boils and blains, and the death of the first-born (Ex. ix. 1–10, xii. 29); and the strokes (מִפְחָה) the rest of the plagues, viz. the frogs, gnats, dog-flies, hail, locusts, and darkness (Ex. viii.–x.). מִלְעָם, an uncommon and harder form of עֲלָם (Judg. xvi. 3; cf. Ewald, § 138, a.).—Ver. 62. Israel would be almost annihilated thereby. “*Ye will be left in few people* (a small number; cf. chap. xxvi. 5), *whereas ye were as numerous as the stars of heaven*.”

Vers. 63 sqq. Yea, the Lord would find His pleasure in the destruction and annihilation of Israel, as He had previously rejoiced in blessing and multiplying it. With this bold anthropomorphic expression Moses seeks to remove from the nation the last prop of false confidence in the mercy of God. Greatly as the sin of man

troubles God, and little as the pleasure may be which He has in the death of the wicked, yet the holiness of His love demands the punishment and destruction of those who despise the riches of His goodness and long-suffering; so that He displays His glory in the judgment and destruction of the wicked no less than in blessing and prospering the righteous.—Vers. 63b and 64. Those who had not succumbed to the plagues and strokes of God, would be torn from the land of their inheritance, and scattered among all nations to the end of the earth, and there be compelled to serve other gods, which are wood and stone, which have no life and no sensation, and therefore can hear no prayer, and cannot deliver out of any distress (cf. chap. iv. 27 sqq.).—Vers. 65, 66. When banished thus among all nations, Israel would find no ease or rest, not even rest for the sole of its foot, *i.e.* no place where it could quietly set its foot, and remain and have peace in its heart. To this extreme distress of homeless banishment there would be added “*a trembling heart, failing of the eyes* (the light of life), *and despair of soul*” (*vid. Lev. xxvi. 36 sqq.*).—Ver. 66. “*Thy life will be hung up before thee,*” *i.e.* will be like some valued object, hanging by a thin thread before thine eyes, which any moment might tear down (*Knobel*), that is to say, will be ever hanging in the greatest danger. “*Thou wilt not believe in thy life,*” *i.e.* thou wilt despair of its preservation (cf. *Job xxiv. 22*).¹—Ver. 67. In the morning they would wish it were evening, and in the evening would wish it were morning, from perpetual dread of what each day or night would bring.—Ver. 68. Last of all, Moses mentions the worst, namely, their being taken back to Egypt into ignominious slavery. “If the exodus was the birth of the nation of God as such, return would be its death” (*Schultz*). “*In ships:*” *i.e.* in a way which would cut off every possibility of escape. The clause, “*by the way whereof I spake unto thee, thou shalt see it no more again,*” is not a more precise explanation of the expression “in ships,” for it was not in ships that Israel came out of Egypt, but by land, through the desert; on the contrary, it simply serves to strengthen the announcement, “The Lord shall bring thee into Egypt again,” namely, in the sense that God would cause them to take a road which they would never have seen again if they had continued in faithful dependence upon the Lord.

¹ “I have never seen a passage which describes more clearly the misery of a guilty conscience, in words and thoughts so fitting and appropriate. For this is just the way in which a man is affected, who knows that God is offended, *i.e.* who is harassed with the consciousness of sin” (*Luther*).

This was the way to Egypt, in reality such a return to this land as Israel ought never to have experienced, namely, a return to slavery. “*There shall ye be sold to your enemies as servants and maids, and there shall be no buyer;*” i.e. no one will buy you as slaves. This clause, which indicates the utmost contempt, is quite sufficient to overthrow the opinion of *Ewald*, *Riehm*, and others, already referred to at pp. 385–6, namely, that this verse refers to Psammetichus, who procured some Israelitish infantry from Manasseh. Egypt is simply mentioned as a land where Israel had lived in ignominious bondage. “As a fulfilment of a certain kind, we might no doubt adduce the fact that Titus sent 17,000 adult Jews to Egypt to perform hard labour there, and had those who were under 17 years of age publicly sold (*Josephus, de bell. Jud.* vi. 9, 2), and also that under Hadrian Jews without number were sold at Rachel’s grave (*Jerome, ad Jer.* 31). But the word of God is not so contracted, that it can be limited to one single fact. The curses were fulfilled in the time of the Romans in Egypt (*vid. Philo in Flacc.*, and *leg. ad Caium*), but they were also fulfilled in a horrible manner during the middle ages (*vid. Depping, die Juden im Mittelalter*) ; and they are still in course of fulfilment, even though they are frequently less sensibly felt” (*Schultz*).—Ver. 69 (or chap. xxix. 1) is not the close of the address in chap. v.–xxviii., as *Schultz*, *Knobel*, and others suppose; but the heading to chap. xxix. xxx., which relate to the making of the covenant mentioned in this verse (*vid. chap. xxix. 12, 14*).

CONCLUSION OF THE COVENANT IN THE LAND OF MOAB.—

CHAP. XXIX. AND XXX.

The addresses which follow in chap. xxix. and xxx. are announced in the heading in chap. xxix. 1 as “*words (addresses) of the covenant which Jehovah commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel, beside the covenant which He made with them in Horeb,*” and consist, according to vers. 10 sqq., in a solemn appeal to all the people to enter into the covenant which the Lord made with them that day ; that is to say, it consisted literally in a renewed declaration of the covenant which the Lord had concluded with the nation at Horeb, or in a fresh obligation imposed upon the nation to keep the covenant which had been concluded at Horeb, by the offering of sacrifices and the sprinkling of the people with the sacrificial blood (Ex. xxiv.). There was no necessity for any repetition of this act, because, notwithstanding the frequent transgressions on

the part of the nation, it had not been abrogated on the part of God, but still remained in full validity and force. The obligation binding upon the people to fulfil the covenant is introduced by Moses with an appeal to all that the Lord had done for Israel (chap. xxix. 2-9); and this is followed by a summons to enter into the covenant which the Lord was concluding with them now, that He might be their God, and fulfil His promises concerning them (vers. 10-15), with a repeated allusion to the punishment which threatened them in case of apostasy (vers. 16-29), and the eventual restoration on the ground of sincere repentance and return to the Lord (chap. xxx. 1-14), and finally another solemn adjuration, with a blessing and a curse before them, to make choice of the blessing (vers. 15-20).

Chap. xxix. 2-9. The introduction in ver. 2a resembles that in chap. v. 1. “*All Israel*” is the nation in all its members (see vers. 10, 11).—Israel had no doubt seen the mighty acts of the Lord in Egypt (vers. 2b and 3; cf. chap. iv. 34, vii. 19), but Jehovah had not given them a heart, *i.e.* understanding, to perceive, eyes to see, and ears to hear, until this day. With this complaint, Moses does not intend to excuse the previous want of susceptibility on the part of the nation to the manifestations of grace on the part of the Lord, but simply to explain the necessity for the repeated allusion to the gracious acts of God, and to urge the people to lay them truly to heart. “By reproving the dulness of the past, he would stimulate them to a desire to understand: just as if he had said, that for a long time they had been insensible to so many miracles, and therefore they ought not to delay any longer, but to arouse themselves to hearken better unto God” (*Calvin*). The Lord had not yet given the people an understanding heart, because the people had not yet asked for it, simply because the need of it was not felt (cf. chap. v. 26).—Vers. 5 sqq. With the appeal to the gracious guidance of Israel by God through the desert, the address of Moses passes imperceptibly into an address from the Lord, just as in chap. xi. 14. (On vers. 5, 6, *vid. chap. viii. 3, 4*; on ver. 7, *vid. chap. ii. 26* sqq., and chap. iii. 1 sqq. and 12 sqq.).—Ver. 9. These benefits from the Lord demanded obedience and fidelity. “*Keep the words of this covenant*,” etc. (cf. chap. viii. 18). לִשְׁבֹּרֶת, to act wisely (as in chap. xxxii. 29), bearing in mind, however, that Jehovah Himself is the wisdom of Israel (chap. iv. 6), and the search for this wisdom brings prosperity and salvation (cf. Josh. i. 7, 8).

Vers. 10-15. Summons to enter into the covenant of the Lord,

namely, to enter inwardly, to make the covenant an affair of the heart and life.—Vers. 10 sqq. “*To-day*,” when the covenant-law and covenant-right were laid before them, the whole nation stood before the Lord without a single exception—the heads and the tribes, the elders and the officers, all the men of Israel. The two members are parallel. The heads of the people are the elders and officers, and the tribes consist of all the men. The rendering given by the LXX. and Syriac (also in the English version: *Tr.*), “*heads (captains) of your tribes*,” is at variance with the language.—Ver. 11. The covenant of the Lord embraced, however, not only the men of Israel, but also the wives and children, and the stranger who had attached himself to Israel, such as the Egyptians who came out with Israel (Ex. xii. 38; Num. xi. 4), and the Midianites who joined the Israelites with Hobab (Num. x. 29), down to the very lowest servant, “*from thy hewer of wood to thy drawer of water*” (cf. Josh. ix. 21, 27).—Ver. 12. “*That thou shouldest enter into the covenant of the Lord thy God, and the engagement on oath, which the Lord thy God concludeth with thee to-day.*” עָבֵר with בְּ, as in Job xxxiii. 28, “to enter into,” expresses entire entrance, which goes completely through the territory entered, and is more emphatic than בְּבִרְית (2 Chron. xv. 12). “*Into the oath:*” the covenant confirmed with an oath, covenants being always accompanied with oaths (*vid. Gen. xxvi. 28*).—Ver. 13. “*That He may set thee up (exalt thee) to-day into a people for Himself, and that He may be (become) unto thee a God*” (*vid. chap. xxviii. 9, xxvii. 9; Ex. xix. 5, 6*).—Vers. 14, 15. This covenant Moses made not only with those who are present, but with all whether present or not; for it was to embrace not only those who were living then, but their descendants also, to become a covenant of blessing for all nations (cf. Acts ii. 39, and the intercession of Christ in John xvii. 20).

Vers. 16–29. The summons to enter into the covenant of the Lord is explained by Moses first of all by an exposition of the evil results which would follow from apostasy from the Lord, or the breach of His covenant. This exposition he introduces with an allusion to the experience of the people with reference to the worthlessness of idols, both in Egypt itself, and upon their march through the nations, whose territory they passed through (vers. 16, 17). The words, “*for ye have learned how we dwelt in Egypt, and passed through the nations . . . and have seen their abominations and their idols*” (*gillulim*: lit. clods, see Lev. xxvi. 30), have this significa-

tion : In our abode in Egypt, and upon our march through different lands, ye have become acquainted with the idols of these nations, that they are not gods, but only wood and stone (see at chap. iv. 28), silver and gold. אָתֶנְתַּתְּךָ, as in chap. ix. 7, literally “ ye know that which we dwelt,” i.e. know what our dwelling there showed, what experience we gained there of the nature of heathen idols.—Ver. 18. “ *That there may not be among you,*” etc. : this sentence may be easily explained by introducing a thought which may be easily supplied, such as “ consider this,” or “ do not forget what ye have seen, that no one, either man or woman, family or tribe, may turn away from Jehovah our God.”—“ *That there may not be a root among you which bears poison and wormwood as fruit.*” A striking image of the destructive fruit borne by idolatry (cf. Heb. xii. 15). *Rosh* stands for a plant of a very bitter taste, as we may see from the frequency with which it is combined with קָרְבָּן, wormwood : it is not, strictly speaking, a poisonous plant, although the word is used in Job xx. 16 to denote the poison of serpents, because, in the estimation of a Hebrew, bitterness and poison were kindred terms. There is no other passage in which it can be shown to have the meaning “ poison.” The sense of the figure is given in plain terms in ver. 19, “ *that no one when he hears the words of this oath may bless himself in his heart, saying, It will prosper with me, for I walk in the firmness of my heart.*” To bless himself in his heart is to congratulate himself. שִׁירָהָת, firmness, a *vox media*; in Syriac, firmness, in a good sense, equivalent to truth ; in Hebrew, generally in a bad sense, denoting hardness of heart ; and this is the sense in which Moses uses it here.—“ *To sweep away that which is saturated with the thirsty :*” a proverbial expression, of which very different interpretations have been given (see Rosenmüller ad h. l.), taken no doubt from the land and transferred to persons or souls ; so that we might supply *Nephesh* in this sense, “ to destroy all, both those who have drunk its poison, and those also who are still thirsting for it” (Knobel). But even if we were to supply יְמֻן (the land), we should not have to think of the land itself, but simply of its inhabitants, so that the thought would still remain the same.—Vers. 20, 21. “ *For the Lord will not forgive him* (who thinks or speaks in this way) ; *but then will His anger smoke* (break forth in fire ; vid. Ps. lxxiv. 1), and *His jealousy against that man, and the whole curse of the law will lie upon him, that his name may be blotted out under heaven* (vid. chap. xxv. 19 ; Ex. xvii. 14). *The Lord will separate him unto evil from all the tribes,—so that he will be shut out from*

the covenant nation, and from its salvation, and be exposed to destruction,—according to all the curses of the covenant.” Although the pronominal suffix refers primarily to the man, it also applies, according to ver. 18, to the woman, the family, and the tribe. “That is written,” etc., as in chap. xxviii. 58, 61.—Vers. 22–24. How thoroughly Moses was filled with the thought, that not only individuals, but whole families, and in fact the greater portion of the nation, would fall into idolatry, is evident from the further expansion of the threat which follows, and in which he foresees in the Spirit, and foretells, the extermination of whole families, and the devastation of the land by distant nations; as in Lev. xxvi. 31, 32. Future generations of Israel, and the stranger from a distant land, when they saw the strokes of the Lord which burst upon the land, and the utter desolation of the land, would ask whence this devastation, and receive the reply, The Lord had smitten the land thus in His anger, because its inhabitants (the Israelites) had forsaken His covenant. With regard to the construction, observe that **בָּנָיִם**, in ver. 22, is resumed in **בָּנָיִם**, in ver. 24, the subject of ver. 22 being expanded into the general notion, “all nations” (ver. 24). With **וְגַם**, in ver. 22b, a parenthetical clause is inserted, giving the reason for the main thought, in the form of a circumstantial clause; and to this there is attached, by a loose apposition in ver. 23, a still further picture of the divine strokes according to their effect upon the land. The nouns in ver. 23, “brimstone and salt burning,” are in apposition to the strokes (plagues), and so far depend upon “they see.” The description is borrowed from the character of the Dead Sea and its vicinity, to which there is an express allusion in the words, “like the overthrow of Sodom,” etc., i.e. of the towns of the vale of Siddim (see at Gen. xiv. 2), which resembled paradise, the garden of Jehovah, before their destruction (*vid. Gen. xiii. 10 and xix. 24 sqq.*).—Ver. 24. “What is this great burning of wrath?” i.e. what does it mean—whence does it come? The reply to such a question would be (vers. 25–29): The inhabitants of the land have forsaken the covenant of the Lord, the God of their fathers; therefore has the wrath of the Lord burned over the land.—Ver. 26. “Gods which God had not assigned them” (*vid. chap. iv. 19*). “All the curses,” etc., are the curses contained in chap. xxviii. 15–68, Lev. xxvi. 14–38.—Those who give the answer close their address in ver. 29 with an expression of pious submission and solemn admonition. “That which is hidden belongs to the Lord our God (is His affair), and that which is revealed belongs to us and our chil-

dren for ever, to do (that we may do) all the words of this law." That which is revealed includes the law with its promises and threats; consequently that which is hidden can only refer to the mode in which God will carry out in the future His counsel and will, which He has revealed in the law, and complete His work of salvation notwithstanding the apostasy of the people.¹

Chap. xxx. 1-10. Nevertheless the rejection of Israel and its dispersion among the heathen were not to be the close. If the people should return to the Lord their God in their exile, He would turn His favour towards them again, and gather them again out of their dispersion, as had already been proclaimed in chap. iv. 29 sqq. and Lev. xxvi. 40 sqq., where it was also observed that the extremity of their distress would bring the people to reflection and induce them to return.—Vers. 1-3. "*When all these words, the blessing and the curse which I have set before thee, shall come.*" The allusion to the blessing in this connection may be explained on the ground that Moses was surveying the future generally, in which not only a curse but a blessing also would come upon the nation, according to its attitude towards the Lord as a whole and in its several members, since even in times of the greatest apostasy on the part of the nation there would always be a holy seed which could not die out; because otherwise the nation would necessarily have been utterly and for ever rejected, whereby the promises of God would have been brought to nought,—a result which was absolutely impossible. "*And thou takest to heart among all nations,*" etc., sc. what has befallen thee,—not only the curse which presses upon thee, but also the blessing which accompanies obedience to the commands of God,—"*and returnest to the Lord thy God, and hearkenest to His voice with all the heart,*" etc. (cf. chap. iv. 29); "*the Lord will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and gather thee again.*" שׁׁבֵּת־שָׁבֹות does not mean to bring back the prisoners, as the more modern lexicographers erroneously suppose (the *Kal* שׁׁבֵּת never has the force of the *Hiphil*), but to turn the imprisonment, and that

¹ What the *puncta extraordinaria* above (דְּלִבְנִים עַד לְגַנְבָּנִים) mean, is uncertain. Hiller's conjecture is the most probable, "that they are intended to indicate a various reading, formed by the omission of eleven consonants, and the transposition of the rest עַד גַּנְדָּלוֹת (at magnalia sæculi sunt);" whereas there is no foundation for Lightfoot's notion, that "they served as a warning, that we should not wish to pry with curiosity into the secret things of God, but should be content with His revealed will,"—a notion which rests upon the supposition that the points are inspired.

in a figurative sense, viz. to put an end to the distress (Job xlvi. 10; Jer. xxx. 8; Ezek. xvi. 53; Ps. xiv. 7; also Ps. lxxxv. 2, cxxvi. 2, 4), except that in many passages the misery of exile in which the people pined is represented as imprisonment. The passage before us is fully decisive against the meaning to bring back the prisoners, since the gathering out of the heathen is spoken of as being itself the consequence of the “turning of the captivity;” so also is Jer. xxix. 14, where the bringing back (*הַשִּׁיבָה*) is expressly distinguished from it. But especially is this the case with Jer. xxx. 18, where “turning the captivity of Jacob’s tents” is synonymous with having mercy on his dwelling-places, and building up the city again, so that the city lying in ruins is represented as *שְׁבָחוֹת*, an imprisonment.¹ —Vers. 4, 5. The gathering of Israel out of all the countries of the earth would then follow. Even though the rejected people should be at the end of heaven, the Lord would fetch them thence, and bring them back into the land of their fathers, and do good to the nation, and multiply them above their fathers. These last words show that the promise neither points directly to the gathering of Israel from dispersion on its ultimate conversion to Christ, nor furnishes any proof that the Jews will then be brought back to Palestine. It is true that even these words have some reference to the final redemption of Israel. This is evident from the curse of dispersion, which cannot be restricted to the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities, but includes the Roman dispersion also, in which the nation continues still; and it is still more apparent from the renewal of this promise in Jer. xxxii. 37 and other prophetic passages. But this application is to be found in the spirit, and not in the letter. For if there is to be an increase in the number of the Jews, when gathered out of their dispersion into all the world, above the number of their fathers, and therefore above the number of the Israelites in the time of Solomon and the first monarchs of the two kingdoms, Palestine will never furnish room enough for a nation multiplied like this. The multiplication promised here, so far as it falls within the Messianic age, will consist in the realiza-

¹ *Hupfeld* (on Ps. xiv. 7) has endeavoured to sustain the assertion that *שְׁבָחוֹת* is a later form for the older and simpler forms, *שְׁבִיה*, *שְׁבֵיה*, by citing one single passage of the Old Testament. The abstract form of *שְׁבִי* is *שְׁבִיתָה*, imprisonment (Num. xxi. 29), then prisoners. This form has been substituted by Jeremiah for *שְׁבָה* in one passage, viz. chap. xxxii. 44; and the Masoretic punctuators were the first to overlook the difference in the two words, and point them promiscuously.

tion of the promise given to Abraham, that his seed should grow into nations (Gen. xvii. 6 and 16), *i.e.* in the innumerable multiplication, not of the “Israel according to the flesh,” but of the “Israel according to the spirit,” whose land is not restricted to the boundaries of the earthly Canaan or Palestine (see vol. i. p. 226). The possession of the earthly Canaan for all time is nowhere promised to the Israelitish nation in the law (see at chap. xi. 21).—Ver. 6. The Lord will then circumcise their heart, and the heart of their children (see chap. x. 16), so that they will love Him with all their heart. When Israel should turn with true humility to the Lord, He would be found of them,—would lead them to true repentance, and sanctify them through the power of His grace,—would take away the stony heart out of their flesh, and give them a heart of flesh, a new heart and a new spirit,—so that they should truly know Him and keep His commandments (*vid.* Ezek. xi. 19, xxxvi. 26; Jer. xxxi. 33 sqq. and xxxii. 39 sqq.). “*Because of thy life,*” *i.e.* that thou mayest live, *sc.* attain to true life. The fulfilment of this promise does not take place all at once. It commenced with small beginnings at the deliverance from the Babylonian exile, and in a still higher degree at the appearance of Christ in the case of all the Israelites who received Him as their Saviour. Since then it has been carried on through all ages in the conversion of individual children of Abraham to Christ; and it will be realized in the future in a still more glorious manner in the nation at large (Rom. xi. 25 sqq.). The words of Moses do not relate to any particular age, but comprehend all times. For Israel has never been hardened and rejected in all its members, although the mass of the nation lives under the curse even to the present day.—Ver. 7. But after its conversion, the curses, which had hitherto rested upon it, would fall upon its enemies and haters, according to the promise in Gen. xii. 3.—Vers. 8 sqq. Israel would then hearken again to the voice of the Lord and keep His commandments, and would rejoice in consequence in the richest blessing of its God. In the expression, **אתה תשוב ותשמעת** (“thou shalt return and hearken”), **תשבת** (“thou shalt return”) has an adverbial signification. This is evident from the corresponding expression in ver. 9b, “for Jehovah will again rejoice over thee” (*lit.* “will return and rejoice”), in which the adverbial signification is placed beyond all doubt.—Vers. 8-10 contain the general thought, that Israel would then come again into its normal relation to its God, would enter into true and perfect covenant fellowship with the Lord, and enjoy all the blessings of the

covenant.—Ver. 9a is a repetition of chap. xxviii. 11. The Lord will rejoice again over Israel, to do them good (*vid. chap. xxviii. 63*), as He had rejoiced over their fathers. The fathers are not the patriarchs alone, but all the pious ancestors of the people.—Ver. 10. A renewed enforcement of the indispensable condition of salvation.

Vers. 11–20. The fulfilment of this condition is not impossible, nor really very difficult. This natural thought leads to the motive, which Moses impresses upon the hearts of the people in vers. 11–14, viz. that He might turn the blessing to them. God had done everything to render the observance of His commandments possible to Israel. “*This commandment*” (used as in chap. vi. 1 to denote the whole law) is “*not too wonderful for thee*,” *i.e.* is not too hard to grasp, or unintelligible (*vid. chap. xvii. 8*), nor is it too far off: it is neither *in heaven*, *i.e.* at an inaccessible height; nor *beyond the sea*, *i.e.* at an unattainable distance, at the end of the world, so that any one could say, Who is able to fetch it thence? but it is *very near thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart to do it*. It not only lay before the people in writing, but it was also preached to them by word of mouth, and thus brought to their knowledge, so that it had become a subject of conversation as well as of reflection and careful examination. But however near the law had thus been brought to man, sin had so estranged the human heart from the word of God, that doing and keeping the law had become invariably difficult, and in fact impossible; so that the declaration, “*the word is in thy heart*,” only attains its full realization through the preaching of the gospel of the grace of God, and the righteousness that is by faith; and to this the Apostle Paul applies the passage in Rom. x. 25 sqq.—Vers. 15–20. In conclusion, Moses sums up the contents of the whole of this preaching of the law in the words, “*life and good, and death and evil*,” as he had already done at chap. xi. 26, 27, in the first part of this address, to lay the people by a solemn adjuration under the obligation to be faithful to the Lord, and through this obligation to conclude the covenant afresh. He had set before them this day life and good (“*good*” = prosperity and salvation), as well as death and evil (*γάτη*, adversity and destruction), by commanding them to love the Lord and walk in His ways. Love is placed first, as in chap. vi. 5, as being the essential principle of the fulfilment of the commandments. Expounding the law was setting before them life and death, salvation and destruction, because the law, as the word of God, was living and powerful, and proved itself in every man a power of life or of death, according to the attitude

which he assumed towards it (*vid. chap. xxxii. 47*). נָכַח, to permit oneself to be torn away to idolatry (as in chap. iv. 19).—Ver. 18, as chap. iv. 26, viii. 19. He calls upon heaven and earth as witnesses (ver. 19, as in chap. iv. 26), namely, that he had set before them life and death. יְבָרֶךְ, in ver. 19, is the apodosis : “*therefore choose life.*”—Ver. 20. בַּיִת הָאָחֵיךְ, *for that* (namely, to love the Lord) *is thy life*, that is, the condition of life, and of long life, in the promised land (*vid. chap. iv. 40*).

IV.—MOSES' FAREWELL AND DEATH.

CHAP. XXXI.—XXXIV.

WITH the renewal of the covenant, by the choice set before the people between blessing and curse, life and death, Moses had finished the interpretation and enforcement of the law (chap. i. 5), and brought the work of legislation to a close. But in order that the work to which the Lord had called him might be thoroughly completed, it still remained for him, before his approaching death, to hand over the task of leading the people into Canaan to Joshua, who had been appointed as his successor, to finish writing out the laws, and to hand over the book of the law to the priests. The Lord also directed him to write an ode, as a witness against the people, on account of their obstinacy, and teach it to the Israelites. To these last arrangements and acts of Moses, which are narrated in chap. xxxi. and xxxii., there are added in chap. xxxiii. the blessing with which this man of God bade farewell to the tribes of Israel, and in chap. xxxiv. the account of his death, with which the Pentateuch closes.

MOSES' FINAL ARRANGEMENTS. COMPLETION AND HANDING OVER OF THE BOOK OF THE LAW.—CHAP. XXXI.

The final arrangements which Moses made before his departure, partly of his own accord, and partly by the command of God, relate to the introduction of the Israelites into the promised land, and the confirmation of their fidelity towards the Lord their God.—Vers. 1–13 describe how Moses promised the help of the Lord in the conquest of the land, both to the people generally, and also to Joshua,

their leader into Canaan (vers. 2–8), and commanded the priests to keep the book of the law, and read it publicly every seventh year (vers. 9–13); and vers. 14–23, how the Lord appeared to Moses before the tabernacle, and directed him to compose an ode as a testimony against the apostasy of the people, and promised Joshua His assistance. And lastly, vers. 24–27 relate how the book of the law, when brought to completion, was handed over to the Levites; and vers. 28–30 describe the reading of the ode to the people.

Vers. 1–8. In ver. 1 Moses' final arrangements are announced. **נִשְׁלַח** does not mean “he went away” (into his tent), which does not tally with what follows (“and spake”); nor is it merely equivalent to *porro, amplius*. It serves, as in Ex. ii. 1 and Gen. xxxv. 22, as a pictorial description of what he was about to do, in the sense of “he prepared himself,” or rose up. After closing the exposition of the law, Moses had either withdrawn, or at any rate made a pause, before he proceeded to make his final arrangements for laying down his office, and taking leave of the people.—Ver. 2. These last arrangements he commences with the declaration, that he must now bid them farewell, as he is 120 years old (which agrees with Ex. vii. 7), and can no more go out and in, *i.e.* no longer work in the nation and for it (see at Num. xxvii. 17); and the Lord has forbidden him to cross over the Jordan and enter Canaan (see Num. xx. 24). The first of these reasons is not at variance with the statement in chap. xxxiv. 7, that up to the time of his death his eyes were not dim, nor his strength abated. For this is merely an affirmation, that he retained the ability to see and to work to the last moment of his life, which by no means precludes his noticing the decline of his strength, and feeling the approach of his death.—Vers. 3–5. But although Moses could not, and was not to lead his people into Canaan, the Lord would fulfil His promise, to go before Israel and destroy the Canaanites, like the two kings of the Amorites; only they (the Israelites) were to do to them as the Lord had commanded them, *i.e.* to root out the Canaanites (*vid. chap. vii. 2 sqq.; Num. xxxiii. 51 sqq.; Ex. xxxiv. 11 sqq.*).—Ver. 6. Israel was therefore to be of good courage, and not to be afraid of them (*vid. chap. i. 21, xx. 3*).—Vers. 7, 8. Moses then encourages Joshua in the same way in the presence of all the people, on the strength of the promise of God in chap. i. 38 and Num. xxvii. 18 sqq. **תָּבֹא אֶת-הָעָם**, “thou wilt come with this people into the land.” These words are quite appropriate; and the alteration of **תָּבֹא** into **תָּבֵא**, according to ver. 23 (*Samar., Syr., Vulg.*), is a perfectly unnecessary conjecture; for

Joshua was not appointed leader of the people here, but simply promised an entrance with all the people into Canaan.

Vers. 9-13. Moses then handed over the law which he had written to the Levitical priests who carried the ark of the covenant, and to all the elders of Israel, with instructions to read it to the people at the end of every seven years, during the festal season of the year of release ("at the end," as in chap. xv. 1), viz. at the feast of Tabernacles (see Lev. xxiii. 34), when they appeared before the Lord. It is evident from the context and contents of these verses, apart from ver. 24, that the ninth verse is to be understood in the way described, i.e. that the two clauses, which are connected together by *vav. relat.* ("and Moses wrote this law," "and delivered it"), are not logically co-ordinate, but that the handing over of the written law was the main thing to be recorded here. With regard to the handing over of the law, the fact that Moses not only gave the written law to the priests, that they might place it by the ark of the covenant, but also "*to all the elders of Israel*," proves clearly enough that Moses did not intend at this time to give the law-book entirely out of his own hands, but that this handing over was merely an assignment of the law to the persons who were to take care, that in the future the written law should be kept before the people, as the rule of their life and conduct, and publicly read to them. The explanation which *J. H. Mich.* gives is perfectly correct, "He gave it for them to teach and keep." The law-book would only have been given to the priests, if the object had been simply that it should be placed by the ark of the covenant, or at the most, in the presence of the elders, but certainly not to all the elders, since they were not allowed to touch the ark. The correctness of this view is placed beyond all doubt by the contents of vers. 10 sqq. The main point in hand was not the writing out of the law, or the transfer of it to the priests and elders of the nation, but the command to read the law in the presence of the people at the feast of Tabernacles of the year of release. The writing out and handing over simply formed the substratum for this command, so that we cannot infer from them, that by this act Moses formally gave the law out of his own hands. He entrusted the reading to the priesthood and the college of elders, as the spiritual and secular rulers of the congregation; and hence the singular, "Thou shalt read this law to all Israel." The regulations as to the persons who were to undertake the reading, and also as to the particular time during the seven days' feast, and the portions that were to be read, he left to

the rulers of the congregation. We learn from Neh. viii. 18, that in Ezra's time they read *in* the book of the law every day from the first to the last day of the feast, from which we may see on the one hand, that the whole of the *Thorah* (or Pentateuch), from beginning to end, was not read; and on the other hand, by comparing the expression in ver. 18, "the book of the law of God," with "the law," in ver. 14, that the reading was not restricted to Deuteronomy: for, according to ver. 14, they had already been reading in Leviticus (chap. xxiii.) before the feast was held,—an evident proof that Ezra the scribe did not regard the book of Deuteronomy like the critics of our day, as the true national law-book, an acquaintance with which was all that the people required. Moses did not fix upon the feast of Tabernacles of the sabbatical year as the time for reading the law, because it fell at the beginning of the year,¹ as *Schultz* wrongly supposes, that the people might thereby be incited to occupy this year of entire rest in holy employment with the word and works of God. And the reading itself was neither intended to promote a more general acquaintance with the law on the part of the people,—an object which could not possibly have been secured by reading it once in seven years; nor was it merely to be a solemn promulgation and restoration of the law as the rule for the national life, for the purpose of removing any irregularities that might have found their way in the course of time into either the religious or the political life of the nation (*Bähr*, Symbol. ii. p. 603). To answer this end, it should have been connected with the Passover, the festival of Israel's birth. The reading stood rather in close connection with the idea of the festival itself; it was intended to quicken the soul with the law of the Lord, to refresh the heart, to enlighten the eyes,—in short, to offer the congregation the blessing of the law, which David celebrated from his own experience in Ps. xix. 8–15,

¹ It by no means follows, that because the sabbatical year commenced with the omission of the usual sowing, *i.e.* began in the autumn with the civil year, it therefore commenced with the feast of Tabernacles, and the order of the feasts was reversed in the sabbatical year. According to Ex. xxiii. 16, the feast of Tabernacles did not fall at the beginning, but at the end of the civil year. The commencement of the year with the first of *Tisri* was an arrangement introduced after the captivity, which the Jews had probably adopted from the Syrians (see my *bibl. Archæol.* i. § 74, note 15). Nor does it follow, that because the year of jubilee was to be proclaimed on the day of atonement in the sabbatical year with a blast of trumpets (Lev. xxv. 9), therefore the year of jubilee must have begun with the feast of Tabernacles. The proclamation of festivals is generally made some time before they commence.

to make the law beloved and prized by the whole nation, as a precious gift of the grace of God. Consequently (vers. 12, 13), not only the men, but the women and children also, were to be gathered together for this purpose, that they might hear the word of God, and learn to fear the Lord their God, as long as they should live in the land which He gave them for a possession. On ver. 11, see Ex. xxiii. 17, and xxxiv. 23, 24, where we also find תְּרִאֵת for תְּהִלָּה (ver. 24).

Vers. 14-23. After handing over the office to Joshua, and the law to the priests and elders, Moses was called by the Lord to come to the tabernacle with Joshua, to command him (תְּמִימֹן), i.e. to appoint him, confirm him in his office. To this end the Lord appeared in the tabernacle (ver. 15), in a pillar of cloud, which remained standing before it, as in Num. xii. 5 (see the exposition of Num. xi. 25). But before appointing Joshua, He announced to Moses that after his death the nation would go a whoring after other gods, and would break the covenant, for which it would be visited with severe afflictions, and directed him to write an ode and teach it to the children of Israel, that when the apostasy should take place, and punishment from God be felt in consequence, it might speak as a witness against the people, as it would not vanish from their memory. The Lord communicated this commission to Moses in the presence of Joshua, that he also might hear from the mouth of God that the Lord foreknew the future apostasy of the people, and yet nevertheless would bring them into the promised land. In this there was also implied an admonition to Joshua, not only to take care that the Israelites learned the ode and kept it in their memories, but also to strive with all his might to prevent the apostasy, so long as he was leader of Israel; which Joshua did most faithfully to the very end of his life (*vid. Josh. xxiii. and xxiv.*).—The announcement of the falling away of the Israelites from the Lord into idolatry, and the burning of the wrath of God in consequence (vers. 16-18), serves as a basis for the command in vers. 19 sqq. In this announcement the different points are simply linked together with “and,” whereas in their actual signification they are subordinate to one another: When thou shalt lie with thy fathers, and the people shall rise up, and go a whoring after other gods: My anger will burn against them, etc. וְעַפְתָּה, to rise up, to prepare, serves to bring out distinctly the course which the thing would take. The expression, “*foreign gods of the land*,” indicates that in the land which Jehovah gave His people, He (Jehovah)

alone was God and Lord, and that He alone was to be worshipped there. בְּקָרְבָּן is in apposition to מִתְחַדֵּשׁ, “*whither thou comest, in the midst of it.*” The punishment announced in ver. 17 corresponds most closely to the sin of the nation. For going a whoring after strange gods, the anger of the Lord would burn against them; for forsaking Him, He would forsake them; and for breaking His covenant, He would hide His face from them, *i.e.* withdraw His favour from them, so that they would be destroyed. הַיְהָ לְאַכְלָן, it (the nation) will be for devouring, *i.e.* will be devoured or destroyed (see Ewald, § 237, c.; and on אַכְלָן in this sense, see chap. vii. 16, and Num. xiv. 9). “*And many evils and troubles will befall it; and it will say in that day, Do not these evils befall me, because my God is not in the midst of me?*” When the evils and troubles broke in upon the nation, the people would inquire the cause, and would find it in the fact that they were forsaken by their God; but the Lord (“but I” in ver. 18 forms the antithesis to “they” in ver. 17) would still hide His face, namely, because simply missing God is not true repentance.—Ver. 19. “*And now,*” sc. because what was announced in vers. 16–18 would take place, “*write you this song.*” “This” refers to the song which follows in chap. xxxii. Moses and Joshua were to write the song, because they were both of them to strive to prevent the apostasy of the people; and Moses, as the author, was to teach it to the children of Israel, to make them learn it, that it might be a witness for the Lord (for Me) against the children of Israel. “This” is defined still further in vers. 20, 21: if Israel, through growing satisfied and fat in its land, which was so rich in costly good, should turn to other gods, and the Lord should visit it in consequence with grievous evils and troubles, the song was to answer before Israel as a witness; *i.e.* not only serve the Lord as a witness to the people that He had foretold all the evil consequences of apostasy, and had given Israel proper warning (*Knobel*), but to serve, as we may see from vers. 20, 21, and from the contents of the song, as a witness, on the one hand, that the Lord had conferred upon the people so many benefits and bestowed upon them such abundant blessings of His grace, that apostasy from Him was the basest ingratitude, for which they would justly be punished; and, on the other hand, that the Lord had not rejected His people in spite of the punishments inflicted upon them, but would once more have compassion upon them and requite their foes, and thus would sanctify and glorify Himself as the only true God by His judgments upon Israel and the nations.

The law, with its commandments, promises, and threats, was already a witness of this kind against Israel (cf. ver. 26); but just as in every other instance the appearance of a plurality of unanimous witnesses raises the matter into an indisputable truth, so the Lord would set up another witness against the Israelites besides the law, in the form of this song, which was adapted to give all the louder warning, “because the song would not be forgotten out of the mouths of their seed” (ver. 21). The song, when once it had passed into the mouths of the people, would not very readily vanish from their memory, but would be transmitted from generation to generation, and be heard from the mouths of their descendants, as a perpetual warning voice, as it would be used by Israel; for God knew the invention of the people, *i.e.* the thoughts and purposes of their heart, which they cherished (*הַשְׁעָר* used to denote the doing of the heart, as in Isa. xxxii. 6) even then before He had brought them into Canaan. (On ver. 20a, *vid.* chap. vii. 5, ix. 5, and Ex. iii. 8.)—In ver. 22 the result is anticipated, and the command of God is followed immediately by an account of its completion by Moses (just as in Ex. xii. 50; Lev. xvi. 34, etc.).—After this command with reference to the song, the Lord appointed Joshua to the office which he had been commanded to take, urging him at the same time to be courageous, and promising him His help in the conquest of Canaan. That the subject to *וְיִהְיֶה* is not Moses, but Jehovah, is evident partly from the context, the retrospective glance at ver. 14, and partly from the words themselves, “I will be with thee” (*vid.* Ex. iii. 12).¹

Vers. 24-27. With the installation of Joshua on the part of God, the official life of Moses was brought to a close. Having returned from the tabernacle, he finished the writing out of the laws, and then gave the book of the law to the Levites, with a command to put it by the side of the ark of the covenant, that it might be there for a witness against the people, as He knew its rebellion and stiffneckedness (vers. 24-27). *בְּחַבֵּל־כְּפֹר*, to write upon a book, equivalent to write down, commit to writing. *עַד תְּקִמּוּ*, till their being finished, *i.e.* complete. By the “Levites who bare the ark of the covenant” we are not to understand ordinary Levites, but the

¹ Knobel's assertion (on Num. xxvii. 23) that the appointment of Joshua on the part of Moses by the imposition of hands, as described in that passage, is at variance with this verse, scarcely needs any refutation. Or is it really the case, that the installation of Joshua on the part of God is irreconcilable with his ordination by Moses?

Levitical priests, who were entrusted with the ark. "The Levites" is simply a contraction for the full expression, "the priests the sons of Levi" (ver. 9). It is true that, according to Num. iv. 4 sqq., the Kohathites were appointed to carry the holy vessels, which included the ark of the covenant, on the journey through the desert; but it was the priests, and not they, who were the true bearers and guardians of the holy things, as we may see from the fact that the priests had first of all to wrap up these holy things in a careful manner, before they handed them over to the Kohathites, that they might not touch the holy things and die (Num. iv. 15). Hence we find that on solemn occasions, when the ark was to be brought out in all its full significance and glory,—as, for example, in the crossing of the Jordan (Josh. iii: 3 sqq., iv. 9, 10), when encompassing Jericho (Josh. vi. 6, 12), at the setting up of the law on Ebal and Gerizim (Josh. viii. 33), and at the consecration of Solomon's temple (1 Kings viii. 3),—it was not by the Levites, but by the priests, that the ark of the covenant was borne. In fact the Levites were, strictly speaking, only their (the priests') servants, who relieved them of this and the other labour, so that what they did was done in a certain sense through them. If the (non-priestly) Levites were not to touch the ark of the covenant, and not even to put in the poles (Num. iv. 6), Moses would not have handed over the law-book, to be kept by the ark of the covenant, to them, but to the priests. מִצְדָּר אַרְבָּן, at the side of the ark, or, according to the paraphrase of *Jonathan*, "in a case on the right side of the ark of the covenant," which may be correct, although we must not think of this case, as many of the early theologians do, as a secondary ark attached to the ark of the covenant (see *Lundius, Jüd. Heiligh.* pp. 73, 74). The tables of the law were deposited in the ark (Ex. xxv. 16, xl. 20), and the book of the law was to be kept by its side. As it formed, from its very nature, simply an elaborate commentary upon the decalogue, it was also to have its place outwardly as an accompaniment to the tables of the law, for a witness against the people, in the same manner as the song in the mouth of the people (ver. 21). For, as Moses adds in ver. 27, in explanation of his instructions, "*I know thy rebelliousness, and thy stiff neck: behold, while I am yet alive with you this day, ye have been rebellious against the Lord* (*vid. chap. ix. 7*); *and how much more after my death.*"

With these words Moses handed over the complete book of the law to the Levitical priests. For although the handing over is not

expressly mentioned, it is unquestionably implied in the words, "Take this book, and put it by the side of the ark of the covenant," as the finishing of the writing of the laws is mentioned immediately before. But if Moses finished the writing of the law after he had received instructions from the Lord to compose the ode, what he wrote will reach to ver. 23; and what follows from ver. 24 onwards will form the appendix to his work by a different hand.¹ The supposition that Moses himself inserted his instructions concerning the preservation of the book of the law, and the ode which follows, is certainly possible, but not probable. The decision as to the place where it should be kept was not of such importance as to need insertion in the book of the law, since sufficient provision for its safe keeping had been made by the directions in vers. 9 sqq.; and although God had commanded him to write the ode, it was not for the purpose of inserting it in the *Thorah* as an essential portion of it, but to let the people learn it, to put it in the mouth of the people. The allusion to this ode in vers. 19 sqq. furnishes no conclusive evidence, either that Moses himself included it in the law-book which he had written with the account of his oration in vers. 28-30 and chap. xxxii. 1-43, or that the appendix which Moses did not write commences at ver. 14 of this chapter. For all that follows with certainty from the expression "this song" (vers. 19 and 22), which certainly points to the song in chap. xxxii., is that Moses himself handed over the ode to the priests with the complete book of the law, as a supplement to the law, and that this ode was then inserted by the writer of the appendix in the appendix itself.

Vers. 28-30. Directly after handing over the book of the law, Moses directed the elders of all the tribes, together with the official persons, to gather round him, that he might rehearse to them the ode which he had written for the people. The summons, "gather unto me," was addressed to the persons to whom he had given the book of the law. The elders and officers, as the civil authorities of the congregation, were collected together by him to hear the ode, because they were to put it in the mouth of the people, i.e. to take care that

¹ The objection brought against this view by *Riehm*, namely, that "it founders on the fact that the style and language in chap. xxxi. 24-30 and xxxii. 44-47 are just the same as in the earlier portion of the book," simply shows that he has not taken into consideration that, with the simple style adopted in Hebrew narrative, we could hardly expect in eleven verses, which contain for the most part simply words and sayings of Moses, to find any very striking difference of language or of style. This objection, therefore, merely proves that no valid arguments can be adduced against the view in question.

all the nation should learn it. The words, "*I will call heaven and earth as witnesses against you,*" refer to the substance of the ode about to be rehearsed, which begins with an appeal to the heaven and the earth (chap. xxxii. 1). The reason assigned for this in ver. 29 is a brief summary of what the Lord had said to Moses in vers. 16–21, and Moses thought it necessary to communicate to the representatives of the nation. "*The work of your hands*" refers to the idols (*vid. chap. iv. 28*).—Ver. 30 forms the introduction to the rehearsal of the ode.

SONG OF MOSES, AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF HIS DEATH.—
CHAP. XXXII.

Vers. 1–43. THE SONG OF MOSES.—In accordance with the object announced in chap. xxxi. 19, this song contrasts the unchangeable fidelity of the Lord with the perversity of His faithless people. After a solemn introduction pointing out the importance of the instruction about to be given (vers. 1–3), this thought is placed in the foreground as the theme of the whole : the Lord is blameless and righteous in His doings, but Israel acts corruptly and perversely ; and this is carried out in the first place by showing the folly of the Israelites in rebelling against the Lord (vers. 6–18) ; secondly, by unfolding the purpose of God to reject and punish the rebellious generation (vers. 19–23) ; and lastly, by announcing and depicting the fulfilment of this purpose, and the judgment in which the Lord would have mercy upon His servants and annihilate His foes (vers. 34–43).

The song embraces the whole of the future history of Israel, and bears all the marks of a prophetic testimony from the mouth of Moses, in the perfectly ideal picture which it draws, on the one hand, of the benefits and blessings conferred by the Lord upon His people ; and on the other hand, of the ingratitude with which Israel repaid its God for them all. "This song, soaring as it does to the loftiest heights, moving amidst the richest abundance of pictures of both present and future, with its concise, compressed, and pictorial style, rough, penetrating, and sharp, but full of the holiest solemnity, a witness against the disobedient nation, a celebration of the covenant God, sets before us in miniature a picture of the whole life and conduct of the great man of God, whose office it pre-eminently was to preach condemnation" (*O. v. Gerlach*).—It is true that the persons addressed in this ode are not the contemporaries of

Moses, but the Israelites in Canaan, when they had grown haughty in the midst of the rich abundance of its blessings, and had fallen away from the Lord, so that the times when God led the people through the wilderness to Canaan are represented as days long past away. But this, the stand-point of the ode, is not to be identified with the poet's own time. It is rather a prophetic anticipation of the future, which has an *analogon* in a poet's absorption in an ideal future, and differs from this merely in the certainty and distinctness with which the future is foreseen and proclaimed. The assertion that the entire ode moves within the epoch of the kings who lived many centuries after the time of Moses, rests upon a total misapprehension of the nature of prophecy, and a mistaken attempt to turn figurative language into prosaic history. In the whole of the song there is not a single word to indicate that the persons addressed were "already sighing under the oppression of a wild and hostile people, the barbarous hordes of Assyrians or Chaldeans" (*Ewald, Kamphausen, etc.*).¹ The Lord had indeed determined to reject the idolatrous nation, and excite it to jealousy through those that were "no people," and to heap up all evils upon it, famine, pestilence, and sword; but the execution of this purpose had not yet taken place, and, although absolutely certain, was in the future still. Moreover, the benefits which God had conferred upon His people, were not of such a character as to render it impossible that they should have been alluded to by Moses. All that the Lord had done for Israel, by delivering it from bondage and guiding it miraculously through the wilderness, had been already witnessed by Moses himself; and the description in vers. 13 and 14, which goes beyond that time, is in reality nothing more than a pictorial expansion of the thought that Israel was most bountifully provided with the

¹ How little firm ground there is for this assertion in the contents of the ode, is indirectly admitted even by *Kamphausen* himself in the following remarks: "The words of the ode leave us quite in the dark as to the author;" and "if it were really certain that Deuteronomy was composed by Moses himself, the question as to the authenticity of the ode would naturally be decided in the traditional way." Consequently, the solution of the whole is to be found in the *dictum*, that "the circumstances which are assumed in any prophecy as already existing, and to which the prophetic utterances are appended as to something well known (?), really determine the time of the prophet himself;" and, according to this canon, which is held up as "certain and infallible," but which is really thoroughly uncritical, and founded upon the purely dogmatic assumption that any actual foreknowledge of the future is impossible, the ode before us is to be assigned to a date somewhere about 700 years before Christ.

richest productions of the land of Canaan, which flowed with milk and honey. It is true, the satisfaction of Israel with these blessings had not actually taken place in the time of Moses, but was still only an object of hope; but it was hope of such a kind, that Moses could not cherish a moment's doubt concerning it. Throughout the whole we find no allusions to peculiar circumstances or historical events belonging to a later age.—On the other hand, the whole circle of ideas, figures, and words in the ode points decidedly to Moses as the author. Even if we leave out of sight the number of peculiarities of style ($\ddot{\alpha}\pi.$ λεγόμενα), which is by no means inconsiderable, and such bold original composite words as נָאָנֶל (not-God, ver. 21; cf. ver. 17) and נָעָנֶל (not-people, ver. 21), which point to a very remote antiquity, and furnish evidence of the vigour of the earliest poetry,—the figure of the *eagle* in ver. 11 points back to Ex. xix. 4; the description of God as a *rock* in vers. 4, 15, 18, 30, 31, 37, recalls Gen. xlix. 24; the *fire* of the wrath of God, burning even to the world beneath (ver. 22), points to the representation of God in chap. iv. 24 as a consuming fire; the expression “to move to *jealousy*,” in vers. 16 and 21, recalls the “jealous God” in chap. iv. 24, vi. 15, Ex. xx. 5, xxxiv. 14; the description of Israel as *children* (sons) in ver. 5, and “*children without faithfulness*” in ver. 20, suggests chap. xiv. 1; and the words, “O that they were *wise*,” in ver. 29, recall chap. iv. 6, “a wise people.” Again, it is only in the Pentateuch that the word הַרְחֵב (greatness, ver. 3) is used to denote the greatness of God (*vid.* Deut. iii. 24, v. 21, ix. 26, xi. 2; Num. xiv. 19); the name of honour given to Israel in ver. 15, viz. *Jeshurun*, only occurs again in chap. xxxiii. 5 and 26, with the exception of Isa. xliv. 2, where it is borrowed from these passages; and the plural form מִזְמֹרָת, in ver. 7, is only met with again in the prayer of Moses, viz. Ps. xc. 15.

Vers. 1–5. *Introduction and Theme.*—In the introduction (vers. 1–3),—“*Give ear, O ye heavens, I will speak; and let the earth hear the words of my mouth. Let my doctrine drop as the rain, let my speech fall as the dew; as showers upon green, and rain-drops upon herb: for I will publish the name of the Lord; give ye greatness to our God,*”—Moses summons heaven and earth to hearken to his words, because the instruction which he was about to proclaim concerned both heaven and earth, *i.e.* the whole universe. It did so, however, not merely as treating of the honour of its Creator, which was disregarded by the murmuring people (*Kamphausen*), or to justify God, as the witness of the righteousness of His doings, in opposition to

the faithless nation, when He punished it for its apostasy (just as in chap. iv. 26, xxx. 19, xxxi. 28, 29, heaven and earth are appealed to as witnesses against rebellious Israel), but also inasmuch as heaven and earth would be affected by the judgment which God poured out upon faithless Israel and the nations, to avenge the blood of His servants (ver. 43); since the faithfulness and righteousness of God would thus become manifest in heaven and on earth, and the universe be sanctified and glorified thereby. The *vav consec.* before אָרְבָּה expresses the desired or intended sequel: so that I may then speak, or “so will I then speak” (*vid. Köhler on Hagg.* p. 44, note). —Ver. 2. But because what was about to be announced was of such importance throughout, he desired that the words should trickle down like rain and dew upon grass and herb. The point of comparison lies in the refreshing, fertilizing, and enlivening power of the dew and rain. Might the song exert the same upon the hearts of the hearers. חַלֵּל, accepting, then, in a passive sense, that which is accepted, *instruction* (doctrine, Prov. xvi. 21, 23; Isa. xxix. 24). To “publish the name of the Lord:” *lit.* call, *i.e.* proclaim (not “call upon”), or *praise*. It was not by himself alone that Moses desired to praise the name of the Lord; the hearers of his song were also to join in this praise. The second clause requires this: “give ye (*i.e.* ascribe by word and conduct) greatness to our God.” נְרָא, applied here to God (as in chap. iii. 24, v. 21, ix. 26, xi. 2), which is only repeated again in Ps. cl. 2, is the greatness manifested by God in His acts of omnipotence; it is similar in meaning to the term “glory” in Ps. xxix. 1, 2, xcvi. 7, 8.

Vers. 4, 5. “The Rock—blameless is His work; for all His ways are right: a God of faithfulness, and without injustice; just and righteous is He. Corruptly acts towards Him, not His children; ? their spot, a perverse and crooked generation.” רָאֶת is placed first absolutely, to give it the greater prominence. God is called “the rock,” as the unchangeable refuge, who grants a firm defence and secure resort to His people, by virtue of His unchangeableness or impregnable firmness (see the synonym, “the Stone of Israel,” in Gen. xlvi. 24). This epithet points to the Mosaic age; and this is clearly shown by the use made of this title of God (*Zur*) in the construction of surnames in the Mosaic era; such, for example, as *Pedahzur* (Num. i. 10), which is equivalent to *Pedahel* (“God-redeemed,” Num. xxxiv. 28), *Elizur* (Num. i. 5), *Zuriel* (Num. iii. 35), and *Zurishaddai* (Num. i. 6, ii. 12). David, who had so often experienced the rock-like protection of his God, adopted it in his

Psalms (2 Sam. xxii. 3, 32 = Ps. xviii. 3, 32 ; also Ps. xix. 15, xxxi. 3, 4, lxxi. 3). *Perfect* (*i.e.* blameless, without fault or blemish) is His work ; for His ways, which He adopts in His government of the world, are right. As the rock, He is “a God of faithfulness,” upon which men may rely and build in all the storms of life, and “without iniquity,” *i.e.* anything crooked or false in His nature.—Ver. 5. His people Israel, on the contrary, had acted corruptly towards Him. The subject of “acted corruptly” is the rebellious generation of the people ; but before this subject there is introduced parenthetically, and in apposition, “not his children, but their spot.” *Spot* (*mum*) is used here in a moral sense, as in Prov. ix. 7, Job xi. 15, xxxi. 7, equivalent to stain. The rebellious and ungodly were not children of the Lord, but a stain upon them. If these words had stood after the actual subject, instead of before them, they would have presented no difficulty. This verse is the original of the expression, “children that are corrupters,” in Isa. i. 4.

Vers. 6–18. Expansion of the theme according to the thought expressed in ver. 5. The perversity of the rebellious generation manifested itself in the fact, that it repaid the Lord, to whom it owed existence and well-being, for all His benefits, with a foolish apostasy from its Creator and Father. This thought is expressed in ver. 6, in a reproachful question addressed to the people, and then supported in vers. 7–14 by an enumeration of the benefits conferred by God, and in vers. 15–18 by a description of the ingratitude of the people.—Ver. 6. “*Will ye thus repay the Lord? thou foolish people and unwise!* *Is He not thy Father, who hath founded thee, who hath made thee and prepared thee?*” **הָבָרֵךְ**, the primary idea of which is doubtful, signifies properly *to show*, or *do*, for the most part *good*, but sometimes *evil* (*vid.* Ps. vii. 5). For the purpose of painting the folly of their apostasy distinctly before the eyes of the people, Moses crowds words together to describe what God was to the nation,—“*thy Father*,” to whose love Israel was indebted for its elevation into an independent people : comp. Isa. lxiii. 16, where Father and Redeemer are synonymous terms, with Isa. lxiv. 7, God the Father, Israel the clay which He had formed, and Mal. ii. 10, where God as Father is said to have created Israel ; see also the remarks at chap. xiv. 1 on the notion of Israel’s sonship.—**הָבָרֵךְ**, *He has acquired thee*; **ηγάγει**, *κτάσθαι*, to get, acquire (Gen. iv. 1), then so as to involve the idea of *κτίζειν* (Gen. xiv. 9), though without being identical with **הָבָרֵךְ**. It denotes here the founding of Israel as a nation, by its deliverance out of the power of Pharaoh. The verbs which

follow (*made and established*) refer to the elevation and preparation of the redeemed nation, as the nation of the Lord, by the conclusion of a covenant, the giving of the law, and their guidance through the desert.—Ver. 7. “*Remember the days of old, consider the years of the past generations : ask thy father, that he may make known to thee ; thine old men, that they may tell it to thee !*” With these words Moses summons the people to reflect upon what the Lord had done to them. The days of old (דֹבֶר), and years of generation and generation, *i.e.* years through which one generation after another had lived, are the times of the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt, including the pre-Mosaic times, and also the immediate post-Mosaic, when Israel had entered into the possession of Canaan. These times are described by Moses as a far distant past, because he transported himself in spirit to the “latter days” (chap. xxxi. 29), when the nation would have fallen away from its God, and would have been forsaken and punished by God in consequence. “*Days of eternity*” are times which lie an eternity behind the speaker, not necessarily, however, before all time, but simply at a period very far removed from the present, and of which even the fathers and old men could only relate what had been handed down by tradition to them.

Vers. 8 and 9. “*When the Most High portioned out inheritance to the nations, when He divided the children of men ; He fixed the boundaries of the nations according to the number of the sons of Israel : for the Lord's portion is His people ; Jacob the cord of His inheritance.*” Moses commences his enumeration of the manifestations of divine mercy with the thought, that from the very commencement of the forming of nations God had cared for His people Israel. The meaning of ver. 8 is given in general correctly by *Calvin*: “In the whole arrangement of the world God had kept this before Him as the end : to consult the interests of His chosen people.” The words, “when the Most High portioned out inheritance to the nations,” etc., are not to be restricted to the one fact of the confusion of tongues and division of the nations as described in Gen. xi., but embrace the whole period of the development of the one human family in separate tribes and nations, together with their settlement in different lands ; for it is no doctrine of the Israelitish legend, as *Kamphausen* supposes, that the division of the nations was completed once for all. The book of Genesis simply teaches, that after the confusion of tongues at the building of the tower of Babel, God scattered men over the entire surface of the earth (chap. xi.).

9), and that the nations were divided, *i.e.* separate nations were formed from the families of the sons of Noah (Gen. x. 32); that is to say, the nations were formed in the divinely-appointed way of generation and multiplication, and so spread over the earth. And the Scriptures say nothing about a division of the countries among the different nations at one particular time; they simply show, that, like the formation of the nations from families and tribes, the possession of the lands by the nations so formed was to be traced to God,—was the work of divine providence and government,—whereby God so determined the boundaries of the nations (“the nations” are neither the tribes of Israel, nor simply the nations round about Canaan, but the nations generally), that Israel might receive as its inheritance a land proportioned to its numbers.¹—Ver. 9. God did this, because He had chosen Israel as His own nation, even before it came into existence. As the Lord’s people of possession (cf. chap. vii. 6, x. 15, and Ex. xix. 5), Israel was Jehovah’s portion, and the inheritance assigned to Him. לְמִתְרָב, a *cord*, or measure, then a piece of land measured off; here it is figuratively applied to the nation.—Vers. 10 sqq. He had manifested His fatherly care and love to Israel as His own property.

Ver. 10. “*He found him in the land of the desert, and in the wilderness, the howling of the steppe; He surrounded him, took care of him, protected him as the apple of His eye.*” These words do not “relate more especially to the conclusion of the covenant at Sinai” (*Luther*), nor merely to all the proofs of the paternal care with which God visited His people in the desert, to lead them to Sinai, there to adopt them as His covenant nation, and then to guide them to Canaan, to the exclusion of their deliverance from the bondage of Egypt. The reason why Moses does not mention this fact, or the passage through the Red Sea, is not to be sought for, either solely or even in part, in the fact that “the song does not rest upon the stand-point of the Mosaic times;” for we may see clearly that distance of time would furnish no adequate ground for “singling out and elaborating certain points only from the renowned stories of old,” say from the 105th Psalm, which no one would think of pronouncing an earlier production than this song.

¹ The Septuagint rendering, “according to the number of the angels of God,” is of no critical value,—in fact, is nothing more than an arbitrary interpretation founded upon the later Jewish notion of guardian angels of the different nations (Sir. xvii. 14), which probably originated in a misunderstanding of chap. iv. 19, as compared with Dan. x. 13, 20, 21, and xii. 1.

Nor is it because the gracious help of God, which the people experienced up to the time of the exodus from Egypt, was inferior in importance to the divine care exercised over it during the march through the desert (a fact which would need to be proved), or because the solemn conclusion of the covenant, whereby Israel first became the people of God, took place during the sojourn at Sinai, that Moses speaks of God as finding the people in the desert and adopting them there; but simply because it was not his intention to give a historical account of the acts performed by God upon and towards Israel, but to describe how Israel was in the most helpless condition when the Lord had compassion upon it, to take it out of that most miserable state in which it must have perished, and bring it into the possession of the richly-blessed land of Canaan. The whole description of what the Lord did for Israel (vers. 10-14) is figurative. Israel is represented as a man in the horrible desert, and in danger of perishing in the desolate waste, where not only bread and water had failed, but where ravenous beasts lay howling in wait for human life, when the Lord took him up and delivered him out of all distress. The expression "found him" is also to be explained from this figure. Finding presupposes seeking, and in the seeking the love which goes in search of the loved one is manifested. Also the expression "land of the desert"—a land which is a desert, without the article defining the desert more precisely—shows that the reference is not to the finding of Israel in the desert of Arabia, and that these words are not to be understood as relating to the fact, that when His people entered the desert the Lord appeared to them in the pillar of cloud and fire (*Ex. xiii. 20, Schultz*). For although the figure of the desert is chosen, because in reality the Lord had led Israel through the Arabian desert to Canaan, we must not so overlook the figurative character of the whole description as to refer the expression "in a desert land" directly and exclusively to the desert of Arabia. The measures adopted by the Pharaohs, the object of which was the extermination or complete suppression of Israel, made even Egypt a land of desert to the Israelites, where they would inevitably have perished if the Lord had not sought, found, and surrounded them there. To depict still further the helpless and irremediable situation of Israel, the idea of the desert is heightened still further by the addition of וְתוּהַהָ וְנוֹ, "and in fact (! is explanatory) in a waste," or wilderness (*tohu* recalls Gen. i. 2). "Howling of the desert" is in apposition to *tohu* (waste), and not a genitive dependent upon it, viz. "waste of the howling of the desert,

or of the desert in which wild beasts howl" (*Ewald*), as if לְלִי stood after לֵישׁוּן. "Howling of the desert" does not mean the desert in which wild beasts howl, but the howling which is heard in the desert of wild beasts. The meaning of the passage, therefore, is "in the midst of the howling of the wild beasts of the desert." This clause serves to strengthen the idea of *tohu* (waste), and describes the waste as a place of the most horrible howling of wild beasts. It was in this situation that the Lord surrounded His people. סָבַב, to surround with love and care, not merely to protect (*vid. Ps. xxvi. 6; Jer. xxxi. 22*). בָּנָה, from בָּנָה or בָּנָה, to pay attention, in the sense of "not to lose sight of them." "To keep as the apple of the eye" is a figurative description of the tenderest care. The apple of the eye is most carefully preserved (*vid. Ps. xvii. 8; Prov. vii. 2*).

Ver. 11. "*As an eagle, which stirreth up its nest and soars over its young, He spread out His wings, took him up, carried him upon His wings.*" Under the figure of an eagle, which teaches its young to fly, and in doing so protects them from injury with watchful affection, Moses describes the care with which the Lord came to the relief of His people in their helplessness, and assisted them to develop their strength. This figure no doubt refers more especially to the protection and assistance of God experienced by Israel in its journey through the Arabian desert; but it must not be restricted to this. It embraces both the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt by the outstretched arm of the Lord, as we may see from a comparison with Ex. xix. 4, where the Lord is said to have brought His people out of Egypt upon eagles' wings, and also the introduction into Canaan, when the Lord drove the Canaanites out from before them and destroyed them. This verse contains an independent thought; the first half is the protasis, the second the apodosis. The nominative to "spreadeth abroad" is Jehovah; and the suffixes in קָרְבָּה and יְשַׁאֲתָה ("taketh" and "beareth") refer to Israel or Jacob (ver. 9), like the suffixes in ver. 10. As בְּ cannot open a sentence like פְּאַשְׁר, we must supply the relative נֶשֶׁר after קָפֹעַ, to waken up, rouse up its nest, *i.e.* to encourage the young ones to fly. It is rendered correctly by the Vulgate, *provocans ad volandum pullos suos*; and freely by *Luther*, "bringeth out its young." "*Soareth over its young:*" namely, in order that, when they were attempting to fly, if any were in danger of falling through exhaustion, it might take them at once upon its powerful wings, and preserve them from harm. Examples of this, according to the

popular belief, are given by *Bochart* (*Hieroz.* ii. p. 762). נָתַר, from נָתַר to be loose or slack (Jer. xxiii. 9) : in the *Piel* it is applied to a bird in the sense of loosening its wings, as distinguished from binding its wings to its body; hence (1) to sit upon eggs with loosened wings, and (2) to fly with loosened wings. Here it is used in the latter sense, because the young are referred to. The point of comparison between the conduct of God towards Jacob and the acts of an eagle towards its young, is the loving care with which He trained Israel to independence. The carrying of Israel upon the eagle's wings of divine love and omnipotence was manifested in the most glorious way in the guidance of it by the pillar of cloud and fire, though it was not so exclusively in this visible vehicle of the gracious presence of God as that the comparison can be restricted to this phenomenon alone. *Luther's* interpretation is more correct than this,—“Moses points out in these words, how He fostered them in the desert, bore with their manners, tried them and blessed them that they might learn to fly, i.e. to trust in Him,”—except that the explanation of the expression “to fly” is narrowed too much.

Vers. 12-14. “*The Lord alone did lead him, and with Him was no strange god. He made him drive over the high places of the earth, and eat the productions of the field; and made him suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flint-stone. Cream of cattle, and milk of the flock, with the fat of lambs, and rams of Bashan's kind, and bucks, with the kidney-fat of wheat: and grape-blood thou drankest as fiery wine.*” Moses gives prominence to the fact that Jehovah alone conducted Israel, to deprive the people of every excuse for their apostasy from the Lord, and put their ingratitude in all the stronger light. If no other god stood by the Lord to help Him, He had thereby laid Israel under the obligation to serve Him alone as its God. “*With Him*” refers to Jehovah, and not to Israel.—Vers. 13, 14. The Lord caused the Israelites to take possession of Canaan with victorious power, and enter upon the enjoyment of its abundant blessings. The phrase, “to cause to drive over the high places of the earth,” is a figurative expression for the victorious subjugation of a land; it is not taken from Ps. xviii. 34, as *Ewald* assumes, but is original both here and in chap. xxxiii. 29. “*Drive*” (ride) is only a more majestic expression for “advance.” The reference to this passage in Isa. lviii. 14 is unmistakeable. Whoever has obtained possession of the high places of a country is lord of the land. The “high places of the earth” do not mean the high places of Canaan only, although the expression in this instance relates to the posses-

sion of Canaan. “*And he (Jacob) ate :*” for, so that he could now eat, the productions of the field, and in fact all the riches of the fruitful land, which are then described in superabundant terms. Honey out of the rock and oil out of the flint-stone, *i.e.* the most valuable productions out of the most unproductive places, since God so blessed the land that even the rocks and stones were productive. The figure is derived from the fact that Canaan abounds in wild bees, which make their hives in clefts of the rock, and in olive-trees which grow in a rocky soil. “Rock-flints,” *i.e.* rocky flints. The nouns in ver. 14 are dependent upon “to suck” in ver. 13, as the expression is not used literally. “Things which are sweet and pleasant to eat, people are in the habit of sucking” (*Ges. thes.* p. 601). חַמְאָה and חַלְבָּה (though חַלְבָּה seems to require a form חַלְבָּה; *vid. Ewald*, § 213, b.) denote the two forms in which the milk yielded by the cattle was used; the latter, milk in general, and the former thick curdled milk, cream, and possibly also butter. The two are divided poetically here, the cream being assigned to the cattle, and the milk to the sheep and goats. “*The fat of lambs,*” *i.e.* “lambs of the best description laden with fat” (*Vitrunga*). Fat is a figurative expression for the best (*vid. Num. xviii. 12*). “*And rams:*” grammatically, no doubt, this might also be connected with “the fat,” but it is improbable from a poetical point of view, since the enumeration would thereby drag prosaically; and it is also hardly reconcilable with the apposition בָּשָׂן בָּשָׂן, *i.e.* reared in Bashan (*vid. Ezek. xxxix. 18*), which implies that Bashan was celebrated for its rams, and not merely for its oxen. This epithet, which *Kamphausen* renders “of Bashan’s kind,” is unquestionably used for the best description of rams. The list becomes poetical, if we take “rams” as an accusative governed by the verb “to suck” (ver. 13). “*Kidney-fat (i.e. the best fat) of wheat,*” the finest and most nutritious wheat. Wine is mentioned last, and in this case the list passes with poetic freedom into the form of an address. “*Grape-blood*” for red wine (as in Gen. xlvi. 11). חַמְרָה, from חַמֵּר to ferment, froth, foam, *lit.* the foaming, *i.e.* fiery wine, serves as a more precise definition of the “blood of the grape.”

Vers. 15–18. Israel had repaid its God for all these benefits by a base apostasy.—Ver. 15. “*But Righteous-nation became fat, and struck out—thou becamest fat, thick, gross—and let go God who made him, and despised the rock of his salvation.*” So much is certain concerning *Jeshurun*, that it was an honourable surname given to Israel; that it is derived from שָׁרוּן, and describes Israel as

a nation of just or right men (a similar description to that given by Balaam in Num. xxiii. 10), because Jehovah, who is just and right (ver. 4), had called it to uprightness, to walk in His righteousness, and chosen it as His servant (Isa. xliv. 2). The prevalent opinion, that *Jeshurun* is a diminutive, and signifies *rectalus*, or “little pious” (*Ges.* and others), has no more foundation than the derivation from Israel, and the explanation, “little Israel,” since there is no philological proof that the termination *un* ever had a diminutive signification in Hebrew (see *Hengstenberg*, Balaam, p. 415); and an *appellatio blanda et charitativa* is by no means suitable to this passage, much less to chap. xxxiii. 5. The epithet *Righteous-nation*, as we may render *Jeshurun*, was intended to remind Israel of its calling, and involved the severest reproof of its apostasy. “By placing the name of *righteous* before Israel, he censured ironically those who had fallen away from righteousness; and by thus reminding them with what dignity they had been endowed, he upbraided them with the more severity for their guilt of perfidy. For in other places (*sc.* chap. xxxiii. 5, 26) Israel is honoured with an eulogium of the same kind, without any such sinister meaning, but with simple regard to its calling; whilst here Moses shows reproachfully how far they had departed from that pursuit of piety, to the cultivation of which they had been called” (*Calvin*). The words, “became fat, and struck out,” are founded upon the figure of an ox that had become fat, and intractable in consequence (*vid.* Isa. x. 27, Hos. iv. 16; and for the fact itself, Deut. vi. 11, viii. 10, xxxi. 20). To sharpen this reproof, Moses repeats the thought in the form of a direct address to the people: “Thou hast become fat, stont, gross.” Becoming fat led to forsaking God, the Creator and ground of its salvation. “A full stomach does not promote piety, for it stands secure, and neglects God” (*Luther*). נִבְלָה is no doubt a *denom.* verb from נִבְלָה, *lit.* to treat as a fool, *i.e.* to despise (*vid.* Micah vii. 6).

Vers. 16-18. “They excited His jealousy through strange (gods), they provoked Him by abominations. They sacrificed to devils, which (were) not-God; to gods whom they knew not, to new (ones) that had lately come up, whom your fathers feared not. The rock which begat thee thou forsookest, and hast forgotten the God that bare thee.” These three verses are only a further expansion of ver. 15b. Forsaking the rock of its salvation, Israel gave itself up to the service of worthless idols. The expression “excite to jealousy” is founded upon the figure of a marriage covenant,

under which the relation of the Lord to Israel is represented (*vid. chap. xxxi. 16, and the com. on Ex. xxxiv. 15*). “This jealousy rests upon the sacred and spiritual marriage tie, by which God had bound the people to Himself” (*Calvin*). “Strange gods,” with which Israel committed adultery, as in *Jer. ii. 25, iii. 13*. The idols are called “abominations” because Jehovah abhorred them (*chap. vii. 25, xxvii. 15; cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 13*). שָׁדִים signifies demons in Syriac, as it has been rendered by the LXX. and Vulgate here; *lit.* lords, like Baalim. It is also used in *Ps. cvi. 37*.—“*Not-God*,” a composite noun, in apposition to *Shedim* (devils), like the other expressions which follow: “gods whom they knew not,” *i.e.* who had not made themselves known to them as gods by any benefit or blessing (*vid. chap. xi. 28*); “new (ones), who had come from near,” *i.e.* had but lately risen up and been adopted by the Israelites. “Near,” not in a local but in a temporal sense, in contrast to *Jehovah*, who had manifested and attested Himself as God from of old (*ver. 7*). שָׁמַר, to shudder, construed here with an accusative, to experience a holy shuddering before a person, to revere with holy awe.—In *ver. 18* Moses returns to the thought of *ver. 15*, for the purpose of expressing it emphatically once more, and paving the way for a transition to the description of the acts of the Lord towards His rebellious nation. To bring out still more prominently the base ingratitude of the people, he represents the creation of Israel by *Jehovah*, the rock of its salvation, under the figure of generation and birth, in which the paternal and maternal love of the Lord to His people had manifested itself. לְחַזֵּק, to twist round, then applied to the pains of childbirth. The ἀπ. λεγ. שְׁמַר is to be traced to הַשֵּׁמֶן, and is a pausal form like יְמַנֵּה in *chap. iv. 33*. הַשֵּׁמֶן = שֵׁם, to forget, to neglect.

Vers. 19–33. For this foolish apostasy the Lord would severely visit His people. This visitation is represented indeed in *ver. 19*, as the consequence of apostasy that had taken place,—not, however, as a punishment already inflicted, but simply as a resolution which God had formed and would carry out,—an evident proof that we have no song here belonging to the time when God visited with severe punishments the Israelites who had fallen into idolatry. In *ver. 19* the determination to reject the degenerate children is announced, and in *vers. 20–22* this is still further defined and explained.—Ver. 19. “*And the Lord saw it, and rejected—from indignation at His sons and daughters.*” The object to “saw” may easily be supplied from the context: He saw the idolatry of the

people, and rejected those who followed idols, and that because of indignation that His sons and daughters practised such abominations. The expression “he saw” simply serves to bring out the causal link between the apostasy and the punishment. יְמִימָה has been very well rendered by Kamphausen, “He resolved upon rejection,” since vers. 20 sqq. clearly show that the rejection had only been resolved upon by God, and was not yet carried out. In what follows, Moses puts this resolution into the mouth of the Lord Himself.—Vers. 20-22. *“And He said, I will hide My face from them, I will see what their end will be : for they are a generation full of perversities, children in whom is no faithfulness. They excited My jealousy by a no-god, provoked Me by their vanities : and I also will excite their jealousy by a no-people, provoke them by a foolish nation. For a fire blazes up in My nose, and burns to the lowest hell, and consumes the earth with its increase, and sets on fire the foundations of the mountains.”* The divine purpose contains two things:—first of all (ver. 20) the negative side, to hide the face, i.e. to withdraw His favour and see what their end would be, i.e. that their apostasy would bring nothing but evil and destruction; for they were “a nation of perversities” (*tahpuchoth* is moral perversity, Prov. ii. 14, vi. 14), i.e. “a thoroughly perverse and faithless generation” (*Knobel*);—and then, secondly (ver. 21), the positive side, viz. chastisement according to the right of complete retaliation. The Israelites had excited the jealousy and vexation of God by a *no-god* and vanities; therefore God would excite their jealousy and vexation by a *no-people* and a foolish nation. How this retaliation would manifest itself is not fully defined however here, but is to be gathered from the conduct of Israel towards the Lord. Israel had excited the jealousy of God by preferring a *no-god*, or הַבָּלִים, nothingnesses, i.e. gods that were vanities or nothings (*Elilim*, Lev. xix. 4), to the true and living God, its Father and Creator. God would therefore excite them to jealousy and ill-will by a *no-people*, a foolish nation, i.e. by preferring a *no-people* to the Israelites, transferring His favour to them, and giving the blessing which Israel had despised to a foolish nation. It is only with this explanation of the words that full justice is done to the idea of retribution; and it was in this sense that Paul understood this passage as referring to the adoption of the Gentiles as the people of God (Rom. x. 19), and that not merely by adaptation, or by connecting another meaning with the words, as *Umbreit* supposes, but by interpreting it in exact accordance with the

true sense of the words.¹ The adoption of the Gentile world into covenant with the Lord involved the rejection of the disobedient Israel; and this rejection would be consummated in severe judgments, in which the ungodly would perish. In this way the retribution inflicted by the Lord upon the faithless and perverse generation of His sons and daughters becomes a judgment upon the whole world. The jealousy of the Lord blazes up into a fire of wrath, which burns down to sheol. This aspect of the divine retribution comes into the foreground in what follows, from ver. 23 onwards; whilst the adoption of the Gentile world, which the Apostle Paul singles out as the leading thought of this verse, in accordance with the special purpose of the song, falls back behind the thought, that the Lord would not utterly destroy Israel, but when all its strength had disappeared would have compassion upon His servants, and avenge their blood upon His foes. The idea of a *no-people* is to be gathered from the antithesis *no-god*. As

¹ But when *Kamphausen*, on the other hand, maintains that this thought, which the apostle finds in the passage before us, would be "quite erroneous if taken as an exposition of the words," the assertion is supported by utterly worthless arguments: for example, (1) that throughout this song the exalted heathen are never spoken of as the bride of God, but simply as a rod of discipline used against Israel; (2) that this verse refers to the whole nation of Israel, and there is no trace of any distinction between the righteous and the wicked; and (3) that the idea that God would choose another people as the covenant nation would have been the very opposite of that Messianic hope with which the author of this song was inspired. To begin with the last, the Messianic hope of the song consisted unquestionably in the thought that the Lord would do justice to His people, His servants, and would avenge their blood, even when the strength of the nation should have disappeared (vers. 36 and 43). But this thought, that the Lord would have compassion upon Israel at last, by no means excludes the reception of the heathen into the kingdom of God, as is sufficiently apparent from Rom. ix.-xi. The assertion that this verse refers to the whole nation is quite incorrect. The plural suffixes used throughout in vers. 20 and 21 show clearly that both verses simply refer to those who had fallen away from the Lord; and nowhere throughout the whole song is it assumed, that the whole nation would fall away to the very last man, so that there would be no further remnant of faithful servants of the Lord, to whom the Lord would manifest His favour again. And lastly, it is nowhere affirmed that God would simply use the heathen as a rod against Israel. The reference is solely to enemies and oppressors of Israel; and the chastisement of Israel by foes holds the second, and therefore a subordinate, place among the evils with which God would punish the rebellious. It is true that the heathen are not described as the bride of God in this song, but that is for no other reason than because the idea of moving them to jealousy with a not-people is not more fully expanded.

Schultz justly observes, “the expression *no-people* can no more denote a people of monsters, than the *no-god* was a monster, by which Israel had excited the Lord to jealousy.” This remark is quite sufficient to show that the opinion of *Ewald* and others is untenable and false, namely, that “the expression *no-people* signifies a truly inhuman people, terrible and repulsive.” *No-god* is a god to whom the predicate of godhead cannot properly be applied; and so also *no-people* is a people that does not deserve the name of a people or nation at all. The further definition of *no-god* is to be found in the word “*vanities*.” *No-god* are the idols, who are called vanities or nothingnesses, because they deceive the confidence of men in their divinity; because, as Jeremiah says (Jer. xiv. 22), they can give no showers of rain or drops of water from heaven. *No-people* is explained by a “foolish nation.” A “foolish nation” is the opposite of a wise and understanding people, as Israel is called in chap. iv. 6, because it possessed righteous statutes and rights in the law of the Lord. The foolish nation therefore is not “an ungodly nation, which despises all laws both *human* and *divine*” (*Ros., Maur.*), but a people whose laws and rights are not founded upon divine revelation. Consequently the *no-people* is not “a barbarous and inhuman people” (*Ros.*), or “a horde of men that does not deserve to be called a people” (*Maurer*), but a people to which the name of a people or nation is to be refused, because its political and judicial constitution is the work of man, and because it has not the true God for its head and king; or, as *Vitringa* explains, “a people not chosen by the true God, passed by when a people was chosen, shut out from the fellowship and grace of God, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and a stranger from the covenant of promise (Ephl. ii. 12).” In this respect every heathen nation was a “no-people,” even though it might not be behind the Israelites so far as its outward organization was concerned. This explanation cannot be set aside, either by the objection that at that time Israel had brought itself down to the level of the heathen, by its apostasy from the Eternal,—for the notion of people and no-people is not taken from the outward appearance of Israel at any particular time, but is derived from its divine idea and calling,—or by an appeal to the singular, “a foolish nation,” whereas we should expect “foolish nations” to correspond to the “*vanities*,” if we were to understand by the *no-people* not one particular heathen nation, but the heathen nations generally. The singular, “a foolish nation,” was required

by the antithesis, upon which it is founded, the “wise nation,” from which the expression *no-people* first receives its precise definition, which would be altogether obliterated by the plural. Moreover, Moses did not intend to give expression to the thought that God would excite Israel to jealousy by either few, or many, or all the Gentile nations.

In ver. 22, the determination of the Lord with regard to the faithless generation is explained by the threat, that the wrath of the Lord which was kindled against this faithlessness would set the whole world in flames down to the lowest hell. We may see how far the contents of this verse are from favouring the conclusion that “no-people” means a barbarous and inhuman horde, from the difficulty which the supporters of this view have found in dealing with the word ‘ז. Ewald renders it *doch* (yet), in total disregard of the usages of the language; and Venema, *certe, profecto* (surely); whilst Kamphausen supposes it to be used in a somewhat careless manner. The contents of ver. 22, which are introduced with ‘ז, by no means harmonize with the thought, “I will send a barbarous and inhuman horde;” whilst the announcement of a judgment setting the whole world in flames may form a very suitable explanation of the thought, that the Lord would excite faithless Israel to jealousy by a “no-people.” This judgment, for example, would make the worthlessness of idols and the omnipotence of the God of Israel manifest in all the earth, and would lead the nations to seek refuge and salvation with the living God; and, as we learn from the history of the kingdom of God, and the allusions of the Apostle Paul to this mystery of the divine counsels, the heathen themselves would be the first to do so when they saw all their power and glory falling into ruins, and then the Israelites, when they saw that God had taken the kingdom from them and raised up the heathen who were converted to Him to be His people. The fire in the nose of the Lord is a figurative description of burning wrath and jealousy (*vid. chap. xxix. 19*). The fire signifies really nothing else than His jealousy, His vital energy, and in a certain sense His breath; it therefore naturally burns in the nose (*vid. Ps. xviii. 9*). In this sense the Lord as “a jealous God” is a consuming fire (*vid. chap. iv. 24*, and the exposition of Ex. iii. 2). This fire burns down even to the lower hell. The lower hell, *i.e.* the lowest region of sheol, or the lower regions, forms the strongest contrast to heaven; though we cannot deduce any definite doctrinal conclusions from the expression as to the existence of more hells than one. This fire “consumes the

earth with its increase," i.e. all its vegetable productions, and sets on fire the foundations of the mountains. This description is not a hyperbolical picture of the judgment which was to fall upon the children of Israel alone (*Kamphausen, Aben-Ezra, etc.*); for it is a mistake to suppose that the judgment foretold affected the Israelitish nation only. The thought is weakened by the assumption that the language is hyperbolical. The words are not intended to foretell one particular penal judgment, but refer to judgment in its totality and universality, as realized in the course of centuries in different judgments upon the nations, and only to be completely fulfilled at the end of the world. *Calvin* is right therefore when he says, "As the indignation and anger of God follow His enemies to hell, to eternal flames and infernal tortures, so they devour their land with its produce, and burn the foundations of the mountains; . . . there is no necessity therefore to imagine that there is any hyperbole in the words, 'to the lower hell.'" This judgment is then depicted in vers. 23-33 as it would discharge itself upon rebellious Israel.

Ver. 23. "*I will heap up evils upon them, use up My arrows against them.*" The evils threatened against the despisers of the Lord and His commandments would be poured out in great abundance by the Lord upon the foolish generation. **הַסֵּבָב**, to add one upon the other (*vid. Num. xxxii. 14*); hence in *Hiphil* to heap up, sweep together. These evils are represented in the second clause of the verse as arrows, which the Lord as a warrior would shoot away at His foes (as in ver. 42; cf. Ps. xxxviii. 3, xci. 5; Job vi. 4). **נִלְבַּחַד**, to bring to an end, to use up to the very last.—Ver. 24. "*Have they wasted away with hunger, are they consumed with pestilential heat and bitter plague: I will let loose the tooth of beasts upon them, with the poison of things that crawl in the dust.*"—Ver. 25. "*If the sword without shall sweep them away, and in the chambers of terrors, the young man as the maiden, the suckling with the grey-haired man.*" The evils mentioned are hunger, pestilence, plague, wild beasts, poisonous serpents, and war. The first hemistich in ver. 24 contains simply nouns construed absolutely, which may be regarded as a kind of circumstantial clause. The literal meaning is, "With regard to those who are starved with hunger, etc., I will send against them;" i.e. when hunger, pestilence, plague, have brought them to the verge of destruction, I will send, etc. **וְיַעֲשֶׂה**, construct state of **וְיַעֲשֵׂה**, *ἀπ. λεγ.*, with which *Cocceius* compares **וְיַעֲשֵׂה** and **וְיַעֲשֵׂה**, to suck out, and for which *Schultens* has cited analogies from the Arabic. "Sucked out by hunger," i.e. wasted away.

“Tooth of beasts and poison of serpents:” poetical for beasts of prey and poisonous animals. See Lev. xxvi. 22, where wild beasts are mentioned as a plague along with pestilence, famine, and sword.—Ver. 25. These are accompanied by the evils of war, which sweeps away the men outside in the slaughter itself by the sword, and the defenceless—viz. youths and maidens, sucklings and old men—in the chambers by alarm. **אַיִלָּה** is a sudden mortal terror, and Knobel is wrong in applying it to hunger and plague. The use of the verb **שְׁבַל**, to make childless, is to be explained on the supposition that the nation or land is personified as a mother, whose children are the members of the nation, old and young together. Ezekiel has taken the four grievous judgments out of these two verses: sword, famine, wild beasts, and pestilence (Ezek. xiv. 21: see also v. 17, and Jer. xv. 2, 3).

Vers. 26 and 27. “*I should say, I will blow them away, I will blot out the remembrance of them among men; if I did not fear wrath upon the enemy, that their enemies might mistake it, that they might say, Our hand was high, and Jehovah has not done all this.*” The meaning is, that the people would have deserved to be utterly destroyed, and it was only for His own name’s sake that God abstained from utter destruction. **אֶכְרֹף** to be construed conditionally requires **לִילֵי**: if I did not fear (as actually was the case) I should resolve to destroy them, without leaving a trace behind. “*I should say,*” used to denote the purpose of God, like “he said” in ver. 20. The **ἀπ.** **λεγ**, which has been rendered in very different ways, cannot be regarded, as it is by the Rabbins, as a *denom.* verb from **פָאַח**, a corner; and *Calvin’s* rendering, “to scatter through corners,” does not suit the context; whilst the meaning, “to cast or scare out of all corners,” cannot be deduced from this derivation. The context requires the signification to annihilate, as the remembrance of them was to vanish from the earth. We get this meaning if we trace it to **פָאַח**, to blow,—related to **פָעַה** (Isa. xlvi. 14) and **פָהַ**, from which comes **פָהַ**,—in the Hiphil “to blow away,” not to blow asunder. **הַתְּבִיבִת**, not “to cause to rest,” but to cause to cease, *delere* (as in Amos viii. 4). “*Wrath upon the enemy,*” i.e. “displeasure on the part of God at the arrogant boasting of the enemy, which was opposed to the glory of God” (*Vitringa*). **לֹא**, lest, after **גַּדֵּר**, to fear. On this reason for sparing Israel, see chap. ix. 28; Ex. xxxii. 12; Num. xiv. 13 sqq.; Isa. x. 5 sqq. *Enemy* is a generic term, hence it is followed by the plural. **נִבְרָא**, Piel, to find strange, *sc.* the destruction of Israel, i.e. to mistake the reason for it, or, as is shown

by what follows, to ascribe the destruction of Israel to themselves and their own power, whereas it had been the work of God. “*Our hand was high*,” i.e. has lifted itself up or shown itself mighty, an intentional play upon the “high hand” of the Lord (Ex. xiv. 8; cf. Isa. xxvi. 11).—The reason why Israel did not deserve to be spared is given in ver. 28 : “*For a people forsaken of counsel are they, and there is not understanding in them.*” “Forsaken of counsel,” i.e. utterly destitute of counsel.

This want of understanding on the part of Israel is still further expounded in vers. 29-32, where the words of God pass imperceptibly into the words of Moses, who feels impelled once more to impress the word which the Lord had spoken upon the hearts of the people.—Vers. 29-31. “*If they were wise, they would understand this, would consider their end. Ah, how could one pursue a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight, were it not that their Rock had sold them, and Jehovah had given them up! For their rock is not as our rock; of that our enemies are judges.*” ↓ presupposes a case, which is either known not to exist, or of which this is assumed; “if they were wise,” which they are not. “*This*” refers to the leading thought of the whole, viz. that apostasy from God the Lord is sure to be followed by the severest judgment. “*Their end,*” as in ver. 20, the end towards which the people were going through obstinate perseverance in their sin, i.e. utter destruction, if the Lord did not avert it for His name’s sake.—Ver. 30. If Israel were wise, it could easily conquer all its foes in the power of its God (*vid. Lev. xxvi. 8*); but as it had forsaken the Lord its rock, He, their (Israel’s) rock, had given them up into the power of the foe. בַּיִת אָמֵן לְאָמֵן is more emphatic or distinct than אָמֵן only, and introduces an exception which does not permit the desired event to take place. Israel could have put all its enemies to flight were it not that its God had given it entirely up to them (sold them as slaves). The supposition that this had already occurred by no means proves, as *Kamphausen* believes, “that the poet was speaking of the existing state of the nation,” but merely that Moses thinks of the circumstances as certain to occur when the people should have forsaken their God. The past implied in the verbs “sold” and “given up” is a prophetically ideal past or present, but not a real and historical one. The assertion of *Hupfeld* and *Kamphausen*, that בַּכְרָה, as used with special reference to the giving up of a nation into the power of the heathen, “belongs to a somewhat later usage of the language,” is equally groundless.—Ver. 31. The giving up

of Israel into the power of the heathen arose, not from the superior power of the heathen and their gods, but solely from the apostasy of Israel from its own God. “Our rock,” as Moses calls the Lord, identifying himself with the nation, is not as their rock, *i.e.* the gods in whom the heathen trust. That the pronoun in “*their* rock” refers to the heathen, is so perfectly obvious from the antithesis “*our* rock,” that there cannot possibly be any doubt about it. The second hemistich in ver. 30 contains a circumstantial clause, introduced to strengthen the thought which precedes it. The heathen themselves could be arbitrators (*vid.* Ex. xxi. 22), and decide whether the gods of the heathen were not powerless before the God of Israel. “Having experienced so often the formidable might of God, they knew for a certainty that the God of Israel was very different from their own idols” (*Calvin*). The objection offered by *Schultz*, namely, that “the heathen would not admit that their idols were inferior to Jehovah, and actually denied this at the time when they had the upper hand (Isa. x. 10, 11),” has been quite anticipated by *Calvin*, when he observes that Moses “leaves the decision to the unbelievers, not as if they would speak the truth, but because he knew that they must be convinced by experience.” As a confirmation of this, *Luther* and others refer not only to the testimony of Balaam (Num. xxiii. and xxiv.), but also to the Egyptians (Ex. xiv. 25) and Philistines (1 Sam. v. 7 sqq.), to which we may add Josh. ii. 9, 10.

Vers. 32 and 33. “*For their vine is of the vine of Sodom, and of the fields of Gomorrah: their grapes are poisonous grapes, bitter clusters have they. Dragon-poison is their wine, and dreadful venom of asps.*” The connection is pointed out by *Calovius* thus: “Moses returns to the Jews, showing why, although the rock of the Jews was very different from the gods of the Gentiles, even according to the testimony of the heathen themselves, who were their foes, they were nevertheless to be put to flight by their enemies and sold; and why Jehovah sold them, namely, *because their vine* was of the vine of Sodom, *i.e.* of the very worst kind, resembling the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, as if they were descended from them, and not from their holy patriarchs.” The “*for*” in ver. 32 is neither co-ordinate nor subordinate to that in ver. 31. To render it as subordinate would give no intelligible meaning; and the supposition that it is co-ordinate is precluded by the fact, that in that case vers. 32 and 33 would contain a description of the corruptions of the heathen. The objections to this view have been thus expressed

by *Schultz* with perfect justice : “ It is *à priori* inconceivable, that in so short an ode there should be so elaborate a digression on the subject of the heathen, seeing that their folly is altogether foreign to the theme of the whole.” To this we may add, that throughout the Old Testament it is the moral corruption and ungodliness of the Israelites, and never the vices of the heathen, that are compared to the sins of Sodom and Gomorrah. The Israelites who were forsaken by the Lord, were designated by Isaiah (i. 10) as a people of Gomorrah, and their rulers as rulers of Sodom (cf. Isa. iii. 9); the inhabitants of Jerusalem were all of them like Sodom and Gomorrah (Jer. xxiii. 14); and the sin of Jerusalem was greater than that of Sodom (Ezek. xvi. 46 sqq.). The only sense in which the “ for ” in ver. 32 can be regarded as co-ordinate to that in ver. 31, is on the supposition that the former gives the reason for the thought in ver. 30b, whilst the latter serves to support the idea in ver. 30a. The order of thought is the following: Israel would have been able to smite its foes with very little difficulty, because the gods of the heathen are not a rock like Jehovah; but Jehovah had given up His people to the heathen, because it had brought forth fruits like Sodom, *i.e.* had resembled Sodom in its wickedness. The vine and its fruits are figurative terms, applied to the nation and its productions. “ The nation was not only a degenerate, but also a poisonous vine, producing nothing but what was deadly” (*Calvin*). This figure is expanded still further by Isa. v. 2 sqq. Israel was a vineyard planted by Jehovah, that it might bring forth good fruits, instead of which it brought forth wild grapes (*vid. Jer. ii. 21; Ps. lxxx. 9 sqq.; Hos. x. 1*). “ Their vine ” is the Israelites themselves, their nature being compared to a vine which had degenerated as much as if it had been an offshoot of a Sodomish vine. שָׂדֶת, the construct state of שָׂדֵה, floors, fields. The grapes of this vine are worse than wild grapes, they are bitter, poisonous grapes.—Ver. 33. The wine of these grapes is snake-poison. *Tannin*: see Ex. vii. 9, 10. *Pethen*: the asp or adder, one of the most poisonous kinds of snake, whose bite was immediately fatal (*vid. Rosenmüller, bibl. Althk. iv. 2, pp. 364 sqq.*). These figures express the thought, that “ nothing could be imagined worse, or more to be abhorred, than that nation ” (*Calvin*). Now although this comparison simply refers to the badness of Israel, the thought of the penal judgment that fell upon Sodom lies behind. “ They imitate the Sodomites, they bring forth the worst fruits of all impiety, they deserve to perish like Sodom ” (*J. H. Michaelis*).

The description of this judgment commences in ver. 34. Israel had deserved for its corruption to be destroyed from the earth (ver. 26); yet for His name's sake the Lord would have compassion upon it, when it was so humiliated with its heavy punishments that its strength was coming to an end.—Ver. 34. “*Is not this hidden with Me, sealed up in My treasures?*” The allusion in this verse has been disputed; many refer it to what goes before, others to what follows after. There is some truth in both. The verse forms the transition, closing what precedes, and introducing what follows. The assertion that the figure of preserving in the treasuries precludes the supposition that “*this*” refers to what follows, cannot be sustained. For although in Hos. xiii. 12, and Job xiv. 17, the binding and sealing of sins in a bundle are spoken of, yet it is very evident from Ps. cxxxix. 16, Mal. iii. 16, and Dan. vii. 10, that not only the evil doings of men, but their days generally, *i.e.* not only their deeds, but the things which happen to them, are written in a book before God. *O. v. Gerlach* has explained it correctly: “All these things have been decreed long ago; their coming is infallibly certain.” “*This*” includes not only the sins of the nation, but also the judgments of God. The apostasy of Israel, as well as the consequent punishment, is laid up with God—sealed up in His treasuries—and therefore they have not yet actually occurred: an evident proof that we have prophecy before us, and not the description of an apostasy that had already taken place, and of the punishment inflicted in consequence. The ἀπ. λεγ. סְמִךָּה in this connection signifies to lay up, preserve, conceal, although the etymology is disputed. The figure in the second hemistich is not taken from secret archives, but from treasuries or stores, in which whatever was to be preserved was to be laid up, to be taken out in due time.

Vers. 35 and 36. “*Vengeance is Mine, and retribution for the time when their foot shall shake: for the day of their destruction is near, and that which is determined for them cometh hastily. For the Lord will judge His people, and have compassion upon His servants, when He seeth that every hold has disappeared, and the fettered and the free are gone.*”—The Lord will punish the sins of His people in due time. “*Vengeance is Mine:*” it belongs to Me, it is My part to inflict. שְׁנֵי is a noun here for the usual שְׁנֵי, retribution (*vid. Ewald, § 156, b.*). The shaking of the foot is a figure representing the commencement of a fall, or of stumbling (*vid. Ps. xxxviii. 17, xciv. 18*). The thought in this clause is not, “At or

towards the time when their misfortune begins, I will plunge them into the greatest calamity," as *Kamphausen* infers from the fact that the shaking denotes the beginning of the calamity; and yet the vengeance can only be completed by plunging them into calamity,—a thought which he justly regards as unsuitable, though he resorts to emendations of the text in consequence. But the supposed unsuitability vanishes, if we simply regard the words, "Vengeance is Mine, and retribution," not as the mere announcement of a quality founded in the nature of God, and residing in God Himself, but as an expression of the divine energy, with this signification, I will manifest Myself as an avenger and recompenser, when their foot shall shake. Then what had hitherto been hidden with God, lay sealed up as it were in His treasures, should come to light, and be made manifest to the sinful nation. God would not delay in this; for the day of their destruction was near. תְּשׁוּ signifies misfortune, and sometimes utter destruction. The primary meaning of the word cannot be determined with certainty. That it does not mean utter destruction, we may see from the parallel clause. "The things that shall come upon them," await them, or are prepared for them, are, according to the context, both in ver. 26 and also in vers. 36 sqq., not destruction, but simply a calamity or penal judgment that would bring them near to utter destruction. Again, these words do not relate to the punishment of "the wicked deeds of the inhuman horde," or the vengeance of God upon the enemies of Israel (*Ewald, Kamphausen*), but to the vengeance or retribution which God would inflict upon Israel. This is evident, apart from what has been said above against the application of vers. 33, 34, to the heathen, simply from ver. 36b, which unquestionably refers to Israel, and has been so interpreted by every commentator.—The first clause is quoted in Rom. xii. 19 and Heb. x. 30, in the former to warn against self-revenge, in the latter to show the energy with which God will punish those who fall away from the faith, in connection with ver. 36a, "the Lord will judge His people."—In ver. 36 the reason is given for the thought in ver. 35. יְתַחֲדֹם is mostly taken here in the sense of "procure right," help to right, which it certainly often has (e.g. Ps. liv. 3), and which is not to be excluded here; but this by no means exhausts the idea of the word. The parallel יְתַחֲדֹם does not compel us to drop the idea of punishment, which is involved in the judging; for it is a question whether the two clauses are perfectly synonymous. "Judging His people" did not consist merely in the fact that Jehovah punished

the heathen who oppressed Israel, but also in the fact that He punished the wicked in Israel who oppressed the righteous. “ His people” is no doubt Israel as a whole (as, for example, in Isa. i. 3), but this whole was composed of righteous and wicked, and God could only help the righteous to justice by punishing and destroying the wicked. In this way the judging of His people became compassion towards His servants. “ His servants” are the righteous, or, speaking more correctly, all who in the time of judgment are found to be the servants of God, and are saved. Because Israel was His nation, the Lord judged it in such a manner as not to destroy it, but simply to punish it for its sins, and to have compassion upon His servants, when He saw that the strength of the nation was gone. יָד, the hand, with which one grasps and works, is a figure employed to denote power and might (*vid. Isa. xxviii. 2.*) לְמַעַן, to run out, or come to an end (1 Sam. ix. 7; Job xiv. 11). The meaning is, “when every support is gone,” when all the rotten props of its might, upon which it has rested, are broken (*Ewald*). The noun סֶפֶךְ, cessation, disappearance, takes the place of a verb. The words עֲזָרָה וְעַזָּבָה are a proverbial phrase used to denote all men, as we may clearly see from 1 Kings xiv. 10, xxi. 21; 2 Kings iv. 8, xiv. 6. The literal meaning of this form, however, cannot be decided with certainty. The explanation given by *L. de Dieu* is the most plausible one, viz. the man who is fettered, restrained, *i.e.* married, and the single or free. For בָּנִים the meaning *caeblebs* is established by the Arabic, though the Arabic can hardly be appealed to as proving that בָּנִים means *paterfamilias*, as this meaning, which *Roediger* assigns to the Arabic word, is founded upon a mistaken interpretation of a passage in *Kamus*.

Vers. 37-39. The Lord would then convince His people of the worthlessness of idols and the folly of idolatry, and bring it to admit the fact that He was God alone. “ *Then will He say, Where are their gods, the rock in whom they trusted; who consumed the fat of their burnt-offerings, the wine of their libations? Let them rise up and help you, that there may be a shelter over you!* See now that I, I am it, and there is no God beside Me: I kill, and make alive; I smite in pieces, and I heal; and there is no one who delivers out of My hand.” יְאֹמֵר might be taken impersonally, as it has been by *Luther* and others, “men will say;” but as it is certainly Jehovah who is speaking in ver. 39, and what Jehovah says there is simply a deduction from what is addressed to the people in vers. 37 and 38, there can hardly be any doubt that Jehovah is speaking in vers.

37, 38, as well as in vers. 34, 35, and therefore that Moses simply distinguishes himself from Jehovah in ver. 36, when explaining the reason for the judgment foretold by the Lord. The expression, “*their gods*,” relates, not to the heathen, but to the Israelites, upon whom the judgment had fallen. The worthlessness of their gods had become manifest, namely, of the strange gods or idols, which the Israelites had preferred to the living God (*vid. vers. 16, 17*), and to which they had brought their sacrifices and drink-offerings. In ver. 38, שְׂעִיר is the subject,—the gods, who consumed the fat of the sacrifices offered to them by their worshippers (the foolish Israelites),—and is not to be taken as the relative with בָּהִיכוּ, as the LXX., *Vulg.*, and *Luther* have rendered it, viz. “whose sacrifices they (the Israelites) ate,” which neither suits the context nor the word חַלְבָּם (fat), which denotes the fat portions of the sacrificial animals that were burned upon the altar, and therefore presented to God. The wine of the drink-offerings was also poured out upon the altar, and thus given up to the deity worshipped. The handing over of the sacrificial portions to the deity is described here with holy irony, as though the gods themselves consumed the fat of the slain offerings, and drank the wine poured out for them, for the purpose of expressing this thought: “The gods, whom ye entertained so well, and provided so abundantly with sacrifices, let them now arise and help you, and thus make themselves clearly known to you.” The address here takes the form of a direct appeal to the idolaters themselves; and in the last clause the imperative is introduced instead of the optative, to express the thought as sharply as possible, that men need the protection of God, and are warranted in expecting it from the gods they worship: “let there be a shelter over you.” *Sithrah* for *sether*, a shelter or defence.—Ver. 39. The appeal to their own experience of the worthlessness of idols is followed by a demand that they should acknowledge Jehovah as the only true God. The repetition of “*I*” is emphatic: “*I, I only it*,” as an expression of being; *I am it*, ἐγώ εἰμι, John viii. 24, xviii. 5. The predicate *Elohim* (*vid. 2 Sam. vii. 28; Isa. xxxvii. 16*) is omitted, because it is contained in the thought itself, and moreover is clearly expressed in the parallel clause which follows, “there is not a God beside Me.” Jehovah manifests Himself in His doings, which Israel had experienced already, and still continued to experience. He kills and makes alive, etc., *i.e.* He has the power of life and death. These words do not refer to the immortality of the soul, but to the restoration to life of the people of Israel, which

God had delivered up to death (so 1 Sam. ii. 6; 2 Kings v. 7; cf. Isa. xxvi. 19; Hos. xiii. 10; Wisd. xvi. 13; Tobit xiii. 2). This thought, and the following one, which is equally consolatory, that God smites and heals again, are frequently repeated by the prophets (*vid.* Hos. vi. 1; Isa. xxx. 26, lvii. 17, 18; Jer. xvii. 14). None can deliver out of His hand (*vid.* Isa. xliii. 13; Hos. v. 14, ii. 12).

Vers. 40–43. The Lord will show Himself as the only true God, who slays and makes alive, etc. He will take vengeance upon His enemies, avenge the blood of His servants, and expiate His land, His people. With this promise, which is full of comfort for all the servants of the Lord, the ode concludes. “*For I lift up My hand to heaven, and say, As truly as I live for ever, if I have sharpened My flashing sword, and My hand grasps for judgment, I will repay vengeance to My adversaries, and requite My haters. I will make My arrows drunk with blood, and My sword will eat flesh; with the blood of the slain and prisoners, with the hairy head of the foe.*” Lifting up the hand to heaven was a gesture by which a person taking an oath invoked God, who is enthroned in heaven, as a witness of the truth and an avenger of falsehood (Gen. xiv. 22). Here, as in Ex. vi. 8 and Num. xiv. 30, it is used anthropomorphically of God, who is in heaven, and can swear by no greater than Himself (*vid.* Isa. xlv. 23; Jer. xxii. 5; Heb. vi. 17). The oath follows in vers. 41 and 42. ﴿אָתָה﴾, however, is not the particle employed in swearing, which has a negative meaning (*vid.* Gen. xiv. 23), but is conditional, and introduces the protasis. As the avenger of His people upon their foes, the Lord is represented as a warlike hero, who whets His sword, and has a quiver filled with arrows (as in Ps. vii. 13). “As long as the Church has to make war upon the world, the flesh, and the devil, it needs a warlike head” (*Schultz*). בְּרֵק חַרְבָּ, the flash of the sword, *i.e.* the flashing sword (*vid.* Gen. iii. 24; Nahum iii. 3; Hab. iii. 11). In the next clause, “and My hand grasps judgment,” mishpat (judgment) does not mean punishment or destruction hurled by God upon His foes, nor the weapons employed in the execution of judgment, but judgment is introduced poetically as the thing which God takes in hand for the purpose of carrying it out. נִשְׁיבֵנֶם, to lead back vengeance, *i.e.* to repay it. Punishment is retribution for evil done. By the enemies and haters of Jehovah we need not understand simply the heathen enemies of the Israelites, for the ungodly in Israel were enemies of God quite as much as the ungodly heathen. If it is evident from vers. 25–27, where God is spoken of as punishing Israel to the utmost when it had fallen

into idolatry, but not utterly destroying it, that the punishment which God would inflict would also fall upon the heathen, who would have made an end of Israel; it is no less apparent from vers. 37 and 38, especially from the appeal in ver. 38, Let your idols arise and help you (ver. 38), which is addressed, as all admit, to the idolatrous Israelites, and not to the heathen, that those Israelites who had made worthless idols their rock would be exposed to the vengeance and retribution of the Lord. In ver. 42 the figure of the warrior is revived, and the judgment of God is carried out still further under this figure. Of the four different clauses in this verse, the third is related to the first, and the fourth to the second. God would make His arrows drunk with the blood not only of the slain, but also of the captives, whose lives are generally spared, but were not to be spared in this judgment. This sword would eat flesh of the hairy head of the foe. The edge of the sword is represented poetically as the mouth with which it eats (2 Sam. ii. 26, xviii. 8, etc.) ; “the sword is said to devour bodies when it slays them by piercing” (*Ges. thes.* p. 1088). פָּרָעָת, from פָּרָעַ, a luxuriant, uncut growth of hair (Num. vi. 5 ; see at Lev. x. 6). The hairy head is not a figure used to denote the “wild and cruel foe” (*Knobel*), but a luxuriant abundance of strength, and the indomitable pride of the foe, who had grown fat and forgotten his Creator (ver. 15). This explanation is confirmed by Ps. lxviii. 22 ; whereas the rendering ἀρχοντες, princes, leaders, which is given in the Septuagint, has no foundation in the language itself, and no tenable support in Judg. v. 2.—Ver. 43. For this retribution which God accomplishes upon His enemies, the nations were to praise the people of the Lord. As this song commenced with an appeal to heaven and earth to give glory to the Lord (vers. 1-3), so it very suitably closes with an appeal to the heathen to rejoice with His people on account of the acts of the Lord. “Rejoice, nations, over His people; for He avenges the blood of His servants, and repays vengeance to His adversaries, and so expiates His land, His people.” “His people” is an accusative, and not in apposition to nations in the sense of “nations which are His people.” For, apart from the fact that such a combination would be unnatural, the thought that the heathen had become the people of God is nowhere distinctly expressed in the song (not even in ver. 21); nor is the way even so prepared for it as that we could expect it here, although the appeal to the nations to rejoice with His people on account of what God had done involves the Messianic idea, that all nations will come to the knowledge of

the Lord (*vid.* Ps. xlvi. 2, lxvi. 8, lxvii. 4).—The reason for this rejoicing is the judgment through which the Lord avenges the blood of His servants and repays His foes. As the enemies of God are not the heathen as such (see at ver. 41), so the servants of Jehovah are not the nation of Israel as a whole, but the faithful servants whom the Lord had at all times among His people, and who were persecuted, oppressed, and put to death by the ungodly. By this the land was defiled, covered with blood-guiltiness, so that the Lord was obliged to interpose as a judge, to put an end to the ways of the wicked, and to expiate His land, His people, *i.e.* to wipe out the guilt which rested upon the land and people, by the punishment of the wicked, and the extermination of idolatry and ungodliness, and to sanctify and glorify the land and nation (*vid.* Isa. i. 27, iv. 4, 5).

In vers. 44–47 it is stated that Moses, with Joshua, spake the song to the people; and on finishing this rehearsal, once more impressed upon the hearts of the people the importance of observing all the commandments of God. This account proceeds from the author of the supplement to the *Thorah* of Moses, who inserted the song in the book of the law. This explains the name Hoshea, instead of *Jehoshuah* (Joshua), which Moses had given to his servant (Num. xiii. 8, 16), and invariably uses (compare chap. xxxi. 3, 7, 14, 23, with chap. i. 38, iii. 21, 28, and the exposition of Num. xiii. 16).—On ver. 46, *vid.* chap. vi. 7 and xi. 19; and on ver. 47, *vid.* chap. xxx. 20.

Vers. 48–52. “*That self-same day*,” viz. the day upon which Moses had rehearsed the song to the children of Israel, the Lord renewed the announcement of his death, by repeating the command already given to him (Num. xxvii. 12–14) to ascend Mount Nebo, there to survey the land of Canaan, and then to be gathered unto his people. In form, this repetition differs from the previous announcement, partly in the fact that the situation of Mount Nebo is more fully described (in the land of Moab, etc., as in chap. i. 5, xxviii. 69), and partly in the continual use of the imperative, and a few other trifling points. These differences may all be explained from the fact that the account here was not written by Moses himself.

MOSES' BLESSING.—CHAP. XXXIII.

Before ascending Mount Nebo to depart this life, Moses took leave of his people, the tribes of Israel, in the blessing which is

very fittingly inserted in the book of the law between the divine announcement of his approaching death and the account of the death itself, as being the last words of the departing man of God. The blessing opens with an allusion to the solemn conclusion of the covenant and giving of the law at Sinai, by which the Lord became King of Israel, to indicate at the outset the source from which all blessings must flow to Israel (vers. 2-5). Then follow the separate blessings upon the different tribes (vers. 6-25). And the whole concludes with an utterance of praise to the Lord, as the mighty support and refuge of His people in their conflicts with all their foes (vers. 26-29). This blessing was not written down by Moses himself, like the song in chap. xxxii., but simply pronounced in the presence of the assembled tribes. This is evident, not only from the fact that there is nothing said about its being committed to writing, but also from the heading in ver. 1, where the editor clearly distinguishes himself from Moses, by speaking of Moses as "the man of God," like Caleb in Josh. xiv. 6, and the author of the heading to the prayer of Moses in Ps. xc. 1. In later times, "man of God" was the title usually given to a prophet (*vid.* 1 Sam. ix. 6; 1 Kings xii. 22, xiii. 14, etc.), as a man who enjoyed direct intercourse with God, and received supernatural revelations from Him. Nevertheless, we have Moses' own words, not only in the blessings upon the several tribes (vers. 6-25), but also in the introduction and conclusion of the blessing (vers. 2-5 and 26-29). The introductory words before the blessings, such as "and this for Judah" in ver. 7, "and to Levi he said" (ver. 8), and the similar formulas in vers. 12, 13, 18, 20, 22, 23, and 24, are the only additions made by the editor who inserted the blessing in the Pentateuch. The arrangement of the blessings in their present order is probably also his work. It neither accords with the respective order of the sons of Jacob, nor with the distribution of the tribes in the camp, nor with the situation of their possessions in the land of Canaan. It is true that Reuben stands first as the eldest son of Jacob; but Simeon is then passed over, and Judah, to whom the dying patriarch bequeathed the birthright which he withdrew from Reuben, stands next; and then Levi, the priestly tribe. Then follow Benjamin and Joseph, the sons of Rachel; Zebulun and Issachar, the last sons of Leah (in both cases the younger before the elder); and lastly, the tribes descended from the sons of the maids: Gad, the son of Zilpah; Dan and Naphtali, the sons of Bilhah; and finally, Asher, the second son of Zilpah. To discover the guiding prin-

ciple in this arrangement, we must look to the blessings themselves, which indicate partly the position already obtained by each tribe, as a member of the whole nation, in the earthly kingdom of God, and partly the place which it was to reach and occupy in the further development of Israel in the future, not only in relation to the Lord, but also in relation to the other nations. The only exception to this is the position assigned to Reuben, who occupies the foremost place as the first-born, notwithstanding his loss of the birth-right. In accordance with this principle, the first place properly belonged to the tribe of Judah, who was raised into the position of lord over his brethren, and the second to the tribe of Levi, which had been set apart to take charge of the sacred things ; whilst Benjamin is associated with Levi as the “beloved of the Lord.” Then follow Joseph, as the representative of the might which Israel would manifest in conflict with the nations ; Zebulun and Issachar, as the tribes which would become the channels of blessings to the nations through their wealth in earthly good ; and lastly, the tribes descended from the sons of the maids, Asher being separated from his brother Gad, and placed at the end, in all probability simply because it was in the blessing promised to him that the earthly blessedness of the people of God was to receive its fullest manifestation.

On comparing the blessing of Moses with that of Jacob, we should expect at the very outset, that if the blessings of these two men of God have really been preserved to us, and they are not later inventions, their contents would be essentially the same, so that the blessing of Moses would contain simply a confirmation of that of the dying patriarch, and would be founded upon it in various ways. This is most conspicuous in the blessing upon Joseph ; but there are also several other blessings in which it is unmistakeable, although Moses' blessing is not surpassed in independence and originality by that of Jacob, either in its figures, its similes, or its thoughts. But the resemblance goes much deeper. It is manifest, for example, in the fact, that in the case of several of the tribes, Moses, like Jacob, does nothing more than expound their names, and on the ground of the peculiar characters expressed in the names, foretell to the tribes themselves their peculiar calling and future development within the covenant nation. Consequently we have nowhere any special predictions, but simply prophetic glances at the future, depicted in a purely ideal manner, whilst in the case of most of the tribes the utter want of precise information concerning their future history

prevents us from showing in what way they were fulfilled. The difference in the times at which the two blessings were uttered is also very apparent. The existing circumstances from which Moses surveyed the future history of the tribes of Israel in the light of divine revelation, were greatly altered from the time when Jacob blessed the heads of the twelve tribes before his death, in the persons of his twelve sons. These tribes had now grown into a numerous people, with which the Lord had established the covenant that He had made with the patriarchs. The curse of dispersion in Israel, which the patriarch had pronounced upon Simeon and Levi (Gen. xlix. 5-7), had been changed into a blessing so far as Levi was concerned. The tribe of Levi had been entrusted with the "light and right" of the Lord, had been called to be the teacher of the rights and law of God in Israel, because it had preserved the covenant of the Lord, after the conclusion of the covenant at Sinai, even though it involved the denial of flesh and blood. Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh had already received their inheritance, and the other tribes were to take possession of Canaan immediately. These circumstances formed the starting-point for the blessings of Moses, not only in the case of Levi and Gad, where they are expressly mentioned, but in that of the other tribes also, where they do not stand prominently forward, because for the most part Moses simply repeats the leading features of their future development in their promised inheritance, as already indicated in the blessing of Jacob, and "thus bore his testimony to the patriarch who anticipated him, that the spirit of his prophecy was truth" (Ziegler, p. 159).

In this peculiar characteristic of the blessing of Moses, we have the strongest proof of its authenticity, particularly in the fact that there is not the slightest trace of the historical circumstances of the nation at large and the separate tribes which were peculiar to the post-Mosaic times. The little ground that there is for the assertion which *Knobel* repeats, that the blessing betrays a closer acquaintance with the post-Mosaic times, such as Moses himself could not possibly have possessed, is sufficiently evident from the totally different expositions which have been given by the different commentators of the saying concerning Judah in ver. 7, which is adduced in proof of this. Whilst *Knobel* finds the desire expressed in this verse on behalf of Judah, that David, who had fled from Saul, might return, obtain possession of the government, and raise his tribe into the royal tribe, *Graf* imagines that it expresses the longing of the kingdom of Judah for reunion with that of Israel;

and *Hofmann* and *Maurer* even trace an allusion to the inhabitants of Judea who were led into captivity along with *Jehoiachin*: one assumption being just as arbitrary and as much opposed to the text as the other.—All the objections brought against the genuineness of this blessing are founded upon an oversight or denial of its prophetic character, and upon untenable interpretations of particular expressions abstracted from it. Not only is there no such thing in the whole blessing as a distinct reference to the peculiar historical circumstances of Israel which arose after Moses' death, but there are some points in the picture which Moses has drawn of the tribes that it is impossible to recognise in these circumstances. Even *Knobel* from his naturalistic stand-point is obliged to admit, that no traces can be found in the song of any allusion to the calamities which fell upon the nation in the Syrian, Assyrian, and Chaldaean periods. And hitherto it has proved equally impossible to point out any distinct allusion to the circumstances of the nation in the period of the judges. On the contrary, as *Schultz* observes, the speaker rises throughout to a height of ideality which it would have been no longer possible for any sacred author to reach, when the confusions and divisions of a later age had actually taken place. He sees nothing of the calamities from without, which fell upon the nation again and again with destructive fury, nothing of the Canaanites who still remained in the midst of the Israelites, and nothing of the hostility of the different tribes towards one another; he simply sees how they work together in the most perfect harmony, each contributing his part to realize the lofty ideal of Israel. And again he grasps this ideal and the realization of it in so elementary a way, and so thoroughly from the outer side, without regard to any inward transformation and glorification, that he must have lived in a time preceding the prophetic age, and before the moral conflicts had taken place.

Vers. 2–5. In the introduction Moses depicts the elevation of Israel into the nation of God, in its origin (ver. 2), its nature (ver. 3), its intention and its goal (vers. 4, 5).—Ver. 2. “*Jehovah came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; He shone from the mountains of Paran, and came out of holy myriads, at His right rays of fire to them.*” To set forth the glory of the covenant which God made with Israel, Moses depicts the majesty and glory in which the Lord appeared to the Israelites at Sinai, to give them the law, and become their king. The three clauses, “*Jehovah came from Sinai . . . from Seir . . . from the mountains of Paran,*” do

not refer to different manifestations of God (*Knobel*), but to the one appearance of God at Sinai. Like the sun when it rises, and fills the whole of the broad horizon with its beams, the glory of the Lord, when He appeared, was not confined to one single point, but shone upon the people of Israel from Sinai, and Seir, and the mountains of Paran, as they came from the west to Sinai. The Lord appeared to the people from the summit of Sinai, as they lay encamped at the foot of the mountain. This appearance rose like a streaming light from Seir, and shone at the same time from the mountains of Paran. *Seir* is the mountain land of the Edomites to the east of Sinai; and the mountains of Paran are in all probability not the mountains of *et-Tih*, which form the southern boundary of the desert of Paran, but rather the mountains of the Azazimeh, which ascend to a great height above Kadesh, and form the boundary wall of Canaan towards the south. The glory of the Lord, who appeared upon Sinai, sent its beams even to the eastern and northern extremities of the desert. This manifestation of God formed the basis for all subsequent manifestations of the omnipotence and grace of the Lord for the salvation of His people. This explains the allusions to the description before us in the song of Deborah (Judg. v. 4) and in Hab. iii. 3.—The Lord came not only from Sinai, but from heaven, “out of holy myriads,” *i.e.* out of the midst of the thousands of holy angels who surround His throne (1 Kings xxii. 19; Job i. 6; Dan. vii. 10), and who are introduced in Gen. xxviii. 12 as His holy servants, and in Gen. xxxii. 2, 3, as the hosts of God, and form the assembly of holy ones around His throne (Ps. lxxxix. 6, 8; cf. Ps. lxviii. 18; Zech. xiv. 5; Matt. xxvi. 53; Heb. xii. 22; Rev. v. 11, vii. 11).—The last clause is a difficult one. The writing **תְּשַׁׂרְפָּה** in two words, “fire of the law,” not only fails to give a suitable sense, but has against it the fact that **תְּ**, law, *edictum*, is not even a Semitic word, but was adopted from the Persian into the Chaldee, and that it is only by Gentiles that it is ever applied to the law of God (Ezra vii. 12, 21, 25, 26; Dan. vi. 6). It must be read as one word, **תְּשַׁרְפָּה**, as it is in many MSS. and editions,—not, however, as connected with **אֲשֵׁר**, **אֲשֵׁדוֹת**, the pouring out of the brooks, slopes of the mountains (Num. xxi. 15), but in the form **שִׁרְפָּה**, composed, according to the probable conjecture of *Böttcher*, of **שִׁיר**, fire, and **רָהָה** (in the Chaldee and Syriac), to throw, to shoot arrows, in the sense of “fire of throwing,” shooting fire, a figurative description of the flashes of lightning. *Gesenius* adopts this explanation, except that he derives **רָהָה** from **רָהָה**, to throw. It is favoured by the

fact that, according to Ex. xix. 16, the appearance of God upon Sinai was accompanied by thunder and lightning; and flashes of lightning are often called the arrows of God, whilst שְׁדָה, in Hebrew, is established by the name שְׁדֵי־אֱלֹהִים (Num. i. 5, ii. 10). To this we may add the parallel passage, Hab. iii. 4, “rays out of His hand,” which renders this explanation a very probable one. By “them,” in the second and fifth clauses, the Israelites are intended, to whom this fearful theophany referred. On the signification of the manifestation of God in fire, see chap. iv. 11, and the exposition of Ex. iii. 2.

Ver. 3. “*Yea, nations He loves ; all His holy ones are in Thy hand : and they lie down at Thy feet ; they rise up at Thy words.*” הַבָּבָב עַמִּים is the subject placed first absolutely : “nations loving,” sc. is he ; or “as loving nations—all Thy holy ones are in Thy hand.” The nations or peoples are not the tribes of Israel here, any more than in chap. xxxii. 8, or Gen. xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, and xlvi. 4 ; whilst Judg. v. 14 and Hos. x. 14 cannot come into consideration at all, for there the word is defined by a suffix. The meaning of the words depends upon whether “all His holy ones” are the godly in Israel, or the Israelites generally, or the angels. There is nothing to favour the first explanation, as the distinction between the godly and the wicked would be out of place in the introduction to a blessing upon all the tribes. The second has only a seeming support in Dan. vii. 21 sqq. and Ex. xix. 6. It does not follow at once from the calling of Israel to be the holy nation of Jehovah, that all the Israelites were or could be called “holy ones of the Lord.” Least of all should Num. xvi. 3 be adduced in support of this. Even in Dan. vii. the holy ones of the Most High are not the Jews generally, but simply the godly, or believers, in the nation of God. The third view, on the other hand, is a perfectly natural one, on account of the previous reference to the holy myriads. The meaning, therefore, would be this : The Lord embraces all nations with His love, He who, so to speak, has all His holy angels in His hand, *i.e.* His power, so that they serve Him as their Lord. They lie down at His feet. The ἄπ. λεγ. קָרְבָּנִים is explained by Kimchi and Saad. as signifying *adjuncti sequuntur vestigia sua*; and by the Syriac, They follow thy foot, from conjecture rather than any certain etymology. The derivation proposed by modern linguists, from the verb קָרַב, according to an Arabic word signifying *recubuit, innixus est*, has apparently more to support it. נָשַׁע, it rises up : intransitive, as in Hab. i. 3, Nah. i. 5, Hos. xiii. 1, and Ps. lxxxix. 10.

מִבְרָתֶךָ is not a Hithpael participle (that which is spoken) ; for it has not a passive, but an active signification, to converse (Num. vii. 89 ; Ezek. ii. 2, etc.). It is rather a noun, **לִבְרָה**, from **בָּרָה**, words, utterances. The singular, **אַתָּה**, is distributive : every one (of them) rises on account of thine utterances, *i.e.* at thy words. The suffixes relate to God, and the discourse passes from the third to the second person. In our own language, such a change in a sentence like this, “ all His (God’s) holy ones are in Thy (God’s) hand,” would be intolerably harsh, but in Hebrew poetry it is by no means rare (see, for example, Ps. xlvi. 19).

Vers. 4, 5. “ Moses appointed us a law, a possession of the congregation of Jacob. And He became King in righteous-nation (Jeshurun); there the heads of the people assembled, in crowds the tribes of Israel.” The God who met Israel at Sinai in terrible majesty, out of the myriads of holy angels, who embraces all nations in love, and has all the holy angels in His power, so that they lie at His feet and rise up at His word, gave the law through Moses to the congregation of Jacob as a precious possession, and became King in Israel. This was the object of the glorious manifestation of His holy majesty upon Sinai. Instead of saying, “ He gave the law to the tribes of Israel through my mediation,” Moses personates the listening nation, and not only speaks of himself in the third person, but does so by identifying his own person with the nation, because he wished the people to repeat his words from thorough conviction, and because the law which he gave in the name of the Lord was given to himself as well, and was ~~as~~ binding upon him as upon every other member of the congregation. In a similar manner the prophet Habakkuk identifies himself with the nation in chap. iii., and says in ver. 19, out of the heart of the nation, “ The Lord is my strength, . . . who maketh me to walk upon mine high places,”—an expression which did not apply to himself, but to the nation as a whole. So again in the 20th and 21st Psalms, which David composed as the prayers of the nation for its king, he not only speaks of himself as the anointed of the Lord, but addresses such prayers to the Lord for himself as could only be offered by the nation for its king. “ A possession for the congregation of Jacob.” “ Israel was distinguished above all other nations by the possession of the divinely revealed law (chap. iv. 5-8) ; that was its most glorious possession, and therefore is called its true *κειμήλιον*” (Knobel). The subject in ver. 5 is not Moses but Jehovah, who became King in Jeshurun (see at chap. xxxii. 15 and Ex. xv. 18).

"Were gathered together;" this refers to the assembling of the nation around Sinai (chap. iv. 10 sqq.; cf. Ex. xix. 17 sqq.), to the day of assembly (chap. ix. 10, x. 4, xviii. 16).

Ver. 6. The blessings upon the tribes commence with this verse. "*Let REUBEN live and not die, and there be a (small) number of his men.*" The rights of the first-born had been withheld from Reuben in the blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix. 3); Moses, however, promises this tribe continuance and prosperity. The words, "and let his men become a number," have been explained in very different ways. מִסְפֵּר in this connection cannot mean a large number (*πολὺς ἐν ἀριθμῷ*, LXX.), but, like מִתְּנָה מִסְפֵּר (chap. iv. 27; Gen. xxxiv. 30; Jer. xliv. 28), simply a *small* number, that could easily be counted (cf. chap. xxviii. 62). The negation must be carried on to the last clause. This the language will allow, as the rule that a negation can only be carried forward when it stands with emphatic force at the very beginning (*Ewald*, § 351) is not without exceptions; see for example Prov. xxx. 2, 3, where three negative clauses follow a positive one, and in the last the נֹלֶא is omitted, without the particle of negation having been placed in any significant manner at the beginning.—*Simeon* was the next in age to Reuben; but he is passed over entirely, because according to Jacob's blessing (Gen. xlix. 7) he was to be scattered abroad in Israel, and lost his individuality as a tribe in consequence of this dispersion, in accordance with which the Simeonites simply received a number of towns within the territory of Judah (Josh. xix. 2–9), and, "having no peculiar object of its own, took part, as far as possible, in the fate and objects of the other tribes, more especially of Judah" (*Schultz*). Although, therefore, it is by no means to be regarded as left without a blessing, but rather as included in the general blessings in vers. 1 and 29, and still more in the blessing upon Judah, yet it could not receive a special blessing like the tribe of Reuben, because, as *Ephraem Syrus* observes, the Simeonites had not endeavoured to wipe out the stain of the crime which Jacob cursed, but had added to it by fresh crimes (more especially the audacious prostitution of Zimri, Num. xxv.). Even the Simeonites did not become extinct, but continued to live in the midst of the tribe of Judah, so that as late as the eighth century, in the reign of Hezekiah, thirteen princes are enumerated with their families, whose fathers' houses had increased greatly (1 Chron. iv. 34 sqq.); and these families effected conquests in the south, even penetrating into the mountains of Seir, for the purpose of seeking

fresh pasture (1 Chron. iv. 39-43). Hence the assertion that the omission of Simeon is only conceivable from the circumstances of a later age, is as mistaken as the attempt made in some of the MSS. of the Septuagint to interpolate the name of Simeon in the second clause of ver. 6.

Ver. 7. The blessing upon JUDAH is introduced with the formula, “*And this for Judah, and he said:*” “*Hear, Jehovah, the voice of Judah, and bring him to his people; with his hands he fights for him; and help against his adversaries wilt Thou be.*” Judah, from whom the sceptre was not to depart (Gen. xlix. 10), is mentioned before Levi as the royal tribe. The prayer, May Jehovah bring Judah to his people, can hardly be understood in any other way than it is by *Onkelos* and *Hengstenberg* (Christol. i. 80), viz. as founded upon the blessing of Jacob, and expressing the desire, that as Judah was to lead the way as the champion of his brethren in the wars of Israel against the nations, he might have a prosperous return to his people; for the thought, “introduce him to the kingdom of Israel and Judah” (*Luther*), or “give up to him the people which belongs to him according to Thine appointment” (*Schultz*), is hardly implied in the words, “bring to his people.” Other explanations are not worth mentioning. What follows points to strife and war: “With his hands (*בָּחַד*) accusative of the instrument, *vid. Ges.* § 138, 1, note 3; *Ewald*, § 283, a.) is he fighting (*בְּנִיר* participle of *בִּרְבֵּר*) for it (the nation); Thou wilt grant him help, deliverance before his foes.”

Vers. 8-11. LEVI.—Vers. 8, 9. “*Thy right and Thy light is to Thy godly man, whom Thou didst prove in Massah, and didst strive with him at the water of strife; who says to his father and his mother, I see him not; and does not regard his brethren, and does not know his sons: for they observed Thy word, and kept Thy covenant.*” This blessing is also addressed to God as a prayer. The *Urim* and *Thummim*—that pledge, which the high priest wore upon his breast-plate, that the Lord would always give His people light to preserve His endangered right (*vid. Ex. xxviii. 29, 30*)—are here regarded as a prerogative of the whole of the tribe of Levi. *Thummim* is placed before *Urim*, to indicate at the outset that Levi had defended the right of the Lord, and that for that very reason the right of the *Urim* and *Thummim* had been given to him by the Lord. “*Thy holy one*” is not Aaron, but Levi the tribe-father, who represents the whole tribe to which the blessing applies; hence in vers. 9b and 10 the verb passes into the plural. To define more

precisely the expression “Thy holy one,” reference is made to the trials at Massah and at the water of strife, on the principle that the Lord humbles His servants before He exalts them, and confirms those that are His by trying and proving them. The proving at Massah refers to the murmuring of the people on account of the want of water at *Rephidim* (Ex. xvii. 1-7, as in chap. vi. 16 and ix. 22), from which the place received the name of *Massah* and *Meribah*; the striving at the water of strife, to the rebellion of the people against Moses and Aaron on account of the want of water at *Kadesh* (Num. xx. 1-13). At both places it was primarily the people who strove with Moses and Aaron, and thereby tempted God. For it is evident that even at Massah the people murmured not only against Moses, but against their leaders generally, from the use of the plural verb, “*Give ye us water to drink*” (Ex. xvii. 2). This proving of the people, however, was at the same time a proof, to which the Lord subjected the heads and leaders of the nation, for the purpose of trying their faith. And thus also, in chap. viii. 2 sqq., the whole of the guidance of Israel through the desert is described as a trial and humiliation of the people by the Lord. But in Moses and Aaron, the heads of the tribe of Levi, the whole of the tribe of Levi was proved. The two provings by means of water are selected, as *Schultz* observes, “because in their correlation they were the best adapted to represent the beginning and end, and therefore the whole of the temptations.”—Ver. 9. In these temptations Levi had proved itself “a holy one,” although in the latter Moses and Aaron stumbled, since the Levites had risen up in defence of the honour of the Lord and had kept His covenant, even with the denial of father, mother, brethren, and children (Matt. x. 37, xix. 29). The words, “who says to his father,” etc., relate to the event narrated in Ex. xxxii. 26-29, where the Levites draw their swords against the Israelites their brethren, at the command of Moses, after the worship of the golden calf, and execute judgment upon the nation without respect of person. To this we may add Num. xxv. 8, where Phinehas interposes with his sword in defence of the honour of the Lord against the shameless prostitution with the daughters of Moab. On these occasions the Levites manifested the spirit which Moses predicates here of all the tribe. By the interposition at Sinai especially, they devoted themselves with such self-denial to the service of the Lord, that the dignity of the priesthood was conferred upon their tribe in consequence.—In vers. 10 and 11, Moses celebrates this vocation: “*They will teach*

Jacob Thy rights, and Israel Thy law; bring incense to Thy nose, and whole-offering upon Thine altar. Bless, Lord, his strength, and let the work of his hands be well-pleasing to Thee: smite his adversaries and his haters upon the hips, that they may not rise!" The tribe of Levi had received the high and glorious calling to instruct Israel in the rights and commandments of God (Lev. x. 11), and to present the sacrifices of the people to the Lord, viz. incense in the holy place, whole-offering in the court. "Whole-offering," a term applied to the burnt-offering (see vol. ii. p. 291), which is mentioned *instar omnium* as being the leading sacrifice. The priests alone were actually entrusted with the instruction of the people in the law and the sacrificial worship; but as the rest of the Levites were given them as assistants in their service, this service might very properly be ascribed to the whole tribe; and no greater blessing could be desired for it than that the Lord should give them power to discharge the duties of their office, should accept their service with favour, and make their opponents powerless. The enemies and haters of Levi were not only envious persons, like Korah and his company (Num. xvi. 1), but all opponents of the priests and Levites. The *loins* are the seat of strength (Ps. lix. 24; Job xl. 16; Prov. xxxi. 17). This is the only place in which *בְּ* is used before a finite verb, whereas it often stands before the infinitive (e.g. Gen. xxvii. 1, xxxi. 29).

Ver. 12. BENJAMIN.—"The beloved of the Lord will dwell safely with Him; He shelters him at all times, and he dwells between His shoulders." Benjamin, the son of prosperity, and beloved of his father (Gen. xxxv. 18, xliv. 20), should bear his name with right. He would be the beloved of the Lord, and as such would dwell in safety with the Lord (*בָּנָיו*, lit. founded upon Him). The Lord would shelter him continually. The participle expresses the permanence of the relation: is his shelterer. In the third clause Benjamin is the subject once more; he dwells between the shoulders of Jehovah. "Between the shoulders" is equivalent to "upon the back" (*vid. 1 Sam. xvii. 6*). The expression is founded upon the figure of a father carrying his son (chap. i. 29). This figure is by no means so bold as that of the eagle's wings, upon which the Lord had carried His people, and brought them to Himself (Ex. xix. 4; *vid. Deut. xxxii. 11*). There is nothing strange in the change of subject in all three clauses, since it is met with repeatedly even in plain prose (e.g. 2 Sam. xi. 13); and here it follows simply enough from the thoughts contained in the different clauses, whilst the

suffix in all three clauses refers to the same noun, *i.e.* to Jehovah.¹ There are some who regard Jehovah as the subject in the third clause, and explain the unheard-of figure which they thus obtain, viz. that of Jehovah dwelling between the shoulders of Benjamin, as referring to the historical fact that God dwelt in the temple at Jerusalem, which was situated upon the border of the tribes of Benjamin and Judah. To this application of the words *Knobel* has properly objected, that God did not dwell between ridges (= shoulders) of mountains there, but upon the top of Moriah; but, on the other hand, he has set up the much more untenable hypothesis, that the expression refers to Gibeon, where the tabernacle stood after the destruction of Nob by Saul.—Moreover, the whole nation participated in the blessing which Moses desired for Benjamin; and this applies to the blessings of the other tribes also. All Israel was, like Benjamin, the beloved of the Lord (*vid. Jer. xi. 15; Ps. lx. 7*), and dwelt with Him in safety (*vid. ver. 28*).

Vers. 13–17. JOSEPH.—Ver. 13. “*Blessed of the Lord be his land, of (in) the most precious things of heaven, the dew, and of the flood which lies beneath,* (ver. 14) *and of the most precious of the produce of the sun, and of the most precious of the growth of the moons,* (ver. 15) *and of the head of the mountains of olden time, and of the most precious thing of the everlasting hills,* (ver. 16) *and of the most precious thing of the earth, and of its fulness, and the goodwill of Him that dwelt in the bush: let it come upon the head of Joseph, and upon the crown of him that is illustrious among his brethren.*” What Jacob desired and solicited for his son Joseph, Moses also desires for this tribe, namely, the greatest possible abundance of earthly blessing, and a vigorous manifestation of power in conflict with the nations. But however unmistakeable may be the connection between these words and the blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix. 22 sqq.), not only in the things desired, but even in particular expressions, there is an important difference which equally strikes us, namely, that in the case of Jacob the main point of the blessing is the growth of Joseph into a powerful tribe, whereas with Moses it is the development of power on the part of this tribe in the land of its inheritance, in perfect harmony with the different times at which the blessings were pronounced. Jacob described the growth of Joseph under the figure of the luxuriant branch of a fruit-tree

¹ “To dwell upon God and between His shoulders is the same as to repose upon Him: the simile being taken from fathers who carry their sons while delicate and young” (*Calvin*).

planted by the water ; whilst Moses fixes his eye primarily upon the land of Joseph, and desires for him the richest productions. “ May his land be blessed by Jehovah from (בְּ) of the cause of the blessing, whose author was Jehovah ; *vid.* Ps. xxviii. 7, civ. 3) the most precious thing of the heaven.” בָּנָה, which only occurs again in the Song of Sol. iv. 13, 16, and vii. 14, is applied to precious fruits. The most precious fruit which the heaven yields to the land is the dew. The “productions of the sun,” and שֶׁמֶן, ἄπ. λεγ. from שֶׁמֶן, “the produce of the moons,” are the fruits of the earth, which are matured by the influence of the sun and moon, by their light, their warmth. At the same time, we can hardly so distinguish the one from the other as to understand by the former the fruits which ripen only once a year, and by the latter those which grow several times and in different months ; and Ezek. xlvi. 12 and Rev. xxii. 2 cannot be adduced as proofs of this. The plural “moons” in parallelism with the sun does not mean months, as in Ex. ii. 2, but the different phases which the moon shows in its revolution round the earth. מִרְאֵשׁ (from the head), in ver. 15, is a contracted expression signifying “from the most precious things of the head.” The most precious things of the head of the mountains of old and the eternal hills, are the crops and forests with which the tops of the mountains and hills are covered. Moses sums up the whole in the words, “the earth, and the fulness thereof :” everything in the form of costly good that the earth and its productions can supply.—To the blessings of the heaven and earth there are to be added the good-will of the Lord, who appeared to Moses in the thorn-bush to redeem His people out of the bondage and oppression of Egypt and bring it into the land of Canaan, the land flowing with milk and honey (Ex. iii. 2 sqq.). The expression “that dwells in the bush” is to be explained from the significance of this manifestation of God as shown at Ex. iii., which shadowed forth a permanent relation between the Lord and His people. The spiritual blessing of the covenant grace is very suitably added to the blessings of nature ; and there is something no less suitable in the way in which the construction commencing with בְּרֵצֶן is dropped, so that an *anakolouthon* ensues. This word cannot be taken as an accusative of more precise definition, as *Schultz* supposes ; nor is בְּ to be supplied before it, as *Knobel* suggests. Grammatically considered, it is a nominative to which the verb בָּרַא תָּהֵא properly belongs, although, as a matter of fact, not only the good-will, but the natural blessings, of the Lord were also to come

upon the head of Joseph. Consequently we have not נְבָרֵךְ (*masc.*), which נְבָרֵךְ would require, but the lengthened poetical feminine form נְבָרַתָּה (*vid. Ewald, § 191, c.*), used in a neuter sense. It, i.e. everything mentioned before, shall come upon Joseph. On the expression, “illustrious among his brethren,” see at Gen. xl ix. 26. In the strength of this blessing, the tribe of Joseph would attain to such a development of power, that it would be able to tread down all nations.—Ver. 17. “*The first-born of his ox, majesty is to him, and buffalo-horns his horns : with them he thrusts down nations, all at once the ends of the earth. These are the myriads of Ephraim, and these the thousands of Manasseh.*” The “first-born of his (Joseph’s) oxen” (*shor*, a collective noun, as in chap. xv. 19) is not Joshua (*Rabb., Schultz*) ; still less is it Joseph (*Bleek, Diestel*), in which case the pronoun *his* ox would be quite out of place ; nor is it King Jeroboam II., as *Graf* supposes. It is rather Ephraim, whom the patriarch Jacob raised into the position of the first-born of Joseph (Gen. xl viii. 8 sqq.). All the sons of Joseph resembled oxen, but Ephraim was the most powerful of them all. He was endowed with majesty ; his horns, the strong weapon of oxen, in which all their strength is concentrated, were not the horns of common oxen, but horns of the wild buffalo (*reem*, Num. xxiii. 22), that strong indomitable beast (cf. Job xxxix. 9 sqq. ; Ps. xxii. 22). With them he would thrust down nations, the ends of the earth, i.e. the most distant nations (*vid. Ps. ii. 8, vii. 9, xxii. 28*). “*Together,*” i.e. all at once, belongs rhythmically to “the ends of the earth.” Such are the myriads of Ephraim, i.e. in such might will the myriads of Ephraim arise. To the tribe of Ephraim, as the more numerous, the ten thousands are assigned ; to the tribe of Manasseh, the thousands.

Vers. 18 and 19. ZEBULUN and ISSACHAR.—“*Rejoice, Zebulun, at thy going out ; and, Issachar, at thy tents. Nations will they invite to the mountain ; there offer the sacrifices of righteousness : for they suck the affluence of the seas, and the hidden treasures of the sand.*” The tribes of the last two sons of Leah Moses unites together, and, like Jacob in Gen. xl ix. 13, places Zebulun the younger first. He first of all confirms the blessing which Jacob pronounced through simply interpreting their names as *omina*, by calling upon them to rejoice in their undertakings abroad and at home. “At thy tents” corresponds to “at thy going out” (tents being used poetically for dwellings, as in chap. xvi. 7) ; like “sitting” to “going out and coming in” in 2 Kings xix. 27, Isa. xxxvii. 28, Ps. cxxxix. 2 ; and

describes life in its two aspects of work and production, rest and recreation. Although “going out” (enterprise and labour) is attributed to Zebulun, and “remaining in tents” (the comfortable enjoyment of life) to Issachar, in accordance with the delineation of their respective characters in the blessing of Jacob, this is to be attributed to the poetical parallelism of the clauses, and the whole is to be understood as applying to both in the sense suggested by *Graf*, “Rejoice, Zebulun and Issachar, in your labour and your rest.” This peculiarity, which is founded in the very nature of poetical parallelism, which is to individualize the thought by distributing it into parallel members, has been entirely overlooked by all the commentators who have given a historical interpretation to each, referring the “going out” to the shipping trade and commercial pursuits of the Zebulunites, and the expression “in thy tents” either to the spending of a nomad life in tents, for the purpose of performing a subordinate part in connection with trade (*Schultz*), or to the quiet pursuits of agriculture and grazing (*Knobel*). They were to rejoice in their undertakings at home and abroad; for they would be successful. The good things of life would flow to them in rich abundance; they would not make them into mammon, however, but would invite nations to the mountain, and there offer sacrifices of righteousness. “The peoples” are nations generally, not the tribes of Israel, still less the members of their own tribes. By the “mountain,” without any more precise definition, we are not to understand Tabor or Carmel any more than the mountain land of Canaan. It is rather “the mountain of the Lord’s inheritance” (Ex. xv. 17), upon which the Lord was about to plant His people, the mountain which the Lord had chosen for His sanctuary, and in which His people were to dwell with Him, and rejoice in sacrificial meals of fellowship with Him (see vol. ii. p. 55). To this end the Lord had sanctified Moriah through the sacrifice of Isaac which He required of Abraham, though it had not been revealed to Moses that it was there that the temple, in which the name of the Lord in Israel would dwell, was afterwards to be built. There is no distinct or direct allusion to Moriah or Zion, as the temple-mountain, involved in the words of Moses. It was only by later revelations and appointments on the part of God that this was to be made known. The words simply contain the Messianic thought that Zebulun and Issachar would offer rich praise-offerings and thank-offerings to the Lord, from the abundant supply of earthly good that would flow to them, upon the mountain which He would make

ready as the seat of His gracious presence, and would call, *i.e.* invite the nations to the sacrificial meals connected with them, to delight themselves with them in the rich gifts of the Lord, and worship the Lord who blessed His people thus. For the explanation of this thought, see Ps. xxii. 28-31. Sacrifice is mentioned here as an expression of divine worship, which culminated in sacrifice; and slain-offerings are mentioned, not burnt-offerings, to set forth the worship of God under the aspect of blessedness in fellowship with the Lord. "Slain-offerings of righteousness" are not merely outwardly legal sacrifices, in conformity with the ritual of the law, but such as were offered in a right spirit, which was well-pleasing to God (as in Ps. iv. 6, li. 21). It follows as a matter of course, therefore, that by the abundance of the seas we are not merely to understand the profits of trade upon the Mediterranean Sea; and that we are still less to understand by the hidden treasures of the sand "the fish, the purple snails, and sponges" (*Knobel*), or "tunny-fish, purple shells, and glass" (*Ps. Jon.*); but that the words receive their best exposition from Isa. lx. 5, 6, 16, and lxvi. 11, 12, *i.e.* that the thought expressed is, that the riches and treasures of both sea and land would flow to the tribes of Israel.

Vers. 20 and 21. GAD.—"Blessed be He that enlargeth Gad: like a lioness he lieth down, and teareth the arm, yea, the crown of the head. And he chose his first-fruit territory, for there was the leader's portion kept; and he came to the heads of the people, he executed the justice of the Lord, and his rights with Israel." Just as in the blessing of Noah (Gen. ix. 26) the God of Shem is praised, to point out the salvation appointed by God for Shem, so here Moses praises the Lord, who enlarged Gad, *i.e.* who not only gave him a broad territory in the conquered kingdom of Sihon, but furnished generally an unlimited space for his development (*vid.* Gen. xxvi. 22), so that he might unfold his lion-like nature in conflict with his foes. On the figure of a lioness, see Gen. xl ix. 9; and on the warlike character of the Gadites, the remarks on the blessing of Jacob upon Gad (Gen. xl ix. 19). The second part of the blessing treats of the inheritance which Gad obtained from Moses at his own request beyond Jordan. בְּאָתָה, with an accusative and נִ, signifies to look out something for oneself (Gen. xxii. 8; 1 Sam. xvi. 17). The "first-fruit" refers here to the first portion of the land which Israel received for a possession; this is evident from the reason assigned, בַּיִשְׁמָן חֲלֹקַת, whilst the statement that Gad chose the hereditary possession is in harmony with Num. xxxii. 2, 6, 25 sqq., where the children of Gad are

described as being at the head of the tribes, who came before Moses to ask for the conquered land as their possession. The meaning of the next clause, of which very different explanations have been given, can only be, that Gad chose such a territory for its inheritance as became a leader of the tribes. קָרְהֵב, he who determines, commands, organizes; hence both a commander and also a leader in war. It is in the latter sense that it occurs both here and in Judg. v. 14. קָרְהֵב תַּחֲלַת חַדֶּשׁ, the field, or territory of the leader, may either be the territory appointed or assigned by the lawgiver, or the territory falling to the lot of the leader. According to the former view, Moses would be the *mechokek*. But the thought, that Moses appointed or assigned him his inheritance, could be no reason why Gad should choose it for himself. Consequently קָרְהֵב תַּחֲלַת חַדֶּשׁ can only mean the possession which the *mechokek* chose for himself, as befitting him, or specially adapted for him. Consequently the *mechokek* was not Moses, but the tribe of Gad, which was so called because it unfolded such activity and bravery at the head of the tribes in connection with the conquest of the land, that it could be regarded as their leader. This peculiar prominence on the part of the Gadites may be inferred from the fact, that they distinguished themselves above the Reubénites in the fortification of the conquered land (Num. xxxii. 34 sqq.). מִפְּרָט, from פָּרָט, to cover, hide, preserve, is a predicate, and construed as a noun, “a thing preserved.”—On the other hand, the opinion has been very widely spread, from the time of *Onkelos* down to *Baumgarten* and *Ewald*, that this hemistich refers to Moses: “there is the portion of the lawgiver hidden,” or “the field of the hidden leader,” and that it contains an allusion to the fact that the grave of Moses was hidden in the inheritance of Gad. But this is not only at variance with the circumstance, that a prophetic allusion to the grave of Moses such as *Baumgarten* assumes is apparently inconceivable, from the simple fact that we cannot imagine the Gadites to have foreseen the situation of Moses’ grave at the time when they selected their territory, but also with the fact that, according to Josh. xiii. 20, the spot where this grave was situated (chap. xxxiv. 5) was not allotted to the tribe of Gad, but to that of Reuben; and lastly, with the use of the word *chelkah*, which does not signify a burial-ground or grave.—But although Gad chose out an inheritance for himself, he still went before his brethren, i.e. along with the rest of the tribes, into Canaan, to perform, in connection with them, what the Lord demanded of His people as a right. This is the meaning of the second half of the verse. The clause,

“ he came to the heads of the people,” does not refer to the fact that the Gadites came to Moses and the heads of the congregation, to ask for the conquered land as a possession (Num. xxxii. 2), but expresses the thought that Gad joined the heads of the people to go at the head of the tribes of Israel (comp. Josh. i. 14, iv. 12, with Num. xxxii. 17, 21, 32), to conquer Canaan with the whole nation, and root out the Canaanites. The Gadites had promised this to Moses and the heads of the people; and this promise Moses regarded as an accomplished act, and praised in these words with prophetic foresight as having been already performed, and that not merely as one single manifestation of their obedience towards the word of the Lord, but rather as a pledge that Gad would always manifest the same disposition. “To do the righteousness of Jehovah,” *i.e.* to do what Jehovah requires of His people as righteousness,—namely, to fulfil the commandments of God, in which the righteousness of Israel was to consist (chap. vi. 25). שָׁמַן, imperfect Kal for שָׁמַנְתִּי or שָׁמַנְתְּךָ; see *Ges.* § 76, 2, *c.*, and *Ewald*, § 142, *c.* “With Israel :” in fellowship with (the rest of) Israel.

Ver. 22. DAN is “*a young lion which springs out of Bashan.*” Whilst Jacob compared him to a serpent by the way, which suddenly bites a horse’s feet, so that its rider falls backward, Moses gives greater prominence to the strength which Dan would display in conflict with foes, by calling him a young lion which suddenly springs out of its ambush. The reference to Bashan has nothing to do with the expedition of the Danites against Laish, in the valley of Rehoboth (Judg. xviii. 28), as this valley did not belong to Bashan. It is to be explained from the simple fact, that in the regions of eastern Bashan, which abound with caves, and more especially in the woody western slopes of Jebel Hauran, many lions harboured, which rushed forth from the thicket, and were very dangerous enemies to the herds of Bashan. Even if no other express testimonies to this fact are to be found, it may be inferred from the description given of the eastern spurs of Antilibanus in the Song of Sol. (iv. 8), as the abodes of lions and leopards. The meaning leap forth, spring out, is confirmed by both the context and dialects, though the word only occurs here.

Ver. 23. NAPHTALI.—“*O Naphtali, satisfied with favour, and full of the blessing of Jehovah; of sea and south shall he take possession.*” If the gracefulness of Naphtali is set forth in the blessing of Jacob, by comparing it to a gazelle, here Moses assures the same tribe of satisfaction with the favour and blessing of God, and pro-

mises it the possession of the sea and of the south, *i.e.* an inheritance which should combine the advantages of the sea—a healthy sea-breeze—with the grateful warmth of the south. This blessing is expressed in far too general terms for it to be possible to interpret it historically, as relating to the natural characteristics of the inheritance of the Naphtalites in Canaan, or to regard it as based upon them, apart altogether from the fact, that the territory of Naphtali was situated in the north-east of Canaan, and reached as far as the sea of Galilee, and that it was for the most part mountainous, though it was a very fertile hill-country (*Josh. xviii. 32–39*). רְצַחַת is a very unique form of the imperative, though this does not warrant an alteration of the text.

Vers. 24 and 25. ASHER.—“*Blessed before the sons be Asher; let him be the favoured among his brethren, and dipping his foot in oil. Iron and brass be thy castle; and as the days of thy life let thy rest continue.*” *Asher*, the prosperous (see at *Gen. xxx. 15*), was justly to bear the name. He was to be a child of prosperity; blessed with earthly good, he was to enjoy rest all his life long in strong fortresses. It is evident enough that this blessing is simply an exposition of the name *Asher*, and that Moses here promises the tribe a verification of the omen contained in its name. בָּרוּךְ כִּבְנֵים does not mean “blessed with children,” or “praised because of his children,” in which case we should have בָּנִי; but “blessed before the sons” (cf. *Judg. v. 24*), *i.e.* blessed before the sons of Jacob, who were peculiarly blessed, equivalent to the most blessed of all the sons of Israel. רְצַי אֲחֵי does not mean the beloved among his brethren, acceptable to his brethren, but the one who enjoyed the favour of the Lord, *i.e.* the one peculiarly favoured by the Lord. Dipping the foot in oil points to a land flowing with oil (*Job xxix. 6*), *i.e.* fat or fertile throughout, which Jacob had already promised to Asher (see *Gen. xlvi. 20*). To complete the prosperity, however, security and rest were required for the enjoyment of the blessings bestowed by God; and these are promised in ver. 25. לְעֵגֶל (*ἀπ. λεγ.*) does not mean a shoe, but is derived from עֲגָל, to bolt (*Judg. iii. 23*), and signifies either a bolt, or that which is shut fast; a poetical expression for a castle or fortress. Asher’s dwellings were to be castles, fortresses of iron and brass; *i.e.* as strong and impregnable as if they were built of iron and brass. The pursuit of mining is not to be thought of as referred to here, even though the territory of Asher, which reached to Lebanon, may have contained brass and iron (see at *chap. viii. 9*). *Luther* follows the LXX. and Vulgate,

and renders this clause, “iron and brass be upon his shoes;” but this is undoubtedly wrong, as the custom of fastening the shoes or sandals with brass or iron was quite unknown to the Israelites; and even Goliath, who was clothed in brass from head to foot, and wore iron greaves, had no iron sandals, though the military shoes of the ancient Romans had nails in the soles. Moreover, the context contains no reference to war, so as to suggest the idea that the treading down and crushing of the foe are intended. “As thy days,” i.e. as long as the days of thy life last, let thy rest be (continue). *Luther’s* rendering, “let thine old age be as thy youth,” which follows the *Vulgate*, cannot be sustained; for although נָבַד, derived from נָבַד, to vanish away, certainly might signify old age, the expression “thy days” cannot possibly be understood as signifying youth.

Vers. 26–29. The conclusion of the blessing corresponds to the introduction. As Moses commenced with the glorious fact of the founding of the kingdom of Jehovah in Israel, as the firm foundation of the salvation of His people, so he also concludes with a reference to the Lord their eternal refuge, and with a congratulation of Israel which could find refuge in such a God.—Vers. 26, 27. “Who is as God, a righteous nation, who rides in heaven to thy help, and in His exaltation upon the clouds. Abiding is the God of olden time, and beneath are everlasting arms: and He drives the enemy before thee, and says, Destroy.” The meaning is: No other nation has a God who rules in heaven with almighty power, and is a refuge and help to his people against every foe. *Jeshurun* is a vocative, and the alteration of בָּנָל into בָּנָל, “as the God of Jeshurun,” according to the ancient versions, is to be rejected on the simple ground that the expression “in thy help,” which follows immediately afterwards, is an address to Israel. Riding upon the heaven and the clouds is a figure used to denote the unlimited omnipotence with which God rules the world out of heaven, and is the helper of His people. “In thy help,” i.e. as thy helper. This God is a dwelling to His people. מִשְׁעָנָה, like the masculine מִשְׁעָן in Ps. xc. 1, and xci. 9, signifies “dwelling”—a genuine Mosaic figure, to which, in all probability, the houseless wandering of the people in the desert, which made them feel the full worth of a dwelling, first gave rise. The figure not only implies that God grants protection and a refuge to His people in the storms of life (Ps. xci. 1, 2, cf. Isa. iv. 6), but also that He supplies His people with everything that can afford a safe abode. “The God of old,” i.e. who has proved Himself to be God from the very beginning of

the world (*vid. Ps. xc. 1 ; Hab. i. 12*). The expression “underneath” is to be explained from the antithesis to the heaven where God is enthroned above mankind. He who is enthroned in heaven above is also the God who is with His people upon the earth below, and holds and bears them in His arms. “Everlasting arms” are arms whose strength is never exhausted. There is no need to supply “thee” after “underneath;” the expression should rather be left in its general form, “upon the earth beneath.” The reference to Israel is obvious from the context. The driving of the enemy before Israel is not to be restricted to the rooting out of the Canaanites, but applies to every enemy of the congregation of the Lord.—Ver. 28. “*And Israel dwells safely, alone the fountain of Jacob, in a land full of corn and wine ; his heavens also drop down dew.*” Because the God of old was the dwelling and help of Israel, it dwelt safely and separate from the other nations, in a land abounding with corn and wine. “The fountain of Jacob” is parallel to “Israel;” “alone (separate) dwells the fountain of Jacob.” This title is given to Israel as having sprung from the patriarch Jacob, in whom it had its source. A similar expression occurs in Ps. lxviii. 27. It completely destroys the symmetry of the clauses of the verse to connect the words, as *Luther* does, with what follows, in the sense of “the eye of Jacob is directed upon a land.” The construction of בָּיִת with בָּיִת, to dwell into a land, may be explained on the ground that the dwelling involves the idea of spreading out over the land. On the “land of corn,” etc., see chap. viii. 7 and 8. בְּיַהֲיֵה is emphatic: yea his heaven, *i.e.* the heaven of this land drops down dew (*vid. Gen. xxvii. 28*). Israel was to be congratulated upon this.—Ver. 29. “*Hail to thee, O Israel ! who is like thee, a people saved in the Lord, the shield of thy help, and who (is) the sword of thine eminence. Thine enemies will deny themselves to thee, and thou ridest upon their heights.*” “Saved;” not merely delivered from danger and distress, but in general endowed with salvation (like Zech. ix. 9; see also Isa. xlvi. 17). The salvation of Israel rested in the Lord, as the ground out of which it grew, from which it descended, because the Lord was its help and shield, as He had already promised Abraham (Gen. xv. 1), and “the sword of his eminence,” *i.e.* the sword which had fought for the eminence of Israel. But because the Lord was Israel’s shield and sword, or, so to speak, both an offensive and defensive weapon, his enemies denied themselves to him, *i.e.* feigned friendship, did not venture to appear openly as enemies (for the meaning “feign,” act the hypocrite, see

Ps. xviii. 45, lxxxi. 16). But Israel would ride upon their heights, the high places of their land, *i.e.* would triumph over all its foes (see at chap. xxxii. 13).

DEATH AND BURIAL OF MOSES.—CHAP. XXXIV.

Vers. 1–8. After blessing the people, Moses ascended Mount Nebo, according to the command of God (chap. xxxii. 48–51), and there the Lord showed him, in all its length and breadth, that promised land into which he was not to enter. From Nebo, a peak of Pisgah, which affords a very extensive prospect on all sides (see p. 214), he saw the land of Gilead, the land to the east of the Jordan as far as Dan, *i.e.* not Laish-Dan near the central source of the Jordan (Judg. xviii. 27), which did not belong to Gilead, but a Dan in northern Peræa, which has not yet been discovered (see at Gen. xiv. 14); and the whole of the land on the west of the Jordan, Canaan proper, in all its different districts, namely, “*the whole of Naphtali*,” *i.e.* the later Galilee on the north, “*the land of Ephraim and Manasseh*” in the centre, and “*the whole of the land of Judah*,” the southern portion of Canaan, in all its breadth, “*to the hinder (Mediterranean) sea*” (see chap. xi. 24); also “*the south land*” (*Negeb*: see at Num. xiii. 17), the southern land of steppe towards the Arabian desert, and “*the valley of the Jordan*” (see Gen. xiii. 10), *i.e.* the deep valley from Jericho the palm-city (so called from the palms which grew there, in the valley of the Jordan: Judg. i. 16, iii. 43; 2 Chron. xxviii. 15) “*to Zoar*” at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea (see at Gen. xix. 22). This sight of every part of the land on the east and west was not an ecstatic vision, but a sight with the bodily eyes, whose natural power of vision was miraculously increased by God, to give Moses a glimpse at least of the glorious land which he was not to tread, and delight his eye with a view of the inheritance intended for his people.—Vers. 5, 6. After this favour had been granted him, the aged servant of the Lord was to taste death as the wages of sin. There, *i.e.* upon Mount Nebo, he died, “*at the mouth*,” *i.e.* according to the commandment, “*of the Lord*” (not “*by a kiss of the Lord*,” as the Rabbins interpret it), in the land of Moab, not in Canaan (see at Num. xxvii. 12–14). “*And He buried him in the land of Moab, over against Beth Peor.*” The subject in this sentence is Jehovah. Though the third person singular would allow of the verb being taken as impersonal (*έθαψαν αὐτόν*, LXX.: they buried him),

such a rendering is precluded by the statement which follows, “*no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.*” “The valley” where the Lord buried Moses was certainly not the Jordan valley, as in chap. iii. 29, but most probably “the valley in the field of Moab, upon the top of Pisgah,” mentioned in Num. xxi. 20, near to Nebo (see p. 148); in any case, a valley on the mountain, not far from the top of Nebo.—The Israelites inferred what is related in vers. 1-6 respecting the end of Moses’ life, from the promise of God in chap. xxxii. 49, and Num. xxvii. 12, 13, which was communicated to them by Moses himself (chap. iii. 27), and from the fact that Moses went up Mount Nebo, from which he never returned. On his ascending the mountain, the eyes of the people would certainly follow him as far as they possibly could. It is also very possible that there were many parts of the Israelitish camp from which the top of Nebo was visible, so that the eyes of his people could not only accompany him thither, but could also see that when the Lord had shown him the promised land, He went down with him into the neighbouring valley, where Moses was taken for ever out of their sight. There is not a word in the text about God having brought the body of Moses down from the mountain and buried it in the valley. This “romantic idea” is invented by *Knobel*, for the purpose of throwing suspicion upon the historical truth of a fact which is offensive to him. The fact itself that the Lord buried His servant Moses, and no man knows of his sepulchre, is in perfect keeping with the relation in which Moses stood to the Lord while he was alive. Even if his sin at the water of strife rendered it necessary that he should suffer the punishment of death, as a memorable example of the terrible severity of the holy God against sin, even in the case of His faithful servant; yet after the justice of God had been satisfied by this punishment, he was to be distinguished in death before all the people, and glorified as the servant who had been found faithful in all the house of God, whom the Lord had known face to face (ver. 10), and to whom He had spoken mouth to mouth (Num. xii. 7, 8). The burial of Moses by the hand of Jehovah was not intended to conceal his grave, for the purpose of guarding against a superstitious and idolatrous reverence for his grave; for with the opinion held by the Israelites, that corpses and graves defiled, there was but little fear of this; but, as we may infer from the account of the transfiguration of Jesus, the intention was to place him in the same category with Enoch and Elijah. As *Kurtz* observes, “The purpose of God was to prepare

for him a condition, both of body and soul, resembling that of these two men of God. Men bury a corpse that it may pass into corruption. If Jehovah, therefore, would not suffer the body of Moses to be buried by men, it is but natural to seek for the reason in the fact that He did not intend to leave him to corruption, but, when burying it with His own hand, imparted a power to it which preserved it from corruption, and prepared the way for it to pass into the same form of existence to which Enoch and Elijah were taken, without either death or burial.”—There can be no doubt that this truth lies at the foundation of the Jewish theogoumenon mentioned in the Epistle of Jude, concerning the contest between Michael the archangel and the devil for the body of Moses.—Vers. 7, 8. Though he died at the age of one hundred and twenty (see at chap. xxxi. 2), Moses’ eyes had not become dim, and his freshness had not abated ($\tau\acute{\eta}\pi\lambda\epsilon\gamma$, connected with $\tau\acute{\eta}$ in Gen. xxx. 37, signifies freshness). Thus had the Lord preserved the full vital energy of His servant, even till the time of his death. The mourning of the people lasted thirty days, as in the case of Aaron (Num. xx. 29).

Vers. 9–12. Joshua now took Moses’ place as the leader of the people, filled with the spirit of wisdom (practical wisdom, manifesting itself in action), because Moses had ordained him to his office by the laying on of hands (Num. xxvii. 18). And the people obeyed him; but he was not like Moses. “*There arose no more a prophet in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face*,” i.e. so far as the miracles and signs were concerned which Moses did, by virtue of his divine mission, upon Pharaoh, his servants, and his land, and the terrible acts which he performed before the eyes of Israel (vers. 11 and 12; *vid. chap. xxvi. 8, and iv. 34*). “*Whom Jehovah knew* :” not who knew Him, the Lord. “To know,” like $\gamma\imath\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\nu$ in 1 Cor. viii. 3, relates to the divine knowledge, which not only involves a careful observance (chap. ii. 7), but is also a manifestation of Himself to man, a penetration of man with the spiritual power of God. Because he was thus known by the Lord, Moses was able to perform signs and wonders, and mighty, terrible acts, such as no other performed either before or after him. In this respect Joshua stood far below Moses, and no prophet arose in Israel like unto Moses.—This remark concerning Moses does not presuppose that a long series of prophets had already risen up since the time of Moses. When Joshua had defeated the Canaanites, and conquered their land with the powerful help of the Lord, which was still manifested in signs and wonders, and had divided

it among the children of Israel, and when the tribes had settled down in their inheritance, so that the different portions of the land began to be called by the names of Naphtali, Ephraim, Manasseh, and Judah, as is the case in ver. 2 ; the conviction might already have become established in Israel, that no other prophet would arise like Moses, to whom the Lord had manifested Himself with such signs and wonders before the Egyptians and the eyes of Israel. The position occupied by Joshua in relation to this his predecessor, as the continuer of his work, would necessarily awaken and confirm this conviction, in connection with what the Lord had said as to the superiority of Moses to all the prophets (Num. xii. 6 sqq.). Moses was the founder and mediator of the old covenant. As long as this covenant was to last, no prophet could arise in Israel like unto Moses. There is but One who is worthy of greater honour than Moses, namely, the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, who is placed as the Son over all the house of God, in which Moses was found faithful as a servant (compare Heb. iii. 2-6 with Num. xii. 7), Jesus Christ, the founder and mediator of the new and everlasting covenant.

CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE COMPOSITION OF THE PENTATEUCH.

IF we close our commentary with another survey of the entire work, viz. the five books of Moses, we may sum up the result of our detailed exposition, so far as critical opinions respecting its origin are concerned, in these words : We have found the decision which we pronounced in our General Introduction, as to the internal unity and system of the whole *Thorah*, as well as its Mosaic origin, thoroughly confirmed. With the exception of the last chapters of the fifth book, which are distinctly shown to be an appendix to the Mosaic *Thorah*, added by a different hand, by the statement in Deut. xxxi. 24 sqq., that when the book of the law was finished Moses handed it over to the Levites to keep, there is nothing in the whole of the five books which Moses might not have written. There are no historical circumstances or events either mentioned or assumed, which occurred for the first time after Moses was dead. Neither the allusion to the place called Dan in Gen. xiv. 14 (cf. Deut. xxxiv. 1) ; nor the remark in Gen. xxxvi. 1, that there were kings

in the land of Edom before the children of Israel had a king over them; nor the statement that the monument which Jacob erected over Rachel's grave remained "to this day" (Gen. xxxv. 20); nor even the assertion in Deut. iii. 14, that Jair called Bashan "Chavvoth Jair" after his own name, furnishes any definite and unmistakeable indication of a post-Mosaic time.¹ And the account in Ex. xvi. 35, that the Israelites ate the manna forty years, till they came to an inhabited land, "to the end," i.e. the extreme boundary, of the land of Canaan, could only be adduced by Bleek (*Einl.* p. 204) as an evident proof that "this could not have been written before the arrival of the Israelites in the land of Canaan," through a *παρερμηνεία*, or misinterpretation of the words, "into the land of their dwelling." For were not the Israelites on the border of the land when they were encamped in the steppes of Moab by the Jordan opposite to Jericho? Or are we to suppose that the kingdoms of Sihon and Og with their cities, which the Israelites had already conquered under Moses, were an uninhabited land? The passage mentioned last simply proves, that in the middle books of the Pentateuch we have not simple diaries before us containing the historical occurrences of the Mosaic times, but a work drawn up according to a definite plan, and written in the last year of Moses' life. This is apparent from the remarks about the shining face of Moses (Ex. xxxiv. 33–35), and the guidance of Israel in all its journeys by the pillar of cloud (Ex. xl. 38, cf. Num. x. 34), as well as from the systematic arrangement and distribution of the materials according to certain well-defined and obvious points of view, as we have already endeavoured to show in the introductions to the different books, and in the exposition itself.

If, however, the composition of the whole *Thorah* by Moses is thus firmly established, in accordance with the statements in Deut. xxxi. 9 and 24, it by no means follows that Moses wrote the whole

¹ But even if the remarks in Gen. xxxv. 20 and Deut. iii. 14 concerning the preservation of the monument over Rachel's grave, and the retention of the names which Jair gave to the towns of Bashan, should really point to a post-Mosaic time, no modest critic would ever think of adducing two such gloss-like notices as a proof of the later origin of the whole Pentateuch, but would regard these notices as nothing more than a gloss interpolated by a later hand. In the case of the monument upon Rachel's grave, however, if it continued in existence for centuries, it is not only conceivable, but by no means improbable, that the spies sent into Canaan from Kadesh, who passed through the land from Hebron to Hamath, saw it by the high road where the grave was situated, and brought the intelligence of its preservation to Moses and the people.

work from Gen. i. to Deut. xxxi. *uno tenore*, and in the closing days of his life. Even in this case it may have been written step by step; and not only Genesis, but the three middle books, may have been composed before the discourses in the fifth book, so that the whole work was simply finished and closed after the renewal of the covenant recorded in Deut. xxix. and xxx. Again, such statements as that Moses wrote this law, and made an end of writing the words of this law in a book till they were finished (Deut. xxxi. 9 and 24), by no means require us to assume that Moses wrote it all with his own hand. The epistles which the Apostle Paul sent to the different churches were rarely written with his own hand, but were dictated to one of his assistants; yet their Pauline origin is not called in question in consequence. And so Moses may have employed some assistant, either a priest or scribe (*shoter*), in the composition of the book of the law, without its therefore failing to be his own work. Still less is the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch rendered doubtful by the fact that he availed himself of written documents from earlier times in writing the primeval history, and incorporated them to some extent in the book of Genesis without alteration; and that in the history of his own time, and when introducing the laws into his work, he inserted documents in the middle books which had been prepared by the priests and *shoterim* at his own command,—such, for example, as the lists of the numbering of the people (Num. i.-iii. and xxvi.), the account of the dedicatory offerings of the tribe-princes (Num. vii.), and of the committee of heads of tribes appointed for the purpose of dividing the land of Canaan (Num. xxxiv. 16 sqq.),—in the exact form in which they had been drawn up for public use. This conjecture is rendered very natural by the contents and form of the Pentateuch.

The Pentateuch contains historical narrative and law, answering to the character of the divine revelation, which consisted in historical facts, and received a development in accordance with the times. And on closer inspection we find that several different elements may be distinguished in each of these. The historical contents are divisible into an annalistic or monumental portion, and into prophetic-historical accounts. The former includes the simple notices of the most important events from the creation of the world to the death of Moses, with their exact chronological, ethnographical, and geographical data; also the numerous genealogical documents introduced into the history. To the latter belong statements, whether shorter or longer, respecting those revelations and promises

of God, by which the Creator of the heaven and the earth prepared the way from the very earliest time for the redemption of the fallen human race, and which, after laying the foundation for the Old Testament kingdom of God by the guidance of the patriarchs and the redemption of Israel out of the bondage of Egypt, He eventually carried out at Sinai by the conclusion of a covenant and the giving of a law. In the same way, we may distinguish a twofold element in the legal portion of the Pentateuch. The kernel of the Sinaitic legislation is to be found in the decalogue, with the moral and rightful conditions upon the basis of which the Lord concluded the covenant with Israel. The religious and moral truths and commandments, which, as being the absolute demands of the holiness and justice, the love and mercy of God, constitute the very essence of true religion, are surrounded in the covenant economy of the Old Testament by certain religious statutes and institutions, which were imposed upon the people of God simply for the time of its infancy, and constituted that "shadow of things to come" which was to pass away when the "body" appeared. This "shadow" embraces all the special theocratic ordinances and precepts of the so-called Levitical law (whether ecclesiastical, disciplinary, or magisterial), in which religious and ethical ideas were symbolically incorporated; so that they contained within them eternal truths, whilst their earthly form was to pass away. These covenant statutes are so intimately bound up with the general religious doctrines and the purely moral commands, by virtue of their symbolical significance, that in many respects they interlace one another, the moral commands being enclosed and pervaded by the covenant statutes, and the latter again being sanctified and transformed by the former, so that the entire law assumes the form of a complete organic whole. A similar organic connection is also apparent between the historical and legal constituents of the Pentateuch. The historical narrative not only supplied the framework or outward setting for the covenant legislation, but it also prepared the way for that legislation, just as God Himself prepared the way for concluding the covenant with Israel by His guidance of the human race and the patriarchs of Israel; and it so pervades every portion of it also, that, on the one hand, the historical circumstances form the groundwork for the legal institutions, and on the other hand a light is thrown by the historical occurrences upon the covenant ordinances and laws. Just as nature and spirit interpenetrate each other in the world around us and in human life, and the

spirit not only comes to view in the life of nature, but transforms it at the same time; so has God planted His kingdom of grace in the natural order of the world, that nature may be sanctified by grace. But, notwithstanding this organic connection between the various constituents of the Pentateuch, from the very nature of the case not only are the historical and legal portions kept quite distinct from one another in many passages, but the distinctions between these two constituents are here and there brought very clearly out to view.

The material differences necessarily determined in various ways the form of the narrative, the phraseology, and even the words employed. In the historical portions many words and expressions occur which are never met with in the legal sections, and *vice versa*. The same remark also applies to the different portions in which we have either historical narrative, or the promulgation of laws. In addition to this, we might reasonably expect to find whole sections also, in which the ideas and verbal peculiarities of the different constituents are combined. And this is really the case. The differences stand out very sharply in the earliest chapters of Genesis, where the account of paradise and the fall, together with the promise of the victory of the seed of the woman over the serpent, which contains the germ of all future revelations of God (chap. ii. 4 sqq.), is appended immediately to the history of the creation of the world (chap. i. 1-ii. 3); whilst in the mode of narration it differs considerably from the style of the first chapter. Whereas in chap. i. the Creator of the heaven and the earth is called *Elohim* simply; in the history of paradise and the fall, not to mention other differences, we meet with the composite name *Jehovah Elohim*; and, after this, the two names *Elohim* and *Jehovah* are used interchangeably, so that in many chapters the former only occurs, and in others again only the latter, until the statement in Ex. vi., that God appeared to Moses and commissioned him to bring the people of Israel out of Egypt, after which the name *Jehovah* predominates, so that henceforth, with but few exceptions, *Elohim* is only used in an appellative sense.

Upon this interchange in the names of God in the book of Genesis, modern critics have built up their hypothesis as to the composition of Genesis, and in fact of the entire Pentateuch, either from different documents, or from repeated supplementary additions, in accordance with which they discover an outward cause for the change of names, viz. the variety of editors, instead of deducing

it from the different meanings of the names themselves ; whilst they also adduce, in support of their view, the fact that certain ideas and expressions change in connection with the name of God. The fact is obvious enough. But the change in the use of the different names of God is associated with the gradual development of the saving purposes of God ; and as we have already shown in vol. i. pp. 73 sqq., the names *Elohim* and *Jehovah* are expressive of different relations on the part of God to the world. Now, as God did not reveal Himself in the full significance of His name *Jehovah* till the time of the exodus of Israel out of Egypt, and the conclusion of the covenant at Sinai, we could expect nothing else than what we actually find in Genesis, namely, that this name is not used by the author of the book of Genesis before the call of Abraham, except in connection with such facts as were directly preparatory to the call of Abraham to be the father of the covenant nation ; and that even in the history of the patriarchs, in which it predominates from Gen. xii.—xvi., it is used less frequently again after *Jehovah* revealed Himself to Abraham as *El Shaddai*, and other titles of God sprang out of the continued manifestations of God to the patriarchs, which could take the place of that name. (For more detailed remarks, see vol. i. pp. 330 sqq.). It would not have been by any means strange, therefore, if the name *Jehovah* had not occurred at all in the account of the creation of the world, in the genealogies of the patriarchs of the primeval and preparatory age (Gen. v. and xi.), in the table of nations (Gen. x.), in the account of the negotiations of Abraham with the Hittites concerning the purchase of the cave of Machpelah for a family sepulchre (Gen. xxiii.), in the notices respecting Esau and the Edomish tribe-princes and kings (Gen. xxxvi.), and other narratives of similar import. Nevertheless we find it in the genealogy in Gen. v. 29, and in the table of nations in Gen. x. 9, where the critics, in order to save their hypothesis, are obliged to have recourse to an assumption of glosses, or editorial revisions. They have dealt still more violently with Gen. xvii. 1. There *Jehovah* appears to Abram, and manifests Himself to him as *El Shaddai*, from which it is very evident that the name *El Shaddai* simply expresses one particular feature in the manifestation of *Jehovah*, and describes a preliminary stage, anticipatory of the full development of the nature of the absolute God, as expressed in the name *Jehovah*. This is put beyond all doubt by the declaration of God to Moses in Ex. vi. 3, “ I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as *El Shaddai*, and by My name *Jehovah* was I not known to them.”

Even *Astruc* observes, with reference to these words, “The passage in Exodus, when properly understood, does not prove that the name of Jehovah was a name of God unknown to the patriarchs, and revealed for the first time to Moses; it simply proves that God had not shown the patriarchs the full extent of the meaning of this name, as He had made it known to Moses.” The modern critics, on the other hand, have erased *Jehovah* from the text in Gen. xvii. 1, and substituted *Elohim* in its place, and then declare *El Shaddai* synonymous with *Elohim*, whilst they have so perverted Ex. vi. 3 as to make the name *Jehovah* utterly unknown to the patriarchs. By similar acts of violence they have mangled the text in very many other passages, for the purpose of carrying out the distinction between the *Elohim* and *Jehovah* documents; and yet for all that they cannot escape the admission, that there are certain portions or sections of the book of Genesis in which the separation is impossible.

It is just the same with the supposed “favourite expressions” of the Elohistic and Jehovahistic sections, as with the names of God. “There are certain favourite expressions, it is said, which are common to the Elohistic portions; and the same things are frequently called by different names in the Elohistic and Jehovahistic sections. Among the Elohistic expressions are: אֶחָד (possession), אֶרְזִים מַנְגָּרִים (land of the stranger's sojourn), בָּשָׂרֵם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, לְמִינּוֹ, לְרוֹתִיכֶם (the self-same day), *Padan-Aram* (the Jehovahistic for this is always(?) *Aram-Naharaim*, or simply *Aram*),¹ בְּרִית, בְּרִיה וּרְבָה (the Jehovahistic is בְּרִית בְּרִיה); wherever the name *Elohim* occurs, these expressions also appear as its inseparable satellites.” This statement is in part incorrect, and not in accordance with fact; and even where there is any foundation for it, it really proves nothing. In the first place, it is not correct that אֶחָד and אֶרְזִים are only to be met with in Elohistic portions. In the very first passage in which we meet with this word in the Pentateuch (Gen. xvii. 8), it is not *Elohim*, but Jehovah, who appears as *El Shaddai*, and promises Abraham and his seed the land of his pilgrimage, the land of Canaan, עַלְקָחוּת עַלְםָן לְאַחֲרֵיכֶם.

¹ The actual fact is, that *Aram-Naharaim* only occurs twice in the Pentateuch, viz. Gen. xxiv. 10 and Deut. xxiii. 5, for which *Aram* alone occurs in Num. xxiii. 7, which is well known to apply not merely to Mesopotamia, but to Syria as well, and is used here simply as a poetical term for *Aram-Naharaim*. Moreover, *Padan-Aram* and *Aram-Naharaim* are not identical; but the former merely denotes one particular district of “Aram of the two rivers,” or Mesopotamia.

This passage is clearly pointed to in Gen. xlvi. 4. In addition to this, the word *achuzzah* occurs in Gen. xxiii. 4, 9, 20, xlvi. 30, l. 13, in connection with the family sepulchre which Abraham had acquired as a possession by purchase; also in the laws concerning the sale and redemption of landed property (Lev. xxv. and xxvii. very frequently), and in those concerning the division of the land as a possession among the tribes and families of Israel (Num. xxvii. 7, xxxii. 5 sqq., xxxv. 2, 8); also in Lev. xxv. 34 and Gen. xxxvi. 43,—in both passages with reference to property or a fixed landed possession, for which there was no other word in the Hebrew language that could be used in these passages; not to mention the fact, that *Stähelin*, *Knobel*, and others, pronounce Num. xxxii. 32 a Jehovahistic passage. So again the expressions בְּרִיתם (to set up a covenant) and לְדוֹתָם (in their generations) occur in Gen. xvii. 7 in a Jehovahistic framework; for it was not *Elohim*, but Jehovah, who appeared to Abram (see ver. 1), to set up (not conclude) His covenant with him and his posterity as an everlasting covenant, according to their generations. To set up (*i.e.* realize, carry out) a covenant, and to conclude a covenant, are certainly two distinct ideas.—In Gen. xlvi. 27, again, and Lev. xxvi. 9, we meet with בְּרִית וּרְבָה in two sections, which are pronounced Jehovahistic. The other three, no doubt, occur in Genesis in connection with *Elohim*; but the expression, “in the self-same day,” could not be expected in Jehovahistic sections, for the simple reason, that the time of the revelations and promises of God is not generally reckoned by day and hour. “After his kind” is only met with in four sections in the whole of the Pentateuch,—in the accounts of the creation and that of the flood (Gen. i. and vi. vii.), and in the laws concerning clean and unclean beasts (Lev. xi. and Deut. xiv.), where it is simply the species of animals that are referred to. Can this word then be called a favourite Elohistic expression, which constantly appears like an inseparable satellite, wherever the name *Elohim* occurs? The same remarks apply to other words and phrases described as Elohistic: *e.g.* *tholedoth* (which stands at the head of a Jehovahistic account, however, in Gen. ii. 4), “*father’s house*,” “in their families” (*mishpachoth*), and many others. But just as such expressions as these are not to be expected in the prophetico-historical sections, for the simple reason that the ideas which they express belong to a totally different sphere, so, on the other hand, a considerable number of notions and words, which are associated with the visible manifestations of God, the promises to the patriarchs,

their worship, etc., are found in the book of Genesis always in connection with the name *Jehovah*: see, for example, קָרְאַ בִּשְׁמֵי יְהוָה, בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה, (עַלְתָּה) עַלְתָּה עַלְתָּה עַלְתָּה, and others of the same kind. And yet the last two occur in the laws of the middle books, which the critics attribute to the Elohist much more frequently than many of the so-called Elohistic expressions and formulas of the book of Genesis. This fact clearly shows, that there are no such things as favourite expressions of the Elohist and Jehovahist, but that the words are always adapted to the subject. In the covenant statutes of the middle books, we find Elohistic and Jehovahistic expressions combined, because the economy of the Sinaitic covenant was anticipated on the one hand by the patriarchal revelations of Jehovah the covenant God, and established on the other hand upon the natural foundations of the Israelitish commonwealth. The covenant which Jehovah concluded with the people of Israel at Sinai (Ex. xxiv.) was simply the setting up and full realization of the covenant which He made with Abram (Gen. xv.), and had already begun to set up with him by the promise of a son, and the institution of circumcision as the covenant sign (Gen. xvii.). The indispensable condition of membership in the covenant was circumcision, which Jehovah commanded to Abraham when He made Himself known to him as *El Shaddai* (Gen. xvii.), and in connection with which we meet for the first time with the legal formulas, "a statute for ever," "in your generations," and "that soul shall be cut off," which recur so constantly in the covenant statutes of the middle books, but so arranged, that the expression "a statute for ever" is never used in connection with general religious precepts or purely moral commandments, the eternal significance of which did not need to be enjoined, since it naturally followed from the unchangeable holiness and justice of the eternal God, whilst this could not be assumed without further ground of the statutory laws and ordinances of the covenant. But these covenant ordinances also had their roots in the natural order of the world and of the national life. The nation of Israel which sprang from the twelve sons of Israel by natural generation, received its division into tribes, and the constitution founded upon this, as a covenant nation and congregation of Jehovah. The numbering of the people was taken in tribes, according to the families and fathers' houses of the different tribes; and the land of Canaan, which was promised them for an inheritance, was to be divided among the tribes, with special reference to the number and magnitude of their families. It is perfectly natural,

therefore, that in the laws and statements concerning these things, words and formularies should be repeated which already occur in the book of Genesis in connection with the genealogical notices.

Modern critics, as is well known, regard the whole of the Sinaitic legislation, from Ex. xxv. to Num. x. 28, as an essential part of the original work, with the exception of Ex. xx.-xxiii., Lev. xvii.-xx. and xxvi., and a few verses in Lev. x., xxiii., xxiv., xxv., and Num. iv. and viii. Now, as a great variety of things are noticed in this law—such as the building and setting up of the tabernacle, the description of the priests' clothes, the order of sacrifice—which are not mentioned again in the other parts of the Pentateuch, it was very easy for *Knobel* to fill several pages with expressions from the original Elohistic work, which are neither to be found in the Jehovahistic historical narratives, nor in the general commands of a religious and moral character, by simply collecting together all the names of these particular things. But what does such a collection prove? Nothing further than that the contents of the Pentateuch are very varied, and the same things are not repeated throughout. Could we expect to find beams, pillars, coverings, tapestries, and the vessels of the sanctuary, or priests' dresses and sacrificial objects, mentioned in the ten commandments, or among the rights of Israel (Ex. xx.-xxiii.), or in the laws of marriage and chastity and the moral commandments (Lev. xvii.-xx.)? With the exception of the absence of certain expressions and formulas, which are of frequent occurrence in the covenant statutes, the critics are unable to adduce any other ground for excluding the general religious and moral commandments from the legislation of the so-called original work, than the *a priori* axiom, “The Elohist had respect simply to the theocratic law; and such laws as are introduced in Ex. xxi.-xxiii., in connection with moral and civil life, lay altogether outside his plan.” These are assertions, not proofs. The use of words in the Pentateuch could only furnish conclusive evidence that it had been composed by various authors, if the assertion were a well founded one, that different expressions are employed for the same thing in different parts of the work. But all that has hitherto been adduced in proof of this amounts to nothing more than a few words, chiefly in the early chapters of Genesis; whilst it is assumed at the same time that Gen. ii. 4 sqq. contains a second account of the creation, whereas it simply gives a description of paradise, and a more minute account of the creation of man than is to be found in Gen. i., the difference in the point of view requiring different words.

To this we have to add the fact, that by no means a small number of sections exhibit, so far as the language is concerned, the peculiarities of the two original documents or main sources, and render a division utterly impossible. The critics have therefore found themselves compelled to assume that there was a third or even a fourth source, to which they refer whatever cannot be assigned to the other two. This assumption is a pure offshoot of critical difficulty, whilst the fact itself is a proof that the Pentateuch is founded upon unity of language, and that the differences which occur here and there arise for the most part from the variety and diversity of the actual contents; whilst in a very few instances they may be attributable to the fact that Moses availed himself of existing writings in the composition of the book of Genesis, and in the middle books inserted public documents without alteration in his historical account.

The other proofs adduced, for the purpose of supporting the evidence from language, viz. the frequent *repetitions* of the same thing and the actual *discrepancies*, are even weaker still. No doubt the Pentateuch abounds in repetitions. The longest and most important is the description of the tabernacle, where we have, first of all, the command to prepare this sanctuary given in Ex. xxv.—xxxii., with a detailed description of all the different parts, and all the articles of furniture, as well as of the priests' clothing and the consecration of the priests and the altar; and then again, in Ex. xxxv.—xxxix. and Lev. viii., a detailed account of the fulfilment of these instructions in almost the same words. The holy candlestick is mentioned five times (Ex. xxv. 31—40, xxvii. 20, 21, xxx. 7, 8, Lev. xxiv. 1—4, and Num. viii. 1—4); the command not to eat blood occurs as many as eight times (Gen. ix. 4; Lev. iii. 17, vii. 26, 27, xvii. 10—14; Deut. xii. 16, 23, 24, and xv. 23), and on the first three occasions, at all events, in passages belonging to the so-called original work. Now, if these repetitions have not been regarded by any of the critics, with the exception of *J. Popper*, as furnishing proofs of difference of authorship, what right can we have to adduce other repetitions of a similar kind as possessing any such significance?—But lastly, the critics have involved *themselves* in almost incomprehensible contradictions, through the supposed contradictions in the Pentateuch. Some of them, e.g. *Stähelin* and *Bertheau*, think these discrepancies only apparent, or at least as of such a character that the last editor saw no discrepancies in them, otherwise he would have expunged them. Others, such as *Knobel*

and *Hupfeld*, place them in the foreground, as the main proofs of a plurality of authors; whilst *Hupfeld* especially, by a truly inquisitorial process, has made even the smallest differences into irreconcilable contradictions. Yet, for all that, he maintains that the Pentateuch, in its present form, is a work characterized by unity, arranged and carried out according to a definite plan, in which the different portions are so arranged and connected together, "with an intelligent regard to connection and unity or plan," yea, "dovetailed together in so harmonious a way, that they have the deceptive appearance of a united whole" (*Hupfeld, die Quellen der Genes.* p. 196). In working up the different sources, the editor, it is said, "did not hesitate to make systematic corrections of the one to bring it into harmony with the other," as, for example, in the names Abram and Sarai, which he copied from the original document into the Jehovistic portions before Gen. xvii., because "he would not allow of any discrepancy between his sources in these points, and in fact could not have allowed it without a manifest contradiction, and the consequent confusion of his readers" (p. 198). How then does it square with so intelligent a procedure, to assume that there are irreconcilable contradictions in the work? An editor who worked with so much intelligence and reflection would never have left actual contradictions standing; and modern critics have been able to discover them simply because they judge the biblical writings according to modern notions, and start in their operations from a fundamental opinion which is directly at variance with the revelation of the Bible.

The strength of the opposition to the unity and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch arises much less from the peculiarities of form, which the critics have placed in the foreground, than from the offence which they take at the contents of the books of Moses, which are irreconcilable with the naturalism of the modern views of the world. To the leaders of modern criticism, not only is the spuriousness, or post-Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, an established fact, but the gradual rise of the Mosaic laws in connection with the natural development of the Hebrew people, without any direct or supernatural interposition on the part of God, is also firmly established *a priori* on dogmatical grounds. This is openly expressed by *De Wette* in the three first editions of his Introduction, in which he opens the critical inquiry concerning the Pentateuch with this observation (§ 145): "Many occurrences are opposed to the laws of nature, and presuppose a direct interposition on the part of

God ;” and then proceeds to say, that “if to an educated mind it is a *decided* fact that such miracles have never really occurred, the question arises whether, perhaps, they may have *appeared* to do so to the eye-witnesses and persons immediately concerned ; but to this also we must give a negative reply. And *thus* we are brought to the conclusion that the narrative is not contemporaneous, or derived from contemporaneous sources.” *Ewald* has expressed his naturalistic views, which acknowledge no supernatural revelation from God, in his “History of the People of Israel,” and developed the gradual formation of the Pentateuch from the principles involved in these fundamental views. But just as *De Wette* expressed this candid confession in a much more cautious and disguised manner in the later editions of his Introduction, so have his successors endeavoured more and more to conceal the naturalistic background of their critical operations, and restricted themselves to arguments, the weakness and worthlessness of which they themselves admit in connection with critical questions which do not affect their naturalistic views. So long as biblical criticism is fettered by naturalism, it will never rise to a recognition of the genuineness and internal unity of the Pentateuch. For if the miraculous acts of the living God recorded in it are not true, and did not actually occur, the account of them cannot have come down from eye-witnesses, but can only be myths, which grew up in the popular belief long after the events referred to. And if there is no prophetic foresight of the future produced by the Spirit of God, Moses cannot have foretold the rejection of Israel and their dispersion among the heathen even before their entrance into Canaan, whereas they did not take place till many centuries afterwards.

If, on the other hand, the reality of the supernatural revelations of God, together with miracles and prophecies, be admitted, not only are the contents of the Pentateuch in harmony with its Mosaic authorship, but even its formal arrangement can be understood and scientifically vindicated, provided only we suppose the work to have originated in the following manner. After the exodus of the tribes of Israel from Egypt, and their adoption as the people of Jehovah through the conclusion of the covenant at Sinai, when Moses had been commanded by God to write down the covenant rights (Ex. xxiv. 4, and xxxiv. 27), and then formed the resolution not only to ensure the laws which the Lord had given to the people through his mediation against alteration and distortion, and hand them down to futurity by committing them to writing, but to write down all

the great and glorious things that the Lord had done for His people, for the instruction of his own and succeeding generations, and set himself to carry out this resolution ; he collected together the traditions of the olden time, which had been handed down in Israel from the days of the patriarchs, partly orally, and partly in writings and records, for the purpose of combining them into a preliminary history of the kingdom of God, which was founded by the conclusion of the covenant at Sinai. Accordingly, in all probability during the stay at Sinai, in the five or six months which were occupied in building the tabernacle, he wrote not only the book of Genesis, but the history of the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt and the march to Sinai (Ex. xix.), to which the decalogue, with the book of the covenant (Ex. xx.-xxiii.), is attached, according to that plan of the kingdom of God which had then been fully revealed, or, in other words, from a theocratic point of view. As he had written the covenant rights in a book by the command of God, as a preliminary to the conclusion of the covenant itself (Ex. xxiv. 4), there can be no doubt whatever that he did not merely publish to the people by word of mouth the very elaborate revelation and directions of God concerning the construction of the tabernacle and the apparatus of worship, which he had received upon the mountain (Ex. xxv.-xxx.), as well as all the rest of the laws, but either committed them to writing himself directly after he had received them from the Lord, or had them written out by one of his assistants, and collected together for the purpose of forming them eventually into a complete work. We may make the same assumption with reference to the most important events which occurred during the forty years' journey through the desert, so that, on the arrival of the camp in the steppes of Moab, the whole of the historical and legal materials for the three middle books of the Pentateuch were already collected together, and all that remained to be done was to form them into a united whole, and give them a final revision. The collection, arrangement, and final working up of these materials would be accomplished in a very short time, since Moses had, at all events, the priests and *shoterim* by his side.—All this had probably taken place before the last addresses of Moses, which compose the book of Deuteronomy, so that nothing further remained to be done but to write down these addresses, and append them as a fifth book to the four already in existence. With this the writing of “all the words of this book of the law” was finished, so that the whole book of the law could be handed over in a

complete state to the priests, to be properly taken care of by them (Deut. xxxi. 24 sqq.).

A copy of the song of Moses was added to this written work, in all probability immediately after it had been deposited by the side of the ark of the covenant ; and, after his death, the blessing pronounced upon the tribes before his departure was also committed to writing. Finally, after the conquest of Canaan, possibly on the renewal of the covenant under Joshua, an account of the death of Moses was added to these last two testimonies of the man of God, and adopted along with them, in the form of an appendix, into his book of the law.

END OF VOL. III.

✓

4

Date Due

M 18 '95	RESERVE	
W 15 '95	Kuist	
FACULTY	Bible	
APR 13 '95	SCT 21 77	
AP 18 '95	FACULTY	
My 23 '95		
JUN 23 '95		
	RESERVE	
	Reference Library	
(Kuist)		
Overnight		
Overnight		
FACULTY		
RESERVE		
(Kuist) English		
Bible		
RESERVE		
FACULTY	JUN 15 1995	
	©	



27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

BS1225 .K27 v.3
The Pentateuch



Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library

1 1012 00039 1708