

BS

1255

.B8

2-10-1872

Recd at the Dept. of State
Sept. 4 1833

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. BS Copyright No. 1255

Shelf 4. B8

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Deposited in the
Cabin of the
U. S. Post Clerk
for South West of
New York
Aug 27. 1837

Wm. H. ...
...
...
...
...





QUESTIONS

AND

NOTES

CRITICAL AND PRACTICAL

UPON

THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS;

DESIGNED AS A GENERAL HELP

TO BIBLICAL INSTRUCTION.

BY GEORGE BUSH,
Author of the "Life of Mohammed."

NEW YORK:
PUBLISHED BY JOHN P. HAVEN,
148 NASSAU STREET.

.....
1833.

BS 1255
B8

"Entered, according to Act of Congress, April, in the year 1833,
by JOHN P. HAVEN, in the Office of the Clerk of the Southern Dis-
trict of New York."

1513

SLEIGHT AND VAN NORDEN, PRINT

HLR 3 D 42

LEVITICUS.

INTRODUCTORY.

What is the title of the third book of the Pentateuch, and from what derived?

Ans. According to the usual custom of the Jews in denominating their sacred books, this is termed in their language, 'Vayikra,' and he called, from the Hebrew word with which it commences. But by the Septuagint and the Vulgate the title of *Leviticus* has been given it, and this name has been retained by all the modern versions. It is so called from the fact that it treats principally of the rites and ceremonies, the services and sacrifices, of the religion of the Israelites, the charge of which was committed to the *Levitical* priesthood, that is, to Aaron and his sons, or descendants, who were of the tribe of *Levi*, and who alone of that tribe exercised the priestly office. It is not, therefore, the *ministry of the Levites* properly so called, who constituted a distinct order from the priests, and subordinate to them, that forms the subject of this book, but the peculiar functions of the sacerdotal body; on which account it is sometimes called by the Rabbins, 'The Law of the Priests,' and 'The Law of Offerings.'

How does it appear that Moses was the real author of this book?

Ans. This is proved not only by the general arguments which demonstrate him to have written the whole Pentateuch, but by particular passages in other portions of the scriptures where it is expressly cited as his inspired work. Thus, Nehem. 8. 14. 'And they found written in the law which the Lord had commanded by *Moses*, that the children of Israel should dwell in booths in the feast of the seventh month.' This ordinance is contained Lev. 23. 34, 42. Again it is said of the mother of Jesus, Luke 2. 22, that 'When the days of her purification according to the law of

Moses, were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem; a law which is to be found Lev. 12. 6. Once more, it is said 2 Chron. 30. 16, of the Priests and Levites, that 'they stood in their place, after their manner, according to the law of *Moses*, the man of the Lord; the priests sprinkled of the blood which they received of the hand of the Levites.' This regulation occurs Lev. 1. 5. The true authorship of the book is by these passages put beyond question.

At what time and place was the book written?

This is determined by the words occurring ch. 27. 34, 'These are the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses for the children of Israel in Mount Sinai.' That this is to be understood not only of those laws which were orally promulgated at that time and place, but of those also which were committed to writing, may be inferred from the parallel expression, Num. 36, 13. 'These are the commandments and the judgments which the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses, unto the children of Israel, in the plains of Moab, by Jordan, near Jericho.' As it was in the plains of Moab here mentioned that Moses died, and as the precepts in the book of Numbers could not have been written either prior or subsequent to the period of the sojourn at that station, it is reasonable to conclude that if in one case mention is made of *written* laws, the same is to be understood in the other. So that there is no room to question that this book was written during the encampment of Israel at the foot of Mount Sinai. This is strikingly confirmed by such allusions as the following, indicating that the state of the Israelites at the time, was that of an encampment, instead of a permanent settlement in cities and villages. Lev. 4. 12. 'The whole bullock shall he carry forth *without the camp*.' v. 28. 'And afterward he shall come *into the camp*.' ch. 14. 33. 'And the Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying, *When ye be come* into the land of Canaan which I give to you,' &c. implying that they had not yet arrived there.

How long a period does the history contain?

Archbishop Usher, who is followed by Mr. Horne, supposes that the book comprises the history of the transactions of a single month, viz. from April 21 to May 21, of the year 2514, which answers to the first month of the second year after the departure from Egypt. Others consi-

der it as containing only the account of what passed during the eight days of the consecration of Aaron and his sons. The former is the more generally received, and the more probable opinion.

What may we suppose to have been the leading design of the appointment of the various ceremonies and sacrifices mentioned in this book?

One great end to be attained by the institution of such a burdensome ritual was, that the Israelites, by being so fully occupied with the services of their religion, might be deterred from the idolatry of the surrounding nations, into which, as we learn from their history, they were constantly prone to fall. As they were intended to be the depositories of the true religion, it was all-important that they should be preserved in a state of marked separation from the idolatrous practices of the heathen. Again, the system of the Levitical rites was intended to serve as a 'shadow of good things to come,' pointing to another and fuller dispensation, of which the mere perfect sacrifice of Christ and his ever-during priesthood were to be the main characteristics. These typical ceremonies, therefore, were calculated to enlighten the apprehensions of the Jews, and to prepare them for the reception of the Gospel. Considered in this point of view, the book of Leviticus is particularly valuable to christians, as throwing light upon many passages of the New Testament, especially the Epistle to the Hebrews, which would in fact be unintelligible without it.

What is to be thought of the theory of those who maintain that the Levitical rites were borrowed, in great measure from the sacred usages of the Egyptians?

It has been supposed by some writers of eminence, that the Legislator of the Hebrews in order to avoid too sudden and violent a reformation, was instructed to retain many of the rites to which the Israelites had been familiarized, and attached in Egypt, only altering them so far as to change their object, appropriating them to the service of the true God, and blending them with the rites which originated solely in the divine appointment. But of this hypothesis

it may be said in the language of Mr. Graves;* that 'If the great Jehovah, the moral governor of the world, did in reality separate the Jewish nation to be the depositories of true religion and sound morality, in the midst of an idolatrous world, and for this purpose brought them forth out of Egypt by a series of stupendous and uncontrolled miracles; if he promulgated to them the moral law of the Decalogue, with the most awful display of divine power and majesty; if he established over them, as their form of national government, a Theocracy, which could not be supported without the continued interposition of an extraordinary providence; if he retained them in the wilderness for forty years, to discipline and instruct them, until the entire generation which had been familiarized to the idolatry and corruptions of Egypt had perished; and if he then planted them in the land of Canaan by a supernatural power, driving out before them its inhabitants, or compelling the Jews to exterminate them as a punishment for their inveterate idolatry and its attendant crimes, commanding them carefully to avoid all similar profanation and guilt, under the terror of suffering similar punishment;—if these facts have been established so as to prove that the Jewish law giver was clearly delegated by God to institute a particular form of worship, with a variety of regulations and rites, to preserve the separation of this chosen people from the surrounding nations;—then the supposition that he should borrow any thing from those rites and customs in order to accommodate the prejudices, habits, and propensities of his countrymen, becomes unnecessary in proportion as we more clearly discern that he possessed authority to conciliate attention and enforce obedience without resorting to any such artifice. And if such an expedient was unnecessary, surely its adoption is extremely improbable. Thus to blend divine appointments and human inventions; to degrade the worship of the great Jehovah with the intermixture of rites originally designed to honor the basest idols; to reprobate the whole system of idolatry, all its profanations and crimes, with the most vehement and indiscriminate condemnation, and prohibit any attempts to introduce any part of it under the severest penalties; and yet secretly, as it were, pilfer from it some of its most attractive charms, varnish them with a new

*Lectures on the Pentateuch, p. 177.

coloring, and exhibit them as the genuine features of true religion; this seems altogether irreconcilable with the dignity of an inspired Legislator, and the purity of a divine law, and indeed forms a scheme so jarring and inconsistent, that it appears utterly incredible that it should be adopted by Divine Wisdom!

How does it appear that in the appointment of these rites regard was had to any thing besides the mere external act?

That something, over and above the simple act of slaying and offering the animal victim, was required by the spirit of the law is evident from the fact, that the obedience of the chosen people is frequently represented as faulty, notwithstanding their scrupulous observance of the outward rite. Thus, *Is. 1. 11, 12* 'To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats.' *Is. 66. 3.* 'He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, is as if he cut off a dogs neck; he that offereth an oblation as if he offered swine's blood.' And still more strikingly, *Jer. 7. 22, 23.* 'For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices: but this thing commanded I them, obey my voice &c.' evidently teaching that the mere external act did not satisfy the demands of the ritual law.

CHAPTER I.

From whence did the Lord address Moses, and what general direction did he give him respecting the offerings of the people? v. 1, 2.

'And the Lord called—and spake.' As the cloud of glory now filled the tabernacle and prevented all access to its interior, Moses stood without while an audible voice from the mercy-seat addressed him in the words immediately following. The word 'called,' in the original has the last letter written in smaller character than the rest, intimating, according to the Jews, that God now spake, not with a loud thundering voice, as upon mount Sinai, but in lower and gentler tones, as befitted a milder and more permanent mode of communication.—'Tabernacle of the congregation,' more correctly rendered 'tabernacle of meeting,' or, 'convention-tent,' i. e. the tent or tabernacle where God and his people met at stated times. See note on Ex. 29. 42. Sup. The term implies the meeting of two parties by previous appointment.—'If any man of you bring an offering.' It is to be observed that the writer is here speaking of *voluntary* and not of *stated* offerings; such as private persons might be induced, from the promptings of a grateful and pious spirit, spontaneously to render to the Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor of mankind. The original word here and elsewhere rendered 'offering,' is 'Korban,' derived from the verb 'Kârab,' signifying radically *to approach, to draw near to*, and in what is termed the Hiphil or causative form, *to cause to approach, to bring near, to present*; hence in the Hiphil the verb is generally rendered in our version *to offer*. In accordance with this the noun 'Korban,' is used to denote an 'offering,' or that which was *brought to the altar*, and dedicated to God, whether it were a thing animate or inanimate, a human being or a brute beast. Thus the bread or meat-offering and the oblation of the first fruits, Lev. 2. 1, 12. have the appellation 'Korban' given them: 'And when any man will offer a meat-offering, (meal-offering,) unto the Lord, his offering (Korban,) shall be of fine flour, &c.' So also the silver vessels, cattle, sheep, &c., offered by the princes, Num. 7. 10—17, et inf. are comprehended under the general name of 'Korban.' Nay, the very wood which was used to burn the sacrifices on the altars, Nehem. 10. 34.

from its being *brought* for that purpose is denominated 'Korban.' And what is still more worthy of notice, the same phraseology is employed in reference to the Levites as a consecrated body of men, from their being *brought near* and *presented* to the Lord for the service of the sanctuary: Num. 8. 10. 'And thou *shalt bring* the Levites before the Lord,' i. e. *shalt offer* them as holy persons dedicated to the service of Jehovah. As the verb 'Kârab,' however, in its Hiphil form denotes principally the bare *act of bringing* any thing to a particular place or person, though rendered by the word 'offer' it is to be observed, that when any private individual is said to 'offer' an animal or other oblation, it is to be understood simply of his *bringing it to the altar*, not of his performing any part of the office which was exclusively appropriated to the Priests and Levites.—'Of the herd;' i. e. of oxen or bullocks; exegetical of the preceding term 'cattle.'—'Flock.' This term comprehends both sheep and goats, as is evident from v. 10. It appears, therefore, that there were only five kinds of living creatures which were accepted in sacrifice, viz. of animals: beeves, sheep, and goats, including the young of each kind of eight day's old, Lev. 22. 27.; and of fowls; turtle doves and young pigeons, 1. 14. These being of the most tame, gentle, and harmless species of creatures, as well as the most serviceable to man, were well adapted at once to point out the distinguishing moral attributes of Christ and his people, those 'living sacrifices' which were 'acceptable to God,' and also to intimate man's absolute dependance upon God for those blessings to which he owes his food and raiment, the crowning comforts of life.

What was prescribed in case the offering were a burnt sacrifice? v. 3, 4.

'Burnt sacrifice;' more correctly rendered 'whole burnt-offering.' The prescribed sacrificial offerings are distinguished in Hebrew by two several terms, 'Isheh' and 'Holah,' of which the first being a derivative from 'Ish,' *fire*, denotes an *offering by fire*, and is applied both to offerings *burnt wholly*, and to those *burnt in part*. This word is generally rendered by 'offering by fire.' The word 'Holah,' on the other hand, literally signifying 'ascension,' from 'Hâlâk,' *to ascend*, because these offerings *went up* in flame

and smoke into the air, is applied to sacrifices *wholly burnt*, which the Greeks denominated 'Holocausta' or 'Holocauston,' from which the word 'holocaust' has been transferred into our language. If rendered in English phrase, it should properly be 'whole burnt offering,' whereas by its being generally rendered by our translators 'burnt offering,' the genuine distinction between the original words is hidden from the ordinary reader, as there is no difference between the expression 'burnt offering,' and 'offering by fire.' But let the phrase 'whole burnt offering' be employed, and the distinction is obvious. Every holocaust or 'Holah,' was an 'Isheh,' or '*offering by fire*,' but every 'Isheh,' or *fire offering*, was not a holocaust. It may here be remarked, that the 'whole burnt offering' was the first or principal sacrifice with which God was daily served by his people, Num. 28. 3. no part of it being eaten, but the whole consumed upon the altar. It pointed to the offering of the body of Christ, as is evident from Heb. 10. 10. In Deut. 33. 10. it is rendered 'whole burnt sacrifice.'—'Male without blemish.' Heb. 'Perfect;' i. e. having neither deformity, defect, nor superfluity of members, and free from distemper. Whence the prophet says, Mal. 1. 14. 'Cursed be the deceiver who hath in his flock *a male*, (i. e. a perfect male,) and voweth and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing;' where 'corrupt' is opposed to 'male.' This was a prefiguration of the perfect excellence of the sacrifice of Christ, who was 'a lamb *without blemish* and without spot.' 1 Pet. 1. 19.—'Of his own voluntary will;' rather, 'for his favourable acceptance;' as the phrase is rendered by the Gr. and Chal. confirmed by Lev. 23. 11. where the same term is rendered, 'to be accepted;' and by Jer. 6. 20, 'Your burnt offerings are *not acceptable*,' where the original phrase is the same except that it is preceded by a negative. —'Shall put his hand upon the head.' From Lev. 16. 21, it is probable that by 'hand' here is implied both the hands. The act denoted that the victim offered was thereby wholly given over and devoted to God, being as it were henceforth solemnly *manumitted* from the possession of the offerer, who from this time ceased to claim any farther interest in it or control over it. Whether this imposition of hands implied the transfer of guilt from the offerer to the victim is considered by many as doubtful, inasmuch as the same ceremony was observed in the presentation of the eucharistic or thank offerings mentioned Lev.

3. 2. But as such a transfer in the case of the scape-goat Lev. 16. 21, is unequivocally taught, it can scarcely be questioned that the same thing was taught by the like rite in other cases.—‘To make atonement.’ The original Hebrew word ‘Câphar’ signifies primarily *to cover*; not so much, however, in the sense of *wrapping* as with a garment, as in that of *smearing* or *plaistering*, it being applied Gen. 6. 14, to the act of *coating* the ark *with pitch*. Its radical sense, therefore, is rather that of an *adhesive* than a *loose covering*. From this primary notion of *covering* it came to be applied by metaphorical usage to the appeasing of anger, or to that act of an offending party by which he succeeds in procuring favour and forgiveness from the person or party offended. In this sense it is applied to the *appeasing* of an angry countenance, Gen. 32. 20, ‘For he said, I will *appease* him, (Heb. will *cover* his face,) with the present,’ 2 Sam. 21. 3, ‘What shall I do for you, and wherewith shall I *make the atonement*, (Heb. *cover*)?’ Prov. 16. 14, ‘The wrath of a king is as messengers of death, but a wise man will *pacify* it, (Heb. will *cover* it).’ Its predominant usage is in relation to the *reconciliation* effected between God and sinners, in which sense *atonement for sin* is the *covering* of sin, or the securing the sinner from punishment. Thus when sin is pardoned, or its consequent calamity removed, the sin or person may be said to be *covered*, *made safe*, *expiated*, or *atoned*. Accordingly we find the pardon of sin expressly called the *covering of sin*, Nehem. 4. 4, 5, ‘Our God give them for a prey in the land of captivity, and *cover* not their iniquity, and let not their sin be blotted out from before thee.’ Ps. 32. 1, ‘Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is *covered*.’ Ps. 85. 2, ‘Thou hast brought back the captivity of Jacob; thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people; thou hast *covered* all their sin.’ All such expiatory offerings pointed directly to Christ, who is the *grand atonement* or *reconciliation* for the sins of men. Dan. 9. 24. 1 John 2. 2. Heb. 10. 8, 10. The burnt offering, it is to be observed, had not, like the sin-offering, respect to any *particular* sin, but was designed to make atonement for sin in general.

What was commanded in reference to slaying

the victim, sprinkling the blood, and consuming the parts? v. 5—9.

‘And he shall kill.’ Gr. ‘And they shall kill;’ implying that this should be done by the Priests and Levites, as is to be inferred from 2 Chron. 30. 17. and 35. 10, 11.—‘Before the Lord;’ i. e. in the open space of the court-yard fronting the tabernacle, in which the Schechinah or cloud of glory, the symbol of the divine presence, rested over the ark of the covenant. This is the general import of the phrase ‘before the Lord’ throughout this book, and in numerous other passages of scripture.—‘Shall sprinkle the blood.’ The act of sprinkling the blood was, during every period of the Mosaic economy, exclusively the prerogative of the priesthood. It was in the effusion of blood which is the *life*, that the virtue of the sacrifice consisted, it being always understood that *life* went to redeem *life*. It was calculated and probably designed to remind the offerer that he deserved to have his own blood shed for his sins, and alluded moreover to the pacifying and purifying of the blood of Jesus shed for us for the remission of sins.—‘Shall flay;’ i. e. shall see that it be flayed, or divested of the skin, not by his own agency, but by the ministry of the Priests and Levites, as before in respect to the killing.—‘Cut it into his pieces;’ i. e. into its natural pieces, such as head, breast, legs, &c. It was not to be confusedly mangled, and the parts heedlessly jumbled together, but decently and carefully separated into its various members and portions, and then laid in a regular manner upon the altar. It is supposed to be in allusion to this ceremony, that the apostle speaks, 2 Tim. 2. 15, of *rightly dividing*, (Gr. *Orthotomounta*,) the word of truth; implying that the truths of revelation were not to be dealt out in a loose, incoherent, disorderly manner, but rather according to a regular methodical plan; not as a rhapsody, but as a system.—‘Shall put fire.’ The fire upon the altar at first came down from heaven, but it was the duty of the Levites to see that it was continually fed with fuel, and not suffered to be extinguished; so that by ‘putting fire upon the altar,’ in this place is probably meant, the supplying the necessary quantity of wood.—‘An offering made by fire, of a sweet savour.’ Heb. ‘A fire-offering, an odour of rest;’ or as the Gr. renders it, ‘A sacrifice for a sweet smelling savour;’ which words the apostle plainly had in view in writ-

ing Eph. 5. 2. 'Christ hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.' Hence we learn that the *holocaust*, or *whole burnt offering*, typified the sacrifice and death of Christ for the sins of the world. See note on Gen. 8. 20, 21. Chal. 'Which shall be received with favourable acceptance before the Lord.'

What were the ceremonies prescribed in case his offering were of the flocks? v. 10—13.

'Of the flocks.' In the divine requirement of the various oblations the circumstances of the offerers were kindly consulted. The less wealthy, who could not so well afford to offer a bullock, would bring a sheep or a goat; and those who were not able to do that were expected to bring a turtle-dove or a young pigeon. Thus it appears that the parents of our Lord, from their humble circumstances in life, brought this latter kind of offering upon the purification of Mary, Luke, 2. 23—25.—'On the side of the altar northward.' If the victims had been slain on the east of the altar, where the ashes were cast, it might have obstructed the entrance to the court; on the south was the ascent to the altar, and on the west, the tabernacle; so that the north was on all accounts the most convenient quarter for this purpose, not only for the slaughter of the sheep, but also of all the other animals offered.

What was the prescribed ceremony where the offering was of fowls? v. 14—17.

'Turtle-doves and young pigeons.' From the Heb. 'Tor,' comes the Latin 'Turtur,' and the English 'Turtle,' generally rendered 'Turtle-dove.' By a beautiful metaphor this bird is made by the Psalmist to denote the church: Ps. 74. 19. 'O deliver not the soul of thy *turtle-dove* unto the multitude of the enemies.' And Solomon, Cant. 2. 12, mentions the return of this bird as one of the indications of spring; 'the voice of the *turtle* is heard in our land.' Young pigeons (Heb. 'sons of the dove,') were thought preferable for food to the old, whereas the full grown turtle-dove was accounted more delicious than the young. The sacrifice was ordered accordingly.—'Wring off his head.' The original term occurs only here and Lev. 5. 8, so that we are chiefly depen-

dent upon the ancient versions for its genuine sense. The Sept. renders it by 'Apoknizo,' to cut with the nail. It probably means to make a *section* or *cut* in the head by pinching it with the fingers and nails, so that the blood might distil from the wound. In this case the head was not actually separated from the body, an idea which would seem to be confirmed by Lev. 5. 8, where it is said that the priest should 'wring off his head (Heb 'cut with the nail') but should not divide it asunder;' i. e. should not entirely separate any one part from another. Though translated 'wring,' it is to be observed that it is wholly a different word in the original form that rendered 'wring' in the close of the verse.—'With his feathers;' or 'with the filth thereof;' the latter undoubtedly the true rendering, as in the Heb. the pronominal suffix for 'his' is in the feminine gender necessarily referring to 'crop' and not to 'bird.' The drift of the precept is to order that the crop or maw with its contents should be cast away.

HEADS OF PRACTICAL REFLECTION.

- V. 1. God, in his wisdom, has seen fit, for the most part to address his creatures through the intervention of mediators; and though the *moral* law was spoken in thunder and lightning from Sinai, the *ceremonial* law, pointing to the great gospel sacrifice, was given in a milder voice from the mercy seat.
- V. 2. Those sacrifices and offerings are peculiarly acceptable to God, which are prompted rather by voluntary impulse than by legal precept.
- V. 2. Although the light of nature alone may suggest to man the *duty* of worshipping the Creator, yet the *proper mode* of rendering him homage is not left to human invention, but is matter of divine revelation.
- V. 3. It is fit that the offerings which are designed for the greatest and best of Beings, the infinitely perfect Jehovah, should be the best, and most perfect of their kind. 'A male without blemish.'
- V. 4. In all our religious services and sacrifices our faith should aim to lay its hand upon the head of the one great Atoning Victim for sin. Failing of this our offerings are of little worth.

V. 5. Were it not for the solution afforded in the gospel, what an inexplicable mystery would be the whole Jewish ritual! How strange the fact that the temple of God should so much resemble a slaughter-house!

V. 9. How precious in the estimation of the Most High must be the merit of Christ's sacrifice, that it should avail to convert the nauseous odor of burning flesh to a perfumed and refreshing incense!

CHAPTER II.

What was the law of the meat offering? v. 1-3.

'And when any will offer.' Heb. 'And a soul when it shall offer;' i. e. a person or man. See note on Gen. 2. 7. as to the scriptural import of the word soul. The English idiom is precisely similar. Thus we say that such a place contains so many thousand *souls*; and in such a battle, so many *souls* perished. Shakespeare also speaks of a ship swallowed in the sea, and the 'freighting *souls*' within her.—'Meat-offering.' Heb. 'Minchah,' a *gift-offering*, or *donative*, implying originally, any kind of *oblation* or *present* made either to God or man. Thus, Gen. 32. 13, 'And he (Jacob) took of that which he had with him a *present* (Heb. Minchah) for Esau his brother.' Gen. 43. 11. 'And their father Israel said unto them—take of the best fruits of the land in your vessels, and carry down the man a *present* (Minchah).' But the present made by Jacob to Esau was of *living things*, viz. cattle, whereas that carried to Joseph was of things that had *not life*. In like manner both the offering of Cain, which was of the *fruits of the earth*, and that of Abel, which was of the *firstlings of the flock*, are each of them called 'Minchah,' Gen. 4. 3-5. So that the word in its general import, does imply things *slain* as well as things *not slain*, although some commentators have maintained the contrary. But in ordinary usage, its meaning was restricted to an offering *made of fine flour*, whether of wheat or barley. The common rendering of the term in the English bible by 'meat-offering' is incorrect according to the modern acceptance of the word 'meat,' which is now applied exclusively to *flesh*, although at the

time when our translation was made it appears to have denoted very nearly the same as the word 'food.' A more suitable rendering therefore at the present day would be 'meal-offering,' 'flour-offering,' or even 'bread-offering,' as the flour before it was offered was generally, though not in the present case, made into thin cakes or wafers, or something very nearly resembling bread.—'Shall pour oil upon it;' to give it a grateful relish, making it more palatable to the priests, who were to eat part of it; v. 3. Oil was to the food of the Israelites what butter is to ours.—'And put frankincense;' in order to cause a sweet smell in the court of the tabernacle, which would otherwise have been offensive in consequence of the vast quantities of flesh burnt there. The incense seems also to have had a typical allusion to the prayers of the saints which are to be connected with the exercise of faith in the great propitiatory sacrifice of the gospel. Rev. 8. 3, 4. 'And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer, and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angels hand.'—'Shall take thereout his handfull.' Heb. 'Shall gather up with the hand.' Of this meal-offering a part only, that is to say, about an handful, was burnt, the rest being reserved for the priests' use; but all the frankincense was burnt because from it the priest could not derive no advantage. This portion was termed a 'memorial' being designed as it were, to put God in mind of his covenant or promise to accept the service of his people, rendered to him according to his commandment. In allusion to this it is said, Ps. 20. 'The Lord remember all thy offerings and accept thy burnt sacrifices.' Acts, 14. 4, 'Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God.'

What was commanded in case the meal-offering had been prepared by baking in the different modes specified? v. 4. 10.

'Baken in the oven.' Heb. 'Of the baking of the oven. Maimonides says it was kneaded and baked within the sanctuary, though the wheat was ground and sifted without. This is confirmed by Ezek. 46. 20, 'This is the place where

the priests shall boil the trespass-offering, and sin-offering, where they shall *bake* the meal-offering.' The original word for 'oven' (Tannoor) probably denotes such a kind of oven as is still in use among the Arabs. This is a large stone vessel resembling a pitcher in which a fire is made, and when sufficiently heated the flour and water after being mingled together and formed into a paste, is spread with the hand over the outside of the vessel. It is baked instantly, and the bread comes off in thin fine pieces like our wafers. An oven of this kind for the purposes of the sanctuary probably stood in the court of the tabernacle.—'Unleavened cakes.' Heb. 'Cakes of unleavenednesses;' an intensitive mode of expression equivalent to 'altogether unleavened.'—'Mingled with oil.' The oil was mingled in kneading instead of being poured on after the bread was baked.—'Baken in a pan.' Heb. 'On a plate;' i. e. on an iron plate of a flat smooth surface, answering to the griddle of modern times. It differed according to Maimonides from the frying pan, afterward mentioned, in having no lip or rim around its edge to prevent the dough from running off, while the 'frying-pan,' designed for baking a thin kind of paste or butter, was furnished with such an appurtenance.—'Shall burn it.' Heb. 'Shall reduce it to fume or vapor; shall evaporate it;' as in the burning of incense. See the original term explained in the note on Ex. 29. 10—14.—'A thing most holy.' Heb. 'A holiness of holinesses.'

What prohibition was made in respect to these offerings? v. 11.

'No leaven, nor any honey;' i. e. as it should seem, neither *sour* nor *sweet*; nothing of the fermenting kind, which would have an unkindly effect, when eaten, upon the animal economy. Perhaps there may have been also a *moral* design in regard to both, the one denoting *hypocrisy*, the other *sensual gratification*.

What was the law of the oblation of the first fruits? v. 12.

'Them,' i. e. leaven and honey. They might be offered with the first fruits, but were forbidden to be offered upon the altar.

What was commanded as an unfailing accompaniment of every species of oblation? v. 13.

‘Seasoned with salt.’ Salt is the opposite to leaven, as it preserves from putrefaction and corruption, and was therefore used to signify the *purity* and *persevering fidelity* necessary in the worshippers of God. It was called the ‘salt of the covenant,’ because as salt was incorruptible, so was the covenant and promise of Jehovah, which on this account is called 2 Chron. 13 5, ‘a covenant of salt;’ i. e. an everlasting covenant.

What was to be the offering of the first-fruits, and what the ceremonies of its presentation? v. 14—16.

‘Ears of corn dried by the fire.’ They dried them in the fire in the green ear, because that otherwise from their moisture they would not admit of being ground in a mill.

HEADS OF PRACTICAL REFLECTION.

V. 3. ‘The remnant of the meat-offering shall be Aaron’s.’ In every dispensation God has evinced a kind concern for the maintenance of those who were devoted to ministry in sacred things. Those who labor in the word are to be competently supported. ‘Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? And they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar. Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.’ 1 Cor. 9. 13, 14.

V. 5. ‘When it is presented unto the priest.’ As none of the ancient sacred offerings were to be presented *immediately* to God, but were first put into the hand of the priest, and through him offered upon the altar, so spiritual sacrifices under the Gospel are not available in the sight of God unless tendered to him through Jesus Christ, the great High Priest of the New Testament.

V. 11. Especial care is to be taken not only that our religious services be cleansed from the leaven of hypocrisy, but that they be thoroughly pervaded by the ‘salt’ of grace.

Col. 4. 6, 'Let your speech be always with salt, seasoned with grace.' Mark, 9. 49, 'Every sacrifice shall be seasoned with salt.'

V. 14. If the 'first-fruits' of the harvest field were of old so peculiarly acceptable to God, how much more must he be pleased now with the first-fruits of the Spirit, and the expressions of an early piety in the young. The 'green ears' of youthful devotion will naturally be followed by the ripened sheaves of a godly old age, and in this form gathered into the garner of eternal life.

CHAPTER III.

What was the law of the peace-offerings provided it was of the herd? v. 1—5.

'His oblation.' Heb. 'His korban;' i. e. his gift. Gr. 'His gift unto the Lord.' See Mark, 7. 11. 'Sacrifice of peace-offering. Heb. 'Shelâmim,' from 'Shâlam' to make up, make good, restore, repay, and thence to make up a difference, to effect a reconciliation, to be at peace. A 'sacrifice of peace-offerings' therefore is properly a 'sacrifice of pay-offerings, of requitals, of retributions, or pacifications,' and was offered (1). Upon the recovery of peace with God in consequence of an expiation for some sin committed; Hos. 14. 2. (2). As an expression of thanksgiving for mercies received; Lev. 7. 12. Judg. 20. 26. 1 Chron. 21. 26. (3). On the performance of a vow, as Ps. 56. 13, 'Thy vows are upon me, O God; I will render praises (Heb. 'will repay confessions') unto thee.' Prov. 7. 14, 'I have peace-offerings with me (Heb. 'peace-offerings are (were) upon me,' i. e. the obligation of peace-offerings); this day have I paid my vows.' This kind of peace-offering being vowed on condition that a particular mercy were bestowed, was performed after the condition was granted. By the Greek the original word is rendered here and elsewhere a 'sacrifice of salvation (or safety);' though sometimes by 'Eireneke,' 'a pacifying or peace-offering;' and by the Chal. a 'sacrifice of sanctities, (or sanctifications),' probably because none but clean and sanctified persons were permitted to eat of it; Lev. 7. 19, 20. Sol. Jarchi, a Jewish

Commentaror, says they are called *peace-offerings*, 'because they bring peace into the world, and because by them there is peace to the altar, to the priests, and to the owners.' This, however, is rather the effect of the expiatory than of the eucharistic offerings.—'Male or female.' In this respect the *peace-offering* differed from the *holocaust*, or *whole burnt-offering*, in which a *male* only was allowed.—'Shall lay his hand.' The imposition of hands in this case differed from the same ceremony in the sacrifice of the holocaust in this, that over the head of the *peace-offering* there was no confession of sins, but merely the uttering of praise and supplication to God.—'Shall offer of the sacrifice;' i. e. part of the *peace-offering*; for of this sacrifice one part, viz. the fat pieces, the kidneys, the caul, &c. was to be burnt; a second consisting of the breast and the right shoulder was reserved for the priest; while all the remainder was appropriated to the offerer, to be eaten by him, his family and friends in a sacrificial feast.—'The fat;' or, 'the suet.' The design of this part of the ceremony may be understood in either of the ways following. (1). As the 'fat' of any thing is sometimes but another name for its *best* or *choicest* part, (see note on Gen. 4. 4), and as the 'fat' was deemed the most valuable part of the animal, it was offered in preference to all other parts, implying that the best of every thing was to be offered to God. (2). As, however, the term is used in other cases to denote the dullness, hardness, and unbelief of the heart, Ps. 119. 70. Acts, 28. 27. it may here signify the consuming of our corruptions by the fire of the Holy Spirit. The 'kidneys' also, the supposed seat of some of the strongest of the sensual propensities, were burnt probably to teach the duty of the mortification of our members which are upon earth, fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, &c. Col. 3. 5.—'Upon the burnt-offering;' i. e. laying it on the altar after the daily offering of the lamb, which always had the precedence.

What was the direction given in relation to the *peace-offering* in case it were of the flock? v. 6—
12.

'Of the flock.' 'Peace-offerings,' says Maimonides, 'are brought of sheep, of goats, and of beeves, male or female,' and great or small; but no fowl is brought for a *peace-*

offering.' The reason of this exception was that fowls had not fat enough to be burnt upon the altar.—'Whole rump.' Heb. 'The perfect or entire tail;' which in the sheep of Syria and other oriental countries, is often very fat and large, not unfrequently weighing as much as twelve or fifteen pounds. Travellers affirm that in order to ease the animal, and to preserve the wool from being draggled in the dirt, or torn by bushes and stones, pieces of thin board are fixed to the under part of the tail, which are sometimes furnished with small wheels.—'The food of the offering.' Heb. 'The head of the offering;' i. e. the *flesh* thus offered was to be considered as the *aliment* of the fire upon the altar. Whence we find such offerings termed the *bread* of God, Num. 28. 2. Ezek. 44. 7. And the priests who burnt them are said to offer 'the *bread* of their God,' Lev. 21. 6, 8, 17, and the holy things which they ate is called by the same name, Lev. 21. 22.

What was commanded provided the offering were a goat? v. 12—17.

'Shall offer thereof.' Heb. 'Shall offer of it;' i. e. a part of it—the part which he immediately goes on to specify, viz. the fat, the kidneys, the caul, &c.—'That ye eat neither fat nor blood.' This prohibition respecting the eating of *fat* is to be understood of the fat of such animals as were offered to God in sacrifice, and not of others, although the Jews, we believe, interpret it of all fat without exception. But the contrary is to be gathered from Lev. 7. 2, 'Ye shall eat of no manner of fat of ox, or of sheep, or of goat;' implying that the fat of other animals might be eaten. As to *blood*, however, the probability is, although the Rabinnical writers maintain that that of locusts, fishes, &c, was lawful, that it was intended to be universally forbidden. The prohibition in Gen. 9. 4, is absolute and unqualified; 'Flesh with the *blood* thereof shall ye not eat.' The reasons of the prohibition doubtless were (1). To put a difference between the chosen people and Gentile idolaters who used to drink the blood of their sacrifices; Ps. 16. 4, 'Their sorrows shall be multiplied that hasten after another God: their *drink-offerings of blood* will I not offer.' (2). To restrain any tendency to the acquisition of a cruel and sanguinary disposition. (3). To inspire respect and reverence for that which was intended to represent the precious blood of Christ, in which the virtue of his atonement was to consist.

HEADS OF PRACTICAL REFLECTION.

- V. 1. As the highest recompense which God requires for his benefits towards us is the tribute of a grateful heart, he that withholds this clearly proves himself unworthy of the least of heaven's mercies.
- V. 1. A cordial thank-offering to God should ever follow the attainment of any lawful object upon which our hearts have been set.

CHAPTER. IV.

Concerning what was Moses next commanded to speak to the children of Israel? v. 1, 2.

'Shall sin through ignorance against any of the commandments.' Heb. 'Shall sin through inadvertently erring from any of the commandments.' The true construction is, not 'sinning against,' but 'erring from,' as the phraseology in the original is in effect the same with that in Ps. 119. 10. 'Let me not *wander from thy commandments.*' 'Through ignorance;' i. e. unadvisedly, unwittingly, unawares. The Heb. 'Shegâgâh,' here used, comes from 'Shâgâh, *to go astray, to err, to transgress through mistake, ignorance, or inadvertency.* In the Greek, it is sometimes rendered by 'Agnoia,' *ignorance*, but here, and frequently elsewhere, by 'Akousios,' *unwittingly*, the exact opposite to 'Ekousios,' *willingly or wilfully*, occurring Heb. 10. 26, and opposite also to what the law, Num. 15. 57, 30, terms *sinning with a high hand, or presumptuously*. The import of the term is fully disclosed, Num. 35. 11, where mention is made of 'killing a person *unawares*;' Heb. 'Shegâgâh, *by error, unwittingly*, which, in the parallel passage, Deut. 19. 14, is expressed by *ignorantly*, or literally, *without knowledge*; both which terms, for greater explicitness, are joined together in Josh. 20. 3. 'The slayer that killeth any person *unawares* (and *unwittingly*)' Heb. 'by error (and without knowledge)' which is also opposed to a 'lying in wait,' i. e. with a set purpose and intention to kill; Deut. 19. 11. Ex. 21. 13. The Apostle, Heb. 9. 7, denominates such sins 'Agnoemata,' *ignorances, or ignorant trespasses*, more fully explained, Heb. 5. 3, by two

distinct words, where he speaks of the duty of priests 'to have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way.' These ignorances or errors therefore occurred when any one, through not knowing, or forgetting, or not duly heeding the law, and impelled rather by a casual infirmity, than by a settled intention, committed some foul act, which God had forbidden. In such cases, as soon as the transgression came to the knowledge of the offender, he was required to offer the sacrifice here prescribed; and not to think that ignorance or inadvertency was an excuse for his sin. But he, on the other hand, who sinned presumptuously, and with an avowed contempt of the law and the law-maker, was to be cut off, and *there remained no sacrifice for the sin*, Heb. 10. 26, 27.—'Shall do against any of them.' Heb. 'Shall do of (any) one of them.'

What was the law of the sin-offering for a priest?
v. 3—10.

'The priest that is anointed;' i. e. the high priest, as he only, after the first institution of the priesthood, was *anointed* upon his entrance into office. See note on Ex. 40. 12—16.—'Sin according to the sin of the people;' or, Heb. 'Sin to the guilt of the people;' i. e. so as to cause the people to transgress and bring guilt upon themselves, by emboldening them in iniquity by his pernicious example, or involving them, in virtue of the intimate relation subsisting between priest and people, in the consequences of his guilt. Thus 1 Chron. 21. 3. 'Why then doth my Lord require this thing?' 'Why will he bring a *cause of trespass* to Israel,' where the word rendered 'cause of trespass,' is the same with that occurring here, and rendered sin.' Gr. 'So that the people sin.' Vulg. 'So as to make the people to offend.' Chazkuni, a Jewish commentator, explains it thus; 'To make the people guilty, in that he hath taught and permitted them to do a thing forbidden.'—'For a sin-offering;' Heb. 'For a sin;' the same word with that occurring a line or two above, called 'a sin-offering,' from the Gr. 'Peri amartias,' i. e. 'Thusia peri amartias,' a *sacrifice for sin*, because the sin was confessed over the victim, and laid, as it were, upon its head. A similar phraseology is met with in the New Test. where it is said of Christ, that God made him to be *sin* for us, who knew no sin; i. e. made him to be a *sin-*

offering for us. So also Heb. 10, 6. 'In burnt-offerings and (sacrifices) for sin. ('Peri amartias') 'thou hast no pleasure;' quoted from Ps. 40. 6, where the original word for 'sin' is rendered in the Sept. by 'Phosphora,' offering. The same phraseology occurs elsewhere in the sacred writers, in instances too numerous to mention.—'Before the veil of the sanctuary;' Heb. 'The veil of holiness!' Gr. 'The holy veil;' by which is meant the veil that separated the holy from the most holy place, called in Heb. 9. 3, 'the second veil.'—'Shall pour all the blood;' i. e. all that is left after the sprinkling. It could not be absolutely *all*, but the quantity of blood sprinkled in the sanctuary was so small, that the remainder might, without impropriety, be termed the whole.

What was to be done with the skin, the flesh, the entrails, &c. of the slain bullock? v. 11—12.

'Without the camp.' This precept has a primary reference to the state of the Israelites during their wandering in the wilderness. After their settlement in Canaan and the erection of the Temple at Jerusalem, they carried them out of the city. The sacrifice, now considered as having the sin of the priest transferred from himself to it, by his confession and imposition of hands, was become unclean and abominable, and was carried as it were out of God's sight. The ceremony, therefore, was strikingly significant of the sinfulness of this sin, and of the availableness of the atonement.—'Where the ashes are poured out.' Heb. 'At the pouring out of the ashes.' There were two places where the ashes were poured, one by the side of the altar where they were first laid, of which mention is made Lev. 1. 16; the other, without the precincts of the camp, to which, as to a general receptacle, the ashes and other refuse matter of the camp was conveyed. The publicity here given to the burning of the sin-offering of the priest, might be intended to convey a deeper impression of the enormity of his sin compared with that of the common people, although the same thing was commanded in case the whole congregation had sinned. There was, therefore, a peculiar reproach attached to this sacrifice, from the offence upon which it was founded.

How is this ceremony alluded to by the Apostle ?
 Heb. 13. 11—14.

What was the law of the sin-offering prescribed
 for the whole congregation ? v. 13—21.

‘If the whole congregation of Israel sin through ignorance.’ This probably refers to some oversight in acts of religious worship, or to some transgression of the letter of the law committed, not presumptuously, but heedlessly, as in the case mentioned 1 Sam. 14, 32; where, after smiting the Philistines, the Israelites ‘flew upon the spoil, and took sheep, and oxen, and calves, and slew them on the ground : and the people did eat them with the blood.’ This was a congregational sin. The sacrifices and rites in this case were the same as in the preceding ; only here the elders laid their hands on the head of the victim, in the name of all the congregation.—‘And the thing be hid from the eyes of the assembly ;’ i. e. they are not, for the present, sensible of their error ; referring to something sinful, into which they had fallen upon the presumption of its being lawful, but which subsequent reflection or instruction showed to be otherwise.—‘The elders shall lay their hands.’ Not the priests in this case, but the heads and magistrates of the nation, who were seventy in number. As all the people could not lay their hands upon the bullock, it was sufficient that it were done by the elders, or a part of them, in the name of the congregation. Maimonides says, that the number of elders that officiated on this occasion was three. This act denoted the faith of the people in a coming Messiah, ‘upon whom the Lord will lay the *iniquity of us all.*’ Is. 53. 6.

What was required when a ruler sinned through
 ignorance ? v. 22—66:

‘When a ruler.’ Heb. ‘Nasi,’ *prince;* i. e. *one preferred, elevated, or advanced* above others, from ‘Nâsâh, *to lift up.* It is a common appellation both of supreme and subordinate rulers, and is very frequently used to signify *the head of a tribe.* The Jews understand it peculiarly of the *head or prince of the great Sanhedrim,* who was the king himself, while they were under kingly government ; but it seems more reasonable to understand it of all the great officers or

magistrates; any one who held any kind of political dignity among the people.—‘And is guilty,’ or, if his sin come to his knowledge;’ i. e. if he is presently reminded of it by the checks of his own conscience, or if after a time it be suggested to him by others. The ceremonies in this case differed from those in the case of the offering of the anointed priest, inasmuch as the blood of the ruler’s sin-offering was not to be brought into the tabernacle, but was all to be bestowed upon the brazen altar, nor was the flesh of it to be burnt without the camp; which intimated that the sin of a ruler, though worse than that of a common person was not so heinous as of that of the high priest, or of the whole congregation.—‘Put it upon the horns of the altar.’ In every sacrifice for sin the horns of one or other of the altars were required to be touched with the blood, but with this difference, that in the sacrifice for the sins of the high priest and the people, when the blood of the victim was brought into the sanctuary, the horns of the altar of incense were sprinkled, in others, those of the altar of holocaust.

What was ordered in respect to the sin-offering of the common people? v. 27—35.

‘If any one of the common people.’ Heb. ‘If one soul of the people of the land;’ i. e. any of the common people, whether Israelite, Priest, or Levite, with the exception of the High Priest and ruler mentioned above.—‘A kid of the goats.’ This was the ordinary sacrifice prescribed on such occasions; but when the poverty of the offerer prevented such an oblation, one of less value was appointed; Lev. 5. 11, 12. The ceremonies were nearly the same as in the preceding cases; v. 35.—‘According to the offerings;’ or, Heb. ‘Upon, with, or beside the offerings made by fire;’ i. e. in addition to the burnt-offerings which were daily consumed upon the altar. As for the flesh or bodies of this and the foregoing sin-offering of the rulers, they were not, like those of the high priest and the congregation, burnt without the camp, but were eaten by the priests, as directed, Lev. 6. 26—30.

HEADS OF PRACTICAL REFLECTION.

- V. 2. Sins of ignorance, though of less guilt than sins of presumption, do as really need the blood of atonement, and as truly form the matter of repentance, as any others.
- V. 2. From the fact that greater sacrifices and more burdensome rites were appointed for the priest and the prince than for private persons, it is evident that the sins of some men are of a more heinous character, more scandalous and pernicious, than those of others. Persons occupying a public station, which makes them conspicuous, cannot sin with impunity, however it may be with others.
- V. 13. As there might be among the people of Israel a sin of the whole congregation, so at the present time there may be a sin of the whole nation, which needs, as it were, a national atonement.
- V. 28. 'If his sin come to his knowledge.' Whenever conscience charges upon us former sins committed, whether against God or man, we are bound to make restitution, though years may have elapsed since the event occurred.

CHAPTER. V.

What is the general subject treated of in this chapter?

Ans. The trespass offering; a species of offerings which were not required of the people as a body, but which were to be offered by individuals who through ignorance, mistake, or want of reflection had neglected some of the ceremonial precepts of Moses, or some of those natural laws which had been adopted into that code, and sanctioned with the penalty of death; and who were subsequently conscious of their error. The precise distinction between the trespass offering and the sin offering has never been satisfactorily settled.

What is said concerning the person who should conceal the truth when sworn as witness before the magistrate? v. 1.

'Hear the voice of swearing.' Heb. 'Voice of adjuration, execration, oath, or curse;' i. e. when one is adjured or put

upon his oath as a witness in court. The precept does not, we suppose, relate to the duty of informing against a common swearer, but to the case of one who is summoned to give evidence before the civil magistrate. Judges, among the Jews, had power to adjure not only the witnesses but the person suspected, (contrary to the criminal jurisprudence of modern times, which requires no man to accuse himself,) as appears from the high priest's adjuring our Savior, who thereupon answered, though he had before been silent, Mat. 26. 63, 64. So the apostle says, 1 Thess. 5. 27, 'I charge (adjure,) by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren.' Now if a person 'heard the voice of swearing,' i. e. if he were adjured by an oath of the Lord to testify what he knew in relation to any matter of fact in question, and yet through fear or favour refused to give evidence, or gave it but in part, he was to 'bear his iniquity;' i. e. to bear the punishment of his iniquity, if he repented not and brought not the appointed sacrifices. It seems to be implied that such an one should be considered in the sight of God as guilty of the transgression which he has endeavoured to conceal, as may be inferred from Prov. 29. 24, 'Whoso is partner with a thief, hateth his own soul: he heareth cursing and bewrayeth it not;' i. e. he hears the words of the magistrate adjuring him, and binding his soul under the penalty of a 'curse' to declare the whole truth, yet he 'bewrayeth,' or uttereth, it not; he persists in wickedly stifling his evidence and concealing the facts; surely such an one is a 'partner' with the culprit, and by exposing himself to the consequences of thus withholding the truth, may be justly said to hate his own soul.'—'Whether he hath seen or known it;' i. e. whether it be a matter which has come under his own personal knowledge, or which he has learnt from the information of others. The spirit of the precept seems to require a *voluntary* rendering of testimony when it was known that information was sought, as well as a true and faithful declaration when summoned by legal process.

What is declared respecting a soul or person who should touch any unclean thing? v. 2.

'Any unclean thing;' i. e. either the *dead* body of a *clean* animal, or the *living* or *dead* body of an *unclean* creature. All such persons were required to wash themselves and their

clothes in clean water, and were considered as unclean until evening, Lev. 11. 8, 24, 31.—‘If it be hidden;’ i. e. if he be not aware of the uncleanness which he has contracted, and goes on to do those things which he would not be at liberty to do, provided he were conscious of his defilement, such as entering the tabernacle or eating of holy things, then when he comes to be acquainted with the fact he shall look upon himself as ‘unclean,’ just as if he had knowingly touched the unclean thing, and also as ‘guilty,’ that is, under obligation to bring the sacrifice prescribed, v. 6.

For what other cases did the same rule apply?
v. 3, 4.

‘Whatsoever uncleanness it be that a man shall be defiled withal.’ Heb. ‘According to all his uncleanness that he shall be unclean withal.’ These different kinds of uncleanness are afterwards specified in detail, Lev. ch. 11—15.—‘If a soul swear, pronouncing with his lips to do evil or to do good;’ i. e. when a man swears rashly that he will or will not do such and such a thing, as David, that he would kill Nabal; Jephthah, that he would sacrifice to the Lord whatsoever should meet him coming out of his doors, &c. The original word ‘Battâ,’ rendered *pronounce*, has the import of *rashly, inconsiderately, or foolishly uttering any thing*, as may be seen, Ps. 106. 33, where it is said of Moses that ‘he spake unadvisedly, (Heb. “Yebatta,”) with his lips.’ So Prov. 12. 18, ‘There is that speaketh, (Heb. “Boteh,”) *speaketh rashly,*) like the piercings of a sword.’ Thus also Num. 30. 6, 8, the phrase, ‘uttered ought with her lips,’ is in Heb. ‘Mibta,’ *the rash or incautious utterance of the lips*. From the Heb. ‘Battâ’ is probably formed the Gr. ‘Battos’ and ‘Battologia,’ *rash, vain, heedless speaking*, which occurs Mat. 6. 7. ‘But when ye pray use not *vain repetitions* (Gr. ‘Battologia,’) as the heathens do;’ i. e. do not indulge in rash or inconsiderate professions; speak not unadvisedly to your Maker in prayer, either in making vows or promises, whatever may be the warmth of your devotions. The import of the precept is doubtless the same as that contained Eccl. 5. 2. ‘Be not *rash* with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter any thing before God.’ The present rendering, ‘vain repetitions,’ does not seem to be warranted by sufficient authority.—‘Shall pronounce with an oath.’ Heb. ‘Shall

rashly utter in swearing.'—'And it shall be hid from him;' i. e. and he through inadvertency be unconscious of the fact of his having done wrong, or taken a precipitate and unlawful oath, as was the case with Saul, 1 Sam. 14. 24, when he adjured the people, saying, 'Cursed be the man that eateth any food until evening.'—'Shall be guilty in one of these;' i. e. he shall be brought into a dilemma from which he cannot extricate himself without incurring guilt; he shall be guilty if he do not perform his oath; and yet, if the matter of it be unlawful, guilty if he do.

What was the duty prescribed in each of the cases above mentioned? v. 5, 6.

'Guilty in one of these things;' i. e. in one of the four sins above mentioned, v. 1—4.—'Shall confess;' at the same time laying his hands on the head of the victim in token of his faith in the great atoning sacrifice. The offering was not acceptable unless accompanied with a penitential confession, and a humble prayer for pardon.—'Tresspass offering;' or, 'guilt offering;' the Heb. 'Asham,' properly signifying *guiltiness* or *trespass*, just as the word rendered 'sin offering,' ch. 4. literally signifies *sin* or *transgression*. The one as well as the other pointed to Christ, of whom it is said Is. 53. 10, 'Thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, (Heb. 'Asham,' a *trespass offering*.)—'The priest shall make an atonement for him.' As the atonement was not accepted without his repentance, so his repentance would not justify him without the atonement.

Suppose him not able to bring a lamb, of what was his offering to consist, and what were to be the accompanying ceremonies? v. 7—10.

'If he be not able to bring a lamb.' Heb. 'If his hand reach not to the sufficiency (or value) of a lamb.' This was ordained that the means of atonement might be within the ability of all classes. In reference to these offering Maimondes says, 'If a poor man brought the oblation of the rich, he was accepted; but if the rich brought the oblation of the poor, he was not accepted.' Pigeons was so plenteous in Palestine and the neighbouring countries, that he must have been poor indeed who could not afford a pair. Adrichomius, the traveller, tells us that there was a single tower

to the south of Jerusalem, in which 5000 doves nested. Maundrell also remarks of Kefteen, in Syria, that 'the adjacent fields abounding with corn give the inhabitants great advantage for breeding pigeons, insomuch that you here find more dove-cotes than other houses.'—'One for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering;' it being necessary for the sinner to have his peace first made with God by the sin offering, in order to have his burnt offering, or gift, accepted.—'According to the manner.' Heb. 'According to the judgment,' i. e. according to the ordinance or statute; the original term 'Mishpot' being used to signify the prescribed mode of doing any thing particularly in the matter of religious services.—'For his sin.' Heb. 'From his sin;' i. e. cleansing him from it.

Suppose one still to be too poor to bring the offering of birds above mentioned, what was then required? v. 11—13.

'Tenth part of an ephah;' i. e. about three quarts. The ephah contained a little more than seven gallons and a half. —'Shall put no oil upon it;' not only because that would make it too costly for the poor, but because it was a sin offering, and therefore to show the loathsomeness of the sin for which it was offered, it must not be grateful either to the taste by oil, or to the smell by frankincense.

What did the Lord say to Moses respecting trespass in holy things committed through ignorance? v. 15—19.

'Commit a trespass;' expressed in the original by one word 'Mâal,' which has the import of *prevaricating* or *dealing fraudulently*, especially in matters of religion.—'In the holy things of the Lord;' as for instance by not paying his full tithes, by neglecting to consecrate or redeem the first-born, by appropriating to his own use the first-fruits, or by eating any of those parts of the sacrifice which pertained to the priests. This was a trespass; an offence which it is here supposed might be done through mistake or forgetfulness, for want of care or zeal, for it were done presumptuously in contempt of the law, the offender died without mercy, Heb. 10, 28.—'With thy estimation,' or, 'With

thy valuation ;' i. e. with so much money as should be an adequate satisfaction for the wrong done to the priest. This estimation was to be made by the priest, as appears from Lev. 27. 8, 12. Or it may mean, as the ancient versions generally understood it, that the ram should be at least of the value of two shekels, the plural for the dual.

HEADS OF PRACTICAL REFLECTION.

- V. 1. We are not to account our duty discharged merely by avoiding sin ourselves ; we are bound to use our utmost endeavors to prevent it in others, and not to shrink from the responsibility or odium of bearing public testimony against it.
- V. 5. 'Shall confess that he hath sinned in that thing.' Confession of sin, in order to be acceptable must be particular. Such was David's confession ; 'I have done this evil ;' and such Achan's. It is not enough to rest in generals.
- V. 7. 'If he be not able to bring a lamb.' It is not the greatness of the gift but the heart of the giver, which God regards.
- V. 16. 'Shall make amends.' Repentance for wrong done to our neighbor is incomplete unless accompanied by restitution.

CHAPTER VI.

What was the law in respect to trespasses done wittingly against a neighbor ? v. 1—7.

'Commit a trespass,' Heb. 'transgress a transgression.' Gr. 'Despising shall despise the commandments of the Lord.' Note, the first seven verses of this chapter, properly belong to the chapter immediately preceding.—'Against the Lord.' Although all the instances specified relate to our neighbor, yet it is called a *trespass against the Lord*, because though the injury be done immediately to a fellow creature, yet an affront is thereby given to the Most High, whose authority has forbidden the wrong ; and who has made the command of loving our neighbor second only to that of loving himself.—'Or in fellowship.' Heb. 'Or in putting

of the hand.' The original phrase occurring only here, seems to denote such a *stipulation* as takes place in *copartnerships*, where the hand of one party is given to the other in pledge of upright and honorable dealing. The term is applicable however to any matter of dealing or traffic accompanied by a joining of hands. Gr. 'Concerning society, or communion.' Chal. 'Fellowship of the hand.' Some would render it a *thing put or given into the hand, a deposit*; but this is expressed by the preceding word 'Pikkadon,' *that which is delivered to keep*, rendered in the Gr. 'Paratheke,' and occurring 2 Tim. 1, 12. 'I am persuaded that he is able to keep *that which I have committed unto him* (Gr. 'Paratheke') against that day.' So again, 2 Tim. 1. 14. 'That good thing which was *committed unto them*, (Gr. 'Paratheke') keep.' 1. Tim. 6. 20, 'O Timothy, keep that which is *committed to thy trust*, ('Paratheke').'—'Or hath deceived.' Heb. 'Hath deceitfully or fraudulently oppressed;' i. e. wronged him by false accusation, or any unjust means, especially by withholding what was due, or extorting what was not. Of this sin Zaccheus cleared himself by a fourfold restitution. Luke 19. 8. 'Who,' says Maimonides, 'is a deceitful oppressor? He that hath his neighbor's goods in his hand, with the owner's consent, and when they are demanded again, he keeps the goods in his own hands by force, and returns them not?'—'Restore it in the principal;' i. e. the property itself, if still remaining; if not, the full value of it, to which a *fifth* part more was to be added.—'In the day of his trespass-offering;' i. e. in the day wherein he is found a trespasser, rendered by the Gr. 'The day wherein he is convicted or reprehended;' or it may be understood as in our present version, the day wherein his trespass-offering was presented.

What was Moses required to enjoin upon Aaron and his sons respecting the burnt-offering? v. 8—11.

'This is the law of the burnt-offering;' i. e. these are the ceremonies which are to accompany the daily burnt-offering, which consisted of a lamb burnt upon the altar both morning and evening. Moses having hitherto given instructions directed more especially to the *people*, and pointing out their duties in respect to their sacred oblations, now enters upon those which had particular reference to the *priests*, who were

charged with the oversight of all the sacrifices and services of their religion.—‘Because of the burning’; or upon the place of burning.’—‘Shall be burning.’ Heb. ‘Shall be made to burn’; as the result of special care.—‘His linen garment,’ Gr. ‘linen coat.’ The original word ‘Middo’ is a derivative from ‘Mâdad,’ *to measure*, and implies a garment *commensurate* to the body, and therefore one of considerable size. ‘It is the coat,’ says Sol. Jarchi, ‘and the scripture calleth it Middo, because it was like his measure (Middatho) that wore it.’ The Heb. word for ‘linen’ (Bad) signifies a finer kind of linen than that made of the common flax, for which another term is employed, and therefore the Chal. here renders it by ‘garments of Bysse,’ of which see note on Ex. 25. 4.—‘Put on other garments;’ i. e. either their common garments, or, as some of the Jewish commentators understand, other holy garments. The garments which the priests wore in the sanctuary they were not allowed to wear elsewhere, Ezek. 44. 17, 19, ‘And it shall come to pass that when they shall enter in at the gates of the inner court, they shall be clothed with linen garments. And when they go forth into the outer court, even into the outer court of the people, they shall put off their garments, wherein they ministered, and lay them in the holy chambers, and they shall put on other garments; and they shall not sanctify the people with their garments.’—‘Carry forth—to a clean place.’ This indicated that some degree of holiness attached to the ashes as the relics of a sacrifice which had its accomplishment in the sufferings and death of Christ.

What was commanded respecting the preservation of the fire upon the altar? v. 12, 13.

‘Fire shall be burning.’ Heb. ‘Fire shall be kindled or made to burn.’ Although the fire that consumed the sacrifices originally came down from Heaven, yet it was to be kept perpetually burning by a supply of fuel. This fuel was to be exclusively of wood, a store of which was provided at the expense of the whole congregation; and as every thing pertaining to the service of God was to be of the best, so the wood according to the Hebrews, was to be of the choicest quality; that which was worm eaten being instantly rejected, as also that which was obtained from the timber of old demolished buildings, none being admitted but that which

was perfectly sound.—‘Every morning,’ Heb. ‘In the morning; in the morning;’ a frequent idiom in the Heb. for expressing the regular occurrence of any act or event.—‘Fire shall be ever burning.’ In imitation of this perpetual fire, the ancient Persian Magi, and their descendants, the *Parsees*, kept also a fire constantly burning; the latter continue it to the present day. Traces of the same custom are to be found among almost all heathen nations. Indeed it can scarcely be doubted that the Greek ‘Estia’ and the Roman ‘Vesta,’ *goddess of fire*, owed their origin to a Heb. source, in which language ‘Esh,’ Chal. ‘Esha,’ signifies *fire*.

What were the ceremonies prescribed to the priests respecting the meat or meal-offering? v. 14—18.

‘The meat-offering.’ Heb. ‘Mincha,’ of which see note on Lev. 2. 1—3. This precept respects not the meat-offering which was to accompany the daily burnt-offering, but that which was offered alone as a free-will-offering, and in place of a voluntary burnt-offering of greater value, as described Lev. 2.—‘With unleavened bread shall it be eaten.’ The insertion of the word ‘with’ in this place, which does not occur in the original, obscures the true sense. The meaning is, not that the remainder of the meal-offering was to be eaten by the priests *with the addition of unleavened cakes*, but that the meal itself was to be *made into unleavened cakes*, and thus eaten.—‘In the holy place.’ This phrase denotes in this connexion, contrary to its ordinary import, the court of the tabernacle where all the holy things were boiled, baked, dressed and eaten by the Levitical order, who ministered at the altar.—‘Every one that toucheth.’ Heb. ‘All that toucheth;’ implying things as well as persons. The meaning is, that no unclean person or common vessel of ministry might touch them. Gr. ‘Whosoever toucheth them shall be sanctified.’

What was required as a meal-offering for the high priests, and what were to be the ceremonies of its oblation? v. 19—23.

‘In the day when he is anointed.’ From the obvious import of this precept we should naturally understand that this offer-

ing, called by the Jews 'the meal-offering of initiation or consecration,' was to be presented only on the day in which any one of the high priests' line was inducted into office ; but it is maintained by several of the Hebrew commentators that the high priest was bound to offer it daily, beginning from the day in which he was anointed. Josephus also says, 'The high priest sacrificed twice every day at his own charges, and that this was his sacrifice.' It is, however, doubtful whether such a construction can fairly be put upon the passage.—'It shall not be eaten.' In this respect it differed from the other meal-offerings.

What was commanded as the law of the sin-offering? v. 24—30.

HEADS OF PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS.

- V. 2. No sentiment should be more deeply engraven upon our hearts than that a sin against our neighbor is a trespass against God. So David says, 'Against thee, thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight,' though his offence was primarily committed against Uriah.
- V. 3. 'Or have found that which was lost,' The judgment of every honest mind is, that he who finds any lost property, and makes not all due enquiry to ascertain the owner, should in equity be treated as a thief.
- V. 5, 6. 'Shall bring his trespass-offering unto the Lord, a ram without blemish.' By this precept we are again taught that disobedience to God is the great evil even of those crimes which are injurious to man, and that repentance and even restitution, though needful, in order to forgiveness, cannot atone for sin.
- V. 12. As the priest was to renew the fire upon the altar every morning, and to guard with the utmost care against its going out, so our first work with the return of the morning light, should be that the fire of holy love be kindled afresh in our hearts, and through the day our study should be to keep it constantly burning.

CHAPTER VII.

What was the law of the trespass-offering appointed for the priests? v. 1—5.

‘Trespass-offering.’ Heb. ‘Asham,’ *trespass* or *guiltiness*. Gr. ‘The ram for trespass.’ The design of this chapter is to give a more particular and detailed explanation of the matters contained in Lev. 5.—‘It is most holy.’ Heb. ‘Holiness of holinesses.’—‘And the fat that is on them ;’ i. e. chiefly the fat that was found in a *detached state*, not mixed with the muscles.

What disposal was to be made of the parts which might be eaten of this and the other offerings? v. 6—10.

‘The priest shall have to himself the skin.’ All the flesh of the burnt-offerings being consumed as well as the fat, there could nothing fall to the share of the priest but the skin; which must have been very valuable, as they were used as mattresses, and probably as carpets to sit upon in the day, as they are still used by some of the inhabitants and the dervishes of the East. See Harmer’s observations, vol. I. p. 236. Bp. Patrick remarks upon this passage, that ‘It is probable that Adam himself offered the first sacrifice and had the skin given him by God, to make garments for him and his wife; in conformity to which the priests ever after had the skin of the whole burnt-offering for their portion: which was a custom among the Gentiles as well as the Jews, who gave the skins of their sacrifices to the priests when they were not burnt with the sacrifices.’—‘All—shall be the priests;’ i. e. with the exception of that part which was called the ‘*memorial*,’ and which was to be burnt upon the altar.—‘And dry;’ i. e. having no oil mixed with it.—‘One as much as another.’ Heb. ‘A man as his brother;’ i. e. the priest who officiated in his turn in the sanctuary to-day was to have as much as he who officiated yesterday.

What was the law of the sacrifice of the peace-offerings when offered for a thanksgiving? v. 11—15.

‘For a thanksgiving.’ Heb. ‘For a confession.’ Gr. ‘For praise;’ i. e. in token of gratitude for special mercies and favours received, such as recovery from sickness, preservation in a journey, deliverance at sea, redemption from captivity, all of which are specified in Psalm 107, and for them men are called upon to offer the sacrifice of thanksgiving. In allusion to this kind of offering the apostle says, Heb. 13. 15, ‘By him, therefore, let us offer the *sacrifice of praise* to God continually.’—‘Shall offer leavened bread.’ Leaven, as denoting corruption, was generally forbidden in all the appointed sacrifices; but in that of the thank-offering it was accepted, not however to be burnt upon the altar, but to be given to the officiating priest.—‘Of it he shall offer one;’ i. e. one of the leavened cakes or loaves before mentioned. The priest had but one cake of every sort, the rest were eaten by the offerers.—‘For an heave-offering.’ Heb. ‘Terumah,’ *heave-offering*, from the root ‘Rum,’ *to lift up*; so called from its being *heaved* or *lifted up on high*, in token that it was thereby tendered to the God of heaven, and devoutly proffered to his acceptance. Gr. and Chal. ‘A separation, or separated thing.’

What was enjoined, provided the sacrifice were for a vow or a voluntary offering? v. 16—21.

‘Be a vow.’ Peace-offerings presented with a vow, were such as were either simply and unconditionally devoted without special respect to any past or future favour, or such as were vowed upon a condition, as when Jacob pledged himself, Gen. 28. 20—22, saying, ‘If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father’s house in peace: then shall the Lord be my God, and this stone which I have set for a pillar shall be God’s house; and of all that thou shalt give me I will surely give the tenth unto thee.’—‘A voluntary offering;’ or ‘A free-will offering;’ i. e. an offering not required by any law, but which a person might be prompted spontaneously to present as the expression of a grateful heart.—‘Shall be eaten the same day;’ because in such a hot country it was apt to putrify; and as it was considered to be holy, it would be very improper to expose that to putrefaction which had been consecrated to the Divine Being.—‘On the morrow also;’ i. e.

if the whole cannot be conveniently eaten on the same day, or if one has a mind to lay up a portion of it till the next day, he may do so; but the indulgence was never to be extended beyond the second day.—‘Shall bear his iniquity;’ i. e. the punishment of his iniquity.

What prohibitions are contained in v. 22—27, and by what sanctions accompanied?

‘Fat of ox.’ This explains and limits the precept contained Lev. 3. 17, restricting it to the fat of the three kinds of animals offered in sacrifice. The prohibition of blood is more general, because the fat was offered to God only by way of acknowledgment; but the blood *made atonement for the soul*, and so typified the sacrifice of Christ much more clearly than the burning of fat; to this, therefore, a greater reverence must be paid, till those types had their accomplishment in the offering up of the body of Christ once for all. The Jews rightly expound this law as forbidding only the *blood of the life*, as they express it, not that which we call the *gravy*, for of that they supposed it was lawful to eat.

What was the law appointed respecting the priest’s share in the peace-offerings? v. 28—34.

‘Waved for a wave-offering;’ the man lifting it up over his head, and waving it to and fro in token of his acknowledgment of God as the Lord of heaven and earth. The act implied also an acknowledgment that every good thing came down from God, and an intimation that all the ways of his people should tend upward, so that their conversation should be in heaven.

CHAPTER VIII.

What was commanded to Moses respecting the consecration of Aaron and his sons, and what is said of his compliance? v. 1—5.

‘And the garments;’ i. e. the holy, priestly garments, which God had before, Ex. 28. 2—4, commanded to be made, and

which were now ready.—‘Gather thou all the congregation;’ i. e. the elders and principal men of the congregation, who represented the body of the people, as the court would hold but few of the many thousands of Israel. This is confirmed by Lev. 9. 1, where Moses is said to have called the *elders* together instead of the *whole congregation*, as here.

What were the principal ceremonies performed upon the persons of Aaron and his sons? v. 6—13.

As these rites have all been minutely considered in the notes upon Ex. 29, a chapter corresponding with this in its general subject, the reader is referred to that for the necessary explanations.

What allusions do we elsewhere find to the pouring of the oil upon Aaron’s head? Ps. 133. 2.

‘Poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron’s head.’ This was a mode of consecration peculiar to the high-priest, as the heads of the common priests were not anointed with oil.

What were the sacrifices offered upon the occasion, and what the principal ceremonies attending them? v. 14—30.

‘Sanctified it.’ The altar by these rites was sanctified, so that thenceforward through the sacrifices daily offered upon it, atonement might be made for the sins of the people, whereas afterwards the altar was to be considered as sanctifying the gifts and oblations laid upon it, according to Mat. 23. 19, ‘Ye fools and blind;’ for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that *sanctifieth the gift.*’

What additional commandments did Moses give to Aaron and his sons? v. 31—36.

‘Shall not go out—in seven days.’ The number *seven* among the Hebrews was the number of *perfection*, and the seven days of consecration implied a *full and perfect* consecration to the sacerdotal office, and correctly intimated, moreover, that their *whole lives* were to be devoted to this solemn service.

CHAPTER IX.

What was the direction now given to the newly consecrated priest? v. 1—7.

‘On the eighth day.’ Not on the eighth day of the month, but on the first day after their consecration, which occupied seven days, and before which they were deemed unfit to minister in holy things, being considered in a state of imperfection. All creatures, for the most part, were considered as in a state of uncleanness and imperfection *seven* days, and perfected on the *eighth*.—The date of these events was the first month of the second year after the departure from Egypt.—‘Take the young calf.’ Heb. ‘Son of the herd.’ This offering is supposed, by the Jewish writers, to have been appointed for Aaron in reference to his sin in the matter of the golden calf.—‘The Lord will appear;’ i. e. the visible glory of the Lord will appear in the increased effulgence of the cloudy pillar resting over the tabernacle, and also in sending forth from the midst of the cloud a fire to consume the offerings upon the altar. By reason of this expected appearance, the people were to prepare and sanctify themselves by every kind of sacrifice, in allusion to which it is said of a still more glorious appearance of which this was a shadow, 1 John 2. 3, ‘We know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself as he is pure.’—‘Stood before the Lord;’ i. e. before the sanctuary in the court; before the residence of the Lord’s glory.

What are Aaron and his sons then said to have done? v. 9—14.

‘Aaron went unto the altar.’ These being the first offerings that were ever offered by the Levitical priesthood, according to the newly enacted law of sacrifices, the manner of offering them is particularly related, that it might appear how exactly they agreed with the institution. Aaron was first required to make expiation for himself, that he might thereby be qualified to do it for the people.—‘He burnt them upon the altar,’ i. e. he laid them in order upon the altar that they might be consumed, not with ordinary fire, but with that which came out from before the Lord.

What was their desire in behalf of the people, and what followed? v. 15—24.

According to the manner.' Heb. 'According to the ordinance.'—'Beside the burnt sacrifice of the morning;' i. e. the daily sacrifice of the lamb, which was not to be superseded by the extra offerings of this or any other occasion.—'Lifted up his hands and blessed them.' The solemnity of blessing the people in the name of the Lord appertained especially to the priestly office; Deut. 10. 8, 'The Lord separated the tribe of Levi to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister unto him, and to *bless in his name* unto this day.' The form of the benediction is given, Num. 6. 23, 27. Considered as a type, this was accomplished by our great high-priest, Christ Jesus, when having finished his ministry on earth, 'he lifted up his hands and blessed' his disciples at his ascension into heaven, Luke 24. 50.—'Came down;' i. e. from the bank or elevation by which ascent was made to the altar, as steps were forbidden.—'Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle.' Aaron, the priest, went in according to the law Ex. 30. 7, 9, to burn incense on the golden altar; Moses went in with Aaron, in all likelihood to instruct him in the manner of the service that was to be performed there, such as burning the incense, lighting the lamps, setting in order the shew-bread, &c., that he might instruct his sons in it.—'The glory of the Lord appeared;' i. e. the visible sign of God's glorious presence, indicated either by the fire mentioned in the next verse, or by the more luminous appearance of the cloudy pillar, as in Ex. 16. 10, and 40. 34, or by both. It was a token of God's gracious acceptance of them and of their services, as in 1 Kings 8. 10—12—'There came a fire.' This miraculous fire now sent forth from the divine presence, was according to the Hebrews, kept alive upon the altar till the time of Solomon. Under the second temple the Jews confess that the sacred fire was wanting.—'They shouted;' from the combined effect of wonder and joy; devoutly and ardently giving thanks to God for this mark of his special favour. Thus on a similar occasion 2 Chron. 27. 3, 'When all the sons of Israel saw how the fire came down, and the glory of the Lord upon the house, they bowed themselves with their faces to the ground upon

the pavement, and worshipped and praised the Lord, saying, For he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever.'

HEADS OF PRACTICAL REFLECTION.

V. 2. The Jewish high priest, being 'compassed with infirmities, ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins;' but we have a more perfect high priest, 'which needeth daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice first for his own sins.'

V. 17. Our accustomed devotions are not to be omitted on account of extraordinary services.

CHAPTER. X.

What is said of the profane and presumptuous conduct of Aaron's sons, and in what did their sin consist? v. 1.

'Took either of them his censer;' i. e. his fire-pan; a vessel in which coals of fire were put, to be sprinkled over with frankincense, in order to create an agreeable odor in the sanctuary. The event here mentioned, doubtless occurred at the time of the evening sacrifice, when the lamps were lighted, and incense burned.—'Offered strange fire;' i. e. other fire than that which the Lord had commanded. The Lord had sent a supernatural fire to consume the first victims offered to him. This was to be kept perpetually alive, and from it only were the coals to be taken for the burning of incense. Such, at least, might have been gathered to be the will of God, although the injunction, in so many words, is not expressly recorded in any part of the preceding narrative. It is probable, however, that an explicit command to this effect had been previously given by Moses, though not mentioned. *Strange incense*, however, had been expressly forbidden, Ex. 30. 9, and it was natural to infer, even if nothing had been said about it, that *strange fire* was forbidden by the scope of Lev. 6. 12, 13. This precept Nadab and Abihu presumptuously disregarded, and filled their censers with common fire. The command was afterwards expressly recorded, Lev. 16. 12, in allusion to which it is

said, Rev. 8. 5; 'The angel took the censer, and filled it with *fire of the altar*.'—'Which he commanded them not.' This, by a figure of speech called *meiosis*, is probably equivalent to saying, 'Which the Lord had pointedly forbidden.' The following are instances of a similar usage; Ps. 78. 50. 'He spared not their soul from death; i. e. he destroyed them with desolating judgments. Prov. 12. 3. 'A man shall not be established by wickedness; i. e. he shall be overthrown. Prov. 17. 21. 'The father of a fool hath no joy;' i. e. hath grief and sorrow. In these cases under a negative form of expression, the contrary affirmative is emphatically implied.

What was the punishment inflicted upon them for their impiety? v. 2.

'Went out from before the Lord.' Heb. 'From the face of the Lord;' i. e. from the Shechinah, the symbol of the divine presence, before which they had presumed to offer the strange fire upon the altar of incense. This stood in front of the most holy place, just without the veil.—'Devoured them.' The action of the fire in this instance was peculiar, as neither their bodies nor their clothes were consumed by it. It was probably a flash of lightning, which, we know, extinguished life in the manner here described. Targ. Jon. 'It burned their souls, but not their bodies.'—'Died before the Lord;' i. e. before the veil that covered the mercy-seat.

What did Moses say to Aaron upon the occasion, and how did he receive it? v. 3.

'This is that the Lord spake.' It does not appear from the record that these precise words were anywhere previously spoken, although some suppose that reference is had to Ex. 19. 22; 'Let the priests which come near the Lord sanctify themselves lest the Lord break forth upon them.' Others again conceive that the words alluded to are found, Ex. 29. 43. 'And there will I meet with the children of Israel, and the tabernacle shall be sanctified by my glory.' The words might have been previously spoken, but not written. Perhaps, however, all that is intended is, that this was the *spirit* and *purport* of what God had said, not on any

particular occasion, but in the general tenor of his instructions to the priests.

What is to be understood by the Lord's being sanctified ?

God is said in the language of Scripture to be 'sanctified,' by his people, when they demean themselves holily and uprightly before him, duly regarding and reverencing every thing by which he makes himself known; 1. Pet. 3. 15. 'Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts,' &c. So also he is 'sanctified' when he righteously punishes those who transgress; Ezek. 27. 22, 'Behold, I am against thee, O Zidon, and I will be glorified in the midst of thee; and they shall know that I am the Lord, when I shall have executed judgments in her, and shall be sanctified in her.' So also Ezek. 38. 16, 23, 'I shall bring thee against my land, that the heathen may know me when I shall be sanctified in thee, O Gog, before their eyes.—Then will I magnify myself, and sanctify myself; and I will be known in the eyes of many nations.' God will either be sanctified *by* all his creatures in a way of active reverence, obedience, and praise, or *upon* them in a way of vengeance and wrath.—'In them that come nigh me.' Heb. 'In my near ones;' i. e. those who approach near to God in the duties of a holy ministration. Thus the Priests and Levites were such as are described Ezek. 42. 13, as '*approaching* unto the Lord.' So also, Ex. 19. 22, 'Let the priests also, *which come near to the Lord*, sanctify themselves;' i. e. those whose office it is to come near to the Lord.' So in 1 Pet. 4. 17, judgment is said to begin *at the house of God;* and in Ezek. 9. 6, '*at the sanctuary.*'—'And Aaron held his peace.' Heb. 'Was hushed, silent, quiescent.' The original word is that which occurs Josh. 10. 13, in reference to the *standing still* of the sun and moon at the command of Joshua. The meaning is that he yielded in quiet submission, without a murmur, to the just judgment of heaven in bereaving him of his sons. So the Psalmist Ps. 34. 9. '*I was dumb*, I opened not my mouth, because thou didst it.'

What did Moses order to be done with the dead bodies of Nadab and Abihu, and what is said of its execution? v. 4, 5.

‘Carry your brethren;’ i. e. your kinsmen. This order was given to the cousins of Nadab and Abihu rather than to their immediate brethren that they might not be called off from their ministrations at the altar. Yet as these sons of Uzziel, were merely Levites, and not priests, it would have been unlawful for them to enter into the sanctuary except in consequence of a special command of Moses.—‘Carried them in their coats;’ i. e. in the tunics or linen garments in which they ministered, and in which they were doubtless buried, as they would be considered as henceforth unfit for any kind of sacred service, whereas in ordinary cases the cast-off dresses of the priests were converted into wick for the lamps of the sanctuary.

What directions did Moses give respecting the mourning? v. 6, 7.

‘Uncover not your heads.’ Gr. ‘Ye shall not put off the mitres from your heads.’ The original word for *uncover*, which primarily signifies to *make free*, would seem also to imply a prohibition against letting their hair become dis-mayed or dishevelled, as was customary in bewailing the dead. The meaning we suppose to be, ‘Let none of the usual signs of grief or mourning be seen upon you;’ for the reason, probably, that the crime of their brethren was so highly provoking to God, and so fully merited the punishment which he had inflicted, that their mourning might be considered as a reflection upon the divine justice towards the offenders.—‘Neither rend your clothes;’ another sign of sorrow, as appears from Lev. 13. 45, and 21. 10. 2. Sam. 13. 31.—‘Let your brethren,’ &c. While Aaron and his sons, for official reasons, were forbidden to assume the badges of mourning, the congregation at large were permitted and commanded to do it. They must lament not only the loss of their priests, but especially the displeasure of God which had occasioned it.—‘The anointing oil of the Lord is upon you;’ i. e. ye are devoted by a solemn unction to the service of God, which is not to be omitted out of respect to any earthly relation; whereas, should you leave your official station before its duties are fully performed, it would be no other than showing greater affection and respect to a dead friend than to the living God. The injunction contained in these two verses seems to have become a stand-

ing law for the priests ever after. This is evident from Lev. 21, 10, 12; 'And he that is high priest among his brethren, upon whose head the anointing oil was poured, and that is consecrated to put on the garments, shall not uncover his head, nor rend his clothes. Neither shall he go out of the sanctuary, nor profane the sanctuary of his God; for the crown of the anointing oil of his God is upon him.'

To what new law did this event give rise, and what were the reasons annexed to it? v. 8—11.

'And the Lord spake unto Aaron.' Hitherto, the Lord on all such occasions had spoken to Moses, but now seeing that Aaron had been very observant of every thing commanded him, and perhaps with a design to afford him some consolation under his heavy affliction, he does him the honor to speak immediately to him, especially as the precept uttered had primary respect to the priests, of whom Aaron was head.—'Do not drink wine.' It is the general opinion of the Jewish commentators, and not improbable in itself, that Nadab and Abihu had drunk wine to excess on the occasion which resulted in their death, and that the present prohibition was grounded upon the circumstance of their attempting to celebrate the divine service in a state of inebriation. The spirit of the precept requires of Gospel ministers that they be *sober, not given to wine*, 1 Tim. 3. 2, 3. 'lest they drink and forget the law, and pervert judgment,' Prov. 31. 5; lest they 'err through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way;' Is. 28. 7. By its being forbidden to be used, however, on a particular occasion, it is implied that at other times it was not prohibited to them, as it was not expected that every priest should be a Nazarite. So under the Gospel, 1. Tim. 5. 23; 'Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmities;' where, however, it will be noted that the precept is specially guarded, both in respect to the *quantity* and the *occasion*.—'Nor strong drink.' Heb. 'Sheker,' from 'Skâkar,' *to inebriate*, signifying any kind of intoxicating drink; whether made of *corn, apples, honey, dates*, or other *fruits*. One of the four prohibited drinks among the Mohomedans in India is called 'Sakar,' which signifies *intoxicating drink* in general, but especially *date wine*. The ancient Egyptians, as we learn from Herodotus, B. II. c. 77, made use of a liquor fer-

mented from barley. Diod. Siculus, Lit I. de Osir. observes, that 'where any region did not admit the growth of the vine, a drink was prepared from barley, not much inferior in flavour and efficacy to wine.' From the original word 'Sheker,' preserved in the Gr. and Lat. in the form of 'Sikera' and 'Sicera,' is probably derived the English 'cider,' a term applied exclusively to the fermented juice of apples.—'When ye go into the tabernacle;' i. e. into the court-yard of the tabernacle.—'Lest ye die;' i. e. lest ye do that which will make you liable to be cut off by the hand of God.—'That you may put difference;' i. e. that you may not by strong drink so cloud and darken your understandings, as to disqualify yourselves from distinguishing in your ministrations, between that which is sacred and that which is common; or from 'separating between the precious and the vile.' As the word, however, in the original has the *causative* form, it implies also that they were not to incapacitate themselves from teaching the people to make the due discrimination. Thus Ezek. 44. 23; 'And they shall teach my people (the difference, or, how to distinguish) between the holy and the profane, and *cause them to discern* between the unclean and the clean.' With neglecting to do this, the priests are thus charged Ezek. 22. 26. 'Her priests have violated my law and have profaned my holy things; they have put no difference between the holy and the profane, *neither have they showed difference* (taught the people the difference) between the unclean and the clean.'

What directions formerly given does Moses here repeat? v. 12--15.

The direction is here repeated, both because they were as yet but little practised in the sacred ceremonies and therefore needed fuller instruction, and because from the pressure of their grief they might possibly forget, or neglect some part of the divine ordinances.

What circumstances occurred on the occasion, which angered the spirit of Moses? v. 16--18.

'Diligently sought;' intimating that he suspected some deviation from the prescribed rule. That rule was, that if the blood of the sin-offering of the people was brought into the

holy place, as was that of the sin-offering for the priest, then the flesh was to be burned without the camp; otherwise it was to be eaten by the priest in the holy place. Now in the present instance, the blood of the goat was not brought into the holy place, and yet, it seems, it was burned without the camp, whereas it ought to have been eaten.—‘To bear the iniquity.’ Gr. ‘That ye shall take away.’ The phrase ‘to bear iniquity,’ often signifies to suffer punishment without forgiveness, as Ex. 28. 43. Lev. 20. 19, but in the present instance its meaning is the reverse of this. It signifies to *bear away, to procure the remission of, the sins of the people.* These sins were in some sense to be transferred to the priests as types of Christ, who ‘bore our sins in his own body on the tree,’ and of whom it is said, ‘Behold the Lamb of God, that *taketh away* the sins of the world.’

What was Aaron’s apology, and how did Moses receive it? v. 19—20.

‘And Aaron said unto Moses,’ &c. Moses charged the fault upon Eleazar and Ithamar, but it is probable they acted by Aaron’s direction, and therefore he apologized for it. In this he makes his affliction his excuse. He supposed that as fasting before the Lord required a joyful frame of heart, his being at this time overwhelmed with sorrow, would render him unfit to eat of the holy things; that he could not do it without polluting them. And from the following passages it would appear that such an impression was not without foundation. When the hallowed things were brought according to the precept, Deut. 26. 14, the offerer was required to say, ‘I have not eaten thereof *in my mourning.*’ And when God would refuse the sacrifice of the wicked he says, Hos. 9. 4, ‘They shall be unto them *as the bread of mourners*; all that eat thereof shall be polluted.’ Moses accordingly admitted the force of his plea, and acquiesced in it without hesitation.—‘Such things have befallen me.’ Chal. ‘Such tribulations have befallen me.’ Jerus. Targ. ‘Great sorrow hath this day befallen me, for that my two sons are dead, and I mourn for them.’—‘Should it have been accepted in the sight of the Lord.’ Heb. ‘Should it have been good in the eyes of Jehovah?’ Jerus. Targ. ‘Lo, if I had eaten the sin-offering to day, were it possible that it could be acceptable and right before the Lord!’—‘He was con-

tent.' Heb. 'It was good in his eyes.' Gr. 'It pleased him.' So in other cases the letter of the law was dispensed with from the pressure of circumstances, as when David ate the shew-bread, and Hezekiah admitted some that were not duly cleansed, to eat of the passover. 2. Chron. 30. 18.—20.

HEADS OF PRACTICAL REFLECTION.

- V. 1. The most joyful and festive scenes may be suddenly clouded and turned to gloom by the unexpected inroad of divine judgments. Let us therefore, rejoice with trembling.
- V. 1. 'Which he commanded not.' How dangerous to innovate upon, or tamper with, the institutions of Heaven! God is peculiarly jealous of the purity of his ordinances, and watches with avenging vigilance around the worship of his altar. He will accept of no 'strange fire,' either in the matter or motives of the offerings presented to him.
- V. 2. Nadab and Abihu sinned by strange fire, and were punished by strange fire. Men's punishments are often marked by a striking analogy with their sins.
- V. 3. The mind and will of God is sometimes to be learned by *inference* from the general scope and tenor of his word, instead of express revelation; and we are not to suppose that an act or a practice may be lawfully indulged in, because it is not, in so many words, forbidden in the Scriptures. The question is, does the *general spirit* of the bible forbid it? Of this, every man must judge as in the sight of God, and act accordingly.
- V. 3. It is of infinitely more consequence that the Most High should be sanctified, and his name glorified, than that the lives of our children, however dear to us, should be preserved.
- V. 3. The most comforting considerations, under affliction, are those which are drawn from the word of God. There is no such source of consolation to mourners as his own precious truth.
- V. 6. 'Uncover not your heads.' The public concerns of God's glory should lie nearer our hearts than any private

griefs, pleasures, or pursuits of our own. The sorrow of the world is often a great hindrance to the performance of our religious duties.

CHAPTER XI.

What is the general object and scope of this chapter?

What rule is laid down for the distinction of clean and unclean quadrupeds? v. 2, 3.

‘Whatsoever parteth the hoof.’ This probably refers to that kind of parting which is to be seen in the foot of the dog, the cat, the lion, where, though there are several distinct toes or claws on the upper side, yet they are united by a membrane on the lower side. The parting therefore is not perfect.—‘Is cloven footed.’ Heb. ‘And cleaveth asunder the cleft of the hoofs.’ This term implies a cleaving quite through, as in the feet of the sheep, the ox, the goats, &c. A third sort of hoofs are solid and unparted, as of the horse. The first and last kind were unclean.—‘Cheweth the cud.’ Heb. ‘Maketh the cud to ascend;’ i. e. that bringeth up again the cud from the stomach to the mouth, to be more thoroughly masticated, as is the case with the ox, and the other ruminating animals. Indeed the word ‘ruminates’ is derived from *rumen* the name of the first stomach in the ox or camel, into which the food is first received, and thence cast up into the mouth.

What exceptions are stated to this rule? v. 4—8.

‘The coney.’ Heb. ‘Shaphan.’ Bochart and others have supposed the ‘Shaphan’ of the scriptures to be the *Jerboa*; but Mr. Bruce proves that the *Ashkoko* is intended. This curious animal is found in Ethiopia, and in great numbers on mount Lebanon. It does not burrow and make holes, as the rat and rabbit, nature having interdicted it this practice, by furnishing it with feet which are round, and of a soft pulpy tender substance. The length of the animal as it

sits is about seventeen inches. It has no tail, and gives, at first sight, the idea of a rat rather than any other creature. The color is grey, mixed with a reddish brown, and the belly white. Instead of holes, these animals seem to delight in less close or more airy places, in the mouths of caves, or clefts in the rock. They are gregarious, and frequently several dozens of them sit upon the great stones at the mouths of caves, and warm themselves in the sun, or come out and enjoy the freshness of the summer evening. They do not stand upon their feet, but seem to steal along as in fear, their belly being nearly close to the ground; advancing a few steps at a time, then pausing. They have something very mild, feeble-like, and timid in their deportment; are gentle and easily tamed, though when roughly handled at first, they bite very severely. They live upon grain, fruit, and roots, and certainly chew the cud. Of these animals, Solomon says, Prov. 30. 26; that 'the rocks are a refuge' to them, and that though 'a feeble folk,' they are 'exceeding wise,' and make their houses in the rocks.'

What was to be the mark of discrimination, in regard to fish? v. 9—12.

'Whatsoever hath fins and scales.' Because these of all the fish tribes are the most nutritious; all others being difficult of digestion.

What are the principal fowls which are to be had in abomination as food? v. 13—20.

What among flying creepings were permitted?
. 21.

What was to be the effect of touching the dead carcasses of unclean animals? v. 24—28.

'For these ye shall be unclean;' i. e. for those which he goes on afterwards to enumerate; not for the flies, ants, locusts, &c. before mentioned.

What were among the creeping things which crept without flying, which were forbidden, and the touch of whose carcasses caused defilement?
v. 29—40.

What is the grand sanction with which those precepts conclude? v. 44—47.

CHAPTER XII.

What was the divine direction in respect to the ceremonial uncleanness of women in child-birth? v. 1, 2.

‘According to the days of her separation,’ &c. See this illustrated, Lev. 15. 19.

What was to be done to the child on the eighth day? v. 3.

How much longer was she to remain at home, in order to her purification for a female than for a male child? v. 4, 5.

The reason of this difference in the two cases is not known.

What allusion to this law do we find in the New Testament? Luke, 2. 21, 21.

What was she commanded to do after the days of her purifying were fulfilled? v. 6, 7.

Suppose she were not able to bring a lamb, what was then required? v. 8.

What was the offering of the mother of our Lord under these circumstances? Luke 2. 21—24.

- CHAPTER XIII.

What is the general scope and object of the present chapter?

To lay down rules for distinguishing the plague of leprosy, together with some directions as to the conduct to be ob-

served by the leper, and as to the treatment of leprous garments. The term 'leprosy,' is derived from the Greek 'Lepra,' from 'Lepis,' a scale, because in this disease the body was often covered with *thin white scales* so as to give it the appearance of snow. Thus it is said of the hand of Moses, Ex. 4. 6, that it was 'leprous as snow;' and of Miriam, Num. 12. 10, that 'she became leprous, white as snow;' so also of Gehazi, 2 Kings, 5. 27. that 'he went from his (Elisha's) presence, a leper as white as snow.' This peculiarity of the disease is thus accounted for in the 'Medica Sacra' of Mead. 'The seeds of leprous contagion are mixed with an acrid and salt humor, derived from the blood, which, as it naturally ought partly to have turned into nutriment, and partly to have perspired through the skin, it now lodges and corrodes the little scales of the cuticle, and these becoming dry and white, sometimes even as white as snow, are separated from the skin, and fall off like bran.' The Heb. term is 'Tezraath,' from a root, signifying to strike, or smite as with some venomous or infectious matter. Hence, the true import of the original is a *fretting soreness*, or a *piercing infectious scabbiness*, denominated also in the scriptures, 'the plague,' i. e. the 'stroke,' or 'the wound' of leprosy, as the Jews regarded it as a disease sent directly from God as a punishment of sin, Moses having prescribed no natural remedy for the cure of it. In the Chal. it is termed 'Segiruth,' *shutting up*, because it caused men to be secluded from society. This dreadful disease which prevails in Egypt, and Syria, generally manifests itself at first, in the manner described in the text. Its commencement is scarcely perceptible; there appearing only a few reddish spots on the skin which are not attended with pain or any other symptom, but which cannot be removed. It increases imperceptibly, and continues for some years to be more and more manifest. The spots become larger, spreading over the skin, till at length they cover the whole body with a leprous scurf. The disease affects at the same time the marrow and the bones; so much so, that the farthest joints in the system gradually lose their powers, and the members fall together in such a manner, as to give the body a mutilated and dreadful appearance. In its final stages, the whole mass of the patient's flesh and blood seems to turn to corruption, and he may be said almost literally to fall to pieces. — This disease, though very unfrequent in Europe, indeed

almost extinct, made its appearance about the year 1730 in the western continent, and spread its ravages in the sugar islands of the West Indies, particularly Guadaloupe. M. Peyssonnel, who was sent to that island in order to acquaint himself with the nature of the disease, observes, after giving the symptoms as above mentioned, that as the disease advances, the upper part of the nose swells, the nostrils become enlarged, and the nose itself soft. Tumors appear on the jaws; the eyebrows swell; the ears become thick; the points of the fingers, as also the feet and toes, swell; the nails become scaly; the joints of the hands and feet separate and drop off. On the palms of the hands, and on the soles of the feet, appear deep dry ulcers, which increase rapidly and then disappear again. In short, in the last stage of the disease the patient becomes a hideous spectacle, and falls in pieces. These symptoms supervene by very slow and successive steps, requiring often many years before they all occur. The patient suffers no violent pain, but feels a sort of numbness in his hands and feet. During the whole period of the disorder, those afflicted with it experience no obstruction in what are called the *Naturalia*. They eat and drink as usual; and even when their fingers and toes mortify, the loss of the mortified part is the only consequence that ensues; for the wound heals of itself without any medical treatment or application. When, however, the unfortunate wretches come to the last period of the disease, they are hideously disfigured, and objects of the greatest compassion.'

What are the symptoms of a commencing leprosy here described, and whose office was it to take cognizance of it? v. 2.

'And it be in the skin of his flesh like the plague of leprosy' Heb. 'And it became in the skin of his flesh to a stroke of leprosy;' i. e. so that it shall assume the appearance and excite the suspicion of leprosy.

What was the priest to do, when the apparent leper was presented before him? v. 3.

'Pronounce him unclean,' Heb. 'Make him unclean;' or, 'pollute him;' a phraseology of not unfrequent occurrence, by which one is said to *do* that which he merely, in a ministerial capacity, pronounces, predicts, or declares to be done.

Thus Ezek. 43. 3, is said to 'destrôy the city,' when he simply pronounced or prophecied its destruction. In like manner the apostles, as ministers of Christ, are said to have been empowered to *bind* and to *loose*, to remit men's sins, and to *retain* them, when all that is intended is, that they were simply to *declare* them to be so bound or loosed, remitted or retained, according to the tenor of God's word.

What were the symptoms which authorized the priest to shut him up for the space of seven days, and what farther experiments were to be made? v. 5.

How was an old leprosy discerned in the skin, and in what case was a man to be pronounced clean? v. 9—13.

'Shall pronounce him clean.' Heb. 'Shall make clean, or cleanse, him.' See this phraseology explained above. It may appear strange that the partial leper should be pronounced unclean, and the person totally covered with the disease clean. This was probably owing to a different species or stage of the disease; the partial being contagious, the total not. The fact moreover that the disease was driven out of the surface argued a more sound and healthy state of the system in general.

What inference was to be drawn from the appearance of raw flesh upon the person suspected, and what was then to be done? v. 14—17.

How was a leprous bright spot to be distinguished from a burning boil? v. 18—23.

The leprosy might break out from previous cutaneous eruption. A person with any sore or disposition to contagion, was more likely to catch the infection from contact with the diseased person, than he was whose skin was whole and sound, and his habits good.

How was the leprosy to be distinguished from a burn by accident? v. 24—28.

'A hot burning.' Heb. 'a burning of fire.' This doubtless

states the case of such as have been hurt by fire; which would leave a scar in which the leprosy might appear, and which was to be distinguished by the rules here given.

How was the leprosy to be distinguished from the dry scall, or a disease of the head common among the Jews? v. 29—27.

‘It is a dry scall.’ Heb. ‘Nethek’ from the word ‘Nâ-thak, to pluck, tear, or draw off’, the name of a disease peculiar to the head or beard, so called from the hairs being drawn off from the place where it broke out, and leaving a morbid baldness in its stead. The Hebrews describe it thus: ‘The plague of the head or beard, is when the hair that is on them falleth off by the roots, and the place of the hair remaineth bare; and this is that which is called ‘Nethek.’’

How was the leprosy to be distinguished from the ‘Bohak’ or freckled spot? v. 38, 39.

‘It is a freckled spot.’ The word ‘Bohak,’ from the Syriac ‘Behak,’ to be white or shining, is used by the Arabs to denote a kind of leprosy of which Niebuhr says; ‘the bohak is neither infectious nor dangerous. A black boy of Mocha, who was attacked with this sort of leprosy, had white spots here and there upon his body. It was said that the use of sulphur had been for some time of service to this boy, but had not altogether removed the disease.’ Forskal, a traveller in the same expedition with Niebuhr says; ‘On the 15th of May, 1765, I myself first saw the bohak leprosy, in a Jew, at Mocha. The spots in this disease are of an unequal size. They do not shine, are not perceptibly higher than the skin; and do not change the color of the hair. Their color is an obscure white, inclining to red. The rest of the skin of the patient was darker than that of the people of the country in general; but the spots were not so white as the skin of an European, when not sunburnt. The spots in this leprosy do not appear on the hands or near the navel, but on the neck and face, yet not on that part where the hair grows thick. They gradually spread, and continue sometimes only about two months, but in some cases one or two years, and then disappear by degrees of themselves. This disorder is neither contagious nor hereditary, nor does it occasion

any inconvenience.' Hence a person infected with the bohak is declared *clean*.

What signs in addition to baldness indicated the presence of leprosy in the head? v. 40—44.

What directions were given to the convicted leper? v. 45—47.

'His clothes shall be rent.' The leprous person was required to be as one that mourned for the dead, or for some great and public calamity. He was to have his clothes rent in token of extreme sorrow; his head was to be made bare; the ordinary bonnet or turban being omitted, and to *have a covering upon the upper lip*; or rather, as the original word for 'upper lip' is with equal probability interpreted *of the whole chin*, he was to have the lower part of his face bound around with a bandage, leaving the mouth just freedom enough to make the declaration, *unclean! unclean!* which uttered from lips thus muffled up must have been sounded forth in a peculiarly doleful accent. The reason of uttering this cry was to prevent any person from coming near him, lest defilement might be incurred by contact. Therefore the Chal. renders it, 'Be ye not made unclean! be ye not made unclean!' and Tar. Jon. 'Avoid! avoid the unclean!' In allusion to this it is said, Lam. 4. 15. 'They cried unto them, depart ye; (I am) unclean; depart, depart, touch not.'

What directions were given with respect to various garments infected with the leprosy? v. 47—59.

This leprosy in garments appears so strange to us that it has induced some to consider it as an extraordinary punishment inflicted by God upon the Israelites, as a sign of his displeasure against sin; while others consider the leprosy in clothes as also in houses, as having no relation to the leprosy in man. The most probable supposition, however, is, that the whole account intimates that the garment was fretted by a process similar, to that which takes place in the skin in a case of real leprosy, occasioned in all likelihood, by a species of animalcula or vermin, which by breeding in the garments must necessarily multiply their kind, and *fret* the threads, i. e. corrode a portion of the finer parts after the

manner of moths, for their nourishment. It is thus that the human skin is affected in the itch, a disease caused by the *psora* or itch animal, which is often communicated from garments. This plague of vestments is termed v. 51, a 'fretting, (or rankling) leprosy,' a word which is applied in Ezek. 28. 24, to a 'pricking' or 'rankling brier,' and is strikingly expressive of the sensation produced by the irritating effect of the itch in the human subject.

CHAPTER XIV.

What was the priest required to do preparatory to cleansing the leper? v. 1—3.

'This shall be the law of the leper;' i. e. this is the mode which God hath ordained for cleansing a leper or qualifying him to be pronounced clean, and thus restored to the communion of God's people.—'He shall be brought unto the priest.' He was to be conducted from his 'several (separate) house,' to the borders of the camp, whither the priest was to go forth to meet him, and to perform the requisite examination. As this coming to the priest was required of the leper in every instance, however thoroughly he might have been healed; therefore, our Savior said to the leper whom he had healed, Mat. 8. 4, 'Go show thyself to the priest and offer the gift that Moses commanded.'

What were the rites and ceremonies commanded for his cleansing? v. 4—9.

Of the cedar wood, hyssop, clean bird, and scarlet wool, were made an instrument to sprinkle with. The cedar served for the handle, the hyssop and living bird were attached to it, by means of the scarlet wool or crimson fillet. The bird was so bound to this handle, as that its tail should be downwards, in order to be dipt into the blood of the bird that had been killed. By this means the blood was sprinkled, and when this was done, the living bird was let loose and permitted to go whithersoever it would. The *general purport* of the ceremonies here prescribed, was to point out the purification of the soul through the atonement and spirit

of Christ, but it is vain to attempt to fix the typical import of each particular rite.—‘Running water.’ Heb. ‘Living water.’ Chal. ‘Spring water.’ It is called ‘living water,’ from its being perpetually in motion.—‘Let the living bird loose.’ This was symbolical of the release of the leper from his confinement, and his restoration to liberty and to society.

What was the offering which he was required to bring on the eighth day, and what was to be done with the blood? v. 10—20.

What was required in case his poverty prevented him from bringing so much of an offering? v. 21—32.

What directions are given relative to the leprosy in houses? v. 33—47.

‘And I put the plague.’ This would seem to indicate that the infection of the house, whatever might be its peculiar nature, was caused by the immediate hand of God. Still it cannot be supposed, that two substances so dissimilar as wood and flesh could be liable to be affected by disease in the same manner. The probability, therefore, is that what is here termed a leprosy of houses, was some kind of affection which operated in a way very nearly resembling that of leprosy in the human system, fretting, corrupting, and wasting away the substance of the wood, and similar to the effect of animalcules in destroying the texture of linen or woollen garments. This effect is supposed by some to have been owing to an excess either of dryness or moisture in buildings, by others to salt petre, and by others to animalcula. But as far as the natural cause is concerned, we are obliged, in the absence of all certainty, to content ourselves with mere conjecture.

What were the ceremonies prescribed for the cleansing of houses thus affected? v. 48—53.

CHAPTER XVI.

What directions was Moses, after the death of Nadab and Abihu, required to give to Aaron respecting his entrance into the most holy place? v. 1, 2.

‘Within the veil;’ i. e. the veil separating the holy from the most holy place, of which see an account Ex. 26, 33.—‘I will appear in the cloud.’ Targ. Jon. ‘The glory of my majesty shall be revealed.’ The allusion is to the bright luminous cloud which took its station over the mercy-seat, and between the cherubims, and constituted the Shechniah, or symbol of the divine presence. Because, therefore, the most holy place was in a peculiar sense the residence of the divine glory, it was to be regarded with the most profound reverence, and not entered but upon special occasions, one of which is here mentioned..

With what ceremonies was Aaron required to make his entrance into this part of the sanctuary? v. 3, 4.

What was he to take of the congregation? v. 5.

What was to be done with the goats? v. 7—10.

‘Present them.’ Heb. ‘Make them to stand.’—‘At the door of the tabernacle,’ i. e. within the court-yard.—‘Shall cast lots upon the two goats.’ According to the Jews, the two lots might be either of wood, stone, or metal. On one was written FOR JEHOVAH, and on the other FOR THE SCAPE GOAT. They were then put into a vessel, while the goats stood with their faces to the west. The vessel was then shaken, and the priest putting in both his hands, brought out a lot in each. Being stationed between the two goats, the lot which was on his right hand he laid upon the goat that was on his right; and that which was in his left hand he laid upon the goat that was on his left; and thus according to what was written on the lots, the *scape goat* and the *goat for sacrifice* were determined.—‘Scape goat.’ Heb. ‘Azazél,’ derived from ‘Az,’ a goat and to ‘Azal,’ send away, dis-

miss; implying the *dismissed* or *sent away goat*, to distinguish it from the goat which was retained for sacrifice.

What was to be done with the blood of the slain bullock and the slain goat? v. 11—19.

What were the ceremonies connected with the sending away of the scape goat? v. 20—22.

The animal thus dismissed was by this act represented as *bearing away* or *carrying off* the sins of the people; and consequently was a striking type of Christ, who by his death and sufferings took and bore away the sins of men. It is supposed also, that as the two goats made only one sacrifice, and yet only one of them was slain, the ceremony pointed out the Lord Jesus *dying* for our sins and *rising again* for our justification, the *slain goat* represent one part of his work, and the *scape goat* the other.

What was Aaron to do after this? v. 23, 24.

What was prescribed to the person who had conducted the scape goat to the wilderness? v. 26.

What was commanded in respect to burning the skins, flesh, and offals of the slain bullock and goats? v. 27, 28.

What was the day appointed for the above mentioned solemnity, and what rules are given for its proper observance? v. 29—34.

CHAPTER XVII.

What was Moses required to enjoin respecting the etiquette to be observed in the sacrifices of the people, and upon what penalty? v. 1—6.

‘Whatsoever man.’ Heb. ‘Man, man.’ This law, as appears from the instances specified, had relation only to such animals as were killed for sacrifice. Those that were slain for

other purposes might be killed any where.—‘Blood shall be imputed;’ i. e. that man shall be accounted as a murderer; shall be reckoned to have spilt innocent blood. Thus in a case where the spirit of the divine institutions was disregarded, Is. 66. 3, it is said, ‘He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man.’—‘To the end,’ &c. The reasons of this requirement were, (1). That as God designed there should be one altar, one high-priest, one sanctuary, and one commonwealth of Israel, this unity of the nation and the religion would be destroyed if various altars and priests were allowed. (2). A plurality of priests, altars, and sanctuaries would very naturally lead to a plurality of gods, and thus all the evils of idolatry would be gradually introduced into the worship of the chosen people. The statute before us requiring all their sacrifices to be presented at one place was happily adapted to prevent these consequences.—‘Which they offer in the open field.’ Heb. ‘Which they sacrifice upon the face of the field.’ The Jewish writers say, ‘Before the tabernacle was set up, the high places were lawful; and the service was by the first-born; after the tabernacle was erected, the high places were unlawful, and the service was performed by the priests.’ This limitation as to the place of worship is graciously done away under the gospel, Mat. 1. 11, ‘My name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a peace-offering.’

Was this law ever dispensed with upon special occasions?

See Judg. 13. 19. 1 Sam. 7. 9.—11. 15.—16. 2. 2 Sam. 24. 18. 1 Kings 18. 23. In such cases we are undoubtedly to suppose that the irregularity had the divine approbation.

What special prohibition is contained in v. 7th.

‘No more offer their sacrifices unto devils.’ The original word here rendered ‘devils’ properly signifies *hairy ones*, or creatures *rough, rugged*, and *shaggy* in aspect, and hence, is applied not only to *he-goats*, but to certain fabulous beings or sylvan gods, who were popularly supposed to appear in the form of goats. Herodotus says that all goats were worshipped in Egypt, particularly the *he-goat*, and from these sprung Pan, Silenus, and the innumerable herd of imagina-

ry beings, *sartys*, *dryads*, *fauns*, &c. all woodland gods, and held in veneration among the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans. From this source too it is not unlikely that the popular representations of the devil in Christian countries, in which he is represented as having a *goat-like* form, with a tail, horns, and cloven feet, are borrowed. Such representations certainly bear a strong resemblance to the ancient heathen Pan.—‘After whom they have gone a whoring.’ Chal. ‘With whom they have committed idolatry.’ This term is often employed in the Scriptures to denote *idolatry*, because that was a violation of the covenant between God and his people, which is repeatedly denominated a *marriage covenant*.

To whom did this precept apply besides native born Jews, and what was to be the penalty for its neglect? v. 8, 9.

What precept is given respecting the use of blood, and what the reason annexed to it? v. 10—12.

‘That eateth any manner of blood.’ This prohibition is met with twice elsewhere in the Levitical law, Lev. 3. 17—7. 26, besides its being formed in the precepts of Noah, Gen. 9. 4. It is repeated again and again, and much stress laid upon it as a law that has more in it than would at first appear.—‘I will set my face against;’ i. e. will direct my anger against. ‘Face’ is often used by the sacred writers for ‘anger,’ as may be seen by the following passages; Gen. 32. 20. ‘I will appease him’ (Heb. ‘I will appease his face’). Lam. 4. 16, ‘The *anger* (Heb. *face*) of the Lord hath divided them.’ Jer. 3. 12. ‘And I will not cause mine *anger* (Heb. *face*) to fall upon you,’ 1 Pet. 3. 12, ‘The *face* (i. e. *anger*) of the Lord is against them that do evil.’ The blood of clean fishes, of locusts, and of creeping things is understood by the Jews to be excepted from this prohibition.—‘Will cut him off;’ i. e. he shall be punished by death; by the sentence of the judge, if the crime were known; if not, by the secret judgment of God.—‘The life of the flesh is in the blood.’ That the blood actually possesses *vitality* or a *living principle*, and that the life of the

whole body is derived from it, is proved by the researches of modern anatomists and physiologists to be a doctrine of sound philosophy, as well as of divine revelation. This is demonstrated by the following among other facts; If blood be taken from the arm in the most intense cold that the human body can suffer, it will raise the thermometer to the same height, as blood taken in the most sultry heat. Now it is known that *living bodies* alone have the power of resisting great degrees of heat and cold, and of maintaining in almost every situation, while in health, that temperature which we distinguish by the name of *animal heat*. This therefore may be considered as a very powerful, if not a conclusive argument of the real *vitality* of the blood.—‘It is the blood that maketh atonement.’ By transgression a man forfeits his *life* to divine justice, and he must die did not mercy provide him a substitute—the *life* of a beast is appointed and accepted by God as a substitute for the sinner’s *life*; but as this *life* is in the *blood*, and as the *blood* is the grand principle of *vitality*, therefore the *blood* is to be poured out upon the altar, and thus the *life* of the beast becomes a substitute for the *life* of the man. But this was a typical ordinance, having direct reference to the atonement of Christ. Christ not only *died* for sinners, but our redemption is ever ascribed to his *blood*: for in order to make a satisfactory atonement, he not only bowed his head upon the cross and gave up the ghost, but his side was opened, the pericardium and the heart evidently pierced, that the vital fluid might be poured out from the very seat of life, and that thus the *blood* which is the life should be shed to make expiation for the *life* of the soul. The forbidding the eating of blood therefore would naturally tend to get a devout and reverent regard for that precious fluid which was visibly represented in the blood of the victims slain upon the Jewish altar.

What additional precepts are here given as appendages to this law and safeguards of its observance? v. 13–16.

‘Cover it with dust.’ Lest it should be licked up by any other animal. The covering of the blood also conveyed the intimation that it should not be imputed as a matter of guilt to the shedder, as appears from the contrary, Job, 16–18, ‘O

earth, *cover* not thou my blood, and let my cry have no place.' Ezek. 24. 7, 8, 'For her blood is in the midst of her; she sets it upon the top of a rock; she poured it not upon the ground, to cover it with dust; that it might cause fury to come up to take vengeance; I have set her blood upon the top of a rock that it should not be covered;' where the blood not covered, signifies a crying to God for vengeance. The Jews regard this as a very weighty precept, and appoint that the blood should be covered with these words: 'Blessed be he that hath sanctified us by his precepts, and commanded us to cover blood.'—'That which dieth of itself or that which was torn.' Because, in both cases, the blood was retained in the body; hence the council at Jerusalem forbade things *strangled*, as well as *blood*; because in such beasts, the blood was coagulated in the veins and arteries.—'He shall wash his clothes.' In this case it is supposed that the person sinned ignorantly or through inadvertency, not of deliberation or set purpose; for any presumptuous sin was to be followed by exemplary judgments.

CHAPTER XVIII.

What is the general scope of this chapter?

Ans. To prohibit marriage and every species of improper intercourse between certain near relations. The design of a considerable portion of the 20th chapter is to specify the penalties annexed to a transgression of these precepts.

What is the import of the expression, 'I am the Lord your God,' so frequently repeated in this connexion?

Ans. These words constitute the grand authoritative sanction of all the ensuing laws, implying that they respect a matter of the utmost importance, one in which the honour and glory of the great God were most deeply involved. Although the God of all, he was in a special and emphatic sense the God of the nation of Israel, with whom they were in covenant, whom they professed to serve, and to whom they were under the greatest obligations imaginable.—

It may here be observed, that as this is the only part of the divine law in which God has formally made known his will to his creatures in relation to the subject of which it treats, and as obedience to these precepts was made a matter of life and death, it is scarcely supposable that there is so great a degree of intrinsic obscurity in the meaning of the laws, that any serious enquirer should necessarily be left in uncertainty as to the mind of the Lawgiver upon this point.

For what reasons are the precepts and regulations here given concerning marriage considered to be obligatory upon us at the present day?

It would seem that they are so to be considered, because (1). The connexions here forbidden are spoken of as being among the abominations of the Egyptians and Canaanites, by which they had defiled the land and incurred the divine indignation. But these heathen nations, not having the written law, had, in so doing, sinned merely against the law of nature; from which the inference is obvious that the law or light of nature, when properly regarded, condemns these connexions as incestuous. This will appear if it be considered. (2). That by marriage two become one flesh; therefore those that were before in a sense one flesh by *nature*, could not, without the greatest absurdity, become one flesh by *institution*; the institution being designed to unite those who before were not united. (3). If these laws are not binding on us we have nothing in the whole compass of Revelation to regulate the subject of marriage alliances; nothing to forbid a man marrying his own mother, sister, or daughter!

With what general prohibition does the chapter open, with what positive precept is it accompanied, and with what promise is it enforced? v. 1-5.

‘Of the land of Egypt.’ Chal. ‘Of the people of the land of Egypt.’—‘Neither shall ye walk in their ordinances;’ i. e. their laws, statutes, or institutions; for so are their iniquitous customs called, which by general prevalence and countenance had become so inveterate, and so deeply rooted and grounded in the corrupt affections of all classes that they had come to be regarded in the light and to possess all

the force, of so many laws and solemn institutions. It is possible at the same time that the word may have respect to *positive enactments*; yet whatever they may have been, the purport of the precept to the Israelites is, 'Do ye not after the manner of these nations, although their conduct may be allowed by the settled laws of their country; for ye are not to regard their practices any the more justifiable on that account.' Teaching us that neither common usage nor statute law can sanctify that which is in itself wrong.—'Ye shall do my judgments,' &c. Peculiar emphasis is here to be put upon the word 'my,' which is equivalent to 'mine only;' as the phrase, 'Him shalt thou serve,' Deut. 6. 13, is expounded by our Savior, 'Him *only* shalt thou serve,' Mat. 4. 10.—'Which if a man do, he shall live in them;' rather, 'shall live *by* them.' This the ancient versions and commentators generally understood as equivalent to, 'Shall have eternal life.' Thus the Chal. 'Shall live by them to life eternal.' So also Solom. Jarchi, 'Shall live in the world that is to come.' But as the term 'life,' 'living,' or 'to live,' is frequently used in the Scriptures to denote living happily, prosperously, and free from calamity, the probability is that it is to be so taken in the passage before us. He shall in consequence of this his obedience be favored to enjoy a long and happy life, whereas by disobedience he shall be judicially cut off.

What is the general precept contained in v. 6?

'None of you shall approach.' Heb. 'Man, man, ye shall not approach.' For this peculiar usage of the term 'approach,' see Gen. 20. 4. Is. 8. 3. Ezek. 18. 6.—'Any that is near of kin.' Heb. 'To any remainder of his flesh;' implying that in the relations about to be specified the parties were, in the economy of heaven's institution, so intimately united or rather identified, that the one was, as it were, the *remainder* of the other. In this case, therefore, the Most High lays down this *nearness of kin* as the foundation of all the following prohibitions, and then proceeds to state and determine, by his own sovereign authority, between whom that nearness of kin subsists. In the interpretation of what follows it is important to bear in mind, that although these prohibitions are principally addressed to the *man*, yet they

are equally binding upon the *woman* who stands in the same degree of relationship.

Between whom is marriage and all illicit intercourse forbidden in v. 7 ?

‘Of thy father, or of thy mother.’ The particle ‘or’ in this verse should undoubtedly be rendered ‘even,’ as these words are designed to express a principle which lies at the foundation of this whole system of marriage laws: viz. *that husband and wife are put for one and the same thing, are completely identified*; ‘they being no more twain but one flesh.’ The nakedness of the one therefore is the nakedness of the other; and he that marries his wife’s brother’s daughter does the same thing as if he married his own brother’s daughter. . The crime of Lot’s daughters was a transgression of the precept contained in this verse.

What marriage or sinful connexion is forbidden in v. 8.?

‘Of thy father’s wife.’ This term includes one’s *step-mother* as well as his *own mother*.

What penalty was annexed to transgression in this case? Lev. 20. 11.

How was this crime alluded to in the curses afterwards pronounced upon Mount Ebal? Deut. 27. 23.

Who was formerly guilty of it? Gen. 35. 32.

What instance of it is related in the New Testament, and how does the apostle speak of it? 1 Cor. 5. 1:

What marriages are forbidden in verses 9 and 11, and in what respect do these two cases differ? The difference appears to be this: the 9th verse contains a general precept forbidding a man to marry his sister, either ‘the daughter of his father born at home,’ i. e. his sister-german, or full sister, by father or mother; or, the daughter of

his mother, born abroad ;' i. e. his half-sister by the mother's side, and by another father. In the 11th verse a man is forbidden to marry a half-sister by his father's side.

What punishment was to follow a violation of this command ? Lev. 20. 17.

With this rule before us, can it be deemed proper for a man and his son to marry in the same family, the one the mother, and the other the daughter ?

Between whom is marriage forbidden in v. 10 ?

Between whom in the 12th ?

Between whom in the 13th ?

What was the punishment in this case ? Lev. 20. 19.

What other forbidden degree may be inferred from these verses ?

The marriage of an uncle to his niece would seem to be hereby prohibited, as the reason is the same in both cases.

Whom is a man forbidden to marry in v. 14, and what was to be the penalty ? Lev. 20. 20.

Whom in v. 15, and what the penalty ? Lev. 20. 12.

Whom in v. 16, and what the penalty ? Lev. 20. 31.

Was there any exception to this law ? Deut. 25. 5.

In case the brother died childless, it was not only *lawful* for her to marry her brother-in-law, but he was *obliged* by the above cited law to take her to wife.

Is it to be inferred from this that a man is forbidden to marry his deceased wife's sister ?

This connexion, it is certain, is not forbidden *in so many words* ; neither is it expressly forbidden that a man shall

marry his *grand-mother*. But as the prohibition v. 16, is founded on the relation subsisting between the parties, and on nothing else, and as the relation in the supposed case is precisely the same, it seems difficult to assign a reason why the one is not equally forbidden with the other. Should it be said that although from the divinely-constituted *oneness* or *identity* of husband and wife, a man is bound to regard his sister-in-law, *during the life-time of his wife*, as his own sister, yet that when his wife dies this peculiar relation dies with her, and his sister-in-law thenceforth becomes to him as any other woman; it may be answered, that this reasoning applies with equal force against the case of the brother's widow, and would consequently annul a plain precept of heaven. It may justly be questioned, therefore, whether the lawfulness of this kind of marriage can be fairly supported unless upon the ground of some real permission, either plainly stated or easily inferred from some other part of the statute. Such a permission it is supposed by many is to be found in v. 18 of this chapter; but it will appear from the note upon that verse, that it is by no means certain that the passage has any bearing at all upon the question.

What connexion is forbidden v. 17, and what the penalty annexed? Lev. 20. 14.

What is forbidden in v. 18?

'Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister.' In endeavoring to fix the true import of this verse, which is important from its supposed bearing on the 16th, it will be necessary to weigh with precision the meaning of the original words. The phrase 'a wife to her sister,' is a Hebrew idiom equivalent to our 'one to another.' Nothing is more common among the Hebrew writers, than to express the adding or joining of one thing to another than by the expression, 'a wife or woman to her sister,' or 'a man to his brother.'—Thus Ex. 26. 3, 'The curtains shall be coupled together *one to another.*' Heb. 'A wife to her sister.' Ezek. 1. 9, 'Their wings were joined *one to another.*' Heb. 'A wife to her sister.' Gen. 26. 31, 'They swore *one to another.*' Heb. 'A man to his brother.' Ex. 25. 20, 'And their faces shall look *one to another.*' Heb. 'A man to his brother.' From these instances in some of which the phrase is applied to things inanimate, it appears that the words in themselves do

not necessarily imply the adding of *one sister to another*, but merely *one wife to another*; as it is rendered in the margin. At the same time we do not regard the precept as containing a formal prohibition of polygamy, which was certainly tolerated at that time, nor does it appear that the Jews themselves ever so understood it; but the scope of it appears to be to forbid the taking of one wife in addition to another, either with the *express intention* of vexing and embittering the life of the first, to which an evil-minded husband might be prompted, or with a *careless indifference* whether this might not prove the result as was evidently the fact in the case of Hannah and Penninah, the two wives of Elkanah, 1 Sam. 1. 6. The point of the prohibition we suppose to be directed against the *malicious* or *heedless* temper with which a man might be induced to take a second wife during the life-time of the first. After her death he might make such a choice as he saw fit, provided it did not violate any of the foregoing precepts; which, however, we are inclined to think it would have done, had he married the deceased wife's sister.—A connexion, of which the lawfulness, to say the least, is so *doubtful*, that in a practical point of view the words in the 16th verse should perhaps have the force of a clear and positive prohibition.

What may be considered as probably the grand and leading design of the above mentioned prohibition?

Although a secondary purpose of the divine lawgiver might have been to guard effectually against the dangers of incestuous connexions, among those who were in habits of constant intercourse and familiarity, yet it seems not unlikely that the primary object was to produce in the minds of all men the deepest practical impression of the *nearness*, *oneness*, and *sanctity* of the marriage relation, and thus to furnish a standing commentary on the words of the original institution, 'they shall be no more twain but one flesh.' It may be doubted whether any thing could more forcibly illustrate the sacred nature of this ordinance than the principle which the mass of the Christian world, judging from their accredited standards, have gathered from the scope of this chapter, viz: 'That a man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than his own.'

As this, however, is a subject which has been much controverted among divines, and as writers of great eminence have adopted views of the nature and obligation of the Levitical laws respecting marriage directly the reverse of those advanced in the previous notes, we deem it right to present the reader with the substance of the arguments urged by our opponents. This we do in the words of Michaelis, in his Commentaries on the Laws of Moses.

“ There arises the question, Whether Moses only prohibits the marriages which he expressly mentions, or others beside not mentioned, where the degree of relationship is the same? This question, which is of so great importance in the marriage-laws of Christian nations, and which from an imperfect knowledge of oriental customs has been the subject of so much controversy, properly regards the following marriages, viz:—

1. With a brother's daughter.
2. With a sister's daughter.
3. With a maternal uncle's widow.
4. With a brother's son's widow.
5. With a sister's son's widow.
6. With a deceased wife's sister.

These marriages we may, perhaps, for brevity's sake, be allowed to denominate *the six marriages*, or *the consequential marriages*. They are as near as those which are prohibited. Moses never mentions them in his marriage statutes, yet the ground of his prohibitions is nearness of relationship. The question, therefore, is, Are these marriages to be or not to be considered as prohibited by just inference from the letter of his laws?

In my opinion *they are not*.

My reasons for denying and protesting against the conclusions are the following.

1. Moses does not appear to have framed or given his marriage-laws with any view to our deducing, or acting upon conclusions which we might think fit to deduce from them: for if this was his view, he has made several repetitions in them which are really very useless. What reason had he, for example, after forbidding marriage with a father's sister, to forbid it also with a mother's, if this second prohibition was included in the first, and if he meant, without saying a word on the subject, to be understood as speaking, not of particular marriages, but of degrees?

2. Moses has given his marriage-laws in two different places of the Pentateuch, viz: in both the XVIIIth and XXth chapters of Leviticus; but in the latter of these passages we find only the very same cases specified which had been specified in the former. Now had they been meant merely as examples of degrees of relationship, it would have been more rational to have varied them; and if it had been said, for instance, on the first occasion, *Thou shalt not marry thy father's sister*, to have introduced, on the second, the converse call, and said, *Thou shalt not marry thy brother's daughter*. This, however, is not done by Moses, who in the second enactment just specifies the father's sister as before, and seems, therefore, to have intended that he should be understood as having in his view no other marriages than those which he expressly names; unless we choose to interpret his laws in a manner to his own meaning and design."

What is forbidden to the Israelites in v. 21?

'Pass through the fire to Molech.' The name of this idol, which was especially worshipped by the Ammonites, is derived from 'Mâlak,' *to reign*, the root of 'Melek,' *king*, and is supposed to have represented the sun, the great fountain of fire and of light. In the inhuman worship of this idol, little children were either actually burnt alive in the way of consecration to him, or were made to pass between two rows of burning fires, from which they barely escaped with life, and probably not always with that. The words 'the fire' do not here occur in the original, but they are supplied in Deut. 18. 10. and 2 Kings 11. 3, which are elsewhere explained as apparently equivalent to 'burn in the fire,' 2 Chron. 28. 3. Leclerc supposes very ingeniously that the term 'pass through' was invented by the priests of Molech or Moloch, that the horrid sacrifice might be expressed by the mildest possible phrase.

What is the reason given for the various prohibitions contained in this chapter? v. 24—28.

What is the sovereign antidote against these abominations with which the chapter concludes? v. 30.

'Keep mine ordinance.' Heb. 'Keep my keeping;' i. e. my charge, that which I have delivered you to keep; imply-

ing that the only way to be preserved from all false worship, is seriously to consider and devoutly to observe the ordinances of the true religion.

CHAPTER XIX.

With what general exhortation to the people of Israel does the present chapter commence? v. 1, 2,

What is commanded respecting the duty of children to parents, and respecting the observance of the Lord's sabbaths? v. 3.

'Fear every man his mother and his father.' The 'fear' here required, is the same with the honor commanded by the fifth commandment. It includes inward reverence and esteem, outward expression of respect, obedience to the lawful commands of parents, care and endeavor to please and render them comfortable, and to avoid any thing that may offend and grieve them, or incur their displeasure.—'Keep my sabbaths;' i. e. not only the seventh day, but all other appointed days, which were also called *sabbaths*. Chal. 'Keep my sabbath days.' This precept is joined with that requiring filial reverence, inasmuch as it is supposed that if God provides by law for the preserving of the honor of parents, parents will use their authority for keeping up in the minds and conduct of their children a due regard for the divine institutions, particularly the one in question. The contempt of parents, and the profanation of the sabbath usually go together, and begin the ruin of the young. The prospects of those children are the brightest who make conscience of honoring their parents and keeping holy the sabbath day.

Against what are the people warned in v. 4? 'Turn not unto idols.' The original word for 'idols' here, is 'Elilim,' *things of nought, nothings, vanities*, in allusion to which the apostle says, 1 Cor. 8. 4, 'We know that an idol is *nothing* in the world.'

What precept is here repeated respecting their peace-offerings? v. 5—8.

What requirement having respect to the welfare of the poor is contained in v. 9, 10?

‘Shalt not wholly reap.’ Heb. ‘Shall not make a full end,’ or, ‘Shall not make clean riddance.’ On this precept the Jewish canons remark; ‘He that reapeth his field must not reap all the field wholly; but must leave a little standing corn for the poor in the end of the field, whether he cut it or pluck it up: and that which is left is called the corner, (Peah). And as he must leave of the field, so of the trees, when he gathereth their fruit, he must leave a little for the poor.’ This is a very interesting and amiable feature of the Levitical law, which has been too seldom imitated in human codes.

What was forbidden to the Israelites in their dealings with their neighbors and with hirelings? v. 11—13.

‘Shall not defraud nor rob.’ The first of these terms signifies in the original to *oppress by fraud*, the second, to *oppress by violence*. Against both these offences John the Baptist warned the soldiers who came to him, Luke 3. 14, ‘And he said unto them, *Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages.*’ These sins of *fraudulent oppression* and *robbery* are often charged by the prophets upon the nation of Israel. See Is. 3. 14. Jer. 22. 2.—‘The wages—shall not abide with thee all night;’ inasmuch as it is the support of the man’s life and family, and they need to expend it as fast as it is earned. This withholding the wages of the hirelings we learn elsewhere is a sin that cries to heaven for vengeance, Jam. 5. 4.

What precept is given relative to the deaf and the blind? v. 14.

‘Thou shalt not cause;’ or as the Gr. renders it, ‘Thou shalt not speak evil of;’ because being unable to *hear*, he cannot vindicate his own character.—‘Nor put a stumbling block.’ Gr. ‘Nor put a scandal;’ a precept which the gospel makes universal; Rom. 14. 13, ‘Let no man put a stumbling block, (Gr. a scandal,) in his brother’s way.’ Again it is said, Mat. 18. 7, ‘Woe unto the world because of *offences*, (Gr. scandals, or stumbling blocks).’ The spirit of these precepts is to forbid the taking advantage, in any case, of the ignorance, simplicity, or inexperience of others, particularly the giving bad counsel to those that are simple and easily imposed upon, by which they may be led to do something to their own injury. On the contrary, we are

always to do to our neighbor as we would upon a change of circumstances, that he should do to us.—‘Shalt fear thy God.’ Though thou mayst not fear the deaf and the blind, who cannot call thee to an account, yet remember that God both sees and hears, and he will avenge thy wickedness.

What distinction is given to judges and magistrates? v. 15.

‘Shall not respect the person.’ Literally, ‘Shalt not lift up or accept the face;’ i. e. shall not show favor from private regards, perverting the cause of justice. Though the poverty of the poor might plead strongly in their favor, yet this was not to influence the decisions of a judge.

What precept is given in respect to tale-bearing? v. 16.

‘Shall not go up and down as a tale-bearer.’ The original ‘Râkil,’ properly signifies a trader, a pedlar, and is here applied to one who travels up and down dealing in slanders and detractions, as a merchant does in wares, possessing himself of the secrets of individuals and of families, and then blazoning them abroad, usually with a false coloring as to motives and a distortion of facts. In the Septuagint the Heb. is rendered Prov. 11. 13, and 20. 19, by a word signifying ‘double tongued;’ and in the New Testament the term seems to be ‘Diabolos,’ false accuser, slanderer, calumniator. The Chal. renders the present passage, ‘Thou shalt not divulge accusations, or detractions, among the people.’ In this sense the word is employed Dan. 6. 24, in reference to ‘the men which had accused (Gr. ‘Diabolantas,’ slandered,) Daniel,’ and analogous to this the common name applied to the Devil in Greek is, ‘Diabolos,’ from his character of calumniator and ‘accuser of the brethren,’ denominated in the Syriac, Mat. 4, a ‘divulger of accusations.’—‘Neither shalt thou stand against the blood,’ &c. i. e. thou shalt neither be a false witness to the endangering of a man’s life, nor shalt thou stand by and see thy neighbor’s blood spilt without an effort to save him. This precept is joined with the preceding, because tale-bearing, by sowing discord and breeding broils in society often led to the shedding of blood. Thus Ezek. 22. 9, ‘In thee are men that carry tales to shed blood.’ The case of Doeg, 1 Sam. 22. 9, 18, is one singularly in point in the present instance. ‘Then

answered Doeg the Edomite, which was set over the servants of Saul, and said, I saw the son of Jesse coming to Nob, to Abimelech the son of Ahitub, &c. And the king said to Doeg, Turn thou and fall upon the priests. And Doeg the Edomite turned, and fell upon the priests, and slew in that day fourscore and five persons that did wear a linen ephod.'

What prohibition is given against hatred and uncharitableness? v. 17.

'Shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart;' i. e. thou shalt not conceal thy hatred against him for any wrong that he has done thee; but shall mildly yet faithfully rebuke him, endeavoring to convince him of the wrong, and to bring him both to acknowledge his sin before God, and to make the adequate reparation. The Jews explain the precept thus; 'When any man sinneth against another, he must not inwardly hate him and keep silence; as it is said of the wicked, And Absalom spake unto his brother Amnon neither good nor bad, for Absalom hated Amnon, 2 Sam. 13. 22, but he is commanded to make it known unto him, and to say, Why hast thou done thus unto me?' This is confirmed by the Gospel rule, Luke 17. 3, 'If thy brother sin against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent forgive him.' The force of the original word rendered 'rebuke' is *to convince*, or rather *to convict, of wrong by reasoning or argument*. — 'And not suffer sin upon him;' or, Heb. 'Thou shalt not bear sin, (or punishment,) for him;' i. e. thou shalt not, on his account, for his sake, by reason of neglecting to do your duty to him, contract guilt to your own soul. This is the usual and appropriate meaning of the phrase, as appears from Lev. 22. 9, 'They shall therefore keep mine ordinance, lest they bear sin for it.' Num. 18. 32, 'And ye shall bear no sin by reason of it;' where the original is the same as in the present case. And in this sense both the Gr. and the Chal. understand it. The import is, that a man who failed to reprove sin in another rendered himself obnoxious to the same punishment as the original offender. The phrase, however, may bear the sense given it in our version, which is equivalent to saying, 'Thou shalt not suffer him to go on in sin by neglecting to inform of it; shalt not leave him under the guilt of sin unreprieved.'

What injunction is given against revenge? v. 18.

‘Thou shalt not avenge;’ i. e. thou shalt not take into thine own hands the business of redressing thy wrongs, nor shalt thou refuse to do a kindness from the remembrance of injuries past.—‘Nor bear any grudge.’ Heb. ‘Thou shalt not watch, mark, or insidiously observe, the sins of thy people;’ i. e. thou shalt not covertly watch an opportunity to vent thy resentment for an old affront. Gr. ‘Thou shalt not bear inveterate anger.’ Chal. ‘Thou shalt not keep (harbor,) enmity.’ So God is said, Nah. 1. 2, ‘to take vengeance on his adversaries, and to *keep* (watch,) for his enemies.’ But not so towards his people, Jer. 3. 12, ‘For I am merciful, saith the Lord, and I will not *keep* (anger) for ever.’ Ps. 103. 9, ‘He will not always chide; nor *keep* (his anger) for ever.’

What is commanded respecting the mixture of different kinds in cattle, seed, and garments? v. 19. ‘Ye shall keep my statutes.’ These words are here inserted lest the ensuing ordinance should be deemed of little moment and so be neglected.—‘Shall not let thy cattle.’ Heb. ‘Shalt not cause thy cattle.’ This might perhaps have been forbidden in order to impress the Israelites with a greater abhorrence of the crime of bestiality, or at least to afford them among the brute creation no example of those unnatural commixtures which were prohibited in the foregoing chapter, v. 22. 23. Yet it would seem that it was not forbidden them to *use* animals produced from such mixtures, as we find *mules* very frequently mentioned in the sacred history, which it is well known are gendered in this manner. See note on Gen. 36. 24. As to *seeds*, it would in many cases, be very improper to sow different kinds in the same spot of ground, as many species of vegetables are disposed to mix and thus produce a very degenerate crop. Thus if oats and wheat were sown together, the latter would be injured, the former ruined. The turnip and carrot would not succeed conjointly, when either of them separately would prosper and yield a good crop; and if this be all that is intended, the precept here given is agreeable to the soundest agricultural maxims. As to *garments*, the prohibition might have been merely intended to keep them aloof from the superstitious customs of the heathen, or to intimate how careful they should be not to mingle themselves with the Gentiles, nor to weave any profane usages into God’s ordinances.

What was the law enacted relative to eating

the fruit of the fruit-trees after they were settled in the land of promise ? 23—25.

‘Three years shall it be as uncircumcised.’ The fruit of a young tree could not be good ; for not having arrived at a state of maturity, the juices were not sufficiently elaborated to produce fruit excellent in its kind. The Israelites were commanded, therefore, not to eat of the fruits of a tree till the fifth year after its planting—in the three first years, the fruit is unwholesome; in the fourth year, the fruit is holy, it belongs to God and should be consecrated to him, v. 24. In the fifth year, and afterwards, the fruits might be employed for common use.

What is said of eating of blood and rising incantations ? v. 26.

‘Shall not eat any thing with the blood;’ i. e. any flesh not fully dead, or of which the blood has not been properly drained out. Thus it is said, 1 Sam. 14. 33, ‘Behold the people sin against the Lord in that they eat with the blood,’ &c.—‘Neither shall ye use enchantment nor observe times;’ i. e. ye shall not have recourse to any superstitious observances in order to learn what is about to happen to you, nor shall be careful to note the differences of times like the foolish astrologers, as if some were lucky and others unlucky.

What is said of a superstitious cutting of the hair ? v. 27.

‘Shall not round the corners;’ i. e. shall not so shave off the hair of the head around the temples and behind the ears as to leave the head wholly bald, except a dish-like tuft upon the crown. This was in opposition to the usages of the heathen.

What superstitious signs of mourning were forbidden to the chosen people ? v. 28.

What pretenders to supernatural skill were they forbidden to consult ? v. 31. See note on Ex. 22. 18.

What marks of reverence were to be shown to the aged ? v. 32.

What was enjoined as to the treatment of stran-

gers, and by what consideration is it enforced? v. 33, 34.

It is supposed that the stranger was not an idolater, but a worshipper of the God of Israel, though not circumcised; a proselyte of righteousness; if such an one sojourned among them they must not vex him, nor oppress, nor overreach him in a bargain, taking advantage of his ignorance of their laws and customs; they must reckon it as great a sin to cheat a stranger, as to cheat an Israelite; 'Nay,' say the Jewish doctors, 'they must not so much as upbraid him with being a stranger, and his having been an idolater.' As all men are children of one common father, it argues a generous disposition and a pious regard to God to show kindness to strangers.

What precept is given regulating their dealings with one another in the way of buying and selling? v. 36.

With what general command does the chapter conclude? v. 37.

CHAPTER XX.

What is the general design of this chapter?

Ans. Principally to specify the punishments which it pleased God to annex to the transgression of the laws contained in the two former chapters.

What law, before given, is here repeated respecting human sacrifices? v. 1—3.

'To defile my sanctuary;' i. e. namely the tabernacle or temple, which was defiled when God was professedly worshipped in any other place or in any other manner, than he had commanded; or when sacrifices were offered by his people to false gods; inasmuch as the temple of God hath no agreement with idols.

What was threatened against those who connived at this flagrant crime? v. 4, 5.

'Hide their eyes.' Gr. 'Winking shall wink;' i. e. shall neglect to punish. The Greek word is the same with that

employed by the apostle, Acts 17. 30, 'The times of this ignorance God *winked at*.'—'After him;' i. e. after his example.

What was threatened to the consulter of familiar spirits? v. 6.

What breach of the fifth commandment is mentioned, and what was threatened to the offender? v. 9.

'His blood shall be upon him;' i. e. he shall be put to death as a malefactor justly condemned to die; one who has brought his guilt upon his own head and who can blame none but himself for the consequences.

What is the punishment denounced against the crime mentioned in v. 14?

'Shall be burnt with fire.' As there are worse crimes mentioned here, v. 11, 17, where the delinquent is merely ordered to be put to death or cut off, it is very likely that the crime specified in the verse was not punished by *burning alive*, but by some kind of *branding*, by which they were ever after rendered infamous.

With what exhortations and promises does the chapter conclude? v. 22—26.

CHAPTER XXI.

What charge was Moses commanded to give to the priests, and with what exceptions was it accompanied? v. 1—5.

'For the dead.' Heb. 'For a soul;' a term repeatedly applied to a *dead body*. See note on Gen. 2. 7. The spirit of the passage forbids that any priest should assist at laying out a dead body, or preparing it for interment. This defilement was contracted not only by touching a dead body, but by coming into a tent or house where a dead body lay, by touching the grave, or by bearing the dead.—'For his kin that is near unto him.' In this class the priests' wife is supposed to be included, though not expressly mentioned.—'Which hath had no husband;' whereas had she been married, it would have been the duty of the surviving husband

to see to the performance of all the requisite rites at her burial, so that the priest, her brother, would have been excused. — ‘Being a chief man.’ Or, ‘for a chief man;’ i. e. he shall not thus defile himself for any one that is not near of kin to him, though the dead person were a chief or the chiefest man among his people. — ‘Shall not make baldness.’ This was that they might not adopt the customs of the heathen, of whom it is said in the apocryphal book of Baruch, 6. 31, that ‘their priests sit in their temples, with their clothes rent, and their heads and beards shaven, and having nothing upon their heads; and they roar and cry before their god’s, as men do at the feast where is dead.’

By what reason is the duty of peculiar sanctity enjoined upon the priests? v. 6.

Were they to be especially careful of degrading themselves in their marriage connexions? v. 7, 8.

‘Or profane;’ i. e. one born of an unlawful marriage. — ‘Thou shalt sanctify him;’ i. e. thou, Israel, shalt hold and repute him as holy, and shalt do all in thy power to keep up the sacred estimation in which, for his office’s sake, he is held.

What was to be the punishment of a priest’s daughter, who had by her ill conduct profaned her father? v. 9.

What things are in a particular manner forbidden to the high-priest? v. 10—12.

‘Shall not uncover his head.’ Heb. ‘Shall not make free his head;’ i. e. shall not suffer his hair to be dishevelled in token of mourning. Gr. ‘Shall not put the mitre off his head.’ Chal. ‘Shall not let his locks grow.’ See note on Lev. 10. 6.

By what rules was he to be governed in the choice of a wife? v. 13—15.

As the high-priest was a type of Christ, his wife, who was to be a virgin, was a type of the Church; which was to be chaste, pure, holy; wherefore the apostle says, 2 Cor. 11. 2, ‘I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you a *chaste virgin* to Christ.’

What general qualifications were requisite in

those that approached to offer the bread of their God, or also officiated in the sanctuary? v. 16—24.

‘That hath any blemish.’ The requisition that men of perfect members and comely face should be chosen to minister in holy things, seems to have been founded upon a just view of human nature, as men are prone to judge by the outward appearance, and to think meanly of any service, however honorable, which is performed by agents distinguished for personal defects. It was greatly for the credit of the sanctuary, therefore, that none should appear then, who were any way disfigured by nature or by accident.

CHAPTER XXII.

What order was Moses now required to give to Aaron and his sons? v. 1—3.

‘Separate themselves from the holy things.’ Gr. ‘Let them take heed of the holy things.’ The precept has respect to such of the priests as were ceremonially unclean. During the time that this uncleanness was upon them they were to abstain from eating the holy things which ordinarily belonged to the priests. The root of the Heb. verb here translated ‘separate,’ is *Nâzar*, from which comes ‘Nazarite,’ *one separated*. — ‘Among your generations;’ i. e. either now or at any time hereafter. — ‘That goeth unto the holy things;’ i. e. for the purpose of eating, as is to be inferred from v. 4.

Mention some of the species of defilements here specified, which obliged the person to abstain from holy things? 4—9.

‘Unclean by the dead.’ Heb. ‘Unclean by a soul;’ i. e. a dead body. Gr. ‘Any uncleanness of a soul.’ — ‘Lest they bear sin for it;’ lest they bear punishment.

What is the precept given concerning the stranger, the sojourner, the hireling, and the slave? v. 10, 11.

‘No stranger;’ i. e. none that is not of the seed of Aaron, or of the family of some priest. — ‘Eat of the holy things;’ i. e. of the wave-breast and the heave-shoulder. — ‘A sojourner of the priest;’ i. e. one that boards with, or only

lodges in the house of a priest; a transient inmate of his family.—‘A hired servant;’ i. e. a day-laborer, or the like.—‘Buy any soul with his money.’ Hence it appears that although the Mosaic economy recognised, under certain restrictions, the possession of slaves, yet they were generally taken from among the heathen, and were doubtless instructed in the true religion; as we find in the present instance, that they were reckoned as a part of the priest’s own family, and treated as such.

Under what circumstances was a priest’s daughter permitted to eat of the holy things? v. 12, 18.

What was required of the man, who, without being entitled to it, had eaten of the holy thing unwittingly? v. 14—16,

‘The fifth part.’ The holy thing of which he had unknowingly eaten was to be fairly valued, and to this value he was to add one-fifth more, and give the whole to the priest.—‘Shall not profane—or suffer;’ i. e. the priests should not profane the holy things by suffering them to be eaten by strangers. The phrase ‘suffer them to bear the iniquity,’ may be rendered ‘cause them to bear,’ meaning that they shall not by their negligence cause the people to fall under the punishment which God would inflict for such a trespass.

What was enjoined as to the quality of the sacrifices offered as free-will offerings, or for the performance of vows? v. 17—25.

At what age were the different animals to be offered to God? v. 26—28.

How was the sacrifice of thanksgiving to be offered? v. 29, 30.

With what general charge, and by what reasons enforced, does the chapter conclude? v. 29—33.

‘Neither shall ye profane my holy name.’ Those who profess God’s name, if they make not conscience of keeping his commandments, do but profane his name.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Concerning what was Moses now required to give charge to the children of Israel? v. 1, 2.

The Levitical law having been thus far for the most part conversant about holy *persons*, holy *things*, and holy *places*, many of which had been incidentally mentioned before, but now comes to treat of holy *times*; are here all stated in connexion, with the exception of the new moons.—‘Feasts.’ The original word ‘Moad,’ literally implies nearly a *set time*, a *stated season*, for any purpose whatever, but is applied here and often elsewhere to the *solemn feasts* of the Israelites, which were appointed by God, and fixed to certain seasons of the year. It is sometimes rendered in the Gr. by ‘Eorte,’ a *feast*, and sometimes by ‘Paneguris,’ a *general assembly*, of which the former occurs, Col. 2. 16, ‘Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an *holy day*, (Gr. ‘Eorte,’) or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days;’ and the other Heb. 12. 23, ‘But ye are come—to the *general assembly*, (Gr. Paneguris,) and church of the first-born.’ Perhaps a more suitable rendering of the term would be ‘solemnities.’—‘Which ye shall proclaim;’ i. e. give notice of by the sound of a trumpet.—‘Holy convocations.’ Heb. ‘Convocations of holiness;’ i. e. times when the people were solemnly to meet together to celebrate the mercies of God with sacrifices of thanksgiving and rejoicings.

In what words is the institution of the sabbath, the first and greatest of these solemnities, introduced? v. 3.

‘A sabbath of rest.’ Heb. ‘A sabbath of sabbatism.’ See note on Gen. 2. 3.—‘An holy convocation;’ i. e. a time of holy convocation; from which it appears that meetings for public worship are an essential part of the due observance of the day, and that they cannot be neglected or omitted without going contrary to our main design of the institution.—‘Shall do no work.’ On other holy days they were forbidden to do any servile work, v. 7, but on the sabbath, and the day of atonement, (which is also called a sabbath,) they were to do no work at all, not even the dressing of meat.—‘In all your dwellings.’ As if he should say; ‘Whether you have opportunity of sanctifying the day in a holy convocation or not, yet let it be a sacred season throughout your private

habitations. Put a difference between this and other days in your families. It is the sabbath of the Lord, the day in which he rested from the work of creation, and on which he has appointed us to rest; let it be observed in all your dwellings with devout reverence.'

On what days were the passover and the feast of unleavened bread to be observed, and in what manner? v. 4—8.

'Shall do no servile work.' This the Jews understood of every kind of labor except that which pertained to the preparation of food. It probably denotes that more laborious kind of service which we understand by *drudgery*; such as ploughing, sowing, reaping, threshing, gathering the vintage, &c.

At what time and in what manner was the feast of first-fruits to be observed? v. 9—14.

'When ye be come into the land.' The actual observance of this law was to be deferred till they had arrived in the land of Canaan, and had become permanently fixed in their settlements; for during their sojourn in the wilderness they could neither sow nor reap.—'Shall wave the sheaf.' A sheaf of the new corn was brought to the priest who was to heave it up, in token of his presenting it to the God of heaven, and to wave it to and fro before the Lord, as the Lord of the whole earth, and the bountiful giver of all its fruits and favors. This offering of the sheaf of the first-fruits did as it were sanctify to them all the rest of the harvest. Besides it served it as a type of Christ who is risen from the dead as the 'first-fruits of them that slept,' 1 Cor. 15. 20.

How long after this was to be the feast of Pentecost, and what is said of the manner of its celebration? 15—21.

'Seven Sabbaths;' i. e. seven weeks; the word *sabbath* among the Jews being equivalent, to one *week*. Accordingly it is said, Luke 18. 12, Gr. 'I fast twice on the sabbath;' i. e. twice in the week. So in Mat. 28. 1, Gr. 'As it began to dawn towards the *first of the sabbath*;' i. e. the first day of the week.—'Ye shall number fifty days.' Hence the name 'Pentecost' by which this feast was called, signifying *fifty*. In Ex. 23. 16, it is called 'feast of harvest,' upon which see note.

What precept, before given, is repeated in v. 22?

What was the feast appointed to be held in the seventh month, and what was required in reference to it? v. 53—25.

‘Memorial of blowing of trumpets.’ Chal. ‘Memorial of shouting.’ As the seventh month corresponded with a part of September, which was the commencement of the civil year, the design of this institution was probably merely to celebrate in a formal way the ushering in of the new year.

What was the festival appointed to be held on the tenth month, and what was required in order to its due observance? v. 26—32.

When and how was the Feast of Tabernacles to be established, and with what design? v. 33—44.

‘The feast of tabernacles.’ In this solemnity, the people left their houses, and dwelt for seven days in *booths* or tents made of the branches of trees, in commemoration of their forty years sojourning and dwelling in *tents* in the wilderness, while destitute of any fixed habitations.

CHAPTER XXIV.

With the repetition of what ordinance does this chapter open? v. 1—4.

‘To cause the lamps to burn.’ Heb. ‘To cause the lamp to ascend;’ i. e. the flame of the lamp. Although we find the word ‘lamps’ in the plural in our version, yet it is in the singular, ‘lamp,’ in the original, although it occurs in the plural v. 4. The reason of this may be, that all the seven lamps were considered as forming but one lamp; in allusion to which the Holy Spirit is represented by ‘seven lamps of fire before the throne,’ Rev. 4. 5; for there are ‘diversities of gifts, but one Spirit.’—‘Continually;’ i. e. from night to night; *not* without intermission. So the ‘continual burnt-offering’ means that which was regularly offered at the appointed season. So Mephibosheth was to eat bread at David’s table *continually*; i. e. at the stated hours of meals, 2 Sam. 9. 7, 13. In like manner when the apostle says, 1 Thess. 3. 17, ‘Pray without ceasing,’ his meaning undoubt

edly is that they were to pray constantly, morning and evening, at the stated hours of prayer.

What was the order respecting the shew-bread ? v. 5—9.

‘ Upon the pure table;’ i. e. the table overlaid with pure gold, and which is to be kept always purely clean and bright. So above the ‘ pure candlestick’ means the candlestick made of pure gold.—‘ That it may be on the bread for a memorial;’ i. e. that the frankincense may be burnt upon the altar of incense instead of the bread; as the handful of the meal-offering with its oil and incense, Lev. 2. 2, was to be a memorial of the whole. The frankincense stood in a golden saucer upon the bread during the whole week; on the sabbath the bread was taken away to be eaten, and the frankincense was to be burnt in lieu of it.

What instance of transgression is mentioned in connexion, and how was it punished ? v. 10—14.

‘ Went out.’ This may mean *went or came forth out of Egypt among the children of Israel.*—‘ Blasphemed the name.’ The ensuing words, ‘ of the Lord,’ are supplied in our translation. The original word ‘ Yikkob,’ from ‘ Nâkab,’ signifies properly to *pierce, bore, or strike through*, and thence may be figuratively used for *cursing and blaspheming*, which is a kind of *striking through or wounding* with the tongue, as it is said in Proverbs, ‘ there is that speaketh like the piercings of a sword.’ It is supposed by some that the *name* which this man blasphemed was the name of his god, some of the false gods of Egypt. But that ‘ Ha-Shem,’ *the name*, denotes JEHOVAH appears, from its being used in the latter part of v. 16, as equivalent to ‘ the name of JEHOVAH’ in the former part. The Jews also frequently use ‘ Ha-Shem’ for JEHOVAH; and that it was an ancient custom thus to allude to the Deity, without mentioning his name, appears from inscriptions among the Palmyrenians, on whose marbles we find, ‘ To the blessed NAME be fear for ever.’—‘ To the blessed NAME, for ever good and merciful, be fear.’—‘ To the blessed NAME for ever be fear,’ &c.—‘ And cursed.’ It is not unlikely that being arraigned before the magistrates, and sentence being given against him, he in a fit of exasperation spoke blasphemous words against God, renouncing his worship, and cursing the judges who had condemned

him.—‘Put him in ward.’ Put him in prison until the will of God should be ascertained respecting him. The case was new and unprecedented, and as there were no law by which the amount of guilt could be determined, nor consequently the degree of punishment, it was necessary to consult the Great Lawgiver on the occasion. Moses no doubt had recourse to the tabernacle, and received the directions afterwards mentioned from the Shechinah dwelling between the Cherubim. The answer was probably by the Urim and Thummim. Gr. ‘To judge him by the commandment of the Lord.’ Chal. ‘Until it was expounded unto them by the decree of the word of the Lord.’—‘Bring him forth without the camp.’ Because the camp of Israel being holy all unclean persons were to be put out of it, much more the flagitious.—‘Lay their hands upon his head.’ By this testimony the people who heard him curse bore their public testimony in order to his being fully convicted; and it was moreover a significant mode of saying to the man, ‘Thy blood be upon thine own head; we hereby clear ourselves of all participation in thy guilt.’ We find no other instance of this ceremony of the imposition of hands in the case of a condemned malefactor, and the Jews hold it to be peculiar to the sin of blasphemy. ‘Of all that are killed,’ says Maimonides, ‘by the Sanhedrin, there is none upon whom they impose hands save the blasphemer only.’

To what standing law relative to this subject did the present transaction give rise? v. 15, 16.

‘He that blasphemeth.’ The word ‘Nâkab,’ here rendered *to blaspheme*, signifies also *to express, specify, or distinguish by name*, as Num. 1. 17 1 Chron. 12. 31. Is. 62. 2. Hence the Jews at a very early period understood this law as prohibiting them from uttering the name JEHOVAH on any other than sacred occasions. The Septuagint renders it ‘Who-soever nameth the name of the Lord let him die;’ from which we see that the Jews, at the time that that version was made which was at least 250 years before Christ, were accustomed to pronounce ‘Adonai,’ or *Lord*, instead of JEHOVAH; for in place of it the Sept. always puts ‘Kurios,’ *Lord*. This shows that the peculiar reverence of the Jews for that sacred title is of very ancient date.

What law respecting the destruction of life is here repeated? v. 17.

In what terms is the *lex talionis*, or law of retaliation and also that of restoration here stated? v. 18—21.

‘He that killeth a beast.’ Heb. ‘He that smitteth the soul of a beast;’ i. e. the life of a beast.—‘Beast for beast.’ Heb. ‘Soul for soul,’ or, ‘life for life.’ There is nothing in the original answering expressly to ‘beast,’ although beasts are the subjects spoken of.

What was enjoined in order to secure an equal administration of justice? v. 22.

What is said of the execution of the order relative to the blasphemer? v. 23.

‘Stone him with stones.’ The mode of punishment by stoning was as follows: When they came within ten cubits of the place where the person was to be stoned, they exhorted him to confess and give God the glory, that although he died by the hand of the law, his soul might be saved in the day of the Lord. When they came within four cubits of the place, they stripped him naked, (but if a woman she retained a single garment,) and the witnesses who condemned him also stripped themselves of their upper garments. The place of execution was an eminence twice the height of a man, from whence he was thrown by the first witness. If not dead, the other witnesses threw a huge stone upon his breast; and after that the rest of the people stoned him till he died.

CHAPTER XXV.

What ordinance, formerly given to the Israelites, is repeated in the opening of this chapter? v. 1—5.

‘In mount Sinai;’ or, as it may be rendered, ‘by mount Sinai;’ i. e. in the vicinity of the mount where the people were still encamped. So Manasseh is said to have been buried in his own house,’ when in the parallel passage 2 Kings 21. 18, he is said to have been buried ‘in the garden of his own house.’—‘The land shall keep a sabbath.’ Chal. ‘The land shall have a release or remission.’ As man was commanded and privileged on the seventh day to abstain from that labor, to which he had subjected himself by sin, so, on the seventh year, the earth was also to rest and enjoy as it

were a respite from the effects of the curse.—‘Neither gather the grapes of thy vine undressed.’ Heb. ‘The grapes of thy separation.’ The original word ‘Nezerikâ,’ is derived from ‘Nazar,’ to separate, from which comes ‘Nazarite,’ one separated, one devoted to God for a season by special consecration. One requisite in this case, was that the hair should be suffered to grow without being shaven; and in like manner the vineyard of the Israelites being in a sense consecrated to God for the space of the sabbatical year, it was to be left in the condition of the Nazarite’s head, untouched by knife or pruning hook. This is the reason of its being rendered in our translation ‘undressed.’ The Gr. renders it, ‘vine of thy sanctification or consecration;’ the Chal. ‘vine of thy leaving;’ i. e. left by thee uncultivated.

What was the law relative to the year of jubilee, and the manner of its observance? v. 8—13.

‘Shalt number seven sabbaths of years.’ The term ‘sabbath’ here is used in the sense of ‘week,’ as before explained, so that as a literal week consisted of seven days, a sabbath of weeks consisted of seven years. It is not, however, to be understood that the jubilee was to be celebrated on the *forty-ninth*, but on the *fiftieth* year, as is evident from v. 11. The forty-ninth was the ordinary seventh or sabbatical year, so that in fact two holy years came together. Thus writes Maimonides: ‘The year of jubilee cometh not into the count of the years of the seven; but the nine and fiftieth year is the release, and the fiftieth year the jubilee.’ The jubilee, therefore, was proclaimed on the *forty-ninth* and celebrated on the *fiftieth* year.—‘Shalt cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound.’ Heb. ‘Shalt cause the trumpet of loud sound to pass through;’ i. e. to be sounded all over the land from one end to the other, that the most general proclamation might be made. Thus in Ezra I. 1, ‘The Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom.’ Heb. ‘He made a voice to pass through all his kingdom.’—‘In the day of atonement.’ This was the general fast-day in which with every returning year, the whole congregation humbled themselves and afflicted their souls before God, and the high-priest made atonement for them in the holy place. The announcement of the jubilee was very wisely fixed to this period, as it might be considered that they would be better disposed to forgive their brethren their debts when they had so recently been re-

ceiving the pardon of their own trespasses on this solemn occasion.—‘Shall proclaim liberty;’ i. e. liberty for Hebrew servants to leave the service of their masters; particularly such as had not availed themselves of the privilege granted Ex. 21. 2. 6, of going out of servitude on the seventh year, but had their ears bored as a signal of serving ‘for ever,’ or until the year of jubilee arrived. But now that year having arrived their ‘ever’ was at an end, and they went out of course.—‘It shall be a jubilee unto you.’ Respecting the literal meaning of the word ‘Yobel,’ *jubilee*, critics are not agreed. Some derive it from *Jubal*, the inventor of musical instruments, Gen. 4. 21, because the year was one of mirth and joy, on which music is a common attendant; or else because it was ushered in by the musical sound of the trumpet. Others contend that as ‘Yobel’ signifies *a ram* in Arabic, this year was so called because it was proclaimed with trumpets made of *ram’s horns*. In this view the Rabbins generally coincide, and the Chal. Targum sometimes renders it by ‘Dichra’ *a ram*. The most natural derivation of the word, however, seems to be from ‘Hobil’ the Hiphil or causative form of ‘Yâbal,’ *to recal, restore, or bring back*; because this year *restored* all slaves to their liberty and *brought back* all alienated estates to their primitive possessions.—‘Return every man unto his possession.’ The Israelites had a portion of land divided to each family by lot. This portion of the promised land they held of God, and were not to dispose of it as their property in fee-simple. Hence no Israelite could part with his landed estate but for a term of years only. When the jubilee arrived it again reverted to the original owners.—‘Return every man unto his family;’ i. e. such as through poverty had been obliged to sell their freedom to others, and thus to separate themselves from their kindred, were now to be restored to them.

What was typically signified by the Jubilee?

Ans. (1.) The Gospel dispensation, the great time of release, ‘the acceptable year of the Lord,’ the ‘year of his redeemed,’ when liberty was proclaimed to the captives of sin, the cancelling of debts to the debtor of divine justice, and the restoration of the heavenly inheritance, forfeited and lost by Adam, to his believing children. (2.) The general resurrection. It is a lively prefiguration of the grand consummation of time, which will be introduced in like manner by the sound of the trump of God, when the children and heirs of God

shall be released from all their forfeitures, and restored from the bondage of corruption in the grave to the eternal possession allotted to them by their Father.

By what rule were they to be governed in their buying and selling? v. 14—17.

‘Ye shall not oppress one another;’ i. e. ye shall take no advantage of each other’s ignorance either in buying or selling; for he that buys an article at less than it is worth, or sells one for more than it is worth, knowing what the real value is, is no better than a thief, as he actually robs his property, as he has bought the article at *below*, or sold it *above*, its current value.—‘According to the number of years.’ The purchases that were to be made of lands were to be regulated by the number of years which remained to the next jubilee. This was something like buying the unexpired term of a lease among us; the purchase being always regulated by the number of years between the time of purchase and the expiration of the term. It is easy to perceive that the nearer the jubilee was, the less would be the value of the land; therefore it is said; ‘According to the fewness of the years thou shalt diminish the price.’—‘According to the number of the years of the fruits.’ They were to reckon, only the productive years, and therefore must discount for the sabbatical years.—‘Fear thy God;’ i. e. shall show thy fear of the divine majesty by abstaining from this iniquity, as ‘by the fear of the Lord men depart from evil.’ Thus while one writer says, 1 Kings 8. 40, ‘That they may fear thee as long as they live,’ the parallel passage 2 Chron. 6. 31, explains it, ‘That they may fear thee, *and walk in thy ways, as long as they live.*’

What promises are made to obedience, and how are they cautioned against unbelief? v. 18—22.

‘Shall dwell in safety.’ The original expresses both the *boldness* and *confidence* with which men that fear and obey God trust in him, and the *safety* and *security* which they feel in his protection in times of doubt or danger.

What prohibition is given respecting alienating inheritances? v. 23, 24.

‘Shall not be sold for ever.’ As the root of the original word

here rendered 'for ever,' signifies *to cut entirely off*, the meaning in this case probably is that the land should not be sold in such a manner as to be entirely *cut off from redemption*; i. e. wholly and absolutely alienated from the hand of the proprietor. This was forbidden because as God, in a miraculous manner, gave them possession of this land, they were to consider themselves merely as *tenants* to him; and, therefore, he as the great landholder or lord of the soil, prescribes to them the conditions on which they shall hold it.—'Shall grant a redemption;' i. e. the privileges of redemption; so that he who sold it, if he became able, or his kinsman or relations in case he died, might redeem it in the interim before the next jubilee; but if it was not done before the year of jubilee, it was not then redeemed, but was restored gratis in virtue of the jubilee-law.

What was ordered in the case of the poor Israelite who had sold away some of his possessions? v. 25.

'Any of his kin came to redeem it.' Heb. 'The redeemer thereof, he that is near unto him, shall come and shall redeem.' The Heb. word for *redeem*, (*Goël*), is the term applied to the *kinsman* to whom pertained the right, according to a very ancient usage, of redeeming lands, houses, or persons, and also of bringing the blood of one slain. The person sustaining this office was a lively figure of Christ, who assuming our nature that he might become our *kinsman-redeemer*, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, in reference to whom it is said, Is. 59. 20. 'The *redeemer* shall come out of Zion:' He has by his sufferings and death *bought back* to man that *inheritance* which had been forfeited by sin.

What if the man had none to redeem it, and he had himself, in the process of time, become able to do it? v. 26, 27.

'Be able to redeem it.' Heb. 'And he hath found the sufficiency of the redemption;' i. e. the means of making the redemption.—'Let him count the years,' &c. i. e. the years from the time the sale was made unto the next ensuing jubilee; computing the income for the years that remain, and paying for them at the original rate agreed upon at the time of sale.

Suppose he were not able to pay this amount to

the buyer, what was then to be the consequence ? v. 21.

‘If he be not able to restore it to him ;’ if he be not able thus to repay the overplus above mentioned.

What was the difference put between the redemption of houses in a city and houses in the country ? v. 29—31.

‘In a walled city.’ Heb. ‘City of wall.’ Houses in walled cities were more the fruit of their own industry, than land in the country which was by the immediate gift of God ; and, therefore, if a man sold a house in a city, he might redeem it any time within a year after the date, but otherwise it was confirmed to the purchaser for ever, and should no more return to the original proprietor, not even in the year of jubilee. This provision was made to encourage strangers and proselytes to come and settle among them. Though they could not purchase *land* in Canaan for themselves and their heirs, yet they might purchase *houses* in walled cities, which would be most convenient for them who were supposed to live by trade. But country villages could be disposed of no otherwise than as lands might.

What exception was made in favor of the houses of Levites ? v. 32—34.

‘May the Levites redeem.’ This was doubtless because the Levites had no other possessions than the 48 cities with their suburbs which were assigned them, and God would show that the Levites were his peculiar care ; and it was for the interest of the public that they should not be impoverished or deprived of their possessions. Therefore as their houses in these cities were the whole of what they could call *their own*, they could not be utterly alienated.

In what way were they forbidden to take advantage of the poverty and distress of the unfortunate ? v. 35—38.

‘Fallen in decay.’ Heb. ‘His hand wavereth.’ Gr. ‘Is weak in his hands ;’ i. e. disabled from helping himself ; one who is as unable to provide for himself as if his hand were shaking with the palsy.—‘Thou shalt relieve him.’ Heb. ‘Thou shalt strengthen him ;’ i. e. shalt extend to him relief, which is otherwise expressed by holding or strengthening the hands of the weak and needy.—‘That he may live

with thee;’ i. e. that he may be enabled to recover himself out of his calamities and live prosperously among you. ‘Life’ in the scriptures is often used in opposition to sickness, distress, ruin, as Is. 38. 9, ‘The writings of Hezekiah king of the Judah, when he had been sick, and was *recovered*, (Heb. was made *alive*,) of his sickness.’ Neh. 4. 2, ‘Will they *revive*, (Heb. make *alive*,) the stones out of the heaps of the rubbish which are burned?’ 1 Chron. 11. 8, ‘And Joab *repaired*, (Heb. made *alive*,) the rest of the city.’ Gen. 45. 27, ‘And the spirit of Jacob their father *revived*, (Heb. was made *alive*).’—‘Take thou no usury of him.’ The original term ‘Neshek,’ *usury*, comes from the verb ‘Nâshak,’ *to bite*, mostly applied to the bite of a serpent, and properly signifies *biting usury*, so called perhaps because it resembles the bite of a serpent; for as this is often so small as often to be scarcely perceptible at first, but the venom soon spreads and diffuses itself, till it reaches the vitals, so the *increase of usury*, which at first is not perceived, at length grows so much as to devour a man’s substance. As this law was ordained merely to prevent cruel exactions, it cannot be considered as applying to that reasonable compensation for the use of money which is known among us by the appellation of *simple interest*.

What was ordained in behalf of unfortunate Israelites who should be sold unto their countrymen? v. 39—43.

‘Be sold unto thee.’ This might be for poverty, debt, or theft, as appears from 2 Kings 4. 1. Ex. 21. 2. Ex. 23. 2.—‘Shalt not compel him to serve as a bond servant;’ i. e. it must not be supposed that his master that bought him had as absolute a property in him as in a captive taken in war, who might be used, sold, and bequeathed, at pleasure, as much as a man’s cattle; but he shall serve thee merely as a *hired servant* whose services the master may command, without pretending to a despotic power over his person.—‘Shall not be sold as bondman;’ i. e. not in the open public manner that other servants or slaves were sold; not, as it were, in the market place; but privately and in a more honorable way.

Of whom were they permitted to take bondmen and bondmaids? v. 44—46.

‘Shall be of the heathen;’ i. e. of the heathen inhabiting the countries round about the Holy Land, but not of the Canaanites whom they were required to destroy.—‘As an inheritance for your children.’ Gr. ‘Ye shall divide or impart them unto your children.’ The words ‘possession’ and ‘inheritance’ thus applied to servants or slaves, intimates their subjection to their masters, in accordance with which God is said Ps. 82. 8, to ‘*inherit* all nations,’ and Christ Ps. 2. 8, ‘to have the heathen for his *inheritance* and *possession*.’—‘Shall not rule one over another with rigor.’ Gr. ‘Shall not rack nor afflict them with labors.’ But though forbidden thus to tyrannise over their own countrymen, were they permitted to treat their heathen bondmen with rigor? On this the Hebrew writers say; ‘It is lawful to make a Canaanitish servant serve with rigor, but notwithstanding this right, it is the property of mercy and way of wisdom that a man should be compassionate, and follow justice, and not make his yoke heavy upon his servant nor afflict him.’ Labor beyond the person’s strength, or labor too long continued, or in unhealthy or uncomfortable places and circumstances, or without sufficient food, &c. is labor exacted with rigor, and consequently inhuman, and so at variance not only with the spirit of the Mosaic dispensation, but with the maxims of right conduct among every people under heaven.

What was ordained in case an Israelite, grown poor, had sold himself to a sojourner who had waxen rich? v. 47—49.

‘If a stranger or a sojourner wax rich.’ Heb. ‘And if the hand of the stranger or sojourner with thee do attain (riches).’—‘May be redeemed.’ Heb. ‘Redemption shall be to him.’

How was the price of his redemption to be computed? v. 50—53.

‘The price of his sale shall be,’ &c. This was a very equitable law, both for the sojourner to whom the man was sold, and to the Israelite who had been thus sold. The Israelite might redeem himself, or one of his kindred might redeem him, but this must not be done to the prejudice of his master, the sojourner. They were therefore to reckon the years he must have served, from that time, till the jubilee; and then taking the current wages of a servant, per year, at that time, multiply the remaining years by that sum, and the aggregate was the sum to be given to his master for his redemption.

The Jews held, that the kindred of such a person were bound if in their power, to redeem him, lest he should be swallowed up among the heathen; and we find from Nehem. 5. 8, that this was done by the Jews on their return from the Babylonish captivity; 'We, after our ability, have redeemed our brethren the Jews, who were sold unto the heathen.' — 'According to the time of a hired servant, (or hirelings,) shall it be with him;' i. e. according to the rate of wages ordinarily allowed to a hired servant for the like period of time shall the sum paid for him be estimated. — 'Shall not rule with rigor over him in thy sight;' with thy connivance; thou, an Israelite, shalt not knowingly suffer a stranger to maltreat or abuse one of their own brethren; it shall be the duty of the magistrates, upon information, to call such an one to account.

Suppose such an one were not redeemed previous to the jubilee, what was then to follow? v. 53.

'In these years;' or 'By these means;' i. e. were not redeemed either by himself or others.

By what reason is obedience to these precepts enforced? v. 55.

CHAPTER. XXVI.

What is the general scope of the present chapter?

Ans. It is in effect a solemn practical conclusion to the main body of the Levitical law, containing a general enforcement of all its precepts by promises of reward in case of obedience, on the one hand, and threatenings of punishment in case of disobedience on the other.

With what prohibition does the chapter commence, and by what reason enforced? v. 1.

'Shall make you no idols.' Heb. 'Nothings, vanities.' Gr. 'Shall not form to yourselves things made with hands.' See note on Lev. 19. 4. — 'Graven image;' i. e. any thing hewed or sculptured out of wood or stone. — 'Standing image;' i. e. either a single stone, or a pile of stones reared and consecrated to religious purposes. Probably the stones or pillars which were at first set up and *anointed* by holy men in commemoration of signal interpositions of God in their behalf, were afterwards abused to idolatrous and supersti-

tious purposes, and are therefore here prohibited.—‘Image of stone.’ Heb. ‘Stone of imagery,’ or, ‘Stone of picture or figure.’ Chal. ‘Stone of adoration, or worship.’

With what other important precept is this connected? v. 2.

‘My sabbaths;’ i. e. my different days of sabbatical rest; not only the sabbath day, but other stated solemnities, which were to be distinguished by holy convocations. These two precepts are an abstract of the second and fourth commandments; which, as they are much the largest in the decalogue, so they are most frequently insisted upon in other parts of the law. As when a master has given many things in charge to a servant, he concludes with the repetition of those things which were of the greatest importance, and which the servant was most in danger of neglecting; bidding him, whatever he did, to be sure to remember those; so here after many precepts delivered to Moses, the Most High closes with a special charge to observe these two great commandments.—‘Reverence my sanctuary;’ i. e. be sure you keep up a great veneration for sabbaths and religious assemblies. As nothing tends more to corrupt religion than the use of images in devotion, so nothing contributes more to its support than the due observance of holy time. Accordingly we find in the prophets, that next to that of idolatry, there is no sin for which the Jews are more frequently reprov- ed and threatened, than the profanation of God’s holy sabbaths.

Mention some of the principal temporal blessings which are promised, in this connection, as a reward to obedience? v. 3—13.

‘Will give you rain.’ Heb. ‘Will give your rains.’ So certain should be their showers in their seasons, so infallibly secured by promise, that they should be entitled to consider and call them *theirs*; ‘I will give *your* rains.’—‘Threshing shall reach unto the vintage;’ i. e. so abundant shall be your corn-crops that the business of threshing shall not be completed before the vintage, and again, so plentiful shall be the produce of the vine that ye shall not be able to finish the gathering and pressing of your grapes till sowing time again arrives. We meet with a similar sentiment in the prophet Amos, ch. 9. 13. ‘The plowman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him who soweth seed.’—‘Will rid evil beasts out of the land.’ Heb. ‘Will cause evil beasts

to cease.'—'Neither shall the sword go through the land;' a metaphorical expression for the ravages of war.—'I will have respect unto you.' Heb. 'I will turn my face to you.' Gr. 'I will look upon you and bless you.' Chal. 'I will have respect by my word to do good unto you.' See this promise verified 2 Kings 13. 23, 'And the Lord was gracious unto them, and had compassion on them, and *had respect unto them*, because of his covenant,' &c.—'Ye shall eat old store;' i. e. to prevent waste from superabundance, ye shall eat of your old stock of provisions notwithstanding the new crop has come in.—'Bring forth the old because of the new;' i. e. ye shall be forced to 'bring forth' or remove from your barns and garners the old stock of your corn, in order to make room for the new.—'I will set my tabernacle among you;' i. e. I will firmly and permanently establish my tabernacle among you; I will secure its continuance with you. In addition to this its primary sense the passage contains in effect the grand promise of the Gospel dispensation, viz: the presence, manifestation, and indwelling of God in human nature. So John 1. 14, 'The word was made flesh and *dwelt* among us.' Gr. '*Tabernacled* among us.' Jesus Christ was the true tabernacle of God, and though this promise was in an eminent manner fulfilled in the Savior's inhabitation of our nature while accomplishing his work on earth, yet it appears from Rev. 21. 3, that we are to look for its fulfillment in a still higher sense at some future period of this world's history; 'And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them.'—'Made you go upright;' i. e. set you free from bondage; brought you into that state of enlargement in which you are no more bowed down by the heaven burdens laid upon your backs, nor hanging down your heads in despondency and woe.

What are some of the principal threatenings denounced in case of disobedience? v. 14—39.

V. 19. 'Will make your heaven as iron and your earth as brass;' i. e. that part of the heavens which is over your country shall afford no more rain than if it were a canopy of iron, and consequently your earth or land shall be as barren of fruit as if the soil were brass.—'Ten women shall bake your bread in one oven,' i. e. there shall be such a scarcity of bread that one ordinary oven shall answer for the baking of ten, that is, a great many, families, whereas in common cir-

cumstances one oven would serve only one family.—‘Deliver by weight.’ As the survivors of a shipwreck, who put to sea in an open boat, are often reduced to the most stinted allowance and have a small quantity of food and drink served out to them by weight, and measure, so should it be in the extremity of famine to which the Israelites should be brought by their disobedience.—‘Chastise you seven times;’ i. e. with seven fold greater severity.—‘Shall eat the flesh of your sins.’ This was literally fulfilled at the siege of Jerusalem. Josephus, J. W. B. 7. c. 2, gives an instance in dreadful detail, of a woman named Mary, who in the height of the famine, during the siege, killed her infant child, roasted, and had eaten part of it when discovered by the soldiers.’

What was the encouragement held out to them to repent and return to God, notwithstanding their calamities? v. 40—45.

‘Uncircumcised hearts.’ Chal. ‘Gross, or foolish, hearts.’ Gr. ‘Proud hearts.’ The phrase implies a perverse heart; one which prompted them to resist the spirit of God. Accordingly we find the Jews in the apostles’ times thus characterised: Acts 7. 51, ‘Ye stiff-necked and *uncircumcised in heart* and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost.’ This is said because, as we learn elsewhere, Rom. 2. 29, the true circumcision is ‘in the heart,’ and ‘in the spirit.’ Conformably to this the prophet complains Jer. 9. 26, that ‘all the house of Israel are *uncircumcised in heart.*’—‘Accept of the punishment of their iniquity.’ Heb. ‘Accept of their iniquity.’ As the words ‘iniquity’ and ‘sin’ are often used by an idiom of the Hebrew for the ‘punishment’ due to transgression, so to accept the same is meekly and willingly to bear it, and even to be well pleased with it, (the term in the original being the same with that employed v. 34, and rendered ‘enjoy;’) as the most suitable means to bring them to repentance. An illustration of this sentiment occurs Mic. 7. 9, ‘I will *bear the indignation* of the Lord, for I have sinned against him.’—‘Then will I remember my covenant.’ This ‘remembrance on the part of God signifies his *actual performance* of the mercies promised; as appears from Ex. 6. 5, 6, ‘I have *remembered my covenant*, &c. and will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians.’ So our *remembering* God’s precepts is explained Ps. 103. 18, as equivalent to *doing* them. See note on Gen. 8. 1. So again

when Christ 'the horn of salvation' was raised up in the house of David, God is said Luke 1. 72, 'to *perform* the mercy promised to our fathers, and to *remember his holy covenant.*'—'Will remember the land;' i. e. to cause it to be re-peopled by its former inhabitants or their seed.

CHAPTER. XXVII.

What is the general drift and design of this chapter?

Ans. Under the influence of extraordinary zeal individuals might sometimes be induced to consecrate themselves, their children, or estate, to God by what is here termed a 'singular vow.' But it was possible that upon reflection, in a cooler moment, the person might regret the step he had taken, or particular circumstances might render the *literal* performance of his vow inconvenient or unsuitable, in which case provision is made in the present chapter for the *redemption* of the persons or things thus consecrated, and a *table of rates* is here given by which the priests were to be governed in their *estimation* of the value of the thing vowed.

What was Moses commanded to speak and say unto the children of Israel? v. 1, 2.

'When a man shall make a singular vow.' Heb. 'A man, who shall have separated a vow;' i. e. separated or exempted, in a peculiar manner, from common use; called a *singular* vow perhaps from its *singling out* the object vowed and appropriating it to a holy purpose.—'By the estimation;' or 'According to thy estimation.' i. e. according to the value set by the priests upon such persons, which value or amount instead of the persons themselves, (there being already a sufficient number set apart for the ministry of the tabernacle,) was to be devoted or paid to the Lord, or in other words, consecrated to the service of the sanctuary. A man might vow or devote *himself*,—his *children*, his *domestics*, his *cattle*, or his *goods*. But if after consecrating these things, he refused to redeem them, then they became the Lord's property forever. The *persons* continued all their lives devoted to the service of the sanctuary; the *goods* were sold for the benefit of the temple or the priests; the *animals*, if clean, were offered in sacrifice; if not proper for sacrifice were sold, and the price devoted to sacred uses.

What was to be the estimation of a male of twenty years and upwards? v. 4.

‘Fifty shekels of silver.’ This would amount to not far from \$35 of our money.

What was it to be for a female? v. 4.

‘If it be a female.’ It has been supposed by some that under the provision contained in this case Jephthah might have redeemed his daughter. But as his vow related to a *burnt-offering*, which is not contemplated here, it is probable that that opinion is erroneous. Moreover the daughter of Jephthah appears to have been rather *devoted* than *vowed*, of which see note on Lev. 27. 28. The estimation of a female is here fixed at little more than one half that of a man, for the obvious reason that a woman if employed would not be of so much service in the sanctuary as the man.

What for young children whether male or female? v. 5, 6.

‘If it be from five years old.’ It is supposed in this case that the vow was made by the parents, or one of them, and not by the child himself, who at that age was wholly incompetent to such a thing. Samuel, who was thus vowed to God, was not redeemed, because he was a Levite and a particular favorite, and therefore was employed in his childhood in the service of the sanctuary.

What for a person sixty years old and upwards? v. 7.

What is directed respecting the estimation of the poor? v. 8.

‘Poorer than thy estimation;’ i. e. if he who has made a vow be not able to pay an estimation according to the above mentioned rates.—‘According to his ability.’ Heb. ‘According to that his hand can attain;’ a precept teaching us that God would not suffer his holy name to be abused by any, but that even the poorest who made a vow should be held under obligation to pay, or else remain a perpetual debtor.

What is the direction given concerning beasts, clean and unclean, which were vowed, and their valuation? v. 9—13.

‘Whereas men bring an offering unto the Lord;’ i. e. such as were lawful to be offered in sacrifice, viz: sheep, goats, or bullocks.—‘Shall be holy;’ i. e. set apart for God’s service according to the nature of the vow; that is to say, it shall be offered at the altar if given or vowed for sacrifice; or shall be given to the Priests or Levites if vowed for that end; or shall be sold and the value of it employed in the service of the sanctuary, if given with that intention; or left at large to be disposed of as should be deemed most meet for the service of God.—‘Shall not alter it or change it;’ i. e. shall not alter it for any beast of another kind, or for any other thing. Whatever was consecrated to God by a vow or purpose of heart was considered from that moment as the Lord’s property; to *change* which was *impiety*; to *withhold* it *sacrilege*.—‘Any unclean beast.’ This may be understood generally of all unclean beasts which men might be prompted to vow, with the exception of the *dog*, of which it is said, Deut. 23. 18, ‘Thou shalt not bring the price of a dog into the house of the Lord thy God for any vow.’ The Hebrews, however, understood it of oxen, sheep, or goats, upon which any blemishes were found, whereby they became unclean and were rendered unlawful to be offered upon the altar.—‘Shall add a fifth part.’ This was probably intended to prevent rash vows and covetous redemption. The priest alone was to value the thing, and whatever was the amount of his valuation, a *fifth part* must be added thereto by him who wished to redeem the consecrated thing.

What is said in respect to the consecration and valuation of a house? v. 14, 15.

‘So shall it stand;’ i. e. so shall the value be, neither less nor more; no man shall attempt to alter it; only the owner if he would redeem it was to give the additional fifth part of the value; inasmuch as he should have considered well before he recover it.

What is said concerning the part of a field that should be sanctified or consecrated to the Lord? v. 16, 17.

‘Some part of a field of his possession.’ The phrase ‘field of one’s possession’ signifies a field inherited from one’s forefathers, and is used in contradistinction from a ‘field which one hath bought,’ spoken of v. 22. Though the words ‘some

part' are not expressed in the original, yet it is generally allowed that they should here be supplied; as it was not lawful for a man in this manner to alienate his whole patrimony: he might express his good will for the house of God, but he must not for this purpose impoverish his own family.—'Thy estimation shall be according to the seed thereof;' i. e. according to the quantity of seed necessary to sow the field.—'A homer of barley seed.' The meaning is, that as much land as required a homer of barley to sow it should be valued at 50 shekels of silver. The *homer* was very different from the *omer*; the latter held about three quarts, the former seventy-five gallons and three pints.

What was ordered in case the field was thus sanctified after the jubilee? v. 18.

What was required in case the man wished to redeem it? v. 19.

Suppose it were not redeemed, or were sold to another, how was it to be disposed of in the year of jubilee? v. 20, 21.

'As a field devoted.' Heb. 'A field of devotion, or separation.' The original is 'Cherem,' denoting a thing so devoted to God as never more to be capable of being redeemed.

What was enacted in case a man sanctified unto the Lord a field which he had bought, instead of one inherited from his ancestors? v. 22—24.

By what standard were their estimations to be regulated? v. 25.

'Shekel of the sanctuary;' so called, it is supposed, from the fact that the standard of this as the foundation of all the other weights and measures was kept in the sanctuary. A literal rendering, however, of the original may be 'Shekel of sanctity, or holiness;' i. e. a true, just, honest shekel.

What is mentioned that could not be thus vatively sanctified to the Lord? v. 26.

'No man shall sanctify it;' inasmuch as the first-born were already sanctified by the law, Ex. 13. 2. 12, so that one in vowing a firstling would be attempting to give that which was not his own.

What was prescribed in regard to the redemption or non-redemption of an unclean beast? v. 27.

'Unclean beast.' An unclean beast might not indeed be offered in sacrifice to the Lord, yet the price of it might be of use in the repair of the sanctuary and the maintenance of the priests, and therefore might be the subject of a vow.

Did the foregoing laws apply to things *devoted*, as well as things *vowed*, and what was the difference? v, 28, 29.

'No devoted thing.' Heb. 'Cherem.' The word 'devoted' but inadequately expresses the force of the original, which means to devote with *imprecations* or *execrations*. The thing so devoted was either inalienably dedicated to the Lord, or utterly destroyed; and the person so devoted put to death. — 'None devoted,' &c. Not that it was in the power of any parent or master thus to devote a child or a servant to death; but it must be meant of the public enemies of Israel, who, either by the appointment of God or the sentence of the congregation, were devoted, as were the seven nations with which they were to make no bargain. The city of Jericho in particular was thus devoted, Josh. 6. 17, and the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead were put to death for violating the curse pronounced upon those who came not up to Mizpeh, Judg. 21. 9, 10. The Heb. 'Cherem' is rendered by the Gr. 'Anathema,' for the import of which see 1 Cor. 16. 22.

What was the rule in regard to tithes, and what the condition of their redemption? v. 30, 31.

'All the tithe.' The 'tithe' of any thing is its tenth part. Of the yearly products of the land of the Isrealites, the first-fruits were first deducted; out of the rest the tenth part was taken for the Levites, Num. 18. 21; of the nine remaining parts, another tenth part was to be taken and brought to Jerusalem, and there eaten by the owners, Deut. 12. 6; though this second tithe was every third year distributed to the poor, Deut. 28. 29.

What is said respecting the tenth of the herds and flocks, and what is to be understood by their 'passing under the rod.'? v. 32.

‘Whatsoever passeth under the rod.’ This is thus explained by the Rabbinical writers: ‘When a man was to give the tithe of his sheep or calves to God, he was to shut up the whole flock in one fold, in which there was one narrow door capable of letting out one at a time. The owner about to give the tenth to the Lord, stood by the door with a rod in his hand, the end of which was dipped in vermillion or red ochre. The mothers of these lambs or calves stood without; the door being opened, the young ones ran out to join themselves to their dams; and as they passed out, the owner stood with his rod over them and counted 1, 2, 3, &c. and when the *tenth* came, he touched it with the colored rod, by which it was distinguished to be the tithe calf, sheep, &c., and whether poor or lean, perfect or blemished, that was received as the legitimate tithe.’ It is probably in reference to this custom that the prophet speaking to Israel says, Ezek. 20. 37, ‘I will cause you to pass under the rod, and will bring you into the word of the covenant;’ i. e. you shall be once more claimed as the Lord’s property, and be in all things devoted to his service, being *marked* or *ascertained* by special providences and manifestations of his kindness to be his peculiar people.

What is the conclusion of the chapter and the book? v. 34.

THE END.







Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: June 2005

Preservation Technologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(424) 779-2117



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 380 454 9

