INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS

This book is commonly called by the Jews Vajikra, from the first word with which it begins, and sometimes μην θέλε, “the law of the priests”\(^\text{f1}\); and this is its name in the Syriac and Arabic versions: by the Septuagint interpreters it is called λευτικόν, and by the Latins, Leviticus, or the Levitical book, because it gives an account of the Levitical priesthood, as the apostle calls it, (Hebrews 7:11). It treats of the sacrifices under the Levitical dispensation, and of the priests concerned in them, and of the times and seasons in which they were offered, and of many other rites and ceremonies. That it was wrote by Moses is not only generally believed by the Jews, but is affirmed in the New Testament; (see Matthew 8:4 John 8:5) compared with (Leviticus 14:2 20:10) from whence, as well as from other citations out of it in other places, the authority of it may be concluded. The matter of it was delivered to Moses, and very likely by him then written upon the erection of the tabernacle, which was in the second year of the Israelites coming out of Egypt, in the first month, and the first day of the month, (Exodus 40:17) and it was on the same day that the Lord spake to Moses out of it, and delivered to him the laws concerning sacrifices, recorded in the first seven chapters; (see Numbers 1:1) compared with (Leviticus 1:1) and on the eighth day of the same month, and some following days, the remainder of it was given to him, and written by him, (see Leviticus 8:1 12:1 16:1) to which agrees the Targum of Jonathan on (Leviticus 1:1).

“when Moses had made an end of erecting the tabernacle, Moses thought and reasoned in his heart, and said, Mount Sinai, its excellency was the excellency of an hour, and its holiness the holiness of three days, it was not possible for me to ascend unto it, until the time that the Word was speaking with me; but this tabernacle of the congregation, its excellency is an excellency for ever, and its holiness an holiness for ever, it is fit that I should not enter into it, until the time that be speaks with me from before the Lord; and therefore the Word of the Lord called to Moses, and the
Word of the Lord spake with him out of the tabernacle of the congregation, saying;”

and to the same purpose the Jerusalem Targum. It was written in the year from the creation of the world 2514, and about 1490 years before the coming of Christ. The various sacrifices, rites, and ceremonies made mention of in it, were typical of Christ, and shadows of good things to come by him: there are many things in it, which give great light to several passages in the New Testament, and it is worthy of diligent reading and consideration.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 1

This chapter contains certain laws and rules concerning sacrifices, particularly burnt offerings, which were delivered by the Lord to Moses, (Leviticus 1:1,2) what those offerings should be of, (Leviticus 1:3,10,14) what rules should be observed, what actions should be done, first by the persons that brought them, (Leviticus 1:3,4) and then by the priest that offered them, with respect to the burnt offering of the herd, (Leviticus 1:5-9) and to the burnt offering of the sheep and goats, (Leviticus 1:11-13) and to the burnt offering of fowls, (Leviticus 1:15-17) all which, when offered aright, were of a sweet savour to the Lord, (Leviticus 1:9,13,17).

Ver. 1. And the Lord called unto Moses, etc.] Or “met him”, as the phrase is rendered in (Numbers 23:4). The word a r q yw translated “called”, the last letter of it is written in a very small character, to show, as the Jews say, that he met him accidentally, and unawares to Moses: other mysteries they observe in it, as that it respects the modesty of Moses, who lessened himself, and got out of the way, that he might not have the government laid upon him, and therefore the Lord called him; or to denote the wonderful condescension of the Lord, whose throne is in heaven, and yet vouchsafed to dwell in the tabernacle, out of which he called to Moses, and from Mount Sinai, and out of the cloud. The word “Lord” is not in this clause, but the following, from whence it is supplied by our translators, as it is in the Syriac version, and as the word “God” is in the Arabic version; the two Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem paraphrase it, “the Word of the Lord called to Moses,” by an articulate voice, though it may be it was a still small one; and which some think is the reason of the smallness of the letter before mentioned; and Aben Ezra says that Moses heard it, but all Israel did not hear: and spoke unto him out of the tabernacle of the congregation; from off the mercy seat, between the cherubim over the ark, where the glory of the
Lord, or the divine Shechinah and Majesty took up its residence, and from whence the Lord promised to commune with Moses, (Exodus 25:22): *saying*; what follows concerning sacrifices; which shows, that these were not human inventions, but of divine institution, and by the appointment of God.

**Ver. 2.** *Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them,* etc.] For unto no other was the law of sacrifices given; not to the Gentiles, but to the children of Israel: *if any man*; or woman, for the word “man”, as Ben Gersom observes, includes the whole species: *of you*; of you Israelites; the Targum of Jonathan adds, “and not of the apostates who worship idols.”

Jarchi interprets it of yours, of your mammon or substance, what was their own property, and not what was stolen from another, (see Isaiah 61:8): *bring an offering unto the Lord*; called “Korban” of “Karab”, to draw nigh, because it was not only brought nigh to God, to the door of the tabernacle where he dwelt, but because by it they drew nigh to God, and presented themselves to him, and that for them; typical of believers under the Gospel dispensation drawing nigh to God through Christ, by whom their spiritual sacrifices are presented and accepted in virtue of his: *ye shall bring your offering of the cattle,* [even] *of the herd,* and *of the flock*; that is, of oxen, and of sheep or goats. The Targum of Jonathan is, “of a clean beast, of oxen, and of sheep, but not of wild beasts shall ye bring your offerings.”

These were appointed, Ben Gersom says, for these two reasons, partly because the most excellent, and partly because most easy to be found and come at, as wild creatures are not: but the true reason is, because they were very fit to represent the great sacrifice Christ, which all sacrifices were typical of; the ox or bullock was a proper emblem of him for his strength and laboriousness, and the sheep for his harmless, innocence, and patience, and the goat, as he was not in himself, but as he was thought
to be, a sinner, being sent in the likeness of sinful flesh, and being traduced as such, and having the sins of his people imputed to him.

**Ver. 3.** *If his offering [be] a burnt sacrifice of the herd, etc.*] So called, because consumed by fire, (see Leviticus 6:9) even all of it except the skin, and therefore its name with the Greeks is “a whole burnt offering”, as in (Mark 12:33) its name in Hebrew is הֵ֥ילוֹן, which comes from a word which signifies to “ascend” or “go up”, because not only it was carried up to the altar by the priest, which was common to other sacrifices, but being burnt upon it, it ascended upwards in smoke and vapour; it was typical of Christ’s dolorous sufferings and death, who therein sustained the fire of divine wrath, and his strength was dried up like a potsherd with it. Jarchi on (Leviticus 1:1) says, there were in the burnt offerings mysteries of future things:

*let him offer a male*; and not a female, pointing at the Messiah’s sex, and his strength and excellency, the child that was to be born, and the Son to be given, whose name should be Immanuel:

*without blemish*; or [perfect], having no part wanting, nor any part superfluous, nor any spot upon it, (see Leviticus 22:19-24) denoting the perfection of Christ as man, being in all things made like unto his brethren, and his having not the least stain or blemish of sin upon him, either original or actual, and so could, as he did, offer up himself without spot to God, (Hebrews 2:17 9:14 1 Peter 1:19):

*and he shall offer it of his own voluntary will*; not forced or compelled to it, or with any reluctancy, but as a pure freewill offering; so our Lord Jesus Christ laid down his life of himself, and freely gave himself an offering and a sacrifice, and became cheerfully and readily obedient unto death:

*at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, before the Lord*; it was to be done openly and publicly, and in the presence of the Lord, to whom it was offered up; showing, that Christ’s sacrifice would be offered up to God, against whom we have sinned, by which his law would be fulfilled, his justice satisfied, and wrath appeased, and that his death would be public and notorious; (see Luke 24:18-20).

**Ver. 4.** *And he shall put his hand on the head of the burnt offering, etc.*] According to the Targum of Jonathan, it was his right hand; but it is generally thought by the Jewish writers that both hands were laid on; so
Ben Gersom and Aben Ezra, with whom Maimonides agrees, who says, he that lays on hands ought to lay on with all his strength, with both his hands upon the head of the beast, as it is said, “upon the head of the burnt offering”: not upon the neck, nor upon the sides; and there should be nothing between his hands and the beast: and as the same writer says, it must be his own hand, and not the hand of his wife, nor the hand of his servant, nor his messenger; and who also observes, that at the same time he made confession over the burnt offering both of his sins committed against affirmative and negative precepts: and indeed by this action he owned that he had sinned, and deserved to die as that creature he brought was about to do, and that he expected pardon of his sin through the death of the great sacrifice that was a type of. Moreover, this action signified the transferring of his sins from himself to this sacrifice, which was to be offered up to make atonement for them; so Gersom observes; (see Leviticus 16:21,22). This denotes the translation of our sins from us, and the imputation of them to Christ, who was offered up in our room and stead, to make atonement for them, as follows:

and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him: that is, the burnt offering should be accepted in his room and stead, and hereby an atonement of his sins should be made for him, typical of that true, real, and full atonement made by the sacrifice of Christ, which this led his faith unto.

Ver. 5. And he shall kill the bullock before the Lord, etc.] That is, the man that brings the burnt offering, for no other is yet spoken of; and according to the traditions of the elders, killing of the sacrifice was right when done by strangers, by women, and by servants, and by unclean persons, even in the most holy things so be it that the unclean did not touch the flesh; and it is observed, that the service of the priest begins in the next clause, killing being lawful by him that was not a priest, according to the Targum of Jonathan, the butcher; but Aben Ezra interprets it of the priests, and certain it is, that the burnt offerings of the fowls were killed by the priests, (Leviticus 1:15) and the Septuagint version renders it, “and they shall kill”: but be this as it will, the burnt offering was to be killed in the court before the Lord; and this was typical of the death of Christ, who, according to these types, as well as to other prophecies, was to die for the sins of men, and accordingly did; and if this was the proprietor and not the priest that killed the sacrifice, it may denote that the sins of God’s people, for whom Christ’s sacrifice was offered up, were the cause of his death:
and the priests, Aaron’s sons, shall bring the blood: in vessels or basins, as the Targum of Jonathan adds, into which they received it when slain:

and sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar that is by the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; which was the altar of burnt offering, and not the altar of incense, as appears by the situation of it, (see Exodus 40:5,6) and the blood was sprinkled all around the altar with two sprinklings: the rule in the Misnah is \textsuperscript{f10}; the slaying of the burnt offering is in the north, and the reception of its blood into the ministering vessels is in the north, and its blood ought to have two sprinklings, which answer to four; which Maimonides \textsuperscript{f11} explains thus; because it is said “round about”, it must needs be that the sprinklings should comprehend the four sides of the altar; and this is done when the two sprinklings are upon the two horns, which are diametrically opposite; and this is what is meant, “which are four”; the sense is, that those two should include the four sides, and the two opposite horns were the northeast and the southwest, as he and other Jewish writers observe \textsuperscript{f12}, and which he expresses more clearly elsewhere \textsuperscript{f13}: when the priest took the blood in the basin, he sprinkled out of it in the basin, two sprinklings upon the two corners of the altar opposite from it; and he ordered it so to sprinkle the blood upon the horn, that the blood might surround the corners in the form of the Greek letter “gamma” \textsuperscript{f14}; so that the blood of the two sprinklings might be found upon the four sides of the altar; because it is said of the burnt offerings, and of the peace offerings “round about”; and this is the law for the trespass offering, and the rest of the blood was poured out at the bottom southward: now this was always done by a priest, for though the bullock might be killed by a stranger, as Gersom on the place observes, yet its blood must be sprinkled by a priest; and it is the note of Aben Ezra, that this might be done by many, and therefore it is said, the “priests, Aaron’s sons”, when the slaying of it was only by one. The “altar” on which the blood was sprinkled typified the divinity of Christ, which gave virtue to his blood, whereby it made atonement for sin; and in allusion to this rite Christ’s blood is called “the blood of sprinkling”, (1 Peter 1:2) (Hebrews 12:24) which being sprinkled on the heart by the Spirit of God clears it from an evil conscience, and purges the conscience from dead works, and speaks peace and pardon there, (Hebrews 10:22 9:14).

Ver. 6. And he shall flay the burnt offering, etc.] Take off its skin; this was the only part of it that was not burnt, and was the property of the priest, (Lev 7:8) but who this was done by is not so manifest, since it is in
the singular number “he”, and seems to be the bringer of the offering; for Aaron’s sons, the priests that sprinkled the blood, are spoken of plurally; and agreeably, Gersom observes, that the flaying of the burnt offering and cutting it in pieces were lawful to be done by a stranger; but Aben Ezra interprets “he” of the priest; and the Septuagint and Samaritan versions read in the plural number, “they shall flay”, etc. and this was the work of the priests, and who were sometimes helped in it by their brethren, the Levites, (2 Chronicles 29:34) and as this follows upon the sprinkling of the blood, it was never done till that was; the rule is, they do not flay them (the sacrifices) until the blood is sprinkled, except the sin offerings, which are burnt, for they do not flay them at all. The flaying of the burnt offering may denote the very great sufferings of Christ, when he was stripped of his clothes, and his back was given to the smiters, and his cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; and the skin of the sacrifice, which belonged to the priest, may be an emblem of the righteousness of Christ, and which also was signified by the coats of skins the Lord God made for Adam and Eve, (Genesis 3:21) that robe of righteousness, and garments of salvation, which all that are made kings and priests to God are clothed with:

and cut it into his pieces; which was done while he was flaying it, and after this manner, as Maimonides relates, he flays until he comes to the breast, and then he cuts off the head, then its legs, and finishes the flaying; then he rends the heart, and brings out its blood; then he cuts off the hands, and goes to the right foot, and cuts off that, and after that he cuts down the beast until its bowels are discovered; he takes the knife and separates the lights from the liver, and the caul of the liver from the liver, and does not remove the liver out of its place; and he goes up to the right side, and cuts and descends to the backbone, and he does not go to the backbone until he comes to the two tender ribs; he comes to the neck, and leaves in it two ribs here and two ribs there; he cuts it and comes to the left side, and leaves in it two tender ribs above and two tender ribs below; then he comes to the point of the backbone, he cuts it, and gives it and the tail, and the caul of the liver, and the two kidneys with it; he takes the left foot and gives it to another; and according to this order they flay and cut in pieces the burnt offering of the cattle; and these are the pieces spoken of in the law, (Leviticus 1:6) some apply this to the ministers of the Gospel, rightly dividing the word of God, and to the effect the word has in dividing asunder soul and spirit; but it is best to apply it to Christ, either to the
evidence given of him in the Gospel, in which he is clearly set forth in his person, natures, and offices, and in all the parts and branches thereof; where every thing is naked and open to view, as the creature was when thus cut up; or rather to his sufferings, which he endured in every part of his body, from head to foot.

Ver. 7. And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar, etc.] The fire of the altar originally came down from heaven, and consumed the sacrifice, and which was a token of God’s acceptance of it, (see Leviticus 9:24 1 Kings 18:23,24,38 1 Chronicles 21:26 2 Chronicles 7:1) and this fire was kept burning continually upon the altar, (Leviticus 6:12,13) and yet the Jewish writers say, it was the command of God, according to this passage, that fire should be brought from another place and put here; Jarchi’s note on the text is,  

“though fire came down from heaven, it was commanded to bring it from a common or private place:”

and Maimonides says the same thing, and so it is often said in the Talmud, and this, as Gersom observes, was not done by any but a priest in the time of his priesthood, or when clothed with his priestly garments; and so in the Talmud it is said, that the putting fire upon the altar belonged to the priesthood, but not flaying or cutting in pieces: this fire denoted the wrath of God, revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness and ungodliness of men, and which is the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels, and all the workers of iniquity; and which Christ endured for his people in human nature, when he bore their sins, and became a whole burnt offering for them:

and lay the wood in order upon the fire; the wood for the sacrifice was an offering of the people, brought to the temple at the times appointed, (Nehemiah 10:34 13:31) where was a place called μυξ [ h τ kς l , “the wood room”, or “wood chamber”, and which was in the northeast part of the court of the women; and here such priests as had blemishes wormed the wood, or searched the wood for worms; for whatsoever wood had a worm found in it, it was not fit to be laid upon the altar; and it was from hence the priests fetched the wood and laid it on the altar; for a private person might not bring it from his own house for his offering, though it was provided by the congregation, and brought thither by private persons; and it might be any sort of wood but that of the vine and olive, which
were not used, because they did not burn well, and were soon reduced to ashes; and because such a consumption would be made of such useful trees hereby, that there would be no wine or oil in the land of Israel, so necessary for private and religious uses. The Vulgate Latin version renders it, “the pile of wood being laid before”: that is, before the fire was put upon the altar; but this is contrary to the text, for the wood was laid upon the fire, and therefore the fire must be first; the case seems to be this, the fire was first kindled, and then the wood laid in order upon it.

Ver. 8. And the priests, Aaron’s sons, shall lay the parts, etc.] That were cut in pieces, (Leviticus 1:6) some of which are particularly mentioned: the head and the fat; the head which was cut off, and the body, the trunk of it; so, Aben Ezra says, the wise men interpret the word *rōd pā* “fat”, which is only used here and in (Leviticus 1:12 8:20) and which he thinks is right; though others take it to be the fat caul, or midriff, which parts the entrails; and the Targum of Jonathan renders it, the covering of fat: these are particularly mentioned, but include in general the rest of the pieces, which were laid: in order upon the wood that is on the fire which is upon the altar; this disposition of the several parts of the burnt offering upon the altar signifies the laying of Christ upon the cross, and the disposition of his head, his hands, and feet there; according to the usual order of crucifixion: the skin, as before observed, was not burnt, but was the property of the priest, and the sinew that shrunk was taken away, and cast upon the ashes in the middle of the altar.

Ver. 9. But the inwards and his legs shall he wash in water, etc.] This was first done in a room in the court of the temple, called *‘yj ḏmḥ t kṣl*, “the room of the washers”, or the washing room, where they washed the inwards of the holy things; and after that they washed them upon the marble tables between the pillars, where they washed them three times at least; and whereas this is said to be done “in water”; Maimonides observes, “not in wine, nor in a mixture of wine and water, nor in other liquids:”

the washing of the inwards and legs denoted the internal purity of Christ’s heart, and the external holiness of his life and conversation, and the saints’
purification by him both in heart and life: with Philo the Jew\textsuperscript{128} these things had a mystical meaning; by the washing of the inwards was signified that lusts were to be washed away, and such spots removed as were contracted by surfeiting and drunkenness, very harmful to the lives of men; and by the washing of the feet was signified that we should no more walk upon the earth, but mount up to the air, and pass through that, even to heaven:

\textit{and the priest shall burn all on the altar; all the other pieces, as well as the inwards and legs, excepting the skin, which denoted the painful sufferings of Christ, and the extent of them to all parts of his body; and indeed his soul felt the fire of divine wrath, and became an offering for sin:}

\textit{[to be] a burnt sacrifice, an offering made by fire;} that is, all the parts of the bullock were burnt on the altar, that it might appear to be a whole burnt offering consumed by fire:

\textit{of a sweet savour unto the Lord:} he accepting of it, and smelling a sweet savour of rest in it, as an atonement for sin, typical of the sacrifice of Christ, which is to God for a sweet smelling savour, (Ephesians 5:2) the Jewish doctors\textsuperscript{129} gather from hence, that whether a man offers much or little, it matters not, if his heart is but directed to God; which Maimonides explains thus\textsuperscript{130}, he that studies in the law, it is all one as if he offered a burnt offering, or a meat offering, or a sin offering, concerning which this phrase is used.

\textbf{Ver. 10. And if his offering be of the flocks, etc.] As it might be:}

\textit{[namely], of the sheep, or of the goats for a burnt sacrifice;} which were both typical of Christ, (see Gill on “Leviticus 1:2”)

\textit{he shall bring it a male without blemish;} (see Gill on “Leviticus 1:3”).

\textbf{Ver. 11. And he shall kill it on the side of the altar northward before the Lord, etc.] This is a circumstance not mentioned in the killing of the bullock: Maimonides\textsuperscript{131} says, there was a square place from the wall of the altar northward, to the wall of the court, and it was sixty cubits, and all that was over against the breadth of this, from the wall of the porch to the eastern wall, and it is seventy six cubits; and this foursquare place is called the “north”, for the slaying of the most holy things; so that it seems this being a large place, was fittest for this purpose. Aben Ezra intimates, as if some respect was had to the situation of Mount Zion; his note is, “on the side of the altar northward”, i.e. without, and so “the sides of the north”,
Psalm 48:2) for so many mistake who say that the tower of Zion was in the midst of Jerusalem; and with this agrees Mr. Ainsworth’s note on Leviticus 6:25) hereby was figured, that Christ our sin offering should be killed by the priests in Jerusalem, and Mount Sion, which was on “the sides of the north”, Psalm 48:2) crucified on Mount Calvary, which was on the northwest side of Jerusalem; as by the Jews’ tradition, the morning sacrifice was killed at the northwest horn of the altar f32:

and the priests, Aaron’s sons, shall sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar; (see Gill on “Leviticus 1:5”).

Ver. 12. And he shall cut it into his pieces, with his head and his fat, etc.] Or “his body”, as the Targum of Jonathan; this was to be cut in pieces in the same manner as the bullock, (see Gill on “Leviticus 1:6”):

and the priest shall lay them in order on the wood that [is] on the fire, which is on the altar; (see Gill on “Leviticus 1:8”).

Ver. 13. But he shall wash the inwards and the legs with water, etc.] As he did the bullock, (Leviticus 1:9):

and the priest shall bring [it] all: all the parts to the ascent of the altar, as the Jews f33 interpret it; all the parts and pieces of it, even the very wool on the sheep’s head, and the hair on the goat’s beard, their bones, sinews, and horns, and hoofs f34, all were burnt, as it follows:

and burn [it] on the altar, it [is] a burnt offering, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord; (see Gill on “Leviticus 1:9”).

Ver. 14. And if the burnt sacrifice for his offering to the Lord be of fowls, etc.] As it might be for the poorer sort, who could not offer a bullock, nor a sheep, or a lamb, (Leviticus 5:7 12:8):

then he shall bring his offering of turtledoves, or of young pigeons; the Jewish writers all agree, that the turtles should be old, and not young, as the pigeons young, and not old; so the Targum of Jonathan, Jarchi, Aben Ezra and Gersom f35; the latter gives two reasons for it, because then they are the choicest and easiest to be found and taken: no mention is made of their being male or female, either would do, or of their being perfect and unblemished, as in the other burnt offerings; but if any part was wanting, it was not fit for sacrifice, as Maimonides f36 observes. These creatures were proper emblems of Christ, and therefore used in sacrifice, whose voice is
compared to the turtle’s, and his eyes to the eyes of doves, (Song of Solomon 2:12 5:12) and who is fitly represented by them for his meekness and humility, for his chaste and strong affection to his church, as the turtledove to its mate, and for those dove like graces of the Spirit which are in him.

**Ver. 15.** And the priest shall bring it unto the altar, etc.] The southeast horn of it; near which was the place of the ashes, into which the crop and its feathers were cast:

and wring off his head; by twisting it back as it should seem; the word used is only to be found here, and in (Leviticus 5:8) the Jews say, it signifies to cut with the nail, and that the priest did this, not with a knife or any other instrument, but with his nail; so Jarchi and Gersom on the place observe: some think he only let out the blood this way, but did not separate the head from the body, which seems to be favoured by (Leviticus 5:8) though Maimonides and Bartenora conclude the reverse from the same place; and that the meaning is, that he should cut off the head and divide it asunder at the time he cuts with the nail: the manner of cutting with the nail was this, the priest held both the feet of the bird with his two fingers of his left hand, and the wings between two other fingers, and the bird upon the back of his hand, that it might not be within the palm of it; then he stretches out its neck upon the thumb about two fingers’ breadth, and cuts it over against the neck with his nail, and this is one of the hardest services in the sanctuary:

and burn [it] on the altar; that is, the head, after squeezing out the blood, and rubbing it with salt:

and the blood thereof shall be wrung out at the side of the altar: or “the wall” of it: this, though mentioned last, must be done before, and immediately upon the wringing of the head, and between that and the burning it on the altar: this wringing off the head, and wringing out the blood, denote violence, and show that Christ’s death, which this was a type of, was a violent one; the Jews laid violent hands upon him, and pursued his life in a violent manner, were very pressing to have it taken away, and his life was taken away in such a manner by men, though not without his Father’s secret will, and his own consent.

**Ver. 16.** And he shall pluck away his crop with his feathers, etc.] Or “with its meat”, or “dung”, as Onkelos renders it, meaning that which was in its
crop; and so the Jerusalem Targum interprets it, “with its dung”; and Jonathan’s paraphrase is, “with its collection”, or what was gathered together in the crop; it includes the entrails, as Gersom observes:

_and cast it beside the altar on the east part, by the place of the ashes_; where the ashes of the burnt offering were put every day, and every time such an offering was made; and all this answered to the washing of the inwards, and legs of the other burnt offerings, and signified the same thing, the cleanness and purity of Christ, and of his people by him.

Ver. 17. _And he shall cleave it with the wings thereof_, etc.] One wing being on one side, and the other on the other side:

_but shall not divide it asunder_; the body of the bird, though it was cleaved down in the middle, yet not parted asunder, nor any of its wings separated from it; the Targum of Jonathan paraphrases it, “but shall not separate its wings from it”; this denoted, that though, by the death of Christ, his soul and body were separated from each other, yet the human nature was not separated from his divine Person, the personal union between the two natures still continuing; nor was he divided from his divine Father, though he was forsaken by him, yet still in union with him as the Son of God; nor from the divine Spirit, by which he offered up himself to God, and by which he was quickened; nor from his church and people, for whom he suffered, they being united to him as members to their head:

_and the priest shall burn it upon the altar, upon the wood that is upon the fire_; in like manner as the ox, sheep, or goat were burnt: according to the Misnah, the priest went up the ascent (of the altar) and turned round about the circuit; when he came to the southeast horn, he cut its head (or nipped it) with his nail, over against its neck, and divided it, and squeezed out its blood by the wall of the altar, and turned the part nipped to the altar, and struck it at it, and rubbed it with salt, and cast it upon the fires; then he went to the body and removed the crop and its feathers (or dung) and the entrails that came out along with it, and threw them into the place of ashes; he cleaved but did not divide asunder, but if he divided it was right, then he rubbed it with salt, and cast it upon the fires:

_it is a burnt sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord_; (see Gill on “<GRBD>Leviticus 1:9”) so with the Heathens, to the gods of the air they sacrificed fowls for burnt offerings.**
CHAPTER 2

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 2

This chapter contains the law of the meat offering, and gives an account of what it was made of, fine flour, with oil poured, and frankincense put upon it, (Leviticus 2:1) what was done with it; part of it burnt upon the altar, and the rest was the property of the priests, (Leviticus 2:2,3,8-10) how it was to be when baked in an oven, or in a pan, or fried in a frying pan, (Leviticus 2:4-7) what was prohibited in it, leaven and honey, (Leviticus 2:11) what was to be used in it, salt, (Leviticus 2:13) and what was to be the oblation and meat offering of the first fruits, and what to be done with it, (Leviticus 2:12,14-16).

Ver. 1. And when any man will offer a meat offering unto the Lord, etc.] Or, “when a soul”, and which Onkelos renders “a man”, so called from his more noble part; and, as the Jews say, this word is used because the Minchah, or meat offering here spoken of, was a freewill offering, and was offered up with all the heart and soul; and one that offered in this manner, it was all one as if he offered his soul to the Lord: there were some meat offerings which were appointed and fixed at certain times, and were obliged to be offered, as at the daily sacrifice, the consecration of priests, the waving of the sheaf, etc. (Exodus 29:40,41 Leviticus 6:20 23:13) but this was a freewill offering; wherefore it is said, “when any man will offer”; the Hebrew word h j nm, “a meat offering”, may be derived from h j n, “to bring” or “offer”, and so is a name common to offerings of any sort; or from j ynh, to “recreate” and delight, it being of a sweet savour to the Lord, as other offerings were; others derive it from j nm, a root not in use, and in the Chaldee language signifies a gift or present, in which sense this word is used, (Genesis 32:13,20)

his offering shall be of fine flour; of flour of wheat, (Exodus 29:2) for, as the Jews say, there is no fine flour but wheat, and this was for the meat offering, (I Chronicles 21:23) and this was to be of the finest of the wheat; for all offerings, whether private or public, were to be of the best, and to be brought from those places which were noted for having the best;
and the best places for fine flour were Mechmas and Mezonicha, and the next to them were Caphariim, in the valley; and though it might be taken out of any part of the land of Israel and used, yet it chiefly came from hence; and according to the Jewish writers, the least quantity of fine flour used in a meat offering was the tenth part of an ephah, which was about three pints and a half, and a fifth part of half a pint: Christ was prefigured by the meat offering; his sacrifice came in the room of it, and put an end to it, (Psalm 40:7,8 Daniel 9:27) whose flesh is meat indeed, the true meat or bread, in distinction from this typical meat offering, (John 6:55) the fine flour denotes the choiceness, excellency, and purity of Christ; the dignity of his person, the superiority of him to angels and men, being the chiefest, and chosen out of ten thousand; the purity of his human nature being free from the bran of original corruption, and the spotlessness of his sacrifice: and fine flour of wheat being that of which bread is made, which is the principal part of human sustenance, and what strengthens the heart of man, and nourishes him, and is the means of maintaining and supporting life; it is a fit emblem of Christ, the bread of life, by which the saints are supported in their spiritual life, and strengthened to perform vital acts, and are nourished up unto everlasting life, and who, as the meat offering, is called the bread of God, (Leviticus 21:6,8) (John 6:33)

and he shall pour oil upon it; upon all of it, as Jarchi observes, because it was mingled with it, and it was the best oil that was used; and though it might be brought from any part of the land of Israel, which was a land of oil olive, yet the chief place for oil was Tekoah, and the next to it was Ragab beyond Jordan, and from hence it was usually brought; and the common quantity was a log, or half a pint, to a tenth deal of fine flour, as Gersom asserts from the wise men, and to which Maimonides agrees; and Gersom on the place observes, that it is proper that some of the oil should be put in the lower part of the vessel, and after that the fine flour should put in it, and then he should pour some of it upon it and mix it: the oil denotes the grace of the Spirit poured out upon Christ without measure, the oil of gladness, with which he was anointed above his fellows, and from whence he has the name of Messiah or Christ, or Anointed; and with which he was anointed to be prophet, priest, and King, and which renders him very desirable and delightful to his people, his name being as ointment poured forth, (Psalm 45:7 Song of Solomon 1:3)
and put frankincense thereon; on a part of it, as Jarchi’s note is; and according to him, the man that brought the meat offering left an handful of frankincense upon it on one side; and the reason of this was, because it was not to be mixed with it as the oil was, and it was not to be taken in the handful with it; and the quantity of the frankincense, as Gersom says, was one handful: this denoted the sweet odour and acceptableness of Christ, the meat offering, both to God and to his people: it is an observation of the Jewish writers, that the pouring out of the oil on the fine flour, and mixing it with it, and putting on the frankincense, might be done by a stranger, by any man, by the man that brought the meat offering, but what follows after the bringing of it to the priest were done by him.

Ver. 2. And he shall bring it to Aaron’s sons, the priests, etc.] And this is all that he did with it; he left it with the priest, who carried it to the altar, to the southwest horn of it. the order of bringing it, according to Maimonides, was this,

“a man brings fine flour from his house in baskets of silver or of gold or of other kind of metals, in a vessel fit to be a ministering vessel; and if it is a meat offering of fine flour, he puts it into a ministering vessel, and sanctifies it in a ministering vessel;”

then did what follows:

and he shall take thereout his handful of the flour thereof, and of the oil thereof; as mixed together: the Jews say, this was done with the right hand, which is very likely, that being generally used in this way: the Talmudists thus describe the manner in which the handful was taken; the priest stretched out his three fingers over the palm of his hand, and gathered the handful in the plate or pan, and parted it off with his thumb above, and with his little finger below; and this was the most difficult piece of service in the sanctuary: though Maimonides rejects this notion of difficulty, and says it was done in the common way, in which men take up a handful of anything: but Bartenora says, it was not in the usual way, but much as before described: the priest put the sides of his fingers into the flour, and gathered the flour with the sides of his fingers within his hand, and took of the flour only three fingers’ full, upon the palm of his hand, and no more; and that it might not be heaped or go out, he pared it off, above with his thumb, and below with his little finger; and this he affirms, according to the Gemara, and what his masters had taught him, was one of the hardest pieces of service in the sanctuary:
with all the frankincense thereof; this was not taken along with the handful of flour and oil; for if there was ever so small a quantity of frankincense in the handful it was not right; for the frankincense, when brought, was put on one side of the fine flour, and when the handful was taken, then that was taken altogether, and put upon it:

and the priest shall burn the memorial of it upon the altar: that is, he was to burn the handful of fine flour and oil with the frankincense, as a “memorial”; either to put the Lord in mind of his lovingkindness to his people, and of his covenant with them, and promises unto them, to which the allusion is, (Psalm 20:3) or to put the offerer in mind of the great sacrifice of Christ, who was to be offered for his sins, and to be a meat offering to him: this was the part the Lord had in this offering, and which related to his worship, as the word used sometimes signifies, as De Dieu has observed:

[to be] an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord; (see Gill on “Leviticus 1:9”).

Ver. 3. And the remnant of the meat offering shall be Aaron’s and his sons’, etc.] Which not only shows the care taken by the Lord for the maintenance of the priests, from whence the apostle argues for the support of ministers of the Gospel, (1 Corinthians 9:13,14) but denotes that such who are made priests unto God by Christ, have a right to feed upon Christ the meat offering by faith; who is that altar and meat offering, which none but such have a right to eat of:

it is a thing most holy of the offerings of the Lord made by fire; some offerings with the Jews were only holy things, or, as they call them, “light” holy things, comparatively speaking; others were heavy holy things, or most holy; or, as it is in the original, “holiness of holiness”, the most holy of all.

Ver. 4. And if thou bring an oblation of a meat offering baken in an oven, etc.] This is another kind of meat offering, or in another form; the former was only fine flour and oil mixed together, and frankincense put on it, but this was made up into cakes, and baked in an oven, and not in anything else, according to the Jewish tradition; he that says, lo, upon me be a meat offering baked in an oven, he may not bring that baked otherwise; and this meat offering was made into cakes and wafers, and then baked, as follows: and
[it shall be] unleavened cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, or unleavened wafers anointed with oil; which according to the Jews were made after this manner: the priest put the oil into a vessel before the making of it, then put the fine flour to it, and put oil upon it, and mixed it, and kneaded it, and baked it, and cut it in pieces, and put oil upon it, and mixed it, and again put oil upon it, and took the handful, and it was the fourth part of an hin of oil that was divided into the several cakes; the cakes, they say, were obliged to be mixed, and the wafers to be anointed; the cakes were mixed, but not the wafers the wafers were anointed, and not the cakes. The oil denoted the grace of the Spirit of God in Christ, and in his people; and being unleavened, the sincerity and truth with which the meat offering, Christ, is to be upon.

Ver. 5. And if thy meat offering be an oblation [baken] on a pan, etc.] Which had no edge or covering, and the paste on it hard, that it might not run out:

it shall be of fine flour unleavened, mingled with oil; signifying the same as before.

Ver. 6. Thou shalt part it in pieces, etc.] This answered to the dividing of the pieces of the burnt offering, (Leviticus 1:6,12) and signified the same thing; (see Gill on Leviticus 1:6) (see Gill on Leviticus 1:12) All meat offerings, it is said, that were prepared in a vessel, were obliged to be cut to pieces; the meat offering of an Israelite, one (cake) was doubled into two, and two into four, and then divided, each piece was about the quantity of an olive:

and pour oil thereon; after parted into pieces, (see Gill on Leviticus 2:4)

[it is] a meat offering; as well as that of fine flour, or that which was baked in an oven.

Ver. 7. And if thy oblation [be] a meat offering [baken] in the fryingpan, etc.] It is asked, what difference there is between the pan, and the fryingpan? the fryingpan has a cover, but the pan has no cover; the fryingpan is deep, and its works (or paste) flow, or are thin, but the pan is extended, and its works (or paste) are hard or stiff; which Maimonides explains thus, the fryingpan is a deep vessel, which has a lip or edge round about it, and the paste which is baked in it is thin and flows; the pan is a vessel which has no lip or edge, and therefore its paste is hard or stiff, that
it flow not: now all these acts of mixing the flour, and kneading, and baking, and frying, and cutting in pieces, as well as burning part on the altar, signify the dolorous sufferings of Christ when he was sacrificed for us, to be both an atonement for our sins, and food for our faith:

*it shall be made of fine flour with oil*: as the other sort of meat offerings before mentioned.

**Ver. 8.** *And thou shalt bring the meat offering, that is made of these things, unto the Lord*, etc.] Either to the tabernacle, the house of the Lord, or to the Lord’s priest, as it follows:

*and when it is presented to the priest;* by the owner of it:

*he shall bring it unto the altar;* to the south west horn of the altar[f61].

**Ver. 9.** *And the priest shall take from the meat offering a memorial thereof*, etc.] That is, an handful of it; as of the fine flour, ([43E][Leviticus 2:2]) so of the pieces of that which was baked, whether in the oven, or pan, or fryingpan:

*and shall burn it upon the altar;* the memorial or handful:

*[it is] an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord;* (see Gill on “[43E][Leviticus 1:9”).

**Ver. 10.** *And that which is left of the meat offering, etc.*] Not burnt with fire:

*[shall be] Aaron’s and his sons’;* the high priest took his part first, and then the common priests:

*[it is] a thing most holy of the offerings of the Lord made by fire;* (see Gill on “[43E][Leviticus 2:3”).

**Ver. 11.** *No meat offering which ye shall bring unto the Lord shall be made with leaven, etc.*] It might be used in peace offerings, and in the wave loaves, ([43E][Leviticus 7:13 23:17) but not in meat offerings; not only in the handful that was burnt, but in the rest that was eaten by Aaron and his sons; for so is the rule[f62],

“all meat offerings are kneaded in hot water, and are kept that they might not be leavened; and if what is left of them be leavened, a negative precept is transgressed, ([43E][Leviticus 2:11).”
It denoted in Christ, the antitype of the meat offering, freedom from hypocrisy and all false doctrines, which were the leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees, (Luke 12:1 Matthew 16:6,12) and in his people that feed upon him by faith, that they should be clear of malice and wickedness, and of communion with profane and scandalous persons, (1 Corinthians 5:6-8,13) so the Jews say, the corruption of nature is like to leaven, and therefore forbid:

*for ye shall burn no leaven, nor any honey, in any offering of the Lord made by fire*; as leaven was used in some offerings, so honey was brought with the first fruits, (2 Chronicles 31:5) but neither of them might be used in offerings made by fire; they are forbidden to be burnt: the reason why they were forbidden, some think is, because they were used by the Heathens in their sacrifices, so Maimonides, whose customs were not to be followed; and certain it is that honey was used in Heathen sacrifices: Homer speaks of honey as the sweet food of the gods, and what they desire; and so Pausanias relates of the Eleans, that, according to an ancient custom, they used to offer on the altar frankincense, and wheat mixed with honey: Porphyry observes, that the ancient sacrifices with most were sober, the libations of water; after these, libations of honey, ready prepared by the bees, the first of moist fruits, next libations of oil, and, last of all, libations of wine; the Egyptians used honey in their sacrifices; or the reason is, because it was much of the same fermenting nature with leaven, as Aben Ezra, and when burnt gave an ill smell, which was not proper in offerings made by tire, of a sweet savour to the Lord; or rather because a symbol of sin and sinful pleasures. Baal Hatturim on the place says, the corruption of nature is sweet to a man as honey, and intimates that that is the reason of its prohibition: it denotes unto us that such as would feed by faith on Christ ought to relinquish sinful lusts and pleasures; and that those that will live godly in Christ Jesus must not expect their sweets, but bitters, even afflictions, reproaches, and persecutions, for Christ’s sake, in this life.

**Ver. 12.** *As for the oblation of the firstfruits, ye shall offer them unto the Lord,* etc.] Or “in” or “with the oblation”, as some render it; that is, along with the oblation of the firstfruits leaven and honey might be offered: the Arabic version is very express, “but for a sacrifice of firstfruits ye” shall offer both to God; as they might be, as before observed; so the Targum of Jonathan,
“for the leavened bread of the firstfruits shall be offered, and dates in the time of the firstfruits; the fruits with their honey shall be offered, and the priest shall eat them:"

but they shall not be burnt on the altar for a sweet savour; which they could not make, and besides were to be the portion of the priests.

Ver. 13. And every oblation of thy meat offering shalt thou season with salt, etc.] Which makes food savoury, and preserves from putrefaction; denoting the savouriness and acceptableness of Christ as a meat offering to his people, he being savoury food, such as their souls love, as well as to God the Father, who is well pleased with his sacrifice; and also the perpetuity of his sacrifice, which always has the same virtue in it, and of him as a meat offering, who is that meat which endures to everlasting life, (John 6:27) and also the grave and gracious conversation of those that by faith feed upon him, (Mark 9:50 Colossians 4:6)

neither shall thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meat offering; this seems to suggest the reason why salt was used in meat offerings, and in all others, because it was a symbol of the perpetuity of the covenant, which from thence is called a covenant of salt, (Numbers 18:19) namely, the covenant of the priesthood, to which these sacrifices belonged, (Numbers 25:13) hence the Targum of Jonathan,

“because the twenty four gifts of the priests are decreed by the covenant of salt, therefore upon all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt:"

with all thine offerings thou shall offer salt, even those that were not to be eaten, as well as those that were; as the burnt offering of the herd, of the flock, and of fowls, and their several parts; all were obliged to be salted that were offered, excepting wine, blood, wood, and incense; hence there was a room in the temple where salt was laid up for this purpose, called יָלְנַמְּר תְקָכָל, “the salt room”; and which was provided by the congregation, and not by a private person; our Lord has reference to this law in (Mark 9:49) the Heathens always made use of salt in their sacrifices.

Ver. 14. And if thou offer a meat offering of thy firstfruits unto the Lord, etc.] This, according to Aben Ezra, was not any of the offerings of the
firstfruits, which they were obliged to, as at the passover or pentecost, or feast of tabernacles, but a free will offering; but Jarchi thinks it is to be understood of the meat offering of the Omer, (Leviticus 23:13,14) and so Gersom, which was offered up on the sixteenth of Nisan; and this is the general sense of the Jewish writers:

thou shalt bring for the meat offering of thy firstfruits green ears of corn dried by the fire; these were ears of barley, which began to be ripe in the month Abib, which month had its name from hence, and is the word here used; these were dried by the fire, being green and moist, or otherwise they could not have been ground; for, according to Gersom, these were afterwards ground into fine flour:

[even] corn beaten out of full ears; and so made the finest flour: the firstfruits were a type of Christ, who is so called, (1 Corinthians 15:23) the beating of the ears of corn, and drying of them by the fire, and the grinding of them, denoted the sufferings of Christ.

Ver. 15. And thou shalt put oil upon it, and lay frankincense thereon, etc.] Either on the ears of corn dried, or on the fine flour of them when ground; in like manner as the oil and frankincense were put upon the fine flour of wheat, and upon the cakes and wafers baked, (Leviticus 2:1,4,5,7)
it [is] a meat offering; one sort of it, and like the rest.

Ver. 16. The priest shall burn the memorial of it, etc.] That which is taken out of it for a memorial, the same with the handful of fine flour and cakes of the meat offering:

part of the beaten corn thereof; or that which was ground in a mill:

and part of the oil thereof, with all the frankincense thereof; as was done in the other meat offerings:

it is an offering made by fire unto the Lord, (see Leviticus 2:2).
CHAPTER 3

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 3

This chapter contains the law of the peace offerings, and gives an account what they consisted of, and of the various rites and ceremonies used at them, as of the bullock and the rites appertaining to that, (Leviticus 3:1-5) and of the lamb, and of the rites peculiar to it, (Leviticus 3:6-11) and of the goat, and of the rites belonging to it, (Leviticus 3:12-16) and the chapter is concluded with a law forbidding the eating of fat and blood throughout their dwellings for ever, (Leviticus 3:17).

Ver. 1. And if his oblation [be] a sacrifice of peace offering, etc.] The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan render it, the “sacrifice of holinesses”, or “sanctifications”; so called, not because they were more holy than other sacrifices; for they were what the Jews call the lighter holy things, in distinction from the most holy things, such as the meat offerings were, (Leviticus 2:10) but as Ainsworth suggests, either because none but holy persons might eat of them, (Leviticus 7:19,20) though this also was enjoined in other sacrifices, or because hereby the name of God was sanctified. These offerings were either by way of thanksgiving for favours received, or for free devotion, or as a vow, and in order to obtain for himself that offered and family health and safety, peace and prosperity, (see Leviticus 7:11,12) all which the word used signifies; and these sacrifices are by the Septuagint called “sacrifices of salvation” or “health”, because offered either in gratitude for it, or to enjoy it; or else they were offered to make peace and reconciliation, and therefore are called peace offerings, and that they were for this purpose is certain from (Ezekiel 45:15) and Gersom says they had their name from hence, because they bring peace between God and men; they were a kind of a pacific festival between God, the priests, and the owner, and were typical of Christ, who has made peace for us by his blood and sacrifice. There is something very offensive to God in sin, it being a breach of his law, and contrary to his nature and will, provoking to the eyes of his glory, deserving of wrath, and death itself, and so not only sets man at a distance from him, but creates an enmity between them; hence a peace offering became necessary; such an one man could not
bring acceptable to God; for neither his repentance nor good works would do; but Christ has offered up himself a sacrifice, and thereby has made reconciliation for sin and sinners, and procured peace with God for them; the consequence of which is spiritual peace here, and eternal peace hereafter; and so is a “sacrifice of peaces”, as the Hebrew phrase here may be literally rendered, and is the proper antitype and full completion of this sort of sacrifice:

*if he offer [it] of the herd:* that is, a bullock:

*whether [it be] a male or female:* as it might be either; showing, as some think, that in Christ Jesus, and in the Gospel churches, and under the Gospel dispensation, there is no distinction of male and female, with respect to blessings and privileges, (Galatians 3:28) or rather as others, denoting both strength and weakness in Christ; strength in his obedience, and weakness in his sufferings; strong he was as the man of God’s right hand made so by him, and yet was crucified through weakness:

*he shall offer it without blemish before the Lord:* signifying the perfection and purity of Christ’s sacrifice of peace offering in the sight of God: “before the Lord”; this, according to Gersom, was on the west side of the court.

**Ver. 2. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering,** etc.] “His right hand with strength”, the Targum of Jonathan says; perhaps both his hands were imposed; the Septuagint and Arabic versions read it in the plural number, “hands”: this same rite was used in the sacrifice of burnt offering, (see Gill on Leviticus 1:4); which might be done in any place in the court where it was slain, only with this difference: according to Maimonides, there was no confession of sin made at laying on of hands upon the peace offerings, but words of praise were spoken:

*and kill it at the door of the congregation:* it seems as if it was not the priest, but the owner that brought it, and laid his hands on it, that killed it; and so the last mentioned writer says, that slaying the peace offering by a stranger was right; and as he and others say, it might be slain in any part of the court; it was not obliged to be slain in the north part of it, as the burnt offering was, (Leviticus 1:11)

*and Aaron’s sons the priests shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about:* in like manner as the blood of the burnt offering was, and it was done with two sprinklings, which were as four; (see Gill on
Leviticus 1:5) this was typical of the blood of Christ, called “the blood of sprinkling”.

Ver. 3. *And he shall offer of the sacrifice of the peace offering,* etc.] That is, the priest, not all of it, but some of it, even what is after mentioned:

an offering made by fire unto the Lord; for what was offered to the Lord was burnt, and is that part of it which is next mentioned in this and the following verse:

the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards; both that which covered them, and that which stuck to them; and the fat being the best, it was the Lord’s, and offered to him, and denoted Christ the fatted calf, whose sacrifice is best and most excellent; and which was typified by that which Abel offered up, and which being of the fat of the flock, and offered up by faith in Christ’s sacrifice, was more excellent than Cain’s, (Genesis 4:4 Hebrews 11:4).

Ver. 4. *And the two kidneys, and the fat that [is] on them, which is [by] the flanks,* etc.] Meaning either the two kidneys which were next the flanks, or the fat upon them, which was next to them; these, and the burning of them, may signify the burning zeal and flaming love and affections of Christ for his people, which instructed him, and put him upon offering himself a sacrifice of peace offering for them, (see Psalm 16:7)

and the caul above the liver, with the kidneys, it shall he take away; or the caul, which is a thin membrane or skin, in which the liver is enclosed, with the liver, together with the kidneys, he separated from the rest in order to burn, at least with a part of the liver; so Jarchi and Gersom interpret it, that he should take a little of the liver with the caul; and indeed some think the word rendered “caul” signifies a part of the liver, that which the Greeks call the “table”, the broader part of it, like a table; and which word the Talmudists retain, who speak of ἀδβκδής πρόπρός, “the table of the liver”; and by which Jarchi on (Exodus 29:13) interprets the caul above the liver, the same as here.

Ver. 5. *And Aaron’s sons shall burn it on the altar,* etc.] That is, the fat of the several parts before mentioned; this signified the sufferings of Christ, by which our peace is made, and by whose death we are reconciled to God:

this rite of burning the fat of the inwards of sacrifices was used by the Pagans, and is still retained by the idolatrous Indians to this day:
upon the burnt sacrifice; which, as Gersom says, was the burnt offering of the daily sacrifice of the morning, which was offered first of all sacrifices; so Jarchi says,

“we learn that the daily burnt offering preceded every other offering:”

this was an eminent type of Christ’s sacrifice:

which is upon the wood that [is] on the fire; that is, which burnt offering was laid upon the wood on the fire, and the fat of the peace offering upon that:

[it is] an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord; as Christ’s sacrifice is, (Ephesians 5:2 (see Gill on “Leviticus 1:9”)).

Ver. 6. And if his offering, for a sacrifice of peace offering unto Lord, be of the flock, etc.] As it might be: and be either male or female; which he pleased:

he shall offer [it] without blemish; (see Gill on “Leviticus 3:1”).

Ver. 7. If he offer a lamb for his offering, etc.] Which was of the flock, and must be of the first year; this is a rule laid down by Maimonides, that where ever this word is used in the law, it signifies one of the first year:

then shall he offer it before the Lord; bring it into the court, and present it to the priest.

Ver. 8. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering, etc.] The Targum of Jonathan adds here, as before, “his right hand with strength:”

and kill it before the tabernacle of the congregation; in the court, in any part of it; for, as Gersom says, all places were right for this; the man that brought it killed it, or the butcher, as the Targum of Jonathan says here also as on (Leviticus 3:2):

and Aaron’s sons shall sprinkle the blood thereof round about upon the altar; upon the four horns of it, (see Gill on “Leviticus 3:2”).

Ver. 9. And he shall offer of the sacrifice of the peace offering, etc.] That is, the priest, Aaron, or one of his two sons:
an offering made by fire unto the Lord; that part of it which was to be burnt with fire; and in the peace offering of the lamb there was something more than in the peace offering of the bullock, or of the goat, which follows:

the fat thereof, [and] the whole rump, it shall he take off hard by the backbone; not the rump or tail, but the fat of it; the copulative “and” is not in the text; wherefore Aben Ezra says, that Gaon was mistaken in reading it as we do, “the fat there of”, and “the whole rump”; but it should be rendered, “its fat of the whole rump”, or “tail”: in the eastern countries, some sheep and lambs had very large tails, and very fat ones, the least weighing ten or twelve pounds, the largest above forty, and were put in little carts for ease and safety; see Gill “Exodus 29:22” now such as were “whole”, entire, perfect, and without blemish, as the word signifies, the fat of them that was next to the backbone was to be taken off of such as were brought for peace offerings:

and the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards; as before; (see Gill on “Leviticus 3:3”).

Ver. 10. And the two kidneys, etc.] The same direction is given here as about the bullock of the peace offering, (see Gill on “Leviticus 3:4”).

Ver. 11. And the priest shall burn it upon the altar, etc.] The fat of the tail, of the inwards, the two kidneys, and the caul of the liver:

[it is] the food of the offering made by fire unto the Lord; or “bread”; this part of the offering that was burnt belonged to the Lord; it was his food, and what was accepted of by him, and therefore is elsewhere called the bread of God, (Leviticus 21:8,22 Numbers 28:2).

Ver. 12. And if his offering be a goat, etc.] As it might be, and which also was of the flock:

then he shall offer it before the Lord; in the same place and manner as the bullock and the lamb, (Leviticus 3:1,7

Ver. 13. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of it, etc.] His right hand, according to the Targum of Jonathan, as before; the same directions are given for the killing of it, and for the sprinkling of its blood, as in the offerings of the bullock and lamb.
Ver. 14. *And he shall offer thereof his offering*, etc.] The same rules are laid down about taking the fat off of several parts as in the sacrifice of the bullock; but nothing is said of the fat of the rump and tail, as is said of the lamb.

Ver. 16. *And the priest shall burn them upon the altar*, etc.] Which shows that not the fat only, but the inwards and the kidneys, were burnt also; so Maimonides says, that the priest salted the parts, and burned them upon the altar; and the priests might not have the breast and shoulder (which were what belonged to them) until the parts were burnt:

*[it is] the food of the offering made by fire;* which the Lord ate of, or accepted of:

*for a sweet savour;* as a type of the sweet smelling sacrifice of Christ, with which he is well pleased;

*all the fat is the Lord’s;* that is, all that was upon the parts mentioned in the several sacrifices of peace offerings, which was to be taken off and burnt: though the Jewish writers understand it of all fat in general, and so interpret the law that follows.

Ver. 17. *[It shall be] a perpetual statute for your generations*, etc.] That is, unto the end of the Mosaic dispensation, until the Messiah comes, and his sacrifice is offered up, and his blood is shed, till that time in all generations: and

*throughout all your dwellings;* wherever their habitations should be, it is a law to be observed:

*that ye eat neither fat nor blood;* the Jewish writers think, that this is not to be restrained to the fat and blood of sacrifices, because these were not offered in their dwellings, but in the tabernacle and temple, and therefore interpret it of fat and blood in general; but what fat and blood are meant may be seen in (Leviticus 7:23-27) the Targum of Jonathan adds,

“But upon the top of the altar it shall be offered to the name of the Lord,”

which seems to restrain it to the sacrifices.
CHAPTER 4

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 4

This chapter contains the law of the sin offering, which was offered for sins committed through ignorance, error, and mistake, (Leviticus 4:1,2) and gives an account of the matter of them, and the rites belonging thereunto, which were different according to the persons for whom it was made, as for the anointed priest, (Leviticus 4:3-12) for the whole congregation, (Leviticus 4:13-21) and for the ruler, (Leviticus 4:22-26) and for any of the common people, (Leviticus 4:27-35).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying. Continued to speak to him, or, after some pause made, proceeded to speak to him, and give things in commandment concerning the sin offering, what it should be, and for whom, as follows.

Ver. 2. Speak unto the children of Israel, [saying], etc. For this law concerning the sin offering, as the rest, only belonged to them, and such as were proselyted to them:

if a soul should sin through ignorance; sin is from the soul, though committed by the body; it is the soul that sins, (Ezekiel 18:4) it includes, as Aben Ezra observes, both Israelites and proselytes; who sinned through ignorance either of the law, that such things were forbidden, or of having committed them, they being done unobserved, and through inadvertency; or were forgotten that they were done, or were done through error and mistake; these sins are what the apostle calls the errors of the people, their strayings out of the way through ignorance and inadvertency, (Hebrews 5:2 9:7) such sins as a man is overtaken with unawares, and is drawn into at once through temptation and the prevalence of corruption; these are the errors and secret faults which David distinguishes from presumptuous sins, (Psalm 19:12,13):

against any of the commandments of the Lord ([concerning things] which ought not to be done.) The Jewish writers distinguish the commandments of the Lord into affirmative and negative, and make their number to be six hundred and thirteen; two hundred and forty eight are
affirmative, according to the number of bones in a man’s body, and three hundred sixty five are negative ones, according to the number of the days of the year; and they observe it is only the transgression of negative precepts that is here meant, and for which a sin offering was to be brought: 

_and shall do against any of them_; it must be something done, and not merely said: hence the Jews say, that as the neglect of circumcision, and of the passover, does not come under this law, because they are affirmative precepts; so neither blasphemy, because there is nothing done, only something said: of these sins of ignorance, they give instances as follows; if any man eats the fat that is about the kidneys, thinking it is the fat that is about the heart; or that lies with a woman forbidden by the law, thinking her to be his wife; or that commits idolatry, by bowing to the idol, thinking that the law forbids sacrifice, incense, and libation, but not bowing; or that profanes the sabbath, thinking it is a common day.

Ver. 3. _If the priest that is anointed do sin_, etc.] That is, the high priest, as the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, and the Septuagint version, render it; who in after times was only anointed, though at first Aaron’s sons were anointed with him; so an high priest is described in (Leviticus 21:10) and such an one was liable to sin, and often did; which shows not only that the greatest and best of men are not without sin, but proves what the apostle observes, that the law made men high priests which had infirmity, even sinful infirmities, who needed to offer for themselves as well as for the people; by which it appeared that perfection could not be had by the Levitical priesthood, and that it was proper it should cease, and another priesthood take place, (Hebrews 7:11,12,18,19,27,28):

_according to the sin of the people_; committing the like sins of error and ignorance as the common people, to which he was liable as they; or “to make the people guilty”; as the margin reads; to which agrees the Septuagint version, “so that the people sin”; and the Vulgate Latin version, “making the people to sin”; either by his doctrine or example, and both through ignorance, heedlessness, and inadvertency: the Targum of Jonathan is,

“when he offers the offering of sin for the people, not according to its manner”

or rite; as if his sin lay in erring while he was offering; but be it in which way it may, whether by any unadvised inadvertent action of his own, or
ignorant instruction of the people, so causing them to err, or any ignorance or mistake in offering the sacrifices of the people:

*then let him bring for the sin which he has sinned*; in either way:

*a young bullock*; not an ox which was three years old, nor a calf which was but of one year, but a bullock which was of two years; so Maimonides observes, that wherever it is said a calf, that is a young one of the first year, but a bullock it is a young one of the second year: as are men’s characters, so are the aggravations of their sins, and sacrifices were proportioned thereunto; the high priest was obliged to bring the same offering as the whole congregation did in a like case; (see Leviticus 4:13,14)

*without blemish*; a type of the sacrifice of Christ offered up without spot to God, as it follows;

*unto the Lord*; against whom sin is committed, and therefore sacrifice both in the type and antitype must be brought and offered up to him, by whom it is accepted, and to whom it is of a sweetsmelling savour, namely, the unblemished sacrifice of Christ:

*for a sin offering*; or “for sin”: the sin offering is called sin itself, and so is Christ the antitype of it, (2 Corinthians 5:21) Christ is most holy in himself, had no sin in him, nor knew any, nor were any committed by him; yet he appeared in the likeness of sinful flesh, took the place of sinners, and was their substitute, had all their sins laid upon him, and was by imputation made sin itself, and became an offering for it, and so fully answered the type of the sin offering.

**Ver. 4.** *And he shall bring the bullock unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord, etc.*] As the bullock of the burnt offering; (see Gill on “Leviticus 1:3”):

*and shall lay his hand on the bullock’s head*; the Targum of Jonathan says his right hand; (see Gill on “Leviticus 1:4”):

*and kill the bullock before the Lord*; at the door of the tabernacle, that is, in the court, as Gersom observes; according to the above Targum, the butcher killed it, and not the priest: (see Gill on “Leviticus 1:5”) all this is typical of the imputation of sin to Christ, and of his death.
Ver. 5. *And the priest that is anointed shall take of the bullock’s blood, etc.*] Let out and received into a basin; this he did himself, and not another, for he offered for himself, and the blood was to make atonement for him:

*and bring it to the tabernacle of the congregation;* out of the court where the bullock was slain, into the holy place, where were the vail that divided between the holy of holies, and the altar of sweet incense, after mentioned.

Ver. 6. *And the priest shall dip his finger in the blood, etc.*] The finger of his right hand, as Gersom observes, and so Maimonides f88, for blood was always taken and sprinkled with the right hand, if done with the left it was wrong, according to the Jewish canons f89 and though it is only said the priest, and not that is anointed, as before, yet it seems to mean him and not another; though if a private priest did this, Gersom says, it would be right, and so Maimonides f90:

*and sprinkle of the blood seven times before the Lord;* a figure of the blood of Christ, called, in allusion to this rite, the blood of sprinkling; which being presented before the Lord, calls for pardon from him, and sprinkled on the conscience, speaks peace there, and perfectly cleanses from all sin, which the seven times sprinkling is a symbol of:

*before the vail of the sanctuary: the words may be literally rendered, “the face of the vail of the sanctuary”:* as if the blood was sprinkled on the outside of the vail. Jarchi’s note is,

“over against the place of its holiness, he directed (it) over against between the staves; the blood shall not touch the vail, but if it touches, it touches it;”

that is, it is no matter. And according to Maimonides f91 the blood of bullocks and goats burnt was sprinkled seven times upon the vail, which divided between the and the holy of holies. This typified the vail of flesh, whose blood gives boldness to enter into the holiest of all, (Hebrews 10:19).

Ver. 7. *And the priest shall put [some] of the blood, etc.*] With his finger, which he dipped into it:

*upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense before the Lord, which is in the tabernacle of the congregation;* this was the golden altar on which incense was offered: it was placed before the vail, on the outside of it, in
the holy place, (see Exodus 30:1-6) and the priest, when he put the blood on the horns of it, began at the northeast horn, so to the northwest, then to the southwest, and last to the southeast; and the priest dipped his finger at every horn, and when he had finished at one horn, he wiped his finger at the edge of the basin, and after that dipped a second time; for what remained of the blood on his finger was not fit to put upon another horn. This rite shows, that the intercession of Christ, signified by the altar of sweet incense, proceeds upon the foot of his blood and sacrifice, (Revelation 8:3,4) (1 John 2:1,2):

and shall pour all the blood of the bullock at the bottom of the altar of burnt offering, which is at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; this altar stood without the holy place, and the altar of incense within; and after the priest had sprinkled of the blood of the bullock, upon the horns of the altar of incense, what remained he poured at the bottom of the altar of burnt offering; for though it is said “all” the blood, it can mean no more than what was left; wherefore the Vulgate Latin version renders it, “all the remaining blood”: and Jarchi’s explanatory note is, the rest of the blood. The place where this was poured, according to Maimonides, was the west bottom of the altar; and Gersom on the place observes the same. This denotes the efficacy of Christ’s blood to make atonement for sin, and the reverent esteem it ought to be had in, being precious blood.

Ver. 8. And he shall take off from it all the fat of the bullock for the sin offering, etc.] When the priest had killed the bullock, and sprinkled and poured the blood, as before commanded; he then cut up the bullock, and took out its inwards, and put them in a vessel, and salted them, and strowed them on the fires, and burnt them, and the fat of them, as he did with the sacrifice of the peace offerings; so that what is here said, and in the two next verses (Leviticus 4:9,10), is the same with what is ordered concerning them in (Leviticus 3:3-5 (see Gill on Leviticus 3:3)) (see Gill on Leviticus 3:4) (see Gill on Leviticus 3:5)). Jarchi and Gersom both observe that they agree, that as one brings peace into the world, so does the other.

Ver. 11. And the skin of the bullock, etc.] Not taken off; for the sin offerings that were burnt were not flayed at all, but were cut in pieces with their skins on them; in other burnt offerings the skin was taken off, and was a perquisite of the priest, (Leviticus 7:8) but this being an offering for the priest, the skin was burnt with the rest:
and all his flesh, with his head, and with his legs, and his inwards, and his dung; the burning of these denoted the sufferings of Christ, and these several parts the extent of them, they reaching to all parts of his body as stretched upon the cross; and the dung particularly the reproach of them, he dying the death of the cross, and was made sin and a curse for his people.

Ver. 12. Even the whole bullock shall he carry forth without the camp, etc.] The Jewish writers interpret it without the three camps\(^{97}\), the camp of the tabernacle, the camp of the Levites, and the camp of the Israelites; when the temple was built, such sacrifices were carried and burnt without the city of Jerusalem; there were three places for burning; one was in the midst of the court, where they burnt such sacrifices as were unfit and rejected; the other was in the mountain of the house called Birah, where they burnt such as any accident befell them, after the carrying of them out of the court; and the third place was without Jerusalem, called the place of ashes\(^{98}\); this was typical of Christ being had out of the city of Jerusalem, and suffering without the gates of it, (\(<\text{Hebrews 13:11,12}>\):)

unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out; the ashes of the burnt offerings. This, according to Ainsworth, answered to the place where Christ was crucified, being a place of skulls, or dead men’s ashes, (\(<\text{John 19:17}>\):)

and burn him on the wood with fire; any wood might be used for the burning of it, even straw or stubble, which in the Hebrew language are called wood, as Gersom on the place observes, and so Maimonides\(^{99}\); and it is added, “with fire”, as the last writer says\(^{100}\), to exclude lime and cinder coals:

where the ashes are poured out shall he be burnt; openly without; and seeing it is not said, that the priest shall carry forth the bullock, and shall burn it, it is concluded by Gersom on the place, that both may be done lawfully by a stranger, and so Maimonides\(^{101}\).

Ver. 13. And if the whole congregation of Israel sin through ignorance, etc.] That is, all Israel, or the greatest part of them, as Gersom interprets it, through the ignorant teaching of the judges, who by their instruction cause the people to err, and commit sins of ignorance, as Baal Hatturim on the place observes, and Maimonides elsewhere\(^{102}\), wherefore Jarchi, and some others, by the congregation of Israel understand the sanhedrim, or the
bench of judges, consisting of seventy one. Ainsworth remarks on the words, that the church may err:

_and the thing be hid from the eyes of the assembly_; congregation or church, so that they do not know that it is a sin which they have committed:

_and they have done [somewhat against] any of the commandments of the Lord, [concerning things] which should not be done_; transgressed negative precepts:

_and are guilty_; of sin, though as yet they know it not.

Ver. 14. _When the sin which they have sinned against it_, etc.] Any of the commandments of the Lord forbidding such a thing to be done:

_is known_; is made known to them by the priest, or any other, so that they are convinced that what has been done is wrong, though done through ignorance:

_Then the congregation shall offer a young bullock for the sin, and bring him before the tabernacle of the congregation_; the same offering with that of the anointed priest, he being, as Aben Ezra on the place observes, equal to all Israel.

Ver. 15. _And the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock before the Lord_, etc.] These must be two at least, some say three, and some say five; the more generally received notion is, that they were three of the sanhedrim; though the Targum of Jonathan makes them to be the twelve rulers of the twelve tribes:

_and the bullock shall be killed before the Lord_; in the court near the altar of burnt offering, either by a priest, or Levite, or by a butcher, as the above Targum expresses it.

Ver. 16-21. _And the priest that is anointed shall bring of the bullock’s blood_, etc.] That is, the chief priest, as the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan explain it:

_to the tabernacle of the congregation_; as he brought the blood of his own bullock, (Leviticus 4:5) from hence to the (Leviticus 4:16-22) an account is given of the same rites to be observed in the sin offering, for the
congregation, as for the anointed priest; (see Gill on “Leviticus 4:6, 7, 12”).

**Ver. 22. When a ruler hath sinned, etc.]** Or “prince”, the “nasi”, one that is lifted up above others in honour, power, and authority, or that bears the weight of government: the word comes from one which signifies to lift up, or to bear; it may be understood of a governor of a family, or of a tribe, as Aben Ezra observes; and so in the Talmud it is said, it means the prince of a tribe, such as Nachson the son of Amminadab, prince of the tribe of Judah. Maimonides says a king is designed, over whom none has power; and so Gersom on the place, who observes, that David the king is called a prince, (Ezekiel 34:24 46:2)

*and done [somewhat] through ignorance [against] any of the commandments of the Lord his God;* the phrase, “his God”, is here added, and is not used neither of the anointed priest, nor of the congregation, nor of one of the common people; only of the prince, to show, that though he is above others, God is above him, and he is accountable to him; he is his God, of whom he is, and by whom he rules; wherefore if he breaks any of his commandments, though ignorantly, he must bring a sacrifice for it:

*[concerning things] which should not be done, and is guilty;* of transgressing negative precepts, which are as binding on him as others.

**Ver. 23. Or if his sin wherein he hath sinned come to his knowledge, etc.]** Or rather, “and if his sin”, etc. either by means of others informing him of it, or of himself calling to mind what he has done, and considering it to be a transgression of the law:

*he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats, a male without blemish;* his offering was to be a “kid of the goats”, a fat and a large one; because, as Baal Hatturim observes, he ate fat things every day; and to distinguish it from the offering of one of the common people; and “without blemish”; as all sacrifices were, that they might be typical of the offering of Christ without spot.

**Ver. 24. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the goat, etc.]** His right hand, as the Targum of Jonathan; (see Gill on “Leviticus 1:4”)

*and kill it;* not the prince, but the priest after mentioned, or the butcher, as the same Targum:
in the place where they hill the burnt offering before the Lord; in the court on the north side of the altar, (see <span>Leviticus 1:11 6:25>):

**it is a sin offering**: an offering for his sin of ignorance, or “sin”; so Christ our offering is said to be, (<span>2 Corinthians 5:21>).

**Ver. 25. And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin offering with his finger, etc.**] With the finger of his right hand, as the Talmudists observe, and Gersom on the place; the priest first received the blood into a basin or ministering vessel, and then dipped the finger of his right hand into it, that next the thumb:

and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering; the four horns of it; in this there was a difference between the sacrifice of the anointed priest and of the congregation, and this of the ruler; the blood of the former was put upon the horns of the altar of incense, this upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering:

and shall pour out his blood at the bottom of the altar of burnt offering; the South bottom of it; the order of the priest’s proceeding in putting the blood was different from that used in putting it on the horns of the altar of incense; here he first put the blood upon the southeast horn, then upon the northeast, next upon the northwest, and then upon the southwest; and upon the bottom of that horn where he finished, he poured the remainder of the blood, which was the southern bottom.

**Ver. 26. And he shall burn all his fat upon the altar, &e.**] Of burnt offering, that is, the priest shall do it:

as the fat of the sacrifice of peace offerings; (see <span>Leviticus 3:3-5>)

and the priest shall make an atonement for him as concerning his sin; in a typical way, directing to the great sacrifice of Christ, which is the only real atonement and propitiation for sin: the Vulgate Latin, Syriac, and Arabic versions, render, “the priest shall pray for him”; for the pardon of his sin:

and it shall be forgiven him; not for the prayers of the priest, nor for the sacrifice offered up, but for the sake of Christ, the antitype of such sacrifices, and when faith was exercised on him; or the meaning is, he shall not be punished for it.

**Ver. 27. And if anyone of the common people sin through ignorance, etc.**] Or, “if one soul of the people of the earth”: that is, a single person, and so
is distinguished from the congregation, one of the common sort of people; however is neither an high priest, nor a prince, or king, but either a common priest, or Levite, or Israelite; no man is free from sin; all sorts of persons, of all ranks and degrees, high and low, rich and poor, men in office, civil or ecclesiastical, or in whatsoever state of life, are liable to sin, and do sin continually, either ignorantly or willingly; and Christ is a sacrifice for all sins and for all sorts of sinners:

**whilst he doeth somewhat;** etc. (see Gill on “[Leviticus 4:2, 13, 22]”).

**Ver. 28.** Or if his sin which he hath sinned come to his knowledge, etc.]

So that he is convinced that he has sinned:

then he shall bring his offering; to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to the priest there:

a kid of the goats: a young goat:

a female without blemish; and so inferior to the offering of the ruler or prince; for the characters of men are aggravations of their sins, and sacrifices were to be in some measure answerable to them, and suitable to their circumstances:

for the sin which he hath sinned; to atone for it in a typical way.

**Ver. 29.** And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin offering, etc.]

His right hand, as the Targum of Jonathan; not the priest that shall offer it, but the man that has sinned, that brings it, thereby confessing his sin, and transferring it to the sacrifice:

and slay the sin offering in the place of the burnt offering; that is, on the north side of the altar.

**Ver. 30-31.** And the priest shall take of the blood, etc.]

So that all the preceding actions, the bringing the offering, the putting the hand upon the head of it, and slaying it, were done by the man that sinned; of this and what follows here and in the next verse (“[Leviticus 4:31], (see Gill on “[Leviticus 4:25-26]”).

**Ver. 32.** And if he bring a lamb for a sin offering, etc.]

As he might if he would; the Jews observe, that in all places a lamb is put before a goat, as being more excellent in its kind; but here it is mentioned after, which shows, they say, that they are equally alike {f110}:}
he shall bring it a female without blemish; typical of Christ the Lamb of God, without spot and without blemish, (1 Peter 1:19).

Ver. 33. He shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin offering, etc.] On the head of the lamb, as on the head of the goat, even his right hand, as the above Targum, as before:

and slay it for a sin offering, in the place where they kill the burnt offering: for if it was not slain for a sin offering, but for something else, or on any other account, as for a burnt offering, it was not right f111.

Ver. 34-35. And the priest shall take of the blood, etc.] (See Gill on "Leviticus 4:25-26").
CHAPTER 5

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 5

This chapter treats of the trespass offering, points at the sins for which it was to be made, and the matter of it; it was for secret sins, and sins of ignorance, such as refusing to bear witness in a known case, (Leviticus 5:1) touching unclean things and false swearing, (Leviticus 5:2-4) the things directed to in such cases are confession, (Leviticus 5:5) sacrifice of a lamb, or kid of the goats, (Leviticus 5:6) and in case of poverty, two turtle doves, or two young pigeons; concerning the offering of which instructions are given, (Leviticus 5:7-10) and if not able to bring them, then a meat offering of fine flour, about which rules are laid down, (Leviticus 5:11-13) and for sins committed through ignorance in holy things or sacrileges, the sacrifice of a ram is enjoined, and satisfaction ordered to be made for the injury done in the holy thing, by adding a fifth part to it, (Leviticus 5:14-16) and for sins committed ignorantly against negative precepts, only a ram is appointed for the trespass offering, (Leviticus 5:17-19).

Ver. 1. *And if a soul sin,* etc.] The soul is put for the person, and is particularly mentioned, as Ben Melech says, because possessed of will and desire:

*and hear the voice of swearing*; or cursing, or adjuration; not of profane swearing, and taking the name of God in vain, but either of false swearing, or perjury, as when a man hears another swear to a thing which he knows is false; or else of adjuration, either the voice of a magistrate or of a neighbour adjuring another, calling upon him with an oath to bear testimony in such a case; this is what the Jews call the oath of testimony or witness, and which they say is binding in whatsoever language it is heard:

*and is a witness*; is able to bear witness to the thing he is adjured about:

*whether he hath seen or known of it*; what he has seen with his eyes, or knows by any means: of such a case, the Jews observe, that there may
be seeing without knowing, or knowing without seeing, and in either case a man ought to bear witness:

*if he do not utter it*; tell the truth, declare what he has seen or known:

*then he shall bear his iniquity*; he shall be charged with sin, and be obliged to acknowledge his offence, and bring a trespass offering for it: it is said, that the witnesses are not guilty of the oath of the testimony, but in these ten cases; if they are required; if the testimony is concerning goods; if the goods are movable; if he that requires binds himself to pay for their testimony only, in case they bear witness; if they refuse after required; if they refuse in the sanhedrim; if the adjuration or oath is made there by the name of God, or his titles; if knowledge of the testimony goes before the oath; if he particularizes his witnesses in the time of the oath, or at the time of the requirement; and if the oath is in a language they understood.

**Ver. 2. Or if a soul touch any unclean thing, etc.**] Meaning an Israelite, for only such were bound by this law, which pronounced a person unclean that touched anything that was so in a ceremonial sense; this is the general, including whatsoever by the law was unclean; the particulars follow:

*whether [it be] a carcass of an unclean beast*, as the camel, the coney, the hare, and the swine, (Leviticus 11:2-3)

*or a carcass of unclean cattle*; as the horse, and the ass, which were unclean for food, and their dead carcasses not to be touched, (Leviticus 11:26-28)

*or the carcass of unclean creeping things*: such as are mentioned in (Leviticus 11:29-31)

*and if it be hidden from him*; that he has touched them; or the uncleanness contracted by touching, he having inadvertently done it; or being ignorant of the law concerning such uncleanness:

*he also shall be unclean*; in a ceremonial sense, by thus touching them:

*and guilty*; of a breach of the command which forbids the touching of them: this is by way of prolepsis or anticipation; for as yet the law concerning unclean beasts, and creeping things, and pollution by touching them, was not given: Jarchi and Gersom interpret this guilt, of eating of holy things, and going into the sanctuary when thus defiled: in the Jewish Misnah it is said, the word “hidden” is twice used, to show that he is
guilty, for the ignorance of uncleanness, and for the ignorance of the sanctuary.

**Ver. 3.** Or if he touch the uncleanness of man, etc.] The dead body of a man, or the bone of a dead body, or a grave, or any profuvious or menstruous person:

whatsoever uncleanness [it be] that a man shall be defiled withal: not morally, but ceremonially:

and it be hid from him; he is not sensible that he has touched any thing ceremonially unclean:

when he knoweth [of it], then he shall be guilty: acknowledge his guilt, and offer a sacrifice for it, as after directed.

**Ver. 4.** Or if a soul swear, etc.] A rash or vain oath:

pronouncing with his lips; not in his heart, as Jarchi notes; not saying within himself that he would do this, or that, or the other thing, but expressing his oath plainly and distinctly, with an audible voice:

to do good, or to do evil; which was either impossible or unlawful for him to do; whether the good or evil he swears to do is to himself or to another; whether he swears to do good to himself, and evil to another, or, good to another, and evil to himself, (see Psalm 15:4,5). The Targum of Jonathan paraphrases it,

“whatsoever a man expresses, whether of anything present or future;”

as if he swears he has done such and such a thing, whether good or evil; or that he will do it, be it what it will, and it is not in the power of his hands to do it, or, if he did it, it would be doing a wrong thing:

whatsoever [it be] that a man shall pronounce with an oath, and it be hid from him; he has forgot that he ever swore such an oath:

and when he knoweth [of it], then he shall be guilty in one of these; when he is told of it, and it is made clearly to appear to him, that he did at such a time, and in such a place, deliver out a rash oath concerning this, or the other thing, then he shall be chargeable with guilt in one of these; either in rashly swearing to do good when it was not in his power, or to do evil, which would have been unlawful. The Targum of Jonathan is,
“if he knows that he has falsified, and repents not, he is guilty.”

Ver. 5. *And it shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these things*, etc.] Before expressed in the preceding verses; the Targum of Jonathan is,

“in one of the four things,”

which Ben Gersom particularly mentions in the oath of witness, or the pollution of the sanctuary, or the pollution of its holy things, or a vain oath:

*that he shall confess that he hath sinned in that [thing];* not make confession of sin in general, but of that particular sin he is guilty of; and this he was to do before he brought his offering, or at least at the time of his bringing it; for without confession his offering would be of no avail; and which he made, as Ben Gersom says, by laying his hand on the head of the offering, thereby signifying and declaring his guilt, and that he deserved to die as the creature would about to be sacrificed for him; or he might make a verbal confession and acknowledgment of his offence. Fagius, from the Jewish writers, has given us the form of it, which was this;

“I beseech thee, O Lord, I have sinned, I have done wickedly, I have transgressed before thee, so and so have I done; and, lo, I repent, and am ashamed of what I have done, and I will never do the same again.”

Though perhaps this form may be of too modern a date, yet doubtless somewhat like this was pronounced; and they make confession of sin necessary to all sacrifices, and say \[^{117}\] atonement is not made by them without repentance and confession.

Ver. 6. *And he shall bring his trespass offering unto the Lord, for the sin which he hath sinned*, etc.] To make atonement for it; this was typical of the sacrifice of Christ, whose soul was made an offering for sin, μακάριος, “Asham” a trespass offering, (Isaiah 53:10) where the same word is used as here:

*a female from the flock, a lamb, or kid of the goats, for a sin offering*; it is generally thought there was a difference between a trespass offering and a sin offering; but it is not easy to say wherein the difference lies; and what has been observed by learned men is not very satisfactory: and certain it is, that the same offering is here called both a trespass offering and a sin offering; and such as were men of substance, and capable of it, were to
bring a female lamb or kid; it being for sins of ignorance, a sacrifice of a less value was admitted; yet it must be a lamb, typical of Christ the Lamb of God; and atonement cannot be made, even for sins of ignorance, but by the blood and sacrifice of Christ:

*and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his sin*; that is, by offering his sacrifice for him, which was a type of the atonement made by the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without spot and blemish.

**Ver. 7.** *And if he be not able to bring a lamb*, etc.] He is not possessed of a lamb, nor able to purchase one:

*then he shall bring for his trespass which he hath committed, two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, unto the Lord*; either the one or the other; these were common, and in great plenty in the land of Israel, as Maimonides \(^{f118}\) observes, which was the reason of their being ordered, since to be had cheap. The turtledoves were larger, as the Targum of Jonathan calls them, being older, and the pigeons lesser, being young; or the one were grown, and not little, and the other little, and not grown, as the Jewish writers \(^{f119}\) observe; and either of them were proper emblems of Christ in his purity, innocence, and meekness, by whom an atonement is made both for the rich and poor:

*one for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering*; one of the turtledoves or pigeons, whichever were brought, was offered up as a sin offering, and the other that remained was offered up as a burnt offering; so that the poor man had two sorts of offerings out of what he brought, when the rich had but one; and may denote the completeness of his sacrifice, and the full atonement made by it.

**Ver. 8.** *And he shall bring them unto the priest*, etc.] Either two turtledoves, or two young pigeons:

*who shall offer [that] which [is] for the sin [offering] first*; that which is chosen for it, as the Targum of Jonathan; and this choice was made, not by the priest, but by the man that brought the offering, who separated it, and said, lo, this is a sin offering, and after that said, lo, this is a burnt offering \(^{f120}\); the sin offering was offered first, which was to make atonement for sin, and then the burnt offering, to denote the divine acceptance of it; and so Ben Gersom observes, it was proper to offer the sin offering first, to atone for his sin, that after he (God) was appeased this way, he might receive his gift; for the burnt offering was as a gift. Jarchi compares it to an advocate,
who first goes in to appease, and when he has appeased, the gift goes in after him:

*and wring off his head from his neck, but shall not divide it asunder:* be it a turtledove or a young pigeon, so it was to be served; the head was not to be separated from the body, but was nipped by the nail of the priest “in” the neck, as it might be rendered f121; over against the neck, as the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan render it; the hinder part, or what is behind the throat, as Jarchi and Ben Molech interpret it; so that the part which was nipped was the neck; and this nip was made so large, as that the blood was let out by it, as appears from the following verse (Leviticus 5:9), and yet the head was not divided from the body; the head hung by a piece of skin on the back part; of the manner of performing this, and the mystery of it, (see Gill on “Leviticus 1:15”).

**Ver. 9.** And he shall sprinkle of the blood of the sin [offering] upon the side of the altar, etc.] Or “wall” f122 it is asked f123,

“what is the wall at which the rest of the blood is wrung out? this is the lower wall, namely, the half of the height of the altar below, under the thread (of scarlet that goes round the middle of the altar) that the rest of the blood may be squeezed at the bottom of the altar, and because of this the sin offering of the fowl is below,”

that is, the sprinkling of its blood. And so Ben Gersom observes; from hence we learn, says he, that the sprinkling of the sin offering of the fowl was in the lower part of the altar; and I think this sprinkling, adds he, was not in the length, but in the breadth:

*and the rest of the blood shall be wrung out at the bottom of the altar;* the blood sprinkled was that which dropped from it when nipped by the priest; this here was squeezed out by him, and was shed at the foot of the altar; so that the altar had all the blood, and nothing but the blood of the fowl, all the rest belonged to the priest f124: this might be an emblem both of the drops of blood which fell from Christ in the garden, and of the shedding of his blood upon the cross, whereby remission of sin was obtained, and atonement made:

*it [is] a sin [offering];* an offering whereby sin was typically expiated and stoned.
Ver. 10. And he shall offer the second for a burnt offering, according to the manner, etc.] That is, the second turtledove or young pigeon, after the other was made a sin offering; and the manner according to which this was offered was not according to the rite or manner of the bird chosen first for a sin offering, as the Targum of Jonathan, but according to the burnt offering of the fowl in (Leviticus 1:15-17) so Jarchi and Ben Gersom:

and the priest shall make an atonement for him, for his sin which he had sinned, and it shall be forgiven him; upon the atonement made; and so forgiveness of sin with God proceeds upon the atonement made by the blood of Christ, (Hebrews 9:22). God never took one step towards it, without a regard to Christ the propitiation for sin; he promised it with a view to him; there is no instance of pardon under the Old Testament but in this way, and God always has respect to Christ in pardon, it is for his sake; and this way of forgiveness best provides for the glory of the divine perfections; there can be no better way, or infinite wisdom would have used it; there could be no other way, considering the council and covenant of peace; to pardon, without atonement and satisfaction, is not consistent with the purity, justice, and veracity of God; and to observe this great truth, the phrase is afterwards frequently repeated,

Ver. 11. But if he be not able to bring two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, etc.] Which is supposing a man to be in the poorest circumstances he can well be; and such is the grace and goodness of God, that he has provided for the atonement and forgiveness of the poorest, as well as of the rich:

then he that hath sinned shall bring for his offering the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a sin offering; which is an omer, (Exodus 16:36) and is as much as a man can eat in one day, as Aben Ezra remarks:

he shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put [any] frankincense thereon; to distinguish it from the common meat offering, which had both, (Leviticus 3:1) and to make it as easy, and as little chargeable to the poor as possible, both oil and frankincense being things of value; and some think that these were prohibited, to show that atonement and forgiveness, and even the salvation of men, are not owing to grace in them, comparable to oil, or to their prayers, signified by frankincense, and so to any or all of their duties, but to Christ alone, and his atoning sacrifice: or these were forbidden, because emblems of joy and gladness, and therefore not so proper at a confession of sin, and humiliation for it: or rather to show how
disagreeable and offensive sin was to the Lord, being contrary to grace, of which oil was an emblem, and far from being acceptable to him, which frankincense might signify; and therefore being prohibited, might denote how unacceptable, yea nauseous, sin is to him; which agrees with the reason given;

for it [is] a sin [offering], and therefore must not be honoured, as Jarchi, or must have everything removed from it that is beautiful and amiable, as Ben Gersom, such as oil and frankincense.

Ver. 12. Then shall he bring it to the priest, etc.] The flour just as it was, not kneaded and made into a cake, as appears by what follows:

and the priest shall take his handful of it; as much of the flour as he could hold in one hand:

[even] a memorial thereof; to bring to mind his sin, and the goodness of God in admitting of an offering for it, and forgiving it upon that:

and burn [it] on the altar, according to the offerings made by fire unto the Lord; in the same manner as other burnt offerings were made:

it [is] a sin [offering]; or an expiatory sacrifice for sin.

Ver. 13. And the priest shall make an atonement for him, etc.] By burning the handful of flour brought by him, as an emblem of the painful sufferings of Christ, whereby he made atonement for the sins of his people:

as touching his sin that he hath sinned in one of these; for whatsoever sin he had committed in any of the above cases, (Leviticus 5:1-4):

and it shall be forgiven him; upon the foot of the atonement made; (see Gill on “Leviticus 5:10”):

and [the remnant] shall be the priest’s as a meat offering; the whole tenth part of an ephah of fine flour was the priest’s, excepting the handful he took and burnt, just as in the case of a common meat offering, (Leviticus 2:3).

Ver. 14. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] Out of the tabernacle of the congregation, (Leviticus 1:1) he continued to speak to him:

saying, as follows.
Ver. 15. *If a soul commit a trespass, and sin through ignorance in the holy things of the Lord,* etc. In the payment of tithes, or offering first fruits as he ought, by withholding them, or any part of them, or through eating of sacred things he ought not:

*then shall he bring for his trespass unto the Lord;* for it being a trespass in holy things, it might be properly called a trespass to or against the Lord; unless this is rather to be understood of the offering brought to the Lord for his trespass as follows:

*a ram without blemish out of the flocks;* out of the sheep and not the goats, as Ben Gersom observes; and this being for sacrifice, or for a trespass in holy things though ignorantly done, an offering of more value is required than for sins of ignorance in other cases, (Leviticus 5:6) a type of Christ, who for his strength may be compared to a ram, and to one without blemish, for his purity and holiness, and to a choice one, selected out of the flock, for his being chosen out from among the people:

*with thy estimation by shekels of silver, after the shekel of the sanctuary, for a trespass offering;* that is, either an estimation was to be taken of the damage done in the holy things, an account of which was to be brought along with the ram, and the cost paid; or else the ram brought was to be of the value of, or worth shekels of silver; and the least of many being two, as Aben Ezra and Ben Gersom observe, the sense is, that the ram brought for the trespass offering should be at least worth two shekels of silver; so Jarchi and Ben Gersom.

Ver. 16. *And he shall make amends for the harm that he hath done in the holy thing,* etc. This seems to favour the sense of the word “estimation”, in the preceding verse, as understood of the estimate of the damage done in the holy things, which belonged to the priests, for which recompense was to be made according as the damage was valued:

*and shall add the fifth part thereto, and give it unto the priest;* besides paying the whole damage, he was to give a fifth part of the whole to the priest; which was ordered to show the evil nature of the sin of sacrilege, though done ignorantly, and to make men careful and cautious of committing it: the fifth part, according to the Jewish writers, is the fourth part of that of which a man eats, (“viz.” of the holy things,) which is the fifth of the whole; thus, if he eats the value of a penny, he pays the penny and the fourth part of one, and so it is in all the fifths mentioned in
the law; or, as Ben Gersom on the place expresses it, if he has had profit by the holy things to the value of four shekels, he pays five shekels; for the fifth of the shekels they add the fifth part to the four shekels; in this he observes, all are alike, the priest, the anointed, the prince, and a private person, for the law makes no difference between them in this:

_and the priest shall make an atonement for him with the ram of the trespass offering;_ by offering it up for him:

_and it shall be forgiven him;_ after he has paid the whole damage, and a fifth part besides, and offered the trespass offering for atonement; (see Gill on “<030510>Leviticus 5:10”).

**Ver. 17.** _And if a soul sin, and commit any of these things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of the Lord, etc._] Respecting holy things:

_though he wist it not;_ or did not know that he had transgressed a negative command:

_yet he is guilty, and shall bear the iniquity;_ be chargeable with guilt, and is liable to punishment, and must make an atonement and satisfaction for it; (see <421248> Luke 12:48).

**Ver. 18.** _And he shall bring a ram without blemish out of the flock, etc._] (See Gill on “<030515>Leviticus 5:15”)

_with thy estimation for a trespass [offering] to the priest;_ along with the offering was to be brought an estimate of whatsoever damage had been done through the breach of any of the commands of God, where damage could take place, that so recompense be made as before directed; or else the ram brought was to be valued, and examined whether it was worth two shekels of silver, as before explained, (see Gill on “<030515>Leviticus 5:15”) but no fifth was required as in the former cases:

_and the priest shall make atonement for him concerning his ignorance wherein he erred, and wist [it] not, and it shall be forgiven him;_ (see Gill on “<030510>Leviticus 5:10”) this is what the Jews call “Asham Talui”, doubtful trespass offering.

**Ver. 19.** _It [is] a trespass [offering], etc._] An offering for a trespass committed:
he hath certainly trespassed against the Lord; though committed ignorantly, and therefore an offering must be brought; for no sin of any kind must be overlooked, passed by, or forgiven, without a sacrifice, or without atonement made by sacrifice: or, “he shall offer a trespass offering to the Lord”, or before the Lord, as Onkelos; or before the Word of the Lord, as Jonathan; and Maimonides out of Siphri \textsuperscript{f126} observes, that whereas it is said, a trespass or trespass offering to the Lord, it was not lawful for the priests to eat of it.
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This chapter treats of the trespass offering for sins committed knowingly and wilfully, (Leviticus 6:1-7) and of the law of the burnt offering, and of cleansing the altar of burnt offering, and keeping the fire burning on it continually, (Leviticus 6:8-13) and of the meat offering, which is repeated with some additional circumstances, (Leviticus 6:14-18) and of the offering at the consecration of the high priest, (Leviticus 6:19-23) and of the sin offering, and where to be killed and eaten, and by whom, (Leviticus 6:24-30).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] Continuing his speech with him, for the same law of the trespass offering is still discoursed of, only with respect to different persons:

saying: as follows.

Ver. 2. If a soul sin, and commit a trespass against the Lord, etc.] All sin is against the Lord, contrary to his nature and will, and a transgression of his law; but some sins are more apparently so than others, and against which he expresses greater indignation and abhorrence, being attended also with very aggravating circumstances, as these that follow; which are such as are not only contrary to the will of God, but to the good of society, and tend to the subversion of it, of which he is the founder and supporter, and especially when he is sworn by, and appealed to as a witness, in a case not only injurious but false:

and lie unto his neighbour in that which was delivered him to keep; whether money or goods, or any living creature, sheep, cow, horse, etc. and should deny that ever anything was delivered to him, and take his oath upon it; which is a very grievous crime, and not to go unpunished, as was known by the light of nature, and declared by the Heathen oracle 1127; and yet there was to be a trespass offering to make atonement for such a sin: Jarchi thinks, by his neighbour is meant a third person between them; but if that third person was a witness of the goods being delivered, there would have been no occasion of an oath, as follows: the case supposed seems to
be, when anything was delivered to the care and custody of another, without the knowledge of any but the person that delivered it, and he to whom it was delivered; who retaining it for his own use, embezzling the goods, and acting the unfaithful part, affirms to the owner he never had anything of him, and so lies to him, and to that lie adds an oath of perjury:

*or in fellowship:* in partnership; as, for instance, having received money belonging to them both, denies he ever received any, and so cheats his partner of what was his due, and being put to his oath, takes it: or, “in putting of the hand”\(^\text{f128}\), as persons usually do when they enter into fellowship or partnership, they give each other their hand in token of it; or in putting anything into the hand, as money to trade with, and he denies he received any; or by way of purchase for anything bought, and the person of whom the purchase is made affirms the purchaser never put anything into his hand, or paid him anything, but insists upon being paid again; or in a way of lending, as Jarchi and Ben Gersom, because then money is put into the hand of him that receives it, and, in the case supposed, the borrower denies that ever any was put into his hand, or he borrowed any; and being called upon to swear, swears falsely:

*or in a thing taken away by violence:* without the will and knowledge of the owner; privately and secretly, but being suspected, is challenged with it, and denying it, is made to swear, which he does falsely:

*or hath deceived his neighbour:* cheated him in trade and commerce, defrauded him in business, extorted money from him; or by calumny and false accusation got anything out of his hands, (see Luke 19:8) or by detaining the wages of the hireling; so Jarchi and Ben Gersom.

**Ver. 3.** *Or have found that which was lost, and lieth concerning it,* etc.] Who having found anything lost, at once concludes it his own, and converts it to his own use, never inquiring after the proprietor of it, or taking any method to get knowledge of him, and restore it to him; but so far from that, being suspected of finding it, and charged with it denies it: Maimonides\(^\text{f129}\) gives a reason why a lost thing should be restored, not only because so to do is a virtue in itself praiseworthy, but because it has a reciprocal utility; for if you do not restore another’s lost things, neither will your own be restored to you:

*and sweareth falsely:* which is to be understood, not of the last case only, but of all the rest, or of anyone of them, as it follows:
in any of all these that a man doeth, sinning therein; by unfaithfulness in a trust, cheating, defrauding, lying, and false swearing.

Ver. 4. Then it shall be, because he hath sinned and is guilty, etc.] Owns his guilt through remorse of conscience, and makes a confession of it; or otherwise, upon conviction, without such confession he was to pay double, (see Exodus 22:7-9) whereas, in this case it is only ordered,

that he shall restore that which he took violently away: whether money, goods, or cattle:

or the thing which he hath deceitfully gotten; by outwitting him, by extortion, by false accusation, or detention of wages:

or that which was delivered him to keep; in which he was unfaithful to his trust, be it what it will:

or the lost thing which he found; and denied he had it.

Ver. 5. Or all that about which he hath sworn falsely, etc.] In all and each of the above cases, in which he had committed a trespass and denied it, and to the denial adds a false oath, and yet after all acknowledges it:

he shall even restore it in the principal; whatsoever he has embezzled, or cheated another of, or detained from the right owner, the whole of that was to be restored:

and shall add the fifth part more thereto; to the principal, (see Leviticus 5:16) but Maimonides says, this was an instruction to add a fifth to a fifth; and Aben Ezra takes the word to be plural, and observes, that the least of many is two, and so two fifths were to be added to the principal, but the first sense seems best:

[and] give it unto him to whom appertaineth; as, to his neighbour, who had deposited anything in his hands; or his partner, he had any ways wronged; or whomsoever he had defrauded in any respect; or the proprietor of lost goods; Ben Gersom observes, it was not to be given to his son, nor to his messenger: in the case of taking anything away by violence, though but the value of a farthing, it is said, that he shall be obliged to bring it after him (from whom he has taken it) even unto Media (should he be there); he shall not give it to his son, nor to his messenger, but he may give it to the messenger of the sanhedrim; and if he dies, he must return it to his heirs.
in the day of his trespass [offering]; when he brings that, but restoration must first be made: the Targum of Jonathan renders it, in the day he repents of his sin: and so Aben Ezra interprets it, ``in the day he returns from his trespass;’’

when he owns and confesses it, is sorry for it, and determines to do so no more. Maimonides observes \(^{f132}\), that one that takes away anything by violence (which is one of the cases supposed) is not fined so much as a thief; he only restores the principal; for the fifth part is for his false oath; the reasons of which are, because robbery is not so frequently, and is more easily committed, and is more open, and against which persons may guard and make resistance, and the robber is more known than a thief who steals secretly; (see <022201>Exodus 22:1).

Ver. 6. And he shall bring his trespass [offering] unto the Lord, etc.] That is, to the tabernacle of the Lord, to the altar of the Lord in it, and to his priest ministering therein, as it follows:

a ram without blemish out of the flock, with thy estimation, for a trespass [offering] unto the priest; the same offering that was ordered for a trespass through ignorance, (\(^{<030516}\)Leviticus 5:16) typical of the sacrifice of Christ offered up both for sins of ignorance and wilful transgressions, for his blood cleanses from all sin, (see Gill on “\(^{<030516}\)Leviticus 5:16”); the phrase “with thy estimation”, used there also (\(^{<030516}\)Leviticus 5:16), is here interpreted by Ben Gersom of two shekels, the value the ram was to be of, brought for the trespass offering.

Ver. 7. And the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord, etc.] By offering the ram he brought, by which a typical, but not real atonement was made; for the blood of bulls and goats, of sheep and rams, could not take away sin; but as they were types of Christ, and led to him, the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world:

and it shall be forgiven him, for anything of all that he hath done, in trespassing therein; any and everyone of the above sins, with all the aggravations of them, were forgiven, upon the atonement made, though they were so enormous; and, indeed, all manner of sin is forgiven for Christ’s sake, except the sin against the Holy Ghost: and L’Empereur \(^{f133}\) rightly observes, against the Socinians, who deny that sacrifices were offered for crimes very grievous, that these were of such a nature; for what
more vile than unfaithfulness in a trust, than cheating and defrauding, stealing, lying, and perjury?

**Ver. 8.** *And the Lord spake unto Moses,* etc.] It maybe after some intermission, or pause made; for some here begin a new chapter, and indeed a new section here begins in the Hebrew copies:

saying; as follows:

**Ver. 9.** *Command Aaron and his sons,* etc.] Who were nominated, selected, and appointed to the office, though not yet consecrated to it and invested with it, (see  Leviticus 8:1)

saying, *this [is] the law of the burnt offering; of the daily sacrifice,* morning and evening:

*it [is] the burnt offering, because of, [or] for the burning upon the altar all night unto the morning;* as there was nothing offered on the altar of burnt offering after the evening daily sacrifice, nor anything before the morning daily sacrifice, it was the more difficult to keep the fire of the altar burning in the night; wherefore a slow fire was used in the evening sacrifice, and several things remained to be burnt in the night: so Maimonides \(^{134}\) says, the remainder of the fat of the members were burnt all night until the pillar of the morning (first rays of the rising sun, Editor.):

*and the fire of the altar shall be burning in it;* not without it, as Aben Ezra observes, but on it; that is, should be ever burning on it, night and day, as it is after declared.

**Ver. 10.** *And the priest shall put on his linen garment,* etc.] “His measure” \(^{135}\), as the word signifies, a garment that was just the measure of his body, and exactly fitted it; it was a sort of a shirt, which he wore next his body, and reached down to his feet; and in this he always officiated, and was an emblem of the purity and holiness of Christ our high priest, who was without sin, and so a fit person to take away the sin of others, by offering up himself without spot to God:

*and his linen breeches shall he put upon his flesh;* to cover his nakedness; that indecency might be prevented, and that he might not be exposed to ridicule; and though these two garments are only mentioned, yet the wise men say the word “put on” includes the bonnet and the girdle; for the removing of the ashes from the altar, which is the thing he was to be thus
clothed to do, was done in the four garments, though the Scripture mentions but two.\footnote{136}

\textit{and take up the ashes which the fire hath consumed, with the burnt offering on the altar;} this was the first thing the priests did in a morning, and which in later times they cast lots for, and the first lot was for this service, and which was performed very early.\footnote{137}

“every day they cleansed or swept the altar, at cockcrowing or near it, whether before or after, and on the day of atonement at midnight, and at the feasts from the time of the first watch:”

\textit{and he shall put them beside the altar:} without, at the corner of the altar, as Aben Ezra, on the east side of it; so says Jarchi, the priest takes a full censer of the innermost consumptions (that is, of the innermost parts of the sacrifice reduced to ashes), and puts them in the east of the rise of the altar; or, as by another\footnote{138} expressed, he takes the ashes in a censer, more or less, and lays them down at the east of the rise of the altar, and there leaves them, and this is the beginning of the morning service: and we are told by another writer\footnote{139}, that there was a place called the house of ashes, and it was at the east of the rise of the altar, at a distance from the foot of it ten cubits and three hands’ breadth; where the priest, before they began to sacrifice, laid the ashes of the sacrifices, and of the candlestick, and of the altar of incense, and of the offering of the fowl that were cast out.

Ver. 11. \textit{And he shall put off his garments,} etc.] Those before mentioned, he is said to put on:

\textit{and put on other garments;} not common garments or lay-habits, what the priests wore when they were not on duty; for, as Ben Gersom says, these were priestly garments, though meaner than the first, or those that were put off: and so Jarchi says, they were worse than they were: it seems as if they were such that were spotted and dirty, and threadbare, almost worn out, and only fit for such sort of work as to carry out ashes: and so Maimonides\footnote{140} observes, that these other garments are not to be understood of common garments; but of such that are meaner in value and esteem, for both are holy garments; and, indeed, nothing belonging to the priestly office was to be performed but with the priestly garments, and they were only to be worn by the priests while in service:

\textit{and carry forth the ashes;} when these, gathered on a heap, were become large, as Jarchi says, and there was no room for the pile of wood, they
carried them out from thence; and this, he observes, was not obligatory every day, but the taking of them up, as in the preceding verse (Leviticus 6:10), they were bound to every day: and these they carried without the camp, unto a clean place; for though they were ashes, yet being ashes of holy things, were not to be laid in an unclean place, or where unclean things were: as the burnt offering was a type of Christ in his sufferings and death, enduring the fire of divine wrath in the room and stead of his people; so the carrying forth the ashes of the burnt offering, and laying them in a clean place, may denote the burial of the body of Christ without the city of Jerusalem, wrapped in a clean linen cloth and laid in a new tomb, wherein no man had been laid, (Matthew 27:59,60 Luke 23:53).

Ver. 12. And the fire upon the altar shall be burning in it, it shall not be put out, etc.] There were three fires, or piles of wood for fire continually; the first was a large one, on which the daily sacrifice was burnt; the second less, and called the pile of the incense, because they took from it fire in a censer to burn the morning and evening incense; and the third was only for preserving the fire that it might not go out: and of this it is written, (Leviticus 6:12) f141; and Maimonides f142 observes, that some say, the first of these is meant by the burning all night, (Leviticus 6:9) and the second by the fire of the altar burning in it, (Leviticus 6:12) but his own sense is, the third is meant by it; and in the sense of R. Joses, these three fires were all burning upon the altar; the first was towards the east side of the altar, the second towards the southwest, as being nearer to the rise of the altar, where the priests were, and the third was made in any part of the altar as was thought fit f143; and this is the fire not to be put out, and he that quenched it, though but one coal, was to be beaten, yea, though it be brought down from the altar f144:

and the priest shall burn wood in it every morning: until the fourth hour of the day, according to the Targum of Jonathan; that is, unto ten o’clock in the morning:

and lay the burnt offering in order upon it; both morning and evening, and as often as any sacrifices of that kind were offered up:

and he shall burn thereon the fat of the peace offerings; that which was upon the inwards and covered them, and upon the kidneys, and flanks, and caul of the liver; (see Leviticus 3:3,4).
Ver. 13. *The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar*, etc.] This was what first fell from heaven, (Leviticus 9:24) and which in after ages was maintained by constant fuel put unto it, there being every day burnt offerings upon it; which was an emblem of the love of Christ to his people, which is ever in a flame and burning, and can never be quenched by the many waters of their sins and iniquities; nor by all the sufferings he underwent to atone for them; nor by all the meanness and afflictions they are attended with; his love is fervent towards them, and always the same: and also of their love to him, which is unquenchable by the persecutions of men, by afflictions by the hand of God, by divine desertions, by Satan’s temptations, or their own corruptions: it likewise may be an emblem of the graces of the Spirit of God in the hearts of his people, which have both light and heat in them; and though they are sometimes very low as to exercise, yet are in a wonderful manner preserved amidst great oppositions made unto them from within and from without; and may also be a symbol of the word of God, sometimes compared to fire for its light and heat, and may be signified by the fire on the altar for its perpetuity, which continues and abides, notwithstanding the attempts of men and devils to get it out of the world; and though the ministers of it die, that lives, and has been preserved in the worst of times, and will burn most clearly, and shine most brightly in the end of the world. This perpetual fire may also point at the prayers of saints, the fervency of them, and their perseverance in them; or rather to the efficacy and acceptance of the sacrifice of Christ, which always continues; nor may it be amiss applied to the afflictions of God’s people, which constantly attend them in this world, and they must expect to have while in it; and even to the wrath of God on wicked men to all eternity, and which is the fire that cannot be quenched:

*it shall never go out*; as it is highly probable it never did, until the destruction of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar; though the author of second Maccabees states that:

“For when our fathers were led into Persia, the priests that were then devout took the fire of the altar privily, and hid it in an hollow place of a pit without water, where they kept it sure, so that the place was unknown to all men.” 2 Maccabees 1:19)

pretends that some devout priests, who were carried captives into Persia, hid the fire of the altar privily in the hollow of a pit, where was no water,
and in which it was kept sure and unknown to men, and was found and restored in the times of Nehemiah,

“20 Now after many years, when it pleased God, Neemias, being sent from the king of Persia, did send of the posterity of those priests that had hid it to the fire: but when they told us they found no fire, but thick water; 21 Then commanded he them to draw it up, and to bring it; and when the sacrifices were laid on, Neemias commanded the priests to sprinkle the wood and the things laid thereupon with the water. 22 When this was done, and the time came that the sun shone, which afore was hid in the cloud, there was a great fire kindled, so that every man marvelled.” (2 Maccabees 1)

but this is contrary to what the Jews always assert, that the fire from heaven was wanting in the second temple; and yet from the account Josephus gives of a festival called “Xylophoria”, or the feast of the wood carrying, it seems to have been then in being, and great care was taken to preserve it that it might not go out; for, he says, at that feast it is a custom for all to bring wood to the altar, that so there might never be wanting fuel for the fire, for it always remained unextinguished: as to, what some have observed out of Diodorus Siculus, that Antiochus Epiphanes, when he went into the temple, quenched this fire, it appears to be a mistake; for Diodorus does not say that he put out the fire of the altar, but that he extinguished the immortal lamp, as it was called by them (the Jews), which was always burning in the temple; by which he plainly means the lamp in the candlestick, and perhaps what the Jews call the western lamp, which was always burning, and was the middle lamp bending to the west, and to which the rest bent: the Heathens in many places imitated this perpetual fire: the Brahmans among the Indians speak of fire falling from heaven, kept by them on everlasting hearths, or in fire pans, for that purpose: the Persians had their perpetual fire, having a great opinion of that element: in the march of Darius against Alexander, it is observed by the historian, that the fire which the Persians call sacred and eternal was placed on altars of silver, and he is said to adjure his soldiers by the gods of their country, and by the eternal fire on the altars, etc. to rescue the Persian name and nation from the last degree of reproach: the Grecians have many traces of this continual fire on the altar among them: at Mantinia, as Pausanias relates, was a temple of Ceres and Proserpina, where a fire was kindled, and great care taken that it might not be extinguished; and in
the temple of Pan, a fire burned which was never quenched: and the same writer says \textsuperscript{152}, with the Eleans was an altar which had fire continually burning on it night and day: and Aelianus \textsuperscript{153} makes mention of an altar of Venus at Erycse in Sicily, which burnt night and day; and of which he says many things wonderful and fabulous: and it is well known that the Romans had their goddess Vesta, whom Velleius Paterculus \textsuperscript{154} calls the keeper of the perpetual fires; and there were certain virgins, called the “vestal” virgins, whose business it was to take care that the fire never went out; and is by Virgil \textsuperscript{155} called the eternal fire: and Vesta itself is thought by some learned men to be the same with \textsuperscript{h} \textsuperscript{y} \textsuperscript{c} \textsuperscript{a} “Esh-jah”, the fire of Jehovah: now these were all satanical imitations of the perpetual fire on the altar of God.

Ver. 14. \textit{And this [is] the law of the meat offering, etc.} Or the rules to be observed concerning that, for which, though directions are given, (\textsuperscript{\textit{Leviticus 2:1}}, etc. yet is here repeated with some additions to it:

\textit{the sons of Aaron shall offer it before the Lord}; being brought unto them by the children of Israel:

\textit{before the altar}; or at the face of it, for what was properly offered was burnt upon it, as in the following verse (\textsuperscript{\textit{Leviticus 6:15}}): for it should be rather rendered “in”, or “on the altar” \textsuperscript{156}; the face of it is the top of it, on which every sacrifice was offered, and not before it.

Ver. 15. \textit{And he shall take of it his handful, etc.} (See Gill on \textsuperscript{\textit{Leviticus 2:2}}).

Ver. 16. \textit{And the remainder thereof shall Aaron and his sons eat, etc.} What quantity of fine flour the meat offering consisted of is not said; very probably it was left to the offerer to bring what he would, since it was a freewill offering:

\textit{[with] unleavened [bread] shall it be eaten in the holy place}; or rather, “unleavened shall it be eaten”; for it cannot well be thought that bread of any sort should be eaten with this offering, which, properly speaking, was itself a bread offering, and so it should be called, rather than a meat offering; and certain it is, that no meat offering was to be made of leaven, but of fine flour unleavened, and so to be eaten, not by the priests in their own houses, but in the tabernacle; not in that part of it properly called the holy place, in distinction from the holy of holies, but as it follows:
in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation they shall eat it; in a room provided in that court for that purpose, as afterwards in the temple.

Ver. 17. It shall not be baked with leaven, etc.] Which, as it was a type of Christ, may denote his sincerity both in doctrine, life, and conversation; and as it may respect the offerer, may signify his uprightness and integrity, and his being devoid of hypocrisy and insincerity:

I have given it [unto thee for] their portion of my offerings made by fire; this was part of the provision made for the maintenance of the priests, as it was but just that they that ministered at the altar should live of it; and the rather, as the priests and Levites had no portion and inheritance in the land of Israel, and therefore must be supported in another way, which the Lord took care of:

it [is] most holy, as the sin [offering], and as the trespass [offering]; as they, so this being devoted to sacred uses, what were not consumed upon the altar belonged to the priests, and were their perquisites, nor might they be appropriated to the use of any other.

Ver. 18. All the males among the children of Aaron shall eat of it, etc.] And they only, for none but they might eat in the holy place, and therefore these holy things that were to be eaten there, were only eaten by them; what might be eaten by the priests in their own houses, their wives and daughters ate of, but in the holy place only their males, and a male was one that was thirteen years of age:

[it shall be] a statute for ever in your generations, concerning the offerings of the Lord made by fire; a statute to last till the Messiah should come, the true meat or bread offering; and the bread he gave was his flesh, and he that eats of it shall not die, but live for ever, (John 6:27,51):

everyone that toucheth them shall be holy; signifying, that no one ought to touch them but a holy person, one devoted to holy services, the priests and their sons; or “whatsoever” toucheth them, the dishes they eat those offerings out of, or the knives they cut them with, were not to be used for anything else.

Ver. 19. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] At the same time the above laws were delivered:

saying; as follows.
Ver. 20. *This is the offering of Aaron and his sons*, etc.] That is, of such of them as succeeded him in the high priesthood, as appears from

(*Leviticus 6:22*) so Aben Ezra, of him, or of one of his sons in his room; though some think the common priests offered the following oblation at the time of their initiation into their office, though they were not anointed as the high priest was, nor obliged as he to continue the offering daily:

*which they shall offer unto the Lord in the day when he is anointed;* when he, or any of his sons in his stead, were anointed, for as yet he himself was not; (see *Leviticus 8:2*) some, as Aben Ezra observes, think that b, “in”, is instead of m, “from”, and that the sense is, that Aaron, or his successor, and every of them, were to offer the following offering perpetually from the time of their being anointed, and put into the office of the high priest, and which certainly was the case, as appears by what follows:

*the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a meat offering perpetual;* which was an omer, and as much as a man could eat in one day; and this the high priest offered every day, as long as he lived, or was in his office, and that at his own expense, as Josephus says, not altogether, but in the following manner:

*half of it in the morning, and half of it at night;* so that this constantly returned as the morning and evening sacrifices did, and followed them. Jarchi says of this, that it was the common meat offering at the consecration of a priest, but the high priest offered it every day; and it appears from the Misnic writers that this meat offering consisted of twelve cakes, the same number as those of the shewbread; the same phrase, a “perpetual statute”, being used of one as the other; and six of these were offered in the morning, and six at evening; and this as the daily sacrifice had the same mystical meaning, and respected the continual efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ.

Ver. 21. *In a pan it shall be made with oil*, etc.] With oil olive, as the Targum of Jonathan; the pan in which it was made was a vessel that had no covering, nor hollow in the middle, nor any lip or edge, but was a plane, and extended, and the dough made on it was hard and stiff, that it might not run off. In the temple was a chamber of those that made the cakes, where, as Bartenora observes, was prepared the meat offering, which the high priest offered, one half in the morning, and the other half in the evening:
[and when it is] baked, thou shalt bring it in; not thoroughly baked, but very little, as says Josephus, hastily, so that it swells, and rises up in bubbles. Jarchi says, the flour was first mixed in hot water, and after that it was baked in an oven, and then fried in a pan:

and the baked pieces of the meat offering shalt thou offer [for] a sweet savour unto the Lord; or the meat offering cut in pieces shalt thou offer, as both the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem; the twelve cakes were broken each into two, and twelve halves were offered in the morning, and twelve at evening: the manner in which it was done was, the priest divided every cake into two by measure, so that he might offer half in the morning, and half in the evening; and he took the halves and doubled everyone of them into two, and broke them, until he found every broken piece doubled into two, and he offered the halves with half the handful of frankincense in the morning, and in like manner in the evening: this may have respect to the body of Christ being broken for us, whereby he became fit food for faith, and an offering of a sweet smelling savour to God.

Ver. 22. And the priest of his sons that is anointed in his stead shall offer it, etc.] The successor of the high priest:

it is a statute for ever unto the Lord; which he by an everlasting statute appointed to be offered to him by every high priest, until the Messiah should come:

it shall be wholly burnt; of a common meat offering only a handful was burnt, and the rest was the priest’s; (see Leviticus 6:15,16).

Ver. 23. For every meat offering for the priest shall be wholly burnt, etc.] Wherefore the priest that offered this for the high priest got nothing by it: he served him gratis:

it shall not be eaten; neither by himself, nor any other priest. The priests by eating the offerings of the people bore their iniquities, and made atonement for them, (Leviticus 10:17) but the priests might not eat their own sacrifices, to show that they could not bear their own sins, and make atonement for them; and this proves the insufficiency of the legal sacrifices, and the need there was for one to arise of another order to take away sin; and it is thought by some to be typical of the active obedience of Christ, every day yielded to the law and will of God, and is perfect, as the word here signifies, and to be distinguished fromWL, “a burnt offering”.
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Ver. 24. *And the Lord spake unto Moses*, etc.] Continued his discourse with him:

*saying*; as follows.

Ver. 25. *Speak unto Aaron, and to his sons, saying, this [is] the law of the sin [offering]*, etc.] Or the rules to be observed concerning that, besides what had been already delivered in (Leviticus 4:1-35):

*in the place where the burnt offering is killed shall the sin [offering] be killed before the Lord*; and that was on the north side of the altar, (see Leviticus 1:11) and so Aben Ezra and Ben Gersom observe, that the place of slaying every sin offering was the north; and some have observed that Mount Calvary, where our Lord was crucified, lay pretty much to the north of Jerusalem, (see Psalm 48:2):

*it is most holy*; sacred to the Lord, offered up to him, and accepted by him, and typical of the most pure and holy sacrifice of Christ, who was made sin, and an offering for sin, in the room and stead of his people.

Ver. 26. *The priest that offereth it for sin shall eat it*, etc.] Thereby signifying that he bore the sin of the person that brought the offering, and made atonement for it; as a type of Christ, who bore the sins of his people in his own body on the tree, and made satisfaction for them; (see Leviticus 10:17 Hosea 4:8). This is to be understood not of that single individual priest only that was the offerer, but of him and his family; for, as Ben Gersom observes, it was impossible for one man to eat all the flesh of a beast at one meal or two; but it means, as he says, the family of the priest that then officiated, the male part;

*in the holy place shall it be eaten, in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation*; within the hangings, as Ben Gersom’s note is, with which the court of the tabernacle was hung and made; in some room in that part of the sanctuary did the priest, with his sons, eat of the holy offerings that were appropriated to them; an emblem of spiritual priests, believers in Christ, feeding in the church upon the provisions of his house, the goodness and fatness of it.

Ver. 27. *Whatsoever shall touch the flesh thereof shall be holy*, etc.] None but holy persons, such as were devoted to holy services, even the priests and their sons, might touch and eat of the flesh of the sin offering: all that did so were sacred persons; and even what were used in eating it, dishes
and knives, were to be put to no other use, not to any common service, or for anything but holy things; which was done to keep up a veneration for the sacrifices, and especially for the great sacrifice they typified, the sacrifice of Christ, whose flesh is meat indeed; and whoever eats of that by faith dwells in Christ, and Christ dwells in him, (John 6:55,56):

_and when there is sprinkled of the blood thereof upon any garment_; the garment of the priest that slays and offers it:

_thou shalt wash that whereon it was sprinkled in the holy place_; it was not to be carried out of the tabernacle, and washed elsewhere, but in the sanctuary; either at the laver, where the priests washed their hands and feet, or in some room in the court for that purpose. This was done to preserve an esteem and value for the blood of the sacrifice, as typical of the precious blood of Christ.

Ver. 28. _But the earthen vessel wherein it is soddenshall be broken_, etc.] That being porous, the liquor in which the sin offering was boiled might soak into it, and the smell of it be retained, and therefore, as such vessels were not very costly, they were ordered to be broken; but where the broken pieces were carried and laid, the Jewish writers are at a loss about; for, that vessels, which had served for holy uses, should be laid in an open public place and exposed, they thought was indecent; and as there might be in a course of time great quantities broken, it would look very disagreeable and unseemly to have them lie in heaps in the sanctuary; they therefore have framed a miracle, and conceit that they were swallowed up in the ground where they were laid:

_and if it be sodden in a brazen it shall be both scoured and rinsed in water_; brass, being more valuable, must not be destroyed; and besides the liquor could not soak into that, and whatever scent it retained was easily and soon removed by scouring and rinsing; the former was with hot water, and the latter with cold, as Ben Gersom affirms.

Ver. 29. _And all the males among the priests shall eat thereof_, etc.] As of the meat offerings, (Leviticus 6:18) and this shows that not the single priest that offered only ate of it, (Leviticus 6:26) but his male children, and not those only, but those of other priests then upon duty, or in the court:

_it [is] most holy_; (see Gill on “Leviticus 6:25”).
Ver. 30. And no sin [offering], whereof [any] of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile [withal] in the holy place, shall be eaten, etc.] Every offering, and so every sin offering, was killed in the court of the tabernacle, on the north side of the altar; and the blood of some of them, as on the day of atonement, was carried within the vail and sprinkled on the mercy seat for reconciling the holy place, and making atonement for it; now the flesh of such sin offerings might not be eaten by the priests, though all others might:

*it shall be burnt in the fire.* Ben Gersom says, it was burnt in its place in the court, in a place prepared there to burn things rejected, and sanctified; and I think, adds he, this place was on the east side, i.e. of the court; but it is clear from (Leviticus 16:27) where the above case is mentioned, that it was to be carried out without the camp, and burnt there. What use the apostle makes of this, applying it to Christ, (see Hebrews 13:11-13).
CHAPTER 7

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 7

The several things contained in this chapter are the law of the trespass offering, (Leviticus 7:1-7) the portion the priests had in the burnt offerings and meat offerings, (Leviticus 7:8-10) the law of the peace offerings, whether by way of thanksgiving, or a vow, or voluntary oblation, (Leviticus 7:11-21) the prohibition of fat and blood, (Leviticus 7:22-27) the parts the priests should have in the peace offerings, the breast and right shoulder, (Leviticus 7:28-36) and the chapter is concluded with a recapitulation of the various things contained in this and the preceding chapters, (Leviticus 7:37,38).

Ver. 1. Likewise this [is] the law of the trespass [offering], etc.] Or the various rites and rules to be observed at the offering of it: the persons for whom it was to be made are described in the two preceding chapters, (Leviticus 5:1-6:30) both such that sinned through ignorance, and knowingly, and here the place and parts of the offering, and how to be disposed of, are declared:

it [is] most holy; wholly devoted for sacred use, either to the Lord, or to his priests; there were some things the Jews call light holy things, and others most holy in the highest degree, of this sort was the trespass offering.

Ver. 2. In the place where they kill the burnt offering shall they kill the trespass [offering, etc.] (see Leviticus 1:11):

and the blood thereof shall he sprinkle round about upon the altar; on the upper part of it. There was a scarlet thread that was drawn around the altar in the middle, the blood of some of the sacrifices was sprinkled below it; and some above it, as was the blood of the trespass offering.

Ver. 3. And he shall offer of it all the fat thereof, etc.] To the Lord, that being claimed by him, as in the peace offerings of the herd, and of the flock, whether a bullock or cow, a lamb or a goat, (Leviticus 3:3), etc. and in the sin offering of the bullock, (Leviticus 1:8):
and the rump, or tail, which of sheep and rams, for the trespass offering, was very large and fat in those countries; (see Gill on "Exodus 29:22") (see Gill on "Leviticus 3:9"):

and the fat that covereth the inwards; called the “omentum”.

Ver. 4. And the two kidneys, and the fat that [is] on them, etc.] Which are usually covered with fat:

which [is] by the flanks: or rather that which is “upon” them, for this respects not the situation of the kidneys, nor the fat upon them, but the fat which is upon the flanks, as distinct from that, and where there are great collops of it, (see Job 15:27):

and the caul [that is] above the liver; the lobe upon the liver, according to the Septuagint:

with the kidneys, it shall he take away; all the fat before mentioned, together with the kidneys, were to be taken away from the ram of the trespass offering, and burnt, as follows.

Ver. 5. And the priest shall burn them upon the altar, etc.] Fat taken off of the several parts before mentioned, and the kidneys: which were to be

[for] an offering made by fire unto the Lord; and was acceptable to him, being typical of the offering of Christ, which is a sweet smelling savour, bearing the fire of divine wrath in the room and stead of his people:

it [is] the trespass [offering]; an offering for a trespass committed, to make atonement for it; and this part of it, the burning of the fat, was properly the offering to the Lord, all the rest were the priest’s, as follows.

Ver. 6. Every male among the priests shall eat thereof, etc.] Of the flesh of it, after the fat was taken off and burnt, the rest belonged to the priests and their sons, and to them only, not to their wives and daughters:

it shall be eaten in the holy place; in the court of the tabernacle, in some apartment in it, for that purpose, as afterwards in the temple; it was not to be carried home to their houses, for all in the family to partake of, only the priests and their sons were to eat of it:

it [is] most holy; and therefore none but such who were devoted to holy services might eat of it; only sanctified persons, true believers, who are made priests unto God, have a right to eat of the altar Christ, or, can eat
his flesh in a spiritual sense, and feed upon him by faith, and receive nourishment from him, (Hebrews 13:10).

**Ver. 7. As the sin [offering is], so [is] the trespass [offering, there is] one law for them, etc.] The same as in (Leviticus 6:27,28):

the priest that maketh atonement therewith shall have it; who by offering it made atonement for the trespass of the person that brings it, as typical of the atonement by the sacrifice of Christ; he was to have all but what was burnt, for himself and his sons; though no doubt but other priests then on duty in the court ate with him.

**Ver. 8. And the priest that offereth any man's burnt offering, etc.] In which the flesh was wholly burnt, and nothing of it remained to requite the priest for his trouble, as in other offerings:

even the priest shall have to himself the skin of the burnt offering, which he hath offered; in some cases the skin itself was burnt, and then he could have nothing, (see Leviticus 4:11,12) but in others the skin was reserved for the priest. There seems to be an emphasis upon the phrase “to himself”, and may signify, that though in other things other priests might partake with him, yet not in this; and so Maimonides observes, that the skin was not given to every priest, but to him that offered the sacrifice; and elsewhere he says, the skins of light holy things are the owner’s, but the skins of the most holy things are the priest’s. And some have thought this law has some respect to the case of Adam, and is agreeable thereunto; who having offered sacrifice according to divine directions given him, had coats made for him and his wife of the skins of the slain beasts; and it was usual with the Heathen priests to have the skins of the sacrifices, and in which they slept in their temples and others also were desirous of the same, in order by dreams or otherwise to get knowledge of things future; (see Gill on Amos 2:8”).

**Ver. 9. And all the meat offering that is baked in the oven, etc.] Or “every meat offering”, whether dressed in one way or another, and which was done in one or other of these three ways, of which this was one, baked in an oven heated for that purpose:

and all that is dressed in the frying pan; such as we call pancakes:

and in the pan; which was different from the frying pan; it seems to be what was set upon an hearth made hot, and soon baked; (see Gill on
of these three different ways of dressing the meat offering, (see  Leviticus 2:4,5,7).

Ver. 10. And every meat offering mingled with oil, and dry, etc.] Rather it should be rendered “or dry”  170; that is, as Jarchi interprets it, that has no oil in it; the meat offering in common, let it be dressed in what way soever, was mingled with oil; but in the poor man’s offering for sin, which was as a meat offering, no oil was to be put upon it, (  Leviticus 5:11) but whether the offering was with or without oil, moist or dry, it shall all the sons of Aaron have, one [as much] as another; it was to be equally divided among them; or a priest offering it at one time, was to have the same as another priest at another time; it was always alike, all that remained, except the handful that was burnt, was the priest’s.

Ver. 11. And this [is] the law of the sacrifice of peace offerings, which ye shall offer unto the Lord.] Some other laws and rules respecting the oblation of them: in (  Leviticus 3:1-17) an account is given of what they should be, both of the herd and flock, and of the burning of the fat of them; and here the several sorts of them are distinctly observed, what should be offered with them, and the part the priest should have of it, and when the flesh of them should be eaten.

Ver. 12. If he offer it for a thanksgiving, etc.] Which Jarchi restrains to the wonderful deliverances of seafaring persons, of travellers, and of such as have been confined in prison, or have laboured under violent diseases and disorders of body; and so Aben Ezra seems to understand it only of thanksgivings on account of being delivered out of distress; but it might be for the common mercies of life, or any particular mercy or instance of divine goodness a man was sensible of, and thought proper in this way to make an acknowledgment of it:

then he shall offer with the sacrifice of thanksgiving; which, if of the herd, was either a bullock or a cow; and if of the flock, was either a lamb or a goat;

unleavened cakes mingled with oil; ten of them, according to the Jewish writers; the measure of flour, of which they were made, were, as Jarchi says, five Jerusalem seahs or pecks, which were six of those used in the wilderness, and made twenty tenths or omers, an omer being the tenth part of an ephah  171; the oil they were mingled with, as to the quantity of it, was half a log  172; a fourth part of it was for the cakes, hastily baked, (said in
the latter part of this verse to be fried,) an eighth part for those baked, (intended in this clause,) and an eighth part for the wafers next mentioned:

_and unleavened wafers anointed with oil;_ these were a thinner sort of cakes, made without leaven as the others, but the oil was not mixed with the flour in the making of them, but put upon them when made, and therefore said to be anointed with it; there were also ten of these:

_and cakes mingled with oil of fine flour fried;_ these were such as were hastily and not thoroughly baked, (Leviticus 6:21) or, as Jarchi and Ben Gersom, they were mixed and boiled with hot water, as much as was sufficient; or, according to Maimonides, were fried in oil; and there were ten of these, in all thirty,

**Ver. 13. Besides the cakes, etc.]** The unleavened cakes, and the unleavened wafers, and the fried cakes; or with these, as Aben Ezra and Abendana interpret it:

_he shall offer for his offering leavened bread, with the sacrifice of thanksgiving of his peace offerings;_ not that this was offered upon the altar, for all leaven was forbidden there, (Leviticus 2:11) but it was given to the priest, that he might have change of bread, and such as was agreeable to him, to eat with the flesh of the peace offerings he had a share of, and to the owners also; and the whole of this consisted of ten cakes likewise, as will appear by what Maimonides says; he (the offerer) takes twenty tenths of fine flour, and makes ten leavened, and ten unleavened; the ten leavened he makes into ten cakes, and the ten unleavened he makes of them eighty cakes alike, ten cakes of every sort, ten cakes baked in an oven, ten cakes wafers, and ten cakes slightly baked.

**Ver. 14. And of it he shall offer one out of the whole oblation [for] an heave offering unto the Lord, etc.]** That is, one out of the unleavened cakes, and out of the unleavened wafers, and out of the cakes fried, and out of the cakes leavened; lo, says Aben Ezra, four at least, and the truth is, adds he, there were ten; and so Maimonides says, the priest took out of all the four cakes, one out of every sort, as it is said, “and of it he shall offer one”, etc.

_and it shall be the priest’s that sprinkleth the blood of the peace offerings;_ that is, that part of the cakes and bread, which is offered as an heave offering to the Lord, was the portion of the priests; and so Maimonides says,
“the bread waved (rather heaved) with the thank offering was eaten by the priests, and the rest of the bread by the owners.”

Ver. 15. *And the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace offerings for thanksgiving*, etc.] Having given directions about the cakes and bread that went along with the peace offerings, offered in thankfulness for mercies received; instructions are next given about eating the flesh of them; and the order is, that that

shall be eaten the same day that it is offered; partly by him that brought them, and his family, and partly by the poor he was to invite to eat thereof; and also by the priests and Levites, who were to have their share of it; (see Deuteronomy 12:11,12,17,18)

he shall not leave any of it until the morning; which was ordered to encourage liberality to the priests, Levites, and others, since all must be eaten up before morning: according to the Jewish canons, they might eat it no longer than midnight; by that time it was to be all consumed; and it is said, the wise men made an hedge to the law to keep men from sin.

Ver. 16. *But if the sacrifice of his offering be a vow*, etc.] Be on account of a vow made, as, that if he was favoured with such and such benefits, or delivered out of such and such troubles and distresses, then he would offer such a sacrifice:

or a voluntary offering; without any condition or obligation; what from the mere motion of his mind he freely offered, not being directed to it by any command of God, or under any necessity from a vow of his own, and without any view to; any future good to be enjoyed: Aben Ezra describes both the one and the other thus; a “vow” which he uttered with his lips in his distresses, a “voluntary offering”, which his spirit made him willing to bring, a sacrifice to God neither for a vow nor for thanksgiving:

it shall be eaten the same day that he offereth his sacrifice; that is, it shall be begun to be eaten then, and if all is eaten up it is very well, but they were not obliged in either of these cases, as in the preceding, to eat up all, and leave none to the morning, for it follows:

and on the morrow also the remainder of it shall be eaten; some of it, if thought fit, and could not be conveniently eaten, might be kept till the day after the sacrifice, but no longer.
Ver. 17. But the remainder of the flesh of the sacrifice on the third day, etc.] What remained of it uneaten on the second day, and was kept till the third:

shall be burnt with fire; that it might neither corrupt, nor be put to superstitious uses, nor be of any profit in any respect; that so niggardliness and distrust of the care of Providence might be discouraged: perhaps some respect may be had in the type to the resurrection of Christ on the third day, having seen no corruption.

Ver. 18. And if any of the flesh of his peace offerings be eaten at all on the third day, etc.] Any part of it, even the least:

it shall not be accepted; as a sacrifice well pleasing to God; he will take no delight in it, or express any satisfaction therein; but, on the contrary, reject it with abhorrence:

neither shall it be imputed to him that offereth it; the Targum of Jonathan adds, for merit or righteousness; it shall not be accounted a righteous action, or the offerer receive any benefit by it:

it shall be an abomination; to God, the flesh being kept so long, through a sordid and niggardly disposition:

and the soul that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity; it shall not be forgiven him; he shall bear the punishment of it.

Ver. 19. And the flesh that toucheth any unclean [thing] shall not be eaten, etc.] That is, the flesh of the peace offerings; should it be touched by any unclean person, man or woman; that was so in a ceremonial sense, being profluvious or menstruous, or having touched anything unclean, or touched by any unclean creature, as a dog or the like, as it might be while carried from the tabernacle to any of their tents or houses:

it shall be burnt with fire; that no profit might be had of it; and this was to make them careful in carrying it from place to place:

and as for the flesh, all that be clean shall eat thereof; that are clean in a ceremonial sense; as all that are clean in an evangelic sense, through the blood and righteousness of Christ, may, by faith, eat his flesh and drink his blood. Jarchi observes, that whereas it is said, (Deuteronomy 12:27) “thou shall eat the flesh”; some might object and say, that none might eat of the peace offerings but the owners of them, therefore it is said here, “all
that be clean shall eat”; not the owners only, nor the priests and Levites only, but whoever the offerer should invite to eat thereof, provided he was but clean.

Ver. 20. But the soul that eateth [of] the flesh of the sacrifice of the peace offerings, that [pertain] unto the Lord, etc.] That are offered up to him, and so are holy, and therefore not to be eaten by unholy persons, or by any 

having his uncleanness upon him; a profluvious person that has an issue running out of him, a gonorrhoea; (see Leviticus 15:2)

even that soul shall be cut off from his people; be disfranchised as an Israelite, be debarred the privileges of the sanctuary, or be cut off by death before the usual time and term of man’s life; so those that eat and drink unworthily in the supper of our Lord, where his flesh is eaten and his blood drank, eat and drink damnation to themselves, (1 Corinthians 11:29).

Ver. 21. Moreover, the soul that shall touch any unclean [thing], etc.] Person or thing, the dead body of a man, or the bone of a dead body, or a grave in which it was laid:

as the uncleanness of man; the issue that runs from a profluvious person:

or [any] unclean beast; that was so by the law ceremonial; (see Leviticus 11:4-8):

or any abominable unclean thing; which the Targum of Jonathan interprets of every unclean reptile: (see Leviticus 11:20,24,29)

and eat of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace offerings, which [pertain] unto the Lord, even that soul shall be cut off from his people; (see Gill on Leviticus 7:20”).

Ver. 22. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] Continued speaking to him:

saying; as follows.

Ver. 23. Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, etc.] Putting them in mind, by repeating to them the laws concerning fat and blood, (Leviticus 3:17)

ye shall eat no manner of fat; of any creature fit for food, whose flesh otherwise may be eaten, and particularly
of ox, or of sheep, or of goats: creatures used in sacrifice; though this is not to be restrained to such of them, and the fat of them that were sacrificed, whose fat was claimed by the Lord as his, and was burnt on his altar; but this is to be understood of the fat of these creatures when killed for their common use, for the food of them and their families; the fat even of these was not to be eaten; that which was not separated from the flesh, but mixed with it, might be eaten, but not that which was separated.

Ver. 24. And the fat of the beast that dieth of itself, etc.] Of any disease, and is not regularly killed:

and the fat of that which is torn with beasts; with wild beasts:

may be used in any other use; as in medicine, for plasters, or for making candles, or for greasing of anything to make it smooth and pliable, or the like:

but ye shall in no wise eat of it; such carcasses themselves were not to be eaten of, and one would think their fat in course must be unlawful; but however, to prevent the doing of it, this particular law was given, and those that broke this were doubly guilty, as the Jews observe; once in eating things that died of themselves, or were torn with beasts, and again by eating the fat of them.

Ver. 25. For whosoever eateth the fat of the beast, of which men offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord, etc.] As oxen, sheep, rams, goats; meaning not only the fat of those that are offered, but the fat of all those of the like kind:

even the soul that eateth it shall be cut off from his people; (see Gill on “Leviticus 7:20”) Maimonides observes, that the punishment of cutting off is enjoined for the eating of fat, because men used to count it delicious, for which reason also God would honour his sacrifices with it: and he further observes, that the fat of the intestines too much saturates, hinders concoction, generates gross and frigid blood, hence it is much better it should be burnt than eaten; and that blood and what dies of itself are of difficult digestion, and of bad nourishment, wherefore the latter is forbidden in the (Leviticus 7:24), and the former in (Leviticus 7:26): of the punishment for eating fat, the same writer observes, he that eats fat the quantity of an olive, presumptuously, is guilty of cutting off; if ignorantly, he must bring the fixed sin offering: and elsewhere he says, he that eats fat is beaten for it; and he eats it a second time, and is
beaten for it; but if he eats it a third time they do not beat him, but put him into a prison, which is a strait place according to his height, where he cannot stand upright, nor can he lie down in it; and they give him bread and water of affliction till his bowels are distressed, and he become sick, and then they feed him with barley till his belly bursts.

Ver. 26. Moreover ye shall eat no manner of blood, etc.] Of any of the above creatures, or any other, even of any clean creature, and much less of an unclean one:

[whether it be] of fowl or of beast; of all sorts and kinds. Jarchi thinks, the words being thus expressed, the blood of fishes and locusts is excepted, and so lawful to eat:

in any of your dwellings; this shows that this law is not to be restrained to creatures slain in sacrifice in the tabernacle, and to the blood of them, but to be understood of all such as were slain in their own houses for food, and the blood of them.

Ver. 27. Whatsoever soul [it be] that eateth any manner of blood, etc.] The Targum of Jonathan adds, of any living creature, that is, of any while it is alive; for the Jews always interpret the law in (Genesis 9:4) of the member of a living creature torn off from it, and its flesh with the blood eaten directly:

even that soul shall be cut off from his people; Maimonides observes, that to some sorts of food cutting off is threatened, particularly to blood, because of the eager desire of men to eat it in those times, and because it precipitated them to a certain species of idolatry; he means that of the Zabians, of which (see Gill on Ezekiel 33:25) of the true reason of the prohibition of eating blood under the law, (see Leviticus 17:10), etc.

Ver. 28. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] At the same time the above laws were delivered; for what follows relates to the sacrifice of the peace offerings:

saying; as follows.

Ver. 29. Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, etc.] Giving them the further instructions concerning their peace offerings:
he that offereth the sacrifice of his peace offerings unto the Lord; whether it he for thanksgiving, or as a vow, or a voluntary oblation, and whether it be of the herd or of the flock, an ox or a cow, a lamb or a goat:

shall bring his oblation unto the Lord of the sacrifice of his peace offerings; that is, the unleavened cakes, wafers, and fried cakes, and unleavened bread, which are called the whole oblation, (Leviticus 7:10-14).

Ver. 30. His own hands shall bring the offerings of the Lord made by fire, etc.] That is, such parts of the peace offerings as were to be burnt with fire, as the fat on several parts described in (Leviticus 3:3,4) the owners of the offerings were to bring them in the manner as will be presently observed:

the fat with the breast, it shall he bring; the fat to be burnt, and the breast for the priest and his sons, as in the following verse (Leviticus 7:31):

that the breast may be waved [for] a wave offering before the Lord; how this waving was performed, (see Gill on Exodus 29:24”) particularly with respect to these peace offerings it was thus; if a thank offering, the priest takes of the bread brought with it one (cake) out of ten, and lays it with the breast, the shoulder, and the inwards, and waves all upon the hands of the owners; on which he puts the fat, then the breast and the shoulder above (i.e. upon the fat), then the two kidneys, and the caul, and the liver above them; and if there was any bread, he put it over them, and waved all, putting his hand under the hands of the owner.

Ver. 31. And the priest shall burn the fat upon the altar, etc.] Of burnt offering, even the fat upon the inwards, the two kidneys, the flanks, the caul, and liver:

but the breast shall be Aaron’s and his sons; which being waved before the Lord for a wave offering, was the Lord’s, and so was given to his priests to eat of, for the service done by them, it being but reasonable that they that serve at the altar should live of it; and thus, with other things, a maintenance was provided for the priests and their families, as ought also to be for Gospel ministers under the present dispensation.

Ver. 32. And the right shoulder shall ye give unto the priest [for] an heave offering, etc.] Whether of an ox or a cow, a lamb or a goat:
of the sacrifices of your peace offerings; which were of either of these creatures; the Targum of Jonathan paraphrases it,

“the right arm from the shoulder to the elbow.”

The breast being the seat of wisdom, and the shoulder of strength, some think denote Christ as the wisdom and power of God unto his people, his priests, who have all their knowledge and strength from him, and who bears them on his heart and on his shoulder.

Ver. 33. *He among the sons of Aaron that offereth the blood of the peace offerings, and the fat,* etc. [Who sprinkled the blood of them upon the altar round about, and burnt the fat upon it, which were rites enjoined to be observed, (Leviticus 3:2-5):

shall have the right shoulder for [his] part; his particular part and share, because of his service: Aben Ezra remarks, that the right shoulder was given to him that sprinkled the blood, and the breast to all the priests; and Jarchi observes, that he that was fit for sprinkling the blood, and burning the fat, and went out an unclean person in the time of sprinkling the blood, or burning the fat, had no part in the flesh.

Ver. 34. *For the wave breast and the heave shoulder have I taken of the children of Israel,* etc. [These two parts were particularly pitched upon and selected:

from off the sacrifices of their peace offering; the rest being allowed the owners, besides what were burnt:

and have given them unto Aaron the priest and unto his sons, by a statute for ever from among the children of Israel; as long as the priesthood lasted, even to the coming of the Messiah, in whom all these sacrifices would have their accomplishment and their end.

Ver. 35. *This [is the portion] of the anointing of Aaron,* etc. [Of his being anointed to the priestly office; this is the part allotted and assigned him for the execution of it; this is the reward, as Aben Ezra interprets it, of his faithful performance of it, namely, his having the wave breast and heave shoulder of the peace offerings, and a cake out of everyone of the unleavened cakes, together with the leavened bread, besides other perquisites from other offerings:
and of the anointing of his sons; the successors of him in the priest hood; the Targum of Jonathan adds, above all their brethren the Levites:

out of the offerings of the Lord made by fire; out of such whose fat on the several parts of them was burnt with fire, such as the peace offerings were:

in the day when he presented them to minister unto the Lord in the priest’s office; when they were ordered to be taken out from among the children of Israel, and to be consecrated to, and invested with, the priest’s office, as they were by Moses, and presented by him unto him as his priests; at that time the above portion was assigned them, as follows.

Ver. 36. Which the Lord commanded to be given them of the children of Israel, etc.] Whenever they brought their offerings to be offered up by them, such parts thereof were ordered to be allowed them as theirs;

in the day that he anointed them; or from the day they were anointed of Moses, by the direction of the Lord, from that time they had a right and claim to the above things, out of the sacrifices brought, so Aben Ezra: and this was

by a statute for ever throughout their generations; in all successive generations, unto the coming of the Messiah, which would put an end to their priesthood. Thus the Lord provided for the maintenance of his ministers, till that time came; and since it has been the ordinance of Christ, that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel, (1 Corinthians 9:13,14).

Ver. 37. This [is] the law of the burnt offering, etc.] As delivered, (Leviticus 6:9-13):

of the meat offering; as in (Leviticus 6:14-18):

and of the sin offering; as in (Leviticus 6:25,30):

and of the trespass offering; as in (Leviticus 7:1-7):

and of the consecrations; of Aaron and his sons to the priest’s office, as in (Leviticus 6:20-23):

and of the sacrifice of the peace offerings; as in this chapter, (Leviticus 7:11-33) for this is only a recapitulation of the several laws respecting these things before observed.
Ver. 38. Which the Lord commanded Moses in Mount Sinai, etc.] Or “by” or “near” Mount Sinai; for the above laws were not given to Moses when on the mount, but after the tabernacle was erected, and out of it, as appears from (Leviticus 1:1) and to which what follows agrees:

in the day that he commanded the children of Israel to offer their oblations unto the Lord in the wilderness of Sinai; where they were when the above laws were delivered to them, and which wilderness had its name from the mount near to which they now were, and where the tabernacle was pitched, from whence the Lord spoke; and so the Targum of Jonathan paraphrases it,

“in the tabernacle which they made for him in the wilderness of Sinai;”

there they were ordered to offer their oblations of every sort, as before directed. It should be observed, that this is to be understood of the command given in the wilderness to offer sacrifices, but not of the sacrifices themselves then offered, which were not done while there; (see Jeremiah 7:22 Amos 5:25).
CHAPTER 8

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 8

The order for the consecration of Aaron and his sons is renewed, (Leviticus 8:1-3) which accordingly was set about and performed by Moses, (Leviticus 8:4,5) who having first washed and clothed them, first Aaron, and then his sons, with the garments of the priesthood, anointing at the same time the tabernacle of the altar, and what appertained to them and Aaron also, (Leviticus 8:6-13) and then he slew the bullock for the sin offering, and the ram for the burnt offering, and the ram of consecration; and did with the blood, fat, shoulder, and breast, and the meat offering belonging thereunto, as he had been directed, (Leviticus 8:14-30) and the chapter is concluded with some instructions about boiling the flesh, and burning the remainder of it, and keeping the charge of the Lord night and day for seven days, (Leviticus 8:31-36).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] The following section or paragraph, relating to the consecration of Aaron and his sons, was delivered, according to Jarchi, seven days before the setting up of the tabernacle; but to me it seems to have been delivered after the setting it up, since it was out of the tabernacle that the Lord said all those things recorded in the preceding chapters; and after he had given out the laws concerning sacrifices, then he renewed the order for the consecration of Aaron and his sons, that they might offer them:

saying; as follows.

Ver. 2. Take Aaron, and his sons with him, etc.] That is, order them to come, or send a message to them, that they appear at such a time at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, where the ceremony of consecration was to be performed, and was performed, (Leviticus 8:3) which is observed and recorded by Moses, to show that he had a divine warrant for what he did, and that it was not from favour and affection to his brother, and because of the relation he and his family stood in to him, that he invested him and them with the priestly office, but it was by a
command from the Lord; nor did Aaron take this honour to himself, but was called of God to it, (Hebrews 5:4):

*and the garments*; the garments for the priesthood, ordered and described, and now made, (see Exodus 28:1-29:46)

*and the anointing oil*; which also was ordered to be made, and now was made, (Exodus 30:23 37:29)

*and a bullock for the sin offering, and two rams, and a basket of unleavened [bread]*; which were all to be used at the consecration with the anointing oil Aaron was to be anointed, and also the tabernacle and the altar; and the bullock was to be a sin offering, and one of the rams a burnt offering for Aaron, and his sons, and the other ram was the ram of consecration of them; and out of the basket of unleavened bread one cake of each sort was to be taken, and waved with other things, and burnt, which finished the consecration; but with it was no oath, as in the consecration of the antitypical high priest Christ Jesus, which difference is observed by the apostle, (Hebrews 7:21) (see Exodus 29:1,2).

**Ver. 3.** And gather thou all the congregation together, etc.] That is, the heads of the tribes and the elders of the people, as Aben Ezra interprets it; for the whole body of the people, and every individual of them, could not be got together:

*unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation*; taking this for the whole court itself, as it sometimes is; though no doubt on this occasion as great a number was convened as well could be admitted into the court, or about it, to be spectators and witnesses of the solemn investiture of Aaron and his sons with the priestly office.

**Ver. 4.** And Moses did as the Lord commanded him, etc.] He convened Aaron and his sons, and the heads of the people, at the door of the tabernacle, and came himself, and brought with him the garments, the oil, and sacrifices, even everything necessary for the consecration:

*and the assembly was gathered together unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation*; and this was, according to the Targum of Jonathan, on the twenty third day of the month Adar or February; but it rather seems to be later, some time in the beginning of Nisan or March, and before the passover began, (see Numbers 9:1-5).
Ver. 5. *And Moses said unto the congregation*, etc.] Having convened them, he opened to them the reason of their being called together, which was not done of himself, but by divine direction:

*this [is] the thing which the Lord commanded to be done*; namely, what follows, concerning the consecration of Aaron and his sons to be priests, and the investiture of them with that office, attended with various rites and ceremonies to be performed, of which they were to be witnesses.

Ver. 6. *And Moses brought Aaron and his sons*, etc.] To the laver which was in the court of the tabernacle

*and washed them with water*; to show that they should be clean that bear the vessels of the Lord, and offer the sacrifices of the people; all that are in public office in the house of God ought to have both clean hands and a pure heart, to hold the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience, and to be of a pure and holy conversation; and indeed all that are made kings and priests to God, as all the saints are, they are washed from their sins in the blood of Jesus, (Revelation 1:5,6).

Ver. 7. *And he put upon him the coat*, etc.] The embroidered coat of fine linen, which was next to his flesh; (Exodus 28:39) and all the garments were put on just in the order they are here declared; no mention is made indeed of the linen breeches, since it is highly probable these were put on by Aaron himself in some apartment in the tabernacle, or before came thither; it not being so decent to put on, or have these put on, in the sight of the whole congregation:

*and girded him with the girdle*; the girdle of needlework with which the linen coat was girt to him, and was distinct from the curious girdle of the ephod after mentioned, (Exodus 28:39)

*and clothed him with the robe*; the robe of the ephod, which had at the hem of it golden bells and pomegranates, (Exodus 28:31-35)

*and put the ephod upon him*; made of gold, blue, purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen, which had two shoulder pieces, and on them two onyx stones, on which were engraved the names of the twelve tribes, (Exodus 28:6-12)

*and he girded him with the curious girdle of the ephod, and bound [it] unto him therewith*; which was made of the same with the ephod, and by
which it was girt close unto him; of the mystical meaning of these garments, (see Gill on “Exodus 28:6-12, 31-35, 39”).

**Ver. 8. And he put the breastplate upon him, etc.] Which was made of the same materials with the ephod, and was put upon it, and fastened to it:**

*also he put in the breastplate the Urim and Thummim:* that is, Moses did it, as all the rest; for there is no reason to be given why this should be appropriated to God as a divine work, distinct from the rest; and these seem to be the twelve precious stones set in the breastplate, whose names are given, (“Exodus 27:17-20) and if they are not intended, no account is here given of them; but since in (“Exodus 29:8-14) an account is given of the stones, and of the setting of them in the breastplate, and no mention is made of the Urim and Thummim, and here notice is taken of them, but nothing said of the stones; it seems pretty plain they must be the same; (see Gill on “Exodus 28:30”).

**Ver. 9. And he put the mitre upon his head, etc.] Which was made of fine linen, and was a wrap of that of a considerable length about his head, (“Exodus 28:39)***

*also upon the mitre, [even] upon his forehead, did he put the golden plate:* which was put upon the forehead of the high priest, reaching from ear to ear, and was fastened to the mitre with a blue lace, and had on it this inscription, “holiness to the Lord”: (“Exodus 28:36,37) and is here therefore called

*the holy crown:* denoting both the sanctity and the dignity of the high priest, and typical of Christ, who is holiness itself, and to his people, and is now crowned with glory and honour, being a priest upon the throne: hence the Jews speak of the crown of the law, and of the crown of the kingdom, and of the crown of the priesthood: and this, as all the rest, was done

*as the Lord commanded Moses;* all these were made according to the divine order, and were put on in the manner and form he directed him; of the mystery of the mitre and the crown, (see Gill on “Exodus 28:36, 37, 39”).

**Ver. 10. And Moses took the anointing oil, etc.] Which Bezaleel had made, according to the directions which Moses had given him, and he had received from the Lord: this Moses brought with him to the door of the
tabernacle, as he was ordered, (Leviticus 8:2-3) and now he took it and made use of it as follows:

*and anointed the tabernacle and all that [was] therein;* the altar of incense, the candlestick, and table of shewbread:

*and sanctified them*; separated and devoted them to sacred use and service.

**Ver. 11.** *And he sprinkled thereof upon the altar seven times,* etc.] The altar of burnt offering; the order for anointing it is given in (Exodus 30:28 40:10) but in that no directions are given for the manner of doing it by sprinkling, nor the number of times it was to be sprinkled: hence Jarchi confesses his ignorance, and says,

“I know not how it was ordered about these sprinklings;”

but no doubt Moses was instructed of God in what manner to anoint it, and how often; and the number seven may denote the perfect unction of it, and made it a fitter type of Christ, who received the unction of the Spirit without measure:

*and anointed the altar, and all its vessels;* pans, shovels, basins, flesh hooks, and fire pans:

*both the laver and his foot;* which was for the priests to wash at; and very probably this was done before Moses brought Aaron and his sons thither and washed them, (Leviticus 8:6) since it seems most proper that it should be consecrated before used, as it follows:

*to sanctify them;* set them apart for sacred use.

**Ver. 12.** *And he poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron’s head,* etc.] Which ran down to his beard, and to the collar of his coat, the robe of the ephod, but not to the skirts of his garments, as we wrongly render it, (Psalm 133:2). Jarchi says it was first poured on his head, and after that he put it between his eyebrows, and drew it with his finger here and there, or from one eyebrow to another: Maimonides gives a like account, with some addition; he says, the oil was poured on his head, and he was anointed between the eyebrows, in the form of the Greek letter χ, “chi”: a greater profusion of oil was used in the anointing of Aaron than of the tabernacle, altar, and laver, and their vessels, he being so eminent a type of Christ, our high priest, anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows:
and anointed him to sanctify him; to signify that he was set apart and devoted to the sacred office of the priesthood. The Targum of Jonathan observes, that this anointing was after he had clothed him; though some have thought it was done before the mitre and holy crown were put on: but if they were put on to complete the investiture, they might be taken off while the ceremony of anointing was performed.

Ver. 13. And Moses brought Aaron’s sons, etc.] His four sons, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; he ordered and directed them to come there, or sent proper persons to fetch them, or from one part of the court, where they were, he might accompany them thither:

and put coats upon them, and girded them with girdles: which were made of fine linen, (Exodus 39:27,28) and the coats being made long to reach down to the ankles, needed girdles, especially when in service, that they might perform it more expeditiously:

and put bonnets on them; which were made of fine linen also, and differed from the mitre of the high priest only in the manner of rolling up the linen:

as the Lord commanded Moses; as all the above things were made, so they were all put on, according to the directions Moses received of the Lord, who was faithful in his house, with respect to everything he enjoined him, (Hebrews 3:2,5).

Ver. 14. And he brought the bullock for the sin offering, etc.] To the tabernacle, into the court of it, to the altar of burnt offering there; that is, he caused it to be brought thither as he was ordered, (Exodus 29:10)

and Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the bullock for the sin offering; their right hands, according to the Targum of Jonathan, which is not improbable, thereby as it were transferring their sins to it, and confessing them over it; acknowledging their guilt, and that they deserved to die, as that creature would, which was to be a vicarious sacrifice for sin, and whose blood was to purify and sanctify the altar, at which they, sinful men, were to serve.

Ver. 15. And he slew it, etc.] Not Aaron, nor any of his sons, who as yet were not fully consecrated and installed into their office, but Moses, as follows:
and Moses took the blood; which was received into a basin when the bullock was slain:

and put [it] upon the horns of the altar round about with his finger; upon the four horns of the altar, which were at the four corners of it, and dipping his finger into the blood, he besmeared the horns with it, and drew it about with his finger here and there; and so is said to be done round about the altar, as these horns were:

and purified the altar; or cleansed it; not from moral guilt and pollution, which it was incapable of, but from all ceremonial pollution it might be supposed to have:

and poured the blood at the bottom of the altar; the rest of the blood he did not use about the horns:

and sanctified it; separated it from common to sacred use:

to make reconciliation upon it; that it might be fit to have sacrifices offered on it to make atonement and reconciliation for sins; for which reason it was necessary it should itself be pure and holy, in such sense it was capable of being so.

Ver. 16. And he took all the fat that was upon the inwards, etc.] Called the “omentum”:

and the caul [above] the liver; the lobe upon the liver, as the Septuagint; or “the caul” and “the liver”, so says Jarchi; the liver separately, for he took a little of the liver with it, the caul:

and the two kidneys, and their fat, and Moses burned [it] upon the altar: the fat of these several parts, which has been often observed was done; and in imitation of which, the same has been done by the Persians and their Magi, as related by Strabo f189 and others f190; and by the Romans, to which Persius f191 refers; and these several parts are generally covered with fat in fat creatures, and especially sheep, as Aristotle f192 observes.

Ver. 17. But the bullock and his hide, his flesh, and his dung, he burnt with fire without the camp, etc.] Aben Ezra observes, that some say that he did this himself; and others, that it was done by orders, that is, he ordered others to do it, which seems probable enough:

as the Lord commanded Moses; (Exodus 29:14).
Ver. 18. *And he brought the ram for the burnt offering*, etc.] One of the two he was ordered to take, (Leviticus 8:2)

and Aaron and his sons laid their hands on the head of the ram; as they had done before on the head of the bullock, (see Leviticus 8:14) their right hands, as the Targum of Jonathan, and that at the same time; not first Aaron and then his sons, as a famous grammarian, Aben Ezra makes mention of, thought; but, as he himself says, they laid them on together.

Ver. 19. *And he killed it*, etc.] That is, Moses killed the ram, as the Septuagint version expresses it:

and Moses sprinkled the blood upon the altar round about; as he did the blood of the bullock, (Leviticus 8:15).

Ver. 20. *And he cut the ram into pieces*, etc.] Cut off its head and quartered it:

and Moses burnt the head, and the pieces, and the fat; even all of it, as the following verse shows.

Ver. 21. *And he washed the inwards and the legs in water*, etc.] The one being taken out, the other cut off:

and Moses burnt the whole ram upon the altar: it [was] a burnt sacrifice for a sweet savour, [and] an offering made by fire unto the Lord; as the Lord commanded Moses; (see Exodus 29:18).

Ver. 22-25. *And he brought the other ram, the ram of consecration*, etc.] Or “filling”, because, as Jarchi says, these filled and perfected the priests in their priesthood; this was the finishing and consummation of their consecration: what is said in this and the three following verses (Leviticus 8:23-25) is the same as is ordered, (Exodus 29:19-22) and needs no further explanation.

Ver. 26. *And out of the basket of unleavened bread*, etc.] Moses was ordered to take, (Leviticus 8:2),

that [was] before the Lord; being brought to the tabernacle, where now the Lord had taken up his residence:

he took one unleavened cake; which had no oil in it or upon it:

and a cake of oiled bread; which was mixed and tempered with oil:
and one wafer; which was anointed with oil:

and put them upon the fat, and upon the right shoulder; of the ram of consecration, which he took from it, and laid the cakes uppermost upon them.

Ver. 27. And he put all upon Aaron’s hands, and upon his son’s hands, etc.] The fat and the right shoulder, with the cakes upon them:

and waved them [for] a wave offering before the Lord; (see Gill on “Exodus 29:24”).

Ver. 28. And Moses took them from off their hands, etc.] After they had been waved before the Lord:

and burnt [them] upon the altar, upon the burnt offering; of the other ram; or after that burnt offering, as Jarchi, who observes, that we do not find that the shoulder of peace offerings was offered in any place but this, it belonged to the priest; but this being at the consecration of the priests, it was offered to the Lord by Moses, to whom it seems to have belonged, as the breast also, but that was not burnt, but eaten: and the same writer affirms, that Moses ministered all the seven days of the consecration in a white shirt, or surplice; and that he might wear a linen coat, as priests did, is not improbable, since he now officiated as one:

they [were] consecrated for a sweet savour; acceptable to the Lord, and so the priests, Aaron and his sons likewise, on whose account they were made:

it [is] an offering made by fire unto the Lord; the fat, the shoulder, and the cakes.

Ver. 29. And Moses took the breast, etc.] Of the ram of consecration:

and waved it for a wave offering before the Lord; this Moses seems to have waved with his own hands, and not upon the hands of Aaron and his sons, putting his under them, as in the wave offering of the fat, shoulder, and cakes, and for which the following words seem to give a reason:

[for] of the ram of consecration it was Moses’s part; the breast of it was his:

as the Lord commanded Moses; (see Exodus 29:26).
Ver. 30. And Moses took of the anointing oil, and of the blood which was upon the altar, etc.] Which was sprinkled upon the altar round about, (Leviticus 8:24) and these two seem to be mixed together, since it follows:

and sprinkled [it] upon Aaron, etc. (see Gill on Exodus 29:21”).

Ver. 31. And Moses said unto Aaron, and to his sons, etc.] After he had offered the bullock, the two rams, and cakes of unleavened bread for the consecration of them:

boil the flesh at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; the remainder of the flesh of the ram of consecration, which was all but the fat, the shoulder, and the breast:

and there eat it with the bread that is in the basket of consecration; what was left of that, there being one cake of a sort taken out of it and burnt:

as I commanded, saying, Aaron and his sons shall eat it; (see Exodus 29:32).

Ver. 32. And that which remaineth of the flesh and of the bread, etc.] Until the next morning, which could not be eaten by Aaron and his sons:

shall ye burn with fire; that it might not be corrupted, nor put to common nor superstitious uses.

Ver. 33. And ye shall not go out of the door of the tabernacle of the congregation [in] seven days, etc.] Which was the time of their consecration, so long it lasted; and they had provision enough every day from the ram of consecration, whose flesh they were to boil and eat. The Jewish writers are puzzled where they should ease nature, since the place was holy; but the orders are not to be considered as so strict but that they might go in and out, though they were not to stay long, or to attend to any other business; and it was always necessary there should be some upon the spot, keeping the Lord’s charge in their turns; and it was always requisite that they should also sleep alternately; for it cannot be thought that they should be all this time without rest, any more than without food:

until the days of your consecration be at an end; which were to continue so long:
for seven days shall he consecrate you; that is, Moses, who here speaks of himself in the third person, as appears from (Exodus 29:35). Aben Ezra observes, that the word “end” is wanting, and that the sense is, at the end of seven days he shall consecrate you, finish their consecration; all the seven days he was doing it, and at the end of the seventh concluded it.

Ver. 34. As he hath done this day, [so] the Lord hath commanded to do, etc.] The same were to be repeated every day until the seven days were ended; so Jarchi and Aben Ezra; the former of these observes, that their Rabbins explain the phrase “to do”, in the preceding clause, of the business of the red heifer, and that which follows, to make an atonement for you, of the business of the day of atonement; and say, that it may be learned from hence that the high priest was obliged to be separate (from his own house and family) seven days before that, and so the priest that burned the red heifer; and the same is observed by other Jewish writers: but this refers to neither of these cases, but to the present consecration of Aaron and his sons, and the making atonement by sacrifice for them, and the sanctification of them to minister in the priest’s office.

Ver. 35. Therefore shall ye abide at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, etc.] Or rather “within” it, as Noldius renders it, since they were not to go out of the door of it, (Leviticus 8:33) whereas our version seems to leave it undetermined whether they abode without the door or within; where they were to continue, day and night, seven days; even the seven days of their consecration:

and keep the charge of the Lord, that ye die not; not the charge of the tabernacle, and the service of it committed to them upon their investiture with their office, hereafter to be observed by them; but what was charged upon them to attend unto, during the seven days of their consecration; and the penalty being death in case of failure, was to make them more careful and cautious of transgressing; and which was the more necessary, as they were to be pure and holy at their entrance upon their work: and though this may seem somewhat severe, yet the aggravation of their sin would be the greater, as it was to a sacred and honourable work they were called, and to which they were now consecrating; and as what was required of them was what might easily be complied with: however Moses, to show that this was not of himself, but by divine authority, adds,
for so I am commanded; that is, to declare unto them, that if they did not punctually observe the above orders, they must expect to die.

Ver. 36. So Aaron and his sons did all things which the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses.] They submitted to have them done to them, and for them, what was done on the first day of their consecration, all the rest of the days; and they kept within the tabernacle all that time as was enjoined them.
CHAPTER 9

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 9

Aaron and his sons, being consecrated to and invested with the priest’s office, are called upon to the exercise of it, to offer a sin offering and a burnt offering for themselves, and all sorts of offerings, a sin offering, a burnt offering, peace offerings, and a meat offering, for the people; and a promise is made for their encouragement, that the glory of the Lord would appear to them, (Leviticus 9:1-7) and which were in their course accordingly offered; first, Aaron’s sin offering for himself, (Leviticus 9:8-11) then his burnt offering, (Leviticus 9:12-14) after that the several offerings of the people before mentioned, (Leviticus 9:15-21) when Aaron and Moses blessed the people, the one as soon as he had done offering, and both together when they came out of the tabernacle, (Leviticus 9:22,23) upon which a fire came forth from the Lord, and consumed the burnt offering upon the altar, (Leviticus 9:24).

Ver. 1. And it came to pass on the eighth day, etc.] When the seven days of consecration were ended, as Ben Gersom, the day following them, so soon was Aaron called to the execution of his office; and so both the Targum of Jonathan and Jarchi make it to be the eighth day of the consecration, or the day after the anointing of Aaron and his sons, and which they both say was the beginning, or first day of Nisan, the day the tabernacle was erected by Moses: but that seems to have been set up before the consecration; rather this was, as Aben Ezra says, the eighth day of the month Nisan or March, and was the eighth day of the consecration, which began at the first day, on which day the tabernacle was set up, (Exodus 40:2):

[that] Moses, called Aaron and his sons, and the elders of Israel; Aaron and his sons to enter upon their office, by offering sacrifices for themselves, and for the people, and the elders to be witnesses thereof.

Ver. 2. And he said unto Aaron, etc.] In the presence of the people of Israel:
take thee a young calf for a sin offering; one not exceeding a year old, as in (Leviticus 9:3) but this was not for the sin of making the calf only, to which the Jewish writers restrain it, but for all other sins of his, which it was necessary should be expiated before he offered sacrifices for the sins of others:

and a ram for a burnt offering; being a strong and innocent creature, was a proper emblem of Christ, the Lamb of God, that takes away by his sacrifice the sins of men:

without blemish; this character belongs, as Aben Ezra observes, both to the calf and ram, which were both to be without spot, and so proper types of Christ the Lamb without spot and blemish, free both from original and actual sin:

and offer them before the Lord; on the altar of burnt offering, which stood in the court of the tabernacle near where Jehovah was, to whom every sacrifice for sin was to be offered, being committed against him, and whose justice must be satisfied for it.

Ver. 3. And unto the children of Israel thou shalt speak, etc.] That is, Aaron should speak to them, for being now high priest, Moses had no more to do with the sacrifices of the people, but it was incumbent on Aaron to call upon them to bring them to him such as the Lord by this law required of them:

saying, take ye a kid of the goats for a sin offering; this creature fitly represented Christ as made sin, and an offering for sin, in the room of his people:

and a calf, and a lamb; both of them, as before observed, were proper emblems of Christ in his strength and innocence, sometimes called the fatted calf, and frequently the Lamb of God, (Luke 15:23) (John 1:29,36):

[both] of the first year, without blemish, for a burnt offering; denoting the tenderness of Christ, his spotless purity, and painful sufferings.

Ver. 4. Also a bullock and a ram for peace offerings, to sacrifice before the Lord, etc.] An offering being made for the atonement of sin, and the gift of a whole burnt offering accepted by the Lord upon that, peace offerings were to be sacrificed thereupon; one part of which belonged to
the Lord, as the fat and the blood; another part to the priest, as the shoulder and the breast; and the rest to the owners to make a feast with, expressive of the peace and joy which arise from the expiation and atonement of sin, by the great sacrifice of Christ, in commemoration of which a feast is kept by the Lord’s people:

*and a meat offering mingled with oil*; with oil olive; each of these offerings are treated of in the preceding chapters, where an account is given of them, and the mystery of them explained:

*for today the Lord will appear unto you*; or “and today”, as in (Leviticus 9:6) so Noldius, for this is not observed as a reason why the sacrifices were to be offered, but as a promise of the divine appearance, as an encouragement thereunto; and may have special respect to some visible splendour and lustre of the divine glory more than ordinary; and particularly to the fire that should come out from before the Lord, and consume the sacrifice, (Leviticus 9:24) and so Ben Gersom interprets it. And this being on the eighth day of the consecration of the priests, may lead our thoughts to the day when our great High Priest rose from the dead, the day after the seventh, or the Jewish sabbath, even on the eighth day, or first day of the week, on which he made frequent appearances to his disciples; (see Mark 16:9,12,14) (John 20:19,26).

**Ver. 5.** *And they brought [that] which Moses commanded before the tabernacle of the congregation, etc.*] That is, Aaron and his sons, and all the children of Israel, as the Targum of Jonathan paraphrases it. All the above sacrifices they brought into the court of the tabernacle to be offered up:

*and all the congregation drew near, and stood before the Lord*; that is, the elders of Israel, who were called together, (Leviticus 9:1), the heads of the tribes who represented the people; as many as well could be admitted into the court no doubt were, to be spectators of Aaron and his sons officiating first in their new office, and to see their own sacrifices offered; and they stood over against where was the symbol of the divine Presence; and the Targum of Jonathan says, they stood with a perfect heart; and no doubt but they were heartily sincere and upright in their sacrifices, as they had been in their donations toward the building the tabernacle, and providing things belonging to it; and they stood with all humility, reverence, and devotion.
Ver. 6. *This [is] the thing which the Lord commanded that ye should do*, etc.] Namely, what they had done, bring the creatures and things for sacrifice they had:

*and the glory of the Lord shall appear unto you*; either Christ, the brightness of his Father’s glory, in an human form, as a presage of his future incarnation, as he frequently did; or some more than ordinary refulgence of glory breaking out of the holy of holies, where God had now taken up his dwelling between the cherubim; or, as Aben Ezra explains it, the fire that should go out from him, and consume the sacrifice, which would be a demonstration of his presence with them, and of his acceptance of the sacrifice.

Ver. 7. *And Moses said unto Aaron*, etc.] This is only observed to show, that as Aaron did not take upon him this office of himself, but was called unto it, and invested with it, by the appointment of God, so neither did he enter upon it but through the call of God by Moses, in the sight of the congregation:

*go unto the altar, and offer thy sin [offering], and thy burnt offering*; the young calf and ram:

*and make an atonement for thyself and for the people*; first for himself, and then for the people; for, as Aben Ezra says, a man cannot atone for another until he is pure from all sin; which is a character only to be found in Christ, our great High Priest, and so a proper person to atone for and take away the sins of others: hence the priests under the law, with their sacrifices, could never take away sin really, only typically; and this shows the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood, that the priests of that order were obliged to offer first for their own sins; this our high priest, of another order, needed not to do; (see Hebrews 7:27,28)

*and offer the offering of the people, and make atonement for them*; typical of the true and full atonement made by Christ, when he offered himself without spot to God:

*as the Lord commanded*; Aaron to do, and as he commanded Christ, his Son and our surety, the antitype of Aaron, (John 10:18 14:31).

Ver. 8. *Aaron therefore went unto the altar*, etc.] Of burnt offering, freely and cheerfully, at the direction and introduction of Moses, who acted in this affair in the name of the Lord:
and slew the calf of the sin [offering], which [was] for himself; which was
to be offered first, as it was proper it should, that, atonement being made
for his sins, his after burnt offering might be accepted with God, and he be
fit to offer the sacrifices of the people: the calf he slew on the north side of
the altar, where all the sin offerings and burnt offerings were slain; (see
Leviticus 1:11 6:25).

Ver. 9. And the sons of Aaron brought the blood unto him, etc.] The blood
of the calf of the sin offering, which they had received in a basin when it
was slain:

and he dipped his finger in the blood, and put [it] upon the horns of the
altar; the four horns of it, as Moses had done at his consecration, which
was an example to him, (Leviticus 8:15). This was typical of the blood
of Christ, to which persons may have recourse from the four quarters of
the world for atonement and pardon:

and poured out the blood at the bottom of the altar; what remained after
he had put what was proper on the horns of it.

Ver. 10. But the fat, and the kidneys, and the caul [above] the liver of the
sin [offering], he burnt upon the altar, etc.] The Septuagint version is, “he
offered them”:
as the Lord commanded Moses; (see Leviticus 4:8,9).

Ver. 11. And the flesh and the hide he burnt with fire without the camp.] With
common fire, for the fire from the Lord came only upon the altar,
which perhaps may be the reason of this expression being used when
anything was burnt without the camp, and not on the altar, (see Exodus
29:14 Leviticus 8:17). Jarchi observes, that we do not find a sin offering
burnt without the camp but this; which is a great mistake; (see Leviticus
4:11,12,20,21 8:17).

Ver. 12. And he slew the burnt offering, etc.] The ram, which was for
himself also; this he slew at the north side of the altar, (Leviticus 1:11)
and Aaron’s sons presented unto him the blood: which they had received
into a basin, when it was slain:

which he sprinkled round about upon the altar; as he had seen Moses do
before him, (Leviticus 8:19).
Ver. 13. *And they presented the burnt offering to him*, etc.] After it was cut in pieces, as the ram of the burnt offering was by Moses, (Leviticus 8:20) and so it was done to this, as appears by what follows:

*with the pieces thereof, and the head, and he burnt them upon the altar*; the Septuagint version is, “he put them on the altar”.

Ver. 14. *And he did wash the inwards and the legs*, etc.] As Moses also had done, (Leviticus 8:21)

*and burnt [them] upon the burnt offering on the altar*; upon the pieces, and the head, before mentioned, said to be burnt, or “after” the burnt offering, after they were burnt: the Septuagint version is as before.

Ver. 15. *And he brought the people’s offering*, etc.] To the altar, having offered his own first:

*and took the goat, which [was] the sin [offering] for the people, and slew it*; where he had slain his own:

*and offered it for sin, as the first*: the first offering he offered for himself, which was of the same sort.

Ver. 16. *And he brought the burnt offering*, etc.] The calf and the lamb, (Leviticus 9:3)

*and offered it according to the manner*; judgment, ordinance, and appointment of God respecting that sort of offerings; (see Leviticus 1:1-17).

Ver. 17. *And he brought the meat offering*, etc.] Made of fine flour, with oil and frankincense put upon it, (see Leviticus 2:1)

*and took a handful thereof, and burnt [it] upon the altar*; (see Leviticus 2:2,3)

*beside the burnt sacrifice of the morning*; the daily morning sacrifice, which was not to be omitted on account of these extraordinary sacrifices, both for the priest and for the people; or “after the burnt sacrifice of the morning”; for no sacrifice was offered up before that: so Jarchi.

Ver. 18. *He slew also the bullock and the ram, a sacrifice of peace offerings, which [was] for the people*, etc.] That they might feast, rejoice,
and be glad that atonement was made for their sins, and their gifts and sacrifices accepted of God, (see <RSV>Romans 5:11)</p>

and Aaron’s sons presented unto him the blood; of the peace offerings, the bullock and the ram, which they had received into a vessel as they were killing:

which he sprinkled upon the altar round about; as he did with the blood of his own burnt offering, (Leviticus 9:12).

Ver. 19. And the fat of the bullock, and of the ram, etc.] Which in all offerings was the Lord’s, and was burnt, (see Leviticus 3:16)

the rump; or tail of the ram; which in those countries was very large, and had a great deal of fat upon it; (see Gill on Exodus 29:22” (see Gill on Leviticus 3:9”)

and that which covereth [the inwards]; called the “omentum”:

and the kidneys, and the caul [above] the liver; and the fat that was upon each of these: Ben Gersom observes, that the kidneys and liver are mentioned last, to show that they were laid uppermost in waving (after directed to), that the owners might be stirred up, or moved by these things.

Ver. 20. And they put the fat upon the breasts, etc.] Both of the bullock and of the ram, while they were waving:

and he burnt the fat upon the altar; after having been waved.

Ver. 21. And the breasts and the right shoulder, etc.] The breasts of the bullock and the ram, and the right shoulders of them both:

Aaron waved for a wave offering before the Lord; which was given to him as his part of the peace offerings, after they had been thus waved before the Lord; whereby an acknowledgment was made that he was Lord of all, and had a right to all they had; in token of which these parts were given to his priests towards their maintenance:

as Moses commanded; (see Exodus 29:27,28 Leviticus 7:34-36).

Ver. 22. And Aaron lifted up his hand towards the people, and blessed them, etc.] After he had offered the above sacrifices both for himself and them: the manner of the priests lifting up their hands when they blessed is thus described; in the provinces the priests lift up their hands to their
shoulders, and in the sanctuary above their heads, excepting the high priest, who did not lift up his hands above the plate of gold: but R. Judah says, the high priest lift up his hands above the plate, as it is said (Leviticus 9:22); the modern Jews describe it thus, they lift up their hands to their shoulders, and they lift up the right hand somewhat higher than the left; then they stretch out their hands, and part their fingers, and frame them so as to make five airs; between two fingers and two fingers one air, and between the forefinger and the thumb, and between the two thumbs; they spread out their hands so, that the middle (or palm) of the hand may be towards the earth, and the back part of it towards heaven: Aaron lift his hands upwards, signifying from whence he implored the blessing, and towards the people on whom he desired it might descend; in this was a type of Christ, who, after he had offered himself a sacrifice for the sins of his people, when he was risen from the dead and about to ascend to heaven, blessed his disciples, (Luke 24:50,51) in Christ the saints are blessed with all spiritual blessings; by him they are procured for them, through his blood, sacrifice, and satisfaction; and he ever lives to make intercession for the application of them to them, (see Ephesians 1:3 Galatians 3:13,14 Acts 3:26)

and came down from offering of the sin offering, and the burnt offering, and peace offerings; from the altar with joy, as the Targum of Jonathan; being glad he had done his service with acceptance; he is said to “come down”, there being a rise or ascent to the altar, which, as Aben Ezra observes, was three cubits high, and therefore it is with propriety said he came down; which he did as soon as he had made an end of offering all the sacrifices.

Ver. 23. And Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle of the congregation, etc.] They went out of the court where the altar of burnt offering stood, and where Aaron had been offering the sacrifices; and they went into the holy place, where stood the altar of incense, the shewbread table, and the candlestick; and it is probable Moses went in with Aaron thither, to show him how to offer the incense, to order the shewbread on the table, and to light and trim the lamps of the candlestick; and so Jarchi observes, that he went in to teach him concerning the business of the incense; but it may be, it was also to pray for the people, as the Targum, and for the Lord’s appearance to them, as was promised and expected, and that fire might descend on the sacrifices as a token of acceptance of them, as Aben Ezra notes:
and came out, and blessed the people:; Aaron had blessed them before, but now both Moses and Aaron blessed them, atonement being made by the sacrifice of Christ, and law and justice thereby fully satisfied; Christ and the law agree together in the blessing of the Lord’s people; way was hereby made for the communication of blessings to them, consistent with the law of God, and his holiness and justice, (Galatians 3:10,13,14):

and the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people: some visible signs of his glory, some very great splendour or lustre, or breaking forth of his glory; or Christ, the glory of the Father, appeared in an human form, as a pledge of his future incarnation, when all the above sacrifices, which were types of him, would have their accomplishment; and this being immediately upon the offering of them, may signify that the glory of God greatly appears in the sacrifice and satisfaction of Christ, and in the redemption and salvation of his people in that way, (Psalm 21:4 85:10) and the glorious and gracious presence of God is enjoyed by his people, in consequence of the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, which was signified by the mercy seat, from whence the Lord communed; and it is through Christ, his blood and sacrifice, saints have access to God, and fellowship with him, (Ephesians 2:18 3:12 1 John 1:3).

Ver. 24. And there came a fire out from before the Lord, etc.] Either from heaven, or from the holy of holies, where was the symbol of the divine Presence, and Jehovah had now took up his residence:

and consumed upon the altar the burnt offering, and the fat:; according to Aben Ezra, the burnt offering of Aaron, and of the people, and of the daily sacrifice, for so it is written, besides the burnt offering of the morning, (Leviticus 9:17) and the fat of the calf and ram of Aaron, and of the goat, ox, and ram of the people, which though they were laid upon the altar at the time of their offering, yet it is thought by some they were not burnt till now: it is a conjecture of Bishop Patrick’s, that this burnt offering was the burnt offering of the evening sacrifice, which was consumed by the fire from the Lord; he supposes that the offering of the above sacrifices had taken up the whole day, from the time of the morning sacrifice until the evening; and that all the other sacrifices were burnt with common fire, but this with fire from the Lord; but then, what was the fat that was consumed? however, this was a token of acceptance; in like manner as it descended on the sacrifice of Abel, as is thought, (Genesis 4:4) and on the sacrifices offered at the dedication of the temple, (2 Chronicles 7:1) and on the
burnt sacrifice of Elijah, (1 Kings 18:38) testifying the divine approbation and acceptance of them: for though in the mystery, the fire may design the wrath of God as a consuming fire, which was very distressing to Christ, and brought him to the dust of death; yet, with respect to the persons for whom this sacrifice was offered, it denotes acceptance of it, that it was an offering by fire, and of a sweet smelling savour to God, his law and justice being satisfied, and having honour done them: concerning this fire, and the perpetual burning of it, (see Gill on Leviticus 6:12-13”). The Heathens, in imitation of this, have pretended to have fire come down also from heaven on their altars, as the Brahmans, among the Indians, taken notice of in the above note. And so Solinus speaks of the Vulcanian hill in Sicily, where they that serve in sacred things lay wood of vines on the altar, but put no fire; and if God is present (and so the sacrifice is approved) the branches, though green, will take fire of themselves, and a flame is kindled by the deity sacrificed to, no one setting them on fire. And Servius says, that with the ancients fires on altars were not kindled, but they procured a divine fire by their prayers, which kindled on the altars; but these were mere pretences, and juggling tricks, in which they were assisted by Satan to vie with this wonderful appearance of God in the acceptation of the sacrifice of his people:

[which] when all the people saw, they shouted, and fell on their faces; Aaron blessing them, and the appearance of the glory of God unto them, no doubt, gave them joy and pleasure, as the spiritual blessings by Christ, and the gracious presence of God do to his people, (Psalm 103:1-4 4:6,7) but what filled them with joy unspeakable was the acceptance of their sacrifices, as typical of the sacrifice of Christ, and atonement by it, which made them shout, and the court to ring with it; and yet fell down on their faces with all reverence and humility, under a sense of the divine Majesty being so near unto them, in this sensible token of his presence.
CHAPTER 10

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 10

This chapter begins with the sin and punishment of two sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, (Leviticus 10:1-5) for whose death Aaron and his sons are commanded not to mourn, nor to depart from the tabernacle, (Leviticus 10:6,7) and an order is given, prohibiting the priests from drinking wine when they went into it, (Leviticus 10:8-11) the law of eating holy things, both those that were more, and those that were less holy, is enjoined, (Leviticus 10:12-15) and the flesh of the sin offering not being eaten, but burnt, Aaron’s sons are blamed for it, for which he makes an apology to the satisfaction of Moses, (Leviticus 10:16-20).

Ver. 1. And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, etc.] His two eldest sons, as seems from (Exodus 6:23):

took either of them his censer; a vessel in which coals of fire were put, and incense upon them, and burnt it, and so it follows:

and put fire therein, and put incense thereon; which, as Aben Ezra says, was on the eighth day, that is, of their consecration, the day after their consecration was completely finished, and the same day that Aaron had offered the offerings for himself and for the people, (see Leviticus 9:1):

and offered strange fire before the Lord; upon the golden altar of incense, which stood in the holy place right against the vail, within which were the ark, mercy seat, and cherubim, the symbol and seat of the divine Majesty: this fire was not that which came down from heaven, and consumed the sacrifice, as related at the end of the preceding chapter (Leviticus 9:24), but common fire, and therefore called strange; it was not taken off of the altar of burnt offering, as it ought to have been, but, as the Targum of Jonathan, from under the trivets, skillets, or pots, such as the flesh of peace offerings were boiled in, in the tabernacle;

which he commanded not; yea, forbid, by sending fire from heaven, and ordering coals of fire for the incense to be taken off of the altar of burnt offering; and this, as Aben Ezra observes, they did of their own mind, and
not by order. It does not appear that they had any command to offer incense at all at present, this belonged to Aaron, and not to them as yet; but without any instruction and direction they rushed into the holy place with their censers, and offered incense, even both of them, when only one priest was to offer at a time, when it was to be offered, and this they also did with strange fire. This may be an emblem of dissembled love, when a man performs religious duties, prays to God, or praises him without any cordial affection to him, or obeys commands not from love, but selfish views; or of an ignorant, false, and misguided zeal, a zeal not according to knowledge, superstitious and hypocritical; or of false and strange doctrines, such as are not of God, nor agree with the voice of Christ, and are foreign to the Scriptures; or of human ordinances, and the inventions of men, and of everything that man brings of his own, in order to obtain eternal life and salvation.

Ver. 2. *And there went out fire from the Lord,* etc.] They sinned by fire, and they were punished by fire, either from heaven, or from the most holy place, where the Lord dwelt between the cherubim; this was of the nature of lightning, as appears by what follows:

*and devoured them;* not reduced them to ashes, for neither their bodies nor their clothes were burnt with this fire, as is clear from (Leviticus 10:4,5) but their lives were destroyed, they were lifeless, their souls were separated from their bodies by it, and they died; which is often the case by the lightning, that the clothes of those who are killed with it are untouched, and scarce any marks of violence on their bodies; and so the Targum of Jonathan says of these, their bodies were not burnt:

*and they died before the Lord;* upon the spot where they were offering incense, in the holy place, over against the most holy place. This was very awful, like the case of Ananias and Sapphira, and may seem severe: it was for the terror of others in the priesthood, or who should come after, to take care that they performed their office according to the divine precepts, and brought in no innovation into their service. And when it is considered that these were the sons of the high priest, newly invested with an high and honourable office, and just had the laws of the priesthood delivered unto them, and yet deviated from them as soon as in their office, and very probably, from what follows, went drunk into their service, their sin will appear aggravated, and the punishment less severe. This shows there is nothing in carnal descent, these were the sons of Aaron the high priest, that
acted this part, and came to this end; the proneness of men to transgress
the laws of God as soon as given them; thus the people of Israel fell into
idolatry as soon as the moral law was given; and here the priests, as soon
as the ceremonial laws, relating to the priesthood, were delivered to them;
and also that the law made sinful men priests, and that the Levitical
priesthood was imperfect; and that no order of men are free from sin, or
exempt from punishment: and the whole of the divine conduct in this affair
may lead us to observe how jealous God is in matters of worship; how
much he dislikes hypocrites, and formal professors; how severe he will be
against such who bring in strange doctrines; what will be the fate of the
contemners of Gospel doctrines and ordinances; and how much he resents
those who trust in themselves, and their works, and bring in anything of
their own in the business of salvation, which is strange fire, sparks of their
own kindling, a burning incense to their own drag, and sacrificing to their
own net.

Ver. 3. And Moses said unto Aaron, etc.] Upon this awful occasion, and in
order to quiet and humble him under the mighty hand of God:

this [is it] that the Lord spoke, saying; but when he spoke it, and where it
is said and recorded, is not so very clear; it might have been said, and yet
not recorded, or the substance of it may be recorded, though not in the
express words here delivered; it may refer, as some think, to (Exodus
19:22) or else to (Exodus 29:43) which seems to come nearest to what
follows, so Jarchi:

I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me; in the priests that drew nigh
to him, and offered sacrifice and burnt incense to him; by these he expected
to be sanctified, not to be made holy, but to be declared to be so, and
obeyed and worshipped as such; as he is, when his commands and
ordinances are observed, as he would have them be, in faith and fear, which
were not done by these sons of Aaron; and therefore the Lord, by the
punishment he inflicted, showed himself to be an holy, righteous, and
jealous God:

and before all the people I will be glorified; as he is when he is believed
and trusted in; when his worship is carried on in his own house, according
to his will; when his ordinances are kept as they were delivered, and when
he is reverenced in the assembly of his saints; all which were wanting in this
case. And this may also have respect to the glory of divine justice, in the
public punishment of the sin of those men, that since he was not glorified
by them before the people in the way of their duty, he would glorify himself in their punishment:

_and Aaron held his peace_: was in a stupor, as the Septuagint, quite amazed, thunderstruck, as we say; he was silent, said not one word against what was done; murmured not at the providence, nor complained of any severity, but was patient under the hand of God, and resigned to his will; and since God was sanctified and glorified, he was contented.

**Ver. 4.** And Moses called Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel, the uncle of Aaron, etc.] Uzziel was a son of Kohath, a brother of Amram, the father of Aaron, and so Aaron’s uncle, as here; he had four sons, two of which are here mentioned as called by Moses; these were first cousins to Aaron, and second to his sons; (see Exodus 6:18,22):

_and said unto them, come near_; it is very probable they were in the court of the tabernacle, being Kohathites, of the tribe of Levi; but not being priests, had no right to go into the holy place, where the two sons of Aaron lay dead, without a special order for it, which they here had for this time, and upon this occasion:

_carry your brethren from before the sanctuary, out of the camp_; the sons of Aaron are called their brethren, though but cousins, it being usual to call any relations brethren, and even if only of the same tribe, yea, of the same nation. Now these were ordered to take the dead bodies of Aaron’s sons out of the holy place, and out of the tabernacle, even from before it, which, as Aben Ezra says, was the court over against the camp; and they were to carry them out of the camp into some field, or place adjacent, and there bury them; it not being usual in those times to bury in cities and towns, and much less in places devoted to sacred worship, as the tabernacle was; and therefore they were carried from both the sanctuary and the camp: it is an observation of Aben Ezra, that

“some say the incense was before the altar of burnt offering, and the Levites entered there;”

but if by incense is meant the altar of incense, the place where these sons of Aaron offered theirs, that was in the holy place, and not in the court, where stood the altar of burnt offering: but they seem to mean as if their incense was offered in another place, and not on the altar, somewhere in the court, and before you come to the altar of burnt offering; and so the persons
Moses called could come in thither, and take up their bodies there fallen: but the same writer observes, that others say, that

“it was upon the altar of incense (i.e. that their incense was offered), and Moses brought them out of the tabernacle of the congregation,”

and then called these men to carry them from thence without the camp.

Ver. 5. *So they went near*, etc.] To the place where the bodies lay, having an order from Moses so to do, let them have been where they will;

*and carried them in their coats out of the camp, as Moses had said*; or bid them do; they took them up in their clothes as they found them, and carried them in them; not that these men carried them in their own coats, but in the coats of the dead, as Jarchi expresses it; and had them without the camp, and there buried them, probably in their coats in which they had sinned, and in which they died: the Targum of Jonathan says, they carried them on iron hooks in their coats, and buried them without the camp.

Ver. 6. *And Moses said unto Aaron, and unto Eleazar, and unto Ithamar, his sons*, etc.] His two younger sons, which yet remained; and so the Septuagint version adds, as in (Leviticus 10:12,16)

*uncover not your heads*; that is, do not take off your mitre, as the Septuagint version; or the bonnets which they wore in the time of their ministry; for the Jewish priests always had their mitres and bonnets on when they sacrificed; in imitation of which, the Heathens had their heads covered when they offered their sacrifices: now it was the way, or custom of a mourner, as Ben Melech observes, to remove his mitre, bonnet, or tiara, from his head; but in this case, that no sign of mourning might be shown, Aaron and his sons are forbid to uncover the head: the Targum of Onkelos is,

“do not increase the hair,”

or nourish it, or suffer it to grow, as Jarchi and Ben Gersom interpret it: now in times of distress and mourning they used to let the hair grow, whether on the head or beard, (see 2 Samuel 19:24) and in this the Jews were imitated by the Egyptians, contrary to other nations; the priests of the gods in other places, says Herodotus, took care of their hair (or wore their hair), in Egypt they are shaved; with others the custom is, for the head
immediately to be shaved at funerals; but the Egyptians, at death, suffer their hair to grow in the parts before shaved; but this custom with the Jews, though at other times used, is here forbid Aaron and his sons:

neither rend your clothes, which was sometimes done at the report of the death of near relations, as children, in token of mourning, (Genesis 37:34 Job 1:20) but here it is forbid, that there might be no sign of it: it is a particular word that is here used: Ben Melech says, there is a difference between rending and tearing; tearing is in the body of a garment where there is no seam, but rending (which is what is here meant) where there is a seam: the priests rending their garments was after this manner, according to the Jewish canons,

“an high priest rends below and a common priest above;”

that is, as one of their commentators interprets it, the former rends the extreme part of his garment next the feet, and the latter at the breast near the shoulder; but in this case no rent at all was to be made:

lest ye die, and lest wrath come upon all the people; so very provoking to God would be any signs of mourning in Aaron and his sons, on this account:

but let your brethren, the whole house of Israel, bewail the burning which the Lord hath kindled: though Aaron and his sons might not mourn on this occasion, the whole body of the people might, though not bewail so much the death of the persons, as the cause of it; and be concerned for the awful judgment of God, and for the wrath that was sone forth, lest it should proceed and destroy others also, all being sinners.

Ver. 7. And ye shall not go out from the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die, etc.] That is, they were not to relinquish the service of the sanctuary, on the account of the death of these relations of theirs, and through grief for it, but go on in it; not Aaron on account of his children, nor his sons on account of their brethren: from hence, says Ben Gersom, we learn, that whatsoever priest leaves his service, and goes out of the sanctuary, is guilty of death: some think the seven days of consecration were not quite over, during which time Aaron and his sons were obliged to continue there, on pain of death, (Leviticus 8:33,35) but it is pretty plain those days were over, and that it was the day after the consecration was finished; (see Leviticus 9:1) and (see Gill on Leviticus 10:2”) wherefore this respects their continuance in the
tabernacle on the day the above affair happened, and they were obliged to
continue in and go through the service of the day, notwithstanding that:

*for the anointing oil of the Lord is upon you*; a learned man \(^{205}\) infers from
hence, that this affair happened within the days of consecration, they being
every day afresh anointed with oil, at least had it, with the blood of the
sacrifices, sprinkled on them, on their garments, taking it in the strict sense,
for the oil being still upon them; whereas it seems only to signify, that
inasmuch as they were consecrated with oil to the priest’s office, they were
under obligation to continue and perform their service without being let or
hindered by what had happened:

*and they did according to the word of Moses*; they showed no tokens of
mourning on account of the dead, and did not offer to go out of the
tabernacle and leave their service.

**Ver. 8.** *And the Lord spake unto Aaron*, etc.] Because he was a prophet,
Aben Ezra says; but the reason rather seems to be, because be was the high
priest, and now invested with his office, and in the execution of it, and
therefore the following law respecting the priest’s drinking of wine was
given: some say, as the same writer observes, that God spake to him by
Moses; but it rather seems that he spoke to Aaron immediately: according
to Jarchi, this order was delivered to him as a reward for his silence, and to
do honour to him on that account: saying; as follows.

**Ver. 9.** *Do not drink wine or strong drink*, etc.] This law following upon
the affair of Nadab and Abihu has caused some to think, and not without
some reason, that they were drunk with wine or strong drink, when they
offered strange fire; and indeed it is hardly to be accounted for upon any
other foot that they should do it; but having feasted that day upon the
peace offerings, and drank freely, it being the first day of their entrance on
their office, they were, it may be supposed, elated and merry, and drank
more than they should; wherefore this law was given, to restrain from such
a disorderly and scandalous practice; not only wine, which is inebriating,
but strong drink also is forbidden, which, as Aben Ezra says, is made either
of a sort of wheat, or honey, or dates: and so Kimchi \(^{206}\) and Ben Melech
on the place after him observe, that this includes whatsoever inebriates,
besides wine; and that their doctors say, whosoever drinks milk or honey
(they must mean some strong liquor extracted from thence), if he enters
into the tabernacle he is guilty:
thou nor thy sons with thee; the Targum of Jonathan adds, as did thy sons, who died by the burning of fire; that is, he and his sons were to avoid drinking wine or strong drink to excess, as his two sons had done, which led them to offer strange fire, for which they suffered death:

when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; they might drink wine at other times, in a moderate manner; but it seems by this they were not to drink any at all when they were about to go to service, or to enter into the tabernacle in order to do it: indeed, according to the Jewish canons, every priest that is fit for service, if he drinks wine, it is forbidden him to enter in (to the tabernacle, and so) from the altar (of burnt offering) and inward (into the holy place); and if he goes in and does his service it is profane (unlawful and rejected), and he is guilty of death by the hand of heaven; and he that drinks the fourth part (of a log) of wine at one time, of wine forty days old; but if he drinks less than a fourth part of wine, or drinks a fourth part and stops between, and mixes it with water, or drinks wine out of the press within forty days (i.e. not quite so many days old), though more than a fourth part, he is free, and does not profane his service; if he drinks more than a fourth part of wine, though it is mixed, and though he stops and drinks little by little, he is guilty of death, and his service is profane (or rejected); if he is drunk with the rest of liquors that make drunk, he is forbidden to go into the sanctuary; but if he goes in and serves, and he is drunk with the rest of liquors that make drunk, whether of milk or of figs (a strong liquor made of them), he is to be beaten, but his service is right; for they are not guilty of death but on account of wine in the hour of service; and it does not profane service, but being drunken with wine. in imitation of this, Heathen priests were forbid wine, and abstained from it, particularly the Egyptian priests; at whom it is said, some of them never drink any wine, and others taste but a little of it, because it is said to harm the nerves, to fill the head, or make it heavy, to hinder invention and excite to lust:

[it shall be] a statute for ever throughout all your generations: even to the coming of the Messiah; and now under the Gospel dispensation, though wine in moderation is allowed Gospel ministers, yet they are not to be given to it; it is a shame to any Christian man to be drunk with wine, and more especially a minister, and still more so when in his service; (see Ezekiel 44:21).
Ver. 10. And that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, etc.] That being sober they might be able to distinguish between the one and the other; which a drunken man, having his mind and senses disturbed, is not capable of; as between holy and unholy persons, and between holy and unholy things; particularly, as Aben Ezra interprets it, between a sacred place and one that is common, and between a holy day and a common week day; the knowledge and memory of which may be lost through intemperance; and so that may be done in a place and on a day which ought not to be done, or that omitted on a day and in a place which ought to be done:

and between unclean and clean; between unclean men and women, beasts and fowls, and clean ones; and between unclean things in a ceremonial sense, and those that are clean, which a man in liquor may be no judge of: hence, as the above writer observes, after this section follow laws concerning fowls clean and unclean, the purification of a woman after childbirth, the leprosy in men, garments and houses, and concerning profluvius and menstruous persons; all which the priests were to be judges of, and therefore ought to be sober.

Ver. 11. And that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes, etc.] Laws, precepts, ordinances, moral, ceremonial, and judicial, which was the business of the priests to do, (Malachi 2:7) but one inebriated with liquor would be incapable of giving instructions about any of those things:

which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses: particularly those delivered and recorded in (Exodus 20:1-26 22:1-23:33) and as not the priests, so neither any other Israelite might instruct, nor indeed would be capable of instructing others when in liquor; and therefore excessive drinking, as it should be carefully avoided by all men, so more especially by those who by their office are teachers of others; (see Proverbs 31:4,5).

Ver. 12. And Moses spake unto Aaron, and unto Eleazar, and unto Ithamar, his sons that were left, etc.] Of the burning, as the Targum of Jonathan; who survived his other two sons that were burnt, who remained alive, not being concerned with them in their sin, and so shared not in their punishment:

take the meat offering that remaineth of the offerings of the Lord made by fire; for all but the handful that was burnt of that kind of offerings
belonged to the priests, (see <sup>Leviticus 6:14-18</sup>) this meat offering, according to Jarchi, was the meat offering of the eighth day, that is, of the consecration, or the day after it was finished, on which the above awful case happened, (see <sup>Leviticus 9:17</sup>) and also the meat offering of Nahshon the son of Amminadab, of the tribe of Judah, who offered his offering first at the dedication of the altar, on the day the tabernacle was set up, which he supposes was on this day, (see <sup>Numbers 7:1,10,13</sup>), now these meat offerings were not as yet eaten, and which may be true of the first of them, wherefore Aaron and his sons, notwithstanding their mourning, are bid to take it:

and eat it without leaven beside the altar: the altar of burnt offering in the court of the tabernacle, as directed (see Gill on “<sup>Leviticus 6:16</sup>”):

for it [is] most holy: and so might be eaten by none but holy persons, such as were devoted to sacred services, and only in the holy place, as follows; within hangings, where the most holy things were eaten, as Jarchi, that is, within the court of the tabernacle, which was made of hangings.

Ver. 13. And ye shall eat it in the holy place, etc.] Not in that which was properly so called, but in the court of the tabernacle; at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, as Aben Ezra, in some apartment there; for it was not to be carried out of the sanctuary, and eaten in their own houses or tents, as others might, after mentioned:

because it [is] thy due, and thy sons’ due, of the offerings of the Lord made by fire; and not any others; neither his wife nor his daughters, nor any other related to him, or whom he might invite, as in other cases, might eat of it; this none but he and his sons might eat of, and nowhere else but in the sanctuary:

for so I am commanded; to make known and declare this as the will of God.

Ver. 14. And the wave breast and heave shoulder shall ye eat in a clean place, etc.] The breast of the peace offerings that was waved, and the shoulder of them that was heaved before the Lord; these were given by him to the priests, towards the maintenance of their families, (see <sup>Leviticus 7:34</sup>) and they might be eaten anywhere, provided the place was clean from all ceremonial pollution, and in which there were no polluted persons, as leprous ones; they were to be eaten within the camp, as Jarchi observes, where lepers came not: for, as he adds, the light holy things, such as these
were, might be eaten in every city; and so it is said in the Misnah \[^{210}\], and by the commentators on it:

*thou and thy sons, and thy daughters with thee*; these were not restrained to him and his sons only, as the meat offerings, and the flesh of the sin offerings were, but were common to the whole family:

*for [they be] thy due, and thy sons’ due*; for their service of the sanctuary, and by the appointment and direction of the Lord:

*which* are given out of the sacrifices of peace offerings of the children of Israel: of which (see \[^{139}\]Leviticus 7:1-38) these are said to be “given out” of them, for the whole was not given, only the breast and shoulder; and after the fat was burnt, the rest belonged to the owners, with which they kept a feast of joy and thankfulness.

**Ver. 15. The heave shoulder and wave breast shall they bring**, etc.] Not the priests, but the owners to the priests, (\[^{66}\]Leviticus 7:29,30):

*with the offerings made by fire of the fat*: upon the inwards, kidneys, and caul of the liver, which was all burnt:

*to wave [it] for a wave offering before the Lord*, the shoulder was lifted up, and the breast waved to and fro before the Lord of the whole earth, and towards the several parts of it, to show and own his right to all they had, and then they were given to the priests as a token of it:

*and it shall be thine, and thy sons with thee*; both the shoulder and the breast:

*by a statute for ever*, to be observed as long as the ceremonial law and Levitical priesthood lasted, even to the end of the Jewish age and economy, and the coming of the Messiah:

*as the Lord hath commanded*; (\[^{165}\]Leviticus 7:33,34).

**Ver. 16. And Moses diligently sought the goat of the sin [offering], etc.**] The Targum of Jonathan says,

“three goats were offered on that day, the goat of the new moon, of the sin offering for the people, and of the sin offering, which Nahshon the son of Amminadab offered at the dedication of the altar; Aaron and his sons, it adds, went and burnt these three, Moses came and sought, etc.”
Jarchi also speaks of three goats offered, but says that only one was burnt, the goat of the new moon; and so Ben Gersom, who gives this reason for the diligent search after it, because it was always to be offered up, and was not a temporary affair, as the others were: but it rather seems to be the goat of the sin offering for the people, for it is not certain that the other goats were offered on this day, but this was, (see <Leviticus 9:15>) now according to the law, the flesh of this goat was not to be burnt, but to be eaten by the priests in the holy place, (see <Leviticus 6:25,26>). Moses now suspecting that Aaron and his sons, through their grief for the death of Nadab and Abihu, had neglected the eating of it, sought diligently after it, and so it proved:

_and, behold, it was burnt:_ as they had no appetite to it themselves, they burnt it, that it might not be eaten by any others, for none but they might eat it, and that it might not corrupt:

_and he was angry with Eleazar and Ithamar, the sons of Aaron, [which were] left alive;_ when their two elder brothers were killed with lightning for doing what was not commanded, which should have made them more observant of the laws of God, to do that which was commanded them: and though they were spared, and survived their brethren, yet they transgressed, in burning the sin offering of the people, when they should have eaten it. Jarchi observes, that he expressed his anger not to Aaron, but to his sons, which he did for the honour of Aaron, laying the blame not on him, who was overwhelmed with grief, but on his sons:

_saying;_ as follows.

**Ver. 17. Wherefore have ye not eaten of the sin [offering] in the holy place, seeing it [is] most holy, etc.]** The sin offering was one of the most holy things, and therefore to be eaten only in the sanctuary; though this was not the fault they are here charged with that they had eat it, but not in the holy place; for they had not eaten it at all, but burnt it, as appears from the preceding verse; this is what they are blamed for particularly, though they are reminded of the whole law concerning it, that it was to he eaten by them, that it was to be eaten in the holy place, the reason of which is given; but they had not eaten it any where:

_and [God] hath given it to you, to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord?_ for by eating the sin offering, or sin itself, as it is in the original text, (see <Hosea 4:8>) they made the
sins of the people, for whom the offering was, in some sense their own; and they bore them, and made a typical atonement for them; in which they were types of Christ, who was made sin for his people, took their sins upon him, and by imputation they were made his own, and he bore them in his own body on the tree, and made full satisfaction and atonement for them. Now since the eating of the sin offering of the people was of so great importance and consequence, the neglect of it by the priests was very blameworthy.

**Ver. 18.** Behold, the blood of it was not brought in within the holy place, etc.] When that was the case, indeed, the flesh of the sin offering was not to be eaten, but burnt, (see Leviticus 6:30) but this was not the case now, and therefore its flesh should have been eaten, and not burnt: ye should indeed have eaten it in the holy place, as I commanded, (Leviticus 6:26).

**Ver. 19.** And Aaron said unto Moses, etc.] For what Moses had said was said in his presence, though not addressed to him directly, but to his sons; and he was sensible that he was pointed at, and that if there was any blame in this affair, it lay as much or more on him than on his sons; and therefore he takes it upon him to give an answer, and to excuse the fact as well as he could:

**behold, this day they have offered their sin [offering] and their burnt offering before the Lord;** that is, the people of Israel had brought a kid of the goats for a sin offering, and a calf and a lamb for burnt offering, and he and his sons assisting him, had offered them for them, even on the very day his two eldest sons were removed by death in an awful manner:

**and such things have befallen me;** at this very time, soon after the above sacrifices were offered, happened the death of his two sons, which occasioned great anguish and distress, grief and sorrow, so that he could not eat of the sin offering; he had no appetite for it, and if he had, he thought in his present circumstances it would not have been right, as follows:

**and [if] I had eaten the sin [offering] today, should it have been accepted in the sight of the Lord?** he being a mourner. The Jews say, an high priest may offer, being a mourner, but not eat; a common priest may neither offer nor eat; and which they illustrate by this passage, that Aaron offered and did not eat, but his sons did neither.
Ver. 20. And when Moses heard [that], he was content.] He said no more, he did not proceed in blaming him and his sons, but was satisfied with the answer returned; he considered the grief and trouble of mind that attended Aaron, which might not only cause him to disregard food, but even to forget what was commanded to be done in this case; and besides he might observe, that there was some difficulty attending it; in some cases the flesh of the sin offering was to be eaten, and not burnt; in others, to be burnt, and not eaten; and this being the first time of offering one, the mistake might be the more easily made; and fearing one might be made, and especially when Aaron was in such circumstances, might be the reason Moses so diligently sought after the goat of the sin offering: moreover, what Aaron had done appeared to be not out of any wilful neglect of the command of God, but with a good design, as judging it would be unacceptable to him, should he have eaten of it in his circumstances. Moses upon the whole thought him excusable, at least insisted no more upon the blame. The Jewish writers make the mistake to lie on the side of Moses and not Aaron; and which the former acknowledged, according to the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem: (see Deuteronomy 26:12-14).
CHAPTER 11

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 11

This chapter treats of creatures clean and unclean, as fit or not fit to be eaten; and first of beasts, whose signs are given, (Leviticus 11:1-8) then of fishes, which are likewise described, (Leviticus 11:9-12) after that of fowls, and those that are not to be eaten are particularly named, (Leviticus 11:13-19) next of creeping things, which are distinguished into two sorts, as flying creeping things, of which those that are unclean, their carcasses are not even to be touched, as neither the carcasses of unclean beasts, (Leviticus 11:20-28) and creeping things on the earth, which defile by touching, as well as eating, and make everything unclean, upon which, being dead, they fall, (Leviticus 11:29-43) and these laws are enforced from the holiness and goodness of God, (Leviticus 11:44,45) and the chapter is concluded with a recapitulation of them, (Leviticus 11:46,47).

Ver. 1. *And the Lord spake unto Moses, and unto Aaron, etc.*] The one being the chief magistrate, and the other the high priest, and both concerned to see the following laws put into execution; according to Jarchi, the Lord spoke to Moses that he might speak to Aaron; but being now in office, and one part of his office being to distinguish between clean and unclean, the following discourse is directed equally to him as to Moses:

*saying unto them;* as follows.

Ver. 2. *Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, etc.*] For to them only belong the following laws, and not unto the Gentiles, as Jarchi rightly observes; these were parts of the ceremonial law, which was peculiarly given to them, and lay, among other things, in meats and drinks, and now abolished; for it is not what goes into a man that defiles him; nor is anything common or unclean of itself, but every creature of God is good if received with thanksgiving. The sons of Noah had free liberty, without any restraint or limitation, of using for food any living creature that moved upon the face of the earth; in the choice of which they were left to exercise
their reason and judgment, and is the case with us now; but as men have not so nice a smell as some animals have, and cannot distinguish by their senses so well as they what food is most wholesome, which makes the exercise of their reason and judgment necessary, and the people of the Jews being a special people, and for whom the Lord had a peculiar regard; for the sake of their health, and to preserve them from diseases they were subject to, such as the leprosy and others, and to direct them to what was most salubrious and healthful, gave them the following laws; and which, though they are not obligatory upon us, yet may be a direction to us, in the use of what may be most suitable and proper food for us, the difference of climates, and of the constitutions of men’s bodies, being considered: not that we are to suppose, that the case of health was the only reason of delivering out these laws to the children of Israel, for other ends, besides that, may be thought to be had in view; as to assert his sovereign right to the creatures, and his disposal of them to them according to his will and pleasure; to lay a restraint on their appetites, to prevent luxury, and to teach them self denial, and compliance with his will; as also to keep them the more from the company and conversation of the Gentiles, by whom they otherwise might be led into idolatry; and to give them an aversion to their idols, to whom the creatures forbidden them to eat, many of them were either now or would be sacred to them; and chiefly to excite to a care for purity, both inward and outward, and create in the man abhorrence of those vices which may be signified by the ill qualities of several of the creatures; and to instruct them in the difference between holy and unholy persons, with whom they should or should not have communion; (see Acts 10:11-15,28)

these are the beasts that ye shall eat among all the beasts that are on the earth; they are not particularly mentioned here, but they are in (Deuteronomy 14:4,5) and they are these ten; the ox, the sheep, and the goat, the hart, and the roebuck, and the fallow deer, and the wild goat, and the pygarg, and the wild ox, and the chamois; of all which, (see Gill on “Deuteronomy 14:4-5”): here only some general things are observed to describe them by, as follow.

Ver. 3. Whatsoever parteth the hoof, and is cloven footed, etc.] That is, whose hoof is parted and cloven quite through; for there are some creatures that have partitions in their feet, but not quite through, they are parted above, but underneath are joined together by a skin; wherefore both these phrases are used to describe the beasts lawful to be eaten: the
Egyptians seem to have borrowed this law from the Jews, for Chaeremon says, that they abstain from such four footed beasts that have only one hoof, or have many partitions, or have no horns: and so the Targum of Jonathan adds here,

“which have horns,”

which, though not in the text, agrees well with the creatures allowed by this law to be eaten, (see Deuteronomy 14:4,5) for such are all horned cattle; nor are there any cattle horned forbid to be eaten:

*and cheweth the cud among the beasts, that shall ye eat:* who having no upper teeth cannot thoroughly chew their food at once, and therefore bring it up again out of their stomachs into their mouths and chew it over again, that it may be better prepared for digestion in the stomach, and so yield better nourishment; and this makes the flesh of such creatures fitter for food: and these creatures have more stomachs than one; the ventricles for rumination are four; the first is the paunch, which in oxen is so big as to hold food of fifty pound weight, the second the honeycomb, the third the tripe, the fourth the honey tripe, and to which are helpful the pectoral muscle, the abdomen, with the diaphragm: all this might have a moral and spiritual meaning in it, and may be applied either to ministers of the word; who ought rightly to divide the word of truth, and give to everyone their part, and who should walk uprightly according to it, and who should give themselves up wholly to the meditation of it, and thoroughly digest it; and study to show themselves workmen, that need not to be ashamed; or to private Christians, who have a discerning spirit in spiritual things, and can distinguish not only morality from immorality, but spiritual things from carnal, heavenly things from earthly, the voice of Christ from the voice of a stranger, and the doctrines of Christ from the doctrines of men; and who also walk as they should do, by faith on Christ, in the ways of God, and according to the Gospel; these chew the cud, meditate on the word, feed upon it while delivered, recall it, and have it brought to their remembrance by the divine Spirit, and ponder it in their hearts; (see Psalm 1:1,2).

**Ver. 4. Nevertheless, these shall ye not eat,** etc.] To whom one of these descriptive characters may agree but not the other:

*of them that chew the cud, or of them that divide the hoof:* there being some that chewed the cud but did not divide the hoof; others that divided the hoof but did not chew the cud, of which instances are given as follow:
[as] the camel, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof; he [is] unclean unto you; and not to be eaten, whether male or female; or rather, “though he cheweth the cud”; and this account agrees with what naturalists give of it; so Aristotle\textsuperscript{214} says it has not both rows of teeth, but wants its upper teeth, and chews as horned cattle do, and has bellies like theirs; for they have more bellies than one, as the sheep, and goat, and hart, and others; since the service of the mouth is not sufficient to grind the food for want of teeth, this is supplied by the bellies, which receive the food one after another; in the first it is undigested, in the second somewhat more digested, in the third more fully, in the fourth completely: and so many bellies the camel has, as a very learned searcher\textsuperscript{215} into these things observes; the first is the biggest, the second very small, the third much greater than the second, and the fourth equal to the second; in the second belly between the tunics, he says, seem to be the hydrophylacia, in which the water they drink is kept, very commodious for these animals passing through sandy deserts, so that they can long bear thirst: Pliny\textsuperscript{216} says four days: Leo Africanus\textsuperscript{217} relates a method used by travellers in the deserts of Lybia, who being in extreme want of water kill one of their camels, out of whose intestines they press out water; this they drink, this they carry about till they find a well, or must die with thirst: and the account also which is given of the feet of these creatures agrees; it parts the hoof, but not thoroughly, it is not cleft quite through, and so comes not up to Moses’s descriptive character of clean creatures; its hoof is divided in two, but so divided, as Aristotle\textsuperscript{218} observes, that it is but little divided on the back part unto the second joint of the toes; the fore part is very little divided, to the first joint of the toes, and there is something between the parts, as in the feet of geese: and so Pliny says\textsuperscript{219} it has two hoofs, but the lower part of the foot is but very little divided, so that it is not thoroughly cleft: but though the flesh of these creatures was forbidden the Jews, it was eaten by people of other nations; both Aristotle\textsuperscript{220} and Pliny\textsuperscript{221} commend the milk of camels; and by the former the flesh of them is said to be exceeding sweet; and Diodorus Siculus relates\textsuperscript{222}, that what with their milk and their flesh, which is eaten, as well as on account of their carrying burdens, they are very profitable unto men; and Strabo\textsuperscript{223} says, the Nomades eat the flesh and milk of camels; and so the Africans, according to Leo Africanus\textsuperscript{224}; and a countryman of ours\textsuperscript{225}, who lived some time in Arabia, relates, that when a camel falls they kill it, and the poorer sort of the company eat it; and he says that he himself ate of camel’s flesh, and that it was very sweet and nourishing: these creatures, in the mystic sense, may be an...
emblem of such persons, that carry their heads high, are proud and
haughty, that boast of their riches, or trust in their righteousness.

Ver. 5. And the coney, etc.] Or rabbit:

*because he cheweth the cud*; or “though he cheweth”; which yet, some
observe, the coney or rabbit does not, it having upper teeth, and therefore
they think some other creature is meant by Shaphan, the word here used;
and Bochart is of opinion, that the Aljarbuo of the Arabians, a sort of
mountain mouse, is meant, which chews the cud and divides not the hoof,
and resides in rocks, which agrees with the account of the Shaphan in
(<Proverbs 30:26>) but this is rejected by Dr. Shaw, who takes the
creature here to be the Daman Israel, or Israel’s lamb, an animal of Mount
Lebanon, a harmless creature of the same size and quality with the rabbit,
and with the like incurving posture, and disposition or the fore teeth, but
is of a browner colour, with smaller eyes, and a head more pointed, like the
marmots; the fore feet likewise are short, and the hinder are nearly as long
in proportion as those of the jerboa; and though this animal is known to
burrow sometimes in the ground, yet its usual residence and refuge is in the
holes and clifts of the rocks; but a learned man, and very inquisitive in
the things of nature, tells us, that the “cuniculus”, coney, or rabbit, this sort
of animals do chew half an hour after eating:

*but divideth not the hoof*; which is well known of this creature:

*he [is] unclean unto you*; not fit or proper to be eaten of, but to be
abstained from as an unclean animal; and may be an emblem of timorous
persons, as these creatures by Aristotle are observed to be, and it is well
known they are; even of the fearful and unbelieving, reckoned among the
impure, who will have their portion in the lake of fire, (<Revelation 21:8>).

Ver. 6. And the hare, because he cheweth the cud, etc.] Or, “though he
chews” it:

*but divideth not the hoof; he [is] unclean to you*; and so not to be eaten; so
Plutarch says, that the Jews are said to abstain from the hare, disdaining
it as a filthy and unclean animal, and yet was in the greatest esteem with the
Romans of any four footed beast, as Martial says: Moses, as Bochart
and other learned men observe, is the only writer that speaks of the
hare as chewing the cud; though they also observe, that Aristotle makes
mention of that in common with those that do chew the cud, namely a "coagulum" or "runnet" in its stomach; his words are,

“All that have many bellies have what is called πυετιόνα, a coagulum or runnet, and of them that have but one belly, the hare;”

only that: this creature being prone to lust, may be an emblem of lustful persons, who give up themselves to lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness, ( Ephesians 4:19).

Ver. 7. And the swine, though he divide the hoof, and be cloven footed, etc.] Not only its hoofs are parted, but cloven quite through, and so in this respect answers Moses’s first descriptive character of clean creatures; though Aristotle and Pliny speak of some kind of swine in Illyricum, Paeonia, and other places, which have solid hoofs; but perhaps these were not properly swine, though so called:

yet he cheweth not the cud; and a learned physician observes, that such creatures that chew not the cud, so perfect a chyle cannot be elaborated by them as is by those that chew the cud, and therefore their flesh must be less wholesome; and of the swine, he says, they have but one belly, and so there is no rumination or chewing the cud by them; wherefore they are to be placed, and are in a lower degree than the camel, the coney, and the hare; and as they cannot digest the chyle so well as those that chew the cud, and also live upon most sordid and filthy food, the eating of swine’s flesh, he observes, must produce many inconveniences to the body, as especially scorbutic, arthritic, scabious, and leprous disorders: so Manetho the Egyptian says, that he that eats swine’s milk is liable to be filled with the leprosy; and Maimonides gives it as the principal reason of its being forbid the Jews, because it is such a filthy creature, and eats such filthy things:

he [is] unclean to you: and so it has always been accounted by the Jews, and nothing is more abominable to them, as is even testified by Heathen writers; and in this they have been imitated by many nations, particularly the Egyptians, who, as Herodotus says, reckon swine a very filthy creature; so that if anyone does but touch it passing by, he is obliged to plunge himself into a river with his clothes on; and keepers of them may not go into any of their temples, nor do the rest of the Egyptians intermarry with them, but they marry among themselves; the reason of this their abhorrence of swine, Aelianus says, is because they are so gluttonous
that they will not spare their own young, nor abstain from human flesh; and
this, says he, is the reason why the Egyptians hate it as an impure and
voracious animal: likewise the Arabians entirely abstain from swine’s flesh,
as Solinus says, who adds, that if any of this sort of creatures is carried
into Arabia, it immediately dies; and the same Pliny attests: and so the
Phoenicians, the near neighbours of the Jews, would not eat the flesh of
them; hence Antoninus is said to abstain from it after the manner of the
Phoenicians, unless the historian should mean the Jews; also the Gallo-
Grecians or Galatians; nay, even the Indians have such an abhorrence of
it, that they would as soon taste of human flesh as taste of that, and it is
well known that the Mahometans abstain from it; and they have such an
aversion to it, that if any chance to kill a wild pig, for tame they have none,
they look on the merit of it to be almost equivalent to the killing a Christian
in fight: now these creatures may be an emblem of filthy and impure
sinners, especially apostates, who return to their former impurities and
wallow in them, (2 Peter 2:22).

Ver. 8. Of their flesh shall ye not eat, etc.] Meaning, not of swine only,
but of the camel, coney, and hare:

and their carcass shall ye not touch; which must not be understood of
touching them in any sense; for then it would have been unlawful for a Jew
to have rode upon a camel, or to take out and make use of hog’s lard in
medicine; but of touching them in order to kill them, and prepare them for
food, and eat them; and indeed all unnecessary touching of them is
forbidden, lest it should bring them to the eating of them; though perhaps it
may chiefly respect the touching of them dead:

they are unclean to you: one and all of them; for as this was said of each
of them in particular, so now of all of them together; and which holds good
of all wild creatures not named, to whom the description above belongs,
and which used to be eaten by other nations; some of which were called
Pamphagi, from eating all sorts, and others Agriophagi, from eating wild
creatures, as lions, panthers, elephants, etc.

Ver. 9. These shall ye eat of all that are in the waters, etc.] In the
waters of the sea, or in rivers, pools, and ponds; meaning fishes; for though
some persons abstain from eating them entirely, as the Egyptian priests, as
Herodotus relates; and it was a part of religion and holiness, not with
the Egyptians only, but with the Syrians and Greeks, to forbear eating them;
and Julian gives two reasons why men should abstain from fishes;
the one because what is not sacrificed to the gods ought not to be used for food; and the other is, because these being immersed in the deep waters, look not up to heaven; but God gave the people of Israel liberty of eating them, under certain limitations:

*whatsoever hath fins and scales, in the waters, in the seas, and in the rivers, them shall ye eat*; some render it disjunctively, “fins or scales”\(^{1253}\); but as Maimonides\(^{1254}\) observes, whatsoever has scales has fins; and who also says, if a fish has but one fin and one scale, it was lawful to eat: fins to fishes are like wings to birds, and oars to boats, with which they swim and move swiftly from place to place; and scales are a covering and a protection of them; and such fishes being much in motion, and so well covered, are less humid and more solid and substantial, and more wholesome: in a spiritual sense, fins may denote the exercise of grace, in which there is a motion of the soul, Godward, Christward, and heavenward; and scales may signify good works, which adorn believers, and protect them from the reproaches and calumnies of men.

**Ver. 10.** *And all that have not fins nor scales in the seas, and in the rivers, etc.*] Such as eels, lampreys, etc.

*of all that move in the waters, and of any living thing which [is] in the waters*; the former of these are interpreted by Aben Ezra and Ben Gersom of little fishes that have but a small body, and such as are created out of the waters; and the latter, of such as are produced of a male and female; or, as Maimonides\(^{1255}\) explains it, the one signifies the lesser creatures, such as worms and horse leeches; the other greater ones, sea beasts, as sea dogs, etc.

*they shall be an abomination to you*; not only unclean, and so unfit to eat, but to be had in abhorrence and detestation, as being exceeding disagreeable and unwholesome; and, as a learned man observes\(^ {1256}\), to these prohibited in general belong all those animals in lakes, rivers, or seas, which are of a slow motion, and which, because of the slow motion of their bodies, do not so well digest their food; and for that may be compared with four footed beasts that have but one belly, and so unwholesome as they.

**Ver. 11.** *They shall be even an abomination to you, etc.*] This is repeated again and again, to deter from the eating of such fishes, lest there should be any desire after them:
ye shall not eat of their flesh, here mention is made of the flesh of fishes, as is by the apostle, (1 Corinthians 15:39). Aben Ezra observes, that their wise men say, this is according to the usage of words in those ages: but you shall have their carcasses in abomination; not only abstain from eating them and touching them, but to express the utmost aversion to them.

Ver. 12. Whatsoever hath no fins nor scales in the waters, etc.] Which is repeated that they might take particular notice of this law, and be careful to observe it, this being the only sign given: that [shall be] an abomination unto you; the Targum of Jonathan says, that not only the flesh of such fish, but the broth, and pickles made of them, were to be an abomination; which contradicts what Pliny relates, that the Jews made a pickle of fishes that lacked scales; so Grotius understands him: this law of the Jews is taken notice of by Porphyry, who says, it is forbidden all the Jews to eat horse flesh, or fishes that lack scales, or any animal that has but one hoof: and Pliny, from an ancient author, Cassius Hemina, makes mention of a law of Numa, forbidding the use of fish that had not scales, in feasts made for the gods.

Ver. 13. And these [are they which] ye shall have in abomination among the fowls, etc.] No description or sign is given of fowls, as of beasts and fishes, only the names of those not to be eaten; which, according to Maimonides, are twenty four; so that all the rest but these are clean fowls, and might be eaten; wherefore the same writer observes, that, “whoever was expert in these kinds, and in their names, might eat of every fowl which was not of them, and there was no need of an inquiry:”

but what creatures are intended by these is not now easy to know; very different are the sentiments both of the Jews and Christians concerning them; and indeed it does not much concern us Christians to know what are meant by them, but as curiosity may lead us to such an inquiry, not thinking ourselves bound by these laws; but it is of moment with the Jews to know them, who think they are; wherefore, to supply this deficiency, they venture to give some signs by which clean and unclean fowls may be known, and they are three; such are clean who have a superfluous claw, and also a craw, and a crop that is uncovered by the hand; and on the contrary
they are unclean, and not to be eaten, as says the Targum of Jonathan, which have no superfluous talon, or no craw, or a crop not uncovered:

*they shall not be eaten, they [are] an abomination*; and they are those that follow:

*the eagle, and the ossifrage, and the ospray*; about the first of these there is no difficulty, all agree the eagle is intended; which has its name either from the nature of its sight, or from the casting of its feathers, or from its tearing with its bill: it is a bird of prey, a very rapacious creature, and sometimes called the bird of Jupiter, and sacred to the gods; and these may be the reasons why forbid to be eaten, as well as because its flesh is hard, and not fit for food, and unwholesome; “the ossifrage” or “bone breaker” has its name from its tearing its prey and breaking its bones for the marrow, as the word “peres” here used signifies, (Micah 3:3) it is said to dig up bodies in burying places to eat what it finds in the bones: this is thought to be of the eagle kind, as it is reckoned by Pliny, though Aristotle speaks of it as very different from the eagle, as larger than that, and of an ash colour; and is so kind to the eagle’s young, that when they are cast out by that, it takes them and brings them up: the “ospray” is the “halioeetus”, or sea eagle, as the Septuagint version and several others render it; which Aristotle describes as having a large and thick neck, crooked wings, and a broad tail, and resides about the sea and shores: Pliny speaks of it as having a very clear sight, and, poised itself on high, having sight of a fish in the sea, will rush down at once and fetch it out of the water; and he also reports that she will take her young before they are fledged, and oblige them to look directly against the rays of the sun, and if any of them wink, or their eyes water, she casts them out of her nest as a spurious brood. Aristotle, who relates the same, says she kills them. The name of this creature, in the Hebrew text, seems to be taken from its strength; wherefore Bochart is of opinion, that the “melanoeetos”, or black eagle, which, though the least of eagles as to its size, exceeds all others in strength, as both Aristotle and Pliny say; and therefore, as the latter observes, is called by the Romans “valeria”, from its strength. Maimonides says of these two last fowls, which we render the ossifrage and the ospray, that they are not to be found on the continent, but in the desert places of the isles of the sea very far off, even those which are at the end of the habitable world.
Ver. 14. And the vulture, and the kite after his kind.] Perhaps it might be better if the version was inverted, and the words be read, “and the kite, and the vulture, after his kind”; and the last word is by us rendered the vulture in (Job 28:7) and very rightly, since the kite is not remarkable for its sight, any other than all rapacious creatures are, whereas the vulture is to a proverb; and besides, of the vulture there are two sorts, as Aristotle says, the one lesser and whiter, the other larger and more of an ash colour; and there are some that are of the eagle kind, whereas there is but one sort of kites; though Ainsworth makes mention of two, the greater of a ruddy colour, common in England, and the lesser of a blacker colour, known in Germany, but produces no authority for it; however, these are both ravenous creatures: of the kite, Aelianus says, it is very rapacious, and will take meat out of the meat market, but not touch any sacrificed to Jupiter; the truth of which may well be questioned; and of vultures he reports, that they will watch a dying man, and follow armies going to battle, expecting prey; (see Gill on “Matthew 24:28”).

Ver. 15. Every raven after his kind.] The red raven, night raven, the water raven, river raven, wood raven, etc. this also includes crows, rooks, pies, jays, and jackdaws, etc. The raven was with the Heathens sacred to Apollo, is a voracious creature, and so reckoned among unclean ones, and unfit for food; nor does the care that God takes of these creatures, or the use he has made of them, contradict this; (see Job 38:41, Psalm 147:9, 1 Kings 17:4,6).

Ver. 16. And the owl, etc.] The great and little owls being after mentioned, it seems best, by the word here used, to understand the “ostrich” with the Septuagint, Vulgate Latin, the Oriental versions, and the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan: the account which Pliny gives of the African and Ethiopic ostriches is this; that they are the largest of birds, and almost of the kind of beasts; that they exceed the height of a horseman on horseback, and are swifter than the horses; that their wings are given them to help them in their running, otherwise they are not flying fowls, nor are they lifted up from the earth. Their hoofs are like to those of harts, with which they fight, and are cloven, and serve to gather up stones, which in their flight they throw with their feet against them that follow them; they have a wonderful concoction, digesting whatever is swallowed down; and, according to Galen, all the parts of them, their flesh and their eggs, are hard and difficult of digestion, and excermentitious: Aben Ezra says, their flesh is as dry as a stick, and it is not usual to eat it, for there is no
moisture in it; and therefore nothing can be eaten of the whole species, but
the daughter or young one, for that being a female and little, there is some
moisture in it; but not so the male when little; wherefore as the flesh of this
creature is always reckoned by the Jews as unlawful to be eaten, it may the
rather be supposed to be intended here, since if not here, it cannot be
thought to be any where observed; and yet we find that both the eggs and
the flesh of this creature have been eaten by some people: their eggs with
the Indians were reckoned delicate eating, as Aelianus\textsuperscript{280} reports; and near
the Arabians and Ethiopians were a people, as both Diodorus Siculus\textsuperscript{281}
and Strabo\textsuperscript{282} relate, who were called Struthophagi, from their living on
ostriches; and they eat them in Peru, where they are common\textsuperscript{283}; and in
several parts of Africa, as Nubia, Numidia, and Lybia, as Leo Africanus\textsuperscript{284}
relates:

\textit{and the night hawk}; which, according to Pliny\textsuperscript{285}, is sometimes called
“cymindis”, and is seldom to be found in woods, sees not so well in the day
time, and wages a deadly war with the eagle, and they are often found
joined together: Bochart\textsuperscript{286} who thinks that the female ostrich is meant by
the preceding bird, is of opinion that the male ostrich is meant here, there
being no general name in the Hebrew language to comprehend both sexes:

\textit{and the cuckoo}; a bird well known by its voice at least: some have thought
it to be the same with the hawk, changing its figure and voice; but this has
been refuted by naturalists\textsuperscript{287}: but though it is here forbidden to be eaten,
yet its young, when fat, are said to be of a grateful savour by Aristotle: and
Pliny\textsuperscript{288} says, no bird is to be compared to it for the sweetness of its flesh,
though perhaps it may not be here intended: the word is by the Septuagint
rendered a “sea gull”, and so it is by Ainsworth, and which is approved of
by Bochart\textsuperscript{289}:

\textit{and the hawk after his kind}; a well known bird, of which, according to
Aristotle\textsuperscript{290}, there are not less than ten sorts: Pliny\textsuperscript{291} says sixteen; it has
its name in Hebrew from flying, it being a bird that flies very swiftly; (see
\textsuperscript{183926}Job 39:26) the hawk was a symbol of deity with the Egyptians, and was
reverenced and worshipped by them\textsuperscript{292}.

Ver. 17. \textit{And the little owl, and the cormorant, and the great owl.}\]
Ainsworth translates the words just the reverse, and takes the first word to
signify the great owl, and the last the little one; the great owl may intend
the great horn owl, called sometimes the eagle owl, which is thus
described; it is of the size of a goose, and has large wings, capable of
extending to a surprising breadth: its head is much of the size and figure of that of a cat, and has clusters of black feathers over the ears, rising to three fingers’ height; its eyes are very large, and the feathers of its rump long, and extremely soft; its eyes have yellow irises, and its beak black and crooked: it is all over mottled with white, reddish, and black spots; its legs are very strong, and are hairy down to the very ends of the toes, their covering being of a whitish brown: and as this is called the great horn owl, others, in comparison of it, may be called the little owl. Some reckon several species of owls—there are of three sizes; the large ones are as big as a capon, the middle sized are as big as a wood pigeon, the smaller sort about the size of an ordinary pigeon—the horned owl is of two kinds, a larger and a smaller—the great owl is also of two sorts, that is, of a larger and a smaller kind; it is a bird sacred to Minerva: but though it is pretty plain that the last of the words used signifies a bird that flies in the twilight of the evening, from whence it seems to have its name, as Aben Ezra, Ben Gersom, and other Jewish writers observe, and fitly agrees with the owl which is not seen in the day, but appears about that time; yet the first is thought by Bochart to be the “onocrotalus” or “pelican”, which has under its bill a bag or sack, which will hold a large quantity of anything; and the word here used has the signification of a cup or vessel, (see Psalm 102:6). The word we render “cormorant”, the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan paraphrase it, a drawer of fish out of the sea, so Baal Hatturim; and thus it is interpreted in the Talmud; and the gloss upon it says, this is the water raven, which is the same with the cormorant; for the cormorant is no other than “corvus aquaticus”, or water raven; (see Gill on Zephaniah 2:14”). The Septuagint render it by “catarrhactes”, which, according to the description of it, resides by rocks and shores that hang over water; and when it sees fishes swimming in it, it will fly on high, and contract its feathers, and flounce into the water, and fetch out the fish; and so is of the same nature, though not the same creature with the cormorant. Aben Ezra observes, that some say this is a bird which casts its young as soon as born; and this is said of the “catarrhactes”, that it lets down its young into the sea, and draws them out again, and hereby inures them to this exercise.

Ver. 18. And the swan, etc.] This is a bird well known to us, but it is a question whether it is intended by the word here used; for though it is so rendered in the Vulgate Latin, it is differently rendered by many others: the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem call it “otia”, which seems to be the
same with the “otus” of Aristotle, who says it is like an owl, having a tuft of feathers about its ears (from whence it has its name); and some call it “nycticorax”, or the owl; and here, by Bochart, and others, the owl called “noctua” is thought to be meant; and with which agrees the account some Jewish writers give of it, as Aben Ezra and Baal Hatturim, who say it is a bird, which every one that sees is astonished at it, as other birds are at the owl, are frightened at the sight of it, and stupefied. But as the same word is used (Leviticus 11:30) among the creeping things, for a mole, what Jarchi observes is worthy of consideration, that this is “calve (chauve) souris” (the French word for a bat), and is like unto a mouse, and flies in the night; and that which is spoken of among the creeping things is like unto it, which hath no eyes, and they call it “talpa”, a mole. The Septuagint version renders it by “porphyrian”, the redshank; and so Ainsworth; and is thought to be called by the Hebrew name in the text, from the blowing of its breath in drinking; for it drinks biting, as Aristotle says:

and the pelican; which has its name in Hebrew from vomiting; being said by Aben Ezra and Baal Hatturim to be a bird that vomits its food; and it is observed by several naturalists, of the pelican, that it swallows down shellfish, and after they have lain some time in its stomach, it vomits them up again; where having been heated, the shells open, and it picks out the meat:

and the gier eagle; or vulture eagle, the “gypoetos” of Aristotle, and who says it is called also “oripelargos”, or the mountain stork; and which Pliny also makes to be an eagle of the vulture kind. Dr. Shaw says, that near Cairo there are several flocks of the “ach bobba” (white father, differing little from the stork but in its colour), the “percnopterus” or “oripelargos”, which like the ravens about London feed upon carrion, and nastiness that is thrown without the city; this the Arabs call “rachama”, the same with µ j r , (Leviticus 11:18) and h mj r in (Deuteronomy 14:17) and whatever bird is here meant, it must be one that is tender toward its young, as its name signifies, as Aben Ezra and Baal Hatturim observe; and though both the eagle and the vulture are rapacious birds, yet have a great regard to their young; of the eagle (see Deuteronomy 32:11) and the vulture, with the Egyptians, was an “hieroglyphic” of a tender mother, or any merciful person; it being reported of it, that during the one hundred twenty days its young are under its care, it very rarely flies from them, being so solicitous of nourishing them; and that by making incisions in its thigh, it lets out a bloody flow of milk, when it has nothing
else to support them. The Talmudists say, that the bird “racham”, as it is here called, is the same with “serakrak”, and is by the Targum of Jonathan, and in the Syriac version, here rendered “serakraka”, so called from \( \gamma r \zeta \), which signifies to “squall”; and, according to Munster, is thought by some to be the “pica”, magpie, or rather the jay; and Dr. Shaw observes, that by a small transmutation of letters, that and the “shagarag” of the Arabs are the same; which he says is of the size and shape of a jay, though with a smaller bill, and shorter legs; the back is brownish; the head, neck, and belly, of a light green; and upon the wings and tail there are several spots or ringlets of a deep blue; it makes a “squalling” noise; and, he adds, it has no small affinity both in voice and plumage with the jay. The Septuagint version renders the word by the “swan”; which if not intended by the first word in this text, may by this, being kind to its young, though otherwise reckoned a cruel and unmerciful bird, as Bochart observes; some think the woodpecker is meant, so called from its love to its parents.

Ver. 19. And the stork, etc.]. A bird of passage, (Jeremiah 8:7) it has its name from kindness, which it exercises both to its dam, and to its young. Various writers speak of the kindness of these birds to their dams, which when they are old they take care of and feed them, to which the apostle is thought to allude, (1 Timothy 5:4) and its tenderness to its young is no less manifest: when the city of Delf in Holland was on fire, the storks were seen very busy to save their young from the flames, and which when they could not do, threw themselves into the midst of them, and perished with them, as Drusius from the Dutch historians relates. It is said to feed upon serpents; and hence by Virgil to be “invisa colubris”; and Juvenal says, it nourishes its young with them; and which may be a reason of its being forbid to be eaten, and is the reason given by the Mahometans for the prohibition of it; though on this account it was in great honour in Thessaly, that country being freed from serpents by it, and therefore they made it a capital crime to kill them, as Pliny relates; formerly people would not eat the stork, but at present it is much esteemed for the deliciousness of its flesh. The heron after her kind; this bird has its name in Hebrew from its being soon angry, as Aben Ezra observes; and Jarchi calls it the angry vulture or kite, as it is in the Talmud, and adds, and it appears to me to be what they call the “heron”, one sort of which named “asterias”, as there is one sort so called by Pliny; it becomes tame in Egypt, and so well
understands the voice of a man, as Aelianus reports, that if anyone by way of reproach calls it a servant or slothful, it is immediately exceeding angry. There are three kinds of herons, as both Aristotle and Pliny; and by a learned man of ours, their names are thus given, the criel or dwarf heron, the blue heron, and the bittour; some reckon nineteen:

*and the lapwing*; the upupa or hoopoe; it has its name in Hebrew, according to Jarchi, from its having a double crest; and so Pliny ascribes to it a double or folded crest, and speaks of it as a filthy bird; and, according to Aristotle and Aelian, its nest is chiefly made of human dung, that by the ill smell of it men may be kept from taking its young; and therefore may well be reckoned among impure fowl. Calmet says, there is no such thing as a lapwing to be seen in any part of England; but there are such as we call so, whether the same bird with this I cannot say:

*and the bat*; a little bird which flies in the night, Aben Ezra says; Kimchi describes it a mouse with wings, which flies in the night, and we sometimes call it the “flitter mouse”; it is a creature between a fowl and a beast; and, as Aristotle says, it partakes of both, and is of neither; and it is the only fowl, as Pliny observes, that has teeth and teats, that brings forth animals, and nourishes them with milk. It is a creature so very disagreeable, that one would think almost there was no need of a law to forbid the eating of it; and yet it is said by some to be eatable, and to be eaten, as Strabo affirms, yea, to be delicious food. It is asserted, that there is a sort of them in the east, larger than ordinary, and is salted and eaten— that there are bats in China as large as pullets, and are as delicate eating. Of these several fowls before mentioned, some are of the ravenous kind, and are an emblem of persecutors and covetous persons, and such as live by rapine and violence; others are of a lustful nature, and are an emblem of those who serve various lusts and pleasures, and give up themselves to uncleanness; others are night birds, and are a proper emblem of them whose works are works of darkness, and love darkness rather than the light; and others never rise higher than the earth, and so may denote earthly minded persons; and others live on impure things, and so fitly represent such who live an impure life; with all such the people of God are to have no fellowship.

Ver. 20. All fowls that creep, etc.] Or rather “every creeping thing that flies”; for what are designed are not properly fowls, but, as the Jewish
writers interpret them, flies, fleas, bees, wasps, hornets, locusts, etc. so the Targum of Jonathan, Jarchi, Ben Gersom, and Maimonides.

*going upon [all] four*; that is, upon their four feet, when they walk or creep:

*these shall be* an abomination to you; not used as food, but detested as such.

**Ver. 21. Yet these may ye eat, etc.]** Which are after described and named:

*of every flying creeping thing that goeth upon [all] four*; even though it is a creeping thing that flies and goes upon four feet, provided they be such, *which have legs above their feet, to leap withal upon the earth*; there is a double reading of this clause; the textual reading is, “which have not legs”, and is followed by several interpreters and translators; and the marginal reading, which we follow, is, “which have legs”; and both are to be regarded as true, and written by Moses, as Ainsworth observes; for locusts are born without legs, and yet creep low, as Pliny asserts, and they have them afterwards; and it is a canon of the Jews, that what have not legs or wings now, or have not wings to cover the greatest part of them, but shall have after a time when grown up, these are as free (to eat) now, as when grown up. Dr. Shaw thinks the words may bear this construction, “which have knees upon” or “above their [hinder] legs, to leap withal upon the earth”; and applying this to the locust afterwards, and only instanced in, he observes, that this has the two hindermost of its legs and feet much stronger, larger, and longer than any of the foremost. In them the knee, or the articulation of the leg and thigh, is distinguished by a remarkable bending or curvature, whereby it is able, whenever prepared, to jump, to spring, or raise itself up with great force and activity. And these Aristotle calls the leaping parts; and though he attributes to the locust six feet, as does also Pliny, yet he takes the two leaping parts into the account; whereas Moses distinguishes those two from the four feet; and so Austin observes, that Moses does not reckon among the feet the two hinder thighs with which locusts leap, which he calls clean, and thereby distinguishes them from such unclean flying creatures which do not leap with their thighs, such as beetles; and so the Jewish writers always describe a clean locust as having four feet, and two legs, thighs, or knees. Maimonides gives three signs of them, which are these, whatsoever has four feet and four wings, which cover the greatest part of its body in
length, and the greatest part of the compass of it, and has two thighs or
knees to leap with, they are of the clean kind; and although its head is long,
and it hath a tail, if its name is “chagob” (a locust) it is clean.

Ver. 22. [Even] these of them ye may eat, etc] The four following ones,
which seem to be no other than four sorts of locusts:

the locust after his kind; this is the common locust, called by the name of
Arbeh, from the great multiplication and vast multitudes of them; the
phrase, “after his kind”, and which also is used in all the following
instances, signifies the whole entire species of them, which might be eaten:

and the bald locust after his kind; which in the Hebrew text is Soleam, and
has its name, as Aben Ezra suggests, from its ascending rocks: but since
locusts do not climb rocks, or have any peculiar regard for them, rather this
kind of locust may be so called, from their devouring and consuming all
that come in their way, from the Chaldee word μ[ l s , which signifies
to swallow, devour, and consume; but why we should call it the bald locust
is not so clear, though it seems there were such, since the Jews describe
some that have no baldness, which the gloss explains, whose head is not bald,
which shows that some are bald; and so, this is described by
Kimchi, it has an eminence, a rising, or bunch upon it; some render it
baldness, and it hath no tail, and its head is long; and so Ben Melech:

and the beetle after his kind; which is another sort of locust called
Chargol, and should not be rendered a beetle, for no sort of beetles are
eatable, nor have legs to leap withal, and so come not under the general
description given of such flying, creeping things, fit to eat: Kimchi says it is
one kind of a locust, and Hiscuni derives its name from d j t and l gr ,
because it strives to leap with its feet, which answers to the above
descriptive character: the Septuagint and Vulgate Latin versions, and some
others, render it by Ophiomachus, a fighter with serpents, to which the
locust is an enemy, and kills them, taking fast hold of their jaws, as Pliny
says, and so Aristotle:

and the grasshopper after his kind; this is another, and the fourth kind of
the locust that might be eaten; its name is Chagab, from the Arabic word
Chaguba, “to vail”, locusts vailing the light of the sun: and according to the
Jewish doctors, it is a name which every locust fit to eat should have;
“among the locusts (fit for food) are these, who have four feet, and four wings and thighs, and wings covering the greatest part of them, and whose name is Chagab;”

and commentators say, it must be called by this name, as well as have those signs: the difference between these several sorts is with them this; the Chagab has a tail, but no bunch; Arbeh neither bunch nor tail; and Soleam has a bunch, but not a tail; and Chargol has both bunch and tail. Maimonides reckons up eight sorts of them fit to eat; and these creatures were not only eaten by the Jews, but by several other nations: with the Parthians they were very agreeable and grateful food, as Pliny relates; who also says, that some part of the Ethiopians live only upon them all the year, hardened in smoke, and with salt: Diodorus Siculus makes mention of the same, and calls them Acridophagi, locust eaters, and gives a particular account of their hunting and taking them, and preserving them for food; and so does Strabo; and the same Solinus relates of those that border on Mauritania; and they are still eaten in Barbary, where they dry them in ovens to preserve them, and then either eat them alone, or pounded and mixed with milk: their taste is said to be like shrimps; and Bochart has shown, from various writers, that they were a delicious food with the Greeks, especially among the common people; and so they are with the Indians.

Ver. 23. But all [other] flying creeping things, etc.] Excepting the four sorts before mentioned, wherefore we rightly supply the word “other”:

which have four feet; or more; the Vulgate Latin version adds, “only”, but wrongly; for those that have more are unclean, and forbidden to be eaten, excepting those in the preceding verse; and most creeping things that fly have six feet, as the locusts themselves, reckoning their leaping legs into the number; though it may be observed, that those creatures that have six feet have but four equal ones, on which they walk or creep; and the two foremost, which are longer, are as hands to them to wipe their eyes with, and protect them from anything that may fall into them and hurt them; they not being able to see clearly because of the hardness of their eyes, as Aristotle observes, and particularly it may be remarked of the fly, as it is by Lucian, that though it has six feet it only goes on four, using the other two foremost as hands; and therefore you may see it walking on four feet, with something eatable in its hands, lifting them up on high, just after
the manner of men: now all such creatures that have four feet or more, excepting the above,

[shall be] an abomination unto you; abhorred as food, and abstained from.

Ver. 24. And for these ye shall be unclean, etc.] That is, for eating them; or should they eat them they would be unclean:

whosoever toucheth the carcass of them shall be unclean until the even; not only he was unclean that ate them, but he that even touched their dead bodies was reckoned unclean; might not go into the tabernacle, nor have conversation with men, nor eat of the holy things, which were forbid men in any uncleanness; and though there is no mention of his washing himself, it may be understood, this being a short or concise way of speaking, as Aben Ezra observes; who adds, that it was necessary that he should wash himself in water; which was typical of washing and cleansing by the grace and blood of Christ, without which a man cannot be cleansed from the least sin, and pollution by it; and may signify that during the legal dispensation there was no proper cleansing from sin, until the evening of the world, when Christ came and shed his blood for the cleansing of it.

Ver. 25. And whosoever beareth [ought] of the carcass of them, etc.] That carries them from one place to another, out of the camp, city, village, or house or field where they may lie; and though this is done with a good design, as being offensive or infectious, yet such an one shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even; from whence both Jarchi and Aben Ezra infer, that the pollution by hearing or carrying is greater than that by touching; since such a man, so defiled, was obliged to wash his clothes as well as his body; so saints, that have contracted pollution by any manner of sin, are to wash their garments and make them white in the blood of the Lamb, (Revelation 7:14).

Ver. 26. [The carcasses] of every beast which divideth the hoof, and is not cloven footed, etc.] As the camel:

nor cheweth the cud; though it may divide the hoof, as the swine; and on the other hand, such as may chew the cud, and yet not dividing the hoof, as the coney and hare; for the Scripture here, as Aben Ezra observes again, uses a short and concise way of speaking: these
[are] unclean unto you; to be reckoned by them such, and neither to be eaten nor touched:

everyone that toucheth them shall be unclean; until the evening; and obliged to washing, though not expressed: this is not to be understood of touching them while alive, as some Sadducees or Karaites understand it, according to Aben Ezra; for camels, horses, mules, etc. might be, and were rode upon, and so touched; but of them when dead, or their carcases, as is rightly supplied in the beginning of the verse; and the Jewish writers understand this of the flesh of the carcass only, not of the bones, horns, and hoofs, which, they say, do not defile, only the flesh: this is repeated from (Leviticus 11:8).

Ver. 27. Whatsoever goeth upon his paws, etc.] Or “the palms” of his hands; meaning such creatures, whose feet are not divided into two parts, but into many, like the fingers of an hand, as apes, lions, bears, wolves, foxes, dogs, cats, etc.

among all manner of beasts that go on [all] four; this is added, to distinguish them from fowl, such as are clean; who walk but on two feet, though their feet are divided into fingers or talons, and may be called hands on which they walk:

these [are] unclean unto you: and as they might not be eaten, so neither touched, as follows:

whoso toucheth their carcass shall be unclean until the even; (see Gill on “Leviticus 11:24”).

Ver. 28. And he that beareth the carcass of them, etc.] Carries it upon any account, from place to place:

shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even; as he that bore the carcases of any of the flying creeping things, (Leviticus 11:25)

they are unclean to you; even the carcases of the one and of the other; and to all the Israelites, men, women, and children, as Aben Ezra observes.

Ver. 29. These also [shall be] unclean unto you among the creeping things that creep upon the earth, etc.] As distinguished from those creeping things that fly, these having no wings as they; and which were equally unclean, neither to be eaten nor touched, neither their blood, their skin, nor their flesh, as the Targum of Jonathan paraphrases it: and the
Misnic doctors say that the blood of a creeping thing and its flesh are joined together: and Maimonides observes, that this is a fundamental thing with them, that the blood of a creeping thing is like its flesh; which in Siphre (an ancient book of theirs) is gathered from what is said in (Leviticus 11:29) “these shall be unclean”, etc. hence the wise men say, the blood of a creeping thing pollutes as its flesh: the creeping things intended are as follow:

*the weasel, and the mouse, and the tortoise after his kind*; the first of these, “the weasel”, a creature well known; there are two sorts of it, as Pliny says, the field weasel, and the house weasel; the former are called by the Jewish writers the weasel of the bushes, and the latter the weasel that dwells in the foundations of houses; and of the former there was a doubt among some of them whether it was a species of the eight reptiles in (Leviticus 11:29) or whether it was a species of animals, and which, Maimonides says, is a species of foxes like to weasels: Bochart thinks the mole is intended; but the generality of interpreters understand it of the weasel; and so Jarchi and Kimchi, and Philip Aquinas, interpret it by “mustela”, the weasel: however, all agree the second is rightly interpreted “the mouse”; which has its name in Hebrew from its being a waster and destroyer of fields; an instance of which we have in (1 Samuel 6:5 (see Gill on “1 Samuel 6:5”)); so that this sort may be chiefly intended, though it includes all others, who are distinguished by their colours, the black, the red, and the white, which are all mentioned by Jonathan in his paraphrase of the text: this animal, as a learned physician expresses it, eats almost everything, gnaws whatever it meets with, and, among other things, is a great lover of swine’s flesh, which was an abomination to the Jews; nor does it abstain from dung, and therefore it is no wonder it should be reckoned among impure creatures; and yet we find they were eaten by some people, (see Isaiah 66:17) especially the dormouse; for which the old Romans made conveniences to keep them in, and feed them, and breed them for the table: so rats in the West Indies are brought to market and sold for food, as a learned author of undoubted credit assures us, who was an eyewitness of it: the last in this text, “the tortoise”, means the land tortoise; it has its name from the shell with which it is covered, this word being sometimes used for a covered wagon, (Numbers 7:3) there are various kinds of them, as Pliny and other writers observe, and who, as Strabo and Mela also, speak of a people they call Chelonophagi, or tortoise eaters: a tortoise of the land kind is esteemed a very delicate dish:
Dr. Shaw, speaking of the land and water tortoises in Barbary, says, the former, which hides itself during the winter months, is very palatable food, but the latter is very unwholesome: the Septuagint version renders it, the “land crocodile”, which, is approved of by Bochart: and Leo Africanus says, that many in Egypt eat the flesh of the crocodile, and affirm it to be of good savour; and so Benzon says, its flesh is white and tender, and tastes like veal; though some among them, as Strabo asserts, have a great antipathy and hatred to them; and others worship them as gods, and neither can be supposed to eat them; the land crocodiles are eaten by the Syrians, as Jerom affirms, for those feeding on the sweetest flowers, as is said, their entrails are highly valued for their agreeable odour: Jarchi says, it is a creature like a frog; he means a toad; so Philip Aquinas and many render the word: Dr. Shaw takes the creature designed to be the sharp-scaled tailed lizard.

Ver. 30. And the ferret, etc.] Whatever creature is here meant, it has its name in Hebrew from the cry it makes; and so the ferret has but one note in its voice, which is a shrill, but small, whining cry: it is used to drive rabbits out of their holes: the Septuagint and Vulgate Latin versions render the word by “mygale”, the weasel mouse, or “mus areneus” of the Latins, the shrew or shrew mouse: it has something of the mouse and weasel, from whence it has its name in Greek, being of the size of the one, and the colour of the other: but Bochart is of opinion, that a sort of lizard called “stellio”, an evet or newt, is meant; one sort of which, according to Pliny, makes a bitter noise and screaming:

and [the] chameleon; this is a little creature like a lizard, but with a larger and longer head; it has four feet, and on each foot three claws; its tail is long; with this, as well as with its feet, it fastens itself to the branches of trees; its tail is flat, its nose long, and made in an obtuse point; its back is sharp, its skin plaited and jagged like a saw, from the neck to the last joint of the tail, and upon its head it hath something like a comb; in other respects it is made like a fish; that is to say, it has no neck; what is said of its living on air, and changing colour according to what it is applied, are now reckoned vulgar mistakes: but whatever creature is here meant, it seems to have its name in Hebrew from its strength, wherefore Bochart takes the “guaril” or “alwarlo” of the Arabs to be meant; which is the stoutest and strongest sort of lizard, and is superior in strength to serpents, and the land tortoise, with which it often contends:
and the lizard; so Jarchi interprets the word by a “lizard”; it has a larger letter than usual in it, that this creature might be taken notice of, and guarded against as very pernicious, and yet with some people it is eaten: Calmet says \(^{f388}\), there are several sorts of lizards, which are well known: there are some in Arabia of a cubit long, but in the Indies there are some, they say, of twenty four feet in length: in America, where they are very good, they eat them: one lizard is enough to satisfy four men: and so in the West Indies, says Sir Hans Sloane \(^{f389}\), I was somewhat surprised to see serpents, rats, and lizards sold for food, and that to understanding people, and of a very good and nice palate; and elsewhere \(^{f390}\), he says, all nations inhabiting these parts of the world (the West Indies) do the same: “Guanes” or “lizards” are very common in Jamaica, and eaten there, and were of great use when the English first took this island, being, as I was assured, says he, commonly sold by the first planters for half a crown apiece: Dr. Shaw \(^{f391}\) says, that he was informed that more than 40,000 persons in Cairo, and in the neighbourhood, live upon no other food than lizards and serpents, though he thinks \(^{f392}\), because the chameleon is called by the Arabs “taitah”, which differs little in name from h a j l , “letah”, here; that therefore that, which is indeed a species of the lizard, might, with more propriety, be substituted for it:

and the snail; so the word is rendered by Jarchi, on the place, and by Kimchi, and Philip Aquinas, and David de Pomis, in their lexicons; and these creatures, though forbid to the Jews, yet are not only used for medicine, but also for food by many: snails of several kinds, we are told, are eaten with much satisfaction in Italy and France: in Silesia they make places for the breeding of them at this day, where they are fed with turnip tops, etc. and carefully preserved for the market; and the Romans took care of them in the same manner \(^{f393}\): Bochart \(^{f394}\) thinks a kind of lizard is meant, which lies in sand, called by the Arabs “chulaca”, or “luchaca”, because the word here used signifies, in the Talmudic \(^{f395}\) language, sandy ground:

and the mole; and so it is interpreted by Onkelos and Jarchi here, and by David de Pomis, and Philip Aquinas, in their lexicons: the same word is used for a certain sort of fowl, which we translate the “swan”; \(^{f388}\) (Leviticus 11:18) but here of a creeping thing: whatever is intended by it, it seems to have its name from its breath; either in a contrary signification, if understood of the mole, which either holds its breath, or breathes not while under ground; or from its breathing more freely,
wherefore Bochart \(^{f396}\) takes it to be the “chameleon”; which, as Pliny \(^{f397}\) says, is always gaping with its mouth for air; and it has been a vulgar notion, though a wrong one, that it lives upon it: the Targum of Jonathan interprets it by the “salamander”; now whoever ate any of the above eight creeping things, according to the Jewish canons, was to be beaten \(^{f398}\).

**Ver. 31.** _These are unclean to you of all that creep, etc._] Unfit for food, and not to be touched, at least when dead, as in the next clause, that is, these eight sorts of creeping things before mentioned, as the Targum of Jonathan expresses it, and these only, as Maimonides says \(^{f399}\):

*whosoever doth touch them when they are dead shall be unclean until the even;* for touching them while alive did not defile, only when dead; and this the Jews interpret, while they are in the case in which they died, that is, while they are moist; for, as Ben Gersom says, if they are so dry, as that they cannot return to their moisture, they do not defile; for which reason, neither the bones, nor nails, nor nerves, nor skin of these creeping things, defile; but, they say \(^{f400}\), while the back bone is whole, and the bones cleave to it, then a creeping thing is reckoned moist, and while it is so it defiles.

**Ver. 32.** _And upon whatsoever [any] of them, when they are dead, doth fall, it shall be unclean, etc._] Any of the above eight creeping things, that is, of their flesh, for as for their bones, nails, nerves, and skin, as before observed, being separated from them and dry, they do not defile:

*whether [it be] any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack;* every wooden vessel, as the Targum of Jonathan; and all sorts of clothes, of woollen, linen, or silk, and all sorts of skins, excepting skins of sea beasts; for these, according to the Jews \(^{f401}\), received no pollution; and also sacks or sackcloth, made of goats’ hair, and the like:

*whatsoever vessel [it be], wherein any work is done;* any tool or instrument made use of by any artificer in his trade, or any vessel wrought by him:

*it must be put into water;* dipped into it, even into forty seahs of water, according to the Targum of Jonathan; and which is to be understood, not of any working tool, or finished vessel only, but of any vessel of wood, raiment, skin, or sack, before mentioned:

*it shall be unclean until the even;* even though put into water and washed:
so it shall be cleansed; in the above manner, by being put or dipped into water; or “afterwards”, as the Septuagint, when it has been dipped and the even is come, and not before.

Ver. 33. And every earthen vessel, whereinto [any] of them falleth, etc.] Any of the above eight reptiles, should they by chance fall into the midst an earthen vessel:

whatsoever [is] in it shall be unclean; if it only by falling touched the outside of it, it was not unclean; but if it fell into it, then whatever was contained in it was unclean; for, as Jarchi says, an earthen vessel does not pollute or receive pollution, but from the air of it from its inside:

and ye shall break it; other vessels might be put into water and rinsed, and so be cleansed, but earthen vessels, being of no great value, were to be broken in pieces: an emblem this, as Ainsworth suggests, of the dissolution of our bodies, which are as earthen vessels, and of the destruction of sin thereby, and of the entire removal of it by death.

Ver. 34. Of all meat which may be eaten, etc.] Which otherwise is lawful to eat and fit for food, whether herbs, or whether the flesh of clean creatures:

[that] on which [such] water cometh shall be unclean; that is, such water as is put into an unclean vessel, become so by the fall of any unclean reptile into it; wherefore such water poured out upon any sort of food, clean and fit to eat, or that is put into such water, to be dressed, it becomes unclean and unfit to eat; for the vessel, being unclean, defiles the water, and the water defiles the food: Jarchi interprets this of water in general, which coming upon anything eatable, prepares it for uncleanness;

“we learn (says he) that no food is fit and prepared to receive defilement until water comes upon it once; and after it is come upon it once, it receives defilement for ever, even though it becomes dry;”

but the former seems to be the true sense:

and all drink that may be drank in every such vessel shall be unclean; whatever otherwise might be lawfully drank, yet being put into such a vessel, into which any unclean reptile was fallen, or being in it when it fell into it, became unclean and not fit to be drank; and those liquors which
receive uncleanness, and make meats unclean by coming on them, according to the Misnic doctors, are these seven, dew, water, wine, oil, blood, milk, and honey.

Ver. 35. And everything whereupon [any part] of their carcass falleth shall be unclean, etc.] Before the Scripture seems to speak of anyone of the reptiles perfect, that falling upon anything should pollute it; but here of any part of them, though ever so small, which should, through any accident, fall and light upon anything, even that would render it unclean and unfit for use:

[whether it be] oven, [or] ranges of pots; the one to bake bread in, and the other to boil flesh in, as Aben Ezra observes:

they shall be broken down; and no more made use of for baking and boiling:

[for] they are unclean, and shall be unclean to you; were made hereby unfit for use, and should not be used: the Jewish writers explain the phrase, “to you”, to your necessity, that which they had need of, but now should not use nor receive advantage from; even “to you”; all men, women, and children, as Hiskuni interprets it: all this was ordered to create in them an abhorrence of these creatures, and to make them cautious of eating and touching them, and careful that they come not nigh, or touched, or fell upon anything, since it would give them so much trouble, as well as occasion loss.

Ver. 36. Nevertheless, a fountain or pit, [wherein there is] plenty of water, etc.] Or, “a fountain or pit, a collection of waters”, the copulative being wanting, as some observe, Aben Ezra takes notice of; or it may be by way of apposition, and so may explain what fountain or pit is meant, even such an one where there is a large continence of water, into which, if any carcass of a creeping thing fell, or any part of it, yet it

shall be clean; and fit for use, either because of the abundance of water in it, which could not be affected with the fall of such a creature into it as where there is but a small quantity; or rather this exception was made, because pools of water were of considerable value in these countries, and frequently in use for bathings, etc. and therefore for the good of men, and that they might not suffer so great a loss by such an accident, they are declared notwithstanding to be clean and free for use: hence you may learn, says Jarchi, that he that dips in them is pure from his uncleanness; that a
man might lawfully make use of them for a bath on account of any uncleanness, notwithstanding the carcass of a creeping thing had fallen into it; as a mouse, or rat, or any such creature:

*but that which toucheth their carcass shall be unclean*; not the waters which touch the carcass, as Aben Ezra interprets it, for then the whole would be defiled, and unfit for use; but either the man that touched the carcass, laid hold upon it to pluck it out of the fountain or pit, or that which he made use of to get it out, or both these, were unclean in a ceremonial sense: the Targum of Jonathan is,

“but he that toucheth their carcasses in the midst of these waters shall be unclean.”

**Ver. 37. And if [any part] of their carcass fall upon any sowing seed that is to be sown, etc.]** That which is selected from the other seed in order to be sown, and which is laid by and laid up for that purpose; should the carcass, or any part of the carcass of a creeping thing fall upon an heap of it, into a vessel in which it was put, as a dead mouse or the like:

*yet it shall be clean*; be fit for use and sown in the earth; because being cast into the earth, and dying and quickening there, and then springing up again in stalk and ear, it would go through various changes before it became the food of man: the Targum of Jonathan describes it, such as is sown in its dryness, or being dry; for if it was wetted it was unfit for use, as follows.

**Ver. 38. But if [any] water be put upon the seed, etc.]** Either accidentally or on purpose; whether on sowing seed, and with water with which they water the field, as Aben Ezra interprets it; or on seed used for food, by steeping it in water, as sometimes wheat is, and boiled; and whether it is water or the rest of the liquors, and whether they are put on the seed, or the seed falls into them, it matters not, as Jarchi says:

*and [any part] of their carcass fall thereon*; that is, on the seed, though Aben Ezra observes, some say upon the water: the Targum of Jonathan adds, in its moisture, or while it is wet; and so may be thought to be more susceptible of impurity from the touch of a dead reptile, or any part of it, and which would render it unfit for sowing or eating, until it was dried and cleansed; yea, Jarchi says, if it falls thereon, even after it is dried:

*it [shall be] unclean unto you*; unfit for use.
Ver. 39. *And if any beast of which ye may eat die*, etc.] Any clean beast, as the ox, sheep, goat, deer, etc. what, if rightly killed, is very lawful to eat of; but if it died of itself through any distemper, or was torn by the wild beasts, so the Targum of Jonathan:

*he that toucheth the carcass thereof shall be unclean until the even*; not the bones, nerves, horns, hoofs, or skin, as Jarchi observes; these might be handled, because some of them, at least, were wrought up into one instrument or another, by artificers, for use and service, but the flesh of them might not be touched; whoever did touch it was ceremonially unclean, and might not go into the sanctuary, or have conversation with men, until the evening of the day in which this was done.

Ver. 40. *And he that eateth of the carcass of it*, etc.] For though it might be eaten, if rightly killed, yet not if it died of itself, or was strangled, or torn to pieces by wild beasts:

*shall wash his clothes*; besides his body, which even he that touched it was obliged to:

*and be unclean until the even*; though he and his clothes were washed, and he might not go into the court of the tabernacle, or have any concern with holy things, or conversation with men:

*he also that beareth the carcass of it*; removes it from one place to another, carries it to the dunghill, or a ditch, and there lays it, or buries it in the earth:

*shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even*; from whence, as before observed by the Jewish writers, uncleanness by bearing is greater than uncleanness by touching, since the former obliged to washing of clothes, not so the latter; so Jarchi here; and yet still was unclean until the evening, though he had washed himself in water, as Aben Ezra notes; and so says Jarchi, though he dips himself, he has need of the evening of the sun.

Ver. 41. *And every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth*, etc.] Nothing is called a creeping thing, as Jarchi says, but what is low, has short feet, and is not seen unless it creeps and moves: and “every creeping thing” comprehends, as Aben Ezra and Ben Gersom observe, the eight creeping things before mentioned, (Leviticus 11:29,30) and mention is made of them here, that they might not be eaten, which is not expressed before; and
being described as creeping things “on the earth”, is, according to Jarchi, an exception of worms in pease, beans, and lentiles; and, as others observe, in figs and dates, and other fruit; for they do not creep upon the earth, but are within the food; but if they go out into the air, and creep, they are forbidden:

[shall be] an abomination; detested and abhorred as food:

it shall not be eaten; it shall not be lawful to eat such a creature. This, as Jarchi, is binding upon him that causes another to eat, as well as he that eats, the one is guilty as the other. And indeed such are not fit to eat, and cannot be wholesome and nourishing; for, as a learned physician observes \(^{f405}\), insects consist of particles exceeding small, volatile, unfit for nourishment, most of them live on unclean food, and delight in dung, and in the putrid flesh of other animals, and by laying their little eggs or excrements, corrupt honey, syrups, etc. (see \(^{211001}\) Ecclesiastes 10:1) and yet some sorts of them are eaten by some people. Sir Hans Sloane, after having spoken of serpents, rats, and lizards, sold for food to his great surprise at Jamaica, adds \(^{f406}\), but what of all things most unusual, and to my great admiration, was the great esteem set on a sort of “cossi” or timber worms, called cotton tree worms by the negroes and the Indians, the one the original inhabitants of Africa, and the other of America; these, he says \(^{f407}\), are sought after by them, and boiled in their soups, pottages, olios, pepper pots, and are accounted of admirable taste, like to, but much beyond marrow; yea, he observes \(^{f408}\), that not they only, but the most polite people in the world, the Romans, accounted them so great a dainty, as to feed them with meal, and endeavour breeding them up. He speaks \(^{f409}\) also of ants, so large as to be sold in the markets in New Granada, where they are carefully looked after, and bought up for food; and says, the negroes feed on the abdomen of these creatures: he observes \(^{f410}\), that field crickets were found in baskets among other provisions of the Indians.

Ver. 42. Whatsoever goeth upon the belly, etc.] Jarchi’s paraphrase is, “whatsoever goeth”, as worms and beetles, and the like to them, “upon the belly”, this is the serpent; and to go upon the belly is the curse denounced upon it, (\(^{010314}\) Genesis 3:14) this and every such creature are forbidden to be eaten; as there are others who either have no feet, or what they have so short, that they seem to go upon their belly; and yet, as horrible and detestable as the serpent is, it has been the food of some, and accounted very delicious, as by a people mentioned by the Arabic geographer \(^{f411}\).
Mela speaks of a people, who, from their eating serpents, were called Ophiophagi, serpent eaters; and Pliny says of the Troglodytes, that the flesh of serpents was their food. The Spaniards, when they first found out the West Indies, going ashore on the isle of Cuba, found certain spits of wood lying at the fire, having fish on them, about one hundred pound weight, and two serpents of eight feet long, differing nothing from the crocodiles in Egypt, but not so big; there is nothing, says my author, among the delicate dishes (of the natives of that place), they esteem so much as these serpents, insomuch that it is no more lawful for the common people to eat of them, than of peacocks and pheasants among us; the Spaniards at first durst not venture to taste of them, because of their horrible deformity and loathsomeness; but the brother of Columbus being allured by a sister of one of the kings of the country to taste of them, found them very delicious, on which he and his men fell to, and ate freely of them, affirming them to be of more pleasant taste than either our pheasants or partridges; and that there is no meat to be compared with the eggs of these serpents. Diodorus Siculus speaks of serpents in the island of Taprobane of great size, harmless to men, and whose flesh is eaten, and of a sweet savour:

*and whatsoever goeth upon [all] four;* that is, whatsoever creeping thing; for otherwise there are beasts that go upon all four that are clean and fit to eat; but this is observed to distinguish this sort of creeping things from those that go upon their belly, and from those that have more feet, as in the next clause; Jarchi particularly instances in the scorpion:

*or whatsoever hath mere feet among all creeping things that creep upon the earth;* such as caterpillars, and particularly the Scolopendra, which the eastern people call Nedal; so Jarchi says, this is Nedal, a reptile which hath feet from its head to its tail, called Centipeda; and the Targum of Jonathan is,

“from the serpent, to the Nedal or Scolopendra, which has many feet.”

Some of them, have seventy two, thirty six on a side, and others eighty four; some fewer, but all have many:

*them ye shall not eat, for they [are] an abomination;* abominable for food, and to be had in the utmost aversion.
Ver. 43. Ye shall not make yourselves abominable with any creeping thing that creepeth, etc.] With any creeping thing that flies in the air, excepting the four sorts of locusts, (Leviticus 11:22) and with any creeping thing in the waters, (Leviticus 11:10) or with anything that creeps on the land, by eating any of them; which being abominable for food, would make the eater of them so to God, he thereby breaking a command of his:

neither shall you make yourselves unclean with them; by touching and bearing them, as with dead beasts, so with dead flies and the like:

that ye should be defiled thereby; in a ceremonial sense.

Ver. 44. For I [am] the Lord your God, etc.] Their Lord, and therefore had a right to enjoin them what laws he pleased concerning their food; and their God, their covenant God, and therefore would consult their good, and direct them to what was most proper, convenient, and wholesome for them:

ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy, for I [am] holy; that is, separate themselves from all other people, and be distinct from them, by using a different diet from theirs, as their Lord and God was different from all others, so called; and thus by observing his commands, and living according to his will, and to his glory, they would be holy in a moral sense, as they ought to be, who were under the peculiar care and notice of a holy God, and so highly favoured by him; and particularly by attending to the above laws concerning food, they would be kept from mixing with, and having conversation with the Gentiles, and so be preserved from falling into idolatry, and continue a holy people, serving and worshipping the Lord their God, and him only; and which seems to be a principal view as to religion, in delivering out the above commands:

neither shall ye defile yourselves with any manner of creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth; which is repeated to keep them at the utmost distance from these things, and to fill them with an aversion to them, that they might be careful to avoid them. There is no penalty annexed to these laws, but the breach of them making them unclean, thereby they were debarred the use of the sanctuary, and of holy things, and of the conversation of men, for that day; but, according to the Jewish writers, such transgressions were punishable with stripes. Jarchi observes out of the Talmud⁴¹⁷, that he that eateth “putitha” (a small water reptile) was to be
beaten four times, and if an ant or pismire five times, and if a wasp or hornet six times.

**Ver. 45.** *For I am the Lord that bringeth you up out of the land of Egypt,* etc.] He had brought them out of it, and was now bringing them on in the wilderness towards Canaan’s land, in order to settle them there; and this is observed, to show what obligations they lay under to him to observe his commands; for since he had done such great things for them, it became them to be obedient to him in all things: and the more, since his end herein was, as he observes to them,

*to be your God;* to make it appear that he was their God, and they were his special people, whom he had chosen for himself above all people upon the earth; that he was their King and their God, to protect and defend them, to provide for them, and take care of them, and bestow all good things on them proper for them:

*ye shall therefore be holy, for I [am] holy,* separate from all others as he was, living holy lives and conversations, agreeably to his will made known to them, in imitation or him who had chosen and called them to be his people; for, since holiness is his nature, it becomes them who are his house and family, his subjects and people.

**Ver. 46.** *This [is] the law of the beasts,* etc.] Clean and unclean, what were to be eaten, and what not,

*and of the fowl;* (GLSEP Leviticus 11:2-8) the unclean ones, which are particularly mentioned that they might be avoided, all others excepting them being allowed, (GLSEP Leviticus 11:13-19):

*and of every living creature that moveth in the waters;* all sorts of fish in the sea, rivers, ponds, and pools, such as have fins and scales, these were to be eaten, but, if they had neither, were forbidden, (GLSEP Leviticus 11:9-12):

*and of every creature that creepeth upon the earth;* eight of which are mentioned particularly, which, when dead, defiled by touching; and all others are forbidden to be eaten, (GLSEP Leviticus 11:29-43) together with such creeping things that fly, excepting those that had legs above their feet to leap with, (GLSEP Leviticus 11:20-23). This is a recapitulation of the several laws respecting them, though not in the exact order in which they are delivered in this chapter.
Ver. 47. *To make a difference between the unclean and the clean, etc.*

Whether of beasts, fish, fowl, and flying creeping things:

*and between the beast that may be eaten, and the beast that may not be eaten;* the former clause takes in all in general, this instances in a particular sort of creatures; and the first mentioned of which, that might be eaten, are, that part the hoof, are cloven footed, and chew the cud; and that might not, that chew the cud, but divide not the hoof, or divide the hoof, but chew not the cud; and now, by such like descriptions and distinctions of the creatures treated of, the Israelites would be able to make a difference between the one and the other, and know what was to be eaten, and what not.
CHAPTER 12

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 12

This chapter treats of the purification of a new mother, the time of whose purification for a man child was forty days, and for a maid child eighty, (Leviticus 12:1-5) at the close of which she was to bring her offerings to the priests, to make atonement for her, (Leviticus 12:6-8).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] The laws in the preceding chapter were delivered both to Moses and Aaron, but what follows in this only to Moses; but inasmuch as the priest had a concern in it, it being his business to offer the sacrifices required by the following law, it was no doubt given to Moses, to be delivered to Aaron, as well as to the people. R. Semlai remarks, that as the creation of man was after that of the beasts, fowls, fishes, etc. so the laws concerning the uncleanness of men are after those relating to beasts, etc, and they begin with the uncleanness of a new mother, because, as Aben Ezra observes, the birth is the beginning of man: saying: as follows.

Ver. 2. Speak unto the children of Israel, etc.] For this law only concerned them, and not other nations of the world:

if a woman have conceived seed; by lying with a man, and so becomes pregnant, and goes on with her pregnancy until she brings forth a child. The Jews from hence gather, that this law respects abortions; that if a woman has conceived and miscarryes, eighty one days after the birth of a female, and forty one after a male, she must bring her offering; but the law seems only to regard such as are with child, and proceed to the due time of childbirth, whether then the child is born alive or dead:

and born a man child; which is, generally speaking, not only matter of joy to the mother, but to the whole family, (see John 16:21): then she shall be unclean seven days; be separate from all company, except those whose presence is necessary to take care of her in her circumstances, and do what is proper for her, and even these became ceremonially unclean thereby; yea,
her husband was not permitted to sit near her, nor to eat and drink with her:

*according to the days of the separation for her infirmity shall she be unclean;* the same number of days, even seven, she was unclean on account of childbirth, as she was for her monthly courses, called here an infirmity or sickness, incident to all females when grown up, at which time they were separate from all persons; and the case was the same with a new mother; (see Leviticus 15:14-29).

**Ver. 3. And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised.**] Or the foreskin of his flesh, that is, of the man child born according to the law, (Genesis 17:12) and this seems to furnish out a reason why a male child was not circumcised before the eighth day, and why it was then, because before that its mother was in her separation and uncleanness, and then was freed from it; and so the Targum of Jonathan. The circumcision of a male child on the eighth day was religiously observed, and even was not omitted on account of the sabbath, when the eighth day happened to be on that, (see Gill on “John 7:22-23”). It is an observation of Aben Ezra on this place, that the wise men say “in the day”, and not in the night, lo, he that is born half an hour before the setting of the sun is circumcised after six days and a half, for the day of the law is not from time to time.

**Ver. 4. And she shall continue in the blood of her purifying three and thirty days, etc.]** That is, so many more, in all forty; for though at the end of seven days she was in some respects free from her uncleanness, yet not altogether, but remained in the blood of her purifying, or in the purifying of her blood, which was more and more purified, and completely at the end of forty days: so with the Persians it is said, a new mother must avoid everything for forty days; when that time is passed, she may wash and be purified; and which perhaps Zoroastres, the founder of the Persian religion, at least the reformer of it, being a Jew, as is by some supposed, he might take it from hence:

*she shall touch no hallowed thing;* as the tithe, the heave offering, the flesh of the peace offerings, as Aben Ezra explains it, if she was a priest’s wife:

*nor come into the sanctuary;* the court of the tabernacle of the congregation, or the court of the temple, as the same writer observes; and
so with the Greeks, a pregnant woman might not come into a temple before the fortieth day, that is, of her delivery:

until the days of her purifying be fulfilled; until the setting of the sun of the fortieth day; on the morrow of that she was to bring the atonement of her purification, as Jarchi observes; (see Gill on "<031206>Leviticus 12:6").

Ver. 5. But if she bear a maid child, etc.] A daughter, whether born alive or dead, if she goes with it her full time:

then she shall be unclean two weeks; or fourteen days running; and on the fifteenth day be free or loosed, as the Targum of Jonathan, just as long again as for a man child:

as in her separation; on account of her monthly courses; the sense is, that she should be fourteen days, to all intents and purposes, as unclean as when these are upon her:

and she shall continue in the blood of her purifying sixty and six days; which being added to the fourteen make eighty days, just as many more as in the case of a male child; the reason of which, as given by some Jewish writers, is, because of the greater flow of humours, and the corruption of the blood through the birth of a female than of a male: but perhaps the truer reason may be, what a learned man suggests, that a male infant circumcised on the eighth day, by the profusion of its own blood, bears part of the purgation; wherefore the mother, for the birth of a female, must suffer twice the time of separation; the separation is finished within two weeks, but the purgation continues sixty six days; a male child satisfies the law together, and at once, by circumcision; but an adult female bears both the purgation and separation every month. According to Hippocrates, the purgation of a new mother, after the birth of a female, is forty two days, and after the birth of a male thirty days; so that it should seem there is something in nature which requires a longer time for purifying after the one than after the other, and which may in part be regarded by this law; but it chiefly depends upon the sovereign will of the lawgiver. The Jews do not now strictly observe this. Buxtorf says, the custom prevails now with them, that whether a woman bears a male or a female, at the end of forty days she leaves her bed, and returns to her husband; but Leo of Modena relates, that if she bears a male child, her husband may not touch her for the space of seven weeks; and if a female, the space of three months;
though he allows, in some places, they continue separated a less while, according as the custom of the place is.

**Ver. 6. And when the days of her purifying are fulfilled, for a son, or for a daughter, etc.]** For a son forty days, and for a daughter eighty; but the ancient Jews formerly, that they might not break it, ordered, that the offering enjoined as follows should not be brought until the next day after the time was up: their canon runs thus \(^{f425}\),

“a new mother does not bring her offering on the fortieth day for a male, nor on the eightieth day for a female, but after her sun is set; and she brings her offering on the morrow, which is the forty first for a male, and the eighty first for a female; and this is the day of which it is said, “when the days”, etc. ([\(\text{\textcopyright}\) Leviticus 12:6].”

**She shall bring a lamb of the first year;** the Septuagint adds, without blemish, as all sacrifices should be, if not expressed; “or the son of his year” \(^{f426}\); some distinguish between “the son of a year”, as the phrase sometimes is, and “the son of his year”, as here; the latter denoting a lamb in its first year, though something wanting of it, the former a full year old, neither more nor less:

**for a burnt offering;** in gratitude, and by way of thanksgiving for the mercies she had received in childbearing:

**and a young pigeon, [or] a turtledove, for a sin [offering];** either the one or the other. With the Persians \(^{f427}\), it is incumbent on a new mother, in Abam (the twelfth month), to bring twelve oblations for the sin which proceedeth from childbirth, that so she might be purified from her sins. It is an observation of the Misnic doctors \(^{f428}\), that turtles precede pigeons in all places; upon which they ask this question, is it because they are choicer or more excellent than they? observe what is said, ([\(\text{\textcopyright}\) Leviticus 12:6]) from whence may be learned, that they are both alike, or of equal value. But why a sin offering for childbearing? is it sinful to bear and bring forth children in lawful marriage, where the bed is undefiled? The Jews commonly refer this to some sin or another, that the childbearing woman has been guilty of in relation to childbirth, or while in her labour; and it is not unlikely that she may sometimes be guilty of sin in some way or other, either through an immoderate desire after children, or through impatience and breaking out into rash expressions in the midst of her pains; so Aben Ezra suggests, perhaps some thought rose up in her mind in the hour of childbirth because
of pain, or perhaps spoke with her mouth; meaning what was unbecoming, rash, and sinful. Some take the sin to be a rash and false oath: but there seems to be something more than all this, because though one or other of these might be the case of some women, yet not all; whereas this law is general, and reached every new mother, and has respect not so much to any particular sin of her’s, as of her first parent Eve, who was first in the transgression; and on account of which transgression pains are endured by every childbearing woman; and who also conceives in sin, and is the instrument of propagating the corruption of nature to her offspring; and therefore was to bring a sin offering typical of the sin offering Christ is made to take away that, and all other sin; whereby she shall be saved, even in childbearing, and that by the birth of a child, the child Jesus, if she continues in faith, and charity, and holiness, with sobriety, (1 Timothy 2:15) these offerings were to be brought

unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, unto the priest; to offer them up for her. When the temple was built, these were brought to the eastern gate, the gate Nicanor, where the lepers were cleansed, and new mothers purified.

Ver. 7. Who shall offer it before the Lord, etc.] Upon the altar of burnt offering:

and make an atonement for her; for whatsoever sin in connection with or that attended childbearing; as typical of the atonement by Christ both for sin original and actual:

and she shall be cleansed from the issue of her blood; in a ceremonial sense, and according to that law be pure and clean:

this [is] the law for her that hath born a male or a female; enjoined her, and to be observed by her; and though now with the rest of the ceremonial law it is abolished, yet it has this instruction in it; that it becomes women in such circumstances to bring the freewill offerings of their lips, their sacrifices of praise, and in a public manner signify their gratitude and thankfulness for the mercy and goodness of God vouchsafed to them, in carrying them through the whole time of childbearing, and saving them in the perilous hour.

Ver. 8. And if she be not able to bring a lamb, etc.] As everyone was not in circumstances sufficient to be at the expense of buying a lamb for this purpose, having none of their own:
then she shall bring two turtles, or two young pigeons; which was a kind and merciful provision for the poorer sort; since it was necessary that by them the favour received should be acknowledged, as well as the sin attending them in such circumstances should be atoned for. This being the offering brought by the mother of our Lord, shows the state of poverty in which she was; and by this, and the circumcision of her child, and the presentation of it before the Lord at the time of her purification, it appears that they were both under the law, and obedient to it:

the one for a burnt offering, and the other for a sin [offering]; Jarchi observes, that in oblations the sin offering goes before the burnt offering, for sin being atoned for, the gift was accepted; but here the burnt offering went first, the reason is not very apparent:

and the priest shall make an atonement for her, and she shall be clean; equally the same as if she had brought a lamb, instead of young pigeons, or turtledoves.
CHAPTER 13

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 13

In this chapter an account is given of the various sorts of leprosy, and the rules by which they were to be judged of, (Leviticus 13:1-3) of the bright spot and scab, (Leviticus 13:4-8) of the rising or swelling, (Leviticus 13:9-17) of the bile or hot ulcer, (Leviticus 13:18-23) of the hot burning or inflammation, (Leviticus 13:24-28) of the plague of the scall, (Leviticus 13:29-37) of bright spots or blisters, (Leviticus 13:38,39) and of shedding the hair, and baldness, (Leviticus 13:40-44) of what the leper was to do, and to be done unto, (Leviticus 13:45,46) of the leprosy in garments made of linen, woollen, or of skin, (Leviticus 13:47-59).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, etc.] Aaron is addressed again, though left out in the preceding law, because the laws concerning leprosy chiefly concerned the priests, whose business it was to judge of it, and cleanse from it; and so Ben Gersom observes, mention is made of Aaron here, because to him and his sons belonged the affair of leprosies, to pronounce unclean or clean, to shut up or set free, and, as Aben Ezra says, according to his determination were all the plagues or strokes of a man, who should be declared clean or unclean: saying; as follows.

Ver. 2. When a man shall have in the skin of his flesh, etc.] Rules are here given, by which a leprosy might be judged of; which, as a disease, was frequent in Egypt, where the Israelites had dwelt a long time, and from whence they were just come; and is doubtless the reason, as learned men have observed, that several Heathen writers make the cause of their expulsion from Egypt, as they choose to call it, though wrongly, their being infected with this distemper; whereas it was the reverse, not they, but the Egyptians, were incident to it. Moreover, the leprosy here spoken of seems not to be the same with that disease, or what we now call so, though some have thought otherwise; it being rather an uncleanness than a disease, and the business of a priest, and not a physician to attend unto; and did not
arise from natural causes, but was from the immediate hand of God, and was inflicted on men for their sins, as the cases of Miriam, Gehazi, and Uzziah show; and who by complying with the rites and ceremonies hereafter enjoined, their sins were pardoned, and they were cleansed; so that as their case was extraordinary and supernatural, their cure and cleansing were as remarkable: besides, this impurity being in garments and houses, shows it to be something out of the ordinary way. And this law concerning it did not extend to all men, only to the Israelites, and such as were in connection with them, such as proselytes. It is said \footnote{431}, all are defiled with the plague (of leprosy) except an idolater and a proselyte of the gate; and the commentators say \footnote{432}, even servants, and little ones though but a day old; that is, they are polluted with it, and so come under this law. Now the place where this disorder appears is “in the skin of the flesh”; that is, where there is a skin, and that is seen; for there are some places, the Jewish writers \footnote{433} say, are not reckoned the skin of the flesh, or where that is not seen, and such places are excepted, and they are these; the inside of the eye, of the ear, and of the nose: wrinkles in the neck, under the pap, and under the arm hole; the sole of the foot, the nail, the head and beard: and this phrase, “in the skin of his flesh”, is always particularly mentioned; and when there appeared in it

\textit{a rising, scab, or bright spot}; the scab that is placed between the rising or swelling, and the bright spot, belongs to them both, and is a kind of an accessory, or second to each of them: hence the Jews distinguish the scab of the swelling, and the scab of the bright spot; so that these make four in all, as they observe \footnote{434}. And to this agrees what Ben Gersom on this text remarks; the bright spot is, whose whiteness is as the snow; the rising or swelling is what is white, as the pure wool of a lamb of a day old; the scab is what is inferior in whiteness to the rising, and is as in the degree of the whiteness of the shell or film of an egg; and this is the order of these appearances, the most white is the bright spot, after that the rising, and after that the scab of the bright spot, and after that the scab of the rising or swelling; and, lo, what is in whiteness below the whiteness of this (the last) is not the plague of leprosy:

\textit{and it be in the skin of his flesh [like] the plague of leprosy}; either of the above appearances in the skin, having somewhat in them similar to the leprosy, or which may justly raise a suspicion of it, though it is not clear and manifest;
then he shall be brought to Aaron the priest, or unto one of his sons the priests; for, as Jarchi notes, there was no pollution nor purification of the leprosy, but by the mouth or determination of a priest. And a good man that was desirous, and made conscience of observing the laws of God, when he observed anything of the above in him, and had any suspicion of his case, would of himself go, and show himself to the priest; but if a man did not do this, and any of his neighbours observed the appearances on him, brought him to the priest whether he would or not, according to the text,

*he shall be brought*: that is, as Aben Ezra explains it, whether with or without his will; for he that sees in him one of the signs, shall oblige him to come to the priest; and who observes, that by Aaron the priest is meant, the priest anointed in his room; and by his sons the priests, the common priests, who are found without the sanctuary; such as the priests of Anathoth, but who were not of those that were rejected.

**Ver. 3.** *And the priest shall look on the plague in the skin of the flesh,* etc.] Whether it be a swelling, scab, or a bright spot that appears, and judge of it by the following rules, and none but a priest might do this:

*and [when] the hair in the plague is turned white:* it arising in a place where hair grows, and which hair is not naturally white, but of another colour, but changed through the force of the plague; and there were to be two hairs at least, which were at first black, but turned white; so Jarchi and Ben Gersom: and these hairs, according to the Misnah f435, must be white at bottom; if the root (or bottom) is black, and the head (or top) white, he is clean; if the root white, and the head black, he is defiled; for hairs turning white is a sign of a disorder, of weakness, of a decay of nature, as may be observed in ancient persons:

*and the plague in sight [be] deeper than the skin of his flesh:* appears plainly to view to be more than skin deep, to have corroded and eat into the flesh below the skin:

*it [is] a plague of leprosy:* when these two signs were observed, hair turned white, and the plague was more than skin deep, then it was a plain case that it was the leprosy of which (see Gill on “Matthew 8:2”) (see Gill on “Matthew 8:3”) (see Gill on “Luke 5:12”). This was an emblem of sin, and the corruption of nature, which is an uncleanness, and with which every man is defiled, and which renders him infectious,
nauseous, and abominable; and of which he is only to be cured and cleansed by Christ, the great High Priest, through his blood, which cleanses from all sin. The above signs and marks of leprosy may be observed in this; the white hair denoting a decay of strength, (see Hosea 7:9) may be seen in sinners, as in the leper, who are without moral and spiritual strength to keep the law of God, to do anything that is spiritually good, to regenerate, renew, convert, and sanctify themselves, or to bring themselves out of the state of pollution, bondage, and misery, in which they are; and, like the leprosy, sin lies deep in man; it is in his flesh, in which dwells no good thing, and in which there is no soundness; it does not lie merely in outward actions, but it is in the heart, which is desperately wicked; for the inward part of man is very wicked:

and the priest shall look on him, and pronounce him unclean; and so should be obliged to rend his clothes, make bare his head, put a covering on his upper lip, and cry, unclean, unclean; dwell alone without the camp, and at a proper time bring the offering for his cleansing, and submit to the several rites and ceremonies prescribed, (Leviticus 13:45,46 14:1-57).

Ver. 4. If the bright spot be white in the skin of his flesh, etc.] The Targum of Jonathan is, white as chalk in the skin of his flesh; but other Jewish writers make the whiteness of the bright spot to be the greatest of all, like that of snow; (see Gill on "Leviticus 13:2"):

and in sight [be] not deeper than the skin, and the hair thereof be not turned white; though it be a bright spot, and be very white, yet these two marks not appearing, it cannot be judged a leprosy, at most it is only suspicious: wherefore

then the priest, shall shut up [him that hath] the plague seven days; in whom the bright spot is, and of whom there is a suspicion of the plague of leprosy, but it is not certain; and therefore, in order to take time, and get further knowledge, the person was to be shut up from all company and conversation for the space of seven days; by which time it might be supposed, as Ben Gersom observes, that the case and state of the leprosy (if it was one) would be altered; and Aben Ezra remarks, that most diseases change or alter on the seventh day.

Ver. 5. And the priest shall look on him the seventh day, etc.] In the day, and not in the night, as Maimonides, but not on the seventh day, if it happened to be on the sabbath, then it was put off till after it; and,
according to the Jewish canons, they do not look upon plagues in the morning, nor in the evening, nor in the middle of a house, nor on a cloudy day, nor at noon, but at the fourth, fifth, eighth, and ninth hours:

*and, behold, [if] the plague in his sight be at a stay*; it appears to the priest, according to the strictest view he can take of it, that it is in the same state and condition it was, neither better nor worse:

*[and] the plague spread not in the skin*: is not greater or larger than it was, though not less:

*then the priest shall shut him up seven days more*; such abundant care was taken, lest after all it should prove a leprosy.

**Ver. 6. And the priest shall look on him again the seventh day, etc.*] On the second seventh day, at the end of a fortnight from his being first presented to him, and shut up:

*and, behold, [if] the plague [be] somewhat dark*; the spot be not so bright, or so white as it was at first; though Aben Ezra observes, that indeed many wise men say, that $\text{הִחָק}$ is as $\text{אֶצֶף}$, signifying dark, and the testimony or proof they bring is (Genesis 27:1) but according to my opinion, adds he, the word is the reverse of $\text{הָכַפ}$, to spread; and the sense is, if the plague does not spread itself in another place; and so some translators render it “contracted”, or “contracts itself”: and this seems best to agree with what follows:

*and the plague spread not in the skin*; but is as it was when first viewed, after waiting fourteen days, and making observations on it:

*the priest shall pronounce him clean*; that is, from leprosy, otherwise there was an impure disorder on him, a scabious one:

*it [is] but a scab*; which is the name, Jarchi says, of a clean plague or stroke, that is, in comparison of the leprosy, otherwise such cannot be said with any propriety to be clean. Ben Gersom better explains it, it is a white scab, but not of the kind of leprosy, although it is found as the whiteness of the bright spot; but there are not seen in it the signs of leprosy, the hair is not turned white, nor has the plague increased:

*and he shall wash his clothes, and be clean*; for seeing he was obliged to be shut up, as Jarchi observes, he is called unclean, and stood in need of dipping, that is, his body and his clothes into water; so the people of God,
though they are justified by the righteousness of Christ, and are pronouned clean through it, yet since they have their spots and scabs, they have need to have their conversation garments continually washed in the blood of the Lamb.

Ver. 7. But if the scab spread much abroad in the skin, etc.] Or “in spreading spread” \(^{439}\); spreads, and proceeds to spread more and more:

_after that he hath been seen of the priest for his cleansing:_ even after he had been viewed upon the first presentation of him to him, and after he had been twice seen by him by the end of two weeks, in which he was shut up, and after he had been pronounced clean, and had washed his clothes for his purification:

_he shall be seen of the priest again:_ either he shall go to him of himself, or be brought to him, to be reviewed and pass under afresh examination.

Ver. 8. And [if] the priest see that, behold, the scab spreadeth in the skin, etc.] Is not at a stay, as when he looked at it a second and third time:

_then the priest shall pronounce him unclean:_ a leprous person; to be absolutely so, as Jarchi expresses it; and so obliged to the birds (to bring birds for his cleansing), and to shaving, and to the offering spoken of in this section, as the same writer observes:

_it [is] a leprosy:_ it is a clear and plain case that it was one, and no doubt is to be made of it, it is a spreading leprosy: as sin is; it spreads itself over all the powers and faculties of the soul, and over all the members of the body; and it spreads more and more in every stage of life, unless and until grace puts a stop to it.

Ver. 9. When the plague of leprosy is in a man, etc.] He has all the signs of it, and it is pretty manifest both to himself and others that it is upon him;

_then he shall be brought unto the priest:_ by his friends and neighbours, if he is not willing to come of himself: a sinner insensible of the leprosy of sin, and of his unclean and miserable state through it, has no will to come to Christ the great High Priest for cleansing; but one that is sensible of it, and of Christ’s ability to help and cleanse him, will come freely and gladly, and importunately seek to him for it; though indeed such an one is brought by powerful and efficacious grace to him, yet not against, but with his full
will; (see John 5:40 6:37,44); compare with this (Matthew 8:1-3 Luke 17:12-14).

Ver. 10. And the priest shall see [him], etc.] Look at him, and closely and narrowly inspect and examine his case:

and, behold, [if] the rising [be] white in the skin; this is another appearance of the leprosy; the preceding were a bright spot, and the scab of it; but this a rising or white swelling in the skin, as white as pure wool, as the Targum of Jonathan:

and it have turned the hair white; to the whiteness of an egg shell, or the film of it, as the same Targum; that is, hath turned the hair of another colour, into white which was before black;

and [there be] quick raw flesh in the rising, or swelling; or “the quickening” or “quickness of live flesh” either such as we call proud flesh, which looks raw and red; or sound flesh, live flesh being opposed to that which is mortified and putrid; and so Jarchi renders it by “saniment”, a French word for “soundness”: and the Septuagint version, in this and all other places where the word is used, renders it “sound”: this clause may be considered disjunctively, as by Gersom, “or there be quick raw flesh”; for either the hair turning white, or quick raw flesh, one or the other, and one without the other was a sign of leprosy, so Jarchi observes; even this is a sign of uncleanness, the white hair without the quick flesh, and the quick flesh without the white hair: this may seem strange that quick and sound flesh should be a sign of the leprosy and its uncleanness; though it should be observed, it is such as is in the rising or swelling: and in things spiritual, it is a bad sign when men are proud of themselves and have confidence in the flesh; when in their own opinion they are whole and sound, and need no physician; when they trust in themselves that they are righteous, and boast of and have their dependence on their own works; he appears to be in the best state and frame that cried out as David did, that there is “no soundness in his flesh”, (Psalm 38:3,7).

Ver. 11. It [is] an old leprosy in the skin of his flesh, etc.] An inveterate one, of long standing and continuance, an obstinate one, not to be cured by medicine; as this sort of leprosy was, and therefore the person was sent not to a physician, but to the priest: the leprosy of sin is an old disease, brought by man into the world with him, and continues with him from his youth.
upwards, and nothing but the grace of God and blood of Christ can remove it:

*and the priest shall pronounce him unclean, and shall not shut him up;* there being no doubt at all of it being a leprosy, and of his uncleanness, and therefore no need to shut him up for further examination, but to turn him out of the camp till his purification was over:

*for he [is] unclean;* in a ceremonial sense, and was obliged to the law for cleansing, such as after given.

**Ver. 12. And if a leprosy break out abroad in the skin, etc.]** Or, if flowering it flowers; the man that has it on him looks like a plant or tree covered with white flowers, being spread all over him in white swellings, bright spots or scabs, as it follows:

*and the leprosy cover all the skin of [him that hath] the plague, from his head even to his foot;* such an one as the leper was that came to Christ for healing, said to be full of leprosy, (Luke 5:12); and such in a mystical sense is every sinner, whether sensible of it or not, even from the Crown of the head to the sole of the foot, full of the wounds, bruises, and putrefying sores of sin, (Isaiah 1:6);

*wheresoever the priest looketh*; that is, he cannot look any where upon any part of him but he sees the signs of the leprosy on him; and from whence the Jewish writers gather, that a priest that inspects leprous persons ought to have a clear sight, and to have both his eyes, and that the inspection should not be made in a dark house.

**Ver. 13. Then the priest shall consider, etc.]** Look wistly upon it, and well weigh the matter in his own mind, that he may make a true judgment and pronounce a right sentence:

*and, behold, [if] the leprosy have covered all his flesh;* from head to foot, so that no quick, raw, or sound flesh appear in him:

*he shall pronounce [him] clean [that hath] the plague;* not clean from a leprosy he is covered with; but that he is free from pollution by it, and under no obligation to bring his offering, or to perform, or have performed on him any of the rites and ceremonies used in cleansing of the leper:

*it is all turned white;* his skin and flesh with white bright spots, scabs and swellings, and no raw and red flesh appears:
he [is] clean; in a ceremonial sense: this may seem strange, that one that had a bright spot, or a white swelling, or a scab that spreads, a single one of these, or here and there one, should be unclean, and yet, if covered over with them, should be clean; the reason in nature is, because this shows a good healthful inward constitution, which throws out all its ill humours externally, whereby health is preserved; as we see in persons that have the measles or smallpox, or such like distempers, if they stick in the skin, and only here and there one rises up in a tumour, and to an head, it is a bad sign; but if they come out kindly and well, though they cover the whole body, things are very promising: the mystical or spiritual meaning of this is, that when a man sees himself to be a sinful creature, all over covered with sin, and no part free, and disclaims all righteousness of his own to justify him before God, but wholly trusts to, and depends upon the grace of God for salvation, and the righteousness of Christ for his acceptance with God; he becomes clean through the grace of God and the blood and righteousness of Christ.

Ver. 14. But when raw flesh appeareth in him, etc.] Between the white spots, scabs, or swellings, or in the midst of them:

he shall be unclean; be pronounced unclean, and be subject to all the prescriptions of the law concerning lepers.

Ver. 15. And the priest shall see the raw flesh, etc.] Or when he sees it, the person being brought to him to be viewed:

and pronounce him to be unclean; or shall pronounce him to be unclean:

[for] the raw flesh [is] unclean; made a man so in a ceremonial sense; (see Gill on “Leviticus 13:10”);

it [is] a leprosy; wherever any quick raw flesh appears in a swelling.

Ver. 16. Or if the raw flesh turn again, etc.] Changes its colour, from redness, which is in raw flesh:

and be changed unto white: and does not look ruddy as flesh in common does, nor red and fiery, as raw and proud flesh, but is white, of the same colour with the swelling or scab:

he shall come unto the priest; again, and show himself, even though he was before by him pronounced clean.
Ver. 17. *And the priest shall see him*, etc.] Review him, and examine him thoroughly:

*and, behold, [if] the plague be turned into white*; the raw flesh in the swelling, which looked red, is become white:

*then the priest shall pronounce [him] clean [that hath] the plague*; that was supposed to have the plague of leprosy; but upon a review, and on this change of things, has not, he shall declare him free from it,

*he [is] clean*; and under no obligation to the laws and rites concerning it.

Ver. 18. *The flesh also, in which, [even] in the skin thereof, was a boil*, etc.] Or hot ulcer, by which, says Maimonides 1442 you may understand any stroke by a stone, stick, or iron, or any other thing: and in the Misnah 1443, it is asked, what is an ulcer (or boil)? a stroke by wood, stone, pitch, or hot water; all that is from the force of fire is an ulcer:

*and is healed*; by the use of medicine, and the part, in all appearance, as well and as sound as ever.

Ver. 19. *And in the place of the boil there be a white rising*, etc.] In the place where the boil was, a white swelling appears:

*or a bright spot, white, and somewhat reddish*; white and red mixed, as the Targum of Jonathan; and so Aben Ezra interprets the word “reddish”, of the bright spot being mixed of two colours, or part of it so; and such a mixed colour of white and red, Gersom observes, is usual in a swelling, and adds, we are taught how to judge of these appearances, according to a tradition from Moses, which is this: take a cup full of milk, and put in it two drops of blood, and the colour of it will be as the colour of the bright spot, white and reddish; and if you put into it four drops, its colour will be as the colour of the rising (or swelling) reddish; and if you put into it eight drops, its colour will be as the colour of the scab of the bright spot, more reddish; and if you put into it sixteen drops, its colour will be as the colour of the scab of the swelling, very red: hence it appears, says he, that the bright spot is whitest with its redness, and after that the swelling, and next the scab of the bright spot, and then the scab of the swelling; but Bochart 1444 is of opinion that the word is wrongly rendered “reddish”, which, he thinks, contradicts the account of the bright spot being white, and especially as the word for “reddish” has its radicals doubled, which always increase the signification; and therefore if the word bears the sense of...
redness, it should be rendered “exceeding red”, which would be quite contrary to the spot being white at all; wherefore from the use of the word in the Arabic language, which signifies white, bright, and glittering; (see Gill on “<250407> Lamentations 4:7”); he chooses to read the words, “or a bright spot, white and exceeding glittering”: but this word we render reddish and white, being read disjunctively, (<031324>Leviticus 13:24); seems to contradict this observation of his:

*and it be shewed to the priest;* to look upon and pass his judgment on it.

**Ver. 20.** *And if, when the priest seeth it, etc.]* And has thoroughly viewed it and considered it:

*behold, it [be] in sight lower than the skin;* having eaten into and taken root in the flesh under the skin:

*and the hair thereof be turned white;* which are the signs of leprosy before given, (<031303>Leviticus 13:3);

*the priest shall pronounce him unclean;* not fit for company and conversation, but obliged to conform to the laws concerning leprosy:

*it is a plague of leprosy broken out of the boil;* which was there before: this is an emblem of apostates and apostasy, who having been seemingly healed and cleansed, return to their former course of life, and to all the impurity of it, like the dog to its vomit, and the swine to its wallowing in the mire, (<Proverbs 26:11>2 Peter 2:22); and so their last state is worse than the first, (<Matthew 12:45> Luke 11:26), as in this case; at first it was a boil, and then thought to be cured, and afterwards arises out of it a plague of leprosy.

**Ver. 21.** *But if the priest look on it, etc.]* Upon a person in a like case as first described, having had a boil, and that healed, and afterwards a white swelling, or a bright spot in the place of it:

*and, behold, [there be] no white hairs therein;* not two hairs turned white, as Gersom interprets it:

*and [if] it [be] not lower than the skin;* the bright spot not lower than the skin; not having got into the flesh, only skin deep: the Targum of Jonathan is, not lower in whiteness than the skin; for the bright spot is described as white, and so the rising or swelling, (<031319>Leviticus 13:19);
but [be] somewhat dark; or rather “contracted”; to which spreading is opposed in the next verse; (see Gill on “\text{Leviticus} 13:6”);

then the priest shall shut him up seven days; to wait and see whether it will spread or not: a boil and burning, the Jews say, make a man unclean in one week, and by two signs, the white hair, and the spreading; by the white hair, both at the beginning and at the end of the week after dismission, and by spreading at the end of the week after it \footnote{445}.

Ver. 22. And if it spread much abroad in the skin, etc.] Upon viewing it on the seventh day, though it is not expressed, the swelling or bright spot; or “in spreading spread”; (see Gill on “\text{Leviticus} 13:7”); which Ben Gersom interprets, not of the skin of the flesh, but of the ulcer:

then the priest shall pronounce him unclean; even though there are no white hairs in it, nor is it lower than the skin, yet is not at a stand or contracted, but spreading:

it [is] a plague; or stroke; it is one sort of a leprosy, and such an one as makes a man unclean in a ceremonial sense.

Ver. 23. But if the bright spot stay in his place, [and] spread not, etc.] Continues as it was when first viewed:

it [is] a burning boil; but not a plague of leprosy:

and the priest shall pronounce him clean; as clear of a leprosy, and so not bound by the law of it, though attended with an inflammation or burning ulcer.

Ver. 24. Or if there be [any] flesh, in the skin whereof [there is] a hot burning, etc.] Or “a burning of fire” \footnote{446}; it is asked, what is a burning? that which is burnt with a coal or with hot ashes; all that is from the force of fire is burning \footnote{447}; that is, whatever sore, pustule, or blister, is occasioned by fire touching the part, or by anything heated by fire:

and the quick [flesh] that burneth have a white bright spot, somewhat reddish, or white; the Targum of Jonathan is, a white spot mixed with red, or only white; and so Aben Ezra interprets the last clause: this seems to set aside Bochart’s interpretation of the word “adamdemeth”, which we render “somewhat reddish”, and be, very white, bright, and glittering since white is here opposed unto it; though it may be, the sense is, that the flesh burnt has a bright white spot in it, exceeding glittering; or however, at least, a
white one: by the “quick flesh” that burneth, Gersom says, is meant the weak, the tender flesh which is renewed there, after it is healed from the purulent matter in it.

**Ver. 25. Then the priest shall look upon it**, etc.] And examine it, whether it has the marks and signs of a leprosy or not, such as follow:

*behold, [if] the hair in the bright spot be turned white*; which before was black, or of another colour from white, and is now, turned into the whiteness of chalk, as the Targum of Jonathan:

*and it [be in] sight deeper than the skin*; the same Targum is,

“and its sight or colour is deeper in being white like snow, more than the skin;”

but this respects not the colour of it, as appearing to the sight, but the depth of the spot, going below the skin into the flesh, which, with the change of hair, are the two signs of leprosy, (Leviticus 13:3);

*it [is] a leprosy broken out of the burning*; which sprung from thence, and what that had issued in:

*wherefore the priest shall pronounce him unclean*; a leper, and to be treated as such:

*it [is] the plague of leprosy*; being a plain case, according to the rules by which it was to be judged of.

**Ver. 26. But if the priest look on it**, etc.] On the hot burning and bright spot in it, in another person:

*and, behold, [there be] no white hair on the white spot, and it be no lower than the [other] skin*; why the word “other” should be supplied I know not, any more than in (Leviticus 13:21);

*but be somewhat dark*; or “contracted”, (see Gill on “Leviticus 13:21”);

*then the priest shall shut him up seven days*; as in the case of the burning boil or hot ulcer, as in (Leviticus 13:21).

**Ver. 27. And the priest shall look upon him the seventh day**, etc.] When that is come, any time on that day; not needing to wait until the end of it, or till, the seven days are precisely up; the same is to be understood in all places in this chapter where the like is used:
[and] if it be spread much abroad in the skin; in the space of seven days: then the priest shall pronounce him unclean; it [is] the plague of leprosy: according to the law; so that it was necessary, in such a case for him to conform to it in order to his cleansing.

Ver. 28. And if the bright spot stay in his place, [and] spread not in the skin, etc.] If, after being shut up, seven days, it appears that the spot is no larger than, when it was first viewed, but is as it was, and not at all increased:

but it [be] somewhat dark; either not so bright as it was, or more contracted:

it [is] a rising of the burning; or a swelling of it, a swelling which sprung from it, and nothing else:

the priest shall pronounce him clean; from the leprosy, and so set him at liberty to go where he will, and dwell and converse with men as usual:

for it [is] an inflammation of the burning; or an inflammation or blister occasioned by the burning, and no leprosy.

Ver. 29. If a man or a woman hath a plague upon the head or the beard.] Any breaking out in those parts a swelling, scab, or spot, on a man’s beard or on a woman’s head; or on the head of either man or woman; or on a woman’s beard, if she had any, as some have had though not common.

Ver. 30. Then the priest shall see the plague, etc.] The person on whom it is shall come or be brought unto him; and he shall look upon it and examine it:

and, behold, if it [be] in sight deeper than the skin; which is always one sign of leprosy;

[and there be] in it a yellow thin hair; like the appearance of thin gold, as the Targum of Jonathan; for, as Ben Gersom says, its colour is the colour of gold; and it is called thin in this place, because short and soft, and not when it is long and small; and so it is said, scabs make unclean in two weeks, and by two signs, by thin yellow hair, and by spreading, by yellow hair, small, soft, and short. Now this is to be understood, not of hair that is naturally of a yellow or gold colour, as is the hair of the head and beard of some persons, but of hair changed into this colour through the force of
the disease; and so Jarchi interprets it, black hair turned yellow; in other parts of the body, hair turned white was a sign of leprosy, but here that which was turned yellow or golden coloured: Aben Ezra observes, that the colour expressed by this word is, in the Ishmaelitish or Arabic language, the next to the white colour:

*then the priest shall pronounce him unclean*; declare him a leper, and unfit for company, and order him to do and have done for him the things after expressed, as required in such a case:

*it [is] a dry scall*; or “wound”, as the Septuagint version; “nethek”, which is the word here used, Jarchi says, is the name of a plague that is in the place of hair, or where that grows; it has its name from plucking up; for there the hair is plucked away, as Aben Ezra and Ben Gersom note:

*[even] a leprosy upon the head or beard*; as the head is the seat of knowledge, and the beard a sign of manhood, and of a man’s being arrived to years of discretion; when wisdom and prudence are expected in him; this sort of leprosy may be an emblem of errors in judgment, of false doctrines and heresies imbibed by persons, which eat as doth a canker, and are in themselves damnable, and bring ruin and destruction on teachers and hearers, unless recovered from them by the grace of God.

**Ver. 31. And if the priest look on the plague of the scall**, etc.] As it may appear in another person, brought to him for inspection and examination:

*and, behold, it [be] not in the sight deeper than the skin*; it do not seem to be got into the flesh, or lower than the skin:

*and [that there is] no black hair in it*; or, “but no black hair in it”; for, as Jarchi says, if there was a black hair in it, he would be clean, and there would be no need of shutting up; for black hair in scalls is a sign of cleanness, as it is said, (Leviticus 13:37); it would be a clear case that such a man had no leprosy on him; for black hair is a token of a strong and healthful constitution; and there could remain no doubt about it, and it would require no further trial and examination: Ben Gersom says it means two black hairs; and further observes, that black hair in the midst of a scall is a sign of cleanness; but this being wanting,

*then the priest shall shut up [him that hath] the plague of the scall seven days*; from the time of his viewing the scall; and so Ben Gersom, this is the seventh day from the time of looking upon the scall.
Ver. 32. *And in the seventh day the priest shall look on the plague*, etc.]

To see whether it has got any deeper, or spread any further, and has any hair growing in it, and of what colour, that he might be also able to judge whether it was a leprosy or not:

*and, behold, [if] the scall spread not;* was neither got into the flesh, nor larger in the skin;

*and there be in it no yellow hair;* that is, a thin yellow hair, for such only, as Ben Gersom observes, was a sign of leprosy in scalls, as in (Leviticus 13:30); and the same writer observes, that “and” is here instead of “or”, and to be read, “or there be in it no yellow hair”; since a scall was pronounced unclean, either on account of thin yellow hair, or on account of spreading:

*and the scall [be] not in sight deeper than the skin;* but be just as it was when first looked upon.

Ver. 33. *He shall be shaven*, etc.]

His head or beard, where the scall was, as Aben Ezra; and so Ben Gersom, who adds, the law is not solicitous whether this shaving is by a priest or not; so it seems any one might shave him:

*but the scall shall he not shave;* that is, the hair that is in it, but that was to continue and grow, that the colour of it might be easily discerned at the end of seven other days; according to the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, he was to shave round about it, but not that itself; Jarchi says, he was to leave two hairs near it, that he might know whether it spread; for if it spread it would go over the hairs, and into the part that was shaven; when it would be a clear case it was a spreading leprosy: now, that there might be an opportunity of observing this, whether it would or not, the following method was to be taken:

*and the priest shall shut up [him that hath] the scall seven days more;* by which time it would be seen whether there was any increase or decrease, or whether at a stand, and of what colour the hair was, by which judgment might be made of the case.

Ver. 34. *And in the seventh day the priest shall look on the scall*, etc.]

That is, according to Ben Gersom, on the thirteenth day from the first inspection of him by the priest:
and, behold, [if] the scall be not spread in the skin, nor [be] in sight deeper than the skin; neither appears spread on the surface of the skin, nor to have eaten into the flesh under it; also no thin yellow hair, though it is not expressed, for that made a person unclean, though there was no spreading:

then the priest shall pronounce him clean; free from a leprosy:
and he shall wash his clothes, and be clean; there was no need to say he shall wash them in water, as Aben Ezra observes, that is supposed; and then he was looked upon as a clean person, and might go into the sanctuary, and have conversation with men, both in a civil and religious way, and not defile anything he sat upon.

Ver. 35. But if the scall spread much in his skin after cleansing.] After he has been declared clean by the priest; for it was possible that it might spread after this, though so much precaution had been used, and so much time taken to observe it: with this compare (2 Peter 1:9 2:20).

Ver. 36. Then the priest shall look on him, etc.] Again, and which is no less than the fourth time; for notwithstanding his being pronounced clean, he was still subject to the inspection of the priest, if any alteration appeared:

and, behold, if the scall be spread in the skin; which was a certain sign of a leprosy:

the priest shall not seek for yellow hair; or be solicitous about that, whether there is any or not, for either one or the other of these signs were sufficient to determine the case:

he [is] unclean; and so to be pronounced.

Ver. 37. But if the scall be in his sight at a stay, etc.] If in a few days, or in a short space of time after this, it should appear that the scall is at a full stop, and does not spread any further at all:

and [that] there is black hair grown up therein; which is a sign of health and soundness, and so of purity; yea, if it was green or red, so be it, it was not yellow, according to Jarchi, it was sufficient:

the scall is healed; from whence it appears that it had been a leprous scall, but was now healed, an entire stop being put to the spread of it; and
though yellow hairs might have appeared in it, yet, as Gersom observes, two black hairs having grown up in it, it was a clear case that the corruption of the blood had departed, and it had returned to its former state:

*he [is] clean, and the priest shall pronounce him clean*; he was clean before, and is the reason why he pronounces him so; wherefore it is not the sentence of the priest, but the truth of his case that makes him clean; teaching, as Ainsworth observes, that the truth of a man’s estate, discerned by the word and law of God, made the man clean or unclean, and not the sentence of the priest, if it swerved from the law.

**Ver. 38. If a man also, or a woman, etc.** One or the other, for the law concerning leprosy respecteth both:

*have in the skin of their flesh bright spots*; and them only; not any rising or swelling, nor scab, nor scall, nor boil, nor burning, only bright spots, a sort of freckles or morphew:

*even white bright spots*; these, Ben Gersom observes, are white spots, but not plagues; and which were in whiteness inferior to the four species of the plague of leprosy, the white spot, the white swelling, and the scab of each.

**Ver. 39. Then the priest shall look, etc.** Upon the man or woman that has these spots, and upon the spots themselves, and examine them of what kind they are:

*and, behold, [if] the bright spots in the skin of their flesh [be] darkish white;* their whiteness is not strong, as Jarchi observes; but dusky and obscure, or “contracted”¹⁴⁵⁰, small white spots, not large and spreading:

*it [is] a freckled spot [that] grows in the skin;* a kind of morphew, which the above writer describes as a sort of whiteness which appears in the flesh of a ruddy man:

*he [is] clean;* from leprosy; this is observed, lest a person that is freckled and has a morphew should be mistaken for a leprous person; as every man that has some spots, failings, and infirmities, is not to be reckoned a wicked man.
**Ver. 40.** And the man whose hair is fallen off his head, etc.] That is, from the back part of his head, from the crown of his head toward his neck behind:

*he [is] bald*; in that spot of the head where the hair is fallen off; and it denotes such a baldness as is occasioned by that, for it signifies one that had hair, but it is fallen off; whereas the baldness after spoken of is thought by some to be of such who never had any hair; though others will have it, that this intends a person bald all over; but it seems plain from what follows, that it designs one whose hair was fallen off behind, and was bald on that part only; and it may be observed, that this is only said of a man, not of a woman, because, as Aben Ezra remarks, she has much moisture in her, and therefore her head does not become bald; hair being like to grass, which flourishes in moist places:

*yet is] he clean*; from the leprosy, or from the scalls, as Jarchi observes, because he is not judged by the signs of the head and beard, which are the place of hair, but by the signs of leprosy in the skin of the flesh, i.e. by the raw flesh and spreading.

**Ver. 41.** And he that hath his hair fallen off from the part of his head towards his face, etc.] That is, from the crown of his head towards his forehead and temples, the fore part of his head; and so the Misnic doctors distinguish baldness, which is from the crown of the head descending behind to the channel of the neck; and that here mentioned, which is from the crown of the head descending to his face and forehead, over against the hair above:

*he [is] forehead bald*; to distinguish him from him that is bald behind:

*yet is] he clean*; as the other: these cases are observed, that it might not be concluded that every man that shed his hair or was bald either before or behind was a leper, because the hair of a leper used to fall off from him; if he had not the other signs of leprosy, and which were the sure and true signs of it before mentioned.

**Ver. 42.** And if there be, etc.] Or, “but if there be”, or, “when there shall be”, or shall appear to be:

*in the bald head, or in the bald forehead, a white reddish sore*; white and red mixed, as the Targum of Jonathan, having something of both colours, neither a clear white nor thorough red; though, according to Bochart, it
should be rendered “a white sore exceeding bright”; (see Gill on Leviticus 13:19);

it [is] a leprosy sprung up in his bald head, or in his bald forehead; the signs of which were raw flesh and spreading; so it is said in the Misnah, "those two sorts of baldness defile in two weeks, by two signs, by quick raw flesh and by spreading;"

if there was the bright spot and no quick flesh, then he was to be shut up seven days, and looked upon at the end of them; and if there was either quick flesh or a spreading, he was pronounced unclean, but if neither, he was shut up seven days more; and if either of the above signs appeared he was pronounced unclean, if not he was set free.

Ver. 43. Then the priest shall look upon it, etc.] The white reddish sore:

and, behold, [if] the rising of the sore; or the swelling of it:

[be] white reddish in his bald head, or in his bald forehead; (see Gill on Leviticus 13:42):

as the leprosy appeareth in the skin of the flesh; as in Leviticus 13:2; having the signs of the leprosy there given; anyone of them, excepting the white hair, which in this case could be no sign, there being none: Jarchi’s note is, according to the appearance of the leprosy, said in Leviticus 13:2; and what is said in it is, it defiles by four appearances, and is judged in two weeks; but not according to the appearance of the leprosy said of the boil, and burning, which were judged in one week; nor according to the appearance of the scalls, of the place of hair, which do not defile by the four appearances, the rising or swelling, and the scab of it, the bright spot, and the scab of that.

Ver. 44. He is a leprous man, he [is] unclean, etc.] And so to be pronounced and accounted; only a leprous man is mentioned, there being no leprous women, having this sort of leprosy, their hair not falling off, or they becoming bald, usually; unless, as Ben Gersom observes, in a manner strange and wonderful:

the priest shall pronounce him utterly unclean; as in any other case of leprosy:
his plague [is] in his head; an emblem of such who have imbibed bad notions and erroneous principles, and are therefore, like the leper, to be avoided and rejected from the communion of the saints, (Titus 3:10); and shows that men are accountable for their principles as well as practices, and liable to be punished for them.

Ver. 45. And the leper in whom the plague [is], etc.] Meaning not he only that has the plague of leprosy in his head, but every sort of leper before mentioned in this chapter:

his clothes shall be rent; not that he might the more easily put on his clothes without hurting him, as some have thought; or that the corrupt humours might evaporate more freely, for evaporation would rather be hindered than promoted by being exposed to cold; nor that he might be known and better avoided, for his cry after mentioned was sufficient for that; but as a token of mourning: and so Aben Ezra having mentioned the former reason, that he might be known by going in a different habit, adds, or the sense is, as a token of mourning; for he was to mourn for the wickedness of his actions; for, for his works came this plague of leprosy upon him; and so the Jews in common understand it, not as a disease arising from natural causes, but as a punishment inflicted by God for sin; wherefore this rite of rending the garments was an emblem of contrition of heart, and of sorrow and humiliation for sin, (see Joel 1:13):

and his head bare; or “free” from cutting or shaving, but shall let his hair grow; and so the Targum of Jonathan and Jarchi interpret it; or free from any covering upon it, hat, or cap, or turban: Ben Gersom observes, that the making bare the head, or freeing it, is taken different ways; sometimes it is used of not shaving the head for thirty days, and sometimes for the removal of the vail, or covering of the head it has been used to; but in this place it cannot signify the nourishing of the hair, but that his head ought to be covered: and so Maimonides observes, that a leper should cover his head all the days he is excluded, and this was a token of mourning also; (see 2 Samuel 15:30 19:4 Esther 6:12 Jeremiah 14:3,4):

and he shall put a covering upon his upper lip; as a mourner, (see Ezekiel 24:17 Micah 3:7). Jarchi interprets it of both lips, upper and under, which were covered with a linen cloth or vail thrown over the shoulder, and with which the mouth was covered; and this was done, as Aben Ezra says, that the leper might not hurt any with the breath of his mouth;
and shall cry, Unclean, unclean; as he passed along in any public place, that everyone might avoid him, and not be polluted by him: the Targum of Jonathan is,

“a herald shall proclaim and say, Depart, depart from the unclean.”

So every sinner sensible of the leprosy of sin in his nature, and which appears in his actions, should freely confess and acknowledge his uncleanness, original and actual, the impurity of his heart and life, and even of his own righteousness in the sight of God, and have recourse to Christ, and to his blood, for the cleansing him from it.

Ver. 46. All the days wherein the plague [shall be] in him he shall be defiled, etc.] Reckoned an unclean person, and avoided as such:

he [is] unclean; in a ceremonial sense, and pronounced as such by the priest, and was to be looked upon as such by others during the time of his exclusion and separation, until he was shown to the priest and cleansed, and his offering offered;

he shall dwell alone; in a separate house or apartment, as Uzziah did, (<2 Chr 26:21>) none were allowed to come near him, nor he to come near to any; yea, according to Jarchi, other unclean persons might not dwell with him:

without the camp [shall] his habitation [be]; without the three camps, as the same Jewish writer interprets it, the camp of God, the camp of the Levites, and the camp of Israel: so Miriam, when she was stricken with leprosy, was shut out of the camp seven days, (<Num 12:14,15>). This was observed while in the wilderness, but when the Israelites came to inhabit towns and cities, then lepers were excluded from thence; for they defiled, in a ceremonial sense, every person and thing in a house they came into, whether touched by them or not. So Bartenora f455 observes, that if a leprous person goes into any house, all that is in the house is defiled, even what he does not touch; and that if he sits under a tree, and a clean person passes by, the clean person is defiled; and if he comes into a synagogue, they make a separate place for him ten hands high, and four cubits broad, and the leper goes in first, and comes out last. The Persians, according to Herodotus f456, had a custom much like this; he says, that if any of the citizens had a leprosy or a morphew, he might not come into the city, nor be mixed with other Persians (or have any conversation with them), for they say he has them because he has sinned against the sun: and there was
with us an ancient writ, called “leproso amovendo” f457, that lay to remove a leper who thrust himself into the company of his neighbours in any parish, either in the church, or at other public meetings, to their annoyance. This law concerning lepers shows that impure and profane sinners are not to be admitted into the church of God; and that such who are in it, who appear to be so, are to be excluded from it, communion is not to be had with them; and that such, unless they are cleansed by the grace of God, and the blood of Christ, shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven; for into that shall nothing enter that defiles, or makes an abomination, or a lie; (see 1 Corinthians 5:7,11,13) (Revelation 21:27).

Ver. 47. The garments also, that the plague of leprosy is in, etc.] Whether this sort of leprosy proceeded from natural causes, or was extraordinary and miraculous, and came immediately from the hand of God, and was peculiar to the Jews, and unknown to other nations, is a matter of question; the latter is generally asserted by the Hebrew writers, as Maimonides f458, Abraham Seba f459, and others f460; but others are of opinion, and Abarbinel among the Jews, that it might be by the contact or touch of a leprous person. Indeed it must be owned, as a learned man f461 observes, that the shirts and clothes of a leper must be equally infectious, and more so than any other communication with him; and the purulent matter which adheres thereunto must needs infect; such who put on their clothes; for it may be observed, that it will get between the threads of garments, and stick like glue, and fill them up, and by the acrimony of it corrode the texture itself; so that experience shows that it is very difficult to wash such a garment without a rupture, and the stains are not easily got out: and it must be allowed that garments may be scented by diseases, and become infectious, and carry a disease from place to place, as the plague oftentimes is carried in wool, cotton, silk, or any bale goods; but whether all this amounts to the case before us is still a question. Some indeed have endeavoured to account for it by observing, that wool ill scoured, stuffs kept too long, and some particular tapestries, are subject to worms and moths which eat them, and from hence think it credible, that the leprosy in clothes, and in skins here mentioned, was caused by this sort of vermin; to which, stuffs and works, wrought in wool in hot countries, and in times when arts and manufactures were not carried to the height of perfection as now, might probably be more exposed f462; but this seems not to agree with this leprosy of Moses, which lay not in the garment being eaten, but in the colour and spread of it:
[whether it be] a woollen garment or a linen garment: and, according to the Misnic doctors, only wool and linen were defiled by leprosy; Aben Ezra indeed says, that the reason why no mention is made of silk and cotton is because the Scripture speaks of what was found (then in use), as in (Exodus 23:5); wherefore, according to him, woollen and linen are put for all other garments; though, he adds, or it may be the leprosy does not happen to anything but wool and linen; however, it is allowed, as Ben Gersom observes, that when the greatest part of the cloth is made of wool or linen, it was defiled by it: the Jewish canon is, if the greatest part is of camels hair, it is not defiled; but if the greatest part is of sheep, it is; and if half to half (or equal) it is defiled; and so flax, and hemp mixed together; the same rule is to be observed concerning them.

Ver. 48. Whether [it be] in the warp, or woof, of linen, or of woollen, etc.] When these are woven and mixed together, it seems difficult, if not impossible, to judge whether the plague of leprosy was in the one or in the other; one would think it should be unavoidably in both; wherefore Castalio renders the words, whether “in the outer part of it, or in the inner”; in the outside or inside, or what we call the right side or the wrong side of the cloth: but to me it seems that the warp and woof, whether of linen or woollen, are here distinguished not only from garments made of them, but from the cloth itself, of which they are made, and even to be considered before they are wrought together in the loom; and, according to the Jews, when upon the spindle:

whether in a skin, or anything made of skin; that is, whether in unwrought skin, which is not made up in anything, or in anything that is made of skins, as tents, bottles, etc. but skins of fishes, according to the Jewish traditions, are excepted; for so they say, sea skins, i.e. skins of fishes, are not defiled by plagues (of leprosy); for which the commentators give this reason, that as wool and linen are of things which grow out of the earth, so must the skins be; that is, of such animals as live by grass, that springs out of the earth; but if anything was joined unto them, which grew out of the earth, though but a thread, that received uncleanness, it was defiled.

Ver. 49. And if the plague be greenish or reddish the garment, or in the skin, etc.] Either of these two colours were signs of leprosy in garments; but it is not agreed whether stronger or weaker colours are designed; the radicals of both these words being doubled, according to some, and particularly Aben Ezra, lessen the sense of them; and so our translators
understand it; but, according to Ben Gersom, the signification is increased thereby, and the meaning is, if it be exceeding green or exceeding red; and this is evidently the sense of the Misnah \footnote{468}; garments are defiled by green in greens, and by red in reds; that is, by the greenest and reddest; the green, the commentators say \footnote{469}, is like that of the wings of peacocks and leaves of palm trees, and the red like crimson or scarlet; and now these garments or skins, in which the green or red spots appeared, must be white, and not coloured or dyed: the canon runs thus \footnote{470}; skins and garments dyed are not defiled with plagues (of leprosy); a garment whose warp is dyed, and its woof white, or its woof dyed, and its warp white, all goes according to the sight; that is, according to what colour to the eye most prevails, whether white or dyed:

\textit{either in the warp or in the woof, or in anything of the skin;} the same held good of these as of a garment, or anything else made of them:

\textit{it [is] a plague of leprosy;} it has the signs of one, and gives great suspicion that it is one:

\textit{and shall be shewed unto the priest;} by the person in whose possession it is, that it may be examined and judged of whether it is a leprosy or no.

\textbf{Ver. 50.} \textit{And the priest shall look upon the plague, etc.}] The green or red spot in the garment, etc.

\textit{and shut up [it that hath] the plague seven days;} the woollen or linen garment, the warp or the woof, or skins, and those things that were made of them.

\textbf{Ver. 51.} \textit{And he shall look on the plague on the seventh day, etc.}] To see whether there is any alteration in it in that space of time:

\textit{if the plague be spread in the garment, either in the warp or in the woof, or in a skin, [or] in any work that is made of skin;} the green and red spot be spread more and more in either of them, whether the colour remains the same or not, be changed, the green into red, or the red into green, yet if there was a spreading, it was a sign of leprosy. According to the Jewish canon \footnote{471}, if the plague was green and spread red, or red and spread green, it was unclean; that is, as Bartenora \footnote{472} explains it, if it was red in the size of a bean, and at the end of the week the red had spread itself to green; or if at the beginning it was green like a bean, and at the end of the week had
spread itself to the size of a shekel, and the root or spread of it was become red;

*the plague [is] a fretting leprosy*; according to Jarchi, a sharp and pricking one, like a thorn; which signification the word has in Ezekiel 28:24. Ben Gersom explains it, which brings a curse, corruption, and oldness into the thing in which it is; an old “irritated, exasperated” leprosy, as Bochart, from the use of the word in the Arabic tongue, translates it:

*it [is] unclean*; and the garment or thing in which it is.

**Ver. 52.** He shall therefore burn that garment, etc.] That there may be no more use of it, nor profit from it; and this was done without the city, as Ben Gersom asserts:

*whether in warp or woof, in woollen or in linen, or anything of skin, wherein the plague is*; all and either of them were to be burnt:

*for it [is] a fretting leprosy*; (see Gill on Leviticus 13:51):

*it shall be burnt in the fire*; which may teach both to hate the garment spotted with the flesh, and to put no trust in and have no dependence on a man’s own righteousness, which is as filthy rags, and both are such as shall be burnt, and the loss of them suffered, even when a man himself is saved, yet so as by fire, (1 Corinthians 3:15).

**Ver. 53.** And if the priest shall look, etc.] On the seventh day as before, after shutting up:

*and, behold, the plague be not spread in the garment, either in the warp, or in the woof, or in anything of skin*; but is at an entire stay, that it may be hoped it is not a fretting leprosy: so when men do not proceed to more ungodliness, as wicked men commonly do, but there is a stop put to their vicious life and conversation, it is an hopeful sign of future good.

**Ver. 54.** Then the priest shall command that they wash [the thing] wherein the plague [is], etc.] The priest did not wash it himself, but ordered others to do it; and this was either the part in which the plague was, or the whole garment or skin in which it was; which may be typical of the washing of the garments of men in the blood of Christ, which cleanses from all sin, (Revelation 7:14 1 John 1:7 Zechariah 13:1):
and he shall shut it up seven days more: the garment or skin in which the leprosy was, or suspected to be, to see what alteration would be made by that time through the washing, whether the colour would be altered, or whether it would spread any more or not.

Ver. 55. And the priest shall look on the plague after it is washed, etc.] That is, on the second seventh day, or thirteenth day from his first inspection of it:

and, behold, [if] the plague has not changed its colour; and the plague be not spread, it [is] unclean, thou shalt burn it in the fire; if it remains just as it was at first, very green or very red, and has not diminished of its colour at all, nor changed from one colour to another, although it should not have spread itself, yet it is defiled, and to be burnt without the camp, as before; that which spreads itself here and there, it is to be burnt:

it [is] after inward, [whether] it [be] bare within or without; that is, whether it be threadbare on the wrong or right side of the garment, the nap being eaten off by the leprosy; which shows it to be a fretting, eating, and corroding one: in the Hebrew text it is, “in the boldness of the hinder”, or “in the baldness of the fore part”; they are the same words which are used of the boldness of the back part and fore part of the head, (Leviticus 13:42,43); the nap being off either of the outer and right side of the cloth, or of the inner and wrong side, made it look like a bald head, whether before or behind.

Ver. 56. And if the priest look, and, behold, the plague [be] somewhat dark after the washing of it, etc.] Is become of a weaker colour, either not quite so green, or not quite so red as it was, or is “contracted”, and does not spread itself, (see Gill on “Leviticus 13:6”); but is rather become less:

then he shall rend it out of the garment, or out of the skin, or out of the warp, or out of the woof; that is, that piece which has the plague in it, and burn it, as Jarchi says; that so the whole may not be lost, which is otherwise pure, and clean, and free from any infection. The manner of expression confirms what I have observed on (Leviticus 13:48); that the warp and woof are considered as separate things, and as before they are wove together, or wrought into one garment. This rending out may denote the denying of ungodliness and worldly lusts, the parting with right eye and
right hand sins, and having no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.

Ver. 57. And if it appear still in the garment, either in the warp, or in the woof, or in anything of skin, etc.] After the piece has been rent out, in another part of the garment, etc. where before it was not seen:

it [is] a spreading [plague]; or leprosy; a flourishing one, as the word signifies, a growing and increasing one:

thou shalt burn that wherein the plague [is] with fire; according to Aben Ezra, only that part in which the plague was; but Jarchi says the whole garment; with whom Ben Gersom seems to agree, who reads the words, thou shalt burn it, with that in which the plague is; the whole garment, skin, warp, or woof, along with the part in which the leprosy is.

Ver. 58. And the garment, either warp or woof, or whatsoever thing of skin [it be], which thou shalt wash, etc.] After it had been shut up seven days, and viewed by the priest again: if the plague be departed from them: upon a review of them:

then it shall be washed the second time, and shall be clean; and so reckoned even thoroughly clean, and used; this denotes the thorough washing and cleansing of sinners by the blood of Jesus, (see Psalm 51:2); this washing was by dipping; and so the Targum renders it; and Jarchi observes, that all washings of garments, which are for dipping, they interpret by the same word.

Ver. 59. This [is] the law of the plague of leprosy, etc.] The rules by which it was to be judged of; whether or no it was

in a garment of woollen, or linen, either the warp or woof, or any thing of skins; which include everything in which this sort of leprosy was:

to pronounce it clean, or to pronounce it unclean; either to declare it free from the plague of the leprosy, or as infected with it, and so accordingly dispose of it.
CHAPTER 14

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 14

This chapter treats of the purification of lepers, and the rules to be observed therein; and first what the priest was to do for his cleansing when brought to him, by making use of two birds, with cedar wood, scarlet and hyssop, as directed, (Leviticus 14:1-7); what he was to do for himself, shaving off all his hair, and washing his flesh and clothes in water, (Leviticus 14:8,9); the offerings to be offered up for him, two he lambs and one ewe lamb, and a meat offering, with a particular account of the use of the blood of the trespass offering, and of oil put upon the tip of his right ear, the thumb of his right hand, and the great toe of his right foot, (Leviticus 14:10-20); but if poor, only one lamb was required, a meat offering of one tenth deal, and two turtle doves or two young pigeons, and blood and oil used as before, (Leviticus 14:21-32); next follow an account of leprosy in an house, and the signs of it, and the rules to judge of it, (Leviticus 14:33-48); and the manner of cleansing from it, (Leviticus 14:49-53); and the chapter is closed with a recapitulation of the several laws concerning the various sorts of leprosy in this and the preceding chapter, (Leviticus 14:54-57).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] In order to deliver the same to Aaron, who, and the priests his successors, were chiefly to be concerned in the execution of the law given:

saying; as follows.

Ver. 2. This shall be the law of the leper, in the day of his cleansing, etc.] Or the rules, rites, ceremonies, and sacrifices to be observed therein. Jarchi says, from hence we learn that they were not to purify a leper in the night:

he shall be brought unto the priest: not into the camp, or city, or house, where the priest was, for till he was cleansed he could not be admitted into either; besides, the priest is afterwards said to go forth out of the camp to him; but he was to be brought pretty near the camp or city, where the priest went to meet him. As the leper was an emblem of a polluted sinner, the priest was a type of Christ, to whom leprous sinners must be brought
for cleansing; they cannot come of themselves to him, that is, believe in him, except it be given unto them; or they are drawn with the powerful and efficacious grace of God, by which souls are brought to Christ, and enabled to believe in him; not that they are brought against their wills, but being drawn with the cords of love, and through the power of divine grace, sweetly operating upon their hearts, they move towards him with all readiness and willingness, and cast themselves at his feet, saying, as the leper that came to Christ, “Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean”, (Matthew 8:2) (Mark 1:40 Luke 5:12); and it is grace to allow them to come near him, and amazing goodness in him to receive and cleanse them.

Ver. 3. And the priest shall go forth out of the camp, etc.] A little without the camp, as Ben Gersom notes. There have been several goings forth of Christ our High Priest; first in the council and covenant of grace and peace, when he became the surety of his people; then in time by the assumption of human nature, when he came forth from his Father, and came into the world to save them; next, when he went forth out of the city of Jerusalem to suffer for them; and also, when, at the time of conversion, he goes forth in quest of them, and looks them up, and finds them, and brings them home, which may answer to the type here; and all shows the great readiness of Christ to receive sinners:

and the priest shall look, and, behold, [if] the plague of leprosy be healed in the leper; that all the signs of uncleanness are removed, the swelling, the scab, or bright spot, and the white hair in them, and, instead of that, black hair is grown up. The typical priest did not heal, nor could he, the healing was of God; he only looked to see by signs if the plague was healed; but our antitypical priest looks with an eye of pity and compassion on leprous sinners, and they are enabled to look to him by faith, and virtue goes out of him to the healing of their diseases; as he looks upon them in their blood, and says to them, Live, so he looks upon them in their leprosy, and touches them, and says, “I will, be thou clean”, (Matthew 8:3 Mark 1:41 Luke 5:13), and they are immediately healed; he is the sun of righteousness, which arises upon them with healing in his wings.

Ver. 4. Then shall the priest command to take for him that is to be cleansed, etc.] The command is by the priest, the taking is by any man, as Ben Gersom observes; anyone whom he shall command, the leper himself, or his friends. Aben Ezra interprets it, the priest shall take of his own; but
he adds, there are some that explain it, the leper shall give them to him, namely, what follows:

*two birds alive, [and] clean;* any sort of birds, to whom this description agrees; for not any particular sort are pointed out, as “sparrows” \(^{f474}\), as some render the word, or any other; because either they must be clean or unclean; if unclean, then not to be used; if clean, then this descriptive character is used in vain. These were to be alive, taken alive with the hand, and not shot dead; and this also excepts such as were torn, as Jarchi, or any ways maimed and unsound, and not likely to live; and they were to be “clean”, such as were so according to a law given in a preceding chapter; they were to be none of those unclean birds there mentioned; and, according to the Misnah \(^{f475}\), they were to be alike in sight and height, and in price and value, and to be taken together; and, by the same tradition, they were to be two birds of liberty, that is, not such as were kept tame in cages, but such as fly abroad in the fields, These birds may be considered as a type of Christ, who compares himself to a hen, (\(^{a402337}\) Matthew 23:37); and “birds” may denote his swiftness and readiness to help his people, his tenderness and compassion towards them in distress, and his weakness and frailty in human nature, and his meanness and despicableness in the eyes of men; and these being “alive”, the character well agrees with him, who is the living God, the living. Redeemer, the Mediator that has life in himself, and for his people; and as man, now lives, and will live for evermore, and is the author and giver of life, natural, spiritual, and eternal. And the birds being clean, may denote the purity and holiness of Christ, and so his fitness to be a sacrifice, and his suitableness as food for his people: and the number two may signify either his two natures, divine and human, in both which he lives, and is pure and holy; or his two estates of humiliation and exaltation; or his death by the slain bird, and his resurrection by the living bard, of which more hereafter:

*and the cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop;* a stick of cedar, as Jarchi; it was proper it should be of such a size, as to be known to be cedar wood, but was not to be too heavy for the priest to sprinkle with it, as Ben Gersom; and the same writer observes, it ought to have a leaf on the top of it, that it might appear to be cedar: according to the Misnah \(^{f476}\), it was to be a cubit long, and the fourth part of a bed’s foot thick: “scarlet” was either wool dyed of that colour, or crimson, so Jarchi; or a scarlet thread or line with which the hyssop was bound and fastened to the cedar wood; and, according to the above tradition \(^{f477}\), the “hyssop” was to be neither
counterfeit nor wild, nor Greek, nor Roman, nor any that had any epithet to it, but common simple hyssop; and, as Gersom says, there was not to be less than an handful of it. The signification of these is variously conjectured; according to Abarbinel, they have respect to the nature of the leprosy, and as opposite to it; that as the two live birds signified restoration to his former state, when he had been like one dead, so the cedar wood, being incorruptible and durable, showed that the putrefaction of humours was cured; the scarlet, that the blood was purged, and hence the true colour of the face returned again, and a ruddy and florid countenance as before; and the hyssop being of a savoury smell, that the disagreeable scent and stench were gone: but others think there is a moral meaning in them, that the cedar being the highest of trees, and the scarlet colour coming from a worm, and the hyssop the lowest of plants, (see 1 Kings 4:33); the “cedar wood” may denote the pride and haughtiness of spirit the leprosy is the punishment of, as in Miriam, Gehazi, Uzziah, and the family of Joab: and the worm that gives the scarlet colour, and the hyssop, may signify that humility that becomes a leper that is cleansed, so Jarchi: but they will bear a more evangelical sense, and may have respect either to Christ; the cedar wood may be an emblem of the incorruption of Christ, and of the durable efficacy of his death; the scarlet, of his bloody sufferings, his flaming love to his people, expressed thereby, and the nature of those sins and sinners being of a scarlet die, for whom he suffered; and the hyssop, of the purgative nature of his blood, which cleanses from all sin: or else to the graces of his Spirit; faith may be signified by the cedar wood, which is in some strong, and in all precious and durable; love by scarlet, of a flaming colour, as strong love is like coals of fire, that give a most vehement flame; and hope by hyssop, which is but a lowly, yet lively grace; or faith may be set forth by them all, by the cedar wood for its continuance, by scarlet for its working by love, and by hyssop for its purifying use, as it deals with the blood of Christ.

Ver. 5. And the priest shall command that one of the birds be killed, etc.] That is, shall command another priest to kill one of them, or an Israelite, as Aben Ezra; and who also observes, that some say the leper, or the butcher, as the Targum of Jonathan; the killing of this bird, not being a sacrifice, might be done without the camp, as it was, and not at the altar, near to which sacrifices were slain, and where they were offered: and this was to be done
in an earthen vessel over running water: this vessel, according to the Jewish traditions, was to be a new one, and a fourth part of a log of running water was to be put into it, and then the bird was to be killed over it, and its blood squeezed into it, and then a hole was dug, and it was buried before the leprous person; and so it should be rendered, “over an earthen vessel”, as it is in the Tigurine version, and by Noldius; for how could it be killed in it, especially when water was in it? the killing of this bird may have respect to the sufferings, death, and bloodshed of Christ, which were necessary for the purging and cleansing of leprous sinners, and which were endured in his human nature, comparable to an earthen vessel, as an human body sometimes is; (see 2 Corinthians 4:7); for he was crucified through weakness, and was put to death in the flesh, (2 Corinthians 13:4 1 Peter 3:18); and the running or living water mixed with blood may denote both the sanctification and justification of Christ’s people by the water and blood which sprung from his pierced side, and the continual virtue thereof to take away sin, and free from it; or the active and passive obedience of Christ, which both together are the matter of a sinner’s justification before God.

Ver. 6. As for the living bird, he shall take it, etc.] And dispose of it as after directed; for there was an use for that:

and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop; which were all bound up in one bundle, but whether the living bird was joined to them is a question; according to Jarchi they were separate, the bird by itself, and the cedar wood, etc. by themselves; they were neither bound together nor dipped together; and Ben Gersom is very distinct and expressive; we learn from hence, says he, that three were bound up in one bundle, but the living bird was not comprehended in that bundle; but according to the Misnah they were all joined together, for there it is said, he (the priest) takes the cedar wood, scarlet, and hyssop, and rolls them up with the rest of the scarlet thread, and joins to them the extreme parts of the wings and of the tail of the second bird and dips them; and this seems best to agree with the text, as follows:

and shall dip them and the living bird in the blood of the bird [that was] killed over the running water; that is, into the blood of it as mixed with the running water in the earthen vessel, which together made a sufficient quantity for all these to be dipped into it; whether separately, first the living bird, and then the cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop, or all together: the
bird that was kept alive was a type of Christ, who as a divine Person always alive, and ever will; he is the living God, and impassable: the dipping of this living bird in the blood of the slain one denotes the union of the two natures in Christ, divine and human, and which union remained at the death of Christ; and also shows that the virtue of Christ’s blood arises from his being the living God: the dipping of the cedar wood, scarlet, and hyssop, into the same blood, signifies the exercise of the several graces of the Spirit upon Christ, as crucified and slain, and their dealing with his blood for pardon and cleansing, as faith and hope do, and from whence love receives fresh ardour and rigour.

Ver. 7. And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, etc.] With the hyssop fastened to the cedar stick, with the scarlet wool or thread bound about it, dipped into the blood and water in the earthen vessel; to which the psalmist alludes, (Psalm 51:7); the Egyptians had a great notion of “hyssop”, as of a purifying nature, and therefore used to eat it with bread, to take off the strength of that: upon what part of the leper this sprinkling was made is not said; the Targum of Jonathan says, upon the house of his face, that is, upon the vail that was over his face: but in the Misnah it is said to be on the back of his hand; and so Gersom, though some say it was on his forehead; and sprinkling was typical of Christ’s blood of sprinkling, and of the application of it, and of sharing in all the blessings of it; and this was done seven times, to denote the thorough and perfect cleansing of him, and of every part, every faculty of the soul, and every member of the body, and that from all sin, and the frequent application of it: the last mentioned writer says, at every sprinkling there was a dipping, and that the sense is, that he should sprinkle and dip seven times, as Naaman the Syrian leper did in Jordan; but of the washing of the leper mention is afterwards made:

and shall pronounce him clean; from his leprosy, and so fit for civil and religious conversation, to come into the camp or city, and into the tabernacle;

and shall let the living bird loose into the open field; as a token of the freedom of the leper, and that he was at liberty to go where he pleased: the Misnic doctors say, when he came to let go the living bird, he did not turn its face neither to the sea, nor to the city, nor to the wilderness, as it is said, “but he shall let go the living bird out of the city into the open field”, as in (Leviticus 14:53); the Targum of Jonathan here adds, if the man
should be prepared to be smitten with the leprosy again, the live bird may return to his house the same day, and be fit to be eaten, but the slain bird he shall bury in the sight of the leper: some say, if the bird returned ever so many times, it was to be let go again: this may be a figure of the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and of his justification upon it, as the head and representative of his people, and of their free and full discharge from guilt, condemnation, and death, through him, and of his and their being received up into heaven, and whither their hearts should be directed, in affection and thankfulness for their great deliverance and salvation; (see 1 Timothy 3:16, Colossians 3:1,2).

**Ver. 8.** And he that is to be cleansed shall wash his clothes, etc.] That there may be no remains of the infection in them, and that they might not convey an ill scent to others: so the conversation garments of the saints are to be washed in the blood of the Lamb, (Revelation 7:14);

and shave off all his hair; what is here expressed in general is more particularly declared in (Leviticus 14:9); the hair of his head, beard, and eyebrows; according to Gersom, this was done by the priest, and so Maimonides says, that none but a priest might shave him; and yet the text seems plainly to ascribe this, as well as the washing of his clothes and himself, to the leper that was to be cleansed; and the same writers say, that if two hairs were left it was no shaving; and so says the Misnah: the shaving of the leper’s hairs signified the weakening of the strength of sin; the mortification of the deeds of the body, through the Spirit, and the laying aside all superfluity of naughtiness, and the excrescences of the flesh; a parting with every thing that grows out of a man’s self, sin or self-righteousness; a laying a man bare and open, that nothing may lie hid and covered, and escape cleansing:

and wash himself in water, that he may be clean: which was to be done by dipping in a collection of water, and not in running water, as Gersom observes, in a quantity of water sufficient to cover the whole body; which, according to the Talmud, was forty seahs, and was a cubit square in breadth, and three cubits deep: this may denote the washing of sinful men with the washing of regeneration, but more especially with the blood of Christ, the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness, (Zechariah 13:1);

and after that he shall come into the camp; into the camp of Israel, while in the wilderness, and in after times into the city, where he used to dwell; and may sign try the admittance of such into the church of God again, who
appear to be cleansed from sin, to have true repentance towards God for it, and faith in the blood of Christ:

and shall tarry abroad out of his tent seven days; that is, out of his own tent or house, where his wife and family dwelt: this precaution was taken, lest there should be any remains of his disorder lurking, in him that might endanger his wife and family, especially his wife, with whom he was to have no conjugal conversation as yet; so it is said in the Misnah, that he was to be separated from his house seven days, and forbid the use of the marriage bed; and this prohibition. Jarchi thinks is intended in this clause, and so Maimonides, to which agrees the Targum of Jonathan,

“he shall sit without the tent of the house of his habitation, and shall not come near to the side of his wife seven days.”

Ver. 9. But it shall be on the seventh day, etc.] After he was first brought to the priest, and cleansed by the two birds, taken and used for him as directed, and he had been shaved and washed:

that he shall shave all his hair; a second time, whatsoever was grown in those seven days:

all off his head, and his beard, and his eyebrows; even all his hair he shall shave off; not only the hair of the parts mentioned, but all other, the hair of his feet also, as Aben Ezra notes, who observes, that some say, the hair of his arms, and thighs, and breast; and so according to the Misnah, this was a second shaving, for it is said,

“in the seventh day he shaves a second time, according to the first shaving:”

he shall wash his clothes, also he shall wash his flesh in water, and he shall be clean; this was also repeated on the seventh, both the washing of his clothes, and the dipping of him in water; after which he was accounted clean, and was neither defiled nor defiling, and might go into his own tent or house, and into the tabernacle, and offer his offerings, and partake of the privileges of it, at least some of them, even the same day; according to the tradition he may eat of the tithes, and after sunset he may eat of the heave offerings, and when he has brought his atonement he may eat of the holy things.
Ver. 10. And on the eighth day, etc.] From the leper’s first appearance before the priest, and the day after the above things were done, in (Leviticus 14:9):

he shall take two he lambs without blemish; the one for a trespass offering, and the other for a burnt offering; and both typical of Christ the Lamb of God, without spot and blemish:

and one ewe lamb of the first year without blemish; for a sin offering, a type of Christ also:

and three tenth deals of fine flour, [for] a meat offering, mingled with oil; that is, three tenth parts of an ephah, or three omers; one of which was as much, or more than a man could eat in a day, (see Exodus 16:36); there were three of these to answer to and accompany the three lambs for sacrifice, just such a quantity was allotted to the lambs of the daily sacrifice, (Exodus 29:40); typical, likewise of Christ, who is the true bread, and whose flesh is meat indeed:

and one log of oil; to be used as after directed: this measure was about half a pint, and is an emblem of the grace and Spirit of God, received by the saints in measure, and is the same with the oil of gladness, poured on Christ without measure, (Psalm 45:7 John 3:34).

Ver. 11. And the priest that maketh [him] clean, etc.] By the above rites and ceremonies, and the after sacrifices offered:

shall present the man that is to be made clean, and those things before the Lord; the two he lambs, and the ewe lamb; and it seems also the meat offerings, and the log of oil; but these Ben Gersom excepts, and when the leper, with these, is said to be set or presented before the Lord, this must not be understood of his being introduced, into the tabernacle, had of his being placed in the court itself; for as yet, as Jarchi says, he was “Mechoser Cippurim”, one that needed expiation, and therefore, till that was done, could not be admitted; but he was set

[at] the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; at the eastern gate, which afterwards, when the temple was built, was called the gate of Nicanor, and lay between the court of the women and the court of the Israelites: thus everyone that has received favours from the Lord, by restoration of health, or by deliverance from dangers, or be it in whatsoever way it will, should present himself and his sacrifice of praise
unto him; and his case should be presented in a public manner before the congregation of the saints by the minister of it, in token of gratitude and thankfulness for mercies received.

**Ver. 12. And the priest shall take one he lamb**, etc.] One of the he lambs brought by the leper for his offering:

*and offer him for a trespass offering*; for though the leprosy itself was a disorder or disease, and not sinful, yet the cause of it was sin, a trespass against God, and therefore a trespass offering must be offered: which was typical of Christ, whose soul was made a trespass offering, (Isaiah 53:10); where the same word is used as here:

*and the log of oil*; (see Gill on “Leviticus 14:10”);

*and wave them [for] a wave offering before the Lord*; heaving of them up and down, moving of them to and fro towards the several parts of the world, east, west, north, and south, even both the log of oil, and the he lamb for the trespass offering, and that alive, as Jarchi observes, and so says Maimonides ⁴⁹¹.

**Ver. 13. And he shall slay the lamb**, etc.] The priest, or the butcher, as the Targum of Jonathan, the slaughterer, the priest appointed for that service; at which time both the hands of the leper were laid upon it, as says the Misnah ⁴⁹²; for though the leper might not go into the court as yet, the sacrifice was brought to the door of the tabernacle for him to put his hands on it: so Maimonides ⁴⁹³ relates; the trespass offering of the leper is brought to the door, and he puts both his hands into the court, and lays them on it, and they immediately slay it:

*in the place where he shall kill the sin offering in the holy place*; in the court of the tabernacle, on the north side of the altar, as Jarchi observes, (see Leviticus 1:11 6:25);

*for as the sin offering [is] the priest’s, [so is] the trespass offering*; and to be eaten by him and his sons in the holy place, and by none but them, (see Leviticus 6:26,29);

*it [is] most holy*; which is the reason why none else might eat of it, typical of Christ the most Holy, whose flesh is only eaten by true believers in him, made priests unto God by him.
Ver. 14. *And the priest shall take [some] of the blood of the trespass offering*, etc.] According to the Misnath f494, two priests received the blood of it, one in a vessel and the other in his hand; he that received it in a vessel went and sprinkled it upon the wall (or top, as Maimonides f495) of the altar; and he that received it in his hand went to the leper, and the leper having dipped himself in the chamber of the lepers, went and stood in the gate of Nicanor:

*and the priest shall put [it] upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot*; as was done at the consecration of the high priest, (see Gill on “<022920>Exodus 29:20”), (see Gill on “<030824>Leviticus 8:24”): now as the leper stood at the door of the tabernacle without the court, he was obliged to put in his head, his right hand, and his right foot, in order to have the blood put on them by the priest, who was in the court; and these were put in either separately one after another, or together: the tradition runs thus f496, he (the leper) thrust in his head, and (the priest) put (the blood) upon the tip of his ear; his hand, and he put it upon the thumb of his hand; his foot, and he put it upon the great toe of his foot: and the application of the blood to these parts showed that the leper had now a right to hear the word of God, to partake of all privileges, to touch anything without defiling it, and to go into any house or company where he thought fit, he was now at full liberty; more evangelically these things may signify the sanctification and cleansing of those parts, and of the whole man by the blood of Christ; and particularly may signify, that as the ear is unclean, uncircumcised, and unsanctified in a leprous sinner and even there are hearing sins in the best of men, the ear is sanctified, and hearing sins removed by the blood of Christ; and as the right hand, being the instrument of action, may denote the evil works of men, and even since the most righteous performances of the best of men are attended with sin, the blood of Christ, which cleanses from all sin, had need to be put upon them; and whereas the conversation of then, which the foot may be an emblem of, is sinful and vain, it is by the blood of Christ that they are redeemed from it; and the influence of that blood sprinkled on the conscience will oblige and constrain men to live and walk soberly, righteously, and godly.

Ver. 15. *And the priest shall take [some] of the log of oil*, etc.] With his right hand, as the Targum of Jonathan adds:
and pour [it] into the palm of his own left hand: but in the original text it is, “pour it into the palm of the priest’s left hand”: and it is a question, whether he or another priest is meant; according to Aben Ezra, the oil was to be poured into the hand of the priest that was cleansing the leper, and which, he thinks, is plain from what follows; but Gersom thinks it is better to understand it of another priest, since it is not said into his own hand, but into the hand of the priest; and the Misnah is clear for it, he (the priest) takes of the log of oil and pours it into the palm of his fellow (priest), but if he pours it into his own palm it is sufficient.

Ver. 16. And the priest shall dip his right finger, etc.] The finger of his right hand, the forefinger of it:

in the oil that [is] in his left hand; either that is in his own left hand, or in the left hand of a fellow priest:

and shall sprinkle of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord; that is, over against the house of the holy of holies, as Jarchi, where Jehovah dwelt; but standing at the same time at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, which was eastward, and so he looked westward to the holy of holies; so says the Misnah, on which one of the commentators observes, that he did not bring the oil into the temple to sprinkle it before the vail: but he stood in the court, and turned his face to the holy of holies, and so sprinkled upon the floor of the court: and the Jewish doctors are very express for it, according to the Misnah, that for every sprinkling there was a dipping; that as often as he sprinkled, so often he must dip his finger in the oil, and not that he might dip his finger once, and of that sprinkle two or three times; for the finger must be dipped seven times: this may denote the thanksgiving of the leper for his cleansing, proceeding from the grace of God, and the Lord’s gracious acceptance of it.

Ver. 17. And of the rest of the oil that [is] in his hand, etc.] That was either in the hand of the priest that was cleansing, or in the hand of his fellow priest; such of it as was left after some of it had been sprinkled seven times before the Lord:

shall the priest put upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot; signifying that these parts in the leprous sinner need to be sanctified by the grace of the Spirit of God, comparable to oil, with which
all the Lord’s people are anointed, and is that unction they receive from the Holy One, their great High Priest; by this the ear is sanctified so as to hear the word, so as to understand it and mix it with faith; and the thumb of the right hand having oil put on that, may signify that the actions of good men are influenced by the Spirit of God, who works in them both to will and to do, and without whose grace they can do nothing in a spiritual manner; and the great toe of the right foot, the instrument of walking, being anointed with the same, may denote that it is through the grace of God saints have their conversation in the world in simplicity and godly sincerity, and as becomes the Gospel of Christ: the oil was to be put,

*upon the blood of the trespass offering:* that is, upon the place of the blood of it, as in (Leviticus 14:28); which is, as the Targum of Jonathan paraphrases it, the place in which he put at first the blood of the trespass offering: for the Jewish writers observe, that the log of oil depended on the trespass offering; for if the flood of the trespass offering was not first sprinkled, the sprinkling of the oil was of no avail: this shows that the blood of Christ, is the foundation of men’s receiving the grace of the Spirit, and that it is owing to that it is bestowed upon them; the application of his grace follows redemption by the blood of Christ, who gave himself to redeem them from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works; and for whomsoever expiation is made by the blood of Christ, they are sanctified by the Spirit of Christ.

**Ver. 18. And the remnant of the oil that [is] in the priests hand,** etc.] Either in the hand of the priest that makes the leper clean, or in the hand of a fellow priest; what was left of that after some of it had been sprinkled seven times before the Lord, and after other of it had been put upon the several parts of the leper, as directed in (Leviticus 14:17):

*he shall pour upon the head of him that is to be cleansed;* for the plague of leprosy was sometimes in the head, (Leviticus 13:44); and this may denote either the blessings of grace on the head of the righteous, or that a man’s head should be sanctified; he should have pure principles as well as pure practices; and that his head knowledge should be sanctified knowledge; some have only the form of godliness, but deny the power of it:

*and the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord;* by putting the oil on the several parts, particularly on the head, which was done, as is said in the Misnah, to make atonement; if he puts it,
atonement is made, but if he does not put it, there is no atonement made; but one would think rather the atonement refers to all the priest did, both in offering the trespass offering, and in putting both the blood of that and the oil on the several parts that are mentioned: this atonement was made for the sin or sins which were the cause or the man’s leprosy: what was done with the rest of the log of oil is not said; it was the portion of the priests, and was for their use: Maimonides says \textsuperscript{f503}, the rest of the log of oil is not eaten but in the court by the males of the priests, as other the most holy things; and that it is unlawful to eat thereof until the priest had sprinkled of it seven times, and put it on the above parts; and if one eats he is to be beaten.

Ver. 19. \textit{And the priest shall offer the sin offering}, etc.] This was the ewe lamb, according to the rite of every sin offering, as Aben Ezra says; and was typical of Christ, as all such offerings were, who was made sin and a sin offering for his people:

\textit{and make an atonement for him that was to be cleansed from his uncleanness}; for it seems the atonement was not perfected by the trespass offering and all the preceding rites; but a sin offering was necessary both on account of moral uncleanness, the cause of the leprosy, and of ceremonial uncleanness by it:

\textit{and afterward he shall kill the burnt offering}; the other he lamb; the burnt offering for the most part following the sin or trespass offering as a gift by way of thankfulness, atonement being made for sin by the other offerings; which also was typical of Christ, as all burnt offerings were.

Ver. 20. \textit{And the priest shall offer the burnt offering and the meat offering upon the altar}, etc.] The meat offering which belonged to that, and went along with it, even one tenth deal of fine flour mingled with oil; but no mention being made of any meat offering with the other offerings already offered, the trespass offering and the sin offering; some say, as Aben Ezra observes, that the whole meat offering, consisting of three tenth deals of fine flour, was offered with the burnt offering, which must be a saving to the priest, if he only burnt one handful of it, as in other cases, the rest falling to his part:

\textit{and the priest shall make an atonement for him}; these offerings still furthering of it, and sending to perfect it, and did complete it:

\textit{and he shall be clean}; in a typical and ceremonial sense.
Ver. 21. And if he [be] poor, and cannot get so much, etc.] As three lambs, and three tenth deals of fine flour:

then he shall take one lamb [for] a trespass offering to be waved, to make an atonement for him; one he lamb, and was excused the other he lamb for a burnt offering, and the ewe lamb for a sin offering; but a lamb he must bring, a type of Christ the Lamb of God, for without his blood and sacrifice there is no atonement for rich poor, but for both thereby:

and one tenth deal of flour mingled with oil for a meat offering: instead three tenth deals; this abatement in the several kinds of offerings was a great indulgence to the poor, and an instance of God’s goodness to them, that they might not be pressed above measure, and yet share the same benefits and advantages as the rich:

and a log of oil: here was no abatement in this, nor was there need of any; half a pint of oil, in a country which abounded with it, might be bought for a small price: however, the grace of the Spirit, signified by oil, is to be had freely of Christ, and in as large a quantity by a poor man as by a rich man, and is equally necessary to the one as to the other, who are all one in Christ Jesus; (see <480328>Galatians 3:28 <510311>Colossians 3:11).

Ver. 22. And two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, such as he is able to get, etc.] As good as he can get for his money, or his money he is possessed of will purchase; but if he was not able to purchase these of the better sort, the best he could get would be acceptable; so indulgent, kind, and merciful was God to the poor in this case; these were instead of the other two lambs required of those that were able to bring them, and answered all the purposes of them:

and the one shall be a sin offering, and the other a burnt offering: one of the turtledoves or one of the young pigeons should be for the one, and the other for the other; so that the poor man had as many offerings for his atonement and cleansing as the rich, and his expiation and purgation were as complete as theirs.

Ver. 23. And he shall bring them on the eighth day, for his cleansing, etc.] Which supposes him to have gone through all the rites and ceremonies of cleansing throughout the seven days, from his first appearance before the priest; such as his being sprinkled with the cedar wood, hyssop, and scarlet, dipped in the blood of the slain bird, mixed with running water; the shaving off of his hair, and washing his flesh and clothes
in water; all which being done, on the eighth day he was to bring his lamb for a trespass offering, and one tenth deal of fine flour, for a meat offering, and two turtledoves or two young pigeons, one for a sin offering and the other for a burnt offering:

unto the priest, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord; where the rich man also and his offerings were presented; (see Gill on “<031411>Leviticus 14:11”); and the same rites are enjoined for the cleansing of the poor leper as the rich one, in (<031423>Leviticus 14:23-31), of which see the notes on (<031412>Leviticus 14:12-21), signifying that they are not exempt from duty, or abridged of any privilege on account of poverty; the persons and services of the people of God being equally acceptable to him, whether rich or poor.

Ver. 24. And the priest shall take the lamb of the trespass offering, etc.] (See Gill on “<031412>Leviticus 14:12”).

Ver. 25. And he shall kill the lamb of the trespass offering, etc.] (See Gill on “<031413>Leviticus 14:13”).

and the priest shall take some of the blood of the trespass offering, etc. (See Gill on “<031414>Leviticus 14:14”).

Ver. 26. And the priest shall pour of the oil into the palm of his own left hand.] (See Gill on “<031415>Leviticus 14:15”).

Ver. 27. And the priest shall sprinkle with his right finger some of the oil, etc.] (See Gill on “<031416>Leviticus 14:16”).

Ver. 28. And the priest shall put of the oil that is in his hand, etc.] (See Gill on “<031417>Leviticus 14:17”).

Ver. 29. And the rest of the oil that is in the priest’s hand, etc.] (See Gill on “<031418>Leviticus 14:18”).

Ver. 30. And he shall offer the one of the turtledoves, etc.] (See Gill on “<031422>Leviticus 14:22”).

Ver. 31. [Even] such as he is able to get, the one for a sin offering, etc.] (See Gill on “<031422>Leviticus 14:22”).

Ver. 32. This is the law of him in whom is the plague of leprosy, etc.] The former part of the chapter contains an account of the laws, rites,
and ceremonies of a leper who was able to bear the expenses them: this latter part respects such laws, rites, and ceremonies, that belonged to him: whose hand is not able to get [that which pertaineth] to his cleansing; as the three lambs and three tenth deals of fine flour, and therefore one lamb, and one tenth deal of fine flour, and two turtles or two young pigeons, were admitted of in the room of them, in consideration of his poverty. The Jewish canons respecting the cases of a poor and rich leper are these 1504: if a poor leper offers the sacrifice of a rich man, it is very well; but if a rich leper offers the sacrifice of a poor one, it is not sufficient; if a poor leper offers his sacrifice and he becomes rich, or if when rich, and he afterwards becomes poor, all goes after the sin offering; that is, as they 1505 explain it, if a man when he offers his sin offering is poor, and so his offering is of a turtle or pigeon, though he should become rich he must finish the offering of the poor, by bringing for a burnt offering one of the fowls; and so if he was rich, and offered the sin offering out of the lambs, though he should become poor, he must offer the burnt offering of the same; but the trespass offering is generally pitched upon as the rule in which the poor and the rich were equal: and Maimonides 1506 says, all goes after the trespass offering; as if at the time of slaying the trespass offering he is rich, he must finish the offering of a rich man, but if poor he must finish the offering of a poor man: it may be observed that a great deal of notice is taken of a leper, and strict inquiry made into the nature of leprosy, and the various signs of it given; and a great deal to do about the cleansing and expiation of him; all which shows what notice God takes of leprous sinners, and what a diligent scrutiny should be made into the evil nature of sin, and what a provision God has made for the cleansing and atonement of sinners by the blood and sacrifice of his Son; which is here typified by all sorts of offerings, the sin offering, the trespass offering, the burnt offering, and the meat offering.

**Ver. 33. And the Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, etc.**] At the same time as the above laws were delivered concerning the leper, and the cleansing of him, or however immediately upon that; the affair of the leprosy of houses being what belonged to the priest to examine into and cleanse from:

* * * * * * * * * * *

* * * * * * * * * * *

**Ver. 34. When ye be come into the land of Canaan, etc.**] Which as yet they were not come to, being in the wilderness, and so the following law
concerning the leprosy in houses could not yet take place, they now dwelling in tents, and not in houses:

*which I give to you for a possession*; the Lord had given it to Abraham, and his seed, long ago, to be their inheritance, and now he was about to put them into the possession of it, which they were to hold as their own under God, their sovereign Lord and King:

*and I put the plague of leprosy in a house of the land of your possession*; by which it appears that this kind of leprosy was from the immediate hand of God, and was supernatural and miraculous, as the Jewish writers affirm \[f507\]; nor is there anything in common, or at least in our parts of the world, that is answerable unto it; and from hence the same writers \[f508\] conclude, that houses of Gentiles are exempt from it, only the houses of the Israelites in the land of Canaan had it; and they likewise except Jerusalem, and say \[f509\], that was not defiled with the plague of leprosy, as it is written, “and I put the plague of leprosy in a house of the land of your possession”; for Jerusalem was not divided among the tribes; and they suppose, whenever it was put into any house, it was on account of some sin or sins committed by the owner; and so the Targum of Jonathan, and there be found a man that builds his house with rapine and violence, then I will put the plague, etc. thought they commonly ascribe it to evil speaking, which they gather from the case of Miriam.

*Ver. 35. And he that owneth the house shall come, and tell the priest, etc.*] As soon as he observes any sign of leprosy in it, or which gives him a suspicion of it:

*saying, it seemeth unto me [there is] as it were a plague in the house*; he must not say expressly there is one, how certain soever he may be of it, because the matter must be determined by a priest: so runs the Jewish canon \[f510\], he whose the house is comes and declares to the priest, saying, there appears to me as a plague in the house; and though he is a wise man, and knows that there is a plague certainly, he may not determine, and say, there appears to me a plague in the house, but there appears to me as it were a plague in the house; it looks like one, there is some reason to suspect it.

*Ver. 36. Then the priest shall command that they empty the house, etc.*] Clear it of all persons and things; everybody was obliged to go out of it;
and all the furniture of it, all the household goods in it, were to be removed from it:

before the priest go [into it] to see the plague, that all that [is] in the house be not made clean; as would be the case should the priest view it, and pronounce it unclean before the removal of them; agreeably to which is the Jewish tradition \(f^{511}\), before a priest comes to see the plague, not anything in the house is defiled; but after he is come to see it, even bundles of sticks, and of reeds, are defiled, which are not reckoned under the uncleanness to be removed: so that this was a kindness to the owner of the house, that his loss might not be so great as it otherwise would be, if he did not take care to get his goods out previous to the inspection of the priest:

and afterward the priest shall go in to see the house; to examine it, whether the signs of leprosy are in it.

Ver. 37. And he shall look on the plague, etc.] That which is taken or suspected to be one, being pointed unto by the owner of the house:

and, behold, [if] the plague [be] in the walls of the house; for there it chiefly was, if not solely; and from hence Gersom infers that it must be a walled house, and that it must have four walls, neither more nor fewer; and with this agrees the Misnah \(f^{512}\), according to which it must be four square; the signs of which were, when it appeared,

with hollow strakes, greenish or reddish, which in sight [are] lower than the wall: these signs agree with the other signs before given of leprosy in men and garments; the first, the hollow strakes, which are explained by being lower in appearance than the wall, a sort of corrosion or eating into it, which made cavities in it, answer to the plague being deeper than the skin of the flesh in men; and the colours greenish or reddish, or exceeding green or red, as Gersom, are the same with those of the leprosy in clothes; and some such like appearances are in salpetre walls, or in walls eaten by saline and nitrous particles; and also by sulphureous, oily, and arsenical ones, as Scheuchzer observes \(f^{513}\), and are not only tending to ruin, but unhealthful, as if they had rather been eaten by a canker or spreading ulcer; who also speaks of a fossil, called in the German language “steingalla”, that is, the gall of stones, by which they are easily eaten into, because of the vitriolic salt of the fire stone, which for the most part goes along with that mineral, which is dissolved by the moist air. Though this leprosy, in the walls of a house, seems not to have risen from any natural causes, but was
from the immediate hand of God; and there have been strange diseases, which have produced uncommon effects on houses, and other things: in the times of Narses is said to be a great plague, especially in the province of Liguria, and on a sudden appeared certain marks and prints on houses, doors, vessels, and clothes, which, if they attempted to wash off, appeared more and more.

Ver. 38. Then the priest shall go out of the house to the door of the house, etc.] Thereby signifying that it was not fit to be inhabited, and there standing to see it shut up, as follows:

and shut up the house seven days: to observe what alteration would be made in that time, and which would sooner be discovered in a house uninhabited.

Ver. 39. And the priest shall come again the seventh day, and shall look, etc.] On the seventh day from his shutting of it up, he shall open it again, go into it, and observe in what condition it is:

and, behold, [if] the plague be spread in the walls of the house: the hollow strakes are become deeper, or the coloured spots are become larger: spreading was always a sign of leprosy, both in the bodies of men, and in garments.

Ver. 40. Then the priest shall command that they take away the stones in which the plague [is], etc.] In there appeared any cavities, or the above colours, and these spreading: in order to put a stop thereunto, these stones were to be drawn or pulled out, as the word signifies, in such manner as not to endanger the fall of the house, and two stones at least were to be taken out; for, as Gersom says, a house was not shut up unless the plague appeared on two stones:

and they shall cast them into an unclean place without the city; where dead carcasses were laid, and dung, and filth of every sort; and being laid in such a place, it would be known that they were unclean, as Aben Ezra observes, and so would not be made use of for any purpose.

Ver. 41. And he shall cause the house to be scraped within round about, etc.] All the walls on each side, and at each end, and every stone in them; which, though they had no appearance on them, yet should there be any infection in them, which as yet was not seen, it might be removed, and a spread prevented:
and they shall pour out the dust that they scrape off without the city, into an unclean place; the scrapings they were to put into some vessel, and carry them thither and pour them out, or into a cart, and there throw them, that they might lie with other rubbish, and not be made use of any more.

Ver. 42. And they shall take other stones, etc.] From elsewhere, such as are sound and whole:

and put [them] in the place of these stones; such as will exactly answer them, as to number and size, and so fill up the space vacant by the removal of the other, and support the building:

and he shall take other mortar, and plaster the house; the master of the house was to do this, or take care that it was done; but others by the order of the priest, as they took away the tainted stones, put others in their place.

Ver. 43. And if the plague come again, and break out in the house, etc.] In the above signs of it:

after that he hath taken away the stones; which were infected, or ordered them to be taken away:

and after he hath scraped the house; so that there seemed to be no remains of the plague:

and after it is plastered; to prevent if possible any return of it, but in vain.

Ver. 44. Then the priest shall come and look, etc.] On the seventh day of the second week; though, according to Maimonides f515, this was at the end of the third seven day, or on the nineteenth day from his first inspection into it; the seventh day being reckoned for the last of the first week, and the first of the second, and so on:

and, behold, [if] the plague be spread in the house; after all the above precaution is taken;

it [is] a fretting leprosy in the house; like that in the garment, (see Gill on “<031351>Leviticus 13:51”):

it [is] unclean; and so not to be inhabited.

Ver. 45. And he shall break down the house, etc.] Order it to be pulled down, and demolished entirely, that is, the priest shall give such orders; but
Gersom thinks this was to be done by the owner of the house, and that he was to do it himself, and have no associate with him in it:

"the stones of it, and the timber thereof, and all the mortar of the house;" and, according to the Jewish canons, a house was not defiled with the plague of leprosy, unless it had in it stones, and timber, and dust, or earth; a house which had not stones, timber, and dust in it, and the plague appeared in it, even if anyone after that brought in stones; timber, and dust, it was clean

"and he shall carry [them] forth out of the city unto an unclean place: such materials were not to be made use of to rebuild that house, or to be employed in the building of any other. This house may be an emblem of a visible church of God on earth, which is often in Scripture compared to a house, as that signifies both an edifice and a family, and is sometimes called the house of the living God; and into which sometimes the leprosy of immorality and profaneness gets and spreads, or of errors and heresies, which creep in unawares, spread themselves gradually, and sometimes very fast, and eat as do a canker, and are very troublesome and defiling; and which God permits to enter in, that they which are approved might be made manifest: now when this is the case, or there is any appearance of it, the priests, the ministers of the Lord, are to be told of it, who are to examine into it, and rebuke sharply, as the case requires; and care is to be taken that the infection spread not; the tainted stones, immoral or heretical persons, are to be removed from the communion of the church, and others to be put in their room, as may present; such as are dug out of the common quarry of nature, and separated from the rest of the world, and are hewn and squared by the Spirit and grace of God, and are become lively stones; such are to be added to the church for the support and increase of it. Sharp reproofs are to be given to those who are incorrigible, which may be signified by the scraping of the house; and forgiveness, tenderness, and love, that covers a multitude of sins, are to be shown to those who truly repent, of which plastering may be an emblem; but if, after all, the above disorders in principle and practice spread, and they appear to be incurable, then the house is pulled down, the church-state or candlestick is removed out of its place. And this may be illustrated in two instances, first in the Jewish church, which is sometimes called the house of Israel, and in which great corruptions prevailed, especially in the times of Christ and his apostles; and all means of reformation then being ineffectual, it was utterly destroyed, their ecclesiastical state, and all the ordinances of it; the temple,
the house of God, was demolished, and not one stone left upon another, (Matthew 24:2); and next in the church of Rome, once a church of God, a temple of his, where antichrist rose up and sat, and has by him been overspread with the leprosy of immorality, false doctrine, superstitious and idolatrous worship; and at times God has been emptying it, or removing his own people out of it, and will do so again before the utter destruction of it, which is hastening on; when it will be utterly demolished, as Babylon its emblem was, so that a stone of it shall not be taken, either for foundations or for a corner, (Jeremiah 51:26). This also may be applied to the earthly houses of our tabernacles, in which the leprosy of sin is so deeply rooted, that, until they are dissolved, it will never be removed, notwithstanding all the means made use of for the mortification of the deeds of the body.

Ver. 46. Moreover, he that goeth into the house all the while it is shut up, etc.] The utmost of which were three weeks, as Jarchi observes; during the time a house was shut up, no man might enter it: if he did, he

shall be unclean until the evening; might not have any conversation with men until the evening was come, and he had washed himself; nay, according to the Misnah, if a clean person thrust in his head, or the greatest part of his body, into an unclean house, he was defiled; and whoever entered into a leprous house, and his clothes are on his shoulder, and his sandals (on his feet), and his rings on his hands, he and they are unclean immediately; and if he has his clothes on, and his sandals on his feet, and his rings on his hands, he is immediately defiled, and they are clean.

Ver. 47. And he that lieth in the house shall wash his clothes, etc.] Which is more than bare entrance into it, and might be supposed the more to be infected by it, and therefore obliged to the washing of himself, and his garments:

and he that eateth in the house shall wash his clothes; if he stayed no longer than while he ate half a piece of wheaten bread he was clean, but not if he stayed so long as to eat a like quantity of barley bread, and sat down and ate it with food.

Ver. 48. And if the priest shall come in, and look [upon it], etc.] That is, on the seventh day of the second week of its being shut up:
and, behold, the plague hath not spread in the house, after the house was plastered; (see Gill on “<031442>Leviticus 14:42”):

then the priest shall pronounce the house clean; fit to be inhabited, and so no more to be shut up, but free for use as before:

because the plague is healed; the infection being wholly removed by taking out the stones, scraping, and plastering the house, and so an entire stop put to the spread of it.

Ver. 49. And he shall take to cleanse the house, etc.] The priest, or by his fellow priest, as Aben Ezra, though some interpret it of the master of the house; in (<031449>Leviticus 14:49-53), an account is given of the manner of cleansing a leprous house, which is the same with that of cleansing a leprous man, see notes on <031404>Leviticus 14:4-7,

Two birds. The birds here indeed are not described as “alive and clean”, (<031404>Leviticus 14:4); but both are plainly implied and the house is said to be cleansed with the blood of the slain bird, as well as with the living bird; and it was the upper door post of the house which was sprinkled seven times with it, but there were no sacrifices offered; in this case, as in the cleansing of the leper, the atonement for it was made by the other rites, which were sufficient to render it habitable again, and free for use, either of the owner or any other person;

and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop. (See Gill on “<031404>Leviticus 14:4”).

Ver. 50. And he shall kill the one of the birds in an earthen vessel over running water.] (See Gill on “<031405>Leviticus 14:5”).

Ver. 51. And he shall take the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet, and the living bird, etc.] (See Gill on “<031406>Leviticus 14:6”).

and sprinkle the house seven times. (See Gill on “<031407>Leviticus 14:7”).

Ver. 52. And he shall cleanse the house with the blood of the bird, etc.] (See Gill on “<031408>Leviticus 14:4”).

Ver. 53. But he shall let go the living bird out of the city into the open fields, etc.] (See Gill on “<031407>Leviticus 14:7”).

Ver. 54. This [is] the law for all manner of plague of leprosy, and scall.] The leprosy in general in the bodies of men, and of that in particular which
was on the head and beard, and went by the name of the scall, (Leviticus 13:29-37). In (Leviticus 14:54-56) is a recapitulation of the several laws and rules relating to leprosy of all kinds, delivered in this and the preceding chapter.

Ver. 55. And for the leprosy of a garment, etc.] Of which (see Leviticus 13:47-59);

and of an house; largely treated of in this chapter, (Leviticus 14:34-48).

Ver. 56. And for a rising, and for a scab, and for a bright spot.] Which were three sorts of leprosy in the skin of man’s flesh; (see Gill on "Leviticus 13:2").

Ver. 57. To teach when [it is] unclean, and when it is clean, etc.] A man, his garment, or his house; for it respects them all, as Aben Ezra observes; which was the business of the priests to teach men, and they by the above laws and rules were instructed how to judge of cases, and by which they were capable of pronouncing persons or things clean or unclean:

this [is] the law of leprosy; respecting every sort of it, and which is very remarkably enlarged upon.
CHAPTER 15

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 15

This chapter treats of uncleanness by issues in men and women; in men, a running issue, (Leviticus 15:1-3), which defiles him, and everything he touches, or that touches him or them, (Leviticus 15:4-12); the cleansing from which is directed to, (Leviticus 15:13-15); and seed flowing from him, (Leviticus 15:16-18); in women, their ordinary courses, (Leviticus 15:19-24); or extraordinary ones, (Leviticus 15:25-27); and the law for the cleansing of them, (Leviticus 15:28-31); and a recapitulation of the whole, (Leviticus 15:32,33).

Ver. 1. *And the Lord spake unto Moses, and unto Aaron, etc.*] Aaron is spoken to as well Moses, because some of these purifications, after mentioned, depended on the priest, as the affair of profluvious men and women, as Gersom observes:

saying; as follows.

Ver. 2. *Speak unto the children of Israel, etc.*] From whence we learn, says the above mentioned writer, that these uncleannesses were only usual among the children of Israel, not among the Gentiles; that is, the laws respecting them were only binding on the one, and not on the other: and say unto them, when any man; in the Hebrew text it is, “a man, a man”, which the Targum of Jonathan paraphrases, a young man, and an old man:

*hath a running issue out of his flesh*; what physicians call a “gonorrhoea”, and we, as in the margin of our Bibles, “the running of the reins”:

*[because of] his issue, he [is] unclean*; in a ceremonial sense, though it arises from a natural cause; but if not from any criminal one, from a debauch, but from a strain, or some such like thing, the man was not defiled, otherwise he was; the Targum of Jonathan is,

“if he sees it three times he is unclean;”
so the Misnah \textsuperscript{f520}.

Ver. 3. \textit{And this shall be his uncleanness in his issue}, etc.] Or the sign of it, by which it may be judged whether he is unclean by it or no:

\textit{whether his flesh run with his issue}; or salivates, or emits a flow of matter like a saliva, or in the manner of spittle:

\textit{or his flesh be stopped from his issue}; with it, or because of it; because it is gross, as Jarchi says, it cannot come forth freely:

\textit{it [is] his uncleanness}; whether it be one or the other, he is reckoned on account of it an unclean person. This was an emblem of the corruption and vitiosity of nature, and of all evil things that are in or flow out of the evil heart of man, which are defiling to him; (see \textit{Matthew 15:18,19}).

Ver. 4. \textit{Every bed whereon he lieth that hath the issue is unclean}, etc.] Which he constantly makes use of; so the Targum of Jonathan, which is peculiar to him, and appointed and appropriated for him to lie upon. Jarchi says, every bed that is fit to lie upon, thou is appropriated to another service; but, he adds meaning is, which he shall lie upon (or continue to lie upon); for it is not said, which he hath laid upon, but which he lieth upon, and is used by him continually; according to the Misnah \textsuperscript{f521}, a man that has an issue defiles a bed five ways, so as to defile a man, and to defile garments; standing, sitting, lying, hanging, and leaning:

\textit{and everything whereon he sitteth shall be unclean}; which is appropriated to sit upon; and so the Targum, as before, what is his proper peculiar seat, what he is used to sit upon, and is fit for that purpose: and it is observed by some Jewish writers \textsuperscript{f522} that a vessel that is not fit to sit upon is excluded, as if a man was to turn up a bushel, or any other measure, to sit upon it; (see \textit{Titus 1:15}).

Ver. 5. \textit{And whosoever toucheth his bed}, etc.] Is unclean. According to the Misnah \textsuperscript{f523}, a bed defiles a man seven ways, so as to defile garments; standing, sitting, lying, hanging, and leaning, and by touching, and by bearing:

\textit{shall wash his clothes, and bathe [himself] in water}; in forty seahs of water, as the Targum of Jonathan:

\textit{and be unclean until the even}; be unfit for conversation with other men till the even, though both his body and clothes are washed.
Ver. 6. *And he that sitteth on [any] thing whereon he sat that hath the issue,* etc.] Shall be unclean, even though he does not touch it. Jarchi says, though there should be, as he adds, ten things or vessels one upon another, they all defile because of sitting, and so by lying:

*shall wash his clothes, and bathe [himself] in water, and be unclean until the even;* as in the preceding case. (See Gill on “*Leviticus* 15:5”).

Ver. 7. *And he that toucheth the flesh of him that hath the issue,* etc.] Shall also be unclean, even any part of his flesh, or member of his body: the Jewish canon is 1524, he that toucheth one that has an issue, or he that has an issue touches him, or anyone moves him that has an issue, or he moves him, defiles food, and drink, and washing vessels by touching, but not by bearing; and particularly touching the issue itself is instanced in, and such a man’s spittle, etc. are defiled:

*shall wash his clothes, and bathe [himself] in water, and be unclean until the even;* as before. (See Gill on “*Leviticus* 15:5”).

Ver. 8. *And if he that hath the issue spit upon him that is clean,* etc.] Not purposely, which is not usual for a man to do, and whenever it is done, nothing is more affronting; but accidentally, when, as Aben Ezra expresses it, he spreads his spittle, and it falls upon a clean person; and under this, as Gersom observes, is comprehended whatever is brought up by coughing, as phlegm, or flows from the nose, or is pressed out of it; and so Maimonides 1525: and this may denote all corrupt communication which proceeds out of the mouth of evil men, whether immoral or heretical, which not only defiles the man himself, but those he converses with; for evil communication corrupts good manners:

*then he shall wash his clothes,* etc. as in the foregoing instances. (See Gill on “*Leviticus* 15:5”).

Ver. 9. *And what saddle soever he sitteth upon that hath the issue,* etc.] When he rides upon any beast, horse, ass, or camel, whatever is put upon the creature, and he sits upon it, the saddle, and whatever appertains to it, the housing and girdle:

*shall be unclean;* and not fit for another to use, but be defiling to him, as follows.
Ver. 10. And whosoever toucheth anything that was under him shall be unclean until the even, etc. Either when lying along, or sitting, or riding, as in Leviticus 15:4,6,9; various are the traditions of the Jews concerning these things; if one that has an issue and a clean person sit together, in a ship, or on a beam, or ride together on a beast, though their garments do not touch, they are unclean, etc.

and he that beareth [any of] those things; that carries any of the above things from place to place, as his bed, his seat, his saddle, or anything on which he has lain, sat, or rode.

shall wash his clothes, and bathe [himself] in water, and be unclean until the even; (see Gill on Leviticus 15:5).

Ver. 11. And whomsoever he toucheth that hath the issue, etc. Not only he that touched him that had the issue, but whomsoever, and indeed whatsoever he touched, as the Targum of Jonathan, the Septuagint, and Arabic versions, were unclean; (see Gill on Leviticus 15:4);

and hath not rinsed his hands in water; which is to be understood, not of the man that is touched, but of him that toucheth; and is interpreted by the Jewish writers, generally, of bathing the whole body; according to Aben Ezra, the simple sense is, every clean person, whom he that hath an issue touches and hath rinsed his hands, he is indeed unclean, but not his garments; and if his hands are not rinsed his garments are unclean, and this is as he that touches all that is under him; wherefore it follows:

he shall wash his clothes, etc. that is, if a man is touched, as the Targum of Jonathan, and not a thing, as directed and prescribed in the above cases instanced in; all which are designed to instruct men to abstain from conservation with impure persons in doctrine and practice.

Ver. 12. And the vessel of earth that he toucheth which hath an issue shall be broken, etc. That it might not be made use of afterwards; which was ordered, that they might be careful what they touched who were in such circumstances: according to Gersom an earthen vessel received no uncleanness but from the middle, though he owns the law does not distinguish between the middle and the outside; wherefore Jarchi is of opinion, that if the back or outside of it was touched, it was unclean, and to be broken:
and every vessel of wood shall be rinsed in water; and after that be used: what should be the reason why an earthen vessel defiled by touching should be broken, and a wooden vessel defiled in the same way should not, but be rinsed and cleansed, when an earthen vessel might as well be rinsed and fit for use as that, is not easy to say; it depended upon the will of the lawgiver: according to Ainsworth, the one may signify the destruction of reprobate persons, the other the cleansing of penitent sinners.

Ver. 13. And when he that hath an issue is cleansed of his issue, etc.] That is, it is ceased from him, as the Targum of Jonathan and Jarchi explain it; for otherwise, according to the ceremonial law, he was not yet cleansed, until he had done everything next prescribed; but when he perceived there was an entire stop put to his disorder:

then he shall number to himself seven days for his cleansing; by which time it would appear whether he was thoroughly rid of it or not; and these seven days, as Jarchi observes, must be seven pure days, quite free from pollution, and continued in a constant course, without interruption; for, as Gersom says, if he saw any impurity in anyone of these days it did not come into the account: nay, according to Maimonides, he must begin to number again from the day of the last appearance:

and wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in running water; typical of the fountain opened in Christ to wash in for sin and uncleanness, even the fountain of his blood, which cleanses from all sin; and in which both the persons and garments of the saints are washed and made white:

and shall be clean; in a ceremonial sense; as all that are washed from their sins in the blood of Christ are clean in a spiritual and evangelical sense.

Ver. 14. And on the eighth day, etc.] Having on the seventh done as before directed:

he shall take to him two turtledoves, or two young pigeons; of his own, or purchase them; this was the meanest offering that was brought, and of the least expense, and which, in other cases, the poorer sort were allowed to bring, but here it was the offering of poor and rich:

and come before the Lord unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; not into the tabernacle, where he was not admitted till the sacrifice was offered, and atonement made; but he was to stand at the door of the tabernacle, at the eastern gate; and so fronting the west, where stood
the holy of holies, the place of the divine Majesty, he is said to come before the Lord, presenting himself to him to be cleansed:

and give them unto the priest; the two doves or pigeons, to be offered for him according to the usual rites.

**Ver. 15.** And the priest shall offer them, the one [for] a sin offering, and the other [for] a burnt offering, etc.] As in the case of a new mother who is poor, and of a poor leper, (Leviticus 12:8 14:22); and the priest shall make atonement for him before the Lord for his issue; which, though not in itself sinful, yet might be occasioned by sin, for which the atonement was made: or, however, it was a ceremonial uncleanness, and therefore a ceremonial expiation must he made for it, typical of the atonement by the blood and sacrifice of Christ, by which all kinds of sin is expiated and removed.

**Ver. 16.** And if any man’s seed of copulation go out from him, etc.] Not in lawful cohabitation, nor voluntarily, but involuntarily, as Aben Ezra observes; not through any disorder, which came by an accident, or in any criminal way, but through a dream, or any lustful imagination; what is commonly called nocturnal pollution; then he shall wash all his flesh in water, and be unclean until the even; and so the Egyptian priests, when it happened that they were defiled by a dream, they immediately purified themselves in a laver so the Jewish priests did when the like happened to them asleep in the temple; (see Deuteronomy 23:10,11).

**Ver. 17.** And every garment, and every skin, etc.] Or that is made of skin, which a man wears, or lies upon, (see Leviticus 13:48); whereon is the seed of copulation; or on any other, for, as Gersom says, there is the same law concerning the rest of vessels, seeing this is a principal uncleanness, and defiles vessels; and perhaps the law makes mention of these, because it is more apt to be found on them: shall be washed with water, and be unclean until the even; (see Jude 1:23).

**Ver. 18.** The woman also with whom man shall lie [with] seed of copulation, etc.] It seems to respect any congress of a man and woman, whether in fornication or adultery, or lawful marriage, and particularly the
latter; for though marriage is honourable and holy, and carnal copulation in itself lawful, yet such is the sinfulness of nature, that as no act is performed without pollution, so neither that of generation, and by which the corruption of nature is propagated, and therefore required a ceremonial cleansing:

*they shall [both] bathe [themselves] in water, and be unclean until the even*; so Herodotus \(^{f531}\) reports, that as often as a Babylonian man lay with his wife, he had used to sit by consecrated incense, and the woman did the same: and in the morning they were both washed, and did not touch any vessel before they had washed themselves; and he says the Arabians did the like: and the same historian relates \(^{f532}\) of the Egyptians, that they never go into their temples from their wives unwashed; (see \(^{021915}\)Exodus 19:15 \(^{092104}\)1 Samuel 21:4).

Ver. 19. *And if a woman have an issue*, etc.] Having finished, as Aben Ezra observes, what was to be said of the male, now the Scripture begins with the female, whose issue, of a different sort, is thus described:

*[and] her issue in her flesh be blood*; or, “blood be her issue in her flesh”; not in any part of her, but in that which by an euphemism is so called, in the same sense as the phrase is used of men, (\(^{031502}\)Leviticus 15:2); and so it distinguishes it from any flow of blood elsewhere, as a bleeding at the nose, etc.

*she shall be put apart seven days*; not out of the camp, nor out of the house, but might not go into the house of God:

*whosoever toucheth her shall be unclean until the even*; the same as one that had touched a man that had an issue, (\(^{031507}\)Leviticus 15:7); the pollution of the one reached to the same things as that of the other; and so, in the Misnah \(^{f533}\), they are put together, and the same is ascribed to the touch of the one as of the other; it may be understood of everything as well as of every person.

Ver. 20. *And everything that she lieth upon in her separation shall be unclean*, etc.] During her being apart from her husband, with whom she might be, and do all offices for him, but not lie with him; and whatsoever she lay upon during this time, bed or couch, and the clothes upon them, were unclean:
everything also that she sitteth upon shall be unclean; chair, stool, etc. as is the case of a man, (Leviticus 15:4).

Ver. 21. And whosoever toucheth her bed, etc.] The same thing that is said of a profluvious man, and so in (Leviticus 15:22,23).

Ver. 22. And whosoever toucheth anything that she sat upon, etc.] Which was appropriated to her to sit upon, as the Targum of Jonathan, which was her proper and peculiar seat, what she usually sat upon; such were obliged to wash their clothes and bathe, as in all the above cases. (see Leviticus 15:5,10).

Ver. 23. And if it [be] on [her] bed, or on anything whereon she sitteth, etc.] That is, if any person or thing should be upon her bed or seat; a vessel on her bed, or a vessel upon a vessel, as Aben Ezra expresses it:

when he toucheth it; that person or thing that should be on her bed or seat, as well as touch her bed or seat:

shall be unclean until the even; in a ceremonial sense; so defiling was a woman in such circumstances, and to whom the Scriptures often compare unclean persons and things: and Pliny speaks of menstrues as very infectious, or worse, to various creatures and things, in a natural way.

Ver. 24. And if any man lie with her at all, etc.] Not presumptuously but ignorantly, as Aben Ezra observes; for he was guilty of cutting off, that lay with her wilfully, (Leviticus 20:18);

and her flowers be upon her; or, “her separation” , her monthly courses not being ceased:

he shall be unclean seven days; and be excluded from all conversation civil and religious:

and all the bed whereon she lieth shall be unclean; that and every thing upon it; and this uncleanness also lasted seven days, as Aben Ezra notes, and defiled others, though it is not written.

Ver. 25. And if a woman have an issue of her blood many days out of the time of her separation, etc.] Not an ordinary but an extraordinary one, not within that time, but out of it, and which continued three days at least; so the Targum of Jonathan, and sometimes many years; as the poor woman
Christ cured, which she had had twelve years, (see Gill on “<400920>Matthew 9:20”):

or if it run beyond the time of her separation; beyond the seven days of her separation, and so out of the usual way and time of it; whereby it appears to be somewhat extraordinary and unusual:

all the days of the issue of her uncleanness shall be as the days of her separation: all the while it was upon her, be it ever so many days or years, she was kept apart from her husband, and in all respects in the same condition and circumstances, as in the seven days of her separation because of her monthly courses:

she [shall be] unclean; as long as it is upon her, and neither be admitted to her husband’s bed, nor to the house of God, which made her condition a very deplorable one.

Ver. 26. Every bed whereon she lieth all the days of her issue shall be unto her as the bed of her separation, etc.] As defiled and as defiling as that, (<031520>Leviticus 15:20,21);

and whatsoever she sitteth upon shall be unclean, as the uncleanness of her separation; as such were when she was in that condition, (see <031520>Leviticus 15:20).

Ver. 27. And whosoever toucheth those things shall be unclean, etc.] Her bed and seat; the Septuagint version is, “that toucheth her”, (see <031519>Leviticus 15:19);

and shall wash his clothes, and bathe [himself] in water, and be unclean until the even; let it be observed, that in all the above passages, where it is said, “he shall bathe [himself] in water”, the Targum of Jonathan adds, in forty seahs or pecks of water; for this was done by dipping the body all over.

Ver. 28. But if she be cleansed of her issue, etc.] The disease is healed, or a stop is put to it; there are no signs of it remaining:

then she shall number to herself seven days; from the time she observed it to cease:

and after that she shall be clean; having bathed herself according to the usual manner of unclean persons, for their cleansing; when she would be fit
to be admitted to her husband, though not as yet into the tabernacle, until she had offered her offering next directed to.

**Ver. 29.** And on the eighth day, etc.] From the cessation of her issue, and the healing of it, at least from the time she began to number for her cleansing:

*she shall take unto her two turtles, or two young pigeons;* the same as the man that had an issue was obliged to bring. Now this is to be understood not of a woman that had an ordinary issue, or her monthly courses; for this would have been both troublesome and expensive to have brought every month, but of a woman that had laboured under an extraordinary one; though some think every menstruous woman was obliged to this offering:

*and bring them unto the priest, to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation;* whither the man that had an issue brought his; (see Gill on “<031514>Leviticus 15:14”).

**Ver. 30.** And the priest shall offer the one [for] a sin offering, etc.] As in the case of a man that had an issue, the offerings of one and the other were the same and for the same purpose; (see Gill on “<031515>Leviticus 15:15”); there being a legal uncleanness in their case, atonement must be made by sacrifice, typical of the atonement of Christ, who by himself has purged our sins. The design of these several laws concerning uncleanness by issues, was to set forth the filthiness of sin arising from the corruption of human nature; particularly the pollution of fleshly lusts, and the necessity of purification from them by the grace of God, and blood of Christ, and of holiness of heart and life, in order to a near approach to God, particularly in public worship, as the next words suggest.

**Ver. 31.** Thus shall ye separate the children of Israel from their uncleanness, etc.] Or because of it, and while they are in it, as from other persons, even their nearest relations, and from the house of God, as the next clause shows; or teach them, by observing the above laws and rules, to separate themselves, and that they be careful and cautious to keep themselves apart while in such impurities; and the children of Israel are only made mention of, because these laws are only binding upon them, with their proselytes and servants, free or not free, but not upon Gentiles; (see Gill on “<031502>Leviticus 15:2”):

*that they die not in their uncleanness, when they defile my tabernacle that [is] among them;* from whence it appears, that men and women, in the
above circumstances, might not go into the tabernacle; and it was chiefly to prevent their access to it that these laws were given, for the greater reverence and honour of it; and that for such persons to enter there was a pollution of it, and the punishment was cutting off, or death; and for one to die in his impurity, without purification and sacrifice, was a dreadful thing, and to be deprecated, and to be guarded against by an observance of the above laws. But the Jews now say \textsuperscript{1537}, that forasmuch as the reason of these precepts was, because such persons were forbidden to enter into the temple, that being destroyed, all these precepts of uncleanness are ceased also.

**Ver. 32.** This [is] the law of him that hath an issue, etc.] In (\textsuperscript{<031532>Leviticus 15:32,33}) is a recapitulation of the several laws in this chapter, as of a man that has a “gonorrhoea”:

\textit{and [of him] whose seed goeth from him, and is defiled therewith; involuntarily, that suffers a nocturnal pollution.}

**Ver. 33.** And of her that is sick of her flowers, etc.] Her monthly courses, for these are a sickness, (\textsuperscript{<032018>Leviticus 20:18}); and make a woman languid and faint, as the word is rendered, (\textsuperscript{<250113>Lamentations 1:13}); or to be in pain \textsuperscript{1538}, as some render it here; and pains are reckoned among the signs of them by the Misnic doctors \textsuperscript{1539}:

\textit{and of him that hath an issue, of the man, and of the woman; of both, whether the one or the other:}

\textit{and of him that lieth with her that is unclean; though her own husband.}
CHAPTER 16

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 16

This chapter treats of the day of atonement, and of the rites, sacrifices, and services of it, directs when Aaron should come into the holy of holies, (Leviticus 16:1,2); and in what habit he should then appear, and with what offerings both for himself, and for the people, (Leviticus 16:3-10); and that having slain his own sin offering, and that for the people, he should offer incense before the mercy seat, and sprinkle that with the blood of both, (Leviticus 16:11-15); and by these offerings make atonement for the holy place, the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, (Leviticus 16:16-19); and having done this, he was to take the live goat, lay his hands on it, confess over it, and put upon it all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and then send it away by a fit man into the wilderness, (Leviticus 16:20-22); upon which he was to put off his linen garments, wash his flesh, and put them on again, and offer the burnt offering for himself, and for the people, (Leviticus 16:23-25); also he that let go the goat, and he that carried and burnt the sin offerings without the camp, were to wash themselves and clothes also, (Leviticus 16:26-28); the observance of this day, once a year, which was on the tenth of the seventh month, as a day of affliction and atonement, was to be a statute for ever to the children of Israel, (Leviticus 16:29-34).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, after the death of the two sons of Aaron, etc.] That is, either immediately after their death, and so this chapter would have stood in its natural order next to the tenth; or else after the above laws concerning uncleanness on various accounts were delivered out, designed to prevent the people entering into the tabernacle defiled, whereby they would have incurred the penalty of death; wherefore, as Aben Ezra observes, after the Lord had given cautions to the Israelites, that they might not die, he bid Moses to caution Aaron also, that he might not die as his sons died; these were Nadab and Abihu: when they offered before the Lord, and died; offered strange fire, and died by flaming fire, as the Targum of Jonathan; or fire sent down from heaven, as Gersom, by lightning; (see Leviticus 10:1,2).
Ver. 2. *And the Lord said unto Moses, speak unto Aaron thy brother,* etc.

Who was the high priest; and what is here said to him was binding on all high priests in succession from him:

*that he come not at all times into the holy [place];* or “holiness”\(^{f540}\), which was holiness itself, or the most holy place, as distinguished from that which was sometimes called the holy place, where stood the incense altar, the showbread table, and the candlestick, into which Aaron went every day, morning and evening, to do the service there enjoined him; but into the holy of holies here described, as appears by the after description of it, he might not go at all times, or every day, or when he pleased, only once a year, on the day of atonement; though, according to the Jewish writers, he went in four times on that day, first to offer incense, a second time to sprinkle the blood of the bullock, a third time to sprinkle the blood of the goat, and a fourth time to fetch out the censer; and if he entered a fifth time, he was worthy of death\(^{f541}\). Some have observed\(^{f542}\), that this respected Aaron only, and not Moses; that though Aaron might not go in when he pleased, and only at a time fixed, yet Moses might at any time, and consult the Lord upon the mercy seat, (see \(^{Exodus 25:22}\). Pausanias makes mention of several Heathen temples which were opened but once a year, as the temples of Hades Dindymene, and Eurymone\(^{f543}\), and particularly the temple of Minerva, into which only a priest entered once a year\(^{f544}\); which perhaps was in imitation of the Jewish high priest:

*within the vail, before the mercy seat, which [is] upon the ark;* this is a description of the holy place, into which the high priest might not go at any time, or at pleasure; it was within the vail that divided between the holy place, and the most holy, where stood the mercy seat, which was a lid or covering to the ark, at the two ends of which were the cherubim, the seat of the divine Majesty; which was a type of heaven for its holiness, being the habitation of the holy God, Father, Son, and Spirit, and of holy angels, and holy men, and where only holy services are performed; and for its invisibility, where dwells the invisible God, where Christ in our nature is at present unseen by us, and the glories of which are not as yet to be beheld; only faith, hope, and love, enter within the vail, and have to do with unseen objects there; and also for what are in it, as the ark and mercy seat, types of Christ, through whom mercy is communicated in a way of justice, he being the propitiation and the fulfilling end of the law for righteousness. And this caution was given to Aaron,
that he die not; by appearing in the presence of God without his leave and order:

for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy seat; this one would think should be a reason why he should not die, when he came into the most holy place, because there was the mercy seat, and Jehovah on it: and besides the cloud of incense on it, he went in with, for so many understand by the cloud, the cloud of incense: thus Aben Ezra says, the sense is, that he should not enter but with incense, which would make a cloud, and so the glory not be seen, lest he should die: and Jarchi observes, that the Midrash, or the more mystical and subtle sense is, he shall not go in but with the cloud of incense on the day of atonement; but the more simple meaning, or plain sense of the words is, as the same writer notes, that whereas he did continually appear there in the pillar of cloud; and because his Shechinah or glorious Majesty is revealed there, he is cautioned not to use himself to go in, i.e. at any time; with which agrees the Targum of Jonathan,

“for in my cloud the glory of my Shechinah, or divine Majesty, shall be revealed upon the mercy seat.”

And this being the case, such a glory being there, though wrapped up in a cloud and thick darkness, it was dangerous to enter but by divine order.

Ver. 3. Thus shall Aaron come into the holy [place], etc.] The most holy place; and this was after he had offered the daily sacrifice of the morning, and had performed the rest of the service then done, as Gersom observes; such as burning the incense and trimming the lamps, for no offering preceded the daily sacrifice:

with a young bullock for a sin offering, and a ram for a burnt offering; which were both for himself and his family; and such were the weakness, imperfection, and insufficiency of the Levitical priesthood, and priests, that they were obliged first to offer for their own sins, and then for the sins of the people: the meaning is not, as Aben Ezra says, that he should bring the bullock into the holy place, only that he should first give of his own a bullock for a sin offering, to atone for himself, and for the priests; nor could it be the body of the bullock he brought, only the blood of it into the most holy place, where he entered not without blood, first with the blood of the bullock, and then with the blood of the goat; for the body of the bullock for a sin offering was burnt without the camp, and the body of the
ram for the burnt offering was burnt upon the altar of burnt offering; (see Hebrews 9:7,12).

Ver. 4. He shall put on the holy linen coat, etc.] Which he wore in common with other priests:

and he shall have the linen breeches upon his flesh; upon those parts of his body which are more secret, and less honourable flesh, meaning the same, as in (Leviticus 15:2):

and shall be girded with a linen girdle and with the linen mitre shall he be attired, as the other priests were; which were an emblem of the purity and holiness of Christ, whereby he became a proper and suitable high priest, to make atonement for sin, he having none in himself; and of his mean estate of humiliation affictions, and sufferings, whereby he expiated sin, and made reconciliation for iniquity; the high priest on the day of atonement not appearing in his golden garments, as the Jews call others worn by him, because there were some gold in them, as being unsuitable to a day of affliction and humiliation, but in garments of flax, a meaner dress; and which also were an emblem of the righteousness of Christ, and his saints, called fine linen, clean and white; which is wrought out by him, as the author of it, is in him as the subject of it, and worn by him as the Lord our righteousness, and in which, as the instilled head and representative of his people, he entered into heaven to show it to his Father, and plead it with him:

these are holy garments; and to be used only in sacred service: there were four more holy garments besides these worn by the high priest, as the breastplate, the ephod, the robe, and the plate of gold, and which also were put on at certain times on this day, as at the offering of the morning and evening sacrifice, and at the slaying and offering of the several creatures on this day (Leviticus 16:23,24):

therefore shall he wash his flesh in water, and put them on; by dipping, and that in forty seahs of water, as the Targum of Jonathan; and this he did as often as he changed his garments, which were no less than five times on this day. The tradition is, no man goes into the court for service, even though clean, until he has dipped himself: the high priest dips five times, and sanctifies, i.e. washes his hands and feet ten times on that day, and all are done in the holy place, over the house of Parvah, excepting this only, that is, first here: Jarchi on the text observes, on this day, he (the
high priest) is bound to dipping at every change, and five times he changes, and to two washings of his hands and feet at the laver: this washing may be either an emblem of Christ’s baptism, which he submitted to before he entered on his public ministry, and was, by dipping; or rather of his being cleared, acquitted, and justified from all sin, upon his resurrection from the dead, after he had made atonement for it, and before his entrance into heaven; as he had no sin of his own he needed not the washing of regeneration, or the water of sanctifying grace to be sprinkled on him, to cleanse him from it but inasmuch as he had sin imputed to him, and which he took upon him to make atonement for, it was proper and necessary, when he had made it, that he should be justified in the Spirit, that so he might enter into heaven without sin imputed, as he will appear without it when he comes a second time.

Ver. 5. And he shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel, etc.] With whom only the high priest had to do on the day of atonement; as Christ our high priest has only with the Israel of God, the elect, given him by the Father, for whom he offered up himself, and for whose sins he made reconciliation:

two kids of the goats for a sin offering; the one of which was killed, and the other let go alive, and both were but one offering, typical of Christ in both his natures, divine and human, united in one person; and who was made sin, and became a sin offering for his people:

and one ram for a burnt offering; a type of Christ, mighty to save, this creature being a strong one; and of his dolorous sufferings, this offering being burnt; and of God’s gracious acceptance of his sacrifice, which was of a sweet smelling savour to him; the burnt offering following by way of thanksgiving for atonement made by the sin offering graciously accepted by the Lord.

Ver. 6. And Aaron shall offer his bullock of the sin offering, which [is] for himself, etc.] That is, bring it into the court, and present it before the Lord in order to its being slain and sacrificed; for as yet it was not killed, and so could not be offered on the altar, (see <Leviticus 16:11>); the place where the bullock was set was between the porch and the altar, his head in the south, and his face to the west, and the priest stood in the east, and his face to the west, and laid both his hands upon him, and confessed his sins, and his family’s: and this is said to be “for himself”; not to atone for him, which is afterwards expressed, but which should come of him or from him,
and not from the congregation, as Jarchi explains it; or as the Targum of Jonathan more clearly, which is of his own money, wholly at his own expense, and not the people’s:

_and make atonement for himself, and for his house_; for himself, for his own personal sins and for his family’s sins, those of his wife and children; and it may be extended to all the priests of the house of Aaron; and some say to the Levites also, as Aben Ezra notes, though he disapproves of it: by this it appears, that Christ, the antitype of Aaron, is a more perfect and excellent priest than he, who needed not to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for his people’s, for this he did once, when he offered up himself, (Hebrews 7:27); and which was for his whole family, and them only, the elect of God, consisting of Jews and Gentiles; part of which is in heaven, and part on earth, and both were reconciled, or atonement made for them, by the blood of Christ; whose house and family men appear to be, when they believe and hope in him, and hold fast their faith and hope; and who are made by him priests as well as kings to God; (see Ephesians 3:15 Hebrews 3:6) (Revelation 1:6).

Ver. 7. _And he shall take the two goats_, etc.] The sin offering for the people, a proper emblem of Christ, this creature being clean and fit for food, denoting the purity of Christ, and his being suitable and wholesome food, as his flesh is to the faith of his people; and because comely in its going, as Christ was in his going from everlasting, and in his coming, into this world, travelling in the greatness of his strength; and even by reason of its having something in it unsavoury and offensive, and which made it the fitter emblem of Christ, as a surety of his people; for though he had no sin inherent in him and natural to him, yet he appeared in the likeness of sinful flesh, and had sin imputed to him, which rendered him obnoxious to divine justice: the number of these goats was two, typical either of the two natures in Christ; his divine nature, in which he is impassable, and lives for ever, which may be signified by the goat presented alive and let go; and his human nature, in which he suffered and died, and may be fitly represented by the goat that was slain; or else of the two estates of Christ before and after his resurrection, his being put to death in the flesh and quickened in the Spirit; or rather this may signify the twofold consideration of Christ as Mediator, one with respect to his divine Father, to whom he made satisfaction by his death; and the other with respect to Satan, with whom he conflicted in life, and to whose power he was so far delivered up, as not only to be tempted, and harassed by him, but through his instigation to be
brought to the dust of death; (see Gill on “Leviticus 16:10”); and these two goats, according to the Jewish writers, were to be alike in sight or colour, in stature and in value, and to be taken together: Christ, the antitype of them, is the same dying and rising; the same that died, rose again from the dead; the same that suffered, is glorified; and the same that went up to heaven, will come again in like manner:

*and present them before the Lord, [at] the door of the tabernacle of the congregation;* at the east of the court, and the north of the altar, as the Misnah; so that their faces were towards the west, where the holy of holies, the seat of the divine Majesty, was, and so said to be before the Lord, or over against where he dwelt: this presentation may have respect to the death of Christ, when he presented himself to God as an offering and a sacrifice; and which was done publicly in the sight of great multitudes, and on the behalf of the whole congregation of the Lord’s people, and before him against whom sin is committed, and to whom satisfaction is given.

**Ver. 8.** And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats, etc.] Which should be slain, and which should be kept alive, and let go: the manner of casting lots, according to the Misnah, was this; the high priest went to the east of the court, to the north of the altar, the Sagan (or deputy priest) at his right hand, and Rosh Beth Ab (or the chief of the house of the fathers) on his left hand, and the two goats were there; and there was a vessel (box or urn, called Calphi), and in it were two lots of box tree: the high priest shook the Calphi (or urn) and took out the two lots; one, on which was written, “for the Lord”, and the other, on which was written, “for Azazel”; if that came up on the right hand, the Sagan said to him, my lord high priest, lift up thy right hand on high; and if that on the left hand came up, Rosh Beth Ab said to him, my lord high priest, lift up thy left hand on high: he put them upon the two goats and said, a sin offering for the Lord; and they answered after him, blessed be the Lord, may the glory of his kingdom be for ever and ever: now these lots, as Ben Gersom observes, were alike, not one greater than another; and they were of the same matter, for if one had been of stone and the other of wood, they might, have been known by feeling, and so the lots would not have been legal: and the same is observed by Maimonides, that though they might be of any matter, of wood, or stone, or metal, yet one might not be great, and the other small, and the one of silver, and the other of gold, but both alike, for the reason before given:
one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scapegoat: one had written upon it, as in the above account, “for the Lord”; and the other had written upon it, “for Azazel”; directing that the goat on which the lot for the Lord fell was to be slain and offered up for a sin offering to him; and the other, on which the lot for Azazel fell, was to be kept alive and let go: now, however casual and contingent the casting of a lot may seem to men, it is certain to God, the disposal of it is of him, and according to his determination, (Proverbs 16:33); and this, in the mystical sense, here denotes, that the sufferings and death of Christ were according to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, and so were foretold in the Scriptures, and came to pass according to his appointment, will, and command, as was also his resurrection from the dead, (John 10:18); (see Acts 1:23 4:28 1 Corinthians 15:3,4); and likewise his conflict with Satan, (John 14:30,31).

Ver. 9. And Aaron shall bring the goat on which the Lord’s lot fell, etc.] Alluding to the manner of taking out the lot by the high priest, who, when he took it out, lifted it up with his hand, and then let it down, and put it on the head of the goat; after which he brought it to the altar to be sacrificed:

and offer him [for] a sin offering; an offering for the sins of the people, as a type of Christ, who made his soul an offering for sin for his people; but this was not done by Aaron until he had brought and killed the sin offering for himself; after which we read of killing this sin offering for the people, (Leviticus 16:11,15); wherefore some take this offering here to be no other than a setting apart or devoting the goat for this service.

Ver. 10. But the goat on which the lot fell to be the scapegoat, etc.] Or for Azazel, of which more hereafter in the latter part of the verse:

shall be presented alive before the Lord; this seems to be a second presentation; both the goats were presented before the Lord before the lots were cast, (Leviticus 16:7); but this was afterwards, when one of the goats, according to the lot, being presented, was ordered to be killed for a sin offering, and the other according to the lot being presented alive, was ordered to remain so:

to make an atonement with him; to make an atonement for the sins of the people of Israel along with the other, for they both made one sin offering, (Leviticus 16:6); and this, though spared alive for a while, yet at length was killed; and how, the Jewish writers relate, as will be after observed:
[and] to let him go for a scapegoat into the wilderness; or, unto Azazel into the wilderness; which, some understand of a mountain in the wilderness called Azazel, to which the Targum of Jonathan has respect, which paraphrases the word,

“to send him to die in a place strong and hard, which is in the wilderness of Zuck;”

and so Saadiah Gaon, Jarchi, Kimchi, and others; and one in Aben Ezra says, it was near Mount Sinai; but as it is rightly observed by some, was this the name of a mountain, Moses would have called it the mountain Azazel, as he does other mountains by their names: nor is there any account of any such mountain in those parts, by such who have travelled in it, and if near Sinai, it was a long way to send it from Jerusalem; and for which there seems to be no reason, since there were many deserts between those two places: Aben Ezra suggests, there is a secret or mystery in the word Azazel, and says, you may know it and the mystery of his name, for he has companions in Scripture; and I will reveal to you, says he, part of it by a hint, when you are the son of thirty three, you may know its meaning, that is, by reckoning thirty three verses from (Leviticus 16:8); where this word is first mentioned, which will fall on (Leviticus 17:7); “they shall no more offer unto devils”; and so R. Menachem interprets Azazel of Samael, the angel of death, the devil, the prince that hath power over desolate places: there are several Christian writers of great note, that understand this of the devil, as Origen, among the ancients; and of the moderns, Cocceius, Witsius, and Spencer, who think that by these two goats is signified the twofold respect of Christ our Mediator; one to God, as a Judge, to whom he made satisfaction by his death; the other to the devil, the enemy with whom he conflicted in life; who, according to prophecy, was to be delivered up to Satan, and have his heel bruised by him; and who was to come, and did come into the wilderness of this world, and when Jerusalem was a desert, and became a Roman province; and who was led by the Spirit into wilderness of Judea, in a literal sense, to be tempted of the devil, and had a sore conflict with him in the garden, when he sweat, as it were, drops of blood; and upon the cross, when he submitted to the death of it; during which time he had the sins of all his people on him, and made an end of them, so as to be seen no more; all which agrees with (Leviticus 16:21,22); of which see more there; and it must be owned, that no other sense seems so well to agree with the type as this; since the living goat had all the sins of the people on him, and was
reckoned so impure, that he that led him into the wilderness stood in need of washing and cleansing, (Leviticus 16:21,26); whereas, when Christ was raised from the dead, he was clear of all sin, being justified in the Spirit; and in his resurrection there was no impurity, nor could any be reckoned or supposed to belong to him, as Witsius well observes, no, not as the surety of his people; nor in his resurrection was he a sin offering, as this goat was; nor could his ascension to heaven, with any propriety, be represented by this goat being let go into the wilderness: as for the notion of Barabbas, as Origen, being meant by Azazel, or the rebellious people of the Jews, carried into the wilderness, or into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar, and which is the sense of Abarbinel, and in which he is followed by many Christian writers, they need no confutation.

Ver. 11. And Aaron shall bring the bullock of the sin offering which [is] for himself, etc.] In the same manner, and is to be understood in the same sense as in (Leviticus 16:6);

and shall make atonement for himself and for his house: by a confession of words, as the Targum of Jonathan adds, and which Jarchi calls the second confession; for the same was made, and in the same words as before, (see Gill on “Leviticus 16:6”);

and shall kill the bullock of the sin offering which [is] for himself; which was a type of Christ; the creature itself was, being strong for labour, and patient in bearing the yoke; Christ had a laborious service to perform, the work of man’s redemption, and he was strong for it, able to go through it, and did not only readily take upon him the yoke of the law, and became obedient to every command of his divine Father, but even to death itself, the death of the cross; the kind of sacrifice was a sin offering, and such Christ in soul and body was made for his people; in order to which, as this sacrifice, he was put to death, the use of which was, to atone for all the sins of his mystical self, his body, the church; for all his family, his children, the priests of the Lord.

Ver. 12. And he shall take a censer, etc.] A fire pan, a sort of chafing dish or perfuming pot; this was a golden one, as appears from (Hebrews 9:4); hence Christ, the Angel of God’s presence, our interceding High Priest, is said to have such an one, (Revelation 8:3); and so Josephus says, it was a golden one the high priest used on the day of atonement; with which agree the Misnic doctors, who say, on other days he took
off the coals with a silver one, and poured them into a golden one, but on this day he took them off with a golden one:

**full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord;** these were bright lively coals, not smoking and half extinct; and they were taken from off the altar of burnt offering, from the western side of it, as Jarchi says, which was towards the holy of holies, where the Lord had his dwelling; these burning coals denoted the sufferings of Christ, which were properly punishments for the sins he bore, flowed from the wrath of God comparable to fire, were the curses of a fiery law, and equal to the sufferings of the wicked, often expressed by fire; they were many, and very painful and excruciating, though no ways inconsistent with the love of God to him as his Son, for they were endured by him as the surety of his people, and by which he expressed his flaming love and affection for them: he himself is altar, sacrifice, and priest, the altar which sanctifies the gift; and the coals as on the altar, denote the sufferings of Christ as upon him, which he was able to bear; and the taking off the coals signifies the cessation of his sufferings; and the altar, coals, and taking of them off, being before the Lord and in his sight, show that Christ, as a divine Person, is, and always was before him; that his sufferings were ever in view, being appointed and foretold by him, and when endured were grateful to him, a sacrifice of a sweet smelling savour; and that the cessation of them was in his presence, and according to his will; and Christ now is the Lamb in the midst of the throne, as though he had been slain, where, as such, he is always beheld with pleasure and acceptance by the Lord:

**and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small;** both his hands, as Aben Ezra, two handfuls of this he took and put into a cup: of this sweet incense and its composition, (see [Exodus 30:34-37](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?v=Ex%2030%3A34-37)); this was small itself, but on the evening of the day of atonement it was put into the mortar again, as Jarchi says, and beaten very small, and so was, as expressed in the Misnah "small of small": this may represent the intercession of Christ our high priest for his people; for as the prayers of the saints are set before the Lord as incense, (Psalm 141:2); so the intercession and mediation of Christ in favour of the acceptance of their prayers is signified by "much incense", (Revelation 8:3); and which is always acceptable to God, and may well be expressed by sweet incense: handfuls of it may denote the largeness of his intercession, being for all the elect of God, and for all things for them they stand in need of; and the infinite perfection and virtue of his person, blood, righteousness, and sacrifice, to make his intercession effectual: and
being “beaten small” may signify his intercession made for particular persons, and those the meanest, and for particular things of every sort they want; as well as it may point at the fragrance and acceptance of Christ’s mediation on such accounts, the incense being more fragrant the smaller it is beaten:

_and bring [it] within the vail:_ not the incense only, but the burning coals of fire also, the one in one hand, and the other in the other hand; so the Misnah \textsuperscript{1560}; they brought out to him (the high priest) the cup and the censer; he took his handful and put it into the cup, a large one according to its largeness, and a small one according to its smallness, and so was its measure; he took the censer in his right hand, and the cup in his left, and went into the sanctuary, until he came between the two rails which divide between the holy and holy of holies: this was typical of Christ our high priest, who is entered within the vail into the holiest of all, with his blood, righteousness, and sacrifice, where he ever lives to make intercession for us; not that Christ is considered in heaven as in a suffering state, for he is in a most exalted one; but the virtue and efficacy of his sufferings and death always continue, and which he ever improves on the behalf of his people, by interceding for them; and their faith and hope enter within the vail, and deal with him as having suffered for them.

**Ver. 13. And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, etc.]**
Both the incense and burning coals of fire being carried within the vail, the incense was put upon the coals, and so it burned before the Lord, whose seat was between the cherubim; and from whence it appears, that this was done, not without but within the vail: the Sadducees under the second temple would have it, that the incense was put upon the fire without the vail, wherefore the high priest, on the evening of this day, was sworn by the messengers of the sanhedrim not to make any alteration in what they should say to him; and this oath was given him in the house of Abtines, where the incense was made, with a special respect to that, since it being within the vail, they could not see it performed: the manner of his performance of this part of his service is thus related; he went in between the rails, till he came to the north; when he was come to the north, he turned his face to the south; he went on his left hand near the vail, till he came to the ark; he put the censer between the two bars, and heaped the incense upon the top of the coals, and the whole house was filled with the smoke; he then went out backwards, and prayed a short prayer in the outward house (the holy place), and he did not continue long in prayer, lest
the people of Israel should be frightened: the prayer he made is given us by the Jews: now the incense being put upon the coals may denote the fervour and ardency of Christ’s intercession, and that his sufferings are the foundation of it, on which it proceeds, and are what give it a grateful odour, or make it acceptable to the Lord:

_and this was done, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat that [is] upon the testimony_; where was the Shechinah, or glorious majesty of God, and which was not to be seen, and therefore to be covered after this manner; which shows, that there is no access to God but as upon a seat of mercy and a throne of grace; and even that there is no coming to him upon that, but through the mediation and intercession of Christ:

_that he die not_; as his sons did, boldly intruding where, and doing what they should not: there is no approaching to God as an absolute God, and live; but through Christ the Mediator, and his intercession, believers may draw nigh and see the face of God in Christ, and live, as Jacob did, (Genesis 32:30).

Ver. 14. _And he shall take of the blood of the bullock, etc._] When the high priest slew the bullock, the blood was received in a basin, and given to another priest, that he might keep stirring it on a foursquare bench in the temple, that so it might not thicken and congeal, but by a continual motion might become thin and liquid, and fit for sprinkling; and this was doing, while the high priest was gone into the most holy place to offer the incense; which being done, he came out again and took the basin of blood out of the hand of the priest, and went in a second time, and did with it as follows:

_and sprinkle [it] with his finger upon the mercy seat, eastward_; with his right finger, or forefinger, as the Targum of Jonathan; and the blood sprinkled with it did not fall upon the mercy seat, as our version seems to intimate, but it was sprinkled over against it, towards the upper part of it. Aben Ezra says, that according to their interpreters, “upon the face of the mercy seat”, as the words may be literally rendered, signifies above, between the two bars, and here it was the high priest stood; for, according to the Misnah, he went in to the place where he had gone in, and stood in the place where he had stood, and then sprinkled, that is, in the same place where he had been and offered the incense; (see Gill on Leviticus 16:13); and here he stood, not with his face to the east, for then his back
must have been to the mercy seat, but he stood with his face to the eastern part of the mercy seat, and there sprinkled the blood upwards:

**and before the mercy seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times**; besides the first sprinkling that was upward, and those downward; so says the Misnah \(^{1565}\), he sprinkled of it (the blood) once above, and seven times below; the same Jarchi observes; and the tradition adds, and he did not look in sprinkling neither above nor below; that is, he did not look to the mercy seat, nor was there any need of it, since the blood did not reach the mercy seat, but fell upon the ground; it was enough that it was done before it, and over against it, and with a respect unto it; or otherwise, had it, fallen on it, it would have been besmeared with it, and would not have been so comely and decent: the mystery of this was to represent the blood of Christ, and perfect purification and atonement by it, and that mercy and justice are reconciled to each other, and agree together in the forgiveness of sinners; and that there is no mercy but in a way of justice, no remission of sin, no justification of persons, no salvation for any of the sons of men, but through the blood of Christ, and the complete atonement made thereby.

**Ver. 15.** *Then shall he kill the goat of the sin offering that [is] for the people*, etc.] That upon which the lot came for the Lord, (\(^{<031609>}\)Leviticus 16:9); the high priest having sprinkled the blood of the bullock, came out of the most holy place, and went into the court of the tabernacle to the altar of burnt offering, and on the north side of that slew the goat for the sin offering, the place where all such were killed; (see \(^{<030111>}\)Leviticus 1:11 6:25). This was a type of Christ, of his being slain, and made an offering for the sins of his people:

**and bring his blood within the vail**: it being received into a basin, as before the blood of the bullock was, he took it, and with it went in a third time into the most holy place:

**and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy seat, and before the mercy seat**; it should be rendered “toward the mercy seat” it is by Noldius \(^{1566}\), (see Gill on “\(^{<1614>}\)Leviticus 16:14”).

**Ver. 16.** *And he shall make an atonement for the holy [place], etc.*] Even the holy of holies, as Aben Ezra interprets it, into which the high priest entered with blood for that purpose; the Targum of Jonathan adds, by a
verbal confession, that is, of sin; but atonement was not made in that way, but by the blood of the bullock and goat, which was sprinkled towards the mercy seat, above and below: and this was made _because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins_; which heap of words shows how many and heinous the sins of the people of Israel were, being defections from God, rebellions against him, transgressions of his law, and which brought pollution and guilt upon them, which could only be expiated by blood; and though the people of Israel did not enter so much as into the holy place, where the priests at times went, and much less into the holiest of all, yet their sins in some sense entered there, and came before the Lord that dwelt there; as the sins of men do even reach up to heaven itself, and cry for wrath and vengeance: and so made the Israelites unworthy of such a favour as for the Lord to dwell among them in that most holy place, in so solemn a manner; and for their high priest to enter there, and consult the oracle of God for them, and make intercession on their account, to which atonement was necessary; even as men by their sins render themselves unworthy of entering into the heavenly state, nor can they, without the atonement and sacrifice of Christ; and to this purification of the patterns of heavenly things; and of the heavenly things or places themselves, the apostle refers, (Hebrews 9:23,24):

_and shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation that remaineth among them, in the midst of their uncleanness_; that is, the court of the tabernacle where the Israelites were admitted, and where they often came in their uncleanness, either ignorantly or presumptuously, and yet notwithstanding the tabernacle remained among them; but, it was necessary that atonement should be made for the uncleanness in it, and around it, that it might continue, and they might have the privilege of coming into it, and worshipping in it. This shows that there are sins of holy things, and which attend the most solemn service, which are committed in the sanctuary of the Lord, and while waiting upon him in his house and ordinances; which must be expiated and removed. The same rites were observed, in making the atonement for this part of the sanctuary, as for the most holy place, particularly by sprinkling the blood in like manner, only, elsewhere; so says Jarchi, as he sprinkled of them both within, that is, of the blood of the bullock, and of the goat, within the vail, once above, and seven times below; so he sprinkled, by the vail without, of both of them, once above, and seven times below.
Ver. 17. *And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation,* etc.] Not any of the priests, as Aben Ezra, no, not in the holy place where they ministered, nor in the court of the tabernacle, nor in any of the courts, nor indeed any of the people: all places were cleared

*when he,* the high priest,

*goeth in to make an atonement in the holy [place] until he come out;* this in the mystery of it was to signify, that atonement for sin is made only by Christ our high priest; he himself, and no other, bore our sins, and he himself purged them away, or by his sacrifice alone expiated them; his own arm wrought salvation, and of the people there were none with him to help and assist him; when he the Shepherd was smitten by the sword of justice, the sheep were scattered, all his disciples forsook him and fled; there were none to appear for him, or stand by him, or in the least to lend an assisting hand in the great work in which he was engaged; he is the only Mediator, between God and man, both of redemption and of intercession; he is the alone Saviour, to him only are sinners to look for salvation, and he is to have all the glory; he had no partner in the work, and he will have no rival in the honour of it:

*and have made an atonement for himself, and for his household;* his whole family, and all the priests, by the bullock of his sin offering, as Aben Ezra observes, and by carrying in the blood of it within the vail, and sprinkling it there:

*and for all the congregation of Israel;* by the goat of their sin offering, as the same writer notes, and doing with the blood of that as with the blood of the bullock; all typical of the atonement of Christ for his mystical self the church; for the whole family and household of God; for the general assembly and church of the firstborn, whose names are written in heaven.

Ver. 18. *And he shall go out unto the altar that [is] before the Lord,* etc.] The golden altar, the altar of incense, which stood in the holy place without the vail, over against the most holy place, where Jehovah dwelt, and so is said to be before him; of this altar the Misnah understands it, and so do Jarchi and Ben Gersom; and, according to (Exodus 30:10); once a year Aaron was to make an atonement on the horns of it, with the blood of the sin offering, which plainly refers to this time, the day of atonement; but Aben Ezra is of opinion, that the altar of burnt offering is meant; and Bishop Patrick is inclined to think so too, because he supposes the high
priest’s going out signifies his coming from the sanctuary, where the
golden altar was, and which had been cleansed, (Leviticus 16:16); and
because, if the altar of burnt offering is not here meant, no care seems to be
taken of its cleansing; but it should be observed, that the holy place,
(Leviticus 16:16), means the holy of holies, and not the holy place
where the altar of incense stood; and that the altar of burnt offering was
atoned for and cleansed, when the tabernacle of the congregation was, in
which it stood, and from which, this altar is manifestly distinguished,
(Leviticus 16:20); wherefore the reason given for the altar of burnt
offering holds good for the altar of incense, since if that is not intended, no
care is taken about it; add to this, that the last account of the high priest
was, that he was in the most holy place, and not the holy place,
(Leviticus 16:17); out of which he now came into the holy place, where
the altar of incense was:

and make an atonement for it; where incense was daily offered up,
signifying the prayers of the saints, which having many failings and
imperfections in them, yea, many sins and transgressions attending them,
need atonement by the blood of Christ, of which this was a type:

and shall take of the blood of the bullock, and of the blood of the goat;
mixed, as the Targum of Jonathan paraphrases it; and so Jarchi asks, what
is the atonement of it? he takes the blood of the bullock, and the blood of
the goat, and mixes them together: the account given of this affair in the
Misnah is; he poured the blood of the bullock into the blood of the
goat, and then put a full basin into an empty one, that it might be well
mixed together: and having so done, he did as follows,

and put [it] upon the horns of the altar round about; upon the four horns
which were around it; and it is asked in the Misnah, where did he begin?
at the northeast horn, and so to the northwest, and then to the southwest,
and (ended) at the southeast; at the place where he began with the sin
offering on the outward altar, there he finished on the inward altar, and as
he went along he put the blood on each horn, which was the atonement for
the altar.

Ver. 19. And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven
times, etc.] This was done with his right finger, or forefinger, as the
Targum of Jonathan, and seven times, to denote the perfect cleansing of
the altar with it. Jarchi observes, that after he, the high priest, had put the
puttings (of blood) upon the horns of it, he sprinkled of it seven sprinklings
on the top of it: the Misnah says, upon the pure place of it, that is, upon a place of it, from whence the coals and ashes were removed, and where the gold appeared:

_and cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel;_ by sprinkling the blood upon it; Jarchi’s note is, “and cleanse it” from what was past, “and hallow it” for time to come.

**Ver. 20.** _And when he hath made an end of reconciling the holy [place], etc._ That is, the holy of holies, by carrying in the blood of the bullock, and of the goat there, and sprinkling them as before observed:

_and the tabernacle of the congregation;_ the great court where the people met, and where the altar of burnt offering stood:

_and the altar;_ the altar of incense in the holy place; and so all the parts of the tabernacle were reconciled and atoned for, even the holy of holies, the holy place, and the court of the people: all the work the day of atonement, we are told, was done according to the order prescribed, and that if anything was done before another, it was doing nothing: thus, for instance, if the blood of the goat went before (or was sprinkled before) the blood of the bullock, he must return and sprinkle of the blood of the goat after the blood of the bullock; and if before he has finished the puttings (of the blood) within, the blood is poured out, (that is, at the bottom of the altar of burnt offering,) he shall bring other blood, and return and sprinkle anew within, and so in the temple, and at the golden altar, for every atonement is by itself:

_he shall bring the live goat;_ that which remained alive after the other was slain, as it was to do, according to the lot that fell upon it, (Leviticus 16:10); this was brought to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, whither the high priest went, and performed the following rites.

**Ver. 21.** _And Aaron shall lay both his hands on the head of the live goat, etc._ In this order as the Targum of Jonathan says, his right hand upon his left hand on the head of the live goat; this was done in the name of the people, hereby transferring their sins, and the punishment of them, to it:

_and confess him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins;_ which takes in their sins, greater or lesser, sins of ignorance and presumption, known or not known, even all sorts of and all of them: the form of confession used in after times was this; O
Lord, thy people, the house of Israel, have done perversely, have transgressed sinned berate thee, O Lord, expiate now the iniquities, transgressions, and sins, in which thy people, the house of Israel, have done perversely, transgressed, and sinned before thee, as it is written in the law of Moses thy servant (Leviticus 16:30); and it is added, and the priests and people that stood in the court, when they heard the name Jehovah go out of the mouth of the high priest, they bowed, and worshipped, and fell upon their faces, and said, blessed be God, let the glory of his kingdom be for ever and ever:

*putting them upon the head of the goat;* that is, the iniquities, transgressions, and sins of the people of Israel before confessed, and that by confession of them, with imposition of hands; and which was typical of the imputation of the sins of the people of God to Christ, of the Lord laying, or causing to meet on him the iniquities of them all, and of his being made sin by imputation for them:

*and shall send [him] away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness;* whether the wilderness of Judea, or what other is intended, is not certain. The Targum of Jonathan calls it the wilderness of Zuck; which, according to the Misnah, was three miles from Jerusalem, at the entrance of the wilderness; and whereas in another Misnah, instead of Bethchadudo, Bethhoron is mentioned, which is said also to be three miles from Jerusalem: it is not an improbable conjecture of Dr. Lightfoot, that the goat was sent in the way to Bethhoron, which was the same distance from Jerusalem as the other place was, in the northern coast of Judea, and had very rough hills about it, and a narrow passage to it. The man, by whom he was sent, was one fit for the purpose, that knew the way to the wilderness, and was acquainted with it; a man of years and understanding, and of a disposition suitable for such a service; the Septuagint version renders it one that was “ready”; and the Targums, one that was “prepared” to go, or “appointed”, and got ready; Jarchi says, the day before; but the Targum of Jonathan a year ago: perhaps it designs one, that being once appointed, was continued, and so was used to it from time to time, and constantly did it: the phrase properly signifies “a man of time” or “opportunity”; Aben Ezra finds fault with those who render it a wise man, but observes, that some of their Rabbins say it was a priest that led the goat to the wilderness, which he approves of; according to the Misnah, all were fit for this service (formerly common and unclean), but what the high priest did (afterwards) was fixed, and they did not suffer an Israelite to lead him (i.e.
a common Israelite, one that was not a priest); according to the Talmud, even a stranger, and an unclean person, was fit for this service. In the mystical sense, by this fit man, or man of opportunity, is not meant, according to Abarbinel, Nebuchadnezzar, who led the children of Israel into the wilderness of the people, into the Babylonish captivity; but rather, if it could be understood of Christ being sent, and carried into the wilderness of the Gentile world, upon his resurrection and ascension to heaven, the Apostle Paul might be thought of; who was a chosen vessel to carry his name there, and was eminently the apostle of the Gentiles: but seeing by Azazel, to whom this goat was let go, Satan seems to be meant; if, as some think, Christ was baptized on the day of atonement, and on that day was led by the Spirit to the wilderness of Judea, there to be tempted of the devil, that might be considered as a very singular accomplishment of the type; and the Jews seem to expect the Messiah on the day of atonement: or rather, as Witsius observes, the hand of the fit man may denote the power that rose up against Christ, namely, the Gentiles and the people of Israel, and particularly Pilate, who took care that Christ, burdened with the cross, an emblem of the curse, should be led without the gate, where he had his last conflict with the devil; (see Gill on "Leviticus 16:10"). This is applied to Pilate by Origen.

Ver. 22. And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited, etc.] Where it would never be seen, and from whence it would never return more; and so was a proper type of Christ, who has borne all the sins of all his people in his own body on the cross, and all the punishment due unto them; and so has made full satisfaction for them, and has removed them from them, as far as the east is from the west, and out of the sight of avenging justice; so that when they are sought they shall not be found, nor shall they ever return unto them, or be brought against them any more; (see Isaiah 53:12 1 Peter 2:24 Zechariah 3:9) (Psalm 103:12 Jeremiah 50:20):

and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness; that is, the man that was appointed to have him thither; and so the Targum of Jonathan,

“and the man shall let go the goat into the wilderness of Zuck; and the goat shall go upon the mountains of Beth Chadure (or Chadudo), and a tempestuous wind from the Lord shall drive him down, and he shall die.”
The manner of conducting this whole affair was this; they made for him a causeway (i.e. for the man that had the goat committed to his care, to have it out of the court, and out of the city), because of the Babylonians, who would pluck him by the hair, and say, Get out, begone, get out, begone. The nobles of Jerusalem accompanied him to the first booth, for there were ten booths from Jerusalem to Zuck, which were ninety furlongs, seven and a half to every mile; at every (i.e. twelve miles) at every booth they said to him, Lo food, lo water, and they accompanied him from booth to booth, excepting the last of them; for there was not one went with him to Zuck, but stood afar off, and observed what he did: what did he do? he parted a scarlet line, half of it he bound to the rock, and half of it he bound between his horns (the goat’s), and pushed him backwards, and he rolled and went down, but before he came half way down the mountain he was dashed to pieces; then he (the man) went and sat under the last booth until it was dark--they said to the high priest, the goat is got to the wilderness; but from whence did they know that the goat was got to the wilderness? they made watchtowers or beacons, and they waved linen cloths, and so knew when the goat was come to the Wilderness. But the Scripture is entirely silent about the death of this goat, though it no doubt died in the wilderness, only says that it was let go, and was at liberty to go where it would; intimating that the people of Israel were free from all their sins, and they should be no more seen nor remembered; typical of the deliverance and freedom of the people of God from all their sins by Christ. This affair was imitated by Satan among the Heathens, particularly the Egyptians, as has been observed by many out of Herodotus, who relates, that they used to imprecate many things upon the head of a beast slain for sacrifice, and then carried it to market, where were Grecian merchants, to whom they sold it; but if there were none, they cast it into the river, execrating the head after this manner, that if any evil was to befall either themselves that sacrificed, or all Egypt, it might be turned upon that head. And on account of this custom, which obtained among all the Egyptians, no one among them would ever taste the head of any animal; which Plutarch also affirms, who says, that having made an execration upon the head of the sacrifice, and cut it off, formerly they cast it into the river, but now they give it to strangers. And a like custom obtained among other nations, as the Massilians and Grecians.

Ver. 23. And Aaron shall come into the tabernacle of the congregation, etc.] Having been into the most holy place a fourth time, as the Jews say,
to fetch out the censer and the incense cup; wherefore the Jewish writers observe, that this verse is not in its proper place; so Jarchi from the Rabbins says, the whole section is in its order, excepting this, which was after the sacrifice of his burnt offering, and the burnt offering of the people; and the burning the inwards of the bullock and the goat, which were done without in the golden garments; and then he dipped himself, and washed his hands and feet, and stripped and put on the white garments, and went in to fetch the incense cup and the censer, with which he offered in the inmost place (the holy of holies):

*and shall put off the linen garments which he put on when he went into the holy [place]*; the holy of holies, that is, as Jarchi interprets it, after he had brought it (the censer) out, then he clothed himself with the golden garments for the daily evening sacrifice; and this was the order of the services (on the day of atonement); the daily morning sacrifice (was performed) in the golden garments; the service of the bullock and of the goat, and the incense of the censer, in the white garments; and his ram, and the ram of the people, and some of the additions, in the golden garments; and the bringing out of the incense cup and the censer in the white garments; and the rest of the additions, and the daily evening sacrifice, and the incense of the temple, on the inward altar, in golden garments; and the order of the Scripture, according to the services, so it was:

*and shall leave them there*; in one of the chambers of the tabernacle, as afterwards, in the temple, where they were laid up, never to be used more, as say the Jewish writers, Ben Gersom, and others; hence we learn, says Jarchi, that they were obliged to be laid up, and he, the high priest, might not minister in these four garments on another day of atonement.

Ver. 24. *And he shall wash his flesh with water in the holy place*, etc.] In the court of the tabernacle of the congregation, where, as Aben Ezra says, they spread fine linen for him; Jarchi says, it was a place on the roof of the house of Parvah, where all the dippings and washings were made, except the first; (see Gill on “*Leviticus 16:4*”); and this washing was no other than the dipping of his whole body in water; and if our Lord was baptized on this day, as some have thought, before observed, whose baptism was by dipping, (“*Matthew 3:16,17*”); there will appear in this a great likeness between the type and the antitype:

*and put on his garments and come forth*; put on his golden garments, and come out of the place where he had washed himself, to the court, where
was the altar of burnt offering: all which may be an emblem of Christ’s putting off the pure and spotless garment of the flesh, in which he appeared in a low estate, and made atonement for sin; and of his burial, which the washing of the flesh may point at, being what was used of the dead, and which washing in baptism is a figure of; and of his resurrection from the dead, when God gave him glory, and he appeared in a glorious body, signified by his golden garments put on again:

and offer his burnt offering, and the burnt offering of the people; his ram, and the people’s ram, and the bullock of the people, and their seven lambs, as it is written, (Numbers 29:8); so Aben Ezra, first his own, and then the people’s, which order was before observed in the sin offerings:

and make an atonement for himself, and for the people; which though properly made by the sin offerings, and the carrying the blood of them into the most holy place, yet these were the completing of it, being the last of the services peculiar to the day of atonement: the service performed by the high priest after the sending away the goat into the wilderness was this; he read this “sixteenth” chapter of Leviticus, and (Leviticus 23:27-32), if he read in linen garments, he washed his hands and his feet, he stripped himself, went down and dipped himself, and came up and wiped himself; then they brought him the golden garments, and he put them on, and washed his hands and his feet, and went out and offered his ram, and the people’s ram, and the seven perfect lambs of a year old; then he washed his hands and his feet, and stripped and went down and dipped, and came up and wiped himself; then they brought him the white garments, and he put them on, and washed his hands and his feet, and went into the holy of holies to fetch out the incense cup and the censer; then he washed his hands and his feet, and stripped, and went down and dipped, and came up and wiped himself; then they brought him the golden garments, and he put them on, and he washed his hands and his feet, and went in (to the holy place) to offer the evening incense, and to him the lamps; and then he washed his hands and his feet, and stripped, and they brought him his own garments (what he usually wore when out of service), and he put them on; and they accompanied him to his house, where he made a feast for his friends, because he was come out of the sanctuary in safety: where, it seems, sometimes some died, and others became sick by getting cold through frequent shifting of their clothes and washing, and wearing thin linen garments.
Ver. 25. *And the fat of the sin offering shall he burn upon the altar.*] The brazen altar of burnt offering, and so says Jarchi, on the outward altar; for of the inward (i.e. the altar of incense) it is written, ye shall not offer upon it strange incense, nor a burnt offering, nor a meat offering; and this fat he explains to be what was on the inwards of both the bullock and the goat; and so says Aben Ezra, the fat of the bullock for the sin offering, and the fat of the goat for a sin offering, and also the fat of the kid of the goat, which, was a sin offering for the priest, (Numbers 29:11); this fat was burnt at the same time the burnt offerings were offered in (Leviticus 16:24).

Ver. 26. *And he that let go the goat for the scapegoat,* etc.] Or unto Azazel; who or what Azazel is, (see Gill on “Leviticus 16:10”) and (see Gill on “Leviticus 16:21”); for the goat and Azazel are different, not the same, nor to be confounded as they are in our version:

*shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water;* in forty seahs of water, according to the Targum of Jonathan; so unclean was this person reckoned by what he had to do with the goat sent away by him; which, in a typical and ceremonial sense, had all the sins of the people of Israel on it: and he and his garments were defiled as soon as he could be said to be letting go; and that was, as Gersom says, as soon as he was out of the city; for as long as he was in the city he was in the place from whence the motion was made, but as soon as he was out of it he was in the way, and then he began to be in that motion, and might be then called, “he that let him go”: and from that time the clothes he had on were defiled; according to the Misnah, from the time he was got without the walls of Jerusalem:

*and afterwards come into the camp;* of Israel, while in the wilderness, and into the city in later times, and so into the sanctuary, and enjoyed all civil and religious privileges as another man: and something like this obtained among the Heathens, as has been observed by many learned men, particularly out of Porphyry; who says, all divines agree in this, that such sacrifices as were offered for averting evils were not to be touched, but such needed purifications; nor might any such an one go into the city; nor into his own house, before he had washed his clothes and his body in a river or in a fountain: all this may be an emblem of those who were concerned in having Christ without the gates of Jerusalem to be crucified, and who afterwards, being sensible of their sin, not only had forgiveness of it and were washed from it in the blood of Christ, but, being baptized in
water, were admitted into the church of God, (Acts 2:37,38); and in general may show the nature of sin, that such who have anything to do with any who have it on them, though only in a ceremonial way, are defiled by it, and need washing; and also the imperfection of ceremonial rites and sacrifices to take away sin.

Ver. 27. And the bullock [for] the sin offering, and the goat [for] the sin offering, etc.] The one for Aaron and his family, the other for the people of Israel, of which (see Leviticus 16:5,6,9,11,15);

whose blood was brought in to make an atonement in the holy [place]; the holy of holies, where it was brought and sprinkled, as directed in (Leviticus 16:14,15);

shall [one] carry forth without the camp; by command, as Aben Ezra observes; by the order of the high priest; and, perhaps, more than one was employed to carry out those carcasses, they being too large for one man, and as it seems from a following clause; and the Targum of Jonathan is,

“they shall be carried out on staves by the hands of the junior priests;”

so Jarchi says, four men carried two staves, two before and two behind, and they went staff by staff, and the bullock and the goat were upon them, and they carried them one upon another: this was done after the high priest had done to them what was necessary; for so it is said, he went to the bullock and to the goat that were to be burnt; he ripped them up and took out their inwards, and put them in a bowl, and offered them on the top of the altar; and cut them with cuttings (made incisions into the flesh of them, but did not part it), and ordered them to be carried out to the place of burning, which was without the camp of Israel, and afterwards without the city of Jerusalem: the mystery of this, and the application of it to Christ, setting forth the nature and place of Christs sufferings, are fully and largely expressed by the apostle in (Hebrews 13:11-13);

and they shall burn in the fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung; the priests, as Aben Ezra; for there were more than one concerned, as in carrying them out, so in the burning of them: the high priest was not concerned in it, for while these were burning he was reading, as observed on (Leviticus 16:24); so that he that saw, the high priest when he was reading, saw not the bullock and the goat when they were burnt; and he that saw the bullock and the goat burnt, saw not the high priest when he
read; not because it was not lawful, but because the way was distant, and the business of both was done together. This was done in a place called the place of ashes, where the ashes of the altar of burnt offering were carried; (see Gill on “Leviticus 4:11-12”).

**Ver. 28.** And he that burneth them shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, etc.] In forty seahs of water, as the Targum of Jonathan; that is, everyone of those that burnt them, as Aben Ezra observes; for these being sin offerings, and had a connection with the sins of men, for whom they were offered, the persons concerned in the carrying and burning of them were equally defiled, and needed washing, as the man that led and let go the goat into the wilderness: 

*and afterwards he shall come into the camp*; and have the liberty of conversation with men in civil and religious things, but not till evening; so long he was defiled; and according to the Misnah from the time they got without the walls of the court; and after washing and bathing, and when the evening was come, they were clean; and might go where they pleased.

**Ver. 29.** And [this] shall be a statute for ever unto you, etc.] As long as the Aaronic priesthood was in being, and the Levitical dispensation lasted, until: the true Messiah came and put an end to all these rites and ceremonies; until that time this service was to be performed by the high priest in succession every year:

*[that] in the seventh month*; the month Tisri, as the Targum of Jonathan explains it, which answers to part of our September, and was the seventh month from the month Abib or Nisan, answering to part of our March; which was appointed the first month, upon the Israelites coming out of Egypt in that month, and for that reason; otherwise this seventh month, or Tisri, was the first month of the year before, and, indeed, continued to be so notwithstanding, with respect to things civil:

*on the tenth [day] of the month*; on which day, the Jews say, Moses descended from the mount the second time, with the tables of the law, and the tidings of forgiveness of the sin of the calf; wherefore this day is thought to be appointed a day of affliction and humiliation for that and all other sins, and for the atonement of them, and on this day the jubilee trumpet was blown, (Leviticus 25:9);

*ye shall afflict your souls*; not only by humiliation of the heart for sin, and by repentance of it, and by turning from their evil ways, but by corporeal
fasting, which is chiefly meant by the affliction of their souls; so the Targum of Jonathan explains it, by abstaining from eating and from drinking, and from the use of baths, and from anointing, and from the use of shoes, and of the marriage bed; and so it is said in the Misnah\(^{596}\), on the day of atonement, eating and drinking, and washing, and anointing, and putting on of the shoes, and the use of the bed, are forbidden; whoever eats the quantity of a gross date with its kernels, or drinks a mouthful (as much as he can hold in his jaws), is guilty: they do not afflict children on the day of atonement, but they train them up a year or two before, that they may be inured to the command; hence this day, in (Acts 27:9) is called “the fast”:

*and do no work at all*; no bodily work, for it was in that respect a sabbath, as it is afterwards called; the Jewish canon is, he that ate and did any work was guilty of two sins, or was obliged to two sin offerings\(^{597}\):

*[whether it be] one of your own country, or a stranger that sojourneth among you*; whether a native of the land of Israel, that was born there, and of parents who were Israelites, or one that was a proselyte to the Jewish religion, a proselyte of righteousness, as Ben Gersom interprets it; this law concerning fasting and abstinence from all servile work on the day of atonement was binding on the one as on the other.

**Ver. 30.** *For on that day shall [the priest] make an atonement for you to cleanse you,* etc.] By offering the sin offering for them; typical of the sacrifice of Christ, whose soul was made an offering for sin whereby atonement is made for it, and whose blood cleanses from all sin. Though the word “priest” is not in the text, it is rightly supplied, as it is by Aben Ezra, for by no other could, a sacrifice be offered, or atonement made; and on the day of atonement only by the high priest, who was a type of Christ our high priest, who has by his sacrifice made reconciliation for sin, and by himself has purged from it:

*[that] ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord;* which is a general phrase, as Aben Ezra observes, and may be understood of sins of ignorance and presumption; as Christ by his blood and sacrifice has cleansed all his people from all their sins of every sort, so that they stand pure and clean, unblamable and unreproveable, before the throne of God, and in his sight; (see Colossians 1:22 Revelation 14:5).
Ver. 31. *It [shall be] a sabbath of rest unto you*, etc.] From all servile work, as before observed; typical of a cessation from the performance of sinful works, at least from a sinful course of life, and from a dependence on works of righteousness, when a man is brought to believe in Christ, and in the atonement which he has made, (see <580403>Hebrews 4:3,10):

*and ye shall afflict your souls by a statute for ever:* as long as the ceremonial law, and its statutes and ordinances lasted, which were to be until the time of reformation; and till that time came, once a year, on the day of atonement, they were to keep a severe fast, here called an afflicting of their souls; and in this respect this day differed from the seventh day sabbath, which was rather a festival than a fast, and is what led some of the Heathen writers into that this take, that the Jews fasted on the sabbath day. The time of Christ’s sufferings, and of his being a sacrifice for the sins of his people, was a time of great affliction to his disciples; then it was the children of the bridegroom fasted, he being taken from them; and true humiliation for sin, and repentance of it, are occasioned and influenced by a view of a suffering Saviour, and atonement by him; and this may denote also, that such that believe in Christ, and in his atonement, must expect afflictions and troubles in this world.

Ver. 32. *And the priest whom he shall anoint*, etc.] Whom God shall anoint, or shall be anointed, that shall succeed in the high priesthood, as Aaron’s sons did, the eldest of them, and none but such were anointed:

*and whom he shall consecrate;* or fill his hands, by putting the sacrifices into them; (see Gill on “Exodus 28:41”) and (see Gill on “Exodus 29:9”) (see Gill on “Exodus 29:24”); by which, and by anointing him, and clothing him with the priestly garments, he was consecrated and installed into his office, in order

*to minister in the priest’s office, in his father’s stead:* a son of an high priest was always preferred to any other, and to him it of right belonged to succeed his father in his office: and such an one, thus consecrated,

*shall make the atonement;* on this day of atonement; not a common priest, but the high priest only; so Jarchi observes, this expiation of the day of atonement was not right but by an high priest; for the whole section is said concerning Aaron, and therefore it must needs be said of an high priest that comes after him, that should be as he was:
and shall put on the linen clothes, [even] the holy garments: that is, on the day of atonement; in which clothes all the service peculiar to that day, as it was done by Aaron, so it was to be done by all his successors.

Ver. 33. And he shall make an atonement for the holy sanctuary, etc.] The holy of holies, just in the same manner as Aaron had done, (Leviticus 16:16,20);

and he shall make an atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation; the court of the tabernacle, and the holy place, and all in them, as Aaron did, in the places referred

and for the altar; (see Leviticus 16:18,20):

and he shall make an atonement for the priests; for himself and for his family, and for all the priests, as Aaron did by his bullock of the sin offering, (Leviticus 16:6,11,17):

and for all the people of the congregation of Israel; the whole body of the Israelites, and with them the Levites, as Aben Ezra observes, for they are not called priests; indeed every priest was a Levite, but not every Levite a priest; wherefore these were included not among the priests, but in the congregation of Israel. These several atonements, according to Ben Gersom, were separate and distinct, and did not hinder one another, or interfere with one another.

Ver. 34. And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, etc.] Which is the third time of its being observed, (Leviticus 16:29,31), to show that this was a law of considerable moment, and to be taken notice of, and strictly and closely kept by the priests, to whom these words are directed, and on whom the chief service of the day lay:

to make atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year; namely, on the tenth day of the seventh month, or Tisri, as before directed:

and he did as the Lord commanded Moses; that is, Aaron did, as the Targum of Jonathan, Aben Ezra, and Ben Gersom supply it; when the day of atonement came, as Jarchi expresses it, he did according to this order, to fulfil the decree of the king, even the King of kings; whose will it was that such a day should be yearly observed, and such and such rules performed in it; so very significant of Christ, and of the atonement to be made by him, and which has been made.
CHAPTER 17

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 17

In this chapter a law is given, ordering all sorts of persons, Israelites and sojourners, to bring their sacrifices to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, on pain of being cut off, (Leviticus 17:1-9); and a special and particular prohibition of sacrificing to devils is delivered out, (Leviticus 17:7); and the eating of blood, and of everything that dies of itself, or is torn with beasts, is forbidden under the above penalty, (Leviticus 17:10-16).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] After he had given him the law about the day of atonement, and the rites belonging to it:

saying; as follows.

Ver. 2. Speak unto Aaron, and unto his sons, etc.] Who were now constituted priests, the business of whose office it was to offer the sacrifices of the people, ordinary and extraordinary:

and to all the children of Israel; who were all under obligation to sacrifices at certain times; under whom may be comprehended the Levites, who were not priests, and the strangers that sojourned in Israel, for these are concerned in the following law:

and say unto them; which is spoken to Moses, who was to say what follows to Aaron, and by him to his sons, and by his sons to the people of Israel, and by them to the strangers:

this [is] the thing which the Lord hath commanded; ordered to be observed as his will and pleasure by everyone of them:

saying; namely, what follows.

Ver. 3. What man soever [there be] of the house of Israel, etc.] Whether high or low, rich or poor:

that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat in the camp; which are particularly mentioned, as Gersom observes, because of these the offerings were; for
the law respects the killing of them not for common food, but for sacrifice, as appears from the following verses; for this law was to be a statute for ever, whereas in that sense it was not, and could not be observed, especially when they were come into the land of Canaan; nor would it have been decent or convenient to have brought such vast numbers of cattle every day to be killed at the door of the tabernacle, and must have made the service of the priests extremely laborious to kill them, or even to see that they were killed aright:

or that killeth [it] out of the camp; which furnishes out another reason against the same notion, since it was not usual to kill for common food without the camp, but in their own tents within it; whereas to sacrifice without the camp was commonly done.

Ver. 4. And bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, etc.] Near to which stood the altar of burnt offering to offer it upon, and the priests ready for such service: now the Lord would have every sacrifice brought thither
to offer an offering to the Lord before the tabernacle of the Lord; that it might be offered publicly, and be known to be offered to the Lord, and not to idols or devils, as in (Leviticus 17:7); and so to prevent private idolatry, and private persons from intruding into the priest’s office; and this was typical of the acceptance of all spiritual sacrifices in the church of God, through Christ the minister of the tabernacle, which God pitched, and not man; and who is the door into the house of God, where such sacrifices are publicly to be offered up:

blood shall be imputed unto that man, he hath shed blood; which though it was only the blood of a beast, yet being shed as a sacrifice for man, and typical of the blood of Christ to be shed for man, was sacred and precious to God; and therefore he resented the shedding of it to any but himself, or by any person, or in any place but by his appointment; such a man was to be punished as a murderer, idolatry being equally heinous in the sight of God as murder, (see Isaiah 66:3);

and that man shall be cut off from among his people; not merely excommunicated from the church of God, deprived of the privileges of his house, but even put to death; for such a man was guilty of blood, that is, of death, and therefore to be put to death either by the hand of the civil magistrate, if his case was known and came under their cognizance, or by
the immediate hand of God by a premature death, which seems to be chiefly intended; also (see Leviticus 17:10).

**Ver. 5.** *To the end that the children of Israel may bring their sacrifices which they offer in the open field, etc.* Which, before the tabernacle was erected, they were used to offer there, as it was lawful for them to do, and on high places, but now unlawful; though sometimes this was dispensed with by the Lord, and was done by some of his prophets, as Samuel, David, and Elijah, though not by priests:

*even that they may bring them unto the Lord, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, unto the priest;* by whom they were to be offered, and by him only, and which is a principal reason why they were ordered to be brought thither:

*and offer them [for] peace offerings unto the Lord;* which though only mentioned, include all others. These are only taken notice of because most frequent, and because most profitable to the people, having a part of them; wherefore if these were to be brought to the tabernacle, which came the nearest of any to their meals and feasts in their own houses, then much more burnt offerings, and sin offerings, in which the Lord, had so great a concern.

**Ver. 6.** *And the priest shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar of the Lord, etc.* The altar of burnt offering, (Leviticus 1:5);

*[at] the door of the tabernacle of the congregation;* near to which it stood, (see Leviticus 1:5);

*and burn the fat for a sweet savour to the Lord;* the fat that covered the inwards, the kidneys, the flanks and caul of the liver; (see Leviticus 3:3,4,9,10,14-17).

**Ver. 7.** *And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, etc.* As it seems they had done, which was monstrously shocking, and especially by a people that had the knowledge of the true God. Such shocking idolatry has been committed, and still is among the Indians, both East and West: when Columbus discovered Hispaniola, and entered it, he found the inhabitants worshippers of images they called Zemes, which were in the likeness of painted devils, which they took to be the mediators and messengers of the great God, the only one, eternal, omnipotent, and invisible; and so at Calecut and Pego in the East Indies, and in other parts thereof, they
sacrifice to the devil: one can hardly think the Israelites would give into such gross idolatry as this; wherefore by “devils” may be meant idols in general; for if men do not worship God and Christ, let them worship what they will, it is only worshipping devils, (1 Corinthians 10:20 Revelation 9:20); and so the calves of Jeroboam are called devils, (2 Chronicles 11:15); hence the golden calf also, the Israelites worshipped but lately in the wilderness, might go by the same name; to which sense is the Targum of Jonathan,

“and they shall not offer again their sacrifices to idols, which are like to devils.”

The word here used signifies “goats”, and these creatures were worshipped by the Egyptians, and so might be by the Israelites, while among them; this is asserted by several writers. Diodorus Siculus says, they deified the goat, as the Grecians did Priapus, and for the same reason; and that the Pans and the Satyrs were had in honour by men on the same account; and Herodotus observes, that the Egyptians paint and engrave Pan as the Greeks do, with the face and thighs of a goat, and therefore do not kill a goat, because the Mendesians reckon Pan among the gods; and of the Mendesians he says, that they worship goats, and the he goats rather than the she goats; wherefore in the Egyptian language both Pan and a goat are called Mendes; and Strabo reports of Mendes, that there Pan and the goat are worshipped: if these sort of creatures were worshipped by the Egyptians in the times of Moses, which is to be questioned, the Israelites might be supposed to have followed them in it; but if that be true, which Maimonides says of the Zabii, a set of idolaters among the Chaldeans, and other people, long before the times of Moses, that some of them worshipped devils, whom they supposed to be in the form of goats, the Israelites might have given in to this idolatry from them, and be the occasion of this prohibition:

after whom they have gone a whoring; idolatry being a spiritual adultery, a forsaking God, who had taken them into a conjugal relation, and been as an husband to them, and cleaving to idols, which were as paramours; (see Jeremiah 31:32 Ezekiel 16:26);

this shall be a statute for ever unto them throughout their generations: not only this of not sacrificing to devils, but all before commanded, particularly that they should bring their sacrifices to the priest, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.
Ver. 8. *And thou shalt say unto them,* etc.] To Aaron and his sons, and to the children of Israel, as in (Leviticus 17:2);

*whatsoever man [there be] of the house of Israel:* belonging to that nation, and to any of its tribes and families, of whatever age; as a young man or an old man, as the Targum of Jonathan; or of whatsoever rank, class, and condition in life:

*or of the strangers which sojourn among you:* that is, of the proselytes among them; not the proselytes of the gate, who were not admitted to offer sacrifice on the altar of the Lord; and if they were, they could not for non-compliance with this law be cut off from the Jewish church and commonwealth, of which they were no part, only suffered to dwell among them, but partook of none of their privileges; but this is to be understood of proselytes of righteousness, such as embraced the Jewish religion, and submitted to all the rituals of it, and had communion with the body of the people, and shared in all the immunities of their civil and church state, and so liable in case of any real practice to be cut off from them:

*that offereth a burnt offering or sacrifice:* any other sacrifice besides a burnt offering, as a sin offering, or a trespass offering, or a peace offering.

Ver. 9. *And bringeth it not to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer it unto the Lord,* etc.] In a public manner, by one of the priests of the Lord; by which it might appear that he did not take upon him to be a priest himself, nor to offer it to an idol:

*even that man shall be cut off from his people:* from being one of them, and having communion with them, and sharing in their privileges; or by death, either by the hand of the civil magistrate, or rather by the hand of God; so Jarchi, his seed shall be cut off, and his days shall be cut off; that is, he shall die childless, and in the midst of his days, a violent and premature death. Also (see Gill on “Leviticus 17:4”).

Ver. 10. *And whatsoever man [there be] of the house of Israel,* etc.] That is by birth an Israelite, of every age, sex, or condition, as before:

*or of the strangers that sojourn among you:* proselytes of righteousness, for the following law was only obligatory on such, and upon Israelites, as appears from its being lawful to give or sell that which dies of itself to a stranger, that is, to a proselyte of the gate, or to an Heathen, (Deuteronomy 14:21);
that eateth any manner of blood; that is, as Ben Gersom interprets it, of beasts and birds, concerning which the prohibition only is, according to him; for as for the blood of others there was no obligation, nor were any guilty on account of them; particularly the blood of fishes, and of locusts, or human blood, the blood of a man’s teeth, which a man might swallow without being guilty of the breach of this law $. Some restrain this to the blood of the sacrifices before treated of; but Jarchi observes, lest any should think, because it is said, it is “the blood that maketh the atonement for the soul”: that a man is not guilty only on account of the blood of sanctified things, therefore it is said “any manner of blood”:

I will set my face against that soul that eateth blood; signifying how greatly he should be provoked thereby, how much he should resent it, how exceedingly displeasing it would be to him, and what severity might be expected to be exercised towards him for it; for dreadful it is to have the face of God set against a man, (see Psalm 34:16). Maimonides observes, that this form of speech does not occur in any third precept besides these two, concerning idolatry or sacrificing a son to Moloch, (Leviticus 20:3), and eating blood; because eating of blood gives an occasion to one species of idolatry, worshipping of devils, (see Leviticus 19:26);

and will cut him off from among his people; which confirms the above sense of the phrase of cutting off as expressive of death by the hand of God; (see Gill on Leviticus 17:4”).

Ver. 11. For the life of the flesh [is] in the blood, etc.] The animal life or soul, the life and soul of every creature, and even the animal life and soul of man; agreeably to which our famous Dr. Harvey, who found out the circulation of the blood, says of it, that it is the principal part which first appears in generation; is the genital part, the fountain of life the first that lives, and the last that dies; the primary seat of the soul or life, from whence motion and pulsation take their rise; in which the innate heat is produced the vital spirit is generated and the life consists; and therefore it is spread all over the body, and according to the condition that it is in, such is the health and such the diseases of the body; yea, the affections of the mind, such as fear, shame, joy, and anger are discovered by it. Hence Antoninus the emperor, more than once, calls the soul a vapour or exhalation arising out of the blood; and the sentiments of various Jewish writers agree herewith: says Aben Ezra, it is a truth, that the soul or life,
with which man lives, is in the blood of the heart; so says Jarchi the soul or life depends upon the blood; and Ben Gersom observes, that the blood is the vessel of the soul to carry in it the fundamental heat, and food to the parts of the body; and hence the animal only dies when the blood is removed;

*and I have given it unto you to make an atonement for your souls*: that being the life of the creature, was given for theirs to preserve them alive, and secure them from death their sins deserved; and so the Targum of Jonathan is, for the sins of the soul; which shows that these sacrifices were vicarious, in the room of men, and for the life of them, and to atone for them; and is the reason given why blood should not be eaten, at least while these typical expiatory sacrifices were used. Ben Gersom seems to intimate, as if it was only the blood of those that was forbidden: his words are, hence we learn says he, that they were not guilty of cutting off, but on account of the blood, which, according to its way was put upon the altar; and this was the blood of the soul as it saith the blood of the bullock, and the blood of the goat; but the blood that was pressed out, and the blood of the members they were not guilty of cutting off, on account of them:

*for it [is] the blood [that] maketh an atonement for the soul*; so here was life for life, soul for soul as Aben Ezra expresses it; it was a vicarious sacrifice and atonement, typical of the sacrifice and atonement of Christ, in the room and stead of his people, there being no atonement, no remission of sins without shedding of blood; and the reason of the prohibition of eating blood was to direct to that blood as the atonement for sin, and to keep up a reverence of it, and a value and esteem for it; but now seeing that blood has been shed and atonement made by it, the end of the law is answered, and the reason of it ceased, and so the law itself; and as Christ’s blood is now to be eaten in a spiritual sense, the eating of blood in a literal sense, properly dressed, is lawful. And indeed, as before observed the law concerning it was never binding upon Gentiles, only on Jews and proselytes.

**Ver. 12.** *Therefore I said unto the children of Israel, no soul of you shall eat blood*, etc.] Great or small as Jarchi observes, for the reason above given; which, though not expressed before, was the true reason of this law, which had been given before, and now repeated; (see [[Leviticus 3:17 7:26,27]]);
neither shall any stranger that sojourneth among you eat blood; any proselyte of righteousness; this is not observed before.

Ver. 13. And whatsoever man [there be] of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, etc.] This form of speaking, which is often used in this chapter, is still observed to point out the persons on whom the law is obligatory, Israelites and proselytes of righteousness: which hunteth and catcheth any beast or fowl that may be eaten; that is, clean beasts and fowls, such as by a former law are observed; and this excepts unclean ones, as Jarchi, but includes all clean ones, whether wild or tame, that may be taken and killed though not taken in hunting; but such are particularly mentioned, because not only hunting beasts and fowl were common, but because such persons were more rustic and brutish and, being hungry, were in haste for their food, and not so careful about the slaying of the creatures, and of, taking care about their blood:

he shall even pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with dust; that it might not be eaten by men, nor licked up by beasts and that there might be kept up a reverend esteem of blood, being the life of the creature; and this covering of it, as Maimonides tells us, was accompanied with a benediction in this form,

“Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, the King of the world, who hath sanctified us by his precepts, and hath given commandment to us concerning covering of the blood:”

and the same writer elsewhere gives us another reason of this law, that the Israelites might not meet and feast about the blood, as the Zabians did, who, when they slew a beast, took its blood and put it into a vessel, or into a hole dug by them, and sat and feasted around it: (see Leviticus 19:26).

Ver. 14. For [it is] the life of all flesh, etc.] Of every animal:

the blood of it [is] for the life thereof; for the production, preservation, and continuance of life; that on which life depends, as Jarchi observes:

therefore I said unto the children of Israel, ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh; of beasts or birds, whose flesh was fit for food; but their blood was not to be eaten, for the reasons before given:
for the life of all flesh [is] the blood thereof; which is repeated, that it might be observed and taken notice of, as that in which the force of the reason lay for giving this law:

whosoever eateth it shall be cut off; by death, whether he be an Israelite or a proselyte of righteousness; wherefore if this law was now in force, its penalty also would be continued, whereas it is not, and which shows the abrogation of it. Also (see Gill on “Leviticus 17:4”).

Ver. 15. And every soul that eateth that which died [of itself], etc.] Through any disease upon it, or by means of any other creature seizing upon it and worrying it, or was not lawfully killed; if a man ate ever so little of it, even but the quantity of an olive, it was a breach of this law; which is connected with the preceding, there being a similarity between them, because such creatures must have their blood in them, not being regularly let out, and so eating of them would offend against the above law. It is very probable, as Grotius thinks, that Pythagoras took his notion from hence, and strictly enjoined his followers to abstain from all animals that died of themselves, as Laertius and Aelianus relate, and which Porphyry suggests, was what universally obtained among men:

or that which was torn [with beasts]; though not dead, yet ready to die, and so unfit for food; (see Gill on “Exodus 22:31”);

[whether it be] one of your own country, or a stranger; a native of Israel, or a proselyte of righteousness; for as for any other stranger he might eat of it, (Deuteronomy 14:22);

he shall both wash his clothes, and bathe [himself] in water; in forty seahs of water, as the Targum of Jonathan, dip himself all over:

and be unclean until the even; and so have no conversation with men in civil or religious things:

then shall he be clean; when he has washed his garments, and bathed himself, and the evening is come, and then shall be admitted to society as before: this is to be understood of one who ignorantly eats of the above things, not knowing them to be such; otherwise, if he did it presumptuously, he was to be punished.
Ver. 16. *But if he wash [them] not*, etc.] Neither wash his clothes: nor bathe his flesh; if he is negligent, and does not take care to make use of these ablutions:

*then he shall bear his iniquity*; his guilt shall remain on him, and he shall suffer the punishment the law exposes him to, either by the hand of God, or the civil magistrate, which is due to persons that enter into the sanctuary in their uncleanness, or eat of holy things. For not washing his body the punishment was cutting off, and for not washing his garments, beating, as Jarchi says.
CHAPTER 18

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 18

In this chapter the Israelites are directed in general not to imitate the customs and practices of the Egyptians and Canaanites, but to keep the ordinances, statutes, and judgments of the Lord, (Leviticus 18:1-5); and they are instructed particularly to avoid incestuous marriages, (Leviticus 18:6-18); carnal copulation with a menstruous woman, (Leviticus 18:19); adultery, (Leviticus 18:20); letting any of their seed pass through the fire to Molech, (Leviticus 18:21); sodomy, (Leviticus 18:22); and bestiality, (Leviticus 18:23); and they are deterred from these things by observing to them the pollution and destruction which they brought on the inhabitants of Canaan, and would bring the same on them should they commit them, (Leviticus 18:24-30).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] He continued speaking to him, after he had delivered to him the laws respecting the day of atonement, and the bringing of the sacrifices to the door of the tabernacle, and particularly concerning the Israelites not worshipping devils, as they had done in Egypt: the Lord proceeds to deliver out others, the more effectually to guard against both the immoral and idolatrous practice, of the Egyptians and Canaanites:

saying, as follows.

Ver. 2. Speak unto the children of Israel, etc.] To the heads of their tribes, that they might deliver to them the following laws; or Moses is bid to publish them among them, either by word of mouth, or by writing, or both:

and say unto them, I am the Lord your God; with which they were to be introduced; showing the right he had to enact and enjoin such laws, since he was Jehovah, the Being of beings, and from whom they received their beings; their sovereign Lord and King, who had a right to rule over them, and command what he pleased; and also the obligation they lay under to him to regard them, and yield a cheerful obedience to them, since he was their God, not only that had made them, but had redeemed them out of Egypt; and who had made a covenant with them, and had taken special
care of them, and had bestowed many wonderful favours on them; and for
this purpose is this phrase often used in this chapter, and very frequently in
the next. (see \textit{Leviticus 18:2,4,30}) (\textit{Leviticus}
19:3,4,10,25,31,34,36).

\textbf{Ver. 3.} \textit{After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye
not do, etc.] Where they had dwelt many years, and were just come out
from thence, and where they had learned many of their evil practices; not
only their idolatrous ones referred to in the preceding chapter, which it is
certain they followed, (\textit{Ezekiel 20:7,8}); but also their immoral practices,
particularly respecting incestuous marriages, after insisted on, some of
which were established by a law among them; so Diodorus Siculus relates
\textit{f614}, that it passed into a law with the Egyptians, contrary to the common
custom of all others, that men might marry their own sisters; which is one
of the incestuous marriages taken notice of in this chapter, and forbid:

\textit{and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye
not do:} which land had been promised to their ancestors and to them long
ago, and whither they were now going under divine direction and guidance,
to inherit it, and are here particularly warned of the evil practices among
them, that they might avoid them: Maimonides \textit{f615} says, these are what our
Rabbins call “the ways of the Amorites” (the principal people of the nations
of the land of Canaan), and which, he adds, are as branches of the magic
art; namely, such which do not follow from natural reason, but from
magical operation, and depend upon the dispositions and orders of the
stars, and so were necessarily led to worship them: hence, they say, in
whatsoever is anything of medicine, in it is nothing of the way of the
Amorites; by which they mean nothing else than this, that everything is
lawful in which there appears a natural reason for it; and on the contrary,
all others are unlawful: but here respect is had not to magical operations
but to incestuous marriages, which prevailed among that people, and which
they might have received from their ancestor Canaan, who learned them
from his father Ham, of whom Berosus \textit{f616} writes, that even before the
flood he corrupted mankind; asserting and putting it in practice, that men
might lie with their mothers, sisters, daughters, and with males and brutes,
or any other, for which he was cast out by Noah:

\textit{neither shall ye walk in their ordinances:} which they ordained, appointed,
and settled, for they were such a people the Psalmist speaks of, which
framed mischief or wickedness by a law, (\textit{Psalm 94:2}); so Diodorus
Siculus says of the incestuous marriage before referred to, and which the above writer, Berosus, derives from Ham their ancestor, that they are said νομοψετησαι, “to pass into a law”; but Aben Ezra puts another sense on these words, let no man use himself to walk in this way until it becomes an ordinance or statute unto him; custom is second nature, and in course of time has the force of a law, wherefore bad customs should be strictly guarded against.

Ver. 4. *Ye shall do my judgments*, etc.] Which are just and right, and according to the rules of justice and equity; these are things, as Jarchi observes, which are said in the law with judgment, or are laws framed with the highest reason, even by the judgment of God himself, whose judgment is always according to truth: Aben Ezra thinks, these are the judicial laws in (Exodus 21:1-23:33); but though they may include them, they have more particular respect to the following laws:

*and keep mine ordinances, to walk therein:* which he had ordained and appointed of his own will and pleasure, which Jarchi calls the decree of the king, or which he decreed and determined as a king, having absolute power over his subjects to enact and enjoin what he pleased; wherefore some think these refer to ceremonial laws, which depended upon the will of the lawgiver, and were not founded in any natural sense or reason, wherefore it follows:

*I [am] the Lord your God:* who had a right to make what laws he pleased, being their Sovereign, and which they in gratitude as well as in justice ought to obey, he being their God, their covenant God, who had done great and good things for them.

Ver. 5. *Ye shall therefore keep my statutes, and my judgments*, etc.] The same as before; these they were to keep in their minds and memories, and to observe them and do them:

*which if a man do he shall live in them:* live a long life in the land of Canaan, in great happiness and prosperity, (see Deuteronomy 30:20 Isaiah 1:19); for as for eternal life, that was never intended to be had, nor was it possible it could be had and enjoyed by obedience to the law, which fallen man is unable to keep; but is what was graciously promised and provided the covenant of grace, before the world was, to come through Christ, as a free gift to all that believe in him, (see Galatians 3:11–12).
3:11,12,21); though some Jewish writers interpret this of eternal life, as Jarchi, Aben Ezra, and Ben Gersom:

*I [am] the Lord*; that has enjoined these statutes and judgments, and promised life to the doers of them, able and faithful to perform what is promised.

**Ver. 6. None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, etc.]**

Or to all “the rest of his flesh”\(^\text{6}17\), which together with his make one flesh, who are of the same flesh and blood with him, and are united together in the bonds of consanguinity; and such, with respect to a man, are his mother, sister, and daughter; his mother, of whom he was born, his sister, who lay in and sprung from the same “venter” he did, and his daughter, who is his own flesh; and with respect to a woman, her father brother, and son, who are in the same degree of relation, and both sexes are included in this prohibition; for though in the original text it is “a man, a man”\(^\text{6}18\), yet as it takes in every man, so every woman: hence, as Jarchi observes, it is expressed in the plural number, “do not ye approach”, to caution both male and female; and it is also understood by the Talmudists\(^\text{6}19\) of Gentiles as well as Israelites, for they ask, what is the meaning of the phrase “a man, a man?” the design of it is, they say, to comprehend the Gentiles, who are equally cautioned against incests as the Israelites; and indeed the inhabitants of the land of Canaan are said to defile the land with the incests and other abominations hereafter mentioned, and for which they were driven out of it: now when man and woman are forbidden to “approach” to those of the same flesh and blood with them, the sense is not that they may not come into each other’s company, or make use of any civil or friendly salutations, or have a free and familiar conversation with each other, provided that modesty and chastity be preserved; but they are not so to draw near as to lie with, or have carnal knowledge of one another, in which sense the phrase is used, (\textit{Genesis 20:4}; \textit{Isaiah 8:3}; \textit{Ezekiel 18:6}); or to tempt to it or solicit it, and as it follows, which explains the meaning of it,

\textit{to uncover [their] nakedness}; that is, those parts, which, by a contrary way of speaking, are so called, which should never be naked or exposed to view; but should be always covered, as nature teaches to do, and as our first parents did, when they perceived themselves naked, and were ashamed, (\textit{Genesis 3:7,10}); this phrase signifies the same as to lie with another, or have carnal knowledge of them, wherefore the following laws
are generally understood of incestuous marriages; for if such an action is not to be done between persons standing in such a relation, as here in general, and afterwards more particularly described, then there ought to be no intermarriages between them; and if such marriages are forbidden, and such actions unlawful in a married state, then much more in an unmarried one; wherefore the several following instances are so many breaches of the seventh command, (Exodus 20:14), and so many explications and illustrations of it, and consequently of a moral nature, and binding upon all men, Jews and Gentiles:

*I [am] the Lord;* that gave this caution, and enjoined this prohibition, and would greatly resent and severely revenge the neglect of it: the particulars follow.

**Ver. 7.** *The nakedness of thy father, or the nakedness of thy mother, shall thou not uncover, etc.* By uncovering a father’s nakedness is not meant anything similar to what befell Noah, which Ham beheld with pleasure, and the other two sons of Noah studiously and with reverence to their father covered; nor any sodomitical practice of a son with his father; as Gersom interprets it; but the same is meant by both phrases, and the words are by many interpreters thus rendered, “the nakedness of thy father, that is, the nakedness of thy mother thou shalt not uncover”: for what is the mother’s is the father’s, and uncovering the one is uncovering the other; wherefore the mother only is made mention of in the next clause, where the reason of this prohibition is given:

*she [is] thy mother, thou shalt not uncover her nakedness;* that is, not lie with her, nor marry her, because she is his mother that bore him, of whom he was born, and therefore ought not to become his wife, or be taken into his bed; such a marriage must be incestuous and shocking; such were the marriages of Oedipus with his mother Jocasta, and of Nero with Agrippina; though the words will bear another sense, that a woman may not marry her father, which may be meant by the first clause, nor a man his mother, intended in the next; and where indeed it is not expressed, females in the same degree of relation are included with the males, and under the same prohibition; and so the Targum of Jonathan explains this, a woman shall not have to do with her father, nor a man with his mother; as Lot’s two daughters had with him, and the Persians with their mothers; among whom such incestuous marriages and copulations were frequent, and especially among their Magi who might not perform their office unless they had
lain with their mothers, sisters, and daughters, or were begotten in such incest: a man guilty of such incestuous copulations was cursed by the law of Moses, (Deuteronomy 27:20); this is contrary to nature, what the brute creation abhors; a camel will not cover its dam: Aristotle reports of one who was betrayed into it by his keeper, who, after he had discovered it, fixed his teeth in him and slew him; and he also relates of a horse after that he had ignorantly done the same, ran away in great haste and cast himself down from a precipice headlong.

Ver. 8. *The nakedness of thy father’s wife shalt thou not uncover, etc.*] That is, who is indeed a man’s father’s wife, but not his own mother, but a stepmother or mother-in-law; or otherwise this law would coincide with the former; a man lying with such an one is accursed by the law, (Deuteronomy 27:23); such an incestuous copulation was that of Reuben with Bilhah, and Absalom with his father’s concubines or secondary wives, and such an incestuous marriage was that of the Corinthians, (1 Corinthians 5:1); and of Antiochus Soter, king of Syria, with Stratonice his mother-in-law: and even it was criminal to do this after a father’s death, as Jarchi interprets it; and though she was only betrothed, and not married, and the father dead after such betrothing; as Gersom; nay, though she was divorced by the father, yet was not lawful for the son to have, no, not after his death:

*it is thy father’s nakedness*; being espoused to him, and so one flesh with him; and the son and father being one flesh, such a mixture must be unlawful; and since then the nakedness of a mother-in-law is the father’s, then surely that of an own mother’s must be so likewise, which confirms a sense given of it in (Leviticus 18:7): Cicero exclaims against such marriages as incredible and unheard of, as instances of unbridled lust and singular impudence.

Ver. 9. *The nakedness of thy sister, etc.*] To lie with one in so near a relation is exceeding criminal, and for which the law curses a man, (Deuteronomy 27:22); and to marry her is not lawful; for though it was necessary for the propagation of mankind that a man should marry his sister, for who else could Cain and Abel marry? yet afterwards, when there was an increase of mankind, and there were people enough remote from each other, it became unlawful for persons in such near ties of consanguinity to marry with each other; though the Egyptians did, in
imitation of Isis and Osiris, and so the Persians, following the example of Cambyses:

the daughter of thy father, or the daughter of thy mother; whether she is a sister both by father and mother’s side, or whether only by the fathers side and not the mother’s, as Sarah was to Abraham, (Genesis 20:12); or only by the mother’s side and not the father’s:

[whether she be] born at home or born abroad; not whether born and brought up in his and her father’s house, or born and brought up in another place and province; though there were some, as Aben Ezra observes, that so interpreted it, according to the sense of the word in (Genesis 50:23); but rather the sense is, as that writer gives it, whether born according to the law of the house of Israel, after espousals and marriage, or without it; that is, whether begotten in lawful marriage or not, whether a legitimate offspring or spurious, born in adultery and whoredom, whether on the father or mother’s side; so the Targum of Jonathan, whom thy father begat of another woman, or of thy mother, or whom thy mother bore or brought forth, of thy father, or of another man; and to the same purpose Onkelos:

[even] their nakedness thou shalt not uncover; neither lie with, or have carnal knowledge of, nor marry one or the other.

Ver. 10. The nakedness of thy son’s daughter, or of thy daughter’s daughter, etc.] A man might not marry his granddaughter, whether a descendant of his son or of his daughter, nor any further off descending from him in a right line, not his great-granddaughter, and so on; and if he might not marry his granddaughter, much less his own daughter, as Jarchi observes, for the relation is still nearer; therefore that being prohibited, this in course must, though not mentioned:

[even] their nakedness thou shalt not uncover; neither debauch nor marry such an one:

for theirs [is] thine own nakedness; which sprung from his, being the descendants either of his son or daughter; the Targum of Jonathan is,

“for they are as thy nakedness,”

his own flesh and blood.
Ver. 11. *The nakedness of thy father’s wife’s daughter*, etc.] Either the daughter of his father by another wife, which seems to be countenanced by what follows:

*begotten of thy father, she [is] thy sister*; but then this coincides with what is prohibited, (Leviticus 18:9), “the daughter of thy father”; that is, by another woman than a man’s mother, only with this difference, that there is added, or “daughter of thy mother”, that is, by another man than a man’s own father; so that there is a prohibition of a sister whether by father or mother’s side; here only as by the father’s side, and so is only a part of that law; and, as some think, is for the confirmation of it, as Aben Ezra observes; or else the sense, as he thinks, is, that if a man marries a woman, and she has a little daughter by a former husband, that daughter may not be given in marriage to his son; and so the Septuagint version finishes this clause first, before it gives the other, which it considers as distinct from it, thus, “the shame of thy father’s, wife’s daughter thou shalt not uncover”; and then makes a distinct law of the latter; “she that is begotten of thy father is thy sister, thou shalt not uncover her shame”; but then this last falls in with (Leviticus 18:9), the Sadducees, as Aben Ezra also observes, by whom he means the Karaites, interpret it not of a mother’s daughter, but of one brought up and educated by a man’s father, and so is his adopted daughter, whom his son might not marry; and thus with the Romans it is said, that adoptive kindred hindered marriage between parents and children altogether; and among brethren so far forth as the loss of freedom did not intervene: some understand this law in this light, as De Dieu, that in (Leviticus 18:9); the son of a second marriage is forbidden to marry with an half sister of the first marriage, whether she is the father’s daughter, that is, which the father had by his deceased wife, or the mother’s daughter, that is, which his mother had by a deceased husband; but here the son of a first marriage is forbidden with a half sister of a second marriage, which his mother-in-law has bore to his father, and is therefore called “the daughter of thy father’s wife”; that is, of thy stepmother, but so the same may be said to be “begotten of thy father”; and therefore one begotten in a former marriage may not be understood; but then as this forbids the marriage of a brother with a sister, that is, of the same father, though not of the same mother, it falls in within the former law; wherefore some have been of opinion, that this law forbids a man to marry the daughter of a woman whom his father has taken to wife, who was his deceased brother’s wife, upon the law in (Deuteronomy 25:5);
by which marriage she became the father’s daughter, and the son’s sister; wherefore they take the phrase, “begotten of thy father”, to signify “being akin” to thy father; which, if it can be established, makes a distinct law: Jarchi observes, on this phrase, “the daughter of thy father’s wife”,

“this teaches that a man is not guilty concerning his sister that is by an handmaid or stranger; therefore it is said, the daughter of thy father’s wife, namely, one that was fit for marriage.”

_thou shalt not uncover her nakedness_; (see Gill on “<031809>Leviticus 18:9”).

**Ver. 12. Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father’s sister, etc.]** His aunt by his father’s side, an instance of which we have in Amram, (<020620>Exodus 6:20); and Maimonides says, an aunt was forbidden whether she was a father’s sister in lawful wedlock or in fornication:

_she [is] thy father’s near kinswoman_; or, the rest of thy father, the residue of his flesh, one of the same flesh and blood with him; wherefore, as he could not marry her himself, so his son likewise was too near akin to enter into such a relation with her.

**Ver. 13. Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy mother’s sister, etc.]** Which is the same relation as before, an aunt by the mother’s side; wherefore, if such a marriage was unlawful, this must also, and for the same reason:

_for she [is] thy mother’s near kinswoman_; the same phraseology is used here as in the preceding verse; (see Gill on “<031812>Leviticus 18:12”); and by the same rule a woman might not marry her uncle, whether by father or mother’s side, the relation being the same, and this reaches to great-uncle and great-aunt; instances of women marrying their uncles, and men their aunts, among the Heathens, have been given, as among the Persians and Lacedaemonians by Herodotus, and among the Romans by Tacitus, but were, in his time, new things with the latter.

**Ver. 14. Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father’s brother, etc.]** Which Gersom understands of committing sodomy with him, on which account he was doubly guilty, partly because of lying with a male, and partly because of uncovering the nakedness of his father’s brother; but it rather seems at first sight as if the sense was, that a woman should not marry her father’s brother, that is, her uncle, as a man might not marry his aunt, whether by father or mother’s side, as in (<031812,13>Leviticus 18:12,13); but
Jarchi directs to a better sense than either, when he asks, what is his nakedness? in answer to which he recites the following clause as explanatory of it:

*thou shall not approach to his wife;* in the use of the bed, as the Targum of Jonathan adds, that is, to lie with her, her husband being living, or to marry her, he being dead:

*she [is] thine aunt:* even as a father’s or mother’s sister, only they are aunts by blood, this by marriage or affinity: in the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan it is, she is the wife of thy father’s brother; and as Aben Ezra, she is accounted as thine aunt, and so marriage with her prohibited; and the same holds good of a father’s brother’s wife, which being not mentioned, the same writer says, we have need of the tradition which expresses that and also of a father’s sister’s husband; for if marriage with a father’s brother’s wife is unlawful, then marriage with a father’s sister’s husband must be so too; for a father’s sister’s husband stands in the same degree or line of affinity as a father’s brother’s wife; and it is a sure rule, that in whatsoever degree or line of affinity males are forbid to marry females, in the same females are forbid to marry males.

**Ver. 15.** *Thou shall not uncover the nakedness of thy daughter in law,* etc.] Shall not he with her in his son’s lifetime, or marry her after his death:

*she [is] that son’s wife;* and so one flesh with him, and who is of the same flesh and blood with his father, and therefore the nearness of the relation forbids such incestuous copulation or marriage:

*thou shall not uncover her nakedness;* or have carnal knowledge of her, whether in the life or after the death of his son, even then marriage with her is not lawful.

**Ver. 16.** *Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother’s wife,* etc.] Neither debauch her nor after the death of the brother marry her, that is, unless he dies without issue; and then, by another law, he was obliged to marry her, (Deuteronomy 25:5); hence the Targum of Jonathan adds; by way of explanation.

“in the life of thy brother, or after his death, if he has children,”

but then that law was but an exception from this general rule, and so did not make it void in other respects, but bound it the more strongly; and
besides, it was a special and peculiar law to the Jews, until the Messiah came to make it manifest of what tribe and family he came; and the reason of it ceasing, the law itself is ceased, and so neither binding on Jews nor Gentiles: hence John the Baptist boldly told Herod to his face, that it was not lawful for him to have his brother’s wife (Matthew 14:3,4); and even such marriages were condemned by the very Heathens: Dionysius Halicarnassensis relates, that Lucius Tarquinius, Superbus, his brother being removed by poison, took Tullia to wife, whom his brother Aruntus had before married; but the historian calls it ἄνοσσιον γάμον, “an unholy marriage”, and abominable both among Greeks and Barbarians: Plutarch also reports, that Marcus Crassus married the wife of his deceased brother; but such marriages are condemned by the same writer, as they are by the ancient Christians in their councils and canons; now by this same law, if it is not lawful for a man to have his brother’s wife, then it is not lawful for her to have her sister’s husband; or, in other words, if it is not lawful for a woman to marry two brothers, then it is not lawful for a man to marry two sisters: the case of Jacob will not countenance such a marriage, since he was imposed upon and deceived; and such marriages have also been disapproved of by the Heathens and Christians: Honorius the emperor married two daughters of Stilico, one after another, but the unhappy exit of both sisters showed that those marriages were not approved of by God, for they both died premature deaths, leaving no children;

*it [is] thy brother’s nakedness*; that is, his wife is, being by marriage one flesh with him, and his brother being so to him, the relation is too near to intermarry, and more especially when there is issue by the first, which connects them strongly.

**Ver. 17. Thou shall not uncover the nakedness of a woman and her daughter, etc.]** That is, if a man marries a woman, and she has a daughter, which is the man’s daughter-in-law, after the death of his wife he may not marry this daughter; for this daughter is of the same flesh with her mother, who became one flesh with the man she married, and therefore his relation to her daughter is too near to marry her: Jarchi says, if he does not marry the woman, but only deflower her, it is free for him to marry her daughter; but Aben Ezra says, if he has lain with the mother, the daughter is forbidden; however, if he married either of them, the other was forbidden; he could not marry them both, neither in the lifetime of them both, nor after the death of either of them:
neither shalt thou take her son’s daughter, or her daughter’s daughter, to uncover her nakedness; not any of her granddaughters, either in the line of her son or daughter; that is, might not lie with either of them, or marry them, and much less then marry her own daughter, these being a further remove from her:

[for] they [are] her near kinswomen; one or other of them, even every one of them, “the rest” and residue “of her”\[^{[639]}\], of her flesh, who together made one flesh with her; and therefore not to be married to her husband, either in her life, or after her death:

it [is] wickedness: a very great wickedness, abominable in the sight of God, and to be detested by man as vile and impious; it is whoredom, as the Targum of Jonathan renders it.

Ver. 18. Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, etc.] Both of them together, as Jarchi; two sisters at one and the same time; so the Targum of Jonathan,

“a woman in the life of her sister thou shall not take;”

that is, in marriage, that sister being his wife; for the sense of the Targumist can never be that a man might not take a woman for his wife, she having a sister living, but not to take one sister to another, or marry his first wife’s sister, whether, as Maimonides\[^{[640]}\] says, she was sister by father or mother’s side, in marriage or in fornication:

to vex [her], to uncover her nakedness; two reasons are given, why, though polygamy, or having more wives than one, was connived at, yet it was not allowed that a man should have two sisters; partly, because they would be more apt to quarrel, and be more jealous and impatient of one another, if more favour was shown or thought to be shown to one more than another; and partly, because it was a filthy and unbecoming action to uncover the nakedness of one, or lie with one so nearly related to his wife:

besides her in her life [time]; from whence some have concluded, and so many of the Jewish writers\[^{[641]}\], that a man might marry his wife’s sister after her death, but not while she was living; but the phrase, “in her lifetime”, is not to be joined to the phrase “thou shall not take a wife”; but to the phrases more near, “to vex her in her lifetime”, or as long as she lived, and “to uncover her nakedness by her”\[^{[642]}\], on the side of her, as long as she lived; for that a wife’s sister may be married to her husband, even
after her death, cannot be lawful, as appears from the general prohibition, (Leviticus 18:6); “none of you shall approach to him that is near of kin to him”; and yet it is certain that a wife’s sister is near akin to a man; and from the prohibition of marriage with an uncle’s wife, with the daughter of a son-in-law, or of a daughter-in-law, (Leviticus 18:14,17); now a wife’s sister is nearer of kin than either of these; and from the confusion that must follow in case of issue by both, not only of degrees but appellation of kindred; one and the same man, who as a father of children, and the husband of their mother’s sister, stands in the relation both of a father and an uncle to his own children; the woman to the children of the deceased sister stands in the relation both of a stepmother, and of a mother’s sister or aunt, and to the children that were born of her, she stands in the relation both of a mother and an uncle’s wife; and the two sorts of children are both brethren and own cousins by the mother’s side, but of this (see Gill on Leviticus 18:16”) for more; some understand this of a prohibition of polygamy, rendering the words, “thou shall not take one wife to another”; but the former sense is best; polygamy being not expressly forbidden by the law of Moses, but supposed in it, and winked at by it; and words of relation being always used in all these laws of marriage, in a proper and not in an improper sense: there is a pretty good deal of agreement between these laws of Moses and the Roman laws; by an edict of Dioclesian and Maximian, it was made unlawful to contract matrimony with a daughter, with a niece, with a niece’s daughter, with a grandmother, with a great-grandmother, with an aunt by the father’s side, with an aunt by the mother’s side, with a sister’s daughter, and a niece from her, with a daughter-in-law to a second husband, with a mother-in-law, with a wife or husband’s mother, and with a son’s wife; and several of these laws are recommended by Phocylydes, an Heathen poet, at least in a poem that hears his name; and the marriage of a wife’s sister after her death has been condemned by several Christian councils.

Ver. 19. Also thou shall not approach unto a woman, etc.] Not even a man to his own wife, and much less to another woman:

to uncover her nakedness, as long as she is put apart for her uncleanness; in her monthly courses; and the time of her separation from her husband on that account was seven days, (Leviticus 15:19); if a man lay with a woman when in such circumstances, they were both to be cut off from their people, (Leviticus 20:18); and such an action is reckoned among sins, and uncleanness of the worst sort, (Ezekiel 22:10).
Ver. 20. Moreover, thou shalt not lie carnally with thy neighbour’s wife, etc.] Which is adultery, and a breach of the seventh command, (Exodus 20:14):

to defile thyself with her; not only adultery is a defiling a man’s wife, as it is sometimes called, but the adulterer defiles himself: all sin is of a defiling nature, but especially this, which defiles a man both in soul and body, and brings a blot and stain upon his character, which shall not be wiped off, (Proverbs 6:32,33).

Ver. 21. And thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through [the fire] to Molech, etc.] The name of an image or idol, according to Aben Ezra, who observes, that their wise men interpret it as a general name for everyone whom they made to reign over them; and it is right, he says, that it is the abomination of the children of Ammon, and so the same with Milcom, (1 Kings 11:5); and with Baal, as appears from (Jeremiah 32:35); and they are both of much the same signification, the one signifies a king, the other a lord; and perhaps is the same with the Melicarthus of Sanchoniatho, who is also Hercules; to whom Pliny says that the Phoenicians offered human sacrifices every year: of Molech, (see Gill on “Jeremiah 7:31”) (see Gill on “Amos 1:13”); by “seed” is meant children and offspring; and because the word “fire” is not in the original text, some, as Aben Ezra observes, explain the phrase, “let to pass through”, of their causing them to pass from the law of God to the religion of Molech, or of devoting them to his service and worship; but the word “fire” is rightly supplied, as it may be from (Deuteronomy 18:10); and the same writer says, the phrase to pass through is the same as to burn; but though this they sometimes did, even burn their infants, and sacrificed them to idols, (2 Chronicles 28:3 Psalm 106:37,38 Ezekiel 16:20,21); yet this seems to be something short of that, and to be done in the manner, as Jarchi and other Jewish writers relate; who say, the father delivered his son to the priests (of Molech) and they made two great fires, and caused the son to pass on foot between the two fires, which was a kind of a lustration, and so of a dedication of them to the idol; though it must be owned that both were done; yea, that both the phrases of passing through the fire, and of burning, are used promiscuously of the same, (2 Kings 16:3); compared with (2 Chronicles 28:3) and also (Ezekiel 16:20,21); and they might be both done at different times, or the one previous and in order to the other; and perhaps they might cause the child
so often and so long to pass through the fire, as that at last it was burnt and destroyed:

*neither shall thou profane the name of thy God;* who had given them children, and to whom they ought to have devoted them, and in whose service they should have trained them up to the honour of his name; but instead of that profaned it, by the above idolatrous and cruel usages:  

*I [am] the Lord;* who would avenge such a profanation of his name.

**Ver. 22.** *Thou shall not lie with mankind as with womankind,* etc. By carnal knowledge of them, and carnal copulation with them, and mixing bodies in like manner: this is the sin commonly called sodomy, from the inhabitants of Sodom, greatly addicted to it, for which their city was destroyed by fire: those that are guilty of this sin, are, by the apostle, called “abusers of themselves with mankind”, (<sup>1</sup> Corinthians 6:9);  

*it [is] abomination;* it is so to God, as the above instance of his vengeance shows, and ought to be abominable to men, as being not only contrary to the law of God, but even contrary to nature itself, and what is never to be observed among brute creatures.

**Ver. 23.** *Neither shall thou lie with any beast, to defile thyself therewith,* etc. A female one, as Aben Ezra notes, as a mare, cow, or ewe, or any other beast, small or great, as Ben Gersom, or whether tame or wild, as Maimonides; and even fowls are comprehended, as the same writers observe:  

*neither shall any woman stand before a beast to lie down thereto:* that is, stand before a beast, and by a lascivious and obscene behaviour solicit the beast to a congress with her, and then lie down after the manner of four-footed beasts, as the word signifies, that it may have carnal copulation with her: for a man to lie with a beast is most shocking and detestable, but for a woman to solicit such an unnatural mixture is most horrible and astonishing: perhaps reference may be had to a most shocking practice among the Egyptians, from among whom the Israelites were lately come, and whose doings they were not to imitate, (<sup>Leviticus 18:3</sup>); and which may account for this law, as Bishop Patrick observes: at Mendes, in Egypt, a goat was worshipped, as has been remarked (<sup>Leviticus 18:7</sup>); and where the women used to lie with such creatures, as Strabo and Aelianus from Pindar have related; yea, Herodotus reports, of his own knowledge, that a goat had carnal copulation with a woman openly, in
the view of all, in his time; and though that creature is a most lascivious and lustful one, yet, as Bochart from Plutarch has observed, when it is provoked by many and beautiful women, is not inclined and ready to come into their embraces, but shows some abhorrence of it: nature in brutes, as that learned man observes, is often more prevalent in them than in mankind:

\textit{it [is] confusion}; a mixing of the seed of man and beast together, a blending of different kinds of creatures, a perverting the order of nature, and introducing the utmost confusion of beings, from whence monsters in nature may arise.

\textbf{Ver. 24.} \textit{Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things}, etc.] In incestuous copulations and marriages, in adultery, corporeal and spiritual, and bestiality:

\textit{for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you}; that is, the seven nations of the land of Canaan, which God was about to eject out of their land to make room for the Israelites, and that on account of the above shocking vices which abounded among them; so that in some sense the land they dwelt upon was defiled by them, and called for vengeance on them, as even loathing its inhabitants, as afterwards suggested.

\textbf{Ver. 25.} \textit{And the land is defiled}, etc.] The inhabitants of it, with the immoralities and idolatries before mentioned:

\textit{therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it}; or punish the inhabitants that are on it for their sins:

\textit{and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants}; as a stomach loaded with corrupt and bad food it has taken in, nauseates it, and cannot bear and retain it, but casts it up, and never receives it again; so the land of Canaan is represented as loathing its inhabitants, and as having an aversion to them, and indignation against them, and as not being able to bear them, but entirely willing to be rid of them and throw them out of their places in it, never to be admitted more, being as nauseous and as useless as the cast of a man’s stomach; (see Revelation 3:16).

\textbf{Ver. 26.} \textit{Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments}, etc.] Before observed to them, whether of a ceremonial nature, and enjoined them according to his sovereign will and pleasure; or of a moral nature, and founded in justice and equity, and so worthy of their regard, and
obligatory upon them; as well as in their own nature they recommended themselves to their regard, as being the reverse of those loathsome and abominable things before dehorted from:

And shall not commit [any] of these abominations; such as incest, adultery, idolatry, and bestiality, which are in themselves abominable things, execrable to God, and to be detested by men:

[Neither] any of your own nation; that belonged to any of their own tribes, or should be born to them in the land of Canaan when they came thither, and were properly natives of it:

Nor any stranger that sojourneth among you; any proselyte, and especially a proselyte of righteousness, who conformed to the Jewish religion, and had laid himself under obligation to do everything that was binding upon an Israelite.

Ver. 27. For all these abominations have the men of the land done, etc.] The then present inhabitants of Canaan, who dwelt in it before the Israelites came into it; these were guilty of unclean copulations, of incestuous, marriages, of fornication and adultery, and of bestiality and idolatry:

Which [were] before you; lived in the land before them, had long dwelt there, but now about to be cast out for their sins; and therefore they who were going to succeed them should take warning by them, lest, committing the same sins, they should be cast out likewise:

And the land is defiled; (see Gill on “Leviticus 18:25”).

Ver. 28. That the land spew not you out also, when ye defile it, etc.] By sinning on it, and so rendering it obnoxious to the curse of God, as the whole earth originally was for the sin of man; and so be cast out of it, as Adam was out of paradise, and as the Israelites might expect to be cast out of Canaan, as the old inhabitants of it had been:

As it spewed out the nations that [were] before you; which for the certainty of it is spoken of as done, though it was as yet future; and what the Lord did is ascribed to the land, the more to aggravate their crying sins and abominations, for which the land mourned, and which it could not bear.
Ver. 29. *For whosoever shall commit any of these abominations*, etc.] Before particularly forbid, any of them, be it which it will, they all being very heinous and vile, and especially these last mentioned:

*even the souls that commit [them]*; whether male or female, as Jarchi observes; for the above things concern them both for the most part, however some one, and some another; and though most, if not all the said crimes are committed by the members of the body, yet since under the influence and direction of the soul, the commission of them is attributed to that, and the punishment threatened respects both:

*shall be cut off from among the people*; be removed from their church state, and deprived of ecclesiastical privileges, and from their civil state, and reckoned no more of the commonwealth of Israel; and if known and convicted, to be punished by the civil magistrate, and if not, by the immediate hand of God.

Ver. 30. *Therefore shall ye keep mine ordinance*, etc.] Whatever the Lord appointed them and commanded, whether contained in this chapter, or elsewhere:

*that [ye] commit not [anyone] of these abominable customs*; for attending to the ordinances of God, and a close in them, they would be preserved from the commission of such abominable things, and giving in to such detestable customs as before warned against:

*which were committed before you*; by the inhabitants of Canaan; and by the punishment on them for them they might be deterred from doing the same:

*and that ye defile not yourselves therein*; for though the land is so often said to be defiled, yet, properly speaking, and chiefly, it was the inhabitants that were defiled by their abominable customs; and so would the Israelites also, should they observe the same, and thereby become abominable in the sight of God, and incur his displeasure, and be liable to his vengeance:

*I [am] the Lord your God*; who had a sovereign authority over them, and a right to give out what commands he pleased, both negative and affirmative; and to whom they were under obligations to obey, as the God of nature and providence, from whom they had their beings, and were supported in them, and as their covenant God, who had bestowed special and spiritual favours on them.
CHAPTER 19

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 19

This chapter contains various laws, ceremonial and moral, tending to the sanctification of men, in imitation of the holy God, (Leviticus 19:1,2); as concerning the reverence of parents, and observing the sabbaths, (Leviticus 19:3); against idolatry, (Leviticus 19:4); about offering and eating of peace offerings, (Leviticus 19:5-8); concerning harvest and gleaning of fields and vineyards, (Leviticus 19:9,10); respecting the breach of several of the commandments of the law, as the eighth, ninth, and third, particularly, (Leviticus 19:11-13); and others relating to the ill usage of the deaf and blind, and having respect to persons rich or poor in judgment, and acting the part of a tale bearer among people, (Leviticus 19:14-16); and bearing hatred and ill will to any of their neighbours, (Leviticus 19:17,18); and others forbidding mixtures in the generation of cattle, sowing fields, and wearing apparel, (Leviticus 19:19); and concerning the punishment of a man that lay with a bondmaid, and the offering he should bring for his atonement, (Leviticus 19:20-22); then follow certain laws concerning fruit trees, when the fruit of them should be eaten, (Leviticus 19:23-25); and concerning eating with blood, using enchantments, and observing times, and managing the hair of the head and beard, and avoiding to make any marks, prints, and cuttings in the flesh for the dead, (Leviticus 19:26-28); a caution not to prostitute a daughter to whoredom, and to observe the sabbath, and reverence the sanctuary of God, and pay no regard to wizards and familiar spirits, (Leviticus 19:29-31); to show reverence to ancient persons, and not to vex and distress strangers, (Leviticus 19:32-34); and to do no injustice in weight and measure, (Leviticus 19:35,36); all which instructions are to be carefully observed, and put in execution, (Leviticus 19:37).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] About the same, or quickly after he had delivered the above laws to him; and there are many in this chapter, which were before given, and here repeated: saying; as follows.
Ver. 2. *Speak unto all the congregation of the children of Israel*, etc.] They could not be all spoke to together, but tribe after tribe, or family after family; or rather the heads of the tribes, and at most the heads of families were convened, and the following instructions were given, to be communicated to their respective tribes and families. Jarchi says this section was spoken in the congregation, because the greater part of the body of the law, or the more substantial parts of it, depend upon it; and indeed all the ten commandments are included in it, with various other laws, both judicial and ceremonial. Aben Ezra remarks, that all the congregation are spoken to, to include the proselytes, because they had been warned of incests, as the Israelites, in the preceding chapter, (see Gill on “<031826>Leviticus 18:26”);

*and say unto them, ye shall be holy*: a separate people from all others, abstaining from all the impurity and idolatry they are cautioned against in the foregoing chapter, and observing the holy precepts expressed in this:

*for I the Lord your God [am] holy*: in his nature, essence, originally, independently, immutably, and perfectly; and the more holy they were, the more like they would be to him; (see Gill on “<031144>Leviticus 11:44-45”); where the same words are used, after the laws given about creatures clean and unclean to be eaten, as here, after those about impure copulations and incests.

Ver. 3. *Ye shall fear every man his mother and his father*, etc.] This has respect to the fifth command, which is the first with promise, and is here referred to first, because a man has his beginning in the world from his parents, and by them he is trained up in the observance of all the other laws of God, equally to be respected; and the fear of them is not servile, but filial, joined with love and affection to them, and includes an inward esteem and reverence of them, an outward respect unto them, a readiness to obey their commands, and giving due and equal honour unto them; (see Gill on “<022012>Exodus 20:12”); Pythagoras, Phocylides, and other Heathens, next to honouring God, exhort to the honour and reverence of parents:

*and keep my sabbaths*: this is expressed in the plural number, because there were various sabbaths. The seventh day sabbath, and the seventh year sabbath, and the jubilee, which was once in seven times seven years; the seventh day sabbath is chiefly meant: this follows upon the other, because it lay upon parents to teach their children the observance of the sabbath, and to train them up in it; and indeed the fear of them greatly depends on
it, for children that are sabbath breakers have seldom much respect to their parents; and besides this suggests, that though children are to honour, reverence, and obey their parents, yet not in anything that is contrary to the laws of God; and, particularly should they suggest to them that sabbaths were not to be observed, they should not hearken to them:

I [am] the Lord your God; that gave them their being, parents being but instruments, and who had a right to enjoin them what laws he pleased; and among the rest had ordered them to observe the sabbath, and which in gratitude they were obliged unto, as well as in point of duty.

Ver. 4. Turn ye not unto idols, etc.] From the one only true and living God to them that are not gods, as the word used signifies, who are nothing; for, as the apostle says, an idol is nothing in the world, (1 Corinthians 8:4), is of no worth and value, of no consequence and importance, of no avail and usefulness to its devotees; wherefore to turn from the true God to such as these is the greatest stupidity, as well as wickedness: or “look not” at them for help or assistance, for they are not able to give it: and to look at them so as to view them attentively, and consider their likeness, the Jews say is forbidden; and even in the heart and mind, as Aben Ezra observes, to have respect unto them was not right; or in the thoughts, as Gersom:

nor make to yourselves molten gods; of gold, silver, or brass, melted and cast into a mould, as the golden calf was, to which respect may be had. These laws have a respect unto the first and second commandments, (Exodus 20:3,4):

I [am] the Lord, your God; who only is to be worshipped, and who has forbid the making and worshipping any image, molten or graven, and who will therefore resent idolatry of every sort, and punish for it.

Ver. 5. And if ye offer a sacrifice of peace offerings unto the Lord, etc.] Which were of three sorts, a thanksgiving, a vow, and a voluntary offering, (Leviticus 7:11,12,16); the latter seems to be here meant, as appears by what follows:

ye shall offer it at your own will; a voluntary freewill offering, of their own accord, and not by force, as Aben Ezra; and in such offerings they were left to their liberty to offer what they pleased, it might be of the flock, or of the herd, a male or a female, (Leviticus 3:1,6). The Targum of Jonathan is
“for your acceptation;”

that is, that should be offered, and in such a manner as to be accepted of you with God; which sense is countenanced by (Leviticus 19:7); and becomes acceptable, when what follows about eating them is attended to.

Ver. 6. *It shall be eaten the same day ye offer it, and on the morrow,* etc.] The meaning is, that if it could be, it was best to eat it all up the same day it was offered, but if not, the remainder was to be eaten on the morrow, but by no means to be kept any longer; this shows that that sort of peace offering is intended, which was either a vow or a voluntary offering, (Leviticus 7:16); and the Jews gather from hence, that sacrifices were to be slain in the day, and not in the night;

*and if ought remain unto the third, it shall be burnt with fire*; as it is ordered, (Leviticus 7:16); that so the owner might have no profit by it, and therefore be under no temptation to keep it longer than the fixed time.

Ver. 7. *And if it be eaten at all on the third day,* etc.] Or “in eating be eaten” any of it be eaten, the least bit of it:

*it [is] abominable*; it is as any common thing, as if it was no sacrifice; yea, as if it was corrupt and putrefied flesh; nay, as what is abominable to God: and therefore it follows,

*it shall not be accepted*; of the Lord, but rejected, his will not being attended to.

Ver. 8. *Therefore [everyone] that eateth it shall bear his iniquity,* etc.] Be chargeable with sin, be pronounced guilty, and endure the punishment, which is cutting off, (Leviticus 7:20):

*because he hath profaned the hallowed thing of the Lord*; the flesh of the peace offerings, by keeping it longer than the fixed time for it, when it was liable to corruption and putrefaction; for after the inwards and the fat of them were offered, as Aben Ezra says, the flesh was holy, and to be eaten as an holy thing, and within the time the law required, or otherwise it was profaned and polluted:

*and that soul shall be cut off from among his people*; be deprived of his civil and religious privileges, or be punished by the hand of the civil magistrate, or else by the immediate hand of God.
Ver. 9. *And when ye reap the harvest of your land*, etc.] Of the land of Canaan, when come into it, which having sown, and it was harvest, either barley harvest or wheat harvest, or both, and especially the latter, to which reaping seems best to agree:

*thou shall not wholly reap the corner of the field*; but a part was to be left for the poor. This follows upon the peace offerings: and, as Aben Ezra observes, as the fat of them was to be given to God, so somewhat of the harvest was to be given for the glory of God to the poor and stranger. In the Misnah is a whole treatise, called “Peah”, which signifies “the corner”, in which there are many decisions concerning this affair; and among the rest, whereas it is not fixed in the law how large the corner should be, what quantity should be left, how many ears of corn, or what a proportion of the field, this is there determined by the wise men, who say, they do not leave less than a sixtieth part; for though they say there is no measure (certain) for the corner, yet the whole is according to the largeness of the field, or according to the multitude of the poor, or according to the plenty of the increase$^{f657}$, so that, as these were, more or less were left: and though the place to be left is called a corner, it was a matter indifferent in what part of the field it was; for so it follows, they give (or leave) the corner at the beginning of the field, or in the middle$^{f658}$; and Ben Gersom observes, that the corner was at the end of the field, where the harvest is finished; and it is plain where the harvest is finished, he says, the corner should be left; for the law does not precisely determine, only that part of the corner should be left to the poor; and it is of no consequence to the poor whether it is in the middle of the field or in the end of it; but Maimonides$^{f659}$ thinks it was to be left at the end of the field, that the poor might know where to come for it: and in the above treatise the times are also set when the poor should come and gather it, which they might not do at any time; and there were three times on a day they had leave to come, in the morning, in the middle of the day, and at the evening sacrifice$^{f660}$, i.e. about three o’clock in the afternoon; the morning was appointed, as the commentators say$^{f661}$, for the sake of women that had young children, who were then asleep, the middle of the day for the sake of nurses, and the evening for the sake of ancient persons:

*neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest*; ears of corn which fall from the hand or sickle of the reaper, or in gathering the reaps to bind up in sheaves. In the above treatise it is asked, what is a gleaning? that
which falls in reaping; if the reaper reaps his handful, or plucks up an handful, and a thorn strikes him, and it falls out of his hand to the ground, lo, it is the owner’s; but if out of the middle of his hand, or out of the middle of the sickle, it is the poor’s; if from the further part of his hand, or of the sickle, it is the owner’s; but if from the top of his hand (or tip of his fingers) or the point of the sickle, it is the poor’s: and it is further said,

“two ears are a gleaning, but three are not,”

and so Jarchi on the text, that is, when three fall together; this is according to the school of Hillel, but according to the school of Shammai, if there were three ears that fell together, they were the poor’s, if four they belonged to the owner.

Ver. 10. And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, etc.] Or cut off the little clusters which are, as Aben Ezra observes, like an infant, as the word signifies, infant clusters, which were small in comparison of the large ones, as infants are to men; those which had but a grape or two, or very few upon them, were not to be cut off, but left for the poor: and Gersom says, if the whole vine consisted of such clusters, it all belonged to the poor:

neither shall thou gather [every] grape of thy vineyard; every particular single grape; these were such as were left on the vine after the large clusters were gathered, and a man upon viewing it again might not gather such as had only a single grape or two upon them; for the Misnic doctors say, two grapes or berries make a “peret” (the word here rendered “every grape”), but three do not; so that if there were three grapes upon a cluster it was the owner’s, and might be gathered, but if fewer, then it belonged to the poor; or this may be understood also of such single grapes that fell to the ground in gathering, which might not be taken up by the owners, but were to be left to the poor; and, as Gersom says the grape gatherers might not put a bushel under the vines in the time of gathering, to catch the single grapes that fell:

thou shall leave them for the poor and stranger: for the poor Israelite, and the stranger that sojourns with you, as Aben Ezra interprets it; the stranger intends a proselyte, not a proselyte of the gate, but a proselyte of righteousness, as Gersom and it is a rule laid down by Maimonides, that every stranger spoken of concerning the gifts of the poor is no other than a proselyte of righteousness, one that has been circumcised upon embracing
the Jewish religion, and agreeing to conform to all the laws and rituals of it; though the same writer observes, that they do not restrain the poor of the Gentiles from these gifts, but they are in general included among the poor of Israel; and they come and take them because of the ways of peace; for the sake of peace, to promote peace and harmony among them:

*I am the Lord your God*; that gave them fields and vineyards, and times of harvest, and vintage, and blessed them with fruitful seasons, and therefore had a right to require such things of them; and they were in duty and gratitude bound to observe his commands; and this shows his regard unto, and concern for the poor, and that he is the father and patron of them.

**Ver. 11. Ye shall not steal**, etc. Which is the eighth command; (see Gill on *Exodus 20:15*); though Jarchi thinks something different from that law is here intended; that this is a caution against stealing of money, that in the decalogue against stealing of souls, or men. And it may be observed, that one is expressed in the singular number, the other in the plural, as here, and takes in more; not the actual thief only, but he that sees and is silent, who, as Aben Ezra observes, is even as the thief; and perhaps this follows upon the preceding laws, to suggest, that he that deprives the poor of the corner of the field, and of the gleaning of the harvest and vintage, is as if he robbed; and the last mentioned writer seems to make the force of this depend on that: and Maimonides on the above law observes, that he that put a basket under a vine, in the time of gathering grapes, robbed the poor:

*neither deal falsely*; in any respect defrauding and over-reaching in trade and commerce, particularly not being faithful to a trust committed to them; so Aben Ezra restrains it to what is deposited with a man to keep, which he denies he ever had; and he observes, that he that knows it, and does not bear witness of it, is as he that deals falsely; and such an one, according to a former law, having sworn falsely, and, when convicted, was obliged to restore the principal, and add a fifth part, and bring a trespass offering to make atonement for his sin likewise, (Leviticus 6:2-7):

*neither lie one to another*; in common speech and conversation, in trade and business, and particularly by demanding money of a man who never had anything of him, as Aben Ezra; and who owes him nothing, and yet affirms, with a lie, that he is indebted to him, and insists on payment.
Ver. 12. *And ye shall not swear by my name falsely*, etc.] Or “to a falsehood”\(^\text{f668}\), to any of the above cases; as that a man has not the deposit of another’s in his hands, when he has; or that such a man owes him so much money, when he does not, or any other false thing. Stealing, dealing falsely, lying, and false swearing, are mentioned together, as following one another, and as tending to lead on, the one to the other, as Jarchi observes;

“if thou stealest, this will lead thee on to deal falsely, and then to lie, and after that to swear;”

and who further remarks, because it may be thought a man is guilty only because of the proper name (of God he may swear by); therefore to comprehend all the surnames (or epithets of God, such as gracious, merciful, etc.) it is said, “ye shall not swear by, my name falsely”: every name which is mine, by which he is called; and so Gersom, any epithet or attribute of his, or any word or phrase by which he is described, as he that made the heavens, or that dwelleth in the heavens, or liveth for ever and ever, and the like; and the word being of the plural number, ye shall not swear, takes in, as Aben Ezra thinks, him that causes to swear, as well as him that swears:

*neither shall thou profane the name of thy God:* through swearing falsely by it, or through any rash or vain oath in common conversation; not only perjury in a court of judicature, but all profane oaths, curses, and imprecations are forbidden, as breaches of the third command, which this refers to; (see Gill on \&quot;\text{\textcopyright} Exodus 20:7\&quot;):

*I [am] the Lord;* whose name is holy, and who can and will revenge every abuse of it in a profane way, and to the injury of men.

Ver. 13. *Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbour, neither rob [him],* etc.] Not defraud him secretly, nor rob him openly and by force, as Aben Ezra; not defraud him in buying and selling, in retaining wages due to him, and refusing to return to him what has been committed to trust, or to repay him what has been borrowed of him: the Vulgate Latin is, “thou shall not calumniate [him]”, or get anything from him, by raising a calumny upon him; nor rob him by coming into his house, or entering into his fields, and taking away his goods, or his cattle without his will, and in a forcible manner; or by meeting him on the highway and demanding his money, and taking it from him:
the wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning; unless he that is hired agrees to it; for then it may be kept two or three days, or a week, or for whatsoever time may be agreed upon between them: this must be understood of one that is hired by the day, whose wages are due at night, and who may want his money to buy food for his family, and therefore should not without his consent be detained from him; and not of one that is hired by the week, or by the year, whose wages are not due until the end of the week or year for which he is hired; and the Jewish writers observe, that this Scripture speaks of a day hireling, or a day labourer, whose wages became due at night; as another Scripture, (Deuteronomy 24:15); speaks of a night hireling, or a night labourer, whose hire is not due until the pillar of the morning arises, or the sun is up, and therefore it must be paid him before it goes down; to detain the wages of such, or defraud them of it, is a very crying sin; (see Jeremiah 22:13 James 5:4).

Ver. 14. Thou shalt not curse the deaf, etc.] Who are naturally so, born deaf, or become so through some accident, and cannot hear what is objected to them, and they are cursed for; and so cannot reply in their own defence, and remove the calumny cast upon them, if it be such which is the cause of their being cursed; and therefore there is something mean and base as well as wicked in cursing such: the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan render it, “him that heareth not”, and respects any absent person who is not within the hearing of the curse, and so equally incapable of answering for himself as a deaf man: Gersom observes, that this is a caution not to curse any Israelite; for if we are cautioned, says he, not to curse a deaf man who hears not, and therefore cannot be moved at it, much less should we curse him that is not deaf, from whence quarrels and fightings arise:

nor put a stumblingblock before the blind: to cause him to fall; and in this negative is implied, that a man should be serviceable and helpful to the blind as much as may be; as to lead, and guide, and direct them in the way, and not put them out of it, as well as do nothing to cause them to stumble in it; Jarchi and Ben Gersom interpret this figuratively, of ignorant persons imposed upon by the bad advice of others: on the other hand, agreeably to this sense, Job says, he was “eyes to the blind”, (Job 29:15); gave good advice to the ignorant, instructed them what ways and methods to take to do themselves justice, or obtain it, which otherwise they knew not:
but shalt fear thy God: who, as Aben Ezra observes, can punish thee by making thee deaf and blind also; by striking them with deafness and blindness at once; wherefore the awe and fear of God should be on persons, and make them cautious and fearful how they abused those in such circumstances:

I [am] the Lord; the Lord God, omnipresent and omniscient, that hears when the deaf are cursed, though they do not; and sees the stumblingblocks laid before the blind, and knows who laid them, though they do not, and will revenge such abuses and injuries: the apostle seems to have respect to this law in (Romans 14:13 1 Corinthians 8:9,13).

Ver. 15. Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, etc.] This is said with respect to judges and witnesses, as Aben Ezra notes; that the one should not bear false witness in a court of judicature to the perversion of justice, and the other should not pronounce an unrighteous sentence, justifying the wicked and condemning the righteous:

thou shalt not respect the person of the poor; that is, in judgment, or in a court of judicature, when a cause of his is brought before it; though privately his person may be respected, and he relieved in his distress as a poor man; but in a court of justice his person and character as a poor man are not to be regarded; the cause is not to be given either for him or against him on that account, without regard to the justice and equity of it; he may be pitied in other respects but in a cause between him and another, even a rich man, not pity, but justice, must take place, (see Gill on “Exodus 23:3”):

nor honour the person of the mighty; not fear to put him to shame and blushing, by giving the cause against him, if he is in the wrong; his riches, his grandeur, his honour, must not came into any account, or have any weight or influence on the court to pervert justice: the Jewish writers, particularly Maimonides  suggest that there was to be no difference between a rich man and a poor man while their cause was trying; that they were to be clothed either both in a rich habit, or both in a mean one; and that their posture was to be alike, whether sitting or standing; as well as that no favour should be shown to one more than to another; as that one might have liberty to speak as much and as long as he pleased, and the other bid to be short; or the one be spoken tenderly to, and the other harshly:
[but] in righteousness shall thou judge thy neighbour; be he rich or poor, doing justice to both, and showing no partiality to either; (see Proverbs 18:5).

Ver. 16. Thou shalt not go up and down [as] a talebearer among thy people, etc.] The word used signifies a merchant, and particularly one that deals in drugs and spices, and especially a peddler in those things, that goes about from place to place to sell them; and such having an opportunity and making use of it to carry stories of others, and report them to their disadvantage, hence it came to be used for one that carries tales from house to house, in order to curry favour for himself, and to the injury of others; and such a man is a detestable person, and ought not to be encouraged, (see I Timothy 5:13 Proverbs 11:13);

neither shall thou stand against the blood of thy neighbour; either by bearing a false testimony, whereby his blood is in danger of being shed when innocent; or by being silent, and not hearing a testimony for him, whereby the shedding of his innocent blood might have been prevented; either way may be interpreted standing against it: the Jewish writers think, that a man by this law, is bound to do all he can to preserve the life of his neighbour, when it is by any means in danger, by drowning, or by thieves and wild beasts, so Jarchi:

I [am] the Lord; the just and righteous One, who will resent and punish for all unjust proceedings in courts of judicature, secret tale bearing, doing any injury to another, or not preventing it when in the power of his hands.

Ver. 17. Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart, etc.] Although no hatred may be expressed either by words or deeds, yet being in the heart is a breach of the sixth command, (see Matthew 5:21,22); and of this a man may be guilty, when he does not attempt to save the life of his neighbour, either by bearing a testimony for him, or by delivering from danger, as preserving him from drowning, from wild beasts and thieves, as (Leviticus 19:16); or when he does not reprove him for sin, as in the next clause, but suffers him to go on in it to his ruin, either of which by interpretation is an hatred of him:

thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, for any sin committed by him, though secretly, yet known; which rebuke should be private, and repeated as may be found necessary, and given gently in meekness and tenderness:
and not suffer sin upon him; unconvinced of, unrepented of and persisted in, which may prove of fatal consequence to him; and therefore to let him alone, and go on in it without telling him of it, and reproving him for it, would be so far from acting the kind and friendly part, and showing him love and respect, that it would be an evidence of hating him at heart, at least it might be strongly suspected: or, “and not bear sin for him”\(^\text{1671}\); become a partner with him in his sin, and so become liable to bear punishment for it; which is a strong reason for reproving sin, in a proper manner, lest we should be partakers of other men’s sins; (see \(^\text{540520}\) 1 Timothy 5:20,22).

Ver. 18. Thou shalt not avenge, etc.] That is, not avenge ourselves on him that has done us an ill thing, but leave it to him to whom vengeance belongs, (see \(^\text{451219}\) Romans 12:19); which is done when a man does an ill thing for another, or denies to grant a favour which he has been denied by another; Jarchi thus illustrates it, one says to him (his neighbour) lend me thy sickle; he answers, no (I will not); on the morrow (the neighbour comes, who had refused, and) says to him, lend me thy hatchet; he replies, I will not lend thee, even as thou wouldest not lend me; this is vengeance: this was reckoned mean and little, a piece of weakness with the very Heathens \(^\text{1672}\): nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people; those of the same place, city, or kingdom; or “not observe”\(^\text{1673}\) the injury done, take no notice of it, nor lay it up in the mind and memory, but forget it; or “not keep”\(^\text{1674}\) or retain enmity, as the Targum of Jonathan supplies it; and so do an ill turn, or refuse to do a good one; or if that is done, yet upbraids with the former unkindness; for upbraiding with unkindness shows that a grudge is retained, though the suit is not denied:

but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; sincerely and heartily, as a man loves himself, doing all the good to him as a man does to himself, or would have done to himself, and hindering all the mischief done to him he would have himself preserved from: Jarchi observes, that it was a saying of R. Akiba, that this is

“the great universal in the law,”

and it does indeed comprehend the whole of the second table of the law, and is the summary of it, and is pretty much the same our Lord says of it, that it is the second and great commandment, and like unto the first, on
which two all the law and the prophets hang, (Matthew 22:37-40); and so the Apostle Paul makes all the laws of the second table to be comprehended in this, (Romans 13:9);

I [am] the Lord; the Creator of all men, and who has commanded them to love one another, and to whom alone vengeance belongs, and who expects obedience to the above laws of his.

Ver. 19. Ye shall keep my statutes, etc.] Those which follow, and which are of a different sort from what are last mentioned, of a moral nature, and are planted in the heart, as Aben Ezra says; are agreeably to the law and light of nature, and part of the work of the law written on the heart, as the apostle calls it, (Romans 2:15); but the following are of positive institution, and depend upon the will of the lawgiver, the reasons of which are not so apparent and manifest; and therefore Jarchi calls them the decree of the king, who gives no reason for it; ordinances and appointments of a ceremonial kind, which, though there is a meaning in them, and a reason for them, yet not clear and plain:

thou shall not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind; or “cause [them] to gender” for cattle do not usually of themselves gender with a diverse kind, unless directed and solicited to it, as a male of one kind with a female of another; for instance, an horse with a she ass, or an he ass with a mare, and even creatures that were like one another, yet of different kinds, were not to mix together; as a wolf and a dog, a hound and a fox, goats and roebucks, goats and sheep, a horse and a mule, a mule and an ass, an ass and a wild ass; for though they are like one another, they are of different kinds: a creature thus gendered was not forbidden to be used, as a mule; and if a clean creature and gendered of clean ones, though of a different kind, it might be eaten, as Maimonides affirms; for not the creature gendered was unlawful for use, but the act of causing to gender is what is forbidden: the design was to preserve the order of beings, and the nature of creatures as they were at the first creation; that there might be no change among them, or anything taken from or added to what God had made; not to separate what God had joined, or join what God had separated, which to do must reflect upon his wisdom; as also, that men and women, as Philo observes, might abstain from unlawful converse, from unnatural lusts and mixtures; and as Ainsworth thinks, this was to lead Israel to the simplicity and sincerity of religion, and of all the parts and doctrines of the law and Gospel in their distinct kinds, as faith and works,
to mingle which together in our justification before God is forbidden; or rather to teach the saints not to mix with the men of the world, in evil conversation, or in superstitious worship; to which may be added, to show that spiritual regeneration is not partly of corruptible and partly of incorruptible seed, nor partly of the will of man, and partly of the will of God; nor partly of the power of man, and partly of the power of God, but wholly of the Spirit and grace of God:

*thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed:* or seed of divers sorts, as wheat and barley, and which, according to the Jews, was not mingled unless there be two grains of wheat and one of barley, or one of wheat and two of barley; or wheat, and barley, and rye: they also include herbs and trees in this law, and make an graft of them a forbidden mixture; hence, they say, they do not ingraft one tree in another, nor one herb in another, nor a tree in an herb, nor an herb in a tree, of which they give instances: and there are various sorts of seeds, herbs, roots, and trees, which are and are not of divers kinds, and some that are alike and yet diverse; for they have a whole treatise of such like things, called “Celaim”, or divers kinds: as to the mystical sense, the “field” may represent the church of God, which is not an open but an enclosed field, enclosed by the grace of God, and separated from others by it, well manured and cultivated by the Spirit of God, and through the word and ordinances, as means, in which manner of fruit and flowers grow, and is the property of Christ; (see Song of Solomon 4:12-14; Matthew 13:44); the seed may signify the word or doctrine of the Gospel, sown by the ministers of it, skilfully and plentifully, which should be pure and unmixed, not contradictory, nor inconsistent, but all of a piece; the doctrines of it, as those of election, justification, peace, pardon, and salvation, are to be represented, not as partly of works and partly of grace, but as entirely of the grace of God through Christ: or good and bad men may be signified by the mingled seed; good men, who are made so by the grace of God, and are the good seed, or the good ground which receives it, which hear the word, understand it, and bring forth fruit; bad men, such as are of bad principles and practices, these are not to be mixed together in a church state; bad men are neither to be received nor retained:

*neither shall a garment mingled of linen and woollen come upon thee:* for, as Josephus says, none but the priests were allowed to wear such a garment, and with which the Misnah agrees; in which it is asserted, that the priests have no other clothing to minister in, in the sanctuary, but of
woollen and linen; which seems to be a better reason of this prohibition than what Maimonides gives, that it was on the account of idolatrous priests, who used to go clothed with such a garment, and a metal ring on their fingers: the Jewish tradition is, nothing is forbidden on account of divers kinds (i.e. in garments) but wool and flax; camels’ wool, and sheep’s wool, mixed together, if the greater part is camels’, it is free, but if the greater part is sheep’s wool, it is forbidden, if half and half, it is forbidden; and so flax and hemp mixed together; also that nothing is forbidden on such account but what is spun and wove: the design of this, as of the other, seems to be in general to caution against unnatural lusts and impure mixtures, and all communion of good and bad men, and particularly against joining the righteousness of Christ with the works of men, in the business of justification: Christ’s righteousness is often compared to a garment, and sometimes to line linen, clean and white; and men’s righteousness to filthy rags, (Revelation 19:8 Isaiah 64:6); which are by no means to be put together in the said affair; such who believe in Christ are justified by the obedience of one and not of more, and by faith in that obedience and righteousness, without the works of the law, (Romans 5:19) (Romans 3:28 4:6); to join them together is needless, disagreeable, and dangerous.

Ver. 20. And whosoever lieth carnally with a woman, etc.] Has carnal knowledge of her: a man and woman are expressed, signifying those that are of age, Aben Ezra observes, that according to the mystical exposition of these words, this same carnally lying is as of divers kinds, of a free man with a bondwoman, and so follows upon the above law and in connection with it: the woman is described as one that is a bondmaid; either meaning a Canaanitish maid, as Jarchi, or an Israelitish one, as Aben Ezra, whom her father had sold, (Exodus 21:7); betrothed to her husband: to an Hebrew servant, as Jarchi, or who was promised marriage, either by her master or his son, as Aben Ezra, (Exodus 21:8,9);

and not at all redeemed, nor freedom given her: or redeemed and not redeemed, as Jarchi; or, as the Targum of Jonathan, not yet redeemed with an entire redemption (or wholly redeemed) with silver, nor a writing of her freedom given her, part of the redemption price being paid, but not the whole; so that she was, as Jarchi and Ben Gersom express it, half a bondmaid and half free:
she shall be scourged; and not he, as the Targum of Jonathan and Jarchi remark, though the Vulgate Latin version renders it, “both shall be beaten”; and the original text does not clearly determine it whether one or both should be scourged, since it may be rendered, “there shall be a scourging”; and seeing both were guilty of sin, it is reasonable to suppose that both should be scourged, but this is contrary to the sense of the Jewish writers; so Kimchi observes, the word is in the singular number and feminine gender, and not in the plural; wherefore, according to the simple sense, she is to be beaten, and not he to be beaten; and this was done with the thong of an ox’s hide, as is the sense of the word used, according to Gaon, and so some in Aben Ezra; and so it is remarked in the Misnah, all the uncleannesses, whether of a man or woman, are alike as to stripes and sacrifice, but with respect to a bondmaid, he (i.e. God) hath not made the man equal to the woman as to stripes, nor the woman to the man as to sacrifice:

they shall not be put to death, because she was not free; otherwise adultery was punished with death of both parties, when committed with a woman married to an husband, (Deuteronomy 22:22); and she a free woman, but this not being so, were not guilty of death, because, as Jarchi says, her espousals were no espousals, whereas they would had she been free, and so have been guilty of death: this difference the law made between a bond and free woman, but in Christ Jesus and under the Gospel dispensation there is no difference, (Galatians 3:28).

Ver. 21. He shall bring his trespass offering unto the Lord, etc.] To the priest of the Lord, to offer it for him; he, and not she, as the Targum of Jonathan has it; (see Gill on Leviticus 19:20): unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; where all offerings were to be brought, (Leviticus 17:4,5);

[even] a ram for a trespass offering; which was the usual creature for such a sacrifice, (Leviticus 5:15,18 6:6); the woman was not obliged to bring any, she being a bondmaid; and so having nothing of her own, but what was her master’s, her circumstances are considered, and scourging was sufficient.

Ver. 22. And the priest shall make an atonement for him, etc.] By offering his sacrifice for him, typical of the atoning sacrifice of Christ:
with the ram of his trespass offering before the Lord; presented before him at the door of the tabernacle, and offered up on his altar:

for his sin which he hath done; or “sinned”, which is so expressed, according to Jarchi, to take in his sin, whether done ignorantly or presumptuously:

and the sin which he hath done shall be forgiven him; upon the atonement made, as all the sins of God’s people are forgiven through Christ, upon the foot of his atoning sacrifice, (see Hebrews 9:22).

Ver. 23. And when ye shall come into the land, etc.] The land of Canaan, whither they were now going:

and shall have planted all manner of trees for food; such that brought forth fruit that was eatable, as figs, grapes, olives, etc. so that all such trees as did not bear fruit fit for man’s food came not under the following law; nor such as grew up of themselves and were not planted; nor such as were planted for any other use than for fruit; nor such as were planted by the Canaanites before the Israelites came into their land; for so say the Jews, what were planted for an hedge or for timber are free from the law; and add, at the time our fathers came into the land, what they found planted was free, what they planted, though they had not subdued it (the land), was bound:

then ye shall count the fruit thereof as uncircumcised; not fit to be eaten, but to be taken off and cast away as the foreskin of the flesh:

three years it shall be as uncircumcised unto you, it shall not be eaten of; which was a provision partly for the benefit of fruit trees newly planted, whose fruit, when they first bear, gardeners frequently take off immediately, and do not suffer them to grow to any perfection, by which means a tree will grow stronger, and will bear more and better fruit another year; and partly for the health of man, which physical reason is given by Aben Ezra, who observes that the fruit that comes unto the third year there is no profit by it, but is hurtful; and chiefly because, as it is proper that the first fruits should be given to the Lord before any is eaten, so it is right that it should be given seasonably, and when it is brought to its perfection: three years were to be reckoned, as Jarchi and Ben Gersom say, from the time the tree was planted.
Ver. 24. But in the fourth year all the fruit thereof shall be holy, etc.] Separated and devoted to the service of God, to be given to the priest, or to be bought again of him; wherefore the Targum of Jonathan adds, at the end of the verse, “redeemed from the priest”, a redemption price being given to the priest; and, as Jarchi observes, as the tithe was not eaten without the walls of Jerusalem, but by redemption, even so likewise this:

to praise the Lord [withal]; for his abundant goodness in blessing and making the trees fruitful, and bringing their fruit unto perfection; and by devoting the first fruits to God, his name was praised and glorified, as well as by eating them with joy and gladness before the Lord in Jerusalem.

Ver. 25. And in the fifth year shall ye eat of the fruit thereof, etc.] And so in all succeeding years as long as the tree lasted and bore:

that it may yield unto you the increase thereof; may be so abundantly blessed, and produce so large an increase as to answer the three years’ want of any fruit from it, and the dedication of the fruit of the fourth year to the Lord:

I [am] the Lord your God; who has promised this increase, is both able and faithful to make it good.

Ver. 26. Ye shall not eat [anything] with the blood, etc.] Or upon, over, or by the blood, for this law seems different from that in (Genesis 9:4), and from those in (Leviticus 3:17 7:26 17:10); and is variously interpreted by the Jewish writers; some of not eating flesh, the blood not being rightly let out of it, as not being thoroughly cleared of it, and so comes under the notion of things strangled; others of not eating of sacrifices until the blood stands in the basin; and others of not eating any flesh whose blood is not sprinkled on the altar, if near the holy place: some think it refers to the custom of murderers who eat over the person slain, that the avengers of the slain may not take vengeance on them, supposing something superstitious in it, because of what follows; though it rather has respect to an idolatrous practice of the Zabians, as Maimonides informs us, who took blood to be the food of devils, and who used to take the blood of a slain beast and put it in a vessel, or in a hole dug in the earth, and eat the flesh sitting round about the blood; fancying by this means they had communion with devils, and contracted friendship and familiarity with them, whereby they might get knowledge of future things; (see Gill on “Ezekiel 33:25”):
neither shall ye use enchantment; soothsaying or divination by various creatures, as by the weasel, birds, or fishes, as the Talmudists; or rather by serpents, as the word used is thought to have the signification of; or by any odd accidents, as a man’s food falling out of his mouth, or his staff out of his hand, or his son calling after him behind, or a crow cawing to him, or a hart passing by him, or a serpent on his right hand and a fox on his left, or one says, do not begin (any work) tomorrow, it is the new moon, or the going out of the sabbath.

nor observe times; saying, such a day is a lucky day to begin any business, or such an hour an unlucky hour to go out in, as Jarchi, taking the word to have the signification of times, days, and hours, as our version and others; but Aben Ezra derives it from a word which signifies a cloud, and it is well known, he says, that soothsayers view and consult the clouds, their likeness and motion; but some of the ancient writers, as Gersom observes, derive it from a word which signifies an eye, and suppose that such persons are intended who hold the eyes of people, cast a mist before them, or use some juggling tricks whereby they deceive their sight.

Ver. 27. Ye shall not round the corners of your heads, etc.] The extremities of the hairs of the head, round about, on the forehead, temples, and behind the ears; this is done, as Jarchi says, when any one makes his temples, behind his ears, and his forehead alike, so that the circumference of his head is found to be round all about, as if they had been cut as with a bowl; and so the Arabians cut their hair, as Herodotus reports, (see Gill on “Jeremiah 9:26”);

neither shall thou mar the corners of thy beard; by shaving them entirely; Jarchi and other Jewish writers say, there are five of them, two on the right, as Gersom reckons them, one on the upper jaw, the other on the nether, and two over against them on the left, and one in the place where the nether jaw joins the right to the left, the chin; the same observes, that it was the manner of idolaters to do the above things; and Maimonides is of opinion that the reason of the prohibition is, because the idolatrous priests used this custom; but this law does not respect priests only, but the people of Israel in general; wherefore rather it was occasioned by the Gentiles in common cutting their hair, in honour of their gods, as the Arabians did, as Herodotus in the above place relates, in imitation of Bacchus, and to the honour of him; and so with others, it was usual for young men to consecrate their hair to idols; but inasmuch as such practices
were used on account of the dead, as Aben Ezra observes, it seems probable enough that these things are forbidden to be done on their account, since it follows,

**Ver. 28. Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead, etc.]** Either with their nails, tearing their cheeks and other parts, or with any instrument, knife, razor, etc. Jarchi says, it was the custom of the Amorites, when anyone died, to cut their flesh, as it was of the Scythians, as Herodotus relates, even those of the royal family; for a king they cut off a part of the ear, shaved the hair round about, cut the arms about, wounded the forehead and nose, and transfixed the left hand with arrows; and so the Carthaginians, who might receive it from the Phoenicians, being a colony of theirs, used to tear their hair and mouths in mourning, and beat their breasts; and with the Romans the women used to tear their cheeks in such a manner that it was forbid by the law of the twelve tables, which some have thought was taken from hence: and all this was done to appease the infernal deities, and to give them satisfaction for the deceased, and to make them propitious to them, as Varro affirms; and here it is said to be made “for the soul”, for the soul of the departed, to the honour of it, and for its good, though the word is often used for a dead body: now, according to the Jewish canons, whosoever made but one cutting for a dead person was guilty, and to be scourged; and he that made one for five dead men, or five cuttings for one dead man, was obliged to scourging for everyone of them:

nor print any marks upon you; Aben Ezra observes, there are some that say this is in connection with the preceding clause, for there were who marked their bodies with a known figure, by burning, for the dead; and he adds, and there are to this day such, who are marked in their youth in their faces, that they may be known; these prints or marks were made with ink or black lead, or, however, the incisions in the flesh were filled up therewith; but this was usually done as an idolatrous practice; so says Ben Gersom, this was the custom of the Gentiles in ancient times, to imprint upon themselves the mark of an idol, to show that they were his servants; and the law cautions from doing this, as he adds, to the exalted name (the name of God): in the Misnah it is said, a man is not guilty unless he writes the name, as it is said, (Leviticus 19:28); which the Talmudists and the commentators interpret of the name of an idol, and not of God:
I [am] the Lord; who only is to be acknowledged as such, obeyed and served, and not any strange god, whose mark should be imprinted on them.

Ver. 29. Do not prostitute thy daughter, to cause her to be a whore, etc.] Not by delaying to marry her, which is the sense the Jews give , but it refers to a wicked practice among the Phoenicians or Canaanites, Athanasius speaks of, whose women used to prostitute themselves in the temples of their idols; and to such filthy services, in a religious way, the Israelites, in imitation of them, are forbid to expose their daughters: such filthy practices, under a notion of religion, were committed at Babylon, Corinth, and other places; (see Gill on “Micah 1:7”);

lest the land fall to whoredom, and the land become full of wickedness: of the wickedness of whoredom, both corporeal and spiritual, fornication and idolatry; both of which would be promoted by such abominable practices, and in process of time the land be filled with them.

Ver. 30. Ye shall keep my sabbaths, etc.] By attending to the worship and service of God on sabbath days, they and their children would be preserved from the idolatry of the Gentiles, and all the filthy practices attending it:

and reverence my sanctuary; and not defile it by such impurities as were committed in the temples of idols: the sanctuary being an holy place, sacred to him whose name is holy and reverend, and where was the seat of his glorious Majesty, and therefore not to be defiled by fornication or idolatry, or by doing anything in it unseemly and unbecoming, (see Gill on “Mark 11:16”):

I [am] the Lord; who had appointed the observance of the sabbath day, and dwelt in the sanctuary, and therefore expected that the one would be kept and the other reverenced, and neither of them polluted.

Ver. 31. Regard not them that have familiar spirits, etc.] The word used signifies “bottles”, and that sort of diviners here intended go by this name, either because what they sat on when they divined was in the form of a bottle, or they divined by one, or they were swelled and inflated as bottles when they delivered out their answers, or spoke as out of a bottle or hollow place; hence they are called masters or mistresses of the bottle: they seem to be the same with the ventriloquists, and so the Septuagint version here calls them; such whose voice seemed to come out of their bellies, and even the lower parts of them; and such was the Pythian prophetess at Delphos, and very probably the maid in the times of the apostles, who had
a spirit of divination, or of Python, (Acts 16:16); and so the words may be rendered here, “look not to the Python”, or those who have the spirit of Python; so Jarchi from the Misnah interprets the word here used, “Baal Ob” or the master of the bottle, this is Python, one that speaks from under his arm holes:

*neither seek after wizards*; such as pretend to a great deal of knowledge, as the word signifies; such as are called cunning men, who pretend to know where lost or stolen goods are, and to tell people their fortunes, and what will befall them hereafter:

*to be defiled by them*; for by seeking to them, and believing what is said by them, and trusting thereunto, and expecting events answerable to their predictions, they would be guilty of a gross sin, and so bring pollution and guilt on them; according to the Jewish canons, such sort of persons as are cautioned against were to be stoned, and they that consulted them to be reproved;

*I [am] the Lord your God*; who only is to be regarded and sought unto for advice and assistance; (see Isaiah 8:19).

**Ver. 32. Thou shall rise up before the hoary head**, etc.] Or “before old age”, which may be discerned by the hoary or grey hairs upon the head; that is, before a grey-headed man, or an old man, and one was reckoned so when he was of seventy years of age; for so it is said, one of sixty years is arrived to old age, and one of seventy to grey hairs. Fagius relates, that according to the tradition of the Hebrews, a young man was obliged to rise up when an ancient man was at the distance of four cubits from him, and to sit down again as soon as he had passed by him, that it might appear it was done in honour of him. And this was not only observed among the Jews, but anciently among Heathens, who reckoned it abominable wickedness, and a capital crime, if a young man did not rise up to an old man, and a boy to a bearded person. Herodotus reports, that the Egyptians agreed in this with the Lacedaemonians, and with them only of the Grecians, that the younger, when they met the elder, gave them the way and turned aside, and when coming towards them rose up out of their seat; and this law was enjoined them by Lycurgus, and which Aelianus commends as of all the most humane. And this respect to ancient persons is due to them from younger persons, because of their having been in the world before them, and of their long continuance in it, and because of the favour and honour God has bestowed upon them in granting them long life, as also because of
the experience, knowledge, and wisdom, they may be supposed to have
attained unto: the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan restrain this to such as
are expert in the law; so Jarchi says, there is no old man but he that has
acquired wisdom; but it seems not to be the intention of this law to limit
the respect to such only; though it must be allowed that ancient persons,
who are wise and good, are worthy of special regard, (see Proverbs
16:31);

and honour the face of the old man; who for the wrinkles of it, and his
withered countenance, might be liable to be despised. The Targum of
Jonathan interprets it, the face of a wise man, which agrees with what is
observed before; and so Jarchi, Ben Gersom, and other Jewish writers
explain it; and the former asks, what is this honour? he may not sit in his
place, nor contradict his words. All this may be applied to elders by office,
as well as in age, to magistrates, masters, and teachers; and particularly, as
Ben Gersom observes, this may admonish us to give honour to God, who
is the Ancient of days, who always was, and ever will be:

and fear thy God, I [am] the Lord; who has commanded such reverence of
ancient persons, and will punish for any marks of irreverence shown them;
and who is himself to be feared and reverenced above all, being, from
everlasting to everlasting, God, and whose name is holy and reverend.

Ver. 33. And if a stranger sojourn with you in your land, etc.] Ben
Gersom, and others, understand this of a proselyte of righteousness, who
was circumcised, and in all things conformed to the Jewish religion; but it
may be interpreted of a proselyte of the gate, who was not an idolater,
since he is described as one sojourning with them, and indeed of any
stranger, who for a time was providentially cast among them:

ye shall not vex him: with hard and grievous words, upbraiding him with
his former ignorance and idolatry, and saying unto him, as Jarchi observes,
yesterday thou wast a worshipper of idols, and now thou comest to learn
the law; nor distress him by any means in business, or with law suits; (see

Ver. 34. [But] a stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one
born among you, etc.] Especially if a proselyte of righteousness; for then
he enjoyed the same privileges, civil and religious, the Israelites did, for
there was one law for them both, (Exodus 12:49):
and thou shalt love him as thyself; and show it by doing all the good things for him they would have done for themselves in like circumstances:

for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt: and therefore knew what hardships such were exposed unto; and it became them to put on bowels of compassion, and show pity to those in a like condition, and particularly consider, as Jarchi suggests, that they were idolaters there also, and therefore ought not to upbraid strangers with their former idolatry:

I [am] the Lord your God; who showed kindness to them when strangers in Egypt, and had brought them out of that land, and therefore ought to obey his commands, and particularly in this instance.

Ver. 35. Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, etc.] This is repeated from (Leviticus 19:15); and in order to lead on to some other laws and instructions; though Aben Ezra thinks this is said in connection with the preceding words, and in reference to the stranger, agreeably to (Deuteronomy 1:16); but Jarchi refers it to what follows concerning weights and measures, and observes, that a measurer is a judge; and if he acts deceitfully, he perverts judgment, and does that which is detestable and abominable, and is the cause of the five following things said of a judge; he defiles the land, and profanes the name of God, and causes the Shechinah or divine Majesty to remove, or causes Israel to fall by the sword, or carries them captive out of their land:

in meteyard, in weight, or in measure; the first of these, according to Jarchi, signifies the measure of land, of fields, etc. and so likewise of anything that is measured, not only by the rod or line, but by the yard or ell, as cloth and other things, whether broad or narrow, that are measured in their length; and the second may respect the weight of all sorts of things that are weighed in scales, as money in former times, as well as various sorts of goods; and the last has respect to the measure of both dry and liquid things, by the bushel, peck, quart, pint, etc.

Ver. 36. Just balances, just weights, etc.] Which were for such sort of things as were bought and sold by weight, and these were to be according to the custom and usage which universally obtained among them, or were fixed and settled by them; they were to be neither lighter nor heavier; they were not to have one sort to buy with, and another to sell with, which was not just, and was an abomination to the Lord, (Proverbs 11:1); for “weights”, it is in the original text “stones”, for those were formerly used in
weighing, and were with us: hence it is still in use to say, so much by the stone. And according to Maimonides \(^{715}\), the Jews were not to make their weights neither of iron, nor of lead, nor of the rest of metals, lest they should rust and become light, but of polished rock, and the like;

* a just ephah, and a just hin, shall ye have; * the first of these was the measure of things dry, as corn, and the like, the latter of things liquid, as oil and wine; the one held three seahs or pecks, or ten omers, (Exodus 16:36); or, according to a nicer calculation, the ephah held seven gallons, two quarts, and half a pint; and the other, according to some, held three quarts; but, as more exactly calculated, it held a wine gallon, and a little more than a quart, (see Gill on "Exodus 30:24"). Some Jewish writers \(^{716}\) refer this to words, promises, and compacts, expressed by yea and nay, which they were to abide by; that their yea should be yea, and their nay, nay, (Matthew 5:37 2 Corinthians 1:17 James 5:12); that their affirmation should be just, and so their negation:

* I [am] the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt; * and therefore were under great obligations to observe his commands, as follows.

**Ver. 37. Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, etc.**] Delivered in this and the preceding chapters, and elsewhere, whether ceremonial or judicial, or moral, as there were of each, which had been delivered to them; and which are all comprehended in these two words, “statutes”, or ordinances, which were the determinations of his sovereign will, and of mere positive institution; and “judgments”, which were such laws as respected their civil or religious conduct, formed according to the rules of justice and equity: “all” and everyone of which were to be “observed”, taken notice of, and regarded, in order to be put in practice, as follows:

* and do them; * act according to them, in civil, moral, and religious life:

* I [am] the Lord; * who enjoined all these things, and had a right to do so, and expected obedience to them, which it was right fit that they should give.
CHAPTER 20

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 20

In this chapter several laws are, repeated, enforced with a penalty annexed to them, and the breach them made capital, to deter from it, as giving seed to Molech, (Leviticus 20:1-5); going after such that have familiar spirits, or are wizards, (Leviticus 20:6); by shunning which, and other sins, a regard would be shown to holiness, (Leviticus 20:7,8); such as cursing parents, (Leviticus 20:9); committing adultery, (Leviticus 20:10); incestuous copulations, and marriages, and beastly actions, (Leviticus 20:11-21); all which it became the Israelites to avoid, lest, when come into the land of Canaan, they should be cast out of it, as the old inhabitants were for the same things, (Leviticus 20:22-24); and therefore, that they might appear to be a distinct people from others, they were to put a difference between clean and unclean creatures, (Leviticus 20:25,26); and the chapter is closed with a law, making it death for any person to have a familiar spirit, or to be a wizard, (Leviticus 19:27).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] After he had delivered the above laws to him in the preceding chapter, he added penalties, to many of them, or declared what punishment should be inflicted on the transgressors of them:

saying; as follows.

Ver. 2. Again thou shalt say to the children of Israel, etc.] The body of the people by their elders, and the heads of their tribes; for the following laws were binding on them all:

whosoever [he be] of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn in Israel; everyone of the people of Israel, of whatsoever age, sex, or condition of life: and not they only, but the strangers and proselytes; and not the proselytes of righteousness only, but the proselytes of the gate, who, as well as the others, were to shun idolatry, and other impieties and immoralities after mentioned:
that giveth [any] of his seed unto Molech; which Aben Ezra interprets of lying with an idolatrous woman, or a worshipper of Molech, the abomination or idol of the Ammonites, (1 Kings 11:7); of which (see Leviticus 18:21); but more than that is here intended, or even than causing their seed or offspring to pass through the fire to Molech, as in the place referred to; more is meant by it than a lustration of them, or a dedicating them to Molech, by delivering them to his priests to lead them between two fires for that purpose, but even the sacrificing of them to him; and so the Targum of Jonathan seems to understand it, which is,

“that makes (or sacrifices) of his seed Molech to be burnt in the fire:”

for that the Phoenicians or Canaanites, whose customs the Israelites were in danger of imitating, and therefore cautioned against, did sacrifice human creatures, and these the dearest to them, even their beloved and only begotten children, to Saturn, is certain, as Porphyry and Eusebius affirm, or to Hercules, as Pliny, and both the same with Molech, or the sun:

he shall surely be put to death; by the hand of the civil magistrate, which death was to be by stoning, as follows:

the people of the land shall stone him with stones: that is, the people of the house of Israel, as both the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan; such as lived in that part of the country where the idolater lived, and where he committed the sin, or was condemned for it; of the manner of stoning, (see Gill on Acts 7:58).
privileges in this life, and sent into everlasting punishment in another, unless forgiving grace should be vouchsafed:

because he hath given of his seed to Molech; an iniquity to be punished by the judge, and deserving of everlasting wrath and destruction:

to defile my sanctuary; not by doing this horrid action in it, but by coming into it, having done it; or by offering sacrifice in another place than where God had commanded, as well as such a sacrifice as was abominable to him, sacrifice being to be offered nowhere but on the altar of the Lord in the sanctuary. Jarchi interprets this of the congregation of Israel, which was sanctified to the Lord, in the midst of which this wickedness was committed, and with which they were polluted:

and to profane my holy name: by sacrificing to an idol, when sacrifice should be offered to God; and such a sacrifice as would cause the name of God, and his holy laws, and true religion, to be blasphemed and evil, spoken of among the Gentiles, (Romans 2:23,24).

Ver. 4. And if the people of the land do any ways hide their eyes from the man, etc.] That is, the people of the house of Israel, as the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan; if the friends, relations, and neighbours of such a man, though they know what he is about to do, or has done, yet they shut their eyes wilfully, or look another way; or, however, wink and connive at his wickedness, and will not discover him, and bear witness against him; or if a court of judicature, before whom he comes, does not take the evidence of his crime, nor condemn for it, or are negligent in punishing him as the law directs, a gift having blinded their eyes, or they careless and remiss in their duty:

when he giveth his seed unto Molech; a crime so heinous and abominable:

and kill him not; do not bring witness against him, so as that he may be put to death, or do not upon the evidence given condemn him to death, or do not take care to have sentence executed, by stoning him to death.

Ver. 5. Then I will set my face against that man, etc.] That man that sees him do the fact, and winks at it, or the judge that connives at him, and will not condemn him, as well as the man that has committed the iniquity:

and against his family; either the family of the witness, who could and should have testified against him, or of the judge negligent of his office, or
of the man himself, whose family must be privy to so shocking an action, and were abettors of it, and aiders and assisters in it; and so Onkelos renders it, “and his helpers”:

*and will cut him off:* the head of the family, whether judge, witness, or the criminal himself:

*and all that go a whoring after him:* that commit the like idolatry after his example, and encouraged to it by the connivance of others at it:

*to commit whoredom with Molech:* that is, idolatry, which is spiritual whoredom, and often so called in Scripture, and with great propriety; for since God had espoused these people to himself, and was their husband, as he was from the time of his bringing them out of Egypt, and making a covenant with them, (Jeremiah 31:32); and their sacrificing to and serving other gods being a breach of their matrimonial covenant with him, it was no other than whoredom in a spiritual sense, for which he threatens to cut them off:

*from among their people:* by an immature death, even all that were guilty of such abominable actions, or made themselves accessory to them, by any ways conniving at them, either as judges or witnesses.

**Ver. 6. The soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits, etc.]** The man or woman that has respect unto them, seeks after them, and inquires of them, in order to get knowledge of things:

*and after wizards* who pretend to tell fortunes, and discover lost and stolen goods, (see Gill on “Leviticus 19:31”);

*to go a whoring after them:* for to consult them is to forsake the Lord, and have recourse to Satan and his instruments; to relinquish their trust in God, and put confidence in them, and attribute such things to them as only belong to God, even the knowledge of things future; and this is to commit idolatry, which is spiritual adultery:

*I will even set my face against that soul:* show like resentment and indignation as at him that gives his seed to Molech:

*and will cut him off from among his people:* in case his people do not bear witness against him, but hide their eyes, and wink at his crimes, or the civil magistrate does not condemn and punish him; the Targum of Jonathan is,
“I will destroy him by the pestilence.”

Ver. 7. Sanctify yourselves therefore, etc.] By abstaining from such impious and idolatrous practices, and separating themselves from all that gave into them, as well as by observing the holy commandments of the Lord; otherwise internal sanctification is not the work of man, but of the Lord himself, as in (Leviticus 20:8):

and be ye holy; or a separate people from all others in worship and conversation:

for I [am] the Lord your God; who is a holy God, and therefore it became them to be holy, in imitation of him, (Leviticus 19:2).

Ver. 8. And ye shall keep my statutes, and do them, etc.] Not only those respecting the above things, but all others, which would be a means of preserving them from sin, and of promoting holiness in their lives and conversations:

I [am] the Lord which sanctify you: who had separated and distinguished them from all other people on earth, and who had given them holy laws, as the means of holiness; and who only could and did sanctify internally, by his Spirit and grace, such or them as were sanctified in heart, as well as outwardly.

Ver. 9. For everyone that curseth his father or his mother, etc.] Here begins the account of the penalties annexed to the several laws in the preceding chapter; and that respecting the fear and honour of parents being the first, (Leviticus 19:3), is here begun with:

shall surely be put to death; the Targum of Jonathan adds,

“by casting of stones,”

stoning being the punishment of such transgressors:

he hath cursed his father or his mother: to do either is his sin, and a capital crime it is:

his blood [shall be] upon him: he shall be guilty of death, be condemned unto it, and punished with it, namely, by stoning; for, as Jarchi observes, wherever it is, “his blood [shall be] on him”, or “their blood shall be on them”, it is to be understood of stoning.
Ver. 10. *And the man that committeth adultery with [another] man’s wife, etc.*] Which is a breach of the seventh command, (Exodus 20:14);

*even he* that *committeth adultery with his neighbour’s wife*: which is only an explanation of the former clause; though the Jewish writers, as Jarchi and Ben Gersom, say this is so expressed to except the wife of a stranger, or a Gentile; but it means whether a Gentile or an Israelite; and which may be confirmed by the instance of Phinehas slaying a prince of Israel, that lay with a Midianitish woman, (Numbers 25:6-8):

_the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death_; on account of her that is espoused, by strangling, with a hard napkin within a soft one; and on account of her that is married, by casting stones; even both the adulterer and adulteress, as the Targum: and the Jews say, strangling was thus performed; they that were strangled were fixed up to their knees in dung, and then they put a hard napkin within a soft one, and rolled it about his neck, and one drew it to him this way, and another drew it to him that way, until he expired: and there is no unlawful copulation punished with strangling, according to Maimonides, but lying with another man’s wife; and who observes, that the death which is spoken of in the law absolutely, that is, without specifying any kind of death, is strangling; but stoning seems rather meant, agreeably to (Deuteronomy 22:24 <John 8:5>),

Ver. 11. *And the man that lieth with his father’s wife, etc.*] Whether she be his mother, or another woman, as the Targum of Jonathan; that is, whether she is his own mother, or a stepmother, or whether he did this in the lifetime of his father, or after his death, or whether she was betrothed or married, it mattered not; according to the Jewish tradition, this is a breach of the law, (Leviticus 18:8); and a man guilty of this

_hath uncovered his father’s nakedness_; and which is a foul and shameful piece of wickedness; the penalty follows:

_both of them shall be put to death_; by casting stones on them, as the Targum of Jonathan adds; for, as before observed, wherever the following phrase,

_their blood [shall be] upon them_, is used, stoning is meant; and so, according to the Misnah, all those were to be stoned, after mentioned, of whom this phrase is used.
Ver. 12. *If a man lie with his daughter in law*, etc.] His son’s wife, whether in the lifetime of his son, or after his death, or whether she was espoused or married, according to the above tradition\(^7\)

*both of them shall surely be put to death*; it being a breach of the law in (Leviticus 18:15); and this is the penalty annexed to it, even death:

*they have wrought confusion*: have been guilty of a shocking and shameful mixture, as Jarchi and Ben Gersom, as well as confounded the degrees of relation and affinity:

*their blood [shall be] upon them*; it being a capital crime, their blood shall be shed for it; they shall be found guilty of death by stoning, as the Targum of Jonathan.

Ver. 13. *If a man lie also with mankind, as he lieth with a woman*, etc.] Is guilty of the sin of sodomy, this is a breach of the law in (Leviticus 18:22);

*both of them have committed an abomination*; he that lies, and he that is lain with, both consenting to perpetrate the abominable wickedness; which may well be called an abomination, being contrary to nature, and more than brutish, for nothing of that kind is to be found among brutes:

*they shall surely be put to death*; if he that is lain with is not forced, as Aben Ezra observes:

*their blood [shall be] upon them*; be slain by stoning, as the above Targum.

Ver. 14. *And if a man take a wife, and her mother*, etc.] Marry both the one and the other, or commit uncleanness with them, they consenting to it:

*it [is] wickedness*; abominable wickedness, shocking and detestable; there are other things, which also are wicked and not to be done, but this is extremely wicked, wickedness to a high degree:

*they shall be burnt with fire, both he and they*; the man, the mother and her daughter both being married together to him, or both consenting to his lying with them; otherwise, if one of them was first his wife, it was not reasonable that she should be put to death; and therefore some interpret “they”, one of them, as Jarchi observes, one or other of them; and so Aben Ezra explains it, this or that; if the mother was his wife, the daughter was
to be burnt; and so on the contrary, if the daughter was his wife, the mother was to be burnt; according to the Targum of Jonathan, they were to be burnt by pouring lead into their mouths: and so the manner of burning is described in the Misnah \textsuperscript{f725}; they that are to be burnt are fixed in dung up to their knees, then they put a hard napkin within a soft one, and roll it about is neck; one draws it one way, and another another way, until he opens his mouth; then they take hot melted lead, and pour it into his mouth, which goes down into his bowels and burns them. But it was rather done with faggots, of which an instance is given:

\textit{that there be no wickedness among you}; of such kind, continued, countenanced, and pass unpunished. This punishment was to be inflicted, to deter persons from it. The law against it is in (\textsuperscript{f726}Leviticus 18:17).

Ver. 15. \textit{If a man lie with a beast, etc.}] A sin quite unnatural, exceeding shocking and detestable, forbid (\textsuperscript{f727}Leviticus 18:23):

\textit{he shall surely be put to death}: by stoning, as the Targum of Jonathan adds; and this is the death such are condemned to in the Misnah \textsuperscript{f728}:

\textit{and ye shall slay the beast}; with clubs, as says the Targum of Jonathan; the reasons given in the Misnah \textsuperscript{f729}, why the beast was to be slain, are, because ruin came to the man by means of it, and that it might not be said, as it passed along the streets, that is the beast for which such an one was stoned. Aben Ezra says it was to be slain, that it might not cause others to sin; and he adds, there are that say it was to cover the reproach: no doubt the true reason was to deter the more from this detestable sin, that if a beast, which was only accessory to it, and an instrument of it, was put to death, of how much sorer punishment must the man that committed it be worthy of, even of eternal wrath and destruction, and, unless repented of and forgiven, must be expected by him?

Ver. 16. \textit{And if a woman approach unto any beast, and lie down thereto, etc.}] In order that the beast may lie with her, and solicit it to commit such an action with her, (see \textsuperscript{f730}Leviticus 18:23):

\textit{thou shall kill the woman and the beast}: the woman by stoning, and the beast with clubs, as the Targum of Jonathan; and this for the same reasons as before, as well as to prevent monstrous births:

\textit{they shall surely be put to death}; both the one and the other, and not spared:
their blood [shall be] upon them; they are guilty of a capital crime, a crime which deserves death; this must be understood of the man that lies with a beast, and of the woman; for as for the beast itself, as it is not capable of sinning, so not of guilt, in a proper sense.

Ver. 17. And if a man shall take his sister, his father’s daughter, or his mother’s daughter, etc.] Take her to be his wife, or commit lewdness with her, whether she be his sister by both father and mother’s side, or whether by one only, either way she is his sister, and it is not lawful to marry her, or lie with her, (see Leviticus 18:9):

and see her nakedness, and she see his nakedness; which is not to be understood of an immodest view, exposing to each other what should not be seen, and pleasing themselves wills such obscene sights, but of the act of lying together, for so it is afterwards explained by a phrase frequently used to express that action by; and it denotes, as Aben Ezra observes, their mutual consent and agreement in it:

it [is] a wicked thing; and by no means to be done; it is a breach of a former law, it is a scandalous and reproachful thing, and the word is sometimes used for reproach, as in Proverbs 14:34;

and they shall be cut off in the sight of their people; by death, either by the hand of the civil magistrate, or by the hand of God, by the pestilence, as the Targum of Jonathan; Ben Gersom interprets it, of their dying childless, as in some following cases, (Leviticus 20:20,21);

he hath uncovered his sister’s nakedness; or lay with her, which explains a preceding clause:

he shall bear his iniquity; the punishment of it, and he alone, as Aben Ezra observes.

Ver. 18. And if a man shall lie with a woman having her sickness, etc.] Her monthly courses, which make her weak and languid, which is forbidden, (Leviticus 18:19); this is not to be understood of a man’s lying with his wife ignorantly, when in such a condition, for this being the case, he was only unclean seven days, (Leviticus 15:24); whereas this made him and her liable to cutting off, as in an after clause; but of his lying with her, knowing this to be the case with her, and of which she could not be ignorant, and therefore both liable to the same punishment; or else of
any other man lying with her, or of any man lying with any woman, married
or unmarried, being in such circumstances:

*and shall uncover her nakedness*; that is, have carnal knowledge of her:

*he hath discovered her fountain*; from whence her issue of blood flows:
and she hath uncovered the fountain of her blood; freely and willingly, as
Aben Ezra observes; for if she had been forced, he alone would have been
cut off; but both these phrases put together show agreement in this matter,
that they both had knowledge of her case, and both consented to commit
the sin:

*and both of them shall be cut off from among their people*; by death, either
by the hand of the civil magistrate, the case being known and proved, or
else by the hand of God being known by mortality or the pestilence, as the
Targum of Jonathan, or they should die childless; (see Gill on “*Leviticus*
20:17”).

Ver. 19. *And thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy mother’s sister,
nor of thy father’s sister, etc.*] An aunt either by mother or father’s side,
against which the law is, (*Leviticus* 18:13);

*for he uncovereth his near kin*; as an aunt is to a man, and so an uncle to a
woman, and both equally criminal; for it is a rule that holds good in all
those cases, though not expressed, that what is binding upon one sex is
upon the other, being in the same degree of relation, whether of
consanguinity or affinity:

*they shall bear their iniquity*; “both” of them, as the Vulgate Latin version,
the man and his aunt, and so a woman and her uncle;

*the guilt of their sin shall be upon them*, and the punishment of it be
inflicted on them; either they should be cut off from their people, as before,
or be childless, as in the following instances.

Ver. 20. *And if a man shall lie with his uncle’s wife, etc.*] His uncle being
dead, and he marry her, which is forbidden, (*Leviticus* 18:14);

*he hath uncovered his uncle’s nakedness*: his wife’s, which was his, and
therefore the kindred too near for a man to marry in, and such a copulation
must be incestuous:
they shall bear their sin; “both” of them, as the Vulgate Latin, as before, (Leviticus 20:19); the punishment of it, as follows:

they shall be childless; which Jarchi and other Jewish writers interpret, if they had any children at this time, that is, by a former marriage, they should die and be buried before them, which was reckoned a great punishment, (see Jeremiah 22:30).

Ver. 21. And if a man shall take his brother’s wife, etc.] To his wife, whether in his life, as the Targum of Jonathan adds, or whether after his death, unless when there is no issue, then he was obliged to it by another law, (Deuteronomy 25:5); which is now ceased, and the law in (Leviticus 18:16); here referred to, stands clear of all exceptions:

it [is] an unclean thing; or a “separation” from which a man should remove and keep at a distance, as from menstruous women, of whom this word is used; and so denotes that it is by all means to be avoided, as an abominable and detestable thing; and it is observed that of all copulations it is only used of this: and the Jewish writers, as Aben Ezra and others, observe that this case is somewhat like that of a menstruous woman, who in the time of her separation is unlawful, but when out of it lawful; and so, in this case, a brother’s wife might not be taken, he being alive; but after his death she might, if she had no son, according to the law before referred to, but that is now abolished:

he hath uncovered his brother’s nakedness; his wife’s, which was his brother’s; which through nearness of kin, he ought not to have done; and the same holds good of a wife’s sister, the relation being the same:

they shall be childless; they shall have none by such a marriage or copulation, and die without any; and as this supposes the brother’s wife to have children by her first husband, or otherwise while the Jewish law lasted, it would not have been unlawful to marry her husband’s brother; the meaning may be, that these should die before them, or rather, as some think, those that might be born of such a marriage should not be reckoned legitimate, and so not inherit.

Ver. 22. Ye shall therefore keep all my statutes, etc.] All the ordinances, institutions, and appointments of God, whether observed in this chapter or elsewhere, but particularly those concerning incestuous marriages and unlawful copulations:
and all my judgments, and do them; all the laws and commandments of God, founded injustice and judgment, and according to the rules thereof; or else, as Aben Ezra, the judgments of punishment, or the penalties annexed to the above laws, which were carefully to be observed, and put into execution, to deter from the transgression of them:

that the land, whither I bring you to dwell therein, spew you not out; as the stomach does its food when it is loathsome and nauseous to it, and it cannot bear it; (see Leviticus 18:25,28).

Ver. 23. And ye shall not walk in the manners of the nation which I cast out before you, etc.] Nation seems to be put for nations, for there were seven nations cast out for them; though the Canaanites may be intended, being a general name for the whole: some think the Amorites are meant, who were a principal nation, and notorious for their wickedness: hence we often meet with this phrase in Jewish writings, “the way of the Amorites”, as being exceeding bad, and so to be avoided, and by no means to be walked in, (Genesis 15:16);

for they committed all these things; were guilty of all the idolatries, incests, and uncleannesses before mentioned, and forbid under severe penalties:

and therefore I abhorred them; the sins committed by them, being so abominable and detestable: their persons, though the creatures of God, were had in abhorrence by him, and this he showed by casting them out of the land; and hereby it is suggested, that, should they, the Israelites, be guilty of the like, they also would be rejected and abhorred by him: the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan are,

“my Word abhorred them,”

Christ, the eternal Word, (Psalm 45:7).

Ver. 24. But I have said unto you, ye shall inherit the land, etc.] Promised it unto them, as he had to their fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and also to them; or he had said the above things unto them, that they, observing them, might possess the land of Canaan, and continue therein, which is the sense of the Targum of Jonathan: the Jews say, that the right of inheritance belonged to them, from Shem the son of Noah, whose portion it was, and which they gather from Melchizedek being king of Salem, whom they take to be Shem; and they say, the Canaanites only dwelt in it to make it better, till they should come and inherit it:
and I will give it unto you to possess it; in whose gift it was, and who had a right to dispose of it; and could give them a good title to it, and secure them in the possession of it:

a land that floweth with milk and honey; abounding with all good things, with all the comforts of life, with everything both for necessity and delight; (see <sup>408</sup>Exodus 3:8);

I [am] the Lord your God, which have separated you from [other] people; had chosen them above all people, to be a special and peculiar people to him; had distinguished them by his favours, and had given them particular laws and ordinances, to observe and walk according to them, different from all other nations, which it became them carefully to regard.

Ver. 25. Ye shall therefore put difference between clean beasts and unclean, etc.] The ten clean ones, as Aben Ezra observes, and all the rest that are unclean, according to the law before given, (<sup>403</sup>Leviticus 11:3-8), by using the one for food, and not the other, and so the Targum of Jonathan, ye shall separate between the beast which is fit for food, and that which is not fit for food:

and between unclean fowls and clean; and which the same Targum interprets, what is unfit to eat and what is fit, even all that are particularly mentioned as unclean, and not fit for food, in (<sup>403</sup>Leviticus 11:13-19) and all the rest not excepted to as clean and fit for food, which was one way and means God made use of to separate them from other nations, and so preserve them from their idolatrous and evil works:

and ye shall not make your souls abominable by beast, or by fowl, or by any manner of living thing that creepeth on the ground; that is, by eating them, contrary to the command of God, which would make them abominable in his sight; (see <sup>403</sup>Leviticus 11:43); every sin or transgression of this law being so to him:

which I have separated from you as unclean; which by law he had commanded them to abstain from the use of, as clean, and not fit to be eaten.

Ver. 26. And ye shall be holy unto me, etc.] Separated from all unclean persons and things, and devoted to his service, and obedient to all his commands, and so live holy lives and conversations, according to his will, and to his honour and glory:
for I the Lord [am] holy; and therefore they, his people, should be like him, and imitate him, and observe those things which are agreeable to his holy nature and will, and yield a cheerful obedience to his holy precepts:

and have severed you from [other] people, that ye should be mine; which is a very forcible argument, a strong motive, and which laid them under great obligation to obedience and holiness.

Ver. 27. A man also or a woman that hath a familiar spirit, etc.] Or the spirit of Python or divination, (see Leviticus 19:31); such as the damsel had in Acts 16:16; a woman is here particularly mentioned, though before included in the above law; because, as Aben Ezra says, such sort of practices were more frequently committed by women; to which Maimonides adds another reason, because men have a natural clemency towards the female sex, and are not easily prevailed upon to put them to death; therefore the law says, “thou shall not suffer a witch to live”, (Exodus 22:18);

or that is a wizard; a knowing one, who pretends to a great deal of knowledge of things; as of lost or stolen goods, and even knowledge of things future, and imposes upon persons, and cheats them of their money they give for information: such

shall surely be put to death: and not spared through favour and affection: the death they are to be put to follows:

they shall stone them with stones; until they are dead; of the manner of stoning, (see Gill on Acts 7:58);

their blood [shall be] upon them: they are worthy of death, and they shall suffer it: this phrase following upon the former, the Jews gather from hence, that, wherever it is used, it is to be understood of stoning; (see Gill on Leviticus 20:9).
CHAPTER 21

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 21

This chapter respects the priests, the sons of Aaron, and forbids their mourning for the dead, unless in some cases, (Leviticus 21:1-6); or their marriage with an whore or a divorced woman, (Leviticus 21:7,8); and the daughters of any of them to commit fornication, which is made punishable with death, (Leviticus 21:9); and it contains particular laws for the high priest to observe, who was not to mourn for any, even for his parents, (Leviticus 21:10,11); nor to go out of the sanctuary, (Leviticus 21:12); nor to marry any woman but a virgin, (Leviticus 21:13-15); and it also directs, that none of the priests having any blemish in them should be employed in divine service, though they might eat of the holy things, (Leviticus 21:16-24).

Ver. 1. And the Lord said unto Moses, etc.] According to some Jewish writers this was said on the day the tabernacle was set up; no doubt it was delivered at the same time the above laws were given; and as care was taken for the purity and holiness of the Israelites in general, it was necessary that the priests that were concerned in a more especial manner in the service and worship of God should be holy also, and have some instructions given them to take care and keep themselves from all defilements; and particularly the Jewish writers observe, that this paragraph or section concerning the priests follows upon, and is in connection with the law concerning such as have familiar spirits, and wizards, to teach men, that in matters of doubt and difficulty they should not have recourse to such persons, but to the priests of the Lord:

speak unto the priests, the sons of Aaron; the priests, whether elder or younger, whether fit for service, and whether having blemishes, or not; for there are some things which concern them, and these are sons, male children of Aaron, as the Targum of Jonathan, and not daughters, as Jarchi and others observe; for they were not obliged to regard the laws and rules here given:
and say unto them, there shall none be defiled for the dead among his people; by entering into a tent or house where a dead body lay, by touching it, or by hearing it, or attending it to the grave, or by any expressions of mourning for it, (see Numbers 19:11,14,16); that is, for any person in common that were of his people, that were not nearly related to him, as in the cases after excepted; so it was a custom with the Romans, as we are told, that such as were polluted by funerals might not sacrifice, which shows that priests were not allowed to attend funerals, which perhaps might be taken from hence; and so Porphyry says, that sacred persons and inspectors of holy things should abstain from funerals or graves, and from every filthy and mournful sight.

Ver. 2. But for his kin that is near unto him, etc.] For such he might be defiled and mourn, or be where they were, and take care of, and attend their funerals: this clause some take to be general, of which the particulars follow, as Aben Ezra; but others take it to be the first particular excepted, and instanced in, and intends his wife; for it may be rendered, as by some, “for his flesh”, or “the rest of him”, the other part of himself, his wife, which is his other self, and one flesh with him; and so Jarchi and others observe, there is no flesh of his, but his wife; and if she is not intended here, she is not expressed elsewhere, though must be supposed, because it is allowed the priest to defile himself for other relations not so near; and it is plain from the case of Ezekiel, that a priest might mourn for his wife, (Ezekiel 24:15-18); he being forbid it, shows his case to be an extraordinary one, and that ordinarily it was admitted, otherwise there would have been no need of a particular prohibition of him:

[that is], for his mother, and for his father, and for his son, and for his daughter, and his brother; R. Alphes adds, “and his wife”; these being all near relations, and for whom natural affection would lead and oblige him to mourn, and show a concern for their death, and to take care of their funeral. This is to be understood of common priests; for as for the high priest, he might not mourn, or be concerned for either of these.

Ver. 3. And for his sister a virgin, that is nigh unto him, etc.] That is, his sister by both father’s and mother’s side, as Aben Ezra; though, according to Gersom, his sister by his father’s side, and not by his mother’s side, is meant; but, according to Alphes, by his mother’s side: perhaps this may signify not nearness of kin, which is expressed by being his sister, but
nearness of place, for, being unmarried, she remained unto her death in her father’s house:

*which hath had no husband*; neither betrothed to one, for then she would have been nigh to her husband, and not her brother, and therefore he might not pollute himself for her, as Gersom observes; nor married to him, for such an one he might not defile himself, even though she might have been rejected or divorced by her husband, as the same writer says:

*for her may he be defiled*; for a pure virgin that had never been betrothed nor married to a man, and had never departed from her father’s house, and so had no husband to mourn for her, and take care of her funeral, and so for all the rest before mentioned; and which Jarchi says is a command, and not a bare sufferance or allowance, but what he ought and was obliged to do; and so it is related of Joseph 1735, a priest, that his wife died in the evening of the sabbath, and he would not defile himself for her, and his brethren the priests obliged him, and made him defile himself against his will.

**Ver. 4. [But] he shall not defile himself, [being] a chief man among his people, etc.]** Which is not to be understood of any lord or nobleman or any chief ruler or governor of the people; for the context speaks only of priests, and not of other personages; besides, such might defile themselves, or mourn for their dead, as Abraham did for Sarah; nor of any husband for his wife, for even a priest, as has been observed, might do this for his wife, and much more a private person; nor is there any need to restrain it, as some Jewish writers do, to an adulterous wife, which a husband might not mourn for, though he might for his right and lawful wife; but there is nothing in the text, neither of an husband, nor a wife: the words are to be interpreted of a priest, and either of him as considered as a person of eminence, consequence, and importance, and sons giving a reason why he should not defile himself for the dead, because he was a principal person among his people to officiate for them in sacred things; wherefore if he did not take care that he was not defiled for the dead, which might often happen, he would be frequently hindered from doing his office for the people, which would be attended with ill consequence to them; and therefore the above cases are only excepted, as being such that rarely happened: or rather the words are to be considered as a prohibition of defiling himself “for [any] chief”, 1736, or principal man, lord, ruler, or governor, among his people; even for such an one he was not to defile himself, being no relation of his:
to profane himself; make himself unfit for sacred service, or make himself a common person; put himself upon a level with a common private man, and be no more capable of serving at the altar, or doing any part of the work off priest, than such an one.

Ver. 5. They shall not make baldness upon their head, etc.] For the dead, as Jarchi, Aben Ezra, and Ben Gersom; not shave their heads, or round the corners of them, or make baldness between their eyes on that account; as those things were forbid the Israelites, so the priests also; this and what follow being superstitious customs used among the Heathens in their mournings for the dead, particularly by the Chaldeans, as Aben Ezra observes; and so by the Grecians; when Hephestion, one of Alexander’s captains, died, he shaved his soldiers and himself, imitating Achilles in Homer; so the Egyptians, mourning for the loss of Osiris, annually shaved their heads; and the priests of Isis, mourning for her lost son, are called by Minutius Felix her bald priests; (see Leviticus 19:27,28; Deuteronomy 14:1);

neither shall they shave off the corner of their beard: the five corners of it; (see Gill on Leviticus 19:27”). This the Israelites in common might not do, and particularly their priests; though the Egyptian priests shaved both their heads and beards, as Herodotus relates: and so they are represented in the Table of Isis:

nor make any cuttings in their flesh; either with their nails, tearing their cheeks and breasts, or with an instrument cutting their flesh in any part of their bodies, as was the custom of Heathen nations; such were made by the Egyptians in their mourning; (see Gill on Leviticus 19:28”).

Ver. 6. They shall be holy unto their God, etc.] Sacred to his service, and wholly given up to it, and not interest themselves in things which hindered from it, or made them unfit for it; and such care becomes the ministers of the word, who should give up themselves to it, and not entangle themselves with other affairs; they should be clean, pure, and holy, that bear the vessels of the Lord, and minister in holy things, and should set an example of purity and holiness to others:

and not profane the name of their God; or cause it to be profaned and evil spoken of on their account, or his service to be interrupted, and they who bore his name put upon a level with common persons through their pollutions:
for the offerings of the Lord made by fire; the burnt offerings, which were offered up to the Lord on the altar of burnt offering every day, besides others on divers occasions:

[and] the bread of their God do they offer; the shewbread, which they set every week before the Lord on the shewbread table, and the meat or bread offering, the “minchah”, which they continually offered along with the sacrifices: or the word “and”, being a supplement, may be left out; and so this clause is put by way of apposition, and as interpreting the fire offering to be the bread of their God, which being wholly burnt on the altar, and devoted to God, was his meat and food, and accepted by him, (see <030311>Leviticus 3:11);

therefore they shall be holy; separate from all others, and abstain from all impurity both of flesh and spirit, from all uncleanness, moral and ceremonial; it being highly fit and proper that the bread of God should be offered by holy persons.

Ver. 7. They shall not take a wife [that is] a whore, or profane, etc.] By the former is meant a common whore, that prostitutes herself to any one through lust or for gain; and by the latter one whose chastity is violated, but either unwillingly, that has been forced and ravished, or else willingly, being enticed, persuaded, and prevailed upon, but did not make a practice of it; this seems to be the true sense of the words: but the Jewish writers understand them differently; by a “whore” they suppose is meant one that is not an Israelitish woman, that is not born of an Israelite, at least of an Israelitish woman, as proselytes or freed persons; for they say there are no whores but such, or one that lies with such persons, she may not marry with; as such as are guilty of cutting off, or any of the Nethinim, or spurious persons, so Jarchi; and by a “profane” person they think is meant such as are born of those that are rejected, as the Targum of Jonathan paraphrases it; that is, that are either born of incestuous marriages, such as are forbidden, (<031801>Leviticus 18:1-18); or that are born of those that are rejected in the priesthood, or whom a priest might not marry, as the daughter of a widow, by the high priest, or the daughter of one divorced, by a common priest, which is the sense of Jarchi:

neither shall they take a woman put away by her husband: which was, in these and later times, common for any offence, when the crime of adultery was not pretended; but this always supposed something bad or amiss, and made such a woman suspected of having done an unseemly thing, therefore
priests were forbidden marrying such persons: the Targum of Jonathan adds,

“or by her husband’s brother;”

and so takes in one that has loosed the shoe, as the Jews call her, who being left without issue, her husband’s brother refused to marry her, and therefore she plucked off his shoe, and spit in his face, (see Deuteronomy 25:7-9); such an one a priest might not marry, according to this paraphrast, and other Jewish writers, and if he did was to be beaten;

for he [is] holy unto his God; separated from common persons, and devoted to the service of God, and therefore not to be defiled with such sort of women, or to lie under any scandal or reproach through such, marriages.

Ver. 8. Thou shalt sanctify him therefore, etc.] In thought and word, as Aben Ezra, by thinking and speaking well of him; should esteem and reckon him a holy person, being in a sacred office, and honour him as such; and do all that can be done to preserve him from unholiness and impurity, and particularly from marrying with improper and unsuitable persons, such as would bring a scandal on him and his sacred office: this seems to be spoken to Moses, and so to the civil magistrate in succession, who were not to suffer such marriages to take place in the priesthood; and were not only to persuade from it, but to exercise their authority, and oblige them to put away such wives, and if they refused, to use severity; so Jarchi,

““thou shalt sanctify him”, whether he will or not; if he will not put her away, beat him and chastise him until he does put “her away”,” (see Ezra 2:62);

for he offereth the bread of the Lord; meaning not the shewbread he set in order before the Lord every week, but the various gift and sacrifices which were offered to God by him, and were acceptable to him as his food; and therefore he ought to be holy that drew nigh to God, and was employed in such service, (see Leviticus 21:6);

he shall be holy unto thee; in thy account and estimation, and for thy service to offer holy sacrifices, and therefore should be careful of his holiness to preserve it;
for I the Lord, which sanctify you, [am] holy; in his nature, works, and ways, and who had separated them from all other people to be a holy people to him, and therefore they that ministered in holy things for them should be holy likewise.

Ver. 9. And the daughter of any priest, etc.] The Targum of Jonathan restrains it to one that is betrothed; but others, as Jarchi and Aben Ezra, whether betrothed or married; and all confess, as the former says, that the Scripture does not speak of one that is single or entirely free: but there is no exception in the text; and besides, the daughter of any man that was betrothed to a man, and guilty of the crime here spoken of, was to die, (Deuteronomy 22:23,24); and therefore such a law respecting the priest’s daughter would be needless; unless it can be thought that it was made merely for the sake of the different kind of death she was to be put to, and that burning was a more terrible one than stoning:

if she profane herself by playing the whore; which brings scandal and disgrace on any person, and much more on anyone that had the honour of being related to a person in such a sacred office, and the advantage of a more strictly religious education, and had eaten of the holy things in her father’s house; all which were aggravations of her crime, and made it the more scandalous and reproachful to her: some render it, “when she begins to play the whore”, as soon as ever it is discovered in her, and she is taken in it; even for the first that she commits, she is not to be spared, but put to death:

she profaneth her father: which is another aggravation of her sin; she brings him under disgrace, disparages his office, and exposes him to censure, reproach, and ridicule, as not having taken care of her education, and taught her better, and kept her under restraints; men will upbraid him with it, saying, this is a priest’s daughter that has committed this lewdness; nor will say of him, as Jarchi observes, cursed be he that begat her, and cursed be he that brought her up:

she shall be burnt with fire; not with hot melted lead poured down her mouth, but with faggots set about her; (see Gill on Leviticus 20:14”); no punishment is here fixed for the person that lay with her, but, according to the Jewish canons, she was to be strangled.

Ver. 10. And [he that is] the high priest among his brethren, etc.] Either among his brethren, the priests, being in office above them; or among his
brethren the Israelites, among and over whom he is high priest; or, as others render it, “the priest who is greater than his brethren” 1746, in an higher office; the Jews say 1747 the high priest was to be greater than his brethren, in beauty, in strength, in wisdom, and in riches; and if he had not money enough, all the priests were to give him of theirs, everyone according to his riches, until he became the richest among them all:

upon whose head the anointing oil was poured: as it was poured upon Aaron at his consecration, and those that succeeded him, (Exodus 29:7) (Leviticus 8:12);

and that is consecrated to put on the garments; the eight garments with which the high priest was clothed at the time of his consecration, (Leviticus 8:7-9); and in which he and his sons are said to be consecrated, (Exodus 29:29); in order to which he was “to fill his hand”; as the phrase here is, that is, with the fat and right shoulder of the ram of consecration, and with the loaf of bread, and cake of oiled bread, and wafer, (Exodus 29:23,24); in all which he was a type of Christ, the great High Priest, as he is often called, who is greater than his brethren in all the above things, the high priest exceeded his brethren, except in worldly riches; and yet the earth also is his, and the fulness thereof, well as he is fairer than the children of men, stronger than the strong man armed, and the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hid in him; he is anointed also with the oil of gladness above his fellows; and all his garments smell of myrrh, aloes, and cassia, and is consecrated an high priest for evermore: of the high priest it is said, he

shall not uncover his head: that is, on account of the dead; not take off his mitre, or in any such way express mourning for the dead; or shall not nourish his hair or let it grow, as the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan; and so Jarchi interprets it, he shall not let the hair grow for mourning; and what is nourishing of the hair? when it is let grow more than thirty days:

nor rend his clothes; that is, on the same account, and therefore Jonathan adds, in the hour of distress, or mourning for the dead; otherwise, in case of blasphemy, he might rend his clothes, (see Matthew 26:65); and indeed, according to the Jewish canons, he might rend his clothes in mourning, only in a different manner from common priests; for so they say 1748,

“he may not rend for the dead, as other priests,”
as it is said: “nor rend his clothes”; and if he rends he is to be beaten, but he may rend below over against (or near) his feet; and so in the Misnah, an high priest rends below, and a common priest above; (see Gill on Leviticus 10:6’).

Ver. 11. Neither shall he go in to any dead body, etc.] That is, into a tent or house where any dead body lies, as Jarchi and Aben Ezra interpret it, for whoever went into such a place was unclean seven days; and so long therefore an high priest, should he enter there, would be prevented doing the duty of his office, (see Numbers 19:14); this was aped and followed by the Heathens in later times; so among the Romans, the “Flamen Dialis”, or high priest of Jupiter, might not go into a place where a dead body was burnt or buried, nor touch any; and it was a custom with them, as Servius tells us, to put a branch of cypress at the door of a house where a dead body was, that an high priest might not enter through ignorance, and be defiled:

nor defile himself for his father, or for his mother; by entering into the tent or house where they lay dead, or by touching them, or attending the funeral of them, or by concerning himself about it; and there was no need to mention his son or his daughter, his brother or his sister; for if he was not to defile himself for any of his parents, much less for any of those which are excepted in the case of a common priest, (Leviticus 21:2,3); the Jews do indeed make one exception in the case of an high priest, and that is, that if he meets with a dead body in the way, he was obliged to defile himself for it and bury it; and so among the Romans, though it was a crime for an high priest to look upon a dead body, yet it was reckoned a greater, if, when he saw it, he left it unburied.

Ver. 12. Neither shall he go out of the sanctuary, etc.] In the time of service, upon any occasion whatever; otherwise, when there was a necessity for it, he might go out from thence, though this was rarely done, and only in the night time: Maimonides says he had a house prepared for him in the sanctuary, called the chamber of the high priest; and it was his honour and his glory to remain in the sanctuary all the day, and he did not go out, except to his own house, and that only in the night, or an hour or two in the day; and his house was in Jerusalem, and from thence he never removed: but this law respects him only in the case of his dead; as when any news was brought him of the death of his father, or of his mother, if in his service, he was not to quit it on any account; for we are
told, that an high priest might offer when mourning, though he might not eat in such a circumstance, whereas a common priest might neither offer nor eat; nor might an high priest go out of the sanctuary on such an occasion, if he was not in service, as to follow the dead corpse or bier, as Jarchi and Aben Ezra interpret it; at least, he was to go no further than the gate of the city; though even this is not allowed by others, who say, if the dead were his, he might not go out after it; he might not go out of the door of his house, nor out of the sanctuary, and all the people were to come and comfort him at his own house:

nor profane the sanctuary of his God; by deserting the service of it, on any account, and particularly on account of the dead, by departing from it to go after them, and by entering into it again before the time, when so defiled:

for the crown of the anointing oil of his God [is] upon him; the anointing oil, which was a crown of glory, and gave him a superior dignity to others, which it became him to be careful not to debase by any of the above things: or “the crown and the anointing oil”, so some supply the word “and”; both the golden plate or the holy crown, as it is sometimes called, and the anointing oil were upon him, which showed him to be a very dignified person, a sort of king as well as a priest, and so a type of Christ, who is a priest upon his throne, (Zechariah 6:13);

I [am] the Lord: whose high priest he is, and who command him all these things, and expect to be obeyed in them.

Ver. 13. And he shall take a wife in her virginity.] One, and not two, or more, as Ben Gersom observes; and so Maimonides says, an high priest might never take two women together; for it is said, “a wife”, or “woman”, one, and not two; and so it is explained in the Talmud; for though polygamy was practised by the Israelites, and even by the common priests, yet these writers suppose it was by no means allowed to an high priest: among the Egyptians, though they took as many wives as they pleased, their priests, married but one; and so a minister of the New Testament is to be the husband of one wife, (1 Timothy 3:2); and this wife the high priest was to take was to be a “virgin”, one that not only had never known a man, but that was never betrothed to any; yea, according to the Talmudists, who was not quite ripe for marriage, or the time of her puberty not fully completed, which was the age of twelve years; within, or somewhat before that time, the high priest was to marry her, that it might be out of all doubt that she was a pure virgin; since it is said, “in her
virginity”, within the time of her puberty, before it was quite up; this, by many, is thought to be an emblem of Christ and his church; as he was typified by the high priest, so the church by the virgin he married, which is espoused to Christ as a chaste virgin, (2 Corinthians 11:2).

**Ver. 14.** A widow, etc.] The high priest might not marry, whether the widow of a priest or of an Israelite, as Aben Ezra, that is, of any Israelite that was not of the priesthood; and this, whether a widow after espousals, or after marriage, as runs the Jewish canon; the meaning is, that if she was betrothed to a man, and that man died before he married her, and so was a virgin; yet being betrothed to him was reckoned as his widow; and such an one the high priest might not marry, any more than one that had been left a widow, having being married: though, according to the same constitutions, if he had betrothed a widow, and after that was appointed an high priest, he might marry her, and an instance of it is given in Joshua the son of Gamla: and in the same it is observed, that an high priest, when his brother dies, must suffer his shoe to be plucked off, and not marry his brother’s widow; which, in other cases, when there was no issue, was required:

*or a divorced woman;* whether by a priest, or a common Israelite; and indeed, if a common priest might not marry such a person, much less an high priest: or profane anyone born of those that were not fit for priests to marry, as the Targum of Jonathan and Jarchi; (see Gill on “Leviticus 21:7”);

*[or] an harlot;* a common prostitute:

**those shall he not take** any or either of them, to be his wife; which are forbid in order to maintain the dignity of his office, and a reverence of it: there seems to be a gradation in these instances, he might not marry a widow, which was forbidden no other man; and if not such an one, much less a divorced woman, still less a profane person, and least of all an harlot;

**but he shall take a virgin of his own people to wife;** which phrase, “of his own people”, did not limit him to his own tribe, and to the fraternity of priests in it, as if he was to marry only in it, or the daughter of a priest; for the priests and Levites being scattered in the several tribes, and having no inheritances in them, were not restrained from marrying into other tribes, as the rest of the tribes were; and so an high priest sometimes married into another tribe, though he took care not to debase himself, by marrying into
a mean family: so Jehoiada, the high priest, married Jehoshabeath, the daughter of King Jehoram, (2 Chronicles 22:11); but by this law he was forbid to marry a virgin of another nation, even though a proselytess and one that was made free, as Gersom observes; a captive virgin, and one that was become a Jewess, as Aben Ezra says, he was not allowed to marry.

Ver. 15. *Neither shall he profane his seed among his people,* etc. By marrying any such persons, whereby his children, born of them, would lie under disgrace, and be unfit to succeed him in the priesthood, or by marrying among mean persons, or by marrying them to such as were unlawful, and would be a disparagement to them:

*for I the Lord do sanctify him*; separate him from all others, to the high and sacred office of the high priesthood, and am concerned for his honour and holiness; and therefore it became him to observe these laws and rules, and abstain from such disagreeable marriages.

Ver. 16. *And the Lord spake unto Moses,* etc.] After he had spoken to him of the holiness of the priests, that they should not defile themselves, neither with the dead nor with impure marriages, he proceeded to add some things concerning blemishes in their bodies, which rendered them unfit for the service:

*saying*; as follows.

Ver. 17. *Speak unto Aaron, saying,* etc.] Who being the high priest, it was incumbent on him, at least at this time, to see that the laws and rules relating to the priesthood were observed; and particularly to examine carefully who were and who were not to be admitted to serve in it:

*whosoever [he be] of thy seed in their generations*; or, “a man of thy seed” for this only respected his male seed, females of his seed had no concern in the following laws; but his sons, in all successive ages and generations, to the coming of the Messiah, had, whether high priests or common priests:

*that hath [any] blemish*; in any part of his body, particularly such as are after mentioned:

*let him not approach to offer the bread of his God*; neither go into the holy place, to set the shewbread in order there, nor to offer any sacrifice upon the altar; so Josephus explains this law; that a priest should be perfect,
and if he laboured under any defect, should not ascend the altar, nor enter into the temple: this was imitated by the Heathens: Romulus ordered that such as were weak and feeble in any part of the body should not be made priests: the Jewish priests were types of Christ, who is holy, harmless, without spot and blemish; and through whose blood and righteousness all who are made priests by him are unblamable, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; and a Gospel minister, bishop, or pastor, ought to be unblemished in his life and conversation, (Titus 1:6,7); and there are some who think that the blemishes of the mind and of the life are rather here meant than those of the body.

Ver. 18. For whatsoever man [he be] that hath a blemish, etc.] Let him be otherwise ever so well qualified for his office, as with respect to his parentage, against which no objection lies; or, as to his character and abilities, being a man of knowledge and of good manners; and whether these blemishes be, as the Jews call them, fixed, settled ones, which have attended them ever since they were born, and are likely to attend them as long as they live; or are transient ones, only for the present, and perhaps, in a short time, wilt be removed; yet it matters not, while these blemishes are on them,

he shall not approach; to the altar to offer sacrifice, or do any part of the priestly office, for this phrase is expressive of a sacerdotal act: the particular blemishes unfitting a man for such service follow:

a blind man, or a lame; that is blind of one eye, or of both; and is lame of one leg, or of both:

or he that hath a flat nose; which Jarchi explains, whose nose is sunk between his two eyes, whose nose is short, and crooked, or mutilated:

or anything superfluous; more members than usual, as six fingers on an hand, or two gristles in an ear, as Ben Gersom; or whose members are not proportionate, as one eye large and the other small, or one thigh or leg longer than the other, so Jarchi; the Targum of Jonathan is,

“whose thigh (or thigh bone) is out of joint;”

and so a man draws his foot after him, which is the sense of the Rabbins, as observed by Kimchi, and Ben Melech from him; and so such are not fit to be called the priests of the Lord, and much less ministers of his word, who are blind as to the knowledge of divine and spiritual things, and walk
not as becomes the Gospel of Christ; or halt between two opinions, or savour not the things of God, and lay not aside all superfluity of naughtiness.

Ver. 19. *Or a man that is brokenfooted or brokenhanded.*] That has any of the bones or joints in his hands and feet broke, or when they are distorted, and he is clubfooted, or his fingers crooked and clustered together; and such a man could not be fit to ascend the altar, and lay the sacrifice in order upon it; and may be an emblem of such as are awkward or disorderly in their walk and conservation, and to every good work and action unfit, and so unfit for their master’s use.

Ver. 20. *Or crookbackt,* etc.] That has a protuberance, or bunch upon his back, one that we commonly call “hunchbacked”; the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem paraphrase it,

“whose eyebrows lying cover his eyes;”

and so Jarchi, interprets it, the hair of whose eyebrows is long and lying; and so other Jewish writers understand it of some deformity about the eyes, the hair of the eyebrows being thick and heavy over them, and so hinder the sight, at least it makes the person not so sightly and graceful; it is said 1768, he that hath no eyebrows, or but one eyebrow, is the “Gibben” (the word here used) spoken of in the law, (Leviticus 21:20):  

*or a dwarf;* one of a small stature, as Aben Ezra, as generally hunchbacked persons are, and so unfit to attend the altar, being scarce able to reach up to it, and do the business of it, as well as must make a very mean appearance; but the above Targums understand this also of some blemish about the eyes, paraphrasing it

“or he that has no hair on his eyebrows,”

just the reverse of the former; Jarchi seems to understand it of a thin small film upon the eye; though something of that kind seems to be intended in the next clause:

*or that hath a blemish in his eye;* a mixture, a confusion, or rather a suffusion in it, as the above Targum; in which, as one of them says, the white is mixed with the black, and with which agrees what is said in the Misnah 1769, where it is asked, what is the confusion or suffusion? the white which spreads in the his, and enters into the black of the eye; it seems to be
a white speck in the pupil of the eye, and so Jarchi, Kimchi \(^{1770}\), and others interpret it:

_**or be scurvy or scabbed**_; both these were kinds of ulcers, according to the Jewish writers, particularly Jarchi, who says of the first, that it is a dry scab within and without; and of the other, that it is the Egyptian scab, which is moist without and dry with it; and so the Targum of Jonathan:

_**or hath his stones broken**_; this is differently interpreted in the Misnäh \(^{1771}\), and by other Jewish writers; some say it signifies one that has no testicles, or only one; so the Septuagint and the Jerusalem Targum: others, whose testicles are broken or bruised, so Jarchi: or are inflated, so Akiba, Aben Ezra, and the Targum of Jonathan; some understand it of an “hernia” or rupture, when a man is burstened: all which may in a moral and mystical sense signify either some defect in the understanding, or vices in the heart or life, which render unfit for public service in the sanctuary.

**Ver. 21. No man that hath a blemish, of the seed of Aaron the priest, etc.]** Whether an high priest or a common priest that lies on him anyone of the above blemishes; and which the Jewish writers \(^{1772}\) make to amount to the number of one hundred and forty, and which they reckon, so many in one part of the booty and so many in another, till they make up the said number; and whoever had any might not come nigh to offer up the sacrifices of the Lord made by fire; the burnt offerings on the altar, to which he might not approach, and the meat offerings, and the fat, and the incense:

_**he hath a blemish**_; in one part of him or another; and though but one,

_**he shall not come nigh to offer the bread of his God**_: this is repeated for the confirmation of it, and to show how determined the Lord was in this matter; and how much he should resent it in any that should be found guilty of the breach of those rules, and so it is designed to deter from attempting it.

**Ver. 22. He shall eat the bread of his God, etc.]** That part of the sacrifices which was appropriated by the Lord to the priests, for the maintenance of them and their families; for though their natural infirmities disqualified them for service, yet they did not become hereby impure, either in a moral nor ceremonial sense, and might eat of the sacrifices, which impure persons might not; and so the tradition is, blemished persons, whether their
blemishes are fixed or transient, may divide and eat, but not offer; these being priests, and having no inheritance, nor any way of getting their livelihood, provision is made for them that they might not perish through their defects in nature, which were not voluntary and brought upon them by themselves, but by the providence of God; and such were allowed to eat

[both] of the most holy and of the holy; there were things the priests eat of, which were most holy, as what remained of the meat offerings, and of the sin offerings, and of the trespass offerings, which only the males of the priest’s family might eat of, and that only in the holy place; and there were others less holy, the lighter holy things, as the Jews call them, as the wave breast, and heave shoulder, and the tithes and firstfruits, which were eaten of by all in their families, their daughters as well as their sons, and in their own houses; now of each of these might the blemished priests eat; (see Numbers 18:9,10), etc.

Ver. 23. Only he shall not go in unto the vail, etc.] So far as to the vail, which divided between the holy and the holy of holies; that is, he shall not go into the holy place which was before the vail; not to set the shewbread upon the table there, nor to light and him the lamps in the candlestick, nor to offer incense on the altar of incense, which stood in it: some render it “within the vail”, where only the high priest might enter once a year; but if he had any blemish on him he might not, nor might such an one be an high priest; Aben Ezra seems to have some respect to this in his note,

“to the vail he shall not come, that he may be an high priest:”

nor come nigh unto the altar; as not to the altar of incense in the holy place, so neither to the altar of burnt offering in the court of the tabernacle, that is, so as to officiate there: but though they might not be employed in such sacred service, the Jews in later times have found business for them to employ them in, and that was worming the wood, or searching the wood for worms, which was used in the burning of the sacrifices; for we are told, that at the northeast corner (of the court of the women) was the wood room, where the priests that had blemishes wormed the wood; and whatsoever wood in which a worm was found, was rejected from being laid upon the altar: the reason why he might not go into either place before mentioned is repeated,
because he hath a blemish; either fixed or transient; one of those particularly expressed, or any other; for the Jews suppose there are others implied besides those expressed, which disqualified for service:

that he profane not my sanctuaries; if an high priest, the holy of holies, if a common priest, the holy place, and the court of the tabernacle:

for I the Lord do sanctify them; the vail, to which blemished priests might not go: and the altar, to which they might not come nigh: or rather, the sanctuaries or holy places, where they might not officiate, which God had separated and devoted for sacred uses, and were not to be defiled by any; though Ben Gersom observes, that this has no respect to the sanctuary, for if it had it would have been said, “I am the Lord, that sanctify it”; but since a plural word is used before, I see not but that with great propriety it is expressed, and with reference thereunto, “sanctify them”; which he would have understood of holy things, but what he means is not easy to say, unless the holy things such persons might eat of, (Leviticus 21:22), which is fetched.

Ver. 24. And Moses told [it] to Aaron, and to his sons, etc.] What God had said to him concerning the priests defiling themselves for the dead, both common priests and high priest, and concerning their marriages and their blemishes; that they might be careful not to transgress the laws and rules given them concerning those things:

and to all the children of Israel; to the heads of the tribes and elders of the people, and by them to the whole, that they might know who were fit, and who not, to put their sacrifice into their hands, to offer for them: Jarchi thinks this was to warn the sanhedrim concerning the priests, whose business it was to examine and judge who were fit for service and who not; for so we are told, that in the chamber Gazith, or of hewn stone, the great sanhedrim of Israel sat and judged the priests, and rejected some and received others.
INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 22

In this chapter several laws are delivered out, forbidding the priests to eat of holy things, when in any uncleanness, or at any time what dies of itself, or is torn of beasts, (Leviticus 22:1-9); also showing who belonging to the priests might or might not eat of the holy things, (Leviticus 22:10-16); and others requiring that whatever offerings were brought by the children of Israel, they should be perfect and without blemish, (Leviticus 22:17-25); and also declaring what age a creature should be of when sacrificed, and the time when thank offerings were to be eaten, (Leviticus 22:26-30); concluding with an exhortation to observe the commands of God, and sanctify him, and not profane his name, (Leviticus 22:31-33).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] Immediately after he had spoken concerning blemishes in priests, and in a continued discourse signifying, that though priests that had blemishes might eat of the holy things, yet neither they, nor even such who had not any, if they were under legal impurity, might eat of them:

saying; as follows.

Ver. 2. Speak unto Aaron and to his sons, etc.] The priests; the children of Israel or the common people are not mentioned, as having no concern in the following laws about eating holy things:

that they separate themselves from the holy things of the children of Israel; both from offering their lawful sacrifices, which was the business of their office when pure, and chiefly from eating that part of them which was their due, and was allowed them; neither of these they were to do, particularly the latter, when they were in any uncleanness, as the following words show:

and that, they profane not my holy name [in those things] which they hallow unto me; which the children of Israel set apart and devoted to his service; which they would do, by eating their part of them when unclean,
and thereby show little reverence to that holy name to which they were devoted; or which the priests themselves sanctified, by offering them to him; for Jarchi says, this takes in the holiness of the priests themselves; but the former seems best, and is confirmed in (Leviticus 22:3):

*I am the Lord*; who is holy himself, and whose holy things these are, and will be sanctified by those that draw nigh unto him.

Ver. 3. *Say unto them, whosoever he be of all your seed among your generations,* etc.] Whether male or female, in all succeeding ages, as long as the ceremonial law lasted; for females as well as males of the families of the priests ate of the holy things, provided they had no uncleanness on them, but if they had, they might not:

*that goeth unto the holy things, which the children of Israel hallow unto the Lord:* that approaches to any of the sacrifices which the children of Israel have devoted to the Lord, either to offer them, or even to touch them, and particularly to eat of them; and so Jarchi and Ben Gersom observe, that this going or drawing near is no other than eating; for touching only, a man was not guilty of cutting off:

*having his uncleanness upon him;* through a leprosy, or running issue, or touching any unclean person or thing, as the following words explain it:

*that soul shall be cut off from my presence;* excluded from the sanctuary, and the service of it, where the presence of God was; or be removed out of the world by death, either by the civil magistrate, or by the hand of God, by an immediate death, by the pestilence, as the Targum of Jonathan:

*I am the Lord;* that will avenge the breach of such a law, able to inflict such punishment, and faithful to accomplish every word of his, whether in a way of threatening or promise.

Ver. 4. *What man soever of the seed of Aaron is a leper,* etc.] A young, or an old man, as the Targum of Jonathan, and indeed man or woman; for the wives and daughters of the priests, if in this, and other circumstances following, might not eat of the holy things until cleansed, who otherwise might, (see Leviticus 13:2, Numbers 18:13);

*or hath a running issue;* a gonorrhoea, whether man or woman, (Leviticus 15:2,25);
he shall not eat of the holy things until he be clean; he might eat of the
tithes, but not of the wave breast, or heave shoulder:

and whoso toucheth any [that is] unclean [by] the dead; not only that
touched the dead, which made unclean, but that touched any person or
thing that was made unclean by it:

or a man whose seed goeth from him; involuntarily when asleep, in a
dream, and through a lustful imagination; (see <031516>
Leviticus 15:16).

Ver. 5. Or whosoever toucheth any creeping thing, whereby he may be
made unclean, etc.] Jarchi thinks this respects the measure or quantity of
what is touched, as if but the quantity of a lentil or small pea, (see
<031131>Leviticus 11:31-38);

or a man of whom he may take uncleanness, whatsoever uncleanness he
hath; as of a leper, a profluvious, or a dead man; Jarchi interprets it of the
latter, and of the quantity which defiles, which is that of an olive; who also
observes, that the phrase, “whatsoever uncleanness”, includes touching a
profluvious man or woman, a menstruous woman, and a new mother.

Ver. 6. The soul which hath touched any such shall be unclean until even,
etc.] Which is the time fixed by the several laws for such uncleannesses,
(see <031131>Leviticus 11:31 15:5,7,16);

and shall not eat of the holy things, unless he wash his flesh with water; in
forty seahs of water, as the Targum of Jonathan; yea, when the evening is
come, he may not eat of the heave or wave offerings, until he has dipped
himself all over in water; nor should any eat of the Lord’s supper under the
New Testament, but such as are first baptized in water.

Ver. 7. And when the sun is down he shall be clean, etc.] Having washed
himself in water, otherwise not, though the sun may be set:

and shall afterwards eat of the holy things; the families of the priests lived
upon:

because it [is] his food: his common food, his ordinary diet, that by which
he subsists, having nothing else to live upon; this being the ordination of
God, that he which ministered about holy things should live on them; and
these being his only substance, in compassion to him they were detained
from him no longer than the evening; and this was done, to make him
careful how he defiled himself, since thereby he was debarred of his ordinary meals.

Ver. 8. *That which dieth of itself, or is torn [with beasts],* etc.] Whether fowls or beasts, and even clean ones, which, had they been killed in a proper manner, were fit to cut, but dying of themselves, or torn to pieces by other birds or beasts of prey, might not, (see Ezekiel 44:31);

*he shall not eat, to defile himself therewith,* being impure food, at least in a ceremonial sense, and not fit to be eaten; these things were forbid a common Israelite, and much less might a priest eat of them, (see Leviticus 17:15);

*I [am] the Lord;* who enjoin this, and expect to be obeyed.

Ver. 9. *They shall therefore keep mine ordinance,* etc.] The observance of my word, as the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, of his word of command; either respecting the not eating of such creatures that died of themselves, or were torn by beasts; or else the not eating holy things in uncleanness, so Jarchi and Gersom; but Aben Ezra thinks the sanctuary is referred to, which was to be kept by the priests, and which seems to agree with what follows:

*llest they bear sin for it:* the sanctuary, by neglecting it, and so be charged with the guilt of sin, and be obliged to bear the punishment of it:

*and die therefore if they profane it;* by going into it in their uncleanness, and eating of the most holy things there when in such circumstances, and die by the hand of God, as Jarchi and Ben Gersom interpret it, as Nadab and Abihu did, and even in like manner, by fire, (Leviticus 10:1,2); and so the Targum of Jonathan,

“lest they die by flaming fire:”

*I the Lord do sanctify them;* the priests, who were separated from others, and devoted to his service, and therefore ought to be holy; or the holy things separated for the use of the priests, but not to be eaten in their uncleanness; the Arabic version renders it, “do sanctify that”, the sanctuary, and therefore it should not be profaned, but be kept pure and holy.

Ver. 10. *There shall no stranger eat [of] the holy thing,* etc.] Any one of the holy things, as the heave shoulder, wave breast, etc. by a “stranger” is
not meant one of another nation; though indeed all such were called
strangers, and might not eat of these things, (\textit{Ephesians 2:12}); but one
that was not of the family of a priest, though he might be an Israelite, and
even a Levite; anyone that was not of the seed of Aaron, as Aben Ezra; any
common man or laic, as the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, excepting
those after mentioned:

\begin{quote}
\textit{a sojourner of the priests, or an hired servant, shall not eat \textbf{of} the holy
thing}: by the former is not intended an Heathen, a proselyte of the gate,
one that has renounced idolatry, and so permitted to live among the
Israelites, of it uncircumcised, who is often understood by one that
sojourneth in the gate, but here an Israelitish sojourner; and so the Targum
of Jonathan expressly has it,

\begin{quote}
\textquote{“a son of an Israelite, who is a sojourner of the priests;”}
\end{quote}
\end{quote}

not that is a guest for a short time, or a boarder with him; for if he may not
eat of the holy things, what must he live on while with him? but one that
dwells in some part of his house: and by the latter is meant anyone that is
hired by the day, or week, or year, and when the time is expired is at his
liberty; though the Jewish writers commonly, and particularly Jarchi,
interpret the sojourner of the servant that has his ear bored, and is bought
with money, until the year of jubilee, and serves for ever; and the hireling
of one that is purchased for years, and goes out in the sixth year; but the
above objection will lie against these.

\textbf{Ver. 11.} \textit{But if the priest buy \textbf{[any]} soul with his money, he shall eat of it},
\textit{etc.}] Whether any of his own nation, who sometimes, when become poor,
were obliged to sell themselves; or a stranger, as the Targum of Jonathan;
one of another nation, a Canaanitish servant, as Jarchi. Now these being his
own purchase, and always to abide with him, became part of his family, and
so might eat of the provisions of it; and it is from hence the Jews gather, as
Jarchi and Gersom, that his wife might eat of the holy things, because
bought with his money; but there is a better reason to be given for that, for
of whatever family she was before, whether of the priests or not, by
marriage she became a part, yea, a principal of his family, being one flesh
with him, bearing the same name, and entitled to all the privileges of his
house. This is extended by some Jewish writers\textsuperscript{1777} to cattle, for by any soul
they understood also the soul of a beast, which being bought by the priest’s
money, might eat of the offerings of the tithes:
and he that is born in his house; they shall eat of his meat; whether male or female, as Aben Ezra; these are children of handmaids, as Jarchi, that were bought with his money; and these children being born of them, became his property, and part of his family, and so had a right to the provisions of his house. All this may teach us, that the holy ordinances of the Gospel are not to be administered to strangers, persons destitute of the grace of God, nor to such as are not of the family or church of God, but to such as are bought and redeemed with the blood of Christ, the high priest, and are born again of his Spirit and grace.

Ver. 12. If the priest’s daughter also be [married] to a stranger, etc.] Not to an Heathen, but to any Israelite, that is, a common man, or a layman, as the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, one that is not a priest; but is married either to a Levite, or an Israelite, as Jarchi:

she may not eat of an offering of the holy things; the heave shoulder or wave breast, etc. being removed into another family by marriage, she is not reckoned of her father’s family, and so had no more a right to eat of the holy things.

Ver. 13. But if the priest’s daughter be a widow or divorced, etc.] If her husband be dead, or if living, and she is put away by him, whether a Levite, or an Israelite:

and have no child: by him, as the Targum of Jonathan and Jarchi add, nor is with child by him:

and is returned to her father’s house, as in her youth, she shall eat of her father’s meat; not of all, or any part, only of some, of the heave offering, but not of the shoulder or breast, which is the tradition of the wise men, as Maimonides relates. There are two cases in this affair excepted by them, which they suppose are implied in this clause; the one is, if she is detained and reserved for her husband’s brother, according to the law in Deuteronomy 25:5; she being without children; and so the Targum of Jonathan adds,

“and is not kept or reserved for her husband’s brother,”

which is implied by her being returned to her father’s house; and the other is, if she is with child; for though she had no children by her husband, yet if she is pregnant, that made her unlawful to eat of the holy things; for then she is not as in her youth. The Jewish canon concerning such a person
runs thus; the daughter of a priest, married to an Israelite, may not eat of the heave offering; if he dies, and she has a son by him, she may not eat of the heave offering; if she is married to a Levite, she may eat of the tithes: if he dies, and she has a son by him, she may eat of the tithes: if she is married to a priest, she may eat of the heave offering; if he dies, and she has a son by him, she may eat of the heave offering; if her son by the priest dies, she may not eat of the heave offering; if her son by the Levite dies, she may not eat of the tithes; if her son by an Israelite, she may return to her father’s house, as it is said (Leviticus 22:13);

but there shall no stranger eat thereof; as not anyone of another nation, so not anyone of another family beside the priest’s, no, not the son of a priest’s daughter by an Israelite, which some think is principally intended; and so Aben Ezra remarks this is said of a son, if she had any, and upon whose account she herself might not eat.

Ver. 14. And if a man eat [of] the holy thing unwittingly, etc.] Either not knowing that it is an holy thing, or the heave offering, or any thing of that kind; or else is ignorant of the punishment of such an action, as Gersom observes; and this is to be understood of any man that was not a priest, or was not of the priest’s family, even any common Israelite; so the Targum of Jonathan, a man of Israel, or an Israelite, one of the common people:

then he shall put a fifth part thereof unto it; a fifth part of the value of what he has eaten, to an equivalent for the whole, that is, he shall pay the full value for what he has eaten, and a fifth part besides:

and shall give [it] to the priest with the holy thing; the meaning is, that he shall give the fifth part to the priest, with the equivalent for what he has eaten; for he could not give the holy thing itself, but a compensation for it; according to Gersom, he was to give the principal to the priest, whose the holy thing was he ate of, and the fifth part he might give to what priest he would. The Jewish canon, concerning this matter, runs thus; he that ignorantly eats the heave offering pays the principal, and the fifth part; and the same, either he that eats, or drinks, or anoints; and whether the heave offering be clean or unclean, he pays the fifth, and the fifth of the fifth; and he does not pay the heave offering but of common things, rightly ordered, and they become an heave offering, and the compensation of it; and if the priest would forgive, he may not.
Ver. 15. And they shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel, which they offer unto the Lord.] By causing or suffering strangers to eat of them; so Jarchi, referring the words to the priests, who should be careful that strangers ate not of sacred things; or by the strangers themselves eating them, whereby they were profaned and used as common things.

Ver. 16. Or suffer them to bear the iniquity of trespass, etc.] The punishment of sin: either the strangers, when they eat their holy things; the holy things belonging to the priests, which they permitting them to do, suffer them to be liable to the punishment incurred thereby, or else the priests themselves; so the Septuagint version renders the word “themselves”; and in like manner Jarchi interprets it; and then the sense may be, according to the Targums of Jonathan and Onkelos, that the priests shall bear the punishment of their sins,

“when they shall eat the holy things in uncleanness,”

which is what is forbidden them in the former part of the chapter; but this seems to be too remote; rather the former sense is best:

for I the Lord do sanctify them; both the priests, to whom the holy things belong, and the holy things for their use, and the use of their families, and them only.

Ver. 17. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] At the same time; for having said many things concerning the holiness of priests, whose business it was to offer sacrifices, he adds various things concerning the nature, condition, and circumstances of the sacrifices they were to offer:

saying, as follows.

Ver. 18. Speak unto Aaron, and to his sons, etc.] The priests, whose work it was to offer sacrifices, and therefore it behoved them to know what kind and sort were to be offered by them, when brought to them:

and unto all the children of Israel: who were to bring the sacrifices, and for whom they were to be offered, and therefore should be acquainted with the nature and kind of what would be acceptable to God, and what not:
and say unto them, whatsoever [he be] of the house of Israel; this phrase includes women and servants, and even Gentiles, as say the Jewish writers, who may vow vows, and make voluntary gifts, as well as the Israelites:

or of the strangers in Israel: those of other nations that dwelt there, either proselytes of the gate, or proselytes of righteousness, so Ben Gersom; and Aben Ezra observes, that the text speaks of the stranger, because there is some reason in the vows and freewill offerings of an Israelite and stranger, as follows:

that will offer his oblation for all his vows, and for all his freewill offerings, which they will offer unto the Lord for a burnt offering; the wise men, as Aben Ezra observes, distinguish between a vow and a freewill offering; every vow is a freewill offering, but every freewill offering is not a vow; and though these were both of them sorts of peace offerings, yet they were not received from Gentiles under that notion, but as burnt offerings, because they were offered in devotion to God, and not to be eaten by Israelites; so Maimonides says, they do not receive from Gentiles but burnt offerings only, as it is said (Leviticus 22:25), “neither from a stranger’s hand”, etc. even burnt offerings of fowls they receive from a Gentile, though he be an idolater; but they do not receive of them peace offerings, nor meat offerings, nor sin offerings, nor trespass offerings; and so burnt offerings, which do not come by way of a vow, or a freewill offering, they do not receive from Gentiles, as the burnt offering of a new mother and the like unto it; a Gentile that brings peace offerings, they offer them as burnt offerings, because the heart of the Gentile is towards heaven.

Ver. 19. Ye shall offer at your own will, etc.] For vows and freewill offerings were at their own option, and depended on their own will and pleasure, and when offered should be with a willing mind, and from their whole heart: or “for good will to you”; as the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan; or for gracious, acceptation, that is, that they might be well pleasing to God, and acceptable in his sight, so Jarchi; in order to which the following direction was strictly to be observed:

a male without blemish, of the beeves, of the sheep, and of the goats; bullocks, sheep, and goats, were the only sorts of beasts, out of which sacrifices were taken, and those that were for burnt offerings were always to be males, and unblemished, (see Leviticus 1:3,10); but for other offerings, as peace offerings and sin offerings, females might be used, (see Leviticus 3:1 4:32). Fowls are not mentioned, though burnt offerings
were of them, because it was not required in them, only of beasts, that they should be males, and without blemish; for, as Jarchi observes, these were not rejected on account of a blemish, only for want of a member.

Ver. 20. *For whatsoever hath a blemish, that shall ye not offer*, etc.] Which is the general rule, the particulars of which are after given, and which has been imitated by the Heathens. The Egyptians, as they only sacrificed the males of beeves, so they were very curious in examining them, that they might be entirely pure and perfect⁷⁸⁴; and it was a custom among the Romans, that such sheep should be chosen for sacrifice, in which there was nothing wanting⁷⁸⁵; and so, among the Grecians, Homer speaks of perfect goats offered in sacrifice to appease the gods:

*for it shall not be acceptable for you*; be grateful to God, and accepted by him on their account, if blemished; (see Malachi 1:13,14).

Ver. 21. *And whosoever offereth a sacrifice of peace offering unto the Lord*, etc.] This, as Ben Gersom observes, is distinguished from a burnt offering; for though it was to be perfect, and without blemish, yet not obliged to be a male as that, (Leviticus 3:1). This was either by way of thanksgiving for mercies received, (Leviticus 7:12), or

*to accomplish [his] vow*; made in any distress, that if God would deliver him, then he would offer such a sacrifice:

*or a freewill offering*; either on account of favours received, or in order to obtain them: which sacrifice, whether

*in beeves or sheep*; whether in bullocks or sheep, under which are comprehended goats, both being of the flock, (Leviticus 22:19);

*it shall be perfect to be accepted*; perfect in all its parts, not only in those that are without and obvious to view, but in those that are within: wherefore the Jewish writers say⁷⁸⁷, if it had but one kidney, or the spleen was consumed, it was unfit for the altar; wherefore, in order to be an acceptable sacrifice to God, it was to be complete in all respects:

*there shall be no blemish therein*; which is repeated for the confirmation of it, and that it might be observed. Such sacrifices were typical of Christ, the immaculate Lamb of God, who offered himself without spot to him, (1 Peter 1:19 Hebrews 9:14); and shows that no sacrifice of man’s can be
so acceptable to God as to atone for him, since none of theirs are perfect, and without blemish.

Ver. 22. **Blind, or broken, or maimed**, etc.] Which is “blind” of one eye, or both: and so the Egyptians, as they would not sacrifice any of their oxen that had any blemishes on them, and were of a different colour, or changed in their form, so likewise such that were deprived of either of their eyes. Some, as Aben Ezra observes, restrain that which is “broken” to its being broken in the head; but others interpret it of any fracture of the foot, as well as the head, and even of the tail, side, or rib; though others think, that such fractures as were not open and visible are excepted, as that of the rib; so Gersom; and with the Heathens, as Pliny would have remarked, as they were not used to sacrifice calves, brought on men’s shoulders, so neither anything that halted: that which is maimed some understand of that whose foot is broken, as Aben Ezra also remarks; but the word is by the Septuagint rendered, “cut in the tongue”; and the Targum of Jonathan, “whose eyebrows are smitten”; and Jarchi seems to take in both, interpreting it the eyebrow which is cut or broken, and so the lip, which is cut or broken: but it is rather to be understood more generally of its being maimed or mutilated in any part of it; so with the Heathens, as Porphyry affirms, beasts that were mutilated were not to be sacrificed; and in the Comedian, a sacrifice is objected to, because it had no tail; upon which the Scholiast observes, that whatever was mutilated was not offered in sacred services, nor was any thing imperfect or unsound sacrificed to the gods; and particularly Servius remarks, if their tongues were cut or slit; which illustrates the Septuagint version, which is observed by Grotius:

**or having a wen**: or full of warts, as others; the Targum of Jonathan is, whose eyes are smitten with a mixture of white and black; and so Gersom interprets it of a like defect in the eye, in the white of the eye; for he says, if it was in the black or pupil of the eye, the eye would be blind:

**or scurvy or scabbed**: the same of those in men; (see Gill on Leviticus 21:20”):

**ye shall not offer these unto the Lord**: any creatures defective in any of these instances; three times this is said, as Jarchi observes, to make them careful concerning the sanctification of them, and concerning the slaying of them, and concerning the sprinkling of their blood:
nor make an offering by fire of them upon the altar unto the Lord; a burnt offering on the altar of burnt offering, or burn the fat of them upon it.

Ver. 23. Either a bullock, or a lamb that hath anything superfluous, or lacking in its parts, etc. That has either more members than it should have, as five feet, or two grieles in an ear, as Gersom says, or has fewer than it should have; or, as Jarchi, that has one member longer or shorter than another, as the leg or thigh; according to the Targum of Jonathan, that is redundant in its testicles, or deficient therein; the Septuagint version is, that hath its ear or its tail cut; and so the Vulgate Latin version:

that mayest thou offer [for] a freewill offering: for the repair of the sanctuary or temple, as Jarchi and Gersom; money, or the value of the sacrifices, might be given to the priests for that use, but according to them might not be offered upon the altar: but it rather seems to be an exception to the above law, and allows of the sacrifice of them for freewill offering, though not for a vow, as it follows

but for a vow it shall not be accepted; because the other was according to a man’s will and pleasure, and he might bring what he would on that account; but when he made a vow that he would offer such a sacrifice, it must be of creatures that were perfect, and without blemish.

Ver. 24. Ye shall not offer unto the Lord that which bruised, or crushed, or broken, or cut, etc. The Targum of Jonathan is, whose testicles are pressed and bruised, and whose nerves are corrupted and bruised, and so most Jewish writers interpret it:

neither shall you make [any offering thereof] in your land; any offering of any sort, either burnt offering or peace offering, or any other; or ye shall not do, that is, any such thing as here suggested, not bruise, or crush, or break, or cut the testicles of any creature; so the above writers.

Ver. 25. Neither from a stranger’s hand shall ye offer the bread of your God of any of these, etc. That is, from a Gentile, a proselyte of the gate, who had renounced idolatry, and was willing to offer sacrifice to the true God; but what had such defects and blemishes in them as before described the priest might not take of his hands, and offer on the altar of God; and this is the rather observed, because on the one hand the Gentile might think such sacrifices would be acceptable, since he might have been used to offer such to idols; and on the other hand, the priest might think such would do well enough for Gentiles, though not for Israelites:
because their corruption [is] in them; or they are corrupt through being bruised, crushed, broken, or cut:

[and] blemishes [be] in them; which seems to be added to explain the former, and may have respect to all the blemishes before named, and whatsoever is included in them; for though there are but here mentioned, the Jews reckon no less than fifty 1793:

they shall not be accepted for you; to make atonement for you; Jarchi says, or “from you”, the priests; they shall not be accepted of the Lord from their hands, and so be of no avail to the offerers, nor to those for whom they are offered.

Ver. 26. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] At the same time, as before, in a continued discourse, the subject being of the same kind, relating to sacrifices:

saying, as follows.

Ver. 27. When a bullock, or a sheep, or a goat, is brought forth, etc.] Those three are only mentioned, because they were only made use of in sacrifice, to which this law refers:

then it shall be seven days under the dam; whether a calf, or a lamb, or a kid of the goats; it was not to be taken from its dam and killed, either for food or sacrifice, before it was seven days old: Fagius says, the Hebrews give two reasons why a creature might not be offered before the eighth day; one is, that a sabbath might pass over it, nothing being perfect and consistent without it, that giving, as they say 1794 perfection and consistence to all the things of the world; and the other, as the heavens and the earth being perfected in seven days, a creature which lives so long seems to be, as it were, perfect; but he observes, if we inquire after the mystical sense of it, a better reason is to be given, namely, that Christ, the type of all the sacrifices, was not to be offered, or suffer death in his infancy, which Herod contrived, but at man’s estate; and to show that no man is fit to be a propitiatory sacrifice, through weakness and inability, being unable to stand before the justice of God, only Christ, in whom is perfection of strength:

and from the eighth day and thenceforth it shall be accepted for an offering made by fire unto the Lord; become an acceptable burnt offering to God; so Pliny 1795 says, that the young of sheep are fit for sacrifice on the eighth day, and of an ox on the thirtieth day; (see 1796 Exodus 22:30).
Ver. 28. And [whether it be] cow or ewe, etc.] Or “an ox or sheep”[^796], for this law, as Aben Ezra says, respects both male and female, and neither the one nor the other with their young might be slain; though Jarchi says, the custom is concerning the female, for it is forbidden to slay the dam and its son, or daughter; but it is not the custom concerning males, wherefore it is lawful to slay the father and the son:

*ye shall not kill it and her young both in one day*; or, “it and its son”[^797], the young, whether of a cow or ewe, and whether it be male or female; though Gersom observes, that this law takes place only in the dam and its female young, and not in the father and the son; for it is not manifest, in many animals, who is their father, wherefore he is not guilty of stripes, if the father and his son are slain in one day, even though it is known it is its father: the reason of the law seems to be, to encourage mercy and pity, and to discourage cruelty: hence the Targum of Jonathan is,

“and my people, the children of Israel, as our Father is merciful in heaven, so be ye merciful on earth: a cow, or a sheep, etc.”

Ver. 29. And when ye will offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving unto the Lord, etc.] Which was a sort of peace offering, distinct from freewill offerings and vows before spoken of:

*offer [it] at your own will*; just what they pleased, whether a bullock, a sheep, or a goat, and whether a male or female; these were left to their own option, or for acceptation to you, as the Targum of Jonathan, and so Jarchi; that is, it was right in them, and they ought to be careful to offer it in such manner, that it might be acceptable to God, by observing the rules given concerning it, particularly what follows.

Ver. 30. On the same day it shall be eaten up, etc.] Which is the law concerning it; (see Gill on “<030715>Leviticus 7:15”):

*ye shall leave none of it till the morning*; of another day, as the Vulgate Latin version adds, and much less the fat of them, and the most holy things, as Ben Gersom observes, the one being to be burnt upon the altar, the other to be eaten by the priests

*I [am] the Lord*; who has made this law, and expect it will be observed.

Ver. 31. Therefore shall ye keep my commandments, and do them, etc.] Both priests and people, even all the commandments delivered at this time,
as well as all others; these they were to observe and take notice of, and keep them in memory, and put them in practice:

*I am the Lord*; (see Gill on “Leviticus 22:30”).

**Ver. 32.** *Neither shall ye profane my holy name,* etc.] By transgressing the laws of God, particularly by offering blemished sacrifices, or before the proper tithe; or by slaying the dam and its young on one day; for, as Aben Ezra observes, this is said to the sons of Aaron:

*bUT I WILL BE HALLOWED AMONG THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL;* by his priests among them, and by themselves, conforming to all the precepts, and particularly the last mentioned, which respects them, and their eating up the peace offerings the same day:

*I am the Lord which hallowed you*; had separated them from all other people, and had given them holy laws to walk by, through the observance of which they would be at least externally holy.

**Ver. 33.** *That brought you out of the land of Egypt, to be your God,* etc.] Whereby he showed himself to be their covenant God and Father, who had a kind and gracious regard unto them, and which laid them under obligation to fear, serve, and worship him as their God:

*I am the Lord;* that hath sovereign right unto them, and claim upon them, and therefore they ought to be subject to his will, and observe his laws ordinances.
CHAPTER 23

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 23

In this chapter an account is given of the several holy days, times, and seasons, appointed by God, under the general names of feasts and holy convocations; and first of the sabbath, (Leviticus 23:1-4); then of the passover and feast of unleavened bread, (Leviticus 23:5-8); to which is annexed the sheaf of the firstfruits, (Leviticus 23:9-14); after that of the feast of weeks or pentecost, (Leviticus 23:15-22); and of the feast of trumpets, (Leviticus 23:23-25); and of the day of atonement, (Leviticus 23:26-32); and of the feast of tabernacles, (Leviticus 23:33-44).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] Much about the same time as before; and having delivered to him various laws concerning the holiness of the people of Israel, who were to serve him, and of the holiness of the priests, that were to minister in holy things to him, and of the purity and perfections of their sacrifices, he here appoints various times and seasons, for the more special worship and service of him: saying; as follows.

Ver. 2. Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, etc.] Speak to them to gather together, and then say unto them what follows, they all being obliged to keep the feasts, and observe the solemnities hereafter directed to; though it may be the heads of the tribes and the elders of the people were summoned together, and the following things were delivered to them, and by them to the people:

[concerning] the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim [to be] holy convocations, [even] these [are] my feasts; appointed and ordered by God, and to be kept to the honour of his name; these are the general names for the particular holy times and seasons after appointed; they are in general called “feasts”, though one of them, the day of atonement, was, strictly speaking, a fast; yet being a cessation from all work, and opposed to working days, days of labour and business, it is comprehended in this general title: nor is it unusual with other nations to call a fast a feast; so
Aelianus relates of the Tarentines, that having been besieged by the Romans, and delivered from them, in memory of their sufferings appointed a feast which was called a fast: the word used has the signification of stated, fixed, appointed times and seasons, and of convening or meeting together at such times, and that for the performance of solemn worship and service, which is true of them all; for there are certain times of the week and month fixed for them, and when the people in bodies assembled together, and in a solemn manner worshipped the Lord; and these are called “convocations”, because the people were called together at those times by the priests, and that with the sound of a trumpet, (Numbers 10:2,3,8-10); and “holy”, because separated from other days, and set apart for holy services: the words may be rendered, as they are by many: “the solemnities of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim holy convocations, these are my solemnities”; times for holy, religious, and solemn service, of his appointment and for his glory: Aben Ezra seems to understand all this of the sabbath only, which is next mentioned, expressed in the plural number, because, as he observes, there are many sabbaths in a year; and indeed the general title of the rest of the feasts is afterwards given, (Leviticus 23:4).

Ver. 3. Six days shall work be done, etc.] Or may be done by men, any sort of lawful work and honest labour, for the sustenance of themselves and families:

but the seventh day [is] the sabbath of rest; from all bodily labour and work of any kind; typical of rest by Christ and in him:

an holy convocation; when the people were called to holy exercises, to pray and praise, and hear the word, and offer sacrifice:

ye shall do no work [therein]; not any at all, (see Exodus 31:15) (Exodus 35:2,3);

it [is] the sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings: other feasts were kept in the sanctuary, in the tabernacle or temple, or where they were; but this was not only observed there and in their synagogues, but in their private houses, or wherever they were, whether, travelling by sea or land; and so the Targum of Jonathan and Aben Ezra interpret it.

Ver. 4. These are the feasts of the Lord, [even] holy convocations, etc.] What follow besides the sabbath mentioned:
which ye shall proclaim in their seasons; the proper times of the year, the
day or days, and month in which they are to be observed; these were to be
proclaimed by the priests with the sound of trumpet, namely, what follow,
for they are put together, which had been before for the most part singly
delivered.

Ver. 5. In the fourteenth [day] of the first month, etc.] The month Nisan,
the same with Abib, the month in which the children of Israel came out of
Egypt, for which reason it was made the first month in the year, answering
to part of our March and part of April; and for the same reason was the
passover kept at this time, as follows:

at even [is] the Lord’s passover; that is, that was the time for the keeping
the passover, even “between the two evenings”, as it may be rendered;
from the sixth hour and onward, as Jarchi, trial is, after noon or twelve
o’clock the middle of the day, as Gersom, when the sun began to decline;
(see Gill on “Exodus 12:6”).

Ver. 6. And on the fifteenth day of the same month [is] the feast of
unleavened bread unto the Lord, etc.] Which was the day the children of
Israel went out of Egypt with their dough and leaven, having not time to
leaven it; in remembrance of which this feast was appointed:

seven days ye must eat unleavened bread; (see Exodus 12:15,18-20).

Ver. 7. In the first day ye shall have an holy convocation, etc.] That is, on
the first of the seven days of the feast of unleavened bread, even the
fifteenth day of the month Nisan; this was separated from the other days of
the festival, and more particularly devoted to religions exercises, (see
Exodus 12:16);

ye shall do no servile work therein; such as agriculture, or any manufacture
or mechanical business, which they and their servants were at other times
employed in; but they might bake bread, and boil or roast their meat, and
walk abroad, which they might not do on their sabbaths; and therefore it is
so expressed as to distinguish it from the work forbidden on that day.

Ver. 8. But ye shall offer an offering made by, fire unto the Lord seven
days, etc.] A burnt offering was to be offered unto the Lord on everyone of
the seven days, which were two young bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs;
besides a meat offering, and a goat for a sin offering, (Numbers 28:19-
24);
in the seventh day [is] an holy convocation, ye shall do no servile work [therein]; as on the first day, that was on account of the Israelites going out of Egypt; and this is said, on account of Pharaoh and his host being drowned on it; (see Gill on “Exodus 12:16”).

Ver. 9. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] At the same time, for what follow are the other feasts and holy convocations before spoken of:

saying; as follows.

Ver. 10. Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, etc.] What is next observed, it being incumbent on them to do what is enjoined:

when ye be come into the land which I give unto you: the land of Canaan, which God had given by promise to their fathers and to them, and which they were now going to inherit: as yet they were in a wilderness, where there were no sowing nor reaping, nor any harvest; so that the following law, though now given, could not take place till they came into the land of Canaan:

and shall reap the harvest thereof; the barley harvest, which was about this time, the month Nisan, and which had the name Abib, from the barley being then in the ear, (see Exodus 9:31); for the wheat harvest was not till seven weeks after:

then ye shall bring a sheaf of the firstfruits of your harvest unto the priest; to with it as after directed: this is called an omer in the text, which was the tenth part of an ephah, (Exodus 16:36); and so Jarchi interprets it here; according to the Jewish writers, when the sheaf was reaped, the corn was beat out and winnowed, and dried by the fire, and then ground in a mill, and an omer, or a tenth part of an ephah of the flour of it was taken, and oil and frankincense put upon it, an handful of which being put upon the altar, the rest was the priest’s; and with this pretty much agrees the account Josephus gives, who says, on the second day of unleavened bread, which is the sixteenth (day of Nisan), of the fruits they have reaped they take a part; for they do not touch them before, accounting it just to honour God first, from whom they receive the plenty of these things; and bring the firstfruits of the barley after this manner, having dried the handful of ears, and bruised them, and cleansed them from the bran, they bring to the altar a tenth part to God, and casting one handful of it on the altar, they leave the rest for the use of the priests; and from thence forward it is lawful to reap publicly and privately: this has been in some part imitated by the
Heathens: the Egyptians, who ascribe the invention of the fruits of the earth, particularly wheat and barley, to Isis and Osiris, in memory of it, and as a testimony of their gratitude for it, at the time of harvest, bring an handful of the first ears of corn, and beating themselves near them, call upon Isis; and in some cities, at the feast of Isis, vessels of wheat and barley were carried about in great pomp, as Diodorus Siculus \textsuperscript{f801} relates.

Ver. 11. And he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, etc.] Or the omer of barley; this was done by the priest in the tabernacle and temple, where was the presence of God, and that before the handful of it was put upon the altar; which agitation or waving was, as Gersom says, towards the cast; it was moved to and fro, backwards and forwards, upwards and downwards, to make an acknowledgment to the Lord of heaven and earth, that the fruits of the earth and the plentiful harvest were of him, and to give him the praise and glory of it:

\textit{to be accepted for you}; of the Lord, as a thanksgiving to him, for the harvest now ripe, and the appointed time of it, and the plenty thereof; and that the remainder might be sanctified and blessed to them, and they have leave to gather it in, which they had not till this was done:

\textit{on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it}; not after the seventh day, but after the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, which was a sabbath, in which no servile work was to be done, (\textsuperscript{4239}Leviticus 23:7); and so the Targum of Jonathan calls it the day after the first good day of the passover, which was the sixteenth of Nisan, as Josephus expressly says, in the place above referred to; and so it is generally understood by Jewish writers \textsuperscript{f802} the account given of this affair is this; the messengers of the sanhedrim went out (from Jerusalem over the brook Kidron to the fields near it) on the evening of the feast, (i.e. at the going out of the fifteenth) and at the beginning of the sixteenth of Nisan, and bound the standing corn in bundles, that so it might be the more easily reaped; and all the neighbouring cities gathered together there, that it might be reaped in great pomp; and when it was dark, one said to them, is the sun set? they said, yes. With this sickle (shall I reap?) they said, yes. In this basket (shall I put it?) they said, yes. If on a sabbath day, he said to them, On this sabbath day (shall I do it?) they said, yes \textsuperscript{f803}. These questions were put and answered three times; then they reaped it and put it into the baskets, and brought it to the court, where they parched it before the fire, to fulfil the commandment of parched corn; then they put it in mills for
grinding beans, and took out of it a tenth part (of an ephah), which was sifted with eighteen sieves; then oil and frankincense were poured upon it, being mixed; and it was waved, and brought, and a handful taken and burnt, and the rest was eaten by the priests; and when they had offered the omer, they went out and found the streets of Jerusalem full of meal and parched corn, there being now full liberty to reap what they would: now this sheaf of the firstfruits was typical of Christ; it being of barley, may denote the mean estate of Christ in his humiliation; and but one sheaf for all the people, may signify that Christ is the one Mediator, Saviour, and Redeemer: yet as a sheaf comprehends many stalks and grains, so Christ has a complication of blessings in him; yea, he had all his people representatively in him, when he was offered for the whole body of his mystical Israel, all the children of God scattered abroad; the manner of reaping it, by persons deputed by the sanhedrim on the eve of a festival of the passover, in the sight of much people, without Jerusalem, near Kidron, exactly agrees with the apprehending of Christ in the night near Kidron, by persons sent from the Jewish sanhedrim, and his suffering publicly without the gates of Jerusalem; it being brought to the priests in the court, and threshed, winnowed, dried, and parched by the fire, and ground in mills, may denote the various dolorous sufferings of Christ, by means of the priests and elders of the people; and oil and frankincense being put on it, may denote the acceptableness of his sacrifice to God; and the waving of it, his resurrection from the dead, which was on the very day this sheaf was waved; who is the firstfruits of them that sleep in him, and which sanctifies the whole body of them, and ensures their resurrection unto eternal life; (see 1 Corinthians 15:20,23).

Ver. 12. And ye shall offer that day, when ye wave the sheaf, etc.] Besides the daily sacrifice of the morning and evening, and the additional offerings made on everyone of the seven days of the feast of unleavened bread:

*an he lamb without blemish of the first year, for a burnt offering unto the Lord;* typical of the perfect and immaculate Lamb of God, whose sufferings are fitly signified by a burnt offering; and which were endured at the time he became the firstfruits of his people, and sanctified them.

Ver. 13. And the meat offering thereof [shall be] two tenth deals of fine flour mingled with oil, etc.] The usual measure of flour to a meat offering was one tenth deal, (Exodus 29:40); but here it is doubled: some Jewish writers say one tenth was on account of the lamb that was offered at
this time, and the other as was suitable for a meat offering; but the true reason seems to be, because it was on account of the fruits of the earth and the plenty thereof; and therefore a double measure of fine flour mixed with oil was required as a token of gratitude; for thankfulness ought to be in proportion to mercies:

an offering made by fire unto the Lord for a sweet savour; an handful of it was burnt upon the altar, and was received with acceptance by the Lord, and the rest was eaten by the priests, (Leviticus 2:2,8 6:15,16);

and the drink offering thereof [shall be] of wine, the fourth [part] of an hin; which was the common quantity for a drink offering, (Exodus 29:40); for, as Jarchi observes, though the meat offering was doubled, the drink offering was not; the reason of which seems to be, because these offerings were on account of the harvest and not the vintage: the Targum of Jonathan calls it wine of grapes, to distinguish it from wine that might be made of other things, but not to be used in drink offerings, only the pure juice of the grape.

Ver. 14. And ye shall eat neither bread, nor parched corn, nor green ears, etc.] That is, they were not allowed to make bread of the new corn, as Aben Ezra and Gersom explain it; for they were obliged to eat unleavened bread at this time: but it might not be made of the new corn, until the above offering was made; nay, they were not allowed to parch any of the grains of corn, and eat them; yea, even they might not pluck and eat the green ears, though of ever so small a quantity. The Jews say, if it was the quantity of an olive of either of these, a man was to be beaten for it: until the selfsame day that ye have brought an offering unto your God; which includes all the offerings on this account, the offering of the firstfruits, the offering of the he lamb, and the meat offering and the drink offering; until these were offered up, the new corn might not be eaten in any form:

[i] it shall be [a statute for ever throughout your generations; until the Messiah came, who is the substance of these shadows:

in all your dwellings; not at Jerusalem only, but in the several parts of the land of Canaan; yea, as Ben Gersom says, whether in the land, or without the land; a later writer says, it is forbidden to eat of the new corn at this time, whether bread, parched corn, or green ears, until the beginning of the
night of the eighteenth of Nisan, and in the land of Israel, until the beginning of the night of the seventeenth of Nisan.\footnote{f807}

**Ver. 15.** *And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, etc.*] Not the seventh day sabbath in the passover week, nor the whole feast of unleavened bread, but the first day of it, which was an holy convocation, a sabbath in which no servile work was to be done, (Acts 2:1; Acts 2:1; Leviticus 23:7); and it was from the day after this, even the sixteenth of Nisan, that the following count was to be made; so the Targum of Jonathan, after the first feast day of the passover: and Josephus\footnote{f808} is very clear in it, that Pentecost, or the feast of weeks, was the fiftieth day from the sixteenth of Nisan, when the above offerings were made:

*from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering*; which plainly points out the express day from whence the count was to begin, even on the day when the sheaf of the firstfruits of the barley harvest was offered:

*seven sabbaths shall be complete;* or seven weeks, that is, forty nine days; and hence, Jarchi says, we learn that the count began from the evening, or otherwise the weeks would not be complete; and Gersom thinks the day in which the sheaf was offered is included in the days counted; for the count began from the day after the first of the passover, and lo, seven days are seven weeks of days, which make forty nine days.

**Ver. 16.** *Even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath, etc.*] Or weeks, forty nine days being counted, the following was the fiftieth day, or Pentecost:

*shall ye number fifty days;* from whence this feast had the name of Pentecost, (Acts 2:1); all in Israel were obliged to number those days, except women and servants\footnote{f809}; the manner of doing it was this\footnote{f810}; on the night of the second (day of the passover), after the evening prayer, they began to number; but if anyone forgot to number at the beginning of the night, he went and numbered all the night; for the commandment is for everyone to number by himself, and he ought to number standing, and to bless first, and number the days and weeks: How? on the first day he says, This is one day, until he comes to seven days, and then he says, This is the seventh day, which is one week; and on the eighth day he says, This is the eighth day, which is one week and one day, and so till he comes to the fourteenth; then he says, This is the fourteenth day, which make two weeks; and in this way he numbers, and goes on until the forty ninth day:
and ye shall offer a new meat offering unto the Lord; that is, of new corn, as the Targum of Jonathan and Jarchi explain it, and this was of wheat; for it was the offering for the wheat harvest, which was offered on the fiftieth day from the offering of the sheaf or omer of the barley harvest.

Ver. 17. And ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves of two tenth deals, etc.] Out of their habitations in the land of Canaan; and not out of those without the land, as Jarchi observes; and not out of all of them, as Ben Gersom remarks; though the Vulgate Latin version has it, out of “all” of our habitations, but wrongly; and indeed out of no one particular habitation, because it was at the public expense; but they were brought from some part of the country or another, even the quantity of two tenth parts of an ephah, or two omers of wheat flour made into two loaves, which were to be, and were waved before the Lord, and hence so called; and are the same with the new meat offering, or rather bread offering, made of the new corn, in the preceding verse, so Jarchi:

do not bring out of those without the land, as Jarchi observes; and not out of all of them, as Ben Gersom remarks; though the Vulgate Latin version has it, out of “all” of our habitations, but wrongly; and indeed out of no one particular habitation, because it was at the public expense; but they were brought from some part of the country or another, even the quantity of two tenth parts of an ephah, or two omers of wheat flour made into two loaves, which were to be, and were waved before the Lord, and hence so called; and are the same with the new meat offering, or rather bread offering, made of the new corn, in the preceding verse, so Jarchi:

they shall be of fine flour; of wheat flour, the finest of it, of which all meat or bread offerings were made; and this was particularly on account of the wheat harvest, and therefore it was proper that the finest of the wheat should be used on this occasion; (see Gill on “Leviticus 2:1”); each loaf or cake, according to Maimonides, was seven hands’ breadth long, four hands’ breadth broad, and four fingers high:

they shall be baked with leaven; the common meat offering was unleavened, part of which was burnt on the altar, where no leaven might be burnt, (Leviticus 2:4,5,11); and from hence it may be concluded that no part of these loaves was to be burnt, but the whole of them fell to the share of the priests:

they shall be of fine flour; of wheat flour, the finest of it, of which all meat or bread offerings were made; and this was particularly on account of the wheat harvest, and therefore it was proper that the finest of the wheat should be used on this occasion; (see Gill on “Leviticus 2:1”); each loaf or cake, according to Maimonides, was seven hands’ breadth long, four hands’ breadth broad, and four fingers high:

they shall be baked with leaven; the common meat offering was unleavened, part of which was burnt on the altar, where no leaven might be burnt, (Leviticus 2:4,5,11); and from hence it may be concluded that no part of these loaves was to be burnt, but the whole of them fell to the share of the priests:

[they are] the firstfruits unto the Lord; which he claimed as his, and gave unto his priests; and it was but right and just he should have them, as an acknowledgment of all coming from his hands, and as expressive of gratitude for them, and for the sanctification of the rest; hence this is called the feast of the firstfruits of wheat harvest, (Exodus 34:22).

Ver. 18. And ye shall offer with the bread seven lambs without blemish, of the first year, etc.] That is, with the two wave loaves, the meat or bread offering: and besides these,

and one young bullock, and two rams; in Numbers 28:27 it is two young bullocks, and one ram; and Aben Ezra suggests, that this was at the
will and option of the priest, whether one bullock and two rams, or two bullocks and one ram; but according to Maimonides, these sacrifices were distinct from them; they are sacrifices of the day, as being a feast day, and these belonged to the loaves; so that according to him, and so he expresses it, there were to be offered on this day, besides the daily sacrifices, three bullocks, three rams, and fourteen lambs, twenty beasts in all, for burnt offerings; and two goats for sin offerings to be eaten, and two lambs for peace offerings to be eaten; and with this account agrees Josephus, they sacrifice for burnt offerings, he says, three bullocks, and two rams, (or, as Dr. Bernard thinks, it should be read three rams,) and fourteen lambs, and two goats for sin offerings:

*they shall be for a burnt offering unto the Lord, with their meat offering, and their drink offering;* each of the said beasts were offered, unto the Lord on the altar of burnt offering, and burnt thereon; and to every beast they offered, there was a meat offering and a drink offering: the meat offering consisted of three tenth deals, or omers, of fine flour, to a bullock, two to a ram, and one to a lamb; and the drink offering was half an hin of wine to a bullock, the third part of one to a ram, and a fourth part to a lamb, as Jarchi observes, which appears from (Numbers 28:12-14);

*[even] an offering made by fire of a sweet savour unto the Lord;* an acceptable burnt offering to God.

**Ver. 19.** Then ye shall sacrifice one kid of the goats for a sin offering, etc.] Which was for the sin of the whole congregation, typical of Christ, whose soul was made an offering for sin; in virtue of which all other sacrifices become acceptable to God, and believers enjoy the fruits and blessings of divine grace:

*and two lambs of the first year for a sacrifice of peace offerings;* which Gersom says were the most holy things, and were only slain in the north, and only eaten by males, as the rest of the holy things, and are the only peace offerings of the congregation that were offered throughout the whole year.

**Ver. 20.** And the priests shall wave them with the bread of the firstfruits, etc.] The two loaves called the two wave loaves, (Leviticus 23:17); with which were waved the two lambs of the peace offerings; and these alive, as Jarchi and Ben Gersom intimate. The Jewish doctors dispute, whether, in waving, the lambs were put above the bread, or the bread
above the lambs; which some reconcile by observing, that the bread was put by the side of the lambs:

*for* a wave offering *before the Lord*; being waved this way and that way, upwards and downwards, and towards the several quarters of the world, showing that the fruits of the earth were owing to the providential goodness of God everywhere:

with the two lambs: not that all the above sacrifices were waved, or any part of them, along with the lambs, but the wave loaves, and they were waved together, as one wave offering to the Lord:

*they shall be holy to the Lord for the priests*: both the loaves and the lambs, these were separated and devoted wholly to the Lord, and to be eaten by his priests; the peace offerings of a single person were light holy things, as Jarchi says; but the peace offerings of the congregation, as these were, are the most holy things, and so to be eaten only by the priests, and by the males only, in the court of the tabernacle.

**Ver. 21.** *And ye shall proclaim on the selfsame day, [that] it may be an holy convocation unto you,* etc.] This proclamation was made by the priests with the sound of a trumpet, that the people might observe that this fiftieth day, or day of Pentecost, was devoted to sacred service, and that they were called to holy exercises in it:

*ye shall do no servile work [therein]:* what was not necessary for food, as Ben Gersom observes, but what was necessary on that account, as kindling a fire, etc. might be done, (see <Leviticus 23:7,8>); for this was to be kept in like manner as the first and seventh days of the feast of unleavened bread; the general design of which was to express thankfulness for the appointed weeks of the harvest, and to honour the Lord with the firstfruits of the increase of the earth: and the Jews say, as Ben Gersom observes, that this fiftieth day, being reckoned from the sixteenth of Nisan, fell upon the sixth of Sivan, on which day, they say, the law was given, which is another reason for the observance of it: and it is remarkable, that on this same day the Word of the Lord went out of Zion, and the law or doctrine of the Lord, even the everlasting Gospel, went out of Jerusalem, published by the apostles of Christ to the people of all nations, (<Acts 2:14-36>); when they were favoured with the firstfruits of the Spirit, after our Lord’s ascension to heaven, and receiving gifts for men, which he now in an extraordinary manner bestowed on his disciples, (<Acts 2:1-13>); and
which were the firstfruits of all others, after to be given forth in the course of time, and of the effusion of the Spirit in the latter day; and when there was a number of souls converted, as the firstfruits of after conversions among Jews and Gentiles, (Acts 2:41); and particularly of the conversion of the Jews in the latter day, and of the harvest of souls in the end of the world, (Matthew 13:30,39);

[it shall be] a statute for ever all your dwellings throughout your generations; so long as they dwelt in the land of Canaan, and had their harvest in it, even until the Messiah came, in whom all those types and figures had their accomplishment.

Ver. 22. And when ye reap the harvest of your land, etc.] This law is repeated from (Leviticus 19:9,10); and as Aben Ezra observes, the feast of weeks being the feast of the firstfruits of the wheat harvest, it is repeated, that they might not forget what God had commanded them to do at that time, namely, to leave somewhat for the poor; and the Jewish writers observe, that this law, being put among the solemn feasts of the passover, pentecost, and tabernacles, and the beginning of the year, and the day of atonement, teaches, that he that observes it, and leaves the corner of the field and the gleanings to the poor, it is as if he built the sanctuary, and offered his sacrifices in the midst of it; but a much better reason may be given for it, which was, to teach them that when they expressed their thankfulness to God, they should exercise charity and liberality to the poor;

thou shalt not make clean riddance of the corners of thy field when thou reapest, neither shalt thou gather any gleaning of thy harvest: (see Gill on Leviticus 19:9”);

thou shalt leave them unto the poor, and to the stranger: I [am] the Lord your God; (see Gill on Leviticus 19:10”).

Ver. 23. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] At the same time, in a continued discourse, concerning some other days, which were to be observed in a sacred manner:

saying; as follows.

Ver. 24. Speak unto the children of Israel, etc.] For all the people of Israel were concerned in the following precept, and obliged to observe it, even priests, Levites, Israelites, proselytes, and freed servants; though other servants, and women, and children, were not obliged to hear the sound of
the trumpets, and which were blown not in Jerusalem only, but in all cities and towns where the sanhedrim was; and it was the hearing of them the people were bound unto, and not less than nine distinct soundings were they obliged to hear; to which perhaps respect is had in (Psalm 89:15);

in the seventh month; the month Tisri, as the Targum of Jonathan, which was the seventh from the month Nisan or Abib; which was appointed the first month of the year, on account of the Israelites coming out of Egypt in it; otherwise, before, this month Tisri was the first, and so it still continued, for the fixing the years, and settling the sabbatical and jubilee years, and for the planting of trees and herbs:

in the first [day] of the month shall ye have a sabbath; not entirely as the weekly sabbath, in which no manner of work at all was to be done, but in which no servile work was to be done; and was observed in like manner as the first and seventh days of unleavened bread, and the day of pentecost;

a memorial of blowing of trumpets; which, according to the Jewish writers, was continued from sun rising to sun setting; but what this blowing of trumpets was a memorial of is not easy to say; some think it was in memory of the wars the people of Israel had with their enemies the Amalekites and Canaanites, and the victories they obtained over them, and particularly in remembrance of the walls of Jericho falling down at the sound of rams’ horns; but then it must be by anticipation: it is more commonly received with the Jews that it was on the account of the binding of Isaac on this day, being delivered through a ram being sacrificed in his stead; and on this account it is said, that the trumpets blown on this day were made of rams horns, and no other might be used; yea, that ram’s head was used to be eaten on this day, in remembrance of the ram of Isaac, and also to intimate that the Jews would be the head and not the tail: the Jews also say, that this day, every year, was a sort of day of judgment, in which God sat and judged men, and also determined all events of the following year; and this was attended with blowing of trumpets, to strike a terror into them, and put them in mind of the judgment of God, and to induce them to repent of their sins: and it may be observed, that the resurrection of the dead, in order to the last general judgment, will be attended with the voice of the archangel and the trumpet of God, (1 Corinthians 15:52 1 Thessalonians 4:16); whether this is so represented
in reference to this notion, let it be considered: but as this was New Year’s Day, as before observed, this ceremony seems to have been appointed to express joy for all the mercies and blessings of the last year; and the rather, at this time of the year all the fruits of the earth were gathered in, not only the barley and the wheat, but the oil and wine, and under such grateful acknowledgment, to expect the divine blessing to attend them the following year; and besides, at this time of the year, it was generally thought by the Jews, and by others, that the world was created, and this blowing of trumpets might be in memory of that, and as an emblem of the shoutings of the sons of God, the angels, the morning stars, who sang for joy when the foundations of the earth were laid, (Job 38:6,7); to which it may be added, this seventh month was very memorable for holy solemnities, as the day of atonement on the tenth, and the feast of tabernacles, which began on the fifteenth, and therefore was ushered in with blowing of trumpets to make it the more significant, and particularly to put the people in mind to prepare for the day of atonement near at hand; and so Gersom observes, that as the sound of a trumpet strikes men with fear, the design of this precept was, to fill the mind with fear, and to excite to repentance and brokenness of heart, and humiliation for sin, and to search their works and actions, and correct what was amiss, and so be ready for the day of atonement: hence Ainsworth thinks, that this was a figure of the ministry of John the Baptist preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins; but rather it seems to be an emblem of the Gospel, and the ministry of it, in the acceptable year of the Lord, or the Gospel dispensation, which is sometimes signified by the blowing of the great trumpet, and by the ministers of it lifting up their voice like a trumpet, (Isaiah 27:13 58:1); by which sinners are roused and awakened to a sense of their sin and danger, and to hear a joyful sound of love, grace, mercy, peace, pardon, righteousness, and salvation through Christ: the Jews say, this blowing of trumpets was to disturb Satan, when he came to accuse the Israelites; it is certain there is nothing gives him more disturbance than the pure and powerful preaching of the Gospel, which he endeavours to obstruct as much as possible, and there is nothing like what that brings to silence his accusations, (2 Corinthians 4:3,4 1 Thessalonians 2:18 Romans 8:33,34),

an holy convocation; on which the people were called together to holy exercises; and so the Jews observe it to this day; for after they return home from attendance to the blowing of the trumpets in their synagogues, they
sit down to meat, and spend the rest of the day in hearing sermons, and in other religious exercises...

**Ver. 25.** *Ye shall do no servile work [therein], etc.*] Only such as was necessary for dressing food, but not any manual work, such as servants were employed in on other days, as agriculture or any mechanic business:

*but ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord;* a burnt offering, and what that was may be seen in (Numbers 29:1-6).

**Ver. 26.** *And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.*] This phrase, which is a kind of preface to each precept, seems to be used to distinguish one from another, as the preceding one from the feast of Pentecost; and here, the day of atonement from that of the blowing of the trumpets; and afterwards, the feast of tabernacles from the day of atonement; the reason why it is not used before the feast of Pentecost seems to be, because, as Aben Ezra observes, that depended upon the wave sheaf, and was reckoned from it:

*saying;* as follows.

**Ver. 27.** *Also on the tenth [day] of this seventh month, etc.*] Tisri, the same as before, answering to part of our September, and part of October:

*there shall be* a day of atonement; for all the sins of the year past; (see Leviticus 16:29,30);

*it shall be an holy convocation unto you:* when they should be called together for the exercise of holy duties:

*and ye shall afflict your souls:* their souls, by repentance, contrition, and humiliation for sin, and their bodies by fasting; and, as the Targum of Jonathan paraphrases it,

“by abstaining from eating and drinking, and the advantage of bathing and wiping, and the use of the bed and sandals;”

hence called the fast, (Acts 27:9); (see Gill on “Leviticus 16:29”);

*and offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord;* a burnt offering, of which (see Numbers 29:8-11).

**Ver. 28.** *Ye shall do no work in that same day, etc.*] No more than on the weekly sabbath:
for it is a day of atonement, to make atonement for you before the Lord your God: (see Gill on “Leviticus 16:30”); Aben Ezra’s note is, “for you only,“ that is, for the Israelites, and not the Gentiles; but the atonement of Christ, the antitype of this, was not for the sins of the Jews only, but for the sins of the whole world, of all his people in it, (1 John 2:2).

Ver. 29. For whatsoever soul [it be] that shall not be afflicted in that same day, etc.] That is, as the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem explain it, which can fast and does not fast; for a sick person, and a child under nine years of age, were not obliged to fast on this day: he shall be cut off from among his people; by an untimely death, by the hand of God; the Targum of Jonathan says, by the pestilence.

Ver. 30. And whatsoever soul [it be] that doeth any work in that same day, etc.] Any sort of work whatever; for, as before observed, it was to be kept as strictly as the weekly sabbath: the same soul will I destroy from among his people; with the pestilence, as the above Targum; it seems to be but another phrase for cutting them off, and to signify the same thing.

Ver. 31. Ye shall do no manner of work, etc.] Which is repeated, that it might be observed, and to show how strictly God required this day should be kept, and how careful men should be of breaking the command in this respect, and how much he should resent it if they did: [it shall be] a statute for ever, throughout your generations, in all your dwellings; unto the coming of the Messiah, who, by the atoning sacrifice of himself, would answer to this law, and put an end to it.

Ver. 32. It [shall be] unto you a sabbath of rest, etc.] (See Gill on Leviticus 16:31”); and this is thought by some to be the sabbath spoken of in (Isaiah 58:13); and ye shall afflict your souls; in the ninth [day] of the month at even; the fast was to begin at the close of the ninth day, and to continue to the end of the tenth; so Maimonides: he begins to fast and afflict himself at the evening of the ninth next to the tenth; and so at the going out of it he
continues in his affliction a little while of the night of the eleventh, next to the tenth, which is confirmed by what follows:

_from even unto even shall ye celebrate your sabbath;_ which some understand of the sabbath in general; but it seems to have a particular respect to the sabbath of the day of atonement, which was to last from the evening of the ninth to the evening of the tenth day.

**Ver. 33. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.** Concerning the feast of tabernacles here repeated and enlarged upon:

_saying;_ as follows.

**Ver. 34. Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, etc.** Giving them directions about keeping a feast, in which the whole body of them had a very special and particular concern:

_the fifteenth day of this seventh month;_ the month Tisri or September:

_[shall be] the feast of tabernacles [for] seven days unto the Lord;_ the design of which was, partly to give thanks for the fruits of the earth, now all gathered in, (Leviticus 23:39); but chiefly to commemorate the dwelling of the children of Israel in tents and booths, during their forty years’ abode in the wilderness, (Leviticus 23:43); whereby their posterity in later times would be led to observe the difference between them and their forefathers, who lived in tents or booths, pitched sometimes in one place, and sometimes in another, in the open fields, in wastes, and deserts; whereas they dwelt in spacious cities, fortified towns, and magnificent houses; and were possessed of various kingdoms and nations, as was the land of Canaan: the reason, the Jews say, why this feast was kept at this time of the year and not at the season when they went out of Egypt and first dwelt in booths, as at Succoth which had its name from thence, (Exodus 12:37), was this; because then the summer season began when men commonly used to build tabernacles to shelter them from the heat of the sun, wherefore, if the feast had been kept at that time, it would not have been known that it was kept at the command of God, and in remembrance of the above circumstance; but the month Tisri or September being usually a cold and rainy season in those parts, men were wont to leave their tabernacles and go into their houses; and so it was a plain case that the feast was observed not for convenience or through custom, but that it was at the command of God they went out of their houses into tabernacles at this season of the year, in commemoration of the
miraculous benefit of dwelling in tents under the clouds of glory: and they also say, that for this reason it was ordered to begin on the fifteenth day, because it was on the fifteenth day of the month (though of another month) they went out of Egypt, and the clouds began to protect and accompany them; and this was enjoined them seven days, to teach them that the miraculous benefits of God are always and every day to be remembered: the Jews have a whole treatise in their Misnah, called “Succah”, the “booth” or “tabernacle”; in which they give an account of the form and fabric and measure of their tabernacles, and of their dwelling and dining in them; and of the branches they carry in their hands, and of the manner of carrying and shaking them; and of the pouring out of water at this time, and of their piping and singing and other rites and ceremonies attending this feast; (see Gill on “John 7:2”); besides, the uses of this feast before mentioned, it was typical of spiritual and evangelical things, and especially of the incarnation of Christ, whose human nature is the true tabernacle, in distinction from those typical ones, and in which he is expressly said to “tabernacle” among us, (John 1:14); and it is highly probable that his incarnation or birth was at the time of this feast; at which time the temple of Solomon, a type of Christ’s body, was also dedicated; and this season of the year suits better than that in which it is usually placed; and his baptism and the time of his death show it; (see Luke 1:1,8 3:22); and as Christ, our passover, was sacrificed for us at the exact time of the passover, and the firstfruits of the Spirit were given on the very day of Pentecost, or feast of firstfruits; so it is most likely, that Christ was born, or first began to tabernacle in human nature at the feast of tabernacles, which we, in Gospel times, are to keep, by believing in the incarnate Saviour, and by attending to the Gospel ordinances he has appointed, to commemorate the benefits of his incarnation, sufferings, and death, (Zechariah 14:16,17); moreover, the dwelling of the children of Israel in booths in the wilderness, and so at this feast in commemoration of it, may be an emblem of the tabernacles of the saints in their present wilderness state: this world, through which they are passing, is like a wilderness to them; their bodies are called tabernacles, which are pitched for a while; and their state and condition here is that of sojourners, pilgrims, and travellers; yea, these tents and tabernacles may be figures of the several particular churches of Christ, in the present state of things, which are set up for a while for the convenience, comfort, refreshment, and joy of the spiritual Israel of God; (see Psalm 46:4 84:1).
Ver. 35. On the first day [shall be] an holy convocation, etc.] When they should be called together to holy exercises, to prayer, praising, and reading the law; and at this present time they observe this day, by rising early in the morning and going to the synagogue, where they sing and pray much; and everyone takes a bundle of branches of palm tree, olive, etc. in the right hand, and a pome citron in the left, and says, blessed be thou, O Lord our God, the Lord of the world, who has sanctified us by thy precepts, and hath commanded us to carry the palm tree bundle; then they shake it, and give a great shout, according to (Psalm 96:12); all which they frequently repeat on this day, as well as bring out the book of the law, attended with various ceremonies, and read some passages in it. ye shall do no servile work [therein]; as on the first and seventh days of unleavened bread, the day of Pentecost, and of the blowing of trumpets; but what was necessary for preparing and dressing food might be done.

Ver. 36. Seven days ye shall offer an offering made, by fire unto the Lord, etc.] A burnt offering; what this was, and how many were offered on each day, see at large in (Numbers 29:13-34);

on the eighth day shall be an holy convocation unto you; as on the first day; (see Gill on “Leviticus 23:35”):

and ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord; which was different from that on all the other days, being one bullock only, etc. (Numbers 29:35,36);

it [is] a solemn assembly; of all the people, when they were gathered together before the Lord. Some render the word used a “restraint” or “detention”, and interpret it of restraining or detaining them from servile work, as in the next clause; so Aben Ezra and Gersom; but this sense seems to make that clause unnecessary and is never used elsewhere where that is:

ye shall do no servile work [therein]; as on the first day; (see Gill on “Leviticus 23:35”).

Ver. 37. These [are] the feasts of the Lord, etc.] Besides the sabbath, as Gersom observes; even the passover, the seven days of unleavened bread the day of Pentecost, the day of blowing the trumpets, the day of atonement, and the seven days of the feast of tabernacles;
which ye shall proclaim [to be] holy convocations: as they had been directed, (Leviticus 23:2);

to offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord; which is explained by

a burnt offering, and a meat offering, which went along with it;

a sacrifice, which the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan call the sacrifice of holy things; according to Gersom it was the sacrifice of the peace offerings; but rather it seems to be the sacrifice of the sin offering, which was ordered along with the rest in all those feasts:

and drink offerings; which also accompanied the meat offerings:

everything upon his day; there being different sacrifices on one day than on another, everyone was to be offered peculiar to the day as was ordered; of which (see Numbers 28:29).

Ver. 38. Beside the sabbaths of the Lord, etc.] The seventh day sabbaths, which were of his appointing, and sacred to his service and worship; on which, when any of the feasts fell, it did not hinder the observance of them, or the offering of the several sacrifices on them; nor were those of the sabbath to be omitted on the account of them:

and beside your gifts; either of the whole congregation, or of a private person, which they thought well to give of their own good will on these festivals, over and above the sacrifices enjoined:

and beside all your vows, and beside all your freewill offerings, which ye give unto the Lord; which seem to explain what is meant before by gifts.

Ver. 39. Also in the fifteenth day of the seventh month, etc.] The month Tisri or September, the same month, and the same day of the month before observed; only another end and use of this feast is remarked, which was to give thanks for the fruits of the earth gathered in, as follows:

when ye have gathered in the fruit of the land; the barley, wheat, oil and wine, and all others, this being now autumn, when the several fruits were ripe and gathered: ye shall keep a feast unto the Lord seven days; not different from that before mentioned, but the same, one design of which is here suggested, to give thanks for the fruits of the earth gathered in, as follows:
another use of it is after mentioned, to commemorate the children of Israel dwelling in booths in the wilderness:

_on the first day [shall be] a sabbath, and on the eighth day [shall be] a sabbath;_ because on both there was a cessation from servile work, (Leviticus 23:35,36).

**Ver. 40. And ye shall take you the boughs of goodly trees**, etc.] Which the three Targums interpret, of citrons; and so Jarchi and Aben Ezra; and the Jews are so tenacious of observing this, that in those countries where this fruit grows not, they will send for it from Spain, where there is plenty of it: the Targum of Jonathan, paraphrases it, “ye shall take of yours”; suggesting these boughs must be their own, or the bundle of them, with others they call the “lulab”, must be their own property, and not another’s; though it is said, if it is a gift it will do, even though it is given on condition to be returned again:

*branches of palm trees:* which were very common in the land of Judea, and especially about Jericho; (see John 12:13); the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem call them “lulabs”, which is the name the Jews give to the whole bundle they carried in their hands on this day:

*and the boughs of thick trees:*; which the Targums and Jewish writers in general understand of myrtles, being full of branches and leaves:

*and willows of the brook:*; a sort of trees which delight to grow by brooks and rills of water: these, according to the Jewish writers, were not taken to make their booths of, though that seems to be the use of them, from (Nehemiah 8:15,16); but to tie up in bundles, and carry in hands; the citron in their left hand, and a bundle made of the other three sorts of boughs of trees in the right hand, which they called the “lulab”:

*and ye shall rejoice before the Lord your God seven days:*; because of the blessings of his goodness bestowed upon them in the plentiful harvest and vintage they had been favoured with, and in remembrance of past mercies, showed to their fathers in the wilderness, giving them food and drink, and guiding and protecting them with the pillar of cloud and fire; and at the same time, also, thankful for the different circumstances they were in, having cities, towns, and houses to dwell its, and fields and vineyards to possess, when their fathers lived in a wilderness for forty years together; and especially such of them expressed their joy before the Lord, who had any knowledge of this being a type of the Messiah tabernacling in human
nature, they had the promise of, to be their spiritual Redeemer and Saviour: these seven days are kept by the Jews now, chiefly in carnal mirth, and so for ages past, as by carrying the above boughs in their hands, and going round about the altar with them, and, shaking them, and crying Hosanna, and by making use of all sorts of music, vocal and instrumental, piping, dancing, leaping, skipping, and various gestures, even by persons of the highest rank, and of the greatest character for sobriety; and particularly by fetching water from Siloah, when in their own land, and pouring it with wine upon the altar, which was attended with such expressions of joy, that it is said, that he who never saw the rejoicing of drawing of water, never saw any rejoicing in his life: the Jews give this reason of the ceremony, because at this feast was the time of the rains, see Targum of Jonathan on (Leviticus 23:36); and therefore the holy blessed God said, pour water before me, that the rains of the year may be blessed unto you, but others have thought there was something more mysterious in it, and that it had respect to the pouring out of the Holy Ghost; for, they say, the place of drawing water was so called, because they drew the Holy Ghost, as it is said, “ye shall draw water with joy out of the wells of salvation”, (Isaiah 12:3); to this our Lord is thought to allude, (see Gill on “John 7:37-38”): some of the ceremonies used at this feast have been imitated by the Heathens: Strabo says, the carrying branches of trees, dances, and sacrifices, were common to the gods, and particularly to Bacchus; and there was such a likeness between these and the rites of Bacchus, that Plutarch thought the Jews at this time kept two feasts to the honour of him; whereas, as Bishop Patrick observes, the profane Bacchanalia of the Gentiles were only a corruption of this festival.

**Ver. 41. And ye shall keep it a feast unto the Lord seven days in the year, etc.] Every year it was to be kept for the space of seven days, beginning on the fifteenth and ending on the twenty second of the month Tisri or September;**

*[it shall be] a statute for ever in your generations;* until the Messiah should come and tabernacle among men, the substance of this shadow, on whose coming it was to flee away:

**ye shall celebrate it in the seventh month;** which is repeated for the confirmation of it, and that no mistake might be made.

**Ver. 42. Ye shall dwell in booths seven days, etc.] So that it seems they were not obliged to dwell in them on the eighth day, which was an holy
convocation, a sabbath in which no servile work was to be done as the first, (Leviticus 23:36,39). The eighth day was a day by itself, a sort of an appendage to the feast of tabernacles, when they went into their houses again, and kept it as an holy day; and perhaps principally in giving thanks for the ingathering of the fruits of the earth, to which this seems to be appropriated from (Leviticus 23:39). According to the Jewish writers, they did not go out of their booths until they had dined in them on this day; and as they went out used to say,

“may it be the will of God that we may be worthy the next year to dwell in the booth of Leviathan;”

that is, to feast with the Messiah in the world to come. And to those days the Jews have added a ninth, which they call “the joy of the law”, and which they keep for joy of having finished the reading of the law; which being divided into as many sections or lessons as weeks in the year, were so ordered to be read as to be finished at this time:

all that are Israelites born shall dwell in booths; the Targum of Jonathan is,

“all the males in Israel, and even the little ones, that do not need their mothers, sit in the shades blessing their Creator, when they enter there.”

And, according to the Misnah, women, servants, and little ones, are free from the booths (i.e. are not obliged to dwelt in one), but a little one, who hath no need of its mother, is obliged to dwell in the booths: and elsewhere it is said, that sick persons, and such as wait upon them, are not obliged, nor messengers upon any business, nor travellers and watchmen in cities, and keepers of gardens and orchards; if such travel, or keep watch in the day, they are obliged to be in them at night, and if in the night, then they are to dwell in them in the day.

Jarchi says, that everyone born in Israel comprehends proselytes, who were bound by this law.

Ver. 43. That your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, etc.] Which by the providence of God the Israelites were obliged to make for themselves to dwell in:

when I brought them out of the land of Egypt; for the very first place they came to, when they departed from thence, was called Succoth, from the booths they there built:
I [am] the Lord your God; who brought them out of Egypt, made them to dwell in booths in the wilderness, and enjoined them the observance of the feast of tabernacles in memory of it, in which he expected to be obeyed.

Ver. 44. And Moses declared unto the children of Israel the feasts of the Lord.] The several feasts before recited, the order of them, the manner of observing them, and the time.
CHAPTER 24

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 24

This chapter treats of the oil for the lamps, and the ordering of them, (Leviticus 24:1-4); of the making of the shewbread cakes, and the setting of them on the table, (Leviticus 24:5-9); and an Israelite having blasphemed the name of the Lord, and inquiry being made what should be done to him, he, and so any other person guilty of the same, is ordered to be stoned to death, (Leviticus 24:10-16); on occasion of which several laws are repeated concerning killing a man or a beast, or doing injury to any man, (Leviticus 24:17-23).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] After he had delivered to him the laws concerning the purity of the priests, and the perfection of the sacrifices they were to offer, and concerning the feasts the people were to keep, he spoke to Moses of some other things which concerned both people and priests:

saying; as follows.

Ver. 2. Command the children of Israel, etc.] Moses was the chief magistrate under God, and being clothed with authority from him, had power to command the children of Israel to do what the Lord required of them:

that they bring unto thee pure oil olive, beaten, for the light; this was to be at the public expense, and it belonged to the community to supply the priests with oil for the light of the candlestick in the temple, (Exodus 25:6); and this oil was not to be any sort of oil, as train oil, or oil of nuts, almonds, etc. but oil of olives, and not any sort of that, but the purest, which was the first that was taken from them; it seems there were three sorts, the first of which was pure, and this beaten in a mortar, and not ground in a mill; (see Gill on Exodus 27:20);

to cause the lamps to burn continually; the lamps in the golden candlestick, which were seven, (Exodus 25:37); or “the lamp”, in the singular number, as it is in the original text; the western lamp, which is said
to be always kept lighted, from which the rest were lighted when out; though the oil was undoubtedly for the supply of the lamps, that they might burn always, night and day; or from night tonight, as Jarchi; and both on sabbath days and working days, as the Targum of Jonathan.

Ver. 3. Without the vail of the testimony, etc.] That is, on the outside of the vail which divided between the holy and holy of holies, and which was before the ark in which the testimony or law was:

in the tabernacle of the congregation; which the apostle calls the first, namely, the holy place in which the candlestick, with its lamps, stood, (Hebrews 9:2);

shall Aaron order it from the evening unto the morning, before the Lord continually, that is, the lamp or lamps, or candlestick, in which they were, or the light of them; his business was, and so every priest’s that succeeded him, to supply the lamps with oil, to dress, him, and snuff them, that they might burn clear, and burn always, and that before the Lord, in the presence of the Lord:

[it shall be] a statute for ever in your generations; until the Messiah should come, the true light, which would put out all such typical ones, and by his Gospel spread light in all his churches throughout the world; (see Gill on “Exodus 27:20”) and (see Gill on “Exodus 27:21”).

Ver. 4. He shall order the lamps on the pure candlestick, etc.] So called, as Jarchi suggests, for these two reasons, partly because it was made of pure gold, and partly because it was to be kept pure and clean, and free from ashes, by the priest; (see Exodus 25:31);

before the Lord continually; which both respects the situation of the candlestick, and the work about it, which Aaron was to do continually before and in the presence of the Lord. Jarchi thinks this ordering respects the measure of oil for every night, which he says, according to the wise men, was half a log for every lamp, which was about a quarter of a pint of oil.

Ver. 5. And thou shalt take fine flour, etc.] Of wheat, and the finest of it: and bake twelve cakes thereof; answerable to the twelve tribes, as the Targum of Jonathan, which were typical of the spiritual Israel of God;
two tenth deals shall be in one cake; that is, two tenth parts of an ephah, which were two omers, one of which was as much as a man could eat in one day of the manna: so that one of these cakes was as much as two men could eat of bread in one day; each cake was ten hands’ breadth long, five broad, and seven fingers its horns, or was so high.  

Ver. 6. And thou shalt set them in two rows, etc.] The twelve cakes: six on a row; not by the side of each other, but six upon one another: upon the pure table; the shewbread table, so called because overlaid with pure gold, and kept clean and bright, (Exodus 25:24); before the Lord; for this stood in the holy place, in the same place as the candlestick did, which has the same position, (Leviticus 24:4); of the mystical and typical sense of these cakes, (see Gill on “Exodus 25:30”).

Ver. 7. And thou shalt put pure frankincense upon [each] row, etc.] Two cups of frankincense, in each of which was an handful of it, and which were set by each row of the cakes, as Jarchi observes: that it may be on the bread for a memorial; or “for the bread”, instead of it, for a memorial of it; that being to be eaten by the priests, and this to be burned on the altar to the Lord, as follows: [even] an offering made by fire unto the Lord; not the bread that was after a time taken away, and eaten by the priests, but the frankincense.

Ver. 8. Every sabbath he shall set it in order before the Lord continually, etc.] That is, the priest or priests then ministering, who should bring new cakes and place them in the above order, having removed the old ones, which was done in this manner; four priests went in, two had in their hands the two rows (of bread), and two had in their hands two cups (of frankincense); four went before these, two to take away the two rows (of the old bread), and two to take away the two cups (of frankincense); and they that carried in stood in the north, and their faces to the south and they that brought out stood in the south, and their faces to the north; these drew away (the old bread) and they put them (the new), and the hand of the one was over against the hand of the other, as it is said, “before me continually”, (Exodus 25:30); that is, at the same time the hands of the one were employed in taking away, the hands of the other were employed in setting on; so that there was always bread upon the table:
[being taken] from the children of Israel by an everlasting covenant; God requiring it of them, and they agreeing to give it, as they did, either in meal or in money; for this was at the expense of the community.

Ver. 9. And it shall be Aaron’s and his sons’, etc.] The twelve cakes of the old bread, when taken off the shewbread table; these were divided between the courses of the priests that carried in and brought out; and the high priest had half from each course, so that the half was for Aaron or the high priest, and the other half for his sons, or the priests that ministered:

and they shall eat it in the holy place; in the tabernacle or some court of it, and not in their own houses: it is said the shewbread was not eaten sooner than the ninth day, nor after the eleventh; how? it was baked on the evening of the sabbath, and it was eaten on the sabbath, the ninth day; if a feast day happened to be on the eve of the sabbath, it was eaten on the tenth; if the two feast days of the beginning of the year so fell, it was eaten on the eleventh day: the reason why it was only eaten in the holy place is,

for it [is] most holy unto him; it was one of the most holy things, which were only to be eaten by males, and in the sanctuary not as the light holy things, which were eaten in the houses and families of the priests, and by their wives and daughters also:

of the offerings of the Lord made by fire, by a perpetual statute; not that the bread was a burnt offering, but the frankincense upon it, or by it, and so having a connection with it, the whole is said to be an offering by fire: the one was given to the priests of the Lord to eat, and the other was consumed on the altar; and both were an offering to the Lord; and the frankincense being offered by fire unto the Lord, instead of the bread it was reckoned as if that was so offered.

Ver. 10. And the son of an Israelitish woman, etc.] Whose name, and the name of his mother, are afterwards given;

whose father [was] an Egyptian; Jarchi says, this is the Egyptian whom Moses slew, (Exodus 2:12); and so others in Abendana:

went out among the children of Israel; went out of Egypt with them, according to the Targum of Jonathan, and so was one of the mixed multitude, which came from thence with them, which is not improbable; some say he went out of Moses’s court of judicature; but it is more likely
that the meaning is, he went out of his tent, so Aben Ezra, into the midst of the camp, to claim his rank and place among the people of Israel; though the Jewish writers, as Jarchi and Aben Ezra, take this phrase, “among the children of Israel”, to signify that he was a proselyte, and became a Jew, or had embraced the Jewish religion in all respects:

*and this son of the Israelitish [woman] and a man of Israel strove together in the camp;* which man of Israel, according to the Targum of Jonathan, was of the tribe of Dan, as was the mother of the man he strove with; what they strove about is not easy to say; Aben Ezra suggests, because this stands connected with the above laws, as if this man had said some things in a reviling way about the shewbread, the oil, and the offerings, and so a dispute arose between them, concerning them; but Jarchi says, it was about the business of the camp, and it is more commonly received that this man claimed a place to fix his tent on in the tribe of Dan, in right of his mother; but the other urged, that the order of fixing tents was according to the genealogies, and with the ensigns of their father’s house, and therefore he had no right to rank with them, his father being an Egyptian, and perhaps from words they came to blows, (see <Exodus 21:22>); though the Jewish writers understand it of their contending, at least of its issuing in a judiciary way, before a court of judicature: so it is said, when Israel dwelt in the wilderness, he (the son of the Egyptian) sought to spread his tent in the midst of the tribe of Dan, and they would not suffer it, because the ranks of the children of Israel were, every man according to his rank, with the ensigns according to the genealogy of their fathers; and they began and contended in the camp, wherefore they went into the court of judicature, the son of the woman of the daughter of Israel, and the man, a son of Israel, who was of the tribe of Dan.

**Ver. 11.** *And the Israelitish woman’s son blasphemed the name [of the Lord], and cursed,* etc.] As they were striving together, or when the trial was over, he being cast, fell into outrageous blasphemies against God, who made such laws for the civil polity of Israel, and cursed the judges that had given sentence against him; so the Targum of Jonathan; and so the Jews generally understand by the “name” blasphemed, the name Jehovah, which he spake out plainly, and which, they say, is ineffable, and ought not to be pronounced but by the high priest in the sanctuary; but this man expressed it in its proper sound, and made use of it to curse the man that strove with him, or the judge that judged him; so it is said in the Misnah.
“a blasphemer is not guilty until he expresses the name;”

but it undoubtedly means blaspheming God himself, by whatsoever name:

and they brought him unto Moses; having heard his blasphemy, to charge him with it before him, or in order to have due punishment inflicted on him: as to the matter of contest between him and the Israelite, that had been decided in a lesser court of judicature, such an one as had been set up by the advice of Jethro; but though there was full proof of his blasphemy and cursing, which, perhaps, were expressed in open court; they might not know what punishment to inflict upon him for so horrid a crime, of which, perhaps, they had never had an instance before, and therefore sent him to Moses, to whom the hearing and decision of weighty matters belonged; (see <Exodus 18:22>);

and his mother’s name [was] Shelomith, the daughter of Dibri, of the tribe of Dan; which is observed, as it should seem, to show in what tribe this affair happened, and what the quarrel was first about, even a place and rank in this tribe.

Ver. 12. And they put him in ward, etc.] In some prison, a place known in the camp, as Aben Ezra observes:

that the mind of the Lord might be shewed them; for, though this was a breach of the third command, in which God declares he would not hold such an one guiltless, (Exodus 20:7); yet no particular punishment being expressed, it was not a clear case whether the Lord would punish for it himself, by an immediate stroke of his hand, or whether by the civil magistrate; and if by the latter, in what manner; for though it might be concluded, without any hesitation, that he was worthy of death, since cursing father or mother was death, (Exodus 21:17; Leviticus 20:9); and much more blaspheming God, yet what death to put him to they might be at a loss about; or if that was understood of stoning, they might think this deserved a sorer punishment, and therefore consulted God about it.

Ver. 13. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] From off the mercy seat in the holy of holies, where he had promised to meet him and commune with him about anything he should inquire of him, as he did at this time:

going; as follows.
Ver. 14. Bring forth him that hath cursed without the camp, etc.] To show that he had no part nor lot in Israel, and that he was unworthy to be a member of their civil community, or of their church state; and, besides, the place of stoning, or where malefactors suffered any kind of death, was without the camp, as afterwards without the city, (see Hebrews 13:12,13); let all that heard [him] lay their hands upon his head; the Targum of Jonathan adds,

“and the judges;”

so Jarchi remarks, that they that “heard him” are the witnesses, and the word “all” comprehends the judges: Maimonides says the same, and observes that hands were laid on no malefactor but the blasphemer; and this was done to show that the one had bore a faithful testimony, and the other had pronounced a righteous sentence on him; and that he had brought this guilt and punishment upon himself by his sin; wherefore it was usual for them to say, as the same writers observe,

“thy blood be upon thine own head, and we not punished for thy death, which thou hast been the cause of to thyself:”

and let all the congregation stone him; which Aben Ezra interprets of the great men of Israel; nor can it be thought that every individual of the people could cast a stone at him, but it was to be done by some of them, in the presence of them all, or as many as could conveniently get together to behold it; and this was done to show their detestation of the sin, and to deter from the commission of it: it was the same kind of punishment that was ordered to be inflicted on him that cursed his father or mother, (Leviticus 20:9); God, the God of mercy, requiring no sorer punishment, though it deterred a greater, for such a sin against himself, than against a common parent.

Ver. 15. And thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel, etc.] On this occasion, and gave them some laws and rules concerning the above affair, and other things:

saying, whosoever curseth his God shall bear his sin; which some understand of anyone of another nation, that cursed the God he used to serve in his own country; but it can hardly be thought that a law should be made by the one only living and true God, to preserve the honour and
credit of false gods, when he is so jealous of his own glory; and those are
spoken of in Scripture with the greatest contempt, as dunghill deities, and
are actually cursed, (\textit{Jeremiah 10:11}); but they are rather to be
interpreted of judges and all civil magistrates, who, as Aben Ezra observes,
are sometimes called Elohim or gods, (\textit{Psalm 82:1,6}); and the rather, as
it is probable this man had cursed his judges, and so this is a distinct sin
from what follows; and not only the manner of expressing it, but the
punishment of it, seem to be different; for the phrase, “to bear his sin”, is
used where the punishment is not expressly declared, and is by Jarchi and
others interpreted of cutting off from his people, but in what way is not
certain; whereas the punishment of a blasphemer of God is before and after
clearly expressed; (see \textit{Leviticus 20:19}).

**Ver. 16.** \textit{And he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, etc.} Or, “but he
that blasphemeth”, etc. from whence the Jews gather, that the name
Jehovah must be expressed, or it is no blasphemy; so Jarchi; but it is not
bare using or expressing the word Jehovah that is blasphemy, but speaking
ill and contemptuously of God, with respect to any of his names, titles, and
epithets, or of any of his perfections, ways, and works:

\textit{he shall surely be put to death}; no mercy shall be shown him, no reprieve
or pardon granted him: hence it is said \textit{Matthew 12:31,32}; there is no atonement for it, by
repentance, or chastisements, or the day of atonement: so blasphemy
against the Holy Ghost is not forgiven, neither in this world nor in that
which is to come, (\textit{Matthew 12:31,32});

\[and\] \textit{all the congregation shall certainly stone him}; shall have no pity on
him, nor spare him, but stone him till he dies:

\textit{as well the stranger as he that is born in the land, when he blasphemeth
the name [of the Lord], shall be put to death}; even a proselyte of the gate,
a Gentile that sojourned among them, uncircumcised, and did not profess
the Jewish religion, as well as a proselyte of righteousness, and an Israelite
born; yet, if he blasphemed the God of Israel, was to lose his life without
any mercy shown him.

**Ver. 17.** \textit{And he that killeth any man shall surely be put to death.}\] With
the sword, as the Targum of Jonathan adds; which restrains it to any man
of the children of Israel, but wrongly; for the original law respects any man
whatever, (\textit{Genesis 9:6}); and so it does here; (see Gill on \textit{Exodus
21:12}).
Ver. 18. And he that killeth a beast shall make it good, etc.] Pay for it, give the value of it, or another as good as that instead of it, as follows:

beast for beast; or “soul for soul”; life for life, that is, a living one for that the life of which is taken away, and one every way as good as that.

Ver. 19. And if a man cause a blemish in his neighbour, etc.] Does him any hurt or mischief, causes any mutilation or deformity in him by striking him:

as he hath done, so shall it be done unto him: not that a like damage or hurt should be done to him, but that he should make satisfaction for it in a pecuniary way; pay for the cure of him, and for loss of time, and in consideration of the pain he has endured, and the shame or disgrace brought on him by the deformity or mutilation, or for whatever loss he may sustain thereby; (see Gill on “<022118>Exodus 21:18-19”).

Ver. 20. Breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, etc.] Which is not to be taken strictly or literally, but for the price or value of those, which is to be given in a pecuniary way; (see Gill on “<022124>Exodus 21:24-25”);

as he hath caused a blemish in a man, shall it be done to him; unless he gives satisfaction, and pays a valuable consideration for it.

Ver. 21. And he that killeth a beast, he shall restore it, etc.] The same as in (“<032418>Leviticus 24:18”), which is repeated for the confirmation of it, and that it might be observed, though Jarchi takes it to be a different law; before, he says, it speaks of him that kills a beast, here of him that makes any wound or bruise in it, which he must make good; and it must be allowed that the manner of expression is different; there it is, he that smites the soul of a beast so that it dies, here only he that smites a beast, though it dies not, yet having some damage done it, satisfaction must be made:

and he that killeth a man, he shall be put to death; or he that smites a man, though he does not kill him, as Jarchi observes, only makes a wound or bruise in him, because it is not said, the soul of a man, as before; but such damages did not require death, but satisfaction in another way, as in (“<032419>Leviticus 24:19”).

Ver. 22. Ye shall have one manner of law, etc.] Respecting the above things, blaspheming of the name of God, taking away the life of man, or of any beast, and of doing damage to either:
as well for the stranger as for one of your own country; the above laws were binding upon proselytes as well as Israelites, and proselytes of the gate as well as proselytes of righteousness, though the Jews commonly restrain it to the latter:

for I [am] the Lord your God; whose name is holy and reverend, and ought not to be blasphemed; and who is the Maker and preserver of man and beast, and made these laws respecting them, and expected they should be obeyed, especially by the children of Israel, whose covenant God and Father he was, and they under the greatest obligation to serve and obey him.

Ver. 23. And Moses spake unto the children of Israel, etc.] As the Lord had commanded him:

that they should bring forth him that had cursed out of the camp, and stone him with stones; which were the instructions God had given to Moses upon inquiring his mind and will about this matter:

and the children of Israel did as the Lord commanded Moses; they took the blasphemer, and led him out of the camp, put their hands on him, and stoned him with stones till he died.
CHAPTER 25

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 25

In this chapter the Israelites are directed, when come into the land of Canaan, to observe every seventh year as a sabbatical year, in which there was to be no tillage of the land, and yet there would be a sufficiency for man and beast, (Leviticus 25:1-7); and every fiftieth year as a year of jubilee, in which also there was to be no tillage of the land, and every man was to return to his possession or estate, which had been sold to another any time before this, (Leviticus 25:8-17); and a promise of safety and plenty in the seventh year is made to encourage the observance of it, (Leviticus 25:18-22); and several laws and rules are delivered out concerning the sale of lands, the redemption of them, and their return to their original owner in the year of jubilee, (Leviticus 25:23-28); and the sale of houses, and the redemption of them, and the difference between those in walled cities and those in villages, with respect thereunto, (Leviticus 25:29-31); and also concerning the houses of the cities of the Levites, and the fields of the suburbs of them, (Leviticus 25:32-34); to which are added some instructions about relieving decayed, persons, and lending and giving to them, without taking usury of them, (Leviticus 25:34-38); and other laws concerning the release of such Israelites as had sold themselves for servants to the Israelites, in the year of jubilee, since none but Heathens were to be bondmen and bondmaids for ever, (Leviticus 25:39-46); and of such who were sold to proselytes, (Leviticus 25:47-55).

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses in Mount Sinai, etc.] Not when Moses was with the Lord on that mount forty days, but after he came down from thence, even after the tabernacle was set up, while the children of Israel where encamped about that mountain, and before they took their journey from thence; for they continued some time in the wilderness of Sinai, and here it was the Lord spoke to Moses; for the words may be rendered “by” or “near Mount Sinai” f853, and so Josephus f854 says, the following laws were delivered to Moses, when Israel was encamped under Mount Sinai:
saying; as follows.

Ver. 2. Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, etc.] What follows, being what the whole body of the people would be under obligation to observe, and therefore must be delivered to them all, at least to the heads and elders of the people, and by them to the rest:

when ye come into the land which I give you; the land of Canaan, and until they came thither, the following law concerning the sabbatical year could not take place; and as Maimonides \textsuperscript{1855} says, it was only used in the land of Israel, and no where else, according to this text, and that both before and after the temple was built:

then shall the land keep a sabbath unto the Lord; a rest from tillage, as it is afterwards explained; and this being according to the will of God, when observed would be to his honour and glory, and show that he was the proprietor of the land; and that the Israelites held it under him by this tenure, that every seventh year they should let it rest, which would be for the benefit of the land, and preserve it from being impoverished by continual usage and hereby they might learn to depend on the providence of God, and to observe that all increase is from him; and to consider the straits and difficulties the poor live in continually, as they in this seventh year; and by this means they would be at leisure to have an opportunity of reading the law, as they did at this time, (\textsuperscript{[53110]} Deuteronomy 31:10-13); and of meditating upon it, and of giving themselves up to religious exercises, as well as by it they might be led to the typical use of to look for and expect that sabbatism or rest, which remains for the people of God. And now this law did not take place as soon as they came into the land, for it was to be sown six years, and then was the year of rest; and indeed not till after Joshua had subdued the whole land, which was seven years a doing; nor till they were quite settled, and it was divided among them, and every man had his field and vineyard apart, which this law supposes; wherefore the Jewish writers \textsuperscript{1856} say, they were not bound to tithes until the fourteenth year, and from thence they began to reckon the sabbatical year; and the twenty first year they made a sabbatical year, and the sixty fourth a jubilee, which they make to be the first that were kept: and they reckoned this year to commence, not on the first of Nisan or March, which was the beginning of the year for ecclesiastical things, but on the first of Tisri or September, when the harvest and all the fruits of the earth were gathered in; and when on other years they used to proceed to sowing the next month, but were
forbid on this; and so it is said in the Misnah $f^{857}$, the first of Tisri is the beginning of the year for the sabbatical and jubilee years.

**Ver. 3. Six years thou shalt sow thy field, etc.]** Under which is comprehended everything relating to agriculture, both before and after sowing, as dunging the land, ploughing and harrowing it, treading the corn, reaping and gathering it in; (see $x^{2231}$ Exodus 23:10);

*and six years thou shall prune thy vineyard, and gather in the fruit thereof*; which is not to be restrained to vineyards only, but to be extended to oliveyards, orchards and gardens, and to the planting and cultivating of them, and gathering in the fruits of them.

**Ver. 4. But in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land, etc.]** From all tillage of it, from planting and cultivating any sort of trees in it; and even from digging pits, ditches; and caves, as say the Jewish writers $f^{858}$; and this was typical of that rest which believers enter into under the Gospel dispensation, and of the rest in the new Jerusalem state, and especially in the ultimate glory; not only from the labours of the body, but of the mind, through sin, Satan, doubts and fears, and through conflicts with various enemies, and when even all spiritual labours and services will be at an end but that of praise:

*a sabbath for the Lord*; for his honour and glory, to ascertain his property in the land, to show the power of his providence, and display his goodness in his care of all creatures, without any means used by them:

*thou shalt neither sow thy field nor prune thy vineyard*; under which are comprehended all acts of agriculture, which respect the cultivation of vines, olives, figs, and, according to the Misnah $f^{859}$, there were some instruments which it was not lawful to sell to an artificer in the seventh year, such as a plough, with all belonging to it, a yoke, a fan, a spade, but he may sell him a scythe, or a sickle, or a cart, and all its instruments; and which the commentators $f^{860}$ interpret of one that is suspected of working in that year; the house of Shammai say, an heifer that ploughed might not be sold that year.

**Ver. 5. That which growth of its own accord of thy harvest thou shalt not reap, etc.]** That which sprung up of itself from grains of corn, shed in the harvest of the preceding year, without any ploughing or sowing; he might reap it, but not as at other times, the whole of it, and gather it as his own
property, but only somewhat of it in common with others for his, present use:

*neither gather the grapes of thy vine undressed*; which was on this year forbid to be dressed; the grapes of which he might gather in common with others, but not as in other years, all of them, and as peculiarly his own: the words may be rendered, “the grapes of thy separations” f861; either such as in other years he used to separate for himself, and forbid others gathering them, but now made them common; or which he did not labour in the cultivation of, but abstained from it:

*[for] it is a year of rest unto the land*; which is repeated, that it may be observed.

**Ver. 6.** *And the sabbath of the land shall be meat for you*, etc.], That is, that which grew up of itself but of the land, or on trees, vines, olives, etc. undressed, should be the meat or food on which they should live that year: and this comprehends everything that is fit for food, and also for drink, and for anointing, and even for the lighting of lamps, as in the Misnah f862:

*for thee, and for thy servant, and for thy maid*; the owner of the fields and vineyards, he and his family, wife, children, and servants, might eat of the fruits of them in common with others; for whereas it is elsewhere said, (Exodus 23:11), “that the poor of thy people may eat”, this is observed here, lest anyone should think the rich are forbid eating them, as Jarchi remarks:

*and for thy hired servant, and for the stranger that sojourneth with thee*: which the same writer interprets of Gentiles; the food of this year was common to masters and servants, to rich and poor, to Israelites and Gentiles; all had an equal right unto, and share therein; which might be an emblem of the first times of the Gospel, in which all things were had in common, (Acts 4:32), and typical of the communion of saints in things spiritual; in salvation by Jesus Christ, common to Jews and Gentiles, high and low, bond and free; in the free and full forgiveness of sins by his blood; and in justification by his righteousness, which is unto all, and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference; in the participation of faith, and other graces, which are alike precious, and in the enjoyment of promises, privileges, and ordinances, and even of eternal life itself.
Ver. 7. *And for thy cattle, and for the beasts that [are] in thy land*, etc.
The former signifies tame cattle, such as were kept at home, or in fields, or were used in service, and the latter the wild beasts of the field:

*shall all the increase thereof be meat;* for the one, and for the other; Jarchi remarks, that all the time a wild beast eats of the increase of the field, the cattle may be fed at home; but when it ceaseth to the wild beast of the field, then it ceaseth to the cattle at home; nay, the Jews are so strict in this matter, that they say that when there is no food for the beasts in the field, men are obliged to bring out what they have in their houses\(^{\text{f863}}\), (see Isaiah 11:6,7).

Ver. 8. *And thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee*, etc.] Or weeks of years; and there being seven days in a week, and a day being put for a year, seven weeks of years made forty nine years; the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, and Jarchi, interpret it seven “shemittas”, or sabbatical years; and a sabbatical year being every seventh year, made the same number;

*seven times seven years*: or forty nine years, as follows;

*and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be forty and nine years*; just such a space of years there was between each jubilee, which, as afterwards said, was the fiftieth year; so as there were a seventh day sabbath, and a fiftieth day sabbath, the day of Pentecost, so there were a seventh year sabbath, or sabbatical year, and a fiftieth year sabbath.

Ver. 9. *Then shall thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound*, etc.] At the end of forty nine years, or at the beginning of the fiftieth; or “the trumpet of a loud sound”; for here the word “jubilee” is not, which, according to some, was so called from the peculiar sound of the trumpet on this day, different from all others; though others, as Ben Melech, think, and the Jews commonly, that it had its name from the trumpet itself, which they suppose was made of a ram’s horn, “jobel”, in the Arabic language, signifying a ram; but the former reason is best; though perhaps it is best of all to derive it from יב ויח, “to bring back, restore, return”, because at this time men were returned to their liberty, estates, and families, as hereafter expressed:

*on the tenth [day] of the seventh month*; the month Tisri or September, the first day of which was the beginning of the year for “jubilees”\(^{\text{f864}}\); for the
computation of the jubilee year was made from the first day of the month, though the trumpet was not blown, and the rights of the year did not begin till the tenth, as Maimonides\(^\text{1865}\) observes:

*in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land;* which day of atonement was on the tenth day of the said month, and a very proper time it was to sound the trumpet, that after they had been afflicting themselves, then to have joy and comfort; and when atonement was made for all their sins, then to hear the joyful sound; and when it might be presumed they were in a good disposition to release their servants, and restore the poor to their possessions, when they themselves were favoured with the forgiveness of all their sins. This sounding was made throughout all the land of Israel; throughout all the highways, as Aben Ezra, that all might know the year of jubilee was come; and this was done by the order of the sanhedrim, as Maimonides\(^\text{1866}\) says, and who, also observes, that from the beginning of the year, to the day of atonement, servants were not released to their own houses, but did not serve their masters, nor were fields returned to their owners; but servants ate, and drank, and rejoiced, and wore garlands on their heads; and when the day of atonement came, the sanhedrim blew the trumpet, and the servants were dismissed to their houses, and fields returned to their owners.

**Ver. 10.** *And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, etc.*] The year following the seven sabbaths of years, or forty nine years; and which they were to sanctify by separating it from all others, and devoting it to the uses it was to be put to, and the services done on it, and by abstaining from the tillage of the land, sowing or reaping, and from the cultivation of vines, olives, etc.

*and proclaim liberty throughout [all] the land;* to servants, both to those whose ears were bored, and were to serve for ever, even unto the year of jubilee, and then be released; and to those whose six years were not ended, from the time that they were bought; for the jubilee year put an end to their servitude, let the time they had served be what it would; for this year was a general release of servants, excepting bondmen and bondmaids, who were never discharged; hence called the “year of liberty”, (\(^\text{2MR}\) Ezekiel 46:17); and Josephus\(^\text{1867}\) says, the word “jobel” or “jubilee” signifies “liberty”:

*unto all the inhabitants thereof;* that were in servitude or poverty, excepting the above mentioned; from hence the Jews gather, than when the tribes of Reuben and Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, went into
captivity, the jubilees ceased, since all the inhabitants were not then in it; but that is a mistake, for the jubilees were continued unto the coming of the Messiah, and perhaps never omitted but once, in the time of the Babylonish captivity:

*it shall be a jubilee unto you*; to the Israelites, and to them only, as Aben Ezra observes; it was a time of joy and gladness to them, especially to servants, who were now free, and to the poor, who enjoyed their estates again:

*and ye shall return every man unto his possession*; which had been sold or mortgaged to another, but now reverted to its original owner:

*and ye shall return every man unto his family*; who through poverty had sold himself for a servant, and had lived in another family. The general design of this law was to preserve the rights of freeborn Israelites, as to person and property, to prevent perpetual servitude, and perpetual alienation of their estates; to continue families and estates as they were originally, that some might not become too rich, and others too poor; nor be blended, but the tribes and families might be kept distinct until the coming of the Messiah, to whom the jubilee had a particular respect, and in whom it ceased. The liberty proclaimed on this day was typical of that liberty from the bondage of sin, Satan, and the law, which Christ is the author of, and is proclaimed by him in the Gospel, (Galatians 5:1 Isaiah 61:1); a liberty of grace and glory, or the glorious liberty of the children of God: returning to possessions and inheritances may be an emblem of the enjoyment of the heavenly inheritance by the saints; though man by sin lost an earthly paradise, and came short of the glory of God, yet through Christ his people are restored to a better inheritance, an incorruptible one; to which they are begotten by his Spirit, have a right to it through his righteousness, and a meetness for it by his grace, and of which the Holy Spirit is the earnest and pledge, and into which Christ himself will introduce them. And the returning of them to their families may signify the return of God’s elect through Christ to the family that is named of him; these were secretly of the family of God from all eternity, being taken into it in the covenant of grace, as well as predestinated to the adoption of children: but by the fall, and through a state of nature by it, they became children of wrath, even as others; yet through redemption by Christ, and faith in him, they receive the adoption of children, and openly appear to be of the family of God, (2 Corinthians 6:18 Ephesians 1:5 1:3)
Galatians 4:5,6 3:26 John 1:12; and all this is proclaimed by the sound of the Gospel trumpet, which being a sound of liberty, peace, pardon, righteousness, salvation, and eternal life by Christ, is a joyful one, (Psalm 89:15); where the allusion seems to be to the jubilee trumpet.

**Ver. 11.** *A jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you,* etc.] Which, clearly shows, that not the forty ninth year was the year of jubilee, as many learned men have asserted, chiefly induced by this reason, because two years would come together in which were no sowing reaping; but that God, that could cause the earth to forth fruit for three years, (Leviticus 25:21); could make it bring forth enough for four years; and in order to make their sentiment agree with this passage, they are obliged to make the foregoing jubilee one of the fifty, and begin their account from thence; but this could not be done in the first account of the jubilee; of the name, (see Gill on Leviticus 25:9);

*ye shall not sow*; in the year of jubilee, which shows also that this could not be the forty ninth year, which of course being a sabbatical year, there would be no sowing, reaping, etc. and so this law or instruction would be quite needless:

*neither reap that which growth of itself in it, nor gather the [grapes] in it of thy vine undressed*; as in the sabbatical year, (see Gill on Leviticus 25:5); the same with respect to these things being to be observed in the year of jubilee, as in that; and so Jarchi observes that the same that is said of the sabbatical year is said of the jubilee, two holy years being found next to one another, the forty ninth year the sabbatical year, and the fiftieth year the jubilee.

**Ver. 12.** *For it is the jubilee, it shall be holy,* etc.] Men being restored to their liberty, possessions, and families, it must be matter of joy to them, and therefore this year was to be separated from all others, and devoted to the ends and uses before mentioned; and men were to live upon the spontaneous productions of the earth, without any tillage of land, or cultivation of vines, etc.

*ye shall eat the increase thereof out of the field*; they were not to reap corn, and gather grapes and olives, and bring them into their barns and storehouses, as in other years; but were to go out every day into their fields, and gather for present use, and all were common to all sorts of men, and to cattle, as in the sabbatical year; (see Gill on Leviticus 25:7).
Ver. 13. *In the year of this jubilee*, etc.] In the beginning of it, as Aben Ezra, though not on the first day of Tisri, but the tenth day, the day of atonement, when the trumpet was blown:

*ye shall return every man unto his possession*; which is repeated from (Leviticus 25:10); the reason of which, the Jews say, is to include gifts, and which, according to them, are like sales, and returned in the year of “jubilee”; that is, if a man gave his estate in possession to another, he returned to it, in the year of jubilee, equally as if he had sold it; and therefore they observe the same phrase is twice used by Moses, to include gifts: but perhaps the truer reason is, because this was a special business done at this time, and of great importance; the word “return” being so often used, may serve to confirm the sense of the word “jubilee”, given previously, (see Gill on “Leviticus 25:9”).

Ver. 14. *And if thou sell ought unto thy neighbour*, etc.] Any estate or possession, house or land, at any time before the year of jubilee:

*or buyest [ought] of thy neighbour’s hand*; of movable goods, as the Targum of Jonathan interprets it; and so other Jewish writers restrain this to goods which are bought by hand, and delivered from hand to hand; and so they think that fields, and servants, which they say are like to fields, are excluded hereby; but it seems to refer to anything saleable, and chiefly to fields and vineyards, as the following verses show; wherefore Diodorus Siculus, as quoted by Grotius, must be mistaken, when he says, it was not counted lawful by the Jews to sell their inheritance, unless he means for ever, so indeed they could not:

*ye shall not oppress one another*; the buyer giving too little, or the seller requiring too much; no advantage was to be taken, either of the necessity of the one, or the ignorance of the other, but a fair bargain was to be made, and the full value given, neither too much nor too little. The Jews by “neighbour” understand an Israelite, and not a Gentile; not that there might be no buying and selling at all between Jews and Gentiles, or that the former might oppress and defraud the latter, though not an Israelite; but lands and inheritances might not be sold at all to Gentiles, only to Israelites.

Ver. 15. *According to the number of years after the jubilee thou shalt buy of thy neighbour*, etc.] That is, reckoning how many years had past since
the last jubilee, and how many there were to come to the next, and so give as many years’ purchase as were yet to come:

[and] according to the number of years of the fruits he shall sell unto thee; only care was to be taken, that as many years as were sabbatical ones, which were not years of fruit, should be deducted out of the account by the seller; since these were years the buyer could have no profit by the estate, and therefore it was not reasonable that such years should be reckoned into the purchase; and hence the Jewish writers gather, that when a man had sold his field, he could not redeem it in less than two years, because a number of years cannot be less than two, and that if even the buyer agreed to it, it might not be done.

Ver. 16. According to the multitude of years thou shalt increase the price thereof, etc.] More was to be asked and required, and should be given for an estate, when, for instance, there were thirty years to the year of jubilee, than when there were but twenty;

and according to the fewness of years thou shalt diminish the price of it; if it wanted but five, or six, or ten years unto it, then, in proportion, less was to be insisted upon and given:

for [according] to the number [of the years] of the fruits doth he sell unto thee; which also must be considered, how many years of tillage of land, and cultivation of vineyards, etc. there were in the account, and how many sabbatical years to be deducted; for only according to the number of fruit years was the estate to be valued and sold.

Ver. 17. Ye shall not therefore oppress one another, etc.] By over or underrating estates:

but thou shalt fear thy God; and the fear of God being before their eyes, and on their hearts, would preserve both buyer and seller from doing an ill thing, when it was in the power of either, through the necessity of the one, or the ignorance of the other, (see Nehemiah 5:15):

for I [am] the Lord your God; omniscient, and knows all that is done in the most private and artful manner; and omnipotent and able to punish both, which of them either should oppress or defraud, (see 1 Thessalonians 4:6).
Ver. 18. *Wherefore ye shall do my statutes, and keep my judgments, and do them,* etc.] These and all others he enjoined; by which tenure, even obedience to all his commands, moral, ritual, and judicial, they were to hold the land of Canaan, and their possessions in it, which is intended in the next clause:

*and ye shall dwell in the land in safety,*; without any fear of enemies, or of the neighbouring nations about them seizing upon them, and distressing them; and Jarchi observes, that it was for transgressing the sabbatical year that Israel was carried captive, which he thinks is intimated in (<143621>2 Chronicles 36:21); and that the seventy years’ captivity in Babylon were for the seventy sabbatical years that had been neglected.

Ver. 19. *And the land shall yield her fruit,* etc.] That is, continually, and even in the seventh year, the sabbath of rest; for the land, though not manured, ploughed, and sowed, nor the vines, olives, and fig trees pruned, yet shall yield fruit as in other years, the Israelites observing the statutes and judgments of God:

*and ye shall eat your fill,*; feel no want of provisions, but have fulness of everything as at other times, and never make a scanty meal, having sufficiency and plenty of all things:

*and dwell therein in safety,*; not fearing enemies, nor being disturbed by them, nor carried captive.

Ver. 20. *And ye shall say, what shall ye eat the seventh year,* etc.] Such as are of little faith, disbelieve the promise, and distrust the providence of God, and take thought for tomorrow, and indulge an anxiety of mind how they shall be provided with food in the sabbatical year ordered to be observed, in which there were to be no tillage of land, nor pruning of trees:

*behold, we shall not sow,*; that being forbidden:

*nor gather in our increase,*; neither the barley, nor the wheat, nor the grapes, nor olives, nor figs, into their houses and barns, to lay up for stores, as in other years; though they might go out and gather in for present use in common with others: now if any should put the above question, as it was very likely some would, in such a view of things, the answer to it follows.
Ver. 21. *Then I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year,* etc.] Upon their fields, vineyards, and oliveyards, and make them exceeding fruitful, more than in other years; all fruitfulness at any time depends upon the blessing of God, and follows upon it, but is more visible and observable when there is an exceeding great plenty:

*and it shall bring forth fruit for three years*; and thus God blessed the sixth year with such a plentiful increase as was sufficient for time to come, until a new crop was gathered in; as he had blessed the sixth day with a double portion of manna, for the supply of the seventh.

Ver. 22. *And ye shall sow the eighth year,* etc.] Sow the land in the eighth year, and likewise dress their vines, olives, etc.

*and eat [yet] of the old fruit*; even in the eighth year, of the old fruit of the sixth year, as the Targum of Jonathan adds:

*until the ninth year*; that is, as Jarchi explains it, until the feast of tabernacles of the ninth, which was the time that the increase of the eighth came into the house; for all summer it was in the field, and in Tisri or September was the time of gathering it into the house; and sometimes it was necessary to provide for four years on the sixth, which was before the sabbatical year, the seventh, for they ceased from tilling the ground two years running, the seventh and the jubilee year; but this Scripture is said concerning all the rest of the sabbatical years: these encouraging promises, one would have thought, would have been placed more naturally after the account of the sabbatical year that followed, (Leviticus 25:7); but the reason of their being inserted here seems to be, because in the year of jubilee they were neither to sow nor reap, nor gather in the grapes of the undressed vine, as in the sabbatical year, (Leviticus 25:11); wherefore those things are said for encouragement at the one time as at the other; since it might easily be concluded, that he that could provide for them every sixth year for three years to come, could once in fifty years provide for four:

*until her fruits come in, ye shall eat [of] the old [store]*; some of which came in in March, as barley, others in May, as the wheat, and others in August and September, as the grapes, olives, etc. which was the time of ingathering several fruits of the earth, and of finishing the whole.

Ver. 23. *The land shall not be sold for ever,* etc.] That is, the land of Israel; the meaning is, any part of it, for that the whole might be sold or
disposed of at once is not to be supposed, but anyone part of it, which was the property of a single man, or belonged to a family; though it might be sold in case of necessity, yet not for ever, so as never to return to the owner, or his heirs; for if it was sold for ever it returned in the year of the jubilee: the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan render the word “absolutely”, simply, properly; a proper absolute sale was not to be made, but a conditional one, or for so many years, or with a view to its reversion in the year of jubilee, and so the agreement to be made according to the number of years, as before directed: the word, as Aben Ezra observes, signifies “cutting off”, and the sense is, that no land should be sold entirely, so as that the proprietor or his heirs should be wholly cut off from it, or that the entail of it upon the family should be cut off:

_for the land [is] mine_; as indeed the whole earth is, but the land of Canaan was peculiarly his, which he had chosen above all other lands for the inheritance of his people; out of which he drove the old inhabitants of it for their sins, and put in his own people to possess it under him; where he himself had his dwelling place, and where he was served and worshipped, and where the Messiah was to be born, and was born, and therefore called Immanuel’s land; and which was a figure of the better country, or the heavenly glory and happiness, which is of God’s preparing and giving, and will never be alienated from those whose right it is:

_for ye [are] strangers and sojourners with me_; as the Gentiles that lived among them were strangers and sojourners with them, so they were with the Lord; he was the original proprietor, they were but tenants at will; though it was both an honour and happiness to be with him, under any character, to board, and lodge, and dwell with him; and they might well be content to be reckoned not proprietors but strangers and sojourners, and especially such as had faith and hope in a better inheritance, of which this was only a figure; however, this being their present case, it was a reason good, why they could not for ever dispose of their lands and possessions, any more than a sojourner or inmate can of a house of which he has only a part.

Ver. 24. _And in all the land of your possession_, etc.] Which they should possess in the land of Canaan, whatever part of it any of them should enjoy:

_ye shall grant a redemption for the land_; that is, whenever any estate in it was sold through necessity, the buyer was obliged to grant a liberty to the
seller to redeem it, when it was in his power to do it, or any or his relations, especially after two years; so Jarchi observes, he that sells his possession may redeem it after two years, either he himself or he that is near akin to him, nor can the buyer hinder it; (see Gill on “Leviticus 25:15”).

Ver. 25. If thy brother be waxen poor, etc.] Is brought very low, greatly reduced, and is in mean circumstances; hence Jarchi says, we learn, that no man may sell his field, unless his distress presses him and forces him to it; for, as Maimonides observes, a man might not sell his estate to put money into his purse, or to trade with, or to purchase goods, servants, and cattle, only food:

and hath sold away [some] of his possession; not all of it, as Jarchi remarks; for the way of the earth or custom of the world teaches, that a man should reserve a field (or a part) for himself:

and if any of his kin come to redeem it; come to the buyer and propose to redeem it, by giving what it was sold for, or in proportion to the time he had enjoyed it:

then shall he redeem that which his brother sold; nor was it in the power of the purchaser to hinder him, or at his option whether he would suffer him to redeem it or not: such an one was an emblem of our “goel”, our near kinsman and Redeemer the Lord Jesus Christ, who came in our nature into this world to redeem us, and put us into the possession of the heavenly inheritance; nor was it in the power of any to hinder his performance of it, for he is the mighty God, the Lord of Hosts is his name.

Ver. 26. And if the man have none to redeem it, etc.] That is, none of kin that was able or willing to redeem it; otherwise no doubt there were persons in the land able to do it at any time, but none he was in connection with, or from whom he could expect such a favour:

and himself be able to redeem it; or if his hand has got, and he has found a sufficiency for his redemption, as the Targum of Jonathan; not that he has found anything that was lost, as Chaskuni glosses it, but by one providence or another, by the blessing of God on his trade and business, is become rich, and it is in the power of his hand to redeem the possession he had sold, he might do it; but, as the same writer observes, he might not borrow and redeem, but must do it with what he had got of his own since the time of sale, and which is also the sense of others.
Ver. 27. Then let him count the years of the sale thereof, etc.] How many years had passed since it was sold, how many it had been in the hands of the purchaser, and how many were yet to come to the year of the jubilee, by which means the price of redemption might easily be settled; thus, for instance, if the years were alike and there was just half the time gone, then half of the price it was sold at was repaid to the purchaser; and if not alike, then in proportion to what had passed and were to come:

and restore the overplus unto the man to whom he sold it; for the years that were yet to come; if, as Jarchi says, he has eaten of or enjoyed the fruit of the field three or four years, deduct the price of them from the account, and take the rest; this is the meaning, “and restore the overplus”, out of the price of the sale, according to what is eaten, and give it to the buyer: Maimonides explains it thus; that if there were ten years to the year of the jubilee, and the field was sold for an hundred pieces, if he that bought it has eaten of it three years, then the seller that redeems it must give him seventy pieces, and he must restore his field; if he has eaten of it six years, he is to give forty pieces, and the other restores him the field: in the Misnah it is put thus; if he sell it (his field) to the first for an hundred pence, and the first sells it to a second for two hundred, he must not reckon but with the first, as it is said, “unto the man to whom he sold it”; if he sold it to the first for two hundred, and the first sells it to a second for an hundred, he shall not count but with the last, as it is said, “to a man”, i.e. to the man which is in the midst of it, or is possessed of it; nor may he sell it for a distant time, that he may redeem it near, nor when in a bad condition, that he may redeem it in a good one; nor may he borrow to redeem it, nor redeem it by halves:

that he may return to his possession; and enjoy it again.

Ver. 28. But if he be not able to restore it to him, etc.] The overplus, or give him what is in proportion to the time he has had it, and yet to come:

then that which is sold shall remain in the hand of him that bought it until the year of the jubilee; continue in his possession, and he shall enjoy all the benefit of it till that year comes:

and in the jubilee it shall go out: out of his hands or possession; or “he shall go out”, the purchaser shall go out of what he has bought, and shall have no more possession of it, but it shall come into the hands of the seller, and that without money, as the Targum of Jonathan adds:
and he shall return unto his possession; the seller, and enter upon it and enjoy it as his own property, as before he sold it.

Ver. 29. And if a man sell a dwelling house in a walled city, etc.] Which was so from the days of Joshua the son of Nun, as Jarchi:

then he may redeem it within a whole year after it is sold: any time within the year he pleased, either he or any near of kin to him; and if they would, on the day it was sold, or any time after within the compass of the year, even on the day in which the year ended; in this such an house differed from fields, which could not be redeemed under two years, (see Gill on “Leviticus 25:15”);

[within] a full year may he redeem it; from the time it was sold, paying what it was sold for: this is to be understood, Maimonides says, of a solar year, which consists of three hundred sixty five days, and within this space of time such an house might be redeemed.

Ver. 30. And if it be not redeemed within the space of a full year, etc.] Either by the seller or any man of kin to him:

then the house that [is] in the walled city shall be established for ever to him that bought it, throughout his generation; after twelve months were elapsed it was not redeemable by any, but to be held by the purchaser and his heirs for ever:

it shall not go out in the jubilee; from the purchaser or his heirs, to the seller or his heirs; for houses were not like lands, the gift of God, and held under him, but were built by men, and were their absolute property, and therefore they could dispose of them, and they that bought them could hold them after the above mentioned time; nor was there any danger of confounding tribes and families by retaining them: this law was made to encourage persons to settle in walled towns, to make and keep them populous, and to make owners of them careful not to sell them: the Jewish canon is this; when the day of the twelfth month is come, and it (the house) is not redeemed, it is absolutely his, whether he bought it or whether it was given him, as it is said, (Leviticus 25:30); and if in the beginning of the day of the twelfth month he (the purchaser) hides himself, that it may be confirmed to him or be his absolutely; Hillel, the elder, ordered that he (the seller) should put his money in the chamber (belonging to the sanhedrim) and break open the door, and go in; and when he would, he (the purchaser) might come, and take his money; but otherwise, if he suffers this time to
pass it is irredeemable, nor will the year of jubilee help him: the Jews
except the city of Jerusalem from this law, because, they say, that does not
belong to any tribe.

Ver. 31. But the houses of the villages, which have no walls round about
them, etc.] As there were many in the days of Joshua, the Scripture speaks
of: the Jews suppose that such are meant, even though they were
afterwards walled:

shall be counted as the fields of the country; and subject to the same law
as they:

they may be redeemed; at any time before the year of jubilee, and if not,
then

they shall go out in the jubilee; to the original owners of them, freely, as
Jarchi says, without paying anything for them.

Ver. 32. Notwithstanding, the cities of the Levites, etc.] The six cities of
refuge, and forty two others; these and the houses in them are excepted
from the above law, and only they; not such as they might purchase
elsewhere; wherefore it follows,

[and] the houses of the cities of their possession; which were in cities
possessed by them, and which was their possession, and given them as
such:

may the Levites redeem at any time; they were not restrained to a year, as
houses in walled towns, but they might redeem them as they pleased or
could; and if they did not redeem them within the year, they might redeem
them afterwards, even years after, and any time before the year of jubilee;
so it is said in the Misnah the priests and the Levites sell always, and
they redeem always, as it is said, (Leviticus 25:32); on which one of the
commentators says “they sell always”, not as the Israelites, who cannot
sell less than two years before the jubilee; but the Levites can sell near the
jubilee: “and they redeem always”; if they sell houses in walled cities, they
are not confirmed at the end of the year, as the houses of Israelites; and if
they sell fields, it is not necessary they should remain in the hands of the
buyer two years, but they may redeem them immediately if they will: this
redemption was peculiar to the Levites; for if an Israelite has an inheritance
from his father’s mother, a Levite, he might not redeem according to the
manner Levites did, but according to Israelites; and so a Levite that
inherited from his father’s mother, an Israelite, was obliged to redeem as an Israelite and not as a Levite; for this perpetual redemption respected only houses that were in the cities of the Levites.

Ver. 33. *And if a man purchase of the Levites,* etc.] An house or city, as Jarchi, and which the following clause confirms, that is, if a common Israelite made such a purchase, then it was redeemable, but if a Levite purchased of a Levite, then, as the same writer observes, it was absolutely irredeemable:

*then the house that was sold, and the city of his possession, shall go out in [the year of] jubilee;* to the original owner of it, as fields and houses in villages sold by the Israelites

*for the houses of the cities of the Levites [are] their possession among the children of Israel;* and their only possession, and therefore if those, when sold, were irredeemable, they would entirely be without any; and hence care is taken they should not; so Jarchi observes, that the Levites had no possession of fields and vineyards, only cities to dwell in, and their suburbs; wherefore cities were to them instead of fields, and their redemption was as that of fields, that so their inheritance might not be broken off from them.

Ver. 34. *But the field of the suburbs of their cities may not be sold,* etc.] The suburbs to the cities of the Levites reached two thousand cubits on every side of their cities, (Numbers 35:5); in which they had fields to keep their cattle in, and these belonged to them in common; every Levite had not a particular field to himself as his own property, and which is the reason why it might not be sold, nor might they agree together to sell it, for then they would have nothing to keep their cattle in: the Jewish writers generally understand this of changing their fields, suburbs, and cities: hence they say, in the Misnath, they do not make a field a suburb, nor a suburb a field, nor a suburb a city, nor a city a suburb; upon which Maimonides says, all agree that the Levites may not change a city, or suburb, or field which are theirs, because of what is said, (Leviticus 25:34); and the wise men, of blessed memory, say, the meaning of it is, it shall not be changed, for they do not change anything from what it was before:

*for it [is] their perpetual possession:* and therefore never to be alienated from them, or be sold to another, or changed and put to another use; such care was taken of the ministers of the sanctuary, and of their maintenance and support, under the former dispensation; and suggests that they should
continue in their stations without any alteration, as ministers of the Gospel should, who ought to give up themselves to the ministry of the word, and prayer, and not entangle themselves with the affairs of life.

Ver. 35. *And if thy brother be waxen poor*, etc.] An Israelite, as Aben Ezra, be reduced to a low estate, through afflictions in body, or in family, or through losses in trade, or want of business, or through one providence or another:

*and fallen in decay with thee*; in his worldly substance: or “his hand wavers”, or “fails”; so that he cannot support himself and his family, has not a sufficiency, or it is not in the power of his hands to do it; and it is not owing to sloth and negligence, but to unavoidable want and necessity:

*then thou shalt relieve him*; not merely by sympathizing with him, but by communicating to him, and distributing to his necessities; holding him up that he may not utterly fall, and strengthening his hands, that he may have a supply for his present wants:

*yea, though he be* a stranger or a sojourner; whether a proselyte of righteousness, who is circumcised, and in all things conforms to the true religion; or a proselyte of the gate, who takes it upon him not to worship idols, and eat things that die of themselves, as Jarchi notes:

*that he may live with thee*; continue in the land of Canaan, and not be obliged to quit it, and be laid under temptations of apostatizing from the true religion professed by him, and so far as he is come into it, which would bring a worse death than corporeal upon him; or that he may have a livelihood in some tolerable manner at least, and even live comfortably and cheerfully.

Ver. 36. *Take thou no usury of him, or increase*, etc.] Not only give him somewhat for his present relief, but lend him money to put him in a way of business, to get his living for the future, without requiring any interest for it; (see Gill on “<Exodus 22:25>”);

*but fear thy God*; who has given this command, and expects to be obeyed; and who is good, and does good, and should be feared for his goodness’ sake; and is omniscient, and knows what is secretly exacted, and will not suffer any exorbitance of this kind to pass unpunished:
that thy brother may live with thee; which it would be still more difficult for him to do, should usury and increase be taken of him.

Ver. 37. Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, etc.] Lend him money, expecting and insisting upon a large interest for it; this is to be understood of persons in poor and necessitous circumstances, of which the text only speaks; otherwise, if persons borrow money to gain by it, to carry on a greater trade, or to make purchase with it, it is but reasonable that the lender should have a share of profit arising from thence:

nor lend him thy victuals for increase; by which it should seem that those two words, used in (Leviticus 25:36), though in the main they signify the same thing, yet may be distinguished, the one as concerning money, the other food; and which latter is not to be given by way of loan to a person in want of it, but freely; as for instance, if a man gives a poor man a bushel of wheat, on condition he gives him two for it hereafter, this is lending or giving his victuals for increase.

Ver. 38. I [am] the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt, etc.] Where they had been strangers and sojourners, and therefore should be kind to such in necessitous circumstances, and relieve them, and especially their brethren; and where God had given them favour in the eyes of the Egyptians, and they had lent them jewels of gold and silver, and raiment, and therefore they should lend freely to persons in distress; and who had brought them out from thence, that they might take upon them his commandments, though they might be grievous, as Jarchi observes; and this, it may be remarked, is the preface to the ten commandments:

to give you the land of Canaan; freely, a land flowing with milk and honey; and therefore, since he had dealt so bountifully with them, and had given them plenty of good things, they need not grudge giving to their poor brethren, and others in necessitous circumstances:

[and] to be your God; their covenant God, to bless and prosper them, protect and defend them.

Ver. 39. And if thy brother [that dwelleth] by thee be waxen poor, etc.] The above laws and instructions seem designed to prevent such extreme poverty as obliged to what follows, namely, a brother being sold either to an Israelite or to a stranger, by relieving his wants or lending him money; but when these were insufficient to support him, and keep him from sinking
into the lowest state of distress and misery, then he was obliged to be sold, as follows:

*and be sold unto thee*; either by himself, being ready to starve and perish, or by the sanhedrin, having stolen something, as Aben Ezra observes; in such a case the civil magistrate had a power of selling a man, (Exodus 22:3);

*thou shall not compel him to serve as a bondservant*; such as were Heathens, and bought of them, or taken in war and made slaves of; but an Israelite sold was not to serve as they, either with respect to matter or manner, or time of service; such as were bondmen were put to the hardest service, the greatest drudgery, as well as what was mean and reproachful, and were used in the most rigorous and despotic manner, and were obliged to serve for ever, and were never released; but a brother, an Israelite, sold to another through extreme poverty, was not to be put to any low, mean, base, and disgraceful service, by which it would be known that he was a servant, as Jarchi notes; such as to carry his master’s vessels or instruments after him to the bath, or to unloose his shoes; but, as the same writer observes, he was to be employed in the business of the farm, or in some handicraft work, and was to be kindly and gently used, rather as a brother than a servant, and to be freed in the year of jubilee.

**Ver. 40.** *[But] as an hired servant, etc.*] Who is hired by the day, or month, or year; and, when his time is up, receives his wages and goes where he pleases, and while a servant is not under such despotic power and government as a slave is:

*[and] as a sojourner*; an inmate, one that dwells in part of a man’s house, or boards and lodges with him, and whom he treats in a kind and familiar manner, rather like one of his own family than otherwise:

*he shall be with thee*; as under the above characters, and used as such: this the Jews refer to food and drink, and other things, as they do, (Deuteronomy 15:16); and say that a master might not eat fine bread, and his servant bread of bran; nor drink old wine, and his servant new; nor sleep on soft pillows and bedding, and his servant on straw: hence, they say, he that gets himself an Hebrew servant is as if he got himself a master:

*[and] shall serve thee unto the year of the jubilee*; and no longer; for if the year of jubilee came before the six years were expired for which he sold
himself, the jubilee set him free, as Jarchi observes; nay, if be sold himself for ten or twenty years, and that but one year before the jubilee, it set him free, as Maimonides says

Ver. 41. And [then] shall he depart from thee, [both] he and his children with him, etc.] His sons and daughters, and his wife also, who is included in himself: if a man had a wife and children when he sold himself, or married afterwards, with his master’s consent, he was obliged to maintain them; though they were not sold to him, nor properly his servants, and so had a right to go out with him:

*and shall return unto his own family*; his father’s family, and that of his near relations, having been out of it during his time of servitude, and which the year of jubilee restored him to, (Leviticus 25:10);

*and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return*; the estate his father left him by inheritance, and which he was obliged to sell in the time of his poverty, or which fell to him since by the death of his father; to this also he was restored in the year of jubilee, as is expressed in the text referred to.

Ver. 42. *For they [are] my servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt*, etc.] The Lord redeemed them out of Egypt, made a purchase of them, and had a prior right unto them, and being his servants first, they cannot be the servants of others; his right unto them as such antecedes and prevents any other claim upon them:

*they shall not be sold as bondmen*; or, “with”, or, “according to the sale of a bondman”; in the manner they are sold, or according to the laws of selling of servants; not in such a public manner as they are sold in markets, nor for such purposes to be used as slaves in a rigorous manner, nor so as to be retained for ever in servitude; not to be sold by proclamation, as Jarchi observes, saying, here is a servant to be sold; nor shall they set him upon the stone of sale; but now an Israelite was not to be sold in such a manner, so Maimonides says, but privately, in an honourable way.

Ver. 43. *Thou shalt not rule over him with rigour*, etc.] As the Egyptians ruled over the Israelites, and made them to serve, (Exodus 1:13); where the same word is used as here, and seems designed to put them in mind of it, that so they might abstain from such usage of their brethren, which they
had met with from their most cruel enemies; it signifies tyranny and oppression, treating them with great severity, laying hard and heavy tasks and burdens upon them they could not bear; enjoining them things they could not perform, and ordering them to do what were unnecessary, and without any limitation with respect to time:

*but shalt fear thy God*; that has been good to thee, and has brought thee out of hard and rigorous bondage in Egypt; and which should be remembered with thankfulness, and they should fear to offend so good a God by using a brother cruelly.

Ver. 44. Both thy bondmen, and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, etc.] Such it seems were allowed them, if they had need of them; but if they had them, they were to be not of the nation of Israel, but of other nations; this is an anticipation of an objection, as Jarchi observes; if so, who shall I have to minister to me? The answer follows, they

*shall be* of the heathen that are round about thee, of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids; that is, of the Ammonites, Moabites, Edomites, and Syrians, as Aben Ezra, that were their neighbours, that lived round about them, of any but the seven nations, which they were ordered utterly to destroy; wherefore Jarchi observes it is said, “that are round about thee”; not in the midst of the border of your land, for them they were not to save alive, (Deuteronomy 20:16).

Ver. 45. Moreover, of the children of the strangers, that do sojourn among you, etc.] The uncircumcised sojourners as they are called in the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, proselytes of the gate, such of the nations round about who came and sojourned among them, being subject to the precepts given to the sons of Noah respecting idolatry, etc. but were not circumcised, and did not embrace the Jewish religion:

*of them shall ye buy*; for bondmen and bondmaids:

*and of their families that [are] with you, which they begat in your land*; but, as the Targum of Jonathan adds, are not of the Canaanites; though the Jewish writers say, that one of the nations that lies with a Canaanitish woman, and begets a son of her, he may be bought for a servant; and so if a Canaanitish man lies with one of the nations, and begets a son of her, he may also be bought for a servant:
and they shall be your possession; as servants, as bondmen and bondmaids, and be so for ever to them and their heirs, as follows.

Ver. 46. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, etc.] Which they might leave them at their death to inherit, as they did their estates and lands; for such servants are, with the Jews\(^{f893}\), said to be like immovable goods, as fields, vineyards, to inherit [them for] a possession; as their property, as anything else that was bequeathed to hem, as negroes now are in our plantations abroad:

thy shall be your bondmen for ever; and not be released at the year jubilee, nor before nor after; unless they obtained their liberty, either by purchase, which they might make themselves, or by the means of others, or else by a writing under their master’s hand dismissing them from his service\(^{f894}\); or in case they were maimed by him, then he was obliged to let them go free, (Exodus 21:26,27);

but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigour; which repeated for the confirmation of it, and for the fuller explanation and description of the person not to be ruled over with rigour; and that it might be the more taken notice of, and to make them the more careful in the observance of it and though this peculiarly respects masters’ treatment of their servants, yet Jarchi thinks it comprehends a prince over his people, and a king over his ministers, whom he may not rule with rigour.

Ver. 47. And if a sojourner or stranger wax rich by thee, etc.] An uncircumcised one, as the Targums, a proselyte of the gate, who by living among and trading with the Israelites, might grow rich and wealthy in money, at least so as to be able to purchase an Hebrew servant, though not his lands, which he might not buy:

and thy brother [that dwelleth] by him wax poor; comes into low circumstances, and is reduced to great poverty, even extreme poverty; for only in such a case might he sell himself to an Israelite, and much less to a stranger, if this was not the case. Jarchi suggests, as in the phrase, “by thee”, points at the cause or occasion of the sojourner or stranger becoming rich, his nearness unto, or cleaving to all Israelite; and so here the phrase, “by him”, directs to the cause or occasion of the Israelite’s becoming poor, his being near and cleaving to the sojourner or stranger: but they seem rather to be used, to show the reason of the poor Israelite
falling into the hands of a rich sojourner; they being near neighbours to one
another, and having a familiarity, the following bargain is struck between
them:

_and sell himself unto the stranger or sojourner thee_; the uncircumcised
sojourner, as the Targum of Jonathan:

_or to the stock of a stranger’s family_; or “root”\(^{1895}\), one that sprung from a
family, originally proselytes; which some understand of one, who though
he be descended from such a family, was now rooted among the people of
God, and incorporated into the commonwealth of Israel; and yet such an
one could not detain an Hebrew servant longer than the year of jubilee: but
the Jewish writers generally interpret it of an idolater\(^{1896}\).

Ver. 48. _After that he is sold he may be redeemed again_, etc.] Though an
Heathen, sold to an Israelite, was to be a bondman for ever, and could not
be released by the year of jubilee, yet an Israelite sold to an Heathen might
be redeemed before, and if not, he was freed then. The Jewish writers
understand this of an obligation upon the man, or his friends, or the
congregation, to redeem him, and that immediately, as the Targum of
Jonathan, and Jarchi, because of the danger he was in by being in the family
of an idolater, lest he be polluted\(^{1897}\), that is, with idolatry; or be swallowed
up among the Heathens, as Maimonides\(^{1898}\); but it is plain from
(\(^{032554}\)Leviticus 25:54), that there was no obligation for an immediate
redemption; nor was the person sold in such danger as suggested, since the
sojourner, to whom he is supposed to be sold, was no idolater, whether a
proselyte either of righteousness, or of the gate

_one of his brethren may redeem him_; which may be taken in a strict and
proper sense, for any of his brethren who were in circumstances sufficient
to redeem him, or for any near akin to him, as the following words seem to
explain it. No mention is made of his father: the reason of which Abarbinel
\(^{1899}\) says, because it cannot be thought that a father would suffer his son to
be sold, if it was in his power to redeem him, since a father is pitiful to his
son.

Ver. 49. _Either his uncle, or his uncle’s son, may redeem him_, etc.] it is
father’s brother or his father’s brother’s son, as the Targums of Onkelos
and Jonathan:

_or [any] that is nigh kin unto him of his family may redeem him_; from
whence it appears, that it must be a near kinsman that has to be the
redeemer, as in another case, the redemption of inheritances; hence the same word “goel” signifies both a redeemer and a near kinsman:

*or if he be able he may redeem himself*: who either has found something lost, or inherits the substance of anyone deceased, of his family, as Aben Ezra observes; that is, since he sold himself, which puts him into a capacity to redeem himself; the Targum of Jonathan adds,

“or the land of the congregation;”

for such a redemption was sometimes made at the expense of the public; (see Nehemiah 5:8). Baal Hatturim observes, that the words “Ben Dodo”, translated “his uncle’s son”, wanting the letter “tau” as usual, as the same letters with Ben David, which is a known name of the Messiah with the Jews, and which that author seems to have in view; and another Jewish writer expressly says,

“this Redeemer is the Messiah, the son of David, of the tribe of Judah:”

and indeed the whole of this case is applicable to the spiritual and eternal redemption of the people of God by Christ: they through the fall, and in a state of nature, are become poor and helpless, and in a spiritual sense have neither bread to eat, nor clothes to wear, nor money to buy either; and are in debt, owe ten thousand talents, and have nothing to pay, and so are brought into bondage to sin, Satan, and the law; nor can they redeem themselves from these by power or price; nor can a brother, or the nearest relation redeem them, or give to God a ransom for them; none but Christ could do this for them, who through his incarnation, whereby he became of the same nature, of the same flesh and blood with them, and in all things like unto them, is their “goel”, and so their Redeemer, and has obtained eternal redemption for them, not with silver and gold, but by his own precious blood.

**Ver. 50. And he shall reckon with him that bought him, etc.]** That is, either the man himself should reckon with him, or whoever undertook to redeem him:

*from the year that he was sold to him unto the year of jubilee;* and so count how many years he had served, and how many were yet to come; and by this it appears, that one thus sold was not released at the end of six years, or the sabbatical year did not free him:
and the price of his sale shall be according to the number of years; whether more or fewer, as after explained:

according to the time of an hired servant shall it be with him; the time of service he had served his master shall be reckoned, as if he had been hired for so much a year; and according to the number of years he had been with him, so much per annum was to be deducted from the original purchase, and the rest to be made for his redemption to him that bought him.

Ver. 51. If [there be] yet many years behind, etc.] To the year of jubilee, and more than he had served:

according unto them he shall give again the price of his redemption, out of the money that he was bought for; suppose, for instance, when a man sold himself, there were twenty years to the year of jubilee, and he sold himself for twenty pieces of money, gold or silver, be the value what it will; and when he comes to treat with his master about his redemption, or a relation for him, and he has served just as many years as there are to the year of jubilee, ten years, then his master must be paid for the price of his redemption ten pieces of money; but if he has served but five years, and there are fifteen to come, he must give him fifteen pieces; and so in proportion, be the years more or fewer, as follows.

Ver. 52. And if there remain but few years unto the year of jubilee, etc.] Fewer than what he has served, then the less is given for his redemption: thus, for instance, in the above supposed case, if he has served fifteen years, and there remain but five to the year of jubilee:

then he shall count with him, [and] according unto his years shall he give him again the price of his redemption; as in the fore mentioned case, he shall give him five pieces of money; and thus the law of justice and equity was maintained between the buyer and seller, the purchaser and the redeemer: in a like righteous manner the people of God are redeemed by Christ.

Ver. 53. [And] as a yearly hired servant shall he be with him, etc.] Being redeemable every year, and upon his redemption might quit his master’s service, as an hireling may; and the price of his redemption to be valued according to the years he served, and as if he had been hired for so much a year; as well as he was to be treated in a kind and gentle manner, not as a bondman, but as if he was an hired servant, as follows:
[and the other] shall not rule with rigour over him in thy sight; the person he is sold unto, his master, a sojourner or stranger, he might not use an Hebrew he had bought with any severity; for if an Hebrew master might not use an Hebrew servant with rigour, it was not by any means to be admitted in the commonwealth of Israel for a proselyte to use one in such a manner, and that openly, in the sight of an Israelite his neighbour; he looking on and not remonstrating against it, or acquainting the civil magistrate with it, who had it in his power to redress such a grievance, and ought to do it.

Ver. 54. And if he be not redeemed in these [years], etc.] The Targum of Jonathan supplies the text as we do, in any of the years from the time of his sale to the year of jubilee; and so Aben Ezra interprets it, in the years that remain to the jubilee; but he observes there are others that say, by the means of those above mentioned, that is, by his nearest of kin, or by himself; for the word “years” is not in the text, which may be supplied, either with “years” or “relations”; and so the Vulgate Latin, Septuagint, and Oriental versions read, “by these” means, things or persons:

then he shall go out on the year of jubilee: out of the house and service of him that bought him, he shall go out free and freely, without paying anything for his freedom, having served his full time unto which he was bought:

[both] he and his children with him; and his wife too, if he had any, who, was comprehended in himself, and whom, both wife and children, his master was obliged to maintain during his servitude.

Ver. 55. For unto me the children of Israel [are] servants, etc.] And therefore not to be perpetual servants to men, as those who are bought and redeemed by the blood of Christ should not be, (1 Corinthians 7:23); The Targum of Jonathan is, servants to my law; (see Romans 7:25); those that are redeemed by Christ are also servants to his Gospel, and obey from their heart the form and doctrine delivered to them;

they [are] my servants, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt: where they were in cruel bondage, and made to serve with rigour, but now, being delivered from thence, were laid under obligation to serve the Lord; nor was it his will that others should rule over them with rigour, whether of their own nation or strangers, or that they should be bondmen and bondmaids, or perpetual servants to any:
I [am] the Lord your God; their covenant God, who had been kind to them, particularly in the instance mentioned, and would take care that they should not be ill used by others, and therefore ought to serve him readily and cheerfully.
CHAPTER 26

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 26

In this chapter, after a repetition of some laws against idolatry, and concerning keeping sabbaths, and reverencing the sanctuary of God, (Leviticus 26:1,2); in order to encourage the Israelites to keep the various statutes and commandments in this book, and in the preceding, many promises are made of plenty, and peace, and safety from enemies, and of the presence of God with them, (Leviticus 26:3-13); and on the contrary, to such as should despise and break his commandments, the most grievous things are threatened, as diseases of body, destruction by their enemies, barrenness and unfruitfulness of land, the sore judgments of wild beasts, famine, sword, and pestilence, (Leviticus 26:14-39); and yet after all, when they should confess their sins, and were humbled for them, the Lord promises to remember the covenant he made with their ancestors, and would deal kindly with them, and not cast them away, and utterly destroy them, (Leviticus 26:40-46).

Ver. 1. Ye shall have no idols, or graven image, etc.] Some of the Jewish writers, as Jarchi and Aben Ezra, think this law against idolatry is mentioned on account of the Israelite sold to a stranger, spoken of in the latter part of the preceding chapter, lest he should be drawn into idolatry; (see Gill on Leviticus 25:48”); but this is rather mentioned as being a principal law, respecting the honour and glory of God, and the foundation of all religion and godliness, and the breach of it a capital crime, and which led on to other sins, and exposed to the displeasure and resentment of God, and brought on all the calamities after mentioned in this chapter. “Idols” here signify “things of nought”, as an idol is nothing in the world, (1 Corinthians 8:4); and a “graven image”, any likeness of man or beast cut out of wood, or stone; and may include any molten image of gold, silver, or brass, and then engraven with a tool, as the golden calf was, (Exodus 32:4):

*nor rear you up a standing image*; or pillar, an heap of rude stones, set up pillar, not bearing the likeness of any creature; otherwise graven and molten images were standing ones, but these were statues without any
figure; such as the Arabians used to worship; the god Mars, worshipped in Arabia Petraea, was no other than a black stone four square, unformed, four feet high, and two broad, and was placed on a basis of gold; 

*neither shall ye set up [any] image of stone in your land, to bow down unto*; any “figured stone”, as the Targum and Aben Ezra interpret it, which had figures and representations of creatures cut in it, in order to bow down unto and worship: the word has the signification of covering, as they cover a floor with a pavement of stones:

*for I [am] the Lord your God*; who is the alone object of religious worship and adoration.

**Ver. 2.** *Ye shall keep my sabbaths*, etc.] The seventh day sabbaths, and the seventh year sabbaths; especially the former are meant, in which religious worship was given to the one true and living God, and therefore the observance of them is strictly enjoined; and hence this law follows closely upon the former, though Aben Ezra restrains it to the sabbatical years, or seventh year sabbaths, as he applies the sanctuary in the following clause to the jubilee year, which is said to be holy, (Leviticus 26:12); supposing that this refers unto and stands in strict connection with the laws of the preceding chapter, concerning the sabbatical, (Leviticus 25:1-7), and jubilee years, (Leviticus 25:8-55):

*and reverence my sanctuary*; by attending in it, and on the worship in it, with reverence and godly fear, (see Leviticus 19:30);

*I [am] the Lord*; who had a right to such religious worship, and to command such things, in which he ought to be obeyed, his sabbaths kept, and sanctuary reverenced.

**Ver. 3.** *If ye walk in my statutes, and keep my commandments, and do them.*] Both moral, ceremonial, and judicial, which had been delivered unto them, and now completely recorded in this and the preceding book; for what follow in the two next are chiefly repetitions of what are contained in these.

**Ver. 4.** *Then I will give you rain in due season*, etc.] The former and latter rain, in the two seasons of the year in which rain usually fell, and the Scriptures frequently speak of; and when the land of Israel, which required rain, not being watered with a river, as Egypt, was blessed with it; the one was at the sowing of their seed, or a little after it, and the other a little
before harvest; and when it was had in those times it was had in due season, and hence the word is in the plural number, “your rains”\(^9\), unless showers of rain are meant: to encourage to keep the commands of God, promises of many outward good things are made; and this is the first, being a principal blessing, and which only God, and not all the vanities of the Gentiles, could give:

*and the land shall yield her increase*; which is greatly owing to seasonable showers of rain, by which means the earth brings forth bread to the eater and seed to the sower, corn and grass for man and beast:

*and the trees of the field shall yield their fruit*; vines, olives, pomegranates, figs, etc. are meant, with which the land of Israel abounded, (Deuteronomy 8:8).

**Ver. 5.** *And your threshing shall reach unto the vintage, and the vintage shall reach unto the sowing time,* etc.] Signifying that there should be such plentiful harvests of barley and wheat, the first of which began in March, as would employ them in threshing them out unto the time of vintage, which may be supposed to, be in the month of July; for on the twenty ninth of Sivan, which was about the middle of June, was the time of the first ripe grapes, as appears, (see Gill on "Numbers 13:20"); and that they should have such quantities of grapes on their vines, as would employ them in gathering and pressing them until seedtime, which was usually in October, (see Amos 9:13);

*and ye shall eat your bread to the full*; which is put for all provisions; and the meaning is, they should have plenty of food, eat full meals, or however, what they ate, whether little or much, should be satisfying and refreshing to them, having it with a divine blessing:

*and dwell in your land safely*; would have no need to go out of it into other lands for the sake of food, and would be in no danger from enemies invading them and carrying off their substance; plenty without safety would not be so great a blessing as with it, since, though they had it, they might be deprived of it, wherefore security from enemies is promised.

**Ver. 6.** *And I will give peace in the land,* etc.] Among yourselves, as Aben Ezra; that as safety from enemies is promised before, here it is assured they should be free from insurrections and from riots, broils, contentions, and civil wars among themselves:
and ye shall lie down, and none shall make [you] afraid; that is, lie down upon their beds, and sleep quietly and comfortably, and not be in any fear of thieves and robbers breaking in upon them, (Psalm 3:5 4:8);

and I will rid evil beasts out of the land: out of the land of Israel, as the Targum of Jonathan, not out of the world, such as lions, bears, wolves, etc. which were sometimes troublesome and mischievous in the land:

neither shall the sword go through your land; either the sword of the enemy, which if it entered should not be suffered to proceed, much less to pervade the land and destroy the inhabitants of it: so the Targum of Jonathan,

“they that draw the sword shall not pass through your land,”
or the sword of the Lord, that is, the pestilence, (1 Chronicles 21:12); as Ainsworth suggests; though the Jews commonly understand it of the sword of peace, as they call it, though that is of one that is not an enemy, but passes through one country to destroy another; which yet is distressing to the country he passes through, as in the case of Pharaoh Necho, whom Josiah went out to meet, (2 Chronicles 35:20); though, by what follows, it seems rather to be the first of these.

Ver. 7. And ye shall chase your enemies, etc.] Who being overcome in battle, and put to the flight, should be pursued:

and they shall fall before you by the sword; not by the sword of one another, as the Midianites did, (Judges 7:21,22), so Jarchi; but rather by the sword of the Israelites, for oftentimes multitudes of the enemy are killed in a pursuit.

Ver. 8. And five of you shall chase an hundred, etc.] One man chase twenty;

and an hundred of you put ten thousand to flight; which, had it been in proportion to the other number, should have been two thousand, as in (Deuteronomy 32:30); where there is a proportion observed; and Abendana observes, there are some that give the sense of it thus, an hundred of you, an hundred times five, that is, five hundred, and so it comes up to a right computation; but here it seems to be a certain number for an uncertain, and only a proverbial expression, signifying that a very few, under the blessing of divine Providence, should get the advantage
over a large number, and oblige them to retire, and pursue them closely: instances we have of large bodies of the enemy being defeated by a small number of Israelites, ( Judges 7:21,22); and even many by a single person or two, ( 1 Samuel 14:13,14 2 Samuel 23:8-16);

*and your enemies shall fall before you by the sword*; (see Gill on Leviticus 26:7).

**Ver. 9. For I will have respect unto you**, etc.] Look at them with delight and pleasure, and with a careful eye on them, watch over them to do them good, and protect them from all evil; or turn himself to them from all others, having a particular regard for them and special care of them:

*and make you fruitful and multiply you*; increase their number, as he did in Egypt, even amidst all their afflictions; and much more might they expect this blessing in the land of Canaan, when settled there, which is the original blessing of mankind, (see Genesis 1:28 9:1);

*and establish my covenant with you*; not the new covenant spoken of in Jeremiah 31:31); as Jarchi and other Jewish writers suggest; for that was not to take place but in future time, under the Gospel dispensation; but rather the covenant made with them at Sinai, though perhaps it chiefly respects the covenant made with their ancestors concerning multiplication of their seed as the stars of heaven and the sand of the sea, (Genesis 15:5 22:17), since it follows upon the promise of an increase of them.

**Ver. 10. And ye shall eat old store**, etc.] What is very old, corn of three years old, as Jarchi and Kimchi interpret it; such plenty should they have that it would be so long consuming:

*and bring forth the old because of the new*; out of their barns and granaries, to make room for the new, which they should have great quantities of, and scarce know where to bestow them; and therefore should empty their treasures and garner's of the old, and fill them with new; or they should bring them forth out of their barns into their houses, to make use of themselves, or into their markets to expose to sale, being under no temptation to withhold against a time of scarcity in order to make more of it, (see Proverbs 11:26); now all these temporal blessings promised may be emblems of spiritual things, and might be so understood by such who were spiritually enlightened; as of the rain of divine grace, and the blessings of it, and of the doctrines of the Gospel, sometimes compared thereunto, (Deuteronomy 32:2 Isaiah 54:10,11); and of great fruitfulness in
grace and good works, and of internal peace in the minds of good men, and of their safety and security from spiritual enemies; of fulness of spiritual provisions, even of things new and old, and which are laid up for them, (Song of Solomon 7:13); thus promises of a spiritual nature more manifestly follow.

Ver. 11. And I will set my tabernacle amongst you, etc.] Which God had directed them to make, and they had made, and also erected; but here he promises to fix and establish it among them, that so it might continue as a place for the public worship of him, and where he would take up his residence, and grant them his presence; so the Targum of Jonathan,

“I will put the Shechinah of my glory among you:”

and my soul shall not abhor you; though in themselves, and because of their sins, loathsome and abominable; the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan are,

“my Word shall not abhor you;”

and the whole may have respect to Christ, the Word made flesh, and tabernacling among them; the tabernacle being a type and emblem of the human nature of Christ, in which the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily, and is the true tabernacle which God pitched and not man, (John 1:14, Colossians 1:9, Hebrews 8:2).

Ver. 12. And I will walk among you, etc.] As they journeyed from place to place, he walked among them, in the tabernacle built for him, (2 Samuel 7:6); it may be expressive of the familiarity and communion which the Lord grants to his people, in and through Christ:

and will be your God; to provide for them, and supply them with all the blessings of his goodness, both in providence and grace; and to protect and defend them against all their enemies, temporal and spiritual:

and ye shall be my people; appear to be a special and peculiar people of his, chosen, redeemed, and sanctified by him, and to whom he bore a special love, and took special care of; (2 Corinthians 6:16); the Targum of Jonathan of the whole is,

“I will make the glory of my Shechinah dwell among you, and my Word shall be unto you for God the Redeemer, and ye shall be to my name for a people of Holy Ones.”
Ver. 13. **I [am] the Lord your Lord, which brought you forth out of the land of Egypt, etc.**] Who, having done that, was able to fulfil the above promises; and which may be considered as an earnest and pledge of them, as well as be a motive to the Israelites, and an obligation upon them to obey the commandments of God, and walk in his statutes:

*that ye should not be their bondmen;* this was the end of their being brought out of Egypt, that they might be no longer in a state of bondage to the Egyptians, nor to any other, but to serve the Lord their God, by whom they were delivered; as those who are redeemed by Christ from worse than Egyptian bondage, from sin, Satan, and the law, are redeemed, that they might not be the servants of any, but be a peculiar people, zealous of good works to serve the Lord Christ:

*and I have broken the bands of your yoke;* which fastened it on their shoulders, that is, set them at full liberty, from the yoke of all their enemies, particularly the Egyptians, who made their lives bitter in hard bondage, making the yoke of it heavy upon them; as Christ has broken the yoke of spiritual enemies from off the shoulders and necks of his people, (Isaiah 10:27);

*and made you go upright;* who before stooped under the yoke, as well as were of dejected countenances, but now were made to walk in an erect stature, as the Targum of Jonathan, and so Jarchi and Aben Ezra, or in liberty, as Onkelos; (see Galatians 5:1); and with heads lift up and countenances cheerful.

Ver. 14. **But if ye will not hearken unto me, etc.**] To his commandments, as the rule of their duty, and to his promises, as an encouragement to it, or to his prophets and ministers, explaining and enforcing his law, and exhorting to a cheerful obedience to it; so the Targum of Jonathan,

“if ye will not hearken to the doctrine of them that teach my laws;”

which was the sin of the Jews in later times, for which captivity and other calamities befell them, (Jeremiah 7:25 25:3,4 44:5);

*and will not do all these commandments;* which he had delivered to them by Moses, whether moral, ceremonial, or judicial, recorded in this book and in the preceding; even all of them were to be respected, attended to, and performed, for the law curses everyone that does not do all things it requires, (Galatians 3:10).
Ver. 15. *And if ye shall despise my statutes*, etc.] Which is an aggravated sin; to be negligent hearers of the commands of God is bad, not to be doers of them worse, but to treat them with contempt is worse still:

*or if your soul abhor my judgments*: which is worst of all, to despise them as if not wisely or righteously made is a dreadful reflection upon the Maker of them; but to abhor them as bad things, not fit to be regarded, but to be had in the utmost detestation, is shocking impiety:

*so that ye will not do all my commandments*; nor any of them, but are set against them, and determined and resolved on the contrary:

*[but] that ye break my covenant*; the covenant made with them at Sinai, when they promised, on their part, that they would hearken and be obedient, (Exodus 24:7).

Ver. 16. *I also will do this unto you*, etc.] Henceforward follow threatenings of dreadful evils to the transgressors and despisers of the commandments of God, which thus begin:

*I will even appoint over you terror, consumption, and the burning ague, that shall consume the eyes, and cause sorrow of heart*; some, as Aben Ezra observes, take these to design what may affect the seed sown and the increase of it, such as blasting and mildew, because it follows: “ye shall sow in vain”; but no doubt diseases of the body are intended; for what we translate “terror” does not signify terror of mind, but some sudden, hasty, terrible distemper: perhaps the pestilence, as the Targum of Jonathan; some have thought of the falling sickness, as Bishop Patrick, because the word has the signification of haste and precipitance; and the second is a disease well known among us, and so called from its wasting and consuming nature; Jarchi interprets it of a disease which swells the flesh, either fills it with tumours and pustules, the Septuagint calls it the itch; or with wind or water, which has led some to think of the dropsy; and the last of them seems to be rightly rendered a burning ague or fever, though the Septuagint takes it for the jaundice, but that seems not to be so threatening, terrible, and dangerous, as what may be here supposed: now these diseases and all others are by the appointment of God, they come and go by his order, and while they continue have the power over persons, nor can they rid themselves of them at pleasure; and these have such an effect on persons seized by them, as to cause dimness of sight, a hollowness of their eyes, which sink into the head, as well as fill the heart with grief and
sorrow; either through present pains and agonies, or in a view of future judgment and wrath to come:

_and ye shall sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it_; either eat it up for forage before it is ripe, or, if ripe and gathered in the barn, should come and besiege their cities and plunder their granaries.

Ver. 17. _And I will set my face against you_, etc.] Exert his power, and stir up his wrath and indignation against them, as enemies of his, to cut them off; (see <197416>Psalm 34:16); which is the reverse of having respect to them, (<032609>Leviticus 26:9);

_and ye shall be slain before your enemies_; as they were sometimes by the Philistines and others:

_and they that hate you shall reign over you_; as did the Chaldeans and Babylonians; (see <031609>Psalm 106:41);

_and ye shall flee when none pursueth you_; of such pusillanimous spirits should they be, and filled with such dread and terror of their enemies, so contrary from what is promised them on their obedience, (<032608>Leviticus 26:8).

Ver. 18. _And if ye will not for all this hearken unto me_, etc.] If such corrections by diseases of body, and by giving them up into the hands of their enemies, should be ineffectual to reform them, and bring them to obedience to the statutes and commandments of God, but should continue in their disobedience to him, and rebellion against him:

_then I will punish you seven times more for your sins_; that is, abundantly more, with sorer punishments, and these more frequently repeated.

Ver. 19. _And I will break the pride of your power_, etc.] Which the Targum of Jonathan and Jarchi interpret of the sanctuary, which they were proud of, trusted in, and boasted of; but was broke or destroyed, first by Nebuchadnezzar, then by the Romans: but it may rather signify their country, the glory of all lands for its fruitfulness, which for their sins should become barren, as follows; or the multitude of their forces, and the strength of their mighty men of war, in which they put their confidence; it may take in everything, civil and ecclesiastical, they prided themselves with, and had their dependence on, thinking themselves safe on account of them, but should be broken to shivers, and be of no service to them:
and I will make your heaven as iron; so that neither dew nor rain shall descend from thence to make the earth fruitful; but, on the contrary, an heat should be reflected, which would parch it, and make it barren:

and your earth as brass; that the seed could not be cast into it, nor anything spring out of it, for the service of man and beast, so that a famine must unavoidably follow.

**Ver. 20. And your strength shall be spent in vain, etc.]** In endeavouring to till the ground, to plough, or sow, or to dig about the vines or olives, and prune them;

for your land shall not yield its increase; produce corn, and bring forth grass, the one for the use of men, the other for the use of the cattle, and therefore both must starve:

*neither shall the trees of the land yield their fruits;* such as vines, olives, figs, pomegranates, etc. which were very plentiful in the land of Judea, and on which they much lived, and on which their more comfortable subsistence at least depended, (see Habakkuk 3:17); all this is the reverse of (Leviticus 26:4,5,10).

**Ver. 21. And if ye walk contrary unto me, etc.]** To his mind and will, to his laws, commands, and ordinances, showing no regard unto them by a walk and conversation agreeably to them, but neglecting and breaking them continually; or by chance, as the Targum of Jonathan, not with any intention and design to obey the Lord, and to honour and glorify him, but in a careless and indifferent manner, having no regard to the law of God, only now and then, as it happens, act according to it, but having no concern for the honour and glory of God:

and will not hearken unto me; to his voice in his laws and his precepts, or by his prophets, exhorting them to obedience to them:

*I will bring seven times more plagues upon you, according to your sins;* greater and sorer punishments still, and these more frequently repeated, and in proportion to their transgressions of his righteous laws.

**Ver. 22. I will also send wild beasts among you, etc.]** Either in a literal sense, as lions, bears, wolves, etc. and so is the reverse of what is promised to them on their doing well, (Leviticus 26:6); or figuratively, mighty
monarchs and cruel oppressors, such as were the kings of Assyria and Babylon, (Jeremiah 50:17);

*which shall rob you of your children*; as the bears, in a literal sense, destroyed the children of them in the times of Elisha, (2 Kings 2:24);

*and destroy your cattle*; the tame beasts, who often become a prey to the wild ones, as both those of the flock, and of the herd, sheep and oxen, do to lions, wolves, etc.

*and make you few in number*; or diminish them, their number, by bereaving them of their children, and their wealth and substance, by destroying their cattle:

*and your [high] ways shall be desolate*; or ways, the word high not being in the text, and may signify both their public and private ones, which would be all forsaken, none caring to venture to walk in them for fear of beasts of prey.

**Ver. 23.** *And if ye will not be reformed by these things*, etc.] Corrected and amended by these punishments, be prevailed upon to return from their evil ways to the Lord, and walk in his commandments, and keep his judgments, and do them:

*but will walk contrary unto me*; (see Gill on “Leviticus 26:21”).

**Ver. 24.** *Then I will also walk contrary unto you*, etc.] Opposing himself unto them as their enemy, fighting against them in his providence, whetting his sword, bending his bow, and causing the arrows of his wrath and vengeance to fall upon them; or behaving towards them in a careless and indifferent manner, not regarding what befell them, showing no peculiar concern for them, or as exercising any particular providence over them; but as if everything came by chance to them, which was the language of their actions, if not of their lips:

*and will punish you yet seven times for your sins*; add fresh corrections, and these greater than before, and more numerous in proportion to their aggravated transgressions.

**Ver. 25.** *And I will bring a sword upon you*, etc.] War upon them by the sword of their enemies; they that use and kill with the sword, as the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan; their neighbours that delighted in war,
and bore an implacable hatred unto them, and gladly embraced every opportunity of shedding their blood, and ravaging their country:

*that shall avenge the quarrel of [my] covenant*; the covenant made with them at Sinai, which they transgressed, and for which vengeance would be taken on them in this way, God so ordering it in his providence, though the enemy meant it not, (Isaiah 10:5-7);

*and when ye are gathered together within your cities*; from the fields and villages, fleeing from the enemy invading and destroying, to their fortified towns and cities for safety:

*I will send the pestilence among you*; which shall destroy those that escaped the sword, and thought themselves safe in a strong city, and even the very soldiers in the garrisons, who were set for the defence of the city:

*and ye shall be delivered into the hand of the enemy*; so many being taken off by the pestilence, there would not be a sufficient number to defend the place, and therefore obliged to give it up, by which means those that escaped the pestilence would fall into the hands of the enemy.

**Ver. 26.** [And] *when I have broken the staff of your bread*, etc.] Brought a famine, at least a scarcity of provisions upon them, deprived them of bread, the staff of life, by which it is supported; or however made it very scarce among them, so that they had hardly a sufficiency to sustain nature, and perhaps the blessing of nourishment withheld from that; (see Isaiah 3:1);

*ten women shall bake your bread in one oven*; for want of wood, according to Jarchi; or rather through scarcity of bread corn, they should have so little to bake every week, that one oven would be sufficient for ten families, which in a time of plenty each made use of one for themselves; and so Aben Ezra says, it was a custom in Israel for every family to bake in an oven by themselves, which they ate the whole week. Ten is a certain number for an uncertain, and denotes many, as in (Zechariah 8:23).

Making and baking bread was the work of women in the eastern countries, as we find it was particularly among the Persians, and continues to this day among the Moors and Arabs:

*and they shall deliver [you] your bread again by weight*; there being not enough for everyone to eat what they pleased, but were obliged to a
rationed allowance, therefore everyone in the family should have their share delivered to him by weight; (see Ezekiel 4:16,17);

_and ye shall eat, and not be satisfied_; not having enough to eat to satisfaction; or what they did eat, God would withhold a blessing from it for their nourishment, the reverse of (Leviticus 26:5,10).

Ver. 27. _And if ye for all this will not hearken unto me_, etc.] To his commands, and to his prophets sent unto them time after time, and all his corrections and chastisements being ineffectual to reform them, and make them obedient to him:

*but walk contrary unto me*; (see Gill on “Leviticus 26:21”).

Ver. 28. _Then I will walk contrary to you also in fury_, etc.] As in (Leviticus 26:24); with this addition, in fury; being greatly provoked, and highly incensed, that no regard was had to him, neither to his commands, nor to his corrections; and therefore would be determined to stir up his wrath, and pour out the fury of his indignation on them, which must be terrible;

_and I, even I, will chastise you seven times for your sins_; add new and many more chastisements, and that in hot displeasure, for their sins; and the repetition or doubling of the phrase, “I, even I, will do it”, denotes the certainty of it, and that he will do it himself, and his hand should be visible in it; and they should feel the weight of it, and be obliged to own that these were punishments inflicted by him for their sins.

Ver. 29. _And ye shall eat the flesh of your sons_, etc.] Which was fulfilled at the siege of Samaria, in the times of Joram, (2 Kings 6:29); and at the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, (Lamentations 4:10); and though there is no instance of it at that time in the sacred records, the Jews tell us of one Doeg ben Joseph, who died and left a little one with his mother, who was very fond of him; but at this siege slew him with her own hands, and ate him, with respect to which they suppose Jeremiah makes the lamentation, (Lamentations 2:2); and of this also there was an instance at the last siege of Jerusalem, by Titus, when a woman, named Mary, of a considerable family, boiled her son, and ate part of him, and the rest was found in her house when the seditious party broke in upon her, as Josephus relates:
and the flesh of your daughters shall ye eat; of which, though no instances are given, it is as reasonable to suppose it was done as the former. Some of the Jewish writers think, that in this prediction is included, that children should eat their parents, as well as parents their children, as in (Ezekiel 5:10).

Ver. 30. And I will destroy your high places, etc.] Which Jarchi interprets of towers and palaces; but Aben Ezra of the place of sacrifices; for on high places, hills and mountains, they used to build altars, and there offer sacrifices, in imitation of the Heathens; (see Gill on “Ezekiel 6:13”);

and cut down your images; called Chammanim, either from Ham, the son of Noah, the first introducer of idolatrous worship after the flood, as some have thought; or from Jupiter Ammon, worshipped in Egypt, from whence the Jews might have these images; or rather from Chammah, the sun, so called from its heat; so Jarchi says, there were a sort of idols placed on the roofs of houses, and because they were set in the sun, they were called by this name; and Kimchi observes they were made of wood, and made by the worshippers of the sun, (see 2 Kings 23:11); but Aben Ezra is of opinion that these were temples built for the worship of the sun, which is the most early sort of idolatry that appeared in the world, to which Job may be thought to refer, (Job 31:26,27). Some take these to be the πυρατθεῖα, or “fire hearths”, which Strabo described as large enclosures, in the midst of which was an altar, where the (Persian) Magi kept their fire that never went out, which was an emblem of the sun they worshipped; and these, he says, were in the temples of Anaitis and Omanus, and where the statue of the latter was in great pomp; which idol seems to have its name from the word in the text; and these are fitly added to the high places, because on such, as Herodotus says, the Persians used to worship:

and cast your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols; or “dunghill gods”; such as the beetle, the Egyptians worshipped, signifying that they and their idols should be destroyed together:

and my soul shall abhor you; the reverse of (Leviticus 26:6); and by comparing it with that, this may signify the removal of the divine Presence from them, as a token of his abhorrence of them; and so Jarchi and Aben Ezra interpret it.
Ver. 31. *I will make your cities waste*, etc.] By suffering the enemy to besiege them, enter into them, and plunder them, and destroy the houses in them, and reduce them to the most desolate condition, as Jerusalem, their metropolis, was more than once:

*and bring your sanctuaries unto desolation*; the temple, so called from the several apartments in it, the court, the holy place, and the most holy; or rather both sanctuaries or temples are intended, the first built by Solomon, and destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar; the second rebuilt by Zerubbabel, and adorned by Herod, and reduced to ashes by Titus Vespasian: the Jews understand this of their synagogues, which were many both in Jerusalem, and in other parts of their country, but cannot be intended, since it follows:

*and I will not smell the savour of your sweet odours*: of their incense offered on the altar of incense; or the savour of their offerings, as the Targum of Jonathan, of their burnt offerings, and the fat of their other offerings burnt on the altar of burnt offering; signifying, that these would not be acceptable to him, or he smell a savour of rest in them; (see Genesis 8:21); now these were only offered in the temple, not in synagogues.

Ver. 32. *And I will bring the land into desolation*, etc.] The whole country of Judea, cities, towns, villages, fields, vineyards, etc. through the ravage and plunder of the enemy; and they being driven out of it, and carried captive from it, and so the land left untilled, and become barren and unfruitful:

*and your enemies which dwell therein*; having destroyed them, or cast them out, and sent them into other countries, and took possession of theirs in their room;

*shall be astonished at it*; at the desolation of the land, that such a fruitful country, a land flowing with milk and honey, should be turned into barrenness, for the wickedness of its inhabitants, and shall be amazed at the judgments of God upon them and that.

Ver. 33. *And I will scatter you among the Heathen*, etc.] As with a fan, (Jeremiah 15:7); so they were at the time of the Assyrian and Babylonish captivities, some were carried to one place, and some to another, some fled to one place, and some to another, and they are at this day scattered among the several nations of the world;
and will draw out a sword after you; draw it out of its scabbard, and with it pursue after them, when fleeing or going whither they should not; as the remainder of the Jews in Judea sought to go to Egypt, contrary to the will of God, (Jeremiah 42:16); (see Leviticus 26:25);

and your land shall be desolate, and your cities waste; for want of men to till the one, and inhabit the other.

Ver. 34. Then shall the land enjoy her sabbaths, etc.] The sabbatical years, or seventh year sabbaths, when, according to the law in the preceding chapter, it was to rest from tillage, (Leviticus 25:2-4):

as long as it lieth desolate, and ye [be] in your enemies’ land; so long it should lie uncultivated, at least in part, there not being a sufficient number left to till it in general, or as it should be; this was the case during the seventy years’ captivity in Babylon;

[even] then shall the land rest, and enjoy her sabbaths; or complete them, as Aben Ezra, which is a bitter sarcasm upon them for their neglect of observance of the law concerning the sabbatical years; but now the land should have its sabbaths of rest whether they would or not; and it seems as if it was on account of this sin, as well as others, that they were carried captive; and it is remarkable, if what Maimonides says is right, that it was at the going out or end of a sabbatical year, that the first temple was destroyed, and the Jews carried captive, and endured a seventy years’ captivity; which some say was because they had neglected seventy sabbatical years; (see 2 Chronicles 36:21).

Ver. 35. As long as it lieth desolate it shall rest, etc.] From tillage, neither man nor beast working upon it; for which reason such a space of time was called a sabbath:

because it did not rest in your sabbaths, when you dwelt upon it; they manured and tilled it on the seventh years, as on others, neglecting the command which God had given them; and this they did not once or twice, but many times, while they were dwellers in the land; which seems to confirm pretty much the notion of their having omitted so many years, though that cannot be affirmed with certainty; see Jarchi on the place.

Ver. 36. And upon them that are left [alive] of you, etc.] In the land of Judea, or rather scattered about among the nations, suggesting that these would be comparatively few:
I will send a faintness into their hearts in the lands of their enemies; or “a softness”; so that they should be effeminate, pusillanimous, and cowardly, have nothing of a manly spirit and courage in them; but be mean spirited and faint hearted, as the Jews are noted to be at this day, as Bishop Patrick observes; who also adds,

“it being scarce ever heard, that a Jew listed himself for a soldier, or engaged in the defence of his country where he lives:”

and the sound of a shaken leaf shall chase them; either the sound of a leaf that falls from the tree, as the Targum of Jonathan, or which the wind beats one against another, as Jarchi, which makes some little noise; even this should terrify them, taking it to be the noise of some enemy near at hand, just ready to fall on them; such poor faint hearted creatures should they be;

and they shall flee as fleeing from the sword; as if there were an army of soldiers with their swords drawn pursuing them:

and they shall fall when none pursueth; fall upon the ground, and into a fit, and drop down as if dead, as if they had been really wounded with a sword and slain, (see Proverbs 28:1).

Ver. 37. And they shall fall one upon another, etc.] In their hurry and confusion, everyone making all the haste he can to escape the imaginary danger; or “a man upon his brother”; his friend, as Aben Ezra interprets it, having no regard to relation and friendship, every one endeavouring to save himself. There is another sense which some Jewish writers give of this phrase, and is observed by Jarchi, which is, that everyone shall fall for the iniquities of his brother; for all the Israelites say, they are sureties for one another; but the former sense is best:

as it were before a sword, when none pursueth: as if a sword was drawn and brandished at them, just ready to be thrust in them, filling them with the utmost dread and terror, and yet at the same time none in pursuit of them:

and ye shall have no power to stand before your enemies; no heart to resist them, no strength nor spirit to oppose them, and defend themselves but be obliged to surrender their cities, themselves, their families and goods, into the hand of the enemy.
Ver. 38. And ye shall perish among the Heathen, etc.] Not utterly, but great numbers of them, through change of air, and different diet, as Aben Ezra, and through the cruel usage of their enemies; for there is a body of them which continues unto this day; unless this is to be understood of the ten tribes, as R. Akiba interprets it, who are supposed to be entirely lost and swallowed up among the nations where they were carried captive:

and the land of your enemies shall eat you up; they should die in it through one disease or another; by the pestilence, as the Targum of Jonathan, and so be buried in it; in which sense it may be said to eat them up, or consume them, for the grave swallows up and consumes all that are put into it; Jarchi says, this is to be understood of those that die in captivity.

Ver. 39. And they that are left of you shall pine away in their iniquity in your enemies’ lands, etc.] Such as were not taken off by any public calamity, as the sword or pestilence should gradually diminish and melt away like wax before the fire, and die in and for their iniquities in an enemy’s country, (see Ezekiel 24:23 33:10); and also in the iniquities of their fathers shall they pine away with them; or for the iniquities of their evil fathers, as the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan; they treading in their steps, and doing the same evil deeds, whereby they filled up the measure of their fathers’ sins, and brought upon them deserved punishment. (Matthew 23:32,33).

Ver. 40. If they shall confess their iniquity, and the iniquity of their fathers, etc.] The Targum of Jonathan adds,

“in the time of their distress;”

which might serve to bring their sins to remembrance, and them to a confession of them, not only of their own sins, but of their fathers’ also; acknowledging thereby that they had been guilty of sinning against God for a long course of years past; and that God had been long suffering towards them, and bore much with them before he brought his judgments on them, which were just, and what they righteously deserved; and such a confession Daniel made, (Daniel 9:4-8); and the words may as well be rendered absolute as conditional, or better, and as a prediction of what would be done by them when in captivity and distress, “and they shall confess their iniquity”; with shame and sorrow, with repentance for it, and abhorrence of it; or otherwise, if the confession was only verbal and hypocritical, it would not be acceptable:
with their trespass which they trespassed against me; along with their own iniquities, and those of their fathers, they should confess, their trespass against the Lord would be acknowledged by them; which seems to design some particular and grievous sin committed by them, by which perhaps is meant their idolatry, a capital sin, directly against God, and what those people were prone unto:

and that also they have walked contrary unto me; to his mind and will, to his laws, commands, statutes, and ordinances, disregarding him and them, as if enemies to him; or “by chance”; (see Gill on “<032621>Leviticus 26:21”).

Ver. 41. And [that] I also have walked contrary unto them, etc.] Showed no regard unto them, as if he took no care of them, or in a providential way concerned himself for them, but let what would befall them; yea, came out in the way of his judgments against them, as if he was an enemy to them, (see Gill on “<032624>Leviticus 26:24”);

and have brought them into the land of their enemies; should acknowledge the hand of God in it, that he himself brought them out of their own country into an enemy’s land, as Assyria, Babylon, and other nations: and that this was not the chance of war, or owing to the superior power or skill of their enemies, but to the just judgment of God upon them for their sins, who on that account delivered them up into the hands of their enemies:

if then their uncircumcised heart be humbled; their foolish proud heart, as the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan; it signifies a sinful, wicked, hard, and impenitent heart, brought to a sense of sin, to repentance and humiliation for it. Jarchi interprets it, “or if their uncircumcised heart”, etc. as in (<020223>Exodus 2:23); and observes another sense of the word, “perhaps their uncircumcised heart”, etc. not only would in words confess their sins, but be truly humbled at heart for them:

and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity; take it well at the hand of God, bear it patiently without murmuring, or thinking themselves hardly dealt by, but freely owning it is less than their iniquities deserve; or complete and finish the punishment of their sins, as Aben Ezra, which upon their humiliation should be put an end to, and cease. Jarchi takes the word in the sense of atonement and pacification, as if by their chastisement their sins were expiated "922, and God was pacified toward them: but rather it denotes the free and full pardon of their sins, manifested to them upon their repentance and humiliation for sin.
Ver. 42. *Then i will also remember my covenant with Jacob*, etc.] Would fulfil and make good all that he had promised in covenant with Jacob, and his posterity: the account begins with him, and rises upwards to Abraham, whereas it usually begins with Abraham, and descends to Jacob; no sufficient reason is given for this alteration, though several are attempted by the Jewish writers:

*and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember*; which chiefly respects the multiplication of their seed, the continuance of them, and the Messiah springing from them; which is the mercy promised to these fathers, and the principal part of the covenant made with them, and which was remembered and performed when God visited and redeemed his people by him, (Luke 1:68-73);

*and I will remember the land*; the land of Judea, and return the Jews to it, and make it fruitful, after he had given it rest from tillage for many years, which was fulfilled at their return from the captivity of Babylon.

Ver. 43. *The land also shall be left of them*, etc.] This seems to refer to a second time, when this should be the case of the land of Judea again, as it was when subdued by the Romans, and the Jews were carried captive from it, and so it was left by them, as it has been ever since:

*and shall enjoy her sabbaths, while lieth desolate without them*; shall be as in the sabbatical years, uncultivated, neither ploughed nor sown, nor reaped; and thus the land of Canaan, though once so very fruitful, is now desolate and barren, being without its former inhabitants, and so it is like to be until it is restored to them again;

*and they shall accept of the punishment of their iniquity*; that is, when made sensible of their sins, and particularly of their iniquity of rejecting the Messiah; they will not think it hard that they have been punished in so severe a manner, but own the righteous hand of God in it, and be humble under it; and confessing their sins with true sorrow and repentance for them, looking at him whom they have pierced, and mourn, shall have the free and full remission of their sins applied unto them:

*because, even, because they despised my judgments, and because their soul abhorred my statutes*; despised and abhorred Christ, his doctrines and ordinances, which was the reason of their being carried captive out of their land, when it was forsaken by them, and lay desolate as to this day, especially with respect to any benefit of it enjoyed by them; and which,
when they are sensible of, will be a reason of their accepting the
punishment of their iniquity so readily, and not murmur at the hand of God
upon them, or reflect on his dealings with them, but freely and fully confess
their sins, that he may be justified in all that he has done.

Ver. 44. And yet for all that, etc.] I will have on them, in or through my
Word, as the Targum of Jonathan; notwithstanding their many and great
sins and transgressions, and the sad and miserable condition they were
brought into by them, the Lord would have mercy on them and be gracious
to them, through Christ and for his sake, and convert and save them, (see
Romans 11:26,27); the Jews, as Fagius tells us, wonderfully delight
themselves with this passage, and read it with the greatest joy and pleasure,
and with an elevated voice; concluding from hence that they shall certainly
return to their own land; and because the first word in this verse is in sound
the same as the Germans use for an “ape”, they call this paragraph “the
golden ape”, and say, when this shall be fulfilled the golden age will take
place with them: a very learned man has wrote a dissertation upon it:
when

they shall be in the land of their enemies; of the Romans and other
nations, among whom they have been disposed ever since the destruction
of Jerusalem by Titus:

I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them
utterly; for though they have been cast away by the Lord out of their land,
and from being his people, and enjoying either the civil or religious
privileges they formerly did; and though they have been cast off with
abhorrence, and had in great detestation by him, for their sin of rejecting
the Messiah, as appears by the punishment inflicted on them; yet not so as
to make an utter end of them as a body of people, for, notwithstanding
their dispersion everywhere, and their long captivity, they remain a distinct
people from all others, which seems to forebode something favourable to
them:

and to break my covenant with them; which he will not do, even his
promise of the future call and conversion of them, and of their return to
their own land:

for I [am] the Lord their God; their covenant God, and a covenant keeping
God, (Romans 11:27).
Ver. 45. But I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors, etc.] Or rather, “remember to them” \(^{1925}\), to their good and benefit, for their profit and advantage, not for their desert and merit, for any worth or worthiness in them; this covenant respects not the covenant made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as in (\textit{Leviticus} 26:42); but with their fathers, either at Sinai, or rather in the plains of Moab, (\textit{Deuteronomy} 29:1), for it follows:

\textit{whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt in the sight of the Heathen, that I might be their God;} whom he brought out of great bondage and distress in Egypt, with an high hand and outstretched arm, and in the sight of the Egyptians, who were not able to oppose it, yea, because of their plagues, were urgent for it; and in the sight of all the nations round about, who heard of the wonderful power of God in the deliverance of his people; and this he did that he might appear to be their covenant God, who had taken them into covenant with him, and had taken them under his care and protection, and would be still their King and their God; and who also, in like manner, it may be here suggested, would deliver the people of the Jews out of their present exiled and captive state and condition in the sight of the whole world, and declare himself their covenant God and Father:

\textit{I am the Lord;} whose will is sovereign, whose power is uncontrollable, who is a covenant keeping God, faithful to his promises, and able to perform them.

Ver. 46. These [are] the statutes, and judgments, and laws, etc.] Which refer not only to those in this chapter, but in all the preceding chapters in this book, and respect them all, whether ceremonial, moral, or judicial, which may be signified by these three words:

\textit{which the Lord made between him and the children of Israel;} the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan are,

“between his Word and the children of Israel:”

\textit{in Mount Sinai;} or near it, in the wilderness of it, while the children of Israel lay encamped about it:

\textit{by the hand of Moses;} they were first delivered to him, and by means of him to the people.
CHAPTER 27

INTRODUCTION TO LEVITICUS 27

This chapter contains various laws concerning vows made unto the Lord, whether of persons whose estimation was to be made by the priest, according to their age, sex, and condition, (Leviticus 26:1-8); or of beasts, clean and unclean, good or bad, (Leviticus 26:9-13); or of houses, fields, and lands, the estimation of which was to be according to its seed, and the time of its being set apart, whether from or after the year of jubilee, and the number of years to it, (Leviticus 26:14-25); with this exception to the above laws, that no firstling of the Lord’s might be sanctified, and if an unclean beast it might be redeemed, but nothing devoted to the Lord, whether of man, beast, or field, might be sold or redeemed, (Leviticus 26:26-29); and the chapter is concluded with some laws concerning the redemption or change of tithes, what might or what might not be redeemed or changed, (Leviticus 26:30-34);

Ver. 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, etc.] After he had delivered the body of laws in the preceding chapter, which by the close of the last seem to have been finished; but here some rules and instructions concerning vows are given, which a man was not obliged to make, but which he did of his own freewill and good pleasure: saying; as follows.

Ver. 2. Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, etc.] This being an affair which only concerned them; for the Jewish writers say, by this phrase, the children of Israel, Gentiles are excluded:

when a man shall make a singular vow; an unusual, an uncommon one, a very distinguished one, and even what is wonderful, as the word signifies; as when a man, through uncommon zeal for God and his service, devotes himself, or his children, or his cattle, or his houses or fields, to the Lord: the word “man”, the Jewish writers say, includes every male, and even a Gentile; yea, it is said all estimate and are estimated, vow and are vowed, priests, and Levites, and Israelites, women and servants: the persons shall be for the Lord by thy estimation: as when a man devoted himself or any that belonged to him to the service of the sanctuary, out of his great
zeal for it, as to assist the priests and Levites in the meaner sort of work, as
to carry wood and draw water, and sweep the tabernacle, and the like; they
were not allowed to do these things, partly because it was not the will of
God that any or every Israelite should be employed in such menial service,
and partly because there were men appointed for such work, as well as to
prevent too great a number of persons in the sanctuary, which would be
troublesome, and only stand in one another’s way; wherefore, on every
devoted person to such service a value or price was set, according to the
rules after given, which were to be paid in to the priests for the service of
the sanctuary, the repair of the house, etc. (see 2 Kings 12:4,5); the
word may be rendered, agreeably to the accents, “according to thy
estimation of souls (or persons) the vow shall be to the Lord” ; that is,
the price of the person devoted, according to the estimation of the priest,
or as settled by the Lord in some following verses, shall be given to him:
the word “souls” being used, the Jewish doctors understand it of estimation
or value of that on which the soul or life depends; thus, for instance, if a
man says, the value of my hand or of my feet be upon me, he says nothing;
but if he says, the value of my head or of my liver be upon me, he gives the
whole value, i.e. of himself; if he says, the half of my value be upon me, he
gives the half of it; but if he says, the value of half of me, he gives the
whole value: this is the general rule, that on which the soul or life depends
pays the whole value ; for a man cannot live without his head, or
without his liver, or when half of himself is taken away.

Ver. 3. And thy estimation shall be, etc.] The estimation of the man
himself that vowed, or of the priest for him, was not left to be made by
either of them at their pleasure, but was to be made according to the
following rules, in proportion to the age a person was of to be estimated:

of the male from twenty years old even unto sixty years old: the account
begins with these, because men of an age from the one to the other are
fittest for labour, and therefore to be set at the highest price, as they are in
the next clause:

even that estimation shall be fifty shekels of silver, after the shekel of the
sanctuary; a shekel was about half a crown of our money, or somewhat
less, so that fifty of these amounted to about six pounds: these shekels
were to be of the full weight, according to the standard that was kept in the
sanctuary, and were the highest price that was set upon any; and this was
paid equally by all of the same age, whether rich or poor: hence it is said,
“in estimations there is nothing less than one shekel, nor more than fifty.”

**Ver. 4.** And if it [be] a female, etc.] That is, of the same age, full twenty years of age, and not more than sixty:

*then thy estimation shall be thirty shekels*; about three pounds ten shillings of our money, the price of a servant, (Exodus 21:32); the reason of this difference of estimation between a man and a woman is, because the woman is the weaker vessel, and her labour and service of less importance and worth, such as spinning, washing, etc.

**Ver. 5.** And if [it be] from five years old, even unto to twenty years old, etc.] Not that one of five years old is supposed to vow or to make an estimation, but one grown up, that says, the estimation of this little one, who is five years of age, be upon me; and such an one was bound to pay the value of him, which is as follows:

*then thy estimation shall be of the male twenty shekels, and for the female ten shekels*; which were for the one above two pounds, and for the other more than one pound; these were valued at a less price than the former, partly because, generally speaking, there are more die between the age of five and the age of twenty years than between twenty and sixty; and partly because within that time they are not capable of so much work and service as in the latter; and it may be observed, that the females of this age are not valued in proportion to the females of the other; the estimation of these being just half that of the males, whereas that of the other is more than half; the reason is, that women above twenty years of age, their service bears, a better proportion to that of men, than that of young women to young men under twenty.

**Ver. 6.** And if [it be] from a month old even unto five years old, etc.] That is, if a man devotes his child to the Lord within such an age, and says, the estimation of this my son or my daughter be upon me, then he was to pay the value, as next directed; for one under a month old no estimation was to be made: the Jews say,

“one less than a mouth old may be vowed, but not estimated.”

*then thy estimation shall be of the male five shekels of silver*; somewhat more than ten shillings:
and for the female thy estimation [shall be] three shekels of silver; about seven shillings, which is the least value put on any; and though the lives of male or female at this age are equally uncertain, and the service of either of little worth when near the full time fixed; yet the preference is given to the male, as being of the more perfect kind, and its life generally most desirable.

Ver. 7. And if [it be] from sixty years old and above, etc.] When man is almost past his labour, and it is high time to leave off business;

if [it be] a male, then thy estimation shall between shekels; about one pound fifteen shillings:

and for the female ten shekels; about one pound three shillings; it may be observed that there is not the disproportion between a man and a woman in old age as in youth, with respect to the estimation of them; the reason of which is, because there is but little difference in their labour and service; nay, sometimes the woman is most useful and serviceable; for when a man, through age, is quite worn out and his labour gone, an older woman is capable of managing the affairs of the family, and is of great use and service, either by directing and advising, or by doing: so Jarchi observes, when persons come to old age, a woman is nearly to be reckoned as a man, and quotes a proverb of theirs, an old man in a house is a broken potsherd in the house (some interpret the word, a snare or stumbling block, that is in the way); an old woman in a house is a treasure in a house, a good sign in a house, of great use in the management of the affairs of the family.

Ver. 8. But if he be poorer than thy estimation, etc.] If he is so poor that he is not able to pay the value that, is set upon him, according to the rules before given:

then he shall present himself before the priest; that has made the estimation, according to the above directions, observing the difference of years, and of male and female; but if a person could not pay the said sums that were appointed, he might apply to the priest, and tell his case:

and the priest shall value him; put a price upon him he is able to pay, as follows:

according to his ability that vowed shall the priest value him; he was to examine into his circumstances, and as they appeared to him he was to put a value on him, which was to be paid, but not less than, a shekel; for if he
could not pay that, it was to remain as a debt until he could \[^934\]; and it was
the ability of him that made the vow that was to be inquired into, and
according to which the estimation was to be made, and not of him that was
vowed: so it is said in the Misnah,

“ability is regarded in the vower, and years in the vowed, and
estimations in the estimated, and according to the tithe of the
estimation: ability in the vower, how? a poor man that estimates a
rich man, pays the value of a poor man; and a rich man that
estimates a poor man, pays the value of a rich man: if he is poor
and afterwards becomes rich, or rich and afterwards poor, he pays
the price of a rich man \[^935\];”

but the sense which Jarchi gives is, that a priest in such a case was to judge
according to what a man has, and so order him to pay, but was to leave
him so as he might live, a bed and bolster, and working tools, and if he had
an ass he might leave him that.

Ver. 9. *And if [it be] a beast whereof men bring an offering to the Lord*,
e tc.] That is, it such a creature is devoted, which is of that kind which are
used in sacrifice to the Lord, such as bullocks, sheep, goats, rams, and
lambs:

*all that [any man] giveth of such unto the Lord shall be holy*; shall be set
apart to sacred uses, and not applied to profane or common uses, but either
were for the use of the altar or of the priests; or the price of them for the
repair of the sanctuary, according as they were devoted.

Ver. 10. *He shall not alter it nor change it*, etc.] Some think these two
words signify the same, but Abarbinel \[^936\] makes them different; according
to him, to “alter” is for one of another kind, as one of the herd for one of
the flock, or the contrary; and to “change” for one of the same kind:

*a good for a bad, or a bad for a good*; or, as the Targum of Jonathan,

“that which is perfect for that which has a blemish in it, or what has
a blemish in it for that which is perfect;”

a change might not be made neither for the better nor for the worse, but
the creature devoted was to be taken as it was; if not fit for sacrifice it was
to be sold, and its price put to other uses; for, as Abarbinel \[^937\] observes,
whatsoever was devoted to sacred use was never to be put to any profane
one; and this was also to teach men not to be hasty and fickle in such things, but to consider well what they did, and abide by it; for if such alterations and changes could be admitted of, a man after he had vowed might through covetousness repent, and bring a bad one instead of a good one, or, under pretence of bringing a good one instead of a bad one, might bring a bad one and say it was good, as Bechai observes; even one worse than he had brought, thinking to impose upon the ignorance of the priest; and indeed if he was sincere in it, and had a mind to bring a better than what he had vowed, it was not allowed of; if he made any change, though it was for the better, he was to be beaten, as Maimonides affirms:

*and if he shall at all change beast for beast;* whether of the same or of a different kind, or whether for better or worse:

*then it and the exchange thereof shall be holy:* both of them were to be the Lord’s, and appropriated to sacred use, of one sort or another, either for sacrifice or for the priests family, or the price of it for the repairs of the sanctuary.

**Ver. 11. And if [it be] any unclean beast, of which they do not offer a sacrifice unto the Lord, etc.**] Any creature, excepting a dog, the price of which was not to be brought into the house of the Lord; besides oxen, sheep, goats, rams, and lambs; though some understand it even of such that have blemishes on them, and so not fit to be offered unto the Lord; so Jarchi and others:

*then he shall present the beast before the priest;* to be viewed, examined, and judged of as to its worth, and a value put upon it, that it might be sold or redeemed, as no other but a beast might; so it is observed birds, wood, frankincense, and ministering vessels, have no redemption, for it is only said a beast.

**Ver. 12. And the priest shall value it, whether it be good or bad, etc.**] Put a price upon it according to its worth, as it shall appear to him:

*as thou valuest it, [who art] the priest, so shall it be;* that shall be the price at which it shall be sold, not to the owner or devoter of it, for he must give more, as appears from (Leviticus 27:13); but, as Jarchi observes, to all other men who come to purchase it.
Ver. 13. But if he will at all redeem it, etc.] The owner of it, or he that has devoted it, if he is determined to have it again at any rate:

*then he shall add a fifth [part] thereof unto thy estimation*; he shall give the full price for it, as rated by the priest, and for which it might be sold to another man, and a fifth part of the value of it besides; this was done that the full price might be paid for it, the priest not knowing, as it might be, the worth of it so well as the owner; and that the value of consecrated things might be kept to, and to make men careful how and what they devoted, since, though redeemable, they were obliged to pay a large price for them.

Ver. 14. And when a man shall sanctify his house [to be] holy unto the Lord, etc.] Shall set it apart for sacred service, devote it to holy uses, so that it may be sold, and the money laid out in sacrifices, the repairs of the temple, etc. under this any other goods are comprehended, concerning which the Jews say,

“he that sanctifieth his goods, and his wife’s dowry is upon him, or he is a debtor; his wife cannot demand her, dowry out of that which is sanctified, nor a creditor his debt; but if he will redeem he may redeem, on condition that he gives the dowry to the wife, and the debt to the creditor; if he has set apart ninety pounds and his debt is an hundred, he may add a penny more, and with it redeem those goods, on condition he gives the wife her dowry and the creditor his debt: whether he sanctifies or estimates his goods, he has no power over his wife’s or children’s clothes, nor over coloured things, died on their account, nor on new, shoes he has bought for them[^42], etc.”

again it is said[^43],

“if anyone sanctified his goods, and there were among them things fit for the altar; wine, oil, and fowls, R. Eliezer says, they might be sold to those that need any of, that kind, and with the price of them burnt offerings might be bought, and the rest of the goods fell to the repair of the temple:”

*then the priest shall estimate it whether it be good or bad*; shall examine it of what size and in what condition it is, whether a large well built house or not, and whether in good repair or not, and accordingly set a price upon it:
as the priest shall estimate it, so shall it stand; according to the price he shall set upon it, it may be sold; whoever will give it may purchase it, excepting the owner or he that has sanctified it, he must pay a fifth part more, as follows.

Ver. 15. And if he that sanctifieth it will redeem his house, etc.] An house set apart for holy uses might be redeemed, either by another paying the price set upon it by the priest, or by the original owner of it paying a fifth part more; and this was the case, whether of houses in walled cities or in villages: so Maimonides says,

“he that sanctifies his house, whether it be one of those in walled cities, or of those in villages, it may be always redeemed; he that redeems one out of the hand of holiness (or which has been sanctified), if it is a house in a walled city, and remains in the possession of the redeemer twelve months, it is absolutely his; but if it is a house in the villages, and the jubilee comes, and it is in the possession of the redeemer, it returns to its owner in the jubilee;”

but if the owner of it had a mind to redeem it after he had devoted it,

then he shall add the fifth [part] of the money of thy estimation unto it, and it shall be his; that is, he was to give a fifth part more for the house than it was valued at by the priest, or than another might have it for; the reason of which was, to make men careful how they sanctified or vowed their houses or goods, and that it might be certain that the full value was given for it, the worth of which the priest might not know so well as the owner, and the latter, being willing to give the price set by the former, might give suspicion of it; wherefore, in order to have the full price of it with certainty, and to set an high value on things devoted, the owner was to give a fifth part more than the estimation of it: thus, for instance, if an house thus devoted was valued by the priest at the price of an hundred pounds, the owner was obliged, if he would redeem it, to give an hundred twenty pounds.

Ver. 16. And if a man shall sanctify unto the Lord [some part] of a field of his possession, etc.] That which he enjoyed by inheritance from his father, to distinguish it from a field of his own purchase, as in (Leviticus 27:22); and which might be devoted, not all of it, but a part of it; partly that he might have something to live upon, or to improve for a livelihood
for himself and family, and partly that estates might not be alienated entirely from their families and tribes in which they were:

*then thy estimation shall be according to the seed thereof*; not according to the field, the goodness or badness of that, one field being good and another bad, as Jarchi observes, but according to the quantity of seed which it produced, or rather which it required for the sowing of it;

*an homer of barley seed [shall be valued] at fifty shekels of silver*; which was near six pounds of our money; and here we must carefully distinguish between an “omer”, beginning with an “o”, and an “homer”, beginning with an “h”; not observing this has led some learned men into mistakes in their notes on this place, for an “omer” was the tenth part of an “ephah”, (Exodus 16:36); and an “ephah” is but the tenth part of an “homer”, (Ezekiel 45:11); which makes a very great difference in this measure of barley, for an homer of it contained ten ephahs or bushels; and even according to this account a bushel of barley is rated very high, for ten bushels at fifty shekels, reckoning a shekel half a crown, or them at six pounds five shillings, are at the rate of twelve shillings and sixpence a bushel, which is too high a price for barley; wherefore as an ephah, the tenth part of an homer, contained three seahs or pecks, and which some call bushels, then an homer consisted of thirty bushels, which brings down the value of it to little more than two shillings a bushel, which is much nearer the true value of barley; but the truth of the matter is, that the value of barley for sowing is not ascertained, as our version leads us to think; for the words should be rendered, if the “seed be an homer of barley”, it, the field, shall be valued “at fifty shekels of silver”: if the field take so much seed to sow it as the quantity of an homer of barley, then it was to be rated at fifty shekels of silver; and if it took two homers, then it was to be rated at an hundred shekels, and so on.

Ver. 17. *If he sanctify his field from the year of jubilee*, etc.] The very year, as Aben Ezra, while it is current, or when it is past, and he immediately sanctifies it for an holy use, and one comes to redeem it, as Jarchi says, as soon as ever it is devoted, and a priest has valued it, and there is a purchaser of it:

*according to thy estimation it shall stand*; what price soever the priest set upon it, that it was to go at, and he that had a mind to purchase it might have it for it, unless it was he that devoted it, and then he was to give a fifth part more, as afterwards expressed.
Ver. 18. *But if he sanctify his field after the jubilee,* etc.] Some years after it, more or fewer, or it may be, when half way towards another jubilee, or nearer:

then the priest shall reckon unto him the money according to the years that remain, even unto the year of the jubilee; thus, for instance, if it only required an homer of barley to sow it, and the whole value of it from jubilee to jubilee was but fifty shekels of silver; then supposing it to be sanctified in the middle of the fifty years, or at twenty five years’ end, it was to be reckoned at twenty five shekels, and sold for that money, and so in proportion, reckoning a shekel for a year:

and it shall be abated from thy estimation; not the year of jubilee, but a shekel for every year was to be deducted from the original value of fifty shekels, according to the number of years that had passed or were to come.

Ver. 19. *And if he that sanctified the field shall in any wise redeem it,* etc.] Is desirous of it, and determined upon it at any rate, repenting that he had parted with it in this manner:

then he shall add the fifth [part] of the money of thy estimation to it: the Jerusalem Targum is, the fifth part of the shekels of silver: that is, if he has a mind to redeem it, and is resolved on it, as soon as he has sanctified it, then, besides the fifty shekels of silver it is rated at, and might be sold for to another, he must pay a fifth part thereof, that is, ten shekels more, for reasons before given, (Leviticus 27:15);

and it shall be assured to him; remain firm and stable with him, abide by him, and he in the possession of it as his property, ever after, as if he had never sanctified it.

Ver. 20. *And if he will not redeem the field,* etc.] He that sanctified it, does not care to give for it the settled price of the fifth part besides, but chooses it should be disposed of for the uses he devoted it to:

or if he have sold the field to another man; that is, either the original owner having bought it and sold it again, or rather the priest, the treasurer, as Jarchi, who had the disposal of it, for the uses and purposes for which it was devoted, when sold by him:

it shall not be redeemed any more; it was not in the power of him that sanctified it to make a purchase of it again; the buyer of it might not sell it
to him again, for otherwise, by that means, he might come at it cheaper than the law directs; besides, there is another reason for it, which is suggested in (\textit{Leviticus 27:21}).

\textbf{Ver. 21. But the field, when it goeth out in the jubilee, etc.}] Out of the hand of him that bought it:

\textit{shall be holy unto the Lord, as a field devoted}; though it went out of the hand of the purchaser, it did not return to him that sanctified or devoted it, but was separated to sacred uses for the service of the Lord; for every devoted thing, whether of man, beast, or field, was most holy to the Lord, (\textit{Leviticus 27:28});

\textit{the possession thereof shall be the priests’}; it did not return to the treasurer of the sanctuary, who had sold it to another for the repair of the temple, as Jarchi observes, but as a devoted field it was given to the priests, as it is said, “everything devoted in Israel shall be thine”, (\textit{Numbers 18:14}); and even this was divided, as he says, between the priests of that ward or course that happened to be on the day of atonement of the jubilee year: but in case it never was redeemed, but remained sanctified in the year of jubilee, the priests did not possess it without paying for it; and so the Jewish canon runs f945,

“the jubilee comes, and the field is not redeemed, the priests enter into it, and pay the price of it;”

on which one of the commentators f946 observes, when anyone has redeemed it, the money becomes sacred for the repairs of the temple; and when the jubilee comes, it goes out (i.e. of the hands of the purchaser) to the priests freely; but if it is not redeemed, the priests must pay the price of fifty shekels, and take it; and if even it was bought by a priest before out of the hands of the treasurer, it went from him to his brethren the priests, in the year of jubilee: the rule is this,

“if any of the priests redeem it, and, lo, it is in his possession, he may not say, seeing it goes out to the priests in the year of jubilee, lo, it is in my possession, lo, it is mine, but it shall go out to all his brethren the priests f947.”

\textbf{Ver. 22. And if [a man] sanctify unto the Lord a field which he hath bought, etc.}] With his own money, of some person in poverty and distress,
who was obliged to sell it, and which, according to a former law, returned to the original proprietor in the year of jubilee:

which [is] not of the fields of his possession; which he has not by inheritance from his fathers. Jarchi observes, there is a difference between a field bought, and a field possessed; for a field bought is not divided to the priests in the year of jubilee, because a man cannot sanctify it but until the year of jubilee; for in the year of jubilee it would go out of his hands, and return to the owner; wherefore if he comes to redeem it, he must redeem it with the price fixed for the field of possession: the Jewish doctors are divided about a field bought of a father by a son, whether it is a field of purchase or of possession.\(^\text{f948}\)

Ver. 23. *Then the priest shall reckon unto him the worth of thy estimation, [even] unto the year of jubilee, etc.*] The priest was to estimate the field of purchase sanctified, and set a price upon it according to the best of his judgment, and give it to the person that sanctified it, or whoever would redeem it; and this estimate was made, according to the number of years there were to the year of jubilee:

and he shall give thine estimation in that day; the price set upon the field by the priest immediately, either the sanctifier, but without adding the fifth part, as in (\(^\text{<032719>}\)Leviticus 27:19); so Maimonides\(^\text{f949}\) observes, or any other purchaser:

[as] a holy thing unto the Lord; to sacred uses, as the repairs of the temple, etc. to which the purchase money was appropriated.

Ver. 24. *In the year of jubilee, the field shall return unto him of whom it was bought, etc.*] Not to him that sanctified it, whether he redeemed it or not; nor to him that bought it of the treasurer of the temple after it was sanctified; but to the original proprietor and owner of it, of whom he bought it that sanctified it, for so it follows:

[even] to him to whom the possession of the land [did belong]; which was a possession of his he had by inheritance from his fathers, and therefore, according to the law of the year of jubilee, was then to return to him, and could be retained no longer, nor even converted to holy uses; for as it is said in the Misnah\(^\text{f950}\),

“a field of purchase goes not out to the priests in the year of jubilee; for no man can sanctify a thing which is not his own;”
as what he had purchased was no longer his than to the year of jubilee, and therefore could not devote it to sacred uses for any longer time.

Ver. 25. And all thy estimation shall be according to the shekel of the sanctuary, etc.] The shekel kept in the sanctuary, which was the standard of all shekels; not that there was a shekel in the sanctuary different from the common one; for every shekel ought to have been as that, of the full weight and worth of it; and the estimation was to be according to such a shekel, and the money paid in such, even in full weight:

twenty gerahs shall be the shekel; which the Targum of Jonathan calls “meahs” or “oboli”, one of which was about three halfpence of our money, scarce so much, and weighed near eleven grains, as Bishop Cumberland has calculated: (see Ezekiel 45:12).

Ver. 26. Only the firstlings of the beasts, etc.] These are excepted from being sanctified, or set apart for sacred uses, for a very good reason, suggested in the next clause:

which should be the Lord’s firstling, no man shall sanctify it; it being what he has a claim upon, and ordered to be sanctified to him by a law previous to this, (Exodus 13:2); wherefore to sanctify such a creature, would be to sanctify what was his before; not merely in a general sense, in which all creatures are his, but in a special sense, having in a peculiar manner required it as his; and therefore to sanctify, or vow to him, what was his before, must be trifling with him, and mocking of him:

whether [it be] ox, or sheep; the firstlings of either of them:

it [is] the Lord’s; which he has claimed as his own special and peculiar property, antecedent to any vow of its owner.

Ver. 27. And if [it be] of an unclean beast, etc.] This is to be understood, not of the firstling of unclean creatures in common, which were to be redeemed with a lamb, and not with money, according to the estimation of the priest, and a fifth part added to that; but of such as were sanctified, or vowed, for the reparation of the sanctuary, as Jarchi notes:

then he shall redeem [it] according to thine estimation; the price the priest should set upon it, how much it was worth in his judgment:
and shall add a fifth [part] of it thereto; to the price, set upon a fifth part of that over and above the sum; this the sanctifier, or he that made the vow, was obliged to pay, if he thought fit to redeem it:

or if it be not redeemed; by him, he does not choose to give the price, and the fifth part:

then it shall be sold according to thy estimation; to another man, without the fifth part, that chooses to purchase it, and then the purchase money was laid out for sacred uses.

Ver. 28. Notwithstanding, no devoted thing that a man shall devote unto the Lord, etc.] This is a different vow from the former, expressed by “sanctifying”; for though “sanctifying” and “devoting” were both vows, yet the latter had an execration or curse added to it, by which a man imprecated a curse upon himself, if that itself, which he devoted, was put to any other use than that for which he devoted it; wherefore this sort of vow was absolute and irrevocable, and what was vowed was unalienable, and therefore not to be sold or redeemed as afterwards expressed, whereas things sanctified might:

of all that he hath, [both] of man and beast, and of the field of his possession, shall be sold or redeemed; but must be put to the use for which it was devoted. This must be understood of such as were his own, and he had a right to dispose of; which were in his own power, as Aben Ezra interprets the phrase, “of all that he hath”: if of men, they must be such as were his slaves, which he had a despotic power over; such as he could sell, or give to another, or leave to his children for a perpetual inheritance, (Leviticus 25:46); and could dispose of as he pleased, and so devote to the service of the priests: thus Jarchi interprets it of menservants and maidservants, Canaanitish ones; and if of beasts, such as were his own property, and not another’s; and if of fields, such as were his possession by inheritance. Some Jewish writers, as Abendana, from the phrase, “of all that he hath”, gather, that a man might devote only a part of what he had, and not the whole; and so it is said in the Misnah,

“a man may devote of his flock and of his herd, of his servants and maidens Canaanites, and of the field of his possession; but if he devote all of them, they are not devoted

the vow is null and void; and so one of the commentators upon it says, he may devote some movable things, but not all; some of his Canaanitish
servants and maidens, but not all; some part of the field of his possession, but not the whole: but a man’s children, and Hebrew servants, and purchased fields, according to the Jewish canon, might not be devoted;

“if anyone devotes his son or his daughter, his servant or his handmaid, that are Hebrews, or the field of his purchase, they are not devoted (or to be reckoned so), for no man devotes (or ought to devote) what is not his own.”

A commentator excepts his daughter, and says, he may devote his daughter, because he may sell her while a minor, but not an adult virgin; (see <Exodus 21:7>);

every devoted thing [is] most holy unto the Lord; and therefore not to be appropriated to any use but his, nor to be meddled with, not even touched or handled by any but the priests, as the most holy things that were eatable were only to be eaten by them.

Ver. 29. None devoted, which shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed, etc.] This is said, not of such men as are devoted to the Lord, as in the preceding verse; for it is not said here as there, “none devoted unto the Lord”, but of such as are devoted to ruin and destruction, for whom there was no redemption, but they must die; nor is it said, “which is devoted by men, but of men”, or from among men; whether they be devoted by God himself, as all idolaters, and particularly the seven nations of the land of Canaan, and especially the Amalekites, who therefore were not to be spared on any account, but they must die; nor is it said, “which is devoted by men to destruction, either by the people of Israel, as their avowed enemies they should take in war, whom, and their cities, they vowed to the Lord they would utterly destroy, (<Numbers 21:2,3>); and of such Aben Ezra interprets the words of the text; or such as were doomed by the civil magistrates to die for capital crimes, by stoning, burning, strangling, and slaying with the sword. And this sense is given into by many; because the judges kill with many kinds of death, therefore, says Chaskuni, it is said “every devoted thing”, as if he should say, with whatsoever of the four kinds of death the judges pass sentence of destruction on a man, he must die that death; so Jarchi and Ben Melech interpret it of such as go out to be slain, i.e. by the decree of the judges;
and if one says, his estimation, or the price of him be upon me, he says nothing, it is of no avail:

[but] shall surely be put to death; as the same writer observes, lo, he goes forth to die, he shall not be redeemed, neither by price nor estimation. The Targum of Jonathan is,

“He shall not he redeemed with silver, but with burnt offerings, and holy sacrifices, and petitions of mercy, because he is condemned by a sentence to be slain.”

And of either, or of all of these, may the words be understood, and not as they are by some, as if Jewish parents and masters had such a power over their children and servants to devote them to death, or in such a manner devote them, that they were obliged to put them to death; for though they had power in some cases to sell, yet had no power over their lives to take them away, or to devote them to death, which would be a breach of the sixth command, and punishable with death; even a master that accidentally killed his servant did not escape punishment; nay, if he did him any injury, by smiting out an eye, or a tooth, he was obliged to give him his freedom, and much less had he power to take away his life, or devote him to destruction. Some have thought, that it was through a mistaken sense of this law, that Jephthah having made a rash vow sacrificed his daughter, (Judges 11:30-39); but it is a question whether he did or not.

Ver. 30. And all the tithe of the land, etc.] Of which there were various sorts, the first tithe, the tithe out of the tithe, the second tithe, and the poor’s tithe, which are generally reduced to three,

“The first tenth part of all increase I gave to the sons of Aaron, who ministered at Jerusalem: another tenth part I sold away, and went, and spent it every year at Jerusalem:” (Tobit 1:7)

so Maimonides says,

“after they had separated the first tithe every year, they separate the second tithe, as it is said (Deuteronomy 14:22,23); and in the third year, and in the sixth, they separate the poor’s tithe, instead of the second tithe:”

so that, properly speaking, there were but two tithes, though commonly reckoned three; the tithes of all eatables were given to the Levites every
year, and a tenth part of that given by the Levites to the priests, and the second tithe was eaten by the owners; instead of which, according to the above writer, in the third and sixth years it was given to the poor, and called theirs; of this second tithe, Jarchi interprets this law, and so does Maimonides  

[whether] of the seed of the land, [or] of the fruit of the tree, [is] the Lord’s: is to be given to him as an acknowledgment of his being the proprietor of the land, and that all the increase of it is owing to his blessing, and therefore is given in way of gratitude to him: the former of these takes in all sorts of corn that is man’s food, as wheat and barley; and the latter wine and oil, and all sorts of fruits that are eatable; for it is said to be a general rule, that whatever is for food, and is preserved (having an owner, and not being common), and grows up out of the earth, is bound to tithes  

[it is] holy unto the Lord; the first tithe was eaten by the priests and Levites only, and the other before the Lord in Jerusalem only, and that by clean persons. Something of this kind obtained among the Heathens, it may be in imitation of this, particularly among the Grecians; Pisistratus  tells Solon, that everyone of the Athenians gave a tenth part of his inheritance, not to me, says he, who was their governor, but for public sacrifices, and the common good, and when engaged in war, to defray the charge of it; and so, by the oracle of Apollo, the Corcyraenans were directed to send to Olympia and Delphos the tenth part of the produce of their fields  ; and by the same oracle, the island of the Syphnians, in which was a golden mine, were ordered to bring the tenth of it to the same place  . So the Pelasgi  in a time of scarcity vowed the tithes of all their increase to the gods, and having obtained their wish, devoted the tenth of all their fruits and cattle to them.

Ver. 31. And if a man, will redeem [ought] of his tithes, etc.] Of his own, and not his neighbour’s, as Jarchi observes; for if he redeemed the tithes of his neighbour, but did not add a fifth part, which he was obliged to do if he redeemed his own, as follows:

he shall add thereunto the fifth [part] thereof; besides giving the value for what part of his tithes he redeemed, he gave a fifth part of that sum over and above; as, supposing the tithe was worth fifty shillings, then he gave that, and ten shillings more, and so in proportion. The use of this redemption, as Jarchi suggests, was, that he might have liberty of eating it
in any place: for he understands it of the second tithe, as before observed, and which was to be eaten at Jerusalem.

**Ver. 32. And concerning the tithe of the herd, or of the flock, etc.** Of oxen and sheep, as the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem; for this law only concerns such, as Maimonides observes, for none but clean beasts were tithed, though the firstlings of unclean beasts were to be redeemed:

> *even* of whatsoever passeth under the rod, the tenth shall be holy unto the Lord: which being slain, the blood and fat were to be offered the altar, and the flesh eaten by the owners, as Jarchi observes; who adds, this is not reckoned with the rest of the gifts of the priesthood; and we do not find it was given to the priests: the “rod”, under which these are said to pass, is either the shepherd’s rod, as Aben Ezra under, which they passed morning and evening, when led out or brought in, as in ( Jeremiah 33:13); or the rod of the tither: the manner of tithing, as described by Maimonides, was this;

> “he gathers all the lambs and all the calves into a field, and makes a little door to it, so that two cannot go out at once; and he places their dams without, and they bleat, so that the lambs hear their voice, and go out of the fold to meet them, as it is said, “whatsoever passeth under the rod”; for it must pass of itself, and not be brought out by his hand; and when they go out of the fold, after another, he begins and counts them with the rod, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, and the tenth that goes out, whether male or female, whether perfect or blemished, he marks with a red mark, and says, this is the tithe."

the time of tithing the cattle was on the first of Elul or August; for so it is said,

> “the first of Elul is the beginning of the year for the tithing of beasts;”

when they tithed all that were born the preceding year: but we are elsewhere told, there were three times for tithing beasts; fifteen days before the passover, (which was the last of Adar or February,) and fifteen days before the Pentecost, and fifteen days before the feast of tabernacles, which was the last of Elul or August; and these tithings were made for the sake of those that went up to these feasts, that it might be certain the cattle sold and eaten were tithed.
Ver. 33. *He shall not search whether it be good or bad*, etc.] In a good or bad state of health, fat or lean, perfect or blemished, but take it as it is, be it what it will:

*neither shall he change it*; neither for the better nor the worse, no alteration was to be made, but the beast was to be taken as it came:

*and if he change it at all, then both it and the change shall be holy*; be sacred to the Lord, and for his use and service; this was done to restrain men from making any alteration, since if they did, both the one and the other were taken from them; yea, were to be beaten with forty stripes, save one

whether this change was of the herd with the flock, or of the flock with the herd; or of lambs with goats, or goats with lambs; or of males with females, or of females with males; or of perfect with blemished ones, or of blemished ones with perfect ones:

*it shall not be redeemed*; from whence the Jews gather, that a tithe beast was not to be bought and sold, whether blemished or unblemished.

Ver. 34. *These are the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses*, etc.] Meaning either what are contained in this chapter, or rather in the whole book, which he delivered to Moses:

*for the children of Israel*; to be observed by them, priests and people: and these were given to him

*in Mount Sinai*; either when upon it, or rather when near it, in the wilderness of it, after the tabernacle was set up, and the Lord spake to him out of that; (see Leviticus 1:1 25:1).
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ft454 -- Hilchot Tumaat Tzarat, c. 10. sect. 6.


ft456 -- Clio, sive, l. 1. c. 138.

ft457 -- See the Supplement to Chambers’s Dictionary, in the word “Leprosy”.

ft458 -- Hilchot Tumaat Tzarat, c. 16. sect. 10.

ft459 -- Tzeror Hammor, fol. 99. 3.

ft460 -- Ramban, Bechai, Isaac Arama, & alii, apud Muisium in loc.


ft462 -- Calmet’s Dictionary, in the word “Leper”.

ft463 -- Misn. Celaim, c. 9. sect, 1.

ft464 -- Ib. Negaim, c. 11. sect. 2.

ft465 -- Ib. sect. 8.
Maimon. & Bartenora in Misn. Edait, c. 7. sect. 8.

Maimon. & Bartenora in Misn. Edaiot, c. 7. sect. 8.

Misn. ut supra, (c.11.) sect. 3, 4.

In ib.

Hierozoic. par. 1. l. 2. c. 45. col. 493.

µyr p x yt ç “duos passeres”, V. L.

Negaim, c. 14. sect. 5.


Ibid.

Ib. sect. 1.

Ebr. Concord. part. p. 64. No. 318.

Ibid. & Bartenora in ib.

Chaeremon apud Porphyr. de Abstinence, l. 4. sect. 6.

Ut supra. (Misn. Negaim, c. 11. sect. 4.)

Ib. sect. 2.

Hilchot Tumaat Tzarat, c. 11. sect. 3.

Negaim, c. 14. sect. 4.


Ut supra, (Misn. Negaim, c. 11) sect. 2.

Ut supra, (Hilchot Tumaat Tzarat, c. 11.) sect. 1.

Ut supra, (Misn. Negaim, c. 11.) sect. 3.
Hilchot Mechosre Capharah, c. 4. sect. 2.


Ut supra. (Hilchot Mechosre Capharah, c. 4. sect. 2.)

Ut supra. (Misn. Negaim, c. 14. sect. 8)

Ut supra. (Hilchot Mechosre Capharah, c. 4. sect. 2.)

Ut supra, ({r}) sect. 9.

Ib. sect. 10. so Maimon. Mechosre Capharah, ut supra, (c. 4. sect. 2.) & Bartenora, in Misn. Negaim, ib.

Bartenora in ib.

Ibid.

Bartenora in Misn. Zebachim, c. 4. sect. 3.

Ut supra. (Misn. negaim, c. 14. sect. 8.)

Ut supra, (Mechosre Capharah, c. 4.) sect. 3.


Maimon. & Bartenora in ib.

Hilchot Mechosre Capharah, c. 5. sect. 9.

Maimonides, Abarbinel, Abraham Seba, and others.


Misn. Nagaim, c. 12. sect. 5.

Misn. Nagaim, c. 12. sect. 1, 2.


Warnefrid de Gest. Longobard. l. 2. apud Scheuchzer. ib.
---

ft515 -- Hilchot Tumaat Tzarat, c. 15. sect. 1, 2.


ft519 -- So Maimon. & Bartenora in Misn. Edaiot, c. 5. sect. 1.

ft520 -- Zabim, c. 1. sect. 1. Maimon. & Bartenora in ib.

ft521 -- Zabim, c. 2. sect. 4.

ft522 -- Maimon. & Bartenora in Misn. Niddah, c. 6. sect. 3.

ft523 -- Zabim, ut supra. (c. 2. sect. 4.)

ft524 -- Zabim, c. 5. sect. 1, 7.

ft525 -- Hilchot Metame Mishcab, c. 1. sect. 16.

ft526 -- Misn. Zabim, c. 3. sect. 1. & c. 4. sect. 5, 7.

ft527 -- Hilchot Mechosre Capharah, c. 3. sect. 1.

ft528 -- “-----& noctem flumine purgas.” Pers. Satyr. 2.

ft529 -- Chaeremon. apud Porphyr. de Abstinentia, l. 4. c. 7.

ft530 -- Misn. Tamid. c. 1. sect. 1.

ft531 -- Clio, sive, l. 1. c. 198.

ft532 -- Euterpe, sive, l. 2. c. 64.

ft533 -- Zabim, c. 5. sect. 6, 7.

ft534 -- Nat. Hist. l. 7. c. 15.

ft535 -- h t d n “menstruum ejus”, Pagninus, Montanus; “separatio ejus”, Drusius.

ft536 -- Misn. Zabim, c. 2. sect. 1.

ft537 -- Leo Modena’s History of Rites, Customs, etc. of the present Jews, par. 1. c. 8.

ft538 -- h w d h w “et dolentis”, Montanus.
Maimon. & Bartenora in Misn. Celim, c. 1. sect. 9.

Maimon. in Misn. Sanhedrin, c. 11. sect. 1. So Tikkune Zohar, correct. 18. fol. 28. 1.


Ib. Arcadica, p. 531.

Misn. Yoma, c. 3. sect. 4, 6.

Ib. sect. 3.

Misn. Yoma, c. 3. sect. 8.

Misn. Yoma, c. 6. sect. 1.

Ib. c. 3. sect. 8.

Misn. Yoma, c. 3. sect. 9. & c. 4. sect. 1.

Hilchot Yom Hacippurim, c. 3. sect. 1.

Contr. Cels. 1. 6. p. 305.

Comment. in Heb. 9. sect. 25, etc.

De Oeconom. Faederum, l. 4. c. 6. sect. 71, 72, 73.

De Leg. Heb. l. 3. Dissert. 8. c. 1. sect. 2. and of the same mind was our English poet Milton, that Azazel was a demon:

His mighty standard: that proud honour claim’d Azazel as his right, a cherub tall. --Milton’s Paradise Lost, B. 1. l. 533, 534.

In Lev. Homil. 10. c. 16. fol. 82.
ft561 -- lb. c. 5. sect. 1.
ft562 -- Misn. Yoma, c. 5. sect. 1.
ft563 -- Maimon. & Bartenora in ib.
ft564 -- Misn. Yoma, c. 4. sect. 3.
ft565 -- Ibid. c. 5. sect. 3.
ft566 -- Misn. Yoma, c. 5. sect. 3.
ft568 -- Yoma, c. 5. Sect. 5.
ft569 -- Ibid. Sect. 4.
ft570 -- Ut supra. (Misn. Yoma, c.5. sect, 3.)
ft571 -- Yoma, c. 5. sect. 6.
ft572 -- Yoma, c. 5. sect. 7.
ft574 -- Misnah Yoma, c. 6. sect. 2.
ft575 -- Misnah Yoma, sect. 8.
ft576 -- Misn. Hieros. c. 6. sect. 9. fol. 43. 2.
ft578 -- yt [ c ya “viri opportuni”, Montanus; “viri tempestivi”, Tigurine version.
ft579 -- Ut supra, (a)) sect. 3.
ft580 -- T. Bab. Yoma, fol. 66. 1, 2.
ft581 -- Jackson & alii, apud Patrick in loe.
ft582 -- T. Bab. Yoma, fol. 19. 2.
ft583 -- De Oeconomia Foeder. l. 4. c. 6. sect. 72.
ft584 -- In Levit. Homil. 10. c. 16. fol. 82.
ft585 -- Yoma, c. 6. sect. 4, 5, 6, 8.
ft586 -- Euterpe, sive, l. 2. c. 39.
ft587 -- De Iside & Osir.
ft589 -- Misn. Yoma, c. 7. sect. 3, 4.
ft590 -- Misn. Yoma, c. 6. sect. 6.
ft591 -- De Abstinentia, l. 2. c. 44.
ft592 -- In Misn. Yoma, c. 6. sect. 7.
ft593 -- Misn. Yoma, c. 7, sect. 2.
ft594 -- Misn. Zebachim, c. 5. sect. 2. & c. 12. sect. 5.
ft595 -- Misn. Yoma, c. 6. sect. 7.
ft596 -- Seder Olam Rabba, c. 6. p. 19.
ft597 -- Misn. Yoma, c. 8. sect. 1, 2, 4.
ft598 -- Ibid. sect. 3.
ft600 -- P. Martyr. de Angleria, Decad. 1. l. 9.
ft601 -- Vartoman. Navigat. l. 5. c. 2. 23. & l. 6. c. 16. 27.
ft602 -- Bibliothec. l. 1. p. 58, 79.
ft603 -- Euterpe, sive, l. 2. c. 46.
ft604 -- Geograph. l. 17. p. 551.
ft605 -- Moreh Nevochim, p. 3. c. 46.
ft606 -- Hilchot Maacolot Asurot, c. 6. sect. 1.
ft607 -- Ut supra. (Moreh Nevochim, p. 3. c. 46.)
ft608 -- De Generatione Animal. Exercitat. 51. p. 302, 303, etc.
ft609 -- De Seipso, l. 5. sect. 25. & l. 6. sect. 11.
ft610 -- Hilchot Shechitah, c. 4. sect. 1.
ft611 -- Moreh Nevochim, p. 3. c. 46.
ft612 -- In Vit. Pythagor. l. 8. p. 588.
ft613 -- Var. Hist. l. 4. c. 17.
ft614 -- De Abstiuentia, l. 3. sect. 18.
ft615 -- Bibliothec. l. 1. p. 23.
ft616 -- Moreh Nevochim, par. 3. c. 37.
ft617 -- Antiqu. l. 3. fol. 25.
ft618 -- “ad omnes reliquias carnis suae”, Montanus; “ad quascunque reliquias carnis suae”, Tigurine version.
ft619 -- “vir, vir”, Montanus, Vatablus, Drusius.
ft621 -- “id est, nuditatem vel pudenda”, Vatablus, Fagius, Piscator.
ft622 -- Sex. Empir. Pyrrh. l. 3. c. 24.
ft623 -- Patricides apud Selden. de jure natur. Gent. l. 5. c. 11. p. 624.
ft624 -- “Nam magus ex matre et gnato nascatur oportet.” Catull. Epigr. 91.
ft625 -- Hist. Animal. l. 9. c. 47.
ft626 -- Vid. Julian. in Misopogon, p. 72, etc.
ft628 -- Diodor. Sicul. l. 1. p. 23.
ft629 -- Herodot. Thalia, sive, l. 3. c. 31.
ft630 -- Paulus in Mosaic. & Roman. Leg. Collat. tit. 6. a Pithaeo.
ft632 -- Hilchot Issure Biah, c. 2. sect. 5.
Erato, sive, l. 6. c. 71. Polymnia, sive, l. 7. c. 224, 239.

Annal. l. 12. c. 5, 6, 7.

Hist. l. 4.

In Vita M. Crassi.

Canon Apostol. can. 19. Concil. Neocaesar. can. 2.

Zonaras, l. 3. apud Zanchium de Sponsalibus, l. 4. c. 1. p. 786.

“reliquiae sunt ipsae”, Tigurine version.

Hilchot Issure Biah, c. 2. sect. 9.


“apud vel prope eam”; so is sometimes used; see Nold. part. Concord. Ebr. p. 691.

Apud Mosaic. & Roman. Leg. Collat. ut supra. (tit. 6. a Pithaeo)

Concil. Illiber. can. 61. Aurat. can. 17. Auxer. can. 30.


Nat. Hist. l. 36. c. 5.

Ben Melech in loc. Kimchii Sepher Shorash. rad. Æl m.

Hilchot Issure Biah, c. 1. sect. 16.

Geograph. l. 17. p. 551.

De Animal. l. 7. c. 19.

Euterpe, sive, l. 2. c. 46.

Hierozoic. par. 1. l. 2. c. 53. col. 642.

“ne respiciatis”, Montanus, Tigurine version, Drusius.

Pesichta, Maimonides.

"comedendo, comedetur", Drusius.

Misin. Peah, c. 1. sect. 2.

Ibid. sect. 3.

Hilchot Mattanot Anayim, c. 2. sect. 12.

Misin. Peah, c. 4. sect. 5.

Maimon & Bartenora in ib.

Ib. sect. 10.

Maimon. & Bartenora in Misin. Peah, c. 6. sect. 5.

So it is interpreted by R Sol. Urbin. Ohel Moed, fol. 59. 1.

Mattanot Anayim, c. 1. sect. 9.

Mattanot Anayim, c. 4. sect. 16.

"ad fallaciam ullam", Junius & Tremellius, Piscator; so Ainsworth.


Hilchot Sanhedrin, c. 21. sect. 1, 2, 3.


-----quippe minuti, etc. Juvenal. Satyr. 13.

"et non observabis", Montanus.

"Non servabis", Pagninus, Drusius; "neque iram asservato"; Junius & Tremellius, Piscator.

"non facies coire", V. L. Pagninus, Drusius.

Misin. Gelaim, c. 1. sect. 6.

Hilchot Gelaim, c. 9. sect. 3.

De Special. Leg. p. 784.
ft679 -- Misn. ut supra, (f) sect. 9.
ft680 -- Misn. Celaim, c. 1. sect. 7, 8.
ft681 -- Antiqu. l. 4. c. 8. sect. 11.
ft682 -- Celaim, c. 9. sect. 1.
ft683 -- Moreh Nevochim, par. 3. c. 37.
ft684 -- Misn. ut supra, (k) c. 9. sect. 1. 8.

ft685 -- hyht t r q b “vapulatio erit”, Fagius, Vatablus, Ainsworth;
“flagellatio adhibetur”; Junius & Tremellius, Piscator.

ft686 -- Sepher Shorash. rad. r q b.
ft687 -- Ceritot, c. 2. sect. 4.

ft688 -- µdhl [“super sanguine”, Montanus, Munster; “super
sanguinem”, Fagius.

ft690 -- Targum Jon. in loc. T. Bab. Sanhedrin, ib.
ft691 -- Aben Ezra in loc.
ft692 -- Baal Hatturim in loc.

ft693 -- Moreh Nevochim, par. 3. c. 46.

ft695 -- Kimchi, Sepher Shorash. rad. çj n.
ft696 -- Thalia, sive, l. 3. c. 8.
ft697 -- Moreh Nevochim, par. 3. c. 37. Hilchot Obede Cochabim, c. 12.
sect. 1.

ft698 -- Melpomene, sive, l. 4. c. 71.
ft699 -- Alex. ab Alex. Genial. Dier. l. 3. c. 7.

ft700 -- Apud Servium in Virgil. Aeneid. 3.
ft701 -- Misn. Maccot, c. 3. sect. 5.
ft702 -- Ibid. sect. 6.


ft704 -- Jarchi, Maimon. Bartenora, & Ez Chayim in Misn. ut supra. ({g})

ft705 -- Targ. Jon. in loc. T. Bab. Sanhedrin, fol. 76. 1.

ft706 -- Contra Gentes, p. 21.

ft707 -- t b a h l a w p t l a “ne respiciatis ad Pythonas”, Montanus; so Junius & Tremellius, Piscator.

ft708 -- Misn. Sanhedrin, c. 7. sect. 7.

ft709 -- Ibid.

ft710 -- h b yç ynp m “ante canitiem”, Pagninus; so Tigurine version, Junius & Tremellius, Piscator.

ft711 -- Pirke Abot, c. 5. sect. 21.


ft713 -- Euterpe, sive, l. 2. c. 80.

ft714 -- Hist. Animal. l. 6. c. 61.

ft715 -- Hilchot Genibah, c. 8. sect. 4.

ft716 -- Torath Cohanim apud Yalkut in loc. Maimon. & Bartenora in Misn. Sheviith, c. 10. sect. 9.

ft717 -- De Abstinent. l. 2. c. 56.


ft719 -- Nat. Hist. l. 36. c. 5.

ft720 -- Misn. Sanhedrin, c. 7. sect. 3.

ft721 -- Hilchot Issure Biah, c. 1. sect. 6.

ft722 -- Misn. ut supra, (Sanhedrin, c. 7.) sect. 4.

ft723 -- Ibid.
ft724 -- Misn. ut supra. (Sanhedrin, c. 7. sect. 4.)

ft725 -- Sanhedrin, c. 7. sect. 2.

ft726 -- Misn. Sanhedrin, c. 7. sect. 4.

ft727 -- Ibid.

ft728 -- ἡ δὲ ν “separatio”, Drusius,

ft729 -- Moreh Nevochim, par. 3. c. 37.

ft730 -- Torat Cohanim in Yalcut in loc.

ft731 -- Servius in Virgil. Aeneid. l. xi. ver. 3.

ft732 -- De Abstinentia, l. 2. c. 50.

ft733 -- wr a çl “carne sua”, Pagninus, Montanus.

ft734 -- Sepher Alphes, par. 1. fol. 410. 2.

ft735 -- T. Bab. Zebachim, fol. 90. 1.

ft736 -- wym[ b l [ b “in princep populi sui”, V. L. so Pesicta & Ben Melech in loc. & Kimchi Sepher Shorash. rad. l [ b


ft740 -- Euterpe, sive, l. 2. c. 36.

ft741 -- Vid. Pignorii Mens. Isiac. liter. S.

ft742 -- Julius Firmicus, ut supra. (v)

ft743 -- Misn. Maccot, c. 3. sect. 1.

ft744 -- t wnzl । j । t । yk “cum coepit fornicari”, Pagninus, Montanus; so Tigurine version.


ft746 -- So Pagninus, Ainsworth, and others.

Maimon. Cele Hamikdash, c. 5. sect. 6.

Horayot, c. 3. sect. 5.

Massurius Sabinus, apud A. Gell. Noct. Attic. l. 10. c. 15.

In Virgil. Aeneid. l. 3. ver. 64. “atraque cupresso”.

Maimon. Hilchot Ebel, c. 3. sect. 8.

Servius in Virgil. Aeneid. l. 6. ad ver. “praecipue pius Aeneas”, etc.

Cele Hamikdash, c. 5. sect. 7.

Misn. Horayot, c. 3. sect. 5.


So Junius & Tremellius, Piscator, etc.

Hilchot Issure Biah, c. 17. sect. 13.

T. Bab. Yebamot, fol. 59. 1.

Diodor. Sicul. l. 1. p. 72.

T. Bab. Yebamot, ibid. Maimon. ut supra. (Cele Hamikdash, c. 5. sect. 5, 6.)

Misn. Yebamot, c. 6. sect. 4.

Æ[ r zm ç ya “vir de semine tuo”, Pagninus, Montanus, etc.

Antiqu. l. 3. c. 12. sect. 2.

Pompon. Laet. de Sacerdot. c. 6. de Vestalibus.


Sepher Shorash. rad. [ r ç .

Becorot, c. 7. sect. 2.
Ut supra, (Sepher Shorash.) rad. l l b.

Becorot, c. 7. sect. 5.


tkrph la “intra velum”, V. L.

Misn. Middot, c. 2. sect. 5.

Misn. Middot, c. 5. sect. 3.


In Misn. Yebamot, c. 9. sect. 6.

Misn Yebamot, c. 7. sect. 4. & Bartenora in ib.

Misn. Yebamot, c. 9. sect. 6.

Misn. Yebamot, c. 9. sect. 6.


Hilchot Maaseh Hakorbanot, c. 3. sect. 2, 3.

Heredot. Euterpe, sive, l. 2. c. 38.

Servius in Virgil. Aeneid. l. 4.

Iliad. 1. ver. 66.

Maimon. Hilchot Issure Mizbeach, c. 2. sect. 11.

Chaeremon. apud Porphyr. de Abstinentia, l. 4. sect. 7.

Nat. Hist. l. 8. c. 45.

De Abstinentia, l. 2. sect. 23.

Aristoph. Acharnens. ver. 784.

In Virgil. Aeneid. l. 6.
ft793 -- Maimon. Hilchot Biath Hamikdash, c. 7. sect. 1, etc.

ft794 -- Tzerer Hammor, fol. 104. 2.

ft795 -- Nat. Hist. l. 8. c. 51.

ft796 -- hç wa r wç “bovem vel pecus”, Pagninus, Montanus, etc.

ft797 -- wnb t a w wt a “ipsum et filium ejus”, Pagninus, Montanus, etc.

ft798 -- Var. Hist. l. 5. c. 20.

ft799 -- Pagninus, Montanus, Junius & Tremellius, Piscator, Drusius.

ft800 -- Antiqu. l. 3. c. 10. sect. 5.


ft803 -- Misn. Menachot, c. 10. sect. 3, 4.

ft804 -- Ib. sect. 4, 5.

ft805 -- Chaskuni.

ft806 -- Maimon. Hilchot Maacolot Asurot, c. 10. sect. 2, 3.

ft807 -- Schulchan Aruch, par. 1. c. 489. sect. 10. so Lebush, c. 489. sect. 10.

ft808 -- Antiqu. l. 3. c. 10. sect. 6.


ft810 -- Schulchan Aruch, par. 1. c. 489. sect. 1. & Lebush, ut supra, (c. 489.) sect. 1.

ft811 -- Hilchot Tamidin, etc. c. 8. sect. 10.

ft812 -- Ut supra, (Hilchot Tamidin, etc. c. 8.) sect. 1.

ft813 -- Antiqu. l. 3. c. 10. sect. 6.

ft814 -- In Torat Cohenim, apud Yalkut in loc.

ft815 -- In Torat Cohenim, apud Yalkut in loc. & Jarchi.

ft816 -- Maimon. Hilchot Shophar ve Succah, c. 2. sect. 1.
ft817 -- Ibid. sect. 8.

ft818 -- Ib. ch. 3. sect. 1. Schulchan Aruch, par. 1. No. 590. sect. 1.

ft819 -- Misn. Roshhashanah, c. 1. sect. 1.

ft820 -- Schulchan Aruch, par. 1. c. 588. sect. 1. Lebush, par. 2. c. 588. sect. 1.

ft821 -- R. Alphes, par. 1. fol. 346. 2. & Jarchi in loc.


ft823 -- Schulchan Aruch, ib. c. 583. sect. 2. Lebush, ib. 583. sect. 2.

ft824 -- Misn. Roshhashanah, c. 1. sect. 2. T. Bab. Roshhashanah, fol. 16. 2.

ft825 -- Leo Modena’s History of Rites of the present Jews, par. 3. c. 5. sect. 7.

ft826 -- T. Bab. Roshhashanah, fol. 10. 2.


ft828 -- Leo Modena, ut supra.

ft829 -- Maimon. Hilchot Shebitat Ashur, c. 2. sect. 8, 10.

ft830 -- R. Alphes, par. 1. Yom Hacippurim, c. 1. fol. 357. 2.

ft831 -- Ut supra, (Maimon. Hilchot Shebitat Asher) c. 1. sect. 6.


ft833 -- Buxtorf. ut supra. (Synagog. Jud. c. 21. p. 447.)


ft836 -- Misn. Succah, c. 5. sect. 1. 4.

ft837 -- R. Alphes, par. 1. Roshhashanah, c. 1. fol. 346. 2.

ft839 -- Geograph. l. 10. p. 322.

ft840 -- Sympos. l. 1. prob. 3.

ft841 -- Lebush, par. 2. c. 668. sect. 5.

ft842 -- Buxtorf. Synagog. Jud. c. 27. Leo Moden’s History of the Rites of the Jews, par. 3. c. 7. sect. 6.

ft843 -- Minsk. Succah, c. 2. sect. 6.

ft844 -- R. Alphes, par. 1. Succah, c. 2. fol. 374. 2. 375. 1.

ft845 -- Menachot, c. 11. sect. 4.

ft846 -- Menachot, c. 11. sect. 7.

ft847 -- Maimon. Hilchot Tamidin, c. 4. sect. 12, 14.

ft848 -- Menachot, c. 11. sect. 9.

ft849 -- Targum Jon. in loc.

ft850 -- Sanhedrin, c. 7. sect. 5.

ft851 -- Hilchot Obede Cochabim, c. 2. sect. 10.


ft853 -- r b "apud seu juxta montem", Piscator; so Ainsworth, Patrick, etc.

ft854 -- Antiqu. l. 3. c. 12. sect. 3.

ft855 -- Hilchot Shemithah Vejobel, c. 4. sect. 25.

ft856 -- Torat Cohenim apud Yalkut, par. 1. fol. 191. 1. Maimon. ut supra, (Hilchot Tamidin) c. 10. sect. 2.

ft857 -- Roshhashanah, c. 1. sect. 1.

ft858 -- Torat Cohenim apud Yalkut, ut supra. (par. 1. fol. 191. 1.)

ft859 -- Sheviith, c. 5. sect. 6.

ft860 -- Maimon. & Bartenora in ib.
“uvas tuarum separationum”, Pagninus, Montanus; so Drusius & Ainsworth.

Sheviith, c. 8. sect. 2.

Maimon. Hilchot Shemitah Vejobel, c. 7. sect. 1.

Misn. Roshhashanah, c. 1. sect. 1.

In Misn. ib.

Hilchot Shemitah Vejobel, c. 10. sect. 10, 14.

Antiqu. I. 3. c. 12. sect. 3.


Maimon. & Bartenora in Misn. Bava Metziah, c. 4. sect. 9.

Jarchi in loc.


Hilchot Shemittah Vejobel, c. 11. sect. 3.


Hilchot Shemittah Vejobel, ut supra, (c. 11.) sect. 5.

Misn. Eracin, ut supra. (c. 9. 1.)

“discedet emptor”, Junius & Tremellius.

In Misn. Eracin, c. 9. sect. 3.

Misn. Eracin, c. 9. sect. 4.

T. Bab. Bava Kama, fol. 82. 2.

Eracin, c. 9. sect. 8.

Bartenora in ib.

Misn. Eracin, c. 9. sect. 8.

In Misn. Eracin, c. 9. sect. 8.

Maimon. in Msn. Kiddushin, c. 1. sect. 2.

Hilchot Abadim, c. 2. sect. 3.

Maimon. in Msn. Kiddushin, c. 3. sect. 1.

db trkmm “venditione servi”, Drusius.

Hilchot Abadim, c. 1. sect. 5.

Torat Cohanim apud Yalkut, par. 1. fol. 195. 1.

Maimon. & Bartenora in Msn. Kiddushin, c. 1. sect. 3.

Misn. Kiddushin, ib.

“radici”, Vatablus, Piscator.


Pesikta apud Drusium in loc.

Hilchot Abadim, c. 2. sect. 7.

Apud Muis. Varia Sacra, p. 373.

R. Bechai apud Patrick in loc.


“pluvias vestras”, Pagninus, Montanus, Tigurine version, Junius & Tremellius, Piscator.

T. Bab. Taanith, fol. 22. 1. 2.

Torat Cohenim, apud Yalkut, par. 1. fol. 196. 3.

Sepher Shorash. rad. ʒ y.
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