

Leviticus Chapter 22

Verses 1-33: This chapter continues the emphasis from chapter 21. The concept of the Lord as the sanctifier is continued in 22:9, 16, and 32, marking off three distinct sections:

- (1) Impediments to eating priestly food;
- (2) The relatives' right to priestly food; and
- (3) Physical impediments to sacrificial use of animals.

The Aaronites are reminded that they, too, can become defiled ceremonially, just like any other member of the congregation. Purity is mandatory for those officiating at the sacrifices. If a priest approaches "having his uncleanness upon him, that soul shall be cut off from my presence" (verse 3).

These are additional instructions on ceremonial cleanness for the priests, beginning with a death threat (verse 3, "cut off"), to those who might violate these rules.

Verses 1-16: These ordinances regarding problems in presentation, in personnel and in accidents reveal how seriously the Lord viewed the sacrifices. Priests were not permitted to minister if they were "unclean". They also had to ensure that only priests and their families ate the offering, "no stranger" was permitted to do so. Unintentional consumption of the priestly food could be forgiven with a "trespass offering" (5:14-19), but an intentional lack of regard for the holy things of God would cause one to "be cut off from" God's "presence" or even death.

Leviticus 22:1 "And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,"

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.

Leviticus 22:2 "Speak unto Aaron and to his sons, that they separate themselves from the holy things of the children of Israel, and that they profane not my holy name [in those things] which they hallow unto me: I [am] the LORD."

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.

"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.

The only way that I can understand this, is if they have been defiled or made unclean, then the priests or high priest are not to function in his usual duties until his uncleanness is gone. When they are ceremonially unclean in any way, they are not to handle the holy things of God.

Leviticus 22:3 "Say unto them, Whosoever [he be] of all your seed among your generations, that goeth unto the holy things, which the children of Israel hallow unto the LORD, having his uncleanness upon him, that soul shall be cut off from my presence: I [am] the LORD."

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 eat.

"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.

In this verse, we can see what the punishment would be for committing this sin (This separation was not for just a short time, but was a permanent situation). This would be showing lack of respect for the things of God.

Leviticus 22:4 "What man soever of the seed of Aaron [is] a leper, or hath a running issue; he shall not eat of the holy things, until he be clean. And whoso toucheth any thing [that is] unclean [by] the dead, or a man whose seed goeth from him;"

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 Lev. 13:2).

"Or hath a running issue": A gonorrhoea, whether man or woman (Lev. 15:2).

"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 Lev. 15:16).

Leviticus 22:5 "Or whosoever toucheth any creeping thing, whereby he may be made unclean, or a man of whom he may take uncleanness, whatsoever uncleanness he hath;"

Jarchi thinks this respects the measure or quantity of what is touched, as if but the quantity of a lentil or small pea (see Lev. 11:29-38).

"Or a man of whom he may take uncleanness, whatsoever uncleanness he hath": As of a leper, 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 dead man or woman, a menstruous woman, and a new mother.

Leviticus 22:6 "The soul which hath touched any such shall be unclean until even, and shall not eat of the holy things, unless he wash his flesh with water."

Which is the time fixed by the several laws for such uncleanness (see Lev. 11:31).

"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.

We see, in these few verses above, the length of time that the priests would be unclean for this type of situation. We also see the necessity of washing when they had come into contact with something, or someone, who was unclean.

Leviticus 22:7 "And when the sun is down, he shall be clean, and shall afterward eat of the holy things; because it [is] his food."

"He shall be clean": In the same manner, much water is not made unclean by a small contamination. Time was essential for ceremonial purification.

The high priest and his family live of the things of the temple. We can easily see the necessity for them being restored to eating of this food as soon as possible.

Leviticus 22:8 "That which dieth of itself, or is torn [with beasts], he shall not eat to defile himself therewith: I [am] the LORD."

Whether fowls or beasts, and even clean ones, which, had they been killed in a proper manner, were fit to eat. But dying of themselves, or torn to pieces by other birds or beasts of prey, might not (see Ezek. 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 forbidden to a common Israelite, and much less might a priest eat of them (see Lev. 17:15).

"I am the Lord": Who enjoined this, and expects to be obeyed.

Leviticus 22:9 "They shall therefore keep mine ordinance, lest they bear sin for it, and die therefore, if they profane it: I the LORD do sanctify them."

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.

"Lest 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 (Lev. 10:1). 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.

The ordinances for the priests would be different than for the congregation, because they were serving in the sanctuary. To sin against God, by a priest would be a defilement punishable by death.

Verses 10-11: "Buy any soul with his money": This portion of the sacrifice assigned to the support of the priests was restricted to the use of his family. However, an indentured servant or slave was to be treated as one of the priest's family, pertaining to eating the consecrated food. See the laws of release, which show this to be a temporary indenture (25:10; Exodus 21:2-11; Deut. 15:12-18).

Leviticus 22:10 "There shall no stranger eat [of] the holy thing: a sojourner of the priest, or a hired servant, shall not eat [of] the holy thing."

“Stranger”: No “outsider”, that is, one who was not of priestly stock, might eat the holy food, unless he had been incorporated into the priest’s family. Simply to live with the priest or to work for him (verse 10), was not enough, but the slave could be bought, in which case he was considered a member of the family (verse 11).

Leviticus 22:11 "But if the priest buy [any] soul with his money, he shall eat of it, and he that is born in his house: they shall eat of his meat."

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.

"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 too such as are bought and redeemed with the blood of Christ, the high priest, and are born again of his Spirit and grace.

In the previous verses, we have read under what conditions the priest could not eat of the things of the sanctuary. Now we are getting to just who can eat of the things of the sanctuary. We have been told in a previous lesson that the high priest, the priests and their families were to live of the things of the sanctuary. But how far does this go? In the verses above, we see that a stranger could not eat. In (verse 11 above), we see that someone bought with money becomes part of the family and can eat. Even the children of servants who were bought, would also be able to eat. To buy a servant then made that servant part of your family. Isn't it interesting that Jesus bought the Christians with a price, and we have become part of the family of God. We are adopted children of the Father and joint heirs with Jesus. This verse following shows that we are adopted.

Romans 8:15 "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father."

Romans 8:17 "And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and jointheirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with [him], that we may be also glorified together."

Leviticus 22:12 "If the priest's daughter also be [married] unto a stranger, she may not eat of an offering of the holy things."

Not to a 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.

The reason for this is, if she is married to a stranger, that makes her a stranger as well since she and her husband are one flesh.

Leviticus 22:13 "But if the priest's daughter be a widow, or divorced, and have no child, and is returned unto her father's house, as in her youth, she shall eat of her father's meat: but there shall no stranger eat thereof."

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. 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 (Lev. 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.

We see in this Scripture that the explanation above is true. When she lives at home with her father and has no husband, she is part of the father's family, and can eat of his food. The fact that the stranger cannot eat of these things is because these things are holy.

Leviticus 22:14 "And if a man eat [of] the holy thing unwittingly, then he shall put the fifth [part] thereof unto it, and shall give [it] unto the priest with the holy thing."

Either not knowing that it is a holy thing, or the heave offering, or anything 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, for the holy thing he ate of, and the fifth part of its value. 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 a heave offering, and the compensation of it. And if the priest would forgive, he may not.

A person who ate of this unwittingly, would be committing a trespass, as if he had found it and not returned it. This would be subject to 20% penalty. This all belonged to the priestly family. They must be restored for their loss.

Leviticus 22:15 "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.

Leviticus 22:16 "Or suffer them to bear the iniquity of trespass, when they eat their holy things: for I the LORD do sanctify them."

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.

"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.

We know that David, when he and his men were very hungry, ate the showbread in the sanctuary. God excused them, because they were very hungry and had no other place to get bread. In a circumstance as this God would allow this. Possibly, God allowed this because David was the anointed of God. We do see here though, that things given for God's use should not be used for personal things.

Verses 17-22: This section discusses unacceptable sacrifices, beginning with a general statement about free-will offerings (22:18, 21). The prohibition against defective sacrificial animals (22:22-25) is similar to those excluding priests with deformities (21:18-20).

Leviticus 22:17 "And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,"

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.

Leviticus 22:18 "Speak unto Aaron, and to his sons, and unto all the children of Israel, and say unto them, Whatsoever [he be] of the house of Israel, or of the strangers in Israel, 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 priests, whose work it was to offer sacrifices, and therefore it behooved 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. A Gentile that brings peace offerings, they offer them as burnt offerings, because the heart of the Gentile is towards heaven.

Verses 19-21: Sacrificial animals had to be “without blemish” or defect, as befitting a holy God. Christ was the ultimate sacrificial Lamb, perfect in every respect (Mal. 1:7-14; Heb. 9:17; 1 Peter 1:19), and the only one permanently “acceptable” to God.

Leviticus 22:19 "[Ye shall offer] at your own will a male without blemish, of the beeves, of the sheep, or of the goats."

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, or 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 Lev. 1:3). But for other offerings, as peace offerings and sin offerings, females might be used (see Lev. 3:1). 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.

There are some beautiful symbols in this. Notice, that the offering is not restricted to just the house of Israel, but is to whosoever will. This offering is symbolic of the beautiful offering that Jesus made for all of us. We Christians, like the offerors above, must of our own free will accept this offering as our payment. Notice too, that this offering was to be without blemish. Jesus was without blemish, and since this symbolizes the great sacrifice that He made for us, it must also be without blemish. We have gone into the offerings so many times, we will not do that here.

Leviticus 22:20 "[But] whatsoever hath a blemish, [that] shall ye not offer: for it shall not be acceptable for you."

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 perfect. And it was a custom among the Romans, that such sheep should be chosen for sacrifice, in which there was nothing wanting; and so, among the Grecians." For it shall not be acceptable for you; be grateful to God, and accepted by him on their account. If blemished (see Mal. 1:13).

One more time, this shadows Jesus as the Lamb of God and must be free from all blemish.

Leviticus 22:21 "And whosoever offereth a sacrifice of peace offerings unto the LORD to accomplish [his] vow, or a freewill offering in beeves or sheep, it shall be perfect to be accepted; there shall be no blemish therein."

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 (Lev. 3:1). This was either by way of thanksgiving for mercies received (Lev. 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 favors 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 (Lev. 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 say, 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). 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.

Leviticus 22:22 "Blind, or broken, or maimed, or having a wen, or scurvy, or scabbed, ye shall not offer these unto the LORD, nor make an offering by fire of them upon the altar unto the LORD."

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 color, 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. That which is maimed some understand of that whose foot is broken, as Aben Ezra also remarks.

"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 notes on Lev. 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.

God will not accept second best. The most important reason any offering must be perfect however, was because the perfect sacrifice of Jesus Christ (shadowed here), was perfect.

Leviticus 22:23 "Either a bullock or a lamb that hath any thing superfluous or lacking in his parts, that mayest thou offer [for] a freewill offering; but for a vow it shall not be accepted."

That has either more members than it should have, as five feet, or two gristles 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.

It seems there was some leniency shown, when it was a freewill offering instead of a required offering.

Leviticus Chapter 22 Questions

1. Who was Moses to give the message to in verse 2?
2. If the priest has been unclean for any reason, he is not to function in his usual duties, until when?
3. What happens to his seed who go unto the holy things while unclean?
4. Who does verse 4 say cannot eat of the holy things?
5. What are some of the things that make the priest unclean?
6. Whosoever touches something unclean, shall be unclean until _____.

7. What must the person who had touched something unclean, do after he had waited the proper length of time, before he could eat of the holy things?
8. Verse 7 tells us why it is necessary for him to eat the holy things, why is it?
9. Who lives of the things of the temple?
10. What are two things he must never eat?
11. Who sanctifies them?
12. To sin against God, if you were a priest, would be punishable by _____.
13. What three are mentioned in verse 10, who cannot eat of the holy things.
14. Why is it permissible for someone, who was bought by the priest, to eat of holy things?
15. Who live of the holy things?
16. What are Christians allowed to call the Father, that shows they are His adopted children?
17. What does Romans 8:17 say we have in common with Jesus, if we are Christians?
18. Why would the priest's daughter, married to a stranger not be able to eat of the holy things?
19. Why can a daughter, who has been divorced or widowed, eat the holy things?
20. If a man eats unwittingly of the holy things, what shall he do?
21. Offering is not restricted to the house of Israel, but is open to _____.
22. Why must this offering be without blemish?
23. What are some blemishes mentioned in verse 22 that are not acceptable?
24. There is some leniency shown in what offering?