

LESSON SEVENTEEN 21:15—23:14

h. FAMILY REGULATIONS (21:15-21)

(1) THE RIGHT OF THE FIRST-BORN (21:15-17)

15 If a man have two wives, the one beloved, and the other hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the first-born son be hers that was hated; 16 then it shall be, in the day that he causeth his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved the first-born before the son of the hated, who is the first-born; 17 but he shall acknowledge the first-born, the son of the hated, by giving him a double portion of all that he hath; for he is the beginning of his strength; the right of the first-born is his.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 21:15-17

351. Why no word of censure for having two wives?
352. How could a son be "made" the first-born, if he was not?
353. Is it an inevitable conclusion that of two wives, one will be hated and one loved?
354. Why give the first-born twice as much?

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 21:15-17

15 If a man has two wives, one loved and the other disliked, and they both have borne him children, and if the first-born son is hers who is disliked,

16 Then on the day when he wills his possessions to his sons, he shall not put the first-born of his loved wife in place of the first-born of the disliked, who is older.

17 But he shall acknowledge the son of the disliked as the first-born, by giving him a double portion of all that he has, for he was the first issue of his strength; the right of the first-born is his.

COMMENT 21:15-17

The wisdom of having two wives is not even discussed by the law-giver. As in so many other cases in this book, the evil is *anticipated* and the problem faced "as is," not "as hoped."

From an emotional and sentimental standpoint, the father would be tempted to give the son of the beloved wife the greater portion of his inheritance. But law and order crumbles before such sentimentality:

the firstborn was to receive his double portion regardless of the position his mother held in his father's esteem.

Remembering the favoritism Jacob showed to Joseph, though both of these were godly men, it is not difficult to see the need of this exhortation. Whatever the portion given the other sons, the portion allotted to the eldest son was to be twice as much. His right were to be honored.

(2) THE TREATMENT OF STUBBORN SONS (21:18-21)

18 If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, that will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and though they chasten him, will not hearken unto them; 19 then shall his father and mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place; 20 and they shall say unto the elders of his city, This our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton, and a drunkard. 21 And all the men of his city shall stone him to death with stones: so shalt thou put away the evil from the midst of thee; and all Israel shall hear, and fear.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 21:18-21

355. Here is parental discipline with a vengeance! Why was this necessary? Do you imagine it was practiced?
356. Notice the preventative measures taken before the corrective discipline was administered.

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 21:18-21

18 If a man has a stubborn and rebellious son, who will not obey the voice of his father or his mother, and though they chasten him, will not listen to them;

19 Then his father and his mother shall take hold of him, and bring him out to the elders of his city at the gate of the place where he lives,

20 And they shall say to the elders of his city, This our son is rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton and a drunkard. [Prov. 23:20-22.]

21 Then all the men of his city shall stone him to death; so you shall cleanse out the evil from your midst, and all Israel shall hear, and (reverently) fear.

COMMENT 21:18-21

See also 5:16, 27:16 (and notes on both these passages), Ex. 21:15, 17; Lev. 20:9, Prov. 30:17.

This case appears to deal especially with a son who had gained a reputation of gluttony and drunkenness (v. 20), and who would not be deterred from such a life in spite of his parent's exhortations. Their advice and chastisements were only met with stubbornness and rebellion. This son has not simply "slipped," or made a mistake—he has been defiant, unruly, and recalcitrant. The severe punishment given to him is illustrative of God's hatred for such sin.

AND ALL ISREAL SHALL HEAR, AND FEAR (v. 21)—One cannot imagine other young people witnessing such an event without being deeply sobered. When Ananias and Sapphira were struck down by God, "great fear came upon the whole church, and upon all that heard these things" (Acts 5:11). Some "object lessons" are too vivid and real to forget. This was to be a lesson for all Israel as well as punishment for one individual.

i. THE SANCTITY OF THE LAND: MAN HANGED
ON A TREE (21:22, 23)

22 And if a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree; 23 his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt surely bury him the same day; for he that is hanged is accursed of God; that thou defile not thy land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee for an inheritance.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 21:22, 23

357. Read Joshua 10:22-27 and Numbers 25:4 to help understand this section
358. Was the hanging the cause of the death? What purpose was there in hanging on a tree?

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 21:22, 23

22 And if a man has committed a sin worthy of death, and he is put to death, and [afterward] you hang him on a tree, [Josh. 10:26, 27.]

23 His body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but you shall surely bury him the same day, for a hanged man is accursed by God; thus you shall not defile your land which the Lord your God gives you for an inheritance. [Gal. 3:13.]

COMMENT 21:22, 23

Note how Joshua carried out this command in Josh. 10:22-27. See also Num. 25:4. This seems to be not a mode of execution *per se*, but rather a law concerning *exposure after death*. Ancient Syrian sculptures show naked men impaled at the top of long poles, and by the time of Esther the *gallows* (Est. 5:14—apparently a similar device) was employed for the same purpose—public exposure of a criminal as an object of warning to the people.

Crucifixion was a terrible method of punishment adopted later by the Romans from the Orient, and used by them only on slaves and the vilest of criminals. The victim was left to die of exhaustion, whereas *here* the victim was slain first. But it, too, involved hanging on a tree, and "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (Cf. Gal. 3:13). Thus the death of our Savior by this means was doubly humiliating, simply from a standpoint of the opinion society had of such a "criminal."

And Paul's application is that in becoming such a curse *for us*, we may claim the promise of life.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

If a man be found slain in a field, and the cause of his death be unknown, the murder shall be expiated by the sacrifice of a heifer in an uncultivated valley, 1-4. The rites to be used on the occasion, 5-9. The ordinance concerning marriage with a captive, 10-14. The law relative to the children of the hated and beloved wives: if the son of the hated wife should be the first-born he shall not be disinherited by the son of the beloved wife, but shall have a double portion of all his father's goods, 15-18. The law concerning the stubborn and rebellious son, who, when convicted, is to be stoned to death, 19-21. Of the person who is to be hanged, 22. His body shall not be left on the tree all night; every one that is hanged on a tree is accursed of God, 23.

j. LIFE IN THE NEW LAND: VARIOUS LAWS (22:1-12)

(1) LOST POSSESSIONS (22:1-4)

Thou shalt not see thy brother's ox or his sheep go astray, and hide thyself from them: thou shalt surely bring them again unto thy brother. 2 And if thy brother be not nigh unto thee, or if thou know him not, then thou shalt bring it home to thy house, and it shall be with thee until thy brother seek after it, and thou shalt restore it to

him. 3 And so shalt thou do with his ass; and so shalt thou do with his garment; and so shalt thou do with every lost thing of thy brother's, which he hath lost, and thou hast found: thou mayest not hide thyself. 4 Thou shalt not see thy brother's ass or his ox fallen down by the way, and hide thyself from them: thou shalt surely help him to lift them up again.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 22:1-4

359. Responsibility is again demanded. What is involved in the expression, "hide thyself"?
360. There is a reciprocal action involved here. How so?
361. Thoughtfulness and helpfulness are such grant virtues. Why do we need laws for them? Cf. Luke 10:27-37; 13:10-17.

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 22:1-4

You shall not see your brother's ox or his sheep being driven away or stolen, and hide yourself from [your duty to help] them; you shall surely take them back to your brother. [Cp. Prov. 24:12.]

2 And if your brother [the owner] is not near you, or if you do not know who he is, you shall bring the animal to your house, and it shall be with you until your brother comes looking for it; then you shall restore it to him.

3 And so shall you do with his donkey, or his garment, or with anything which your brother has lost and you have found; you shall not hide yourself from [your duty concerning] them.

4 You shall not see your brother's donkey or his ox fall down by the way, and hide from [your duty concerning] them; you shall surely help him to lift them up again.

COMMENT 22:1-4

See also Ex. 23:4, 5. The finder of the lost article was not to avoid his responsibility of making a sincere effort to find the owner. And again, if his fellow Israelite's animal was found in need of help, he was not to avoid responsibility where he could be of *assistance*, much less exploit his brother's loss to his own advantage and betterment. Getting an animal or item back to its proper owner might involve "putting himself out" some, but the next day he might need the *same* services from his brother. By avoiding this duty, and "hiding himself," he could claim the animal or item as his own. But this childish "finders keepers, losers weepers" philosophy was not endorsed.

Verse 4 expresses a *principle of helpfulness* toward those in need. In this case it is with the man's animal—but Jesus would have us to be even more helpful when dealing with our fellow *man*—Luke 10:27-37, 13:10-17.

(2) APPROPRIATE CLOTHING FOR THE SEX (22:5)

5 A woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment; for whosoever doeth these things is an abomination unto Jehovah thy God.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 22:5

362. Why such a strong prohibition against wearing clothes of the opposite sex?
363. Is God saying here we should be able to visibly tell whether a person is male or female? i.e. Should we appear to be the sex we are by the way we dress? Any modern day application for this?

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 22:5

5 The woman shall not wear that which pertains to a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment; for all that do so are an abomination to the Lord your God.

COMMENT 22:5

We are not told *why* God made this distinction in clothing—or even that the distinction *was* between the two types of clothing. But (especially when vv. 9-12 are compared) it appears quite obvious that God wanted Israel to recognize a *distinction*, a *difference*, and a *separation*. He wanted his people to know whether they were seeing a male or female.

But it is likely that the reason for prohibition goes beyond this. Transvestism (the practice of dressing in clothing of the opposite sex) has historically almost always been practiced by those who exemplified the *characteristics* of the opposite sex, and often these were homosexuals.* To wear the clothing of the opposite sex would immediately "label" you in the community, and God would have the Israelites avoid

*Transvestism, with its accompanying evils (such as sodomy) is still a relatively common practice among several aboriginal tribes. Several American Indian groups formerly gave these men places of *honor* among their tribes!

such a stigma. "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches . . ." (Prov. 22:1). "A good name is better than precious oil . . ." (Ecc. 7:1).

By donning improper apparel, a woman might be known as an amazon or virago; a man might be thought effeminate. "The distinction between the sexes is natural and established by God in their creation, and any neglect or violation of that distinction, even in externals, not only leads to impurity, but involves the infractions of the laws of God." (Lange).

(3) NESTING BIRDS (22:6, 7)

6 If a bird's nest chance to be before thee in the way, in any tree or on the ground, with young ones or eggs, and the dam sitting upon the young, or upon the eggs, thou shalt not take the dam with the young: 7 thou shalt surely let the dam go, but the young thou mayest take unto thyself; that it may be well with thee, and that thou mayest prolong thy days.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 22:6, 7

- 364. What lesson, or lessons, is in this concern of our heavenly Father for the mother bird?
- 365. What possible connection does the length of life have to do with saving a bird from death?

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 22:6, 7

6 If a bird's nest chance to be before you in the way in any tree or on the ground, with young ones or eggs, and the mother bird is sitting on the young or on the eggs, you shall not take the mother bird with the young.

7 You shall surely let the mother bird go, and take only the young, that it may be well with you, and that you may prolong your days.

COMMENT 22:6, 7

The young birds, and apparently the eggs, could be taken. But not the mother (dam). In Lev. 22:28, similarly, a cow or ewe could not be killed on the same day as its young.

Jesus said of the sparrows, ". . . not one of them is forgotten in the sight of God." And if God takes such graceful note of the "insignificant" matters of life, "Fear not: ye are of more value than many sparrows" (Luke 12:6, 7).

(4) BATTLEMENTS FOR NEW BUILDINGS (22:8)

8 When thou buildest a new house, then thou shalt make a battlement for thy roof, that thou bring not blood upon thy house, if any man fall from thence.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 22:8

366. God was even interested in the design of the house, or was it another interest?
 367. Read Numbers 35:33 and Genesis 9:6 and indicate how they relate to our text.

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 22:8

8 When you build a new house, then you shall put a railing around your [flat] roof, so that no one may fall from there, and bring guilt of blood upon your house.

COMMENT 22:8

The Hebrew word for battlement (*maaḡeb*), a restraining, holding back, is simply rendered "parapet" by most modern translators and lexicons. This barrier for a flat roof was more than likely a low wall in most cases, perhaps a railing (Amplified O. T.) in others.

Its purpose, of course, was protection, lest the owner be guilty, in a roundabout way, of injuring or taking the life of another. It was a mandatory "safety feature" for each home.

THAT THOU BRING NOT BLOOD UPON THY HOUSE (v. 8)—Apparently the law of Num. 35:33, Cf. Gen. 9:6, would apply here, i.e., if the owner failed to take this precaution he would be liable for the death of any who accidentally fell from it.

(5) FORBIDDEN MIXTURE (22:9-11)

9 Thou shalt not sow thy vineyard with two kinds of seed, lest the whole fruit be forfeited, the seed which thou hast sown, and the increase of the vineyard. 10 Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together. 11 Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 22:9-11

368. Is it a horticultural fact that the mixture of seeds as here described would result in loss? Discuss.

369. The separation of the ox and the ass had some reason; what was it?
 370. Why not wear wool and linen together?

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 22:9-11

9 You shall not plant your vineyard with two kinds of seed, lest the whole crop be forfeited [under this ban], the seed which you have sown and the yield of the vineyard forfeited to the sanctuary.

10 You shall not plow with an ox [a clean animal] and a donkey [unclean] together. [2 Cor. 6:14-16.]

11 You shall not wear a garment of mingled stuff, wool and linen together. [Ezek. 4:18; Rev. 19:8.]

COMMENT 22:9-11

Note the basic concept of *separation* which runs throughout these verses. The fact that two kinds of seed might grow quite well together, or that one could plow together quite well with an ox and an ass, or that linen (originating from flax) and wool might make a durable, warm, and nice-looking garment when combined, was *nothing to the point!* God had said they were not to be mixed! His word was to be respected and honored.

As a separated people, they were to live separated lives (Cf. I K. 8:53, etc.) Such laws as this would also distinguish and identify them as God's own people, different from all others.

Separation is as much a New Testament doctrine as Old—not the separation here spoken of, but the separation from the world and its ways that has *always* characterized God's true children. It is still very necessary that the child of God *distinguish* and *differentiate* in this world—an ability he develops more and more as he matures and grows into the likeness of his Master. Mature Christians should see the difference between light and darkness, sham and sincerity, truth and falsehood.

The "unequal yoke" of the ox and ass (v. 10) perhaps were in the very mind's eye of the apostle when he exhorted the Corinthian Christians, "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers, for what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity . . ." etc. (see II Cor. 6:14—7:1).

(6) FRINGED GARMENTS (22:12)

12 Thou shalt make thee fringes upon the four borders of thy vestures, wherewith thou coverest thyself.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 22:12

371. Is Numbers 15:37-41 a commentary on this verse?
 372. How was the purpose of this practice perverted? Cf. Matthew 23:5.

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 22:12

12 You shall make yourselves tassels on the four corners of your cloak with which you cover yourself. [Num. 15:37-40.]

COMMENT 22:12

The Hebrew word for "fringe" (*gadil*) occurs only in the plural in scripture. Gesenius has "*intertwined threads, twisted work.*" Baumgartner remarks that the basic meaning is "twist firmly," and defines it "tassel" here. This definition is followed by most modern translators, as well as the I.S.B.E.

In Num. 15:37-41 this law is also given,* and note the purpose: as reminders of God's commandments.

As in the case of the exhortation to keep God's word ever before them (6:6-9), the purpose and spirit of *this* exhortation was lost in the effort "to be seen of men" (see Matt. 23:5). The borders of their garments, rather than being reminders of God's law, became reminders of their ostentation and pride. [Compare notes on 6:8.] Albert Barnes remarks, "This fringe was commanded in order to distinguish them from other nations, and that they might remember to keep the commandments of God . . . The Pharisees made them broader than other people [i.e., even other Hebrews] wore them, to show that they had peculiar respect for the law."

These tassels are apparently what the woman with the issue of blood touched when she touched the "border" of Christ's garment (Matt. 9:20), a gesture which also healed those who were sick in the area of Gennesaret (Matt. 14:34-36).

k. SEX OFFENSES (22:13-30)

(1) VIRGINITY OF A BRIDE (22:13-21)

13 If any man take a wife, and go in unto her, and hate her, 14 and lay shameful things to her charge, and bring up an evil name upon her, and say, I took this woman, and when I came nigh to her, I

*A different Heb. word is used in Numbers, but it seems obvious that the same law is being discussed.

found not in her the tokens of virginity; 15 then shall the father of the damsel, and her mother, take and bring forth the tokens of the damsel's virginity unto the elders of the city in the gate; 16 and the damsel's father shall say unto the elders, I gave my daughter unto this man to wife, and he hateth her; 17 and, lo, he hath laid shameful things *to her charge*, saying, I found not in thy daughter the tokens of virginity; and yet these are the tokens of my daughter's virginity. And they shall spread the garment before the elders of the city. 18 And the elders of that city shall take the man and chastise him; 19 and they shall fine him a hundred *shekels* of silver, and give them unto the father of the damsel, because he hath brought up an evil name upon a virgin of Israel; and she shall be his wife; he may not put her away all his days. 20 But if this thing be true, that the tokens of virginity were not found in the damsel; 21 then they shall bring out the damsel to the door of her father's house, and the men of her city shall stone her to death with stones, because she hath wrought folly in Israel, to play the harlot in her father's house: so shalt thou put away the evil from the midst of thee.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 22:13-21

373. Is this section a protection for the wife or for the husband?
374. How would a garment produced by the parents of the wife answer the problem?
375. Either supernatural knowledge or basic honesty plays an important role here, discuss.
376. Adultery was a serious sin; a life and death matter. Is it today? Discuss.

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 22:13-21

13 If any man takes a wife, and goes in to her, and then scorns her,
 14 And charges her with shameful things and gives her an evil reputation, and says, I took this woman, and when I came to her, I did not find in her the tokens of a virgin,

15 Then the father of the young woman, and her mother, shall get and bring out the tokens of her virginity to the elders of the city in the gate;

16 And her father shall say to the elders, I gave my daughter to this man as wife, and he hates and spurns her,

17 And, lo, he has made shameful charges against her, saying, I found not in your daughter the evidences of her virginity. And they shall spread the garment before the elders of the city.

18 And the elders of that city shall take the man and rebuke and whip him;

19 And they shall fine him 100 shekels of silver, and give them to the father of the young woman, because he has brought an evil name upon a virgin of Israel; and she shall be his wife; he may not divorce her all his days.

20 But if it is true that the evidences of virginity were not found in the young woman,

21 Then they shall bring her to the door of her father's house, and the men of her city shall stone her to death; because she has wrought [criminal] folly in Israel, by playing the harlot in her father's house. So you shall put away the evil from among you.

COMMENT 22:13-21

Questioning the virginity of a man's bride was a serious matter in Israel—and these words were doubtless intended both as an incentive for the bride to present herself undefiled to her husband, and as a deterrent to husbands who might be prone to unjustly accuse their wives of unchastity before marriage. Certainly nothing is more utterly humiliating to a woman with a good name than to be so accused. "No act can be conceived more cruel or dastardly than that of a man who groundlessly assails his wife's character, accusing her of ante-nuptial unchastity. As the matter was one proof of which was not directly possible, and the man's word was all that could be adduced on his side, the Law threw the onus of clearing herself upon the woman through her parents, and indicated the mode of doing so." (Pulpit)

THE TOKENS OF VIRGINITY (v. 14) i.e., proofs of chastity.—In v. 17 this phrase seems to be used synonymously with the woman's *garment* that was spread before the elders of the city. A woman's dress depicted much about her marital status in the east, and still does in many areas. In Genesis, ch. 38, for example, Tamar is identified by her *dress* at one time as a widow, and another as a harlot (Gen. 38:14, 15, 19).

The word rendered "garment," Heb. *simlah*, (A.V. *cloth*) refers to her "wrapper, mantle" (Baumgartner). It is especially used of that garment which was wrapped around oneself at night for comfort and

warmth, though it was worn at other times also. Apparently this "proof garment" was kept by her parents for such an occasion, as would need its display—probably put away at the time of her marriage.

Note the severe punishment that was to be given a husband who dared to bring a false accusation against his wife—and hence ruin her name and reputation. He was to be scourged and fined, and legally bound out from ever divorcing the wife he had so abused.

(2) ADULTERY (22:22)

22 If a man be found lying with a woman married to a husband, then they shall both of them die, the man that lay with the woman, and the woman: so shalt thou put away the evil from Israel.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 22:22

377. So much is left to the imagination in the circumstances here described. If a girl, even one who is "betrothed" finds a boy she likes better than her betrothed, why not marry him?
378. Did the "man" of verse 23 have a personal interest in the damsel?
379. Compare John 8:5 for a possible example. Who is missing?
380. Supposing the girl "in the field" consented to the action, how shall this be handled?

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 22:22

22 If a man is found lying with another man's wife, they shall both die, the man who lay with the woman and the woman. So you shall purge the evil from Israel.

COMMENT 22:22

See also 5:18, Lev. 20:10. *Both* were to die, as both were guilty. (Compare the case of the woman taken in adultery—note Jn. 8:5. Where was her partner?)

(3) DEFILEMENT OF A MAIDEN BETROTHED (22:23-27)

23 If there be a damsel that is a virgin betrothed unto a husband, and a man find her in the city, and lie with her; 24 then ye shall bring them both out unto the gate of that city, and ye shall stone them to death with stones; the damsel, because she cried not, being in the city; and he man, because he hath humbled his neighbor's wife: so thou shalt put away the evil from the midst of thee.

25 But if the man find the damsel that is betrothed in the field, and the man force her, and lie with her; then the man only that lay with her shall die: 26 but unto the damsel thou shalt do nothing; there is in the damsel no sin worthy of death: for as when a man riseth against his neighbor, and slayeth him, even so is this matter; 27 for he found her in the field, the betrothed damsel cried, and there was none to save her.

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 22:23-27

23 If a maiden who is a virgin is engaged to be married, and a man find her in the city, and lie with her;

24 Then you shall bring them both out to the gate of that city and shall stone them to death, the young woman because she did not cry for help though she was in the city, and the man because he has violated his neighbor's [promised] wife. So shall you put away evil from among you.

25 But if a man finds the betrothed maiden in the open country, and the man seizes her and lies with her, then only the man who lay with her shall die.

26 But you shall do nothing to the young woman; she has committed no sin punishable by death, for this is as when a man attacks and slays his neighbor;

27 For he came upon her in the open country, and the betrothed girl cried out, but there was not one to save her.

COMMENT 22:23-27

In the case of the maiden in the city, it is assumed assistance and help is available to the girl if she *wants* it. Therefore both are held responsible for the crime. But with the maiden in the country no such assistance is likely to be available. It is assumed that "the damsel cried, and there was none to save her." In this case only the man shall die. She is compared to the victim of a murderer (v. 26).

Note the sanctity and sacredness of the "engagement" period. The betrothed man and maid are referred to already as "husband" and "wife." To be sure, it was a much more firm and binding contract than today. "Indeed, it was esteemed a part of the transaction of marriage, and that the most binding part . . . Its central feature was the dowry (*mohar*), which was paid to the parents, not to the bride. It may take the form of service (Gen. 29; I Sam. 18:25) . . . Among the Jews

the betrothal was so far regarded as binding that, if marriage should not take place, owing to the absconding of the bridegroom or the breach of contract on his part, the young woman could not be married to another man until she was liberated by a due process and a paper of divorce . . . A prolonged interval between betrothal and marriage was deemed undesirable on many accounts, though often an interval was needed that the groom might render the stipulated service or pay the price—say a year or two, or as in the case of Jacob, it might be seven years. The betrothed parties were legally in the position of a married couple, and unfaithfulness was 'adultery,' (Dt. 22:23; Mt. 1:19)." (I.S.B.E.)

(4) DEFILEMENT OF A MAIDEN NOT BETROTHED (22:28, 29)

28 If a man find a damsel that is a virgin, that is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, and they be found; 29 then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel's father fifty *shekels* of silver, and she shall be his wife, because he hath humbled her; he may not put her away all his days.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 22:28, 29

381. Read Exodus 22:16, 17 to complete the record.
382. Who is considered responsible in this circumstance?
383. Is the girl to be considered innocent? What of love in this marriage.

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 22:28, 29

28 If a man find a girl who is a virgin, who is not betrothed, and he seizes her and lies with her, and they are found,

29 Then the man who lay with her shall give to the girl's father fifty shekels of silver, and she shall be his wife, because he has violated her; he may not divorce her all his days.

COMMENT 22:28, 29

By comparing Ex. 22:16, 17, it appears that the father might not accept the new "son-in-law"—but he was still to accept the money. Her husband was not allowed to divorce her throughout their days.

In the case mentioned above it is not *stated* that the maiden was at fault in any way—only what was to be done when the crime had been committed. She may (knowingly or unknowingly) have unduly tempted

him. Or she may have been ignorant of his evil intentions. The book *Scientific Illustrations* states the latter case well:

"Flamingoes are very shy and timid birds, and shun all attempts of man to approach them; the vicinity of animals, however, they disregard. Any one who is acquainted with this fact can take advantage of it by dressing himself up in the skin of a horse or an ox. Thus disguised, the sportsman may get close to them and shoot them down at his ease. They are taken in by appearances. Shy, beautiful, and harmless, the unfortunate bird meets destruction simply for want of wariness. Many a lovely human being with the like qualities has met her doom for want of the same trait."

(5) IMPURITY TOWARD A FATHER'S WIFE (22:30)

30 A man shall not take his father's wife, and shall not uncover his father's skirt.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 22:30

384. Consider Leviticus 18:8; 20:11 and Deuteronomy 27:20 for a complete perspective.
 385. Is this a sin of incest?
 386. How is the word "skirt" used here?

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 22:30

30 A man shall not take his father's former wife, nor shall he uncover her who belongs to his father.

COMMENT 22:30

See also 27:20, Lev. 18:8; 20:11. The sin here is not necessarily with one's mother, for frequently a husband had two or more wives. Note the distinction between Lev. 18:7 and 18:8. Inasmuch as a wife was considered the husband's possession and property, it was "his father's skirt." Reuben's sin was similar, Gen. 35:22, as was also Absalom's, II Sam. 16:20-22.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

Ordinances relative to strayed cattle and lost goods, 1-3. Humanity to oppressed cattle, 4. Men and women shall not wear other's apparel,

5. No bird shall be taken with her nest of eggs or young ones, 6, 7. Battlements must be made on the roofs of houses, 8. Improper mixtures to be avoided, 9-11. Fringes on the garments, 12. Case of the hated wife, and the tokens of virginity, and the proceedings thereon, 13-21. The adulterer and adulteress to be put to death, 22. Case of the betrothed damsel corrupted in the city, 23, 24. Cases of rape and the punishment, 25-27; of fornication, 28, 29. No man shall take his father's wife, 30.

I. EXCLUSION FROM THE CONGREGATION (23:1-14)

(1) PERMANENT EXCLUSION FOR THE SEXUALLY MUTILATED,
CHILDREN BORN OF ILLEGITIMATE UNION AND
CERTAIN ENEMY PEOPLE (23:1-6)

He that is wounded in the stones, or hath his privy member cut off, shall not enter into the assembly of Jehovah.

2 A bastard shall not enter into the assembly of Jehovah; even to the tenth generation shall none of his enter into the assembly of Jehovah.

3 An Ammonite or a Moabite shall not enter into the assembly of Jehovah; even to the tenth generation shall none belonging to them enter into the assembly of Jehovah for ever; 4 because they met you not with bread and with water in the way, when ye came forth out of Egypt, and because they hired against thee Balaam the son of Beor from Pethor of Mesopotamia, to curse thee. 5 Nevertheless Jehovah thy God would not hearken unto Balaam; but Jehovah thy God turned the curse into a blessing unto thee, because Jehovah thy God loved thee. 6 Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days for ever.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 23:1-6

387. Was the exclusion of the sexually mutilated a fair regulation? Discuss.
388. We can see reason for the exclusion of the bastard, but why the rest of the generations?
389. Evidently there is a time and circumstance when even God gives up. Is this a fair conclusion about what is said of the Ammonite and the Moabite?

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 23:1-6

He who is wounded in the testicles, or has been made a eunuch, shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord.

2 A person begotten out of wedlock shall not enter into the assembly of the Lord; even to his tenth generation shall his descendants not enter into the congregation of the Lord.

3 An Ammonite or *Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to their tenth generation their descendants shall not enter into the assembly of the Lord for ever;

4 Because they did not meet you with food and water on the way when you came forth out of Egypt, and because they hired Balaam son of Beor of Pethor of Mesopotamia, against you to curse you.

5 Nevertheless the Lord your God would not listen to Balaam; but the Lord your God turned the curse into a blessing to you, because the Lord your God loved you.

6 You shall not seek their peace or their prosperity all your days for ever.

COMMENT 23:1-6

In all these verses the purity and separateness of God's people is being maintained—and they should be studied with this in mind.

AN AMMONITE OR A MOABITE SHALL NOT ENTER (v. 3)—These two peoples were related to Israel through Lot, Abraham's nephew (Gen. 19:36-38). Two reasons are given here for excluding them from the assembly:

1. Their lack of hospitality when Israel came out of Egypt (v. 4).
2. They hired Balaam to curse Israel (v. 4). See II Pet. 2:12-16, Jude 11.

Moab's actions toward Israel are recorded in Numbers 22-25. Their influence upon the Hebrews was in every way degrading. Ammon's treatment was apparently similar—their border was strong (Num. 21:24), Israel was to avoid conflict with them when entering Canaan (Dt. 2:19) and they evidently joined Moab in the hiring of Balaam. Both of these tribes were later thorns in Israel's flesh, Jud. 3:12, 13; 11:4, etc.

*It must be remembered that the children, according to the Jewish law, followed the father, not the mother. [That is, the family of Boaz for example, although his wife Ruth was a Moabitess, was considered Israelite, including his wife.] The case of Ruth would not, therefore, be touched by this precept (*Ellicott's Commentary*).

(2) TEMPORARY EXCLUSION FOR EGYPTIANS, MOABITES
AND PHYSICALLY UNCLEAN (23:7-14)

7 Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; for he is thy brother: thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian; because thou wast a sojourner in his land.
8 The children of the third generation that are born unto them shall enter into the assembly of Jehovah.

9 When thou goest forth in camp against thine enemies, then thou shalt keep thee from every evil thing. 10 If there be among you any man, that is not clean by reason of that which chanceth him by night, then shall he go abroad out of the camp, he shall not come within the camp: 11 but it shall be, when evening cometh on, he shall bathe himself in water; and when the sun is down, he shall come within the camp. 12 Thou shalt have a place also without the camp, whither thou shalt go forth abroad; 13 and thou shalt have a paddle among thy weapons; and it shall be when thou sittest down abroad, thou shalt dig therewith, and shalt turn back and cover that which cometh from thee: 14 for Jehovah thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp, to deliver thee, and to give up thine enemies before thee; therefore shall thy camp be holy, that he may not see an unclean thing in thee, and turn away from thee.

THOUGHT QUESTIONS 23:7-14

390. Why the lenient attitude toward the Egyptians? Were they not idolators? Discuss.
391. Read verse 14 first, then read verses 9 through 13. If Jehovah was so near then what of today?
392. There must be some connection between physical uncleanness and moral defilement. Discuss.

AMPLIFIED TRANSLATION 23:7-14

7 You shall not abhor an Edomite, for he is your brother [Esau's descendant]. You shall not abhor an Egyptian, because you were a stranger and temporary resident in his land.

8 Their children may enter into the congregation of the Lord in their third generation.

9 When you go forth against your enemies and are in camp, you shall keep yourself from every evil thing.

10 If there is among you any man who is not clean by reason of what happens to him at night, then he shall go outside the camp, he shall not come within the camp;

11 But when evening comes he shall bathe himself in water, and when the sun is down, he may return to the camp.

12 You shall have a place also outside the camp to which you shall go [as a comfort station];

13 And you shall have a paddle or shovel among your weapons, and when you sit down outside [to relieve yourself], you shall dig a hole with it, and turn back and cover up what has come from you.

14 For the Lord your God walks in the midst of your camp to deliver you and to give up your enemies before you; therefore shall your camp be holy, that He may see nothing indecent among you, and turn away from you.

COMMENT 23:7-14

The Edomites, as descendants of Esau, Jacob's brother, and the Egyptians, because Israel sojourned in their land, were to be allowed into the assembly of the congregation after three generations within Israel's borders. Egypt, of course, has been the "spawning ground" of Israel—beginning with seventy souls (Gen. 46:27), and leaving some four hundred years later with a great host which must have totaled well over two million (See the Introduction, II).

Those men deemed unclean while Israel was encamped against the enemy (vv. 9-14) were also to be excluded until they had complied with the cleansing formula here described. See the *Rules for conducting the Holy War*, (II, B, g, 7) following 21:14.

QUESTIONS, LESSON SEVENTEEN (21:15—23:14)

1. How much of the inheritance was the first-born son to receive?
2. If such a son was born of a wife that was hated, could this law be changed?
3. What was the proper treatment of stubborn sons under the Mosaic law?
4. Was Moses describing a single infraction on the part of this son?
5. What purpose did this have besides punishing the offender?
6. What purpose would be served by hanging a dead man on a tree?
7. Why not let him hang all night?
8. How did this Jewish law differ from the *crucifixion* of the Romans?
9. What was an Israelite to do when he found a lost article or animal?
10. Why not wear the clothing of the opposite sex?
11. What could *not* be taken from the bird's nest?

QUESTIONS ON LESSON SEVENTEEN

12. What safety feature was required on their new homes?
13. Give a possible reason for not mixing kinds of seed, cloth, etc.
14. Why have fringed (tasseled) garments?
15. How did the Pharisees exploit and pervert this purpose?
16. Who was to prove the virginity of his married daughter when it was challenged? How? Before whom?
17. How was adultery punished?
18. What distinction was made between the defilement of a betrothed maiden who lived in the *country* and one who lived in the *city*?
19. Why were the Ammonites and Moabites excluded from the assembly?
20. The Edomites and Egyptians were both excluded for only three generations, but for different reasons. What reasons?