

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Women as Booty of War - OT

Women as Booty of War - OT, on: 2007/5/5 14:11

Hey folks. I've been having some problems with the Old Testament - I'm experiencing a kind of "cognitive dissonance" between the laws that God gave man and the personality of Jesus. One law in particular pretty much states that, if you see a hot chick among the captives after a battle, and you want to get with her, wait one month while she grieves for her parents (that she probably watched you kill), then "humble" (have your way with) her... but when she doesn't please you any more, you can toss her out the door. But you can't sell her, because you already "humbled" her.

Can someone please explain how this law came from the Father of Jesus? Scripture below.

"10 When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the LORD thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive,
11 And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast desire unto her, that thou wouldest have her to thy wife;
12 Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house; and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails;
13 And she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month: and after that thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife.
14 And it shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her." (DEUT 21:10-14)

Re: Women as Booty of War - OT - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/5 18:08

Quote:

-----Can someone please explain how this law came from the Father of Jesus?

Part of the explanation of many of these laws is God restraining men rather than remaking them. Of the law of divorce Jesus said "And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away. And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept. But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female." (Mark 10:3-6 KJVS) That is to say that God's original purposes for men and women had been modified by the 'hardness of men's hearts'. The law, says Paul, makes nothing perfect. It was not intended to but it was intended as a restraint upon the consequences of those 'hard hearts'.

The Sinai law was a temporary imposition... "only of meats and drinks and divers washings, ordinances of flesh, imposed until time of setting things right." (Heb 9:10 DRBY) Christ did not come to add more restraint but to set things right.

Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2007/5/5 18:26

Philologos, great answer. I wish someone had told me that in 9th grade when I first came across verses like these!

To add to what was said, consider that these women would be destitute, having lost their husbands in war. Rather than leaving them undefended and unprotected for there is a law instituted to allow NON-JEWS into the family of Israel. In my view incredible mercy is shown here.

Remember that this was pre-grocery store and police department. Women had a much greater dependence upon the strength of men and the protection of marriage.

As for "a beautiful woman", men have different tastes and I'm certain the Lord can impress various standards of beauty to accomplish His will.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/5/5 18:42

In view of what typically happens in wartimes - women getting raped, tortured, killed, etc, this sounds like a very appealing restraint!

Also, when we consider that even today countless women are being sold and treated like merchandise, this is also a very humanitarian restraint:

Quote:

----- thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her

Re: Women as Booty of War - OT, on: 2007/5/5 18:53

Thanks for all your replies. Verses like these have disturbed me for over a decade.

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/5/5 19:26

I concur, thanks for the replies.

Re: Women as Booty of War - OT - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/5 21:54

"10 When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the LORD thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive,

11 And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast desire unto her, that thou wouldest have her to thy wife;

12 Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house; and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails;

13 And she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month: and after that thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife.

14 And it shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her." (DEUT 21:10-14)

I have been pondering this passage in light of Ezra Chapter 10 for a few weeks now and marvel at the complexities of the written law. Here we have in effect 'strange wives' being authorized to be taken from among Israel's enemies. 'Strange wives' have a history of turning the hearts of God fearing and God loving men away from Him. (I Kings 11:1-3)

You will notice that she was to shave her head and nails. This would have certainly been an affront on her beauty as women of the Gentiles often braided their hair and wore costly array in order to seduce. (I Tim 2:9, Prov 6:24-35) She was in effect stripped of a great part of her beauty as if to sober the mind of the man who took her. This, to me, forced the man to reconsider taking a wife merely on the outward appearance.

And she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month: and after that thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife.

This is almost like a 1 month trial for the man. She is shorn and without the clothing and other articles of beauty she likely had when he first lifted up his eyes to behold her. She has been weeping for 30 days which certainly added nothing to her countenance if he were merely looking on the outward appearance. ... *and after that thou shalt go in unto her.* 'That' is a huge word in this passage? The 'that' was God's provision for offering the man opportunity to change his mind. One of the great problems of our times is the many many folk who married based on some outward appearance. The enemy always wants to make sinners look like movie stars and Christian men who love God look like nerds (pardon the expression). I wonder how many men still kept the woman after this 30 day process?

When we get to Ezra 10 we have an odd situation indeed. We have Israel putting away their 'strange wives' and children. This, indeed, is a mystery. We just read where God allowed 'strange wives' to be taken. When we get to I Corinthians Paul tells us not to put away an unbelieving spouse if she/he be pleased to dwell with us. So what happened?

I think the key is found in the track record of these women who to a great extent brought evil upon Israel. This was the c

urse Balaam never got to speak- but yet effected it none the less (Rev 2:14). Inter marriage with unbelievers has been a curse upon God's people forever it seems. But if he/she be pleased to dwell with thee...(I Cor 7:12) What does this mean ?

Could it mean that 'strange wives' are only Strange Wives if they are bent on following their own religion and attempting to turn the heart of the believer away from God? This seems to be the key, I think. But how rare is it? How often is it that a believer marries an unbeliever and they are content with their believing spouses religion? Perhaps we have all seen it. I can't begin to number the women I know who married an unbeliever and he tore her away from God. Or a man that had a wife that complained and acted out until he threw in the towel. They are still together in marriage but estranged from God. And I think our original passage is God's attempt to get the man to think twice (30 days over) about what he is about to do.

Re:, on: 2007/5/6 4:43

Robert, thanks for pointing these things out.

Sure was a "Catch 22" for the woman (or, just as likely, young girl) though. Shave your head and marry one of the men that killed your family... or be sold into slavery (and if she was beautiful, I assume, it meant she'd be a slave-harlot).

Does this kind of thing reduce Mosaic law (not including the Ten Commandments) to a set of "rules of lesser evils"?

Re: - posted by UniqueWebRev (), on: 2007/5/6 5:19

Quote:

Corey_H wrote:

Robert, thanks for pointing these things out.

Sure was a "Catch 22" for the woman (or, just as likely, young girl) though. Shave your head and marry one of the men that killed your family... or be sold into slavery (and if she was beautiful, I assume, it meant she'd be a slave-harlot).

Does this kind of thing reduce Mosaic law (not including the Ten Commandments) to a set of "rules of lesser evils"?

Corey,

Remember that the whole point of the Law was to expose the sin we are prone to, and show up like the jewel it is the grace we live under in Christ.

Blessings,

Forrest

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/6 8:19

Quote:

-----Does this kind of thing reduce Mosaic law (not including the Ten Commandments) to a set of "rules of lesser evils"?

From Ezra onward we have the development of what came to be Rabbinic Judaism. In the first century several hundred years after Ezra the Jews had taken to heart the need to be 'separate' from the gentiles and began calling even the Samaritans 'dogs'. They looked down on non-Jews.

Ron pointed out that hardness of heart was back of many of the laws. This is no doubt true. Some men would have murdered their wives just to be rid of them if they could not divorce them. Keep in mind that they could have had several wives if they could have afforded it so it was not a case of killing the one to get another. It was a viral attitude towards the woman in that he would have literally hated her and wanted her out of his sight. So the law, because of the hardness of heart, allowed the woman to go free and hence it spared her life. She did nothing to deserve death and the law protected her.

er.

The law also in its penalties is a demonstration of the severity of the effect of sin upon humanity. This is seen in the penalties. Adultery, for example, got the death penalty. Why? Because it was a picture of the severity of the crime against humanity. In the law we see the wisdom of God in giving protocol for man's behavior. Any drifting from God's design has terrible natural consequences- so the law had penalties that show us how serious those natural consequences are. Who le volumes of books could be written on this topic.

Re: Women as Booty of War - OT - posted by lovedove88 (), on: 2007/5/8 0:33

I have also ran into a similar problem with the OT text Hosea while in seminary. While in my small OT class discussion groups which was almost entirely female an many of the women had an issue with some of the language used to show how Isreal was going to be punished for being unfaithful to God. Since Isreal was being reimaged as Hosea's unfaithful wife the language is hurtful to many women because so many women have been abused. How do we use and recounicle these text some of my classmates refuse to use them in ministry but I don't want to totally reject any of God's word. Here is some of the text that were problematic for the women:

"Therefore I will take away my grain when it ripens, and my new wine when it is ready.

I will take back my wool and my linen,

intended to cover her nakedness. So now I will expose her lewdness before the eyes of her lovers;

no one will take her out of my hands. I will stop all her celebrations: her yearly festivals, her New Moons, her Sabbath days— all her appointed feasts. I will ruin her vines and her fig trees, which she said were her pay from her lovers; I will make them a thicket, and wild animals will devour them. I will punish her for the days she burned incense to the Baals; she decked herself with rings and jewelry, and went after her lovers, but me she forgot," declares the LORD. "Therefore I am now going to allure her;

I will lead her into the desert and speak tenderly to her. There I will give her back her vineyards, and will make the Valley of Achor a door of hope. There she will sing **as in the days of her youth, as in the day she came up out of Egypt.**

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/8 8:48

God has used marriage as a picture of our relationship to Him. This is a committed relationship the bonds and vows of which are not to be broken. To break the marriage vow in the OT was the death penalty (Deut 22). An evil and adulterous generation does not understand this. They can commit adultery and wipe their mouth and say they have done no wickedness (Proverbs 30:20). But in the Old Testament it was not so. Both fornication and adultery could get you stoned. Why? Because you are taking the love that belongs to the one and giving it to another. Once the bond exists the relationship between the man and wife is utterly exclusive. Tyndale called adultery 'breaking wedlock'. And this is the picture we have in Hosea 2. To break wedlock or commit fornication is to commit whoredom and those who participate are called whores and whoremongers. This is strong language in any generation. Consider this passage from the New Testament:

Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge. (Hebrews 13)

Now take this to the level of our relationship with God. When one takes the love that belongs to God and gives it to another this is Idolatry. It is apostasy for a believer that is supposed to be committed exclusively to God. Hebrews 6 offers severe warnings of the most dreadful sort against such behavior. The use of terms such as whoring and whoremonger, etc. are intended to level upon the perpetrators the enormity of their crimes. A thief is a thief. A killer is a killer. A liar is a liar. A whoremonger is a whoremonger. Ravenhill once said that if we started using Biblical terms to describe these behaviors folk might think twice.

What do people prefer? She had an affair? Use a euphemism to knock the edge off the crime? Suddenly a liar is a fibber with a lofty imagination? Nay verily! Hosea and other like passages are powerful pictures of God's position on man's behavior. It is colorful and loud. It is marvelous expression of how He feels about things. When we read Hosea- we get the message.

Re: Hosea - posted by lovedove88 (), on: 2007/5/8 13:20

I understand and agree with a lot of what you are saying but my classmates and I are concerned for women who have been raped or abused and who when reading this passage think God condones rape or abuse of women. No one was talking about adultery which still would not justify a woman being raped or abused but just how imagery like this may make some abused women think God condones their abuse or how some sick men could use this passage to justify rape or abuse of women.

I understand what the metaphor in Hosea means in reference to our relationship with God but I also have never been raped or abused for a woman who has experienced these things it may be hard for them to get what the passage is saying about their personal relationship with God because they are reminded of the pain of their abuse.

Re: - posted by PassingThru, on: 2007/5/8 14:28

Quote:

-----Part of the explanation of many of these laws is God restraining men rather than remaking them.

God's heart for marriage is also shown in the Old Testament :-

Mal 2:14 Yet ye say, Wherefore? Because the LORD hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant.

Mal 2:15 And did not he make one? Yet had he the residue of the spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a goodly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth.

Mal 2:16 **For the LORD, the God of Israel, saith that he hateth putting away:** for one covereth violence with his garment, saith the LORD of hosts: therefore take heed to your spirit, that ye deal not treacherously.

The passage also re-enforces the "two shall become one" principle. In the cases where Israelites were instructed to put away their foreign wives, it may be that the spiritual condition of the foreign wives in question meant having 'oneness' made it impossible to have 'oneness' with God :-

1Co 6:15 Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of a harlot? God forbid.

1Co 6:16 What? know ye not that he which is joined to a harlot is one body? for two, saith he, shall be one flesh.

It's interesting that the genealogy in Matthew Ch.1 only notes the mothers when the marriage had an 'abnormal' original : Tamar, Rachab, Ruth and Bathsheba.

PassingThru

Re: - posted by PassingThru, on: 2007/5/8 14:51

Quote:

-----...but just how imagery like this may make some abused women think God condones their abuse or how some sick men could use this passage to justify rape or abuse of women.

It may be wise to avoid it if dealing with people that aren't going to understand it, however I would be careful with the idea of avoiding passages of scripture on a permanent basis:

2Ti 3:16 **All** Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

2Ti 3:17 That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

Surely any magazine rack in petrol stations and supermarkets or nearly any television program is going to provoke more pain to someone that has suffered abuse than this vivid imagery for the severeness of sin, especially since they are produced in a pro-abuse spirit ?

PassingThru

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/8 14:59

Quote:
-----I understand and agree with alot of what you are saying but my classmates and I are concerned for women who have been raped or abused and who when reading this passage think God condones rap or abuse of women. No one was talking about adultery which still would not justify a woman being raped or abused but just how imagery like this may make some abused women think God condones their abuse or how some sick men could use this passage to justify rape or abuse of women.

I think it would be a stretch to use the passages in this way. The reality is that these women should be outraged at things that distort men's perception of women such as pornography and the secular media. If I were in such a class I would certainly point that out. There are also laws in the Old Testament that deal with rape and that carried the death penalty also. So I think the important thing is to emphasize the fact that God does not condone any sinful behavior and calls what it is what it is. If someone extrapolated some statement from God's word and conjured some excuse to rape or abuse then there were laws to deal with them. the problem is not with the laws or its language- but with the people who would mishandle it. I would focus on that fact rather than even remotely implying God was somehow at fault for wording things as He did. ;-)

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/8 15:02

Quote:
-----Surely any magazine rack in petrol stations and supermarkets or nearly any television program is going to provoke more pain to someone that has suffered abuse than this vivid imagery for the severeness of sin, especially since they are produced in a pro-abuse spirit ?

And the enemy is a master at making God out to be the 'bad-guy'. People do not rape and abuse because of God's word - but in spite of it.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/8 15:15

I will take back my wool and my linen,
intended to cover her nakedness. So now I will expose her lewdness before the eyes of her lovers; no one will take her out of my hands.

Here I think it is important specifically to look at what God meant by this in the passages before and after. I think it would be a great error to read into this passage the behavior of men who abuse with a God who loves His people. When I read what God is saying- it is that He is going to stop funding their harlotry with His goodness. They had been attributing God's goodness to their lovers. But that was going to stop. And when it stopped; who would deliver them? When God dried up the earth for 3.5 years- who can deliver? It is because of God's mercy that we are not consumed. If He shut down His goodness right now- who would deliver us? Who has the power to deliver when God withholds His provision? God does not owe us anything. What we have from Him is His goodness. If He but lifted His hand (the hedge as it were) our enemies would overtake us. When God lifts the hedge- who can deliver?

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 16:59

PassingThu said

Quote:
-----It may be wise to avoid it if dealing with people that aren't going to understand it, however I would be careful with the idea of avoiding passages of scripture on a permanent basis

I worked at a University last year, and whenever anyone found out I was recently converted, scripture like these (but these ones are mine) were thrown at me like darts:

"Why were women treated like booty of war?" (DEUT 21:14)

"Why isn't a man who lost his goodies (genitals), and fatherless bastards, acceptable in the congregation of the LORD?" (DEUT 23:1)

"Why can't a man ever have sex with his wife after she was raped?" (DEUT 24:4)

"Why is a woman 'untouchable' or 'unlovable' if she's had another man, but a man can have more than one wife - and multiple concubines - why is she abominable and he clean?" (DEUT 21:15)

"If a man marries a woman whose hymen is not intact - even if it's because she rode horseback or fences, or whatever... ought she really to be stoned?" (DEUT 22:21)

"If a woman is raped in the city, but is petrified with fear and doesn't cry out... ought she to be stoned?" (DEUT 22:24)

Can someone please explain to me how a merciful God wrote this law and not man?

Re:, on: 2007/5/8 17:24

RobertW said

Quote:
-----I think it would be a stretch to use the passages in this way... There are also laws in the Old Testament that deal with rape and that carried the death penalty also.

Those same laws sentenced the rape victim to death as well... because she didn't "cry out".

Just imagine how many children and women were threatened, coerced, or forced into sex with a dagger to the throat - and they were stoned for "not crying out".

Quote:
-----I think it would be a stretch to use the passages in this way. The reality is that these women should be outraged at things that distort men's perception of women such as pornography and the secular media. If I were in such a class I would certainly point that out. There are also laws in the Old Testament that deal with rape and that carried the death penalty also. So I think the important thing is to emphasize the fact that God does not condone any sinful behavior and calls what it is what it is. If someone extrapolated some statement from God's word and conjured some excuse to rape or abuse then there were laws to deal with them. The problem is not with the laws or its language - but with the people who would mishandle it. I would focus on that fact rather than even remotely implying God was somehow at fault for wording things as He did.

Anglicans and Catholics used the verses on slavery (even from the NT) to condone slave ownership. I see where you're going.

Quote:
-----"The problem is not with the laws or its language - but with the people who would mishandle it"

Well, to put the Law in perspective, all of the millions of children, teenagers, and women that have been forced into internet pornography, if they were Jews, and were reassimilated by the Jews, ought to be stoned - along with their manhandlers.

I'm not sure if I've mishandled or misinterpreted the Law. But I'm getting worried about the implications.

Irreverence - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/8 18:36

Quote:
-----Those same laws sentenced the rape victim to death as well... because she didn't "cry out". Just imagine how many children and women were threatened, coerced, or forced into sex with a dagger to the throat - and they were stoned for "not crying out".

If a woman was being raped she would scream. If the person had a knife to the throat obviously that would be taken into consideration.

Quote:
-----Anglicans and Catholics used the verses on slavery (even from the NT) to condone slave ownership. *I see where you're going.*

I'm glad you do cause I'm trying to look at these questions one at a time. ;-)

Quote:
-----Well, to put the Law in perspective, all of the millions of children, teenagers, and women that have been forced into internet pornography, if they were Jews, and were reassimilated by the Jews, ought to be stoned - along with their manhandlers.

Error begets error. You start off from a false interpretation and it only snowballs. Hopefully you don't really believe some of this stuff? The God of scripture is a God of justice and righteousness- are we to assume that some ladies or men in a class someplace are in a position to counsel God on justice? The problem is their gross ignorance of Him and the Law. The questions themselves strike me as both ignorant and arrogant. If there is a genuine interest in this topic I will be more than happy to try to share what I know or can research. But if this is an attempt to call God to the carpet as if men were righteous and just I'll have no part of it.

Any discussion I engage in begins with the fear of the Lord. If the person does not have enough sense to reverence their maker I dare not cast pearls before swine. They will turn again and rend me. Fools despise wisdom and instruction. They are too proud to see their own ignorance.

God's word is not a Book to be placed on trial. It is to be prayerfully and reverently studied and searched out. For those who desire to know- God will reveal.

You will likely know that irreverence is a mechanism employed by folk who sense their guilt before God. Mockers deal irreverently with God and His word. What can bring a person closer to utter ruin than to respond to guilt with mockery and irreverence? What could shut down the channels of grace any more? This is what it is to call God a liar.

Re: Irreverence - posted by lovedove88 (), on: 2007/5/8 21:44

I think we have to be careful of judging and jumping to conclusions. I fear God that is why I am on a site like this with teaching that promotes the holiness of God. I brought up my concerns with Hosea not to disrespect God but to have an answer for the hurt women at my school who are not Christians who were almost in tears over this subject. I personally know God so I know he wouldn't condone rape but many do not. Rape and abuse is a sensitive topic so as to protect any sisters on here who have been raped or abused maybe we shouldn't talk about any longer because this conversation is not edifying.

Please know that my questions came out of a general interest in wanting to know how to deal with these text and not out of trying to be irrelevant towards God.

Re: Irreverence, on: 2007/5/9 0:12

RobertW said

Quote:

-----But if this is an attempt to call God to the carpet as if men were righteous and just I'll have no part of it.

I'm not "calling God to the carpet". I'm asking difficult moral questions about the law.

Somewhere on this thread someone pointed out that the law was made to show us how utterly sinful we are. I assume that the hundreds of laws were the result of countless sins we had committed.

Quote:

-----God's word is not a Book to be placed on trial. It is to be prayerfully and reverently studied and searched out. For those who desire to know- God will reveal.

Thanks. I needed to hear that.

Quote:

-----You will likely know that irreverence is a mechanism employed by folk who sense their guilt before God.

And thanks again. I really needed to hear that, too.

God Bless You RobertW!

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/9 0:14

Quote:

-----Lovedove's: I brought up my concerns with Hosea not to disrespect God but to have an answer for the hurt women at my school who are not Christians who were almost in tears over this subject.

I certainly do not feel you are being disrespectful. I tried to give a few thoughts on Hosea earlier. My previous post is directed at the attitude I addressed towards the Old Testament Law in general. It is not uncommon for folk to mock at God's word in the secular world- especially in colleges.

Personally I think an honest reading of the text in Hosea 2 is plain enough. Lots of people have been hurt by lots of terrible things. We all have a story. You have one and I have one. I think we have to keep the blame on the right person though and that person is the one who committed the crime and the devil that inspired Him. The word of God is written to bring God's wisdom to man. We simply cannot in any wise give in to any notion that somehow God is anything other than good.

od.

The whole thread started off as an attack on God's word (so it appeared). Look at the title; it is intended to stir the pot? Women as booty of war? As if God were legislating crimes against humanity or something. So long as the questions come up they almost have to be answered.

If folk are being genuine and want to know the truth they will be reasonable. If they are looking to pick a fight you will know that also. If they accept no answer they are not rational. The challenge is not to allow our experiences (as bad as they are) to somehow indict the word of God. If a professor pointed to the passage to stir the pot- maybe you should have challenged them on the subject. Maybe not? Knowing me I'm sure I would have unless God seriously checked me. We are there to be salt and light.

I would say that the person who has been abused needs to be counseled as much as possible towards knowing that Sin is what causes the hurt she went through. We have to tear down strongholds. *We have to tear down these lies that people believe that make them feel safe towards God while in their sin.* We cannot be saved or excused by the hardships we suffer in this life as terrible and painful as they may be. Folk can't keep pulling these things out every time the subject of God comes up as if it's an excuse. Just keeping it real here. We have no excuse before God. Our sin is as scarlet. There are people today who are sexual predators and use the excuse that it happened to them as a kid- so now they are doing it. I have heard these kinds of things used in court. The judge does not generally buy it. We are accountable for what we are doing right now and cannot keep looking to the past as an excuse for our life. What we do is what we do and God is going to hold us accountable.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/9 0:37

Quote:
-----"Why isn't a man who lost his goodies (genitals), and fatherless bastards, acceptable in the congregation of the LORD?"(DEUT 23:1)
)

I think the question for me is; "Why is any sinner allowed to draw near to God?" Why were only spotless lambs allowed to be sacrificed and not any lamb? Why did God require a perfect sacrifice? Why a near perfect Priest from a certain Tribe? Why can't the King go into the Holy of Holies? Why the closer to God one seems to get the more perfect they are required to be? Why does everything have to be exactly like God described it?

Why can't animals come into the Temple alive? Does this mean that God is prejudiced against animals? Why was a man of war not allowed to build the Temple- was God against soldiers? Why were Gentiles not even allowed in the Holy Place- did God hate the Gentiles? What about women? So on and so forth. The key, I think, is understanding that there is a protocol for doing things God's way and that in that protocol God is teaching us something. The enemy will try to take each illustration and mix the metaphors until God looks like the devil. The question can be summed up as follows:

Rom 3:29

Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also:

Is He the God of women? Yes. Is He the God of illegitimate children? Yes. Is He the God of the other 11 Tribes? Yes. Is He the God of Eunuchs? Yes. Then what is it? We all have certain roles to play, and certain places 'positions' required certain qualifications. It did not mean one person was exalted above the others. It was how it was designed.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/9 0:46

Quote:
-----"Why can't a man ever have sex with his wife after she was raped?" (DEUT 24:4)

That is not what this passage is about. It is about divorcing a wife and taking her back after she has married and had relations with the other man. If it were a sin for a man to take back his wife simply because she had had relations with another man then forgiveness and restoration of a marriage is impossible in cases of adultery. This passage could never lend to such an interpretation because it is contrary to the character of God.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/9 0:51

Quote:
-----"Why is a woman 'untouchable' or 'unlovable' if she's had another man, but a man can have more than one wife - and multiple concubines - why is she abominable and he clean?" (DEUT 21:15)

I can't recall any such law except that a *priest* was to marry only a virgin woman. Non-virgin unmarried women were not brought into serious jeopardy unless they attempted to lie and say they were virgins when they got married to their husbands, but had in the past given their flower to another (not the man she married). She could be stoned to death for that. But I know of no such law that says she could not be married if there was disclosure.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/9 0:56

Quote:
-----"If a man marries a woman who's hymen is not intact - even if it's because she rode horseback or fences, or whatever... ought she really to be stoned?" (DEUT 22:21)

NO! But it is certain that many have used this excuse- even to this day. That is a terrible thing also if it was a lie. The truth will come out sooner or later.

Again, someone would make note of it when and if it happened. The girl would tell someone out of fear if nothing else. I know of no case where anyone was stoned for this in the scriptures.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/9 1:02

Quote:
-----"If a woman's raped in the city, but is petrified with fear and doesn't cry out... ought she to be stoned?" (DEUT 22:24)

She could cry out now or later. If a person came by and caught the people in the act then the eye-witness would have seen the knife to the throat. If she saw someone and they made eye contact or some visual contact she could have yelled at that time. HELP! HELP!! Otherwise there would be no witness and she could not be stoned. The law was to make distinction between rape and adultery. I think it was a quite effective law that demonstrates the wisdom of God. Sort of like the wisdom Solomon had in asking to divide the child. He knew how people would react and so also with this law. A person who is being raped will REACT in desperation and panic.

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 3:32

Quote:
-----Quote:

"Why can't a man ever have sex with his wife after she was raped?" (DEUT 24:4)

That is not what this passage is about. It is about divorcing a wife and taking her back after she has married and had relations with the other man. If it were a sin for a man to take back his wife simply because she had had relations with another man then forgiveness and restoration of a marriage is impossible in cases of adultery. This passage could never lend to such an interpretation because it is contrary to the character of God.

Yet after Absalom "went in unto", or raped, David's concubines in the sight of Israel, the Bible says David took those women and "put them in ward", under lock and key - and they never knew another man.

I assume this was done out of consideration of that law.

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 3:43

Quote:
-----Quote:

"Why is a woman 'untouchable' or 'unlovable' if she's had another man, but a man can have more than one wife - and multiple concubines - why is she abominable and he clean?" (DEUT 21:15)

I can't recall any such law except that a priest was to marry only a virgin woman. Non-virgin unmarried women were not brought into serious jeopardy unless they attempted to lie and say they were virgins when they got married to their husbands, but had in the past given their flower to another (not the man she married). She could be stoned to death for that. But I know of no such law that says she could not be married if there was disclosure.

I understand your point, however, as David's first wife was a widow.

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 3:54

Quote:
-----Quote:

"If a man marries a woman who's hymen is not intact - even if it's because she rode horseback or fences, or whatever... ought she really to be stoned?" (DEUT 22:21)

NO! But it is certain that many have used this excuse- even to this day. That is a terrible thing also if it was a lie. The truth will come out sooner or later.

Again, someone would make note of it when and if it happened. The girl would tell someone out of fear if nothing else. I know of no case where anyone was stoned for this in the scriptures.

Who's gonna log how, where, and when a girl lost her virginity by accident? Some might say something. Some might be to ashamed. Some girls wouldn't even notice until the guy complained.

Even today there are cultures where the girl is "checked" by women to make sure everything's intact when they're married. In S. Korea, women actually get surgery to ensure the man knows she's a virgin (even if she's only a "born again" virgin).

Things like this are why I'm so appreciative of Jesus' Grace.

"... but if these things be true, and the tokens of the virginity be not found for the damsel: Then they shall bring out the damsel to the door of her father's house, and the men of her city shall stone her with stones that she die: because she hath wrought folly in Israel, to play the whore in her father's house..." (DEUT 22:21)

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 4:07

Quote:

-----Quote:

"If a woman's raped in the city, but is petrified with fear and doesn't cry out... ought she to be stoned?" (DEUT 22:24)

She could cry out now or later. If a person came by and caught the people in the act then the eye-witness would have seen the knife to the throat. If she saw someone and they made eye contact or some visual contact she could have yelled at that time. HELP! HELP!! Otherwise there would be no witness and she could not be stoned. The law was to make distinction between rape and adultery. I think it was a quite effective law that demonstrates the wisdom of God. Sort of like the wisdom Solomon had in asking to divide the child. He knew how people would react and so also with this law. A person who is being raped will REACT in desperation and panic.

Tell that to my mother. And my best-friend's mother. And (at least) three of my ex-girlfriends.

Quote:

-----A person who is being raped will REACT in desperation and panic.

Or they will freeze up when threatened, be ashamed to tell anyone it was their father or another relative or close family friend, or be guilted into shutting up when mom or other family members won't listen.

Or maybe they won't say anything because they will be stoned because they didn't "cry out" when it occurred. But staying silent won't keep them safe once their betrothed discover they're not virgins.

The more I read of this law, the more I understand why Jesus freed us from it.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/9 4:09

Quote:

-----"Why isn't a man who lost his genitals, and fatherless bastards, acceptable in the congregation of the LORD?"(DEUT 23:1)

For the same reason that all sacrifices had to be without blemish. "And whosoever offereth a sacrifice of peace offering 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."

(Lev 22:21 KJVS) The high priest was also disqualified if he tore his clothes or uncovered his head. Those who represent God must be without blame or blemish.

This was not a matter of personal salvation but of representing God, his nature and the sacrifice of his son. It does not say they could not know God nor that they could not enjoy him, only that they could not serve him publically in the Levitical types of Christ and his Church.

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 4:14

Quote:
-----For the same reason that all sacrifices had to be without blemish.

Â“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.Â”
(Lev 22:21 KJVS)

The high priest was also disqualified if he tore his clothes or uncovered his head. Those who represent God must be without blame or blemish.

This was not a matter of personal salvation but of representing God, his nature and the sacrifice of his son. It does not say they could not know God nor that they could not enjoy him, only that they could not serve him publically in the Levitical types of Christ and his Church.

Great explanation. Thanks!

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/9 8:27

Quote:
-----The more I read of this law, the more I understand why Jesus freed us from it.

For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God. (Hebrews 7:19)

I certainly am not trying to exalt the Law. But in fairness to God and His word I think we have to answer some of these things as people ask if they are genuinely wanting to know.

Quote:
-----Tell that to my mother. And my best-friend's mother. And (at least) three of my ex-girlfriends.

Lets look at this passage again and see what the Law is saying.

If a man be found lying with a woman married to an husband, then they shall both of them die, both the man that lay with the woman, and the woman: so shalt thou put away evil from Israel. ... and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel, because she cried not, being in the city; and the man, because he hath humbled his neighbor's wife: so thou shalt put away evil from among you.

The passage is assuming that there are at least two witnesses to the act for this was necessary to bring a case.

At least two people are witness to a man lying with his neighbors wife. As these people passed by there would have been a reaction by the woman of some kind that would have shown distress. If she froze up or was weeping (or what have) you it would have been a clear signal. People are smart enough to know the difference when they see it. There would have been some questions, big time. They would have been able to conclude what happened based on what the woman said and did. This law was not intended to deal with men who raped women and got away with it (at least at the present because no one ever gets away with anything, really). It dealt with a man and a married woman caught in the very act.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2007/5/9 8:44

Quote:
-----Who's gonna log how, where, and when a girl lost her virginity by accident? Some might say something. Some might be to ashamed. Some girls wouldn't even notice until the guy complained.

Even today there are cultures where the girl is "checked" by women to make sure everything's in tact when they're married. In S. Korea, women actually get surgery to ensure the man knows she's a virgin (even if she's only a "born again" virgin").

In the Old Testament these things were taken very very seriously. Some scholars believe that these were the tokens of a blood covenant between the man and woman. When I was a teenager and older man came to speak to us and warned us of the seriousness of these things before God. God designed a woman in this way. Why? I personally believe the man had a point; but obviously there are other circumstances that are outside the norm.

Girls do have accidents. I know this for a fact. But it seems evident to me that God's original design was such as it is. And it is utterly horrible that so few marriages actually begin as God intended- from a place of chastity. Not because of an accident but because of fornication. A woman's flower belongs to her husband and no one else. I know that's not popular to say, but it is reality and God's design. To step outside God's design is to invite immeasurable distress and pain. It has been my experience that women stress most on the things they have done willingly and try to come to grips with why they allowed themselves to do things. In many cases they were abused. But the abuse only goes so far as they unravel their lives. At some point they turn the finger back to themselves and ask, "Why did I do what I did?" And it is then that they will fall before the Lord and truly begin to heal from their past.

Israel was a nation that God wanted to use to a great degree to demonstrate His wisdom and design for mankind and the way of redemption through the various pictures and examples. If man had gotten in step with the Law of God it had been a much better world to live in. Our minds strain to comprehend the brutality of people whose conscience had darkened. They worshipped false gods by throwing their babies in the fire. Not just Molech- but here in North America thousands of years ago. Human sacrifice and all manner of evil. the law made nothing perfect- but it was an immeasurable improvement on the pagan worlds.

Re:, on: 2007/5/9 14:28

Quote:
-----Human sacrifice and all manner of evil. the law made nothing perfect- but it was an immeasurable improvement on the pagan worlds.

To show us our utter depravity.

Thanks a million Robert. You've really helped me to understand this.