Laws, Blessings, & Curses

Deuteronomy 23:21-29:1

Reading Questions

- 1. Can a man remarry his ex-wife if she got married after their divorce and then divorced her 2nd husband after him?
- 2. What can we learn from the law regarding the upper and lower millstone in Deuteronomy 24:6?
- 3. What is the penalty for kidnapping someone and selling them or treating them harshly?
- 4. What did הוה do to Miryam on the way as they came out of Mitsrayim? (Deuteronomy 24:9)
- 5. What is the purpose of a pledge?
- 6. Why does the law teach stand outside and let a man you are lending to bring the pledge out to you rather than you go in and get it? (Deuteronomy 24:10-11)
- 7. Why, when beating someone, traditionally would they only go up to 39 lashes?
- 8. Whose remembrance is blotted out from under the skies that we are not to forget and why?
- 9. What is the year of tithing and who gets the tithe in that year?
- 10. Should we guard or do any of the laws given by הוה through the hand of His servant Mosheh? If so, which ones?
- 11. Do we receive blessings for obedience to איהוה laws and commandments?
- 12. Is there a curse for not obeying the laws and commandments?
- 13. Can a believer in יהושע who is forgiven of their sins be cursed or be under a curse because of something they've done?
- 14. How are we to serve רהוה?
- 15. What nation eventually came to fulfill what is written in Deuteronomy 28:49?

Reading Answers

1. No. Deuteronomy 24:1-4 discusses the case of a man divorcing a wife and then her remarrying and becoming defiled. The fact that she became defiled shows that divorce and remarriage was never הוה"'s will because if it was then nothing would cause her to become defiled by doing it. A woman is bound to her husband until he dies – period (Jeremiah 3:1, Romans 7:1-3, 1 Corinthians 7:39). However, before שני came, it was not absolutely clear that remarriage while the former husband was alive was actually a form of adultery. I say, a "form" adultery, because friend did not make it punishable by death before הושע form of a woman to remarry after her husband divorced her, but we learn from that it is, in fact, adultery

(which means it obviously is not הוה 's will). However, the other form of adultery was already known as adultery, and was punishable by death.

With the teachings of """, we now know that remarriage after divorce for a woman is adultery too. However, I believe she is bound to stay in that second marriage, even though it was adultery, because it's a marriage covenant. Two wrongs don't make a right. It was wrong to violate the first covenant, and if she violates the second marriage covenant, I think that's probably just as wrong also.

We also see in Joshua 9 they were bound to stay in a forbidden covenant which further supports that you cannot always get out of an agreement, even if that agreement was originally forbidden and wrong to get into; depending on what that agreement is and what was said, etc.. However, once a divorce happens and a remarriage happens, that bars the woman from ever returning to her first husband ever again. I also believe she can't marry a third husband unless both the first and second die and she has no former living husbands and is considered an official "widow" and not a divorced woman. The teachings of """ make it clear that any woman who has been put away – a divorced woman – who remarries is committing adultery. Once all former husbands die, a woman is no longer a "divorced woman", but a "widow" instead. Widows can remarry, of course. But with any former husbands alive, a woman is a divorced woman still and not yet in a full, definite, widow status which permits remarriage.

Some people refer to 1 Corinthians 7:15 and think that not being in bondage means you can remarry if the spouse was an unbeliever. All that not being under bondage may mean is you're not bound to chase down an unbelieving spouse to live in a non-peaceful home with a non-believing spouse who leaves you and fulfill marital duties once they voluntarily leave. Not being bound to be stuck living every day with them does not necessarily mean you can remarry. He concludes 1 Corinthians 7 by saying the wife is bound as long as the husband lives. There is simply not enough evidence to prove he meant a woman can definitely remarry.

Besides, that would also contradict $\mathfrak{VU}\mathfrak{n}$'s teachings and require a more detailed explanation. How can you separate what Elohiym has joined together? And if you weren't joined by Elohiym, then why try to save the marriage to begin with if it's not really a marriage? He first recommends you try to save the marriage in verse 12 and 13. That, to me, shows it is a real marriage joined by Elohiym. There are too many contradictions and unanswered questions with these doctrines that teach you can divorce due to someone being an unbeliever – based on only one verse in 1 Corinthians 7 which is not absolutely clear to mean remarriage is permissible, and you are left contradicting $\mathfrak{VU}\mathfrak{n}$'s words in my understanding as well. I have tons of questions I could ask someone which I don't think anyone can sufficiently answer, and tons of points I could bring up.

There are other details and scenarios for marriage that are important and I have not covered every aspect and angle and situation in detail, because the focus on this is only discussing a woman in a limited situation similar to Deuteronomy 24. These comments are not exhaustive of the marriage topic and don't address every situation. Don't use these limited commentary notes as though they can answer all your questions because they weren't written to be used that way.

As a side note: The KJV says in 1 Corinthians 7 verse 12, "But to the rest speak I, not the Lord: If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away." The phrase at the end, "let him not put her away", is an **incorrect** translation.

The last 9 Greek words in both the Nestle-Aland Greek and the Textus Receptus Greek show:

και αυτη συνευδοκει οικειν μετ αυτου μη αφιετω αυτην

With strong's numbers this is:

```
και <sup>G2532</sup> CONJ αυτη <sup>G846</sup> P-NSF συνευδοκει <sup>G4909</sup> V-PAI-3S οικειν
G3611 V-PAN μετ <sup>G3326</sup> PREP αυτου <sup>G846</sup> P-GSM μη <sup>G3361</sup> PRT-N αφιετω
G863 V-PAM-3S αυτην <sup>G846</sup> P-ASF
```

In English, with Strong's numbers, the literal translation is:

and^{G2532} She^{G846} approves^{G4909} to dwell^{G3611} with^{G3326} him^{G846} not^{G3361} leave!^{G863} her^{G846}

Regarding the KJV translation of, *"and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away"*, here are two comments:

- a) The word, "him", is only there once in the Greek, not twice. The KJV added it a second time.
- b) The word "leave" from G863 is not the same word used referring to a divorce situation in Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

A better translation of the end of this verse is, *"and she approves to dwell with him, don't leave her"*. It is not necessarily discussing divorce or remarriage in this verse, only <u>leaving</u> which results in separation. The KJV is <u>incorrect</u> for phrasing as a divorce scenario and adding the word "him" a second time.

1 Corinthians 7:13 is similar and ends with simply "don't leave the man/husband".

Back to the Deuteronomy 24:1-4 discussion: Someone might try to argue that if the woman initiated the divorce that would possibly make a difference since, in Deuteronomy 24, the situation is the man divorcing the woman, not the woman divorcing the man against his desires. Someone could try to argue that the man never approved of her leaving, so he has a right to take her back. However, I would now cautiously disagree with someone trying to argue those points. Even if it was a situation where the woman initiated the divorce against the man's will, remarried, and then the second husband died, I consider that too risky and possibly considered an abomination still in $\pi \pi \pi$'s eyes if she went back to the first husband even though the circumstances would be slightly different than Deuteronomy 24.

Regardless of who did the divorce, I would say once she remarries, to be cautious and certain a great sin doesn't happen, even if she had divorced him against his will, I would still say she's barred permanently from returning to the first husband. If we say she could just because the circumstances are slightly different and we're wrong, that would be a great sin. So it's safer to say no, don't do that, even if the circumstances aren't 100% identical to the Deuteronomy 24 situation. Anytime there is a divorce and remarriage, she should never go back to the first husband ever again.

However, what if the wife was taken away from the 1st husband against his desires and he never actually divorced her and she never actually divorced him? Could he take her back then? It seems possible according to 2 Samuel 3:13-16 since there wasn't actually any divorce recorded in that case. He never approved of her leaving to begin with. The Scriptures in 2 Samuel don't make it clear there even was a divorce for certain, so it's possible no divorce ever happened at all and the second "husband" could have been an outright adulterous relationship, not a real marriage perhaps.

- 2. The law is all about justice, compassion, love, and mercy. It would not loving to let someone take another's upper or lower millstone because then the poor man would not be able to turn his wheat or other grains into flour in order to make bread.
- 3. Death (Deuteronomy 24:7)
- 4. She was struck with leprosy when Aharon and her spoke against Mosheh (Numbers 12).
- 5. When someone was poor and needs to borrow food or silver or whatever from their brother, they would give an item of value of theirs as a pledge to show their sincerity in paying back the brother they are borrowing from. In general, a pledge is something given to show the seriousness and the certainty of payment to come.
- 6. This is a sign of respect toward the poor man. Going into his house to get the pledge is more of a "demanding" way to get the pledge. Standing outside and waiting for him is less oppressive feeling and more humble and polite, and does not

come across as being invasive, overbearing, or belittling the value of the poor man just because he is poor. Going in without being invited could come across as treating him as if you have rights to his home and all he owns just because he is poor and in debt to you.

- 7. Deuteronomy 25:3 says only 40 are permitted, so "40 minus 1" (i.e. 39) was done to ensure they would not go over 40 just in case there was a miscount.
- 8. Amaleq for attacking the back where the feeble ones were when Yisra'el was tired and weary on the way out of Mitsrayim (Egypt) (Deuteronomy 25:17-19).
- The third year in every 7 year cycle and the ones who get the tithe are the Lewite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow (Deuteronomy 26:12). You can <u>click</u> <u>here to read a little about tithing</u> if you want to hear more about our perspective on this issue.
- 10. Yes. We should guard and do all the laws given by הוה through His servant Mosheh (Deuteronomy 26:16-27:1).
- 11. Yes (Deuteronomy 28:2)
- 12. Yes (Deuteronomy 28:15)
- 13. As long as a person is still a forgiven and cleansed disciple of עהושע", I do not believe they can be cursed or be under any curses either. If we did not have the blood of עהושע to cleanse us from our sins or if we forsook הושע" and went back into the world and never repented and never came back to עהושע", then yes, a curse could come upon us or the things due to a curse could come upon us. However, as long as the blood of הושע is covering over all of our sins, there is nothing that we have done that is reckoned against us and therefore no cause for a curse to come either. If you are forgiven of all of your sins, then on what basis could a curse for sinning come upon you?

However, that doesn't mean we may never encounter things such as death, disease, barren wombs, fears, or other things that come upon those who have curses or are under a curse. The difference, for us who are covered by the blood of \mathcal{W} , is that if we are permitted to encounter these things it is not due to a curse that is upon us or a curse that we are under, but rather may be due to other things.

For example, Mosheh (Moses) died earlier than he otherwise would have had to as a punishment for hitting the rock rather than speaking to the rock because he did not believe. In Numbers 20:8 Mosheh was commanded to speak to the rock, but in Numbers 20:11 Mosheh instead hit the rock. π and π said to Mosheh in Numbers 20:12 it was because he did not believe Him. This resulted in Mosheh dying earlier

than he otherwise would have as stated in Deuteronomy 32:49-52. We know Mosheh died earlier than he otherwise would have because Deuteronomy 34:7 shows us that Mosheh was in good physical condition and health when he died. So his death was not due to his health or physical condition, but, rather, was a punishment for not believing and obeying $\pi i \pi$.

Was his death the result of a curse? No – it was the result of a punishment. Punishment is not equivalent to curse, and we need to distinguish between punishments given to forgiven children of π and punishments to those who are cursed or under curses. For example, if a parent spanks their child, they are not cursing their child, they are punishing them. So a punishment is not equivalent to a curse, and we should not view them as the same thing.

Similarly, while Mosheh's death was not due to a curse, sicknesses or a barren womb, or other things could happen in the life of someone who is forgiven by הוה because of other reasons. We see, for example, women such as Sarah (Genesis 11:30), Rivqah (Genesis 25:21), Rachel (Genesis 29:31), Shimshon's mother (Judges 13), and Channah the mother of the prophet Shemu'el (1 Samuel 1) were all barren for a time, which shows that there are other reasons besides curses that הוה? can permit a woman to be barren. Similarly, we see in John 9 an example where someone was born blind not due to sin, but simply to manifest the works of Elohiym. In addition, we see the thorn in the flesh, some physical ailment which many believe to be related to the eyes, was permitted for Sha'ul (Paul/Paulus) the disciple of הרשעי in 2 Corinthians 12:7-10 to help keep Sha'ul from exalting himself more than he should. In other words, it helped him remain humble.

In addition, we see the early death of a child in 1 Kings 14 was actually because there was something <u>GOOD</u> found in the child (1 Kings 14:13). The summary of that chapter is that the King of the northern 10 tribes, Yarov'am (Jeroboam), had not obeyed הוה and therefore הוה was going to destroy his entire household. However, because הוה found something good in one of his children, that child died earlier than everyone else and was therefore given a proper burial. The result of the others was that they would <u>not</u> be given a proper burial – instead they would have their bodies eaten by dogs and birds (1 Kings 14:11). So actually, in this case, an early death was an act of mercy and kindness to ensure a proper burial.

Some argue that death itself is a curse, but I think we see with the case of Mosheh death was not a curse but a punishment. Similarly, if you read closely in Genesis 3 you will notice ארוה did <u>not</u> tell the man or the woman <u>they</u> were cursed. He said the serpent was cursed, He said the ground was cursed, but he never said to the man or woman that they were cursed. The blessing upon them was first given already in Genesis 1:28.

It doesn't matter if someone tries to curse us either. We see in Numbers 22-24 that הוה can turn a curse into a blessing. Ultimately, the only curses that can stand or come upon someone are only if הוה permits it. הוה is the one who decides who is blessed and who is cursed and who can have ramifications of a curse come upon them. In fact, one of the reasons יהוש ישא sent was to bless us (Acts 3:26). This is part of fulfillment of Genesis 12:3. This is reconfirmed in Galatians 3 that we are not declared right by our works and therefore not under any curses either.

I also don't understand how someone could say someone is cursed, but also blessed. To me, that's confusing and I don't see any Scriptural examples where someone is referred to as both blessed and cursed in the same instance.

In addition, I'd like to point out that just because forgiven and cleansed disciples of הושע can't be cursed or be under a curse, that doesn't mean we should break the laws of הושע. It is very clear that disciples of יהושע are expected to follow the laws just as יהוש followed the laws. Breaking the laws = sinning (1 John 3:4) and we are to repent (turn away from sinning) and go and sin no more (John 8:11).

Also, I'd like to point out that while <u>WE</u> (forgiven disciples of <u>W</u>) π) can't be cursed or under any curses, objects we own might still have curses upon them. For example, it is written: Deuteronomy 7:25-26 – "The carved images of their mighty ones you are to burn with fire. Do not covet the silver or gold that is on them, nor take it for yourselves, lest you be snared by it, for it is an abomination to π) π , your Elohiym. And do not bring an abomination into your house, lest you be accursed like it. Utterly loathe it and utterly hate it, for it is accursed."

Now, it should be noted that this word "accursed" is from the Hebrew word "cheirem" הַרֶרם also translated as "devoted" or "dedicated" in Leviticus 27:21, but as you can see some translations translate it here in Deuteronomy 7:26 as "accursed". In any event, it seems possible that certain items may have curses on them or be considered "cursed" objects, such as, possibly, carved images or other similar things such as dolls, stuffed animals, action figures, statues, etc. and maybe others. I would consider that a possibility even if this word here in Deuteronomy 7:26 is "dedicated" rather than "accursed". It's possible this word means "dedicated",

generally speaking, and may be understood as something either dedicated or devoted for destruction (an accursed object), or something dedicated for a good purpose (the field in Leviticus 27:21). In any event, carved images, etc., to my understanding, would be considered abominations and therefore should be removed from our homes. If the person who has authority over the home, whether it be the homeowner or the man of the house who runs the family that lives there, knows that such items are wrong and they refuse to remove them, perhaps sometimes ramifications for not removing them could happen.

For example, I know a young man who believes in """, that was living in a home with a family member who owned the home, and someone else who lived there that was the "man of the house". The young man, only a few years in this walk of observing the Torah (Law), was digging through the garage through belongings of his own from his childhood and getting rid of things. He found a cub scouts book which talked about magic and trashed that. He found some statues from baseball and other trophies and trashed those. He found and trashed various other things.

Then, he saw there in the garage, 2-3 ft. tall Christmas-related statues and because he felt like he needed to act, he took the uncertain step of determining although they weren't his things he was going to attempt to have them trashed by placing them in the trash cans or simply directly at the curb.

After placing them at the curb, the others in the house found out what he was attempting to do and instead of letting the items get trashed they called up the person who owned them to come and get them and removed them from the curb, bringing them back on the property until they would be picked up. The young man tried to protest saying, "Don't bring them back! You'll bring a curse on this house!" But his attempts to stop them from keeping or giving the items away were not heeded by the man of the house who had authority there.

Within the next year, the house was foreclosed on.

Could these events be related? I wouldn't rule it out. If we know something is wrong and should be removed, then we should remove it for certain if we have authority over that area. However, if we're not the person in authority then there's only so much we can do. Each situation should be taken on a case by case basis. Sometimes, a person might feel led to get rid of something and may be able to do so without ramifications, but other times a person might not feel led to do so if they aren't in a position of authority, and in that case I'm not sure they would be held responsible since technically they don't have authority over that living area.

Technically, the person in authority of an area would be the one responsible to get out anything that is displeasing in the eyes of π and make the call when to act. It's also debatable when or if a person should get rid of others' items they don't own as some might consider that stealing? I'm not 100% certain when or if a person

should or should not act when the items in question are not their own and when they have no authority over the area where the item is being stored.

The summary of all that is this: If you have authority over a living area, whether it be just a room or an entire house or apartment, exercise the authority you have to get rid of any and all abominations because some items might be cursed items.

שנו להושע died to cleanse us, not pigs, and we should not eat pork. Pigs are still unclean. יהושע did not die to cleanse pigs. Similarly, שנו לופע died to free us from the curses that happen for breaking the laws, not idols and abominations, and we should not keep abominations in our areas in which we have authority over. Carved images and likenesses of a 3D nature (except for those specifically permitted or commanded by הווש (יהוה), to my understanding, are still abominations. שנו להווש did not die to free idols from being cursed. Cursed objects could still be cursed. We are the ones who are freed from the curses.

So while we are not cursed, or under any curses, that doesn't mean there are no objects or items which might be cursed items. If we know what's good for us, we'll get rid of the things that displease יהוה. יהוה have mercy on us all!!!!!!!

- 14. With Joy and Gladness of Heart! (Deuteronomy 28:47)
- 15. Bavel (also known as "Babylon") by King Nevukhadnetstsar (Nebuchadnezzar). As a side note, Bavel is believed to have been located where modern day Iraq is.

Reading Notes

• The issue of tithing comes up in this reading and is a very controversial issue that is disagreed upon among believers. You can <u>click here to read a little about tithing</u> if you want to hear our perspective on this.

Related Verses

Marriage: Genesis 2:24, Exodus 22:16-17, Numbers 1:3 (age of adult when one can marry), Leviticus 19:19 (spiritual similarity to not committing adultery), Proverbs 2:16-19, Jeremiah 3:1, Malachi 2:15-16, Matthew 5:32-34, 13:25 (spiritual similarity to not

committing adultery), 19:6-9, Luke 16:18, 20:34-36, Mark 10:8-12, 1 Corinthians 7, Romans 7:1-3, 14:21 (no offensive marital practices should be practiced), Galatians 3:15

Duty of A Husband's Brother: Genesis 38:8, Ruth 4:1-13

Laws of Pledges: Exodus 22:26, Job 22:6, 24:3, Proverbs 6:1, 11:15, 17:18, 20:16, 27:13, Ezekiel 18:7-16, 33:15, Amos 2:8, 2 Corinthians 1:22, 5:5, Ephesians 1:14

Do Not Oppress Wage Earners/Pay Same Day: Malachi 3:5, Matthew 20:1-16

Do Not Muzzle An Ox: Proverbs 12:10, 1 Corinthians 9:9-10, 1 Timothy 5:17-18

Establish The Words of This Torah: Romans 3:31

Fulfillment of Siege In Deuteronomy 28:52 And Scattering: 2 Kings 24:17-25:22, 2 Chronicles 36:10-36:21, Jeremiah 52:1-52:30

Prophesy & Fulfillment of Cannibalism In Deuteronomy 28:53-57: Leviticus 26:29, Jeremiah 19:9, Ezekiel 5:10, 2 Kings 6:28-29, Lamentations 2:20, 4:10

Daniel Confessing Why they Are Scattered As Predicted, etc.: Daniel 9:1-19

Redeemed From Curse of The Law: Galatians 3:10-13

A Tenth: Genesis 14:20, 28:19-22

Tithes: Genesis 14:20, Leviticus 27:30-32, Numbers 18:20-32, Deuteronomy 12:6, 11, 17, 14:22-29, 2 Chronicles 31:2-12, Nehemiah 10:34-39, 12:44, 13:3-14, Malachi 3, Matthew 23:23, Luke 11:42, 18:12, Hebrews 7:4-10