

## 5779 – Deuteronomy 21-25 - Ki Tetze (When You Go In/Out)

<sup>21:10</sup>**When you go to war** against your enemies and the LORD your God delivers them into your hands **and you take captives**, <sup>11</sup>if you notice among the captives a beautiful woman and are attracted to her, you may take her as your wife. <sup>12</sup>Bring her into your home and have her **shave her head, trim her nails** <sup>13</sup>**and put aside the clothes** she was wearing when captured. After she has lived in your house and mourned her father and mother for a **full month**, then you may go to her and **be her husband** and she shall be your wife. <sup>14</sup>If you are not pleased with her, let her go wherever she wishes. **You must not sell her or treat her as a slave, since you have dishonored her.**

1. The title for the “The Captive Woman” seminar is taken from the way this verse is often misinterpreted. It is assumed (based on the rendering of this verse in English) that the woman is mistreated and humiliated but these things were actually done to protect her from someone who could not control his passions. See the Seminar for details.

<sup>22:6</sup>If you come across a bird's nest beside the road, either in a tree or on the ground, and the mother is sitting on the young or on the eggs, do not take the mother with the young. <sup>7</sup>You may take the young, but be sure to let the mother go, **so that it may go well with you and you may have a long life.**

### 1. Deuteronomy Rabbah VI:2

2. ... R. Abba b. Kahana said: The Holy One, blessed be He, said: 'Do not spend time weighing up the precepts of the Torah ... and do not say, 'Seeing that **this precept is a great one, I will perform it because its reward is great, and seeing that the other precept is a minor one, I will not perform it.**' What did God do? He did **not** reveal to His creatures **the reward for each separate precept**, so that they may perform all the precepts without questioning. Whence this? For it is said, 'Her ways wander, that thou canst not know them.' It is as if a king hired for himself labourers and brought them straight into his garden without disclosing what he intended to pay for the various kinds of work in the garden, **lest they should neglect the work for which the pay was little for work for which the pay was high.** In the evening he called each one in turn and asked him: 'At which tree have you worked?' He replied: 'At this one.' Thereupon the king said to him: 'This is a pepper tree and the pay for working at it is one golden piece.' He then called another and asked him: 'At which tree have you worked?' And he replied: 'Under this tree.' The king thereupon said: 'This is a white-blossom tree and the pay for working at it is a half a golden piece.' He then called yet another, and asked him: 'At which tree have you worked?' And he replied: 'At this one.' Whereupon the

king exclaimed: 'This is an olive tree and the pay for working at it is two hundred zuz.' Said the labourers to the king: 'You should have informed us from the outset which tree had the greater pay attached to it, so that we might have worked at it.' Thereupon the king replied: '**Had I done this, how would the whole of my garden have been worked? So God did not reveal the reward of the precepts, except of two, the weightiest and the least weighty. The honouring of parents is the very weightiest and its reward is long life,** as it is said, Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long (Ex. XX, 12); **and the sending away of the mother bird is the least weighty,<sup>(1)</sup> and what is its reward? Length of days ...**

(1) In the sense that it is easiest to perform.

2. Maimonides states that the mother is chased away to be spared the painful sight of her offspring being taken away. It is not likely, however, that chasing the mother away would spare her pain, because forcible separation from her young and finding them gone later would also be painful. Nor do the comparable laws concerning cattle (Lev. 22:27-28; Deut. 14:21) prevent pain (the mother animal would not know if her calf or kid was sacrificed on the same day or boiled in her milk). **What the Torah finds callous are the acts themselves, quite apart from any effect they may have on the mother.<sup>1</sup>**

a. Leviticus 22:28; b. Deuteronomy 14:21

### 3. Matthew 5:17-19

<sup>19</sup>**Anyone who breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven ...**

#### a. Nedarim (Vows) 39b

We have been taught: There is no measure for visiting the sick. What is meant by "There is no measure for visiting the sick"? R. Joseph thought it meant: "There is no measure for the reward given for it." But is there a definite measure of reward for any precept? Have we not been taught: "**Be heedful of a light precept as of a weighty one, for you know not what is given as reward for any precept**" (Avot 2:1)? Rather, said Abbaye, it means that a great person should visit a humble one. Rava said: Even a hundred times a day.

### 4. Matthew 6:24-34

<sup>26</sup>**Look at the birds of the air; they do not sow or reap or store away in barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not much more valuable than they?**

---

1 David L. Lieber, Sr. Ed., *Etz Hayim, Torah and Commentary*, (The Jewish Publication Society), p. 1117.

5. Zohar, Shemot, Section 2, Page 8a

“If a bird's nest chance to be before thee in the way in any tree, or on the ground, young ones or eggs, and the dam sitting upon the young... thou shalt in no wise let the dam go” (Deut. XXII, 6-7). ‘This passage,’ he said, ‘we interpret as an esoteric commandment in the Law, containing mysteries of doctrine, paths and ways known to the Fellowship and belonging to the thirty-two paths of the Torah.’ Then, turning to R. Eleazar, his son, he said: ‘**At the time when the Messiah shall arise,** there will be great wonders in the world. See now, in the lower Paradise there is a secret and unknown spot, brodered with many colours, in which a thousand palaces of longing are concealed. No one may enter it, except the Messiah, whose abode is in Paradise. **The Garden is encompassed with multitudes of saints who look to the Messiah as their leader, along with many hosts and bands of the souls of the righteous there.** On New Moons, festivals, and Sabbaths, he enters that place, in order to find joyous delight in those secret palaces. Behind those palaces there is another place, entirely hidden and undiscoverable. It is called ‘Eden,’ and no one may enter to behold it. **Now the Messiah is hidden in its outskirts until a place is revealed to him which is called ‘the Bird's Nest.’ This is the place proclaimed by that Bird (the Shekinah) which flies about the Garden of Eden every day.** In that place the effigies are woven of all the nations who band together against Israel. The Messiah enters that abode, lifts up his eyes and beholds the Fathers (Patriarchs) visiting the ruins of God's Sanctuary. **He perceives mother Rachel, with tears upon her face; the Holy One, blessed be He, tries to comfort her, but she refuses to be comforted (Jer. XXXI, 14). Then the Messiah lifts up his voice and weeps, and the whole Garden of Eden quakes, and all the righteous and saints who are there break out in crying and lamentation with him.** When the crying and weeping resound for the second time, the whole firmament above the Garden begins to shake, and the cry echoes from five hundred myriads of supernal hosts, until it reaches the highest Throne. Then the Holy One, blessed be He, beckons to that “Bird,” which then enters its nest and comes to the Messiah, and flits about, uttering strange cries. Then from the holy Throne the Bird's Nest and the Messiah are summoned three times, and **they both ascend into the heavenly places, and the Holy One swears to them to destroy the wicked kingdom (Rome) by the hand of the Messiah, to avenge Israel, and to give her all the good things which he has promised her.** Then the Bird returns to her place. The Messiah, however, is hidden again in the same place as before.

a. **Whether or not one understands the significance of this “mystery,” it is interesting the way that the the misery of Rachel is connected to the travail of the Messiah.**

b. Matthew 2:16-18

<sup>17</sup>**Then what was said through the prophet Jeremiah was fulfilled:**

<sup>18</sup>**“A voice is heard in Ramah, weeping and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children and refusing to be comforted, because they are no more” (Jer 31:15).**

1) Jeremiah 31:15 occurs in a setting of hope. Despite the tears, God says, the exiles will return; and now Matthew, referring to Jeremiah 31:15, likewise says that, **despite the tears of the Bethlehem mothers, there is hope because Messiah has escaped Herod and will ultimately reign ...**

But there may be a further reason why Matthew quotes this OT passage ... Here (Yeshua) does not, as in v. 15, recaptulate an event from Israel's history. **The Exile sent Israel into captivity and thereby called forth tears.** But here the tears are not for him who goes into “exile” **but because of the children who stay behind and are slaughtered.** Why, then, refer to the Exile at all? ... Jeremiah 31:9, 20 refers to Israel = Ephraim as God's dear son and also introduces the new covenant the Lord will make with his people (31:31-34). Therefore **the tears associated with Exile (31:15) will end.** Matthew has already made the Exile a turning point in his thought (1:11-12), for at that time the Davidic line was dethroned. The tears of the Exile are now being “fulfilled,” i.e., the tears begun in Jeremiah's day are climaxed and ended by the tears of the mothers of Bethlehem. The heir to David's throne has come, the Exile is over, the true Son of God has arrived, and he will introduce the new covenant (26:28) promised by Jeremiah.<sup>2</sup>

2) The story ... involving the massacre of the male children in Bethlehem and the surrounding regions, echoes faithfully Pharaoh's slaughter of the male infants of the Hebrews. But Matthew works to connect this event in Egypt with another major tragedy in Israelite history, the Exile of the tribes to Assyria and Babylon. **In the theology of Israel the persecution in Egypt and the Exile were the two greatest trials to which God's people had been subjected; and the Exodus and the return from Exile were the two greatest manifestations of (the Lord's) protective power.** This parallelism is prominent in (Isaiah) who de-

---

<sup>2</sup> Frank E. Gaebelin, Ed., *The Expositors Bible Commentary, Vol. 8, Matthew-Luke* (Regency Reference Library, Zondervan Publishing House, 1978), pp. 94-95.

scribed the return as a second Exodus through the desert (40:3; 52:3-6). If Matthew is interested in the Exodus motif ... which imitated the story of Moses, he is no less interested in the Exile, which is an event demarcating a major division in the genealogy of (Yeshua) (1:11-12). **His ingenuity lies not so much in connecting the two events, as in relating them to what happened in Bethlehem. The massacre of male children was a clear reminder of the persecution in Egypt; Bethlehem, where this happened, was also the place on the way to which Rachel was buried; Jeremiah (31:15) referred to the Exile in terms of Rachel weeping over her children; and now her voice is heard from the tomb again, nay heard as far as Ramah, as the children of Israel suffer persecution once more. But just as God ultimately broke the power of tyrants who persecuted Israel in Egypt and in the Exile, so will he frustrate the power of this tyrant. Thus (Yeshua), who is to save God's people (1:21), relives both great past moments of divine salvation.** A modern interpreter may regard Matthew's exegesis of Jeremiah as fanciful ... but it is an exegesis that detects a divine master plan of salvation. The three ... *Bethlehem*, the city of David, *Egypt*, the land of the Exodus, and *Ramah*, the mourning place of the Exile, offer a theological history of Israel in geographical miniature. Just as (Yeshua) sums up the history of the people named in his genealogy, so his early career sums up the history of these prophetically significant places.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>22:22</sup>**If a man is found sleeping with another man's wife, both the man who slept with her and the woman must die.** You must purge the evil from Israel.

1. <sup>22</sup>*both the man ... and the woman ...*

a. John 8:1-11

<sup>5</sup>**In the Law Moses commanded us to stone such women. Now what do you say?"**

<sup>23:24</sup>If you enter your neighbor's vineyard, you may eat all the grapes you want, but **do not put any in your basket.** <sup>25</sup>If you enter your neighbor's grainfield, you may pick kernels with your hands, but **you must not put a sickle to his standing grain.**

**—Eating implies hunger ... the basket/sickle implies theft.**

<sup>3</sup> Raymond E. Brown, S. S., *The Birth of the Messiah, A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (Doubleday, 1993), pp. 216-217.

1. Matthew 12:1-21 (cf., Mar 2:23ff, Luke 6:1ff)

<sup>3</sup>He answered, "**Haven't you read what David did when he and his companions were hungry? ... <sup>5</sup>Or haven't you read in the Law that the priests on Sabbath duty in the temple desecrate the Sabbath and yet are innocent?**

a. <sup>2</sup>*When the Pharisees saw this, they said to him, "Look! Your disciples are doing what is unlawful on the Sabbath."*

1) When (Yeshua) is asked to justify allowing his disciples to pluck and eat corn on a Sabbath, he appears to reply with an irrelevant story.<sup>4</sup>

2) If we assume that the Pharisees are complaining about the disciples performing labour on a Sabbath, it is irrelevant to answer them with the story about David feeding his men on the Bread of the Presence, because this story does not relate to performing any labour.

a) 1 Samuel 21:1-6

<sup>6</sup>**So the priest gave him the consecrated bread, since there was no bread there except the bread of the Presence that had been removed from before the LORD and replaced by hot bread on the day it was taken away.**

3) Another problem lies in the fact that **there are no rabbinic traditions which forbid performing the labour of preparing a handful of food on a Sabbath**, and there are specific rulings which permit this amount of labour (though no more).

4) These difficulties are eased in Matthew and Mark who append other comments by (Yeshua) which appear to be more relevant, but this still leaves the problem that (Yeshua's) first reply appears to ignore the issue at hand.

5) A comparison of some old traditions within rabbinic legal collections indicates that **the real issue was not Sabbath labour, but eating untithed food.**

a) Leviticus 24:5-9

<sup>9</sup>**It belongs to Aaron and his sons, who are to eat it in the sanctuary area, because it is a most holy part of their perpetual share of the food offerings presented to the LORD."**

6) **Tithing could not be performed on a Sabbath, so freshly harvested food still contained the Heave Offering WHICH ONLY PRIESTS WERE ALLOWED TO EAT.**

7) If this is the case, the story of David allowing his men to eat food only permitted to priests, would be an appropriate and irrefutable reply.

<sup>4</sup> Jerusalem Perspective, David Instone-Brewer, "Jesus' Sabbath Dispute with Pharisees in a Cornfield."

<sup>24:1</sup>If a man marries a woman who **becomes displeasing** to him because he finds something **INDECENT about her**, and **he writes her a certificate of divorce**, gives it to her and sends her from his house, <sup>2</sup>and if after she leaves his house she becomes the wife of another man, <sup>3</sup>and her second husband dislikes her and writes her a certificate of divorce, gives it to her and sends her from his house, or if he dies, <sup>4</sup>then her first husband, who divorced her, is not allowed to marry her again after she has been defiled. That would be detestable in the eyes of the LORD. Do not bring sin upon the land the LORD your God is giving you as an inheritance.

1. Gittin (Bills of Divorcement) 90a

The school of Shammai says: **A man may not divorce his wife unless he has found unchastity in her**, for Scripture says, "Because he hath found in her **indecenty** in anything" (Deut. 24:1). But the school of Hillel says: [He may divorce her] **even if she has merely spoiled his stew**, for Scripture says, "Because he hath found in her indecenty in **anything**." R. Akiva said: **Even if he finds another more beautiful** than she, for Scripture also says, "It cometh to pass, if she find no favor in his eyes" (ibid.).

a. Hyperbole—exaggeration for the sake of emphasis.

1) Matthew 5:29-30

<sup>29</sup>**If your right eye causes you to stumble, gouge it out and throw it away ...** <sup>30</sup>**And if your right hand causes you to stumble, cut it off and throw it away.**

b. When is it time to get a divorce? The Talmud cites three opinions: *The School of Shammai rules: A man should not divorce his wife unless he discovers in her an immoral matter ... the School of Hillel holds: [He may divorce her] even if she burnt his meal. Rabbi Akiva says: Even if he found another more beautiful than she.*

(All three opinions derive from the same verse in the Torah—

**Deuteronomy 24:1—in the section dealing with the laws of divorce, depending on how a key phrase in that verse is interpreted.)**

The *halachah* (final legal ruling) follows the opinion of the sages of Hillel. But pious behavior (*midat chassidut*), which holds itself to a standard "beyond the letter of the law," is to accept the stricter criteria put forth by the disciples of Shammai.

In other words, **a "divorce" is justified if there is actual damage to your well-being and deprivation of your needs. If you find yourself wed to a wife that nightly burns your supper, fouling or depriving you of your material nourishment or spiritual nurture, the Torah understands and condones your decision to sever that relationship and seek a better "marriage."**

That is the "letter of the law." But **a more altruistic approach states that unless your current situation in life spells a violation**

**of your ethical, moral and religious values (in which case even the sages of Shammai permit, indeed obligate, a dissolution of the marriage) the place to be is the place where you are.** Your Creator has placed you there; He has also given you the resources and fortitude to make it work. Sticking it out is not a cop-out—it is to rise to the greater challenge of uncovering those resources ...<sup>5</sup>

2. **Divorce:** From the wording of this verse, it is clear that only the husband can legally initiate divorce proceedings. If the wife, however, feels that there are grounds for divorce and the husband does not agree, she may present her case to the court, and if it is found to be just, they are allowed to force the husband to divorce his wife.<sup>(37)</sup>

Grounds for divorce are defined here as "an unseemly matter."

**This somewhat vague term is understood in Jewish law to include a wide range of circumstances, including (but not limited to) incompatibility, physical impediments to marital relations, childlessness, various types of mistreatment, verbal or physical abuse, irreligion, irresponsibility, spiteful behavior, and infidelity.**<sup>(39)</sup>

Nevertheless, the high value that the Torah places on marital harmony—witnessed by the fact that Aaron is praised as promoting peace between husband and wife<sup>(40)</sup> and that God allows His Name to be erased in order to rehabilitate a shaky marriage<sup>(41)</sup>—has always rendered divorce a last resort. In the sages' words, "When a man divorces the wife of his youth, **the altar itself sheds tears.**"<sup>(42)</sup> Thus, despite the broad range of legal grounds for divorce, divorce has historically been relatively rare in Jewish life ...<sup>6</sup>

**If, however, divorce is determined to be justifiable, the Torah attaches no stigma to it; it is considered a perfectly legitimate release from an unviable relationship.**

(37) *Mishneh Torah, Geirushin* 2:20; *Shulchan Aruch, Even HaEzer* 134:5.

(39) *Shulchan Aruch, Even HaEzer* 119 and commentaries.

(40) Numbers 20:29.

(41) See on Numbers 5:23.

(42) *Gittin* 90b, based on Malachi 2:11-15.

3. The goal of a marriage is twofold: union and children. Through union with his wife, a man finds his **true companion**, his other "self" who, with her physical and psychological characteristics, makes him complete. This union can endure and reach its highest form only when it rises above the immediate and selfish interests of the two parties. That is why the permanence of the union depends upon the consecra-

5 [www.chabad.org/parshah/article\\_cdo/aid/57227/jewish/When-to-Get-Divorced.htm](http://www.chabad.org/parshah/article_cdo/aid/57227/jewish/When-to-Get-Divorced.htm)

6 The Lubavitcher Rebbe Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson, *The Torah, Chumash Devarim* (Kehot Publication Society), p. 136.

tion of the marriage to the service of Hashem. It is this consecration and the united sense of purpose which keeps the marriage from the may threats to its stability. It is this consecration which carries the couple through life's crisis.

The Talmud teaches that whoever is not married lives without happiness, without help or joy or blessing or redemption. Whoever is not married cannot be considered a complete person. However, in this union, the wisdom of the ages attributes the principle role to the wife. It is on her and her conscience that the perfection of harmony in the home will depend. "As the wife, so the husband" teaches an old Jewish saying. Her role, although more reserved and often less acknowledged, is more decisive and more heroic. For her role will be to guarantee the smooth running of the family, to guide the first steps of the children in their lives, to surround the husband "like a fortress" and to be the spirit that truly creates the home ...<sup>7</sup>

4. <sup>1</sup>*a woman who becomes displeasing ...*

a. It is important to distinguish behavior which is legally acceptable from that which is morally and socially desirable. **The fact that a man may divorce his wife if he finds her displeasing does not mean that he is necessarily morally right in doing so.** To demonstrate the wide boundaries of the legal position, the school of Hillel is recorded in the Talmud (*Gittin* 90a) as stating that a valid basis for disfavor would be any grievance, such as that she spoils his meals. R' Akiva states that a man is legally entitled to divorce his wife even if the only reason is that he finds another woman who is more beautiful. **In practice, of course, the man's rabbinical counselors would strongly discourage him from placing matters of personal comfort or aesthetics ahead of family stability and his loyalty to his wife.** Furthermore, he must in any case observe the terms of the marriage contract to provide for his wife's financial welfare.

On the other hand, the school of Shammai argued that divorce was legally permitted only on the grounds of immoral behavior by his wife, as expressed by the next part of the verse ... *for he found in her a matter of immorality.*<sup>8</sup>

5. Matthew 19:3-9

<sup>8</sup>Yeshua replied, **"Moses permitted you to divorce your wives because your hearts were hard.** But it was not this way from the beginning. <sup>9</sup>I tell you that **anyone who divorces his wife, except for marital unfaithfulness,** and marries another woman commits adultery."

a. <sup>3</sup>*for any and every reason ...* <sup>9</sup>*unfaithfulness*

1) πορνεία—*illicit sexual intercourse; adultery, fornication, homosexuality, lesbianism, intercourse with animals etc., sexual intercourse with close relatives* (Lev. 18:1) **sexual intercourse with a divorced man or woman** (Mk. 10:11-12), **metaphor used of the worship of idols, of the defilement of idolatry.**

2) Mark 10:10-11 (cf., Lk 16-18)

<sup>10</sup>When they were in the house again, the disciples asked Yeshua about this. <sup>11</sup>He answered, **"Anyone who divorces his wife and marries another woman commits adultery against her.**

a) **Better:** "Anyone who divorces his wife *in order to* marry another woman commits adultery against her."

b. In the above passage, **the two bold phrases indicate phrases that only occur in Matthew's account.** The parallel passages in Mark and Luke and the reduced saying in the Sermon on the Mount give the same apparent teaching, but without the qualifiers. Much has been made of whether Matthew added or Mark and Luke omitted these phrases, but that is less important than the fact that these phrases are critical clues to the nature of the (discussion) between (Yeshua) and the Pharisees.

There was a debate centering on the proper interpretation of the Law concerning divorce that had been raging for two generations by the time of (Yeshua) between two schools of thought begun by two 1<sup>st</sup>-century BCE rabbis: Hillel and Shammai ... (Hillel in)terpreted Deut.24:1 to mean that a man could divorce his wife for both indecency and for "any matter." The Shammaite school responded that Moses meant not two reasons, but one: a "matter of indecency" ...

In actuality, divorce was granted for 5 grounds from the time of Moses ... a divorce was recognized for infertility, unfaithfulness, neglect of food, clothing, and/or love (conjugal) ...

**The phrases "any matter" and "indecency" are the legal terms used by the two schools of Hillel and Shammai respectively, to delineate their positions. In essence, the Pharisees are asking (Yeshua) which school of thought is right about the practice of "no fault" divorce ... Then why don't Mark and Luke include these phrases? Because any Jewish hearer in the 1<sup>st</sup>-century would have known what was being asked. It would be like asking if it is legal in California for a minor to drink. Of course it's legal to drink, but any one of us would supply the understood "alcoholic beverages" to the question, which otherwise is nonsensical.**

**In the same way, it would be nonsensical to ask (Yeshua) if divorce is lawful, because it was not only lawful for 5 grounds, it was actually considered compulsory for adultery. The Pharisees wanted to know if the Hillelite "brand" of divorce for "any matter"**

<sup>7</sup> Rabbi Elie Munk, *The Call of the Torah*, (Mesorah Publications, Ltd.), p. 248.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., pp. 250-251.

was lawful. And, after a fairly long discourse, (Yeshua) answers with the exact formula of the Shammites, indicating that he sided with their interpretation ...

But did (Yeshua) mean there was only one ground for divorce? Remember the Shammites and Hillelites both, as well as all of Judaism, recognized 5 grounds for divorce ... by defending the Shammaite school, (Yeshua) is not necessarily abrogating the other grounds observed by all Jews. His silence on the other grounds could easily be understood to be included in the Shammaite interpretation that he was accepting ... it is logical to assume that (Yeshua) was not changing the Law that had stood since Moses' time. If he was, that would have been news and most likely would have been recording in the Gospels.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>24:5</sup>If a man has recently married, he must not be sent to war or have any other duty laid on him. For one year he is to be free to stay at home and bring happiness to the wife he has married.

<sup>6</sup>Do not take a pair of millstones—not even the upper one—as security for a debt, because that would be taking a person's livelihood as security.

**<sup>7</sup>If someone is caught kidnapping a fellow Israelite and treating or selling them as a slave, the kidnapper must die. You must purge the evil from among you.**

1. *<sup>7</sup>If someone is caught kidnapping a fellow Israelite and treating or selling them as a slave, the kidnapper must die ...*

a. Exodus 20:13-17

<sup>13</sup>You shall not murder.

<sup>14</sup>You shall not commit adultery.

<sup>15</sup>**You shall not steal.**

<sup>16</sup>You shall not give false testimony against your neighbor.

<sup>17</sup>You shall not covet your neighbor's house. You shall not covet your neighbor's wife, or his male or female servant, his ox or donkey, or anything that belongs to your neighbor."

<sup>24:8-9</sup>In cases of defiling skin diseases, be very careful to do exactly as the Levitical priests instruct you. You must follow carefully what I have commanded them. <sup>9</sup>Remember what the LORD your God did to Miriam along the way after you came out of Egypt.

1. Deuteronomy Rabbah vi. 10

This bears out what Scripture says, *Suffer not thy mouth to bring thy flesh into guilt* (Eccl. v, 5). The Rabbis say: This verse refers to slanderers. How is this implied in the verse? '*Suffer not thy mouth*': **when the mouth speaks slander, it sins against the body and makes it liable**

to receive lashes. Hence the force of it, '*To bring thy flesh into guilt,*' for the mouth sins against the flesh ...

a. Matthew 12:33-37

For **the mouth speaks what the heart is full of ...** <sup>37</sup>For **by your words you will be acquitted, and by your words you will be condemned."**

1) Luke 6:43-45

For **the mouth speaks what the heart is full of.**

b. Psalm 5:8-9

<sup>9</sup>**Not a word from their mouth can be trusted; their heart is filled with malice. Their throat is an open grave; with their tongues they tell lies.**

c. Psalm 19:14

<sup>14</sup>May these **words of my mouth** and this **meditation of my heart** be pleasing in your sight, LORD, my Rock and my Redeemer.

d. Proverbs 15:13-14

<sup>13</sup>**A happy heart makes the face cheerful, but heartache crushes the spirit.** <sup>14</sup>**The discerning heart seeks knowledge, but the mouth of a fool feeds on folly.**

---

<sup>9</sup> Dave Brisbane, "Jesus on Divorce" (CCBCU-Hermeneutics, 4/9/2005).