

HWAPP # 4814 JSU

INTEROFFICE

To: All Members of Doctrinal Committee

Date: February 8, 1973

Department:

Subject: Jeremiah 3:1

From: Ernest L. Martin

God was certainly married (in a BOUND way) to Israel. None of us would object to this! But three prophets (Hosea, Isaiah and Jeremiah) speak about God "putting away" or "divorcing" Israel. The prophets give illustrations for this putting away. One such illustration is Jeremiah 3:1. It reads:

"... saying (i. e. YHVH says), if a man put away his wife, and she go from him, and become another man's (wife), shall he return unto her again? shall not the land be greatly polluted?"

This is Jeremiah bringing up a common point of law found only in Deut. 24:1-4. It has been suggested that this illustration of Jeremiah's is only superficially or unimportantly referring to the permission law (i. e. the law permitting divorce) in Deuteronomy 24. Yet the fact is, the illustration is clearly a direct and solid reference to Deuteronomy 24. The truth of this is beyond question. Here are five reasons. NE

also  
Dt 21:14  
22:19,29

- 1) Deuteronomy 24:1-4 is the only scripture in the Old Testament which refers to "putting away a wife" (and Jeremiah clearly mentions the putting away).
- 2) Deuteronomy is the only scripture which records about becoming another man's wife (and Jeremiah specifically mentions this).
- 3) Deuteronomy 24 has the only scriptural reference which commands a non-return of the wife to her first husband (this is also plainly mentioned by Jeremiah). Shows -- this is not divorce of bound marriage -
- 4) The passage in Deuteronomy concludes by saying "thou shalt not cause the land to sin (i. e. to become polluted) (and this is also directly referred to by Jeremiah).
- 5) Besides this, Jeremiah 3:8 said that God had "given her a bill of divorcement." This is certainly part of the same context as Jeremiah 3:1, and this phrase is found only in Deuteronomy 24:1-4.

why does  
she want  
to return then

separation. God was  
still bound to Israel &  
to God - v. 12



Without any doubt, Jeremiah's analogy in 3:1 has only one section of the Old Testament in mind -- it is Deuteronomy 24 (and to this attests every commentary in my library plus every marginal reference in the various Bible translations).

The point is, Jeremiah is using a common legal illustration to show how God DIVORCED Israel. And since God was certainly BOUND (absolutely and without any doubt) to Israel, the illustration of Jeremiah 3 demands that the first marriage in Deuteronomy 24 was equally BOUND or the prophetic illustration becomes meaningless.

Secondly, Jeremiah records another interesting statement: "If a man put away his WIFE, and she go and become ANOTHER MAN'S..." A question might be asked: "become ANOTHER MAN'S WHAT?" There is only one answer. It means another man's WIFE. *in Dt., yes.*

*Just like people do today*

The illustration about the pollution in the land mentioned in the Law concerned sexual licentiousness, in the case de facto adultery, engendered by the RETURNING of a former wife after she had become another man's WIFE. This analogy is the one Jeremiah used to show how YHVH had put away His BOUND wife. But by the law of Deuteronomy 24, after she became another man's wife, she was not allowed to return to her first husband. But God said: "Yet (i. e. in spite of the prohibition) return again to me." Why mention this clear reference to Deuteronomy 24, as Jeremiah does, if the woman never became another man's wife? The implication is plain: she became "another man's" -- as Jeremiah 3:1 states.

*NO! Only in quoting Dt 24:1- But of Israel, "thou hast played the harlot with many husbands" Jer. 3:8*

Thirdly, for what reason did God put away Israel in the first place? Jer. 3:8 shows why:  
*God did not send Israel away - She rejected Him, went away (1 Sam 17:19) She was not pleased to live w/ him (1 Cor. 7:15) He only made her leaving legal. He never married a*

X

The Bill of Divorcement in Jeremiah, which can only be a reference to Deuteronomy 24, was given because of ADULTERY. That's what Jeremiah says! So the "matter of nakedness" had come to include ADULTERY. The truth is, ADULTERY was not originally included in the "matter of nakedness" statement, because adultery was a capital offense and the deaths of the errants made Deuteronomy 24 irrelevant. BUT, Jeremiah was at a much later time. There is not ONE EXAMPLE in all later scripture where ADULTERY was in actual fact punished by death. Look at David's case. His affair with Bathsheba was outright ADULTERY, but he was not executed. David should have been stoned -- but no one thought of applying the execution law to him -- at least, David was not killed for his adultery. Neither was anyone else, as

*NO, but to make legal her leaving him. and Dt 24 does not refer to an adulterous wife, but a husband's dissatisfied w/ his wife. Israel did NOT marry another, but committed harlotry.*



shall I not  
marry

far as the records go. Indeed, by Hosea's time, God said through Hosea that "I will NOT punish your daughters when they commit whoredom, nor your spouses WHEN THEY COMMIT ADULTERY (Hosea 4:14).

NO

whoredom when married is also adultery  
If he did not he would not have kept his promise to Abraham

By the time of Hosea, no one in Israel was being punished (i. e. put to death) for their adulterous relationships. Hosea 4:14 proves this beyond **No** doubt. So, an amplification of the marriage law in Deuteronomy 24 takes place. Actually, ADULTERY itself became included in the "matter of nakedness." This must be so because God Himself DIVORCED Israel for her ADULTERY (Jer. 3:8) -- and Jeremiah applied the Deuteronomy 24 legislation to substantiate his point. Note that God didn't have Israel killed for her ADULTERY; but He did apply <sup>the</sup> Bill of Divorcement law in Deuteronomy 24. So did Isaiah (50:1) and Hosea (2:2). God utilized the Deuteronomy divorce permission -- but this time it was for ADULTERY and HARLOTRY. He did not have her killed!!! (It could be added that in Exodus 32:10 He was going to kill Israel for adultery, but in Jeremiah's time that is no longer the case.) *except for Hosea*

Fourthly, since Jeremiah 3:8 says that ADULTERY was now being applied by God as a legitimate reason for the legal DIVORCE, (this is the Eternal Himself -- the One who wrote Deuteronomy 24 in the first place) this means the phrase "and it came to pass" clearly involves the passage of TIME. It would have been very unusual for one to have committed ADULTERY on the wedding night. It is true that God noticed ADULTERY in Israel shortly after their spiritual marriage, but He only put her away after years of intense adultery on her part and after He repeatedly appealed to her to mend her ways. Indeed, God was married to Israel several centuries before He finally DIVORCED her. *Harlotry cutting off which does no allow remarriage*

Harlotry

Fifthly, Hosea says that God finally allowed the marriage to break up and Hosea makes it EXPLICIT: "She is NOT my WIFE, NEITHER am I her HUSBAND." To say that Israel was still His WIFE and YHVH was still her HUSBAND contradicts Hosea, who says she wasn't YHVH'S WIFE nor was YHVH her HUSBAND. In Hosea's eyes the DIVORCE was complete. In order for Israel to become God's wife and for Israel to call Him once again ISHI (My Husband), she would have to be BETROTHED to Him again. (It must be emphasized that you can only BETROTH a single woman -- not one to whom you are legally married -- unless we say the words don't mean what they say.) God will enter into a NEW COVENANT (marriage) relationship with Israel. All of this information in Hosea, Jeremiah and Isaiah is without any indication of Christ dying on the cross for Israel (no matter how legitimate the symbol may be). *This sentence untrue. Jer., Isat Has. are prophecies. Jer. 3:12, 14, 17, etc. = 77*

She may have been married at the time she was her husband Jer 3:14

Yet, in Jeremiah, YHVH is called Israel's HUSBAND. (I do not wish to belabor the matter about the word BAAL -- which can mean either Lord or

Christ's death left Israel free to be betrothed (as the Ch. is)



or Husband in Jeremiah 3:14. Yet Hosea was emphatic that YHVH was very upset in the applying of the name BAAL to Him. He was not going to be called BAALI in the re-marriage, but rather, ISHI. This is one of the reasons why EVERY MODERN TRANSLATION has "LORD" and not "HUSBAND" in Jeremiah 3:14.) Yet Rotherham acknowledges that YHVH will be a BAAL or a HUSBAND to Israel, as recorded in Jeremiah 3:14. But when will He again be their BAAL? Jeremiah shows it will be when: "I will take you one of a city, and two of a family, and bring you to Zion" (3:14). The time in which this regathering takes place is still future to us. There can be no doubt that the bringing back of Israel is associated with the NEW MARRIAGE COVENANT that God will make with Israel. This is when God BETROTHS Israel once again and it is THEN that He will be a husband to her. He becomes a husband to her, as Rotherham translates it, when "I bring you to Zion." However, verse 14 makes legal sense if the term BAAL is understood as "LORD" or "MASTER" (as all modern translations, including the Jewish, have it) but it could mean "HUSBAND" if we do as Rotherham and apply it to the time when He regathers Israel back to Himself as the latter part of verse 14 says.

Vo! — A final remark needs to be made. When Isaiah spoke of a Bill of Divorcement he was speaking about a common legal document permitted by God in the Old Testament period. His reference was clearly to Deuteronomy 24. When Jeremiah spoke about a Bill of Divorcement, a putting away, and about her becoming another man's wife, also the pollution of the land, and the return to the first husband, etc., he was clearly referring to the well-known legal per- mission in Deuteronomy 24. And too, when Hosea spoke of God's marriage, he shows that Israel was YHVH'S BOUND WIFE, that she became, in process of TIME, NOT His wife, but later (after her repentance) she was to be ESPOUSED once again and a new marriage (covenant) occurring. All of Isaiah's, Jeremiah's and Hosea's analogies and illustrations are fully in line, with the DIVORCE LAWS as revealed in Deuteronomy; indeed, the prophets reveal how they came to be interpreted in their own times -- even YHVH was DIVORCING for ADULTERY in the time of the prophets. All becomes consistent and plain if we let the prophets and Deuteronomy stand within their legal simplicity! I hope that we, ourselves, will recognize the position of the prophets on this matter.

ACKNOWLEDGE THAT WAS