

Deuteronomy 22:13-21

By WmTipton

Assertions/Conclusions of this Article

To dispute the claim that Deut 22:13-21 is only speaking about a man who has found his wife not to be a virgin on the wedding night.

Our view, as is the view of most of the scholars we have studied, is that this man was bringing the accusation against her well after consummation and hometaking had occurred.

Supporting Evidence

‘When a man taketh a wife, and hath gone in unto her, and hated her, and laid against her actions of words, and brought out against her an evil name, and said, This woman I have taken, and I draw near unto her, and I have not found in her tokens of virginity: **‘Then hath the father of the damsel--and her mother--taken and brought out the tokens of virginity of the damsel unto the elders of the city in the gate,** and the father of the damsel hath said unto the elders, My daughter I have given to this man for a wife, and he doth hate her; and lo, he hath laid actions of words, saying, I have not found to thy daughter tokens of virginity--and these are the tokens of the virginity of my daughter! and they have spread out the garment before the elders of the city. ‘And the elders of that city have taken the man, and chastise him, and fined him a hundred silverlings, and given to the father of the damsel, because he hath brought out an evil name on a virgin of Israel, and she is to him for a wife, he is not able to send her away all his days. ‘And if this thing hath been truth--tokens of virginity have not been found for the damsel-- then they have brought out the damsel unto the opening of her father’s house, and stoned her have the men of her city with stones, and she hath died, for she hath done folly in Israel, to go a-whoring in her father’s house; and thou hast put away the evil thing out of thy midst. ‘When a man is found lying with a woman, married to a husband, then they have died even both of them, the man who is lying with the woman, also the woman; and thou hast put away the evil thing out of Israel.

(Deu 22:13-22 YLT)

IF this were a simple case of her not being a virgin on the wedding night, that ALL that needed to be presented, there would be NO cause for Moses to try to present this man as hating her or bringing an evil name upon her...SHE would have brought that name upon herself by her actions....yet Moses shows HIM as doing so.

"Hate" is NOT required to put away a virgin for suspected betrayal....

Joseph didnt hate Mary when he was about to put her away for this very reason, but acted 'justly'

Moses laying out a punishment, especially firstly, for the man who WRONGLY accuses this virgin of Israel shows very evidently that there were men who were doing this vile thing...WRONGLY accusing her.

It cannot be the case, logically, that Deut 22 is showing only that this could occur during the wedding night because the parents of the woman were required to keep this cloth as proof of her virginity.

Why is it that they would KEEP the cloth at all if it were only on the night of firstly consummating the marriage that this man could bring this charge against the woman of not having been a virgin ?

If she didnt bleed then he would have immediately made his claim, as some suppose.

If she had bled then these false doctrines say that he can NEVER put her away after taking her and accepting her as wife.

The parents keeping the cloth of her virginity, even for one single day, shows that it was not the wedding night alone that was the concern in the matter, that he might bring this accusation at some point after consummation.

What purpose would there be after consummation for the parents keeping the cloth of her virginity *IF* it were a done deal at consummation and the man wouldnt bring this accusation at a later date ?

There would be none.

and HOW did her parents already have this cloth on the wedding night?
What, did they run in and snatch it during consummation?

Then shall the father of the damsel, and her mother, take and bring forth the tokens of the damsel's virginity
unto the elders of the city in the gate:

(Deu 22:15)

IF the man had actually HATED her during the wedding night and she was a virgin, surely this gent would have had the brains to know that hes about to defile her, then lie on her and would have taken the cloth himself to keep her parents from getting it and using it for proof against him.

So why does Moses even lay out a punishment for the man in this case?

Would the man be so stupid as to KNOW the cloth is laying there, looking at it, KNOWING he will be punished for wrongly accusing her, then doing so anyway....ON his wedding night?

This just simply doesnt add up

What makes MORE sense is that the man married the woman, lived with her for some span of time, her parents had already been given the cloth , then this man, wanting to be rid of her, now 'hating' her, decides to bring an evil name upon her by accusing her of not being a virgin when he first was with her.

This view makes the most sense given ALL the details that are actually IN the text.

These erroneous views that claim that Deut 22:13-21 above is speaking ONLY of the wedding night simply cannot be harmonized logically.