

Title: **Truth and Consequences (Part 2)**

Passage: **Ruth 4:3-8**

Theme: **Trusting God in doing right regardless of the consequences**

Number: **0613Ru4.3-8(15)**

Date: **June 9, 2013**

{Read Passage}

IV. Act Four: The Royal Line with Hope Restored (4:1-17)

This is t/final act of what is a 4 act historical narrative know as t/book of Ruth.

If you were 1 of many who wasn't here last week you missed t/priv. of hearing me sing a summary theme song of t/BOR to t/tune of t/B.H.

Come and listen to a story about a gal named Ruth,

A poor Moabite, she and her sister in their youth.

Then one day a Jewish family came to town—

To find good food that in Moab did abound.

Grain that is, stalks of gold, food to eat.

Before too long the sisters had their men,

There names were Mahlon and Chilion.

Naomi was the mother-in-law, Elimelech her guy –

A family broken up when the three men all did die.

Three gals alone, suffering, widowhood.

Back in Israel the famine went away,

Ruth's mother-in-law said, "I have to move today."

"Bethlehem in Judah is the place where God will bless" –

She and Ruth made the journey across the Jordan to the West.

Bethlehem that is. Fields of grain. Kinsman.

Read the rest of the book now, y'hear?

That is t/gist of t/story – at least t/first half (why u hv to rd t/rest)

So we've followed the Ups and Downs, Twists and Turns of the first 3 chapters.

A Jewish family living in a small vill. in Israel – Bethlehem. Time of t/Jdgs – a dark & dreadful time in t/life of t/nation. To mke maters worse there's a famine, symbolic of God's judgemnt. Food is scarce so t/patriarch of t/family, Elimelech, decides to move his fam. to t/east across t/Jord. rvr to a land known as Moab – A pagan people descended from t/incestuous union between Lot and his daughters.

There was food in Moab – also suffering. The Royal line (gen. line that connects t/dots between Elimelech and King David (beyond to Christ) was in peril.

The play begins with ==>

I. Act One: The Royal Line with Hope in Ruin (1:1-22)

10 years in Moab. Eli. sons marry but both wives are barren. No desc. Then Elimelech dies leaving behind a widow, Naomi. Then both of t/married sons die, leaving beh. 2 more wid.: Orpah and Ruth.

Orpah returns to Moab – never to be heard from again. Sad.
Ruth cleaves to her MIL who has decided to return home to Beth.

When t/townspeople see her they cry out ==> **“Is this Naomi?”**

To which she replies (1:20) ==>

“Do not call me Naomi; call me Mara, for the Almighty has dealt very bitterly with me.”

That sums up the first chapt. / Act ==> Hope ... In ... Ruin

II. Act Two: The Royal Line with Hope Renewed (2:1-23)

We're introduced to a kinsman, Boaz. Ruth is providentially directed to a field owned by him. She gleanes there and he takes special note of her. Hope is renewed. T/2 widows have food. Not only food, but a

potential husband in Boaz – a kinsman-redeemer who can save t/Royal Line from extinction.

But will he?

III. Act Three: The Royal Line with Hope at Risk (3:1-18)

Would B. accept Ruth? Would he become kinsman-redeemer? Would N.'s plan work?

What was t/plan?

“It shall be when he lies down, that you shall notice the place where he lies and you shall go and uncover his feet and lie down. Then he will tell you what you shall do.”

Ruth listens and goes out that night doing just as Naomi had said.

Boaz is fast asleep.

Ruth quietly sneaks up on him.

She pulls t/outer garments away from his feet.

She lies down.

She waits.

Boaz awakes w/a start and exclaims, “Who are you!?”

She replies with a veiled response that is a subtle but powerful proposal that he take her as his wife (thus redeeming not only her, but t/family line of Eli.).

It all seems so right. It's all unfolded just as N. had said it would.

Two problems. Not really problems.

First is a Legal issue.

“And now it is true I am a close relative; however, there is a relative closer than I.”

IOW – Acc. to t/Law Boaz wasn't first in line, he was 2nd. So he didn't have legal claim upon Ruth, someone else did.

Second problem (isn't a problem – it's actually a blessing) – B. is a man of integrity to a fault. He knows what's right & he's not going to connive a work-around what is t/right thing to do.

“Remain this night, and when morning comes, if he will redeem you, good; let him redeem you. But if he does not wish to redeem you, then I will redeem you, as the LORD lives.

That all happens in ==>

IV. Act Four: The Royal Line with Hope Restored (4:1-17)

A. Scene One: Resolving Legal Matters (vv. 1-12)

This connects w/what we just saw in ch. 3 ==> nearer relative that has first dibs on Ruth.

As far as how all this unfolds we need to note the integrity of Boaz.

Boaz is one of those kinds of people that will do what's right and trust God with the conseq.

“Truth and Consequences.”

As a gen. rule t/conseq. of our actions are secondary. What's primary is that we do t/right thing. Consequences r up to God.

When we aren't forthright w/the truth or when we try to manipulate circumstances we demonstrate a lack of faith. We think we're t/one that needs to be in control to make t/chips fall t/way we want them.

Where's our focus in that case? What we think is best or what we want. Key word: "WE" (more specifically, "Me").

You're not t/solution, you're t/problem.

Put aside yourself & what you think and do what's right trusting in a sov. God who's big enough to control t/rest.

For us t/focus is X not self. He'll take care of t/circum. and t/conseq. in t/way that is best for us and most glorious to Him.

As far as B. is concerned? ==>

1. Trusting in a Sovereign Loving God Who Controls the Hearts of Men

Think about that a moment . . .

Trust (another word for "faith"). We are to **walk by faith, not by sight.** (2 Cor. 5:7). Parallel to that in t/OT is Prov. 3:5-6.

Hebrews 11:6 **And without faith it is impossible to please Him, for he who comes to God must believe that He is and that He is a rewarder of those who seek Him.**

This is about faith, or trust. But biblical faith always has an object. Not having faith in faith. Your faith is no better than its object. If your faith is in your faith then your faith is no better than you are. Problem.

Biblical faith always has an object & that object is t/Triune God of t/B.
That's what makes faith objectively true.

So r trust isn't in ourselves, our good intentions, or t/opinions of men.
It's in a "Sovereign Loving God"

He's sovereign. He controls all things.

He's loving. He has my best in mind acc. to his will and purpose.

He's God. What more needs to be said than that?

As a sov. loving God he controls His creation which includes ==>
The hearts of men.

That is a truth that is woven into t/very fabric of Boaz' being.

He's going to serve & glory God by doing what's right . . . regardless.

"Truth and Consequences." "Give me truth – I serve a God of truth.
He can and will take care of t/circum."

No doubt that Boaz wants to marry Ruth.

No doubt she wants to marry him.

No doubt that Naomi wants to see this all work out.

As far as they were all concerned, this seemed like t/best thing, t/most
honorable thing.

But there's a hiccup. There's a detour in t/road. A sign that says, "Go
this way." I could go around t/detour sign so that I make what I want
happen. For B. that would be taking R. as his wife w/o bothering to
check w/the nearer kinsman. But that sign is there for a reason. God
put it there. Do I trust Him and follow t/sign, or use my own wisdom
by ignoring it?

That's a matter of trust.

Out of this passage I want to leave you a few principles that I see that relate to this mandate that we trust Him and do right.

Last week we looked at t/first principle from vv. 1-2 ==>

a. God is Glorified When We Follow Through and Follow the Rules
(1-2) T/idea: Follow Thru and Follow t/Rules

(1) Boaz said he'd take care of things and he does

He follows thru on his words in 3:13 where he tells Ruth ==>

“Remain this night, and when morning comes, if he will redeem you, good; let him redeem you. But if he does not wish to redeem you, then I will redeem you, as the LORD lives.

Now Boaz went up to the gate and sat down there,

Boaz didn't delay. First thing in the morning Ruth went home and he went to t/town gate.

Followed t/rules. He did what God would have him do – search out t/closer relative to offer him what was rightly His – by t/rules – Ruth.

and behold, the close relative of whom Boaz spoke was passing by

So he said, “Turn aside, friend, sit down here.” And he turned aside and sat down.

Verse 2 ==>

And he took ten men of the elders of the city and said, “Sit down here.” So they sat down.

b. God is Glorified When We Are People of Integrity (3-4)

(1) How does that idea of Integrity connect here

(a) Everything is open and above-board

No “behind the scenes” deals going on. Boaz is up front. He has witnesses. He's not doing an end-around t/Law. T/elders are there. They are all at t/town gate. Others are watching. He has t/other party in t/legal matter right there in t/flesh! This is a court-room setting.

i. This is all about integrity

Integrity is another word for “honesty” – “consistency” – “X likeness.”

When I think of t/char. of I. in t/life of a bel. I think of someone who's Biblically grounded & principled – but not unkind. There's a wisdom & reasonableness about them. They are about t/glory of G. not self.

Listen to what one commentator says of this scene in chapter 4 ==>
The kind of practical righteousness demonstrated by Boaz is not often found in Christian circles. We often lack patience, are selfish, and play "political" games in order to get what we want. Our thoughts and desires are centered on ourselves. We find it easy to excuse our actions. We blame our hang-ups on our parents, our materialism on the economy, our inordinate desire for things on social trends, and secretly excuse our conduct by comparing ourselves with other people. We conclude, "I'm not so bad after all." It is only as we open our hearts to the searching light of Holy Scripture and compare our conduct with what is revealed there that we realize how mercenary, self-centered, and ungodly we may have become. [Cyril Barber, Ruth, 115]

That ought not be true of us! God deliver us from such idolatry!

How can we who trust a sov. God ever be about a mercenary, self-centered, manipulative self-agenda? Answer is “we can't.”

If we believe in a sov. God we're not going to manipulate // bitter // selfish // demand our rights // cry “foul”

How can we if we believe that God has ordained our circumstances?
"A true recognition of God's Sovereignty humbles as nothing else does or can humble, and brings the heart into lowly submission before God, causing us to relinquish our own self-will and making us delight in the perception and performance of the Divine will". – A.W. Pink

(2) Boaz makes his announcement before them all:

Then he said to the closest relative, “Naomi, who has come back from the land of Moab, has to sell the piece of land which belonged to our brother Elimelech.

“So I thought to inform you, saying, ‘Buy it before those who are sitting here, and before the elders of my people. If you will redeem it, redeem it; but if not, tell me that I may know; for there is no one but you to redeem it, and I am after you.’”

(3) There are a few significant questions and issues we have to address at this point

(a) Wonder, “Didn't Naomi know about this nearer relative?”

She must have. He was a relative of Elimelech. He lived in Beth. Why didn't she just go to him on her own? No way to know for sure. Might have been because t/nearer go'el was married. Maybe she knew something about him we're not told – not an man of integrity. Cert. he wasn't of B. charact.

Maybe she saw how God had led R. into t/portion of t/field belonging to B. and she saw that as a sign of God's providential working.

(b) What about this field? That's a new development in the story

“Naomi, who has come back from the land of Moab, has to sell (has available to sell) the piece of land which belonged to our brother Elimelech.

i. How is it that Naomi has the rights to her husband's land?

T/Law codes of t/OT don't seem to indicate that a widow could inherit her husband's property after his death.

(i) True generally

2 OT passages (other than this one) that address t/issue: Dt. 21/Nu. 27.

The normal practice was that when a man died, his sons would inherit his estate so that it would remain within the family (Deut 21:15-17).

If t/man had no sons, then his daughters would inherit (Num 27:7-8).

But – in order to keep t/inheritance w/i t/family they had to marry w/i the tribe of their father (Num 36:6).

(ii) How did Naomi come to possess land?

After her husband died lawful possession would have gone to her 2 sons. Neither M. or Chi. had children, so after they died Naomi gained control.

This land wasn't in M. it was in Beth. For 10 years it lie dormant. Legally it would have reverted to t/nearest relative of Elimelech. IOW – he had right of redemption. But he had no way of knowing about it.

It may be that a widow was permitted to retain t/land so long as she was living. IOW – N. had t/rights to it as long as she lived. She could use it, farm it, perhaps even lease it to another – But she could not sell it to anyone outside of t/family if E.

Becomes 1 of those confusing & tricky family relationship issues ==>
What do you call the son of your mom's cousin? How about the husband of your mother's uncle's daughter?

Someone actually devised a computer program that can tell you how you're related to the wife of your mother's second cousin's third son: The Wolfram Alpha Computation Engine. (these things get confusing)

(c) Why does Boaz bring up the land at this point but not Ruth?

Strategic reason.

Remember the main point of our outline ==>

1. Trusting in a Sovereign Loving God Who Controls the Hearts of Men

Doing the right thing in a given situation while trusting God with the outcome.

a. God is Glorified When We Follow Through and Follow the Rules (1-2) Boaz follows through and follows the laws and customs of Israel

b. God is Glorified When We Are People of Integrity (3-4)
Boaz is upfront in his dealings. Everything's out in the open.

(c) Why does Boaz bring up the land at this point but not Ruth?

That relates to our third point ==>

c. God is Glorified When We Are People of Wisdom (5)

That God is in control, that He will work out His will, that we need to be truthful and upfront doesn't mean we aren't to prayerfully strategize

There is something to be said for being “shrewd as serpents and innocent as doves.”

(1) You don't negotiate a deal without using wisdom

It isn't a wise thing, for example, if you're out to purchase a new car, to go to a car dealer, pull out a wad of bills, and announce to the salesman: “*I have 8k to spend today, whatcha got?*” He'll rub his hands together and show you a very nice car worth 6.

You do your own research, have an idea what t/type of car you're looking for is worth, and you negotiate.

If you have a trump card (lit. or fig. speaking) you don't use it when you don't need to. That's negating the very meaning of trump.

(a) The Fact is, Boaz has a trump card

And it wasn't the land. In shrewd fashion, Boaz the businessman is using the land as bait. Ruth is trump.

This is all above-board and honest. But it is a strategy.

(2) Let's go back to our scene

It's morning. We're at t/town gate, a busy place. People are streaming past, most of them on their way to work. Boaz has called t/nearer relative aside. He's also called together 10 of t/town elders. They are all sitting down. Other people, seeing that something significant is going to take place, have gathered to watch.

In front of them all, Boaz turns to the nearest relative and says ==>
**“Naomi, who has come back from the land of Moab, has to sell the piece of land which belonged to our brother Elimelech.
“So I thought to inform you (lit. in the Heb. “I thought I would uncover your ear”), saying, ‘Buy it before those who are sitting here, and before the elders of my people. If you will redeem it, redeem it; but if not, tell me that I may know; for there is no one but you to redeem it, and I am after you.’”**

Talk about being put on the spot! Picture t/nearer relative taking a gulp, *“Can I sleep on it?”*

Drum roll. Moment of decision. What will he do?

And he said, “I will redeem it.”

As t/reader of this story. If you're really into it & experiencing it for t/first time, think about how you'd feel.

You've been following this family. You can't help but feel for them – they've been through so much – a family of 6 that in a decade has been whittled down to a 2 destitute widows. The youngest one, Ruth, following t/risky counsel of her MIL has seemingly found a husband, a family redeemer. Mourning is turning into joy. Love is in t/air.

Suddenly you hear t/loud scratch of needle against record and are brought back to earth w/the words of . . . of this meddler ==>
“I will redeem it.”

You feel as though someone has just punched you in t/stomach.

How motivated is this man to make this deal? Sounds like a good business opportunity. T/land may not have been much, but it was land.

According to t/UBS textual commentary his response ==>
... involves a form of the Hebrew verb which indicates a rather weak answer, not a particularly firm or definite one. . . .

But he has agreed – tentatively. Before witnesses in a legal setting.

All seems lost.

And the irony is that the loss is a result of righteousness. Boaz is doing the right thing and it looks like it's going to bite him in the nose!

But he's trusting in a sov. God who controls all things even t/decisions of men.

Boaz knows that ==>

a. God is Glorified When We Follow Through and Follow the Rules

b. God is Glorified When We Are People of Integrity (3-4)

Also ==>

c. God is Glorified When We Are People of Wisdom (5)

Just as we are about to say, "No! Don't let this other guy take Ruth!"

Boaz drops t/trump card in v. 5 ==>

Then Boaz said, "On the day you buy the field from the hand of Naomi, you must also acquire Ruth the Moabitess, the widow of the deceased,

Donald Leggett, a scholar who a gen. ago wrote a ground-breaking study on t/levirate & go'el (kinsman-redeemer) customs in t/OT comments on this moment in t/BOR ==>

"We do not deny that Boaz employed what in modern times would be called a degree of psychology in his handling of the goel. This can be seen in the manner in which he first mentioned the property without mentioning Ruth. However, no scheme which Boaz put forward can be construed in any way as being out of harmony with customary law." [Leggett, 240]

IOW – Boaz is being a bit shrewd (applying wisdom). But he's not acting unethically – he's still in t/boundaries of honesty & integ.

You can picture t/nearer relative thinking to himself,
"Gee I knew there was a catch."

Boaz gives t/reason in t/second half of v. 5 ==>

"in order to raise up the name of the deceased on his inheritance."

(3) Boaz is following the Law as outlined in Deut. 25

Purpose: that the deceased has a name that is not blotted out of Israel
We see this in Deut. 25:5-10 (turn there or follow o/l)

25:5–10 5 "When brothers live together and one of them dies and has no son, the wife of the deceased shall not be married outside the family to a strange man. Her husband's brother shall go in to her and take her to himself as wife and perform the duty of a husband's brother to her. 6 "It shall be that the firstborn whom she bears shall assume the name of his dead brother, so that his name will not be blotted out from Israel.

Leggett adds the note ==>

If a man, after having contracted a marriage, dies without sons, then he dies entirely. It is this blotting out of life which is to be avoided. (51)

Verse 7 . . . (Verses 7-10 - The Ceremony of Refusal)

7 “But if the man does not desire to take his brother’s wife, then his brother’s wife shall go up to the gate to the elders and say, ‘My husband’s brother refuses to establish a name for his brother in Israel; he is not willing to perform the duty of a husband’s brother to me.’ 8 “Then the elders of his city shall summon him and speak to him. And if he persists and says, ‘I do not desire to take her,’ 9 then his brother’s wife shall come to him in the sight of the elders, and pull his sandal off his foot and spit in his face; and she shall declare, ‘Thus it is done to the man who does not build up his brother’s house.’ 10 “In Israel his name shall be called, ‘The house of him whose sandal is removed.’

If the brother refuses, his scorn indicates that he has no further claim on his dead brother's estate.

This is the only law in the Pentateuch (1st 5 books of OT) with a punishment consisting solely of public humiliation.

This is the guideline that Boaz is following in this first scene of Act 4. But there are some differences which would indicate that the Law in Deuteronomy was a general guideline & that there may be circumstances (like those of N. & R.) that are handled a little differently.

Ruth is a Moabite. She's not present at the gate with Boaz and the other man. We also have a woman, the daughter-in-law of Elimelech & property belonging to Elimelech. Person and property.

This suggests that the dead man's name (Eli.) is to be revived in both redeeming his property & raising a male heir. N. has the property, R. is the widow who could give birth to a male heir.

Listen again to Leggett (hope this helps clarify) ==>

If the goel had only married the widow and not redeemed the land, the deceased's name would not have been revived, for the children would not have had any land attaching them to their deceased father, thereby reviving his name.

The two obligations are not of an entirely different nature but are closely related. The book of Ruth, then, shows that the levirate law of Deuteronomy has been extended in both its subjects and objects. The obligation of marrying a childless widow concerned all relatives and operated in order of their degree of relationship. . . . There is no contradiction between the legislation in Deuteronomy and in Ruth; it is merely a question of the case portrayed by the latter being more complex. Deuteronomy speaks of a widow without children, but the book of Ruth adds to that the situation of a widow about to be dispossessed of the land which belonged to her husband. Because circumstances would arise where the obligation of acquiring the property of the deceased would be combined with the duty of raising up children, the number of subjects needed to be extended, since in this undertaking, recourse would need to be made to successive relatives before one would be found willing and able to assume this dual responsibility. [243-48]

c. God is Glorified When We Are People of Wisdom (5)

Then Boaz said, “On the day you buy the field from the hand of Naomi, you must also acquire Ruth the Moabitess, the widow of the deceased, “in order to raise up the name of the deceased on his inheritance.”

Back to t/moment of decision ==> Boaz offers t/nearer go'el t/rights to t/field. He says he will redeem it. B. then adds: there's a catch – you also get Ruth t/Moabite as a wife.

d. God is Glorified When We Trust Him Regardless of the Consequences (6-8)

What we've been looking at all along. Trust. Do the right thing. Concern yourself w/that & trust God to take care of t/rest His way.

At any rate ==>

And the closest relative said, "I cannot redeem it for myself, lest I jeopardize my own inheritance.

(4) Why does he change his mind at this point?

Funny thought – Man thinking to himself – I'm going home to my wife & I'm going to tell her: *"Hey honey, guess what? I found out that a relative died and I'm the heir. I got an inheritance! I got a nice piece of property. It's got to be worth a bit of money. He pauses . . . And, uh, guess what else I get? I get this young Moabite girl also. Honey?"*

Some think that he's being selfish. Sure he was willing to redeem the property with the assumption that it would be his to keep since Naomi had no heirs and was past child-bearing years.

However, with Ruth came t/possibility that she would give birth to a son who would then become t/eventual heir to t/land in t/year of Jubilee.

(a) In Israel land was everything

They left Egypt to inherit t/prom. "land" Even w/i families land was imp. Never wanted to lose t/land of your inheritance. There was a provision in t/Law (outlined in t/book of Lev) that guaranteed this wouldn't happen: Year of Jubilee.

Every 50th yr in Israel the YOJ would begin w/a blast from a ram's horn on the Day of Atonement.

During this year of joy and liberation the law stipulated three respects in which the land and people were to be sanctified:

(1) The land and t/people were to rest. Anything that grew w/i t/fields that year was for t/poor to glean and t/animals to eat.

(2) Every Israelite who had sold himself into slavery (usually due to poverty they would become indentured servants) was freed.

(3) All land that had changed hands t/previous 50 yrs. was to revert to the original owner. So t/original distribution of land was to remain intact. All property which the orig owner had sold was to revert (without payment) to the original owner or his lawful heirs.

A future heir born through Ruth would inherit t/land & likely part of t/man's existing estate which is why he says ==>

“I cannot redeem it for myself, lest I jeopardize my own inheritance.”

I don't know that his is pure selfishness. May be that he was simply protecting his own inheritance. B. gave him the option. He looked at all t/provisions, and decided not to accept.

He repeats ==>

Redeem it for yourself; you may have my right of redemption, for I cannot redeem it.”

With that t/author of t/BOR (unknown) adds a note clarifying a historical matter his readers may not have been familiar with==>

Now this was the custom in former times in Israel concerning the redemption and the exchange of land to confirm any matter: a man removed his sandal and gave it to another; and this was the manner of attestation in Israel.

We saw something sim. in Deut. 25 didn't we? If t/brother refused t/widow's request that he become kinsman-redeemer (marry her and raise up an heir for her dead husband's family) ==>

9 then his brother's wife shall come to him in the sight of the elders, and pull his sandal off his foot and spit in his face; and she shall declare, 'Thus it is done to the man who does not build up his brother's house.' 10 "In Israel his name shall be called, 'The house of him whose sandal is removed.'

This seems to be different. I don't see a stigma attached. I see a custom that served to legally bind two parties (what it says) ==>

Now this was the custom in former times in Israel concerning the redemption and the exchange of land to confirm any matter: a man removed his sandal and gave it to another; and this was the manner of attestation in Israel.

A legal transaction was finalized not by signing a paper but by a dramatic symbolic act that others would witness and remember. The passing of the sandal symbolized Boaz's right to walk on the land as his property.

Sandals were symbolic of property rights. Due to t/fact that when property was off it was typically done by walking it off.

Within the Old Testament, the throwing of a sandal upon a piece of land did mean taking possession of it.

Here it's t/reverse: taking off the sandal meant u were giving up any right to t/property.

Verse 8 ==>

So the closest relative said to Boaz, “Buy it for yourself.” And he removed his sandal.

The deal is sealed. What follows is an announcement and a blessing.

But let me bring you back to verse 4 for a moment {read}

In verse 4 you have some 5 occurrences of the word לְקַיֵּם (used in over 80 vv. / 10 vv. in Ruth).

Primary meaning is to do the part of a kinsman - to redeem a relative from danger or difficulty (TWOT).

Within a family (clan) a gō'ēl's is the nearest relative who is responsible for the well-being of his closest kin.

In t/OT there are 5 aspects of t/redemptive function of a gō'ēl

1. To ensure that the hereditary property of the family stays in the family (Lev 25:25–30)
 2. To ensure the freedom of individuals within the family by buying them back (redeem) when they were forced to sell themselves into slavery because of poverty (Lev 25:47–55)
 3. To avenge a murder (Num 35:12, 19–27).
 4. To receive restitution on behalf of a deceased victim of a crime (Num 5:8). Financial settlement.
 5. To ensure that justice is served in a court case involving a relative.
- #s 2&5 are relevant as a type of salvation. {restate and close}