

KINSMAN DIDN'T WANT TO "MAR" HIS INHERITANCE

The kinsman said, "I cannot redeem *it* for myself,
lest I mar mine own inheritance: . . ."
Ruth 4.6

Unfortunately, we don't have as much cultural information from the days of the Judges to explain this verse as we (*I*) would like. Even though we understand the 1st kinsman's dilemma, we find that there might have been several reasons his "inheritance" might be damaged.

Whenever we come to cultural conundrums such as this, our curiosity is stirred. I choose to believe that none of us can say with certainty, precisely why this man felt his future might be marred, but in heaven we will know with assurance. In the meantime we can look at some of the opinions scholars have put forth over the years.

Let me encourage you to check the 2 or 3 strongest postulates in your opinion.

- My kids have already figured out their share of the inheritance.
- The land would belong to Ruth's children, not mine [*I'd be giving away my kids' inheritance*].
- My money would go to a [*hated*] Moabite.
- My good Jewish name would get an ethnic smudge with Moab.
- Sorry, don't want to go through the "Terrible Twos" again.
- Wasted land.
- I was initially willing [*land investment*], but don't want 2 wives to support.
- Boaz is a mighty man of wealth, so let him spend his own money.
- Not looking for a wife, thank you.
- My kid, by Ruth, wouldn't have my name, but her first husband's name. Nope! Not interested.
- Looks a though I'd inherit a bitter mother-in-law, too. Not a great bargain.
- other _____

Blessings on your study.

I am intentionally not giving my own opinion.

You might note the specific verse or phrase which supports your decision.