

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS, PART 2

EXODUS 20:8-13

The next seven commandments are related to man and his relationship with the other members of the community although I have come to realize they are also very connected to our relationship with God. Nevertheless, the distinction is accurate and appropriate; I just don't see the division being as absolute as I once thought it was.

Exodus 20:8–11 ⁸“Remember the sabbath [שַׁבָּת] day, to keep it holy [קִדַּשׁ]. ⁹“Six days you shall labor and do all your work, ¹⁰but the seventh day is a sabbath of the LORD your God; *in it* you shall not do any work, you or your son or your daughter, your male or your female servant or your cattle or your sojourner who stays with you. ¹¹“For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all that is in them, and rested on the seventh day; therefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day and made it holy [קִדַּשׁ].

This day was to be a day of rest for man and animal. It was not designed to be a formal day of worship; it was designed to be a day of rest. This commandment does not mention worship although almost every theologian you read assigns that meaning to it. Further, it was to be the sign of the Mosaic Covenant.

Exodus 31:13 ¹³“But as for you, speak to the sons of Israel, saying, ‘You shall surely observe My sabbaths; for *this* is a sign between Me and you throughout your generations, that you may know that I am the LORD who sanctifies you.

Some theologians argue that observing the Sabbath was itself the sign of keeping the Mosaic Covenant, but as time went on and the intent of the Law was perverted, ways were found to subvert the Sabbath. The Sabbath is the sign of

the Covenant; keeping it is not the sign. Keeping the Sabbath, which the Pharisees and other legalists faithfully did, was/is not a reliable indicator they were/are keeping the Mosaic Law in the way the Lord originally intended. That was a problem with the Pharisees and Sadducees in the Lord's day and that is the same situation Judaism finds itself in today. Many Jews keep the Sabbath, but it is simply a ritual devoid of any real meaning to them as God's people. Keeping the Sabbath as a day set apart for rest was a sign throughout the generations of Israelites they had a relationship with the Creator God of the universe. In that sense, it is still serving the purpose of setting the Jewish people apart even though the Law is now void.

Arguing that the Sabbath was a day set aside for worship and that keeping it was a sign of keeping the covenant, leads to theological problems in this dispensation when trying to apply the Mosaic Law to the church. "By parallel, in the New Covenant the person who claims to be a follower of Jesus but does not regularly set aside time to worship him is openly indicating that he is in fact not a follower and that his claim to be such is deceptive."¹ There are serious errors in this sentence. First, we are not under the New Covenant. Second, the Gospel does not contain a requirement to regularly worship Jesus in corporate worship as an element of being saved in the first place. Third, the Sabbath was not about worship, it was about rest. Fourth, corporate worship is a sanctification issue and not a justification issue. This seemingly small error in understanding the

¹ Douglas K. Stuart, *The New American Commentary: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture: Exodus* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2006), 457, n. 47.

purpose of the Sabbath led this theologian to promulgate a serious justification error in this dispensation. Anyone reading this sentence in this theologian's commentary would think they cannot be saved apart from regularly setting aside time for corporate worship. We need to do that (Heb. 10:25), but it is not a justification issue.

The Sabbath is not in effect in the dispensation of grace because the Mosaic Law is done away, but it will be observed again under the administration of Kingdom Law. Not only will the Saturday Sabbath be observed in the Kingdom, but there will be other Sabbath observances established just as there was under the Mosaic Law.

Ezekiel 44:24²⁴“In a dispute they shall take their stand to judge; they shall judge it according to My ordinances. They shall also keep My laws and My statutes in all My appointed feasts and sanctify My sabbaths.

The word sabbath, שַׁבָּת, means sabbath or rest period; to cease, desist, or rest. It refers to a period of time for resting which may or may not be the seventh day of the week with a focus on this as a period of rest. This definition does not mention worship. When used in the sense of rest, it is always used in connection with the Sabbath day of rest. Holy, קֹדֶשׁ, as used here does not relate to worship; it relates to no longer being considered common, that is, it is not just another work day, but instead it has been set apart for God's people to enjoy a day of rest just as God entered into His Creation rest on the seventh day of the creation week.

People in this age fall into two errors concerning the Sabbath. One error is to assume we are to worship on the Sabbath meaning on the seventh day of the week. Doing that is to return to the Mosaic Law which has been done away. Indeed, those who do worship on Saturday such as Seventh Day Adventists are very much a Mosaic Law oriented sect in other ways as well. Their mindset is very legalistic and does not understand dispensational distinctions nor does it understand God's plan for history. For Christians to claim they must worship in observance of the weekly Saturday Sabbath, is to deny the biblical revelation that the Sabbath was between God and Israel. It was not between God and any other group including the church. The second error is to refer to Sunday, the first day of the week, as the Sabbath for the New Testament church. Just a few weeks ago I heard Robert Jeffress from First Baptist in Dallas preach a half hour sermon on worshipping God on the Sabbath and he meant Sunday, the first day of the week. The weekly Sabbath is properly and only the last day, or seventh day, of the week and this Scripture specifically relates the Sabbath to that day. God did declare other days to be sabbath days, meaning days set apart for rest, but the weekly Sabbath day is Saturday and those other sabbath days were applicable to Israel. The Feasts that were established shortly after the Ten Commandments were given to the Israelites had other days attached to them that were Sabbath days and there were also Sabbath years established. Only God could establish those other sabbath observances and He did so only under the auspices of the Mosaic Law.

The fact is, Christians may corporately worship God at any time they choose to do so. We may worship on Sunday or we may worship at any other time we choose to appoint as the day of corporate worship. Since we are not under the Law, we may eat or drink whatever we want and we may worship whenever we want. We are not under the Mosaic Law!

Colossians 2:16–17 ¹⁶Therefore no one is to act as your judge in regard to food or drink or in respect to a festival or a new moon or a Sabbath day— ¹⁷things which are a mere shadow of what is to come; but the substance belongs to Christ.

This commandment does not prohibit all work on the seventh day, but the goal was to rest as much as possible. People could still eat, feed, water, and milk their animals, take care of their family, and all the other tasks that must be done on a daily basis in order to live. What it prohibited was all the labor that went into the productivity concerned with making a living and any other activity that would interfere with resting for a day. In other words, land was not prepared for agricultural use, planting and harvesting were not conducted, shops weren't opened, houses and other structures were not built, and so forth. As a rule of thumb, I imagine that whatever didn't need to be done that would do no harm was not to be done on that day. But, of course, that is the issue; what constitutes work in the form such that it was prohibited? Answering that question led to legalistic abuses of the intent of the commandment. As time went on, the purpose for the Sabbath day itself became perverted and more of a burden than working would have been and the Lord addressed that issue a number of times in

various situations during His ministry. For example, people would be expected to rescue a sheep that was in distress on the Sabbath.

Matthew 12:11–12 ¹¹And He said to them, “What man is there among you who has a sheep, and if it falls into a pit on the Sabbath, will he not take hold of it and lift it out? ¹²“How much more valuable then is a man than a sheep! So then, it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath.”

The Word of God did prohibit some specific activities such as plowing and reaping (Ex. 34:21), treading grapes for wine, (Neh. 13:15), loading animals for transporting goods (Neh. 13:15; Jer. 17:21), buying and selling goods in the market (Neh. 13:16; Amos 8:5), gathering manna during the Exodus (Ex. 16:22-30), and building a fire in their dwellings (Ex. 35:3). I'm not sure how building a fire factors into the Sabbath prohibition because they would have a need to eat and to keep warm in the winter both of which require a fire.

It was also impermissible for the Israelites to shift the burden of their labor onto the shoulders of any foreigners living in or traveling through Israel. In the same way, their servants were to enjoy the Sabbath as a day of rest. No one was to work in Israel on the Sabbath.

The Bible relates a number of instances that indicate the Israelites gradually moved away from honoring the Sabbath and instead dishonored the God of the Sabbath by working on that day. That must have been a continual problem for the nation. Nehemiah addressed it after the return from Babylon and said that was one of the reasons God judged them in the first place (Neh. 13:15-22).

For reasons ultimately known only to God, Israelites who violated the Sabbath were to be put to death.

Exodus 31:14–15 ¹⁴Therefore you are to observe the sabbath, for it is holy to you. Everyone who profanes [הִלֵּל] it shall surely be put to death; for whoever does any work on it, that person shall be cut off [כָּרַת] from among his people. ¹⁵For six days work may be done, but on the seventh day there is a sabbath of complete rest, holy to the LORD; whoever does any work on the sabbath day shall surely be put to death.

Here are my thoughts on the death penalty for violating the Sabbath which to us in this day may seem to be an unduly harsh punishment. Sabbath observance set the Israelites apart from all other people and nations which helped fulfill their mandate to represent Yahweh before the world. If they failed to observe the Sabbath, they were profaning the purpose for that day and damaging the reputation and the name of God in the process. Turning something that God has sanctified into something common is a serious act of rebellion and that cannot be tolerated. Profane, הִלֵּל, means to defile or to profane. It refers to treating with contempt; to ceremonially or ritually be common or impure in the eyes of deity and/or society. It can also refer to a violation of covenant. In this case, violating the Sabbath is all of the above. Treating something with contempt that God set apart as holy would have defiled God in the eyes of not only the Israelites but of those people living around Israel who knew the Israelites were supposed to be keeping the Sabbath. By immediately killing any violator, others would be deterred from themselves breaking the covenant by violating the Sabbath and profaning God in the process. If one person gets away with doing it, others

would be sure to follow. It also served to set Israel apart by showing people the God of the Israelites took His relationship with Israel seriously. During the Exodus, a man gathered wood on the Sabbath and he was stoned to death for his transgression (Num. 15:32-36). This must have been done as an example to the people and recorded as an example for future generations.

Cut off, *כָּרַת*, means to cut off, cut down, cut out; it refers to severing an object from its source or cutting it into parts. It can mean to kill. Metaphorically, it can mean root out, eliminate, remove, excommunicate, or destroy by a violent act of man or nature. It is difficult to know at times whether this word is referring to excommunication from the community or whether it refers to the death of the one cut off.² In this case, context informs us the person is to be cut off by means of being put to death which makes the meaning of being “cut off” quite clear.

Lest we get on our modern mindset high horse about God putting people to death, we need to remember that God is the Creator of life and as such it is His right to take any life He has created if it serves His purposes and advances His will. We have no right to question that fact; His ways are not our ways.

Many theologians claim God instituted the Sabbath in Genesis 2:2-3, but that is incorrect. There is no command to be observed in what is simply a statement of fact that God rested on the seventh day of the creation week. Unger claims it was a command to unfallen man to observe this day as the Sabbath, but once Adam rebelled, God had to leave His creation rest to set about the

² R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke, s.v. “כָּרַת,” *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (Chicago: Moody Publishers, 1980), 457

work of redemption; therefore, from Adam to Moses there was no command for unfallen humans to observe the Sabbath. His reasoning is that "God could not impose a memorial upon His fallen race *when the very thing commemorated by it had been destroyed by sin.*" Unger seems to be saying that God had to leave His creation rest in order to engage in the work of restoring His creation which destroyed the notion of Sabbath rest so it was no longer binding on pre-Israelite, fallen people. One problem with that theory is there is no command to undo the presumed command of Genesis 2:2-3. Unger goes on to say there is archaeological evidence that fallen man continued to observe the Sabbath,³ however, that does not appear to be correct. The archaeological resources I checked all said there is no indication the people of the Ancient Near East, observed the Sabbath from Adam to Moses including Egypt where the people had just spent the last four hundred years.

The next commandment concerns honoring one's parents.

Exodus 20:12 ¹²"Honor [כָּבֵד] your father and your mother, that your days may be prolonged in the land which the LORD your God gives you.

This command seems to have two facets to it. The first, is the command for children to submit to parental authority. Honor, כָּבֵד, means to be in a state of high status in a group. In English, using the word in this context refers to having high respect or esteem for a person or the position that person holds or both. The implication is that the honor due the person or position is granted by the subordinate by engaging in the appropriate behavior towards that person. The family

³ Merrill F. Unger, *Unger's Commentary on the Old Testament* (Chattanooga, TN: AMG, 2002), 127.

unit is the foundational building block for society as God intended it. When the family units throughout the nation are stable, the chances are good the nation will be stable. In the New Testament, marriage is a type of the body of Christ (Eph. 5:22-33) representing believers united with Christ Jesus and with one another. Believers, both believing Jews under the dispensation of law (Rom. 9:4) and believing Jews and Gentiles under the dispensation of grace (Rom. 8:15, 8:23; Gal. 4:5; Eph. 1:5), are adopted into the family of God. The book of Hosea metaphorically refers to Israel's relationship with God as a family unit of husband, wife, and children. The father is the spiritual head of his household, then and now. It appears to me that children rebelling against parental authority are a picture of people rebelling against God's authority, and that would be particularly egregious among God's created people, the Israelites.

Additionally, children were expected to take care of their parents in their old age. In that day, there were no retirement plans, no governmental social security programs, no bureaucratic offices of senior affairs, and no welfare programs to care for people who were no longer able to care for themselves; that was the responsibility of the children to the prior generations.

The cultural aspects of family in that part of the world differ significantly from what we are used to in this age. Men were not emancipated from their parents control and supervision once they reached adulthood as those of us living in western civilization are. You can glean hints of that from the stories of Isaac and Jacob and their relationships with their adult sons.

The second facet relates to Israel's longevity in the land. Having the days prolonged in the land is not referring to individual life spans, but to the national life span in the land. The TANAKH translation is clearer in this regard: "Honor your father and your mother, that you may long endure on the land that the LORD your God is assigning to you" (Ex. 20:12). Some theologians think this promise concerning longevity refers to individual life spans, those who honor their parents will live a long life, but that is incorrect. It is about Israel as a nation. There is no guarantee in this verse that honoring one's parents will mean the children who do so will have a long physical life.

This commandment represents a regulated, orderly society as well as a regulated, orderly family unit. Remember, this is a covenant relationship and in such a relationship there are responsibilities and tasks that are to be honored and executed, and this is expressed through hierarchical relationships the most basic of which is the family. People living in these structures must honor those who possess authority over them and that includes the family unit. Fathers are the spiritual head of their homes and they are to teach their children.

Deuteronomy 6:1–2, 7 ¹"Now this is the commandment, the statutes and the judgments which the LORD your God has commanded *me* to teach you, that you might do *them* in the land where you are going over to possess it, ²so that you and your son and your grandson might fear the LORD your God, to keep all His statutes and His commandments which I command you, all the days of your life, and that your days may be prolonged. ... ⁷"You shall teach them diligently to your sons and shall talk of them when you sit in your house and when you walk by the way and when you lie down and when you rise up.

Parents were God's representatives at the family level; therefore, honoring them was honoring God; dishonoring them was dishonoring God.

This commandment is about honoring the hierarchical structure of Israelite society under the Mosaic Covenant, beginning with family, which supports the program call established in and through the Israelites as His people to be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation (Ex. 19:6).

God certainly took this command seriously; he instituted the death penalty for children who cursed their parents and otherwise acted in an incorrigible manner.

Exodus 21:17 ¹⁷“He who curses his father or his mother shall surely be put to death.

Deuteronomy 21:18–21 ¹⁸“If any man has a stubborn and rebellious son who will not obey his father or his mother, and when they chastise him, he will not even listen to them, ¹⁹then his father and mother shall seize him, and bring him out to the elders of his city at the gateway of his hometown. ²⁰“They shall say to the elders of his city, ‘This son of ours is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey us, he is a glutton and a drunkard.’ ²¹“Then all the men of his city shall stone him to death; so you shall remove the evil from your midst, and all Israel will hear of it and fear.

It is interesting to note there is no record of the enforcement of the death penalty for this infraction as there was for violating the Sabbath. Whether or not that was ever imposed is unknown. What is known, is God takes very seriously the family unit and the relationships within it. It is important that people understand the concept of authority and their subsequent submission to it whether it is within the family or in society or in relationship with Him. The first place these lessons on authority are learned is in the family in submission to parental authority.

The New Testament also contains this truth under the Law of Christ, but it expands it to include the proper treatment of children by the parents which also serves to promote harmony within the family unit. Bestowing respect and dignity on people is a two-way street and that includes the family.

Ephesians 6:1–4 ¹Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right. ²HONOR YOUR FATHER AND MOTHER (which is the first commandment with a promise), ³SO THAT IT MAY BE WELL WITH YOU, AND THAT YOU MAY LIVE LONG ON THE EARTH. ⁴Fathers, do not provoke your children to anger, but bring them up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord.

Under the Law of Christ, Paul does apply the promise of blessing to the individual children who do obey and honor their parents in the Lord. This is an example of the Jewish method of interpretation that makes a literal interpretation of the Old Testament as an application in the New Testament. It is also an example of the fact that Old Testament commandments may be eliminated, reiterated, or modified for use under the Law of Christ.

The next commandment concerns the sanctity of human life.

Exodus 20:13 ¹³“You shall not murder” [NASB].

This commandment seems to be straightforward, but it has caused untold problems within Christianity because of the King James translation which uses the word “kill” instead of “murder.”

Exodus 20:13 ¹³Thou shalt not kill” [KJV].

Interestingly, the New King James Version corrected this and translates it “murder.” It is not strictly an error to translate it as “kill,” but it isn't exactly conveying the message the commandment was meant to convey.

Exodus 20:13 ¹³“You shall not murder” [NKJV].

Murder, רָצַח, refers to the taking of the life of another so as to cause a state of death. The primary meaning is to murder or to slay. It refers to the premeditated or accidental taking of the life of another human being and applies to any unauthorized killing of one person by another. Simply translating this word “kill” is far too general in terms of understanding this commandment, although it can mean kill. On the other hand, in English, “murder” is probably overly specific in terms of defining this Hebrew word. It refers not only to premeditated murder but also to what we would call manslaughter and other deaths related to negligence or recklessness. There are no exceptions to this command. Mercy killing is not allowed. Suicide and assisting suicide is not allowed. Since life begins at conception, terminating that life prior to birth is not allowed with the exception of medical exemptions for life and death exigent circumstances affecting the mother. Simply put, to kill is to cause someone to lose a life however that happens whether moral and/or legal culpability attaches to the killing or not; murder is the unlawful taking of a life however that happens.

There are many circumstance in which someone is killed absent legal and/or moral culpability on the part of the person responsible rendering the word “kill” confusing and inadequate. The point is, using the word “kill” is confusing because it encompasses far more than the commandment envisions. For example, a pedestrian running out in front of a car gets killed by the person driving the car, but the driver is not culpable because the pedestrian caused his

own death when he ran into the path of the car beyond the point at which the driver of the car could avoid the crash. Yet, you can say the driver of the car killed that person. Those who put convicted criminals to death kill them, but it is not a murder; it is a justifiable homicide if done according to law and the executioner is not culpable. The same situation exists for police officers. Self-defense cases result in a person getting killed, but the one who killed them is not culpable and did not violate this commandment. Running a red light and killing someone does fall under the purview of this commandment even though it is usually not a premeditated murder.

The use of the word "kill" has led many Christians down the path of pacifism to the point some people refuse to defend themselves or their families. Alvin York, WWI Medal of Honor recipient, claimed conscientious objector status based on the KJV use of the word "kill." He didn't understand that Christians can serve in combat military roles and not run afoul of the commandment not to kill as he understood it. Eventually, a Christian army officer convinced York to serve and he obviously distinguished himself in combat.

The commandment is we are not to do things that endanger other people whether it is premeditated or not. Driving recklessly that involves a crash in which someone is killed would fall under the purview of this commandment. Recklessly shooting a firearm in an unsafe manner that kills someone would render the shooter culpable because a reasonable person would have exercised the appropriate level of care for discharging a firearm, and so on. We may im-

agine all kinds of scenarios where people die due to negligence or reckless behavior that fall short of murder yet fall under the purview of this commandment. This commandment is an imperative that people should not do things to cause another person to die. Since true accidents are by definition not intentional and not premeditated, they cannot fall under the purview of this command.

While these are all contemporary issues, the same kind of circumstances arose in biblical times; the human condition is no different now than it was then. Our modern way of life is different and the instruments that cause death have changed in some ways and in some ways, they are still the same, but the human condition remains stable. The basic command is that no life was/is to be taken apart from the guidelines set forth by God in the Word of God. Human life has a significance and a value in God's sight and that is not a small matter; God takes human life very seriously, because man is made in the image of God (Gen. 1:26-27). Throughout history, it is only the Judeo-Christian worldview sourced in the Word of God that values life and gives it such high regard.

There is one prominent issue relevant to this discussion that is not thought about much today, but it affects the context of this commandment as circumstances dictated at the time it was given. That is, the concept variously referred to as blood revenge or bloodguilt or blood feud which was very common in the Ancient Near East. Even if a man was accidentally killed, his relatives would assume the familial obligation of seeing to it the man who killed him was himself put to death by means of murder. That is the background to the concept of the

cities of refuge in Numbers 35:6-34. Only those who accidentally killed a person could find refuge in these cities; criminals were not afforded protection in them.

These cities were designed to mitigate the application of blood feud retaliation which would be enforced by family members without any consideration for the facts surrounding the case. Leviticus 19:18 specifically forbids the taking of vengeance, yet God knew that wouldn't prevent blood feud retaliation which must have been the reason the cities of refuge needed to be provided. Some theologians believe these cities also provided a place for the person to receive restoration for taking a life. Under the Mosaic Law there was no sacrifice that could remove the guilt of taking a life, even if it was an accident. By staying in the city until the high priest died of natural causes the guilt was removed by the death of the priest. Once the high priest died the offending party was allowed to leave the city of refuge which served as a prison of sorts freed from any further liability for the death.⁴ I don't know whether or not that theory is correct, but it is at least plausible.

Actually, the concept of blood feud is still operative in many places of the world and homicides in this country by reason of blood feud are not unknown. Most law enforcement officials working today would probably characterize them as "revenge killings" rather than as blood feuds, but they still happen. Possibly, the most famous blood feud in American history took place just over one

⁴ G. H. Livingston, "Cities of Refuge" in *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible*, 5 vols., gen. ed. Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1975, 1976), 1:869-871.

hundred years ago, involving the Hatfields and the McCoys in the area along the Kentucky/West Virginia border.

There are circumstances in the Bible that justify taking human life, but that's the point, taking a life in biblically justifiable cases is permissible. Conversely, taking a life outside those biblically set parameters is not permissible. That's not to say it's a good thing or a desirable thing to take a human life simply because it is permissible; it is simply that, a biblically permissible thing. We should do everything we can to avoid taking a life, but we shouldn't mischaracterize what it means when the King James Version says, "Thou shalt not kill" as though it absolutely, without qualification prohibits all killing. There are extremes on both ends of the spectrum concerning what it means to kill. Pacifism and refusing to defend oneself or one's family is an extreme on one end of the spectrum, and the Christian Reconstructionist's assertion that we should stone juvenile delinquents to death are on the opposite, but equally extreme end of the spectrum.

Self-defense was permissible in cases of protecting one's life and property.

Exodus 22:2 ²"If the thief is caught while breaking in and is struck so that he dies, there will be no bloodguiltiness on his account.

Esther 9:1-2, 5 ¹Now in the twelfth month (that is, the month Adar), on the thirteenth day when the king's command and edict were about to be executed, on the day when the enemies of the Jews hoped to gain the mastery over them, it was turned to the contrary so that the Jews themselves gained the mastery over those who hated them. ²The Jews assembled in their cities throughout all the provinces of King Ahasuerus to lay hands on those who sought their harm; and no one could stand before them, for the dread of them had fallen on all the peoples.... ⁵Thus the Jews struck all their enemies with the sword, killing and destroying; and they did what they pleased to those who hated them.

Warfare is not biblically impermissible despite all the arguments to the contrary.

Exodus 17:9 ⁹So Moses said to Joshua, "Choose men for us and go out, fight against Amalek. Tomorrow I will station myself on the top of the hill with the staff of God in my hand."

Capital punishment is a biblical concept. One of the arguments made against capital punishment is that it does not deter crime. That's a questionable assertion, but it is also entirely beside the point. The biblical concept of the death penalty concerns justice and punishment, not deterrence.

Genesis 9:6 ⁶"Whoever sheds man's blood, By man his blood shall be shed, For in the image of God He made man.

The fall did not erase the fact that man was made in the image of God and man retains that image in his fallen state. Violating man by shedding his blood is an affront to the God who made man in His image. Whatever that means to our Creator, He revealed that to be a primary reason for the implementation of capital punishment.