

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective**

**Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective - posted by bigdaveusa (), on: 2004/5/12 12:52**

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/5/12 14:37**

Hi bigdaveusa

What do you have in mind? In my posting on the other forum I tried to open out the whole question of marriage and divorce and I think some others tried to address more your unique situation. It is always difficult with e-mails to decide how completely a subject should be tackled; the dangers are 'too deep' or 'too superficial'. This topic has taken whole books in the past and it seems your choices (as regards posting) are snap decisions or long explanations. I began one of the latter but it is heavy going for a forum.

I would like to hear some biblically justified definitions of 'marriage' from folks on this site. As I said in the forum, this is where the trail starts. When we have defined 'marriage' we can define 'divorce' and then examine 're-marriage'.

**Re: - posted by bigdaveusa (), on: 2004/5/12 15:11**

Ron,

I agree with your assessment of the posts on the other thread. I would like to go in depth and hear all of the argument from all perspectives. I printed out your last post on the other thread and am perusing it. I think that this is a worthy topic to rehash with deliberation. So.....I do have to agree with what I saw Matthew and Keith post. I tend to take the narrow view and am more than willing to err on the side of caution, not wanting to offend God. That's where I am at, but I would like to see some scholarly debate about the topic. Thanks.

**Re: - posted by Yodi (), on: 2004/5/12 17:46**

Quote:

-----... but I would like to see some scholarly debate about the topic. Thanks.

-----

"Scholarly debate" huh? Would that exclude me? I don't have a degree or anything. Actually, I'm a little lost here. What other thread are you guys talking about? What exactly is the question concerning marriage, divorce and remarriage?

A definition of marriage was requested. Well, what about the one given from the very beginning of time - Genesis 2:24?

"Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one flesh."

When religious leaders asked questions about marriage in the New Testament, wasn't this verse referred to? I think it may have even been when they were asking about the grounds of divorce and the law of Moses.

Then there's those famous verses in Ephesians that every husband and wife loves - Ephesians 5:21-33. Hey, what do you know! Paul quotes Genesis 2:24 in those verses. That must be a pretty good definition of marriage then. And like Ephesians 5 says, Christ's love for the church is a pretty good definition for human marriage relationships.

That's all I have for now.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/5/12 18:00**

Hi Yodi

Here's The Other Thread that you asked about, and I don't have a degree either so you will be in good company.

**Re: - posted by bigdaveusa (), on: 2004/5/12 18:42**

ID

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective - posted by christopher, on: 2004/5/12 20:24**

If your marriage was a covenant relationship, then don't remarry...(Having put your hand to the plow).....if however you entered foolishly into a marriage and it meant nothing, then you are not under a covenant.....only you can decide whether you were in covenant.....that's it for now, but if you need further counsel e-mail choctaw@intergate.com

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/5/13 8:38**

Christopher

you write only you can decide whether you were in covenant.

I think this is a mistaken point of view. A covenant is a binding agreement between at least two parties. It is not a matter of personal decision or opinion. How does a covenant stand when one party decides it never existed but the other party decides it did?

I am all for 'covenant' but I think you will be hard pressed to illustrate your point from the scriptures. Let your 'yea be yea' is a statement signifying that every sentence I speak has all the power of an 'oath' in it. I don't know about the US and Canada but in the UK a civil marriage is a 'covenant' making function. In law it is regarded as a solemn agreement and instantly changes laws of inheritance due to changes in next-of-kin. It doesn't matter how frivolously it was entered into it is still a life changing 'covenant'.

**Re: - posted by matthew (), on: 2004/5/13 9:17**

I am greatly concerned by Christopher's post. The one verse he alluded to is a clear reference not to marriage, but to those who sought to follow after Christ as disciples.

I am sorry that I can provide no more at the present time than I did on the other thread.

Just that we must always judge our feelings and thoughts and desires by the BIBLE!

THE BIBLE THE BIBLE THE BIBLE THE BIBLE!!!!

we must start and end there

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/5/13 9:34**

I would like to hear some biblically justified definitions of 'marriage' from folks on this site. As I said in the forum, this is where the trail starts. When we have defined 'marriage' we can define 'divorce' and then examine 're-marriage'.

I'll make a start on marriage by asking a question :-D , what is the difference in Genesis between a "woman" and a "wife"? the hebrew word is the same yet woman is used like "the woman" and wife is used like "his wife".

How were people "married" back then?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/5/13 13:40**

Hi Nasher

the difference is 'his'. By using the possessive pronoun both Hebrew and Greek create a 'his woman' or 'her man' concept which the KJV usually translates as 'husband' or 'wife'. There is no biblical Greek equivalent single word for 'husband' or 'wife' as far as I am aware.

**Re: Oops! Started new thread. - posted by Yodi (), on: 2004/5/13 15:30**

Hey thanks for that link there 'philologos'. I accidently started a new thread titled "Thee Old & New Life" in response to t his whole debate.

I don't know how to fix it, sorry. Maybe I'll copy and paste it all in here? Or maybe you guys can all go over there and re ad it? That would be nice. Thanks.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/5/13 15:36**

Quote:  
-----Hey thanks for that link there 'philologos'. I accidently started a new thread titled "Thee Old & New Life" in response to this whole de bate.  
-----

Sounds good.. heres the new thread continuation:

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id1935&forum36](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id1935&forum36)) Thee Old & New Life ;-)

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/5/14 4:15**

So how were people married back in the days of Adam etc?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/5/14 6:41**

Hi Nasher

you ask So how were people married back in the days of Adam etc?

This is a good question. It is clear that there was no wedding service; no officiating minister or witnesses were available. No legal formalities were possible. There is something in Genesis 2 which shows that the Scripture is looking forwards at this point; there is a reference to a man leaving his father and his mother. Adam and Eve had neither, so this is clearl y in the Scripture for the benefit of subsequent generations. Your question implies a point of marriage and we have no b iblical data to enable a definitive answer to that particular question. However there are principals here in Genesis 2:24 w hich are part of the original revelation; things as they were "from the beginning". This is the phrase that Jesus uses in M atthew 19:8.

God's plan was clearly that the human couple were to enjoy a unifying experience. Adam was one, who became two. In some measure the experience would make the two, one again. They would become "one flesh". We should note that "fl esh" at this point can have no negative connotations, but is clearly an experience that includes the physical. Consequen tly there are three elements of "marriage" that may be identified.

1. "a man shall leave his father and his mother". The old relationship must be ended, marriage is not an additional expe rience but a unique one. There is the phrase in the letter to the Hebrew's that comes to mind; He takes away the first th at he may establish the second. This is very different to the Roman pattern of marriage where the woman became part of the family of the husband's father. This is a brand-new family unit. This is clearly a very deliberate act too, not a casu al or creeping change. The Scripture actually says the man shall leave...is this does not mean that he would move into his wife's family home from his own parents. It is just making the point that the first step in the creation of a new relation ship is separation from an old relationship. I think there's a deep psychological implication to this first step, many a man never leaves his mother and the new relationship is almost inevitably doomed. It is important to notice the element of ch oice, the subject of the sentence is "a man". The "leaving" is the man's choice, this introduces the element of consent. This has its equivalent in the UK civil marriage form where the parties declare legally that they are eligible to marry; ther e are no competing relationships.

2. "And he shall cleave and to his wife" "cleave" is a great word. The NASB uses the word "joined" but this is an anaem ic word, without the necessary passion. "Cleave" signifies to claim, stick to, adhere to, overtake, catch. In the story of Sh etland and diner the NASB has "He was deeply attracted to Dinah the daughter of Jacob, and he loved the girl and spok e tenderly to her." (Gen 34:3 NASB) He was more than "deeply attracted" to Dinah, he was besotted with her, his soul h ad been captured. With the same finality with which he "left" his father and his mother and a man must now "cleave" to his wife. I have commented previously that Hebrew (and Greek) does not have a single specific word for "wife" or "husb and". The desired effect is achieved by using the word for "man" or "one" and adding the necessary personal pronoun, ' his' or 'her'. Literally, this sentence reads "and shall cleave to his woman". This may seem a little blunt that it is a very p

powerful statement. This woman will become "his" woman. This is an exclusive statement, this woman will become exclusively "his". (If this way of expression seems chauvinistic please remember that we are viewing this relationship from one side; this is an Adam's viewpoint way of expression) The point is that these two people will belong to each other exclusively. This also has its equivalent in the UK civil marriage form where each party formally 'takes' the other as their husband/wife. Incidentally, the UK marriage law still defines 'marriage' as the exclusive union of a man and a woman for the period of their natural lives; sadly the reality is often very different.

3. "And they shall become one flesh" (NASB) the NASB is better here than the KJV which simply says "be". This can be understood that in different ways. Does it mean that point 1 and 2 automatically produce point 3. In other words, does "leaving" and "cleaving" automatically create "one flesh"? Or does it mean that point 1 and 2 must be followed by point 3? Is point 3, the sexual union, now permissible because point 1 and 2 are already in place? My instinct is that point 3, consummation, is now legitimate as a result of points 1 and 2 having been fulfilled.

If all three are genuine elements of marriage, it provokes a question in my mind. The 'officiating minister'... 'now pronounces you husband and wife'. Does he have any authority to do so without point 3?

Perhaps this is enough to think over before we add more to it.

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/5/14 10:38**

Hi Ron, this verse from Genesis 2:24 is quoted 3 times in the NT, all 3 times the word for "shall be / shall become" are in the future tense, therefore I would say you are correct in saying that points 1 & 2 must come first.

Where would these points come in a modern day marriage / wedding?

i.e. When would the man "leave" his mother and father? when would he "cleave" to his women?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/5/14 14:27**

Hi Nasher

you write

Where would these points come in a modern day marriage / wedding?

i.e. When would the man "leave" his mother and father? when would he "cleave" to his women?

This is getting into the mechanics of 'marriage' which I think needs real care. I have been trying to identify the principle elements in the bible concept of marriage. Let's wait a while to see what others have to say before. The bible has very little to say about 'weddings' but the concept of 'marriage' is certainly biblical. We have a way of thinking that a 'wedding' is necessary to a 'marriage'; can we justify that biblically?

Thanks for your note of the future tense use of 'shall become one flesh'. It is helpful.

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/5/14 15:42**

Quote:  
-----If all three are genuine elements of marriage, it provokes a question in my mind. The 'officiating minister'... 'now pronounces you husband and wife'. Does he have any authority to do so without point 3?  
-----

Curiosity: is any kind of minister ever Biblically invested with the authority to declare a marriage? Is it not God who does the joining? Or is the minister acting on behalf of God? Biblically?

Also, the minister's declaration "you may now kiss the bride" would seem to be the point where the man has moral access to his woman, thus the third point of the marriage cannot have legitimately taken place before the ceremony. On the other hand, the "bride-kissing" part seems to be an imported Roman custom with a different background.

Another thing I've wondered about is how Jesus' forbiddance of oaths/vows/etc meshes with the concept of "wedding vows."

It's all very confusing. :)

Matthew 19:10

The disciples said to him, "If this is the situation between a husband and wife, it is better not to marry."

1 Corinthians 7:28

But if you do marry, you have not sinned; and if a virgin marries, she has not sinned. But those who marry will face many troubles in this life, and I want to spare you this.

The "troubles" I have in mind are probably different from either what the disciples or Paul thought, but sometimes I readily identify with those statements.

**Re: - posted by bigdaveusa (), on: 2004/5/14 17:11**

I have been searching and searching for a decent exegesis of the scriptures relating to this topic. I have found something that I can say really made a lot of sense. It can be found here:

<http://www.gospelcom.net/rbc/ds/q0806/q0806.html>

It's much too big to reprint here, but is a fairly exhaustive treatment....For what it's worth. It was a big help to me. I'd appreciate some feedback if anyone wants to check it out. Thanks!

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/5/19 7:34**

Regarding the recent ruling of same-sex marriages, and the 3 points that Ron has made in regards to what a marriage constitutes, are these people actually getting married?...in the eyes of God?

**Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/5/21 14:28**

I read some info on Jewish weddings once that was very interesting. It sheds some light on parallels to the church. Too bad that I have long forgotten the source!

The man and woman would become betrothed which already implied an exclusive relationship where adultery was possible. Then the man would build them a place to live and he couldn't go get his woman until his father declared his preparations adequate. Then he went upon that declaration, regardless of the time of day, to get her. She had to be ready and waiting at all times for months until he came and took her away. The wedding was not considered official, or whatever you want to call it, until the father led them back to their home after the party and they consummated it.

We await the father's command for our groom to come get us and take us to the prepared home.

I think it is obvious that sodomites cannot become married to each other in God's view. They are just practicing unnatural disgusting sin. No more than a man can become married to a sheep (might be next in the legislature) just because he practices that perversion.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/8 13:30**

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/>

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 12:01**

Here's a good link that shows how binding betrothal was/is.

<http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=995&letter=B&search=betrothal>

In Deut 22 we see the betrothed wife being put to death for willful sexual sin just the same as the consummated wife. Both were fully bound in marriage, the betrothal 'custom' didn't nullify that fact.

Quote:

nobody wrote:

I read some info on Jewish weddings once that was very interesting. It sheds some light on parallels to the church. Too bad that I have long forgotten the source!

The man and woman would become betrothed which already implied an exclusive relationship where adultery was possible. Then the man would build them a place to live and he couldn't go get his woman until his father declared his preparations adequate. Then he went upon that declaration, regardless of the time of day, to get her. She had to be ready and waiting at all times for months until he came and took her away. The wedding was not considered official, or whatever you want to call it, until the father led them back to their home after the party and they consummated it.

We await the father's command for our groom to come get us and take us to the prepared home.

I think it is obvious that sodomites cannot become married to each other in God's view. They are just practicing unnatural disgusting sin. No more than a man can become married to a sheep (might be next in the legislature) just because he practices that perversion.

**Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 13:36**

All marriages are covenants that God has joined together for life. The scriptures are clear on this throughout.

Mark 10:11 And He said to them, "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another woman commits adultery against her; 12 and if she herself divorces her husband and marries another man, she is committing adultery."

Luke 16:18 "Everyone who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries one who is divorced from a husband commits adultery.

I Corinthians 7:39 A wife is bound as long as her husband lives; but if her husband is dead, she is free to be married to whom she wishes, only in the Lord.

Romans 7:2-3 For the married woman is bound by law to her husband while he is living; but if her husband dies, she is released from the law concerning the husband. So then, if while her husband is living she is joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband dies, she is free from the law, so that she is not an adulteress though she is joined to another man.

Matthew 19:6 "So they are no longer two, but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let no man separate."

God joins us together, and no man has the authority to separate that which he has joined.

I Corinthians 7:10-11 But to the married I give instructions, not I, but the Lord, that the wife should not leave her husband (but if she does leave, she must remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband), and that the husband should not divorce his wife.

1 Corinthians 7:12 But to the rest I say, not the Lord, that if any brother has a wife who is an unbeliever, and she consents to live with him, he must not divorce her. 13 And a woman who has an unbelieving husband, and he consents to live with her, she must not send her husband away.

It is clear from scripture that even a marriage with someone who is not God's child, is still joined by Him and cannot be separated.

You can read a complete study on the subject at (<http://sealedeternal.bravehost.com/1.html>) Biblical Marriage and Divorce

Sealed

**Re: - posted by brentw (), on: 2006/5/13 13:53**

Quote:  
-----It is clear from scripture that even a marriage with someone who is not God's child, is still joined by Him and cannot be separated.  
-----

I think your walking on a fine line here...by this quote.

Furthermore is someone TRULY married IN THE EYES OF GOD IF, IF their not married by the church?? Can a govern

ment marry a couple and be ordained of GOD?? Does the government have spiritual jurisdiction?? Did the government marry in the bible or the church???

Re:, on: 2006/5/13 14:29

Quote:

-----All marriages are covenants that God has joined together for life. The scriptures are clear on this throughout.  
-----

Really?

Then you call Jesus a liar when HE has said 'except'.  
Isn't that right, Sealedeternal?

for a refutation to Sealedeternals doctrinal errors, please see this page...

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/se-deut22-24.html>

I see you're still pushing the fabrication that God is so absent minded that He had to amend Deut 22 with Deut 24 approx 3.5 days later.

That should have been your first clue that your doctrine was/is errant, SE.

Quote:

-----1 Corinthians 7:12 But to the rest I say, not the Lord, that if any brother has a wife who is an unbeliever, and she consents to live with him, he must not divorce her. 13 And a woman who has an unbelieving husband, and he consents to live with her, she must not send her husband away.  
-----

It is clear from scripture that even a marriage with someone who is not God's child, is still joined by Him and cannot be separated.

No, what is clear is that \*IF\* the marriage is mutually content as the Greek clearly states, then the believer is to remain.  
<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/1cor7study.html>

If the unbeliever deserts, then the believer is as free as any other slave that has been freed from his master.

For refutations to doctrinal error concerning God's holy union of marriage....  
<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/index.html>

It's nice to see you here, Sealedeternal, please, let's have a conversation so that we can refute your doctrine for a whole new group of folks here as well :-)

Quote:

-----God joins us together, and no man has the authority to separate that which he has joined.  
-----

interesting.

then you call Moses the greatest lawbreaker of all time as HE not only permitted divorce but also ADDED instruction for divorce right into God's own law.

are you sure you even understand what you're studying?

The fact is Jesus is dealing with FRIVOLOUS divorce in Matt 19....and all throughout the NT....just as the Jews had been permitted by MOSES (a MAN) to do, as our Lord shows.

this permission for frivolous divorce (for EVERY cause) is laid out in writing in Deut 24:1-4, altho divorce had been permi



tted BEFORE this time (see Leviticus 21, the requirements for priests and high priests) but then was REGULATED with Deut 24:1-4 by placing requirements/restrictions on the man putting his wife away.

Jesus clearly is NOT doing away with what God has shown as a breach of covenant in the Law (sexual sin) as Jesus himself gives an exception concerning this divorce.

And we know your doctrine is errant when we see this huge contradiction you present when you say that Jesus is doing away with divorce for sexual sin when speaking to the pharisees in Matt 19, then He turns right around and says 'except for harlotry'.

I think I'm going to add a page to my site for this HUGE contradiction of yours that you seem to be unable to see. This will help folks who read your posts see that you're not adding up the facts correctly....especially when one of your own doctrine (alaska from crosswalk) has even pointed out your inconsistencies.

READERS see this page here

[http://forums.crosswalk.com/m\\_690665/mpage\\_48/tm.htm](http://forums.crosswalk.com/m_690665/mpage_48/tm.htm)

Even SEs own have tried to correct his blatant error, but he persists in it anyway.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/5/13 14:48**

Dear Sealed,

There is a lot more to marriage than you mention, just as there is a lot more to divorce than you don't mention.

Not quoting Matthew's gospel, the gospel which paid particular attention to the Jewish perspective, was a mistake.

EDIT: Apologies. I see you were... selective.... :-(

Matthew 19 continues

7 They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?

8 He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.

9 And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery. (KJV)

EDIT end.

If you are seeking to convince other Bible students you have looked at every relevant scripture, and understood them, then you *have* to find a place for the exception and its context given by our Lord, in *your* dissertation.

This becomes even more vital, when faced with the obvious acceptance Jesus gives to a woman who had five marriages in her past. (John 4)

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 15:07**

Good catch Dorcas.

SE, like lastblast, is very selective in what he tries to present, rejecting God's WHOLE council on this matter.

I'm glad he has shown up here and prayerfully is willing to keep posting for all to see.

Those interested please see my page here for dialogue with SE.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/se-deut22-24.html>



Re:, on: 2006/5/13 15:16

...

Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 16:17

Quote:

-----Dear Sealed,

There is a lot more to marriage than you mention, just as there is a lot more to divorce than you don't mention.

Not quoting Matthew's gospel, the gospel which paid particular attention to the Jewish perspective, was a mistake.

-----

I cover all of those verses in the link that I had at the end of my statement. Here's the pertinent part to your question:

God's word says that we are joined together until one spouse dies, and that remarriage is only an option after the death of a spouse. Therefore, If anyone remarries while their spouse is still alive, God says it's not a legitimate marriage in His eyes, but actually an adulterous relationship, and you will be judged as an adulterer if continue in your sin. Jesus Christ Himself made it very clear that marriage lasts a lifetime, and divorce and remarriage is adultery.

Matthew 5:32 but I say to you that everyone who divorces his wife, except for the reason of unchastity, makes her commit adultery; and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.

Matthew 19:3 Some Pharisees came to Jesus, testing Him and asking, "Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife for any reason at all?" 4And He answered and said, "Have you not read that He who created them from the beginning MADE THEM MALE AND FEMALE, 5 and said, 'FOR THIS REASON A MAN SHALL LEAVE HIS FATHER AND MOTHER AND BE JOINED TO HIS WIFE, AND THE TWO SHALL BECOME ONE FLESH'? 6" So they are no longer two, but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let no man separate." 7 They said to Him, "Why then did Moses command to GIVE HER A CERTIFICATE OF DIVORCE AND SEND her AWAY?" 8 He said to them, "Because of your hardness of heart Moses permitted you to divorce your wives; but from the beginning it has not been this way. 9" And I say to you, whoever divorces his wife, except for immorality, and marries another woman commits adultery." 10 The disciples said to Him, "If the relationship of the man with his wife is like this, it is better not to marry." 11 But He said to them, "Not all men can accept this statement, but only those to whom it has been given. 12" For there are eunuchs who were born that way from their mother's womb; and there are eunuchs who were made eunuchs by men; and there are also eunuchs who made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. He who is able to accept this, let him accept it."

These two sections of scripture, make it clear that divorce and remarriage are adultery, with one exception which is immorality or unchastity. Many people misunderstand the exception clause that Jesus gives here, and try to use these verses to suggest that Jesus is allowing divorce if someone commits adultery. This cannot be true for many reasons.

First of all the word for "immorality" or "unchastity" is (Greek "porneia") and "adultery" is (Greek "moicheia"). Both words are used in the same verses and each have a distinct meaning (Matthew 5:32; 15:19; 19:19; Mark 7:21, 1 Cor.6:9, Gal.5:19, Heb.13:4). These two different words with two different meanings clearly describe two different acts. If Jesus meant adultery, He surely would have used the term for adultery -- "moichao." He was certainly not using terms carelessly, especially in disputing with legal experts. If he wanted to say that adultery is the exception, he would have used the proper word for adultery, rather than "immorality" which is a broad term that could mean different things in different contexts, which leads us to the second reason it isn't adultery.

The context of these verses are of the Pharisees (Jewish law experts) asking "why did Moses command...." referring to the Jewish Mosaic Law, and Matthew himself being a Levite was writing this gospel primarily to the Jews. In that context it is clear that we need to refer back to the Mosaic Law in order to understand what is being taught here, yet many Christian teachers tear these verses out of context in order to create a loophole for divorce and remarriage.

In Jewish marriage there was a betrothal period which was similar to an engagement, except that it was far more binding than what we are familiar with. They were considered husband and wife at the time of betrothal, even though the marriage hadn't been consummated yet. The man could give her a writ of divorce during the betrothal, if he found her not to be a virgin, but could not divorce her for any other reason. This was because a clause of the marriage contract had not been

en fulfilled, in that the girl was not a virgin, as the man was led to believe when the contract was drawn up. The husband is the one who is being wronged in this case, because he has fulfilled his obligations. The girl and her father are the ones acting unjustly here by asserting that she was a virgin when she wasn't.

This law is covered in:

Deut. 22:13-21 "If any man takes a wife and goes in to her and {then} turns against her, and charges her with shameful deeds and publicly defames her, and says, 'I took this woman, {but} when I came near her, I did not find her a virgin,' then the girl's father and her mother shall take and bring out the {evidence} of the girl's virginity to the elders of the city at the gate. "The girl's father shall say to the elders, 'I gave my daughter to this man for a wife, but he turned against her; and behold, he has charged her with shameful deeds, saying, "I did not find your daughter a virgin." But this is the evidence of my daughter's virginity.' And they shall spread the garment before the elders of the city. "So the elders of that city shall take the man and chastise him, and they shall fine him a hundred {shekels} of silver and give it to the girl's father, because he publicly defamed a virgin of Israel. And she shall remain his wife; he cannot divorce her all his days. "But if this charge is true, that the girl was not found a virgin, then they shall bring out the girl to the doorway of her father's house, and the men of her city shall stone her to death because she has committed an act of folly in Israel by playing the harlot in her father's house; thus you shall purge the evil from among you.

This is the only "divorce" that is allowed anywhere in the Bible, and you'll notice that it is before the consummation of the marriage, or immediately after. Many people try to use the immorality clause to suggest that God tolerates divorce, but this was specific to the Jews, and only before the consummation or immediately after. Once a couple was betrothed, they were considered husband and wife, and they needed a bill of divorcement in order to depart from one another. One example of this is regarding Mary and Joseph. Scripture says Mary was Joseph's wife (Matthew 1:20,24, Luke 2:5). But at the same time, she was betrothed to him:

Matthew 1:18-19, "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was as follows: when His mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found to be with child by the Holy Spirit. And Joseph her husband, being a righteous man and not wanting to disgrace her, planned to send her away secretly.

Deuteronomy 22:23-24 is another passage that defines a "betrothed virgin" as a "neighbor's wife" :

Deuteronomy 22:23-24, "If there is a girl who is a virgin engaged to a man, and {another} man finds her in the city and lies with her, then you shall bring them both out to the gate of that city and you shall stone them to death; the girl, because she did not cry out in the city, and the man, because he has violated his neighbor's wife. Thus you shall purge the evil from among you.

Many false teachers will claim that Jesus can't be talking about the betrothal period because He refers to them as husband and wife, and the betrothal is only an engagement and therefore Jesus wasn't referring to it. As you can see they were husband and wife from the moment they were betrothed, and couldn't divorce for any other reason except if unchastity was found. Deuteronomy 22:19 says that if she was innocent of his claims, "she shall remain his wife; he cannot divorce her all his days." The law of no divorce until death do you part was in effect, except for this one very limited exception.

Interestingly, it is this exception that God uses to divorce Israel during their betrothal. The Jewish people would reap what they had sown, by being hard hearted and dealing treacherously with their wives, they would be divorced from God for their harlotry.

Hosea 2:19 "I will betroth you to Me forever;  
Yes, I will betroth you to Me in righteousness and in justice,  
In lovingkindness and in compassion, 20 And I will betroth you to Me in faithfulness. Then you will know the LORD.

Jeremiah 3:1 God says, "If a husband divorces his wife And she goes from him And belongs to another man, Will he still return to her? Will not that land be completely polluted? But you are a harlot with many lovers; Yet you turn to Me," declares the LORD.

8 "And I saw that for all the adulteries of faithless Israel, I had sent her away and given her a writ of divorce, yet her treacherous sister Judah did not fear; but she went and was a harlot also.

The third reason that the exception clause cannot be for adultery is that it would defy common sense. Adultery cannot be both the sin and the justification for not being in sin at the same time. In other words, if divorce and remarriage is adultery, and adultery is the justification for divorce and remarriage, then any divorce and remarriage automatically becomes legal. It is obvious that Jesus Christ would not make such an error in reasoning.

The fourth reason that this cannot be referring to adultery in the consummated marriage, is that Jesus specifically says in verse 8 that this was never God's plan, and that's why the two Gospels that were written primarily to the Gentiles do not offer any exception. The Gospel of Luke was written primarily to the Greeks, and Mark was written primarily to the Romans. It is absurd to suggest that Mark and Luke would be so careless as to miss such important information as whether or not Jesus taught that "adultery" is grounds for divorce in their gospels, knowing that the audience of their day didn't necessarily have the ability to read Matthew's gospel along with theirs as we do today. The reason Mark and Luke do not mention the exception clause is they were addressing a predominately Gentile audience while Matthew was addressing a Jewish one. Then why do so many Gentile Pastors refer only to Matthew, and totally ignore Mark and Luke when teaching on marriage?

Mark 10:11 And He said to them, "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another woman commits adultery against her; 12 and if she herself divorces her husband and marries another man, she is committing adultery."

Notice that if divorce itself nullified the marriage, then if "single" or "unmarried" status was obtained through divorce, it certainly would not have been adultery for such people to then go on to marry someone else. But Jesus teaches otherwise. Since remarriage after divorce is adulterous, therefore divorce does not nullify a marriage.

Luke 16:15 And He said to them, "You are those who justify yourselves in the sight of men, but God knows your hearts; for that which is highly esteemed among men is detestable in the sight of God. 16" The Law and the Prophets were proclaimed until John; since that time the gospel of the kingdom of God has been preached, and everyone is forcing his way in to it. 17" But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one stroke of a letter of the Law to fail. 18" Everyone who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries one who is divorced from a husband commits adultery.

The second half of verse 18 speaks of a woman who did not take the active part in divorcing her husband, but rather was the one divorced by her husband, just like in Matthew 5:32, which says that he "makes her commit adultery" by divorcing her. There is no distinction between who left who, as far as adultery is concerned. Some teach that the "innocent" party can remarry, but they are contradicting our Lord and Savior, and causing others to commit adultery. There is no provision anywhere in the Bible for either party to remarry without committing adultery.

Jesus also teaches in Luke 16:18 that a man that marries a divorced woman is living in adultery. Even if he had never been married himself, because he's guilty of marrying another man's wife, even if the other man divorced her.

Some people claim that Deut. 24 shows that God tolerates divorce, but it is in fact regulating the practice that had been instituted in Deuteronomy 22:13-21.

Deuteronomy 24: 1-4 "When a man takes a wife and marries her, and it happens that she finds no favor in his eyes because he has found some indecency in her, and he writes her a certificate of divorce and puts it in her hand and sends her out from his house, and she leaves his house and goes and becomes another man's {wife,} and if the latter husband turns against her and writes her a certificate of divorce and puts it in her hand and sends her out of his house, or if the latter husband dies who took her to be his wife, {then} her former husband who sent her away is not allowed to take her again to be his wife, since she has been defiled; for that is an abomination before the LORD, and you shall not bring sin on the land which the LORD your God gives you as an inheritance.

The wording here is almost identical to Deuteronomy 22. The man found indecency (immorality) in her during the betrothal period. It has to be during the betrothal period because that's the only time he would be allowed under the law to give a writ of divorce. There is no new grounds for divorce offered here, but these verses are simply regulating an existing practice. He was therefore allowed to divorce her, since that was just grounds. She then became betrothed to another man. If that man gave her a writ, or died, the first man can't remarry her.

This new regulation states that a man is not required to have the woman stoned to death as Deut. 22 commanded, but could give her a writ of divorce instead. It also says that if he does divorce her legally, and she becomes another man's wife, he cannot change his mind and take her back later. He had the right to give her a writ under Jewish law, because h

he assumed she was a virgin, but found indecency in her. He still could have married her when he found out she was indecent, but chose to reject her. The principle being taught here is that if he rejected her then when he found her to be indecent, then he has no right to accept her later on, after she was with another man. The real meaning is prophetic, and reveals that God is not going to take Israel back for her immorality.

Sealed

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/13 16:26**

There is another thread labeled:  
Marriage/Divorce & Remarriage- What does God say about it?

Is this one different in content? or a newer one? you guys really threw me a curve here. :-?

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 16:33**

What SE does is to say that Deut 22 was amended by Deut 24:1-4 and that the woman found NOT a virgin is not to be put to death, but to be divorced from that point on.

One immediate problem that causes is that in Matt 19 Jesus would now be saying NO divorce for this 'fornication' or what they call PREmarital sex (betrothal sex by some).

The ridiculous error SE seems to miss is that after its all said and done, Jesus turns right around and gives EXCEPTION for this very fornication He supposedly just ended divorce concerning, thereby contradicting EVERYTHING He has supposedly just said.

preposterous.

Not to mention that Deut was given over approx 40 days...meaning that Deut 22 was given approx 3.5 days before Deut 24.

this would mean our Great wonderul, all-knowing God gave LAW concerning this woman not found a virgin, then being so absent minded AMENDED this law less than a month later.

Not only are these two BLATANT errors present, but also this means that the HUSBAND is the only person not able to have this wife put to death.

Deut 22:23-24 would STILL be effective meaning that ANYONE else who busted this wife for fornication could have her put to death :-?

SE is simply unwilling to try to harmonize ALL scripture in this matter.

It is my belief that he has been shown errant and sees the contradiction, but pride keeps him from re-evaluating what he believes.

We know all good bible students are always willing to accomodate new information and make every attempt to harmonize the WHOLE word of God.....well, theyre supposed to anyway

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/sealedeternalsbasicerror.html>

Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 16:43

Quote:  
-----The ridiculous error SE seems to miss is that after its all said and done, Jesus turns right around and gives EXCEPTION for this very fornication He supposedly just ended divorce concerning, thereby contradicting EVERYTHING He has supposedly just said.  
-----

That is not what I claim at all. Jesus was affirming the one exception in the Jewish Law for divorce and remarriage which was the discovery of sexual indecency at or before the consummation of the marriage which is described in detail in Deut 22:13-21, and says that God gave them this exception because of their hard heartedness. The reason He said this is that at this was God's legal justification to divorce Himself from Israel and become engaged to the Church. He was speaking to the Jewish people in the context of the verses in Matthew, and Matthew being a Levite wrote the Gospel to the Jews, which is why the exception is covered there, but absent from the other gospels.

Mark and Luke which were written to Gentiles say that there is no exception for anyone to divorce and remarry without committing adultery, because the Gentiles they were written to did not make betrothal covenants, so the Jewish exception wouldn't be applicable. To suggest that there is any scriptural grounds for divorce and remarriage is to deny the scriptural authority of Mark and Luke along with Paul's epistles, or to suggest that Jesus and Paul were heretics.

I Corinthians 7:39 A wife is bound as long as her husband lives; but if her husband is dead, she is free to be married to whom she wishes, only in the Lord.

Romans 7:2-3 For the married woman is bound by law to her husband while he is living; but if her husband dies, she is released from the law concerning the husband. So then, if while her husband is living she is joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband dies, she is free from the law, so that she is not an adulteress though she is joined to another man.

Mark 10:11 And He said to them, "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another woman commits adultery against her; 12 and if she herself divorces her husband and marries another man, she is committing adultery."

Luke 16:18 "Everyone who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries one who is divorced from a husband commits adultery.

If there is any legal justification for divorce, then none of these verses can be true.

Sealed

Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/5/13 16:43

Hi FOC,

Quote:  
-----Good catch Dorcas.  
-----

I'm not out to 'get' anyone. I'm aware of my own past failings as well as the grace of God to me personally, when I reply in these threads on marriage. I'll probably say more in the other thread which you brought back up, because I think I'd contributed to its earlier pages.

Re:, on: 2006/5/13 16:46

its exactly what you are saying.

Sorry SE, but Jesus lays out His rules, THEN gives His exception....thereby refuting your entire doctrinal stance.

NOWwhere does He ever state that it ONLY applies to Jewish betrothal....NO scripture EVER makes that claim....only you and your kind do.

Re:, on: 2006/5/13 16:46

Fornication (porneia G4202) cannot mean illicit sexual activity only 'during Jewish betrothal' as some try to state.

The word porneia (rendered 'fornication') is directed SPECIFICALLY to GENTILE converts in Acts 15 to tell them to abstain from 'fornication' (porneia G4202).

=====  
"Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God: But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood.  
(Act 15:19-20)

fornication

G4202

?????????

porneia

por-ni'-ah

From G4203; harlotry (including adultery and incest); figuratively idolatry: - fornication.

=====  
Since betrothal is a Jewish custom, using this word 'porneia' to instruct the gentiles means that porneia cannot in any way specifically mean, and limited to, sexual sin during the JEWISH betrothal period.

So we can know with absolute confidence that when our Lord says 'except for fornication' pertaining to divorce, that adultery is not committed upon REMarriage in such cases, that His exception applies to His followers, ALL of them, not just Jews....this is the truth that scripture as a whole provides.

HOME

1

Re:, on: 2006/5/13 16:47

-----  
Mark and Luke which were written to Gentiles  
-----

Matthew written to Jews, do the differences matter

Some state that because Matt. was written to Jews that the difference of the exception clause (Matthew 19:9 and 5:32...the part that says "except for fornication" (porneia) applied only to the Jews because of their betrothal customs. The assertion that because the exception clause is present in Matthew, yet not in Mark that it is only for Jews is absurd

y.

Lets look at the example of the empty tomb and see the great differences there. between these two writers.

Mat 28:2-6 And behold, a great earthquake occurred; for an angel of the Lord, having come down out of heaven, came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat on it. (3) And His appearance was like lightning, and his clothing as white as snow. (4) And the guards were shaken for fear of him, and became like dead men. (5) But the angel answered and said to the women, "Do not be afraid, for I know that you seek Jesus who was crucified. (6) He is not here! For He is risen, just as He said. Come; see the place where the Lord was lying.

Mar 16:5-8 And entering into the tomb, they saw a young man sitting on the right clothed with a white robe, and they were alarmed. (6) But he said to them, "Do not be alarmed. You are seeking Jesus the Nazarene, who was crucified. He has arisen! He is not here! See the place where they put Him. (7) But go, say to His disciples, and Peter, that He is going before you into Galilee; there you shall see Him, just as He said to you." (8) And going out, they fled from the tomb, but trembling and amazement held them; and they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid.

See how Marks description of the Angel(s) is lacking greatly compared to Matthews?

Marks writing seems many times to just be recording occurrences without adding a lot of detail.

Possibly why Mark is the shortest of the Gospels

Mark doesn't even mention this "Great Earthquake" that Matthew tells about.

So WHICH is right.....Mark to the Gentile, Matthew to the Jews ?

Was it One angel or two?

Did they appear like a young man in a white robe to Marks audience, or like lightening to Matthews?

Do these record TWO different events or one ?

Did the great earthquake happen according to Matthews account or not?

Was the earthquake taught to Jews and not to Gentiles ? Some would have to say as much by the way they teach that Matthew is written to Jews and Mark to Gentiles.

ALL of them are right, we take the TOGETHER in CONTEXT and find the HARMONY between them.

=====

We see other discrepancies, even among the SAME writer Luke in Acts.

And the men who were traveling with him stood speechless, hearing the voice but seeing no one.

(Act 9:7 EMTV)

versus

"And those who were with me observed the light and became terrified, but they did not hear the voice of the One speaking to me.

(Act 22:9 EMTV)

We have them hearing, but not seeing in chap 9, then just the opposite in chap 22.

Which is correct?

Possibly it's meaningless as that isn't the point of the text, but we can clearly see that even when it's the same writer discrepancies can occur, let alone a writer simply not recording every detail that another has.

=====

Matthew being written to Jews has NO bearing on this matter.

There are other books such as Hebrews to those Hebrew converts and James being written to those of the twelve tribes scattered abroad.

Will we say "these are written to Jew and therefore not for us gentiles" ?

Will we cast aside ANY teaching we don't like if it wasn't written to us gentiles specifically?

Jesus didn't SAY it was only for Jews and their betrothal year. He made one clear exception for divorce and remarriage... ONLY for whoredom or you commit adultery when you remarry.



We know this, God gives His law to humanity. He wants all people everywhere to obey Him. When God distinguishes that a rule is for one group and not the whole, He states it clearly (below about Levitical priests forbidden to take wives "put away").

Since Jesus did not specify that this only applied to Jews, there is no reason to think that it did. Since Jesus also did not specify "espoused wife" but clearly the word for "wife" was used, He must have been upholding that, as it always has, the sexual sins of the guilty break the conditional covenant of marriage. Jesus states we can put away a wife for this reason alone.

So we know that when some proclaim that Matthew was written to Jews, that it is irrelevant, it was written for the followers of Jesus Christ.

The rules apply evenly to all, the Jews do not receive some special ability to protect themselves from a whoring spouse while the rest of His children are left open to abuse. To state as much would be an absurdity.

\*IF\* it made ANY difference that Matthew had differences, then to follow proper rules of interpretation, we would have to do the same with EVERY book in the bible. Anything that was written to Jewish Christians would NOT apply to gentile Christians if it were not repeated in a book written TO Gentiles.

The fact is this is absurd.

The rules of Christianity are given to ALL of us, not some rules for this group and some to the other.

When you hear someone hand you a line like "Matthew was written to Jews and applies to the betrothal period" ask them to PROVE it conclusively...keeping in mind all the other material in this site.

They have not a single clear verse that makes the assertion...all they do is fill in the gaps with their own ideas, rejecting the facts in the matter as we have discussed on this website. (ex. Porneia being ALL inclusive of sexual sin and NOT just premarital sex)

HOME

1

Re:, on: 2006/5/13 16:51

-----  
If there is any legal justification for divorce, then none of these verses can be true.

-----  
Then you understand NOTHING concerning an 'exception'.

Let me ask....are you a sinner?  
Do you sin? Ever?

**1Jo 1:8 If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.**

If I use your logic then THIS passage CANNOT be true.

**1Jo 3:9 Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.**

Context, SE, context.....  
by your method of understanding those two passages MUST conflict.

**Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 16:57**

Quote:

-----Matthew written to Jews, do the differences matter  
-----

It matters a great deal when you are claiming that Jesus Christ is contradicting Himself. It is one thing to tell a consistent story with less details, and quite another to make two statements that are absolutely contradictory to one another.

"Whoever divorces his wife and marries another woman commits adultery...(Mark 10:11)

"Everyone who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery...(Luke 16:18)

"Everyone" and "whoever" are all inclusive statements that by definition mean there cannot be exceptions. Therefore you cannot reconcile an interpretation which says "not necessarily everyone" with these verses without having one or the other be in error.

Sealed

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 17:06**

:D :D

YOU are the one who is contradicting himself.  
Your whole teaching is a contradiction.  
You have been corrected by your own group and still refuse to accept this correction.

Sure we can reconcile the exception.  
It, by its very definition, opposes the normal rules....get it?...an EXCEPTION?

And again we state that \*IF\* you were correct, then Jesus has just done away with divorce for her not being found a virgin in Matt 19....  
THEN turned right around and made EXCEPTION for just that :D :D

your doctrine is what is contradicting itself, not our Lord

**Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 17:06**

Quote:

-----Then you understand NOTHING concerning an 'exception'.

Let me ask....are you a sinner?  
Do you sin? Ever?

1Jo 1:8 If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

If I use your logic then THIS passage CANNOT be true.

1Jo 3:9 Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.  
-----

If 1 John 3:9 were an accurate translation that would be a contradiction, but the NASB is more accurate in the translation in this case.

1Jo 3:9 No one who is born of God practices sin, because His seed abides in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.

It should say "No one who is born of God" abides continually in or practices sin. This is more consistent with the countless other verses that say that those who practice sin can not inherit God's Kingdom.

The problem is primarily in translation and is not a matter of God contradicting Himself. If you are correct in your interpretation of Jesus' statements in the Gospels regarding remarriage, then there is an irreconcilable contradiction in scripture, which obviously isn't the case.

Sealed

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 17:11**

Im sorry, but your NASB is not an accurate word for word rendering.

The greek words (dunamai,ou) there rendered as our 'cannot' appear in many other verses where they mean just that.... CANNOT...

cannot, 48

Mat\_5:14, Mat\_6:24, Mat\_7:18, Mat\_26:53, Mat\_27:42, Mar\_2:19, Mar\_3:24-26 (3), Mar\_7:18, Mar\_15:31, Luk\_11:7, Luk\_14:20, Luk\_14:26-27 (2), Luk\_14:33, Luk\_16:13, Luk\_16:26, Joh\_3:3, Joh\_3:5, Joh\_7:7, Joh\_7:34, Joh\_7:36, Joh\_8:21-22 (2), Joh\_8:43, Joh\_10:35, Joh\_13:33, Joh\_13:37, Joh\_14:17, Joh\_15:4, Joh\_16:12, Act\_4:16, Act\_4:20, Act\_5:39, Act\_15:1, Act\_27:31, Rom\_8:8, 1Co\_12:21 (3), 1Co\_15:50, 1Ti\_5:25, 2Ti\_2:13, Heb\_4:15, Heb\_9:5, Jam\_4:2, 1Jo\_3:9

Your version is faulty

but we also see that regardless of hard, word for word rendering, there is a CONTEXT that causes the NASB writers to make their rendering what it is.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 17:19**

Huh.

and HERE is what your NASB says in the exceptoin clauses.

Mat 5:32but I say to you that everyone who divorces his wife, **except for the reason of unchastity**, makes her commit adultery; and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.

Mat 19:9"And I say to you, whoever divorces his wife, **except for immorality**, and marries another woman commits adultery."

Nothing there about 'jewish betrothal' :-?

are you sure you want to keep using such a 'soft' version?

:-?

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 17:24**

SE

hey, did cindy (lastblast) send you over here?

the timing is very peculiar.

I show up, she disappears, then suddenly you come in and make your very first post.

Hard to believe it was a coincidence :-)

**Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 17:27**

Quote:  
-----The greek words (dunamai,ou) there rendered as our 'cannot' appear in many other verses where they mean just that....CANNOT...  
-----

He is talking about people who perpetually walk in their flesh verses walking in the light. Those who are of the flesh are not born of God, while those who walk in the Spirit are. It is not saying that those who are born of God will instantly achieve perfection. It is referring to our nature itself which is changed by God's regeneration. If there is no change in your nature, you are still a child of Satan, but if your mind has been renewed you are a child of God.

SealedEternal

**Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 17:29**

Quote:  
-----hey, did cindy (lastblast) send you over here?  
-----

No, I heard about this board on a radio show and had no idea you were going to be here.

Sealed

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 17:31**

I know exactly what he is talking about.  
but the WORD is Cannot whether you like it or not.  
It requires 'interpretation' understanding, and CONTEXT ..to understand fully.

The NASB writers hit it dead on, but they are NOT offering a precise, word for word, rendering...so DONT pretend like they are in your failing argument in this matter.

they rendered it according to CONTEXT, but the word IS 'cannot' according to the texts I have studied.

That same type of CONTEXT applies to your quoted passages showing that an EXCEPTION CAN exist along with the rule.

THAT is what an EXCEPTION is, SE, even if you dont get it. :-)

Quote:  
-----  
Sealed wrote:

Quote:  
-----The greek words (dunamai,ou) there rendered as our 'cannot' appear in many other verses where they mean just that....CANNOT...

-----  
He is talking about people who perpetually walk in their flesh verses walking in the light. Those who are of the flesh are not born of God, while those who walk in the Spirit are. It is not saying that those who are born of God will instantly achieve perfection. It is referring to our nature itself which is changed by God's regeneration. If there is no change in your nature, you are still a child of Satan, but if your mind has been renewed you are a child of God.

SealedEternal  
-----

**Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 17:33**

Quote:  
-----are you sure you want to keep using such a 'soft' version?  
-----

Yeah, I prefer it over the Baconian Rosicrucian translation.

Sealed

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 17:35**

...

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 17:37**

Quote:  
-----  
Sealed wrote:  
Quote:  
-----are you sure you want to keep using such a 'soft' version?  
-----

Yeah, I prefer it over the Baconian Rosicrucian translation.

Sealed  
-----

It seems you don't accept all that the NASB has to say then, because it no more states that 'fornication = illicit betrothal sex' than any other version does....

**Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 17:40**

Quote:  
-----It seems you don't accept all that the NASB has to say then, because it no more states that 'fornication = illicit betrothal sex' than any other version does....  
-----

No, but it does say that they are discussing the Mosaic Law, so the context can only be found there.

Sealed

Re:, on: 2006/5/13 17:42

Also, it seems that the NASB translators took a bit a personal freedom in rendering, from the exception clauses.

the word 'porneia' is present in BOTH of these verses, but the translators rendered it differently each time..

Mat 5:32but I say to you that everyone who divorces his wife, except for the reason of **unchastity**, makes her commit adultery; and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.

Mat 19:9"And I say to you, whoever divorces his wife, except for **immorality**, and marries another woman commits adultery."

Now, \*IF\* your translation were so 'perfect' and actually a true 'word for word' rendering, then those should BOTH be the EXACT same word....as both are 'porneia' (g4202) in the greek.

Just a side note....

Re:, on: 2006/5/13 17:45

Quote:  
-----  
Sealed wrote:  
  
Quote:  
-----It seems you dont accept all that the NASB has to say then, because it no more states that 'fornication = illicit betrothal sex' than any other version does....  
-----

No, but it does say that they are discussing the Mosaic Law, so the context can only be found there.

Sealed  
-----

Thats right...because WHO is Jesus talking to?  
The very Jews that Moses had given free reign to put away their wives.

So Jesus clearly does away with what they understand as 'for EVERY cause' divorce, explaining WHY Moses had permitted it....and how God had intended it as well.

THEN Jesus gives an EXCEPTION for FORNICATION !

If we believed your way, then He has just made exceptoin for the very thing He supposedly has ended.

Is this making sense, SE?  
Ive really tried to patiently explain this to you so many times now that I dont know what else to add....

Re:, on: 2006/5/13 17:49

to add...interesting enough MY version DOES use the same word in both cases.....fornication. :-)

Quote:  
-----

FOC wrote:  
Also, it seems that the NASB translators took a bit a personal freedom in rendering, from the exception clauses.

the word 'porneia' is present in BOTH of these verses, but the translators rendered it differently each time..

Mat 5:32but I say to you that everyone who divorces his wife, except for the reason of **unchastity**, makes her commit adultery; and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.

Mat 19:9 "And I say to you, whoever divorces his wife, except for **immorality**, and marries another woman commits adultery."

Now, \*IF\* your translation were so 'perfect' and actually a true 'word for word' rendering, then those should BOTH be the EXACT same word....as both are 'porneia' (g4202) in the greek.

Just a side note....  
-----

**Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 17:51**

Quote:  
-----Now, \*IF\* your translation were so 'perfect' and actually a true 'word for word' rendering, then those should BOTH be the EXACT same word....as both are 'porneia' (g4202) in the greek.  
-----

Translating is not an exact science. Often there are numerous synonyms which all capture the essential meaning of a Greek word, and other times there is no equivalent term that exactly captures it. I believe the NASB accurately captures the essence of the original text, as does the KJV in most cases. I prefer the language of the NASB in general for Bible study, but also consult the KJV and other tools to try to discern God's original intent, which occasionally cannot be fully captured in one English translation. I have never claimed that this translation or any other is perfect, and believe that such claims for any translation are foolish.

SealedEternal

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 17:55**

Quote:  
-----Translating is not an exact science.  
-----

See, I knew I could lead you right where I wanted you ;-)

So, you agree that we have to see if the CONTEXT might make more sense of a word then?

Huh...and since MY passage basically says we CANNOT sin once born of God, then I MUST see what the WHOLE word of God says on this matter to know the WHOLE truth.

It is no different in the case of your anti-remarriage passages.  
They MUST be understood within the WHOLE of God's council.

You believe in the exception, SE, you simply alter the meaning for 'porneia' to fit your doctrine in which you show that God AMENDED a law for sexual sins less than a month later ..and also seem to believe that Jesus ENDED divorce for fornication then turned right around and made EXCEPTION for just that very sin ...

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 18:00**

How long do you want to do this repetition here, brother SE?

You and I have pretty much nowhere else to take our discussion.

Folks can read your site...they can read mine....and draw their own conclusions.



Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 18:09

I have always believed in the importance of context. The problem with your position is that you cause God to seem to contradict Himself, which cannot ever be put into context. Two contradictory statements will simply never conform to one another no matter what. "Everyone" cannot be put in context with "not necessarily everyone."

What you have opted to do is to interpret these two sets of verses in a way that causes them to contradict one another, and then to choose the interpretation you like, and disregard the one you don't. That is not good Bible Hermeneutics, and it is how virtually every false doctrine is defended. Proper Bible interpretation causes all of scripture to fit together in harmony.

Sealed

Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 18:11

Quote:

-----Folks can read your site...they can read mine....and draw their own conclusions.  
-----

Agreed. I'll talk to you some other time in the next forum.

SE

Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/5/13 18:20

NB: THIS POST WAS EDITED ON 17th May, 2006 at 1415h BST (UK)

Hello again, Sealed,

I have read the first part of your very long post, and am at last, beginning to understand that there is a fundamental confusion in the way you are using, not the Greek, but the English.

It is some of this which I'm going to address, up to your paragraph which ends

Quote:

----- Christian teachers tear these verses out of context in order to create a loophole for divorce and remarriage.  
-----

Quote:

-----**Therefore, If anyone remarries while their spouse is still alive**, God says it's not a legitimate marriage in His eyes, but actually an adulterous relationship, and you will be judged as an adulterer if continue in your sin.  
-----

Yes, this is true for those who commit adultery and are then divorced by the spouse whom they have wronged. This is completely in keeping with what Jesus said in Matthew 19:9 And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for **porneia**, and shall marry another, committeth **moicheia**: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit **moicheia**.

Jesus is saying that once a marriage covenant has been broken by one spouse, **the other spouse is not bound to take the adulterer back into marriage union**.

**"Therefore, If anyone remarries while their spouse is still alive",**

Brother, you simply cannot make this sweeping generalisation in the face of Matt 19:9. It is disingenuous in the extreme. The whole point of Matt 19:9 is that Jesus is **separating** between the spouse who has been faithful and the spouse who has been unfaithful. The unfaithful spouse is the one who has removed him or herself from the benefit of the marriage covenant and Jesus clearly suggests that they are entirely at the mercy of the spouse who has not committed adultery.

I know there are men and women who will never let the person who committed adultery, forget it. They use that moment

of indiscretion as a rod with which to beat the person who was unfaithful, making their life a misery. Do you think that God does not see every single abuse committed by a spouse who was faithful to the marriage covenant in fact but not in spirit? Do you think that just because he or she is not an adulterer, God will not judge every other sin by whether they have been washed in the blood of the Lamb, now? Jesus died for every sin, including porneia and moicheia, but, He had not yet died when He was answering the Pharisees.

God Himself divorced Israel for committing spiritual adultery. Let us not forget that the whole concept of marriage is based on the union within the Godhead, and God's desire to prepare a wife for His Son.

Jeremiah 3:8

And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.

At the point in time when Jesus is speaking, He has not yet died for our sin, the Holy Spirit has not been given, and everything about the state of heart of Israel is out of synch with God's heart, except for those who have responded to John the Baptist's call for repentance and giving baptism as an outward sign of such a change of heart (and later, Jesus' own call to the same gospel).

Quote:  
-----These two sections of scripture, make it clear that divorce and remarriage are adultery, with one exception which is immorality or unchastity. Many people misunderstand the exception clause that Jesus gives here, and try to use these verses to suggest that Jesus is allowing divorce if someone commits adultery. This cannot be true for many reasons.  
-----

OK. This is where you start to lose the plot, I believe. You say "These two sections of scripture, make it clear that divorce and remarriage are adultery, with one exception which is immorality or unchastity."

Actually, it is the other way round, and that's why much of what you (and others in the unconditional matrimony lobby) are confused. Jesus is saying that divorce and remarriage is NOT adultery, unless the divorced person - that is, not the Plaintiff but the Respondent - remarries. Then both he or she and his or her spouse are committing adultery, because, the person who committed adultery first, when they were still married to their first spouse, is the person who **should remain unmarried** as a punishment for their sin .... that is, He is saying they do not need to be stoned to death any more, nor does the person with whom they committed adultery. This is a HUGE step forward, for the ministration of mercy from the throne of grace towards the sinner; it is also completely in keeping with the Mosaic law, where, if the adulterer had been stoned to death, the faithful spouse would be free to remarry anyway, now being widow or a widower.

See? Jesus was not making a mistake, and neither are the Bible teachers who understand the spirit of Jesus' teaching here (Matt 19:9)

'This cannot be true for many reasons.' Only because you are trying to make scripture back up a tradition of man, can you suggest this, but, there is no scriptural ground for this assertion. Believe me, brother, I know what it is like to think I could fix someone else's marriage, but the moment I had to leave my own, I realised something about marriage which is never discussed here - that it is private. It is completely humiliating to even begin to put into words the ugliness which can take place in the bedroom, (and other rooms sometimes), and while God is a witness to it all, there is no need, or requirement by Him to describe or discuss it with others afterwards. A spouse who leaves a marriage has their reasons and is often completely beyond recall with the effort they have put into making the marriage what it should be. Onlookers have no rights to judge whether the departing spouse is right or wrong, only to respect them for maintaining their own integrity.

God does not require a faithful spouse to continue in a sexual union with a fornicator or an adulterer, because God Himself does not continue in relationship with fornicators and adulterers. ONLY if there is GENUINE repentance and a change of course by the one who broke the marriage covenant, is there the slightest glimmer of hope for a meaningful reconciliation, but, even that cannot be at the beck and call of others. Broken hearts take time to mend.

Quote:  
-----The context of these verses are of the Pharisees (Jewish law experts) asking "why did Moses command....?"  
-----

Here is another mistake in your thinking. Jesus listens to their question, and then corrects their choice of verb.

Matt 19:7

They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? 8 He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts **suffered** you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.

Quote:

-----These two different words with two different meanings clearly describe two different acts.

YES!

**Porneia** IS different from **moicheia**, when compared with each other, but, it is not possible to commit **moicheia**, without committing **porneia**.

EDIT: **Moicheia** starts with a thought, and that thought, is **porneia** - LUST.

Matthew 5:28

But I say to you, That whosoever looks on a woman to lust after her has committed adultery with her already in his heart.

**Porneia** could also take place *within* in a marriage. For instance, sodomy perpetrated against a wife would be grounds for his divorce, **by her**.

**Porneia** between a **married person and any other**, therefore, is **moicheia**. It does not matter what kind of **porneia** the unfaithful spouse commits, or with whom; **it is the departing from faithfulness to her or his spouse, which is being highlighted in the word moicheia**.

Note, a single person committing sexual sin with a married person, is also committing adultery **against** the married person's spouse, by violating the marriage covenant of the married person. Therefore, when you say

Quote:

-----If Jesus meant adultery, He surely would have used the term for adultery -- "moichao."

I completely agree with you. Jesus was *not* confused about the meaning of the word **moicheia**, for 'adultery'.

So **porneia** committed between married people not married to each other, a married person and a single person, two single people, and between homosexuals or other perversions, covers every kind of sexual sin. Jesus used the all-encompassing word **porneia**. DELIBERATELY. EDIT end

In case you're wondering, then, a fornicator is someone who commits **porneia**. It doesn't matter who he or she commits it with, but, if it is with a married person, or a person who has been divorced by a faithful spouse for his or her infidelity, the word for adultery - **moicheia** - is appropriate for BOTH PARTIES engaging in **porneia**.

If both parties are also married, they are committing **moicheia** against both their own spouse to whom they are being unfaithful, **and** the other fornicator's spouse.

I hope you are much clearer now, as to what Jesus was trying to achieve by the exception which He knew was NECESSARY for the mental health and / or, physical well-being of both the faithful and the unfaithful spouse.

The idea that **God** was somehow mistaken in being able to divide between the sin or righteousness of marriage partners, concerns me. This is the God before whom all things are naked and open, whose double-edged sword can divide between the thoughts and intents of the heart, as between the spirit and the soul, or the bone and the marrow, whose thoughts and ways are higher than ours, whose mercy endures for ever. Amen.

Hebrews 4:11 - 16

Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief. For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.

Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our

profession. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need. (KJV)

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/13 18:21**

And in this corner weighing in at () is FOC the reigning heavy weight champion of the Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective thread, and over here in this corner we have the contender "Sealed" weighing in at () Gentleman or Gentle Women you should protect yourselves all the times during the debate and always use nice words that edify, Build up, and encourage, let there be no words that are unwholesome, offensive, useless, worthless or unprofitable—fit for nothing but the trash heap, are you will be disqualified, now lets have a good debate and shall the best person be humbled, in Jesus name.

:-)

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 18:24**

Quote:

Sealed wrote:

I have always believed in the importance of context. The problem with your position is that you cause God to seem to contradict Himself, which cannot ever be put into context.

:D

an EXCEPTION by its very nature is a contradiction of the rules....get it yet, SE...."EXCEPT" in this case, these are the rules"....make sense?

but in your doctrine Jesus seemingly UNWITTINGLY contradicts himself by disallowing divorce for what you believe is illicit betrothal sex (due to your distortion), then He turns right around in Matt 19 and offers the very men He has just taken this supposed allowance from the very thing He has just supposedly removed....divorce for fornication.

this doctrine is a walking contradiction.

Quote:

----- Two contradictory statements will simply never conform to one another no matter what.  
-----

I believe we just covered this issue from 1 John.

and youre dead wrong.

Two contradictory statements CAN be in perfect agreement WHEN an EXCEPTION is in place giving allowance to the other.

Quote:

-----"Everyone" cannot be put in context with "not necessarily everyone."  
-----

"EVERYONE can go.... EXCEPT if the dishes arent done...then not necessarily everyone will go."

Sorry, youre simply wrong, SE.

There rest is now irrelevant.

**Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 18:31**

Quote:  
-----Jesus is saying that once a marriage covenant has been broken by one spouse, the other spouse is not bound to take the adulterer back into marriage union.  
-----

The covenant is until death, and not until adultery.

I Corinthians 7:39 A wife is bound as long as her husband lives; but if her husband is dead, she is free to be married to whom she wishes, only in the Lord.

Romans 7:2-3 For the married woman is bound by law to her husband while he is living; but if her husband dies, she is released from the law concerning the husband. So then, if while her husband is living she is joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband dies, she is free from the law, so that she is not an adulteress though she is joined to another man.

That's why Jesus says that "Everyone who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery" (Luke 16:18, Mark 10:11) If there were any way to end a marriage other than death, then everyone who divorced and remarried couldn't be guilty of adultery.

Sealed

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 18:34**

Quote:  
-----  
Sealed wrote:

Quote:  
-----Jesus is saying that once a marriage covenant has been broken by one spouse, the other spouse is not bound to take the adulterer back into marriage union.  
-----

The covenant is until death, and not until adultery.

I Corinthians 7:39 A wife is bound as long as her husband lives; but if her husband is dead, she is free to be married to whom she wishes, only in the Lord.

Romans 7:2-3 For the married woman is bound by law to her husband while he is living; but if her husband dies, she is released from the law concerning the husband. So then, if while her husband is living she is joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband dies, she is free from the law, so that she is not an adulteress though she is joined to another man.

That's why Jesus says that "Everyone who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery" (Luke 16:18, Mark 10:11) If there were any way to end a marriage other than death, then everyone who divorced and remarried couldn't be guilty of adultery.

Sealed

-----

except for fornication..whoredom....where the spouse is ALREADY an adulterer.

Does this add up yet?

Who is guilty of 'adultery' is those who put her away EXCEPT for fornication and remarry.

and you've yet to PROVE that this adultery is perpetual.

Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 18:38

Quote:  
-----Do you think that just because he or she is not an adulterer, God will not judge every other sin by whether they have been washed in the blood of the Lamb, now? Jesus died for every sin, including porneia and moicheia, but, He had not yet died when He was answering the Pharisees.  
-----

Jesus did not die to give anyone a license to practice adultery, in fact He said that those who do so are not His children, and cannot inherit His Kingdom.

Hebrews 13:4 Marriage is to be held in honor among all, and the marriage bed is to be undefiled; for fornicators and adulterers God will judge.

I Corinthians 6:9-10 Or do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, will inherit the kingdom of God.

You can be forgiven if you repent of your sin, which means to forsake it. Then He can regenerate your heart so that you will not practice sin anymore. If you continue to practice adultery, God's word says you are born of Him.

Sealed

Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/5/13 18:44

Hi Sealed,

I think you misread your quote of me. I said

'Do you think that just because he or she is **not an adulterer**, God will not judge every other sin by whether they have been washed in the blood of the Lamb, now?'

I did not suggest there is licence for adultery. I suggested there is NOT licence for making an unfaithful spouse's life a misery (and other sins).

Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 18:46

Quote:  
-----OK. This is where you start to lose the plot, I believe. You say "These two sections of scripture, make it clear that divorce and remarriage are adultery, with one exception which is immorality or unchastity."  
-----

Actually, it is the other way round, and that's why much of what you (and others in the unconditional matrimony lobby) are confused. Jesus is saying that at divorce and remarriage is NOT adultery, unless the divorced person - that is, not the Plaintiff but the Respondent - remarries.  
-----

That's not what the text says at all. Jesus and the Pharisees both agree in these verses that it is the Mosaic Law being discussed here. I explained in detail how these verses fit perfectly with the law. Your interpretation is contradictory to the Jewish law, and also is an obvious contradiction to similar statements made by Jesus in other Gospels, as well as sever

al statements by Paul. You are tearing these verses out of context and contradicting much of the Bible in regard to marriage.

Sealed

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/5/13 18:48**

Quote:  
-----You can be forgiven if you repent of your sin, which means to forsake it. Then He can regenerate your heart so that you will not practice sin anymore. If you continue to practice adultery, God's word says you are born of Him.  
-----

I believe you meant to say the Bible says you are NOT born of Him, if you continue to practise adultery (or fornication, homosexuality, or other sins).

**Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 18:55**

Quote:  
-----God Himself divorced Israel for committing spiritual adultery. Let us not forget that the whole concept of marriage is based on the union within the Godhead, and God's desire to prepare a wife for His Son.  
-----

He divorced Israel for spiritual immorality during the betrothal, which is why He made Deut 22 & 24 to begin with. Jesus says the Law of divorce was given due to the hardness of their hearts. Since they refused to soften their hearts to God, he made a New Covenant with the Church where he regenerates our hearts so that we desire to be faithful to Him.

Sealed

**Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 18:57**

Quote:  
-----I believe you meant to say the Bible says you are NOT born of Him, if you continue to practise adultery (or fornication, homosexuality, or other sins).  
-----

Oops. You're correct. thanks.

**Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2006/5/13 19:00**

Quote:  
-----I think you misread your quote of me. I said

'Do you think that just because he or she is not an adulterer, God will not judge every other sin by whether they have been washed in the blood of the Lamb, now?'

I did not suggest there is licence for adultery. I suggested there is NOT licence for making an unfaithful spouse's life a misery (and other sins).  
-----

Sorry, my mistake. I agree that we should forgive even our enemies, much less our own flesh.

Sealed



Re:, on: 2006/5/13 19:12

Quote:

That's not what the text says at all. Jesus and the Pharisees both agree in these verses that it is the Mosaic Law being discussed here. I explained in detail how these verses fit perfectly with the law. Your interpretation is contradictory to the Jewish law, and also is an obvious contradiction to similar statements made by Jesus in other Gospels, as well as several statements by Paul. You are tearing these verses out of context and contradicting much of the Bible in regard to marriage.

Sealed

That's right, they WERE discussing Mosaic law and what he had permitted, for EVERY cause divorce.

then AFTER Jesus is finished explaining He makes an EXCEPTION that shows NO adultery is committed upon marrying another IF the exception applies.

come on SE, this isn't that hard.

Re:, on: 2006/5/13 19:18

Quote:

He divorced Israel for spiritual immorality during the betrothal, which is why He made Deut 22 & 24 to begin with. Jesus says the Law of divorce was given due to the hardness of their hearts. Since they refused to soften their hearts to God, He made a New Covenant with the Church where He regenerates our hearts so that we desire to be faithful to Him.

Sealed

It is irrelevant that you say He divorced her during betrothal.

YOU have yourself admitted that betrothal is LAWFULLY MARRIED and as such a LAWFUL wife is being put away.

NOTHING EVER states that this exception ONLY applies to betrothal....YOU add that.

And I believe we've proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that this 'fornication' (porneia) Jesus speaks of is NOT applicable to Jews and their marital customs alone...

exhibit A...

Quote:

Fornication (porneia G4202) cannot mean illicit sexual activity only 'during Jewish betrothal' as some try to state.

The word porneia (rendered 'fornication') is directed SPECIFICALLY to GENTILE converts in Acts 15 to tell them to abstain from 'fornication' (porneia G4202).

=====  
"Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God: But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood.  
(Act 15:19-20)

fornication

G4202

????????

porneia

por-ni'-ah

From G4203; harlotry (including adultery and incest); figuratively idolatry: - fornication.

=====

Since betrothal is a Jewish custom, using this word 'porneia' to instruct the gentiles means that porneia cannot in any way specifically mean, and limited to, sexual sin during the JEWISH betrothal period.

So we can know with absolute confidence that when our Lord says 'except for fornication' pertaining to divorce, that adultery is not committed upon REMARRIAGE in such cases, that His exception applies to His followers, ALL of them, not just Jews....this is the truth that scripture as a whole provides.  
<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/fornicationnotonlyduringbetrothal.html>

-----

YOU are the one who is making the claim that this 'fornication' ONLY applies to Jews....and we see that this idea is erroneous entirely.

Not to mention that I bet MOST of the folks who read this thread will see the terrible contradictions I've pointed out to you, seeing that I'm no theologian and most folks are probably smarter than I am.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 19:26**

Did Jesus say "wife" or "espoused" wife

In His exception clause, Jesus is clearly referring to a lawful wife. If Jesus had been only referring to the betrothal period in the exception clause, He would have used the very term used for Mary at times...."espoused wife" or "espoused" (see G3423) in His exception clause.

\*IF\* He were restricting His exception to the betrothal period, there is no reason to believe that our Lord would have been so vague about it.

The fact is NOTHING presented in scripture backs this silly assertion by some who say that Jesus only meant to except the betrothed wife.

This is all deceptive propaganda created to further a false doctrine... this idea does not come from God's word.

Jesus clearly used the word that means "wife" or woman. A man's woman was his wife. She was his lawful wife from the moment the marriage was contracted. The betrothed wife was a lawful wife.

Jesus being a Jew and being God, knew this.

When He said "wife" He was referring to whoredom of a wife, pre or post consummation.

(compare Matt 19:9 and 5:32 with Luke 2:5)

Conclusion:

Jesus could have said "espoused" or "betrothed" ("mne?steuo?" as is used for Mary) in His exception, yet He chose to use the normal word for a 'wife'(gune?) in Matthew 19.

If Jesus WAS discerning one OVER the other, His ACTUAL words would be pertaining to the consummated wife and not the betrothed at all.

But seeing that the betrothed wife was lawfully contracted in marriage, she was just as much a 'wife' for legal and religious reasons as the consummated wife.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/13.html>

Re:, on: 2006/5/13 20:28

Quote:

Sealed wrote:

He divorced Israel for spiritual immorality during the betrothal, which is why He made Deut 22 & 24 to begin with.

Now, since when do you get to decide what the motivations were pertaining to Deut 22 and 24?

Deut 22 is clearly about the sexual sins of the wife...betrothed and consummated are both covered.  
Deut 24 says nothing of the sort and is your doctrinal downfall.

As i said, Deut was given over approx 40 days from my understanding.

So you are saying that God gave law for the sexual sins of a wife on one day, then less than a month later, most likely no more than a week, He decides, 'hey wait, scratch that Moses, I change my mind' .....and AMENDS Deut 22... BUT ONLY for the husband.

ANYONE else who finds this wife a cheating is still permitted to have her brutally killed as per Deut 22:23-24.

This is a bit hard for us to swallow SE.

**Fact:** The pharisees speaking to Jesus understood Deut 24:1-4 to be 'for EVERY cause' divorce.

**Fact:** Jesus never corrected this interpretation as He had done with them on occasion telling them they 'err'pertaining to their FALSE understanding

(they did slip in their own twist by making it a 'command' rather than a permission)

**Logical conclusion:** this "hardhearted" divorce being spoken of isn't concerning putting away for her not being found a virgin, but 'for EVERY cause' just as God's word CLEARLY states.

This conclusion is backed by God's word and very clearly supported by the history of the Jews pertaining to marriage.

Quote:

----- Jesus says the Law of divorce was given due to the hardness of their hearts. Since they refused to soften their hearts to God,  
-----

That is correct.

The Jews had tormented their wives, even killing them if able so Moses permitted EASY (for EVERY cause) divorce.  
The Jews then distorted THAT permission into a 'commandment' to divorce upon every trifling occasion.

as you said, Jesus is speaking to JEWS in THEIR context.

THEIR context pertaining to marriage and putting away was the above....hardhearted to the core.

That is the hardheartedness that caused that covenant (Mosaic economy) with a whoring spouse to be put away.

Jesus then adds 'EXCEPT for fornication'....ONLY if she has BROKEN the covenant can you put her away and remarry and not commit adultery against her upon remarriage.

Quote:

----- he made a New Covenant with the Church where he regenerates our hearts so that we desire to be faithful to Him.  
-----

Sealed

Thats right.

Our God is Himself a divorcee...having put away a covenant with Israel over ongoing whoredoms and idolotries.

He knows exactly the pain caused by a hardhearted spouse...which is why Jesus' own exception harmonizes PERFECTLY with the whole of God's word...

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/5/17 10:20**

I have edited my long post on p6, in the second half, clearly marked, not saying anything new but rewording quite a few sentences, in the hope of the content being clearer.

Please let me know if this is not so. Thanks. :-}

Hi Sealed,

I do intend to read the rest of your post and decide whether to reply.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/18 11:11**

Quote:

Hi Sealed,

I do intend to read the rest of your post and decide whether to reply.

Depending on whether it is Mr or Mrs Sealed you may or may not get any more response. Sometimes she begins a conversation and then he comes in at a later point. That is how I found out there were two of them.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/5/18 18:23**

Hi FOC,

If you have not read the edited part of my post on p6, please do, since you revived this thread. I've found it helpful to express some of my recently-found clarity on these matters, so I'd be interested if you have any comments.

Quote:

-----you may or may not get any more response.

As long as the discussion is a genuine attempt to understand biblical morality, with the intention of encouraging its practice in 3D, the exercise is useful - whoever responds.

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/18 20:30**

Quote:

-----divorce and remarriage is NOT adultery, unless the divorced person - that is, not the Plaintiff but the Respondent - remarries. Then both he or she and his or her spouse are committing adultery, because, the person who committed adultery first, when they were still married to their first spouse, is the person who should remain unmarried as a punishment for their sin

Dorcas, that is not what Jesus spoke. How do you fit that reasoning in with Paul's teaching that it is not due to punishment that a woman is prohibited from remarriage, but because the BOND of marriage to a first husband remains intact until that husband dies? (Rom. 7:2-3, I Cor. 7:39) I think in order to say that one is "free" to marry again, they have to show biblical evidence that the marriage bond is dissolved in the eyes of God.....and if that be the case, then ALL parties would be free to remarry. "Punishing" a person and yet saying a person is a partaker of God's Grace and forgiveness is completely at odds---at least to my thinking on what true Grace and forgiveness is.

Quote:

-----ONLY if there is GENUINE repentance and a change of course by the one who broke the marriage covenant, is there the slightest

limmer of hope for a meaningful reconciliation, but, even that cannot be at the beck and call of others. Broken hearts take time to mend.

Exactly, yet what you would say is OK with the Lord(remarrying another while one has a living spouse) flies in the face of what you just spoke above. To remarry says that I WILL NOT allow healing to occur with the possibility of RECONCILIATION with the one God joined me to---the offense is just too great and I am not willing to wait until they come to full repentance. I would ask this: is THIS the mind/heart of Jesus Christ toward the sinner? Does He wash His hands of us BEFORE the day of judgment?

We want to demand time to HEAL from hurts, bitterness, anger, etc (some of which are very sinful things to deal with), but concerning the "sinful" one, we don't want to allow time for repentance---full and genuine, to take place. We want to get on with life. If we grab hold of this mindset, are we walking in the light---as HE is in the light?

One more thing to ponder: What better person than one who is called by His name, to stand in the gap(intercede) for the one HE joined them to when they sin (whatever that sin may)? Is that not a reflection of Christ towards His Body? Blessings in Him, Cindy :-)

Re:, on: 2006/5/18 22:58

Quote:  
-----lastblast:  
(Rom. 7:2-3, I Cor. 7:39)  
-----

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/6.html>

Quote:  
-----Exactly, yet what you would say is OK with the Lord(remarrying another while one has a living spouse) flies in the face of what you just spoke above. To remarry says that I WILL NOT allow healing to occur with the possibility of RECONCILIATION with the one God joined me to---the offense is just too great and I am not willing to wait until they come to full repentance. I would ask this: is THIS the mind/heart of Jesus Christ toward the sinner? Does He wash His hands of us BEFORE the day of judgment?  
-----

What exposes your false doctrine is that you allow for this very thing when it is a betrothed WIFE (which is a lawful WIFE indeed), then disallow it when it is a consummated wife. Scripture does not make this distinction...YOU do.

Your false doctrine ALLOWS this supposed hardheartedness (divorce for whoredom ?) to be given to a betrothed WIFE, then rejects it only because she is consummated.

Whats hilarious is NOTHING in scripture makes this distinction...and \*IF\* it does, I challenge you PERSONALLY to present it !

None of the wording, greek nor english, backs your assertion.  
Your "evidence" has been exposed as not backing a single thing either for or against your argument (hosea/gomer, herod/herodias, Joseph/Mary, etc)

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/18.html>  
<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/19.html>  
<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/8.html>

You folks permit hardheartedness against a wife just as quickly as you claim that we do....you simply alter the details to try to disguise this fact.

And by your actions and words, your doctrine permits a far more heinous crime against women in general by forcing them to be forever bound to an animal who even beats and rapes not only them, but even their own daughters.

This doctrine has completely missed firstly what Moses did by allowing frivolous (for EVERY cause) divorce, and then a gain missed what Jesus was doing in restricting it again.

Ive pointed this out to you all about 1000 times now...when you figure out that BOTH were "protecting" the INNOCENT s pouse, hopefully some enlightenment will occur.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/18 23:27**

Lastblast...would you care to discuss your doctrinal views publically with me here?

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/5/19 0:04**

Cindy,

Very briefly.

The Lord Himself did not put a burden on the faithful spouse, to receive back an adulterous partner. That may be because many times the adulterous partner has left the faithful spouse in her or his heart, and there may be good reasons for that.

God Himself allows that He should not take back an adulterous partner after a certain amount of adultery, unspecified, because He Himself could not stomach it.

Your stance refuses to accept the word of Jesus Christ Himself, as to what is, and what is not acceptable to God, by **ad ding** to God's word what He did not say.

There is liberty for a believer to find their own level in this, in line with what Jesus allowed, whether it fits in with *your* belief system, or not.

**Re: Mrriage, Divorce and ReMarriage, on: 2006/5/19 7:21**

I have a question for anyone who'd care to answer it.

When Jesus quoted (in Matt 19:6)

'What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.'

who do you think the 'man' is, to whom He was referring?

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/19 8:03**

Quote:

-----ALL parties would be free to remarry.

-----

Cindy,

Of course you are right. I was forgetting that the unfaithful spouse would have been divorced, and therefore free to remarry.

However, without repentance toward God, and His forgiveness, he or she would still have adultery on their conscience. But, I am convinced that reconciliation with the faithful spouse is not compulsory.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/19 8:46

Quote:  
-----God Himself allows that He should not take back an adulterous partner after a certain amount of adultery, unspecified, because He Himself could not stomach it.  
-----

Dorcas,

Could you provide me with scripture showing the Lord's words on this? What comes to my mind when reading your post is the passage our Lord spoke concerning forgiving 70x7 times. Blessings in Him, Cindy

PS. I do know of a Church Father's writing on this very issue which states what you do, but even in that instance, remarriage is forbidden for the "innocent" spouse and spoken of adultery on THEIR part (The Shepherd of Hermas).

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/19 8:50

Quote:  
-----reconciliation with the faithful spouse is not compulsory.  
-----

Yes, and I think Paul discussed this one very clearly: the one who has departed must remain unmarried. That is the alternative to reconciliation, though I believe the Lord's ultimate goal is humbling all and bringing all to repentance so that those whom HE joined together are walking in unity as He desires. Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/19 9:33

Quote:  
-----Your false doctrine ALLOWS this supposed hardheartedness (divorce for whoredom ?) to be given to a betrothed WIFE, then rejects it only because she is consummated.  
-----

I make no such distinction FOC. Scripture appears to have allowed Jewish men to put away their espoused wives for premarital infidelity (see Mt. 1:18-24). Joseph was said to be "just", so it appears for him it would not have been hardheartedness, or do you disagree?

As to clinging to the "exception clause" meaning betrothal infidelity, I don't know if I can do that. I now lean much more heavily in the belief that porneia relates to UNLAWFUL (illicit sexual) marriages contracted (homosexual, adulterous, and incestual). THOSE types of marriages are the only ones that can be put away because God never joined them to begin with. It would NOT be hardhearted to put such away, it would be walking in obedience to the Lord's commands/laws. It was my dialogue with you on Family Life concerning Herod and Herodias which really brought me further down the road in this belief.

For me, if Jesus was saying, in fact, that ONLY UNLAWFUL marriages (homosexual, incestual, adulterous) contracted could be put away and the parties be blameless in His sight, it would then fit perfectly with Rom. 7:2-3 which shows that neither adultery nor a remarriage will dissolve a LAWFUL union joined by God Himself. Blessings in Him, Cindy



Re:, on: 2006/5/19 12:14

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

I make no such distinction FOC.

Sure you do.

The exception clause DOESNT use the word required to SPECIFICALLY state 'espoused wife' (mne&#772;steuo&#772;G3423)....so yes...YOU and your false doctrine ADD that distinction.

Quote:

-----Scripture appears to have allowed Jewish men to put away their espoused wives for premarital infidelity (see Mt. 1:18-24).

Im sorry, where again does scripture EVER state this?

Mary and Joseph lived under MOSAIC LAW where Deut was in effect.

Deut 22 says BOTH the betrothed wife (Deut 22:23-24) AND the consummated wife (Deut 22:22) were to be put to DEATH....not divorced.

Are you sure you have understood Gods word on this matter?

Gods word is CLEAR in this.

Any other scenario you present is your own addition to that word.

Quote:

-----Joseph was said to be "just", so it appears for him it would not have been hardheartedness, or do you disagree?

Joseph was just in that he didnt want to subject Mary to what might happen to her. Both in shame and possibly death...to keep from making a 'public example' of her.

**Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a publick example, was minded to put her away privily.  
(Mat 1:19)**

Nothing is said of 'hardheartedness' as Joseph wasnt about to put her away 'for EVERY (any) cause' but had justification in that he believed she had played the harlot (to which the penalty under GODS law was death...Deut 22). There is NOTHING in His word that says Joe couldnt have done the exact same thing post consummation...and you lie if you say there is.

READERS please see....

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/fornicationnotonlyduringbetrothal.html>

You know where this will end, dont you cindy?

Quote:

-----As to clinging to the "exception clause" meaning betrothal infidelity, I don't know if I can do that.

What you can or cant personally do is irrelevant....Gods word is clear...as is the meaning of fornication.

READERS please see....

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/11.html>

Quote:

----- I now lean much more heavily in the belief that porneia relates to UNLAWFUL (illicit sexual) marriages contracted (homosexual, adulterous, and incestual).  
-----

Your leaning is irrelevant.

Even your precious 'early church fathers' were known to use the word 'fornication' in a matter of a wife playing the harlot.

Fornication is not limited to that which you must force it to be limited to in order to make your doctrine work.

It is ALL sexual immorality, married or unmarried...bestiality, incest, etc.

You are only "leaning" because its the ONLY way to make your false doctrine coherent.

But the fact is 'fornication' CANNOT be limited in the manner you try to force it to be...

READERS please see..

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/fornicationnotonlyduringbetrothal.html>

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/2.html>

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/3.html>

Quote:

----- THOSE types of marriages are the only ones that can be put away because God never joined them to begin with.  
-----

Sorry, but we dont need you to REdefine words and meanings for us.

Jesus' words in Aramaic were clearly rendered into the greek as and then into english 'except for FORNICATION'...that word, the expressoin is not limited to what your false doctrine needs it to be.

I again will CHALLENGE you to provide a single shred of proof that it is...

Quote:

-----It would NOT be hardhearted to put such away, it would be walking in obedience to the Lord's commands/laws.  
-----

Im sorry, Im wanting to simply call you a liar here, but to keep from breaking any rules, Ill simply state that you are either deceived or are adding to Gods word again.

Gods COMMANDMENTS/LAWS says this wife, betrothed or consummated, is to be put to death.  
No concession on that matter is EVER offered in scripture.

It would not be 'hardhearted' by GODS command to take this betrothed wife to the door of her father (Deut 22:21) and brutally stone her to death where her mother, father, brothers and sisters can all be witness.  
Yet you find some hardheartedness in simply dismissing her for whoredom.

I believe you cannot understand the simple fact that this 'hardheartedness' Jesus speaks of is for putting her away 'for E

VERY cause' (aka "frivolously") just as the Jews had been doing as per Deut 24:1-4.

Prayerfully you will make the error of making some comment concerning Deut 22 being AMENDED by Deut 24:1-4 so we can dissect that for all to see.

Is that what you now believe?

Quote:  
----- It was my dialogue with you on Family Life concerning Herod and Herodias which really brought me further down the road in this belief.

-----  
Dont bring me onto this deceptive road you follow...your fabrications are between you and your god alone.

Quote:  
-----For me, if Jesus was saying, in fact, that ONLY UNLAWFUL marriages(homosexual, incestual, adulterous) contracted could be put away and the parties be blameless in His sight, it would then fit perfectly with Rom. 7:2-3 which shows that neither adultery nor a remarriage will dissolve a LAWFUL union joined by God Himself. Blessings in Him, Cindy

-----  
Romans 7 mentions NOTHING about her being put away for according to the law as those who "know the law (Deut 24) would have known was permitted.

And please, dont hand me a line of not being UNDER law. Paul is CLEARLY speaking to those who know the LAW for his example to be understood. Not presently being under law is irrelevant to his point.

IF she remarries while this former husband lives she IS an adulteress, not having been LAWFULLY put away as per the LAW Paul refers to (Mosaic economy).

\*IF\* you ever come to grips with the FACT that Paul is speaking to those who "KNOW THE LAW"...then I believe you might someday let go of your hate for your remarried brethren and accept the WHOLE truth in this matter.

Romans 7 doesnt present the contradiction you seem to believe it does.

Paul is speaking about the law to those that know that law.

That law made provision for divorce for EVERY cause thus proving that this 'law of the husband' was not UNconditional as you seem to try to assert.

READERS please see  
<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/6.html>

Evidence of remarried divorcees alive and well in the early church..  
<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/15.html>

Thanks cindy for returning and giving me further chance to refute you before a new crowd.

wm

Re:, on: 2006/5/19 12:24

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Quote:

-----reconciliation with the faithful spouse is not compulsory.  
-----

Yes, and I think Paul discussed this one very clearly: the one who has departed must remain unmarried. That is the alternative to reconciliation, though I believe the Lord's ultimate goal is humbling all and bringing all to repentance so that those whom HE joined together are walking in unity as He desires. Blessings in Him, Cindy  
-----

more fabrications?

READERS please see...

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/1cor7study.html>

Paul is clearly telling those who are BOTH Christians to stay single or reconcile as he then says "BUT to the REST.." and then lays out rules for these who are UNEqually yoked...that the believer is not in bondage to the UNbeliever who deserts.

Cindy seems to be unable to see the "BUT TO THE REST" part there that DOES distinguish the two groups.

It's amazing how you ADD distinctions when you must, then REJECT the clear ones from God's own word. Of course, the motivation is apparent.

Re:, on: 2006/5/19 12:26

Quote:

Dorcas,

Could you provide me with scripture showing the Lord's words on this? What comes to my mind when reading your post is the passage our Lord spoke concerning forgiving 70x7 times. Blessings in Him, Cindy  
-----

huh....and how many times had God forgiven Israel, His beloved, before He ENDED the covenant He made with their fathers?

Are you suggesting that 70x7 is perpetual?

Then you condemn God Himself with your judgment as not even HE perpetually ignored whoredom..did He?

It would have been 'hardhearted' for God to put them away 'for EVERY cause'.

But He was justified in ending that covenant...just as a spouse is justified in doing so for whoredom, that which Christ Himself has made exceptoin for.

Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/5/19 12:37

Quote:

-----the one who has departed must remain unmarried

Cindy,

You know very well that this applies only to the separation of couples who were both Christians before the marriage, or, who both become Christians and decide to stay together. If one becomes a Christian, and the other wants to leave, the Christian can remarry. You know this.

The reconciliation to which I was referring, which I believe you also knew very well, was that of a faithful spouse not having to take back an unfaithful spouse. (Matt 19:9)

Therefore, if from within a Christian marriage, one partner commits adultery, the Lord's word - that the faithful spouse is free to divorce the unfaithful spouse, and to remarry - this NOT being adultery - stands.

That is why when porneia (and moicheia) have **not** occurred, Jesus *endorses* that the marriage covenant has not been broken, and therefore, divorce of a *faithful* spouse creates the potential for adultery, should **either** of the divorcees remarry.

Clearly, the Lord is saying in Matt 19:9, that **He ceases** to count them as 'joined', if one has broken the marriage covenant. This is not to say they cannot be reconciled... but, **it is not compulsory**.

Quote:

-----I believe the Lord's **ultimate** goal is humbling all and bringing all to repentance

Yes, but

Quote:

-----so that those whom HE joined together are walking in unity as He desires.

The fact is, we do not have eternity to spend waiting for some people to repent. And no matter what their intentions were, the door will shut, and the Bridegroom will go in with those who are ready. Therefore, God Himself has decreed that a faithful spouse may divorce and remarry, and that is the end of the opportunity for reconciliation.

Why can you not accept this simple concept, and accept God's decree?

God Himself does not wait forever. He understands more than you do, that people have a breaking point, and it is not His desire to destroy the sanity of the faithful spouse, by punishing\* them - the concept you resisted for the adulterer, in an earlier post - for the unfaithful spouse's sin. Everyone must bear their own punishment, or, accept Jesus Christ's sacrifice on their behalf. Even so, having been reconciled to God, which is His 'ultimate goal', may not guarantee reconciliation to an estranged spouse.

Were God truly like this\*, then it is inconsistent with His otherwise deeply compassionate nature.

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/19 13:37

Cindy said

Quote:

-----What comes to my mind when reading your post is the passage our Lord spoke concerning forgiving 70x7 times.

This is the correct context for the Lord's exhortation to forgiveness.

(NKJV) Matthew 18

21 Then Peter came to Him and said, "Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Up to seven times?"

22 Jesus said to him, "I do not say to you, up to seven times, but up to seventy times seven.

23 "Therefore the kingdom of heaven is like a certain king who wanted to settle accounts with his servants.

24 "And when he had begun to settle accounts, one was brought to him who owed him ten thousand talents.  
25 "But as he was not able to pay, his master commanded that he be sold, with his wife and children and all that he had, and that payment be made.  
26 "The servant therefore fell down before him, saying, 'Master, have patience with me, and I will pay you all.'  
27 "Then the master of that servant was moved with compassion, released him, and forgave him the debt.  
28 "But that servant went out and found one of his fellow servants who owed him a hundred denarii; and he laid hands on him and took him by the throat, saying, 'Pay me what you owe!'  
29 "So his fellow servant fell down at his feet and begged him, saying, 'Have patience with me, and I will pay you all.'  
30 "And he would not, but went and threw him into prison till he should pay the debt.  
31 "So when his fellow servants saw what had been done, they were very grieved, and came and told their master all that had been done.  
32 "Then his master, after he had called him, said to him, 'You wicked servant! I forgave you all that debt because you begged me.  
33 'Should you not also have had compassion on your fellow servant, just as I had pity on you?'  
34 "And his master was angry, and delivered him to the torturers until he should pay all that was due to him.  
35 "So My heavenly Father also will do to you if each of you, from his heart, does not forgive his brother his trespasses."

Please could you show me the bit where the Lord says a man is to forgive his brother 70 times 7 for committing adultery with his spouse?

(NKJV) Leviticus 18

1 Then the LORD spoke to Moses, saying, 2 "Speak to the children of Israel, and say to them: 'I am the LORD your God

3 **'According to the doings of the land of Egypt, where you dwelt, you shall not do; and according to the doings of the land of Canaan, where I am bringing you, you shall not do; nor shall you walk in their ordinances.**

4 'You shall observe My judgments and keep My ordinances, to walk in them: I the LORD your God.

5 'You shall therefore keep My statutes and My judgments, which if a man does, he shall live by them: I the LORD.

6 'None of you shall approach anyone who is near of kin to him, to uncover his nakedness: I the LORD.

7 'The nakedness of your father or the nakedness of your mother you shall not uncover. She your mother; you shall not uncover her nakedness.

8 **'The nakedness of your father's wife you shall not uncover; it your father's nakedness.**

(A list of other forbidden liaisons follows the above.)

Two things are clear from the foregoing verses from Leviticus.

Firstly, God regards the male responsible for uncovering and approaching a woman.

Secondly, He regards the male responsible for approaching a female who is already one flesh with her husband.

(Young) Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians 5

1 Whoredom is actually heard of among you, and such whoredom as is not even named among the nations--as that one hath the wife of the father! --

2 and ye are having been puffed up, and **did not rather mourn, that he may be removed out of the midst of you who did this work**, 3 for I indeed, as being absent as to the body, and present as to the spirit, have already judged, as being present, him who so wrought this thing: 4 in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ--ye being gathered together, also my spirit--with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, 5 to deliver up such a one to the Adversary for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

(NKJV) 1 Corinthians 5:1

It is actually reported sexual immorality among you, and such sexual immorality as is not even named among the Gentiles -- that a man has his father's wife! 2 And you are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he who has done this

deed might be taken away from among you.

Leviticus 18:20

'Moreover you shall not lie carnally with your neighbor's wife, to **defile yourself with her**.

24 ' **Do not defile yourselves with any of these things**; for by all these the nations are defiled, which I am casting out before you.

25 'For the land is defiled; therefore I visit the punishment of its iniquity upon it, and the land vomits out its inhabitants.

26 'You shall therefore keep My statutes and My judgments, and shall not commit any of these abominations, either any of your own nation or any stranger who dwells among you

1 Corinthians 6

15 Do you not know that **your bodies are members of Christ**? Shall I then take the members of Christ and make them members of a harlot? Certainly not!

16 Or do you not know that he who is joined to a harlot is one body with her? For "the two," He says, "shall become one flesh."

17 But he who is joined to the Lord is one spirit with Him.

18 Flee sexual immorality. Every sin that a man does is outside the body, **but he who commits sexual immorality sins against his own body**.

**19 Or do you not know that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit in you, whom you have from God, and you are not your own?**

20 For you were bought at a price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's.

Cindy, I don't see Paul mentioning the 70 x 7 here. Do you?

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/19 13:41**

When Jesus answered the Pharisees, He endorsed the natural order expressed in Leviticus, by referring to the man putting away his wife, or taking a wife.

I asked on p9

Quote:

-----When Jesus quoted (in Matt 19:6)

'What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.'

who do you think the 'man' is, to whom He was referring?

-----

I think it is obvious. It is the man who separates a wife from her husband, to commit adultery with her.

It has been immensely helpful to me personally, to keep searching the scriptures to find the whole counsel of God. Cindy, thank you for your part in provoking me. :-)

Re:, on: 2006/5/19 14:14

Quote:

-----  
It has been immensely helpful to me personally, to keep searching the scriptures to find the whole counsel of God. Cindy, thank you for your part in provoking me.  
-----

This 'provoking' is mainly what drove me as well early on.

Seeing the blatant inconsistencies and outright fabrications being presented to falsely accuse the brethren is enough to make any true follower of Christ take it upon themselves to study to show themselves approved so that they may themselves be equipped to cast down the lies of our enemy Satan who has infiltrated our very ranks.

Wait till you've gotten a bit more acquainted with the Sealedeternals... ;-)

Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/5/19 14:34

Quote:

-----  
Seeing the blatant inconsistencies and outright fabrications being presented to falsely accuse the brethren is enough to make any true follower of Christ take it upon themselves to study to show themselves approved so that they may themselves be equipped to cast down the lies of our enemy Satan who has infiltrated our very ranks.  
-----

Bro FOC,

There is a difficulty for women who believe they must submit to men, while suspending their own spiritual discernment, falsely believing a male has the right to overrule what **God** has shown them. This attitude (of submission) was cultivated in me for quite a few years, and while being a good submitter, I came to a whole lot of spiritual and mental harm, because I was submitting to one who was not even born again, nor full of the Holy Spirit - not even a Christian, in fact. But, he was leading a church which was cultlike in its isolation from other truly Christian teachers.

This same scenario exists in other settings, where 'doctrines of men' are made to rise above the word of God itself, and certainly not made to conform to the word of God. Even, the word of God is altered in interpretation, to justify false doctrine, or, is simply misunderstood and preached incorrectly.

The confusion which is thus engendered, especially when a flock-member believes their salvation depends on compliance with denominational doctrine, rather than a living relationship with God the Father, through Jesus Christ His Son, can take a long time to unpick. Often there is truth woven into the fabric of the culture, and other people are complying.... so it takes a BIG move - usually of desperation, I guess - to break out and risk everything with God alone.

In this respect, if it is true that authority is on the head of men because they are male, rather than because they are submitted to Jesus Christ as Head of the Body - and God's will and word - then they are even more culpable, for not making a stand for truth, in Jesus, Who is THE TRUTH.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/19 15:57

Quote:

-----  
-huh....and how many times had God forgiven Israel, His beloved, before He ENDED the covenant He made with their forefathers?  
-----

Rom. 11:25-33. :-)



Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/19 16:10

Quote:

-----If one becomes a Christian, and the other wants to leave, the Christian can remarry. You know this.

Sorry, but I know no such thing. I do not believe that I Cor. 7:15 gives the right to remarriage. I believe ALL first marriages are joined by God. He did not make marriage just for Christians, but for ALL of mankind. A "lost" person who puts away his/her spouse and marries another is just as guilty of adultery as a Christian who does such a thing.

Concerning the "option" of taking back an unfaithful spouse, sorry, but I cannot reconcile what you believe with what the scriptures say. NOT taking back one who has been unfaithful and comes in repentance is UNFORGIVENESS----something completely at odds with Christian teachings on reconciliation and restoration.

You are right in that God does not wait forever, but the scriptures do teach this.....until the wedding occurs and the doors are shut, there is time made for repentance (Mt. 25:10, II Pet. 3:9). The same heart and mind that is in Christ is supposed to be what leads our thoughts/actions---even to the sacrificing of our own dreams and wants. Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re:, on: 2006/5/19 16:20

Romans 9

my kinsmen according to the flesh: 4 Who are Israelites; to whom **the adoption**,

2 Corinthians 5:16

Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, **yet now henceforth know we no more.**

Cindy, Israel after the flesh rejected the first covenant, and the Messiah, and must come the same way as any other believer.

Furthermore, it is clear from John 15

6 If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.

and

Romans 11

20 Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear: 21 For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee.

Even in the vine - or the olive tree - it is required of us to abide, or, 'the betrothal' is over. God is not done with divorcing idolaters.

Re:, on: 2006/5/19 16:27

Quote:

-----  
lastblast wrote:

Quote:

-----huh....and how many times had God forgiven Israel, His beloved, before He ENDED the covenant He made with their forefathers?

Rom. 11:25-33. :-)

yeah, thats real nice....and clearly a dodge....nothing less than Id expect from you.

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/19 16:29**

Quote:  
----- (NKJV) Matthew 18:21 Then Peter came to Him and said, "Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Up to seven times?"  
22 Jesus said to him, "I do not say to you, up to seven times, but up to seventy times seven.  
Please could you show me the bit where the Lord says a man is to forgive his brother 70 times 7 for committing adultery with his spouse?

Dorcas,

You believe the Lord has limitations on what sins He/or we can should forgive? I don't see where He limited forgiveness

Quote:  
----- Secondly, He regards the male responsible for approaching a female who is already one flesh with her husband.  
-----

Yes, I see your point. John the Baptist went to Herod, not Herodias, to accuse him of having his brother's wife (notice the divorce/remarriage did not make Herodias Herod's wife. She still belonged to Philip).

We do have to acknowledge that Jesus does account a woman guilty of adultery by putting away her husband and marrying another (Mk. 10:11-12). So all blame does not fall on the man in trying to separate what God has joined together. When we try to discern what "man" is concerning "let not man put asunder", we must realize that "man" was used as a general term in speaking about mankind (male and female)....see Gen. 1:27. Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re:, on: 2006/5/19 16:31**

Quote:  
-----  
You are right in that God does not wait forever, but the scriptures do teach this.....until the wedding occurs and the doors are shut, there is time made for repentance (Mt. 25:10, II Pet. 3:9). The same heart and mind that is in Christ is supposed to be what leads our thoughts/actions---even to the sacrificing of our own dreams and wants. Blessings in Him, Cindy  
-----

Maybe you are making comparisons where they are not relevant.

Satan and his minions were in God's presence and cast down....just as ANYONE who would or will apostate themselves would be.

NOTHING in scripture shows that Jesus' exception only applies to the Jewish custom of betrothal. You and your kind ADD that to His word.

AGAIN I will demand that you provide even one shred of PROOF that Jesus ONLY gave His exception to Jews for their marital customs.

Jesus gave His instruction for His FOLLOWERS, not just Jews

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/19 16:35**

Foc,

I see from your responses that you are continuing to conduct yourself in a less than Christ honoring way, so I will choose to not enter into more dialogue with you. As you seek His face and will for your life, may you be blessed. In Jesus, Cindy

**Re:, on: 2006/5/19 16:37**

Quote:

-----You believe the Lord has limitations on what sins He/or we can should forgive? I don't see where He limited forgiveness.  
-----

really?

So now youre preaching Universalism?...Forgiveness without repentance?  
This explains a LOT about your doctrine cindy.

Quote:

-----John the Baptist went to Herod, not Herodias, to accuse him of having his brother's wife(notice the divorce/remarriage did not make Herodias Herod's wife. She still belonged to Philip).  
-----

And NEITHER was lawfully permitted to have her as she was their own niece.  
You always seem to conveniently forget to mention this fact, cindy.

Quote:

-----We do have to acknowledge that Jesus does account a woman guilty of adultery by putting away her husband and marrying another(Mk. 10:11-12).  
-----

sorry, but Mark 10 and Matt 19 are the SAME event  
READERS see...  
<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/25.html>

So you are again conveniently pointing out what seems to back your doctrine, then not mentioning that which refutes it.  
Jesus said 'except for whoredom' that day in Mark 10....Matt 19 proves that fact.

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/19 16:37**

Quote:

-----Cindy, Israel after the flesh rejected the first covenant, and the Messiah, and must come the same way as any other believer.  
-----

Absolutely correct. That is my point. God is NOT done with Israel in the flesh, is He? Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re:, on: 2006/5/19 16:39**

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Foc,

I see from your responses that you are continuing to conduct yourself in a less than Christ honoring way, so I will choose to not enter into more dialogue with you. As you seek His face and will for your life, may you be blessed. In Jesus, Cindy

as usual you will refrain from honest dialogue where it presents your error.  
Thats fine, I will simply respond to your posts here.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/19 16:41**

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Quote:

-----Cindy, Israel after the flesh rejected the first covenant, and the Messiah, and must come the same way as any other believer.

Absolutely correct. That is my point. God is NOT done with Israel in the flesh, is He? Blessings in Him, Cindy

Nice try Cindy.

EVERY person of Israel who wishes to come to God since the cross MUST become one with the NEW bride of Christ...t  
hey will come thru this NEW covenant or they will not come.

There has ALWAYS been a remnant of Jews as scripture shows, that does not nullify that God is a divorcee who put away a covenant, that is now dead, with a whoring nation.

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/19 16:48**

Foc,

If you really did want honest dialogue, instead of baiting and then lashing when one responds, then I would be more than happy to dialogue with you, but.....the problem is I KNOW you now. You have followed me to at least two different boards and "dialogued" with me. The fact that you are now on your third marriage and are quite embittered against your last two wives makes you not a good person to be involved in an open, honest, dialogue on this issue. You are one who can be perceived as having a personal "agenda" on this topic---and that certainly shows through on how you conduct yourself towards those who have opposing beliefs. Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re:, on: 2006/5/19 17:02**

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Foc,

If you really did want honest dialogue, instead of baiting and then lashing when one responds, then I would be more than happy to dialogue with you, but.....the problem is I KNOW you now.

You also know that I will systematically refute every single assertion you make....you and all those of your doctrine...with Gods WHOLE word.

You stopped conversing with me shortly after I created my website as I remember. Seemingly you wanted to simply make it so agitating to keep repeating myself that I'd simply give up like all the others do with you folks.

Quote:

----- You have followed me to at least two different boards and "dialogued" with me.  
-----

don't flatter yourself, cindy, I've been a member of this site since the end of last year.  
I came here to download the Tozer sermons and just happened to notice you.

Quote:

-----The fact that you are now on your third marriage  
-----

Something I make public, so don't try to pretend I'm hiding anything.  
I'm on my third marriage because, like a whoring Israel, my exs decided that harlotry is the better lifestyle to lead.

Quote:

-----and are quite embittered against your last two wives  
-----

\*IF\* I were bitter towards anyone or anything, it is YOU and this doctrine that pushes ANTICHRIST teachings in order to destroy second marriages.

I get along perfectly fine with my exs now, although I don't speak to them often. I pray for them almost daily.

They both are leading the exact same life of sin they were before.

Quote:

-----makes you not a good person to be involved in an open, honest, dialogue on this issue.  
-----

:-D

Is this all you have cindy? :-D

resorting to distracting now with the details of my life instead of God's word?

I know you well enough to know that when your doctrine is backed into the corner that THIS is what you turn to...distract on.

FACTS are FACTS....my life does not alter those facts.

The FACTS as a whole stand against your doctrine...period.

Quote:

----- You are one who can be perceived as having a personal "agenda" on this topic---and that certainly shows through on how you conduct your self towards those who have opposing beliefs. Blessings in Him, Cindy  
-----

#### **Dorcas take note.**

THIS is what I was telling you about.

Just as I told you she would do and does, cindy is now playing the "gentle lamb" card here to distract from the relevant facts in this discussion.

This is the typical tactic I've seen from most of this doctrine.

Firstly they distract with one's personal life, trying to make the claim that they cannot be credible because of the details of their own lives.

Then they try to show that the 'meek' one must be presenting the truth.

Keep your eye on this type of distraction, its common enough

Re:, on: 2006/5/19 17:09

...

Re:, on: 2006/5/19 17:13

When is a marriage "dissolved"

Some ask "when is marriage dissolved"

Firstly, dont let yourself fall into the trap of when "one flesh" is dissolved. This is a semantics game those of the anti-remarriage camp play because they KNOW scripture speaks nothing of it. So when you cant find it, they believe theyve won the discussion.

When the union is 'dissolved' is defined clearly in Deut 24:1-4.  
Jesus never altered that definition of 'divorce', He merely reigned in the allowances FOR the divorce.  
When a divorce is filed for the reasons Jesus (GOD) has excepted for, THAT is when the marriage is 'dissolved'.  
Nor did Jesus argue/correct the pharisees 'interpretation' of Deut 24:1-4 being 'for any cause'.  
He merely stated 'why' Moses had given the allowance to begin with.  
Moses had permitted them to put their wives away 'for any cause' because 'she find no favor in his eyes' simply over their hard hearts.  
Moses chose to go with the lesser of the 2 evils....easy divorce or a tortured innocent wife....to deal with a problem that was out of control.

The fact is, as is proven by 1 Corinthians 6:16, that "one flesh" is nothing more than a man being one body with a woman, whether she is his wife or not. This is proven by Pauls even quoting our Lords words in 6:16 there to show it IS the same.

When God created Adam and Eve, He created them in manner so as they could become "one flesh" or one body (aka 'sex'). So when you see this reference, consummation between the two is all that is being shown.

When we marry someone, or in the customs of the Jews when betrothed or contracted in marriage, we enter Gods holy union. For the Jews, they did it a bit differently. A virgin was given a year at home with her family after being contracted in this union, but make no mistake, she WAS the lawful bride of her husband as is shown in Deut 22 where she would have been brutally killed for sexual sins just as if she were fully married and consummated.  
Once this union was contracted, she WAS married for all religious and legal purposes.

And yet, she was not yet "one flesh" with her husband. That happens when the marriage ceremony is over, and he takes her to his bed and they consummate their union.  
A man is also 'one flesh' or 'one body' with a harlot he is with (1 Cor 6:16) showing that 'one flesh' is not exclusive to the marriage union.

When we look at divorce in Matt 19, we see that the pharisees were asking Jesus if they were permitted to divorce "for any cause", something they had grown used to over the centuries.  
Jesus response is to tell them that from the beginning it wasnt so....God had created them male and female, the husband would leave parents and cleave to his wife. They become "one flesh" together and what God Himself has put together, man should not tear down.

They ask Jesus why then Moses had permitted them to do so.  
He tells them its because their hearts were hard. (Do a study on the matter and youll see what Jesus meant, these Jews who asked Him these things were very vile, wicked men who tormented their innocent wives many times)

He tells them whoever puts her away now for any reason short of fornication, commits adultery when he remarries as she does as well, because God doesnt have to accept a divorce just because we file it.  
If its not for this fornication, then sorry, its not valid and you DO commit adultery by remarrying.

This 'dissolving' of a marriage occurs very simply, when one party has broken the covenant with sexual sin and the innocent party decided to officially end it just as God finally ended His covenant with Israel that He made with their fathers out of Egypt.

They did not keep His covenant, and He tolerated their sins for a long time, but fully and finally He put that covenant away publicly so as to not make any mistakes about it (see Zechariah speaking about His covenant ending)

The plain fact is that \*IF\* a marriage was not "dissolved" and "one flesh" kept the union intact, then Moses was kidding himself when he wrote Deut 24:1-4 as NOTHING he could have permitted would have broken this supposed indestructible "one flesh" bond created in the beginning.

In essence Moses would have been condemning to eternal torment anyone who he permitted to divorce in this manner as they would still have been "one flesh" with their first spouse based on what anti-remarriers show as being some eternal, UNbreakable 'one flesh' bond created by God from the beginning. This supposed perpetual "one flesh" bond would have still been intact while they were married to another and thus living IN adultery. The same thing many try to assert to day.

Surely Moses allowed for easy putting away, but divorce it was, it ENDED the covenant, as ALL divorce does when scripture allows for it, as in Jesus' exception.

Moses even allowing putting away at all for ANY reason shows that there ARE cases that can be permitted to end a covenant without the death of one party.

Now, surely it was for hardness of hearts in the case of those Jews Moses permitted as we can see the condition of their hearts all throughout the OT. These same Jews are the types that are asking Jesus "can we divorce for ANY cause" as Moses had to permit to keep the wife safe.

If Moses was permitted to allow divorce simply because "she find no favor in his eyes", then surely the Lord who created us all has the AUTHORITY to narrow that to sexual sin alone as shown by His own exception.

There is no magic thread attaching a man to a woman called "one flesh".

One flesh is a sexual relationship between a man and woman, married or not, as proven in 1 Cor, 6:16. A man and wife are "one flesh" just as God created them to be when they consummate their union and are literally 'one flesh' thru their subsequent sexual relationship because they are 'male and female' as He has made them.

When God joins two people in His union, it is done as soon as the two have agreed to marry and are contracted in whatever manner is acceptable to both of them.

The Jews had their customs, as do all peoples in the world, and most are different, but all are equally valid.

Isaac and Rebekah had no betrothal at all...she agreed to be his wife, she went immediately to him and became just that.

When one has broken the covenant in a manner that Jesus or Paul permits, then divorce is filed publicly to show the world our intent, that is when marriage is "dissolved" . ..'one flesh' becomes a moot point as these two are no longer under a covenant together over sins JESUS Himself has excepted.

Don't let yourselves be drawn into semantics games my brethren. Stick to the facts. God's word is very easy to understand, there's just a LOT to it.

=====

A response to a forum poster

lastblast:

Nowhere do we read where Paul ever gives any indication that a marriage is dissolved, with the freedom to marry again, .....

Nowhere does he teach that adultery dissolves. Nowhere does he teach that a remarriage dissolves the previous marriage. Nowhere does he teach that a divorce dissolves.....

In Him, Cindy

response by FOC:

cindy, youre being outright deceptive in this matter.

Deut 24:1-4, a CLEAR passage that shows the meaning of 'divorce', shows EXACTLY what happens to the marriage when a man 'divorces' his wife....she is NO LONGER his WIFE !

THERE is your 'dissolved'...

Jesus did NOT REdefine 'divorce/putting away'.

He clearly stated that ONLY in a case of whoredom can one do so and remarry without committing adultery.

What is painfully clear here is that you arent studied in this matter whatsoever.

Otherwise youd have known that 'divorce/putting away' doesnt need to be DEFINED again in the NT...Moses already did that.

"Divorce" is 'putting away' with the written proof that Moses required in Deut 24.

Jesus didnt alter that meaning...nor the meaning of 'putting away'.

All He did was do away with the allowance for frivolous divorce (for any cause) that Moses had permitted.

So as I said, your semantics game is apparent to all...

**Re:, on: 2006/5/19 17:21**

Dorcas said

Quote:

----- Cindy, Israel after the flesh rejected the first covenant, and the Messiah, and must come the same way as any other believer.

Cindy said

Absolutely correct. That is my point. God is NOT done with Israel in the flesh, is He?

-----  
Ah. That is why I quoted the verse from the beginning of Romans 9, and emboldened 'the adoption'. Here is is again.

my kinsmen according to the flesh: 4 Who are Israelites; to whom the adoption,

'The adoption' is discussed in both Ephesians and Romans 8, and Paul puts it FIRST here, because, as FOC has pointed out, this is the only way to the Father, now, by being adopted into His family; by the cross, Jesus made of Israel and the Gentiles, one new man - joined the two folds (of sheep) to make one flock.

So, your mention of Israel in the flesh, is slightly concerning, because all of Israel in the flesh was crucified with Christ, as much as all Gentiles in the flesh were crucified with Christ - should any of us choose to receive His death (as we should - Romans 6).

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/5/19 17:27**

Quote:

-----I do not believe that I Cor. 7:15 gives the right to remarriage.

-----  
That's your privilege.

Quote:

-----I believe ALL first marriages are joined by God.

-----  
The scripture doesn't say this. It simply says WHAT God has joined, let not man put asunder.

This is similar to John pointing out in ch 20 that Jesus did not say he would live until His return.

It is clear from the scripture I quoted in an earlier post on this page, that being one flesh with another person does not 'make' a marriage. It is unscriptural to suggest that it does, and we've talked about this before.



You refuse to accept the testimony of those whose paper certificate was not and could not be endorsed by God's blessing. I understand this ruins your belief system, but, it takes TWO people to be joined to make one flesh, and if one is not 'joined' with the other, you have to take their word for it, and accept the emotional debris which ensues, if indeed it does.

Sometimes there is a great deal more emotional health for BOTH parties, when a paper marriage is allowed to move from fiction into divorce.

Quote:

-----He did not make marriage just for Christians,  
-----

I know. I thought of mentioning that earlier. But don't you see? That's exactly why there are provisions for divorce and remarriage.

It is pie in the sky to think all marriages will work as if they are Christian marriages. Even Christian marriages are made between two fallible human beings, no matter how serious they are about pleasing God. What hope can there be of non-Christians - satanists, sex offenders, murderers, violent and angry people - making a happy marriage. It is another strand of unobtainable idealism, Cindy. The reality is, it's hard enough for Christians who honestly give God every opportunity to change them from within, to make a marriage 'work', sometimes.

Quote:

-----Concerning the "option" of taking back an unfaithful spouse, sorry, but I cannot reconcile what you believe with what the scriptures say. NOT taking back one who has been unfaithful and comes in repentance is UNFORGIVENESS----something completely at odds with Christian teachings on reconciliation and restoration.  
-----

Sure, there is an expectation that a Christian will not commit adultery, because he has victory over sin. There is also the possibility that a Christian will truly forgive such a misdemeanour, if the unfaithful spouse can find true repentance, forgiveness and healing from God. But without those (repentance, forgiveness and healing), there is no real restoration of the marriage. The blood of the Lamb has to be truly applied to the soul of the covenant-breaker, and the acceptance by the wronged spouse has to be equally genuine.

But, you are, again, suggesting that Jesus was mistaken when he said a faithful spouse was free to divorce an unfaithful spouse. Rather you than me, choosing to dispute His words.

Quote:

-----there is time made for repentance  
-----

This is mainly a picture of Christ and the church and, while you reject His exception clause, you are never going to believe He knows human nature better than you do. If He can't persuade you, who can?

Quote:

-----even to the sacrificing of our own dreams and wants.  
-----

As you know, I believe that God can restore a person's spiritual virginity. Purity is retrievable in Him. But, there is a doctrine about which suggests that healing is in the atonement - which it is, from sin - but not from woundedness due to the emotional aspects of the physical trauma associated with sexual sin (committed by or against a person). Only *after* such wounds have been healed (By His stripes we are healed; it is a separate need, with a separate remedy), can there be real wholeness of spirit, soul and body. I have every sympathy with the millions of Christians who are held in bondage to their pasts, by inadequate ministry to their inner man.

No matter what one 'gives up', there will continue to be conflict where there is unrecovered pain. This is only natural. It is not a sin to be in pain. It is a sin not to take it to the Lord for healing, once it is recognised. A person whose inner health has been restored, is in a sound position to lay down their life in whatever way the Lord asks.

If sacrificing your dreams and wants brings you real heartache, there is something wrong. It should be possible to spend time with the Lord wrestling through every stronghold which exalts itself against the knowledge of Him, and to win. If winning is evasive, then either your heart is not in winning, or, there are other needs to be tackled, to bring victory within reach.

One thing I am sure, if two people are not one, they will know, and staying in such an arrangement is not required by God for salvation.

Re:, on: 2006/5/19 17:43

Did Jesus say "wife" or "espoused" wife

In His exception clause, Jesus is clearly referring to a lawful wife. If Jesus had been only referring to the betrothal period in the exception clause, He would have used the very term used for Mary at times...."espoused wife" or "espoused" (see G3423) in His exception clause.

\*IF\* He were restricting His exception to the betrothal period, there is no reason to believe that our Lord would have been so vague about it.

The fact is NOTHING presented in scripture backs this silly assertion by some who say that Jesus only meant to except the betrothed wife.

This is all deceptive propaganda created to further a false doctrine... this idea does not come from God's word.

Jesus clearly used the word that means "wife" or woman. A man's woman was his wife. She was his lawful wife from the moment the marriage was contracted. The betrothed wife was a lawful wife.

Jesus being a Jew and being God, knew this.

When He said "wife" He was referring to whoredom of a wife, pre or post consummation.

(compare Matt 19:9 and 5:32 with Luke 2:5)

Conclusion:

Jesus could have said "espoused" or "betrothed" ("mne?steuo?" as is used for Mary) in His exception, yet He chose to use the normal word for a 'wife'(gune?) in Matthew 19.

If Jesus WAS discerning one OVER the other, His ACTUAL words would be pertaining to the consummated wife and not the betrothed at all.

But seeing that the betrothed wife was lawfully contracted in marriage, she was just as much a 'wife' for legal and religious reasons as the consummated wife.

Re:, on: 2006/5/19 18:13

To any moderators who happen thru, this type of post is what causes problems where I'm concerned.

Quote:

-----

lastblast wrote:

Foc,

..... The fact that you are now on your third marriage and are quite embittered against your last two wives makes you not a good person to be involved in an open, honest, dialogue on this issue. You are one who can be perceived as having a personal "agenda" on this topic-.....

-----

Cindy makes sure to 'sound' very meek and mild, but the CONTENT of this post is clearly a personal attack on the details of my life.

Cindy believes she can skirt around your rules concerning attacking another poster by pulling this kind of stunt rather than using harshness in her posts.

I'd ask that \*IF\* I'm corrected in this thread, that Cindy is also told to stop making indirect personal attacks making these kinds of comments...

cindy has NO clue as to the emotional state Im in pertaining to my exes and uses this to aggravate the situation in an attempt to cause me to break your rules when I respond harshly with her.

Ive seen this from her probably 100 times at this point.

If correction is to be made here as far as Im concerned, ask cindy to refrain from her innuendo meant to defame my character and to STICK to the topic of the thread. (which is what fueled my posts concerning her going to psychics/palmreaders)

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/19 18:48**

Quote:

-----

FOC wrote:

**To any moderators who happen thru**, this type of post is what causes problems where Im concerned.

-----

As for a me personally speaking "most" of thread has just been like someone posting and someone coming back to jump on someone like a dog on a bone, I have sat and watched this in action, I have seen many posts here on this thread that sure has not edified anyone at all and to be completely honest with you I am just shocked it's made it this far. I just think sometimes it's better just to let go and don't worry it's not the end of the world "yet" were not in battle's here on this site to see who wins a war of words because this kind of stuff is a lose,lose situation, I am not speaking personally to anyone that has participated here at all, I just think this site had more integrity then any other site I have ever been a member of and we should all try and keep it that way for the good of "all" here because this reflects on "all" of us when new folks join. The word says the whole body should grow and build up itself in love and edify one another, Ok I am finished I guess I am ready for my slashing's now. :-)

**Re:, on: 2006/5/19 18:54**

mrbillpro, if dorcas and i 'let it go'...do you think lastblast is going to?

Do you actually believe she will pass up the opportunity to perpetuate her doctrine in our absence?

Ive literally seen lastblast tell a woman who was put away from her first husband for adultery and then REMarried that the reason she still had feelings for her first husband was that she was STILL married to him. \*IF\* this woman takes cindys advice, she FRIVOLOUSLY divorces her second husband. Some of us will not quietly sit by and allow this.

This doctrine DESTROYED the marriage of a woman named Cheryl who calls herself '1956ford'...and if lastblast and those of her doctrine have their way, by OUR remaining silent, then EVERY second marriage while the first spouse lived, no matter how vile this person remains, would be torn down under this accusation of 'perpetual adultery'

Now brother, you can feel free to leave lastblast and this false doctrine to its own ends, but SOME of us are called to dispel this lie.

Please dont take it upon yourself to stifle the WORK of Gods Spirit thru His children who take His word very seriously.

God bless.

wm

**Re:, on: 2006/5/19 19:17**

Additionally, mrbillpro, can you see Paul telling those in the church to simply allow false doctrines instead of fighting against them?

that idea is foreign to both the Gospel and the word of God as a whole.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/19 19:29

Quote:

-----If sacrificing your dreams and wants brings you real heartache, there is something wrong.  
-----

Dorcas, unless that works for all people, then it is a fallacy to believe such a thing. Scripture states that the Lord is not a respecter of persons. If it is as you say, that HEARTACHE caused by giving up one's dreams and wants is wrong, then you believe that people can continue in relationships that are sinful because giving up such a relationship causes immeasurable pain? I'm sorry, but I can't apply that to what I know repentance means. Repentance can be a VERY painful thing to walk through and many times repentance DOES involve giving up things we 'want'.

Quote:

-----It is pie in the sky to think all marriages will work as if they are Christian marriages. Even Christian marriages are made between two fallible human beings, no matter how serious they are about pleasing God. What hope can there be of non-Christians - Satanists, sex offenders, murderers, violent and angry people - making a happy marriage. It is another strand of unobtainable idealism, Cindy. The reality is, it's hard enough for Christians who honestly give God every opportunity to change them from within, to make a marriage 'work', sometimes.  
-----

Dorcas, it's 'pie in the sky' to believe that ANY sin will be fully conquered before the coming of the Lord, but.....should we buckle because things are not what they should be? How are we any different from those who don't confess Jesus as Lord if we respond due to the reality of things? Are we not called to a higher calling to live as Christ.....to die to ourselves for His sake? I cannot see it any other way.....Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re:, on: 2006/5/19 19:49

Quote:

-----LASTBLAST: FoC, before I was saved I went to a palm reader/psychic. She told me things that were IMPOSSIBLE for her to know  
-----

While we're speaking about 'credible' persons and their pasts....was this not your own quote lastblast/cindy?

So, cindy....does the PAST make one unable to discern truth? Is that what you are claiming?

I surely NEVER consulted Satan's own minions for help as you have admitted to.

Augustine brought a lot of baggage into his walk with Christ. Things he brought in with him affected his WHOLE walk...his perceptions on our faith. Oddly enough, sex and marriage were the main areas as is the case here with you.

He was involved with a cultlike religion before salvation and he carried some of their bizarre beliefs into Christianity with him.

Are you sure your views are unclouded in this matter?

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/19 20:53**

Quote:

FOC wrote:

Additionally, mrbillpro, can you see Paul telling those in the church to simply allow false doctrines instead of fighting against them? that idea is foreign to both the Gospel and the word of God as a whole.

Whatever your on a mission here a blind man could see that, I said what I felt about this kind of stuff being exposed to the whole forum and I don't think it's healthy, I don't know why it could not be taken to PM's so I will say goodbye to this thread because I sure don't want to get caught up in this nor be any part of it, carry on soldier. :-)

**Re:, on: 2006/5/19 21:07**

Quote:

MrBillPro wrote:

Quote:

FOC wrote:

Additionally, mrbillpro, can you see Paul telling those in the church to simply allow false doctrines instead of fighting against them? that idea is foreign to both the Gospel and the word of God as a whole.

Whatever your on a mission here a blind man could see that, I said what I felt about this kind of stuff being exposed to the whole forum and I don't think it's healthy, I don't know why it could not be taken to PM's so I will say goodbye to this thread because I sure don't want to get caught up in this nor be any part of it, carry on soldier. :-)

interesting.

so \*Im\* supposed to remain silent while cindy is free to present her doctrinal stance here?

You DO understand the concept of a discussion forum, I assume.

And I have debated these folks privately and no longer do so by my own judgment.

WHO might be enlightened when two folks exchange words privately? No one, thats who.

cindy isnt going to change so PMS are a waste of time. Someone on the OPEN forums might find direction in seeing this discussion unfold.

And if you feel to leave this thread, please do so.

As a man of your word, Im holding you to this as your brother in Christ.

wm

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/20 17:03**

Quote:

-----Are we not called to a higher calling to live as Christ.....to die to our selves for His sake?

Hi Cindy,

I started answering your post in order of your points, and it got longer and longer, so, I've decided to begin at the end, where really you touch on the heart of the matter, in your sentence which I've quoted.

Please, please, do not think I'm nit-picking here. This is a major topic, and every nuance of emphasis needs to be extra

cted from the relevant scriptures.

Your sentence is loaded with active verbs, apart from the first one, 'called', with which I agree.

There is, however, a big difficulty for anyone who thinks they have to die for His sake, as this is not possible. We only c  
an *receive* His death for our sake. This is all we are required to believe into. Our faith in His death, sets us free from sin

And, through His death, He opens the way for us to enter a relationship with His Father, who can be our Father, after we have repented of our sins, and been forgiven. Thus cleansed by His blood, we may receive the Holy Spirit who enables us to live as Christ.

For *years*, I did not understand the beauty of receiving His all-sufficient death on my own behalf, but it is the simplest thi  
ng to do, and it is a step which cannot be avoided if resurrection life is to be engaged effectively.

I would like to leave these few thoughts for now, and return to answer the earlier points you raised, in a future post.

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/20 18:04**

Sure is a semantics fest in here....

GOD help us...

**Re:, on: 2006/5/20 20:14**

Quote:

Scroggins wrote:

Sure is a semantics fest in here....

GOD help us...

interesting and unproductive post.  
could you expound upon this accusation?

If you believe as much, can you offer your own work and detailed studies on this matter?

Do you consider any discussion where much time, study and effort is spent in relaying information as 'semantics'?

You sound a bit like a friend of mine who continually tells me that too much learning is wrong, even if its Gods word.  
Does 'study to show yourself approved' sound familiar?

Regardless of your stance on this issue, this discussion is hardly a game of words.  
If you feel as much, possibly you simply are unable to grasp what is being presented.  
if so, feel free to inquire and Im quite sure any poster here will be more than happy to help clear things up for you.

If youre simply being insulting, then you might consider not wasting diskspace and bandwidth posting irrelevance.

God bless

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/20 20:53**

Quote:  
-----There is, however, a big difficulty for anyone who thinks they have to die for His sake, as this is not possible. We only can receive His death for our sake. This is all we are required to believe into. Our faith in His death, sets us free from sin.  
-----

Dorcas,

When we are born again through faith in Christ and repent of our dead works, we DO die. I think we can agree though that our flesh is still alive and kicking and it is our flesh that we are called to put to death on a daily basis as the Lord reveals those areas in which we place "self" above the kingdom of God. Scripture teaches that "it is no longer I that live, but Christ who lives within me". Jesus also taught that "whosoever shall seek to save his life will lose it and whosoever shall seek to lose their life for my name's sake, shall save their life".

The Christian walk is all about DYING to self for the kingdom of God's sake. We are no longer here to satisfy our own wants and desires, but are here to glorify and represent on earth our Lord in Heaven---what we seek to do should reflect what is done in heaven. In other words, whatever we do, should be what Jesus would do. I don't think that's 'pie in the sky'. That's what we are called to because of what was done for us. It is our reasonable service. The world, who will not die, do not care to follow Jesus and are not called to be "light". We however, are called to be light in a dark world---showing the world God's love to the unlovely/undeserving. We are not called to follow the world's ways of handling our tribulations. Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/20 21:43**

What accusation has been made Bro. FOC?

Semantics is the trouble here.

Quote:  
-----Regardless of your stance on this issue, this discussion is hardly a game of words.  
If you feel as much, possibly you simply are unable to grasp what is being presented.  
if so, feel free to inquire and I'm quite sure any poster here will be more than happy to help clear things up for you.  
-----

These people do play word games Brother. Plain and simple.

Some more grace could be needed on your part, but never the less, thank you for your disdain for me Brother.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/20 22:08**

Scroggins.  
when you pop in, make the assertion you did without backing it with some evidence of some sort, it simply makes it seem like you're being sarcastic with everyone in the thread.

I think a bit more grace could have been offered on your part by simply not responding here if you're not happy with the content so you didn't offend anyone needlessly, don't you think?

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/20 22:16**

Quote:  
-----Matthew 5:27-32 (KJV)

27Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery:

28But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

29And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that th

y whole body should be cast into hell.

30And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.

31It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement:

32But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, **saving for the cause of fornication**, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

---

Matthew 19:7-9 (KJV)

7They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?

8He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.

9And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, **except it be for fornication**, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.

---

Matthew 5:27-32 (AMP)

27You have heard that it was said, You shall not commit adultery.(A)

28But I say to you that everyone who so much as looks at a woman with evil desire for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart.

29If your right eye serves as a trap to ensnare you or is an occasion for you to stumble and sin, pluck it out and throw it away. It is better that you lose one of your members than that your whole body be cast into hell (Gehenna).

30And if your right hand serves as a trap to ensnare you or is an occasion for you to stumble and sin, cut it off and cast it from you. It is better that you lose one of your members than that your entire body should be cast into hell (Gehenna).

31It has also been said, Whoever divorces his wife must give her a certificate of divorce.

32But I tell you, Whoever dismisses and repudiates and divorces his wife, **except on the grounds of unfaithfulness (sexual immorality)**, causes her to commit adultery, and whoever marries a woman who has been divorced commits adultery.(B)

---

Matthew 19:7-9 (AMP)

7They said to Him, Why then did Moses command to give a certificate of divorce and thus to dismiss and repudiate a wife?(A)

8He said to them, Because of the hardness (stubbornness and perversity) of your hearts Moses permitted you to dismiss and repudiate and divorce your wives; but from the beginning it has not been so .

9I say to you: whoever dismisses (repudiates, divorces) his wife, **except for unchastity**, and marries another commits adultery, **and he who marries a divorced woman commits adultery.**

---

The answer is here. Remember if you dismiss the Word, you dismiss GOD and Christ. For GOD is the Word and the Word is Christ.

Quote:

-----John 1:1-5 (KJV)

1In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

2The same was in the beginning with God.

---

John 1:14-18 (KJV)

14And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth .



15John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me: for he was before me.

16And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace.

17For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.

18No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/20 22:20**

Quote:

We however, are called to be light in a dark world---showing the world God's love to the unlovely/undeserving. We are not called to follow the world's ways of handling our tribulations. Blessings in Him, Cindy

this is fine cindy, for most circumstances in which we deal with the world.  
BUT...

Gods marriage covenant is a HOLY union that is to not to be defiled or made mockery of.

Christianity is NOT under a HOLY covenant with the world...we ARE under one with our spouse, christian or not.

We have no agreements, no contracts, no conditions set forth when we deal with those of the world.

We DO have things such as these with our spouse.

BOTH parties came under this covenant, even the unbeliever, understanding the CONDITION of fidelity.

It is a given, EVERYONE who marries, christian or not, understands this, that adultery DEFILES this monogamous, man /woman union.

What Im getting at is when you put up with being beaten down and hurt by the world, you may well be doing as you are called.

God did NOT create covenants so that any man could abuse them, neglect them, defile them, etc....yet your doctrine permits this perpetually.

Clearly a God who would fully and finally end a covenant He Himself had made is presenting that there comes a time when enough is enough.

If God Himself did not have this perpetual patience that you seem to require, then how on earth do you believe that this very God who finally ended His own covenant could ever expect a mere man to be even stronger and more patient than even Himself?

Heres the facts.

God ended a covenant with Israel for playing the harlot against Him...for ongoing idolatries.

When Jesus gives His exceptoin it fits perfectly within the context of Gods whole word that when His holy covenants are casually and purposely broken perpetually, that this 70x7 thing you present seems to not always apply (in that YOU seem to interpret it as 'perpetuity')....unless of course you are accusing God Himself of not being as forgiving as He is requiring of mere men.

Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/20 22:31

Quote:  
-----Scroggins.  
when you pop in, make the assertion you did without backing it with some evidence of some sort, it simply makes it seem like youre being sarcastic with everyone in the thread.

I think a bit more grace could have been offered on your part by simply not responding here if youre not happy with the content so you didnt offend anyone needlessly, dont you think?  
-----

You make that assertion on your own free will. Your offense is only of your own cause and your rebuke of me is only of that assertion. No claim was made by me other than fact. This is all a battle of semantics with very high stakes (the evidence is in almost every last post in this thread by these people.)

People do not want the truth because it shakes their foundations. So they play games in an attempt to make you stumble and make them feel that much more right.

They have GOD in their box and do not want to take HIM out though HE does not fit nor belong in it. The very idea that HE does not belong in that box they have tried to cram HIM in for oh so long brings a fear with it that all could be a farse.

This Battle, Dear Brothers and Sisters, is one that should be tread upon lightly. You will not win minds with sheer blade alone. The sword draws blood, but can it fix the wounds?

In Christ,  
Scroggins

Re:, on: 2006/5/20 22:51

Quote:  
-----  
Scroggins wrote:  
No claim was made by me other than fact. This is all a battle of semantics with very high stakes (the evidence is in almost every last post in this thread by these people.)  
-----

I fail to see how this is about semantics.  
Those on each side hardly see their argument as a game.  
Even in cindys defense, which I rarely take upon myself, I know she believes what she claims.  
In her mind, as in others, this is hardly simply a matter of words but of faith and action.

Quote:  
-----People do not want the truth because it shakes their foundations. So they play games in an attempt to make you stumble and make them feel that much more right.  
-----

Games?

Firstly, what side of the tracks are you on in this matter so I might more correctly discern your intent ?

Either you are saying I am playing games to cause someone to stumble or you are saying this of lastblast.  
Neither is the case.  
Cindy firmly believe she is representing the truth....even if she is not presenting the whole truth...she believes she is.  
I dont believe she is simply playing a game trying to cause someone to stumble.  
Cindy knows the consequence of such a crime as that.

Quote:  
-----This Battle, Dear Brothers and Sisters, is one that should be tread upon lightly. You will not win minds with sheer blade alone. The sword draws blood, but can it fix the wounds?  
-----

What on earth makes you believe that words alone are at play here?  
Many of us are praying for the other as well as ourselves, for understanding in this matter.

You might well consider refraining from posting unless you have something to offer in relation to the actual topic here.

If my arguments are 'semantics' then so be it.  
As long as my posting privileges remain, I will offer whatever is necessary to help anyone reading these threads to see the whole truth on this issue.

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/21 0:15**

Quote:  
-----I fail to see how this is about semantics.  
Those on each side hardly see their argument as a game.  
Even in Cindy's defense, which I rarely take upon myself, I know she believes what she claims.  
In her mind, as in others, this is hardly simply a matter of words but of faith and action.  
-----

It is. I do not say that there is not much wrapped up in this. There is much at stake, I agree. Do we really always know when we argue semantics or not? No. Agreed it is not a matter of just words. As I said before, this is a high stakes argument.

Quote:  
-----Games?

Firstly, what side of the tracks are you on in this matter so I might more correctly discern your intent?

Either you are saying I am playing games to cause someone to stumble or you are saying this of lastblast.  
Neither is the case.  
Cindy firmly believe she is representing the truth....even if she is not presenting the whole truth...she believes she is.  
I don't believe she is simply playing a game trying to cause someone to stumble.  
Cindy knows the consequence of such a crime as that.  
-----

Read my scriptural reference. It should be obvious what I believe on this matter. And I do not claim that anyone here intentionally is "playing games." But regardless of intention, we are simply dancing in circles here. Get to the point. State the scripture, define it with crossreferences and believe the full word of GOD. I will state again; be careful how you go about this, or people will stumble. And everyone here knows the consequences of that crime.

Quote:  
-----What on earth makes you believe that words alone are at play here?  
Many of us are praying for the other as well as ourselves, for understanding in this matter.  
-----

I never said they alone were at play. But what I did say is to be careful that they are not.

That is good that you are praying. Are you fasting on this as well?

Quote:

-----You might well consider refraining from posting unless you have something to offer in relation to the actual topic here.

That is fine Brother. Say what you will of me and think what you will of me. But maybe you should examine the way you come across and maybe start sounding more like Sister Linn on this.

Quote:

-----If my arguments are 'semantics' then so be it.

As long as my posting privileges remain, I will offer whatever is necessary to help anyone reading these threads to see the whole truth on this issue.

That is good then Brother. All I can say is that I hope you post only things that edify.

In HIS Love,  
Scroggins

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/21 0:17**

Matthew 5:27-32 (KJV)

27Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery:

28But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

29And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.

30And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.

31It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement:

32But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, **saving for the cause of fornication**, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

---

Matthew 19:7-9 (KJV)

7They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?

8He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.

9And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, **except it be for fornication**, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.

---

Matthew 5:27-32 (AMP)

27You have heard that it was said, You shall not commit adultery.(A)

28But I say to you that everyone who so much as looks at a woman with evil desire for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart.

29If your right eye serves as a trap to ensnare you or is an occasion for you to stumble and sin, pluck it out and throw it away. It is better that you lose one of your members than that your whole body be cast into hell (Gehenna).

30And if your right hand serves as a trap to ensnare you or is an occasion for you to stumble and sin, cut it off and cast it from you. It is better that you lose one of your members than that your entire body should be cast into hell (Gehenna).

31It has also been said, Whoever divorces his wife must give her a certificate of divorce.

32But I tell you, Whoever dismisses and repudiates and divorces his wife, **except on the grounds of unfaithfulness (sexual immorality)**, causes her to commit adultery, and whoever marries a woman who has been divorced commits adultery.(B)

---

Matthew 19:7-9 (AMP)

7They said to Him, Why then did Moses command to give a certificate of divorce and thus to dismiss and repudiate a wife?(A)

8He said to them, Because of the hardness (stubbornness and perversity) of your hearts Moses permitted you to dismiss and repudiate and divorce your wives; but from the beginning it has not been so .

9I say to you: whoever dismisses (repudiates, divorces) his wife, **except for unchastity**, and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries a divorced woman commits adultery.

---

Matthew 5:27-32 (NASB)

27"(A)You have heard that it was said, '(B)YOU SHALL NOT COMMIT ADULTERY';

28but I say to you that everyone who looks at a woman (C)with lust for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart.

29"(D)If your right eye makes you stumble, tear it out and throw it from you; for it is better for you to lose one of the parts of your body, than for your whole body to be thrown into (E)hell.

30"(F)If your right hand makes you stumble, cut it off and throw it from you; for it is better for you to lose one of the parts of your body, than for your whole body to go into (G)hell.

31"It was said, '(H)WHOEVER SENDS HIS WIFE AWAY, LET HIM GIVE HER A CERTIFICATE OF DIVORCE';

32(I)but I say to you that everyone who divorces his wife, **except for the reason of unchastity**, makes her commit adultery; and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.

---

Matthew 19:7-9 (NASB)

7They said to Him, "(A)Why then did Moses command to GIVE HER A CERTIFICATE OF DIVORCE AND SEND her AWAY?"

8He said to them, "Because of your hardness of heart Moses permitted you to divorce your wives; but from the beginning it has not been this way.

9"And I say to you, (B)whoever divorces his wife, **except for immorality**, and marries another woman commits adultery."

Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/21 0:31

John 8:4-11 (AMP)

4Teacher, they said, This woman has been caught in the very act of adultery.

5Now Moses in the Law commanded us that such shall be stoned to death. But what do You say?(A)

6This they said to try (test) Him, hoping they might find a charge on which to accuse Him. But Jesus stooped down and wrote on the ground with His finger.

7However, when they persisted with their question, He raised Himself up and said, Let him who is without sin among you be the first to throw a stone at her.

8Then He bent down and went on writing on the ground with His finger.

9They listened to Him, and then they began going out, conscience-stricken, one by one, from the oldest down to the last one of them, till Jesus was left alone, with the woman standing there before Him in the center of the court.

10When Jesus raised Himself up, He said to her, Woman, where are your accusers? Has no man condemned you?

11She answered, No one, Lord! And Jesus said, I do not condemn you either. Go on your way and from now on sin no more.

---

John 8:4-11 (KJV)

4They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act.

5Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou?

6This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him. But Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, as though he heard them not.

7So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.

8And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground.

9And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst.

10When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee?

11She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more.

---

John 8:4-11 (NASB)

4they said to Him, "Teacher, this woman has been caught in adultery, in the very act.

5"Now in the Law (A)Moses commanded us to stone such women; what then do You say?"

6They were saying this, (B)testing Him, (C)so that they might have grounds for accusing Him. But Jesus stooped down and with His finger wrote on the ground.

7But when they persisted in asking Him, (D)He straightened up, and said to them, "(E)He who is without sin among you

u, let him be the (F)first to throw a stone at her."

8Again He stooped down and wrote on the ground.

9When they heard it, they began to go out one by one, beginning with the older ones, and He was left alone, and the woman, where she was, in the center of the court.

10(G)Straightening up, Jesus said to her, "Woman, where are they? Did no one condemn you?"

11She said, "No one, Lord." And Jesus said, "(H)I do not condemn you, either Go From now on (I)sin no more."

---

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/21 0:37**

1 Corinthians 7:13-15 (AMP)

13And if any woman has an unbelieving husband and he consents to live with her, she should not leave or divorce him.

14For the unbelieving husband is set apart (separated, withdrawn from heathen contamination, and affiliated with the Christian people) by union with his consecrated (set-apart) wife, and the unbelieving wife is set apart and separated through union with her consecrated husband. Otherwise your children would be unclean (unblessed heathen, outside the Christian covenant), but as it is they are **prepared for God** .

**15But if the unbelieving partner leaves, let him do so; in such brother or sister is not morally bound. But God has called us to peace.**

---

1 Corinthians 7:13-15 (KJV)

13And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him.

14For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband : else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.

15But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace.

---

1 Corinthians 7:13-15 (NASB)

13And a woman who has an unbelieving husband, and he consents to live with her, she must not send her husband away.

14For the unbelieving husband is sanctified through his wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified through her believing husband; for otherwise your children are unclean, but now they are (A)holy.

15Yet if the unbelieving one leaves, let him leave; the brother or the sister is not under bondage in such cases , but God has called us (B)to peace.

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/21 2:30**

Take your pick with what rendering you would have for the scripture. These statements are all the same and can be taken at face value here and should be, before we tread into the land of further explanation in trying to define the terms independently.

What we have to do here is look and say; if it is true that this is in fact the Word of GOD, and this Word is GOD which also is Christ and thus is also the Word and GOD. Then to take some of HIS word and dismiss another is to oppose GOD HIMSELF and deny the deity of Christ.

With that said, what we have going on here is the misunderstanding of the exception clause that was further introduced by Jesus Christ. Let us first make the determination that if Christ said this, and it is HIS Word, and HE is GOD, GOD is the Word and thus so is Christ. We MUST accept what HE tells us in this scripture or see of it at the Judgment Throne.

Let us take the scripture that I have posted earlier (for the sake of most people we will use the KJV rendering of the texts .)

-----  
John 8:4-11

4They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act.

5Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou?

6This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him. But Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, as though he heard them not.

7So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.

8And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground.

9And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst.

10When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee?

11She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more.

In this we see that what are brought up here are the Laws.

What does the Law say?

Exodus 20:14

14Thou shalt not commit adultery.

Deuteronomy 5:18

18Neither shalt thou commit adultery.

Leviticus 20:10

10 " 'If a man commits adultery with another man's wife—both the adulterer and the adulteress must be put to death.

John 8

3The teachers of the law and the Pharisees brought in a woman caught in adultery. They made her stand before the group

4and said to Jesus, "Teacher, this woman was caught in the act of adultery.

5In the Law Moses commanded us to stone such women. Now what do you say?"

6They were using this question as a trap, in order to have a basis for accusing him.

So in these we see that the wage of sin is death which is reiterated countless times in meaning of Spirit and Judgment by the Law.



-----  
So what does the Law say of divorce?

Deuteronomy 24:1-4

1When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house.

2And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife.

3And if the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, and giveth it in her hand, and sendeth her out of his house; or if the latter husband die, which took her to be his wife;

4Her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled; for that is a bomination before the LORD: and thou shalt not cause the land to sin, which the LORD thy God giveth thee for an inheritance.

Deuteronomy 20:20-29

20But if this thing be true, and the tokens of virginity be not found for the damsel:

21Then they shall bring out the damsel to the door of her father's house, and the men of her city shall stone her with stones that she die: because she hath wrought folly in Israel, to play the whore in her father's house: so shalt thou put evil away from among you.

22If a man be found lying with a woman married to an husband, then they shall both of them die, both the man that lay with the woman, and the woman: so shalt thou put away evil from Israel.

23If a damsel that is a virgin be betrothed unto an husband, and a man find her in the city, and lie with her;

24Then ye shall bring them both out unto the gate of that city, and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel, because she cried not, being in the city; and the man, because he hath humbled his neighbour's wife: so thou shalt put away evil from among you.

25But if a man find a betrothed damsel in the field, and the man force her, and lie with her: then the man only that lay with her shall die.

26But unto the damsel thou shalt do nothing; there is in the damsel no sin worthy of death: for as when a man riseth against his neighbour, and slayeth him, even so is this matter:

27For he found her in the field, and the betrothed damsel cried, and there was none to save her.

28If a man find a damsel that is a virgin, which is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, and they be found;

29Then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel's father fifty shekels of silver, and she shall be his wife; because he hath humbled her, he may not put her away all his days.

So what we see here is that in both cases that if a woman is found to be unfaithful to her spouse, it would mean death for her and those that are with her other than the husband. This in itself is an exception clause in the Law that says: The marriage is able to be ended by Law if there is unfaithfulness.

Marriage is until death. A crime as this resulted in death, thus meaning that the marriage was at the ability to be "over" in the eyes of our GOD. The partner not in violation could in fact, walk away from the marriage.

And as you see in cases of rape, we see that Law would have the one responsible for it punished by death.

And if found unmarried in relations with a man, they are to marry and may not part unless there is unfaithfulness.

-----

However in-

John 8:7

7However, when they persisted with their question, He raised Himself up and said, Let him who is without sin among you be the first to throw a stone at her.

-we see that, she was no longer given execution as the Law had stated before.

Now that moves us on to another set of points.

If death is no longer the consequence, what then is to end the unfaithful marriage?

What does GOD say about ending a marriage that has been found unclean before the eyes of GOD in a day where there is no death as the consequence?

-----

So since death is no longer the punishment, how can marriage be rendered meaningless?

Matthew 5:32

32But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

Matthew 19:9

9And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.

It is clearly stated that when an adulterer is present in the marriage then you have the option to leave. What does that mean? That means that you may not only choose to forgive, but you may choose to annul that marriage.

-----

So what about when there is not adultery and one party leaves?

1 Corinthians 7:13-15

13And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him

14For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.

15But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace.

We see here that if a believer and non-believer are joined in marriage and the non-believer were to depart from the marriage of the believer, the believer may also then let them go and will not be bonded to them by the Law or moral standard.

-----

In Christ,  
Scroggins

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/21 9:05**

Quote:

-----It is clearly stated that when an adulterer is present in the marriage then you have the option to leave. What does that mean? That means that you may not only choose to forgive, but you may choose to annul that marriage.

-----

As I said before, this idea is what I have issue with----if one CHOOSES to forgive? Do we have a "choice" to forgive or not to forgive? Sorry, but "moving on" to someone new is walking in unforgiveness and outwardly stating that one WILL NOT forgive and be reconciled to the one God joined them with. However, some believe that others CAN choose to forgive and to either accept back a repentant spouse or to "stand" praying, no matter the length of time for a spouse who is wayward. Which choice seems to align with the very heart of Jesus? It seems clear to me..... Blessings in Him,

Cindy

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/21 9:33**

Cindy,

You spiritualise this matter beyond what God does, in that the man and woman promise **each other** to keep themselves for each other. God witnesses this promise between the two people and endorses their union with His blessing **while they keep those promises**.

Once the promise *between the spouses* has been broken by one of them, God is in an impossible position to continue a blessing upon the original union, unless there is immediate repentance and returning by the spouse who committed adultery..... AND an acceptance of that returning by the spouse who did not commit adultery. God DOES NOT put a *requirement* on the spouse who was faithful, to forgive.

This is because He Himself retained to Himself the right not to forgive a wayward spouse. And He Himself plans to marry another - the new Israel.

That's one reason, that the option NOT to forgive, MIGHT prevent some would-be adulterers, from straying. God knows this.

But, knowing this, once a person HAS committed adultery, they had really - in other words - not just broken the promise they made, they have committed themselves to a different sexual union, (whether their respondent is free to marry them or not). Such a commitment not just *represents* but IS, an ending to the marriage covenant.

Yes, it's a mess, but, it is a reality which God does not pretend doesn't exist.... This IS a difficult concept, because there are always consequences, in divorce, for other people.

But, God doesn't minister the confusion of the unfaithful spouse onto the faithful spouse. He gives the faithful spouse the opportunity of a clean break and a new relationship. That is GOD's prerogative. He knows it is the path to greater human health in some situations, which I noticed FOC expounded last night, again.

As I also have said before, God knows people have a breaking point. It appears from the words of Jesus, that He also is more interested in the sum of human happiness, than those who support unscriptural doctrine - no matter how wholeheartedly they do so, (erroneously).

Another aspect has come to my attention, namely, that a marriage - the one flesh part - is not based on agape, it is based on eros. The reason a Christian marriage (where fidelity prevails) is expected to succeed, is because of the agape. But, if the eros dies, God recognises the damage that does to the emotional health of both spouses. That's why where the eros is still intact, He does NOT permit divorce 'for every cause'.

It goes without saying that the love of which He speaks in Ephesians 5:22 - 33, is not compatible with domestic abuse of any kind.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/21 9:52**

Now, it occurred to me to investigate the damage done by the Council of Trent, which first introduced the idea of unconditional matrimony. (See next post.)

I was fascinated by the first sentence, which seeks to put the formation of Eve, as the foundation of their lie.

We know that when Adam was naming the animals, which were male and female, he found himself looking for one like him, and could see no-one. So, when God has put him into a deep sleep, and forms Eve, Adam's first words reflect his desire for a *human* with whom to rub noses.

We are all, flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone, are we not? I believe Jesus quoted the relevant part of Genesis, with

regard to marriage. Adam did not have a father and mother to leave, but, he was required to cleave to his wife, and we assume that he did.

It is also interesting that Adam understood the concept of parenthood, even though his Father was not human. (Luke 3: 38)

Genesis 2

23 And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man.

{Woman: Heb. Isha} {Man: Heb. Ish}

24 Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh. (KJV)

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - toward a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/21 10:00**

Here is the relevant statement from the first Council of Trent.

Let me draw your attention to the specific references within the text, to those places where scripture is refuted, and the authority of the Roman Church placed above the word of God.

Perhaps someone else could draw these out in future posts, with the exact paragraph numbers.

**SESSION THE TWENTY-FOURTH,**

Being the eighth under the Sovereign Pontiff, Pius IV., celebrated on the eleventh day of November, MDLXIII.

**DOCTRINE ON THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY**

The first parent of the human race, under the influence of the divine Spirit, pronounced the bond of matrimony perpetual and indissoluble, when he said; This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh. But, that by this bond two only are united and joined together, our Lord taught more plainly, when rehearsing those last words as having been uttered by God, He said, therefore now they are not two, but one flesh; and straightway confirmed the firmness of that tie, proclaimed so long before by Adam, by these words; What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. But, the grace which might perfect that natural love, and confirm that indissoluble union, and sanctify the married, Christ Himself, the institutor and perfecter of the venerable sacraments, merited for us by His passion; as the Apostle Paul intimates, saying: Husbands love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered himself up for it; adding shortly after, This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church. Whereas therefore matrimony, in the evangelical law, excels in grace, through Christ, the ancient marriages; with reason have our holy Fathers, the Councils, and the tradition of the universal Church, always taught, that it is to be numbered amongst the sacraments of the new law; against which, impious men of this age raging, have not only had false notions touching this venerable sacrament, but, introducing according to their wont, under the pretext of the Gospel, a carnal liberty, they have by word and writing asserted, not without great injury to the faithful of Christ, many things alien from the sentiment of the Catholic Church, and from the usage approved of since the times of the apostles; the holy and universal Synod wishing to meet the rashness of these men, has thought it proper, lest their pernicious contagion may draw more after it, that the more remarkable heresies and errors of the above-named schismatics be exterminated, by decreeing against the said heretics and their errors the following anathemas.

**ON THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY.**

**CANON I.**-If any one saith, that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the evangelic law, (a sacrament) instituted by Christ the Lord; but that it has been invented by men in the Church; and that it does not confer grace; let him be anathema.

**CANON II.**-If any one saith, that it is lawful for Christians to have several wives at the same time, and that this is not prohibited by any divine law; let him be anathema.

**CANON III.**-If any one saith, that those degrees only of consanguinity and affinity, which are set down in Leviticus, can hinder matrimony from being contracted, and dissolve it when contracted; and that the Church cannot dispense in some of

those degrees, or establish that others may hinder and dissolve it ; let him be anathema.

CANON IV.-If any one saith, that the Church could not establish impediments dissolving marriage; or that she has erred in establishing them; let him be anathema.

CANON V.-If any one saith, that on account of heresy, or irksome cohabitation, or the affected absence of one of the parties, the bond of matrimony may be dissolved; let him be anathema.

CANON VI.-If any one saith, that matrimony contracted, but not consummated, is not dissolved by the solemn profession of religion by one of the married parties; let him be anathema.

CANON VII.-If any one saith, that the Church has erred, in that she hath taught, and doth teach, in accordance with the evangelical and apostolical doctrine, that the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved on account of the adultery of one of the married parties; and that both, or even the innocent one who gave not occasion to the adultery, cannot contract another marriage, during the life-time of the other; and, that he is guilty of adultery, who, having put away the adulteress, shall take another wife, as also she, who, having put away the adulterer, shall take another husband; let him be anathema.

CANON VIII.-If any one saith, that the Church errs, in that she declares that, for many causes, a separation may take place between husband and wife, in regard of bed, or in regard of cohabitation, for a determinate or for an indeterminate period; let him be anathema.

CANON IX.-If any one saith, that clerics constituted in sacred orders, or Regulars, who have solemnly professed chastity, are able to contract marriage, and that being contracted it is valid, notwithstanding the ecclesiastical law, or vow; and that the contrary is no thing else than to condemn marriage; and, that all who do not feel that they have the gift of chastity, even though they have made a vow thereof, may contract marriage; let him be anathema: seeing that God refuses not that gift to those who ask for it rightly, neither does He suffer us to be tempted above that which we are able.

CANON X.-If any one saith, that the marriage state is to be placed above the state of virginity, or of celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity, or in celibacy, than to be united in matrimony; let him be anathema.

CANON XI.-If any one saith, that the prohibition of the solemnization of marriages at certain times of the year, is a tyrannical superstition, derived from the superstition of the heathen; or, condemn the benedictions and other ceremonies which the Church makes use of therein; let him be anathema.

CANON XII.-If any one saith, that matrimonial causes do not belong to ecclesiastical judges; let him be anathema.

(<http://history.hanover.edu/texts/trent/ct24.html>) <http://history.hanover.edu/texts/trent/ct24.html>

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/21 10:01**

Quote:  
-----You spiritualise this matter beyond what God does, in that the man and woman promise each other to keep themselves for each other. God witnesses this promise between the two people and endorses their union with His blessing while they keep those promises.  
-----

Dorcas, I realize you believe I spiritualize this topic. I did previously see things "somewhat" as you do, though I must say, the renewed virginity thing, to me, is very much spiritualizing.

I believe as I've sought the Lord on this issue, He has greatly opened up my eyes to not only what the written Word states, and where many Pastors are contradictory/hypocritical in their teachings/practices on this issue, but what is His very heart on this issue. The fact remains that many proponents of the "lawfulness" of remarriage while one has a living spouse cannot explain away the meaning of Rom. 7:2-3 though I've seen many "words" on it. Go through commentaries and see what you find. Either they gloss right over it(saying that this is not a teaching on marriage)or skip those verses entirely. Why is that?

The truth is that Paul was addressing CHRISTIANS, not Jews living under the law. He again spoke of the permanency of marriage in I Cor. 7:39----again, to a CHRISTIAN audience. After a full discourse on marriage, he never once mention

s it to be ok to remarry while one had a living spouse. Even in I Cor. 7:15, we cannot find such an allowance, though many "infer" that is what Paul meant, though he used a different word for "bondage" than he used in his teachings on the marriage "bond".

Then we go to Herod/Herodias----she divorced her husband Philip (the historical account of that relationship can be found in the writings of Josephus). Her divorce did not dissolve her marriage to Philip. Her remarriage (adultery/incestual relationship) to Herod did not dissolve her marriage to Philip. John clearly states that Herod HAS Philip's wife. This aligns with Paul's teachings in Rom. 7:2-3, which states that if a woman marries another while her husband is living, she SHALL be called an adulteress. Herodias was Philip's wife, not Herod's wife---in spite of the divorce, in spite of the remarriage (adultery)-----which also lines up with Jesus' teachings that if one divorces and remarries they commit adultery or if one marries one divorced, they commit adultery (because the Lord has not "loosed" the bond between the lawful couple.

Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/21 10:34**

Hello Scroggins,

I see you have been diligent in expounding scripture clearly. Thank you. May it be a blessing to many who have been burdened with unscriptural doctrine, promulgated by carnal thinking.

Quote:

-----And if found unmarried in relations with a man, they are to marry and may not part unless there is unfaithfulness.  
-----

One thing I've been thinking about since yesterday, is related to the matter of what we call 'marriage vows'.

Clearly, from Paul's actions, he felt free to make a vow to God. This was a matter of faith between him and God. It did not involve the co-operation of any other human being. And this was not a covenant, in that it was one-sided.

When making a marriage covenant, the man and woman are making it to each other. God witnesses this, and the Hebrew writer says 'Marriage is honourable and the bed undefiled'.

I've also been thinking about the word 'defiled', because it appears in both Leviticus, and Paul's writing. There is a related statement by God to Peter, 'What God has cleansed...' (Acts 10)

The main thing that dawns on me, in the light of knowing 'the Church' was not involved in the pretence of ratifying marriages until the sixteenth century (the Roman Catholic Council of Trent), is that the marriage vows are not made TO GOD, although they are made in His presence.

A marriage covenant, therefore, is a human, not a divine institution.

Cindy,

I feel I'm falling behind in what I'd like to say to you. I *am* hearing you, and will do my best to respond while your comments are still warm... if you know what I mean ... including yesterday's. But, I will not forget.

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/21 10:46**

Quote:

-----Let me draw your attention to the specific references within the text, to those places where scripture is refuted, and the authority of the Roman Church placed above the word of God.  
-----

For me, I don't care too much for the RC Church. There are many things within it that make me cringe. However, on the topic of divorce/remarriage, though this document was put together in the 1600's, it very much aligns with what the church practiced in the first and second centuries---way before Constantine and "Popes" came into being.

I do not see in regards to the indissolubility of marriage where they are scripturally "off" in that document. They allow for separation (I Cor. 7:10-11), yet they hold fast to the permanency of the marriage bond til death (I Cor. 7:39, Rom. 7:2-3), denying that adultery does away with that marriage bond. If you read the Shepherd of Hermas' writings, you will find that the "innocent" would be charged with adultery should they remarry. There is very much a consistency in the earliest writings on divorce/remarriage all the way down the line until the reformation, when marriage/divorce practices started changing.

I believe, in trying to repudiate the false teachings found within the RC Church, the reformers threw the baby out with the bathwater. Many of the reformers could not even agree with each other on what dissolved a marriage and who was able to remarry, so practices in the reformed churches were not consistent. We are now seeing the end result of their inconsistencies. Today, some churches believe remarriage is ok---that a divorce(no matter the reason) dissolves the first union. Some churches believe that adultery dissolves a marriage union. Some churches teach that it is adultery to remarry, but the remarriage nullifies the previous marriage. Some churches teach that the remarriage is adultery until confession is made, then it becomes a lawful marriage in God's sight. Confusion.....that's all I see in the present day's church on this issue.

The thing that grieves me beyond measure is that there are people who have entered into 2nd marriages who ARE convicted they are living in a state of perpetual adultery since they have a spouse who is still living. Many a pastor has tried to brush away those convictions.....and the people in such cases remain in torment----because of what they see in the Word of God. Those pastors cannot explain why repentance is lived out in one way concerning some illicit relationships(forsaking the sin), yet concerning this sin why they are counselling in opposition to this(to remain in that illicit relationship).

There is one teacher in particular, John Piper, whom I just love. I think he is grounded in many areas of doctrine. He, in the 80's, came to the conclusion that the marriage bond remains intact until death---no matter what. He will not marry divorced persons under any circumstance(though other pastors in his church will). He believes that the "exception" clause does not pertain to adultery within the marriage and gives allowance for divorce/remarriage. Yet, though he believes neither adultery nor divorce can dissolve the marriage bond, he will counsel those in 2nd marriages(adultery) to remain together.....even though he sees the relationship as adultery. Somehow God's grace covers "this" sin. Though I am glad to see that he has been given eyes to see the permanency of marriage, I am sad to see that his practices are contradictory. Either a marriage bond is til death or it is not. He says it is, yet allows for remarriages to continue. Again, confusion.

Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/21 10:54**

Quote:  
-----the marriage vows are not made TO GOD, although they are made in His presence. A marriage covenant, therefore, is a human, not a divine institution.  
-----

I disagree completely. Marriage was made by God for man. He is not merely a "witness" to the marriage, He JOINS the two as ONE. Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/21 11:08**

It's really has nothing to do as a whole with the RC Church because the Church is the "People" it's the religion, perfect example I have a few neighbors that are RC and they sit in Church every Sunday because Grandma and Grampa and Mom and Dad did, but "don't" believe in a lot of there ways period. Yes as I am anticipating some reply's like this well they should pack up and move on but if you have never been in those shoes it's not that easy to leave especially RC Church sometimes your "whole" family will disown you. So to me if you are interjecting different religions in this thread it will be impossible to come to a final conclusion, and no one can really cut the other person because of his religion that would be wrong also, so see were I am going? Yes in a "real" world when we all are on the same track with our faith and not religion then threads like this one can have a finality, but I don't see that happening until I hear a big shout in the sky. Yes I al



so realize there is only one "Word Of God" but I still don't believe that anyone on earth can perfectly interpret every scripture in the Bible but for some that think they can it sure keeps the threads like this going on for everyone to ponder and come to there "own" conclusions. :-)

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/21 11:56**

Quote:  
-----As I said before, this idea is what I have issue with----if one CHOOSES to forgive? Do we have a "choice" to forgive or not to forgive? Sorry, but "moving on" to someone new is walking in unforgiveness and outwardly stating that one WILL NOT forgive and be reconciled to the one God joined them with. However, some believe that others CAN choose to forgive and to either accept back a repentant spouse or to "stand" praying, no matter the length of time for a spouse who is wayward. Which choice seems to align with the very heart of Jesus? It seems clear to me..... Blessings in Him, Cindy  
-----

Cindy

the reason you have a problem with that is that you fail to realize that the freedom to make that choice to forgive or walk away is in a way negating the very sin of unforgiving in this case.

If we walk away, we are to do it forgivingly.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/21 11:59**

Quote:  
-----I will state again; be careful how you go about this, or people will stumble. And everyone here knows the consequences of that crime.  
-----

I believe that presenting the truth is being 'careful' enough.  
You do almost sound as if you are against preaching the truth if it means preaching against opposition.  
Would you have told John the baptist to 'be careful' ?

Quote:  
-----  
That is good that you are praying. Are you fasting on this as well?  
-----

hopefully this is not your answer to everything.  
AIP, a genetic disorder, would have me in the ICU within 48 hours if I were to fast.  
I suppose you believe God will do nothing with prayer alone in this matter if I am unable to fast?

Quote:  
-----That is fine Brother. Say what you will of me and think what you will of me. But maybe you should examine the way you come across and maybe start sounding more like Sister Linn on this.  
-----

And possible you should examine the plank in your own eye first.  
Your returning post was very insulting to those of us who have actually spent the last couple years studying Gods word in this matter.

Quote:  
-----That is good then Brother. All I can say is that I hope you post only things that edify.  
-----

Do you believe John and Peter as well as our Lord and Paul 'edified' the false teachers they stood against?

You seem to be somewhat confused as to how we are to deal with false ones.



Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - toward a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/21 12:01

Quote:

-----It's really has nothing to do as a whole with the RC Church

Bill,

Quite simply, until the Council of Trent in the EDIT **1500s** end, the Church - no church - was part of the marriage arrangements made between families.

For Christians, though, and Jews, God had always been involved.

This discussion is as much about the pronouncements of Jesus, which are truth for every member of the human race living on God's earth, as it is about whether Paul knew what he meant and what he was talking about, when he said certain things in certain letters to certain churches.

You, and probably some others watching this thread, seem not quite to realise what a bondage is being perpetrated against innocent man, women and children, by the false doctrine of **unconditional matrimony** - something God Himself does not 'espouse' - and the subsequent false doctrine of **perpetual adultery**.

For those reading, God Himself UNDERSTANDS the individual timeline of each life on earth, and it is His desire that EACH PERSON should know HIM personally. Therefore, the fairness of marriage arrangements are of deep interest to Him.

I disagree with Cindy in her assertion that "God made marriage for man".

I believe God Himself, and therefore us made in His image, cannot but be 'for marriage', but, **I have a question now, for FOC.**

**Where in scripture is there support for the idea that marriage is 'HOLY'?**

This is not to say that God does not bless a marriage union, but, to say that marriage is *holy*, goes a step further (I feel).

I have grown up with the idea this was an introduction of the Catholic Church, which, because of the Council of Whitby, (the synod was held in 664 AD at Whitby Abbey,) affected the whole of the English church, at least. How the Presbyterians ended up with church ceremonies for marriage, I'm not sure.

([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Council\\_of\\_Whitby](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Council_of_Whitby)) [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Council\\_of\\_Whitby](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Council_of_Whitby)

Re:, on: 2006/5/21 12:13

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Quote:

-----the marriage vows are not made TO GOD, although they are made in His presence. A marriage covenant, therefore, is a human, not a divine institution.

I disagree completely. Marriage was made by God for man. He is not merely a "witness" to the marriage, He JOINS the two as ONE. Blessings in Him, Cindy

And seeing that HE is the one who created it, HE, not you or your church, has the authority to give exception to what it may be ended for.

You have yet to ever present PROOF, as I have asked of you and your group many times now, that 'fornication' is applicable ONLY to Jewish custom or equivalent.

Acts 15 alone stands in direct defiance of your doctrinal views...yet you seem unwilling to refute this fact.

=====

Fornication (porneia G4202) cannot mean illicit sexual activity only 'during Jewish betrothal' as some try to state.

The word porneia (rendered 'fornication') is directed SPECIFICALLY to GENTILE converts in Acts 15 to tell them to abstain from 'fornication' (porneia G4202).

=====

"Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God: But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood. (Act 15:19-20)

fornication

G4202

?????????

porneia

por-ni'-ah

From G4203; harlotry (including adultery and incest); figuratively idolatry: - fornication.

=====

Since betrothal is a Jewish custom, using this word 'porneia' to instruct the gentiles means that porneia cannot in any way specifically mean, and limited to, sexual sin during the JEWISH betrothal period.

So we can know with absolute confidence that when our Lord says 'except for fornication' pertaining to divorce, that adultery is not committed upon REMarriage in such cases, that His exception applies to His followers, ALL of them, not just Jews....this is the truth that scripture as a whole provides.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/fornicationnotonlyduringbetrothal.html>

=====

\*IF\* your claim of unlawful marriages is true, then the council is ONLY restricting SOME instances of sexual sin there and clearly not even mentioning simple adultery.

In Ephesians AND in Colossians we see NO mention of 'adultery' being spoken against either...only this fornication. Are you claiming that Paul was not interested in prohibiting adultery in those churches but only 'unlawful marriages' or incest?

**Re:, on: 2006/5/21 12:18**

Quote:  
-----As I said before, this idea is what I have issue with----if one CHOOSES to forgive? Do we have a "choice" to forgive or not to forgive? Sorry, but "moving on" to someone new is walking in unforgiveness and outwardly stating that one WILL NOT forgive and be reconciled to the one God joined them with. However, some believe that others CAN choose to forgive and to either accept back a repentant spouse or to "stand" praying, no matter the length of time for a spouse who is wayward. Which choice seems to align with the very heart of Jesus? It seems clear to me..... Blessings in Him, Cindy  
-----

Sorry, but Jesus exception shows a REMARRIAGE as well as a divorce. Apparently ADULTERY is NOT committed upon REMarriage when the previous spouse is put away for fornication.

You agree with this as you have to.

You simply change the meaning of 'porneia' to make your false doctrine palatable.

**Re:Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/5/21 12:22**

Scroggins said,

Quote:

-----If we walk away, we are to do it forgivingly.

Praise God!

Thank you for bringing the mind of the Spirit to bear on this point.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/21 12:25**

Quote:

-----The thing that grieves me beyond measure is that there are people who have entered into 2nd marriages who ARE convicted they are living in a state of perpetual adultery since they have a spouse who is still living. Many a pastor has tried to brush away those convictions.....and the people in such cases remain in torment----because of what they see in the Word of God. Those pastors cannot explain why repentance is lived out in one way concerning some illicit relationships(forsaking the sin), yet concerning this sin why they are counselling in opposition to this(to remain in that illicit relationship).

Cindy, this is just nonsense.

TRUE conviction comes from God WITHOUT hearing accusations from men or distortions from scripture.

MOST folks who simply pick up the bible and READ Jesus expect to see it for what it is.

It is only when they start hearing your doctrinal twists that they start to make the twist themselves and start rejecting that adultery is not committed upon remarriage when the former spouse is put away for sexual sin whereby they committed adultery to begin with.

It is ONLY after having another person of YOUR doctrine push this lie on them that they start to fall for this fabrication.

tell me that NO one EVER said anything to you to start you down this path your on ....

1956ford is a perfect example of a woman who was duped into divorcing frivolously.

and you have yet to PROVE this 'perpetual adultery' nonsense from God's word.

to add, I'm on my third marriage over the harlotries of my exes and NEVER have felt conviction for being remarried.

are you claiming I'm not a Christian?

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/21 12:33**

Let us take a look at this scripture and analyze it as well in context with the other scripture.

Romans 7:2-3:

2For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.

3So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.

1 Corinthians 7:10-11:

10And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband:

11But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.

1 Corinthians 7:39:

39The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord.

What does the Law state here?

In Rom. 7:2-3 the Law clearly states that marriage is until death. But what's more to remember is that this is still within the exception clause not only made by Christ, but was also given by Moses.

In 1 Cor. 7:10-11 the Law once again states that marriage is not something you can just walk out of. With that said, we must look at the context of the other scripture to gain more understanding on this topic. The other scripture has the exceptions in them where unfaithfulness is reason to annul the marriage. Even in times of Moses, this was done and could be done in the eyes of GOD. The punishment was death in those times but that is no longer the case here. The exception clause by Jesus was introduced to further explain the Law's role in this ever-changing world. This passage then, states that if divorced, this woman were to stay unmarried. Is this the woman that committed adultery? If the answer is yes, then that would fit right into the exception clause that Jesus did speak of.

Divorce is not for every reason. Scripture tells us divorce is possible in unfaithfulness. If a man were to put away his wife because she does not submit like she should, is that cause? No. If he does so, against GOD's will, they are to remain unmarried as that does not fit in with the exception clause and thus they are still bound to their promise of the marriage. This scripture could then be interpreted this way.

Quote:  
-----1 Corinthians 7:10-11:  
10And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife leave her husband unless there be unfaithfulness:  
11But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife unless there be unfaithfulness.  
(Scripture Edited to show correlation with Matthew 5:27-32, Matthew 19:7-9.)  
-----

In 1 Cor. 7:39 the Law states the same as seen time and time again. Marriage is matrimony until "death do us part." But is this not held under the Law of the exception clause? I submit to you that it is.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/21 12:37**

Quote:  
-----  
I believe as I've sought the Lord on this issue, He has greatly opened up my eyes to not only what the written Word states, and where many Pastors are contradictory/hypocritical in their teachings/practices on this issue, but what is His very heart on this issue.  
-----

Cindy...MOST false teachers honestly believe they have the truth....you only confirm this fact.

Quote:  
----- The fact remains that many proponents of the "lawfulness" of remarriage while one has a living spouse cannot explain away the meaning of Rom. 7:2-3 though I've seen many "words" on it.  
-----

sure we can...it has been explained to you MANY times.  
Rejecting the explanation doesn't mean it hasn't been given to you.

Paul is using ONE aspect of marriage to show our relationship to the law and to the new covenant.

Under the very LAW Paul is referring to DIVORCE for EVERY cause was permitted.  
Paul would have KNOWN this fact...but apparently you do not...or do and simply try to ignore it.

Quote:  
-----

Go through commentaries and see what you find. Either they gloss right over it(saying that this is not a teaching on marriage)or skip those verses entirely. Why is that?  
-----

Now you are lying.

I have MANY commentaries and I cant remember a single one that dismisses Romans 7 in ANY manner.

Why do you make comments like this cindy? you surely know they arent true as you make them.

What commentary are you using?

Additionally.

Romans 7 CLEARLY is not a teaching on marriage.

if it WERE, then Paul, a man who KNEW the law, would have KNOWN that Deut 24 (the LAW) gave provision for this very woman being spoken of to have been put away AND remarried.

You simply refuse to accept the FACT that Romans 7 isnt the conclusive rules for marriage or otherwise Paul himself is teaching those who 'know the law' while being seemingly ignorant of it himself.

Quote:  
-----

The truth is that Paul was addressing CHRISTIANS, not Jews living under the law. He again spoke of the permanency of marriage in I Cor. 7:39----again, to a CHRISTIAN audience. After a full discourse on marriage, he never once mentions it to be ok to remarry while one had a living spouse.  
-----

Shall we go thru Gods word and see what all Christ stated that Paul did not repeat?

if that is your basis then we may as well toss out EVERYTHING that Paul didnt state again from Jesus teachings.

preposterous !

Jesus own exception clearly shows a ReMarriage.

Are you denying that fact sister?

Quote:  
-----

Even in I Cor. 7:15, we cannot find such an allowance, though many "infer" that is what Paul meant, though he used a different word for "bondage" than he used in his teachings on the marriage "bond".  
-----

Oh brother...playing greek scholar again I see.

READERS SEE....

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/virginboundbylaw.html>

Quote:  
-----

-----Then we go to Herod/Herodias----she divorced her husband Philip (the historical account of that relationship can be found in the writings of Josephus). Her divorce did not dissolve her marriage to Philip. Her remarriage (adultery/incestual relationship) to Herod did not dissolve her marriage to Philip. John clearly states that Herod HAS Philip's wife. This aligns with Paul's teachings in Rom. 7:2-3, which states that if a woman marries another while her husband is living, she SHALL be called an adulteress. Herodias was Philip's wife, not Herod's wife---in spite of the divorce, in spite of the remarriage (adultery)-----which also lines up with Jesus' teachings that if one divorces and remarries they commit adultery or if one marries one divorced, they commit adultery (because the Lord has not "loosed" the bond between the lawful couple.

Blessings in Him, Cindy  
  
-----

## Herod and Herodias

Let us next discuss some of the evidences used to support their assertions.

Some assert that because John accused Herod of having his brother's wife, that ALL divorce and remarriage is adultery. But let's look at the facts that will show there is far more to this picture than many want to present.

The first thing to remember is that Jesus had not yet begun His ministry when John started accusing Herod and Herodias. (Luke 3:19-23)

John's ministry was the beginning of, the transition into, the gospel kingdom. Herodias was the niece of Phillip and Herod, the daughter of their own brother Aristobulus, and as such a close kinswoman.....

Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's brother, thou shalt not approach to his wife: she is thine aunt. (Lev 18:14 KJV)

....thus marrying her was unlawful for either Phillip or Herod as she was closely related.

Another sin that was committed was that Herod and Herodias met and conspired to put away their spouses for no good reason, then marry each other. (Josephus XVIII, 5)  
Not that God approved of this incestuous marriage to begin with, but this frivolous manner in which they held the marriage covenant exposes just how morally corrupt they were.

Some will try to assert a point of 'while his brother still lived' that it was unlawful for Herod to have Herodias, but we see that 'while his brother lived' is a moot point entirely.

\*IF\* Herodias had not been a niece, and \*IF\* Philip HAD been dead even, Herod STILL could not have her. He was ONLY permitted to marry His brother's widow \*IF\* she was childless according to God's WHOLE law. A man is not permitted to marry his brother's wife. He could ONLY marry his brother's widow IF she was left childless...otherwise it was unlawful.

Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife: it is thy brother's nakedness. (Lev 18:16 KJV)

"If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger: her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of an husband's brother unto her. (Deu 25:5 KJV) (not dissimilar to Matt 22:25-28)

The Law does not say..."until your brother's death" as would be the case normally where a man can marry a widow. God's law is clear...you SHALL NOT marry your brother's wife. Plain and simple. The only exception to this rule seems to be Deut 25:5 above.

John's use of 'your brother's wife' in his accusation of Herod quite possibly is explained by the law showing that Herod could NEVER have Herodias as his wife, even if she wasn't his niece, simply because Herodias DID have a child with his brother Philip...thereby making it UNLAWFUL for Herod to EVER have her.

Of course, neither was Philip lawfully permitted to have this niece, so who knows what all John held against them?

=====

Now let's approach this from the NEW covenant pov.

My assertion is that Jesus has done away with frivolous divorce....let's see if that fits as well.

Josephus shows us a great deal on this matter in book 18.  
Chapter 5

"ABOUT this time Aretas (the king of Arabia Petres) and Herod had a quarrel on the account following: Herod the tetrarch had, married the daughter of Aretas, and had lived with her a great while; but when he was once at Rome, he lodged with Herod, (15) who was his brother indeed, but not by the same mother; for this Herod was the son of the high priest Sireh's daughter. However, he fell in love with Herodias, this last Herod's wife, who was the daughter of Aristobulus their brother, and the sister of Agrippa the Great. This man ventured to talk to her about a marriage between them; which address, when she admitted, an agreement was made for her to change her habitation, and come to him as soon as he should return from Rome: one article of this marriage also was this, that he should divorce Aretas's daughter"

#### FRIVOLOUS DIVORCE !!

These two met and conspired to put away their spouses for NO reason other than they wanted each other. Not to mention the fact that she was his own NIECE, and thus closely related. In both the old and the new covenants this union was morally corrupt !

In either covenant these two were in opposition to God's instruction for marriage and presented NO remorse at all for their actions. They were led by lust, and put away spouses for no reason at all to have each other.

They would have been defying Mosaic law under that covenant, and been going against Jesus' own exception in the new .

In NO way does their vile incestuous affair NULLIFY our Lord Jesus' own exception.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/21 12:42**

Quote:  
-----In 1 Cor. 7:39 the Law states the same as seen time and time again. Marriage is matrimony until "death do us part." But is this not held under the Law of the exception clause? I submit to you that it is.  
-----

Cindy will agree that there is indeed an exception, but she alters the exception from what the word 'porneia' clearly means to what she needs it to mean. which she has admitted (in this thread) is migrating to other definitions.

She will not accept that even \*IF\* it ONLY applied to Jewish betrothal it is STILL a contradiction to 'until death' as betrothal, as she admits, is LAWFULLY married just as after consummation.

to her, for some reason, her contradiction makes sense while ours does not.

Getting these folks to comprehend that an 'exception' by its very definition is contrary to the norm is seemingly impossible.

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/21 14:10**

Another point that crosses my mind is that, regardless the Law for the Jews, which is what seems to be the supposed issue here.

Are we not grafted to the same tree as Gentiles under Christ?

If that is so, then by very reason, the "Jewish Law" that you say applies only to the Jews also applies to us as we were made one faith with the Jews and one Body with the Jews under Christ.

You may argue then that the Law does not apply to Christians at all.

If that Law does not apply to Christians at all then, does that Law no longer apply then to the Jews for Jesus?

For they are still Jews.

Romans 11:24

24For if you have been cut from what is by nature a wild olive tree, and against nature grafted into a cultivated olive tree, how much easier will it be to graft these natural back on their own olive tree.

Speaking of the Gentiles being grafted to the olive tree (which is GOD's chosen people and Children) and further saying, if that is possible, how much easier then will it be for one whom is already HIS child but only disobedient.

Which meaning if we are grafted and thus HIS children in Christianity, then change to correct ourselves should not only be easily accepted, but should be done, or else you are being disobedient. We all know what that means in terms of GOD. And let me warn you that disobedience effects others, and you will be Judged accordingly for what you have done.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/21 14:48**

As dorcas pointed out earlier, we were both made into one new man....the rules apply evenly to both now.

Jesus, in making His exception, was not making it for Jewish custom, but was simply telling the pharisees how things were to be under His "law" instead of being what they had been...easy divorce for no justifiable reason...as Moses had had to permit with these hardhearted Jews to keep them from actually harming an innocent wife.

the exception our Lord gave applies to BOTH Jews and gentiles as we know God does not cater to traditions of men.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/21 15:31**

Hi FOC,

I've brought this question from me to you, over from the previous page, because it seems to have got left behind.

Quote:

----- **Where in scripture is there support for the idea that marriage is 'HOLY'?**

Then I commented:

Quote:

-----This is not to say that God does not bless a marriage union, but, to say that marriage is holy, goes a step further (I feel).

I have grown up with the idea this was an introduction of the Catholic Church, which, because of the Council of Whitby, (the synod was held in 664 AD at Whitby Abbey,) affected the whole of the English church, at least.

([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Council\\_of\\_Whitby](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Council_of_Whitby)) [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Council\\_of\\_Whitby](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Council_of_Whitby)

**Re:, on: 2006/5/21 16:15**

Quote:

-----  
dorcas wrote:

Hi FOC,

I've brought this question from me to you, over from the previous page, because it seems to have got left behind.

Quote:

----- **Where in scripture is there support for the idea that marriage is 'HOLY'?**

Then I commented:

Quote:

-----This is not to say that God does not bless a marriage union, but, to say that marriage is holy, goes a step further (I feel).

I have grown up with the idea this was an introduction of the Catholic Church, which, because of the Council of Whitby, (the synod was held in 664 AD at Whitby Abbey,) affected the whole of the English church, at least.



-----  
Well, firstly look to the creation of the union between Adam and Eve.

God Himself made this woman FOR the man, He must have some vested interest in this union rather than it simply having come about by an act of man.

Then look at the our 'marriage' to the Lord.

Marriages here between men and women are an allegorical example of this marriage of Christ and His bride.

**Rev 19:7 Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready.**

**Rev 19:9 And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb. And he saith unto me, These are the true sayings of God.**

also;

**Heb 13:4 Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.**

clearly if God is going to judge those who defile His institution of marriage, He must see it as more than simply a human institution.

Also, why would God forbid the taking of certain wives unless He had vested interest in these unions?

Im not sure if I can dig you up a passage that states in precise words "marriage is holy", tho I will look it up...but I think more that we conclude this from His clearly creating the institution and His making so many rules for it.

We also see that God Himself is the one who joins this union, not man...do you think God joining them makes it holy or simply neutral?

**Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.  
(Mat 19:6)**

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/21 17:10**

Quote:  
-----In Rom. 7:2-3 the Law clearly states that marriage is until death. But whats more to remember is that this is still within the exception clause not only made by Christ, but was also given by Moses.  
-----

Scroggins, if Paul would have used a different scenerio (not used a woman who remarries (committing adultery)) as an example in Rom. 7:2-3 and if Jesus had not used the example of an innocent wife put away committing adultery if she remarries as an example, I may agree with you. However, it is not the case.

It is not by accident or coincidence that Paul uses such a wife as an example instead of a faithful wife. It is also of significance that Jesus in Mt. 19:9 speaks of a husband who puts away his wife to marry another and speaks that whoever marries this wrongly put away woman will be committing adultery. Clearly the husband's adultery (unlawful second marriage) does not give the "innocent" wife allowance to marry without sin or sin on the part of the man who marries her. It's a hard thing for those who believe adultery gives allowance for a marriage to be dissolved to answer why Paul and Jesus use the examples they do. Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - toward a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/21 17:34**

Quote:  
-----It is also of significance that Jesus in Mt. 19:9 speaks of a husband who puts away his wife to marry another and speaks that whoever marries this wrongly put away woman will be committing adultery. Clearly the husband's adultery (unlawful second marriage) does not give the "innocent" wife allowance to marry without sin or sin on the part of the man who marries her.  
-----

Cindy,

Until now, I had thought you are genuinely confused, and genuinely want to understand God's heart and word, but this la

st post pushes me towards the thought you are being deliberately dense, or, you have been blinded by something, and need a proper blaze of light from the Almighty to show you the consistency of His thought.

Do you not SEE that you have crossed the two circumstances over, in your attempt to justify your position?

In Romans 7, there was NO ADULTERY, until a woman left her faithful husband and remarried. THAT IS WHY she is called an adulteress.

Whereas in Matthew 19, the man who remarries, is ONLY FREE TO DO SO, because of the PRIOR adultery of his wife, for which he has already divorced her.

IF, in Matthew 19 she is put away as you say, WITHOUT ADULTERY, it is THE SAME as in Romans 7. Neither of them are free to remarry without it being adultery, in that situation.

Quote:  
-----It is also of significance that Jesus in Mt. 19:9 speaks of a husband who puts away his wife to marry another and speaks that whoever marries this wrongly put away woman will be committing adultery. **Clearly the husband's adultery** (unlawful second marriage) **does not give the "innocent" wife allowance to marry without sin or sin on the part of the man who marries her.**  
-----

This sentence does not reflect the meaning of Matthew 19:9. Please try again.

The "innocent" wife IS ALLOWED to marry again, if it is HER HUSBAND who committed adultery before she divorced him.

If you really can't see this, it would be helpful if you just said so.

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/21 18:15**

Quote:  
-----In Romans 7, there was NO ADULTERY, until a woman left her faithful husband and remarried. THAT IS WHY she is called an adulteress.  
-----

Dorcas, I don't think the insults are helpful to our conversation, so I'll ignore those and focus on the scriptures at hand. Possibly you are correct that there is no adultery til the woman remarries (although we know that Jesus expanded the definition of adultery to include much more than just the physical aspect of it). The thing is that neither a divorce nor a remarriage (adultery) dissolves the bond of marriage with her first husband, only death will accomplish this severing. That much is clear in Paul's words. Notice what is absent in that passage: Paul teaching that a divorce from an adulterous wife will sever the bond. It is just not there, in spite of the fact that Paul uses an adulterous woman as an example when speaking of the bond of marriage.

My point is that many teach today that adultery or divorce dissolve the bond of marriage----the bond God instituted. Paul clearly shows in Rom. 7:2-3 that this woman will be called an adulteress as long as her husband lives. Why? Because she is still married to her first husband and her new marriage(adultery) does not nullify her previous marriage. What does this do to those teachings which say that one can remain in such a relationship and NOT be in adultery?

Quote:  
-----IF, in Matthew 19 she is put away as you say, WITHOUT ADULTERY, it is THE SAME as in Romans 7. Neither of them are free to remarry without it being adultery, in that situation.  
-----

Yes, Jesus says the husband is guilty of adultery through remarriage and.....in the same breath explains that whosoever(the second husband) marries her that is put away(innocently) commits adultery. If the "innocent" wife was free to remarry again due to her husband's adultery (remarriage), why would the man who marries her be charged with adultery?  
?

Do you see this in terms of the "whens" of the divorce as affecting which innocent party can remarry or which cannot? ex: man commits adultery within the marriage---the INNOCENT files for divorce and can get married. You believe that type of divorce/remarriage is ok, right?

Jesus' example is that the GUILTY files for divorce---committing adultery through remarriage. The "innocent" in His scenario cannot marry lawfully without the sin of adultery occurring.

Just for the record again: I do not believe "porneia" is adultery within a lawful marriage and that is why I think you are having trouble understanding how I see this. I believe 'porneia' can refer to two different things: one, in regards to betrothal marriage (Mt. 1:18-24). Secondly, it can refer to illicit marital relationships that the Lord DOES allow to be put away because He never joined them together to begin with: adulterous marriages(one married another's spouse), homosexual marriages, incestual marriages. Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/21 18:47**

And the beat goes on. :-)

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/21 18:51**

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Quote:

-----Dorcas, I don't think the insults are helpful to our conversation

I don't think there helpful period in any conversation "especially" in conversations that are supposed to be between Christians but hey it just goes to show were all still work in progress, it's just sad this is exposed to the whole world and could not be taken to PM's.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/21 21:37**

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Scroggins, if Paul would have used a different scenerio (not used a woman who remarries (committing adultery)) as an example in Rom. 7:2-3 and if Jesus had not used the example of an innocent wife put away committing adultery if she remarries as an example, I may agree with you. However, it is not the case.

It IS the case, however, that the very law Paul is comparing to DID offer permission for divorce WITHOUT the death of the spouse.

This flies in the face of what you are trying to show with this passage.

Yet you do not seem to either understand that fact or at least acknowledge it.

Quote:

-----It is not by accident or coincidence that Paul uses such a wife as an example instead of a faithful wife.

You're not offering the WHOLE scope of truth here, lastblast, as usual.

Again, this woman whom was under the very law Paul is referring to COULD have been put away for EVERY cause at that point WITHOUT the death of her husband.

Paul is simply using this 'law of the husband' that is normally until death to show our relationship to the law and to the new covenant.

This has been explained to you ad nauseum

Quote:  
----- It is also of significance that Jesus in Mt. 19:9 speaks of a husband who puts away his wife to marry another and speaks that whoever marries this wrongly put away woman will be committing adultery.  
-----

EXACTLY !!

\*IF\* he puts her away TO MARRY another, just as the Jews were notorious for at that point, then he DOES commit adultery against her upon remarriage.

Re:, on: 2006/5/21 21:47

Quote:  
----- Paul clearly shows in Rom. 7:2-3 that this woman will be called an adulteress as long as her husband lives.  
-----

But you pretend that this 'law' is something NEW and currently unbreakable.  
This is a falsehood entirely.

Jesus Himself shows in Matt 19 that from the beginning this law that bound the wife to her husband until his death was in place.

So what of Moses?

Are you saying he WAS indeed the greatest lawbreaker of all time, causing men and women alike to fall to a fiery doom in hell when he permitted them to divorce and remarry?

You surely must be with your stance as NO man supposedly can break what God has joined in your mind...meaning that Moses himself not only permitted divorce AGAINST God's will and this 'law of the husband'...but also had the audacity to ADD to God's own law INSTRUCTION for divorce WITHOUT the death of the husband.

something is very seriously errant with your doctrine dear lastblast....

Quote:  
-----  
Just for the record again: I do not believe "porneia" is adultery within a lawful marriage and that is why I think you are having trouble understanding how I see this  
-----

Now THIS was a mistake.

I fully intend on digging up those ECFs words where even they use 'fornication' (porneia, g4202) to describe the adulteries of a wife...since you have clinged so tightly to these men.

It literally doesn't matter what you think concerning 'porneia', Cindy, the words used in the NT clearly show that ALL sexual sin is covered with its use....your denial of this fact only shows either how entirely unstudied you are....or, even worse, how willing you are to reject anything that doesn't agree with your doctrine.

Re:, on: 2006/5/21 21:58

Quote:  
-----I believe 'porneia' can refer to two different things: one, in regards to betrothal marriage (Mt. 1:18-24). Secondly, it can refer to illicit marital relationships that the Lord DOES allow to be put away because He never joined them together to begin with: adulterous marriages(one married another's spouse), homosexual marriages, incestual marriages. Blessings in Him, Cindy  
-----

Interesting because, as I said, your own ECFs used 'fornication' to describe the adultery of a wife, I've seen their words myself and will dig it up when I'm able to take the time to dig thru the whole works again.

Also, your statement has serious flaws.

Again, in Ephesians and Colossians NO mention of adultery is present..only porneia and a couple of its forms ( pornos, ect).

If your assertion were true, then AGAIN Paul would not be instructing against ANYTHING except those areas you just covered.

And AGAIN...the council of Jerusalem in Acts 15 uses ONE word to tell the gentiles what to abstain from as far as sexual sin goes...."PORNEIA"

You can ignore my posts all you want to Cindy, but when the council used that ONE word, it CLEARLY shows that porneia is NOT a word directed ONLY at Jewish sexual sins as it is clearly aimed at gentiles there.

And \*IF\* you were correct, the ONLY those two areas are being prohibited with the gentiles which would be preposterous.

the COMMONLY accepted definitions of porneia is ALL sexual sins...immorality in general....whoredom...harlotry....not what you want it to be restricted to.

I think Dorcas seems to finally be coming to understand what I've known about you for some time...that you seem to simply reject any amount of information, regardless of how accurate it is, if it stands against your doctrine.

I thank you for one thing, Cindy.

Your doing what you have here has caused yet another one of His children to see more light than they did.

Each and every time you are so adamant against the facts folks see this and it becomes clear to them that your doctrine must be false in order for you to be so determined to reject factual details as often as you do (ie, the actual meaning of 'porneia', for one)

Re:, on: 2006/5/21 22:02

Quote:  
-----The thing is that neither a divorce nor a remarriage (adultery) dissolves the bond of marriage with her first husband, only death will accomplish this severing.  
-----

Huh...then you DO call Moses a lawbreaker here.

**"When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife. And if the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, and giveth it in her hand, and sendeth her out of his house; or if the latter husband die, which took her to be his wife; Her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled; for that is abomination before the LORD: and thou shalt not cause the land to sin, which the LORD thy God giveth thee for an inheritance.**

(Deu 24:1-4)

clearly no death was required, yet Jesus shows that this 'until death' bond was from the beginning.

Something just isnt right here cindy.

Does it take death (from the beginning) or are there 'exceptoins' that may apply?????

Moses ever giving permission to divorce WITHOUT the death of the husband shows conclusively that EXCEPTIONS can and DO override the rule....the same kind of exception that Jesus made.

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/21 23:50**

Quote:

-----it's just sad this is exposed to the whole world and could not be taken to PM's.

I don't care to open a PM with insults/namecalling either, Billpro. Our conduct shouldn't change, whether public or private, IMHO. Blessings in Jesus, Cindy

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/22 0:09**

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

I don't care to open a PM with insults/namecalling either, Billpro. Our conduct shouldn't change, whether public or private, IMHO. Blessings in Jesus, Cindy

I completely understand and agree.

Take Care

Mr. Bill

**Re:, on: 2006/5/22 10:09**

Porneia...aka Fornication

Some claim that fornication in Matthew is PRE marital sex alone and that divorce and remarriage for any other reason is not permissible.

But we see that conflicts with the use of the word throughout the NT.

Porneia is whoredom, harlotry, illicit sex of any kind.

This included every sexual sin of every nature.

Sex with men, women, animals or any other perversion in existence or any new ones that a person can come up with.

This can be committed by anyone. A husband or wife or a single person.

When porneia (any sexual sin) is carried out by the married, the crime of adultery is committed.

Even the current english definition of Fornication is against these false doctrine as it says NOTHING about Unmarried people, but only that the two engaging in Fornication are not married to each other.

Here is the current definition...

Main Entry: fornication

Pronunciation: "for-n&-'kA-sh&n

Function: noun

: consensual sexual intercourse between two persons not married to each other

Source: Merriam-Webster's Medical Dictionary, © 2002 Merriam-Webster, Inc.

Notice not a single word about either person being 'unmarried'.

One or both could be married to someone else, they just aren't married to EACH OTHER.

Or both could be single.

Fornication means just what porneia presents,...having sex with someone who ISNT your lawful spouse, whether you're married or not.

Here is the Greek word rendered as "fornication" in your KJV bibles.

G4202

????????

porneia

por-ni'-ah

From G4203; harlotry (including adultery and incest); figuratively idolatry: - fornication.

Also....

In Acts 15 and 21, four items are given for gentiles to abstain from as presented in the following verses.

Act 15:20 But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood.

Act 15:29 That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well.

Act 21:25 As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from strangled, and from fornication (G4202, same as the exception clause in Matthew).

1. Things offered to idols
2. blood
3. Things strangled
4. fornication (G4202 same as the exception clause).

I ask those who say fornication (porneia G4202) is premarital or betrothal sex only and not "adultery", why is it that the writer ONLY used "porneia" in Acts 15 and 21 and didn't seem to think it necessary to mention "adultery" as something to abstain from as well?

He's already on the topic of sexual sin here, why not mention the big one \*IF\* adultery is a separate sin?

The reason is "porneia" covers ANY sexual sin. Paul knew that as did whoever rendered Jesus' words in Matthew into Greek.

When it was used in Acts 15, he was laying out a blanket coverage for ANY sexual sin, that we abstain from ALL sexual sin. Just as Jesus meant all sexual sin in Matthew 19.

"Porneia" (whoredom, harlotry), by default, would be "adultery" within a marriage; there was no need to mention adultery, it was covered. And neither was there any need for Jesus to use the word adultery, which would have left a hole or two in His teaching (see "why didn't Jesus say 'except for adultery'").

1 Corinthians chapter 5

We see in the following passage that only the fornicator is mentioned..

I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators:

Yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world.

But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat. For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person.

(1Co 5:9-13 KJV)

Now, \*IF\* adultery isnt included in 'porneia' or 'fornication', why on earth didnt Paul mention not keeping company with the adulterer ?

Was Paul stating to not keep company with the fornicator..but hey, its ok to hang out with adulterers ?

Hardly.

Paul used a word that covers all sexual sin.

He mentions a "brother" and isnt it odd that the word he chose rendered as 'fornicator' here is the masculine form of porneia ?

G4205

???????

pornos

Thayer Definition:

- 1) a man who prostitutes his body to another's lust for hire
- 2) a male prostitute
- 3) a man who indulges in unlawful sexual intercourse, a fornicator

Paul was clearly stating to not keep company with any man called a brother who is out having illicit sex.....married or not.

Porneia and its forms are all inclusive of sexual sin of the married and the UNmarried.

=====

In Ephesians and Colossians both we see references to Fornication, but none about adultery.

But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints; Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks. For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God.

(Eph 5:3-5 KJV)

(whoremonger being the masculine form ... pornos)

and

When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory. Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry: For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience:

(Col 3:4-6 KJV)

So if this porneia (fornication) does not include all sexual sin, then we would have to suppose that Paul is only directing these two churches to abstain from SOME sexual sins (incest, premarital sex, etc) , and surely not adultery (if it were the case that porneia is not all inclusive of sexual immorality)

=====

When Jesus' words were rendered as "porneia" in Matt 5:32 and 19:9, He was saying the same thing "Sexual Sin" or whoredom. Jesus did not mean just PREmarital sex, and neither does the definition of 'fornication' present that idea either.



He used a word, the same as in Acts 15, that covers ALL sexual sin....whoredom....as 'fornication' clearly shows as well. ....porneia even covers the possibility of bestiality if it has occurred.  
We cannot divorce our spouse and remarry without committing adultery against that union, EXCEPT for any sexual sin... EXCEPT that this person we marry has had sex with someone they arent married to.

That is what is clearly conveyed with 'porneia' and what is also presented with the REAL definition of 'fornication'.

What is funny about this one is we can get total agreement from everyone that a man can 'divorce' his wife for 'porneia', but the anti-remarriage camp then restricts the meaning of the word to fit their doctrinal stance...whichever it may be based on the many VARIED versions of their doctrine.

**Re: - posted by ConsiderHim, on: 2006/5/22 10:32**

Quote:

-----FOC said: Porneia (fornication) includes ALL sexual immorality, cindy, adultery as well.

Essentially true. However, 'porneia' cannot be seen as 'adultery' in Jesus exception clause of Matthew 19:9, as it causes a 'circular thinking' that doesn't make sense. In the same verse, 'mochia' is deliberately used to differentiate between 'pornea' as fornication or adultery.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/22 10:37**

Quote:

ConsiderHim wrote:

Quote:

-----FOC said: Porneia (fornication) includes ALL sexual immorality, cindy, adultery as well.

Essentially true. However, 'porneia' cannot be seen as 'adultery' in Jesus exception clause of Matthew 19:9, as it causes a 'circular thinking' that doesn't make sense. In the same verse, 'mochia' is deliberately used to differentiate between 'pornea' as fornication or adultery.

I believe if you plan on entering this discussion you need to actually offer some clear evidence to back your assertion.

"essentially true" unless it conflicts with what I believe" ?

You cant simply enter this thread and handwave away all the work presented herein.

It causes no circular thinking whatsoever as adultery and fornication within marriage are one and the same just as Hermas has also shown and proven that he agrees.

You need to PROVE that there is any issue caused by these words being interchanged

The word porneia has a concrete definition that does not bend and sway to your needs.

Now please....PROVE to us how fornication means 'adultery' in EVERY instance EXCEPT for Jesus exception clause....

additionally, there are instances where adultery and fornication appear together....and there are as many or MORE where fornication and its varied forms appear completely alone...including the entire letters of Ephesians and Colossians.

As recently proven, even Hermas believed fornication and adultery as one and the same...

Re:, on: 2006/5/22 10:45

Quote:

LASTBLAST: :Just for the record again: I do not believe "porneia" is adultery within a lawful marriage and that is why I think you are having trouble understanding how I see this.

And yet these ECFs that you commonly quote seem to disagree entirely.....

HERMAS

On Putting One's Wife Away for Adultery.

Chap. I.

...And I said to him, "Sir, if any one has a **wife** who trusts in the Lord, and if he detect her in **adultery**, does the man sin if he **continue to live with her**?"

And he said to me, "As long as he remains ignorant of her sin, the husband commits no transgression in living with her. But if the husband know that his wife has gone astray, and if the woman does not repent, but persists in her **fornication**, and yet the husband continues to live with her, he also is guilty of her crime, and a sharer in her **adultery**."

Clearly hometaking had already occurred since it plainly asks if he should continue to live with her, so we don't have to worry about someone claiming that this was simply a betrothed wife.

Apparently, Cindy, this isn't causing any misunderstanding on Dorcas' part at all, but seemingly you're seeing that even the men you love to quote believe that fornication and adultery can be one and the same.

The reason why Dorcas is having trouble understanding how you 'see' this, is most likely because she, like Hermas, understands that 'fornication' (PORNEIA) DOES include adultery.

Hermas seemed to use 'fornication' and 'adultery' in such a manner as they were one and the same WITHIN a marriage. ...against your ideas above.

I'll be digging up more over as I find it over the next few days.

The purpose here is to show, since many of the anti-remarriage camp use the ECFs' words so often, that even these ECFs saw adultery as 'fornication' .....and that whether folks today try to limit 'fornication' or porneia to 'unlawful marriage', incest, etc.

Porneia (fornication) includes ALL sexual immorality, Cindy, adultery as well. Even the ECFs understood that apparently.

Additionally, and with great contradiction, you have stated in the past that you do accept betrothal as lawfully wed, yet you believe that putting away was permitted during this year.

I'm having a very hard time believing that you often have the audacity to accuse my doctrine of containing contradictions given these blatant ones yours presents.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/adulteryisfornication.html>

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/22 11:33

160 ad---Pastor of Hermas, commandment fourth, chapter 1:

1:6 "What then, Sir," say I, "shall the husband do, if the wife continue in this case?" "Let him divorce her," saith he, "and let the husband abide alone: but if after divorcing his wife he shall marry another, he likewise committeth adultery."

1:7 "If then, Sir," say I, "after the wife is divorced, she repent and desire to return to her own husband, shall she not be received?"

1:8 "Certainly," saith he, "if the husband receiveth her not, he sinneth and bringeth great sin upon himself; nay, one who hath sinned and repented must be received, yet not often; for there is but one repentance for the servants of God. For the sake of her repentance therefore the husband ought not to marry. This is the manner of acting enjoined on husband and wife. "

but if after divorcing his wife he shall marry another, he likewise committeth adultery.

1:7 "If then, Sir," say I, "after the wife is divorced, she repent and desire to return to her own husband, shall she not be received?" 1:8 "Certainly," saith he, "if the husband receiveth her not, he sinneth and bringeth great sin upon himself

Re:, on: 2006/5/22 12:49

Cindy...your post did absolutely nothing in this matter.

We ALL know hermas was antiremarriage....that isnt the point at all. Apparently you missed the point.

Hermas CLEARLY states that this WIFE who is committing adultery is **fornicating**...thereby helping to crush this error of yours where YOU say fornication is 'not adultery within a lawful marriage'

(a comment which defies even your own belief since you DO agree that betrothal IS lawful marriage)

Quote:

LASTBLAST: :Just for the record again: I do not believe "porneia" is adultery within a lawful marriage and that is why I think you are having trouble understanding how I see this.

Hermas says your wrong....your own ECF....and yet you seem to still make up what you wish to in this matter.

which was my ONLY point.

=====

HERMAS

On Putting One's Wife Away for **Adultery**.

Chap. I.

...And I said to him, "Sir, if any one has a **wife** who trusts in the Lord, and if he detect her in **adultery**, does the man sin if he continue to live with her?"

And he said to me, "As long as he remains ignorant of her sin, the husband commits no transgression in living with her. But if the husband know that his wife has gone astray, and if the woman does not repent, but persists in her **fornication**, and yet the husband continues to live with her, he also is guilty of her crime, and a sharer in her **adultery**."

=====

Possibly, cindy, you need to REevaluate your position on fornication and admit your view is errant in this matter so that we might see you are at least willing to admit when you are errant and consider the ACTUAL facts involved.

Porneia INCLUDES adultery as proven by Hermas, your dear ECF...contrary to YOUR own views that defy the actual de

definition of the greek word porneia (g4202)

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/22 13:06**

Hello Cindy,

Thank you for bearing my exasperation with such a good attitude yesterday.

I have time to pick up on only one quote, this evening. It's going to take me a while to go back through the posts where you've left questions, but I do intend to answer them.

Slowly, it is dawning on me, that you are willing to take the word of men, over the word of the Lord, whereas experience has shown many times, that He IS the Word and His word really does break open mysteries.

If - just if - you were to believe that Jesus Christ was *not* mistaken when HE said it would not be adultery for a faithful spouse to divorce and remarry, I believe every other consideration which concerns you, would find a place of peace within the rest of the written word OF GOD.

Regarding your comment about adultery here, I wish to say a little more:

Quote:  
-----Just for the record again: I do not believe "porneia" is adultery **within** a lawful marriage and that is why I think you are having trouble understanding how I see this.  
-----

Older dictionaries used to define fornication as sex between two people at least one of whom was not married, but porneia cannot be limited to this, as FOC shows.

I'd go further, and highlight the last bit which suggests idolatry is *only* figurative.

Idoltrous sexual practices go on all the time, both outside and inside marriages. That is why I've emboldened 'within', to emphasise what I mentioned in an earlier post.

The idea that it is ok for rape and sodomy to be committed within a marriage, and this is somehow not an abomination in God's sight, appalls me. Even if the couple knew this is how they wanted to behave after they are married (which some do), this is not a marriage bed which is undefiled, by any biblical definition.

The attempt to exclude porneia from marriage is so unrealistic, that if you weren't so serious about it, I'd say you were disingenuous. I will settle for naive.

Moving on, it is not possible to read these verses from Ephesians 5

28 So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself.

29 For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church:

and then say that one who only ever rapes his wife is demonstrating the kind of tenderness that Christ has for the Church. Of the man who beats his wife up first, this is also an extreme departure from Paul's three-times exhortation to 'husbands, love your wives'.

Neither should you assume I'm talking about unbelievers. This sort of thing goes on in so-called Christian marriages. They are *not* Christian marriages, of course, in anything other than name, often because it enhances the respectability of the perpetrator of the porneia, and makes it humiliatingly difficult for the other spouse to get support or protection from Christians.

Please explain to me again, how it is God overlooks such porneia within a marriage, without compromising His own Integrity?

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/22 14:19

This scripture endorses my previous post, I believe.

(KJV) Deuteronomy 13

6 If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, **or the wife of thy bosom**, or thy friend, which as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which thou hast not known, thou, nor thy fathers;

7, of the gods of the people which round about you, nigh unto thee, or far off from thee, from the end of the earth even unto the end of the earth;

8 Thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him:

9 But thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people.

10 And thou shalt stone him with stones, that he die; because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the LORD thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage.  
{bondage: Heb. bondmen}

11 And all Israel shall hear, and fear, and shall do no more any such wickedness as this is among you.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/22 16:11

Quote:  
-----Slowly, it is dawning on me, that you are willing to take the word of men, over the word of the Lord, whereas experience has shown many times, that He IS the Word and His word really does break open mysteries.  
-----

Dorcas,

I know you speak privately to FOC as he has admitted such on another board, so I'm not surprised you would say such a thing. He just can't accept the fact that I came to my present viewpoint through study. I supposed it is much easier to believe that a man taught me what I now believe than to believe God just may have shown it to me as I sought Him in His Word.

Truly, it is the Word which I rely upon above all.....that is why, I believe, my views are at odds with many in the modern day Western Church. They elevate feelings and experiences over what the Word of God speaks. If someone asks a question, many will point to so and so's book on the topic because they don't know how to answer. Instead of saying "thus saith the Lord".....they say "surely the Lord wouldn't....." based upon what they or someone they love is going through. The truth is that the church is filled today with humanistic teachings. Ten Shekels and a Shirt deals with humanism in the church and I'm afraid that this mindset towards self surely has infiltrated the church in regards to marital practices---the evidence of this is plain to see in all the divorces and remarriages and all the justifications for such.

Confusion on what God says in His Word and the infiltration of humanism in the church is why there is such diverse, confused teachings on divorce/remarriage within the confessing Body of Christ. Do you believe all the varying camps on the MDR issue are following the Word of the Lord? If so, how can that be? Could it be possible that the confusion is a result of men listening to "men" telling them what the Word of God means? I personally think that is the case since I have had men's teachings pushed at me from pastors who could not answer my questions or the questions of my husband. I don't mind sharing good reading materials with others, but I won't push something as truth unless I can firmly discuss it from the Word of God myself.

Quote:

-----Please explain to me again, how it is God overlooks such porneia within a marriage, without compromising His own Integrity?  
-----

If you are wanting me to give an "out" for a wife/husband who is married to a scoundrel, I cannot do that, Dorcas. I cannot because I can't see it in scripture. The only "out" I see is separation. That much is clear to me (I Cor. 7:10-11 (Christian wife/husband separated), I Cor. 7:15 (Christian allowing spouse to leave peacefully)). I see no justification for remarriage while a spouse is alive because one has transgressed against 1 or more of the marriage vows. None of us lives perfectly up to our vows, though hopefully as the Lord reveals our sin, we strive to obey Him in honoring and loving our spouses as He would have us do so.

It is interesting to me how 1 supposed exception has now turned into a multitude of acceptable reasons for the dissolution of a marriage. The same ones who say that the exception has to do with sexual immorality within a marriage then will allow for all kinds of other things way beyond that one supposed exception (emotional abuse, physical abuse, laziness, gambler, hooked on pornography, controlling, liar, cheats on taxes, smokes dope, etc, etc).....and then we're right back to where we were when Jesus was dealing with the Pharisees---right back to the same hardheartedness.....We don't want what we have.....we don't want to love those who we feel don't deserve our love, we only want to love those who DO deserve our love---those who love us as we want to be loved.

I'm sorry, but like I said, I can no longer grasp what you are speaking as being something from the Lord because He Himself has shown me something different in how His love is supposed to be manifested. I see this now in the written Word of God as well as the "revealed/Rhema" Word of God through the Holy Spirit. Believe me, I am far from walking perfectly in this love (completely self-sacrificial for the good of the kingdom of God and others), but I am gaining an understanding of how He wants me to love and it sure isn't comfortable to the flesh most of the time. Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/22 16:17**

But thou shalt surely kill him;

Quote:

-----But thou shalt surely kill him;  
-----

Do you believe we should "kill" those guilty of the above? I guess I'm not quite sure how you are fitting this OT passage with the divorce/remarriage issue. Could you clarify---especially since this passage relates to those who lead others away from the Lord---including perhaps even one's own children? Thanks. Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re:, on: 2006/5/22 16:20**

Quote:

-----  
I know you speak privately to FOC as he has admitted such on another board, so I'm not surprised you would say such a thing.  
-----

always trying to make things look more diabolic than they actually are...

Dorcas..happy promisekeeper over at family life asked me where I'd been and I told him I'd been posting around and made a new friend named dorcas...that was about the extent of it.

Quote:

-----He just can't accept the fact that I came to my present viewpoint through study.  
-----

we'd both be being dishonest if either of us said that you had absolutely NO influence at all other than your bible when you studied this.  
I've seen words from you and from 1956ford that make it very clear that there were ministries involved in the process during both of your 'studies'...

Re:, on: 2006/5/22 16:24

Reposting this since cindy didnt actually address the issue of her own ECF contradicting her own belief by stating that an adulterous wife DOES commit "fornication"

=====

Cindy...your post did absolutely nothing in this matter.

We ALL know hermas was antiremarriage....that isnt the point at all. Apparently you missed the point.

Hermas CLEARLY states that this WIFE who is committing adultery is **fornicating**...thereby helping to crush this error of yours where YOU say fornication is 'not adultery within a lawful marriage'  
(a comment which defies even your own belief since you DO agree that betrothal IS lawful marriage)

Quote:

-----

LASTBLAST: :Just for the record again: I do not believe "porneia" is adultery within a lawful marriage and that is why I think you are having trouble understanding how I see this.

-----

Hermas says your wrong....your own ECF....and yet you seem to still make up what you wish to in this matter.

which was my ONLY point.

=====

HERMAS

On Putting One's Wife Away for **Adultery**.

Chap. I.

...And I said to him, "Sir, if any one has a **wife** who trusts in the Lord, and if he detect her in **adultery**, does the man sin if he continue to live with her?"

And he said to me, "As long as he remains ignorant of her sin, the husband commits no transgression in living with her. But if the husband know that his wife has gone astray, and if the woman does not repent, but persists in her **fornication**, and yet the husband continues to live with her, he also is guilty of her crime, and a sharer in her **adultery**."

=====

Possibly, cindy, you need to REevaluate your position on fornication and admit your view is errant in this matter so that we might see you are at least willing to admit when you are errant and consider the ACTUAL facts involved.

Porneia INCLUDES adultery as proven by Hermas, your dear ECF...contrary to YOUR own views that defy the actual definition of the greek word porneia (g4202)

Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/22 16:31

Reference scripture and expound it.

Re:, on: 2006/5/22 16:36

Quote:

-----

Confusion on what God says in His Word and the infiltration of humanism in the church is why there is such diverse, confused teachings on divorce/re marriage within the confessing Body of Christ. Do you believe all the varying camps on the MDR issue are following the Word of the Lord? If so, how can that be? Could it be possible that the confusion is a result of men listening to "men" telling them what the Word of God means?

-----

yes it could be.

it could be that many pastors are TOO lenient on divorce and remarriage, and it could be that in response to that some fanatical groups condemn their innocent brethren because instead of just accepting the ACTUAL definition of 'porneia/fornication' these 'men' redefine this word (as you clearly do) to push the other extreme end of the spectrum of this doctrine

Quote:  
-----I personally think that is the case since I have had men's teachings pushed at me from pastors who could not answer my questions or the questions of my husband.  
-----

So because some half hearted or unlearned pastor couldn't answer your question, you decide to follow the paths of fanatics? (what mainstream christianity might see as fanatical)  
That's hardly the way of our Lord who gave His exception.

Quote:  
-----I don't mind sharing good reading materials with others, but I won't push something as truth unless I can firmly discuss it from the Word of God myself.  
-----

But cindy, you haven't yet proven you can discuss this yourself.  
I've been fighting with you for well over a year about one silly little word (porneia) and its CLEAR definition and intent.  
This kind of thing makes it very hard to accept anything you present...

Quote:  
-----lastblast:"Just for the record again: I do not believe "porneia" is adultery within a lawful marriage and that is why I think you are having trouble understanding how I see this.  
-----

...especially seeing the the very ECFs you quote don't believe as much as we have seen ourselves now.

Quote:  
-----If you are wanting me to give an "out" for a wife/husband who is married to a scoundrel, I cannot do that, Dorcas. I cannot because I can't see it in scripture.  
-----

Scoundrel or whore?  
Jesus gave clear exception for the one.  
Paul's concession in 1 Corinthians shows the rest of the 'spirit' of the matter.  
Legalism cannot see beyond the letter of the law....hence the term 'legalism'....  
The scripture does not cover every contingency....we are to use this 'spirit' of the law to judge rightly when God's word is not so clear....such as physical abuse.

Wasn't it you, cindy, who elsewhere said that if I kill my ex that my current marriage would then be validated in God's eyes?  
Does this represent the 'spirit' of God's word to you?  
<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/lastblast.html>

I reference this to show that being what I believe is a legalist, that you seemingly miss the 'spirit' of God's word/law.

God is not bound to see as valid the marriage of any man who maliciously murders his ex for the express purpose of making his current marriage 'lawful'.



**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/22 20:57**

Foc,

I am going to publically state this because for one, I don't feel comfortable corresponding with you via PM. You need to get a grip and stop fixating on me. I've already told you that I will no longer respond to you. We have exhausted our differences and many times you are just downright disrespectful in your dialogue. It also appears to me that you are obsessed with me. This is like the 3rd or 4th(maybe more) website you have tracked me down to and revived old posts in which I have contributed. You can say what you will, but I know that you have followed me around the web. Thankfully, you have been banned from some of those websites due to your unChristlike conduct.

I'm really trying to discern your motives and I don't know if you are bored, just want someone to argue with, or what, but the fact that you have dedicated part of your website to me, well, that's a bit over the top. It's creepy actually especially since there are many much more well known persons who hold the same viewpoint that I do. I've told you I no longer want to correspond with you, so I would appreciate it if you respect that. Blessings as you seek to honor HIM, Cindy

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/22 21:38**

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Foc,  
I don't know if you are bored, just want someone to argue with Cindy

My guess would be both of the above. :-)

Although I did think for a while it was personal. :-)

**Re:, on: 2006/5/22 21:47**

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Foc,

I am going to publically state this because for one, I don't feel comfortable corresponding with you via PM. You need to get a grip and stop fixating on me.

You are the only one posting a stance I disagree with concerning MDR.  
While that is the case, of course you will be the ONLY person I respond to.

if your asking me to give you a free license to state whatever you wish and not respond, that I cannot do unless you leave MDR out of your posts.

YOU choose whether or not to publically make your assertions and risk having them refuted.  
No one is picking on you or fixated on you.  
If you don't want to have your doctrine scrutinized, DONT make your views public.

Quote:

I've already told you that I will no longer respond to you. We have exhausted our differences and many times you are just downright disrespectful in your dialogue. It also appears to me that you are obsessed with me.

Im direct, that is for sure.  
The only thing Im 'obsessed' with is false doctrine and exposing them.

You just so happen to be the only person in this thread currently pushing such, so of course it is you I respond to. Send stephen wilcox over to this thread and Ill spend some time with him as well so you wont feel like youre being singled out.

I do notice, however, that you offer nothing in relation to what Ive presented.

Quote:  
----- This is like the 3rd or 4th(maybe more) website you have tracked me down to and revived old posts in which I have contributed.  
-----

I think you need to check with moderation and ask them to check their records last week and see WHY I came here. I downloaded over a gig and a half of Tozer sermons....YOU are not the reason I ended up here then. I have been a member of this site since end of last year. I came last week again when I discovered the Tozer sermons....agian, have the mods check download records.

At some point I noticed these divorce threads....YOU were of no interest at first while I initially reading until I saw the same old, same old and decided to respond.

these forums from my understanding are PUBLIC access thus if you wish to remain anonymous, I suggest either not posting or using another screenname

Quote:  
----- You can say what you will, but I know that you have followed me around the web. Thankfully, you have been banned from some of those websites due to your unChristlike conduct.  
-----

No..i have been banned from TWO sites.  
Unchristlike?  
How did Jesus and His apostles deal with false ones?

Quote:  
-----I'm really trying to discern your motives and I don't know if you are bored, just want someone to argue with, or what,  
-----

I think we've made this clear enough cindy.  
Your doctrine destroys marriages.  
ive personally seen you state clearly to a MARRIED woman that her feelings for her EX husband was because she was STILL married to her ex, even while she was MARRIED to another man.

Its amazing to me that familylife even lets you post there given your motivation in tearing apart second marriages if you are able...considering they dont agree with your doctrine at all.  
Poor moderation over there apparently.

Quote:  
----- but the fact that you have dedicated part of your website to me, well, that's a bit over the top. It's creepy actually especially since there are many much more well known persons who hold the same viewpoint that I do.  
-----

I think youre being a bit vain here.  
GO to my site and see how many others are listed there...youre hardly the only one.

And I quote your words...there are no nude pictures of you...so dont play like someone is being out of line. You post your

doctrine publically, that gives me every right to quote you and comment.

id bet a crisp \$10 bill that if old stephen wilcox did the same youd have no issue with it whatsoever....his page on my site is already there, but nothings been added yet until I cover some more of his material....

And theres FAR more there about Sealedeternal than you, cindy.

My site is to help folks who cross your doctrine...because some of you post in so many forums, it helps MY readers to see you listed by name.

What I found 'creepy' is seeing a christian say that if I murdered my ex wives that God would have to 'validate' my marriage to Laura....THAT is creepy...

Quote:  
-----I've told you I no longer want to correspond with you, so I would appreciate it if you respect that. Blessings as you seek to honor HIM, Cindy  
-----

I dont "correspond" with you at all.

Everything we say is public.

I will not sit here and let you post error without commenting if that is what you are asking.

these forums are generally for discussion and that is what Im doing....discussing points where your error is evident...such as your views on 'porneia'

You dont have to post your views in public sis....that is your own choice.

I do pray for your enlightenment and return to the truth everyday if that helps you understand me better...but I wont let you post your doctrine without responding...sorry....

God bless

**Re:, on: 2006/5/22 22:00**

Quote:  
-----  
MrBillPro wrote:

Quote:  
-----

lastblast wrote:  
Foc,  
I don't know if you are bored, just want someone to argue with Cindy  
-----

My guess would be both of the above. :-)

Although I did think for a while it was personal. :-)  
-----

You might say 'personal' if you mean that I take defending His innocent ones against doctrines that wrongly accuse them personally....that I do.

If you'll notice, Ive provided ample evidence to refute most of what cindy claims....she gets like this each and every time shes been shown errant.

Instead of just admitting that she is probably errant in her views, say concerning 'porneia', she lashes out like her preceding post.

The reason she gets so much attention is she is the one poster who seems to be posting on so many sites....as I do myself

elf.

I rarely see Heartmen, Stephen wilcox, 1956ford, etc on any other sites....if I did then Id do as Ive done with them as wel  
I and comment/refute.

Cindy has shown she doesnt like being proven wrong...THAT is the issue here.

\*IF\* it werent, then shed offer up evidence/proof to show me Im errant and Id pretty much have to let it go.

If youve seen her posts, then hopefully you see the damage her doctrine does to our brethren in second marriages who  
were justified in divorcing when they did.

I dont know how any knowledgeable christian could sit back idly and let this doctrine tear apart marriages...i certainly hav  
e a hard time with it.

Oddly enough, its ok for cindy when SHE digs up MY personal past and tries to defame me.

Read thru the last few pages....SHE is the one who attacked me first by trying to show that because Im remarried that m  
y witness is invalid and I am supposedly 'bitter' with my exs...something cindy has no clue as to what she is speaking ab  
out.

Additionally, there is MUCH more in the way of quotes on my site from a poster "sealedeternal" than there is lastblast.  
Just look and see. She is exxagerating that I am fixated with her personally.

I am fixated soley with errant doctrine...the face that presents it is unimportant.

at this point, Id ask that we RETURN to the topic of this thread....thanks

**Re:, on: 2006/5/22 22:24**

LASTBLAST, etc.

I suggest we RETURN to the topic of this thread.

also, Id appreciate not being PMed again (you know who you are) if the PM is not going to pertain to this discussion...tha  
nks

**Re:, on: 2006/5/22 22:32**

Quote:

-----

Scroggins wrote:

Reference scripture and expound it.

-----

Im not sure what you mean.

I was referencing an ECF when speaking to cindy...is that what you are refering to?

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/22 23:08**

Quote:

-----Im not sure what you mean.

I was referencing an ECF when speaking to cindy...is that what you are refering to?

-----

Not every comment by every person is directed at you. Curb the paranoia Bro. Dont worry about that one.

In Christ,  
Scroggins

Re:, on: 2006/5/22 23:51

Quote:

-----  
Scroggins wrote:

Quote:

-----Im not sure what you mean.  
I was referencing an ECF when speaking to cindy...is that what you are refering to?  
-----

Not every comment by every person is directed at you. Curb the paranoia Bro. Dont worry about that one.

In Christ,  
Scroggins  
-----

sorry.  
Vagueness typically = confusion.

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/23 14:43

Hello Cindy

Quote:

-----Dorcas,

I know you speak privately to FOC as he has admitted such on another board, so I'm not surprised you would say such a thing.  
-----

Your quote of me

'Slowly, it is dawning on me, that you are willing to take the word of men, over the word of the Lord, whereas experience has shown many times, that He IS the Word and His word really does break open mysteries. '

is entirely my own observation.

My conversation with FOC has been to establish that both of us are using scripture as our main source of enlightenment , believing the word of God is all that is necessary to understand His heart on these matters.

Even though FOC uses my name in his posts, as *if* we have discussed how he might respond to your points, we are not collaborating behind the scenes in a material way. (I don't think either of us have time to, apart from anything else.)

By both referring to scripture, it is hardly surprising we are offering the same insight.

Further, apart from the fact he is a man and I a woman, our experiences of searching scripture for God's heart on our personal situations, is widely differing. Yet both of us have encountered a compassionate God who knows the limitations of the men and women He has made.

I will say more about this in future posts. Also, your question about killing a person who merely *suggests* to the man of the house that they go worship false gods, I will address in full. Thank you for asking it.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/23 15:25

Quote:

-----is entirely my own observation.  
-----

Fair enough, Dorcas. If it be the case, that I lift up man's teachings above God's Word, could you provide examples of me doing such? Thank you. Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re:, on: 2006/5/23 17:45**

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Quote:

-----is entirely my own observation.  
-----

Fair enough, Dorcas. If it be the case, that I lift up man's teachings above God's Word, could you provide examples of me doing such? Thank you. Blessings in Him, Cindy  
-----

ooh ooh....pick me !!! (hand flailing wildly)

Jesus exception nowhere presents that He is referring ONLY to betrothal.  
NOTHING in scripture even hints at this restriction.

Your manmade doctrine insists that He is without any proof whatsoever and the 'evidence' you use to support your assertions is by no means evidence for either side of the argument...

Does that help some?

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2006/5/23 21:46**

Cindy wrote:

Truly, it is the Word which I rely upon above all.....that is why, I believe, my views are at odds with many in the modern day Western Church. They elevate feelings and experiences over what the Word of God speaks. If someone asks a question, many will point to so and so's book on the topic because they don't know how to answer. Instead of saying "thus saith the Lord".....they say "surely the Lord wouldn't....." based upon what they or someone they love is going through. The truth is that the church is filled today with humanistic teachings. Ten Shekels and a Shirt deals with humanism in the church and I'm afraid that this mindset towards self surely has infiltrated the church in regards to marital practices----the evidence of this is plain to see in all the divorces and remarriages and all the justifications for such.

People will take this approach whenever they want to discard any Biblical directive they do not wish to obey.

I agree with you, Cindy.

Blessings,  
ginnyrose

**Re:, on: 2006/5/24 1:18**

Quote:

-----People will take this approach whenever they want to discard any Biblical directive they do not wish to obey.  
-----

also, false prophets and teachers also tell us to reject the CLEAR instruction of our Lord Jesus when HE says 'except for whoredom'...and listen to what THEY say He means by making up any nonsense they can to redefine anything that gets in their way (ie, the ACTUAL meaning of 'porneia')

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/24 9:35

Hi Cindy,

I've been musing on your last question to me, and I've come up with one of my own, which may help me to understand something more about the reason you take the stance you do.

My approach to the thought that Matthew 19:9 might be a contradiction to Jesus' other teachings, would be to try to understand HIS thinking, by using other information which is available to me in scripture. (*Please clarify: do you say this is a contradiction to other of Jesus' words?*)

I accept what the Lord said, and, I believe there must be a reason for it.

So my question is this: **if you are right, that Jesus was alluding ONLY to the divorce of an 'espoused wife', why would He?**

I ask, because the end of the Old Covenant (and Mosaic Law, therefore), had already been announced *again* by John the Baptist, (with his prophecy of the individual's pentecost).

Then, when speaking to the Greeks (John 12:24) Jesus refers to His death, and had already done so by His allusion to bringing sheep from another fold (John 10:16) (to make one fold of two). He later added 'Love one another' (John 15:12, 17; 17:26), while by His death, re-defined *sabbath rest*, (Heb 4:11).

So, in the light of John 10:15 - 18 and 19:11, ('Thou couldest have **no** power against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin.') and knowing *exactly* what He was saying and would be doing through His death and resurrection, Jesus is, in decrees such as Matt 19:9, (with a little help from the Pharisees) leaving no stone unturned in giving indisputable instruction for the New Covenant era **only**... isn't He?

Paul endorses the supersession of the Old Covenant with phrases such as 'especially... of the household of faith' (Gal 6:10) and 'he has denied the faith' (1 Tim 5:8) and gives a clear explanation of 'one new man' in Ephesians 2.

From Peter, we see how important he believes was the mission of the Messiah, in 2 Peter 1:15 - 21, and John underlines everything - especially the place of 'faith' in being victorious - in the last chapter of his first epistle.

The writer to the Hebrews, also, (whom Tyndale believed was Paul), explains in detail and in several different ways, that the first Covenant has been brought to an end by Jesus.

I hope the meaning of my questions is clear. If not, please ask and I'll try to do iron out the difficulty.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/24 10:43

Quote:  
-----I've been musing on your last question to me, and I've come up with one of my own, which may help me to understand something more about the reason you take the stance you do.  
-----

I don't know why you won't accept my words, Dorcas. Why I take the stance I do is because of what I see in God's Word. NONE of my beliefs are based upon emotional reasonings or indoctrinations of man-----or over spiritualizing some passage taken completely out of context. I DID believe one could remarry once upon a time----BEFORE I studied this out for myself.

As for betrothal being what Jesus speaks of, as I said, I don't grab hold of that view 100% as truth. However, it is something that cannot be discounted as we have a SCRIPTURAL precedent of this occurring (Mt. 1:18-24). It's not something I made up to boost my point of view. It is there for all to see and weigh its meaning in the larger scope of this issue.

Personally, I don't know how anyone who truly desires to seek the truth on this matter can discount, without even a second

and thought, that this very well could be what Jesus was speaking about, since we find this "exception" ONLY in the Gospel of Matthew---a gospel aimed at JEWS who practiced the betrothal custom.

I also don't know how anyone in good conscience can disregard the possibility that "porneia" can very well be speaking of UNLAWFUL unions---unions that God DID NOT join together. That, in my opinion, is the only type of marital union that truly can be put away and there be NO hardheartedness, as it is an act of obedience to the Lord and the forsaking of a sinful relationship NOT joined by God (adulterous, homosexual, incestual).

In any case, getting back to the betrothal custom, in the other two gospels, aimed at Gentile audiences, they had no such betrothal custom, only marriage. There we find NO exception made. The sin of adultery is charged to ANYONE who joins himself/herself with another unlawfully or takes another's spouse after a divorce has occurred. This teaching is NOT found in the Mosaic law. A divorce gave permission for the parties to marry another (Deut.24:1-4). Jesus changed that to say that now a divorce did not give right to marry again, but whosoever did so would be committing adultery in His sight.

The other thing which SHOULD make one pause and consider is what I speak of all the time---WHY, if adultery gave means to a dissolution of marriage as some suppose the Mt. 19:9 passage means---WHY did Paul use the example of an adulterous woman (remarried) in regards to the permanency of the marriage bond (death is what severs the bond and frees one to remarry). No mention of divorce on the part of the innocent party.

If, as some contend, Paul is speaking of OT Mosaic law, why use the same wording when speaking to ANOTHER Christian group (I Cor. 7:39). If Paul is speaking of Mosaic law, it was NOT adultery to remarry after a divorce. I believe it is because the "law" Paul is speaking of is NOT the Mosaic law, it is God's law of marriage, which Jesus speaks of in His discourse---bringing marriage back to the created intent for marriage. THAT is the standard the Lord holds us to. That is why He speaks of joining oneself with another as adultery---because that person does not belong to the one who took them---until their rightful spouse dies as Paul teaches.

No hardheartedness is permitted---at all, that is why for a Christian, there is NO option to forgive. We MUST forgive or we will not be forgiven. When I hear a Christian say that we have an option in this regard, I cannot understand that mindset. What they are saying is that there IS a difference between the one who DOES forgive and either is reconciled or "stands" for the wayward spouse and the person who will NOT accept back a wayward spouse. Does the Lord look on each in an equal manner? For me, it always comes back to "how would Jesus handle such a situation?".....and there, I find my answer to what is right in His sight.

As to the rest of your post, I really am not understanding your point, Dorcas. Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re:, on: 2006/5/24 11:08**

Quote:

-----

lastblast wrote:

I DID believe one could remarry once upon a time---BEFORE I studied this out for myself.

-----

answer honestly, yes or no....

Did you have even one single resource from the anti-remarriage camp...a book, brochure, website, audio-sermon, pamphlet, a pastor....ANYTHING from them giving ANY direction at all either before or while you were studying this all out? God knows the answer to this, even if you will not state it.

Quote:

-----As for betrothal being what Jesus speaks of, as I said, I don't grab hold of that view 100% as truth. However, it is something that cannot be discounted as we have a SCRIPTURAL precedent of this occurring (Mt. 1:18-24). It's not something I made up to boost my point of view. It is there for all to see and weigh its meaning in the larger scope of this issue.

-----

But Cindy...we have CLEAR precedent...no.."LAW"...that shows that the punishment for WILLFUL sexual sin of the WIF



E is DEATH BOTH for the espoused wife AND the consummated wife.

If GOD saw them the same, and your evidence shows nothing opposing this fact, then your evidence isnt evidence of anything that you assert.

The punishment from GODS law is the SAME for the betrothed AND the consummated wife.  
NOTHING in your 'evidence' shows ANY refutatin to this fact.

Quote:  
-----Personally, I don't know how anyone who truly desires to seek the truth on this matter can discount, without even a second thought, that this very well could be what Jesus was speaking about, since we find this "exception" ONLY in the Gospel of Matthew---a gospel aimed at JEWS who practiced the betrothal custom.  
-----

MOST of the BOOK is WRITTEN TO JEWS cindy...that is irrelevant.  
are you going to dismiss Hebrews as well?

Mark 10 and Matt 19 are the one and the same event.  
Matt also omits 'for every cause' as well...are you saying Matt ADDED it and it wasnt stated?  
Are you saying Matt ADDED "except for harlotry" to our Lords words to appease Jewish CUSTOM ?

Quote:  
-----I also don't know how anyone in good conscience can disgard the possibility that "porneia" can very well be speaking of UNLAWFUL unions----unions that God DID NOT join together.  
-----

Its not that we dismiss that possibility at all.  
YOU are the one who errantly is narrowing the word to fit your doctrine, not us.

\*IF\* a man is UNLAWFULLY married to a woman, porneia would cover it.  
You have yet to PROVE that I am UNLAWFULLY married to Laura after putting my wife away for harlotry.

Quote:  
-----  
In any case, getting back to the betrothal custom, in the other two gospels, aimed at Gentile audiences, they had no such betrothal custom, only marriage.  
-----

Irrelevant.  
Deut 22 shows the SAME EXACT death punishment for both the espoused and the consummated wife for sexual immorality..  
cindy, GOD sees the EXACTLY the same !

Quote:  
-----There we find NO exception made.  
-----

irrelevant, again

Quote:  
----- The sin of adultery is charged to ANYONE who joins himself/herself with another unlawfully or takes another's spouse after a divorce has occurred. This teaching is NOT found in the Mosaic law. A divorce gave permission for the parties to marry another(Deut.24:1-4).  
-----

the punishment for whoredom is DEATH in Deut...NOT divorce.

Deut 24 was a REGULATION to divorce that been going on already (readers see Leviticus 21)

There is NO permission EVER in the OT for 'divorce' for whoredom...the punishment is death, plain and simple.

Quote:  
----- Jesus changed that to say that now a divorce did not give right to marry again, but whosoever did so would be committing adultery in His sight.  
-----

wrong.

Jesus CLEARLY states that EXCEPT for whoredom you commit adultery upon remarriage if you divorce.

Quote:  
-----The other thing which SHOULD make one pause and consider is what I speak of all the time---WHY, if adultery gave means to a dissolution of marriage as some suppose the Mt. 19:9 passage means----WHY did Paul use the example of an adulterous woman (remarried) in regards to the permanency of the marriage bond (death is what severs the bond and frees one to remarry). No mention of divorce on the part of the innocent party.  
-----

Paul was using ONE aspect of the law in Romans 7.

that very law gave instruction on how to divorce WITHOUT the death of the spouse...you clearly reject this fact.

Quote:  
-----If, as some contend, Paul is speaking of OT Mosaic law, why use the same wording when speaking to ANOTHER Christian group (I Cor. 7:39).  
-----

because paul is dealing very clearly with frivolous divorce in 1 cor 7.

IF one puts away a wife and its not for fornication, then they DO commit adultery upon remarriage as they were bound until death "except for whoredom"

You just dont get it that an exception is just that...something that defies the norm.

Quote:  
-----If Paul is speaking of Mosaic law, it was NOT adultery to remarry after a divorce. **I believe it is because the "law" Paul is speaking of is NOT the Mosaic law**, it is God's law of marriage, which Jesus speaks of in His discourse---bringing marriage back to the created intent for marriage.  
-----

What you believe is clearly errant.

Romans 7 is about what cindy?

Do you comprehend the concept of CONTEXT?

Why dont you read the very NEXT verse in Romans 7?

**"Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.  
(Rom 7:4)**

DEAD to the LAW !!!!

WHAT "law" cindy?...what "law" was nailed to the Cross with our Lord? (Col 2:14)

Paul IS speaking about the Mosaic law, what you believe is irrelevant.  
He is comparing the Mosaic law to this 'law of the husband'...how it is 'for life' by its very nature.

If a man apostates himself from God's law (or Christ) what happens?  
The very same thing applies to a wife who 'apostates' herself from the "law" of her husband.  
Paul simply did not need to bring this into the discussion to make the point he was making....that's the extent of it.

Oddly enough, "adulteress" there in Romans 7 ALSO figuratively means "apostate"...

G3428

ἁγία; ἁγία; ἁγία; ἁγία; ἁγία; ἁγία; ἁγία; ἁγία;

moichalis

Thayer Definition:

1) an adulteress

2) as the intimate alliance of God with the people of Israel was likened to a marriage, those who relapse into idolatry are said to commit adultery or play the harlot

2a) fig. equiv. to faithless to God, unclean, apostate

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/24 11:26

Hi Cindy,

First, thanks for your response, which is the the most clear (to me) as to the way you are reasoning across the *whole* of this subject.

Quote:

-----As to the rest of your post, I really am not understanding your point, Dorcas

-----  
My point is, that although Jesus was born under the Old Covenant customs - hence Joseph's concern for Mary's and his reputation - and the reasonableness of Joseph having raised this concern in his heart. The fact is, even Joseph did not deal with his espoused wife, who, being found with child, he could have had stoned to death. Why? Because God Himself intervened

and an angel appeared to Joseph in a dream. This complete departure from the Jewish betrothal laws, indicates clearly God's suspension of them in principle. Jesus came TO FULFIL THE LAW. Yet, this law was broken before He was born.....

So, the part of my post which you did not understand, was probably, that Jesus Himself **did away with the Old Covenant and the Mosaic Law**. That's why the whole discussion about Him speaking to Jewish law and custom is incomprehensible, and makes no sense, not even to the natural mind, which understands that the Old Covenant was replaced by the New Covenant IN HIS BLOOD. 'His blood' is why I referred so many times to His death and that He knew what His death would accomplish.

In that you asked a previous question about my quote of Deuteronomy, I will come back to this.

If you read Matthew, looking at what he is actually saying (to the Jews, but **not only** to the Jews), he's actually pointing to a series of prophecies (I know he mentions Isaiah a few times (6 - just checked)), to draw attention to the historical justification for the Christ's having had a mission to bring the **Gentiles** in under God's blessing **instead of** the Jews. Far from Matthew's gospel being a reframing of Jewish thinking, now under Christ, he is really telling them, they have missed the boat. Their Messiah came, and they didn't recognise Him.... which was the fulfilment of a lot of prophecy about them (the Jews) AND about the Gentiles.

There is a progression of thought through the gospels, with regard to Caesar, which is interesting. Matthew records the trick question from the Pharisees, then Mark records it then Luke.

Luke 23:2

And they began to accuse Him, saying, "We found this perverting the nation, and forbidding to pay taxes to Caesar, saying that He Himself is Christ, a King."

By the time we get to John, he is exposing just **how far** the Jews were willing to compromise and depart from, their favored position under God, with

John 19:12

From then on Pilate sought to release Him, but the Jews cried out, saying, "If you let this Man go, you are not Caesar's friend. Whoever makes himself a king speaks against Caesar."

John 19:15

But they cried out, "Away with away with Crucify Him!" Pilate said to them, "Shall I crucify your King?" The chief priests answered, "**We have no king but Caesar!**"

And so, I don't accept that Jesus, through Matthew, is giving a revision to the Mosaic Law, because there is **no** justification for this interpretation, in the light of the rest of the New Testament. And that's a lot of New Covenant teaching, which doesn't tie in.

Quote:  
-----What they are saying is that there IS a difference between the one who DOES forgive and either is reconciled or "stands" for the wayward spouse and the person who will NOT accept back a wayward spouse.  
-----

Scroggins had it right when he said the faithful spouse could 'walk away forgivingly'.

That's because it is possible to forgive without being able to re-instate the relationship which has broken down.

Not only has God done this for us in Christ, *knowing* that only a few will be reconciled to Him, but thousands (maybe millions) of incest survivors who find Christ, find an active reconciliation with the sex offender, (such as you claim is the only possible interpretation of scripture, with an offending spouse), is out of the question. In this, they do not fail. Simply to *forgive* is all that's required of them.

I fully accept that a couple who were both Christians when they got married, are under a different charge, and this is workable, if both of them really ARE Christians.

Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/24 12:15

Quote:  
-----No hardheartedness is permitted---at all, that is why for a Christian, there is NO option to forgive. We MUST forgive or we will not be forgiven. When I hear a Christian say that we have an option in this regard, I cannot understand that mindset. What they are saying is that there IS a difference between the one who DOES forgive and either is reconciled or "stands" for the wayward spouse and the person who will NOT accept back a wayward spouse. Does the Lord look on each in an equal manner? For me, it always comes back to "how would Jesus handle such a situation?".....and there, I find my answer to what is right in His sight.  
-----

Forgiving someone and staying with them are two different things Sister.

I would much like to see you quote the scripture here and expound it here. It is much easier to follow someone's train of thought that way. Because the problem we are having here (whichever side has it, because both sides are so sure of themselves) could possibly be revealed somewhere along the lines in the thought process in expounding the scripture. That is, if we can see exactly where you see these things.

Devil's Advocate.

In Christ,

Scroggins

Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/24 12:32

Quote:  
-----I fully accept that a couple who were both Christians when they got married, are under a different charge, and this is workable, if both of them really ARE Christians.  
-----

Amen Sister Linn!

If a Christian, you would think they would not commit adultery.

I keep thinking about this. If they commit adultery (which might make you wonder about their status as a Christian) and you do not take them back as your spouse. Is that not the same thing as this scripture in a way?

Quote:  
-----1 Corinthians 7:13-15 (AMP)

13And if any woman has an unbelieving husband and he consents to live with her, she should not leave or divorce him.

14For the unbelieving husband is set apart (separated, withdrawn from heathen contamination, and affiliated with the Christian people) by union with his consecrated (set-apart) wife, and the unbelieving wife is set apart and separated through union with her consecrated husband. Otherwise your children would be unclean (unblessed heathen, outside the Christian covenant), but as it is they are **prepared for God**.

**15But if the unbelieving partner leaves, let him do so; in such brother or sister is not morally bound. But God has called us to peace.**  
-----

Committing adultery is in the eyes of GOD, leaving the marriage behind, do you not think?

So if it is leaving the marriage behind, and being that not a single person can really say if another "Brother" or "Sister" are saved, except by the value of their word, and maybe under examination of their fruits. In which case, adultery shows no fruit of the spirit, then you would question their word that they are Christian. Then by that you are not morally bound when adultery is committed, or when they leave you either way, for it is one in the same act.. For it is said, you have been called to peace.

In HIS Love,  
Scroggins

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/24 13:21

Quote:  
-----And so, I don't accept that Jesus, through Matthew, is giving a revision to the Mosaic Law, because there is no justification for this interpretation, in the light of the rest of the New Testament. And that's a lot of New Covenant teaching, which doesn't tie in.  
-----

I am confused to where I have ever stated that Jesus "revised" Mosaic law for Christians to follow. I don't think I said any such thing. I did say that the betrothal custom concerning divorce IS spoken of in scripture. As a matter of fact, in the very same Gospel and only Gospel (Mt. 1:18-24) we find the so called "exception" clause.

Quote:  
-----Scroggins had it right when he said the faithful spouse could 'walk away forgivingly'.  
-----

I disagree. As I asked, what is the difference TO THE LORD in one who "walks away" never turning back and the one who "remains unmarried", desiring their wayward spouse to repent and remaining faithful to the Lord and spouse---even if the spouse never repents? Is one right/one wrong---both right? What scriptures would you give to justify either position?

Quote:

-----Not only has God done this for us in Christ, knowing that only a few will be reconciled to Him,  
-----

Here is what the Lord states concerning those who have yet to repent:

The Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as some count slackness, but is LONGSUFFERING toward us, not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance (II Pet. 3:9).

and:

I Cor. 13.....love .....suffers long, does not seek its own, bears all things, believes all things, hopes for all things, endures all things.....Love NEVER fails.

Marriage is compared to Christ and the Church. Do you not think that we are to conduct ourselves towards one another (husbands/wives) as Christ does to His Body? Until the day comes when death embraces a person or His Second Advent comes, a person STILL has a chance at "life" and reconciliation with Jesus. Why should we not be of the same mind towards the one God joins us to? Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re:, on: 2006/5/24 13:28**

When is a marriage "dissolved"

Some ask "when is marriage dissolved"

Firstly, don't let yourself fall into the trap of when "one flesh" is dissolved. This is a semantics game those of the anti-remarriage camp play because they KNOW scripture speaks nothing of it. So when you can't find it, they believe they've won the discussion.

When the union is 'dissolved' is defined clearly in Deut 24:1-4.

Jesus never altered that definition of 'divorce', He merely reigned in the allowances FOR the divorce.

When a divorce is filed for the reasons Jesus (GOD) has excepted for, THAT is when the marriage is 'dissolved'.

Nor did Jesus argue/correct the pharisees' interpretation' of Deut 24:1-4 being 'for any cause'.

He merely stated 'why' Moses had given the allowance to begin with.

Moses had permitted them to put their wives away 'for any cause' because 'she found no favor in his eyes' simply over their hard hearts.

Moses chose to go with the lesser of the 2 evils....easy divorce or a tortured innocent wife...to deal with a problem that was out of control.

The fact is, as is proven by 1 Corinthians 6:16, that "one flesh" is nothing more than a man being one body with a woman, whether she is his wife or not. This is proven by Paul's even quoting our Lord's words in 6:16 there to show it IS the same.

When God created Adam and Eve, He created them in a manner so as they could become "one flesh" or one body (aka 'sex'). So when you see this reference, consummation between the two is all that is being shown.

When we marry someone, or in the customs of the Jews when betrothed or contracted in marriage, we enter God's holy union. For the Jews, they did it a bit differently. A virgin was given a year at home with her family after being contracted in this union, but make no mistake, she WAS the lawful bride of her husband as is shown in Deut 22 where she would have been brutally killed for sexual sins just as if she were fully married and consummated.

Once this union was contracted, she WAS married for all religious and legal purposes.

And yet, she was not yet "one flesh" with her husband. That happens when the marriage ceremony is over, and he takes her to his bed and they consummate their union.

A man is also 'one flesh' or 'one body' with a harlot he is with (1 Cor 6:16) showing that 'one flesh' is not exclusive to the marriage union.

When we look at divorce in Matt 19, we see that the pharisees were asking Jesus if they were permitted to divorce "for any cause", something they had grown used to over the centuries.

Jesus' response is to tell them that from the beginning it wasn't so....God had created them male and female, the husband would leave parents and cleave to his wife. They become "one flesh" together and what God Himself has put together, man should not tear down.

They ask Jesus why then Moses had permitted them to do so.

He tells them it's because their hearts were hard. (Do a study on the matter and you'll see what Jesus meant, these Jews who asked Him these things were very vile, wicked men who tormented their innocent wives many times)

He tells them whoever puts her away now for any reason short of fornication, commits adultery when he remarries as she does as well, because God doesn't have to accept a divorce just because we file it.

If it's not for this fornication, then sorry, it's not valid and you DO commit adultery by remarriage.

This 'dissolving' of a marriage occurs very simply, when one party has broken the covenant with sexual sin and the innocent party decided to officially end it just as God finally ended His covenant with Israel that He made with their fathers out of Egypt.

They did not keep His covenant, and He tolerated their sins for a long time, but fully and finally He put that covenant away publicly so as to not make any mistakes about it (see Zech speaking about His covenant ending)

The plain fact is that \*IF\* a marriage was not "dissolved" and "one flesh" kept the union intact, then Moses was kidding himself when he wrote Deut 24:1-4 as NOTHING he could have permitted would have broken this supposed indestructible "one flesh" bond created in the beginning.

In essence Moses would have been condemning to eternal torment anyone who he permitted to divorce in this manner as they would still have been "one flesh" with their first spouse based on what anti-remarriers show as being some eternal, UNbreakable 'one flesh' bond created by God from the beginning. This supposed perpetual "one flesh" bond would have still been intact while they were married to another and thus living IN adultery. The same thing many try to assert to day.

Surely Moses allowed for easy putting away, but divorce it was, it ENDED the covenant, as ALL divorce does when scripture allows for it, as in Jesus' exception.

Moses even allowing putting away at all for ANY reason shows that there ARE cases that can be permitted to end a covenant without the death of one party.

Now, surely it was for hardness of hearts in the case of those Jews Moses permitted as we can see the condition of their hearts all throughout the OT. These same Jews are the types that are asking Jesus "can we divorce for ANY cause" as Moses had to permit to keep the wife safe.

If Moses was permitted to allow divorce simply because "she find no favor in his eyes", then surely the Lord who created us all has the AUTHORITY to narrow that to sexual sin alone as shown by His own exception.

There is no magic thread attaching a man to a woman called "one flesh".

One flesh is a sexual relationship between a man and woman, married or not, as proven in 1 Cor, 6:16. A man and wife are "one flesh" just as God created them to be when they consummate their union and are literally 'one flesh' thru their subsequent sexual relationship because they are 'male and female' as He has made them.

When God joins two people in His union, it is done as soon as the two have agreed to marry and are contracted in whatever manner is acceptable to both of them.

The Jews had their customs, as do all peoples in the world, and most are different, but all are equally valid.

Isaac and Rebekah had no betrothal at all...she agreed to be his wife, she went immediately to him and became just that.

When one has broken the covenant in a manner that Jesus or Paul permits, then divorce is filed publically to show the world our intent, that is when marriage is "dissolved" . ..'one flesh' becomes a moot point as these two are no longer under a covenant together over sins JESUS Himself has excepted.

Dont let yourselves be drawn into semantics games my brethren. Stick to the facts. Gods word is very easy to understand, theres just a LOT to it.

=====

A response to a forum poster

lastblast:

Nowhere do we read where Paul ever gives any indication that a marriage is dissolved, with the freedom to marry again,

.....  
Nowhere does he teach that adultery dissolves. Nowhere does he teach that a remarriage dissolves the previous marriage. Nowhere does he teach that a divorce dissolves.....

In Him, Cindy

response by FOC:

cindy, youre being outright deceptive in this matter.

Deut 24:1-4, a CLEAR passage that shows the meaning of 'divorce', shows EXACTLY what happens to the marriage when a man 'divorces' his wife....she is NO LONGER his WIFE !

THERE is your 'dissolved'...

Jesus did NOT REdefine 'divorce/putting away'.

He clearly stated that ONLY in a case of whoredom can one do so and remarry without committing adultery.

What is painfully clear here is that you arent studied in this matter whatsoever.

Otherwise youd have known that 'divorce/putting away' doesnt need to be DEFINED again in the NT...Moses already did that.

"Divorce" is 'putting away' with the written proof that Moses required in Deut 24.

Jesus didnt alter that meaning...nor the meaning of 'putting away'.

All He did was do away with the allowance for frivolous divorce (for any cause) that Moses had permitted.

So as I said, your semantics game is apparent to all...

HOME

1

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/24 13:30

Quote:

-----Forgiving someone and staying with them are two different things Sister.

Who said that one had to "stay" with someone who is unrepentant? Paul addressed that (I Cor.7:10-11). However, if someone IS repentant and wants their marriage restored, yet the other will NOT restore, how is that forgiveness? When someone "moves on" the door to reconciliation of that relationship has been slammed shut. What picture does that send to our children on the nature of God's love towards us? Not a very good one in my opinion.....

If we are to bring in other types of relationships, we must acknowledge that there is no other relationship like a marriage--none. It is so different and special that it is used as a Picture of Christ and the Church(His Body). When one of us sins against Him, even spiritual adultery----does He cast us out never to be reconciled to us again or, does He desire that we



repent and our relationship restored? I think we'll both agree on the answer to that one. Are we different in how we are to respond then? Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/24 13:33**

Quote:  
-----Marriage is compared to Christ and the Church. Do you not think that we are to conduct ourselves towards one another (husbands/wives) as Christ does to His Body? Until the day comes when death embraces a person or His Second Advent comes, a person STILL has a chance at "life" and reconciliation with Jesus. Why should we not be of the same mind towards the one God joins us to? Blessings in Him, Cindy  
-----

YES! We are to conduct ourselves in the same way, but we cannot. Why else would there be need of Christ if we could?

In the world today, you have homosexual marriages, marriages for media coverage, and marriages that are by no means formed by GOD. They are in fact, only extreme abuses of what GOD has given us, for example, much like the sexual ability is abused by masturbation, homosexuality, extreme sexual lifestyles and premarital sex by almost everyone in the world today.

The institution of marriage (or rather a bonding of man and woman to create one flesh for worship of GOD, for where there are two in praise, HE is with them) is very much so, GOD's institution. But, this institution created by GOD has been abused, and such making not every marriage, one where the two are joined by GOD, but rather by state alone.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/24 13:33**

lastblast,

I have stated before that I'm on disability and my bills have accumulated over time that I cannot pay. Bill collectors have been calling, and because the debt is so high, they want way more than I can even afford in payments.

Cindy...You have stated numerous times in many places that we are all CALLED to obey God---whether we want to or not.

Your Lord has said this and you are CALLED to obey..whether you WANT to or not...

**"Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away"**  
**(Mat 5:42)**

I'm ASKING you for some financial help in this matter.

Now....are you going to follow the direction, the command of your Lord.....

or will you prove yourself a hypocrite who puts the yoke upon the backs of OTHERS, then excuse yourself from any laws you yourself don't want to adhere to?

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/24 13:39**

Quote:  
-----If we are to bring in other types of relationships, we must acknowledge that there is no other relationship like a marriage---none. It is so different and special that it is used as a Picture of Christ and the Church (His Body). When one of us sins against Him, even spiritual adultery---does He cast us out never to be reconciled to us again or, does He desire that we repent and our relationship restored? I think we'll both agree on the answer to that one. Are we different in how we are to respond then? Blessings in Him, Cindy  
-----

I guess we will see how that sort of thing weighs in at the Judgment Seat, now won't we? That is, when another debate is settled as well, that debate is eternal security.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/24 15:06

Quote:

-----YES! We are to conduct ourselves in the same way, but we cannot. Why else would there be need of Christ if we could?

Don't you see that we now are using the same argument the world uses for its inability to adhere to the Commands of God? The thing is the "world" is right, they cannot. However, now you are saying that those who supposedly have His Spirit cannot follow Him as well? I don't agree.

Quote:

-----this institution created by GOD has been abused, and such making not every marriage, one where the two are joined by GOD, but rather by state alone.

I very much agree with this statement. The problem is the church is pointing outward saying God did not join THOSE marriages, yet feels that God DOES join those unions He calls adultery. It's an interesting thing to see that history has repeated itself. The Lord rebuked the Pharisees for coming against those who committed adultery when they themselves were guilty of the very same thing(yet they couldn't see it either)..... Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/24 15:14

FOC said:

Quote:

-----Oddly enough, "adulteress" there in Romans 7 ALSO figuratively means "apostate"...

G3428

&#956;&#959;&#953;&#967;&#945;&#955;&#953;&#769;&#962;

moichalis

Thayer Definition:

1) an adulteress

2) as the intimate alliance of God with the people of Israel was likened to a marriage, those who relapse into idolatry are said to commit adultery or play the harlot

2a) fig. equiv. to faithless to God, unclean, apostate

-----  
This is new to me. How interesting.

I know from my other studies of related topics, that there is a consistency across God's word, which reflects again and again, His thought and heart. I've come to view it in my mind's eye, as a globe, within which all the points on the surface of the globe connect across to each other, internally, and at peace with each other. If my idea doesn't fit His wider scheme, then it is I, not He, who makes the adjustment.

Cindy, I noticed you refer to **spiritual adultery**. I'd be very interested in your definition of that.

So far, you have not given a definition of either adultery, or fornication, which is able to be applied with the simple consistency which it appears in scripture.

I'm also interested in the phrase, because a few posts ago you were saying you think I over-spiritualise virginity. I realise this is not quite the same as a *concept* of **spiritual virginity** but they are very close.

I'm not sure how you can know what spiritual adultery IS, if you are not clear about spiritual virginity, and whether, if one loses one's spiritual virginity, it can ever be regained?

Re:, on: 2006/5/24 15:15

lasatblast..

Since you refuse, as usual, to deal with being proven errant, I guess I will simply just respond to your posts.

btw, ignoring a refutation doesnt nullify it.

You WERE proven errant...again...Paul IS speaking about Mosiac Law in Romans 7.

additionally..

Quote:  
-----The problem is the church is pointing outward saying God did not join THOSE marriages, yet feels that God DOES join those unions He calls adultery.  
-----

No, we feel that YOU arent given permission to reject His exception clause in which a SECOND marriage is NOT adultery by HIS OWN WORDS where the previous spouse was put away for whoredom.

YOU call these adultery...GOD does not.

Quote:  
-----t's an interesting thing to see that history has repeated itself. The Lord rebuked the Pharisees for coming against those who committed adultery when they themselves were guilty of the very same thing(yet they couldn't see it either)..  
-----

Yes it is.

Its also interesting to see folks who are too 'lazy' to take the time to actually distinguish the innocent from the guilty, so they simply toss everyone into the same basket of condemnation to keep from actually having to 'rightly divide' His word and instruction.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/24 15:17

Quote:  
-----I guess we will see how that sort of thing weighs in at the Judgment Seat, now won't we? That is, when another debate is settled as well, that debate is eternal security.  
-----

Ah, yes, the eternal security debate. Right now, I lean in the Calvinist direction, but very far from Cheap Grace. I believe the evidence of our salvation WILL be seen, but that does not mean that I believe in a works salvation. I believe if one truly is a child of God they can get off into sin, but they WILL come home in repentance.

I think it's kinda ironic that some who believe one can lose their salvation think it ok to remain in adulterous marriages---- somehow thinking that this one type of illicit relationship turns into a lawful union even though there's nothing in scripture to show such a thing. Many of these same "repentance" preachers will teach that if one does not forsake an adulterous extramarital affair, they are hellbound.....as is any person who continues in a known sin, be it sexual or other sins as spoken of by Paul concerning those who will/will not inherit the kingdom of God. There are many interesting things to ponder when one scratches beneath the surface concerning this issue of remarriage=adultery. Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re:, on: 2006/5/24 15:22

Quote:  
-----  
dorcass wrote:  
  
FOC said:  
  
Quote:  
-----Oddly enough, "adulteress" there in Romans 7 ALSO figuratively means "apostate"...

G3428  
&#956;&#959;&#953;&#967;&#945;&#955;&#953;&#769;&#962;  
moichalis  
Thayer Definition:  
1) an adulteress  
2) as the intimate alliance of God with the people of Israel was likened to a marriage, those who relapse into idolatry are said to commit adultery or play the harlot  
2a) fig. equiv. to faithless to God, unclean, apostate  
-----  
This is new to me. How interesting.  
-----

Sadly enough, its been pointed out to cindy ad nauseum.....she simply rejects anything that doesnt agree with her doctrine.

You see how Iw proven in this thread that Romans 7 IS referring to Mosaic law....but you can bet your buttons cindy not only wont admit it or accept it, but keep you eye on her posts, she'll be repeating the same exact thing at some point, that Paul supposedly ISNT comparing the Mosaic 'Law' to this 'law of the husband'.  
Denial is a powerful thing...

Quote:  
----- If my idea doesn't fit His wider scheme, then it is I, not He, who makes the adjustment.  
-----

As is the case with ALL true students of His word.  
We can easily discern the false student when they casually dismiss even the most basic of correction when their error is as evident as we've seen in this thread.

The true student will ALWAYS adjust his views to fit new information when that data is shown to be true.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/24 15:24

Quote:  
-----Cindy, I noticed you refer to spiritual adultery. I'd be very interested in your definition of that.  
-----

Dorcass,

If you are not familiar with the multitudes of scriptures in which God speaks of His people committing adultery (not physical, sexual relations, but idolatry), then I would be happy to look some up for you. I think that is a very clear teaching throughout scripture. It is not the same as your concept of spiritual/renewed virginity.

As for definitions of adultery/fornication, I think the Strong's on those words and greek lexicons have already been posted, no? I am not at odds with those definitions. Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re:, on: 2006/5/24 15:28

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

I think it's kinda ironic that some who believe one can lose their salvation think it ok to remain in adulterous marriages---

Again...you have yet to PROVE these marriages are adulterous when the ex has been put away for whoredom.

Quote:

There are many interesting things to ponder when one scratches beneath the surface concerning this issue of remarriage=adultery . Blessings in Him, Cindy

scratches beneath the surface?  
Is that all you have done here?

You know full well how much time Ive invested in this discussion cindy....hardly 'scratching' beneath the surface.

Not a single one of your assertoins has gone unrefuted by myself and others who have dug deeply enough to understand that 'except for whoredom' means precisely what it clearly states

Re:, on: 2006/5/24 15:34

Quote:

As for definitions of adultery/fornication, I think the Strong's on those words and greek lexicons have already been posted, no? **I am not at odds with those definitions.** Blessings in Him, Cindy

Actually you are.  
Strong's includes simple adultery in its definition of fornication.

**G4202**  
**&#960;&#959;&#961;&#957;&#949;&#953;&#769;&#945;**  
**porneia**  
**por-ni'-ah**  
**From G4203; harlotry (including adultery and incest); figuratively idolatry: - fornication.**

You, yourself, admitted that you dont believe fornication (porneia, g4202) is 'adultery' within a lawful marriage....thus you ARE at odds with the Strong's....and MANY other dictionaries and scholars...including your dear Hermas, ECF.

readers see...  
<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/adulteryisfornication.html>

Re:, on: 2006/5/24 15:43

Did Jesus say "wife" or "espoused" wife

In His exception clause, Jesus is clearly refering to a lawful wife. If Jesus had been only refering to the betrothal period in the exception clause, He would have used the very term used for Mary at times...."espoused wife" or "espoused" (see G3423) in His exception clause.

\*IF\* He were restricting His exception to the betrothal period, there is no reason to believe that our Lord would have been so vague about it.

The fact is NOTHING presented in scripture backs this silly assertion by some who say that Jesus only meant to except the betrothed wife.

This is all deceptive propaganda created to further a false doctrine... this idea does not come from Gods word.

Jesus clearly used the word that means "wife" or woman. A mans woman was his wife. She was his lawful wife from the moment the marriage was contracted. The betrothed wife was a lawful wife.

Jesus being a Jew and being God, knew this.

When He said "wife" He was refering to whoredom of a wife, pre or post consummation.

(compare Matt 19.9 and 5:32 with Luke 2:5)

Conclusion:

Jesus could have said "espoused" or 'betrothed' ("mne?steuo?" as is used for Mary) in His exception, yet He chose to use the normal word for a 'wife'(gune?) in Matthew 19.

If Jesus WAS discerning one OVER the other, His ACTUAL words would be pertaining to the consummated wife and not the betrothed at all.

But seeing that the betrothed wife was lawfully contracted in marriage, she was just as much a 'wife' for legal and religious reasons as the consummated wife.

#### Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/24 16:18

Hi Cindy,

I'm not planning to quote the Matthew 19 verses again, but, I want to say this, which has just occurred to me.

When Jesus said 'Moses suffered ...' them to put away their wives 'for every cause' because of the hardness of mens hearts, by **excluding** divorce for fornication (porneia), He was (by simple logic) also vindicating a faithful spouse from hardness of heart for that divorce..... because, ONLY those who divorced their spouse 'for every cause', were guilty of 'hardness of heart'.

The spouse with the hardness of heart, in that case, is the spouse who committed porneia - that is, the spouse who not only committed adultery in her or his heart and mind, but put it into action.

This is another reason the faithful spouse is free from guilt.

You know, it strikes me as strange that you not only want a system where one spouse goes so far as to actually commit adultery, and then, that person is to EXPECT, having broken the most serious flesh covenant they can make during their lifetime, that the person they have deserted and betrayed is BOUND to WAIT, until THEY are in the mood to repent.

Not even God does this for ever. EDIT It is a Divine attribute that He waits as long as He does, when He could simply have walked away from us all. EDIT end

In the earlier quote you made from Peter, the operative verb is WILLING. Of course GOD is not **willing** that any should perish. He believes He has done enough in Jesus to prevent that. But, this knowledge / information, has to be balanced against the Lord's own prophecies about few finding the narrow gate, and the way to destruction being broad.

Also, that HE said, there would be publicans and harlots going into the kingdom of God (Matt 21).

The *whole* counsel of scripture has to be included in our analysis.

#### Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2006/5/24 23:00

This discussion reminds me of the experience I had while working with female clients at the Crises Pregnancy Center.

Many of my clients were involved in adulterous situations. Some were married and divorced; others were fornicating. To the divorced I would ask "how do you feel about that? is it right?" What was so interesting were the answers I got from them. The average woman agreed that to remarry with a spouse living was sin, or adultery. The women who said it was not sin were those who relied on logic and human reasoning to justify their position and they could jump through some fancy hoops in doing so. They arrived at those positions by having been persuaded by another eloquent preacher or friend

The simple person understands Jesus words as recorded in Mark 10:11; Luke 16:18 (15-18) as simply meaning that if a person remarries after divorcing his/her spouse commits adultery.

After counseling with many females of all kinds: rich, poor, in-between, intellectual, average, mature, immature, Christian, non-Christian, lost, saved persons guilty of any sin under the sun I have gained an insight as to why Jesus resorted to the masses to teach and not the religious (Jewish) hierarchy.

The simple person on the street was not given to arguments but accepted his words as given. The Scribes and Pharisees on the other hand were given to circumvent the OT law to fit their own logic and reasoning for whatever reason, thus nullifying God's word. THIS is what would rile Jesus when discussing law with the Jewish leaders. An example of this is found in Mark 7:9-13: "And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition.

10: For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death:

11: But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free.

12: And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother;

13: Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.

If you were to accept the directive given by Jesus in Mark 10:11-12: 11: And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her.

12: And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery. OR Luke 16: 15-18 :15: And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God.

16: The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it.

17: And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.

18: Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery" it would solve a lot of disputes.

In v. 16 Jesus is plainly saying he is issuing a NEW directive: the Old Testament law was until John and NOW the kingdom of heaven is being preached and EVERYONE is pressed into it, meaning HE has the last word on this issue.

ginnyrose

Re:, on: 2006/5/24 23:46

Quote:  
-----The simple person understands Jesus words as recorded in Mark 10:11; Luke 16:18 (15-18) as simply meaning that if a person remarries after divorcing his/her spouse commits adultery.  
-----

And those who 'rightly divide His word' who aren't so 'simple' understand that Matt 19 and Mark 10 are the SAME event... so Jesus said 'for every cause' and 'except for fornication' that day, even though Mark for some reason didn't record it.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/25.html>

Quote:  
-----  
If you were to accept the directive given by Jesus in Mark 10:11-12: 11: And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her.  
-----

...and now for the rest of the story....

"And I say to you, that, whoever may put away his wife, **if not for whoredom**, and may marry another, doth commit adultery; and he who did marry her that hath been put away, doth commit adultery.'  
Mat 19:9

but I say to you, that whoever may put away his wife, **save for the matter of whoredom**, doth make her to commit adultery; and whoever may marry her who hath been put away doth commit adultery.

(Mat 5:32)

Quote:

-----  
In v. 16 Jesus is plainly saying he is issuing a NEW directive: the Old Testament law was until John and NOW the kingdom of heaven is being preached and EVERYONE is pressed into it, meaning HE has the last word on this issue.  
-----

Really?

because Jesus sure seems to be saying 'from the BEGINNING it wasn't this way.  
Sounds more like He's returning them to a pre-"for every cause" state to me.

A state where she actually has to break the covenant to be put away.

It's amazing how many folks I see who cannot seem to grasp the fact that this 'hardheartedness' Jesus speaks of was concerning the manner in which these Jewish men were treating their wives.  
It has nothing to do with putting her away for playing the harlot, but doing so 'for EVERY cause' ....

and Jesus 'last word' includes 'EXCEPT for fornication' (whoredom)...which even the ECF Hermas knows is within a LAWFUL marriage.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/adulteryisfornication.html>

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a BIBLICAL perspective, on: 2006/5/25 8:15**

Quote:

-----who ARE convicted they are living in a state of perpetual adultery  
-----

Cindy, good morning.

I know I've lifted these words of yours out of the context of a second marriage which *you* say others feel convicted of, as adulterous.....

From my own experience of feeling guilty (and I have LONG experience of feeling guilty!) I know it is possible to live under a sense of condemnation which is *nothing* to do with conviction for sin, and everything to do with *someone else's guilt*, which that person has imparted while (that other person was) sinning against them (me).

Men *and* women can have the foundation laid for an *aptitude* to carry someone else's guilty conscience, way back in their childhood. My repeated testimonies of healing, allude non-verbally to the layers which God has brought to my attention, of emotional injury which continue(d) to damage my soul, until they are / were addressed.

I don't dispute some real guilt may belong to the person feeling it, (eg me) but (I have found that) that too, may be *only* historical rather than related to my / their current situation.

Guilt is *intended* to be deeply disturbing, *because* it has the happy potential to turn us to seeking God over parts of our lives



ves which have never received, or need again, to receive His touch. However, a sense of guilt can lay us open to using our mental, rather than our spiritual perception, to consider how we may have sinned. There is a considerable mystery in one's soul, when one goes on and on feeling condemned, but without any immediate understanding of *why*, or obvious reason for it. Of course, the Adversary is night and day accusing us to the Father, so it's important to be sure of our ground in Christ first. I have been tremendously blessed this week by Patrick's testimony here.

[https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id=10719&forum=44&18](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=10719&forum=44&18)

"for the last at least six months, I have had no joy, no peace, no holiness. I struggled with lust, with the praise of man, bitterness, envy, gossip, oh you name it and it was there before me and God.

It had gotten to the place where I was very dry, withered I would say. I could barely pray, I could not really read the Scriptures, yet I went on every Sunday preaching to people about how to live above these things. Yes I was a hypocrite, and I carried this guilt day by day. It affected how I interacted with my wife, and with everyone else. I was putting on a show basically, a show of learned behaviour that I learned from reading good books and listening to good sermons, yet I was miserable.

Today, oh about 10 minutes ago, I know for certain that I received Christ and His Spirit. My heart is clean, and I have been crucified with Him. It is more than a feeling, it is like a deep truth in me, I know that I am in the vine now!!!!

All this is to say that we cannot toy with sin, and walk with God when He is so willing and able to cleanse us. Oh let us labour to enter into His rest.  
Hallelujah!!!!"

#### Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/25 8:19

contd.

Because Jesus and Paul speak so strongly about God's attitude to adultery - and fornication etc - and their being sufficient to exclude one from the kingdom of God forever, the phrase 'perpetual adultery', has the potential to strike genuine fear of damnation into hearts.

Yet even Paul, when exhorting believers to depart from adultery and fornication, never uses the phrase 'perpetual adultery', as if it is a sin from which one can never be free, forgiven or healed. It conveys a hideous spectre of perpetual bondage - of sin from which one can never get free.... and that image is a lie.

If one is not clear as to the *source* of one's guilt before God, I can see - and know from experience of concern for my own salvation - that to avoid marital happiness might present itself as a first step to ruling out adultery as a source of inevitable damnation.

It would be ideal if no-one could get married until they had a completely clean conscience before God, but, there are many reasons this may not be possible, except within the acknowledgement of the efficacy of the blood of Christ through the Spirit, to present one faultless before the Father's throne.

*Experiencing* the benefit of His work in our lives, at the tangible level of our soul through healing, may take much longer than anyone would like. But, it is good to move in that direction. It is much better to allow His blessing to infiltrate our deepest understanding, than to juggle the presentation of our exterior life eg

(NKJV) 1 Timothy 4

1 Now the Spirit expressly says that in latter times some will depart from the faith, giving heed to deceiving spirits and doctrines of demons,

2 speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their own conscience seared with a hot iron,

3 forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from foods which God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and know the truth.

Lastly, I would draw attention to the state of heart which IS in perpetual adultery.... having nothing to do with the outward appearance of departing from the marriage bed. Is not this marriage bed as defiled as that of the adulterer who commits the outward act?

Matthew 5:28

But I say to you that whoever looks at a woman to lust for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart.

Obviously, this is as applicable to women, as men.

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/25 8:28**

Dorcas,

If you go back and read the dialogue in Mt. 19 you will see that first the Pharisees asked Jesus if they could put away a wife for ANY cause. Jesus then spoke of the creation intent of marriage---that once a couple is joined by God, they are now 1 flesh with His command for man not to separate.

THEN they came back and brought Moses into it, asking why, if divorce is not ok, did Moses command a certificate of divorce be given. Jesus then goes on to say that this was done ONLY for the reason of man's hardheartedness. Can you find a Mosaic law BY MOSES for divorce "for any cause" in scripture? I can't. All I can find is Deut. 24, so it appears to me that THIS writing is what Jesus is talking about-----As usual though, even this ONE "allowance" given for the hardheartedness of man was perverted and expanded upon to now include "for ANY cause" (meaning it perverted to mean that it was up to man's discretion to decide what "unclean" meant to THEM).

That sounds awfully familiar to what people do with the so called "exception" clause. Every person I know who teaches adamantly that adultery "can" dissolve a marriage, does not believe that adultery is the ONLY reason----they now expand that definition to include many things OUTSIDE sexual infidelity. This generation is very MUCH like the Pharisees in that regard from what I see.

Quote:  
-----You know, it strikes me as strange that you not only want a system where one spouse goes so far as to actually commit adultery, and then, that person is to EXPECT, having broken the most serious flesh covenant they can make during their lifetime, that the person they have deserted and betrayed is BOUND to WAIT, until THEY are in the mood to repent.  
-----

I don't "want" this system, Dorcas. I SEE this portrayed in the scriptures----very different. My "flesh" sees this as unfair, yet even so, I see the wisdom of God in the permanency of marriage. I can see from your response that this really all ends back to the "innocent's" wants and desires and the fairness of it all. As I said, I can't see this issue from that stance anymore as it appears very fleshy to me and not of the Spirit----who indeed many times calls us to suffer for the benefit of others.

Also, if this is a "time" thing for you, let's just say that within a year or less, the offender comes and repents in all sincerity and wants the marriage restored? What to do? As Christians, are we to say, "sorry, your offense was just too great! We will not be reuniting as a family. Go along your way and reap the results of your sin now."

Does Jesus do that to us when we come to Him broken and desiring restoration with Him?

In regards to waiting, you say that it is a divine attribute. I don't agree as there are even UNBELIEVERS who have the heart and stamina to wait for a wayward spouse and even UNBELIEVERS will take back a spouse who has sinned against the marriage. Now you are saying that we, who are supposed to have received the HOLY SPIRIT, the same spirit that was in Jesus Christ our Lord, are not able to do that which even UNBELIEVERS have done----wait, forgive and have the relationship restored? I can't agree with your reasoning. The only reason one cannot/will not wait, forgive, and desire a restoration is because of hardheartedness.

Quote:  
-----Also, that HE said, there would be publicans and harlots going into the kingdom of God (Matt 21).  
-----

Oh, I completely agree.....Paul spoke on this as well.....that's why the Grace of God is so incredible!! However, Paul said, "as such some of you WERE!"----past tense. If Christ truly does regenerate a person and brings them from death

h to life, they will not continue BEING a harlot and publican as sin is uncovered. When Paul spoke of those who will not inherit the kingdom of God, I believe He was speaking of the nature of such---those who have this nature are NOT the children of God, no matter what they say to the contrarywise. Their UNREPENTANT LIFESTYLE choices show them not to be "brethren". Paul was very clearly trying to exhort the brethren not to be deceived into believing that those who live this kind of life will inherit the kingdom of God---not true. Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/25 8:44**

Quote:  
-----Yet even Paul, when exhorting believers to depart from adultery and fornication, never uses the phrase 'perpetual adultery', as if it is a sin from which one can never be free, forgiven or healed. It conveys a hideous spectre of perpetual bondage - of sin from which one can never get free.... and that image is a lie.  
-----

EVERY sin can be repented of Dorcas. The only sin that cannot be repented of is one that is embraced and will not be forsaken.

When Paul speak of those who will not inherit the kingdom of God, it is in regards to those who love their sin MORE than God and that sin is who they are. It is not a one time "oops" I missed the mark. It is the refusal to turn from one's own life/flesh and turn to the Living God who absolutely CAN and DOES give a heart to forsake sin to those who LOVE Him.

Quote:  
-----2 speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their own conscience seared with a hot iron, 3 forbidding to marry,  
-----

Do you quote this to people who come against homosexual marriage, Dorcas? It's interesting that this passage frequently comes up against those who speak against adulterous remarriage, but no one would dare use this passage against those who speak against gay marriage. That is because we KNOW homosexual marriage is WRONG due to the scriptures on homosexual activity---if the activity itself is wrong, surely a marriage including such activity must be wrong as well. In those cases it is OK to prohibit marriage, is it not?

Equally, and even more so, we know adultery is wrong and we do have scripture which speaks not only against adultery, but against adulterous marriages as well. If that be the case, do you think it ok to prohibit marriage for homosexuals, but allow marriages Jesus calls adultery? Is either type of marriage acceptable to the Lord?

Blessings in Him, Cindy

Edited to add more statements.....

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2006/5/25 9:50**

FOC,

I do not know what Bible you are using. Matthew 19:9 reads differently than what you posted: "And I say to you, that, whoever may put away his wife, if not for whoredom, and may marry another, doth commit adultery; and he who did marry her that hath been put away, doth commit adultery." Mat 19:9.

The KJV says: "9: And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."

The NASB says: "And I say to you, whoever divorces his wife, except for immorality, and marries another woman commits adultery." These scriptures clearly say remarrying after a divorce is committing adultery. Simple. Why complicate a simple matter?

Quote:  
Really?

because Jesus sure seems to be saying 'from the BEGINING it wasnt this way.  
Sounds more like Hes returning them to a pre-"for every cause" state to me.

Are you saying Jesus does not have the authority to change the 'law'? Let me ask you another question: do you think Jesus was/is the Jehovah God?

ginnyrose

**Re:, on: 2006/5/25 10:44**

Quote:  
-----dorcass  
"From my own experience of feeling guilty (and I have LONG experience of feeling guilty!) I know it is possible to live under a sense of condemnation which is nothing to do with conviction for sin, and everything to do with someone else's guilt, which that person has imparted while (that other person was) sinning against them (me).

and

"Because Jesus and Paul speak so strongly about God's attitude to adultery - and fornication etc - and their being sufficient to exclude one from the kingdom of God forever, the phrase 'perpetual adultery', has the potential to strike genuine fear of damnation into hearts.

precisely.

What lastblast and their group does is to prey on the less studied.  
You'll notice they get far less recruits than those who walk away from them because when they try these scare tactics with folks, MANY Christians are able to read the scriptures, clearly see that Jesus said 'except for fornication' and easily see that this fornication CANNOT and IS NOT restricted to Jewish betrothal custom (Acts 15 alone refutes this nonsense wholesale)

There are a few though, that they do manipulate and scare the dickens out of, those who only take the study so far, scratching the surface as it has been stated, whom then become scared of hell, who end up feeling this so called "conviction" and doing what 56ford did and put away a spouse unlawfully.

They work on folks' fears of hell and of disobeying God, which when the teaching is correct is productive....but when it's a hellspawned lie is destructive to marriages God Himself has made exception for.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/25 10:49**

Quote:  
-----  
ginnyrose wrote:  
FOC,

I do not know what Bible you are using.  
-----

I use 27 versions, including Greek and Hebrew ones.  
That particular one is a literal version.  
Please don't try to make this a version issue, I'll turn that argument around on you so fast your head will spin.  
'fornication' in the KJV IS whoredom...harlotry....sexual immorality...period.

Quote:  
-----  
Matthew 19:9 reads differently than what you posted: "And I say to you, that, whoever may put away his wife, if not for whoredom, and may marry another, doth commit adultery; and he who did marry her that hath been put away, doth commit adultery." Mat 19:9.

The KJV says: "9: And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."

The NASB says: "And I say to you, whoever divorces his wife, except for immorality, and marries another woman commits adultery."

**These scriptures clearly say remarrying after a divorce is committing adultery. Simple. Why complicate a simple matter?**

-----

Apparently you do not comprehend the meaning of the words 'except for' or 'if not for'.

Your NASB clearly states "EXCEPT FOR immorality"....YOU make that anything less than what it plainly means.

The KJV says fornication...fornication is ANY sexual immorality/sin committed by anyone, married or not.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/adulteryisfornication.html>

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/fornicationnotonlyduringbetrothal.html>

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/11.html>

Do you want me to start REposting everything again, or will you simply take a moment to READ what's been posted in this thread?

Why DO you folks "complicate" this very SIMPLE matter?

Jesus said "except for fornication/whoredom/harlotry/sexual immorality"....you don't have to like it, but if you were studied, you'd surely have to admit it.

Quote:

-----Quote

Really?

because Jesus sure seems to be saying 'from the BEGINNING it wasn't this way.

Sounds more like He's returning them to a pre-"for every cause" state to me.

Are you saying Jesus does not have the authority to change the 'law'? Let me ask you another question: do you think Jesus was/is the Jehovah God?

ginnyrose

-----

Please.

You made an incorrect assertion that was shown errant.

Jesus Himself is the one who said 'from the beginning'....HE is the one showing that He isn't giving a NEW commandment, but returning things to their former order.

What is "new" in this testament, is that forgiveness is offered the adulterer (go and sin no more)...instead of being stoned to death as Deut 22 and Leviticus required.

That in no way nullifies the exception to the rule..

**Re:, on: 2006/5/25 11:03**

Quote:

-----

EVERY sin can be repented of. For all sins, there is repentance. The only sin that cannot be repented of is one that is embraced and will not be forsaken.

When Paul speaks of those who will not inherit the kingdom of God, it is in regards to those who love their sin MORE than God and that sin is who they are. It is not a one time "oops" I missed the mark. It is the refusal to turn from one's own life/flesh and turn to the Living God who absolutely CAN and DOES give a heart to forsake sin to those who LOVE Him.

-----

You have yet to PROVE this perpetual adultery scenario.

You have yet to PROVE that those who remarried after putting away for fornication ARE indeed committing adultery seeing that Jesus (aka GOD) Himself made exception for this situation

Re:, on: 2006/5/25 11:05

Quote:  
-----Do you quote this to people who come against homosexual marriage, Dorcas? It's interesting that this passage frequently comes up against those who speak against adulterous remarriage, but noone would dare use this passage against those who speak against gay marriage. That is because we KNOW homosexual marriage is WRONG due to the scriptures on homosexual activity---if the activity itself is wrong, surely a marriage including such activity must be wrong as well. In those cases it is OK to prohibit marriage, is it not?  
-----

Please, let's not start this nonsense of comparing something that has NEVER been permitted, men with men, with marriages that Jesus Himself says NO adultery is committed upon when the former spouse has been put away for whoredom.

Re:, on: 2006/5/25 11:10

Quote:  
-----Equally, and even more so, we know adultery is wrong and we do have scripture which speaks not only against adultery, but against adulterous marriages as well. If that be the case, do you think it ok to prohibit marriage for homosexuals, but allow marriages Jesus calls adultery? Is either type of marriage acceptable to the Lord?  
-----

Cindy, every time you post this nonsense your lack of study becomes blindingly apparent.

There WERE remarried divorcees IN the church and IN fellowship...that is a fact that ANY historical study will show.

When the corinthian man WAS considered to be 'living in fornication'(1 cor 5) Paul made a BIG stink about it had him REMOVED from the church....yet we see not ONE SINGLE person being removed who was a remarried while this former spouse lived.

and we KNOW that remarried divorcees were a HUGE issue with the early church....far more than these imaginary gay marriages of yours.

Paul CLEARLY has the ONE case of actual sexual sin in the church REMOVED...then says NOTHING concerning removing these YOU claim are living in perpetual sin supposedly as the man in 1 cor 5.

Men with men has ALWAYS been abomination.

And we see that there were, again, those of more than one wife clearly being in fellowship, yet restricted from being considered for bishop.

=====

#### Evidences of divorce and remarriage in the Church

Evidences that there were divorcees who had remarried in the church are found in the list of widows and the requirements for bishops.

>-1Tim 5:9 Do not let a widow be enrolled having become less than sixty years old, the wife of one man,  
>-Titus 1:6 if anyone is blameless, husband of one wife, having believing children, not accused of loose behavior, or disobedient.  
>-1Tim 3:2 Then it behooves the overseer to be without reproach, husband of one wife, temperate, sensible, well-ordered, hospitable, apt at teaching,

Wife of one man

This requirement clearly is not speaking of a woman who had a man-harem.  
There is no real issue of women marrying multiple husbands given in the bible nor in historical accounts.  
This leaves either the remarried widow, or the remarried divorcee.  
It cannot be a remarried widow as no law forbade the widow to remarry. Paul even tells widows

"I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn.  
(1Co 7:8-9 KJV)

Paul would be setting these widows up to be rejected from this list later if she did remarry.  
Also, Paul even insists that younger widows REMarry here...

But the younger widows refuse: for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry; Having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith. And whilst they learn to be idle, wandering about from house to house; and not only idle, but tattlers also and busybodies, speaking things which they ought not. I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully.  
(1Ti 5:11-14 KJV)

He absolutely would be condemning this woman in later years to be rejected the churches help by forcing her to remarry now.

We know Paul was not so callous and uncaring by his instruction for the helping of widows he gave.

The ONLY possibility for this "wife of one man" is that she was divorced and remarried.  
That is the ONLY possibility from scripture.  
It is the only thing that is clearly corrected in Gods word.

and yet this woman is still in fellowship...not being cast out of the assembly such as the man who had his fathers wife and WAS living in fornication.

Her life was not exemplary, so she couldnt be added to the list of widows, but she WAS in the church and in fellowship.

The requisite for her to have been the wife of ONE man CLEARLY indicates that she COULD have been the wife of more than one husband in her lifetime....aka a remarried divorcee...a direct contradiction to this lying doctrine that says second marriages arent marriages but 'affairs'...

husband of one wife

We see here that these are requirements of those in higher positions in the church..folks who are to set the EXAMPLE for the rest to follow.

We will discuss the possible meanings here of "husband of one wife"

It cannot refer to those who are widowed. as the remarried widow(er) was not prohibited or restricted in any manner I have seen, Paul even recommends that younger widows remarry. Paul would be purposefully making it impossible for a woman to later be accepted to this list of widows for no good reason if he were speaking the remarried widow in 1 tim 5:9 above instead of a remarried divorcee.

To provide evidence from GODS word, lets see this..  
"one ruling his own house well, having his children in submission with all reverence;  
for if one does not know how to rule his own house, how will he take care of the church of God? "  
(1Ti 3:4-5 EMTV)

This clearly shows that this man must be one who can maintain his own household, even the obedience of his children.  
A man whos been divorced and remarried MAY not be the best person for this job.

It is very unlikely that it ONLY speaks to polygamists as there is nothing in the NT that clearly condemns the act and Ive not found that the practice was as rampant as some try to assert...I suggest you do your own study to see if Im right or w

rong.

We must see in scripture what meaning to put to this phrase 'husband of one wife'

Of all the possibilities, ONLY divorce and remarriage is corrected clearly in scripture. We can assume that frivolous divorce and remarriage would immediately bar one from the prominent position of bishop.

But Paul makes no distinction, so we must assume that he also means those who divorced an adulteress then remarried as well (just to be on the safe side). Showing that these, although not the most prominent persons, were indeed still in fellowship with the rest of our brethren.

Some will state that this have put away these second marriages, but what I find very peculiar is that, if this matter were so crucial to salvation, Paul should surely have made a point of it. "Only if these second wives have been put away". The way its left, it sounds very much like they could have still been with the person.

Another issue is that those of the anti-remarriage camp state that this second "marriage" is not a marriage at all, but an adulterous affair.

The clear implication above is that the second marriage is a recognized one, if it weren't, then Paul would have simply called these people adulterers and surely they wouldn't even be in fellowship. Let alone being considered for the position of Bishop.

It is also notable that Paul nowhere states that these second marriages were invalid, nor does he state that these people were to have left this second spouse. In fact, in 1 cor 7 Paul tells these frivolously parted from their spouse to "remain Unmarried or reconcile....."....showing that REmarriage is quite possible indeed even if wrong to do.

Some folks will use a preposterous example of Paul also not telling gays to separate (or some other irrelevant distraction), but Jesus offered NO exception to gay couples, did He? His exception is clearly speaking of a MAN and a WOMAN... and husband and a wife when He made His exception for sexual sin.

Re:, on: 2006/5/25 11:44

Quote:

lastblast wrote:  
Dorcas,

If you go back and read the dialogue in Mt. 19 you will see that first the Pharisees asked Jesus if they could put away a wife for ANY cause. Jesus then spoke of the creation intent of marriage---that once a couple is joined by God, they are now 1 flesh with His command for man not to separate.

Firstly it says 'let not man'....it does not say 'man CANNOT'....apparently man is quite capable of separating this bond. ("one flesh" is NOT the bond, again)  
<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/12.html>

And 'one flesh' is NOT the union as proven by 1 Cor 6:16....it is the sexual aspect of a male/female relationship as proven, again, by 1 cor 6:16.

**Or do you not know that he being joined to a harlot is one body? For He says, "The two shall be into one flesh." (1Co 6:16)**

This couple is joined by God in marriage, the sexual relationship (one flesh) is created when they partake in a physical relationship.

**Therefore, a man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife and they shall become one flesh. (Gen 2:24)**



Paul clearly shows that "one flesh" is the SAME act with the married couple as with a harlot in 1 Cor 6:16. It is an 'act' that was created for marriage....outside of marriage it is sin...whoredom.

and they were asking about "for EVERY cause" divorce as Moses had been permitting them to do to protect the innocent wife from these animalistic men.

Quote:  
-----THEN they came back and brought Moses into it, asking why, if divorce is not ok, did Moses command a certificate of divorce be given. Jesus then goes on to say that this was done ONLY for the reason of man's hardheartedness.  
-----

Thats right cindy...."for EVERY cause" divorce was literally permitted because Moses knew these hardhearted animals would literally kill her if necessary to be rid of her.  
You simply havent studied this as much as you claim or you would be able to clearly see what this 'hardheartedness' of the Jews was.

Quote:  
----- Can you find a Mosaic law BY MOSES for divorce "for any cause" in scripture? I can't.  
-----

Please..lets not start your silly semantics game.  
It doesnt have to be a word for word rendering....youre requiring it to do so only shows how desperate you are becoming in this discussion.

Duet 22 CLEARLY gives the rules for sexual sin.  
Deut 24 given just days later shows that the man is the one who defines this 'uncleanness' because HE has found some 'uncleanness' in her.  
Just as Moses permitted to make it so the man could simply end the marriage so that he wouldnt hurt or kill this wife to be rid of her.

What IS clear to us is that Jesus in a few cases tells the Jews when they 'err'....yet Jesus makes no correction for their understanding pertaining to deut 24:1-4 and it being 'for EVERY cause'  
Very odd \*IF\* the Jews were interpreting it incorrectly.

Quote:  
-----All I can find is Deut. 24, so it appears to me that THIS writing is what Jesus is talking about-----  
-----

come now....dont play coy.  
That IS the reference as the discussion with Jesus is plainly showing to give this 'bill of divorce'....Deut 24:1-4 is where that is presented.

Quote:  
-----As usual though, even this ONE "allowance" given for the hardheartedness of man was perverted and expanded upon to now include "for ANY cause" (meaning it perverted to mean that it was up to man's discretion to decide what "unclean" meant to THEM).  
-----

It was for every cause....is this your new twist on this now cindy?  
have you exhausted all other avenues presently?

Again...What IS clear to us is that Jesus in a few cases tells the Jews when they 'err'....yet Jesus makes no correction for their understanding pertaining to deut 24:1-4 and it being 'for EVERY cause'  
Very odd \*IF\* the Jews were interpreting it incorrectly.

SEXUAL sins were ALREADY covered just days before in Deut 22.  
Deut 24 clearly presents a scenario where the man is determining what this 'uncleanness' is.  
Precisely what Moses had permitted to protect this wife...better to have her free than dead or hurt.

Quote:

-----That sounds awfully familiar to what people do with the so called "exception" clause.

nice try, as usual.  
Apparently you cannot understand Deut 24 or Matt 19.

"You cannot divorce and marry another, EXCEPT for whoredom, or you commit adultery" sounds pretty clear to those who can read.

Quote:

-----lastblast:

Every person I know who teaches adamantly that adultery "can" dissolve a marriage, does not believe that adultery is the ONLY reason----they now expand that definition to include many things OUTSIDE sexual infidelity. This generation is very MUCH like the Pharisees in that regard from what I see.

Yup...some folks take it too far...you're right.  
so why don't we all just get lazy and condemn the innocent right along with the many who abuse the rule?

To keep from having to determine who is sinning and who is not...so we don't have to actually do any work...let's simply REJECT Jesus' exception and Paul's concession and condemn EVERYONE who is remarried....that way we don't have to invest any of our precious time in this at all.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/25 12:09**

Cindy....can I expect you to simply ignore my refutations to your assertions?

Quote:

-----

lastblast wrote:

I DID believe one could remarry once upon a time----BEFORE I studied this out for myself.

answer honestly, yes or no...

Did you have even one single resource from the anti-remarriage camp...a book, brochure, website, audio-sermon, pamphlet, a pastor....ANYTHING from them giving ANY direction at all either before or while you were studying this all out?  
God knows the answer to this, even if you will not state it.

Quote:

-----As for betrothal being what Jesus speaks of, as I said, I don't grab hold of that view 100% as truth. However, it is something that cannot be discounted as we have a SCRIPTURAL precedent of this occurring (Mt. 1:18-24). It's not something I made up to boost my point of view. It is there for all to see and weigh its meaning in the larger scope of this issue.

But Cindy...we have CLEAR precedent...no.."LAW"...that shows that the punishment for WILLFUL sexual sin of the WIFE is DEATH BOTH for the espoused wife AND the consummated wife.

If GOD saw them the same, and your evidence shows nothing opposing this fact, then your evidence isn't evidence of anything that you assert.

The punishment from GODS law is the SAME for the betrothed AND the consummated wife.  
NOTHING in your 'evidence' shows ANY refutation to this fact.

Quote:  
-----Personally, I don't know how anyone who truly desires to seek the truth on this matter can discount, without even a second thought, that this very well could be what Jesus was speaking about, since we find this "exception" ONLY in the Gospel of Matthew---a gospel aimed at JEWS who practiced the betrothal custom.  
-----

MOST of the BOOK is WRITTEN TO JEWS cindy...that is irrelevant.  
are you going to dismiss Hebrews as well?

Mark 10 and Matt 19 are the one and the same event.  
Matt also omits 'for every cause' as well...are you saying Matt ADDED it and it wasn't stated?  
Are you saying Matt ADDED "except for harlotry" to our Lord's words to appease Jewish CUSTOM ?

Quote:  
-----I also don't know how anyone in good conscience can disregard the possibility that "porneia" can very well be speaking of UNLAWFUL unions----unions that God DID NOT join together.  
-----

It's not that we dismiss that possibility at all.  
YOU are the one who errantly is narrowing the word to fit your doctrine, not us.

\*IF\* a man is UNLAWFULLY married to a woman, porneia would cover it.  
You have yet to PROVE that I am UNLAWFULLY married to Laura after putting my wife away for harlotry.

Quote:  
-----  
In any case, getting back to the betrothal custom, in the other two gospels, aimed at Gentile audiences, they had no such betrothal custom, only marriage.  
-----

Irrelevant.  
Deut 22 shows the SAME EXACT death punishment for both the espoused and the consummated wife for sexual immorality..  
cindy, GOD sees the EXACTLY the same !

Quote:  
-----There we find NO exception made.  
-----

irrelevant, again

Quote:  
----- The sin of adultery is charged to ANYONE who joins himself/herself with another unlawfully or takes another's spouse after a divorce has occurred. This teaching is NOT found in the Mosaic law. A divorce gave permission for the parties to marry another (Deut.24:1-4).  
-----

the punishment for whoredom is DEATH in Deut...NOT divorce.

Deut 24 was a REGULATION to divorce that been going on already (readers see Leviticus 21)

There is NO permission EVER in the OT for 'divorce' for whoredom...the punishment is death, plain and simple.

Quote:  
----- Jesus changed that to say that now a divorce did not give right to marry again, but whosoever did so would be committing adultery in His sight.  
-----

wrong.  
Jesus CLEARLY states that EXCEPT for whoredom you commit adultery upon remarriage if you divorce.

Quote:  
-----The other thing which SHOULD make one pause and consider is what I speak of all the time---WHY, if adultery gave means to a dissolution of marriage as some suppose the Mt. 19:9 passage means----WHY did Paul use the example of an adulterous woman (remarried) in regard to the permanency of the marriage bond (death is what severs the bond and frees one to remarry). No mention of divorce on the part of the innocent party.  
-----

Paul was using ONE aspect of the law in Romans 7.  
that very law gave instruction on how to divorce WITHOUT the death of the spouse...you clearly reject this fact.

Quote:  
-----If, as some contend, Paul is speaking of OT Mosaic law, why use the same wording when speaking to ANOTHER Christian group (I Cor. 7:39).  
-----

because paul is dealing very clearly with frivolous divorce in 1 cor 7.  
IF one puts away a wife and its not for fornication, then they DO commit adultery upon remarriage as they were bound until death "except for whoredom"

You just dont get it that an exception is just that...something that defies the norm.

Quote:  
-----If Paul is speaking of Mosaic law, it was NOT adultery to remarry after a divorce. **I believe it is because the "law" Paul is speaking of is NOT the Mosaic law**, it is God's law of marriage, which Jesus speaks of in His discourse---bringing marriage back to the created intent for marriage.  
-----

What you believe is clearly errant.  
Romans 7 is about what cindy?  
Do you comprehend the concept of CONTEXT?  
Why dont you read the very NEXT verse in Romans 7?

**"Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.  
(Rom 7:4)**

DEAD to the LAW !!!!  
WHAT "law" cindy?...what "law" was nailed to the Cross with our Lord? (Col 2:14)

Paul IS speaking about the Mosaic law, what you believe is irrelevant.

He is comparing the Mosaic law to this 'law of the husband'...how it is 'for life' by its very nature.

If a man apostates himself from God's law (or Christ) what happens?

The very same thing applies to a wife who 'apostates' herself from the "law" of her husband.

Paul simply did not need to bring this into the discussion to make the point he was making....that's the extent of it.

Oddly enough, "adulteress" there in Romans 7 ALSO figuratively means "apostate"...

G3428

&#956;&#959;&#953;&#967;&#945;&#955;&#953;&#769;&#962;

moichalis

Thayer Definition:

1) an adulteress

2) as the intimate alliance of God with the people of Israel was likened to a marriage, those who relapse into idolatry are said to commit adultery or play the harlot

2a) fig. equiv. to faithless to God, unclean, apostate

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/6.html>

**Re: - posted by ConsiderHim, on: 2006/5/25 12:44**

Quote:  
-----FoC: Evidences that there were divorcees who had remarried in the church are found in the list of widows and the requirements for bishops  
-----

Quite a stretch... and UNbiblical, to say the least.

I Timothy 5:9, which you referenced, simply speaks of a woman (widow) whose husband has died, is over the age of 60, and was faithful to her husband (wife of one man). You're reading MUCH more into this passage than is there. In fact, taking this scripture in context, refutes completely your assertion that the divorced and remarried are considered AT ALL in Paul's instruction to Timothy.

Quote:  
-----FoC wrote: There WERE remarried divorcees IN the church and IN fellowship...that is a fact that ANY historical study will show.  
-----

No proof offered, this is a lot taken for granted, and NOT supported by the scripture you referenced.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/25 13:07**

I suggest you learn to apply ALL relevant scripture to this matter.

Quote:  
-----

ConsiderHim wrote:

Quote:  
-----FoC: Evidences that there were divorcees who had remarried in the church are found in the list of widows and the requirements for bishops  
-----

Quite a stretch... and UNbiblical, to say the least.

-----

says you.

MOST of the actual SCHOLARS Ive read say the same thing...that 'husband of ONE (or FIRST) wife' means they cannot have divorced and remarried or be a polygamist.

So your word is more meaningful than men whom have devoted their lives to the study of history and Gods word?

I have been offered positions of leadership in churches and refused as I am not the 'husband of ONE wife'...as Pauls words clearly require.

Quote:

-----

I Timothy 5:9, which you referenced, simply speaks of a woman (widow) whose husband has died, is over the age of 60, and was faithful to her husband(wife of one man). You're reading MUCH more into this passage than is there.

-----

hardly.

Does the scripture SAY she only had to be 'faithful' to a husband?

No it does not.

It clearly RESTRICTS her to ONE lawful husband.

\*IF\* Paul had simply meant 'chaste' there are clear words that mean 'chaste' that dont have to set a LIMITATION of one spouse as Paul clearly did.

Paul tells younger widows to REMarry...thus making it impossible for them to be put on this list of widows later when they need it.

Showing clearly that this 'wife of ONE man' doesnt apply to a remarried widow.

**But the younger widows refuse: for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry; Having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith. And withal they learn to be idle, wandering about from house to house; and not only idle, but tattlers also and busybodies, speaking things which they ought not.**

**I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully.**  
**(1Ti 5:11-14)**

Paul is not so diabolical to trick this young widow into giving up help from the church later by forcing her to REMarry now, even if you seem to believe he is.

This 'wife of one man' CANNOT simply be a widow who remarried or Paul has literally betrayed this younger widow by forcing her to REMarry...

Quote:

-----

-----In fact, taking this scripture in context, refutes completely your assertion that the divorced and remarried are considered AT ALL in Paul's instruction to Timothy.

-----

Sorry, but you clearly are errant as evidenced above.

What are you defending? That you believe that men who frivolously cast their wives aside should be put into positions of authority in His church?

I disagree..scripture CLEARLY says these are not to be made bishops and such.

There is NO correction for polygamists in the NT..so to say that 'spouse of ONE spouse" refers to polygamy would be the 'stretch' as you say.

To say that the widow being put on the list of widows could not have been remarried AFTER the death of her first husband is clearly absurd as Paul himself tells younger widows to REMarry...Paul is no devil who would trick this young woman from being on that list later when she needed it....yet you seem to think he is.

Quote:

-----No proof offered, this is alot taken for granted, and NOT supported by the scripture you referenced.

-----

sorry, but it clearly was supported and very strongly so.

Apparently you havent spent any time at all in this matter as simply looking at historical fact, nothing else, shows that divorce was as rampant then as it is now....get it? Thats why Jesus and Paul were 'correcting' this issue.

#### Re: Divorce, Marriage, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/25 17:02

Cindy, I'll be honest, I have no idea why you want to disagree with Jesus Christ on the matter of the exception He gives, apart from some man-made construct which requires it, contrary both to scripture and the New Covenant.

Quote:

-----Can you find a Mosaic law BY MOSES for divorce "for any cause" in scripture?

-----

Well, there are so many things that appear in scripture only once, that if we were to discount all of them, and only keep the things which are mentioned more than once, the Bible would look very different.

I know you may not want to hear this, but it's possible you were right the first time, only you had not done enough cross-referencing to be sure.

I also accept that if people calling themselves Christian are effectively swapping partners endlessly, this is NOT what God had in mind by the exception Jesus gave. However, that CAN NOT make every second marriage by a faithful spouse, wrong.

It may be we need a much clearer understanding of what is involved in being 'made one' by God, as opposed to being one flesh with a spouse or a harlot.

I'm sure unbelievers are also 'made one' by God, just as He gives breath to their babies, and makes the sun to shine on the unrighteous as well as the righteous.

However, it makes more sense to me to **accept every word God says** and admit I don't understand it, than to reduce it to the bits I can fit together with (as MikeB would say) my 'fallen cranium', and toss out the rest on the basis GOD must be mistaken because *I* don't follow *His logic*.

#### Re:, on: 2006/5/25 17:49

Quote:

-----Cindy, I'll be honest, I have no idea why you want to disagree with Jesus Christ on the matter of the exception He gives, apart from some man-made construct which requires it, contrary both to scripture and the New Covenant.

-----

Just to jump in on this point, apparently these folks are making a distinction GOD doesn't make with this betrothed wife vs consummated wife.

Go back to deut 22 and we can see clearly that in BOTH cases the WIFE would have recieved the death penalty for willful whoredom.

Cindy and her bunch make this distinction AGAINST the very law of God itself.  
Their "evidence" proves nothing that they assert.

For all we know Joseph may well have tried to put Mary away post-Hometaking or post- consummation if the need arise d...nothing in scripture states that he couldnt have.  
Also, Joe and Mary lived under Mosiac law before Jesus death.  
Whether cindy likes it or not (altho disagreeing with it shows her apparent lack of study altogether), Joseph could have invoked Deut 24:1-4 to put Mary away for something other than sexual sins.

This whole doctrine is so full of wholes it amazes me how the human mind that is intact fails to see the blantant contradictions and terrible inconsistencies it causes.

All of which are instantly fixed by simply admitting that 'except' means precisely what it says.....an exceptoin is just that... something that defies the norm....

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2006/5/25 20:52**

Jesus did not say it was right to remarry after gaining a divorce. This is the issue.

Quote:  
“and may marry another”

I do not find this phrase in any of my Bibles, including “The Interlinear Greek – English New Testament.”

As for me reading all that has been posted, it would be too laborious because many of them are too long. And you do not need to redo what you say you have done.

Quote: Please dont try to make this a version issue, Ill turn that argument around on you so fast your head will spin.

I resent your attitude here. It is not godlike at all. Why you act so angry gives me pause as well. Perhaps you are in a remarriage situation and you work hard to justify it?

In case you think I am being naïve or simple, let me tell you I have relatives who have been M/D/R. Everything I have witnessed there has confirmed my understanding of the Biblical prohibitions against remarriage after divorce with a former spouse still living.

The children from these unions are into immorality; homes break up with no conscience. Eventually, they just shack up without bothering with the marrying part. The point is life does not prove it to be a blessing from God nor approved by God. It is a curse of the worst sort that man inflicts upon himself. (This is an objective observation I have made by watching people who disagree with me on this issue.)

About the simple needing to get more informed opinions: let me remind you of the people Jesus chose to be his disciples. They were considered ignorant and unlearned men by the learned populace! and thereby teachable by Jesus and the Holy Spirit!

ginnyrose



Re:, on: 2006/5/25 21:50

Youre bibles are apparently lacking then....

"And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, **and shall marry another**, committet h adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery"  
(Mat 19:9)

REmarriage is ABSOLUTELY in this discussoin between Jesus and the pharisees...that much is clear

Quote:  
-----  
I resent your attitude here. It is not godlike at all. Why you act so angry gives me pause as well. Perhaps you are in a remarriage situation and you wor k hard to justify it?

-----  
Or perhaps Im sick and tired of you legalists falsely condemning not only me, but my other remarried brethren with your unscriptural rhetoric/lies.  
did you ever think THAT might be the issue?

As for justification...Ive been quite thorough in debunking your false doctrines with the help of the Spirit...Ive nothing to ju stify

Quote:  
-----  
In case you think I am being naïve or simple, let me tell you I have relatives who have been M/D/R. Everything I have witnessed there has confirmed my understanding of the Biblical prohibitions against remarriage after divorce with a former spouse still living.

-----  
You have yet to offer anything beyond emotionalistic legalism devoid of scriptural foundation.

Personal experience is NOT evidence in this matter.

Quote:  
-----  
The children from these unions are into immorality; homes break up with no conscience.

-----  
Care to allow me to share MY experiences with children whos parents are in ministry and ONLY been married ONCE, y et these children are immoral to the core?

Again, you offer no evidence that REFUTES Jesus own exception.

Quote:  
-----  
About the simple needing to get more informed opinions: let me remind you of the people Jesus chose to be his disciples. They were considered ignor ant and unlearned men by the learned populace! and thereby teachable by Jesus and the Holy Spirit!

-----  
Again, irrelevant to this discussion entirely.

Jesus made His exception..refute that or please simply admit you cannot.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/25 21:51

Quote:  
-----I know you may not want to hear this, but it's possible you were right the first time, only you had not done enough cross-referencing to be sure.  
-----

My previous position was based on life experiences and "going along". I was ignorant of what the Bible said on the matter. It was only when I studied myself that I came to my present mindset.

I found it interesting to later learn that what I had seen through my own personal studies---not directed by any man---was exactly the position of the early church in regards to remarriage. Same thing happened to me when I studied the rapture issue and then went to the Early Church Father's writings. They too taught the Church would remain on the earth until the Second Coming of Christ.

Quote:  
-----I also accept that if people calling themselves Christian are effectively swapping partners endlessly, this is NOT what God had in mind by the exception Jesus gave. However, that CAN NOT make every second marriage by a faithful spouse, wrong.  
-----

Dorcas, can you show me where a line should be drawn then, how much swapping is acceptable and how much is not, scripturally speaking of course? Which scriptures show a severing of the marriage bond joined by God---at one incident or adultery---or months, years? What about abuse? Does it have to be physical or can it just be mental/emotional abuse that will allow one to depart from a marriage joined by God and then marry another? If someone is an unrepentant drug abuser/alcoholic and has wasted the family income leaving his wife and children in poverty---can she then "depart" and find a good "Christian" man to take care of her family? I am really interested in what you believe is Ok with the Lord in regards to marriage and the applicable scriptures which lead you to this position.....Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re:, on: 2006/5/25 21:58

Quote:  
-----  
lastblast wrote:  
I found it interesting to later learn that what I had seen through my own personal studies---not directed by any man---was exactly the position of the early church in regards to remarriage.  
-----

Come now cindy, youre not being entirely honest.  
Tertullian did believe that whoredom ended the covenant and allowed remarriage.

Also, you do NOT believe that fornication is "adultery" within a LAWFUL marriage by your own admission...your ECFs say youre wrong.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/adulteryisfornication.html>

So 'exactly' isnt really the truth.  
Also, who cares?  
Views of men 100 years after the fact doesnt nullify Jesus clear exception

Shall I start on this forum presenting what these ECFs believed that you as a protestant MUST reject, cindy...shall we do this here as well for all to see?

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/heresiesecf.html>

Quote:  
-----  
Dorcas, can you show me where a line should be drawn then, how much swapping is acceptable and how much is not, scripturally speaking of course

? Which scriptures show a severing of the marriage bond joined by God---at one incident of adultery---or months, years?

Jesus gives no number of offenses required...therefore ONE is sufficient.

Quote:  
-----What about abuse? Does it have to be physical or can it just be mental/emotional abuse that will allow one to depart from a marriage joined by God and then marry another?  
-----

Isn't covered per se....we use the 'spirit' of the law, something legalists seem to be void of, to see that a God who lays out so many rules for marriage would surely not expect a woman to be beaten by this supposed 'covenant' spouse.

Re:, on: 2006/5/25 22:11

Some quotes from the Early Church Fathers that **lastblast** 'agrees with' on the remarriage issue...apparently these ECFs were a bit off on other issues as well...

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/heresiesecf.html>

=====

Quote:  
----- **Basil the Great**  
"It is necessary to confess our sins to those to whom the dispensation of God's mysteries is entrusted"  
-----

Guess Basil doesn't think confessing my sins to God is quite enough...

Quote:  
----- **Jerome**  
"If the serpent, the devil, bites someone secretly, he infects that person with the venom of sin. And if the one who has been bitten keeps silence **and does not do penance**, and does not want to confess his wound . . . **then his brother and his master, who have the word** that will cure him, cannot very well assist him" (Commentary on Ecclesiastes 10:11 ).  
-----

Wow..and here I always thought I was supposed to confess to Jesus..to repent..I guess Jerome didn't think that was enough either.  
And WHERE is penance in scripture again ? :confused:

Quote:  
----- **Origen**  
", albeit hard and laborious the **remission of sins through penance**, when the sinner . . . **does not shrink from declaring his sin to a priest** of the Lord and from seeking medicine, after the manner of him who say, 'I said, "To the Lord I will accuse myself of my iniquity"'  
-----

WHOA....Origen dude.

Do you REALLY think that remission of sins is thru PENANCE ?!?!?  
AND that we must confess to a PRIEST !!!!

I guess Jesus sacrifice did nothing for my sins at all then :(

Quote:

----- **Augustine**

"When you shall have been baptized, keep to a good life in the commandments of God so that you may preserve your baptism to the very end. I do not tell you that you will live here without sin, but they are venial sins which this life is never without.

Baptism was instituted for all sins. For light sins, without which we cannot live, prayer was instituted. . . . But do not commit those sins on account of which you would have to be separated from the body of Christ. Perish the thought! For those whom you see doing penance have committed crimes, **either adultery or some other enormities. That is why they are doing penance.**

**If their sins were light, daily prayer would suffice to blot them out. . . .**

**In the Church, therefore, there are three ways in which sins are forgiven:** in baptisms, in prayer, and in the greater humility of penance" (Sermon to Catechumens on the Creed 7:15, 8:16 ).

Hey Augustine....what do you mean daily prayer suffices to blot my sin  
Did Jesus' sacrifice NOT cover those :confused:

Quote:

----- **Ambrose of Milan**

"For those to whom has been given, it is plain that either both are allowed, or it is clear that neither is allowed. Both are allowed to the Church, neither is allowed to heresy. **For this right has been granted to priests only**" (Penance 1:1 ).

huh....to the priests ONLY?

Can you show me where GODS word says this Ambrose?

**Re:, on: 2006/5/25 22:34**

Apparently not ALL of these Early Church Fathers agreed with Cindy and Co.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/tertullianonadultery.html>

=====  
**The Writings of Tertullian**

**Part Fourth**

**IV. To His Wife.**

**Book II.**

**Chap. I. - Reasons Which Led to the Writing of this Second Book**

"Very lately, best beloved fellow-servant in the Lord, I, as my ability permitted, entered for your benefit at some length into the question what course is to be followed by a holy woman **when her marriage has (in whatever way) been brought to an end.** Let us now turn our attention to the next best advice, in regard of human infirmity; admonished hereto by the examples of certain, who, when an opportunity for the practice of Continence has been offered them, **by divorce, or by the decease of the husband,** have not only thrown away the opportunity of attaining so great a good, but not even in their **remarriage** have chosen to be mindful of the rule that "above all they marry in the Lord."

=====  
**Tertullian**

**The Five Books Against Marcion**

**Book 4**

"But Christ prohibits divorce, saying, "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, also committeth adultery." (Luk\_16:18)

In order to forbid divorce, He makes it unlawful to marry a woman that has been put away. Moses, however, permitted repudiation in Deuteronomy: "When a man hath taken a wife, and hath lived with her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found unchastity in her; then let him write her a bill of divorcement and give it in her hand, and send her away out of his house." (Deu\_24:1)

You see, therefore, that there is a difference between the law and the gospel- between Moses and Christ?898 To be sure there is!899 But then you have rejected that other gospel which witnesses to the same verity and the same Christ.900

There, while prohibiting divorce, He has given us a solution of this special question respecting it: "Moses," says He, "because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to give a bill of divorcement; but from the beginning it was not so" (Mat\_19:8) - for this reason, indeed, because He who had "made them male and female" had likewise said, "They twain shall become one flesh; what therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." (Mat\_19:4, Mat\_19:6)

Now, by this answer of His (to the Pharisees), He both sanctioned the provision of Moses, who was His own (servant), and restored to its primitive purpose901 the institution of the Creator, whose Christ He was. Since, however, you are to be refuted out of the Scriptures which you have received, I will meet you on your own ground, as if your Christ were mine.

When, therefore, He prohibited divorce, and yet at the same time represented902 the Father, even Him who united male and female, must He not have rather exculpated903 than abolished the enactment of Moses?

But, observe, if this Christ be yours when he teaches contrary to Moses and the Creator, on the same principle must He be mine if I can show that His teaching is not contrary to them.

**I maintain, then, that there was a condition in the prohibition which He now made of divorce; the case supposed being, that a man put away his wife for the express purpose of marrying another.**

**His words are: "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, also committeth adultery," (Luk\_16:8) - "put away," that is, for the reason wherefore a woman ought not to be dismissed, that another wife may be obtained.**

**For he who marries a woman who is unlawfully put away is as much of an adulterer as the man who marries one who is undivorced.**

**Permanent is the marriage which is not rightly dissolved; to marry,905 therefore, whilst matrimony is undissolved, is to commit adultery.**

**Since, therefore, His prohibition of divorce was a conditional one, He did not prohibit absolutely;** and what He did not absolutely forbid, that He permitted on some occasions,906 when there is an absence of the cause why He gave His prohibition.

In very deed907 His teaching is not contrary to Moses, whose precept He partially908 defends, I will not909 say confirm it.

If, however, you deny that divorce is in any way permitted by Christ, how is it that you on your side910 destroy marriage, not uniting man and woman, nor admitting to the sacrament of baptism and of the eucharist those who have been united in marriage anywhere else,911 unless they should agree together to repudiate the fruit of their marriage, and so the very Creator Himself?

Well, then, what is a husband to do in your sect,912 if his wife commit adultery? Shall he keep her? But your own apostle, you know,913 does not permit "the members of Christ to be joined to a harlot." (1Co\_6:15)

**Divorce, therefore, when justly deserved,914 has even in Christ a defender.**

So that Moses for the future must be considered as being confirmed by Him, since he prohibits divorce in the same sense as Christ does, if any unchastity should occur in the wife. For in the Gospel of Matthew he says, "Whosoever shall put

put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery.Â” (Mat\_5:32) He also is deemed equally guilty of adultery, who marries a woman put away by her husband.

**The Creator, however, except on account of adultery, does not put asunder what He Himself joined together,** the same Moses in another passage enacting that he who had married after violence to a damsel, should thenceforth not have it in his power to put away his wife.

(Deu\_22:28-29) Now, if a compulsory marriage contracted after violence shall be permanent, how much rather shall a voluntary one, the result of agreement! This has the sanction of the prophet: Â”Thou shalt not forsake the wife of thy youth.Â” (Mal\_2:15)

Thus you have Christ following spontaneously the tracks of the Creator everywhere, both in permitting divorce and in forbidding it. You find Him also protecting marriage, in whatever direction you try to escape.

**He prohibits divorce when He will have the marriage inviolable;  
He permits divorce when the marriage is spotted with unfaithfulness.**

**You should blush when you refuse to unite those whom even your Christ has united; and repeat the blush when you disunite them without the good reason why your Christ would have them separated.** I have<sup>915</sup> now to show whence the Lord derived this decision<sup>916</sup> of His, and to what end He directed it. It will thus become more fully evident that His object was not the abolition of the Mosaic ordinance<sup>917</sup> by any suddenly devised proposal of divorce; because it was not suddenly proposed, but had its root in the previously mentioned John.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/26 8:23**

Quote:  
-----I am really interested in what you believe is Ok with the Lord in regards to marriage and the applicable scriptures which lead you to his position.....  
-----

Have you ever read the whole book of Hebrews from start to finish, with understanding? (The reason I ask, is directly because you did not understand my post about the ending of the Old Covenant.)

If you can summarise it, picking out the most important eight, nine, or ten points, we might have a basis for my answering your question.

Now that I'm not as confused about your mindset as I was when I joined this discussion, I'm not willing to go on in endless circles, while you require to toss out not just the odd verse from one of the gospels, but some words of Jesus Christ Himself, in order to support your case.

(NKJV) Revelation 22

14 Blessed are those who do His commandments, that they may have the right to the tree of life, and may enter through the gates into the city.

15 But outside are dogs and sorcerers and sexually immoral and murderers and idolaters, and whoever loves and practices a lie.

16 "I, Jesus, have sent My angel to testify to you these things in the churches. I am the Root and the Offspring of David, the Bright and Morning Star."

17 And the Spirit and the bride say, "Come!" And let him who hears say, "Come!" And let him who thirsts come. Whoever desires, let him take the water of life freely.

18 For I testify to everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: If anyone adds to these things, God will add to him the plagues that are written in this book;

19 and if anyone takes away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the Book of Life, from the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.

20 He who testifies to these things says, "Surely I am coming quickly." Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus!

21 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.

If you insist on both adding and subtracting to the word of God, you have placed yourself smack in the middle of this curse. And I'm not going there.

Here is the morning devotion of 31st December from Spurgeon's Morning and Evening. I believe it answers some of you

ur questions better than I, and with more authority.

"In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, if any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink."

John 7:37

Patience had her perfect work in the Lord Jesus, and until the last day of the feast he pleaded with the Jews, even as on this last day of the year he pleads with us, and waits to be gracious to us. Admirable indeed is the longsuffering of the Saviour in bearing with some of us year after year, notwithstanding our provocations, rebellions, and resistance of his Holy Spirit. Wonder of wonders that we are still in the land of mercy!

Pity expressed herself most plainly, for Jesus cried, which implies not only the loudness of his voice, but the tenderness of his tones. He entreats us to be reconciled. "We pray you," says the Apostle, "as though God did beseech you by us." What earnest, pathetic terms are these! How deep must be the love which makes the Lord weep over sinners, and like a mother woo his children to his bosom! Surely at the call of such a cry our willing hearts will come.

Provision is made most plenteously; all is provided that man can need to quench his soul's thirst. To his conscience the atonement brings peace; to his understanding the gospel brings the richest instruction; to his heart the person of Jesus is the noblest object of affection; to the whole man the truth as it is in Jesus supplies the purest nutriment. Thirst is terrible, but Jesus can remove it. Though the soul were utterly famished, Jesus could restore it.

Proclamation is made most freely, that every thirsty one is welcome. No other distinction is made but that of thirst. Whether it be the thirst of avarice, ambition, pleasure, knowledge, or rest, he who suffers from it is invited. The thirst may be bad in itself, and be no sign of grace, but rather a mark of inordinate sin longing to be gratified with deeper draughts of lust; but it is not goodness in the creature which brings him the invitation, the Lord Jesus sends it freely, and without respect of persons.

Personality is declared most fully. The sinner must come to Jesus, not to works, ordinances, or doctrines, but to a personal Redeemer, who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree. The bleeding, dying, rising Saviour, is the only star of hope to a sinner. Oh for grace to come now and drink, ere the sun sets upon the year's last day!

No waiting or preparation is so much as hinted at. Drinking represents a reception for which no fitness is required. A fool, a thief, a harlot can drink; and so sinfulness of character is no bar to the invitation to believe in Jesus. We want no golden cup, no bejewelled chalice, in which to convey the water to the thirsty; the mouth of poverty is welcome to stoop down and quaff the flowing flood. **Blistered, leprous, filthy lips may touch the stream of divine love; they cannot pollute it, but shall themselves be purified.** Jesus is the fount of hope. Dear reader, hear the dear Redeemer's loving voice as he cries to each of us,

"IF ANY MAN THIRST,  
LET HIM  
COME UNTO ME  
AND DRINK."

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/26 9:13

Quote:  
-----Now that I'm not as confused about your mindset as I was when I joined this discussion, I'm not willing to go on in endless circles, while you require to toss out not just the odd verse from one of the gospels, but some words of Jesus Christ Himself, in order to support your case.  
-----

I don't toss out anything, Dorcas. You just don't like my interpretation of that passage(Mt. 19:9) and you do not like that I believe the views allowing for adultery to dissolve a marriage contradict other passages saying otherwise. I think you also may feel offended that I believe to seek another marriage is an act of unforgiveness and hardheartedness---hence the reason for all the "digs" you throw my way about my "spiritual" understanding.

Once again, you have dodged what was not "going in circles" on my part, but a very clearly worded question that should be able to have an answer----biblically.....else how would anyone be able to counsel another on marriage issues? Do you know what dissolves a marriage joined by God or not? Can you counsel someone who comes to you with marriage woes with the Word of God, applying His Word in context to their situation? That's all I'm asking you. If death is NOT what dissolves what God has joined, what does dissolve it?

I'm not trying to trip you up, but if you are so confident that I am wrong, then you have the obligation to bring correction and the RIGHT answers.....and those answers need to be based on God's Word taken in context. Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re:, on: 2006/5/26 10:14

Quote:

lastblast wrote:  
I don't toss out anything, Dorcas.

You dont?  
apparently you just ignore whatever commandment of Jesus you dont wish to apply to yourself...

lastblast,

I have stated before that I'm on disability and my bills have accumulated over time that I cannot pay. Bill collectors have been calling, and because the debt is so high, they want way more than I can even afford in payments.

Cindy...You have stated numerous times in many places that we are all CALLED to obey God---whether we want to or not.

Your Lord has said this and you are CALLED to obey..whether you WANT to or not....

**"Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away"**  
**(Mat 5:42)**

I'm ASKING you for some financial help in this matter.

Now....are you going to follow the direction, the command of your Lord.....

or will you prove yourself a hypocrite who puts the yoke upon the backs of OTHERS, then excuse yourself from any laws you yourself don't want to adhere to?

Quote:

You just don't like my interpretation of that passage (Mt. 19:9) and you do not like that I believe the views allowing for adultery to dissolve a marriage contradict other passages saying otherwise. I think you also may feel offended that I believe to seek another marriage is an act of unforgiveness and hardness of heart---hence the reason for all the "digs" you throw my way about my "spiritual" understanding.

And what about me Cindy?

I play your game by YOUR rules, dealing with your legalism with similar legalism...the only thing you seem to understand....and where does it get us?....

When you are shown errant with your own legalistic method, you simply refuse to respond...as if folks aren't able to see the truth for themselves if you don't take the time to actually say anything :rolleyes:



Quote:

Do you know what dissolves a marriage joined by God or not?

Its called a 'bill of divorcement' cindy, but \*IF\* you were as studied as you CLAIM to be, youd know that divorce or putting away, was going on long before Deut 24:1-4 (readers see Leviticus 21) and this bill of divorce came about.

Deut 24 and this bill of divorce was a RESPONSE to a problem..putting away did not start then.

Quote:

-----Can you counsel someone who comes to you with marriage woes with the Word of God, applying His Word in context to their situation? That's all I'm asking you. If death is NOT what dissolves what God has joined, what does dissolve it?

see above...

readers also see....

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/marriagedissolved.html>

Quote:

-----I'm not trying to trip you up, but if you are so confident that I am wrong, then you have the obligation to bring correction and the RIGHT answers.....and those answers need to be based on God's Word taken in context. Blessings in Him, Cindy

\*I\* know you are wrong and \*I\* have brought correction AND right answers to you.

You simply reject anything presented to you, hiding your head in the sand, pretending no one has spoken.

There is enough on my website to literally destroy your entire doctrine...yours, stephen wilcoxes, Sealedeternals, ect...but you all just blow on by like nothings been said.

Typical behavior for false ones.

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/26 10:22**

As The Sermon Index Turns. :-)

**Re:, on: 2006/5/26 10:47**

Quote:

MrBillPro wrote:

As The Sermon Index Turns. :-)

:-P

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/26 11:39**

Hi Cindy,

Thanks for your response.

Quote:  
-----I'm not trying to trip you up, but if you are so confident that I am wrong, then you have the obligation to bring correction and the RIG  
HT answers.....and those answers need to be based on God's Word taken in context.  
-----

I don't feel obliged to take up your challenge, if by it you are not offering to hear my whole thesis.

You asked me in an earlier post whether I accepted that divorce and remarriage is acceptable in some cases, which I have not yet answered, partly because so far, I have seen NOTHING from you which accepts the exception Jesus made.

Quote:  
-----the "digs" you throw my way about my "spiritual" understanding.  
-----

I just looked up my Greek interlinear, and it has 30 entries for 'fornication'. From what I've understood from FOC's thesis, you restrict the meaning of the word porneia to refer to the Jewish betrothal custom. Have I picked that up correctly?

If I have not, please could you list for me the references in the New Testament where 'fornication' appears as a translation of porneia, where you believe your interpretation of 'porneia' applies - unless you believe they **all** apply to the Jewish betrothal custom - in which case, I have some other questions.

It simply is not possible or practical, for me to explain what I believe in a short post. I've been expounding my stance consistently, since I joined this thread. It may leave you some unanswered questions (at this point), but that's inevitable, partly because I'm not sure if we have any common ground. At the moment, that's what I'm looking for.

Quote:  
-----If death is NOT what dissolves what God has joined, what does dissolve it?  
-----

God does. Whether He does it in response to the sin, or whether He does it in response to the hardheartedness of the departing spouse, is something we could discuss further, but, in that I believe the covenant is made between the spouses and blessed by God, and you appear (from what I can gather) to believe the covenant is made between the individuals and God (separately), here again, for lack of common ground, I have inferred this is yet another strand of (what I see as) a necessarily broad discussion, which is *far from* limited to Bible verses about marriage.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/5/26 12:22**

Jer 3:8 And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/26 12:27**

Quote:  
-----  
ginnyrose wrote:

.....Perhaps you are in a remarriage situation and you work hard to justify it?

ginnyrose

-----  
Hi again ginnyrose.

Id like to 'test' your willingness to obey a clear commandment straight from Jesus own mouth to which NO exception is ever given that Ive ever seen.

Let us see if YOU will "work hard to justify" your own defiance of our Lords DIRECT commandment or if you will do as other anti-remarriagers have done and ignore this test ...

=====

"I have stated before that Im on disability and my bills have accumulated over time that I cannot pay. Bill collectors have been calling, and because the debt is so high, they want way more than I can even afford in payments.

Your Lord has said this and you are CALLED to obey..whether you WANT to or not...

**"Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away"**  
**(Mat 5:42)**

Im ASKING you for some financial help in this matter, ginnyrose.

Now....are you going to follow the direction, the command of your Lord.....

or will you prove yourself a hypocrit who puts the yoke upon the backs of OTHERS, then excuse yourself from any laws you yourself dont want to adhere to?

=====

Cindy has chosen to merely ignore this request in direct defiance of our Lords own words....will you make yourself as hypocritical as she by putting the yoke upon others, then defying it yourself?

**Re:, on: 2006/5/26 12:29**

Quote:  
-----  
Christinyou wrote:  
Jer 3:8 And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.  
-----

also..

"And I took my staff, even Beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my covenant which I had made with all the people. And it was broken in that day: and so the poor of the flock that waited upon me knew that it was the word of the LORD.  
(Zec 11:10-11)

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/26 12:38**

Quote:  
-----you are not offering to hear my whole thesis  
-----

I'm waiting with open ears, Dorcas and make it as long as you like. I will read it. There are many posts I just skip right over now, but I will take the time to read yours, because you haven't expounded on what you believe and I DO want to know---whether I will agree or not.

Quote:

-----You asked me in an earlier post whether I accepted that divorce and remarriage is acceptable in some cases, which I have not yet answered, partly because so far, I have seen NOTHING from you which accepts the exception Jesus made.  
-----

I hope you don't expect me to come into agreement with you on Mt. 19:9 before you will share your views. I wouldn't understand that type of dialogue (only willing to "share" with those who agree). I think that's not a fair way to dialogue with a person---demanding they provide their viewpoints, criticizing those viewpoints, yet refusing to openly state what you do believe. To me, that is as pointless a dialogue as it is with someone who constantly wants to argue the same points over and over and over because they are trying to appear "victor" to the viewers.

Quote:

-----you restrict the meaning of the word porneia to refer to the Jewish betrothal custom. Have I picked that up correctly  
-----

No, you have not picked that up correctly. I said it "could" be concerning the betrothal custom as we have an example in the same Gospel of such a thing (Mt. 1:18-24). I am not firmly convinced that it is referring to this, but not discounting it either. As I said, I don't know how anyone could discount that possibility due to the fact that we have a scriptural precedent of "putting away" due to betrothal unfaithfulness.

Not all women who had sexual relations during the betrothal period were stoned. Those who were taken (sexually assaulted) in the country were given the benefit of the doubt and were not stoned. If the man did not want a "defiled" girl, they would have to get a "writ of divorcement", even though she had never left her father's house yet and been united with her betrothed husband. That is the position Joseph was in---a pregnant betrothed wife who still lived with her father.

In addition, if you reread some of my earlier posts, you will see that I see it very possible that Porneia refers to those who have been joined unlawfully (adulterous unions, homosexual unions, incestual unions). The forsaking of such would include no hardheartedness as God did not join those unions---they are sin---no matter what secular law may state. Such is the case with the man who was with his father's wife.

Quote:

-----I believe the covenant is made between the spouses and blessed by God, and you appear (from what I can gather) to believe the covenant is made between the individuals and God  
-----

Yes, I do, because the Word does not say the Lord merely "blesses" the union, but when two come together in a covenant, He is the one who SEALS it. Scripture states that He JOINS the two as ONE. So I don't see God's role as merely a witness, but something much larger than that.

Quote:

-----I have inferred this is yet another strand of (what I see as) a necessarily broad discussion, which is far from limited to Bible verses about marriage.  
-----

I agree this is (and should be) quite a broad discussion, encompassing much, much, more than the common verses on marriage. Since scripture likens our relationship with Christ to marriage, Christ's role and our role in our relationship should be looked at deeply. Much can be learned about marriage and the very heart of God by looking at our relationship (His with us). Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re:, on: 2006/5/26 14:23

Quote:

-----There are many posts I just skip right over now, but I will take the time to read yours,  
-----

as those of us who have dealt with you long enough to know that you do when refuted completely..yet not wanting to accept it, seemingly.

Not a characteristic of a true bible student.

I use opposition to test my views, which is why i respond to EVERY assertion you offer.

You simply close your eyes and plug your ears and repeat your mantra again and again to keep from dealing with anything that proves you errant.

Quote:

-----  
I hope you don't expect me to come into agreement with you on Mt. 19:9 before you will share your views  
-----

She doesnt.

Ive already informed our dear sister dorcas of what to expect from you cindy.

She has offered some hope for your return to truth in this matter to me, I have tried to explain to her that you dont wish to do so.

So no, she doesnt 'expect' this of you at all..

You will continue to reject the clear definition of 'porneia' as it refutes your doctrine entirely.

You will reject that fornication CANNOT and IS NOT limited to jewish betrothal OR "unlawful" marriages as recognizing the truth in the matter also refutes your belief in this matter.

Denial is an absolute power with some, it seems

Quote:

-----To me, that is as pointless a dialogue as it is with someone who constantly wants to argue the same points over and over and over because they are trying to appear "victor" to the viewers.  
-----

pot...kettle...black...mean anything?

This exact behavior from you, 56ford, S. wilcox, etc, is precisely why I made my website.

Seemingly, you all thought to simply overwhelm me with mindnumbing repetition till I conceded for lack of energy....as soon as I made my site and can copy/paste now, you started making up excuses to not respond to me.

Quote:

-----I said it "could" be concerning the betrothal custom  
-----

Its not 'could be'....it simply IS porneia/fornication as that act is sexual immorality...exactly what fornication is and includes...it is ANY and ALL sexual sin.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/fornicationnotonlyduringbetrothal.html>

Quote:

-----  
Not all women who had sexual relations during the betrothal period were stoned. Those who were taken (sexually assaulted) in the country were given

the benefit of the doubt and were not stoned.  
-----

Nice attempt at distraction.

This point is irrelevant as this woman you speak of was \*assumed\* to not have been guilty of WILLFUL sexual sin....NO ONE murders the innocent.

This point is irrelevant to this discussion.

Quote:  
-----If the man did not want a "defiled" girl, they would have to get a "writ of divorcement", even though she had never left her father's house yet and been united with her betrothed husband. That is the position Joseph was in---a pregnant betrothed wife who still lived with her father.  
-----

\*IF\* this woman pretended to be a virgin, she'd have been stoned according to the law \*IF\* her husband called attention to it (Deut 22:13-21).

\*IF\* he (her betrothed husband) knew she wasn't a virgin because she had been raped, and he WILLINGLY took her as a wife (homotaking) then would not have been permitted to put her away for this later for her not being a virgin.

Your assertion is no less than saying I could take a WIDOW for a wife, then later try to put her away for not being a virgin....preposterous and apparently a simple fabrication to try to make this false doctrine work.

## Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/26 15:12

Quote:  
-----I hope you don't expect me to come into agreement with you on Mt. 19:9 before you will share your views.  
-----

Ah! No.

I expect you to come to agreement with Jesus. That little missing link in your thesis causes me deep concern.

I am not willing to dispute Matthew's record, but, as I have read all your posts, you have disputed it resolutely from the beginning of this discussion in every single thread on this matter. Where have you ever stated that you accept Jesus' exception, and agree that the context is the New Covenant, not the Old?

Quote:  
-----I wouldn't understand that type of dialogue (only willing to "share" with those who agree). I think that's not a fair way to dialogue with a person  
-----

As I said before, I'm trying to find a piece of reasoning from you in which I recognise the consistency of scripture, which can be defined as common ground, at an early stage.

I'm glad you agree we are looking at verses which are not just about marriage. :-)

Another difficulty I'm having, is you compare unlike situations with each other, either without noticing you are, or, genuinely not understanding that they are not a fair comparison. For instance

Quote:  
-----Not all women who had sexual relations during the betrothal period were stoned. Those who were taken (sexually assaulted) in the country were given the benefit of the doubt and were not stoned.  
-----

In this example, the first one is a woman - legal wife of a man, (as yet unconsummated) who has had sexual intercourse willingly with another man; and the other, is a betrothed woman (wife) who was **raped by a stranger**. Had she been raped in the city, someone would have heard her shouting for help. Had she not shouted, she would have been stoned.

It is completely clear from Deu 22, that the COMPLIANCE in a sexual act of one marriage partner, with *anyone other than their spouse* was a stoning offence.

The raped woman has the satisfaction of seeing the rapist stoned (your allusion to sexual assault) and - although you mention that her husband could divorce her, that is not mentioned in scripture.

Quote:  
-----I don't know how anyone could discount that possibility due to the fact that we have a scriptural precedent of "putting away" due to betrothal unfaithfulness.  
-----

Sorry I don't know to which event you refer here. Please could you give me the reference? Thanks.

Quote:  
-----it very possible that Porneia refers to those who have been joined unlawfully  
-----

There was no such thing in Israel. No-one *could* have been in an unlawful union IN ISRAEL.

Therefore, porneia refers to those abominations, obviously, but a host of other sexual behaviours which do not even include 'joining'. This idolatrous practice, Jesus says, is JUST cause for a divorce by the God-fearing spouse.

This ties in completely, with the spirit of meaning in  
Deuteronomy 24:4

Her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled; for that is abomination before the LORD:

It is the defiling of the woman in sexual behaviour with another man, which is the issue - even though she was HIS WIFE at the time she had that sexual relationship with him. God says she is not to return to her first husband. End of discussion (with God).

This is interesting:

Deuteronomy 22

28 If a man find a damsel that is a virgin, which is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, **and they be found**;

29 Then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel's father fifty shekels of silver, and she shall be his wife;

Quote:  
-----I don't see God's role as merely a witness  
-----

**Neither do I.** But I maintain that the mutual consent of the couple being married TO EACH OTHER, is where the covenant takes place. The meaning of their consent to each other, and their legal freedom to enter into such a covenant with each other, are both important.

No-one gets married, unless they want to have sexual intercourse with the other person. A non-sexual living arrangement is not a 'marriage'.

As I said earlier in the thread, and now, in the light of Deu 24:4 specifically, once sexual sin against a spouse has been committed by the other, whether with each other, or with someone outside the marriage, the question of divorce becomes **legitimate** because **GOD** would NEVER - **could never** - sanction such a departure from the purity of the covenant which He once endorsed. **How can He pretend the couple are still joined BY HIM?** He will have nothing to do with sin - let alone sexual sin.

In the following verses, you'll see the breadth of my reasoning (I hope).

Exodus 19

10 And the LORD said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them to day and to morrow, and let them wash their clothes,

11 And be ready against the third day: for the third day the LORD will come down in the sight of all the people upon mount Sinai...

14 And Moses went down from the mount unto the people, and sanctified the people; and they washed their clothes.

15 And he said unto the people, Be ready against the third day: **come not at your wives**.

This is one reason I have difficulty believing marriage partners make their covenant **with God**, or, that marriage is 'holy'.

It is an arrangement ordained by Him, of course, but, it is a flesh arrangement *only* nevertheless, and the meaning of it has to be looked at, I believe, more from the view that we are made in His image, and our flesh teaches about His nature, than, that He is, somehow, an intrinsic part of each marriage.

Spouses only become one flesh. They don't become one spirit, or one soul, no matter how close they are as friends, or, how full of the Holy Spirit through faith in Jesus.

I'm not saying it isn't a wonderful thing for two Christians to be married to each other, but some non-Christians also have wonderfully happy marriages, and I know you agree they also have been joined by God.

Quote:

-----Much can be learned about marriage and the very heart of God by looking at our relationship (His with us).

And ours with Him....

which depends solely on the reason for the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/26 15:31**

Quote:

-----The raped woman has the satisfaction of seeing the rapist stoned (your allusion to sexual assault) and - although you mention that her husband could divorce her, **that is not mentioned in scripture**.

Good catch, dorcas.

It is typical for these to add ideas to scripture with no foundation, then to disallow the same privilege as is shown on page 7 here (see my post where I point this very thing out to cindy)....

[http://www.familylife.com/community/forums/ubb/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=get\\_topic;f=7;t=003910;p=7#000101](http://www.familylife.com/community/forums/ubb/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=get_topic;f=7;t=003910;p=7#000101)

These 'additions' with no foundation from scripture are very common with this group.

They pretend like WE are adding when we actually have Jesus own words to show He makes exception for whoredom, then they turn around and actually make additions themselves to the text and I suppose we're not permitted to call them on it.

Double standard entirely.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/5/26 17:13**

I don't like to use the old testament unless it is Christ that we see Who will be and is our all.

But, this is a good illustration of where we are to turn, no matter whether it is adultery, sexual sin or idolatry. We must return to the Lord, the God of our salvation which is in Christ Jesus and Him in us, literally, The Spirit of Christ in us and without Him we are nothing.

Jeremiah 3:20-22 Surely as a wife treacherously departeth from her husband, so have ye dealt treacherously with Me,



O house of Israel, saith the LORD. A voice was heard upon the high places, weeping and supplications of the children of Israel: for they have perverted their way, and they have forgotten the LORD their God. Return, ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings. Behold, we come unto thee; for thou art the LORD our God.

Given her a bill of divorce; delivered her up into the hands of the Assyrian, where God took from her the title of being His People, 2Ki 17:5-6, &c., which he calls here a bill of divorce; not such a one as the Jews were allowed to give upon every slight ground that Moses gave them because of the hardness of their heart, (for such a one God denies that ever he gave them, "from the beginning it was not so," and challengeth them to produce it, Isa 1:1) but upon just and great occasion, viz. her playing the adulteress against Him in her idolatries. Feared not, i.e. was neither afraid of giving Me offence, nor of the like punishment. But went and played the harlot also; although she had seen the judgment of God executed upon Israel before her eyes, which made it the more stupendous, that she would take no warning by her sister's sufferings, Judah, Pr 28:14, yet she went on still, Eze 23:11-12, &c.

Men and women do all this and then try to justify it by using God's Word either to say we cannot marry or we can marry because of God's law. This is not the answer, the answer is in Christ who is pure and undefiled and we trying to justify ourselves in do's or don'ts are in idolatry by the very act. Let us return to God through Christ Jesus our Lord and make our return the Justification for it is Christ that is our Wisdom, Righteousness, Justification and Redemption, not what we do or don't do. If I have been married 5 times and all divorces are upon the law as the exception and all have committed adultery against me. I am free to Marry again. Well I would feel just like Hosea who was told to Marry and take a wife of whoredom, and in her adulteries I am still to provide her and her suitors with food, clothing, vineyards, jewelry, and take care of her and she not even know it. Then buy her back off the slave block and return her to glory as a Bride, that being the Bride of Christ. Christ paid the price for all and He is still providing us with the best of Himself and will make us His own once and forever. Let the guests see at the wedding feast of the Lamb that we are His Bride and quit using the Law to keep us instead of Christ who's we are. It is Him in whom we live and move and have our being. If we are to marry again after divorce let it be by the acceptance of Christ in the marriage and glorify Him and the Father and not self because I legally I can marry again. Or not marry because God has given celibacy and wants us to Himself.

It is the Heart our Father is after and certainly ours is wicked above all else, be it marriage or divorce. That is why Christ was put to death and resurrected and born again in our Spirit that we might come to the knowledge that the Christ in us is in whom we live and move and have our being. God never intended divorce from the beginning and He will never change His mind. But in that the whole world is divorcing themselves from God let us return to the Christ that is in us and make sure that it never happens again.

Galatians 5:1-6 Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, (law works) Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, (Law works) that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love.

Romans 8:1-3 There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh:

This includes divorce and remarriage and all else that keeps us from the righteousness that Christ is been made in us.

1 Corinthians 1:29-31 That no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/26 17:15

Quote:  
-----The raped woman has the satisfaction of seeing the rapist stoned (your allusion to sexual assault) and - although you mention that her husband could divorce her, that is not mentioned in scripture.  
-----

What category would Mary have fallen into Dorcas, since she was with child while living in her father's home? Didn't the law call for stoning in such a case, yet Joseph was thinking of putting her away quietly and not stoning her? I believe he was giving her the benefit of the doubt---thinking she did resist, but noone heard her cry for help. THIS is the precedent I keep speaking about and have posted over and over in regards to Mt. 19:9, yet you seem to ignore it for some reason. Could you give me your take on this passage (Mt. 1:18-24) and how it fits into OT laws on sexual purity and why you absolutely do not believe this could pertain to Jesus' "exception" in Mt. 19:9?

Also, lay a foundation so it's easier to follow, please. You are all over the place in your discussion on this. In addition, there are many things which you said you would address, but still haven't. Those need to be addressed before going on to "deeper" levels. Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re:, on: 2006/5/26 17:35

Quote:  
-----  
lastblast wrote:  
What category would Mary have fallen into Dorcas, since she was with child while living in her father's home? Didn't the law call for stoning in such a case, yet Joseph was thinking of putting her away quietly and not stoning her? **I believe he was giving her the benefit of the doubt---thinking she did resist, but noone heard her cry for help.**  
-----

Sorry, unfounded conjecture.  
My aren't we ADDING to the text again...

You CANNOT alter Jesus CLEAR exception based on a "hunch" as you clearly seem to be attempting...

And your theory is quite flawed.

What "just" man would put her away \*IF\* he believed she was actually FORCED/RAPED ???

Your ideas make Joseph seem much less than an honorable man.

Quote:  
----- THIS is the precedent I keep speaking about and have posted over and over in regards to Mt. 19:9, yet you seem to ignore it for some reason.  
-----

But cindy, you offered NO ACTUAL PRECEDENT !  
You offered mere conjecture with NO SCRIPTURAL support whatsoever...so it's no wonder it's being ignored !!

Mary's penalty if she had played the harlot under the Law she LIVED under (as Jesus wasn't even born yet) was DEATH (Deut 22)...period!

Joseph's being a 'just' man could just as easily be just what scripture ACTUALLY states..that he did not wish to make a PUBLIC example of her....

**"Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a publick example, was minded to put her away privily.  
(Mat 1:19)**

You offer conjecture with no foundation for your "precedent"  
WE offer absolute FACT in the matter...

From what Gods word ACTUALLY STATES we see that Joe simply didnt want to subject her to what he knew she would suffer IF her supposed sin were made PUBLIC.

Scripture does NOT say he was giving her the benefit of the doubt and believed she was attacked and/or resisted. It clearly states he didnt want to make a public example of her.

Didnt you just get huffy with someone for inserting their own ideas into the text?

Yet again we see this from you and you expect us to allow you to change Jesus own words based on your unfounded theory

Quote:

-----  
Could you give me your take on this passage (Mt. 1:18-24) and how it fits into OT laws on sexual purity and why you absolutely do not believe this could pertain to Jesus' "exception" in Mt. 19:9?  
-----

WHOA...hold on there Tex....YOU are the one limiting 'porneia'....not Dorcas.  
From her and my discussion she seems to fully comprehend that porneia/fornication is harlotry/whoredom in general, married or not...thus including "adultery" when it occurs within marital confines as even Hermas understood....

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/adulteryisfornication.html>

\*IF\* Mary had actually committed sexual sin there, then Matt 19 (except for fornication) WOULD apply...just as it would have POST-consummation.

Porneia is ALL sexual sin, married or not.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/11.html>  
<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/fornicationnotonlyduringbetrothal.html>

**Re: - posted by ANewInHim, on: 2006/5/26 17:42**

Love the Key to (Â“MarriageÂ”)

The question is not so much what is Love, but what Love is NOT.

Love is not I love you today, but I love (Â“\_\_\_\_\_Â”) tomorrow.  
Love is not you were anointed yesterday, but (Â“\_\_\_\_\_Â”) is anointed today.

I used to see my future with (Â“\_\_\_\_\_Â”), but I see my future now with  
(Â“\_\_\_\_\_Â”).

The list goes on, you were beautiful yesterday, but my eyes see (Â“\_\_\_\_\_Â”) beautiful today. You were (Â“\_\_\_\_\_Â”) but today you are (Â“\_\_\_\_\_Â”).

That is not Love. To Love today, is to Love tomorrow. To have Loved yesterday is I will Love today.

To Love is to believe;  
Do you (Â“\_\_\_\_\_Â”) take (Â“\_\_\_\_\_Â”) to be your lawful wedded (Â“\_\_\_\_\_Â”) to have and to hold, for richer or poorer, in sickness and in health, till death do us part. I (“\_\_\_\_\_”)

-ANewInHim

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/26 18:13**

Cindy said

Quote:  
-----Also, lay a foundation so it's easier to follow, please. **You are all over the place in your discussion on this.** In addition, there are many things which you said you would address, but still haven't. Those need to be addressed before going on to "deeper" levels.  
-----

My last post was quite long, and in it I addressed your previous post in a fair amount of detail, showing the reader the references from Deuteronomy, as well as reiterating my belief about the marriage covenant and supporting my new points with scripture.

Cindy, I'm not sure what you mean by 'deeper levels'...?

I have never seen anything in scripture which says the couple who are marrying make a covenant with God. Nor have I seen marriage between a man and a woman defined as holy. **If there is scripture to support these two ideas, please quote it clearly for me, thanks.**

I'm not really 'all over the place', at all - at least no more than is necessary to restate the boundaries of any matter on which Jesus had something to say. And, I don't want to spoonfeed anyone.

From my point of view, I'm covering all the ground that is relevant. I started to do this several posts back, and it has led you to ask questions. I would like you to ask *yourself* why I think these points are relevant. In fact, some of them I would not mention, except I find you hold a different view. I hope you can see, that's why I'm stating mine?

I think we both believe the other has an ear to the Holy Spirit and I know how long it has taken the Lord to lead me through this topic.... so I'm affording to you the same liberty to take your own time in considering my thesis.

Quote:  
-----THIS is the precedent I keep speaking about and have posted over and over in regards to Mt. 19:9, yet you seem to ignore it for some reason.  
-----

But it **isn't** a precedent - because Joseph didn't put Mary away as per Old Covenant law. He did what probably was going on all over Israel, while under Roman rule.

I can't say I've studied the detail of the four hundred years before Jesus was born, but I've heard there was a lot of silence from God, and that's one reason the religious leaders were able to keep adding to the laws - and we know what Jesus said to them about putting burdens on men but not alleviating them with one of their little fingers - and of not going into the kingdom themselves, and deliberately preventing others from entering.

Not only this, but there was all the nonsense with the chief priests and elders when they wanted Jesus killed, in that they couldn't just do it themselves under Jewish law, they had to get Him condemned to death under Roman law, because their **religious killings were now illegal**. What's more, Jesus Himself prophesied that He would be put to death by the Gentiles.... So, I'm not sure Joseph was in a position to have a pregnant woman stoned to death. That's my take on it.

Quote:  
-----and why you absolutely do not believe this could pertain to Jesus' "exception" in Mt. 19:9?  
-----

There are two main points here.

When Joseph was looking for a decent way to conceal his embarrassment over Mary's pregnancy, there was no restoration going on in Israel. John the Baptist was not yet born, and it would be many years before his ministry began. When it did begin, he was not sure who the Messiah was, only the matters which John (who had been one of his disciples, with Andrew) records for us at the beginning of his gospel. But, during Jesus' lifetime, all the prophecy about the return of Elijah was being fulfilled. That is HUGE! It touched many ordinary people in Israel, but, it did not sink - had not sunk - into

many of the religious leaders' souls - as we see, only months later.

The second point is, that when Jesus was speaking in Matthew 19, He was not only born, **He was IN His public ministry**. When we refer to AD, we are referring to after His birth - not His death.

The whole of my post in which I asked *you* a question which you haven't answered, centred on this point - that Jesus came to ABOLISH the law, by fulfilling it. There is such a lot of scripture supporting this fact, I don't think I need to quote it for you... but for anyone unsure, here is Galatians 3 (NKJV)

10 For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, "Cursed is everyone who does not continue in all things which are written in the book of the law, to do them."  
11 But that no one is justified by the law in the sight of God is evident, for "the just shall live by faith."  
12 Yet the law is not of faith, but "the man who does them shall live by them."  
13 Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us (for it is written, "Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree"),  
14 that the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles in Christ Jesus, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.  
15 Brethren, I speak in the manner of men: Though it is only a man's covenant, yet if it is confirmed, no one annuls or adds to it.  
16 Now to Abraham and his Seed were the promises made. He does not say, "And to seeds," as of many, but as of one, "And to your Seed," who is Christ.  
17 And this I say, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years later, cannot annul the covenant that was confirmed before by God in Christ, that it should make the promise of no effect.  
18 For if the inheritance is of the law, it is no longer of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise.  
19 What purpose then does the law serve? **It was added because of transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the promise was made;** and it was appointed through angels by the hand of a mediator.  
20 Now a mediator does not mediate for one only, but God is one.  
21 Is the law then against the promises of God? Certainly not! For if there had been a law given which could have given life, truly righteousness would have been by the law.  
22 But the Scripture has confined all under sin, that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe.  
23 But before faith came, we were kept under guard by the law, kept for the faith which would afterward be revealed.  
24 Therefore the law was our tutor to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith.  
25 But after faith has come, we are no longer under a tutor.  
26 For you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus.  
27 For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ.  
28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.  
29 And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.

I repeat **He was IN His public ministry**. He was restating and simultaneously changing the 'word' by which Christians are to live, from the Old Covenant to the New. This is explained in detail in Hebrews, which is why I asked if you are conversant with it.... I asked if you are conversant with it, because I believe if you were already, you would not gag on Matthew 19:9.

#### Re: Divorce, Marriage, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/27 15:25

I'm posting these verses here, to keep them close to those from Deuteronomy which I used in my post on the previous page, because they show divorce was a separate issue from sexual sin, and from those by which a widow was excluded from becoming the wife of a priest.

EDIT: Under the Old Covenant, God was relying on physical virginity to bring to attention the intended purity of marriage, and He decreed the priesthood should set this example to all.

NKJV) Leviticus 21

1 And the LORD said to Moses, "Speak to the priests, the sons of Aaron, and say to them: ....

7 'They shall not take a wife who is a harlot or a defiled woman, nor shall they take a woman divorced from her husband;

for the priest is holy to his God.

9 'The daughter of any priest, if she profanes herself by playing the harlot, she profanes her father. She shall be burned with fire.

13 'And he shall take a wife in her virginity.

14 'A widow or a divorced woman or a defiled woman or a harlot -- these he shall not marry; but he shall take a virgin of his own people as wife.

There is a detailed list of the kind of physical defect which would exclude a son of Aaron from serving as a priest, including blindness and lameness. This reminds me of a snippet from one gospel:

Matthew 21:14

And the blind and the lame came to him **in the temple**; and he healed them.

Context:

following His triumphal entry to Jerusalem...

12 And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves,

13 And said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves.

We see a dramatic change of priorities, under Jesus' ministry.

5 ... Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood,

6 And hath made **us kings and priests unto God and his Father**; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/27 17:45**

Boy, I am really confused now. :-?

**Re:, on: 2006/5/27 18:27**

Quote:

5 ... Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood,  
6 And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

Most likely when cindy returns she will try to turn this one against you as she has me in the past saying "**see, WE are priests so WE cannot marry this woman divorced from her husband**"

Unless of course, cindy DOES now see that this is flawed because these priests were forbidden to marry even widows as well....something entirely lawful by us...and even coerced by Paul for younger widows...

So as you say, something is definitely different under this new covenant.

These priests were a foreshadow of the Christ to come. The rules that applied to them do not alter His exception for who redom.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/5/27 19:20

Hi Linn,

I see it is so hard to bring the body of Christ out of religion and law, for that is all we have known. You are trying hard and doing a good job, but it takes the Holy Spirit Revelation of Christ in us to free us from religion. That is my prayer that we truly listen to the Spirit within us and hear the freedom we have in Christ. There are not many who really know the Grace we have by His Faith that is in us. Oh, we know about Grace and Faith but we really don't come to the letting go of all that we were and still are in having so many body pulls still hanging on us. If we can only clean up our act, God will be pleased with us. He has already cleaned up our act by the Christ that is in us. I don't know how we could be any more clean than that of the Perfect One Jesus Christ that is in us. Jam 4:17 Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth not, to him it is sin.

Lev 4:35 And he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat of the lamb is taken away from the sacrifice of the peace of offerings; and the priest shall burn them upon the altar, according to the offerings made by fire unto the LORD: and the priest shall make an atonement for his sin that he hath committed, and it shall be forgiven him.

They had it and did not know it. The atonement was not the offering but the Son of God they had been told and was to come and what they were doing under the law was just a picture of what was to come. They did not See Him clearly.

We have Him in us and we still don't see Him clearly. We should because He has come and He is that which is Perfect. I can know Him as I am known and be completely set free from the Law of sin and death. We are in Christ, how much more do we need. Oh, that we might as Paul saw and new, We are crucified with Christ to the old life and live anew in Him. Galatians 2:16-20 Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid. For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor. For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

With divorce and remarriage are we not seeking to build again the things which I destroyed, which are in the Law, and not just the Law of Moses but the Whole Law of God which is all sin against God. Rom 8:2 For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.

Romans 6:15-20 What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid. Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness. I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness. For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness.

For Christ has been made our righteousness.

1 Corinthians 1:29-31 That no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

Let us seek to make marriage what God intends it to be, a perfect picture of The Christ that is in us as we are already betrothed to Him. Not ever allowing divorce or remarriage to even enter the picture. All things are become new in Christ Jesus who loves us and gave Himself for us. For us who have failed, we are washed, cleansed, and stand perfect before God in Christ Jesus. Galatians 5:1 Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

In Christ: Phillip



**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/5/27 19:33**

We will never justify what we have done wrong. We will never justify what we are going to do unless it is by the Christ that is in us who is our Justification.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re:, on: 2006/5/27 20:09**

Quote:

Let us seek to make marriage what God intends it to be, a perfect picture of The Christ that is in us as we are already betrothed to Him. **Not ever allowing divorce or remarriage to even enter the picture**

No offense, but can you tell me this is possible where a woman is being savagely beaten and raped by her husband?

and if he is raping his own children?

Your post was good up till this point where common sense seems to have been thrown to the four winds.

There are times where divorce is unavoidable and only the most sheltered of souls will reject that eventuality.

When divorced for these causes, remarriage is not forbidden...only in the case where it is two actual believers does Paul have a word from God to remain single or reconcile...."but to the REST, says Paul, not the Lord, that if the unbeliever leave, let them leave....

Shall we determine that this man Paul would say a man who continually plays the whore is actually a believer? And the man who beats and rapes his wife without mercy...does Paul think this man a true follower of Christ? Don't we know wicked ones by their fruits?

It's very easy for those who have lived quaint little lives with white picket fences to tell the beaten woman "Not ever allowing divorce or remarriage to even enter the picture"...

to add, I don't know which side of the fence you're on concerning the exception...my comment was directed solely at this remark that no one should ever consider divorce...

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/5/27 20:39**

I did not say anything about what ignorant people that beat and rape others are doing. It is wrong and sin and should be avoided if possible, if not then as Christ said even in His being ravaged by others when He was completely innocent, "Father forgive them for they know not what they do."

There is no avocation of any person staying in an abusive circumstance or situation unless it is specifically demonstrated by the Holy Spirit that we are to stay because it is His working and using the C&S gang to bring forth the Kingdom of Christ in us for someone else. This takes very close scrutiny in each case. If others or self are being abused we have laws that confine them to prison that they cannot hurt others.

Let's not stay in the C&S environment that causes and contributes to abuse. I will say, that forgiveness is necessary for the abused on the part of the abuser. Not for the abuser's sake but for the cleansing and setting free of the abused.

I don't understand where you got that I was for the abuser. This statement was not open season on the abused. ""Let us seek to make marriage what God intends it to be, a perfect picture of The Christ that is in us as we are already betrothed to Him. Not ever allowing divorce or remarriage to even enter the picture."" If this C&S does occur it is probably because of wrong choices on the part of the abused, a mistake in character and person of the abuser, and not heeding God's Word, Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers. My statement was from God's word, Ephesians 5:30-33 For we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church. Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband.



If I in any way suggested anyone stay in an abusive C&S (circumstance or situation) I was wrong and need forgiveness for not being careful enough and being misunderstood. Forgive Me.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/5/27 20:54**

FOC, is your name Linn or Lynn?

In Christ: Phillip

**Re:, on: 2006/5/27 21:18**

Quote:

Christinyou wrote:

FOC, is your name Linn or Lynn?

In Christ: Phillip

My name is william.

I understand that you didnt include an abuser in your previous post, but when you make blanket comments as you did, you make it seem as if you are saying under NO circumstances is divorce to be sought...this is very misleading to a young woman in an abusive relationship who might see that comment.

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/27 21:30**

Quote:

FOC wrote:

My name is william.

Hey that's my name also "mr(bill)pro" you must be a good dude. :-)  
Now please don't tell me your 54 years old like me. :-?

**Re:, on: 2006/5/27 22:33**

Quote:

MrBillPro wrote:

Quote:

FOC wrote:

My name is william.

Hey that's my name also "mr(bill)pro" you must be a good dude. :-)  
Now please don't tell me your 54 years old like me. :-?

hey :)

Nope, turned 40 last october. I feel 54 tho ;)

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/27 22:43

Quote:

FOC wrote:

Nope, turned 40 last october. I feel 54 tho ;)

Well at least our Birthdays are in the same month mine is Oct. 4th 1951

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/28 6:32

Quote:

-----Unless of course, cindy DOES now see that this is flawed because these priests were forbidden to marry even widows as well....so mething entirely lawful by us...and even coerced by Paul for younger widows...

Hi FOC,

Cindy may not wish to respond to that post, and I'd be happy not to put words into her mouth - something I find quite irritating, personally.... no offence to you, I hope.

This isn't a matter of intellectual ability. We know that many Jews did not 'see' that Jesus was the Messiah at the time, and yet, there have always been Jews coming to know Him. I think it's the same with 'getting' the New Covenant. It can *need* to be wrestled with, through personal circumstances (at least in its theory), before the grace of God which is available may present itself as just exactly that - the grace of God - that we are no longer under THE law, even though there is now 'the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus'.

I am very aware that marriage is still a matter of the flesh, not the Spirit, but, being able to make sense of this where things are not straightforward - as in my own experience - can take a long time. God is patient. I think we all know, when we finally see something that others seem - almost to have ALWAYS known - to know, that His patience catches us unaware.

I've come to accept this aspect of His Nature, as a function of His ETERNAL Nature... that He is always **I AM**.

A reader might be able to tell this is something I *know*, from my sig.

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/28 7:27

Quote:

-----Hi Linn,

I see it is so hard to bring the body of Christ out of religion and law, for that is all we have known. You are trying hard and doing a good job, but it takes the Holy Spirit Revelation of Christ in us to free us from religion. That is my prayer that we truly listen to the Spirit within us and hear the freedom we have in Christ. There are not many who really know the Grace we have by His Faith that is in us. Oh, we know about Grace and Faith but we really don't come to the letting go of all that we were and still are in having so many body pulls still hanging on us. If we can only clean up our act, God will be pleased with us. He has already cleaned up our act by the Christ that is in us. I don't know how we could be any more clean than that of the Perfect One Jesus Christ that is in us. Jam 4:17 Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth not, to him it is sin.

Hi Phillip,

I understood you.

But, had you been someone I know less well, I may have picked out the same sentence as FOC. However, it would have been possible to pick out this one too

Quote:

-----Let us seek to make marriage what God intends it to be, a perfect picture of The Christ that is in us as we are already betrothed to Him.

to say, let BELIEVERS understand, that marriage is for the rest of their lives, and enter into it soberly, understanding the commitment they are making, is like the one Christ has made to us.

However, I do agree with FOC that if a so-called believer reverts to behaving like an unbeliever, with no control of their physical behaviour, bringing violence of all kinds into the equation, then one may be justified in questioning that person's *original* claim to know God.

No-one wishes to make this kind of judgment on another, especially not a Christian wife or husband, but, there ARE boundaries, and those whose departure from the outward appearance of a Christian walk, need to ask themselves many questions and find their answers in God, as often the reason for such departures are deep. Not too deep for God to elucidate, but, deeper than a person has acknowledged **to themselves** previously.

Actually, there is nothing 'wrong' with this process. Many people go through it. But, if it affects the mutual comfort in a marriage, there is more to understand than simply one's own viewpoint. The other spouse may not cope with their change in role and may feel they don't have to, either.

My observation is, that for the most part, many cannot cope, and the only way they can remain at their post (within the marriage) is by giving the other spouse freedom to seek support from outside to sort out their inner life. Both then function only outwardly as a spouse. Often, those who struggle most with the betrayal they've experienced, are those who have never been betrayed before, or, those who have already received healing for their own deeper hurts.

It's difficult in the whirlwind of life, sometimes, to be willing to throw away say, a career, or an income, to 'be' what the struggling spouse would wish. This is the real test for both spouses who feel unsupported.... **Can** they turn their eyes toward God and find in Him **all** they need, in this situation?

It cannot be that Paul did not recognise this as the best way forward in God. But, I don't believe Paul would have been unsympathetic to the couple who realised one of them had never been born again, and that's why they were struggling with sin. However, the decision to abandon adultery or fornication, is something which can only be taken by the adulterer or fornicator, and it needs to be not just sincere, but absolute.

The struggle can be over in Christ, and that's how they will know where they are or not. Paul in Corinthians, is talking to those who have successfully abandoned these sins - not just in practice, but in their hearts. Amen. The mortification of the flesh which follows, is well within reach, of those who understand the triggers they themselves battle with. Scripture is clear. Flee.

1 Cor 6:18 Flee fornication.

1 Cor 10:14 Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from idolatry.

1 Timothy 6:11

But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness.

2 Timothy 2:22

Flee also youthful lusts: but follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart

Flee is balanced by BUT FOLLOW RIGHTEOUSNESS ....

#### Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/28 7:40

I thought it was worth looking at the context in Paul's first letter to Timothy, chapter six.

3 If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness;

4 He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings,

5 Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.

6 But godliness with contentment is great gain.

7 For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out.

8 And having food and raiment let us be therewith content.

9 But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition.

10 For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.

11 But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness.

12 Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses.

It interests me that money is so often tied up in idolatry somehow, and this also is a key issue in marriages.

In Scotland, the Covenanters who were driven out of their homes, often watched their loved ones die of exposure and starvation, rather than renounce their faith. Some watched their husbands killed in their own homes - for the faith.

Only God can bring a person through these kind of choices, retaining their sanity, and deepening their knowledge of Him, for His sake.

These were New Testament issues too, which we have great difficulty in translating to our generation, sometimes. Yet, there is liberty, while God does not make our willingness to embrace poverty or not, an issue.

It seems from what Paul says above, that pride has something to do with it. I've discovered in myself, pride over all sorts of strange things, which have nothing to do with money.. so I'd say, it's not *that* simple!

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/28 7:42**

Bill said

Quote:

-----Boy, I am really confused now.  
-----

What's the problem?

Could you put it into a question, at all?

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/28 8:52**

Quote:

-----I'm not really 'all over the place', at all - at least no more than is necessary to restate the boundaries of any matter on which Jesus had something to say. And, I don't want to spoonfeed anyone.  
-----

I appreciate that Dorcas, but it makes dialoging quite difficult when you don't answer what's asked, but instead keep right

t on talking ahead, leaving those questions behind and giving scriptures which, in my opinion, do not have much validity to this discussion. Some passages you quote I don't see any application--some I see application in regards to the SCOPE of marriage, but I don't think you would agree with my take on it---such as the passage on "godliness is gain". That passage/or verse, can very well fit into this discussion as some DO believe "godliness is gain" when it gives them freedoms in regards to remarriage.

In any case, scripture teaches that we do not live by the OT law, but by the Spirit of the Law in Christ, which is ever so much deeper and more demanding in the "dying to self" area. It deals not only with the outward, but the inward.

As for Widows, scripture clearly states that widows are allowed to marry and doesn't put any limitations on "priests" who marry them. If you are linking divorcees with widows, I don't see the connection. Marrying a divorcee in the NT(for anyone, including the unsaved) under Jesus' teachings is adultery. It was not considered adultery in the OT, just forbidden, or do you believe it was adultery for a priest to marry a divorcee?

I also really would like you to address your thoughts on Mary and how you believe she fits in to Deut 22 and why Joseph was thinking to do what he was if it would have meant he was disobeying the law. As I said, it would be much easier a conversation to follow if you would state clearly first, what you believe, and then what scriptures lead you to this belief. For me, it's almost impossible to know where you draw a line with what you may believe is adultery concerning remarriage or what you believe is permissible---to God---concerning remarriage. Thank you. Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/5/28 9:41**

Hi Cindy,

Sorry I don't have more time to reply to your latest post, but I appreciate the time and thought you've given to answering mine, and asking for more detail from me.

I believe I addressed Joseph's situation adequately. I realise for many of us post-war babies today, we don't know what it's like to have our country taken over by a military power, and have them suspend our right to practice our religion in all its details - such as religious killings - but, that was Joseph's situation. In that his wife was carrying the Saviour of the world, and God obviously knew Joseph would not be able to have Mary stoned, by choosing her, at that point in world history, it seems academic in the extreme, to pursue what Joseph might have done according to the law. Deuteronomy was a long way behind. Joseph took what action was available to him under an occupation. That's all he could do. I think we have to accept that.

In the following quote

Quote:  
-----Marrying a divorcee in the NT(for anyone, including the unsaved) under Jesus' teachings is adultery. It was not considered adultery in the OT, just forbidden, or do you believe it was adultery for a priest to marry a divorcee?  
-----

there is a point on which I have a question.

You said 'just forbidden'.... 'In the OT, just forbidden..'

Please tell me where to find the reference for this. Thanks.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/28 11:25**

Quote:  
-----I also really would like you to address your thoughts on Mary and how you believe she fits in to Deut 22 and why Joseph was thinking to do what he was if it would have meant he was disobeying the law.  
-----

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/lastblast.html>

3.1)

This is how badly lastblast is grasping for straws in an effort to hold on frantically to her doctrine;

**LASTBLAST:**

**"What category would Mary have fallen into Dorcas, since she was with child while living in her father's home? Didn't the law call for stoning in such a case, yet Joseph was thinking of putting her away quietly and not stoning her?"**

**I believe he was giving her the benefit of the doubt---thinking she did resist, but noone heard her cry for help.**

Cindy has now altered her views to say that Mary was attacked and raped, or Joseph believed so, and that is why Joseph was putting his betrothed wife away privately.

Scripture clearly tells us that Joseph was putting her away to keep from making a 'public example' of her.

Mat 1:19 Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a publick example, was minded to put her away privily.

-What kind of "just" man would put away his dear young wife privately for being attacked/raped?

-The Law called for NO punishment for the woman who had been attacked/raped, so \*IF\* Joseph believed Mary had been raped, firstly, there'd be NO need to put her away, she had done no wrong,...

...secondly \*IF\* she had been raped, why is it completely unspoken of in scripture...

...thirdly, \*IF\* Joseph had thought she had been raped, why doesn't the Angel simply clear this up with Joseph?

...fourthly, \*IF\* Joseph thought she had been raped, why didn't he simply put her away publicly stating that she HAD been raped so wasn't deserving of death, but he since having a virgin was so important to him, and he was such an uncaring pig that didn't care that she was RAPED, but wanted to be her first sexual experience :rolleyes:

I can think of a couple more issues here that make this scenario not quite fitting of what scripture calls a 'just' man \*IF\* he truly believed Mary was actually raped when he was about to put her away.

The fact is nothing in scripture even hints at this possibility.

This is simply Cindy's way of keeping 'except for fornication' applying ONLY to the Jewish custom of betrothal when NOTHING in scripture ever states as much.

She adds to the text at any point where her doctrine begins to fail...

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/28 11:34**

Quote:

-----

dorcas wrote:

Bill said

Quote:

-----Boy, I am really confused now.

-----

What's the problem?

Could you put it into a question, at all?

-----

Yes, I can put it into a question so just when is remarriage ok Biblically?

**Re:, on: 2006/5/28 11:37**

Quote:

-----

MrBillPro wrote:

Quote:

-----

dorcas wrote:

Bill said

Quote:

-----Boy, I am really confused now.

-----

What's the problem?

Could you put it into a question, at all?

-----

Yes, I can put it into a question so just when is remarriage ok Biblically?

-----

apparently, at the very minimum, when the previous spouse has been put away for harlotry...that much is absolute as adultery is not committed upon remarriage in this case by Jesus own words.

-----

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/28 11:52**

MrBillPro asked

Quote:

-----just when is remarriage ok Biblically?

-----

FOC has given the answer which Jesus gave, which is under fire in this thread from those who believe He was mistaken .

I started a thread last year on Matthew 5:32, with a question about the meaning of fornication. Later, someone made the statement below, which was challenged by philologos, who explained the meanings clearly.

Quote:

-----philologos quoted:

Any sexual relationship outside the marriage of one man and one woman is adultery.

philologos answered:

'I may be misunderstanding what you are saying here but I don't think this is sustainable. While there is a case for arguing that 'fornication' (as used biblically) may include all sexual immorality inside or outside of marriage, 'adultery' would always mean the betraying of the marriage bond and hence really only applicable to someone within a marriage. So 'adultery' would be a sin 'within' marriage but 'fornication' could well include sin 'within and outside' of a marriage union.'

There is also this from another website,

(<http://www.rbc.org/ds/q0806/q0806.html#point5>) <http://www.rbc.org/ds/q0806/q0806.html#point5>

which had been recommended by philologos in a different thread.

Quote from above website:

'In sanctioning divorce for sexual immorality, Jesus also permitted remarriage for people thus divorced. A careful study of the Bible passages dealing with divorce makes clear a principle that we can apply: **Whenever a divorce occurs on grounds God has declared valid, that divorce carries with it the right of remarriage**'

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/28 12:20

Quote:

-----  
dorcass wrote:

but 'fornication' could well include sin 'within and outside' of a marriage union.'

Well excuse me for being just a dumb old country boy with only a High School education, but I thought fornication was sexual immorality outside of marriage. :-?

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/28 12:46

Quote:

-----Well excuse me for being just a dumb old country boy with only a High School education, but I thought fornication was sexual immorality outside of marriage.

-----  
MrBillPro,

I have the feeling my previous post was not clear. That quote you attributed to me, was **philologos speaking**, in a thread called 'Matthew 5:32', in the Scripture and Doctrines forum.

In that thread, he pointed out that we can't make our theology from a dictionary. We must find out what the Bible means by words such as 'adultery' and fornication.

Last year, I didn't really take in the difference he was making about adultery, because I was assuming an outward sexual sin has to be committed by a married person. But, once defining adultery in Jesus' terms, one has to take into account that Jesus said the earliest lusting after a woman was **adultery**.

Earlier in this thread, in Deuteronomy 13, we see that any member of a family who suggested going to worship other gods



ds, had to be stoned to death, because idolatry is such an abomination to God. To understand what is meant by fornication in the Old Testament, you have to read Leviticus 18.

This majors on incest, but not only. Therefore, should ANY man commit such acts within or outside his marriage, he is committing fornication - with or without his wife.

Nowadays, if a man committed those things against his wife, it is grounds for divorce, as much as if he committed them with someone else, thus fulfilling the criteria for adultery. But, the adultery is not the sexual acts, it is the departure IN HIS HEART (or her heart if the woman is leaving the husband) from the purity of the marriage union.

In the *spirit* (note, small 's') of what a marriage union should be, no man or woman should require idolatrous acts from his or her spouse, as this also represents a departure from the purity of the union which is provided by the marriage covenant.

Please read those two chapters, and see if you can get what I mean?

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/28 13:10**

dorcas, I did not mean to attribute it to you sorry, I deleted too much I totally understood it was from philologos. Sorry  
Mr. Bill

**Re:, on: 2006/5/28 13:14**

Quote:

-----  
MrBillPro wrote:

Quote:

-----  
dorcas wrote:  
but 'fornication' could well include sin 'within and outside' of a marriage union.  
-----

Well excuse me for being just a dumb old country boy with only a High School education, but I thought fornication was sexual immorality outside of marriage. :-?  
-----

That is not what scripture shows, nor the ECFs believed, apparently.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/adulteryisfornication.html>

"Adultery" = "fornication" where one or two of the parties is married to someone else, not each other.

simple 'fornication' without 'adultery' would be where neither party is married to anyone else.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/28 14:28**

Quote:

-----simple 'fornication' without 'adultery' would be where neither party is married to anyone else.  
-----

Hi FOC,

This is a dictionary definition.

The committing of sexual sin within a marriage, does *not* exempt it from the biblical definition of 'fornication'.

God still expects purity between marriage partners ***within the marriage***.

Much as one might wish to take this purity for granted, a great many spouses feel betrayed by their marriage covenant, i

into complying with practices for which they were not *consciously consenting* when they promised fidelity.

This is a cause of great confusion and unhappiness, and spouses who are molested, rather than nurtured and comforted, find themselves in a humiliating trap, often lacking a way of expressing how this makes them feel.

It is not helpful therefore, to reject the possibility of fornication within a marriage, even though a dictionary might suggest otherwise. What else should we expect from the world's resources in this matter?

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/28 14:30**

Quote:

-----dorcas, I did not mean to attribute it to you sorry,  
-----

Hi Bill,

No problem. :-)

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/29 9:14**

Quote:

-----dorcas said  
I don't want to spoonfeed anyone.

Cindy said

I appreciate that Dorcas, but it makes dialoging quite difficult when you don't answer what's asked, but instead keep right on talking ahead, leaving those questions behind and giving scriptures which, in my opinion, do not have much validity to this discussion. Some passages you quote I don't see any application--

-----

Good morning, Cindy :-)

I need to establish with you, if I may, that you are ok with my acceptance of the words of Jesus Christ, as a basis for my explanation of what I believe?

From my point of view, it is non-negotiable that I accept the Bible as the word of God, and, what I don't understand, I continue to look to Him for illumination, knowing that if anyone has got it wrong, it's not Him. I support this from the following verses.

1 Peter 1:22 - 25

Since you have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit in sincere love of the brethren, love one another fervently with a pure heart, having been born again, not of corruptible seed but incorruptible, **through the word of God which lives and abides forever**, because

"All flesh is as grass,

And all the glory of man as the flower of the grass.

The grass withers,

And its flower falls away, (Isaiah 40)

**But the word of the LORD endures forever."** (Isaiah 59)

**Now this is the word** which by the gospel was preached to you. (NKJV)

Romans 10:14 - 17

How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed?

And how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?

And how shall they hear without a preacher?

And how shall they preach unless they are sent?

As it is written:

"How beautiful are the feet of those who preach the gospel of peace,

Who bring glad tidings of good things!" (Isaiah 52)

But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Isaiah says,  
"Lord, who has believed our report?" (Isaiah 53)

So then faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.

Matthew 24:35

"Heaven and earth will pass away, **but My words will by no means pass away.**

Matthew 7:23 - 29

"And then I will declare to them, 'I never knew you; depart from Me, you who practice lawlessness!' Therefore whoever hears these sayings of Mine, and does them, I will liken him to a wise man who built his house on the rock: and the rain descended, the floods came, and the winds blew and beat on that house; and it did not fall, for it was founded on the rock. But everyone who hears these sayings of Mine, and does not do them, will be like a foolish man who built his house on the sand: and the rain descended, the floods came, and the winds blew and beat on that house; and it fell. And great was its fall."

And so it was, when Jesus had ended these sayings, that the people were astonished at His teaching, for He taught them as one having authority, **and not as the scribes.**

Paul leaves nothing to the imagination as to the fate of those who think they can deselect truth from their cognizance. He also stresses, this is not truth which required special revelation from God. It is truth which can be *naturally discerned* from observing creation - yet, God visits certain difficulties on those who choose not to acknowledge Him.

Romans 1:16 - 22

For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God to salvation for everyone who believes, for the Jew first and also for the Greek. For in it the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, "The just shall live by faith." (Hab 2:4)

For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness, **because what may be known of God is manifest in them, for God has shown it to them.**

For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made - His eternal power and Godhead - so that **they are without excuse**, because, ***although they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God, nor were thankful, but became futile in their thoughts, and their foolish hearts were darkened.***

Professing to be wise, they became fools,

I'm on my way back from this trip, and honestly, I don't recommend it. I was in GREAT darkness, and the Lord has given me light... I don't mean 'revelation' - although He has given that too - I simply mean, His word is life.

I will post again, whether you reply or not, because I do have much more to say, to explain how I view the matters we are discussing.

Please do explain to me how **Matthew 5:28** fits into your thesis? I've mentioned this in the hope you will comment, and I wonder why you are holding back?

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/5/29 17:07**

All of chapter 5 of Mathew takes the Law of Moses which directs how Israel is to live before God. Jesus said He came to fulfill the Law. He did not come to just keep the Law, to make it fulfilled as God intended. That is why Chapter 5 seems to change all that Moses gave, even to divorce. Matthew 5:16-17 Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven. Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. This is not what Israel was doing, they had added to the Law even their own works that made even more self righteous.

Jesus supplied all that would fulfill the perfection in the Law. He did not destroy it but even increased its perfection, all along knowing that by increasing the Laws Of God and giving a picture of even God that we had not seen or conceived in the Law of Moses, that Israel would see how much they Needed Him to bring the perfect Law of God to fruition. There is even more that we will be learning throughout all eternity, of who God or Father truly is. We will never exhaust learning God.

This is a preview of what Christ would do for the believer when He was born again in us. The increasing of the Perfection of the Law and fulfilling it in Himself would be what God the Father sees in His birthed Children. All that He is "so are we in this world", The Father is looking for nothing else in us, by our works, but by His works wrought in Christ being perfect man and perfect God. This is our new nature in Christ Jesus. That is why we have 1 Corinthians 1:29-31 That no flesh should glory in his presence. But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

We by our works will never attain what God intended for marriage and divorce. For from the beginning divorce was never intended, and marriage was to show the sanctity of God for His Children, as we should have perfection in marriage and bring forth more sons for God's House. We could not and He is showing us that in Jesus Christ is the only way wisdom, righteousness, sanctification or redemption can be accomplished in the believer.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/29 22:51**

Quote:

-----MrBillPro asked "just when is remarriage ok Biblically?"

Dorcas responded: "FOC has given the answer which Jesus gave, which is under fire in this thread from those who believe He was mistaken."

What do YOU believe, Dorcas? I already know what FOC believes. I have been trying to pull your beliefs from you since this discussion began. You ask:

Quote:

-----I need to establish with you, if I may, that you are ok with my acceptance of the words of Jesus Christ, as a basis for my explanation of what I believe?

I may not agree with your take on the Words of Jesus, but I do not reject HIS words and I will look at how you interpret HIS words.

It seems to me that you keep bringing the "law"---OT---into this and the fact is that Jesus fulfilled the law---perfectly, so why do we keep going back to the OT law for NT principles which were discussed by Jesus and Paul? The thing is that Jesus CHANGED many things, very evident by Mt. 5. The life of a Christian is not about receiving compensation for wrongs done to them, it is about putting self down for the glory of God. Where the OT calls for restitution, and the innocent could rightly claim what belonged to them, the Christian now is told by Jesus to put self down and to suffer for other's sakes and the kingdom of God. It is a very hard thing to do, I know.

As for the Word of God abiding and enduring forever, yes, in that, we are in full agreement. Jesus said in Lk. 16:16-17--

"the law and the prophets were until John, since that time the kingdom of God has been preached and everyone is pressing into it. and it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the law to fail".....and then He says in verse 18, "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery; and whosoever marries her who is divorced from her husband commits adultery".

Do you ever wonder why verse 18 is planted right there? Does it seem out of place to you or do you think Jesus had purpose for saying it where and when He did?

I am hopeful Dorcas that you can see beyond what you see as "legalism" to understand my heart on this and why I believe as I do. I know you have suffered great hurt at the hands of your husband, but does he not need intercession and Grace if he is so steeped in sin?

Quote:  
-----Please do explain to me how Matthew 5:28 fits into your thesis? I've mentioned this in the hope you will comment, and I wonder why you are holding back?  
-----

Not holding back, Dorcas. I must have missed when you asked me before. I don't see where "mental lust" is different to the Lord than physically manifested sin in the form of adultery. To the Lord, all sin originates in the heart/mind. Repentance isn't just required when we finally "act" on it, it is required when we even PONDER sin and are enticed by it mentally.

Personally, I think if a man has a lust problem, but has never acted on it, that is not an excuse for the wife to extract herself from the marriage using "lust of the eyes=adultery". Unfortunately, I've seen every excuse under the sun to get out of an undesirable marriage. I've seen Mt. 5:28 used quite often to say porn addicts should/can be divorced due to their addiction to porn or that a husband looks at other women all the time making the wife feel devalued. Does that answer your question? Blessings in Jesus, Cindy

**Re:, on: 2006/5/29 23:59**

Quote:  
-----I am hopeful Dorcas that you can see beyond what you see as "legalism" to understand my heart on this and why I believe as I do. I know you have suffered great hurt at the hands of your husband, but does he not need intercession and Grace if he is so steeped in sin?  
-----

come on cindy, please stop distracting with emotionalism.....this doesn't prove anything pertaining to Jesus' exception at all.

Her ex needing grace/salvation has NOTHING to do with Jesus permitting her to put him away....not one single thing.

Jesus can save the man at some point and still have given exception to release Dorcas from this marriage for a breach of covenant.

It is funny to see you bait with legalism, then switch to emotionalism as often as you do.

Quote:  
-----  
and then He says in verse 18, "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery; and whosoever marries her who is divorced from her husband commits adultery".  
-----

except for whoredom....very simple....

Quote:  
-----  
Do you ever wonder why verse 18 is planted right there? Does it seem out of place to you or do you think Jesus had purpose for saying it where and when He did?

-----  
yeah, Jesus is speaking to Jews who had been given free reign to divorce for just about any reason whatsoever. I imagine that Jesus repeated these words hundreds of times in His ministry to the Jews.

Doesnt negate His exception for whoredom in the least, does it.....

**Re: - posted by Treasureak, on: 2006/5/30 12:36**

Quote:

This is very misleading to a young woman in an abusive relationship who might see that comment.

I can see that this thread has taken a different turn in the spirit. I pray that as it continues to unfold before our very eyes, that it would not only answer our own questions, but the questions that lie deep within everyone's soul, ESPECIALLY those that have experienced these situations and the circumstances of much that is being spoken off on this thread. May God Heal You.

We have those who have been physically, and verbally abused by there spouse/husband or visa versa.

Actually the proper term for physical abuse is BATTERED.

What should a battered wife do?

What should a wife that is always running for her life with her kids from shelter to shelter do?

What should a wife that has her husband continually beat and point a gun at her in front of her children do?

What should a wife do that has a husband that when he is tired of physically hurting her now begins to hurt himself?

What should wife do that has a husband that is a sex offender toward her children, both male and female?

What should a wife do who loves her husband yet finds herself having to always obtain an order of protection.

What should a wife do who has experience all of these experience/situation who loves her husband and does not believe in divorce but yet regardless of all the pain and abuse still remains marry because deep down inside the children need a father.

The story of Abigail and her Husband Naman comes to mind. He looked like he was an insensitive man yet did Abigail divorce him? No she didn't she remained married to him, until his death.

We have many women who have experience several situations women who May I say are unbelievers yet desire to believe they desire to believe in something, or in someone. Someone who will give them the answers and guide them through there experience.

What would you say to these kinds of women? Again women who love there husbands, and do not believe in divorce. PRAY, THE ANSWER IS TO PRAY.

Divorce in there eyes is the ultimate sin. But isn't all of the above sin? YES!

Lead them to Jesus, (before you lead them to Christ) lead them to Jesus -- Jesus is the Christ.

Explain the CROSS TO THEM. Let them know that they are not alone, that you are willing to sit with them through it all.

Let them know that they can start over, that they can have a new life, that God is the only one that can heal her, that God can heal her marriage, that God can heal her husband and make him a changed man. Let her know that God can heal her children.

It can be done, but only through God. Let her know that all things are possible with God, let her know that it is her decision to make. Let her know that God is a forgiving God and a loving God, let her know that he loves her.

I don't have the SCRIPTURES to back all of this up at the moment. But we do know that God's word is TRUE, and all things shall pass away, but his word shall never pass away, it will never return back void but accomplish all that it has been set out to do.

May his spirit accompany you at all times when ministering to these women, may your spirit bear witness of their pain, and anguish, may he give you a NOW word for them, to bring hope and light in the midst of darkness and despair.

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/30 12:52**

Quote:  
-----Explain the CROSS TO THEM. Let them know that they are not alone, that you are willing to sit with them through it all. Let them know that they can start over, that they can have a new life, that God is the only one that can heal her, that God can heal her marriage, that God can heal her husband and make him a changed man. Let her know that God can heal her children.  
-----

Quote:  
-----It can be done, but only through God. Let her know that all things are possible with God, let her know that it is her decision to make. Let her know that God is a forgiving God and a loving God, let her know that he loves her.  
-----

Quote:  
-----May his spirit accompany you at all times when ministering to these women, may your spirit bear witness of their pain, and anguish, may he give you a NOW word for them, to bring hope and light in the midst of darkness and despair.  
-----

Amen and Amen. What a wonderful post, Treasureak---speaking the Lord's very heart on the matter! May His blessings be upon you! In Him, Cindy

**Re:, on: 2006/5/30 13:42**

Quote:  
-----The story of Abigail and her Husband Naman comes to mind. He looked like he was an insensitive man yet did Abigail divorce him? No she didn't she remained married to him, until his death.  
-----

Abigail and Nabal (1Sa 25:3)?

Item 1) The Jews under Mosaic law didn't permit the wife to divorce without the husband's consent....so that she didn't is irrelevant.

Item 2) Even if she were permitted to divorce, we CANNOT compare Nabals simply being 'insensitive' to rape, abuse and adultery.....to do so makes you as bad as lastblast in that you simply want to disregard the INDIVIDUAL circumstance and toss EVERYONE and their unique situation into the same basket.

Thank goodness our Lord Jesus isn't like this but understood David's breaking of the law out of hunger, NECESSITY, and not defiance....He took the INDIVIDUAL circumstance into account instead of simply tossing David into the 'lawbreaker

' basket when David ate forbidden bread.

NO ONE is defending divorce over 'insensitivity' here...so lets not compare apples and oranges...sound good?

Abuse, rape and adultery are not even in the same ballpark as 'insensitivity'....Jesus proves this in part with His OWN words...'except for whoredom"

conclusion;

Abigail not divorcing is irrelevant to MANY cases where abuse, desertion and/or adultery are present

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/30 14:32**

Hello Treasureak,

I have many answers to your many questions, but, I am not going to answer them all in one post, or even, perhaps, all in this thread.

As FOC has said, each situation is individual. With regard to this point alone, what I can share are the principles by which a man or a woman may pick a way through these situations **with God**.

This is a vast topic.

The situations you describe have ramifications for years to come. Only yesterday, I was in tears of complaint to the Lord, at the injustice of adults who think it's ok for them to abuse children. Or, even if they feel guilty about it, don't stop doing it.....

I referred, in a much earlier post, to the private moments in marriage, some of which to describe would be humiliating enough, even more so, if there has been sexual sin involved.

It was never the Lord's heart that what would go on between a man and a woman would cause such distress, or, would ever need to be described in spoken words.

BUT, He Himself has put into words everything that we need to understand about His heart, if we are willing to be guided by Him.

I don't want anyone reading this thread, even for a second, to think they should try to say here, or to a friend, or even to a counselor, ANYTHING that they are not ready to say. The moment the words are out of your mouth, your world has been changed forever. You don't know how you will feel and you can never take those words back. How that person responds, can be the difference between life and death for someone, or, of having a chance to recover while there is still hope of normality, or having such a hope single-handedly destroyed by a few thoughtless words. There IS hope, and God IS practical with your difficulties. We know that, because Jesus wanted to die for us, to set us free from all bondage to fear, to fear of death and to the devil.

If your situation is destroying you or your children, or you are destroying others, and you know it, then the best way to begin to break the cycle, is by blowing it wide open by TALKING with an APPROPRIATE person - regardless of how you might feel afterwards.

If you have never broken the silence on your situation, then if you can, you need to give yourself space and time to recover from the ordeal.

My best advice is, look for a telephone helpline, where the people answering, are properly trained. There is a right way and a wrong way, to 'hear' this sort of information. This will give you the best chance of not wasting all the courage it took to make the call, AND to come away with healthy advice, without even giving your name.

There is much scripture to bring to your attention, some of which would have come in my posting to Cindy's questions, but for now, I will draw attention to one.



Ephesians 5:13

But all things that are exposed are made manifest by the light, for whatever makes manifest is light.

To 'make manifest', is 'to show' - 'to expose'.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/30 15:49**

Quote:

-----If your situation is destroying you or your children, or you are destroying others, and you know it, then the best way to begin to break the cycle, is by blowing it wide open by TALKING with an APPROPRIATE person - regardless of how you might feel afterwards.

I have a little more to say to perpetrators of abuse.

To you who call yourselves Christian, who are in the habit of exercising physical violence of any kind - including sexual violence to children or adults - at home or elsewhere - and you don't seem to be able to stop, Jesus Christ died that you may be delivered from every bondage. His is a truly awesome ministry. You are without excuse in eternal terms, no matter how you define your needs today.

Even if you would not *claim* to be a Christian, God is available to you, too, through turning from your idols and other objects of worship, to Christ Himself.

Hear Him now, if you will. You are deceiving yourselves - all of you. I recognise this may have started through being deceived by another. Or, you may have chosen part of this behaviour consciously. These are not reasons to carry on indefinitely.

There is only one way to become completely freed - the blood of the Lamb. Don't settle for less than a full surrender to His very real spiritual ministry.

And there is more you can receive from the Lord to heal your longstanding injuries and those you have inflicted on yourself through anger and other pains.

**You are not responsible for healing your victims. They too, must find their own healing from the Lord.**

On a practical note, **if you stop hurting them, their healing will begin spontaneously.** The Lord is able to speed up that process in a miraculous way, but sometimes it is not possible for a person to *bear* the receiving of all they need to become whole, in a few sessions. This may apply to you, too; but, look to the end and rejoice that there can be an end!

God the Father sees the circumstances of your confusions and it grieves His heart. He cares deeply, and knows exactly who you are, and why you 'are'. But, you are no different than any other sinner who has to take responsibility for your actions. In that Jesus took your punishment, you have nothing to *fear* from Him, but, you **will lose a large part of your current identity if you decide to be healed.** Still, you will **gain** a whole identity in Christ, if you will receive HIM.

Idolatry is at the root, spiritually, whether or not you have ever consciously embraced it. Maybe you were totally a victim yourself and are struggling to resist repeating to others what happened to you. If this (idolatry) is (was) ingrained in your lifestyle, you will find its tentacles reaching out all over the place, not only at home. **Be prepared to be overhauled thoroughly, under the supervision of only One Who knows exactly how to do it with the minimum of further trauma to you.**

Your first point of call may not be your pastor, (if you have one), unless he has experience or a special gift in ministry. Seek professional help and take the time to grasp the principles of self-management which are offered. If you're a Christian, then pray about everything, detail by detail. Get into the presence of the Lord, who LOVES you, and **stay in His Light.**

You will find Him to be more than all you need, to reclaim emotional, mental and physical control of your life IN HIM. It is the only place to BE; (and to become).

If you are not interested in being delivered, then please, do the decent thing and physically abandon the people you are harming. You can still support them honourably with finance and show you can care for them safely... if you do care for them.

You might even, by removing yourself from the familiar dynamic of those relationships, find you are in more control of your behaviour. God has a way for you to be saved from yourself, and from personal destruction, but... it's your choice. Only you can make that choice.

**The Lord** is the real Counselor you should seek and hear.

**Re: - posted by Treasureak, on: 2006/5/30 16:20**

quote:

Amen and Amen. What a wonderful post, Treasureak---speaking the Lord's very heart on the matter! May His blessings be upon you! In Him, Cindy

Cindy,

May his blessings be upon them. I felt God's burden and leading, therefore I had to speak.

Dorcas,

I heard you and thank you I really felt in my spirit that there were women/wives out there that needed to hear this and needed answers to their questions. I was so broken as I was writing this.

**Re: - posted by ConsiderHim, on: 2006/5/30 17:19**

Quote:

-----Treasureak wrote: Explain the CROSS TO THEM. Let them know that they are not alone, that you are willing to sit with them through it all. Let them know that they can start over, that they can have a new life, that God is the only one that can heal her, that God can heal her marriage, that God can heal her husband and make him a changed man. Let her know that God can heal her children.

It can be done, but only through God. Let her know that all things are possible with God, let her know that it is her decision to make. Let her know that God is a forgiving God and a loving God, let her know that he loves her.

I don't have the SCRIPTURES to back all of this up at the moment. But we do know that God's word is TRUE, and all things shall pass away, but his word shall never pass away, it will never return back void but accomplish all that it has been set out to do.

May his spirit accompany you at all times when ministering to these women, may your spirit bear witness of their pain, and anguish, may he give you a NOW word for them, to bring hope and light in the midst of darkness and despair.

Thank you immensely for this post, Treasureak. You have expressed the very heart of God.

Blessings to you!

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/5/30 17:28**

I have a life situation and would like your input on it. I don't like to air dirty laundry, but I can only speak from my perspective on this situation.

I married at 19 and she committed sexual sin with another, I tried to keep the marriage together, even though I was as guilty as she. It did not work. Divorce 1.

I married a second time when I was 25. Same scenario.

I married a third time. This time I thought it was in the Lord. Annulled

I married a fourth time. This time in the Church by a very close Pastor friend, with counselling and approval all around. S

he was afraid of me getting to close to the family and just wanted a lover and nothing, she annulled the marriage.

I married a fifth time. In the church to a very wonderful woman. It was good for three years and she started to school to finish her teaching degree. I said ok, but we would have to stay very close to the Lord or the world would destroy our marriage. She said, "I was too controlling and possessive and went at it in her own strength, saying it was God's will and still singing in the church and teaching Sunday School, Me too. She had an affair with her music professor. With threats of bodily harm he left her alone. She confessed and all was forgiven. Then she started with me as everything I did was selfish, and controlling and any time we were physically intimate I was only using her for my own selfish reasons.

Before we met she had a boy friend she came from back east to be with an old friend of the family, she had three kids and he split. That is when I met her in Church. Long story short, he married someone else and she died of cancer. My wife saw the obituary and said she was going to the funeral, and did not want me to go. Three weeks later I found an E-mail from him, they were planning a trip to the ocean in his RV. I confronted Her and she said it was a family thing and his kids needed the outing. They went and when I checked, his kids were all home. The e-mails got even worse and were already adultery in print. I confronted her again, ask for counselling from the church and she refused. It got worse and worse and I could not accept another lover in our relationship. I divorced her after 23 years of marriage and in doing so I made it clear I did not want a divorce and If she would stop the relationship with him, we would work this out. Its been three years and she is still seeing him. What is my responsibility before God. Where am I to turn. I am alone except with the Lord 24-7 and am pretty much able to handle everything with Him. This is a real C&S gang, that is circumstances and situations, life living C&S. I am still waiting upon God to make it right between X-wife and myself. Am I wrong, should I just go on and see what happens or stay where I am.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: I am only 25 and I am not married - posted by deltadom (), on: 2006/5/30 17:37**

Hopefully the Lord will bless you in the future

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/5/30 17:40**

Thank you deltadom, He blessed me every day. But how does this life C&S gang pertain to this thread.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/5/30 17:40**

Thank you deltadom, He blessed me every day. But how does this life C&S gang pertain to this thread.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re:, on: 2006/5/31 1:32**

Did we ever get cindys response to this?

A response to lastblast

=====

LASTBLAST: :Just for the record again: **I do not believe "porneia" is adultery within a lawful marriage** and that is why I think you are having trouble understanding how I see this.

=====

And yet these ECFs that you commonly quote seem to disagree entirely.....

=====

HERMAS  
On Putting One's Wife Away for Adultery.  
Chap. I.

...And I said to him, "Sir, if any one has a wife who trusts in the Lord, and if he detect her in **adultery**, does the man sin if he continue to live with her?"

And he said to me, "As long as he remains ignorant of her sin, the husband commits no transgression in living with her. But if the husband know that his wife has gone astray, and if the woman does not repent, but persists in her **fornication**,

and yet the husband continues to live with her, he also is guilty of her crime, and a sharer in her **adultery**.Â”

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/adulteryisfornication.html>

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/31 5:26**

Cindy answered:

Quote:  
-----I don't see where "mental lust" is different to the Lord than physically manifested sin in the form of adultery. To the Lord, all sin originates in the heart/mind.  
-----

Continuing on the definition of adultery then, I have another question based in the account in John 8.

Could the woman have been unmarried, who was taken in the 'very act' of adultery?

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/31 9:54**

Quote:  
-----Could the woman have been unmarried, who was taken in the 'very act' of adultery?  
-----

Do you mean "unmarried" in the sense the Jews viewed "unmarried" in Jesus' day or do mean "unmarried" as Paul spoke of the woman in I Cor. 7:10-11?

In any case, why go to obscure passages in which we do not know the full story, Dorcas? All we could in honesty do is speculate. This would be the same as the "woman at the well" scenario that many try to bring into this type of discussion.....Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re: To Phillip - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/5/31 10:10**

Phillip wrote:

Quote:  
-----What is my responsibility before God. Where am I to turn. I am alone except with the Lord 24-7 and am pretty much able to handle everything with Him. This is a real C&S gang, that is circumstances and situations, life living C&S. I am still waiting upon God to make it right between X-wife and myself.  
-----

IÂ’ve been peaking at this thread from time to time, but never felt inclined to pop in Â– until reading PhillipÂ’s testimony. I just canÂ’t stay in the shadows on this one. Phillip, Your story seems surreal. My first thought was that you were presenting a fictitious story in an attempt to put everyoneÂ’s doctrine to the test.

Well, that it does for sure! If ChristÂ’s death and resurrection is not enough for your situation, then nothing is. Then you may as well give up on God.

Edit: I should say: If one's PERCEPTION of God is useless for your situation, then maybe it needs to be questioned.

I feel speechless. What incredible C&S! I long to see God touch you just where you are now, and bring his glory in and through your life. I pray that you will fully know the freedom that Christ offers as you find him your all-sufficiency even in the pain. May he fill every vacuum and longing in your heart.

You are waiting on God to hopefully make it right Â– that your ex repent and bring about a restored union. That is certainly not a bad longing. Yet the real test may possibly be this: where does your faith genuinely lie - in the hopes of things working out, or in the sufficiency of God, regardless of what happens? Even if she never repents, can you trust that God is enough?

Quote:

-----should I just go on and see what happens or stay where I am

By "go on" or "stay" do you mean, go into new relationships or stay and wait because she may come back?

Neither is likely the issue, or the choice God is offering you at this time. He may wish that you set women aside altogether for the time being, and go on with HIM into uncharted territories of your soul. And just maybe, along the way, he may wish to further refine you into a vessel fit to shine the all-sufficiency of Christ to others who are broken by separation and divorce. He is a master at using one's C&S for his glory.

"... for what it's worth..."

Diane

**Re:, on: 2006/5/31 11:04**

Quote:

-----  
lastblast wrote:

In any case, why go to obscure passages in which we do not know the full story, Dorcas? All we could in honesty do is speculate. This would be the same as the "woman at the well" scenario that many try to bring into this type of discussion.....Blessings in Him, Cindy

-----  
I'm going to remember you said this Cindy...and I will bring it to your attention next time I see you bringing some obscure passage to bear, adding to what it states....count on it.

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/31 11:45**

**Romans 11:6 (AMP)**

**6But if it is by grace (His unmerited favor and graciousness), it is no longer conditioned on works or anything men have done. Otherwise, grace would no longer be grace .**

**Ecclesiastes 1:3 (AMP)**

**3What profit does man have left from all his toil at which he toils under the sun?**

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/31 11:57**

Quote:

-----why go to obscure passages in which we do not know the full story?

-----  
Hi Cindy,

The eighth chapter of John is *not* an obscure passage. It is used the *world over* to make women who have committed adultery feel bad. Many preachers don't mention that PHARISEES, who KNEW THE LAW (as they quoted in John's account), DID NOT BRING THE MAN.

While it may be used to define the forgiving nature of God in Jesus Christ, the issues arising from this story for those who know or knew the law, were enormous. This is AS IMPORTANT a reference to how Jesus dealt with sexual sin within a marriage, as His pronouncement in Matthew 19:9. Why do I say that?

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/31 12:05**

Quote:  
-----Do you mean "unmarried" in the sense the Jews viewed "unmarried" in Jesus' day or do mean "unmarried" as Paul spoke of the woman in I Cor. 7:10-11?  
-----

Cindy,

In that you've already agreed in a previous post in this thread, that Jesus came to fulfil the law, what difference are you extracting from the word 'unmarried', as it applies to Christians?

Obviously, I mean 'unmarried' in the sense that it could have been applied to the situation Jesus was asked to address by the Pharisees.

Let's leave Paul out of this particular question for the moment, because nothing he said is, or can be, *more true* or *more valid* than what Jesus Christ said.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/31 12:25**

Quote:  
-----This would be the same as the "woman at the well" scenario that many try to bring into this type of discussion.....  
-----

Cindy,

The very fact you wish, again, to discount yet another interchange between Jesus and a woman who was not known for her keeping of sexual purity, is worrying. How can this be an irrelevance?

**Re:, on: 2006/5/31 12:40**

Quote:  
-----

Scroggins wrote:

**Romans 11:6 (AMP)**

**6But if it is by grace (His unmerited favor and graciousness), it is no longer conditioned on works or anything men have done. Otherwise, grace would no longer be grace .**

**Ecclesiastes 1:3 (AMP)**

**3What profit does man have left from all his toil at which he toils under the sun?**

-----  
Tit 1:13 This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith;

2Ti 4:2 Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.

Tit 1:9 Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.

Tit 2:1 But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine:

Edit....just adding scripture relevant to the discussion :)

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/5/31 14:28**

Thanks, Diane

I thought while I was writing the post that, wow, this sounds like a story that everybody will think that I am just using it to get people to see that there are real people listening and have gone through many of the C&S of life and it is real.

Well it is real, I cannot begin to even suggest or give a picture of the Pain that I have put myself through by my own decisions in life. The Pain of Adultery and sexual sin is so overwhelming that, if it were not for God, I would be dead or something worse.

I can give testimony that God is still in control, even in my pain of my own making, which I thought at the time was going to make me happy and allow me to make a spouse and children (7) happy, would be what God would approve. When the failure just kept coming, I was so disheartened, I really thought I was going to die, just from the pain in my heart.

God used every C&S to bring me each time closer and closer to Himself and His Son. It is almost as if God knew and put me through each one, because He knew there was no other way He could get to my heart. I am a pretty self-sufficient guy, or at least I thought I was. Now I can praise God for all the hell and pain over everyone involved with my life circumstances and situations. He has brought me to a closer walk with Him each time. I guess I have learned a small bit of what God wants me to know and as you said for now, He has my C&S on hold and there is nothing but Him in the picture. Oh, I still have children and their C&S to deal with, but they are being dealt with, as far as I am able, His way.

There is life after death, for I have died many times and every time I open my eyes, guess Who is there. You got it, My Loving Father who has taught me obedience by the things I suffered. Each time I have come closer to Him. I guess it's like what people say, "we should be careful what we pray for".. My prayer has always been as long as I can have memory of praying, With tears of not being able to be, what I have always wanted, that is to be a congressional medal of honor winner for God and my Family. I am learning the Medal Winner has already been Born Again in me, and He is the Honored One. The less I become the More He becomes. Praise God like Paul I have learned and am learning, Romans 7:24-25 O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin. Jhn 16:33 These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.

He is overcoming the world in His Brothers and Sisters, even when we are killed by it, we still have A Glorious God that will never let us go, be it divorce, remarriage or any other thing that would separate us from the Love of God in Christ Jesus.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/31 15:04**

Quote:

-----The eighth chapter of John is not an obscure passage. It is used the world over to make women who have committed adultery feel bad. Many preachers don't mention that PHARISEES, who KNEW THE LAW (as they quoted in John's account), DID NOT BRING THE MAN.  
-----

You're right, Dorcas, but that context is not what you were addressing. You were trying to find out whether I thought she was "unmarried" or not. The passage gives no clue---and that's what I meant by "obscure". All we know is that she was charged with adultery, yet her accusers could not find it in themselves to exact punishment for that sin----because they too deserved punishment for their own sins. Jesus, as His whole purpose for being here on earth----extended time for repentance to this woman (Grace). This was something NOT done in OT law. Caught in adultery? DEATH. This passage is very important in that it shows a CHANGE in meting out punishment for sin. It is the Lord's heart to give and see repentance come about. It is not His Will that men perish in their sins, though some will.....(II Pet. 3:9). Blessings in Him, Cindy



**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/31 15:15**

Quote:  
-----The very fact you wish, again, to discount yet another interchange between Jesus and a woman who was not known for her keeping of sexual purity, is worrying. How can this be an irrelevance?  
-----

Dorcas, what I do is weigh the Words of Jesus and those He interacted with---yet, what I will refuse to do is definitively come to a conclusion based on what is NOT known/shown scripturally. That is what you are trying to draw me into. I have many times seen how people try to deflect with issues that do not have answers---scripturally speaking. You want to know what I believe about the marital status of the woman caught in adultery, right? Answer me this: does the passage give clue as to whether she is single having relations with a married man, currently married herself, divorced having relations with another, or separated from her husband having relations with another? To me, it is not clear, nor does Jesus say.....in that regard, speculation is needed, but the problem is that speculation can take us very far from truth. Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re: You are a work of God - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/5/31 15:17**

Phillip, With a history like yours you either become very calloused and tough in order not to crack entirely, or you have to cling to God. Praise God, in spite of your bad choices, you made right choices - you turned towards him.

Quote:  
-----God used every C&S to bring me each time closer and closer to Himself and His Son. It is almost as if God knew and put me through each one, because He knew there was no other way He could get to my heart. I am a pretty self sufficient guy, or at least I thought I was. Now I can praise God for all the hell and pain over everyone involved with my life circumstances and situations. He has brought me to a closer walk with Him each time.  
-----

These tender words would never flow from one who has become tough and hardened by life's brutal blows.

He who has been shown much mercy and forgiveness will be inclined to show much mercy and forgiveness to others.

Thanks for having the courage to share. You are a testimony of God's power to forgive.

PS May I put your two posts on my web site?

Diane

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/5/31 15:25**

Yes Diane,

The only thing about testimonies, sometime we think we should get some credit. The only credit for anything good in anything I say or do goes to Him. Only by His leading is there anything good in me and that is Jesus Christ, who is everything good.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/5/31 15:32**

Amen Bro. Phillip

Praise GOD for your testimony... Praise GOD...



Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/31 16:11

Quote:  
-----All we know is that she was charged with adultery, **yet her accusers could not find it in themselves to exact punishment for that sin**-----because they too deserved punishment for their own sins. Jesus, as His whole purpose for being here on earth-----extended time for repentance to this woman  
-----

'yet her accusers could not find it in themselves to exact punishment for that sin-----' As we discussed with regard to Joseph's situation, stoning was not available to the Pharisees either.... viz they had to get Jesus condemned to death by a Roman court.

'because they too deserved punishment for their own sins' Yes they did, but, Jesus knew what He was saying when he quoted the law back at them. It was more than just 'whoever has no sin....' it was, 'whichever of you is not guilty of adultery...' That's why they could not 'cast the first stone'. Because the way the law worked, the people who had **not** committed the specific sin, were allowed to stone the person who **had committed** that specific sin. The Pharisees knew that and were convicted by their own adulteries - which at a different place and time, Jesus pointed out to them.

(YLT) Matthew 23:25

`Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye make clean the outside of the cup and the plate, and **within they are full of rapine and incontinence.**

Quote:  
-----Jesus -----extended time for repentance to this woman  
-----

The text does not say this. This would be an addition.

The marriage status of the woman is a valid question in the present discussion, since we already have a woman - I was looking for an adjective, to ascertain we are using the same definition of adultery - and it appears we are - apart from your rejection of the word for fornication, in Greek, which appears in both Matt 5:32 and Matt 19:9.

Quote:  
-----This passage is very important in that it shows a CHANGE in meting out punishment for sin.  
-----

This is what I was getting at...

How would you define the 'meting out punishment' now?

Re:, on: 2006/5/31 16:25

Quote:  
-----Jesus -----extended time for repentance to this woman  
-----

Quote:  
-----  
The text does not say this. This would be an addition.  
-----

again, good catch, linn.

Fighting legalism with legalism is the only language these folks of this doctrine speak.

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/5/31 20:29

I wanted to look at 'fornication' as it is translated by Young in his Literal translation, to see what else was linked to that mindset, as often there is a cluster or array of other connected issues..... Whatever sin one picks, this is a truth.

I'm posting those verses which add something to the picture.

Matthew 5:32

but I--I say to you, that whoever may put away his wife, **save for the matter of whoredom**, doth make her to commit adultery; and whoever may marry her who hath been put away doth commit adultery.

Matthew 15:19

for out of the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, **adulteries, whoredoms**, thefts, false witnessings, evil speakings:

Matthew 19:9

`And I say to you, that, whoever may put away his wife, **if not for whoredom**, and may marry another, doth commit adultery; and he who did marry her that hath been put away, doth commit adultery.'

Romans 1:29

having been **filled with all unrighteousness, whoredom**, wickedness, covetousness, malice; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, evil dispositions; whisperers,

1 Cor 6:18

**flee the whoredom**; every sin--whatever a man may commit--is without the body, and **he who is committing whoredom, against his own body doth sin**.

1 Cor 7:2

and **because of the whoredom let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her proper husband**;

Galatians 5:19

And manifest also are **the works of the flesh, which are: Adultery, whoredom, uncleanness, lasciviousness**,

Coloss 3:5

Put to death, then, your members that are upon the earth--**whoredom**, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and the covetousness, which is idolatry--

1 Thess 4:3

**for this is the will of God--your sanctification; that ye abstain from the whoredom**,

Jude 1:7

as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities around them, in like manner to these, **having given themselves to whoredom, and gone after other flesh**, have been set before--an example, of fire age-during, justice suffering.

Where there is a 'the' in front of the noun, as in 1 Cor 6:18, 1 Cor 7:2, and 1 Thess 4:3 (below), it is speaking as if that condition has a life of its own; it could be 'Whoredom' with a capital 'w'.

From the above verses, we see that fornication - as with adultery, proceeds from the heart.

Paul says those in Romans 1 had been 'filled with **all unrighteousness** first, then 'whoredom'.

Whoredom (fornication) is a sin against one's own body, which body is for the Lord (the temple of the Holy Spirit).

1 Corinthians 7 is a chapter about continence, primarily, therefore, Paul recommends that marriage first, and fidelity within it, will guard souls against whoredom. This thought is carried on in verse 5, particularly, as well as the same thought in vv 3 and 4, which match Paul's sentiment in Ephesians 5:28 **so ought the husbands to love their own wives as their own bodies: he who is loving his own wife--himself he doth love**; 29 **for no one ever his own flesh did hate, but doth nourish and cherish it**, as also the Lord--the assembly.

Colossians 3:5, establishes the link between whoredom and idolatry.

1 Thessalonians 4:3 makes clear that whoredom and holiness are mutually exclusive.

Looking at these helps to make sense of the start of Romans 2, which links several thoughts with the verses above - particularly hypocrisy (like the Pharisees not being able to condemn the woman because they too were guilty of the same sins); v 5 says hardness of heart and impenitence will attract God's wrath, as will contention and disobedience to truth, which amounts to obeying unrighteousness.

1 Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man --every one who is judging-- for in that in which thou dost judge the other, thyself thou dost condemn, for the same things thou dost practise who art judging,  
2 and we have known that the judgment of God is according to truth, upon those practising such things.  
3 And dost thou think this, O man, who art judging those who such things are practising, and art doing them, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?  
4 or the riches of His goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering, dost thou despise? --not knowing that **the goodness of God doth lead thee to reformation!**  
5 but, according to thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou dost treasure up to thyself wrath, in a day of wrath and of the revelation of the righteous judgment of God,  
6 who shall render to each according to his works;  
7 to those, indeed, who in continuance of a good work, do seek glory, and honour, and incorruptibility-- life age-during;  
8 and to those contentious, and disobedient, indeed, to the truth, and obeying the unrighteousness-- indignation and wrath,  
9 tribulation and distress, upon every soul of man **that is working the evil**, both of Jew first, and of Greek;

I don't think these roots and connections can be ignored, when trying to understand why Jesus made an exception of whoredom as a reason for permitting remarriage.

A faithful spouse, who decides to separate from an unfaithful spouse, and seek a faithful wife (or husband), is outworking a heartstate of fidelity within marriage, which cannot be compared to the 'soul of man that is working the evil', of an **idolatrous heartstate**.

It is also interesting to see 'repentance' translated by Young as 'reformation'. I wonder if that's what we *expect* the effect to be, of penitence towards God?

Here is both 'reform' and 'repent' in the same sentence, making it easier to see the difference.

2 Cor 7:10

for the sorrow toward God reformation to salvation not to be repented of doth work, and the sorrow of the world doth work death,

Cindy, here is his beautiful translation of the verse to which you referred in your last post:

2 Peter 3:9

the Lord is not slow in regard to the promise, as certain count slowness, but is long-suffering to us, not counselling any t

o be lost but all to pass on to reformation,

**Re: thank you for granting permission - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/5/31 22:39**

Quote:

-----Yes Diane,

The only thing about testimonies, sometime we think we should get some credit. The only credit for anything good in anything I say or do goes to Him. Only by His leading is there anything good in me and that is Jesus Christ, who is everything good.

In Christ: Phillip

Thank you, and I appreciate the concern that sometimes we want credit. It doesn't seem like you have much credit to worry about claiming. Although, I suppose it's like pride -- we can become proud of just about anything. Well, aren't you glad that God can knock that down faster than we can blink.

Diane

**Re: Marriage, ReMarriage, Divorce - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/1 3:42**

Quote:

-----I will refuse to ... definitively come to a conclusion based on what is NOT known/shown scripturally. That is what you are trying to draw me into.

I don't think so, Cindy,

I've been thinking about this statement - even in its original context - and I feel it is untrue.

You are correct that the marital status of the woman is not stated. I'm not sure whether the Greek communicates this, to those who know Greek.

But within the wider context of this thread, and scripture, until your reply to my point, you had not acknowledged that an unmarried person CAN commit adultery, when the other party is the married one. I'm glad that you did, because it makes sense of Matt 5:28.

Regarding my last post, in which I quoted from Romans 2, it has slowly dawned on my understanding, that Paul is, again, stating the same point he made in Romans 1, and again - though we skimmed over it - in 1 Timothy 6. (This leads me to guess it appears elsewhere in the New Testament, too, but I haven't looked yet.)

(Young) 1 Timothy 6

1 As many as are servants under a yoke, their own masters worthy of all honour let them reckon, **that the name of God and the teaching may not be evil spoken of;**

2 and those having believing masters, let them not slight them, because they are brethren, but rather let them serve, because they are steadfast and beloved, who of the benefit are partaking. These things be teaching and exhorting;

3 **if any one be teaching otherwise, and do not consent to sound words--those of our Lord Jesus Christ--and to the teaching according to piety,** 4 he is proud (etc)... (piety = godliness)

(NKJV) Romans 2

5 But in accordance with your hardness and your impenitent heart you are treasuring up for yourself wrath in the day of wrath-and-revelation-of-the-righteous-judgment-of-God,

6 who "will render to each one according to his deeds":

7 eternal life to those who by patient continuance in doing good seek for glory, honor, and immortality;

8 **but to those who are self-seeking and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness -- indignation and wrath,**

Also, in my last post, I realised there are **two** verses in Matthew's gospel, (5:32 and 19:9), carrying the same meaning, yet, worded slightly differently in the Greek, as if to make sure there can be no mistake about what our Lord was saying.

This **doubles the impact** of, and makes His introduction of the word 'porneia', even harder to ignore, or try - by any means - to explain away.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - toward a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/1 8:11**

Quote:

-----The Jews under Mosaic law didn't permit the wife to divorce without the husband's consent....

Hi FOC,

I didn't know that this could be arranged. I thought the wife was his possession entirely....

This makes the allusion by Mark, to a wife putting her husband away, less of a departure from previous practices.

I've always had the impression that Jesus brought in a greater equality between the way women were treated according to His words, than had ever existed before. Is that a fair assessment?

**Re:, on: 2006/6/1 11:08**

Quote:

dorcas wrote:

Quote:

-----The Jews under Mosaic law didn't permit the wife to divorce without the husband's consent....

Hi FOC,

I didn't know that this could be arranged. I thought the wife was his possession entirely....

This makes the allusion by Mark, to a wife putting her husband away, less of a departure from previous practices.

I've always had the impression that Jesus brought in a greater equality between the way women were treated according to His words, than had ever existed before. Is that a fair assessment?

Under Mosaic law, Deut 24, from my understanding the Jews believed that Moses was only giving the husband the right of divorce.

The NT does seem to alter some things as far as we Christians go....I don't know if the Jews just dropped their views of the matter, history seems to suggest that they kept this practice.

I'll dig up a story for you of a Jewish man who died in prison who refused to give his wife a divorce, the reason he was imprisoned was his refusal to divorce her.

I've got a link here somewhere and will post it when I find it.

Actually, instead, here is my thread on the issue.

[http://www.familylife.com/community/forums/ubb/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=get\\_topic;f=8;t=003172](http://www.familylife.com/community/forums/ubb/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=get_topic;f=8;t=003172)

See the first link, down towards the bottom it says....

"A HUSBAND JAILED 32 YEARS, FOR REFUSING TO DIVORCE HIS WIFE, DIES"

Be sure to read the other link in the OP...this man was less than admirable...even though many anti-remarriers seem to honor and adore this man....his treatment of his wife was less than a godly man would offer...

Additionally, ill dig up the other material that Ive read, it was on a Jewish site somewhere, that presents that the wife could request a divorce, but it was only given IF the husband permitted it.

Which does seem to fit that story of Yehia in that link...

**"Mrs. Avraham filed for divorce in 1955, but her husband, an Orthodox Jew refused.**

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/6/1 14:44**

Quote:

-----Jesus ----extended time for repentance to this woman

The text does not say this. This would an addition.

"Neither do I condemn thee. Go and sin no more. "

He is the ONLY one who COULD condemn her, yet He did not(even though she WAS guilty). He instead told her to repent of her sin. You do not believe in that very statement He gave her time in regards to repentance(instead of meting out a quick death sentence--- which He COULD have done since that is the sentence HE gave in the OT for the sin of adultery?)

I am confused. You wont' accept that this is how I interpret His Words of Grace towards the woman in the text, yet you want me to speculate on something that cannot be found in the text?

Quote:

-----I was looking for an adjective, to ascertain we are using the same definition of adultery - and it appears we are - apart from your rejection of the word for fornication, in Greek, which appears in both Matt 5:32 and Matt 19:9.

Dorcas, your insistance that I am rejecting biblical definitions of a word(or even Christ's words) is getting tiresome. I do not reject the definitions, nor do I reject the Word of the Lord. What I reject is your insistance that the word as used in that passage is all inclusive and I reject what I see as unbiblical interpretations. Very different than what you keep accusing me of. The simple fact of the matter is that Jesus used BOTH words in the passage(Mt. 19:9). To me, and many others, there is a very good reason for why He chose certain words.

Blessings in Him, Cindy

edited: to delete a paragraph, as I saw you addressed it later.

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/6/1 14:48**

Quote:

-----I don't think these roots and connections can be ignored, when trying to understand why Jesus made an exception of whoredom as a reason for permitting remarriage.

Please define "whoredom", Dorcas.

Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/6/1 15:09

WHAT IS SIN?

Idolatry = murder = theft = adultery(porneia = moichea) etc. etc.

SIN IS SIN... does anyone here think that GOD sees the difference in SIN that we do?

NO. If you think HE does you are greatly deceived.

GOD sees SIN as SIN, all the same. ARE YOU BLIND TO THE **INDIFFERENCE**?

SIN is not committed in the act. It is first in the HEART. GOD does not see only the act, HE LOOKS AT THE HEART EV EN BEFORE THE ACTIONS OF SIN. If you are guilty of porneia, you are *guilty* of moichea and *every other SIN that is o n this earth*. **ALL IS THE SAME TO GOD.**

If you are *not guilty in act* to porneia or moichea, yet you lust after someone at all, **YOU ARE GUILTY OF EVERY LAST SIN THAT THERE IS IN THE VERY EYES OF GOD!**

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/6/1 15:58

Quote:

-----SIN IS SIN... does anyone here think that GOD sees the difference in SIN that we do?  
-----

Not me, Scroggins. That is the very reason why I have trouble agreeing or seeing in scripture where God allows divorce and a subsequent remarriage due to a particular "kind" of sin. ALL sins can be repented of.....Nothing is too difficult for the Lord for them who believe. Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re:, on: 2006/6/1 17:35

Quote:

-----  
lastblast wrote:

Quote:

-----I don't think these roots and connections can be ignored, when trying to understand why Jesus made an exception of whoredom as a reason for permitting remarriage.  
-----

Please define "whoredom", Dorcas.  
-----

Within the exceptoin clause whoredom, at the very least, means ANY sexual sin...defiling of the marriage bed....

it really isnt that hard to grasp, honestly.

Re:, on: 2006/6/1 17:42

Quote:

-----  
lastblast wrote:

Quote:

-----SIN IS SIN... does anyone here think that GOD sees the difference in SIN that we do?  
-----

Not me, Scroggins. That is the very reason why I have trouble agreeing or seeing in scripture where God allows divorce and a subsequent remarriage due to a particular "kind" of sin. **ALL sins can be repented of**.....Nothing is too difficult for the Lord for them who believe. Blessings in Him, Cindy  
-----

ALL sin can be repented of, cindy?

are you sure about that?

I seem to remember our Lord stating that blasphemy wasnt forgivable (Mat 12:32)

Are you sure youre talking about the same God and bible we are?

I also remember passages in Hebrews showing men apostating themselves from the faith and it being shown that there is no 'sacrifice remaining' for these.

You DO comprehend that 'apostacy' and 'adultery' are the same, correct?

### Adulteress

G3428

&#956;&#959;&#953;&#967;&#945;&#955;&#953;&#769;&#962;

moichalis

Thayer Definition:

1) an adulteress

2) as the intimate alliance of God with the people of Israel was likened to a marriage, those who relapse into idolatry are said to commit adultery or play the harlot.

2a) fig. equiv. to faithless to God, unclean, apostate

God ended a covenant He made over this sin.

This Jewish "remnant" will not come thru that covenant put away, but only thru this new bride or they will not come at all.

And what if the adulteress doesnt want to repent?

Does God offer forgiveness and salvation to those who dont WANT to repent and never do?

are you teaching Universalism?

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/6/1 18:15**

Hi FOC,

Thanks for these links. I will be checking them out tomorrow when I have time.

\*\*\*\*\*

Hi Cindy,

I get your question about whoredom and will answer tomorrow.

Please don't forget about this one from p33

You said

Quote:

-----This passage is very important in that it shows a CHANGE in meting out punishment for sin.  
-----

I said

Quote:

-----This is what I was getting at..



How would you define the 'meting out punishment' now?.

Thanks.

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/6/2 10:06**

Quote:

-----This is what I was getting at... How would you define the 'meting out punishment' now?.

In the OT---adultery, homosexuality, consensual relations with another during betrothal=death penalty (no chance for a new life/repentance from old life)

NT---adultery, homosexuality, consensual relations before marriage=time for repentance/Grace, not instant death.....life/time is given instead to "turn around/away from" one's sins. Hope is there.

Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/2 12:43**

Quote:

-----Hope is there.

Are you saying there is now no punishment?

How does this work in practice for the believer?

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/6/2 13:09**

Quote:

-----In the OT---adultery, homosexuality, consensual relations with another during betrothal=death penalty (no chance for a new life/repentance from old life)

NT---adultery, homosexuality, consensual relations before marriage=time for repentance/Grace, not instant death.....life/time is given instead to "turn around/away from" one's sins. Hope is there.

OT = adultery, homosexuality, consensual relations with another = death penalty

Adultery, homosexuality, consensual relations with another, are all capable not only in marriage, but outside of marriage as well. Meaning that this is not limited to be only during the betrothal period, or even while married. SIN IS SIN. SIN makes no difference in time nor circumstance. SIN IS DEATH.

Is SIN any less tomorrow as it is today? NO

Does SIN have circumstance? NO

When is murder not murder when even ill thought towards a man is murder? IT IS ALWAYS MURDER

THE ACT OF SIN MATTERS NOT! IF YOU SIN IN HEART OR MIND, YOU ARE A SINNER IN DEED IN THE EYES OF THE RIGHTEOUS LORD!!!

DO NOT LISTEN TO ANY MAN WHO SAYS OTHERWISE BECAUSE HE SPEAKS NOT OF THE HEART OF GOD BUT OF INIQUITY!

NT = adultery, homosexuality, consensual relations before marriage / during marriage = no time to repent, but rather the option to repent and turn to grace.

GOD NEVER PROMISED ANYONE ALIVE ANOTHER DAY, HOUR OR MINUTE!

We do not live on our time. We have no time on this earth. The time is all lended time, the Lord's time only. Therefore wh at says that you will live so long as to repent?

If you sin, you MUST repent! What says death does not come on the way home or in the next second.

Can you say to any man that you will see the light of the next day? NO.

THERE IS NO TIME FOR YOU...

**Re:, on: 2006/6/2 16:10**

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Quote:

-----This is what I was getting at... How would you define the 'meting out punishment' now?.

In the OT---adultery, homosexuality, consensual relations with another during betrothal=death penalty (no chance for a new life/repentance from old lif e)

NT---adultery, homosexuality, consensual relations before marriage=time for repentance/Grace, not instant death.....life/time is given instead to "turn around/away from" one's sins. Hope is there.

Blessings in Him, Cindy

apparently Jesus doesnt agree with your ideas cindy....HE is the one who has said 'except for whoredom'

Does "except for..." make this supposed claim of hope you state?

Why didnt Jesus simply tell this man to 'hope' instead of offering an exception for whoredom?

Why didnt God simply 'hope' instead of ending the covenant He made with the Hebrew nation?

His exception is in perfect alignment with this very same God who ended a covenant for adultery.

**Re:, on: 2006/6/2 16:14**

Quote:

dorcas wrote:

Quote:

-----Hope is there.

Are you saying there is now no punishment?

How does this work in practice for the believer?

It doesnt work unless one is a closet universalist.

Or if ones theology is so skewed/distorted that one actually believes God must obey the law of marriage He created for man in that this person beleives GOD must accept/validate a second marriage because the person in this second marria

ge has ruthlessly butchered their ex, supposedly freeing them to be REmarried :rolleyes:

2.1

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/lastblast.html>

Legalism...nothing more

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/2 17:07**

Hi Cindy,

I would still like to hear your reply to this, please.

Quote:

-----Hope is there.

Are you saying there is now no punishment?

How does this work in practice for the believer, **as you see it**?

EDIT: had a lot of trouble with my internet connection today. Will answer your question about whoredom when I can.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/4 2:56**

Gal 5:22 But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith,

Eph 5:9 (For the fruit of the Spirit in all goodness and righteousness and truth;)

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/4 2:58**

Act 26:18 To open their eyes, to turn from darkness to light, and the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.

Eph 1:7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;

Col 1:14 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins:

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/4 3:00**

Rom 8:1 therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/4 4:11**

Hi Phillip,

Thank you for these clearly-presented verses.

Hi Cindy,

I have begun to gather together what I want to say about whoredom in answer to your question, and realise it will run to several posts. It would be unreasonable to propose to suspend the rest of the thread's discussion until I'm ready, or even, until it's been completely posted. Perhaps I will use a coloured font, to make them easier to find retrospectively.

Meanwhile, I would still like to hear your reply to this, please - and thank you.

Quote:

-----Hope is there.

Are you saying there is now no punishment?

How does this work in practice for the believer, **as you see it?**

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/5 2:59**

Galatians 5:13-26 For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another. This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law. And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit. Let us not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another.

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/6/5 9:36**

Quote:

-----I would still like to hear your reply to this, please.

Dorcas,

There are MANY things I am waiting on you to respond to. Can we go back and focus on them instead of continually going on with other issues?

Scroggins/Dorcas: I think we can agree that "judgment" does start in the house of God and we can also agree that chastisement is something the believer WILL experience when walking in opposition to the Lord's will---as a matter of fact, we (whoever belongs to the Lord) are promised it as evidence of His love. If one is in sin and NOT being chastised, one has to wonder if they even belong to the Lord.

In any case Scroggins, I think you entirely missed the point of my post. There IS a difference in OT metings out of punishment and the way Jesus dealt with the very same sins. Do you not agree? Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/5 10:17**

Dear Cindy,

It appears you don't know where I'm going with my responses, or where I'm coming from either. I think that may mean I have something to say which you may not have 'heard' before.... (You can tell me after. :-) )

Precisely because of this, I have asked how you define the way Jesus dealt with sin(s) - not seeking a deeply theological answer - just the practical application as you understand it.

I am not discounting the 'time for repentance' which you mentioned regarding your understanding of John 8. Because it is not mentioned in John 8, and there is other scripture which is similar (I'm sure you know), I would give a different answer to my question, than so far, you have.

Still, I hope you can answer my question on

Quote:

-----There IS a difference in OT metings out of punishment and the way Jesus dealt with the very same sins.

while I'm gathering my response on whoredom. The more I looked at the verses I might use, the more I realised I need to do some weeding, to make a clear-enough presentation to engage with the rest of my thesis.

I'm not sure why my question on the way Jesus dealt with sins, appears to pose you a difficulty.

**Re: - posted by ANewInHim, on: 2006/6/5 11:07**

Precisely because of this, I have asked how you define the way Jesus dealt with sin(s) - not seeking a deeply theological answer - just the practical application as you understand it.

Dorcas,

I've ponder this for awhile now, and what keeps coming to mind is this.

When the women was caught in Adultery what did Jesus do. He stooped down and wrote on the ground, and then he spoke. Awesome

He who has no sin let him throw the first stone.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/5 11:44**

Quote:  
-----There are MANY things I am waiting on you to respond to. Can we go back and focus on them instead of **continually going on with other issues?**

Sorry I didn't answer this question in my earlier post.

You may remember that you brought up first, the matter of how Jesus dealt with sins and I am merely asking for clarification.

The reason I'm asking, is that you **extrapolated** a scenario from the text of John 8, about Jesus 'giving time for repentance' (to the woman caught in adultery), and that is not indicated AT ALL by John's account.

That's why I am still keen to hear your understanding of 'the way Jesus dealt with the very same sins'....

Is there a reason you cannot explain your understanding to me?

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/5 11:52**

Hello ANewInHim,

Thank you for posting.... I know there are a lot of people reading this thread, and that's another reason Cindy's answer might be helpful.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/5 15:41**

Cindy wrote, Quote:

""There IS a difference in OT metings out of punishment and the way Jesus dealt with the very same sins. Do you not agree? Blessings in Him, Cindy""

Absolutely, Old testament was stoning and death, the New Testament, Repentance and forgiveness.

1 John 1:7-10 But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus

us Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.

What a roller coaster, walk in the light, cleansed, but sin is there, confess our sins, cleansed, but sin is there, make Him a liar.

Wow! How can I ever reconcile this body of sin to God's way, Praise God through Christ Jesus.

Romans 6:4-7 Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin.

In Christ Jesus we can do all things, even free for sin.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/7 11:58**

Hello Cindy,

This is the next in answer to your question 'what is whoredom?'.

I'm taking as read, the extract from 1 Timothy 6 about money and sound doctrine (meaning an acceptance of the words of Jesus Christ) as a basic qualification for 'a biblical perspective'.

These are connected with that which I've already quoted from Romans 1 and 2, regarding an acceptance of God Himself also. I'll be looking at these chapters again, to bring out a couple more points.

I have already drawn your attention to the cry of the Jewish crowd which called for the crucifixion of Jesus, who said 'We have no king but by Caesar,' (John 19:15), which must be understood in the context of Jesus' answer to the question asked him by the chief priests and the scribes in Luke 20.

(NKJV) And the chief priests and the scribes that very hour sought to lay hands on Him, but they feared the people -- for they knew He had spoken this parable against them.

20 So they watched Him, and sent spies who pretended to be righteous, that they might seize on His words, in order to deliver Him to the power and the authority of the governor.

21 Then they asked Him, saying, "Teacher, we know that You say and teach rightly, and You do not show personal favoritism, but teach the way of God in truth:

22 "Is it lawful for us to pay taxes to Caesar or not?"

23 But He perceived their craftiness, and said to them, "Why do you test Me?

24 "Show Me a denarius. Whose image and inscription does it have?" They answered and said, "Caesar's."

25 And He said to them, "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's."

26 But they could not catch Him in His words in the presence of the people. And they marveled at His answer and kept silent.

(KJV) Luke 20:24 Shew me a penny. **Whose image and superscription hath it?** They answered and said, Caesar's.

In other words - in case anyone reading is not sure what this means and how it is connected to idolatry, the money - the brass - was stamped with the image of the earthly ruler, and we, God's creations, are stamped with His image.

Gen 1:26

Then God said, "Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness;.."

So, when we are talking about God's idea of marriage for mankind, He is modeling it on His own absolute knowledge in

Himself of Who He is, and what He wants. He is also in a position to GET what He wants everytime, and to do away with people who prefer to reject His image in their human nature.

Re:, on: 2006/6/7 12:02

[http://www.familylife.com/community/forums/ubb/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=get\\_topic;f=8;t=003255;p=7](http://www.familylife.com/community/forums/ubb/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=get_topic;f=8;t=003255;p=7)

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/7 12:10

Now, regarding idolatry, God has put it as His number one hate.

Exodus 20

3 "You shall have no other gods before Me.

4 You shall not make for yourself a carved image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth;

5 you shall not bow down to them nor serve them. For I, the LORD your God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children to the third and fourth generations of those who hate Me,

6 but showing mercy to thousands, to those who love Me and keep My commandments.

Judges 8:33

And it came to pass, as soon as Gideon was dead, that **the children of Israel turned again, and went a whoring after Baalim, and made Baalberith their god.**

They had already chosen not to listen to God Himself in Exodus 20

18 Now all the people witnessed the thunderings, the lightning flashes, the sound of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking; and when the people saw it, they trembled and stood afar off.

19 Then they said to Moses, "You speak with us, and we will hear; **but let not God speak with us, lest we die.**"

20 And Moses said to the people, "Do not fear; for God has come to test you, and that His fear may be before you, so **that you may not sin.**"

Here is a vital clue to Israel's later blindness and deafness to God. They **chose** not to hear Him personally, even though He was desperate for a personal relationship with them.

Rightly, they feared that knowing Him would be associated with their death - to sin - but, they did not appreciate that *unless* they received the word of **life from Him**, they would die *anyway*.

Indeed, as we hear of their time in the wilderness, we see them die in large numbers, until only two men of the generation who left Egypt, have exercised faith and obedience towards God, thus qualifying them to enter the Promised Land.

We cannot doubt that God is completely serious about judging sin.

One of the ways that He does this, is by allowing people to reap the rewards of their own choices.

Luke 16:13

"No servant can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will be loyal to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon." (Matt 6:24)

Luke 8

11 " Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God.

12 "Those by the wayside are the ones who hear; **then the devil comes and takes away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved.**

13 "But the ones on the rock are those who, when they hear, receive the word with joy; and these have **no root, who believe for a while and in time of temptation fall away.**

14 "Now the ones that fell among thorns are those who, **when they have heard, go out and are choked with cares, riches, and pleasures of life, and bring no fruit to maturity.**

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/6/7 12:21**

There is more to say about the connection between idolatry and the characteristics described here in Revelation 3, but I shall continue with them another day. For now, I would hope you can see the parallels between these two exhortations from God, in the Old Testament, and Jesus Christ Himself, in the New Testament.

Revelation 3

14 " And to the angel of the church of the Laodiceans write, ' These things says the Amen, the Faithful and True Witness, the Beginning of the creation of God:

15 "I know your works, that you are neither cold nor hot. I could wish you were cold or hot.

16 "So then, because you are lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will vomit you out of My mouth.

17 "**Because you say, 'I am rich, have become wealthy, and have need of nothing' -- and do not know that you are wretched, miserable, poor, blind, and naked --**

18 "I counsel you to buy from Me gold refined in the fire, that you may be rich; and white garments, that you may be clothed, that the shame of your nakedness may not be revealed; and anoint your eyes with eye salve, that you may see.

19 "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten. Therefore be zealous and repent.

At the end of the chapter describing many of the idolatrous acts - we find God say no less than FIVE TIMES that the Israelites are not to commit these abominations as the other nations do. Also, that the land itself is sick because of them, and that's why He's 'vomiting out' the inhabitants. He promises to do the same to Israel, if they commit these abominations.

Leviticus 18

24 ' Do not defile yourselves with any of these things; for by all these the nations are defiled, which I am casting out before you.

25 'For the land is defiled; therefore I visit the punishment of its iniquity upon it, and the land vomits out its inhabitants.

26 'You shall therefore keep My statutes and My judgments, and shall not commit any of these abominations, either any of your own nation or any stranger who dwells among you

27 '(for all these abominations the men of the land have done, who were before you, and thus the land is defiled),



28 'lest the land vomit you out also when you defile it, as it vomited out the nations that were before you.

29 'For whoever commits any of these abominations, the persons who commit them shall be cut off from among their people.

30 'Therefore you shall keep My ordinance, so that you do not commit any of these abominable customs which were committed before you, and that you do not defile yourselves by them: I am the LORD your God.' "

In this respect, in Revelation 3, the love of material wealth rather than the knowledge of God, brings spiritual blindness, spiritual nakedness, MISERY - which God describes as a lukewarmness - a deadened spiritual state which is apathetic through self-abuse and unhealthy worship practices - and declares this will force Him to spew them out.

It's the same picture as Leviticus 18.

This is not new truth. This is very old truth.

**Re:, on: 2006/6/7 12:44**

Dorcas.

Possibly you can bring your discussion to the other forum here.

Cindy has been posting today...possibly she hasn't seen your posts here yet....:)

Quote:

-----

FOC wrote:

[http://www.familylife.com/community/forums/ubb/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=get\\_topic;f=8;t=003255;p=7](http://www.familylife.com/community/forums/ubb/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=get_topic;f=8;t=003255;p=7)

-----

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/6/7 14:12**

Quote:

-----I know there are a lot of people reading this thread, and that's another reason Cindy's answer might be helpful.

-----

I think I did answer your question, Dorcas. If I didn't, I'm not sure what you are looking for.....In Him, Cindy

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/6/7 14:37**

Quote:

-----In this respect, in Revelation 3, the love of material wealth rather than the knowledge of God, brings spiritual blindness, spiritual nakedness, MISERY - which God describes as a lukewarmness - a deadened spiritual state which is apathetic through self-abuse and unhealthy worship practices - and declares this will force Him to spew them out.

-----

Dorcas,

I'm trying to get a handle on your posts. From what I can pull out of your writings, you believe that idolatry fits into the definition of "porneia" as used in Mt. 19:9. Is that correct? I'm not quite sure why you brought in Rev. 3 (the Laodicean church) into this discussion in regards to harlotry .....

Dorcas, I give you permission to spoon feed me :-) because I'm just not getting the connection you are trying to make with idolatry and harlotry with regards to Mt. 19:9. In Him, Cindy

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/7 15:17

Quote:

-----Dorcas.

Possibly you can bring your discussion to the other forum here.

-----  
Hi FOC,

I don't think I have the time, or the strength, to post in two forums. I had a look at your link, thanks. It is enough to do justice to this topic once, here.

Perhaps these verses are relevant. They fit in perfectly with where I'd got to in my dissertation.

(NKJV) 2 Corinthians 4

1 Therefore, since we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we do not lose heart.

2 But **we have renounced the hidden things of shame**, not walking in craftiness nor handling the word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

3 But even if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled to those who are perishing, 4 whose minds the god of this age has blinded, who do not believe, lest the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine on them.

5 For we do not preach ourselves, but **Christ Jesus the Lord**, and ourselves your bondservants for Jesus' sake.

6 For it is the **God** who commanded light to shine out of darkness, who **has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ**.

Ephesians 5

13 But all things that are exposed are made manifest by the light, for whatever makes manifest is light.

14 **Therefore He says:**

**"Awake, you who sleep,  
Arise from the dead,  
And Christ will give you light."**

15 See then that you walk circumspectly, not as fools but as wise,

Romans 1

21 because, although they knew God, **they did not glorify Him as God, nor were thankful, but became futile in their thoughts, and their foolish hearts were darkened.**

22 **Professing to be wise, they became fools,**

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/7 15:20

Romans 1

23 and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man -- and birds and four-footed animals and creeping things.

24 **Therefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, in the lusts of their hearts**, to dishonor their bodies among themselves,

25 **who exchanged the truth of God for the lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen.**

28 And **even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a debased mind**, to do those things which are not fitting; 29 **being filled with all unrighteousness**

#### Exodus 32

1 Now when the people saw that Moses delayed coming down from the mountain, the people gathered together to Aaron, and said to him, "Come, **make us gods that shall go before us**; for as for this Moses, the man who brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we do not know what has become of him."

2 And Aaron said to them, "Break off the golden earrings which are in the ears of your wives, your sons, and your daughters, and bring to me."

3 "So all the people broke off the golden earrings which were in their ears, and brought them to Aaron."

4 And he received the gold from their hand, and he fashioned it with an engraving tool, and made a molded calf. Then they said, "This your god, O Israel, that brought you out of the land of Egypt!"

5 So when Aaron saw, he built an altar before it. And Aaron made a proclamation and said, "Tomorrow is a feast to the LORD."

6 Then they rose early on the next day, offered burnt offerings, and brought peace offerings; and the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.

19 So it was, as soon as he came near the camp, that he saw the calf and the dancing. So Moses' anger became hot, and he cast the tablets out of his hands and broke them at the foot of the mountain.

25 Now when Moses saw that the people were unrestrained (for Aaron had not restrained them, to their shame among their enemies),

26 then Moses stood in the entrance of the camp, and said, "Whoever is on the LORD's side -- come to me." **And all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together to him.**

27 And he said to them, "Thus says the LORD God of Israel: 'Let every man put his sword on his side, and go in and out from entrance to entrance throughout the camp, and let every man kill his brother, every man his companion, and every man his neighbor.' "

28 So the sons of Levi did according to the word of Moses. And about three thousand men of the people fell that day.

**the people were naked;** (for Aaron had made them naked unto their shame among their enemies:)

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - toward a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/7 15:46**

#### Acts 19

5 When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

6 And when Paul had laid hands on them, the Holy Spirit came upon them, and they spoke with tongues and prophesied. 7 Now the men were about twelve in all.

8 And he went into the synagogue and spoke boldly for three months, reasoning and persuading concerning the things

of the kingdom of God.

9, 10, **But when some were hardened and did not believe, but spoke evil of the Way before the multitude**, he departed from them and withdrew the disciples, **reasoning daily** in the school of Tyrannus. And this continued **for two years, so that all who dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus**, both Jews and Greeks.

11 Now God worked unusual miracles by the hands of Paul, 12 so that even handkerchiefs or aprons were brought from his body to the sick, and the diseases left them and the evil spirits went out of them.

13 Then some of the itinerant Jewish exorcists took it upon themselves to call the name of the Lord Jesus over those who had evil spirits, saying, "We exorcise you by the Jesus whom Paul preaches."

14 Also there were seven sons of Sceva, a Jewish chief priest, who did so.

15 And the evil spirit answered and said, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are you?"

16 Then the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, overpowered them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded.

17 This became known both to all Jews and Greeks dwelling in Ephesus; and fear fell on them all, and **the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified**.

18, 19 **And many who had believed came confessing and telling their deeds. Also, many of those who had practiced magic brought their books together and burned them in the sight of all. And they counted up the value of them, and it totaled fifty thousand pieces of silver.**

20 **So the word of the Lord grew mightily and prevailed.**

23 And about that time there arose a great commotion about the Way.

24 For a certain man named Demetrius, a silversmith, who made silver shrines of Diana, brought no small profit to the craftsmen.

25 He called them together with the workers of similar occupation, and said: "Men, you know that we have our prosperity by this trade.

26 "Moreover you see and hear that not only at Ephesus, but throughout almost all Asia, this Paul has persuaded and turned away many people, saying that they are not gods which are made with hands.

27 "So not only is this trade of ours in danger of falling into disrepute, but also the temple of the great goddess Diana may be despised and her magnificence destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worship."

28 Now when they heard this, they were full of wrath and cried out, saying, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians! ..... Great is Diana of the Ephesians!"

35 And when the city clerk had quieted the crowd, he said: "Men of Ephesus, 'What man is there who does not know that the city of the Ephesians is temple guardian of the great goddess Diana, and of the image which fell down from Zeus?'"

This account of the growth of the Christians in Ephesus interests me for several reasons. First, the Christian faith was being demonstrated in a heartland of idolatry. The people believed the image they worshiped, had fallen out of the sky from an invisible god.

The people who worshiped within this system were so unwell, that Paul was overwhelmed with their needs, such that God did special miracles of healing and deliverance through him.

The disputation against the gospel had caused Paul to move to a venue where those who were interested could go and debate in a civilised way with each other.

The local craftsmen made *such* a living from selling little idols, that they were more interested in fighting for their livelihood, than they were in the truth being preached to them.

But those who had believed, wanted to know more. Even though they had received the Holy Spirit, and prophesied and spoke in tongues, there were those who still had not **yet** renounced their magic practices. However, once they did, the word of God grew and prevailed mightily.

Renunciation can be an important part of being freed from idolatrous practices, especially if one has participated with informed consent, and given oneself to sin consciously.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - toward a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/7 15:51**

Quote:

-----I think I did answer your question, Dorcas. If I didn't, I'm not sure what you are looking for.....

Hi Cindy,

Are you alluding to your answer about 'time for repentance', which you extrapolated from John 8, which is not mentioned there?

Can you find something which **Jesus** said, to support your thinking - about 'time for repentance'?

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/6/7 16:26**

Quote:

-----Can you find something which Jesus said, to support your thinking - about 'time for repentance'?

How about ""go" and sin no more""? Do you deny that this woman was not given the "judgement" she deserved, but instead was given the freedom to "go" and sin no more? In the OT law, she would "go" by means of death---and she would sin no more. However, Jesus gave her LIFE instead of death. No? Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re:, on: 2006/6/7 16:33**

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Quote:

-----Can you find something which Jesus said, to support your thinking - about 'time for repentance'?

How about ""go" and sin no more""? Do you deny that this woman was not given the "judgement" she deserved, but instead was given the freedom to "go" and sin no more? In the OT law, she would "go" by means of death---and she would sin no more. However, Jesus gave her LIFE instead of death. No? Blessings in Him, Cindy

and what about the man who apostates by blaspheming the Holy Spirit, cindy....does he get forgiveness too?

As I asked before, you DO understand the similarity between apostasy and adultery, correct?

=====  
"adulteress" (Romans 7)  
G3428  
&#956;&#959;&#953;&#967;&#945;&#955;&#953;&#769;&#962;  
moichalis

Thayer Definition:

1) an adulteress

2) **as the intimate alliance of God with the people of Israel was likened to a marriage, those who relapse into idolatry are said to commit adultery or play the harlot**

2a) fig. equiv. to faithless to God, unclean, **apostate**

=====

To offer a little help, why dont you read that definition, then re-read dorcas' posts and see if you then see the point she is making...

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/7 16:33**

Hi Cindy,

I think, when you could not answer my question about how Jesus dealt with the very same sins in the New Testament, for which in the Old Testament, death by stoning was practised, I began to realise you might not know why I'm pulling together all these scriptures to elucidate the signs and symptoms of idolatry.

But I have more scripture yet to post, which may help you spot the patterns which I've noted from my own Bible study. Please remember, I was driven to Bible study because of my own lack of understanding - my own blindness, the darkness in which I'd walked and the sins from which I'd never been able to get free. Now, read that sentence again carefully. I have not said *whose* sins. Nor am I saying none of them were mine, but, they were not *all* mine.

If anything, the fact of other relationships, (Again, please don't jump to conclusions... I may not be talking about my marriage.) while seeming to complicate breaking into the knottiness of my inner haziness, turned out to throw up a great many more answers in scripture than in my wildest dreams I could have hoped for. All that remained, thereafter, was to engage with the Lord - on *His* terms, obviously - to receive *HIS* answers.

Quote:  
-----I'm trying to get a handle on your posts. From what I can pull out of your writings, **you believe that idolatry fits into the definition of "porneia" as used in Mt. 19:9. Is that correct?** I'm not quite sure why you brought in Rev. 3 (the Laodicean church) into this discussion in regards to harlotry .....

Dorcas, I give you permission to spoon feed me because I'm just not getting the connection you are trying to make with idolatry and harlotry with regards to Mt. 19:9.

-----  
'you believe that idolatry fits into the definition of "porneia" as used in Mt. 19:9. Is that correct?'

Let's not forget Matthew said it twice, making it inescapable.

Probably Young's Literal Translation answers your question best.

(Young) Matthew 5:32

but I--I say to you, that whoever may put away his wife, **save for the matter of whoredom**, doth make her to commit adultery; and whoever may marry her who hath been put away doth commit adultery.

Matthew 19:9

`And I say to you, that, whoever may put away his wife, **if not for whoredom**, and may marry another, doth commit adultery; and he who did marry her that hath been put away, doth commit adultery.'

A quick glance at the Greek shows that the word Young translates as 'whoredom', is indeed 'porneia'.

Judges 10:6

And the children of Israel did evil again in the sight of the LORD, and served Baalim, and Ashtaroth, and the gods of Syria, and the gods of Zidon, and the gods of Moab, and the gods of the children of Ammon, and the gods of the Philistines, and **forsook the LORD, and served not him.**

Judges 8:33

And it came to pass, as soon as Gideon was dead, that **the children of Israel turned again, and went a whoring after Baalim**, and made Baalberith their god.

Exodus 20

4 " You shall not make for yourself a carved image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; 5 you shall not bow down to them nor serve them.

Cindy,

I hope you can easily see that 'a whoring' is 'whoredom' = worshiping other gods (connect Exodus 20:4 with Romans 1:23 - with worshiping the creature more than the Creator v 25) = 'idolatry' in modern English.

Of course, there are aspects other than the angles I've posted on, this evening, which we will come to.

Is your request for 'spoonfeeding', an offer to eat?

Quote:

-----I'm not quite sure why you brought in Rev. 3 (the Laodicean church) into this discussion in regards to harlotry

Well, I would like you to go back to the start of the posts I made today, where I summarised what I've already posted, and look again at the scripture there, to see the recurring themes.

Perhaps, I've posted something helpful, since you left this question.

I'm not prepared to do *all* your work. I'm expecting you to seek the Lord, also. Many times I needed to *sleep* on a question, only to find the answer first in my mind when I awoke.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/7 16:37**

Quote:

----- Do you deny that this woman was not given the "judgement" she deserved, but instead was given the freedom to "go" and sin no more?

Hi Cindy,

No. I do not deny that she was spared immediate judgement and given the freedom to go and sin no more. But, this still does not tell me how her sin was dealt with.

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/6/7 19:27**

Quote:

-----No. I do not deny that she was spared immediate judgement and given the freedom to go and sin no more. But, this still does not tell me how her sin was dealt with.

Does the passage tell how her sin was dealt with, Dorcas---besides us knowing that the Lord extended her mercy and Grace?

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/6/7 19:41

Quote:  
-----I think, when you could not answer my question about how Jesus dealt with the very same sins in the New Testament, for which in the Old Testament, death by stoning was practised, I began to realise you might not know why I'm pulling together all these scriptures to elucidate the signs and symptoms of idolatry  
-----

Dorcas, I did answer you. You do not agree with it, however. You insist on an "out" for the one who is joined with another who commits "whoredom"-----which you have defined as a form of idolatry. I see all the scriptures you have posted and your commentary on the scriptures posted as your way of trying to prove to me that I am following my own imaginations/image of God, not the scriptures. What I also see is this: you seem to be looking very hard at trying to prove something very much beyond the written Word----something not "Rhema", but something that will help you justify what you yourself want to do/believe is God's personal revelation to you.

The reasons for idolatry and how one gets to that point is not the point of this discussion. Is this a many-layered issue? Absolutely, but it seems to me you are going off on some bunny trail and not dealing with the specifics being discussed. I understand the importance of laying a foundation, but it doesn't appear to me that is what you are doing here. Lest you accuse me of being dense/unspiritual/immature in the faith: I know many who are in love with the Lord (very spiritual) and I understand them when they communicate. In those areas where I have not had revelation, I still understand them, though I may not grasp the depth of a particular thing the Lord has shown them. I do not understand you, however. I don't know if it's your writing style or what, but as I've told you before, you are very difficult to follow. To be honest, Dorcas, I just don't have the time to keep going back over and over your posts trying to figure out where you are going with something. Sorry. In Him, Cindy

Re:, on: 2006/6/7 19:55

Quote:  
-----  
lastblast wrote:  
  
Quote:  
-----Can you find something which Jesus said, to support your thinking - about 'time for repentance'?  
-----

How about "'go" and sin no more"'? Do you deny that this woman was not given the "judgement" she deserved, but instead was given the freedom to "go" and sin no more? In the OT law, she would "go" by means of death---and she would sin no more. However, Jesus gave her LIFE instead of death. No? Blessings in Him, Cindy  
-----

**and what about the man who apostates by blaspheming the Holy Spirit, cindy....does he get forgiveness too?**

As I asked before, you DO understand the similarity between apostasy and adultery, correct?

=====  
"adulteress" (Romans 7)  
G3428  
&#956;&#959;&#953;&#967;&#945;&#955;&#953;&#769;&#962;  
moichalis  
Thayer Definition:  
1) an adulteress  
2) **as the intimate alliance of God with the people of Israel was likened to a marriage, those who relapse into idolatry are said to commit adultery or play the harlot**  
2a) fig. equiv. to faithless to God, unclean, apostate  
=====

To offer a little help, why don't you read that definition, then re-read dorcas' posts and see if you then see the point she is making...



Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/8 5:42

Quote:

-----Many times I needed to sleep on a question, only to find the answer first in my mind when I awoke.

Hi Cindy,

I'll back to your posts above, in a tick.

I just want to share with you, that when I woke today, exactly this (in my quote of myself) happened.

I realised that we *both* have missed out an important part of the the conversation between Jesus and the woman in John 8.

He had already said to the Pharisees, (v 7) "He who is without sin among you, let him throw a stone at her first."

Then, when they all left, He said to her, "Woman, where are those accusers of yours? Has no one condemned you?"

11 She said, "No one, Lord."

And Jesus said to her, "Neither do I condemn you;.."

'Neither do I condemn you'. How does this work?

Quote:

-----I'm not prepared to do all your work. I'm expecting you to seek the Lord, also.

I also had said

Of course, there are aspects other than the angles I've posted on, this evening, which we will come to.

And, since you have asked me *several times* to explain how I see things, I don't expect you to respond with

Quote:

-----I just don't have the time to keep going back over and over your posts trying to figure out where you are going with something.

I will be making it clearer and clearer, I hope, as I continue. You don't have to respond immediately. Now I've started, I'll finish.

Quote:

-----You insist on an "out" for the one who is joined with another who commits "whoredom"-----

**No.** You've got that completely wrong. Jesus says it's an option. Nowhere does He say the faithful spouse **must** divorce the unfaithful one.

Can you see.... there is **liberty** to reconcile or **liberty** to part?

Quote:

-----I see all the scriptures you have posted and your commentary on the scriptures posted as your way of trying to prove to me that I am following my own imaginations/image of God, not the scriptures.

Well, you are getting close, here, to a scriptural truth which I believe is critical to your understanding, which is that you are *inviting* spiritual disaster, if you reject a word from the Lord, and intend to live with that rejection of it.

By so doing, you are intimating to the principalities and powers who watch everything on earth, and seek to destroy God's image in man, that you are, on this point (whatever it may be), on *their* side, not God's.

Whether you realise it or not, you are making yourself a target for their playtime, and some of what you said earlier about how hard you find certain things, comes as no surprise.

Another way of looking at this, is to think of the rejection of a word of God, as a hook which you are knowingly keeping well established in your thinking. This is an open invitation for other unscriptural ideas to attach themselves to your thinking, so that rather than being enlightened by truth from above, you are being burdened with lies from beneath. This is completely avoidable, if not deeply desirable - that is, to not give such occasion to the enemy, by offering him such a handy hook.

I also want you to see that there is a big difference between being in the natural darkness of one's first birth and life experiences, wherein one has no insight until God shines a light on our understanding, and **choosing** to reject a word of God found in the Bible, as you are doing. This brings on your own head, a culpability which is inescapable. In some measure, this is one reason I keep asking for you to continue wrestling with the question about how Jesus dealt with that woman's sin.

Again, it's becoming less of a surprise that you don't have the answer I'm seeking, because if you did, we would not be having this discussion. This point is so central to the whole of my thesis, that it is one you **do** need to grapple with. If, after you 'see' it, you choose to reject it, I will have no more to say. Even what I write now, is not an attempt to persuade you to leave your present stance and understanding, without something *better* to put in its place. But, I can only lay out the scriptural pictures. I can't make you accept them.

Quote:

-----What I also see is this: you seem to be looking very hard at trying to prove something very much beyond the written Word-----

This is wishful thinking on your part. I have hardly put any commentary on the scripture I've quoted, by comparison with all those different texts from both Testaments.

**Please be specific. What am I trying to prove, which is beyond the written word?**

Don't misunderstand that question.... I do realise that life is lived 'beyond the written word'. But I also realise that Jesus came that we may have life, **and have it more abundantly**....

Of necessity, there is **faith** beyond the written page, as this is where life is lived, but, it cannot be possible that God has spoken a word to you personally, which contradicts so completely, something Jesus said which is clearly recorded in scripture.

You should see this discrepancy as a red alert that the fault is not on God's side. This is one aspect of what scripture IS FOR - to correct our thinking. (2 Timothy 3:16 **All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness,**)

Again, I do understand it can be mind-boggling to find oneself so far out of tune with God's mind on something, that one has to revise a whole section of belief on which one has been building one's whole life.... but isn't this rather in line with what Jesus said about cutting off that part which offends us, that we may enter into everlasting life?

Isn't it simpler just to accept we all come to Christ with an unregenerate mind bulging with stuff He cannot possibly endorse, and that the only way to have our minds renewed, is to tune into His way of thinking?

1 John 5

1 Whoever believes that Jesus is the Christ is born of God, and everyone who loves Him who begot also loves him who is begotten of Him.

2 By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep His commandments.

3 For this is the love of God, that we **keep His commandments**. And His commandments **are not burdensome**.

4 For whatever is born of God overcomes the world. And **this is the victory that has overcome the world -- our faith**.

5 Who is he who overcomes the world, but he who believes that Jesus is the Son of God?

Surely it is not possible to *truly* believe "Jesus is the Son of God", and then to retain to oneself the idea (thinking it is a right) that it is okay to be **selective** about what we believe of what He said?

I will answer more of this

Quote:

-----... which you have defined as a form of idolatry...

The reasons for idolatry and how one gets to that point is not the point of this discussion. Is this a many-layered issue? Absolutely, but it seems to me you are going off on some bunny trail and not dealing with the specifics being discussed. I understand the importance of laying a foundation, but it doesn't appear to me that is what you are doing here. Lest you accuse me of being dense/unspiritual/immature in the faith: I know many who are in love with the Lord (very spiritual) and I understand them when they communicate. In those areas where I have not had revelation, I still understand them, though I may not grasp the depth of a particular thing the Lord has shown them. I do not understand you, however. I don't know if it's your writing style or what, but as I've told you before, you are very difficult to follow.

-----  
in a future post.

**Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/6/8 9:33**

Quote:

-----Well, you are getting close, here, to a scriptural truth which I believe is critical to your understanding, which is that you are inviting a spiritual disaster, if you reject a word from the Lord, and intend to live with that rejection of it.

Thank you. I now see quite well that the Lord has given me correct discernment of your motives and that you are abusing HIS WORD trying to falsely accuse a sister. I completely understand why you are doing it, Dorcas. I hope someday YOU will see why you are doing it. Blessings in Him, Cindy

**Re:, on: 2006/6/8 10:35**

Quote:

-----  
lastblast wrote:

Quote:

-----Well, you are getting close, here, to a scriptural truth which I believe is critical to your understanding, which is that you are inviting a spiritual disaster, if you reject a word from the Lord, and intend to live with that rejection of it.

Thank you. I now see quite well that the Lord has given me correct discernment of your motives and that you are abusing HIS WORD trying to falsely accuse a sister. I completely understand why you are doing it, Dorcas. I hope someday YOU will see why you are doing it. Blessings in Him, Cindy

-----  
**MODS, if I need to delete or modify this post, please contact me and let me know**

Cindy, this is the most blatant case of the pot calling the kettle black that I've ever seen.

Of course, since I've been at this probably a lot longer than most have with you, I know the FALSE accusations you've levied directly against innocent brethren.

You have a LOT of nerve accusing Dorcas of abusing His word after the stunts Ive seen you pull the last 18 months...including your recent one where Mary was supposedly RAPED by Joes thoughts, and yet not a single word of this is mentioned....and why?

Only so you can try to apply a scripture in Deut 22 to the situation that doesnt apply, and DOESNT even make any sense given the FACTS that are mentioned...and those that arent...for one sole purpose....so that you dont have to accept that the word 'porneia' simply means what it means.

And having a suspicious nature does not mean "god" gave you discernment in this matter.

I have acquaintances who pull this often with me..."i prayed for god to give me words to say, therefore ANYTHING i say is from god"

Your "discernment" is probably your own paranoia at this point sister.

Youve been corrected by so many christians for so long now, you simply know at this point that ALL of us are trying to help you return to truth.

Readers, please browse my site to see some of the information concerning Cindys distortions of Gods word, if you will.

Dorcas is simply trying to help cindy understand why Jesus would have given this exception for whoredom. It is because God Himself has dealt with this crime against the very covenant He made and put away...

Ive tried to get cindy to understand that apostasy against God and His covenant is the same type of sin as adultery against the covenant of marriage and thus why Jesus DID give exception for this "apostasy" against the marital covenant.

Idolatry against God is the very same type of sin as adultery in a marriage, and thus why Jesus has said 'except for whoredom'.

Cindy doesnt get this, she hasnt gotten it, and this is why she refuses to accept Jesus own words in this matter.

Dorcas, sister, I know you have good intentions here, but i told you that cindy has no desire to accept the facts in this matter.

\*IF\* you show her something she cannot refute, she simply will alter her views to accommodate the new information by twisting something else...Ive been watching this for going on two years now from her and the others.

Sorry I did this publically, and I will delete it if a mod asks me to...but the readers here need to understand this situation in a little more detail.

=====

"adulteress" (Romans 7)

G3428

&#956;&#959;&#953;&#967;&#945;&#955;&#953;&#769;&#962;

moichalis

Thayer Definition:

1) an adulteress

2) as the **intimate alliance of God with the people of Israel was likened to a marriage, those who relapse into idolatry are said to commit adultery or play the harlot**

2a) fig. equiv. to faithless to God, unclean, **apostate**

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/6/8 12:08**

So utterly predictable...

Do GOD's words mean nothing? All of your words mean no more than GOD's.

Nothing

Useless...

continuance...

Useless...

Who in the world is not guilty of adultery? Who is not guilty of murder, theft... sin... **Idolatry**

Are we all not guilty of every last sin in the book?

Every last abomination in the eyes of our GOD, NO MAN IS INNOCENT.

You are guilty of one... you are guilty of ALL.

porneia... does the word mean adultery to GOD? or does it mean sin... does it not mean idolatry, murder, fornication, stealing, lying etc. etc.?

Get in your prayer closets... stay on your knees until the day you die and are yet still on your knees at the very feet of Christ our Lord. Rise off of your knees for no man except the Lord our GOD should HE raise you, to move you to another resting place for your knees.

Squack like the heathens do... and you will see no benefit. Ask yourselves what glory have you brought to GOD today. The answer is found with your face in the dirt.

**Re:, on: 2006/6/8 12:12**

Scroggins, I understand where you are coming from..but you MUST fully and finally understand that someone has to keep on guard against false teachings.

I understand you don't like the way things are, but brother, the church has been fighting deception since the beginning...remember why the creeds were created?

You don't have to involve yourself, but you HAVE to accept that SOME brethren are CALLED to dispel false doctrines....as some always have been...

**Re: - posted by Scroggins (), on: 2006/6/8 12:24**

Quote:

-----SOME brethren are CALLED to dispel false doctrines....as some always have been...  
-----

Not disputed.

You can only do so much...

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/8 16:13**

Quote:

-----Thank you. I now see quite well that the Lord has given me correct discernment of your motives  
-----

Please tell me what you believe the Lord has shown you about my 'motives'?

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/8 17:29**

Hi Cindy,

Right up until my post before last, I thought I was answering your questions for which you have complained at having to wait.

Your impatience surprises me, since you are patiently prepared to take every opportunity to cast doubt on an important answer which Jesus gave to a very reasonable question from the Pharisees, on divorce.

I really had thought more of your integrity, and I mean that truly in the best way.

I hope you can see, without having to alter your personal views on what Jesus said, that there is a problem of intellectual integrity presented by your position.

You are willing to accept part of His statement - and create a whole doctrine out of it - but you are simultaneously willing to reject part of it so completely, that it doesn't work any more as the modification which He declared.

Despite your earlier (in this thread) protestations, you **are** tossing out this particular phrase of Jesus' 'rhema' words, which a post or two back you were implying you value.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/8 17:31**

Cindy said

Quote:

-----and that you are abusing HIS WORD trying to falsely accuse a sister.

I reject this accusation completely.

Not only am I not using His word to accuse you, I am not **falsely** accusing you of anything. All I'm doing, is being a mirror, reflecting back to you the meaning of what you are saying in this thread.

Any accusation against you comes from your own clear and repetitious rejection of the Lord's simple word in Matt 5:32 and 19:9.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, Remarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/8 17:43**

Cindy,

I believe I am sharing truth with you, because I'm speaking from experience. I hesitated to say this earlier, but, I would not be as confident of the spiritual dynamics, had I not seen them for myself in my own past.

The mistake I may be making most of all, is of warning you - or in any way alluding to the increase in struggle which you'll have as you continue to try to hold things together on a false foundation. This is not me being negative... this is the good thing which could come out of this situation for you ... that you finally stop trying all the works and weaving, and just let the truth of God's word hit you full and square.

People thought they were trying to warn me, but they had no idea what else I was up against internally, and I didn't know what to call what I was going through. Really, **I wasn't receptive to anyone but the Lord, and I fully respect your position if that is it.**

On its own, that would be one thing. **But**, you attract a great deal more attention because you are working so hard at *spreading* this blatant dissension from believing Jesus' simple word.

Quote:

-----I completely understand why you are doing it, Dorcas.

So, what do you understand about why I'm 'doing' this?

I've given you my perspective above.

Re: Marriage, Divorce, Remarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/8 17:46

Cindy said

Quote:

-----I hope someday YOU will see why you are doing it.

Would this be an allusion to your imagination that I need to justify believing Jesus' words, for personal reasons.....?

Don't you see that one doesn't need 'a reason' to believe the words of Jesus Christ? They are to be believed because they are the Rock on which we build anything which will last.

Re:, on: 2006/6/8 17:49

Quote:

-----  
dorcass wrote:  
Cindy said

Quote:

-----and that you are abusing HIS WORD trying to falsely accuse a sister.

-----  
I reject this accusation completely.

Not only am I not using His word to accuse you, I am not **falsely** accusing you of anything. All I'm doing, is being a mirror, reflecting back to you the meaning of what you are saying in this thread.

Any accusation against you comes from your own clear and repetitious rejection of the Lord's simple word in Matt 5:32 and 19:9.

-----  
I have yet to see you accuse or falsely accuse cindy in this thread.

Bear in mind that cindy will resort to distraction when cornered as she has since I've been at this with her. So to see her say you are accusing her, then huff off, is typical from what I've seen. She may or may not be back for a while...if not, you copy and past your most recent presentations to her here in this thread and bring them right back up when she returns so she doesn't forget where you two left off.

I commend you on your effort, dorcass, I only wish your audience was a little more willing to set aside deception long enough to see what it is you are trying to present to them.

In one of the Star Wars movies Yoda is telling Luke that once he starts down the path of the dark side that there is pretty much no hope of turning back.

I often wonder if Lucas didn't borrow this idea from our faith in that some passages show that God will give a man who clings to error and rejection of His truth over to those deceptions....it is better to never have known the way, than to have known it and then turned away.

cindy has proclaimed that she was once among us...that she believed our way.

\*IF\* our way is the truth, as we believe it is and the whole of God's truth seems to show, it is quite possible that cindy is on this path into error, and because she WILLFULLY refuses to re-examine her views when presented with such overwhelming evidence, that the same may apply.

These are just thoughts of my own and again will be deleted if moderation wishes.

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/8 19:00

Quote:  
-----I commend you on your effort, dorcas, I only wish your audience was a little more willing to set aside deception long enough to see what it is you are trying to present to them.  
-----

Thank you. There is much more to say.

Despite my offer (p37) to stop posting under certain circumstances, there are many others reading, for whom I shall continue to post my understanding. Also, there were other questions which could be addressed more completely.

Re:, on: 2006/6/8 19:12

Quote:  
-----

dorcas wrote:  
thank you. There is much more to say.

Despite my offer (p37) to stop posting under certain circumstances, there are many others reading, for whom I shall continue to post my understanding. Also, there were other questions which could be addressed more completely.  
-----

Please do so, dorcas.

Post your findings out here for all to see, even if they aren't in response to anyone.

As the readers see and make sense of things, this enables those who don't have the time because of work, kids, etc, to study this out entirely to be able to read what you present, compare it to the scriptures you reference, and draw their own conclusions as the noble-minded Bereans did.

Personally, I would let lastblast run her own course, she decides whether to re-examine her views or not, apparently she's decided that already.

But there are readers who come to this forum, and many others, who are looking for answers many times...I'd make it your goal to help these instead of making it your goal to change someone who wants nothing to do with what you present.

Re:, on: 2006/6/9 2:37

....

Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/6/10 12:47

Quote:  
-----I understand the importance of laying a foundation, but it doesn't appear to me that is what you are doing here. Is this a many-layered issue? Absolutely, but it seems to me you are going off on some bunny trail and not dealing with the specifics being discussed. **The reasons for idolatry and how one gets to that point is not the point of this discussion.**  
-----

Hi Cindy,

In the above quote, the sentences are in the reverse order than that which you wrote them, because I wanted to end with your assertion that 'reasons for idolatry and how one gets to that point is not the point of this discussion', to say that **idolatry is where we start**, and it is idolatry – that is, we are born into an alternative worship system - which we have to leave when we come to the Lord.



But, if we come to the Lord without having *understood* our natural condition - the origin of strongholds (bondages) which control parts of our lives – then, even if we have wholeheartedly given Him all of our life, as far as we are able, we may be disappointed, as we will not have dealt with the real heart of the matter. We may be surprised at how tenacious the carnal life can be. Usually, there are reasons for its tenacity, and certainly, God is able to unbind, release and heal, what ever hinders true spiritual progress.

Christianity necessarily brings with it, specific rules in all the major areas of human experience, including sexual behavior. Leviticus 18 (and a few other verses) refer to that which is *incompatible* with Christianity, *if practised as a lifestyle*. The people to whom Paul addresses his comments in 1 Corinthians 6 seem to have understood this *before* turning to Christ.

9 Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived. Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor sodomites,

10 nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners will inherit the kingdom of God.

11 And such were some of you. But you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God.

This understanding is implicit in 1 Thessalonians in v 9, also

For they themselves declare concerning us what manner of entry we had to you, **and how you turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God,**

10 and to wait for His Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead, even Jesus who delivers us from the wrath to come.

EDIT: This post was too long, so it has been divided and added to slightly.

#### Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/6/10 12:57

The western world has been slow to acknowledge its idols, (over and above the fundamental sinful nature which makes them so appealing), but in countries where they are clearly carved or otherwise manufactured, it is easier to understand that idols always have spirits associated with them, keeping those who worship them, in whatever state of obeisance that god requires (or, those gods require). This is not to say they are not clearly portrayed in the western world, but, their feelgood factor is so high, that people don't want to *begin* to think they might be harmful or sinful, or even *abominable* in God's sight and nostrils.

There is a way to identify an idol. Worshipping it, the worshipper feels better, because some need is satisfied, but at the same time, they are not brought closer to God through it. It may even make Him seem further away.... But this is a great oversimplification, because religious spirits are more than happy to offer fake spiritual feelings, which may lull the worshipper into a sense of security, which is false.

When the Hebrews left Egypt, they brought idols with them. You will remember that the Law had not yet been given, and there were no tables of stone (representing God's heart, and, Jesus the Rock – the fulfilment of the Law), no Ark of the Covenant within which they were (later) placed with Aaron's rod that budded, and the manna. This is the main reason that generation perished in the wilderness. This is a picture of what has to happen to our natural religion, as **we** turn our faith in Jesus Christ into active worship of Him, through the power given by the Spirit.

1 Corinthians 10

11 Now all these things happened to them as examples, and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the ages have come.

12 Therefore let him who thinks he stands take heed lest he fall.

13 No temptation has overtaken you except such as is common to man; but God is faithful, who will not allow you to be tempted beyond what you are able, but with the temptation will also make the way of escape, that you may be able to bear it.

14 Therefore, my beloved, flee from idolatry.

15 I speak as to wise men; judge for yourselves what I say.

16 The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?

17 For we, though many, are one bread and one body; for we all partake of that one bread.

18 Observe Israel after the flesh: Are not those who eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?

19 What am I saying then? That an idol is anything, or what is offered to idols is anything?

20 Rather, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to demons and not to God, and I do not want you to have fellowship with demons.

21 **You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; you cannot partake of the Lord's table and of the table of demons.**

You said

Quote:  
----- I do not understand you, however. I don't know if it's your writing style or what, but as I've told you before, you are very difficult to follow.  
-----

I hope you will tell me if the above paragraphs did not make sense to you. I'm sure you'll mention it if you don't agree.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/6/10 13:07**

I'd like to say one thing more about strongholds (2 Cor 10:3-6)

There are people, who through loving discipline of them as children, by parents who know (knew) the Lord or somehow understood (understand) what is good for their kids and society, arrive at adult life with the minimum of spiritual obstruction between themselves and God.

There are others (and I count myself one), who did not have appropriate attention during the formative years, or, who had inappropriate attention (ie - abusive attention), or whose parents abandoned what appeared to be an unequal struggle with child-rearing, who arrive at adult life with definite bondages - possibly because of which, later, they seek God all the more determinedly.

This is not to *blame* parents for choices made by their children over which they had no control, but, the complex responses drawn by each generation from and against the other, must be addressed by God, in the believer - both the parents and children.

All of us have to enter in the same way, but without doubt, some people do have a more difficult time understanding the spiritual meaning of their choices, and receiving their freedom in the Spirit.

It is paradoxical, perhaps, that often the people with the strongest, most stubborn wills, (which may have defeated their careers), later acknowledge that it was their refusal to give up on God, which He used to bring them to a place of understanding that He had never given up on them, even though they could not 'see' it – and perhaps others could not see it either.

All of that struggle, is for God to have His perfect way (in a life), and to free / rid them of anything contrary to it - the strongholds which bind them. The choice is always left with the believer, how far to move out of their comfort zone, in the quest to know Him more. This way, the believer *makes* Him Lord in a way which binds with true spiritual reality.

1 John 5

18 We know that whoever is born of God does not sin; but he who has been born of God keeps himself, and the wicked one does not touch him.

19 We know that we are of God, and the whole world lies under the sway of the wicked one.

20 And we know that the Son of God has come and has given us an understanding, that we may know Him who is true; and we are in Him who is true, in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life.

21 **Little children, KEEP YOURSELVES from idols. Amen.**

**Re:, on: 2006/6/10 13:31**

lastblast: "but it seems to me you are going off on some bunny trail and not dealing with the specifics being discussed. The reasons for idolatry and how one gets to that point is not the point of this discussion.

Dorcas: "to say that idolatry is where we start...

=====

Dorcas, sister, this is the issue with cindy and this doctrine. Cindy believes you taking her down some 'bunny trail' showing that she isn't comprehending what it is you are showing her, what you are trying to tie together to lay a foundation to show her.

All cindy sees from my experience in this ONE issue is 'if you divorce and remarry you commit adultery'

She's not interested in exceptions that are very clearly backed by what it is you are presenting here in this thread.

Cindy doesn't see that what you are presenting is the very foundation for Jesus making His exception...all cindy sees is this bunny trail.

Good luck, dear sister, in your attempt to help cindy see anything here except a 'bunny trail'.

I again commend you for taking the time to do all this.

Rest assured your work is not fruitless even with the probability that cindy has made up her mind in this matter and does not plan to return to the truth in this.

There are many readers who will see your words and be able to see where you are going with all this, laying the foundation you are, then when they read Jesus' exception they will be able to tie it all together and understand that Jesus wasn't laying out an exception for Jewish marital custom, but for the breaking of the covenant by a spouse...just as man has done to our God since the beginning with his 'idolatry'.

With the ability you have been presenting here in this thread, it's a shame you aren't a teacher in a bible study class of some sort (are you ;) )

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/10 14:16

Quote:

-----Cindy doesnt see that what you are presenting is the very foundation for Jesus making His exception...

Dear FOC, :-)

**Please** give Cindy a chance to read my defence for herself, and to comment!!!

I understand you're exercising extra-ordinary patience, but, there may be a long way to go yet... I feel it may be counter-productive to wade in **ahead** of Cindy's own response.

Also, I am happy to give her time to add my posts to her deliberations, because it appears from all she has said so far, that these points have never figured in them.

Dear Cindy,

You must know that I think one of the biggest weaknesses of your thesis, is that it cannot be turned over, shaken and kicked around from every angle, without falling apart.

Whether you agree, one day, or not, I believe there is greater consistency in the Lord's exception, than there is in your scenarios of 'perpetual adultery' and 'unconditional matrimony'.

Somewhere in your thesis, there is what I call **reversal of truths** .... and I hope to pin-point them clearly, for your understanding.

Isaiah 5

20 Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil;  
Who put darkness for light, and light for darkness;  
Who put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!

21 Woe to those who are wise in their own eyes,  
And prudent in their own sight!

22 Woe to men mighty at drinking wine,  
Woe to men valiant for mixing intoxicating drink,

23 Who justify the wicked for a bribe,  
And take away justice from the righteous man!

24 Therefore, as the fire devours the stubble,  
And the flame consumes the chaff,  
So their root will be as rottenness,  
And their blossom will ascend like dust;  
Because they have rejected the law of the LORD of hosts,  
And despised the word of the Holy One of Israel.

25 Therefore the anger of the LORD is aroused against His people;  
He has stretched out His hand against them  
And stricken them, And the hills trembled.  
Their carcasses were as refuse in the midst of the streets.  
For all this His anger is not turned away,  
**But His hand is stretched out still.**

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/11 2:49

Just a little perceptual ingredient to add to the mix. If Jesus is the Word? What must we look at when He speaks? If there is One Body and that is what we are Baptized into, it is not water baptism we are speaking of. It is the whole package which is the spiritual part of the equation, and water baptism is the shadow of the Whole part of being Baptized into one Body, the Body of Christ. It is like the New Jerusalem which is heavenly and the old Jerusalem which is only a shadow of the Heavenly. If a tree is the trunk, limbs and leaves, what is its shadow? It is still the part of the whole but the shadow must come from the real tree.

You ask, where is this going? If we have a Godly, heavenly picture of what marriage is, then the earthly is just a shadow of what that picture is. We cannot have the Perfect picture of heavenly marriage, because we are just the shadow in parts and pieces. We have the shadow in imperfect human beings and although it is our understanding that we would like to have the perfect it is not possible, for marriage is ordained by God but it is not a heavenly attainable fact. There is no marriage in heaven as we know it. If we have the Word to give us the permission and the occupation of Marriage, we seek to make it perfect. Impossible. That is why Christ had to come to this earth and go to a cross and be slain, that we might be forgiven for our short comings and the sin that permeates our being. Even though we are Perfect in the Spirit of Christ that is in us and our Soul; Mind is becoming the Mind of Christ, we still are the shadow of Christ and His Perfection which is given us by God the Father in Christ Jesus and His birth in us. All marriage is just a shadow of what God intended it to be for human beings on this earth. Just like God won't hold sin against us anymore because of Christ, and He sees Christ as our Life and won't destroy us for the least infraction of His Law anymore, the same goes for marriage. He may not like divorce but in His permissible will He does allow it and forgiveness is the way of His responsibility to us, because of "Christ". We cannot take the perfect and make it work if we are just the shadow of the real Perfection.

What are we to do? Keep trying and allow God to teach us the real from the shadow. We may never get it, but it is our obligation to the One we love and for what He has done for us to keep trying and Love Him for His guidance and Love which He first loved us. Baptism in water does not save us, it is just a shadow of what has already happened. Marriage is the Same, but it takes two people, which just compounds the shadow we are in.. God Hates Divorce, but if we did not have it we would really be in a mess, trying to put together anything that even resembles God's real want for His People when it comes to Man and Woman bringing forth offspring for His Kingdom. He wants Children in His House and He will get them, in spite of our inability to keep our marriage vows. But we must keep trying. I hate divorce for what it has done to me the X spouse and children involved, but I won't give up on God's perfect Plan for Man and Woman on this earth and Husband and Wife, and children. I will keep seeking God's will in all relationships, I may fail, but I won't give up on God.

In Christ: Phillip

In Christ Phillip

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/11 3:39

Quote:  
-----If a tree is the trunk, limbs and leaves, what is its shadow? It is still the part of the whole **but the shadow must come from the real tree.**  
-----

Phillip, I thought this was a **brilliant** sentence. Of course, I know the reference to 'shadow', in Hebrews, but you have captured here in a few precise words, the **necessity** of the pattern in the heavenlies, by which we make the only sense which *can* be made, of life on earth.

Thank you. :-)

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/11 5:05

I got a revelation from a friend of mine, he said, "that a seed has all the potential of the mature plant." A small acorn has a trunk that will be 6 to 8 feet across, 100's of limbs, millions of leaves. If we apply the Seed of Christ in the believer, what we have is unfathomable to the finite mind. All the potential of Christ is born in the believer of Incorruptable Seed. The only place we can understand this is in the Mind of Christ which we already have as believers. That is why Paul so many times says we must know what we have in Christ Jesus. This is mind blowing. To know. This is just a small sample, there are hundreds more by Paul. To know, is to bring the shadow of things we are and will be, to who we are now, because of the Real that is in us. Praise God, Christ in you the Hope of Glory.

1Cr 2:2 For I determined not to (((know))) any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.

1Cr 2:12 Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might (((know))) the things that are freely given to us of God.

1Cr 2:14 But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he ((know)) , because they are spiritually discerned.

1Cr 3:16 (((Know))) ye not that ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?

1Cr 4:4 For I (((know))) nothing by myself; yet am I not hereby justified: but he that judgeth me is the Lord.

1Cr 4:19 But I will come to you shortly, if the Lord will, and will (((know,))) not the speech of them which are puffed up, but the power.

The world (((knows))) not the things of Christ for they cannot ((know)) them. But, "We have the Mind of Christ". NOW.

1Cr 12:27 Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.

1Cr 13:12 For (((now))) we see through a glass, darkly; but (((then face to face:))) now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.

What is Then? Then is NOW that we are in Christ Jesus. As He Knows us we are coming to know Him Now.

Marriage has the same potential in Christ as does all the rest we have in the Now. Not future of past, but NOW. We see the shadow but can possess the real thing through Christ Jesus and to know HIM.

You picked out the one sentence that is the whole of the Post. Praise God and Thank you.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re:Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/6/11 23:29**

Hi Cindy,

Here is a question you left for me on p18, regarding the verses from Deuteronomy 13 which I quoted, in which anyone - wife, child or friend of a man - was to be reported and stoned for suggesting to go worship other gods - and he was to cast the first stone. You picked this out

Quote:

-----But thou shalt surely kill him;

And asked 'Do you believe we should "kill" those guilty of the above? I guess I'm not quite sure how you are fitting this OT passage with the divorce/remarriage issue. Could you clarify---especially since this passage relates to those who lead others away from the Lord---including perhaps even one's own children? Thanks.'

I hope by now, it is much clearer to you, how central I believe idolatry (worship of other gods) figures in the picture of why people might commit adultery as a lifestyle (that is, having their heart far from a covenant they have undertaken), hankering after ideals or practises or goods which are unobtainable or unkeepable.

With regard to your central question:

Quote:

-----'Do you believe we should "kill" those guilty of the above?

Yes.

Moses was not exaggerating the importance of this misdemeanour in God's eyes. Look at Leviticus 18 again, to see what was involved in idol worship, and understand from your own life experience - and of living through the last thirty years

- how breaches of purity, whether virginity or someone else's marriage - seem to break down a resistance beyond what a human being can retrieve on their own. Anyone who has been sexually violated, knows that only God can restore almost everything they lost through that / those events.

This law was damage limitation. It protected the majority from a worse fate.

Look at Leviticus 19:29 (NASB)

Do not profane your daughter by making her a harlot, so that the land will not fall to harlotry and the land become full of lewdness.

See how far-reaching the consequences of just ONE father, behaving in this way?

Also, with regard to stoning offspring, this was not the only sin for which that might happen. The whole of Achan and his family were stoned in Exodus, after a battle was lost because he took a chalice and a garment belonging to the enemy.

Then there is this, too, which stood as a warning to young men.

(KJV) Deuteronomy 21

18 If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, which will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and, when they have chastened him, will not hearken unto them:

19 Then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place;

20 And they shall say unto the elders of his city, This our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton, and a drunkard.

21 And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones, that he die: **so shalt thou put evil away from among you; and all Israel shall hear, and fear.**

Cindy, I'm not clear why there should be a problem with this, since you have taken seriously the punishment of stoning for adultery (and porneia within your so far, limited acceptance of its scope).

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/6/12 8:41**

Hi Cindy,

I had another thought about 'children' being stoned; some of the Jewish marriages will have been made between quite young women, and older men. Presumably, if any of the young women were found not to be virgin, this would require her to be stoned, no matter how young she was.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/14 8:27**

On re-reading the declaration from the Council of Trent (p14 of this thread), I felt there is enough of interest to look at it more closely, comparing their attributions (of who said what), with those in scripture.

This meeting of Roman Catholic officials between 1545 and 1548, eventually got around to making some statements about their views on marriage, in the second last session. This marks the beginning of the involvement of churches with marriages...

I suppose it might have been on their mind because of the famous trouble during the previous century, when a king of England chose to announce *himself* as head of the church in his kingdom, after the head of the church in Rome refused to give him a divorce he wanted.

The Council of Trent statement begins with this.

*'The first parent of the human race, under the influence of the divine Spirit, pronounced the bond of matrimony perpetual and indissoluble, when he said; This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh.'*

The first time I read it, I immediately saw that the reference to 'bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh', was because Adam had been given by God, to name all the animals, and he found himself looking for another one like himself - but found none. (We are all bone of Adam's bone, and flesh of Adam's flesh, in that sense.)

Genesis 2

18 **And the LORD God said, "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a helper comparable to him."**

19 Out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field and every bird of the air, and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them. And whatever Adam called each living creature, that was its name.

20 So Adam gave names to all cattle, to the birds of the air, and to every beast of the field. **But for Adam there was not found a helper comparable to him.**

So... please notice this is all the same event.

21 And the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall on Adam, and he slept; and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh in its place.

22 Then the rib which the LORD God had taken from man He made into a woman, and He brought her to the man.

23 And Adam said,

"This is now bone of my bones  
And flesh of my flesh;  
She shall be called Woman,  
Because she was taken out of Man."

The next verse begins and ends without any explanation as to who is speaking.

24 Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one flesh.

The Council of Trent attributed verse 24 to Adam, **but Jesus** had already made clear Who had made the statement about a man being joined to his wife, in Matthew 19:

4 And He answered and said to them,

"Have you not read that He who made them at the beginning 'made them male and female,'

5 "and said, 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh'?

So now, the Council of Trent's who said what, looks different.

*'The first parent of the human race, under the influence of the divine Spirit, pronounced the bond of matrimony perpetual and indissoluble, when he said..'*

Then, (Matt 19), it is Jesus who adds, after, "So then, they are no longer two but one flesh..... **Therefore what God has joined together, let not man separate.**"



Re:, on: 2006/6/16 23:14

It appears youve lost your intended audience, dorcas.  
Id keep checking back, tho ;-)

Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - toward a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/17 14:20

Here is the next sentence from the declaration by the Council of Trent:

*'But, that by this bond two only are united and joined together, our Lord taught more plainly, when rehearsing those last words as having been uttered by God, He said, therefore now they are not two, but one flesh; and straightway confirmed the firmness of that tie, proclaimed so long before by Adam, by these words; What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.'*

It is impossible to say this sentence makes sense, without being disingenuous.

Â'when rehearsing those last words **as** having been uttered by GodÂ',

This part seems to be saying the Council of Trent did recognise that God, *not Adam*, had said them, but, it is deliberately indistinct. I say Â'deliberatelyÂ', because the Council has already shown itself capable of using precise and distinct language in the first sentence of the first paragraph, and it does so again by choosing words which are indisputably clear, later in this sentence.

This makes it harder to believe they were not *fully conscious* of introducing poetic licence in this second sentence with their use of the word Â'asÂ'.

Thus, having **implied** that Jesus had **repeated** a word from God,

Â'therefore now they are not two, but one fleshÂ',

the Council returns to attributing those words to Adam, **stating** incorrectly, by use of the word Â'proclaimedÂ', that Adam had spoken them for sure. If this had been true, then, Jesus would be quoting Adam - *not the Godhead*, as He was. Thus, repeating at the end of the sentence, the main message one wishes the reader to take away, (having stated it clearly at the beginning), is a recognised style, which further shows the device was being used consciously.

Then, the emphasis given to the words attributed to Adam instead of the Lord, compounds their real dishonesty.

Â'and straightway confirmed the firmness of that tie, **proclaimed so long before by Adam**'

actually bears less relevance, than if they had acknowledged what Jesus had said, in a straightforward manner.... as Adam's word cannot be more important than the word of God Himself, (Jesus Christ).

The implication that age (Adam - 'long before'), or prior existence gives more weight to a word, also shows what the Council members really thought of Christ compared with Adam, in this matter. They give no acknowledgement of Jesus being the Word Incarnate - the very One who made Adam and spoke the words originally, and pass over His authority as if He is unimportant. EDIT end.

Remember, this document was written to and for church members who were not allowed to read the scripture after it was becoming available in English for the first time. People died for translating it into English, and many scholars were furious that the Latin Bible had been set aside as the text of choice, for the translations to be made from the original languages.

This helps us to understand why they were keen to cast doubt on the truths which were now apparent from the newer translations.

For a change, therefore, Iâ'm going to quote from Tyndale, on whose Greek-into-English the majority of the KJV is based. This, from his 1535 version, is a little different from what we are used to, and I'm glad to say, clearer, too.

Matthew 19:3 Â– 12

Then came unto him the Pharisees tempting him, and saying to him: Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for all manner of causes? He answered and said unto them: Have ye not read, how that he which made man at the beginning, made them man and woman and said: for this thing, shall a man leave father and mother and cleave unto his wife, and the y twain shall be one flesh. Wherefore now are they not twain, but one flesh. Let not man therefore put asunder, that which God hath coupled together.

Then they said to him: why did Moses command to give a testimonial of divorcement and to put her away? He said unto them: Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives: But from the beginning it was not so. I say therefore unto you, whosoever putteth away his wife (except it be for fornication) and marrieth another, breaketh wedlock. And whosoever marrieth her which is divorced, doth commit adultery.

Then said his disciples to him: if the matter be so between man and wife, then is it not good to marry? He said unto them: all men cannot away with that saying save they to whom it is given. There are chaste, which be were so born out of their mother's belly. And there are chaste, which be made of men. And there be chaste, which have made themselves chaste for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that can take it, let him take it.

The Council of Trent said: 'by these words; What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder'.

Jesus said: Let not man therefore put asunder, that which **God** hath coupled together.

The meaning being contrasted is that of the power of God to join a man to his wife, and the possible attempt by man to interfere with God's creation.

Is 'let not man' substantially different from 'let no man'?

I feel there is a difference in emphasis which I understand, and which I'm sure would have been clear to the Council too, from the Bibles available to them.

I believe the subtle change which the Council achieved by altering one very small word in the English, does not accord with the exact meaning of the original, and, having attributed this to Jesus, the Council is knowingly putting into the public domain, a *misquote*.

**Re:Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/6/18 14:22**

Two things struck me, from Tyndale's rendering of Matthew's words.

The first is that the use of the word 'wedlock', makes perfect sense as a way of stating that fidelity between two spouses continues.

It seems clear that the departure of either spouse to fornication, 'breaketh wedlock' (end of second paragraph), making the possible ending of the marriage formal by a 'testimonial of divorcement', and also setting the faithful spouse free to remarry without the accusation of adulterer/ess.

The second is that wonderful question mark in the third paragraph:

'Then said his disciples to him: if the matter be so between man and wife, then is it not good to marry?'

Perhaps someone who can dissect the original language is needed here, to confirm this inflexion. But, from my small knowledge of English and French, there is a clear difference in meaning between 'Is it?' and 'It is', and it's difficult to imagine

e that older languages did not have the ability to pose questions, just as neatly tied into their construction. However, perhaps, here again, we find Tyndale being more sensitive to the meaning of the dialogue than later translators dared to be.

Nevertheless, I can't help but feel that the sense of the disciples' comment is less easily used to support the case for celibacy, if they really did ask Jesus a question. And, there are many other instances of them asking Him questions. In fact, by the time He was leaving them, they had lost confidence in their ability to know anything about themselves (even though they did their best to sound hopeful about protecting Him from death), which makes me lean towards a question, here.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2006/6/19 11:17**

Below is Tyndale's rendering of Romans 7:1 - 6.

You will see that the last two words of the first sentence are different from any of your Bibles. Knowing that Tyndale was an honest scholar, I want to trust this difference, but, I don't know whether the Greek would have been different to produce this translation, from the Greek which has been used to translate more modern versions.

To those who value access to the older writings, perhaps this is useful.

Earlier I made a mistake with the date. This was published in 1534.

I may make some comments tomorrow. For now, I just want to put this here for readers to consider.

Remember ye not brethren (I speak to them that know the law) how that the law hath power over a man as long as it endureth? For the woman which is in subjection to a man, is bound by the law to the man, as long as he liveth. If the man be dead, she is loosed from the law of the man. So then, if while the man liveth she couple herself with another man, she shall be counted a wedlock-breaker. But if the man be dead, she is free from the law: so that she is no wedlock-breaker, though she couple herself with another man.

Even so ye, my brethren, are dead concerning the law by the body of Christ, that ye should be coupled to another (I mean to him that is risen again from death) that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the lusts of sin which were stirred up by the law, reigned in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now are we delivered from the law and dead from that whereunto we were in bondage, that we should serve in a new conversation of the spirit, and not in the old conversation of the letter.

**Re:, on: 2006/6/20 19:35**

Regarding whether Romans 7:1 - 6 supports a 'no divorce' thesis, this seems not to be the focus, when the verses touching marriage are taken in context of the preceding and following verses.

The teaching Paul is giving, is about the ending of the law and the liberty from bondage which enables us to 'serve in a new conversation of the spirit', rather than about whether a woman or man who commits adultery can be released from the marriage in the same way as described in Matthew 19:9. Under that law, the adulterer/ess was stoned to death (traditionally), to bring that form of wickedness in the community, to an end. The spouse is freed to marry again, thereby. There is an underlying assumption that a couple who stay together until death, do so because they want to - which is as it should be.

I like the phrase Tyndale uses to describe the unspoken consent of a wife to her husband, (as much as the power of the law to bind them together), in the introductory sentence about marriage... 'the woman which is in subjection to a man'. To me, this speaks of *willing* consent, much as in Ephesians 5 (NKJV)

21 submitting to one another in the fear of God.

22 Wives, submit to your own husbands, **as to the Lord**.

Here in Ephesians, the burden is well and truly on the husband to set the standard for subjection, by demonstrating that his will has been subjected to the Lord's.

That said, the man who is doing everything he should, cannot *control* his woman. This is the essence of consent – that two people *choose* to give the other power over their body and how they spend their time.

If a slave who ran away under the law, was not to be sent back to his master, (Deu 23:15), it is difficult to see why an arrangement which should be based on ***mutual*** consent, should not accommodate the possibility of one spouse leaving, especially if one is an unbeliever and the other not.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/20 23:57**

Adultery was not a problem in divorce for the Jews and the Law. The erring spouse was simply stoned to death and there was no question of remarriage, if a spouse dies you are free to remarry.

The bill of divorcement for burning the toast is what upset Jesus when He said, "from the beginning it is not so".

God will give us revelation when we ask for it. Great asking Linn.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/21 16:50**

Returning to my thesis that we all start off in idolatry (see the results in Lev 18 as a start), this is in keeping with what Jesus said here:

(NKJV) Matthew 15:19

"For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies.

Mark 7:21

"For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders,

and Paul's thesis in Romans 3.

(He quotes Psalms 5, 10, 14, 36 and Isaiah 59.)

9 What then? Are we better Not at all. For we have previously charged both Jews and Greeks that they are all under sin .

10 As it is written:

"There is none righteous, no, not one;

11 There is none who understands;

There is none who seeks after God.

12 They have all turned aside;

They have together become unprofitable;

There is none who does good, no, not one."

13 "Their throat an open tomb;

With their tongues they have practiced deceit";

"The poison of asps under their lips";

14 "Whose mouth full of cursing and bitterness."

15 "Their feet swift to shed blood;

16 Destruction and misery in their ways;

17 And the way of peace they have not known."

18 "There is no fear of God before their eyes."

19 Now we know that whatever the law says, it says to those who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.

20 Therefore by the deeds of the law no flesh will be justified in His sight, for by the law the knowledge of sin.

21 But now the righteousness of God apart from the law is revealed, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets,

22 even the righteousness of God, through faith in Jesus Christ, to all and on all who believe. For there is no difference;

23 for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God,

**Re:, on: 2006/6/24 18:08**

bump.

still awaiting lastblasts responses to dorcas' well thought out posts...

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/24 19:07**

With an eye on the title of this thread - a 'biblical perspective', let's look at the next little bit of the Council of Trent's well-thought out misrepresentation of scripture. They said (next):

*'But, the grace which might perfect that natural love, and confirm that indissoluble union, and sanctify the married, Christ Himself, the institutor and perfecter of the venerable sacraments, merited for us by His passion;'*

First, the Council seems to be saying that Christ instituted and perfected the all the sacraments, of which they hereby claim marriage is one. They make clear elsewhere that this is a new sacrament, nevertheless, they also claim here that Christ had already ordained all the sacraments.

Also they say, that by His passion He brought sanctification to marriage, grace which is necessary to perfect the natural love (of the couple) and (most importantly they embed this next in the centre of their complicated sentence) that He confirmed the indissolubility of the marriage union.

I know this may seem a mean point to spell out here, but I feel it is a relevant one: we have to agree, I think, that it is God who dissolves a marriage when one spouse dies.

This has nothing to do with whether the spouse is a believer or not. My point is, that **God dissolves the union**.

This is in keeping with what Jesus said about the woman who had been married seven times, *not* being given in marriage in heaven, because we become like the angels in this respect.

(NKJV) Mark 12

18 Then some Sadducees, who say there is no resurrection, came to Him; and they asked Him, saying:

19 "Teacher, Moses wrote to us that if a man's brother dies, and leaves his wife behind, and leaves no children, his brother should take his wife and raise up offspring for his brother.

20 "Now there were seven brothers. The first took a wife; and dying, he left no offspring.

21 "And the second took her, and he died; nor did he leave any offspring. And the third likewise.

22 "So the seven had her and left no offspring. Last of all the woman died also.

23 "Therefore, in the resurrection, when they rise, whose wife will she be? For all seven had her as wife."

24 Jesus answered and said to them, "Are you not therefore mistaken, because you do not know the Scriptures nor the power of God?"

25 "For when they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven."

26 "But concerning the dead, that they rise, have you not read in the book of Moses, in the burning bush passage, how God spoke to him, saying, 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'?"

27 "He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living. You are therefore greatly mistaken."

In this account, we see how erroneous are those doctrines which suggest a couple should commit themselves to each other for eternity. This was never God's intention. He plans for His Son to take a Bride (the Church) for eternity.

#### Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/24 19:54

Returning to the text discussed in the last post:

*'But, the grace which might perfect that natural love, and confirm that indissoluble union, and sanctify the married, Christ Himself, the institutor and perfecter of the venerable sacraments, merited for us by His passion;'*

Part of the Council's intention was to make the modern marriage of their day *more 'perfect'* than the marriage of Adam and the early fathers of the human race. They end with this point. We will reach it eventually.

Right now, it's hard to see where they are going, apart from to hedge their 'no divorce' rule around with spurious claims of Christ's involvement in making marriage indissoluble, and bricking it up with a religious ceremony also burdened with unscriptural claims.

Here there are three more.... When one looks at scripture, it is clear that someone knew scripture, and knew how ideas were linked. For instance, the reference to *'institutor and perfecter'* is straight out of Hebrews 12:

1 Therefore we also, since we are surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which so easily ensnares us, and let us run with endurance the race that is set before us,

2 looking unto Jesus, **the author and finisher of our faith**, who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross... (NKJV)

Where in the two verse above, is there any basis for this claim, that *'Christ Himself, is 'the institutor and perfecter of the venerable sacraments'?*

I understand that the ordinary church-attender would not have access to the scriptures. They would not know that the word 'sacrament' doesn't appear anywhere. It is a theological term.

But there would be room for plenty of guilt-tripping by the clergy, as they emphasized the suggestion that Christ died to make marriage 'holy' through His passion, thus instituting a sacrament which had not been part of the *'ancient marriages'* blessing.

(Those reading this thread know that I don't believe marriage is 'holy'. *Pure, undefiled*, but not holy - even though the participants are to be holy. Now there's a paradox, but I prefer it, as I have no scriptural grounds to think of natural marriage as 'holy'.

Hebrews 13:4

Marriage is honorable among all, and the bed undefiled; but fornicators and adulterers God will judge.)

The Council's phrase '*sanctify the married*', also has no basis in scripture. Individuals may be sanctified - that is, set apart to God - and continue in keeping themselves set apart to God - **from the life of sin** - but, there is nowhere the suggestion that married people are *more* sanctified than unmarried people.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/24 20:01**

There is also a link between grace and faith, in Ephesians 2

8 For **by grace you have been saved through faith**, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God,

9 not of works, lest anyone should boast.

10 For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand that we should walk in them.

11 Therefore remember that you, once Gentiles in the flesh -- who are called Uncircumcision by what is called the Circumcision made in the flesh by hands

12 that at that time you were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world.

13 But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ.

I have included all those verses, to show something of the picture language which Paul moves towards in chapter 5, regarding Christ and the Church, which he uses as a foundation to discuss marriage. This same point is addressed by the Council of Trent in the next section.

Here, we have an important words 'gift'. Then an important phrase 'not of works'.

Then he introduces the comparason between flesh and circumcision Jew, and Gentile and uncircumcision, and states that the Gentiles were 'without God'. From this extremity, they were brought into the commonwealth of Israel, through the death of Jesus Christ, who (Paul later says) made of the two, one new man (vv 15, 16).

These are important to keep in mind, as we look at what Paul *did* say about marriage.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/25 6:21**

Dorcas wrote:

"Then he introduces the comparason between flesh and circumcision Jew, and Gentile and uncircumcision, and states that the Gentiles were 'without God'. From this extremity, they were brought into the commonwealth of Israel, through the death of Jesus Christ, who (Paul later says) made of the two, one new man (vv 15, 16).

Ephesians 2:12 That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world:

12 says we were without Christ, so were they. We were aliens from the common wealth of Israel, and We are still aliens of the common wealth of Israel, Praise the Lord. We are still strangers from the covenants and promises give to Israel. We were without God in this world, but now we are brought to the Father by The Cross of Christ.

Ephesians 2:13 But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.

Notice the in Christ statement. Israel was never in Christ is still not. We were far off because Israel was supposed to bring the good news of a Savior that would come for the whole world, but they did not, and then when He did come they did not believe Him and crucified Him.

Israel was offered the same salvation we have after the cross and approx 15 years after the Cross Paul told them they h



ad fulfilled what Esaias the prophet said unto our fathers, Acts 28:26-27 Saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive: For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.

Now Paul for the Last Time says to the People of Israel: Acts 28:28 Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and that they will hear it.

By hearing we by Him are at peace with God, not Israel. Ephesians 2:14-15 For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace;

Making us one is not Israel and Gentiles, It is Christ and us made one in Him, this is how we are made nigh. The wall of partition is not between us and Israel but between Gentiles and God and also Israel, they are saved the same way we are. Ephesians 2:15-16 Having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace; And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby:

"for to make in Himself of twain (two) one new man, so making peace" with God. Of two is not Israel and Gentile, it of Himself and the believer by Christ being born again in us who believe, one new man. Gal 6:15 For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. ("One New Man")

Then finally in :16 Ephesians 2:16 And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby:

Reconcile both unto God. To the end is to make peace between God and man, that He might reconcile both Jew and Gentile, which means nothing in Christ, to reconcile us to Him, Jesus Christ and His Body the Church to the Father.

What was the enmity slain? The middle wall of partition between us and God the Father and Having abolished in His flesh that enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; Christ took away the wall of Partition and the enmity that kept us from God, bringing us to Himself by birthing of "Our Father" His Son in us.

This make marriage even more by showing by Paul the mystery of Christ and the Church. What is the Mystery? Christ in you the Hope of Glory.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/25 7:20**

EDIT: Phillip, you posted while I was preparing my next. I'll return to the above when I've laid the next few out. :-)

The Council of Trent went on to say:

*'as the Apostle Paul intimates, saying: Husbands love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered himself up for it; adding shortly after, This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church.'*

Here is what Paul said in Ephesians 5

22 Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord.

23 For the husband is head of the wife, as also Christ is head of the church; and He is the Savior of the body.

24 Therefore, just as the church is subject to Christ, so the wives to their own husbands in everything.



25 Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself for her,  
26 that He might sanctify and cleanse her with the washing of water by the word,  
27 that He might present her to Himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that she should be holy and without blemish.  
28 So husbands ought to love their own wives as their own bodies; he who loves his wife loves himself.  
29 For no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, just as the Lord the church.  
30 For we are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones.  
31 "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh."  
32 This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the church.  
33 Nevertheless let each one of you in particular so love his own wife as himself, and let the wife that she respects husband.

It takes faith for a man to lay down his life for his wife, just as it takes faith for a woman to submit to her husband. The order is clearly for the man to lead in this, by laying down his life first, because he loves his wife so much.

As Phillip said earlier, human marriage is the shadow of the real tree. As Eve was taken from Adam's side, becoming flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone, so the church is born out of Christ's death (the blood and water from His pierced side), that v 30 above may apply. By faith, He presents (gifts) Himself with a (v 27) 'a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that she should be holy and without blemish.'

The Council's '*adding shortly after, This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church.*' is typically inaccurate.

contd.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/25 7:30**

contd.

Paul was clear of the differences between when he spoke from his own understanding and when he shared what the Lord had revealed to him. In Ephesians he makes no claim to be speaking for the Lord, whereas in 1 Corinthians 7, he says

10 And unto the married I command, **not I, but the Lord**, Let not the wife depart from husband:  
11 But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to husband: and let not the husband put away wife.  
12 But **to the rest speak I, not the Lord**: If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away.  
13 And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him.  
14 For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.

15 But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such : but God hath called u s to peace.

16 For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save husband? or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save wife?

17 But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all ch urches.

In this extract of the chapter, there is a recognition of the deep connection between a husband and a wife, which is hono ured by God, when they are in emotional and spiritual harmony with each other.

There is also a recognition of the bondage which is represented by a marriage where this emotional and spiritual sympat hy (sympathy = feeling the same way) is consistently missing. This is backed up by Paul's other exhortations for believe rs to have no spiritual fellowship with unbelievers.

2 Corinthians 6:14

Do not be unequally yoked together with unbelievers. For what fellowship has righteousness with lawlessness? And wha t communion has light with darkness?

1 Corinthians 10:20

Rather, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to demons and not to God, and I do not want you to ha ve fellowship with demons.

Ephesians 5:11 And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather expose

Here is the context for v 11

6 Let no one deceive you with empty words, for because of these things the wrath of God comes upon the sons of disob edience.

7 Therefore do not be partakers with them.

8 For you were once darkness, but now light in the Lord. Walk as children of light

9 (for the fruit of the Spirit in all goodness, righteousness, and truth),

10 finding out what is acceptable to the Lord. 11 And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rathe r expose

12 For it is shameful even to speak of those things which are done by them in secret.

**13 But all things that are exposed are made manifest by the light, for whatever makes manifest is light.**

**14 Therefore He says: "Awake, you who sleep, Arise from the dead, And Christ will give you light."**

15 See then that you walk circumspectly, not as fools but as wise,

16 redeeming the time, because the days are evil.

17 Therefore do not be unwise, but understand what the will of the Lord

18 And do not be drunk with wine, in which is dissipation; but be filled with the Spirit,

19 speaking to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lo rd,

20 giving thanks always for all things to God the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,

21 submitting to one another in the fear of God.

22 Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord.

There is an assumption in both Eph 5 and 1 Cor 7, that the unbelieving spouse who stays with the believer, accepts the principle that the believer's spiritual status with God, over-rules the spiritual status of the idolater. This is the only way to make sense of the equality which appears between men and women who are in Christ, when their marital status is not taken into account.

contd.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/25 7:35**

contd.

Galatians 3

26 For you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus.

27 For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, **there is neither male nor female**; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

Therefore, I am stating the obvious when I point out that while the male has leadership qualities and responsibilities within the 'one flesh' status of a marriage, this does not extend to the spiritual leadership, until he also has Christ as his Head. While the wife is the only spouse who has Christ as her Head, there is an uneasy re-assessing and re-distributing of certain aspects of spiritual leadership *to her*, which is God-given, and which by remaining with her after her conversion, a husband acknowledges - or must come to acknowledge.

This tension leads to a huge question for the wife, about how far she needs to lay down her life for her husband, bearing in mind she *is* called to lay it down for **the Lord**.

One thing is for sure... she does not need to lay it down physically, nor be destroyed by her mate. Paul is not saying she should; neither need a man be destroyed by his wife's idolatry, nor beaten to death by her.

In fact, it is clear from Eph 5:29, that Paul is specifically speaking **against** physical violence by a man towards a woman, within marriage. He is almost incredulous that a man would ever think he is *loving* his wife - his own body - by hurting or harming her. Unusually, Paul goes as far as saying '**no one ever**' and uses the word 'hate' of the behaviour wherein a man would hurt his own body.

This is interesting, when placed beside John's statement about the effect of hating:

1 John 2

9 He who says he is in the light, and hates his brother, is in darkness until now.

10 He who loves his brother abides in the light, and there is no cause for stumbling in him.

11 But he who hates his brother is in darkness and **walks in darkness, and does not know where he is going, because the darkness has blinded his eyes.**

Here, we are back to the link between blindness, darkness, sin and idolatry. It has to be taken seriously, when placed beside Paul's comments about children of light in Eph 5. It is **this choice** which faces the unbelieving spouse, when they try to decide whether to stay with a believing spouse. If the believing spouse is truly full of light, then the darkness in the unbeliever is going to come under severe pressure. By staying, they are intimating a willingness to come to the light and to dwell in the light, are they not?

contd.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - toward a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/25 8:36**

contd.

I would like to return to 1 Corinthians 7:17

But as God hath distributed to every man, **as the Lord hath called every one**, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all churches.

as Tyndale's rendering is divided differently between the sentences, making 'as the Lord hath called everyone', the beginning of a new paragraph. As the phrase I emboldened is often used to chide the partners of a broken or struggling marriage to continue persevering with marital disharmony or undivorced estrangement or divorced-but-not-remarried status, it deserves its own examination.

First though, to Phillip's response.

Phillip, I do see how you make this interpretation of Ephesians 2, but, there are several other scriptures which cannot be fitted into your thesis, which are relevant, including one from Ephesians 2 itself.

14 For He Himself is our peace, who has made both one, and has broken down the middle wall of separation,

15 having abolished in His flesh the enmity, **the law of commandments** in ordinances, so as to create in Himself one new man the two, making peace,

16 and that He might reconcile **them both to God** in one body through the cross, thereby putting to death the enmity.

17 And He came and preached peace to you who were afar off that is, and to those who were near .

18 **For through Him we both have access by one Spirit to the Father.**

Quote:

-----Israel was never in Christ is still not.

Matthew 15:24

But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

John 10:16

"And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they will hear My voice; and there will be one flock one shepherd.

Quote:

-----Israel was offered the same salvation we have after the cross and approx 15 years after the Cross Paul told them they had fulfilled what Esaias the prophet said unto our fathers,

-----  
So how do you account for the conversions between the Day of Pentecost and Paul's agreement with the other apostles for him to preach specifically to the Gentiles?

Acts 2

5 And there were dwelling in Jerusalem **Jews**, devout men, from every nation under heaven.

6 And when this sound occurred, the multitude came together, and were confused, because everyone heard them speak in his own language.

7 Then they were all amazed and marveled, saying to one another, "Look, are not all these who speak Galileans?

8 "And how we hear, each in our own language in which we were born?

9 "Parthians and Medes and Elamites, those dwelling in Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia,

10 "Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya adjoining Cyrene, visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes,

11 "Cretans and Arabs -- we hear them speaking in our own tongues the wonderful works of God."

12 So they were all amazed and perplexed, saying to one another, "Whatever could this mean?"

13 Others mocking said, "They are full of new wine."

14 But Peter, standing up with the eleven, raised his voice and said to them, "Men of Judea and all who dwell in Jerusalem, let this be known to you, and heed my words.

15 "For .....

42 And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in prayers.

47 ... And the Lord added to the church daily those who were being saved.

**These were Jews - Israelites.**

Romans 9

1 I tell the truth in Christ, I am not lying, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit,

2 that I have great sorrow and continual grief in my heart.

3 For I could wish that I myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my countrymen according to the flesh,

4 who are Israelites, to whom **the adoption**,

the *adoption* comes FIRST... *then*

the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the service and the promises;

5 of whom the fathers and from whom, according to the flesh, Christ who is over all, eternally blessed God. Amen.

6 But it is not that the word of God has taken no effect. For they not all Israel who of Israel,

7 nor all children because they are the seed of Abraham; but, "In Isaac your seed shall be called."

8 That is, those who the children of the flesh, these not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted as the seed.

Galatians 6

14 But God forbid that I should boast except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world.

15 For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision avails anything, but a new creation.

16 And **as many as walk according to this rule, peace and mercy upon them, and upon the Israel of God.**

Galatians 4

22 For it is written that Abraham had two sons: the one by a bondwoman, the other by a freewoman.

23 But he of the bondwoman was born according to the flesh, and he of the freewoman through promise,

24 which things are symbolic. For these are the two covenants: the one from Mount Sinai which gives birth to bondage, which is Hagar --

25 for this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and corresponds to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children --

26 but the Jerusalem **above** is free, which is the mother of us all.

Hebrews 12 (see also Exodus 19 and 20)

21 And so terrifying was the sight Moses said, "I am exceedingly afraid and trembling.")

22 But you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, to an innumerable company of angels,

23 to the general assembly and church of the firstborn registered in heaven, to God the Judge of all, to the spirits of just men made perfect,

24 to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaks better things than Abel.

Hebrews 11:39

And all these, having obtained a good testimony through faith, did not receive the promise,

40 God having provided something better for us, that they should not be made perfect apart from us.

Remember to whom Hebrews was written...? ;-) In other words 'us' in v 40 is not the Gentiles, except as we are included in the church which was originally full of solely Jewish converts. (Look at Heb 13:12, 13 with Exodus 33:7)

Quote:

-----What was the enmity slain? The middle wall of partition between us and God the Father and Having abolished in His flesh that enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances;

-----  
Did the law of commandments apply to the Gentiles? I don't think so....

This is not to say that Israel as a **political entity** received the Messiah. It was as with the seven thousand non-Baal worshippers in Elijah's day, and in Jeremiah's day; - 'the people' - the flock - recognised God's Son and the voice of their true Shepherd, and were responsive to following Him.

I'm sorry that was so long, and I know you are well-versed in scripture, but I thought it was worth bringing together all these leads in one place.

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - toward a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/25 12:07**

Hi Cindy,

I hope you've been keeping up with the thread here... I am slowly moving towards all the other answers I've promised you.

In the meanwhile, I have a rather long preamble to a question I'd like you to think about. I really don't want you to rush an answer down without giving the question deep consideration.

Suppose you were a Jewish man in your twenties when Jesus was born, but, you'd never heard of him until He came to your town preaching, followed by an entourage of supporters and enormous crowds. By now, you're in your fifties. You've been married and divorced three times, the children of your first marriage are themselves married and you have grandchildren. You did eventually find a woman you could live with comfortably, and you have been married to her for several years. Whatever the priests and Pharisees have required of you, you have, however reluctantly at times, complied with, and without question. But suddenly, your life of religious complacency is challenged by the young preacher who is claiming to be the Messiah, who has healed one of your neighbours' children, and who is speaking candidly to the leaders of your local synagogue, with more word-for-word truth than you've ever heard about in your life. You hear more and more about the claims He makes for himself from the lodgers you take in while He's passing through, and you decide to join them to hear Him the next day. Completely unexpectedly to your personal culture of not rocking the boat, you are convinced He is who He says, and you quickly realise what this means for your normal religious practices... BIG CHANGES. You go all out for the baptism of repentance, and give yourself to keeping your word to God, and your new zeal for His ways.

Months later, news of Pentecost arrives in your village, and you receive it with joy, are born again - and so is your wife.

**How has God dealt with you over the broken hearts and marriages in your past, including your own?**

Cindy, I have put the question this way, because this must have been a common situation in the days of the apostles.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/25 17:24**

Hi Linn, You wrote:

Here is what Paul said in Ephesians 5

22 Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord.

In reference to Christ and the Church, :22 would be rendered: The bride of Christ submit yourself to your husband, for He is the Bridegroom. Submitting to Christ in the same way brides submit to their own husbands. Husbands are the Bride of Christ also

23 For the husband is head of the wife, as also Christ is head of the church; and He is the Savior of the body.

The Bridegroom is the Head of the Bride His Body The Church.

24 Therefore, just as the church is subject to Christ, so the wives to their own husbands in everything.

Therefore just as the Bride is subject to Her Bridegroom, (Christ) so let individual brides be subject to Christ in every way and everything.

25 Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself for her,

Christ loves His Bride and gave Himself for her.

26 that He might sanctify and cleanse her with the washing of water by the word,

That Christ might put His Bride The Church to the use of what she was intended for from before the foundation of the World. "Ye must be born again of water and the Spirit" "Out of Her belly shall flow rivers of Living Water, Christ, and the Word most certainly is Christ in us. That is our cleansing.

27 that He might present her to Himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that she should be holy and without blemish.

That He might present His Bride to Himself a glorious church, GLORIOUS CHURCH. A perfect bride.

28 So husbands ought to love their own wives as their own bodies; he who loves his wife loves himself.

No interpretation needed.

29 For no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, just as the Lord the church.

Christ does not and never will hate His own Flesh, which we are His Body.

30 For we are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones.

For of His Flesh of His bones, we are. Husband and Wife the same, one flesh.

31 "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh."

We are to leave our old family and our old husband Satan and be joined to our New Husband Jesus Christ. Rom 6:2 God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?

Rom 6:11 Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

32 This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the church.

The old husband is the author of sin our old husband Satan, in other words we are dead from him, or he is dead to us.

33 Nevertheless let each one of you in particular so love his own wife as himself, and let the wife that she respects husband.

Now to us with respect to how Christ loves His Bride let each one of us so love our own wife as himself. Christ must love Himself or He could not love His Bride, Why does Christ love Himself? Because His Father's Love lives and moves and has its being In The Son. So also us, for He is our love and life in whom we live and move and have our being. This is how we are to treat each other in Christ, and even more of Husband and Wife.

That is how Eph 2: is connected to marriage. Taking away the enmity between God and His children in Christ. Making the two One, By slaying the enmity between God and man and between husband and wife.

In Christ: Phillip



Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - toward a biblical perspective, on: 2006/6/25 18:47

Dear Phillip,

Quote:

-----Husbands are the Bride of Christ also

Yes. In the same way, sisters in Christ are 'sons of God' ;-).

Quote:

-----The bride of Christ submit yourself to your husband, for He is the Bridegroom. **Submitting to Christ in the same way brides submit to their own husbands.**

I don't see this (in bold) as the example for Christ and the Church. I believe Paul is saying Christ and the Church is the example to the husband and wife.

I don't know if you were unconsciously saying the opposite of what Paul is, or, you do actually disagree with him?

Quote:

-----Therefore just as the Bride is subject to Her Bridegroom, (Christ) so let individual brides be subject to Christ in every way and everything.

Do you mean here, that individual 'brides' are both the men and the women who hold Christ as their Head?

Quote:

-----Christ does not and never will hate His own Flesh, which we are His Body.

Yes, but, isn't it a fact that Paul is saying no *ordinary man* ever hated his own body, implying strongly that if he hurts his wife, he is hurting his own body.

I believe this speaks volumes about what a man who hurts his wife regularly, really thinks of her (and by implication, of himself). Some men who *do* love and cherish their wives as their own body, could never honestly lay claim to *love* (the way they do actually love), if they were also hurting their spouse. To these *lovers* hurting a spouse and love are mutually exclusive.

Quote:

-----32 This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the church.

Somehow, the Council of Trent managed to turn this into '*This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church.*'

Quote:

-----That is how Eph 2: is connected to marriage. Taking away the enmity between God and His children in Christ. Making the two One, By slaying the enmity between God and man and between husband and wife.

This is an interesting way to put it. Another picture is of Christ making one new man of Jew and Gentile - reconciling two parts of the human race to Himself, in one Body - the Church - the Bride of Christ, to whom He can (now) be joined in peace. I think we are saying the same thing. 8-)

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/25 20:54**

I am not using man and woman in these analogies but the bride is both man and woman and as you say, son's are both man and woman.

You wrote: "Do you mean here, that individual 'brides' are both the men and the women who hold Christ as their Head?"

"We" are the bride of Christ. In our oneness with Christ is where The Marriage between Christ and His Body the Church is the picture of what an earthly marriage between a man and woman should be and that it should image the truth of Christ in you the Hope of Glory. Especially when it says we are part of His Body and Part of His Bones. Ephesians 5:30 For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.

This goes so much deeper than we have ever thought possible. The same as marriage between a man and a woman. Proverbs 30:19 The way of an eagle in the air; the way of a serpent upon a rock; the way of a ship in the midst of the sea; and the way of a man with a maid.

We as born again believers are in Christ which Paul calls the mystery. Then He uses the mystery of a man and a woman for his analogy of our Oneness in Christ. It would work just the same as using our oneness in Christ as the oneness a man and woman have in marriage to each other especially if both are in Christ. Do you see what I am trying to say. The words of this wonderful mystery are not able to be conveyed by my limited knowledge of English. There is something so much deeper than we see on the surface, but it is there. Some day the Holy Spirit will give the words to bring the knowledge to our mind that we might convey it to other. But for now the oneness we have in Christ we also have with each other and because of the one flesh of husband and wife it is most shown by their union in marriage.

Ephesians 5:29-30 For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church: For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.

I think this goes deeper than just a man taking care of his own flesh, I think if man and woman are one flesh in marriage, this is the flesh being spoken of and the word "It" is the same word when Jesus is describing the Spirit as blowing from the sound thereof where we don't see, but "thereof" is the sound and the same word as "it". Which is a baffling wind, strange.

This man is not just a man but is a "man, woman or thing" in Strong's. It goes deeper than just a man hurting his wife. It includes woman hurting her husband. Then it says "we" are members of His Body, of His Flesh and of His Bones. If we hurt each other we are hurting ourselves even more. Christ went to the depth of Love and did not hurt himself but let mankind Hurt Him for our sakes. The Husband and Wife should see the same thing in each other. Giving self for each other is the same as Christ giving Himself for us. This is the Love and mystery Paul is speaking of. Still mysterious and still much more to be revealed.

In the Mystery of Christ in us and each other: Phillip

**Re:, on: 2006/7/2 16:29**

Phillip said:

Quote:

-----Giving self for each other is the same as Christ giving Himself for us. This is the Love and mystery Paul is speaking of.

I agree. This ties in with the command from the Lord, to 'Love one another', and perhaps the equality you express above, is outworked in the man laying down his life for his wife - perhaps that's what it feels like to him - and the wife showing due reverence to her husband - perhaps that feels like a death to the woman. Perhaps these are a way of saying that mutual respect is in order. :-D

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/14 1:43**

Ephesians 5:19-21 Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord; Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God.

Mutual submission, mutual respect, Love, all as man and woman is submitting ourselves to one another: 5293. hupotas so

Search for G5293 in KJVSL

upotassw hupotasso hoop-ot-as'-so

from 5259 and 5021; to subordinate; reflexively, to obey:--be under obedience (obedient), put under, subdue unto, (be, make) subject (to, unto), be (put) in subjection (to, under), submit self unto.

To one another: 240. allelon

Search for G240 in KJVSL

allhlwn allelon al-lay'-lone

Genitive plural from 243 reduplicated; one another:--each other, mutual, one another, (the other), (them-, your-)selves, (selves) together (sometimes with 3326 or 4314).

Free in Christ and Free in each other in Christ.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re:, on: 2006/7/20 11:36**

Dorcas, I didnt check too many pages back, but I dont see that lastblast has ever given any response to all that work you presented.

[http://forums.crosswalk.com/m\\_690665/mpage\\_67/tm.htm](http://forums.crosswalk.com/m_690665/mpage_67/tm.htm)

Shes been about at other forums, so I dont understand why she wouldnt take some time to get back with you.

You did a fine job in your presentation, laying out a wonderful foundation some pages back.

I thought it laid things out very well and set the stage to show just how Jesus exception means just what it says.

If I were you, Id save all that you wrote for future reference and discussion....I may go back thru this thread and save what you wrote as well, if thats ok with you :)

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/7/21 9:37**

Hi FOC,

Interesting discussion in that link you've posted. Thanks. I noticed I'm not the only person alive who believes the marriage covenant is made between the two people marrying each other, and not between the individuals and God. That's reassuring.

I've been without internet access at home for a few weeks, or probably I'd have come back here to continue my comment on the decree by the Council of Trent. I do intend to complete it, when I'm back online with more leisure.

Quote:

-----I may go back thru this thread and save what you wrote as well, if thats ok with you :)

-----

Please take whatever you find useful. :-)

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, ReMarriage - towards a biblical perspective, on: 2006/7/21 9:55**

Hi Cindy,

After reading the discussion on the other forum, it occurs to me to make a comment which has been circling the back of my mind for a long time...

So far, this thread has majored on whether a man can divorce his wife if she has committed adultery (fornication, as Jesus decrees), and you have resisted strongly the right of a man to take this option, insisting that to show he's a real Christian (I assume) he MUST forgive the wayward spouse. You completely reject the notion that he may feel so betrayed, that he follows the example of God with Israel, and chooses to divorce her. You reject the word that Jesus gave, which contains no qualification such as, for example, the number of adulterous events... that is, you seem to feel that even if adultery was the estranged wife's lifestyle, he should continue offering to share his bed with her. With this in mind, you also assume that even if he is nauseous at this prospect and has found out about the woman's adultery after the first occasion, **he** is the unreasonable one, for finding within his own heart, a finality of ending to the love within which he first held his now ex-spouse - that is, 'ex' by her prior choice.

OK, so here's my thought to the Christian woman who has fallen into the sin of adultery and who genuinely wants to be someone else's wife.... Why not let her husband divorce her?

And rather than pressing him to accept her word for her repentance towards God - as if that somehow heals his broken faculty of trust (of her) and laying guilt on him for his knowing his own heart sufficiently to desire to carry through a legitimate divorce - **allow** her to be set free from that marriage, to begin to rebuild her life as a single woman?

And yes :-o if she has made her peace with God, and she feels freed by His forgiveness to remarry :-o let her show her changed heart and mind in a new, faithful marriage relationship (if anyone *will* have her)?

Isn't this option as much included in the 'exception' verses of Matthew 5:32 and 19:9, as the option of the faithful husband to divorce her?

**Re: - posted by Sealed, on: 2007/6/15 23:59**

To understand the "divorce" provision offered by Jesus, you must look at the context:

Matthew 19:7-9 They \*said to Him, "Why then did Moses command to GIVE HER A CERTIFICATE OF DIVORCE AND SEND her AWAY?" He \*said to them, "Because of your hardness of heart Moses permitted you to divorce your wives; but from the beginning it has not been this way. "And I say to you, whoever divorces his wife, except for immorality (porneia), and marries another woman commits adultery."

They are clearly discussing the Law of Moses by the context of saying "why then did Moses command" and "Moses permitted", and by the fact that the Pharisees speak of the "CERTIFICATE OF DIVORCE" which only appears in Deuteronomy 24:1. Therefore the allowance must be for porneia which means fornication, and must be found when the man married her. The man couldn't find fornication in his wife at a later date, because by then she would be expected to not be a virgin since presumably he would have consummated the marriage. The passage makes perfect sense once you understand what the Hebrew term "ervah" means "fornication":

Deuteronomy 24:1 "When a man takes a wife and marries her, and it happens that she finds no favor in his eyes because he has found some indecency (ervah or fornication) in her, and he writes her a certificate of divorce and puts it in her hand and sends her out from his house"

He finds fornication in his wife when he marries her. This is what Jesus said the Law of Moses allowed for. We have a scriptural example of this law in effect pertaining to Mary and Joseph:

Matthew 1:18-19, "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was as follows: when His mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found to be with child by the Holy Spirit. And Joseph her husband, being a righteous man and not wanting to disgrace her, planned to send her away secretly.

Joseph mistakenly thinking that Mary had committed fornication while they were betrothed to one another, planned to send her away. It says that he was a righteous man, so he must have been following what the Law permitted.

Also, If you want proof that "porneia" was the proper term for betrothal fornication, we also have a scriptural reference for that:

John 8:41 "You are doing the deeds of your father." They said to Him, "We were not born of "porneia"; we have one Father: God."

In this text, the Pharisees give a bit of a back handed sneer at Jesus, claiming that he was born of "porneia." This claim could be made by anyone since it is obvious that Mary was pregnant before her and Joseph were married. Therefore they are accusing Jesus of being born by sexual promiscuity before his parents were married (in the betrothal period). This is what Jesus said was the one allowance in the Law of Moses, and therefore must be what Deuteronomy 24 was speaking about.

Therefore, the "porneia" that Jesus said was an allowance for "divorce", was only to those under the Law of Moses, and only for the cause of fornication prior to marriage. Once the two were joined by God, there was no provision for divorce to the Jews, and especially to the Gentiles.

SealedEternal

**Re: Marriage, Divorce, and ReMarriage.. Toward a Biblical Perspective, on: 2007/6/16 15:51**

Hello SealedEternal

For new readers to this thread, there are many refutations of the stance in the previous post.

These mainly comprise of Jesus' choice of the word 'porneia', which includes breaking out of wedlock after marriage, as well as homosexual or other sexually perverted behaviour.

Our Lord did not make a mistake in the word He chose to allow for divorce in certain situations.

He was completely against divorce for any other reason, than the outworked betrayal of the marriage union.

Even then, we all know that forgiveness can be possible in certain circumstances, but, He Himself doesn't mention it at all, here.