

The Lydic - Barnett Debate

Discussing The Question:
Are All Marriages Acceptable To God?

Affirmative: Philip F. Lydic

Negative: Maurice Barnett

1962

INTRODUCTION TO THE AFFIRMATIVE

I recommend this study to you as worthy of your close consideration. It contains a number of fresh ideas on the subject of marriage that I have never before seen in print. Some of these ideas may seem a good deal out of line with your own, but on the other hand, some arguments may seem to bolster convictions that you already hold. It is generally admitted that most people go into a study of this nature with a purpose. They hope to find more new material to strengthen the position that they have already taken. Friends, if you approach this discussion with a network of premises already fixed in your mind, you will be depriving yourself of much possible benefit. It is said that the gold miners of the early west unknowingly discarded millions of dollars in silver and other precious metals simply because they were looking for gold. The potential profit of literally millions and millions was in their hands, but they threw it aside as utterly worthless; they saw the matter, but they did not see its value. They were looking for gold.

Why not say to yourself, "I am going to have a very enjoyable argument with myself over the pros and cons of this question. When I read the affirmative I am going to objectively examine everything from that viewpoint, and when I read the Negative, I am going to study objectively from the other viewpoint. I am going to be analytical in my approach; there will be no favoritism."

If you will adopt this attitude, and consider what has been presented only as additional information, we will both be glad for what you find. Although I have argued a position, I can sincerely say that I have no desire to persuade anyone to accept my convictions; my only desire is that the Bible student have at his disposal every available piece of information, and every worthwhile idea that has ever been presented, in order that he might study for himself and react prudently to every situation relating to this subject. This is why I wanted a discussion rather than a one-sided affirmation of my own convictions. Brother Barnett and I have profited from this exchange, and we have enjoyed it; I hope that it will be equally profitable and enjoyable for you.

-Philip Lydic

INTRODUCTION FOR THE NEGATIVE

by Gene Frost

The forces of evil are never content. Issues resolved in one age do not promise peace for other ages; the forces of evil retreat from one battle to launch another. The devices of Satan are many and his search for souls to devour is relentless. (2. Cor. 2:11, I Pet. 5:8) Children of God are committed to the fight as the soldiers of Jesus Christ. (2 Tim 2:3) And “though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ; and having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.” (2 Cor. 10:3-6)

For years the declining moral integrity of our nation, as evidenced in an increasing rate of divorces and a general liberal trend toward sex relations, has portended a serious problem to the church in maintaining its purity. Comforting prophets of legal adulterers have arisen to make this threat a reality. And so the battle is joined.

Battles are not pleasant, but they must be fought for the sake of truth. Neither are they easily resolved due to the emotions and desires of those involved. None is so emotional as this issue of adulterous marriages, involving marital relationships and families. But with all who seek for the truth that makes men free (John 8:31-32), the emotions must be omitted in a calm and honest study of the Word. Truth, and it alone, must be the answer and must dictate our conduct. For such a study we plead as we commend to the reader the following discussion.

The battle is joined. Now is the time for all loyal soldiers of Christ to stand and be counted for the right. The enemy of righteousness is not defeated through compromise or reluctance; sin must be resisted at every turn. There is no rest from battle until the battles of life are won. (Heb. 4:1)

We appreciate God-fearing men who dare to stand in Satan*s way, undaunted by reproaches. The World will cheer for the fleshly interests, and it takes conviction to stand unmoved. For this we commend our brother, Maurice Barnett. Heed well the truth he upholds.

-Camden, Arkansas June 12, 1962

Lydic's First Affirmative

SECTION I: THE PROBLEM EXPRESSED

Part I: Out of Tune

Today there is a powerful movement within the church aimed at eliminating the teaching known as the "living in adultery" doctrine which (ironically) labels as illegitimate all second marriages not pre-sanctified by fornication. "You are living in adultery; you must separate." These are the words that identify the hosts of the doctrine in question. Hundreds of preachers, elders, and teachers within the church denounce and deplore this teaching and are beginning to unite in favor of its exposure as error.

No other doctrine seems to be more out of tune with New Testament Christianity than this dogma. To what rule or religion would one go to find a precept more disruptive to peaceful marriage or as devastating to family life? We are told of superstitious pagans who, to submit to the will of their non-existent gods, offered their children as burnt offerings and threw their infants to alligators. But we could hardly expect to find such horrible practices among the civilized cultures of today, and infinitely less anything analogous to them among the provisions of Christ's New Testament. Any precept that orders a broken home in the name of Christ is as out of place in the church as a cobra in a crippled Children's home. In spite of this, thousands have been told that in order to please God they must first disintegrate their home and either return to their first companion or remain in matrimonial isolation. As a result of obedience to this teaching, children are "thrown to the alligators" of suffering. An order that serves to deprive children of what is naturally theirs, is not a teaching that will be taken too casually by sane men and women. Of course, the fact that such grave consequences result directly from this teaching does not necessarily mean that the teaching is false; it does mean that we should be extremely cautious (James 3:1-2).

PART 2: Out of Writing

Early in my Christian experience I learned that in order for a precept to be scriptural, it must be found in the scriptures. "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where it is silent" is a slogan that has always expressed the church's dependence upon what is written. Conversely, the silence of the scriptures has always demanded keen respect, for it is in that realm that error reigns supreme. Thus, any precept emanating from an area of scriptural silence is a precept about which Christians are un-derstandably suspicious. When, therefore, a precept is taught as a matter of faith, every discriminating saint immediately turns to the Bible to see if that precept is written. If it cannot be found written, the child of God is not too concerned with any alleged obligation to that unwritten precept, for he knows that he is to be judged by "what is written" and not by what some man has supposed (See Rev. 20:12).

When we search to find what is written on the subject of Matrimonial separation, we find that the married are commanded to remain together. Notice what is written: "And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, 'Let* not the wife depart from her husband; but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.'" (I Cor. 7:10-11) This is written!

Logically expressed, the separation order is seen to fall by default.

1. All precepts of faith not found written in the scriptures are unscriptural precepts.
2. The precept ordering matrimonial separation is not found written in the scriptures.
3. Therefore, the precept ordering matrimonial separation is an unscriptural precept.

Men are privileged to have their own opinions and judgments about any matter falling within the realm of conjecture, but only that can be bound up-on others which is a matter of absolute faith; that which is specifically stated in the scriptures. Thus we see that the order for married persons to separate is unscriptural, tragic, and sinful. Instead, the scriptures specifically forbid matrimonial separation.

SECTION 2: THE ACTUAL ISSUE

We are, thus far, involved in an oversimplification; that anyone will advocate separation for the married is doubtful. An accurate representation of the “living in adultery” doctrine will reveal that the order is not for the married persons to separate, but is for persons to separate who *erroneously think they* are married. On the basis of our Lord’s statement in Matt. 19:9 men have been led to reason that unless a first marriage is dissolved on the grounds of fornication, a second marriage cannot actually and literally take place. Thus, it is supposed, people who divorce for reasons other than fornication and remarry actually have not divorced and have not remarried. They only thought they had, for the first marriage is still a valid contract and the second union without matrimony - adultery. The “living in adultery” concept is based upon the theory that God does not count the subsequent union of those divorced for unspecified reasons as marriage. Now this is important: **THE ENTIRE CASE AGAINST THE SANCTITY OF SECOND MARRIAGES RESTS UPON THIS PREMISE: “IT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR A MAN TO PUT AWAY HIS WIFE BY HIS OWN VOLITION.”** The reader will notice the implications of this position when he realizes that it does not treat the desirability or legality of divorce, but that it denies that divorce can even take place. Now notice; if divorce and remarriage constitutes the sin of adultery, we are then forced to ask, “Can one in this way commit adultery?”

It will be my obligation in this discussion to show that (1) a man can divorce at will and (2) can subsequently become married to another and different wife. It will also be my responsibility to show that regardless of why the first marriage was dissolved, the second marriage is legitimate and valid. Being married, the participants of the second contract are just as obligated to the command not to depart or to divorce as were the participants of the first marriage.

SECTION 3: TAKING CHRIST AT HIS WORD

PART 1: Adding to the Word

When the Pharisees came to tempt Christ by asking about the legality of putting away a wife for every cause, Christ replied, “Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery:” In a simple statement of fact, Christ is in this scripture identifying the man who is guilty of adultery: it is the man who **SHALL** put away for other causes and **SHALL** remarry. The attack upon second marriages seems to depend entirely upon a denial of Matt, 19:9. Unless Christ’s statement can be changed from a positive to a negative, the “living in adultery” cause will have no foundation. Notice the interpolation that would be necessary. “Whosoever shall (NOT) put away his wife.....and shall (NOT) marry another, committeth adultery.” The reader will note that it was a “not” in the devil’s original tale that brought about the condemnation of all mankind. Those who contend that divorce and remarriage cause adultery must allow that the divorce and remarriage **CAN** actually take place, for if there is no actual divorce and no actual

remarriage, there can also be no actual adultery (as per Matt. 19:9). Thus we see that to play host to the doctrine condemning second marriages, one is forced, by conclusion, *to deny that it is even possible to commit adultery!*

Logically expressed we see that:

- 1) All who shall divorce for reasons other than fornication and shall remarry are guilty of adultery.
- 2) This man has not actually divorced and remarried.
- 3) Therefore, this man is not actually guilty of adultery (as expressed).

If we must talk about a man who in reality cannot divorce we must talk about a subject other than the one identified by Christ in Matt. 19:9, for the complete subject of that sentence is “whosoever shall put away and shall remarry”. Any modification of the essential descriptive clauses will automatically destroy all identity of the subject and render the passage entirely meaningless. Allowing then that the man under discussion can actually become loosed from a wife, we are possessed of a major premise and a possible syllogism.

- 1) All who are loosed from a wife are single persons.
- 2) John Ames became loosed from a wife,
- 3) Therefore, John Ames is a single person.

Assuming that this logic is sound, I’ll endeavor to establish a major premise for a second related syllogism by referring to I Cor. 7:27-28. “Art thou bound unto a wife: seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a wife. But and if thou marry, thou hast not sinned.” We see here, in plain, understandable English, that a man, who is “loosed” from a wife may remarry without sin. My entire burden in this discussion will be to affirm the truth of this inspired text and to show that one can indeed become loosed from a wife.

But now that this truth is established, we have another major premise.

- 1) All marriages contracted by single persons are legitimate.
- 2) John Ames is a single person
- 3) Therefore, John Ames’ second marriage will be a legitimate marriage.

No one will defend the evil of divorce, for this is something that God hates (see Mai. 2:16). But once a person has divorced there can be *found no scriptural reason why he may* “not remarry.”

PART 2: A Pretext for Chastity

The whole opposition is predicated upon a misunderstanding of what Christ was teaching in the 19th, chapter of Matthew. This same misunderstanding has kept thousands in bondage to orthodox Roman Catholic marriage-divorce dogma, and has emphasized the need for a more realistic evaluation of such antiquated teachings. While the restoration has made significant advances in other fields, it has sorely neglected those held in bondage to ignorance in this field. In order to determine what Christ actually taught we must of necessity examine what he did not teach. There is probably no better example of the latter than the following material quoted from the *Liguorian*, published monthly by the Redemptorist Fathers, authorized July 17, 1918, and published with ecclesiastical approval of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. This material is taken from the June issue, 1958, which appeared in the article entitled “Why Marriage is for Life” by Donald F. Miller, C.S.S.R.

“Perhaps it (the article) will help some of those who are tempted to enter invalid marriages to resist the temptation if they can be brought face to face with all the evidence for the fact that such marriages are unmistakably contrary to the will and the law and the love of God. Perhaps this will help some who have already entered into such attempted marriages to make a beginning of escape from their continuing state of sin. Let it be made clear at the outset just exactly what we are talking

about when we speak of invalid marriages due to a previous marriage and divorce of one of the partners. The kind of marriage from which no power on earth can free a person so that he can enter another marriage is one that has three marks. First, it is valid in the sense that it was properly, knowingly, and freely entered into by both partners. Second, it is sacramental....Third, it must have been consummated; if it can be proved that it never was, then the Church can dissolve it as a non-completed contract. Thus the position of the Catholic Church is this: that after such a valid, sacramental, consummated marriage, neither partner can ever validly marry unless death breaks the previous bond. This holds true both for Catholics and for Protestants. If one such person attempts a second marriage after divorce from the first spouse, he commits a grave sin in the very attempt, and continues to live in sin so long as he lives as if married to the second partner. And the second partner shares in the sin. Nor does it matter how innocent one of the partners was in the breakup of the first marriage.”

This is a rather space-consuming quotation, but its appearance is here justified as a clear, concise, and accurate picture of what CHRIST DID NOT TEACH. The dogma concerning Mary, the mother of Jesus, is not the only false “assumption” of which the Catholic Church is guilty. Here is a list of ten more traditional “assumptions” that must be defended in order to de-fend the traditional doctrine in question. They are that.....

- 1) God has an eternal, universal marriage law bound upon all men; that
- 2) God joins individual persons in matrimony; that
- 3) Only God, death or fornication can dissolve marriage; that
- 4) Those who are not members of the church are also under Christ’s marriage and divorce precepts; that
- 5) Divorce and remarriage cause the adultery Christ mentioned in Matt. 19:9; that
- 6) Adultery is a state of being; that
- 7) The fornication of Matt. 19:9 must be a sex act; that
- 8) Christ’s teaching on marriage-divorce are precepts of law belonging to his spiritual law; that
- 9) Christ was banning all second marriages not pre-sanctioned by fornication;
- 10) And that Christ’s statement of Matt, 19:9 is to be given a general application.

I will hereby assume the burden of proving that these ten premises are unscriptural and that the case for all second marriages is as sound as the case for the first marriages.

SECTION 4: A FINGER ON THE PILLARS

Blind as he was, Sampson was yet able to locate the two pillars upon which tthe great house of the Philistines rested, and with the strength of God in his human arms, he bowed himself and brought down the entire struc-ture in one effort (Judges 16:30). We can, without too much groping, place our finger against the two pillars upon which the entire negative structure stands. Perhaps we also can summon the strength of God’s truth to crumble these key supporters.

The “living in adultery” structure is a house of torture dedicated to the eternal torment of those participating in second marriages, and it is resting its weight upon the first two of the ten listed premises. Perhaps the case for second marriages can be released from bondage to doubt by their destruction. Let us therefore try their soundness.

PART 1: Natural and Punitive

I suggest that God does have an eternal marriage law, but that this law is not bound upon anyone; that no man is obligated by that law to obey that law~ Basically, there are two “types”~of law. One type seeks to control man’s will and the other does not. The first type is called “punitive

law” and the latter type is called “natural law”. Let’s examine the nature of each and see if we can determine which one matches the characteristics of God’s “eternal marriage law”.

Funk and Wagnall’s Standard Dictionary defines natural law as “The uniform occurrence of natural phenomena in the same way or order under the same conditions, as far as human knowledge goes; a rule of the universe, as, the law of gravitation. A natural law is simply a recognized system of sequences or relations”. In contrast to natural law, punitive law is issued in mandatory form by a competent authority with adequate penalty for disobedience.

Having noticed these two contrasting definitions, an application of their individual characteristics to the nature of God’s marriage law is in order. Notice Gen. 2:24: “Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh”. First let us notice that God’s marriage law is not punitive in nature.

- 1) It is not issued in mandatory form.
- 2) It does not seek to control the will of man.
- 3) It does not carry with it any provision of punishment for offenders. M-) And indeed, it cannot be voluntarily obeyed or disobeyed. Second, we might be impressed with the adherence of God’s marriage law to the characteristics of natural law.
- 4) God said that man would (not must or should) leave father and mother and cleave unto his woman; and they would become one flesh. This is indicative of natural law, for since the beginning this prediction has been a uniform occurrence of natural phenomena in (the) same way or order under the same conditions, as far as human knowledge goes; (it has been) a rule of the universe, (even) as the law of gravitation.
- 6) God’s words are a picture of what we have all witnessed from youth: (1) man leaving father and mother, (2) joining his woman, and (3) become one flesh - an earthly conjunction. This is no more than “simply a recognized system of sequences or relations” that we recognize as “marriage”.

God’s law of marriage is no more than a natural law, is not bound upon anyone for obedience, and cannot be obeyed any more than can his law of physical reproduction. Therefore, any precept ordering conduct and expecting obedience relative to marriage must of necessity be contained in Christ’s punitive spiritual law.

PART 2: What God hath Joined

The idea that God joins people individually in marriage is one of the most casual of all assumptions and yet has served as a major pillar of the church’s cruelest doctrine. This tenet cannot be too severely scorned, for it has no excuse for existence.

In his answer to the Pharisees, Christ referred to Gen. 2:24 and said, “He that made them in the beginning made them male and female. *What* therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder”. Christ did not say that God has joined WHOs, but that he has joined *WHAT*. “What” is an impersonal pronoun and does not refer to people. It refers to things or ideas. It has been suggested that God HAS JOINED MALE AND FEMALE BY AN INSTITUTION CALLED MARRIAGE. When men do not take this institution seriously they adulterate it and thereby put asunder what God hath enjoined upon mankind.

You will remember also that God’s laws have always been aimed at lust. From the beginning marriage has been an institution that has been a natural refuge of escape from fornication (I Cor. 7:2), sexual lust, uncontrolled breeding, illegitimate children, and the desecration of womanhood. Conversely, marriage has provided for the orderly distribution of property through inheritance, and orderly and socially accepted avenue of normal fulfillment, and specifically it has insured the just and honorable use of the woman.

The law of Moses had apparently failed to guarantee the fair treatment of the woman, for the Jews took them, used them, and divorced them to take other more appealing women. Marriage had become a medium for fulfilling the lust of the flesh. (See Mai. 2:14-17) This practice was bad, but now we see the Pharisees coming to Christ to see if he would agree to their questionable practice. History tells us that many Israelites considered themselves blameless and justified under the terms of the law, even though they were profaning the use of woman (using them to fulfill their lusts with little more concern for them than for a beast of burden) and oblivious to the significance of marriage. "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" Of course the law allowed putting away for many causes (Deut. 24:1-4) and if Christ said "yes" he would in effect be approving of their evil practices. Yet if he said "no" he would doubtless have been accused of questioning the authority of the law.

As might be expected, Christ aimed his denunciation at the heart of the problem - which was the lust in the hearts of the Pharisees. The various lusts serve as the basis for sin (James 1:15). The old law identified and condemned the overt expression or act, while Christ's entire ministry was dedicated to the conversion of the heart; for that is where he expected to write his law (Jer. 31:31). Notice where Christ went to identify and condemn adultery: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, 'Thou shalt not commit adultery:'¹ But I say unto you, 'That whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.'" (See Matt. 5:27-28)

If it can be allowed that the Pharisees were (1) marrying, (2) looking to lust after other women, (3) divorcing, and (4) remarrying as a matter of practice, can it not also be allowed that they were guilty of adultery prior to the overt act of divorcing and of remarrying? Allowing this possibility, it is easy to see how divorce and remarriage are consequences of heart-adultery. This idea is strengthened by a close analysis of what Christ said. "He that shall put away....and shall remarry committeth adultery." An example will illustrate. Let us suppose that John Ames marries a girl but divorces her in order to marry another woman. This is the first part of what Christ said. He goes with the second woman to the judge, is pronounced married in the courthouse and is judged guilty of adultery at that moment. He has never had sexual relations with the second woman, but he is yet guilty of adultery according to Matt. 19:9. Just when this adultery entered the picture is a matter for discussion, but that he is guilty of adultery at or before the exact moment he is married is not debatable! The suggestion of some that the adultery was committed prior to the divorce and remarriage seems to have merit.

I am convinced that the "living in adultery" doctrine is an attack upon the God-sanctioned institution of marriage. It is cruel, unchristian, Roman Catholic, and false. It is an ever-present evil in the church and is preached by some of the most precious souls upon the earth - our own cherished gospel preachers. When we have learned the truth on this and other important questions now being discussed within the church, we will have attained another goal in the restoration movement.

Ten questions are posed for your consideration. Please answer each one with as much directness as you can command.

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED IN THE FIRST NEGATIVE ARTICLE

- 1) Is the "fornication" of Matt. 5:32 19:9 the physical, overt sexual act by one of the marriage partners?
- 2) What must one do in order to become married, and at what point in time or sequence is the marriage affected? Is sexual intercourse a prerequisite to marriage?
- 3) Can a scripture be produced that tells married people to separate?
- 4) Do the scriptures actually say that God joins people individually in marriage, or is this idea based upon reasoning?

- 5) Do the scriptures say that adultery is caused by divorce and remarriage, or is this concept at all dependant upon reasoning?
- 6) Can an idea which depends upon human reason for support be bound upon others as a matter of faith?
- 7) Are aliens bound by Christ's spiritual law? Are they to obey all of its precepts? Are Paul's teachings concerning marriage in I Cor. 7 bound up-on married aliens?
- 8) Has God ever been guilty of conducting himself so as to violate one of his own laws?
- 9) Is it true that when one becomes "loosed" or divorced form a wife that he then is no longer married and thus does not have a wife?
- 10) Do you allow that the silence of the scriptures should be respected? Are the scriptures silent regarding the order for baptismal candidates to reorder their marital relations? If this is admitted, how would you proceed to respect this silence?

-Philip F. Lydic

Barnett's First Negative

It is with mixed emotions that I enter into this discussion; sorrow that such a discussion is necessary in the first place; and pleasure over the opportunity to discuss our differences. If differences occur, they need to be discussed, I have never met brother Lydic, and all I know of him is from his first article. This discussion then, should be on a very impersonal level. I concur that there are many false doctrines among brethren today, and they will cause the damnation of many souls. This discussion is over just what the Bible teaches on divorce, remarriage, and sin.

Throughout the course of the first affirmative, brother Lydic intimates that I am guilty of breaking up happy homes, throwing children to the alligators, or offering them as burnt offerings as the pagans have done, or that I teach Roman Catholic Dogma, and advocate a house of torture, etc. That is a terrible picture, but such wordage does not prove one's proposition, nor does it prove I am guilty of the same. Jesus said on one occasion that He came to "break up happy homes" (Matt. 10:34-36). I wonder what awful picture could be drawn from that, concerning the Lord? In addition to prejudicial statements, a sizable amount of the first affirmative is given to stating what I am supposed to believe, then setting about to answer that; making, then, conclusions from that and attributing them to me. Peculiar procedure. It is brother Lydic's task to set forth what he thinks the Bible teaches, and my task to review and refute. He will have ample time to refer to what I believe after I have stated it. I will not take up space referring to his prejudicial statements. Neither will I bog down the discussion with a philosophical discussion of the relationship of "natural" and "punitive" laws. We are to discuss what the Bible teaches; what God's laws say on this matter. He talks somewhat about accepting human reason. Thou art the man!

Brother Lydic has set himself to prove that ALL second marriages, regardless of the reason for the termination of the first, are holy and acceptable to God. There are only four ways the proposition can be stated. (1) All second marriages are acceptable to God; (2) No second marriages are acceptable to God; (3) Some second marriages are acceptable to God; (4) Some second marriages are not acceptable to God. Brother Lydic has put forth the first, a universal affirmative. All that I need do to destroy the proposition he has espoused then is to show *just one* instance where a second marriage is not and was not acceptable to God. I will show not one, but several instances in the Scriptures that destroy the affirmative proposition. First of all-

ROMANS 7:2-3

"For the woman that hath a husband is bound by law to the husband while he liveth; but if the husband die, she is discharged from the law of the husband. So then if, while the husband liveth, she be joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if the husband die, she is free from the law, so that she is no adulteress, though she be joined to another man."

The same thought is in I Corinthians 7:39,

"A wife is bound for so long time as her husband liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is free to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord."

The inference here is that if he is not dead, then she is not free to marry. Paul does not take into discussion in these passages the exception allowance in Matt. 19, but that does not destroy the statements made. He is dealing with a particular circumstance that does not require a review of the whole picture of marriage. We'll note Matt. 19:9 later on.

Paul says here that a woman is bound by law to her husband. The word "bound" means "to bind - to fasten with chains," Thayer, p. 131. She is bound to him as long as he lives. Paul says that if

“while the husband liveth” that she is joined to another man, she is an adulteress. The word “joined” means “to become to”, Thayer, p. 116, Arndt & Gingrich, Greek-English Lexicon, 59. The word is sometimes translated as “married, marriage, or marry”, and carries that meaning. The woman is “bound” to her husband even while she is “joined” to another man; that is why she is an adulteress. The word “while” denotes duration. If she is married to another man for ten years; and yet her husband is alive all that time, then for ten years she is an adulteress. She could certainly marry another man, but the marriage would be an adulterous one. The word “marriage” does not of itself denote a holy relationship. Let’s illustrate that further.

MARK 6:17-18

“For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for the sake of Herodias, his brother Philip’s wife; for he had married her. For John said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife.”

This is a flat statement. Herod had married Herodias. Yet he was condemned of God. It was not lawful for him to HAVE his brother’s wife. Although she was married to Herod, God still reckoned her as belonging to Philip. The word “have” is defined by Arndt S Gingrich, p. 332 “to denote the possession of persons to whom one has close relationships”. Thayer p. 266 says on the same word “.....used of those joined to any one by the bonds of nature, blood, marriage, friendship, duty, law, compact and the like.” Both point out several passages where it is so used. Mark 6 here is one.

Another is John 4:17-18. Jesus here is talking with the woman at the well in Samaria. He asked her to call her husband. She replies that she has no husband. Jesus says then,

“Thou saidst well, I have no husband; for thou hast had five husbands; and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband:”

She had a man alright, but he was not reckoned as her husband, because it was not a lawful relationship. The word “have” here is used in the same way as Herod “having” Herodias; they were married. Note again, I Cor. 5:1,

“It is actually reported that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not even among the Gentiles, that one of you *hath* his father’s wife.”

The union was naught but fornication however. She was still the wife of the man’s father. Herod was married to Herodias, but she was not counted as *his* wife; she was still Philip’s. The woman at the well had a man too, but he was not considered *her* husband. The man at Corinth had married a woman also, but the matter was that she was the wife of another, and was not even considered his wife. Paul said that a woman was bound to her husband as long as he lived, and if while her husband lived that she was joined to another man she would be an adulteress. She was still regarded by God as the wife of another; the second man is not even called her “husband”. Brother Lydic affirms that *all* second marriages are acceptable to God. Here are some instances where they were not, and we *are under the same commandments*. Brother Lydic’s universal affirmative falls right here.

I ask the question: “What would be necessary for the woman in Romans 7 to do to cease to be an adulteress?” Either her husband be dead, or she sever the relationship that makes her an adulteress! She would not have been in that condition if she had not married the *other* man.

Brother Lydic has a lot to say about “living in adultery” as being entirely unfounded in scripture. I admit the phrase as stated is not there. But what is the difference in “living as an adulterer or adulteress” and “living in adultery”? The woman in Romans 7 was living as an adulteress; she was in adultery as long as she was married to the second man and her husband was alive. The people spoken of in Colossians 3 were “living in fornication”. We will note shortly that in many places

“fornication” includes “adultery”. We shall note also more scripture shortly that destroys the affirmative proposition. Let us note now however, some

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Some of the terms that are important to our study need some meaning before we can fully understand the subject. Here are definitions of some words that have been touched on and will be discussed further as we continue.

MARRIAGE: There are several things necessary to what we call marriage. (1) An agreement between a man and woman to join together and establish a home; (2) Compliance with Civil Law; (3) Consumation, (“to complete a marriage by sexual intercourse”, The American College Dictionary). But, just because someone may be married does not mean that their relationship is lawful to God. It may be adulterous. (Note: Herod had *married* her, but....Mark 6:17-18).

FORNICATION: “Of illicit sexual intercourse in general”, Thayer, p. 532. “Prostitution, unchastity, fornication, of every kind of unlawful sexual intercourse.....of sexual unfaithfulness of a married woman. Matt. 5:32 19:9.” Arndt & Gingrich, p. 688, There are several forms of the word in Greek, but this is the root meaning, and carries throughout the different forms.

ADULTERY: “To have unlawful intercourse with another’s wife, to commit adultery with”, Thayer, p. 417. Webster then defines adultery as, “Sexual unfaithfulness of a married person; voluntary sexual intercourse by a married man with another than his wife, by a married woman with another than her husband.....” It is commonly thought that fornication refers to intercourse between persons that are not married, and adultery just to someone who is married. The word fornication is a general word for all illicit intercourse; adultery specifies a certain relationship of fornication. Adultery is fornication, but not all fornication is adultery is another way of putting it. So the word fornication stands in several places in the Bible for all illicit sexual relationship, including adultery. In some other places, they are distinguished.

DIVORCE: The English translation of the N.T. usually reads “put away” which means “to dismiss from the house to repudiate, used of divorce”, Thayer, p. 66. Arndt & Gingrich, on p. 96 says “Let go, send away, dismiss...divorce, send away one’s wife, or betrothed,” In Matthew 19, the question asked was concerning a “bill of divorcement” which simply was a formal document given by the husband to publicly proclaim that he had repudiated his wife, and to protect her. I do not deny that a man can put away or divorce his wife, and marry another. Jesus said that he could. But he also said that if he did without the one exception of fornication, he would commit adultery, Matt. 19: 9. The bond between a man and his wife is much deeper than mere ceremony or the civil and social sanction of divorce. We have noted that the bond is a “tying, chaining together”. Divorce, of itself, does not indicate a severing of this bond. The word indicates no more than the definitions stated for it. Brother Lydic’s position necessitates a changing of these definitions to mean something other than I have set forth here. Brother Lydic, give us some definitions of these words, your authority for them, and how such definitions harmonize with the scriptures. Your use of these words is essential to your proposition. I will give attention now to the arguments used in the affirmative. The first is

I CORINTHIANS 7:10-11

“And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, let not the wife depart from her husband; but if she depart let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.”

Brother Lydic shows that this is a command here, and I so accept. His position is, though, that a man can put away his wife for ANY CAUSE and marry another without sin. You will note that the

same passage that forbids the separation, *forbids the remarriage also*. The command covers the “let her remain unmarried” as well as the “not depart. Paul further strengthens the statement by his choice of word, tense, and mood, “Let her remain” is “meneto”, and is 3rd, person, singular, *present imperative*. Thayer, p. 399, defines the word, meaning “to continue, to remain as you are”. The present imperative is used to refer to the action as *continuing on*, as being repeated; the imperative is used in *commands*, (see Greek Grammar, Machen, p, 180), Hence, she is commanded to remain continually in an unmarried condition, or go back to her husband. Brother Lydic says that she can go ahead and marry another though, and doesn’t have to go back to her *husband*, and it will be acceptable and holy before God. Paul’s statement in Romans 7 points out that if this woman here married another man, she would be an adulteress as long as her *husband* was alive. That’s why Paul said for her to remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband. The next passage is in

I CORINTHIANS 7:27-28

“Art thou bound unto a wife? seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a wife. But shouldest thou marry, thou hast not sinned; and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned.....”

The argument is then made on this passage that once you are divorced, regardless of the reason for the divorce, you can go ahead and remarry and not sin in so doing. Brother Lydic, you have assumed this conclusion, and have put yourself in an awful predicament. Paul isn’t *necessarily* even speaking of those who have ever been married when he says “Art thou loosed from a wife.” He is speaking of present condition. Arndt & Gingrich on page 85 renders this statement thusly: “are you free from a wife, i.e., not bound to a wife?” But I will grant that by inference he includes those who have been married and are not bound to a wife presently. Certainly there are conditions that allow remarriage of a man who has been married before, or a woman who was once married. Because of death or fornication. Paul is discussing those persons who have a *right* to marry in the first place. Brother Lydic’s interpretation here in I Cor. 7 has put Paul in the position of saying that breaking God’s commandments is not sin. We have just noted that Paul *commanded* “Let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband.” Now brother Lydic wants Paul to turn right around and say seventeen verses later that if they do marry another *they have not sinned*. Just go ahead and break his commandments and you wont sin! Paul is not urging anyone to enter an unlawful relationship with the idea that it is not sinful. Some of my present day brethren would, but not Paul.

“HEART-ADULTERY”

Under Part 2 of Section 3, brother Lydic discusses the matter of lust in the heart as the basis of the act. One whole paragraph, containing some conclusions, is admittedly hypothetical. It is characterized by “If it can be allowed”; “can it not also be allowed”, “allowing this possibility”, and “seems to have some merit”. And he talks about basing our faith on human reasoning!

I will readily grant that man’s lust brings about his sin; it comes from the heart. Adultery comes from lust in the heart, Matt. 5:27-28, just as murder comes from hate, I John 3:15. Jesus said,

“But the things which proceed out of the mouth come forth out of the heart; and they defile the man. For out of the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, railings: these are the things which defile the man;” Matt. 15:18-19.

Are we to conclude from this therefore that adultery is *just* a condition of the heart? How about thefts? Railings? The heart is the seat of it, that brings about the action. I anticipate brother Lydic making a play on the middle voice of the Greek verb for “commit adultery” in Matthew 19 to show

more of this “heart-adultery” business, but will answer the argument when it is made. Adultery and fornication are not just conditions of the guilty persons heart. Both are inseparable from the matter of sexual illicitness. I have pointed out scriptures to show this.

Brother Lydic implies that the adultery of Matthew 19 is committed at the ceremony before civil magistrates; that it then is not actual sexual illicitness. He says, “He goes with the second woman to the judge, is pronounced married in the courthouse and is judged guilty of adultery at that moment. He has never had sexual relations with the second woman, but he is yet guilty of adultery according to Matt. 19:9”. I simply refer you to the material I have already given. Adultery necessarily involves sexual intercourse. Brother Lydic, tell us, can a man commit adultery by long distance telephone by having the ceremony said with a woman in a distant place? Ceremonies, legally, have been performed in that way. Imagine, a man in New York committing adultery with a woman in New Orleans by telephone! Pshaw! The civil ceremony is not the point of union, nor of adultery. The adultery that Jesus spoke of in Mat. 19, makes both parties guilty of adultery because they are *both engaged* in the illicit intercourse.

Notice Matthew 5:27-28 in this connection. “Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, that everyone that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.” Jesus well knew what “commit adultery” meant. The word “look-eth” means to “turn the eyes to anything, to look at, look upon, gaze at.” Thayer, p. 103. The phrase “lust after” is “to keep the passion turned upon a thing, hence to set one’s heart upon a thing, to have desire for, long for, lust after, covet. Of sexual desire”. Thayer, p. 238. And, the “commit adultery” is “to commit adultery with, have unlawful intercourse with another’s wife.” Thayer, p. 417. I suppose though, according to brother Lydic’s idea of the time of adultery, that this fellow would simply be repeating the vows of the civil ceremony each time he looked upon a woman to lust after her. But, what the man is desiring is sexual intercourse with the woman. There is a matter of intent involved. The man intends to fulfill his passion by actual commission of the act, and has gone over the actual fulfillment already in his heart with her. Jesus here is defining lust; what lust is. When a man looks on a woman to lust after her, this is what he has done—committed adultery with her already—in his heart. That’s the definition of the lust. But, to say that that is what Jesus had reference to in verses 31-32 and 19:9 is to completely misuse the scriptures. Here Jesus discusses what an individual does within himself, and the other passages speak of what a person’s PRACTICE is with someone else, which makes them *both* guilty.

MATTHEW 19

“And there came unto him Pharisees, trying him, and saying, is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said, Have ye not read, that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh? So that they are no more two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him. Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses for your hardness of heart suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it hath not been so. And I say unto you, whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery. The disciples say unto him, if the case of the man is so with his wife, it is not expedient to marry.”

A CASUAL ASSUMPTION????

Brother Lydic states that the idea that God joins *people* individually in marriage is a casual assumption and has no excuse for existing. He bases that on “*What* therefore God has joined together” as meaning that God joined the institution of marriage together with man and “when men do not take this institution of marriage seriously they adulterate it and thereby put asunder what God hath enjoined on mankind”. (The words “joined” and “enjoined” do not mean the same thing). In his list of questions he asks “do the scriptures actually say that God joins people individually in marriage, or is this idea based upon reasoning?” Well, if he doesn’t, we must be joined together as a group. Everyone is married to everyone else. Maybe this is where some get the “free love” idea, I think we need a little more what of what “what” means from brother Lydic.

Does God join individuals together in marriage? We have noted scriptures that state so. (I Cor. 7:39, Rom. 7:2-3., etc.) Jesus said “for this cause shall *a man* (individual) leave his father and mother, (individuals) and shall cleave to *his wife*’ (individual) and the two shall become *one* flesh.” Then when Jesus said “What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder”, the Jew readily understood what he meant by this statement, because they then asked, “Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorcement and to put her away?” Divorce has to do with two individuals who have been married. I grant that the “what” is “impersonal”. Jesus states a principle with the immediate application of the joining of two people together for good.

JEWISH PRACTICE AND THE WORDS OF CHRIST

In Matthew 19 Jesus deals with the PRACTICE of the Jews; they were putting away their wives for ANY CAUSE, and marrying others. This is precisely what brother Lydic is trying to justify. Jesus said that Moses *allowed* them to put away their wives because of “hardness of heart”, but it was not that way from the beginning. “AND I SAY UNTO YOU.....” Jesus says as he upholds what God intended from the very beginning.

There is an exception clause in verse 9. Let’s read it leaving out the clause first. “And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery.” The subject of Matthew 19 is the right CAUSE for the PUTTING AWAY. Jesus said that they could “put away” (divorce) their wives, and for “any cause”. The “putting away” has no more significance than separation of bed and board, and civil legal responsibility. And, they *could* do that for any reason. But, he also said that if they did, and then married another they would commit adultery; (have “unlawful intercourse with,” Thayer, p. 417). The only justification would be “except for the cause of fornication”. The only CAUSE, or reason, acceptable to God, for putting away a mate, and then marrying another, is fornication; it is the only exception given.

The disciples got the point, and felt this was too severe. In verse 10 they said, “If the case of the man is so with his wife, it is not expedient to marry”. Vincent refers to the word “case” here like this: “*Aitia* refers to cause (verse 3), and the meaning is, if the matter stands thus with reference to the cause which the man must have for putting away his wife”. (Vincent’s Word Studies, Vol. 1, p. 109). If the bond is so tight, then it is best not to marry. The words of Jesus were just a little too much even for the twelve. Jesus then goes on to say that let those receive it that can receive it, and that “some are made eunuchs for the kingdom of heavens sake”. In other words, then you just stay unmarried.

I hardly think it necessary to point out the scriptures that state that all adulterers will be damned; and there are several that do. One who persists in sin has only one end in eternity.

IN CONCLUSION

In this article, I have not referred to every argument specifically, but I have answered all arguments made for the affirmative proposition. I did not deal with the syllogisms specifically, but if you will note, you will see that I answered the arguments made in them; destroyed the premises. I do want to give a syllogism based on the first syllogism introduced by brother Lydic. It is this:

- 1) All precepts not found written in the scriptures are unscriptural precepts.
- 2) The precept allowing divorce for ANY CAUSE and remarriage is not found written in the scriptures.
- 3) Therefore, the precept allowing divorce for ANY CAUSE and remarriage is an unscriptural precept.

HIS QUESTIONS

- 1) Yes!
- 2) Have answered this.
- 3) Yes, by necessary inference.
- 4) God joins individuals in marriage. I have a paragraph on this.
- 5) This question is not clear.
- 6) What do you mean “human reason”?
- 7) Alien sinners are amenable to the law of Christ, but I do not intend to have that proposition injected into this discussion. If you believe they are not amenable in any way to the law of Christ, we will have a separate discussion on that proposition, but it has no place in the present one. It would simply sidetrack the present proposition.
- 8) Give me a specific so I will know what you mean by the question.
- 9) Your terms are ambiguous. I have dealt with this subject in my article.
- 10) Depends on what you mean by “silence” of the scriptures. Several of your questions have inferred you want a clear statement “thou shalt” or “thou shalt not” in the scriptures for everything.

For Brother Lydic

- 1) Is marriage today simply a civil arrangement only?
- 2) Can a person “live in fornication”? If so, what would be necessary to cease?

-Maurice Barnett

Second Affirmative

SECTION 1: WHERE THE BURDENS LIE PART 1: A Brief Review

In order to focus attention upon the key issues of the discussion, I will offer a brief review.

The first affirmative article (1) branded the separation precept “unscriptural” while it (2) reaffirmed the scriptural command forbidding separation. It argued (3) that a man can become “loosed” from a wife at will and can subsequently remarry; that (H) the “living in adultery” doctrine to which many have subscribed has its basis in Roman Catholic dogma rather than in the New Testament; and (5) that this marriage-breaking doctrine is predicated upon ten erroneous assumptions. It argued that (6) we are amenable only to the marriage precepts of Christ’s punitive law; that (7) God’s joining of the sexes is called “marriage” and that (8) Christ’s denunciation of heart adultery has today been transformed into a misdirected and unjustified attack upon the God-sanctioned institution of marriage.

This article will reply to the objections raised by the Negative; it will deal, point for point, with every negative argument. He has (1) offered four propositions as the only possible expressions of my burden. After (2) citing four examples as exceptions to the first of his propositions, he (3) defined four basic terms, (4) expressed the negative conception of how adultery is committed in illegitimate marriages; (5) argued that God joins people individually in marriage; (6) expounded the “scriptural grounds” theory of Matt, 19: 9; (7) constructed a rebuttal syllogism and (8) answered 6 of 10 affirmative questions.

PART 2: God gave Our Proposition

I would not affirm an unscriptural proposition; that is, I would not affirm a proposition that I cannot read in the scriptures. My proposition is found in Heb, 13:4. “Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled,” The Negative contention that “The word ‘marriage’ does not of itself denote a holy relationship” seems to be a clear denial of the proposition. If the relationship is marriage, it is holy; if the relationship is something other than marriage, I am not interested in its defense. But if *God* has modified his proposition, and has in other scriptures shown that *some* marriages are UNholy, we have no recourse but to allow God’s exception.

This defense is dedicated to the honor of marriage itself and will not attempt to contend for every policy, practice or act that some have thought to justify by marriage. If illegal possession, adultery, and lust are evil, they are not made right by any benefit of marriage: this is to say that all who do these things do evil, regardless of his or her status. But the critical question is, do the partners of any marriage commit *fornication* by having sexual relations with each other? The Negative calls some marriages “adulterous” yet maintains that all adultery is fornication; thus he will agree that all adultery will be avoided by the avoidance of all fornication. Paul tells us how fornication is avoided: “Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.” (I Cor. 7:2) The man of any marriage is avoiding adultery and fornication between himself and his wife if they are married, i.e., if she is his “own wife”. However, the woman would not be avoiding adultery between herself and her other husband IF she is ALSO the wife of another man and still owes allegiance to the other husband’s fidelity-demanding law. A man cannot commit fornication with his own wife, but adultery would be indicated for her if she became guilty of sexual unfaithfulness toward her first husband. But if marriage does not make an inherently evil practice right, the unlawful practice does not make the marriage evil.

PART 3: Two Words and Two Meanings

Fornication and adultery are two different words, and therefore have two distinct meanings; if not, they would have no justification for being two different words. If a single man had an illicit relationship with a married woman, he would be committing fornication and she would also be guilty of adultery. "Adultery" is a word designed to indicate the relationship of the evil act or thought to a specific marriage as an act or thought of unfaithfulness toward the other marriage partner. On the other hand, the single man has no wife to whom the sin can be related. The application is this: the bed of the second marriage is not defiled because the husband cannot commit fornication with his own wife; the wife cannot commit fornication with her own husband. But if by taking advantage of this benefit of marriage the wife commits adultery against the *other* husband, the undefiled bed nevertheless becomes a forbidden bed. This is something like the eating of meats, I Cor. 8:9-13; even though a bed or the eating of meats has been cleansed and made holy by God, it may be, or may become, forbidden due to the fact that it is injurious to others, and thus no longer allowed by God. This will be more clear when the meaning of "marriage" is examined.

In this discussion I am defending, according to I Cor. 7:27-28, the right to marry only of those who are loosed from a wife or from a husband, i.e., single persons, committing adultery against the husband. This brings the issue clearly into focus, and band of the second marriage. reveals a major burden of this study; Just WHO has the power to completely dissolve the marriage, the bond, and the obligations involved in that marriage - God, or the contracting partners of the marriage covenant? The Negative is contending that "divorce, of itself, does not indicate a severing of this (marriage) bond." This is a statement calling for immediate consideration.

SECTION II: THIS CONCEPT OF "MARRIAGE"

PART 1: Examples that do Prove Something

QUESTION: IS MARRIAGE A DISSOLVABLE CONTRACT BETWEEN TWO SPOUSES?

The examples which were offered to illustrate "unacceptable" marriages lend themselves more to this issue than to the others, so I will deal with them at this time.

The HEROD-HERODIAS EXAMPLE does illustrate something: it exemplifies something obvious to every Bible student - that under the law of Moses it was unlawful for a man to possess (have) another man's wife. Had Herod (1) coveted, (2) stolen, and (3) illegally possessed another man's wife? If he had, he was breaking Jewish law which forbade each of these in specific terms (See Exod. 20:15-17; Lev, 19:13). IF herod *had not married her*, he would still have been charged with the *same* offense. The marriage itself did not justify his inherently evil acts, but the acts in turn did not make the marriage evil. If the marriage covenant was within itself an unlawful thing, we would expect to find such existing marriages prohibited by Old Testament precept, and to find John indicting the *marriage* - not just the "having" that the scriptures specify.

Just what pertinent facts and conclusions can be drawn from this Negative example? Notice the *facts*: (1) Herodias was Phillip's wife; (2) it was unlawful for one to have another man's wife, (3) *but* it was *not* unlawful for one to have a woman who had been put away (Apoluo - loosed away). (4) It was un-lawful for Herod to have Phillip's wife, so (5) the conclusion must follow that Herodias had not been put away - she was a polygamist. Herod could lawfully have possessed her if (1) she had been put away, or if (2) Phillip had died. If this example proves anything pertinent to the issue, it proves that divorce would have had the same loosening effect that Phillip's death would have had,

and that if Herodias had been so “loosed” by divorce there would have been no charge of transgression at all.

This incident can be profitably reevaluated by reversing the elements of sex-identification in order to review its potential application to Christian marriage law. If Herod had been the one to steal away from his marriage partner, without the benefit of divorce, and had married another woman, would he have been unlawfully possessed by his new wife? The answer is obvious. A woman was judged an adulteress by the old law if she was guilty of polygamy, but a man in an identical situation (practicing polygamy) was innocent. The same act was legal for one sex but was absolutely forbidden - under pain of death - for the other!

If the Negative example has proven that (1) because Herod’s conduct was unlawful conduct then, the same conduct is therefore unlawful now, it also proves that (2) what *would have been lawful conduct then, would also be lawful conduct now*. It would have been lawful for Herod to have Herodias IF she had been freed from her husband’s marriage law by divorce (on any grounds); so the Negative is, in effect, arguing for the legality of owning any woman who has been divorced. If not, why not? Also, Herod would have been legally justified in the practice of polygamy, so this must also be acceptable for us today (?) - per the Negative argument for authority. This, in spite of the fact that if our sisters do exactly the same thing they are to be called Adulteresses.

THE ROM. 7:1-4 EXAMPLE proves something also (to those who know the law). It proves, relative to O.T. marriage law, just what Paul intended to teach to the Roman brethren, relative to Christ and his spiritual (marriage) law. The very reason for Paul’s use of this Old Law illustration was to impress upon the Roman brethren the necessity of being loosed from one law before becoming bound to another, conflicting marriage law, Israel had been married to God through the Old (marriage) Covenant, the one she had made with God at Mt. Hor-eb when she became espoused to him by the acceptance of his terms (Ex.19:5-8). God, representing the man, had not died, but Israel had become loosed, freed, released from the HUSBAND by becoming “dead to the law by the body of Christ”. In type, it was not the death of the man (God) that freed Israel, but rather by the death of the HUSBAND-WIFE RELATIONSHIP between them. This freedom from the first husband’s marriage law was made possible by the *body* of Christ - the body of him that she (Israel) was to *then* marry.

The point so many have missed in Rom. 7:1-4 is that the term “husband” denotes *only* a relationship or status. Terms like elder, student, president, husband and wife can be used to *identify* certain personalities, but the terms themselves are only as applicable as real as the relationships or statuses they denote. The people of the United States could put away their president by impeachment. We would *then no longer have a president* although Mr. Kennedy the person, would still be *~aTTve*. If *~Yr. Kennedy! tKe”* man, should die, the relationship would also die, and we would not have a president. The point is this: the woman of Israel could become a WOMAN WITHOUT A HUSBAND in two ways. She was bound to her husband as long as her *husband* lived, but if he died or if he put her away, the relationship also died and she was free, i.e., single. Like the Negative, my contention is an opinion; but unlike the Negative, my opinion is based upon logic - not assumption. Logically expressed we see that:

- 1) All Jewish women who had husbands were not free to marry (Rom. 7:1-3).
- 2) The Jewish woman who had been divorced was free to marry (Deut. 24:4).
- 3) Therefore, the Jewish woman who had been divorced no longer had a husband.

Marriage is a temporal covenant and is therefore automatically terminated by the death of either spouse. However, termination of this relationship was possible under the law of Moses through divorce on any grounds and without the physical death of either partner. Rom, 7:1-3 fails to establish

a valid Negative premise, and thus fails to justify the pillar upon which the house of marriage persecution stands.

THE TWO EXAMPLES OF FORNICATION involving the Woman at the Well and the Corinthian Brother also fail to indict marriage. To the woman Christ said, ⁵ „he whom thou now hast is not thy husband:” The Negative reasons accurately when he says that theirs was an unlawful relationship, for their relationship was one of fornication - not of marriage. A wild assumption is offered as evidence that this woman was married but within a husbandless-wifeless—relationshipless marriage. Because Herod was married and did “have” Herodias does not prove that because the Samaritan woman did “have” a man that she was also married. This type of reasoning would conclude that because Isaac was married, and because he sported with his woman, that all who sport with women are also married (Gen. 26:8). If the mere absence of a husband-wife relationship proves anything, it proves the absence of marriage - a union of fornication (I Cor. 6:16-19). Certainly the word “have” means to possess in a relationship like marriage, but it also means to possess in a relationship like fornication, and a thousand other relationships.

But carefully analyze the following points offered by the Negative and then evaluate the conclusions that must be drawn from them in the light of revelation.

- 1) He holds that marriage is indicated by the word “have” and that “not thy husband” denotes an invalid, illegitimate marriage.
- 2) He also states that “marriage” is (1) an agreement to join together and establish a home, (2) a legalization and (3) a consummation.
- 3) He admits that divorce for any cause and a subsequent remarriage can actually take place (“Christ said they could”).
- 4) He has indicated that had Christ wished to denote a valid, honorable, surenuff marriage, he would have so determined by referring to the Samaritan woman’s man as “thy husband.”

But now turn to Matt, 1:18-24 and notice that by the Negative’s own logic, Joseph and Mary were recognized by God as bound in marriage *before and without consummation!* Check the facts: (1) Joseph and Mary had not come together; vs. 18 (2) Joseph, seeing her with child, knowing it was not his doing, and having this assurance of her *fornication* (a premarital, or unrelated-to-marriage defilement), was minded to “put her away” (for the cause of fornication - scriptural grounds according to Deut, 22:13-21 and reaffirmed in Matt, 19: 9). (3) *God* called Joseph, “husband” and Mary “wife” - thus, by Negative logic, determining that a valid, legitimate marriage did exist *before and without the coming-together of consummation!*

IN MATT. 19:9 CHRIST SAID, “Whosoever *shall put away* his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, *committeth* adultery: and whoso marrieth her that is put away doth commit adultery,” Since the marriage of Joseph and Mary was of Christ’s time, since it involved “putting away” and since the cause or reason was the one specified by Christ, we should be justified in using it to illustrate the Affirmative application of Matt. 19:9. First, note carefully that the *time of guilt* of adultery is set by Christ as being either at the exact moment of, or before, the remarriage. Now make the application and see that since two people could actually be married without and before “consummation” the man could also be guilty of adultery before and without the “coming together” of “consummation”. Therefore, contrary to the Negative’s conclusion, but by his own criteria, it can be established that neither adultery or marriage are dependent upon sexual union.

Second, if Joseph *had* carried through with his intention to “put away” Mary, and then had married another, he would have placed himself under the negative application of Matt. 19:9 even though he had never had sexual relations with either of his two wives, for he could have been married to both without touching either one.

Third, if Joseph had *not* been informed of Mary's innocence he would have been putting her away (separating her from "bed and board") (?) for the only apparent cause originally intended by the law (See also Deut. 24:1-4). If the Jewish virgin entered into a marriage covenant under false colors, as a virgin, but already with child, *she* would be the unfaithful of heart and certainly the man would be justified in divorcing her that he might make room for a worthy companion. If she was innocent, her parents were to bring the proof - probably the evidence of recent menstruation - Deut. 22:17, and he would be assured that the child was his own. Christ was not one to use words indiscriminately, so assuming that he chose "fornication" rather than "adultery" as an exception because he had the *meaning* of his word in mind, I must believe that he meant *pre-marital* defilement.

That Christ was indiscriminate in his terminology and actually meant to make "adultery" legitimate grounds for divorce and remarriage seems even more questionable when we remember that a wife who was guilty of adultery was immediately stoned and her husband then had no need for "grounds" of any type, for he automatically became single. In addition to this, the "scriptural grounds" theory is rendered meaningless when we realize that a Jew could marry as many women as he pleased without violating the command "thou shalt not commit adultery". Why would the so-called "sexual unfaithfulness" definition of Matt. 19:9 "*adultery*" depend upon divorce for its cause??????? If the marriage bond is so deep that it cannot be broken by divorce, as the Negative has argued, all in the world that Christ would be saying in Matt. 19:9 is that POLYGAMY IS ADULTERY FOR MEN! How about this, Negative? Was polygamy adultery for the men of Israel -the ones to whom Christ spoke? If it was, why did Christ make divorce a contingency????? Now this question is clear. It needs no "clarification". The only thing it needs now is an answer!

PART 2: Marriage Defined

WHAT IS MARRIAGE, in the light of scriptural harmony? I would favor this definition: Marriage is (1) a mutual agreement (or covenant) between a man and a woman wherein (2) the body of each becomes at once the property of the other (3) for the purpose of legitimate sexual union. This is my own wording, but notice that it is scripturally sound: (A) it is expressed as a "covenant" in Mai. 2:14: "Yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant." (B) The body of each becomes at once the property of the other: "The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband; and the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife. Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency." (I Cor. 7:4-5). This shows that the body of each becomes the property of the other, else they could not defraud one the other and could have no rights concerning one another's body. (C) That the concept of marriage is within itself wrapped up in the meaning of legitimacy is evident from I Cor. 7:2 and Heb. 13:4. "Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife and every woman have her own husband." "Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled; but fornicators and adulterers God will judge." What more can God say? Where does he modify his complete sanction of marriage for all? I predict that the same scripture, when found, that forbids marriage will also forbid the eating of meats (See I Tim. 4:3). To call marriage itself "adulterous" is to call "good", "evil". Opposites cannot modify, and adulterous cannot be either an intelligent, enlightened, or scriptural adjective for "marriage".

Marriage is an institution of God which is, in essence, the only license by which male and female may be legitimately joined. Christ said, ".....he which made them in the beginning made them male and female; and said, 'for this cause shall a man leave father and mother and shall cleave unto his wo-man, and they shall be one flesh. WHAT therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.'" Matt. 19:6. God in the beginning made them opposite in sex and said that because of

this distinction they would come together. But He has also indicated that there is by law a wall between the sexes which he has termed “fornication”. He provided an opening, or door, in this wall of prohibition which he calls “marriage”; through which the SEXES MAY JOIN and at the same time avoid fornication. Male and female is *what* God has joined, and marriage is the only means by which God has ever joined them. But man has ever tried to put asunder what God hath joined and, beginning with the Catholic Church, those content to accept any teaching condoned by the majority or those in power have helped to put asunder what God hath joined by extending the wall of prohibition on down through God’s opening called “marriage” and labeling their invention “adulterous marriages”.

Paul said that he had the power to *lead about* a sister, a wife; but if he was a eunuch, as some have supposed, he could not have the power to engage in the Negative’s marriage because of the inability to consummate. But even if he wasn’t a eunuch he still would not have the power to contract a “Negative marriage” because proposing to “lead a wife about” would certainly be the opposite of “agreeing to establish a home”. Of course his power to marry would have been further diminished if Roman law of the time had forbidden marriage between a Roman citizen and a Christian woman.

Concerning this questionable definition of marriage that requires three prerequisites, one might wonder if order of occurrence would have any bearing on the validity of such marriages. Could consummation come first, agreement second, and legalization last? In the case of common law marriages, in some states, seven years of cohabitation causes the legalization and they are automatically classified by state law as married, Couldn’t this be seven years of “consummation” if followed by legalization and agreement? If this is seven years of fornication, what criteria would apply to prove that any so-called “consummation” is anything but fornication? If the Negative’s marriage is an *effect* of consummation it cannot precede its cause, i.e., (1) agreement, (2) legalization and (3) consummation. Sexual union must come before the marriage if it is all or part of the cause. The Negative’s consummation is God’s definition of fornication - sexual union before and out of wedlock. Since the Negative insists that marriage comes into reality when the consummation has been effected, he must allow that the act is at least begun out of wedlock, i.e., as fornication. If not, the marriage pre-exists the joining of bodies and so does the adultery of Matt. 19:9. If the time element plays no part or has no significance relative to the consummating act, the seven years that it takes to validate a common law marriage would be as justified as whatever time is required in more common (ordinary) marriage.

Marriage is, as I have suggested, simply a mutual agreement between two people and can be validated upon the mutual agreement of the contracting parties at whatever time they choose, and can be made binding at the point where full commitment is made. This could be by phone, letter or sign language. This agreement might, according to the customs of the times, obligate the woman’s body to the husband only, but might at the same time (by mutual agreement) allow the man more than one wife; it is still marriage. The body of man is the woman’s, but her agreement might have included - by consent or by custom - a commitment to share his body with other women. Thus, as in Jewish marriages, this covenant has apparently always reflected the customs of the times. Our custom in America prohibits polygamy, but even if such was our custom, there would be no direct command forbidding *men* to have more than one wife.

Benefits of marriage, such as intercourse, fidelity, sharing of property, legitimate children, etc. are not integral parts of marriage itself. It is foolish to argue that because people cannot have children, or cannot establish a home, or cannot have sexual relations that they cannot marry. I know people who were married in spite of the fact that they were paralyzed in the lower half of their bodies, but who are today living in all the familiarities of intimate cohabitation. One might wonder if the bed

of such partners, or companions, would be an unholy thing; or if one such companion should run away with another man if she would or could commit adultery?

PART 3: Advice to the Married

When I am credited with advising a sister to marry another man when that sister already has a husband, I am being misrepresented. The only thing I will tell a person to do or not to do relative to marriage law, is what I can read word for word from the law of Christ in direct answer to a specific question. If the question is asked of me, “may I marry?” I would, in order to give a scriptural answer, be required to go to the scriptures. “Art thou loosed from a wife?” If the answer is, “Yes, I am loosed.” I will read, “...if thou marry thou hast not sinned; and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned.” (I Cor. 7:27-28) What we know about this subject is just what we read. What we conclude and believe in addition to what we read is of necessity the product of human reason. Some reasoning is good and some is bad: but all reasoning has one thing in common if it is human - it is all subject to error, I freely admit that I do place a good deal of confidence upon what I believe to be sound reasoning, for that is all I have upon which to base my OPINION. Opinion is very important; all of what I *believe* to be true on the subject of marriage is in this classification; all of what I know to be true is stated clearly in the Bible. I know that “Marriage is honorable” and I know that the “virgin” and the “loosed” may marry without sin. A sound opinion is like a good rope: it binds a number of related Bible truths together into a meaningful whole and keeps the imagination from running wild. But it serves as a dismal standard for judging the all-important marriages of others and it becomes an anchor chain around the necks of all upon whom we bind it. My arguments in this discussion are offered with confidence because (1) I think they are, for the most part, sound; (2) they are offered only for what they are worth as an aid to study (the Negative’s arguments will evaluate them); they are, admittedly, subject to error. The scriptures stand by themselves, but the arguments of this discussion can, at best, only serve as a basis for personal opinion.

IF THE DEPARTED SISTER OF I Cor. 7:10-11 has a husband to whom she can be reconciled, she is yet under the saine obligation to fidelity even though she is not living with him. This means that even though a sister voluntarily withdraws her agreement to give her body to her husband and then defrauds him by physically removing herself from his presence, she is nevertheless not loosed from the moral obligations of the agreement, for he has not consented to the marriage breakup. However, if an unbelieving husband or wife should depart, the brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases (I Cor. 7:15). “Not under bondage” means that the remaining partner is released, freed from obligation relative to the marriage. The significance of mutual agreement or consent in this case cannot be ignored, for it is in sharp contrast to the case of the one-sided decision of the departed sister. If marriage is a mutual agreement, that is, if it is made by mutual agreement, it can also be dissolved by mutual agreement - as verse 15 clearly indicates.

Some are horrified by the thought that this concept of marriage makes the evil of divorce too easily obtained, that the deterrent (of believing that marriage dissolution is impossible through agreement) would be lost, and people would thus be encouraged to divorce and remarry. We must remember that the only doctrinal tool that Christians are allowed to use is truth. The use of some device is not justified just because it is effective in scaring people into submission; we must confine ourselves to the truth, to bind only what is written and applicable,

SECTION III: THE BURDEN OF CHRIST’S MINISTRY

PART I: The Old Concept

The entire burden of Christ's ministry was to prepare his people for their entrance into a new dispensation. They had been kept under the bondage of a physically enforced law all their lives through fear of death (Heb.2:15). Now it was Christ's burden to work a transition of thinking, to turn the attention to the heart, to question the reason for conduct, and to get the people to think in terms of motivation rather than in terms of what the letter of the law allowed or disallowed.

Such commands as "Thou shalt not kill" and "Thou shalt not commit adultery" were only meaningful as the physical acts which they contemplated. They were overt acts that were defined as transgressions, were viewed by two or three witnesses, and brought death without mercy under two or three witnesses (Heb. 10:28), We read that under Moses, every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, and that many of the disobedient died because of what they did; judgement and punishment was executed by man and was not based upon the thought of the heart. It is easy to see why the Jews of Christ's time had come to judge all things almost exclusively in terms of what the law had to say about acts.

- 1) All sin is the transgression of the law (I John 3:4).
- 2) Looking to lust after a woman is not a transgression (Matt. 5:27-28).
- 3) Therefore, looking to lust after a woman is not sin.

Of course we know that looking to lust is sin, but this was not revealed to the Jew by the old law. Adultery was viewed - that is, it was seen as an act and punished according to the specifications of the law. (See John 8:3-5). The above reasoning from the limited knowledge provided by the old law might seem to clear the Pharisees from guilt of adultery, for in their practice of trading wives they had committed no *observable* transgression of the law. But - and this is important - if they were in the process, lusting after their neighbor's wife, they were transgressing the tenth commandment: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife.....nor anything that is thy neighbour's". (Exod. 20:17) The Jews to whom Christ spoke were evidently lusting after, coveting, and obtaining desirable women. We seem to have agreement in this discussion regarding the premise that under Christ's teaching a man can be guilty of murder and adultery in his heart before it is ever expressed in action. (Matt. 5:27-28; 15:18-19; I John 3:15), But can we agree that although *it is possible* for one to murder without hate and commit adultery without lust, it is *not possible* for one to lust without committing adultery (according to Matt. 5:27-28)? and to hate a brother without being guilty of murder? The point is that the old law was clear in defining the overt act, or expression, of adultery but it carried with it no vehicle for conveying the conviction of guilt to the hard hearts of those who were (1) lusting after other women, (2) coveting their neighbour's wife, and (3) who were unfaithful in heart toward the wife of their covenant. (See Mal. 2:14-16). All this was going on beneath the surface and was expressing itself in the "put away-marry" conduct, a conduct that was within the very legal provision of the law's letter.

Paul testifies that he would have not known "lust, except the law had said, 'thou shalt not covet.*'" (Rom. 7:7). If adultery is illicit, sexual lust; and if lust is *coveting*, as Paul here indicates, the Jews were guilty on at least two counts of direct transgression. "Thou shalt not covet" is the only command of the ten that dealt exclusively with the unexpressed motivations of the Jewish heart, but due to the nature of Moses's law, conviction of guilt depended on something being manifested that could be undeniably identified as a transgression. How could a Jew have been convicted of coveting? How could it be witnessed? How could an expression, such as stealing, be infallibly linked with the intangible concept of coveting? There was already a command which forbade stealing - the 8th. - so the two were not synonymous. How could the hard heart of Israel be touched with a feeling of guilt for a transgression that had no certain expression?

Like a shark's fin above the water, the "put away-marry" conduct of the Jews signaled the presence of what lay beneath the surface. But this was His problem: coveting and adultery were both

evils of the heart which could exist without expression, or which could be expressed in different ways under different circumstances. Adultery might express itself by “looking” or by “the act”. *The cause, coveting and adultery, was forbidden by the law, but the expression, divorce and remarriage was justified by the same law!* This was doubtless the reason why Moses was forced to tolerate such conduct. It took the spiritual law of Christ, written in the heart, to free man from unrighteousness in heart. (Rom. 8:2).

With this in mind, we can understand the reason for Christ’s expression-to-the-motive approach to the problem; dealing with what they could see and understand, he then worked on back to the cause, what they could not see, yet what they most needed to know. They were guilty of heart adultery and were identifying themselves as hosts to this sin by they undesirable yet legal conduct.

CONCLUSION:

The Negative syllogism is false, because the minor premise is false. All precepts not found written in the scriptures are unscriptural precepts, but the precept allowing marriage for the “loosed” (those who are, or have been loosed) is a scriptural precept (I Cor. 7:27-28).

His Questions:

- 1) No, marriage is not simply a civil arrangement.
- 2) Yes, a person can live in fornication and stop living in it by ceasing whatever he is doing that constitutes the fornication of which he is guilty.

QUESTIONS FOR THE NEGATIVE:

- 1) If the liberated woman of I Cor. 7:39 should disregard Paul’s command, should marry out of the Lord, and then should determine to repent of her transgression, could she be forgiven without doing anything about her marriage? Would her marriage be holy?
- 2) Two people decide to dissolve their marriage on grounds of incompatibility. The woman marries again. If this marriage is unholy, can you pinpoint the exact reason? If the man of the first marriage suddenly died, would the 2nd. marriage become holy?

-Philip Lydic

Second Negative

It will be noted the extra length of the second affirmative article. I do not object to this one exception and it indicates no more than his enthusiasm to get the subject across. However, it puts me in a difficult position of trying to keep my article within the preagreed limit of 4000 words. I find this nearly impossible to do.

PART 1: TWO WORDS - ONE MEANING

Brother Lydic asserts that since “fornication” and “adultery” are two different words they must have two different meanings, else they wouldn’t be two words. (I fear from this that the affirmative would do away with the entire realm of synonyms). I agree that there is *some* difference in the two words, yet the basic meaning is the same - “unlawful sexual intercourse”. I pointed out in the first negative the definition of the words, and usage in English definition, and that from those the meaning is obvious. But the affirmative is his own authority, stating what he thinks the definitions to be and then building his position on that.

All adultery is fornication, but not all fornication is adultery. “Fornication” is a general term, and “adultery” more specific. Following are quotations taken from various dictionaries of the Greek language, and then from Webster’s Unabridged. The word “fornication” is the Greek word “pornea”. It’s defined thusly:

THAYER, p. 532 - “a. pro. of illicit sexual intercourse in general...used of adultery.....in the N.T. univ. any woman indulging in unlawful sexual intercourse, whether for gain or for lust.....univ. a man who indulges in unlawful sexual intercourse, a fornicator.”

ARNDT S GINGRICH, p. 688 - “prostitution, unchastity, fornication, of every kind of unlawful sexual intercourse.....of sexual unfaithfulness of a married woman. Matt. 5:32 19:9.”

MOULTON S MILLIGAN, Vocabulary of the Greek N.T., p. 529 - “....originally meant ‘prostitution’, ‘fornication’, but came to be applied to unlawful sexual intercourse generally. It was a wider term than (adultery) embracing the idea of ‘barter’, ‘traffic’ in sexual vice, though in the O.T. there was a tendency to assimilate in some respects the two terms.”

To these could be added Bagster, Robinson, Strong, Greenfield, Abbot Smith. They all concur in the meaning. Webster says - “1. Illicit sexual intercourse on the part of an unmarried person; the act of such illicit sexual intercourse between a man and woman as does not by law amount to adultery (which see). Fornication is sometimes, esp. in the Bible, used to include all sexual intercourse except between husband and wife or concubine; but usually is distinguished from adultery, and sometimes from incest.”

To these authorities could be added such Dictionaries and Encyclopedias on the Bible as International Standard, Hastings Dictionary, W.E. Vine’s Expository Dictionary of N.T. Words, and such critical commentators on the Greek as A.T. Robertson’s Word Pictures, and Vicent’s Word Studies.

As to the word “Adultery” I can call upon the same authorities. They all point out the definition is “unlawful sexual intercourse” involving a person that is married. The term specifies nothing more than simply that one of the persons involved lawfully belongs to another. The meaning of sexual intercourse cannot be taken from these words”.

Now I realize that this particular point will have no effect on the affirmative since he believes that one can divorce for any cause and remarry without sin. Just taking the statement of Jesus in Matt.19:9 he has the except “for fornication”. If fornication means only unmarried persons unlawful sexual intercourse, then a man would only be able to put away his wife if she had had intercourse before they were married, but there is no provision made if she has intercourse with another after

they are married. It should be evident that unlawful intercourse after marriage is much more detrimental to the marriage relationship than before. Too, if the couple had had intercourse together before they were married, and with no other, they would be guilty of fornication, and hence after a while, if he tired of her he could put her away for fornication, though he had been as guilty as she. That interpretation doesn't make much sense to me.

The affirmative keeps asserting the idea of "heart-adultery" as the adultery in Matt. 19: something that takes place only in the heart, and is not actual commission of the act. The only place the phrase "in the heart" is used is in Matt. 5, and then is connected with "looking to lust". Adultery is unlawful sexual intercourse; the man here was going over the act in his heart, and intended to fulfill his lust in the act with the woman if the opportunity were there. The affirmative is doing like the Adventist does with the Sabbath, he just hangs the phrase "in the heart" onto the passage that suits his position the best. Jesus does not modify "adultery" with "in the heart" in Matt. 19. The affirmative has read that into it. He speaks of actual commission. I could as well argue that adultery is only a condition of the eye-ball since Peter says that some had "eyes full of adultery", and hence either needed an Optometrist, or to "pluck them out and cast them away". Matt. 19 speaks of what people do, not what they think. In Matt. 5:28, Jesus speaks of lust, and in verses 31-32 he speaks of their conduct.

PART 2: MARRIAGE

The affirmative affirms that ALL second marriages are holy, regardless of what reason for the termination of the first. He says that "if the relationship is marriage, it is holy." He rightly expresses that marriage is a relationship. He has gone through a great deal of rigamarole about marriage is an institution enjoined on man, and is not individual, but still cannot, in any of his argumentation, speak of marriage in any way other than the relationship existing between a man and woman. We are to establish whether all of these relationships are holy or unholy, right or wrong, lawful or unlawful.

The affirmative kind of slips in through a side door the loophole that he will not sanction everyone who is married. He wants to say that the ideal of marriage is always holy, but there are some that take advantage of it. Note: "This defense is dedicated to the honor of marriage itself and will not attempt to contend for every policy, practice or act that some have thought to justify by marriage. If illegal possession, adultery, and lust are evil, they are not made right by any benefit of marriage: this is to say that all who do these things do evil, regardless of his or her status". We make note also of this tidbit. "But if marriage does not make an inherently evil practice right, the unlawful practice does not make the marriage evil." Tell us affirmative, can a marriage (relationship between a man and woman) be holy and unholy at the same time? Illegal possession, adultery, and lust are evil, and cannot be made right by any benefit of marriage! That's what this discussion is all a-bout.

MARK 6:17-18

I am completely astounded at the affirmatives rejoinder on the case of Herod and Herodias. "The marriage itself did not justify his inherently evil acts, but the acts in turn did not make the marriage evil." The affirmative *assumes* first that Herodias had never divorced Philip, then builds a colossal argument on it. To the affirmative, the word "marriage" must denote a holy relationship. This was marriage, but far from holy. He makes fun of an idea of a "wifeless - husbandless" relationship called marriage. Well, here it is. It was marriage, but Herodias was not accepted as the wife of Herod!

A point on polygamy is made here also. He says that a woman would be guilty of adultery if she had more than one husband at a time. But, the man could have more than one wife at a time and it be holy. The implied conclusion is that since Herodias hadn't divorced Philip, then married Herod, she was an adulteress. If the situation were reversed, it would have been lawful for Herod to have married her, and had other wives also. In that case, this would have been unlawful for Herodias, but lawful for Herod, since Herodias was guilty of having more than one husband. But as a casual observation note that John said to HEROD, "it is not lawful for you to have thy brother's wife."

The rest of the affirmative remarks and attempts at counter arguments, are based on his assumption that Herodias had not gotten a divorce from Philip. The Jewish historian Josephus, p. 541, states that Herodias *did* divorce Philip, and *then* married Herod. But, let's suppose that she didn't divorce Philip. Mark says that she and Herod were married. The affirmative says that a marriage necessitates that it be a holy, lawful relationship. Yet, it wasn't! Pshaw! It was evil, but was holy. Looks like a contradiction to me.

John said, "it is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife." Paul said of the Christian at Corinth, "one of you has his father's wife." Same phraseology, and both were unlawful!

HEBREWS 13:4

"Let marriage be had in honor among all, and let the bed be undefiled: for fornicators and adulterers God will judge." This passage is supposed to contain the affirmatives affirmative and prove that all second marriages are holy and acceptable to God, regardless. The King James translation reads some differently than this American Standard, but the context shows amply the meaning. The purpose of marriage is to be holy, yet there are some that corrupt the marriage relationship, and those will be condemned. I think the Goodspeed translation of this passage gets at the meaning. "Marriage should be respected by everyone, and the marriage relation kept sacred, for vicious and immoral people God will punish." Those that violate God's laws in respect to marriage will be condemned.

Now, notice in this connection, Matt. 19:9. The man that divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery. The adultery is committed at the time of marriage. Now take that in the light of Brother Lydic's interpretation of Heb. 13. The man enters into a valid and holy, acceptable to God marriage, but being guilty of adultery will be condemned. Now that's a picture for you. A man will enter a marriage that's acceptable to God, but will still be condemned for entering that marriage.

WHAT IS MARRIAGE?

Marriage is a relationship that exists between a man and woman, that is to have certain God given purposes. There are many scriptures that touch on the marriage relationship. We have discussed many of them. Sometimes the word "marriage" can be misleading. The Bible also speaks of a man and woman being "joined together", or "bound", or "glued". These words are not necessarily synonyms of the word "marriage". (Note: Herod married Herodias, but she was still counted the wife of Philip). God wants all men to be honorable in respect to his regulations concerning marriage, Heb. 13:4, I Thess. 4:1-5, and keep that relationship undefiled, but men have not done so. Marriage is a personal relationship between a man and woman. Let's notice now what makes this relationship.

AGREEMENT: The affirmative declares that marriage is only an agreement between a man and woman to marry, and, that such agreement might even include sharing the husband with another woman. He says, "Our custom in America prohibits polygamy, but even if such was our custom, there would be no direct command forbidding men to have more than one wife." Shades of the

Book of Mormon! I deny that polygamy is authorized by the law of Christ, and I challenge for proof. Certainly there is no *direct command* that *forbids* polygamy. There is no *direct command* that forbids instrumental music in worship, corn bread and cider for the Lord's supper, or sprinkling for baptism, but we have no authority to accept and practice them. But then, why limit it to men. There would be no direct command forbidding women having more than one husband at a time, (polyandry). Brother Lydic is basing a lot of his doctrine on the Old Testament. I wonder if it would be alright for men to have concubines now if custom and the wives agreed to it? If the agreement does it, they could agree to anything.

In the first affirmative he placed the point of marriage at the civil ceremony before the judge, in the second he places it at the point of mutual agreement between the man and woman. I'm curious as to where he will put it in the third affirmative.

Now, what is the purpose of marriage? The affirmative states as the only purpose sexual intercourse, or negatively, "to avoid fornication" (unlawful sexual intercourse). That seems to me a degraded view. But here is an amazing thing. The purpose of marriage is sexual intercourse lawfully, yet you can have the marriage union without it, so says the affirmative. Doesn't make much sense to me. Most every passage he submitted on this subject here had to do with sexual intercourse.

"To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife." I Cor. 7:2, AV. That's just the point, one does not avoid fornication by having someone else's wife. There is that word "have" again. Herod "had" his brother's wife; the Corinthian "had" his father's wife; but to avoid fornication let every man "have" his own wife, and let every woman "have" her own husband. This is just what we've been discussing; this passage doesn't help the affirmative any.

I pointed out in the first negative that Marriage necessitated an agreement between a man and woman to marry, and to establish a home. To say that the only purpose in marriage is to satiate one's lust does not fit the scriptures. Sexual gratification is not all there is. "For this is the will of God, even your sanctification, that ye abstain from fornication; that each one of you know how to possess himself of his own vessel in sanctification and honor, not in the passion of lust, even as the Gentiles who know not God;" (I Thess. 4:3-5). God ordained the purpose of union in the beginning. There is the relationship between a man and woman of mutual help and care; the sharing of living. It is not good for man to "live alone". There is also involved in God's purpose the legitimate propagation of the species. These are the things God had in mind when he made them male and female to begin with. Now I meant by "home" the relationship between a man and woman. Brother Lydic, you knew that. You knew I didn't mean a brick bungalow, or apartment, or a geographical location. Why bring up whether Paul was a eunuch; or that he couldn't have a home because he wouldn't be in one place long enough to build a house. That's just quibbling. You could have cut out all that stuff and made your article shorter. The first statement that Webster's Unabridged Dictionary under "marriage" makes is the one I have stated here.

CIVIL LAW: The affirmative makes light of my including civil law as a necessary thing to make a marriage. Marriage to him is just an agreement. I suppose that when a man asks a woman, "will you marry me?" and she says "yes", at that moment they are married and can begin cohabitation at that moment even though it may be in *violation of* civil law. Too, any ceremony they would go through before the judge would be for married people.

Paul states in Romans 13 that God expects us to submit to civil requirements. As long as civil law does not *violate God's law*, we are obligated to observe it, or be in rebellion both to civil law and God. Brother Lydic, do you believe that we can ignore civil law, and live as we please? You say it is "custom" that prohibits us from practicing polygamy; I say it is law. The "custom" in this country is opposed to polygamy. Why? Because civil law rules against it. If we can rebel against civil law on marriage requirements, we can do the same on polygamy, or *any other thing*.

The affirmative introduces “common-law” marriages as supposed refutation of civil requirements, and as a demonstration of his affirmative. He greatly misunderstands what “common-law” marriages indicate. Either Common-Law or Statutory-Law has requirements that must be met. One can be married either by the Common Law or the Statutory Law, but he must meet legal requirements in *both*. In Texas, which has a Common Law on marriage, two people are considered *married* when they have agreed to marry, can meet the civil requirements, and *begin cohabitation* as husband and wife. I refer you to Texas Jurisprudence, Vol. 28, p. 714. Now, whether it is Common Law or Statutory Law, people still satisfy the requirements of civil law. That is all I have contended, a person must meet the requirements of civil law.

Now all the argueing that the affirmative has done on this point has no point if he is not contending that we can just ignore civil law entirely. Come on brother Lydic, do you actually teach people to become law-breakers?

CONSUMMATION: When is a marriage consummated? Brother Lydic says it is at the agreement made. I pointed out that it is at the coming together in sexual intercourse. One definition of “consummation” is “to complete a marriage by sexual intercourse.” (American College Dictionary). The quibble is made that this intercourse must precede marriage and hence would be fornication. No, it is in this act that consummation takes place. Each step is a lawful step. Certainly, to turn these steps around, and place intercourse first, would be unlawful. It is just like the plan of salvation. Each step, taken in its turn, faith, repentance, confession, baptism, is the lawful order. But to put baptism first, though it might be the same otherwise, would be wrong.

MATTHEW 1:18-20 - JOSEPH AND MARY

I pointed out in my last article some scriptures of unlawful marriage relationships, and simply noted that the persons in them were not considered as belonging to one another as “husband” and “wife”. This was a simple observation as stated in our English Bible, In Greek there is no special term for “husband” and “wife”. These words are taken from the same words that simply mean “man” and “woman”, regardless of marital condition. The only way that they can be determined to mean “husband” and “wife” is by the context of the statement. The terms themselves do not indicate whether the man or woman is married or single. This is pertinent to the case of Mary and Joseph. Also, we are dealing for a large part with Jewish custom, and that must be considered. It is stated that Mary was “espoused” (betrothed) to Joseph. The word is “mnasteuo” and means “to be promised in marriage, be betrothed”, Thayer, p. 416. After the Lord had appeared to Joseph, he took Mary, then came the taxation and they left for Bethlehem; so it says, “And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judea to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and family of David; to enroll himself with Mary, who was betrothed to him, being great with child.” Luke 2:4-5. The King James translation says, “To be taxed with Mary his es-poused wife, being great with child.” After all those events had passed, the Lord having appeared to him a long time before, Mary was still only just “espoused” to him, or if you please, still just “promised to marry”. The Jewish betrothal period was much more serious than our own engagement period, and was attended by great formality. The promise to marry sort of “staked out the claim”, and marked one another as belonging to each other, to that extent. Any violation had great consequences. The affirmative says that marriage is just an agreement to marry. Here is an instance where the agreement was made, but for a long time afterward, they were still just “promised” to marry, and there is a great deal of difference.

Much play is made on the subject of “put away”, or as used in some passages, “divorce”. Notice again the definition given by Arndt & Gingrich, Greek-English Lexicon, p. 96, “let go, send away,

dismiss....divorce, send away one's wife, or betrothed". In the case of persons who are married, it means simply to dismiss or send away (separation of bed and board). In the instance of betrothal, it is simply a repudiation of the other, a formal breaking of the promise to marry. It was attended in both instances by a pap-er testifying to that fact.

Now, instead of being an argument for the affirmative, it is the contrary. Mary was just "es-poused" to Joseph until he "knew" her.

MATTHEW 19

I must admit that it is very difficult to figure out just what the af-firmative is saying on some things, including this passage. Under the heading of Matthew 19, the affirmative makes a sort of argument based on the case of Joseph and Mary. I have dealt with Joseph and Mary, so his argument using Matthew 19 doesn't mean anything. I was amused at his detailed argument getting Joseph and Mary under Matthew 19:1-10 *before Christ is even born*. I am interested to know if the affirmative thinks that Matthew 19 is part of the Law of Moses or the law of Christ. I'm not interested in what the Law of Moses has to say; it has no bearing here. There are places where it touches on incidents, such as the Jews questions in Matt. 19, but we're not under the Law of Moses now, I disagree with his use of Deut. 2*4:1-4, but do not intend to get into a long discussion of what the Law of Moses re-quired or allowed. Jesus said that Moses allowed the people to put away their wives for any cause but he was stating something different from Moses.

The affirmative further says, "Note carefully that the *time of guilt* of adultery is set by Christ as being either at the exact moment of, or before, the remarriage." Now Jesus stated this, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery." From this language, how do you possibly, brother affirmative, get the committing adultery in before the marrying again? You would have to change it up to say, "Whosoever shall put away his wife,....commits adultery, and shall marry another." That does not make any sense, nor is it what Jesus said. How-ever, you admit to the adultery being committed at the point of marriage. That's what Jesus is say-ing, and what I've been contending. I have already pointed out that adultery is *unlawful sexual inter-course*. Jesus speaks here, not of what they *think*, but what they do. Adult-ery involves intercourse, but is committed at the point of marriage, so marriage necessitates intercourse.

The affirmative next brings up polygamy, and Jewish practice in relation to Matt. 19. His arguments are dependent on Matt. 19 being part of the Law of Moses. Now which is it affirmative, the Law of Christ or the Law of Moses? If it is a part of the Law of Moses, then it is of that which has been taken out of the way (Col. 2:14-16) and has absolutely no bearing on us today. Affirmative, you have been nibbling around on Matt. 19 all along, now come out and tell us just what the passage is all about. Quit nibbling and take a good bite of it. You dabble around in the Old Testament trying to make laws of the Mosaic time apply today, then try to take some of Christ's laws and make them part of the Old. Just where do you stand?

PART 3: MISCELLANEOUS SCRIPTURES

ROMANS 7

Paul, in this passage, is using the marriage relationship to illustrate a point concerning the Old Law. He does not indicate the marriage subject he discusses is the Law of Moses on that subject. The affirmative argues solely from the standpoint that Paul was speaking of marriage according to the Law of Moses. Here is an instance where he wants to put this practice back into the Old, but when it

suits him better, he doesn't mind dipping back there to try finding an argument to use in their practices. In speaking of the marriage condition here Paul uses the present tense. His statement is "For the woman that hath a husband is bound by law to the husband while he liveth; but if the husband dies, she is discharged from the law of the husband." First, in I Cor. 7:39 Paul says, "A wife is bound for so long time as her husband liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is free to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord." This is the *same* statement of fact. Speaks of the condition under the law of Christ. Second, Paul says he is addressing men who "know law". The definite article "the" is not in the Greek, but has been supplied by the translators. In the second half of verse 1 he refers then to "the" law, the law of Moses. In verse 2 he says that the woman is bound by "law" to the husband, and no definite article is used here and does not indicate "the" law of Moses. I simply refer you back to my comments on Romans 7 in the first negative. The affirmative hasn't destroyed them.

I CORINTHIANS 7:10-11

"That the wife depart not from her husband (but should she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband)"

I refer you to my remarks on this passage in the first negative article. You can simply note here that the woman, if she "departs" ("separate, divide, part, put asunder. To separate one's self from." Thayer, p. 674) she is to remain *unmarried*. This is a command. Here is a woman that is *not married*. Paul says she is to remain that way or go back to her husband. There is no indication by this passage that there was not mutual consent or agreement. The affirmative has been arguing all along that if a person is not married, they are loosed, and if they are loosed they can remarry anyone they want to. Paul says you can't. The affirmative's position is that you can divorce at *your own will*, and for whatever reason you want, and marry again to someone else, and it is holy and acceptable to God. He has just come up with this mutual agreement to separate thing because this passage is uncomfortable for him.

I CORINTHIANS 7:15

"Yet if the unbelieving departeth, let him depart: the brother or the sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us in peace."

The affirmative presents that desertion by the unbeliever is grounds for remarriage. Of course, any cause for divorce and remarriage is acceptable to the affirmative, but that is not what Paul is saying here. The word "bondage" is from "doulou" and means *servitude*. The word "bond" in verse 39, where a woman is bound to her husband as long as he lives, is "deo", and means to "bind together, fasten with chains". (Both definitions from Thayer). Verse 39 refers to the fact of being bound together; verse 15 to the matter of serving one another. If the unbeliever departs, the believer is not obligated to try to, or be forced to, fulfill their obligations towards their spouse; they are no longer expected to be in servitude to the other. Neither is there any indication of "mutual agreement" to dissolve anything in this passage.

I CORINTHIANS 7:27-28

I have touched on this passage also in the first negative, and there is no need to go over it again. The affirmative still meets himself coming back here, and puts Paul into a contradiction with himself in verses 10-11 of the same chapter.

HIS QUESTIONS:

1) I Cor. 7:39. Brother Lydic, the subject of whether a Christian must marry only another Christian, or can marry one who is not, does not belong in this discussion, and I don't intend to have it injected into it. That is a subject to itself. The part of the passage that is pertinent to our discussion is that a woman is bound to her husband as long as he lives, and is not free to marry anyone else she chooses.

2) Part 1. Answer, Matt. 19:9. Part 2. Any answer I would give on this would be opinion.

-Maurice Barnett

Third Affirmative

SECTION I: THE BIG QUESTION

PART I: The Meat of the Coconut

We are now getting right down to the meat of the coconut. The question that we must now deal with is a question that holds the key to our problem. Do people commit adultery by simply getting married? The Negative argues that they do, and I contend that they do not.

Here is the simple framework of the Negative case, as I understand it:

- 1) The man who attempts to dissolve an existing marriage for any other reason than that his wife was unfaithful, is making a futile attempt; the marriage cannot be dissolved.
- 2) The man who therefore puts away his wife for some reason other than fornication, and who marries another woman, is a man who A. is still married to the first wife, and B. who has to be sexually united with the second woman in order to become married to her.
- 3) Therefore, to say that he remarried, is to say that he had an unlawful (adulterous) relationship with a second woman: the second marriage is “adulterous”.

This is my case:

- 1) Marriage is simply a covenant, or agreement, between a man and a woman, and as such can be voluntarily dissolved by them on any grounds (the reason for the nullification is immaterial to whether or not it can be dissolved, REMEMBER: I do not argue that marriage dissolution is right, permissible, convenient or good; I only argue that it is possible.)
- 2) The man who has dissolved a marriage is a man who is therefore A. single, and B. who can therefore marry without sin (I Cor. 7:27-28).
- 3) To say that he remarried, is to say that he entered into a holy relationship with a wife; a relationship that will make any sexual union within, and relative to, that relationship, a sanctified thing.

PART II: What is Marriage?

Marriage is an agreement: on this we agree. The difference between us lies in our opposing answers to this question: what is required to bring about this agreement, and what has the power to dissolve the agreement? This issue is important. If a man can put away his wife and marry another without the Negative’s consummation, he can presumably be guilty of the adultery mentioned by Christ without the physical union which the Negative insists is the way the adultery is committed. Is marriage an agreement, or isn’t it? Can a man put away his wife and enter into a marriage with a second woman without a sexual union? If he can, it is possible for him to be guilty of the adultery Christ spoke of without becoming involved in a sexual act, illicit or otherwise. If, on the other hand, the Negative premise is true, and marriage is a product of (1) agreement, (2) compliance with law, and (3) consummation, then marriage is an EFFECT of its cause, the three conditions. On the *one hand*, the Negative says that marriage is an agreement, and on the other hand he says that it is a product of three contingencies, only one of which is “agreement”.

Here he is in serious trouble. There are only two alternatives. If the order is that first the part-

ners enter a state of marriage, and then later there is a possible or probable sexual relationship, the effect will be that what Christ said in Matt. 19:9 would not apply to men who had (1) put away and (2) married another: it would *only* apply to those who (1) put away, (2) married another, and (3) who were *then* able to physically unite. This would mean that the divorce and the remarriage has nothing to do with how and why the adultery is committed; it would mean that the physical union after the marriage, and only the physical union, brought about the adultery. If a man could put away and remarry without a subsequent sexual union, there would be no adultery. If marriage is first and union second, one could not commit adultery just by getting married.

We know that it is possible for married people to live separately, and we know that many have done so for long periods of time. So people can remain married without physical contact. The question is, can they GET married without first going through the Negative's sexual consummation? This is the thing we need to determine: is marriage an effect of sexual union?

One of the basic rules of logic in cause-effect relationship reasoning is that any cause, with all its parts, must precede its effect. An effect cannot predate its cause, or any of its contingent parts. We know that sexual union does not have to follow a marriage, so the *only* question that concerns us is, must his union precede the marriage? **IF MARRIAGE IS A PRODUCT OF SEXUAL UNION, THAT UNION MUST PRE-DATE THE EFFECTIVE TIME OF THE MARRIAGE.**

To this the Negative agrees. Notice: "I have already pointed out that adultery is unlawful sexual intercourse. Jesus speaks here, not of what they think, but of what they do. Adultery involves intercourse, but is committed at the point of marriage, so marriage necessitates intercourse." This means that marriage depends upon intercourse. Sexual union is possible without marriage, but marriage is not possible without sexual union.

What does God call sexual union before and out of wedlock? FORNICATION! This point was treated with a word in the last Negative article: "quibbling". Marriage is designed to eliminate fornication, but yet marriage depends upon fornication for its existence. My argument may carry no weight with the Negative, but I know of many who consider it extremely serious. This is the second horn of his dilemma. Will it be dealt with?

PART III: Common-Law Marriages

Although the Negative has disagreed with me in conclusion, some of his last arguments have, oddly enough, supported my case. Notice his comments about Texas law. "In Texas, which has a common Law on Marriage, two people are considered married when they have agreed to marry, can meet the civil requirements, and begin cohabitation as husband and wife. I refer you to *Texas Jurisprudence*, Vol. 28, p. 714. Now, whether it is Common Law or Statutory Law, people still satisfy the requirements of civil law. That is all I have contended; a person must meet the requirements of law." This was offered in reply to my point on the *order* of what it takes to bring about a marriage -sexual union first, agreement, and then compliance with law? (We know- that in some states, seven years of fornication makes the pair automatically husband and wife, and they must then subject themselves to lawful recognition as married). What the Negative has said in effect, is that he agrees with me: that (in Texas, at least) when two people agree that they *are* married, they *are* married. In Texas they are married before and without consummation, so in Texas a man can put away his wife, marry another (by agreement only) without committing the adultery Christ mentioned. Should Texas Bibles be changed to read, "Whosoever shall put away,.....and shall marry another, except in Texas, committeth adultery"? Can a man escape an application of Matt. 19:9 by living in a certain state or by getting a common law marriage?

Why so much argument about the fact that Joseph and Mary were married before and without

“consummation” if there is to be an admission that the same thing is possible today in Texas? According to the Negative definition, both civil law and consummation are equal factors in the cause of marriage. But according to the stipulation that one must comply with prevailing law, he may sometimes find such law in conflict with one or both of the other two factors. In this case, the consummation factor says that consummation comes first, and the law factor says that they are married by agreement and then may consummate. Now how is that for a head-scratcher? We concur that marriage is an agreement. If we stick to that, we can avoid all contradictions.

Certainly we must comply with civil law, but if I defy the law and go fishing without a license, will you argue that I’m not fishing - just because I’m defying the law? It seems a little silly to tell me that I’m not fishing when we’re standing there looking at the fish laying on the bank at my feet, and I have a line in the water. It also seems a little strange that some will tell a woman that she isn’t married when she has two or three kids pulling at her skirt and crying for attention; and there she is fixing supper for her husband - and there is a signed marriage agreement in the dresser drawer. The only person on earth who is qualified to judge a marriage is the person who is married - and he is only qualified to judge his *own*. (See James 4:11-12)

PART IV: Getting at it Through Questions

“And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery:” (Matt. 19:9).

If we can briefly and sincerely answer the following questions, and then write them down in their order, we can find the answer to this entire discussion. Do we have the sincerity and the desire to find the truth that it will take to deal justly with these questions?

- 1) Did the subject of this text actually “put away” the first woman and actually marry the second?
- 2) If he actually did put her away, did he then become single?
- 3) If he did not become single, when he put her away, did he not then simply become the husband of two wives when he married the second woman?
- 4) If he simply became the husband of two wives as a result of having married the second woman, why did Christ use “adultery” in referring to this behavior?
- 5) If this behavior was of itself “adulterous” conduct for the Jews (to whom Christ spoke), why was it not attacked simply as polygamy rather than as a specific action pattern?
- 6) Was polygamy adultery? If it was, why did Christ bring the act of putting away and the exception of fornication into the picture as contingencies? That is to say, would the man be justified in marrying another if he did *not* put the first one away?
- 7) If, on the other hand, (see #'s 2 & 3) he did become single as a result of having put her away for some small reason, how could he then commit adultery by entering into a subsequent marriage?
- 8) Can the single commit adultery? Are not single people free to marry? In my next article I intend to fully explain my understanding of Matt. 19. How I treat this text will depend somewhat upon how the Negative answers the 8 questions.

SECTION II: REPLIES

PART I: The Nature of Marriage

The Negative likes the Goodspeed Translation of Heb. 13:4. I will quote: “Marriage should be

respected by everyone, and the marriage relation kept sacred, for vicious and immoral people God will punish.” Indeed, marriage should be respected by everyone; but who is more disrespectful of marriage than those who say it is “unholy” and “adulterous”? Who, who is more vicious than those who charge, “Your marriage is unholy! You must separate!”? This text does not say, “My marriage should be respected by everyone.” It says that MARRIAGE should be respected by EVERYONE. A second marriage is either a marriage or it is not: if it is, it should be respected by everyone. This text does not doubt that the marriage relation is sacred. It simply demands that it be kept as such.

One sin is unforgivable; and that is blasphemy of the Holy Spirit. When men call good “evil” and evil “good” there is no hope for them. They have so twisted their values so out of shape that not even God can reach them. The principle applies to marriage. Marriage is of itself, good. The very nature of what it is supposed to do is good. All the evil that people have done with marriage they could have done without marriage. There are only two things that are made possible by marriage that are not possible without marriage: (1) God-sanctioned sexual relationships and (2) legitimate children. Name any other thing that you want to name, from sharing of property to establishing a domicile, and I’ll show you how you can have the same thing without having a marriage. There are two, and only two things that come only through and by marriage. Thus it is inescapable that these two results are the only two results that marriage is designed to achieve. This is the sum-total of marriage: an agreement by which the bodies of each at once become the property of the other for the purpose of legitimate sexual union. *Any other* result can be obtained without marriage, so the only purpose of marriage is good. Who will defy the scripture and call it evil?

Marriage is a covenant and has a purpose; it is not a series of events. All sexual relationships on the outside are relationships of fornication. If one of the partners of the marriage becomes guilty of adultery, the marriage cannot save him. Marriage cannot make an evil, good. If an illegitimate child comes into the family at a later time, is the marriage therefore adulterous? It is not responsible.

Let us say that a married woman runs off to another town some 100 miles away from her husband’s house and lives with a single man for six months. He is guilty of fornication and she is committing adultery. After six months they make a marriage covenant. The fornication (used in this sense) ceases, but the adultery on her part continues. They are still condemned. The marriage was able to eliminate the evil between them, but the adultery still existed because of the infidelity on her part. In all this evil, which existed six months prior to the marriage, the marriage was the only good thing that they did. Subtract the marriage agreement, and not one smallest bit of evil is gone. Therefore, the marriage, of itself, is not any part of the evil.

Now, let us say that the first husband died the eighth month. The adultery would cease as an act in violence to the first marriage. If they were indeed married, the subsequent sexual unions between them would be without significance in terms of sin. They might still be condemned for their past or general wickedness, but if they are married, they are not committing fornication or adultery. Why? Because the marriage underwent a change? No. Then what happened? She had been living in constant violation to a covenant of fidelity to her first husband, and he would not release her from it (Rom. 7: 1-3). His death did what his heart would not do. Was the second marriage evil, or was the adultery evil? The coming and going of the adultery did not affect the marriage itself. The reading of Rom. 7:1-3 applies word for word to this example. If the husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. The adultery was based upon two, and only two conditions: (1) she was bound to one husband, and (2) at the same time she was living with another man. The fact that she was married to the second man has not the slightest effect on the result. This is true also in the case of Herod and Herodias.

PART II: Shades of Mormonism?

In my last article I said, “Our custom in America prohibits polygamy, but even if such was our custom, there would be no direct command forbidding *men* to have more than one wife.” To this the Negative replied, “Shades of the Book of Mormon! I deny that polygamy is authorized by the law of Christ, and I challenge for proof. Certainly there is no direct command that forbids polygamy.”

Why am I accused of upholding Mormonism, challenged for proof on some-thing that I did not say, and then favored with a statement of complete agreement with what was supposed to have been so terrible?

“.....that the wife depart not from her husband (but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband)” (I Cor. 7:10).

The Negative states that the departed sister is “not married”. Then surely he will agree that Paul is not addressing his remarks to her, for he clearly states that he is giving this command to the “married” (see v. 10). If she is single, she is exempt from this command. In addition to this, if she is not married, she must certainly be single, loosed, and unmarried. Paul distinctly says that the unmarried may marry if they choose, and without sin. And this he specifically says to the unmarried - to the woman of this passage. If indeed she is unmarried.

Being married or unmarried is a relative matter. One can be dead and a-live at the same time, depending upon the object of the verb. I am dead to sin, alive to Christ. The departed woman is married to the man she left, but to the prospective second husband she is to remain unmarried. How can a sing-le woman return “to her husband”? Do unmarried people have husbands and wives?

Some of the same type of thinking is responsible for the idea that Her-odias could not have been the wife of Herod, because it was said she was the wife of Philip. Isn't it at all possible that she could have been married to both, and thus the wife of both. In fact, this is just what the Bible says, isn't it? “..... for he (Herod) had married her...” and “...it is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife...” Polyandry.

PART III: Definitions

We are agreed on the definitions of adultery and fornication. How they are used depends upon the context. We are not agreed that the “adultery” of Matt. 19:9 demands the literal act as imperative to its meaning. We know that Christ taught that a man can commit adultery in his heart without and before its expression in act. (Matt. 5:27) It is true that Christ says nothing of adultery “in the heart” in Matt. 19:9, but neither does he say it is in the second marriage. If it must be said to be believed, why do you believe that the adultery is in the Marriage? I know why. Because Christ said, “He that putteth away and marries another committeth adultery.” This means that adult-ery is in the second marriage? He also said, “He that looketh to lust.....

committeth adultery.” Then, to be consistent, he must have meant here that the adultery is committed in the looking. Maybe this is the “eyeball adultery” you mentioned in the last Negative article.

We know that it was in the heart, because Christ said it was. Now let's bear down on the point. A married man (1) decides to take advantage of his first opportunity, (2) he sees a woman who appeals to him, and he looks to lust after her, (3) the opportunity arrives and he fulfills his lust. Now, just when did the man become guilty of adultery? We know he was guilty of sin at the time of #1, when he decided to take advantage of the first opportunity. Now, let us change number 3 to read, (3) He puts away his wife and marries the other woman. Does this change the time of guilt. No, of course not. The only possible conclusion we can reach is that the adultery is not in the put-ting away and/or

the remarriage any more than it was in the looking. It was in the heart. Whether or not it was identified and expressed in a thousand different ways is beside the point and immaterial to the TIME OF GUILT. What was in the heart determines the guilt, what a man did in looking, or divorcing or remarrying only evidences the guilt - it does not add to it.

What if a man looks to lust, but unknown to him, his wife had been killed the day before. Is he committing adultery? We know he is. How? In his heart, not in act. Even if he carried out his desire, he would not be guilty in act - he would be guilty in heart. The act changes nothing, so the act is not the adultery of which the man is guilty.

PART IV: Herod & Herodias

The point was made that Herodias did divorce Philip? Was this a divorce by Roman or Jewish Law? If Roman, was it made fact according to Jewish law? Was it possible for a Jewess to divorce her husband under the terms of the Old law? I have shown by syllogism (which you evidently accepted) that had she been divorced by Philip, she would have been single, and free to marry. The fact that she was still his wife, proves that she was not divorced from and by him. But, answer this, John said, "It is not lawful for thee to have her." If Herod had given her up, had separated physically from her, but had not dis-solved the marriage, would he have remained in adultery solely on the basis of the undissolved marriage?

PART V: Joseph and Mary

The Negative position is that Joseph and Mary did not become married until he "knew her". Since this was after the birth of Christ, the Negative is saying,

1) that there was not a husband-wife relationship between Joseph and Mary until after the birth of Christ.

A. "And Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus." (See Matt. 1:16)

B. "Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary, thy wife." (See Matt. 1:20) C.

"Then Joseph, being raised from sleep, did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife: and knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name Jesus." (See Matt. 1:25) 2) That Christ was born an illegitimate child, out of wedlock, and was introduced into the world as the product of sin. A. "... and Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ." (Matt. 1:16)

The argument is made that Jewish betrothal, although not a marriage, was a very serious thing, etc. About being married, and just being betrothed, he says, "... and there is a great deal of difference." But he shows no difference. He has maintained to the end that Joseph and Mary were not, and could not be, married before and without the physical union.

This is a fatal mistake. The betrothal is an agreement, and so is marriage. Their relationship was one of marriage; of this there can be no mistake. They were indeed promised, but the promise was the marriage covenant and the promise looked forward to the ultimate union after the birth of Christ. Remember, "... (Joseph) took unto him his wife." (Matt. 1:24) This shows possession of her. What was the purpose of their marriage? to make sexual union holy and to provide for legitimate birth. Will you argue that the marriage of Joseph and Mary was impossible until their was first an illegitimate child and an act of fornication?

-Philip Lydic

Third Negative

In some respects the Affirmative is right in saying we are getting down to the meat of the Coconut, but as far as the *positions* he has put forth in this discussion go, it may rather be that we had the Coconut first, and are getting started on the Pineapple now. It may well turn into a lemon by the next article.

He intimates confusion at my articles. I must admit that I am at a loss at what change in position to expect next from the Affirmative. I answered his first affirmative article to find that there was a change in basic positions in the second, which has taken on new dimensions in the third.

Part I: The Proposition

The proposition, in exclamatory form, is that “the sanctity of all second marriages can be scripturally substantiated.” Phil is not affirming that *marriage* (singular) is holy but that *all second marriages* (plural) are holy and acceptable to God. We get these statements from, for example,

“It will be my obligation in this discussion to show that (1) a man can divorce at will and (2) can subsequently become married to another and different wife. It will also be my responsibility to show that regardless of why the first marriage was dissolved, the second marriage is legitimate and valid. Being married, the participants of the second contract are just as obligated to the command not to depart or to divorce as were the participants of the first marriage.....that anyone will advocate separation for the married is doubtful.....THE ENTIRE CASE AGAINST THE SANCTITY OF SECOND MARRIAGES RESTS UPON THIS PREMISE ‘IT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR A MAN TO UTTER AWAY HIS WIFE BY HIS OWN VOLITION’.....*But once a person has divorced there can be found no scriptural reason why he may not remarry....If the relationship is marriage, it is holy....*”

In his second affirmative, and enlarged upon in the third, comes his position that if a woman still owes allegiance to a former husband, then a second marriage would still be holy, but she would go to hell because she was having unlawful intercourse with another man. I admit it to have been hard to figure out. I have shown that all second marriages are not acceptable to God, and will further show it.

The Affirmative tries so hard to make many of my statements agree with his positions. Especially in his third article, for some reason, he has twisted some of them to try to make it appear that I agree with what he has said. Another implication he leaves is that because I do not reply specifically to a syllogism he makes, or a specific argument that therefore I accept them. Come now! He has tried very hard to make some contradictions in what I have presented but we will shortly find that he cannot “avoid contradictions himself”.

Joseph and Mary

I am astonished at some of the things said on this subject. The arguments made on it are as follows.

(1) He says that there was a “husband-wife” relationship between Joseph and Mary before the birth of Christ. I would like to know *how* that could be seeing he says that the only thing *peculiar to marriage* is lawful sexual intercourse and child bearing. Since they could not and did not have sexual relations, how could there have been a ‘husband-wife’ relationship between them?

(2) He says that they would have to have been married or Jesus would have been an illegitimate child. This is going on the assumption that Joseph was the actual father of Jesus. If Mary had never

married, Jesus still wouldn't have been illegitimate. She conceived by the Holy Spirit, not Joseph. It couldn't have been illegitimate if God did it. On his intimations then, since she conceived by the Holy Spirit, but had to be married to Joseph to make it legitimate, then she committed fornication with the Holy Spirit. Secondly, since the conception took place after the betrothal, which he says is the marriage, it would actually have been adultery. Now I know all that is a bunch of nonsense, but there are your conclusions if you want to put it all in the natural realm.

Jesus took legal parentage and outward respectability from Joseph, but that was as far as parental inheritance went. Phil quotes Matt, 1:16 twice in proof that Jesus was born of Joseph, The passage says ".....and Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ". The modernists use the same passage the same way. They want to make the "whom" refer to Joseph, so it will destroy the virgin birth fact. I will answer the Affirmative the same way I answer them. The word "whom" is *feminine singular*. It *excludes* Joseph. It only includes MARY. Joseph going ahead and "taking" Mary kept out the social uproar it would cause if it appeared Mary had conceived in sin.

(3) Betrothal. I pointed out that there is a "great deal of difference" between betrothal and marriage. The Affirmative says, "But he shows no difference". I'm sorry. I figured he could see it. Thayer defines the word as "promised in marriage". That is the only definition I can find on the word. Phil says the promise was the marriage, but note the definition. Mary was his wife, but in what way? In promise! Jesus spoke of the Kingdom, and other things in the same way. Used the present tense, but were really in promise.

The Affirmative says that the betrothal was an agreement and so is marriage, therefore they are the same. Well, a monkey has eyes, ears, nose and mouth; the Affirmative has eyes, ears, nose and mouth, so they are the same.

Both Matthew and Luke indicate a period of time that the betrothal existed, yet Mary and Joseph hadn't "come together". Luke says that the angel came to "a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph....." The angel told her of what was to come to pass; Mary went to stay with Elizabeth for at least three months, then returned to her house. Matthew says that "When his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Spirit." Before Joseph and Mary had come together her pregnancy was discovered. Now, if they were in actual fact married at the betrothal, they sure didn't act like it. Now, after all these things had transpired, and just before the birth of Jesus, Luke says that Joseph went to Bethlehem, "to enrol himself with Mary, who was betrothed to him, being great with child." (ASV) (Luke 2:5). She was still just "betrothed" to him. That's what the Holy Spirit said.

Herod and Herodias

Since the Affirmative has changed his basic position some, this example doesn't mean much in dealing with part of his position. However, it does in respect to the meaning of words, etc. He maintains that a woman who doesn't divorce her husband and marries another is guilty of polyandry, hence an adulteress. The man she marries is sinless, because it is marriage. (He uses this example to bolster his argument on that point). However, why was it unlawful for HEROD to have her, if she was the only one who was sinning? If the word "marriage" itself indicates a holy, acceptable to God relationship, why was it unlawful for Herod to "have" (possess) her?

Yet, their relationship being marriage, it had to be respected. He says ".....but who is more disrespectful of marriage than those who say it is 'unholy' and 'adulterous'? Who, who is more vicious than those who charge, 'Your marriage is unholy! You must separate!'" I suppose John the Baptist lost his head for nothing. It was mean, vicious, and contrary to God for John to condemn

Herod for having Herodias. Didn't he know it was marriage, and hence holy. At least he could have said to Herodias, "you are an adulteress, but Herod hasn't done any wrong, and your second marriage is holy because that is what the word indicates, and since there is no authority for the married having to separate, you stay married to Herod." Does that bring the example up to date Phil?

Twice in Mark 6:17-18 Herodias is referred to as Philip's wife, but she is never referred to as Herod's. These are the facts. If you know of a place in the New Testament where two persons are referred to as husband and wife of one another in an unlawful relationship, perhaps you will enlighten us.

I Corinthians 7:10-11

"But unto the married I give charge, yea not I, but the Lord, That the wife depart not from her husband (but should she depart let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband); and that the husband leave not his wife,"

I realize that Paul's comments here are addressed to those who are married. The Affirmative concludes therefore that he isn't talking to the woman who is unmarried. That statement is one of those "head-scratchers". He says that if she is unmarried, single, she is exempt from this command, and hence can remarry without sin. Take a look at the passage again, Paul's statement is to those who are married at the moment, then in parentheses he adds "*but should she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband*". What if the woman who is now married should divorce her husband? Here's what Paul says. I requote my statements on this from the first negative.

"'Let her remain' is 'meneto', and is 3rd. person, singular, *present imperative*. Thayer, p. 399, defines the word, meaning 'to continue, to remain as you are'. The present imperative is used to refer to the action as *continuing on*, as being repeated; the imperative is used in *commands*. (See Greek Grammar, Machen, p. 180). Hence, she is commanded to remain continually in an unmarried condition, or go back to her husband." It is stated definitely by Paul that she is *not married*. Phil says that she therefore is single, loosed, and can remarry without sin. If she did though, she would be going contrary to the express command of God here. Hence, the only conclusion we can reach is that to disobey God's commands is *not sin*. Now the Affirmative says "How can a single woman return 'to her husband'? Do unmarried people have husbands and wives?" Paul says that she has a husband, but is unmarried. That's the point I've been hammering at on all along. The word "marriage" and "bond" are not synonyms.

HEBREWS 13:4

"Let marriage be had in honor among all, and let the bed be undefiled: for fornicators and adulterers God will judge."(ASV) This passage is supposed to have contained Phil's affirmative that every marriage is holy and sanctified. The passage doesn't talk about every marriage being honorable and holy, but that we are all to view marriage with honor and respect, and keep the bed undefiled. Why? Paul tells us why..."for fornicators and adulterers God will judge". It is the fornicators and adulterers that dishonor marriage, and defile "the bed" of it. They will be condemned.

I don't know if Phil knows what "bed" here means or not. He referred to the man he knew that was paralyzed, and incapable of sexual relations, and wanted to know if the bed of such partners would be unholy. I suppose it would depend on how old the sheets were. I am sure that most everyone knows that "the bed" here refers to sexual relations. We are to keep the sexual relations of marriage without defilement. Fornication and adultery are such defilements of "the bed".

The Affirmative says on this that “a second marriage is either a marriage or it is not: if it is, it should be respected by *everyone*”. How about the woman who didn’t get the divorce from her husband and married, or the one who divorced, but without consent of the husband? I guess John didn’t have any respect for marriage, when he condemned Herod. On the one hand we are to respect their marriage as being holy, and yet God condemns them for being adulterers. And he talks about a “head-scratcher”. It’s the fornicators and adulterers that don’t have any respect for marriage.

PART II: Those Words Again

The Affirmative keeps asserting that fornication indicates unlawful relations relative to a person that isn’t married (is single), and adultery then only to a person who is married. I have already presented the definitions on these two words. The Affirmative intimates we agree on definition, but not on application of the words. Let’s see how the words are used. Note first the word “fornication”.

The word “harlot” and like words, is the word “fornicator” in Greek. It means one who engages in unlawful sexual intercourse, for gain or for lust. (Thayer, p. 532). Moulton and Milligan (Lexicon, p. 529) quotes a statement made by a man who is in turn quoting his wife as saying “Colubus has made me a prostitute.” The word “prostitute” is the word “fornicator”, but it was a married woman committing it.

Under comments on Romans 7 the Affirmative accepts that Israel was married to God. There was a husband-wife relationship that existed. When Israel went off like a “gadding” wife, and followed false gods, she was spoken of as committing whoredom, or playing the harlot. The Septuagint (Greek translation of the Old Testament) gives the word “fornication” for what she did. If the word itself signifies a single person, why would she be guilty of fornication since she was *married* to God. Note this from Ezekiel: “And the names of them were Oholah the elder, and Oholibah her sister: and they became mine, and they bare sons and daughters. And as for their names, Samaria is Oholah, and Jerusalem Oholibah. And Oholah played the harlot when she was mine; and she doted on her loves, on the Assyrians her neighbors.....(vs. 4-5). The word “harlot” is *porneia*, fornication. In verse 43, still talking about the same ones he says, “Then said I of her that was old in adulteries, Now will they play the harlot with her, and she with them.” The word “adulteries” is *moicheia*, and “harlot” *porneia*. Here both words are used to describe what they did. All previous fornication is spoken of as “adulteries”, and still she commits *fornication*. In I Cor. 10:8 Paul says, “Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand.” That refers us back to Numbers 25: Iff where it tells of Israel playing the harlot. She was married to God, but Paul says she committed “fornication”. (Note also Lev. 17:7 Hos. 4:12 II Chron. 21:11).

In Revelation 2:20-22 we also note: “But I have this against thee, that thou sufferest the woman Jezebel, who calleth herself a prophetess; and she teacheth and seduceth my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to idols. And I gave her time that she should repent; and she willeth not to repent of her fornication. Behold, I cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of her works.” Here both words are used. Why, I don’t know. God’s people could commit *fornication* (vs. 20) and *adultery* (vs. 22) with the same woman.

The words may also be used to make a distinction between them. Some passages use both words to make an emphasis, and some use only one to stand for all unlawful relations, or the word fornication can be specific in referring to adultery. That is why the Greek dictionaries define the word as being “un-lawful sexual intercourse in general”, and point out that it can also mean “adultery” if the “fornication” is committed by a person that legally belongs to another.

In Matthew 19:9 Jesus points out that “he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth

adultery”. Matthew 5*32 gives the same. Now it doesn’t matter who marries her, he is guilty of adultery. If he has never been married before, it makes no difference. He still commits adultery. Why? “Adultery” identifies the unlawful intercourse as involving a person lawfully belonging to another. As the Affirmative’s position goes, Jesus is really pointing out that that would be so, provided that the man had first been married to another woman, and hadn’t divorced her before being married to this woman. You have to do a powerful lot of finaglin to get that out of it.

PART III: Marriage

The Affirmative uses the term “marriage” in several different ways, by definition. (1) It is but an institution enjoined on man; God does not join people together in marriage; (2) the union of man and woman which is to be respected; (3) just an agreement between two people; (4) a relationship that continues to exist. On point four note this: “To say that he *remarried*, is to say that he *entered into a holy relationship with a wife; a relationship that will make any sexual union within, and relative to, that relationship, a sanctified thing.*” (My emphasis, MB). But he keeps arguing that it isn’t the relationship at all, but just the agreement. If marriage is just the agreement, what do you call the relationship established? Answer that for us Affirmative.

The Affirmative misses my definitions again. He charges me with saying that a “marriage” cannot be dissolved. He also charges me with saying that marriage is just an agreement. Where have I said that? Perhaps you should reread my articles.

NATURE OF MARRIAGE

If I understand the Affirmative, he asserts that marriage can make some intercourse righteous, but does not really change a thing for others. The argument is made that a woman leaves her husband, and lives with a man for six months. She is committing adultery against her first husband and he is committing fornication. They then agree to marry, and from then on she is still an adulteress, but from his side he has ceased sinning in it because she is his wife. By the way, he points out the case of Herod and Herodias here as perfectly fitting this point. Tell us, Affirmative, why did John condemn HEROD for having Herodias? He would have been without sin in the affair. Phil says that the marriage was the only good thing about the affair (mentioned above). I can’t see that agreeing with someone to keep on sinning is a good thing. The thing that was making her a sinner was her relationship with the second man. It was sin before and after true enough, but it does not mean therefore the marriage was sacred. Now get it. The Affirmative said that “being married, the participants of the second contract are just as obligated to the command not to depart or to divorce as were the participants of the first marriage.” “That anyone will advocate separation for the married is doubtful.” Here is the woman then. She is an adulteress because she is still bound by the law of her first husband, and having intercourse with a second man, whereby her sin comes, but being married to the second man, she is under command not to divorce him. Now, isn’t that a barrel of pickles. Affirmative, your position is based on your own definitions of words, plus the human reasoning you condemned in your first article.

Note again Matt. 19:9. “He that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery”.

CAUSE AND EFFECT

I pointed out that in order to have the relationship of marriage, there are three things that are necessary. Agreement, meeting of civil requirements, and consummation by sexual intercourse. The

Affirmative insists then that these three must precede in entirety the marriage; that is, they are the causes. Hence he concludes that the consummation is fornication since it precedes the marriage. Now, cause and effect does not always work the way the Affirmative puts forth that it does.

In order to get *into* Christ, one must meet certain requirements. Faith, Repentance, and Baptism. Now, a person cannot have remission of sin, cannot get into Christ without meeting these requirements. Are we to say then that a man believes, repents, and is baptized; then some time after that he has remission of sins, and enters into Christ? No. In Romans 6 we find out that it is in *the* act of baptism that one enters into Christ, and has justification of sin". How about *your* cause and effect relationship on this Affirmative?

That example is as close a one as I know for the point I have made. The point of marriage is at intercourse, that is the consummation of the agreement made. Now the Affirmative recognizes this principle. Here is a statement from his first affirmative. "Just when this adultery entered the picture is a matter for discussion, but that he is guilty of adultery at or *before the exact moment he is married is not debatable!*" (Emphasis mine~MB). At least he admits it could be at *the exact moment* "of marriage. He says it is not debatable, so why does he? I have contended for the adultery of Matt. 19:9 to be at the point of the remarriage, but that the adultery there is unlawful sexual intercourse....so....

AGREEMENT: Certainly to have marriage there must be agreement. But, agreement to what? Agreement to have continual sexual intercourse? Marriage is the relationship established, and requires an agreement to establish it.

The Affirmative maintains that the agreement could include the sharing of the man with another woman, or his taking another wife; provided the custom of the times allowed. He said, "Our custom in America prohibits polygamy, but even if such was our custom, there would be no direct command forbidding *men* to have more than one wife." Phil, if you didn't mean to justify polygamy for us today, provided that custom allowed it, why did you make that statement?

If that isn't what you meant, the statement makes no sense whatever. Your inference was that if our custom allowed it, and since there is no direct command forbidding it, therefore it would be alright. I stated that certainly there is no *direct command* forbidding it, but there is no direct command forbidding instrumental music, or a lot of *other* things. Your argument is one based on the "silence" of the scriptures which you condemned in your first article. Either revise your statement or repudiate it.

CIVIL REQUIREMENTS: My point on this was that God required us to meet what civil law required. I thought that what I had said was quite clear. But, let's go into it again.

(1) My point was on what civil law required, not what it *allowed*. Civil law allows some things that are sinful for a person to participate in. Drinking, gambling, controlled prostitution, fornication, idolatry, to name but a few. Will you say that because the law allows some things therefore it requires we do them?

(2) Some Civil governments may pass laws that require one to disobey God's laws, and God then comes first. I mentioned this in both previous articles. Did you miss it?

(3) When Civil laws require of us nothing immoral or contrary to His will, God demands of us we obey them. The passages showing such have already been noted.

The Affirmative brought up common law marriages and that they have a seven year period of cohabitation before the law recognizes it as marriage, hence it would be seven years of fornication. In the first place, I would like to see the law that states that. I inquired of a lawyer here, and he could find no such reference. But, suppose that it were true. Did I contend that we must marry according to such laws? Can you read where I have Affirmative? If the state allowed fornication, we certainly could not commit it. You have misrepresented me here by your insinuations. Note the three points stated above. If there were no civil laws on marriage, then it would be no consideration at all.

I presented as a “for instance” the statement of Texas Common Laws on marriage. The Affirmative quotes me and then turns right around and misrepresents what I said, and builds some arguments on his conclusions. Read what I said again. There are three things necessary in order to be married at Common Law in Texas. (1) The agreement between a man and woman to marry; (2) meeting of requirements of the Common Law (if they can’t meet the legal requirements, they cannot be married even by Common Law; (3) and then begin cohabitation. They are not considered married until they begin cohabitation, having met the two previous requirements. It is not “just an agreement”. The Affirmative then concludes “he agrees with me”. If I do, then he has lost his whole case. Affirmative, do you want me to tell you what the “cohabitation” involves, or do you think you can figure it out?

The Affirmative gives us a fish story here. No, one cannot deny that one is fishing even though he has no license to fish. One could not deny that a man was robbing a bank when he was seen holding up the tellers and running off with the money. So what? What do you prove with that illustration? Civil law won't deny that one is fishing, even without a license, but it will deny that one is married, if they don't meet the civil requirements. Your fish story is not a parallel. After all, you don't get the license to *marry* the fish.

As to the woman with the children tagging along, and the license in the drawer, I say again, so what? Tell me, what difference would the marriage agreement in the dresser drawer have. She doesn't need it if your arguments on civil law mean anything, I haven't denied that people could enter into second marriages. I deny their right to under certain circumstances. Affirmative, if this woman had a living husband, would you tell her she is living as an adulteress as long as she is having sexual relations with the second man, or would you tell her she is committing no sin? If she *divorced* her first husband, without mutual consent, would *divorce* make any difference?

CONSUMMATION: This means the consummation of the agreement made. The Affirmative contends that there are some people who cannot have intercourse that can still marry. This is peculiar since he says that the only thing peculiar to marriage is lawful intercourse and child-bearing. Let's see.

In Matthew 19:10-12 we note: [†]The disciples say unto him, if the case of the man is so with his wife, it is not expedient to marry. But he said unto them, Not all men can receive this saying, but they to whom it is given. For there are eunuchs, that were so born from their mother's womb: and there are eunuchs, that were made eunuchs by men: and there are eunuchs, that made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.”

The point is that some persons have no capacity for obeying or transgressing his commands here. It does not apply to eunuchs, as they have no capacity to do anything about it. I assume you know what a eunuch is. A eunuch has no capacity for marriage to begin with, and why should he want to? You say the only thing peculiar to marriage is sexual intercourse and child-bearing.

PURPOSE OF MARRIAGE

The Affirmative says that there are only* two things that come through marriage, legal sexual intercourse, and child-bearing. Now in the second affirmative, Phil says this: “Benefits of marriage, such as intercourse, fidelity, sharing of property, legitimate children, etc. are not integral parts of marriage itself.” I admit, Affirmative, I don't understand.

PART IV: Matthew 19

We have a wonderful promise. The Affirmative is finally, in his last article, going to come out

and tell us his understanding of Matthew 19. But, how he treats it will depend on my answers to his questions. Here are his questions.

- 1) Yes.
- 2) Depends on your definition of “single”.
- 3) Again, depends on your definition. I have shown that though divorce severs the marriage relationship, it does not necessarily affect the bond God recognizes.
- 4) I have already dealt with the word “adultery”.
- 5) I asked you, in previous writings, if you placed this passage in the Jewish dispensation, or as part of the law of Christ for us today. Let us know and then it will be dealt with.
- 6) The subject of this whole incident is primarily the cause a person has for putting away his spouse. It was started by the Jew’s question. Jesus answers them by pointing out that the only rightful cause a person has for the “putting away” is fornication. If he puts away for any other reason and marries another, he commits adultery. Your question on this doesn’t make sense.
- 7) Jesus said that if he put his wife away and married another he would commit adultery. That’s good enough for me.
- 518) “He that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery.” I have dealt with the word under another heading.

IN *THE* HEART

The Affirmative still holds that the adultery of Matt, 19 is in the heart. I pointed out that Jesus does not so identify it as such, but is what they do. The very language of it, in both English and Greek establish that fact. The Affirmative says that neither does it say that the adultery is in the second marriage. He claims to know why I believe that it does. Look again. Adultery is unlawful sexual intercourse, and is committed by unlawful sexual intercourse with the second woman. Too, “He that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery”. He is guilty too, when he marries her. I anticipate your making a play on the reading of Mark 10. I’m ready for it.

He asserts that actually committing the adultery does not add to the guilt. The time of guilt is in the lust previous to the act, and must be what Jesus is saying here in Matt. 19. Tell us, why are so many ACTS condemned in the Bible, if it is the lust that is the bad spot. Hatred is sinful, but the actual murder affects another person. A man can lust after a harlot, but God forbids his being joined to one, I Cor. 6:15-16. He further states there “Flee fornication, every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body.” The body is used as the instrument of the sin. Now, Paul thinks that the actual commission is worse. Jesus said that it was out of the heart the ACTS come; fornication and adulteries. A man can lust after a bottle; being drunken is condemned. A thief may covet having something or other: *stealing* is condemned. The lust is wrong, but the act is also. You can’t have fornication and adultery without lust, but the actual acts are condemned also. Lust is wrong, and to commit the acts adds to the wrong. Two things are transgressions. Jesus is speaking of what they DO, not what they THINK. He talks about what they think in Matt. 5. Marriage changes something also. Another person is involved. “He that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery.”

-Maurice Barnett

Fourth Affirmative

SECTION I: WHAT CHRIST TAUGHT

PART I: His Pre-Christian Era Teaching

In Matt, 19:3 we read of the Pharisees coming to tempt Christ with a question, “Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?” What the Lord then said to his tempters has come to be the springboard for an oft-heard indictment against many second marriages: “Your marriage is a union of fornication; you must separate,” Did Jesus mean to attack those second marriages which are not pre-sanctified by fornication? Let us begin at the beginning and analyze the entire discourse to see what he actually did teach,

Israel had a problem in Christ’s time that was as old as womankind and as common as lust. It was a practice among many men of Israel to look upon a fair woman, lust after her, marry her in order to fulfill that lust, use her until the need was satisfied, see another desirable woman, put away the old one and marry the new one for the same motive, I am told that this practice was encouraged by Beth Hillel, who advocated sexual gratification within the technical limits of the old Law’s letter. This, as I have said earlier, was the problem of the time and was the situation Christ well understood as he faced his tempters.

The question was loaded. On the one hand it asked only about the legality of the action while on the other hand it assumed the right of motive. One can appreciate the delicacy of the moment when he realizes that the answer “yes” would have been in effect an approval of their vile passions to the extent that it condoned the only *expression* of their unholy purpose, the put away-marry conduct. Yet, had he said “no” he would certainly have been accused of questioning the authority and sufficiency of the law. The old law forbade covetousness and lust (See Exod, 20:17 and Rom. 7:7) but no man of Israel, so far as we know, had ever died at the hand of two or three witnesses for the sin of coveting. The Jew stood justified or condemned before his fellows always in terms of *what* he did, rather than in terms of *why* he did it. Achan transgressed the commandment in his heart by coveting the devoted thing (Josh. 7:21) but was stoned because he *took* it. (Josh. 7:11) To the Israelite, the question of right and wrong was a question of legality, not motive.

Those who have made a careful study of the ministry of Christ know that the major burden of his ministry was to change his people’s thinking from evaluating always in terms of the effect - what people do, to evaluating in terms of cause - *motive* for doing. Christ was interested in converting the heart, for that was where he planned to write his law. (Jer. 31:31). This then was not a problem of legal justification; it was a problem of *motive*. The only avenue open for Jesus was to deal with the problem in terms of what they could witness, in order to get at the cause for condemnation - lust in the heart.

God Had A Motive. When He Made Them

“Have ye not read, that he who made them in the beginning made them male and female, and said, ‘For this cause (motive) shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh.’ What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.”

How is it that David could become one flesh with each of his many wives in the same way that Uriah could become one flesh with his own wife? The answer lies in an understanding of the phrase “*what* God hath joined”; in understanding that people can join themselves at any time, either in

fornication or in a sanctified sexual union, but that MALE and FEMALE are only put together by and in the one institution, marriage.

The concept of male and female is a concept that would have no meaning in the realm of right and wrong if it were not for the meaning of “fornication”. “All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one flesh of men, and another of beasts.” (I Cor. 15:39) There are two fleshs of mankind: (1) male and (2) female. These two impersonal fleshs become one flesh in physical union. “Know ye not that he that is joined to a harlot is one body? for, ‘The twain,’ saith He, shall become one flesh”. (I Cor. 6:16) God does not join a man to a harlot, yet when they join themselves, they become one flesh. The legality or morality of the matter is of no consequence to the fact that two bodies become one in physical union; bodies are joined with and/or without the benefit of marriage by personal choice. In I Cor. 6:16 Paul speaks of what a man does - he joins himself.

Christ speaks here of what God HAS done: he has joined the two, male and female; - and man is not to void this arrangement. The Creator of all flesh made then opposite in sex for a purpose and at the same time placed (figuratively speaking) a wall of prohibition between the two sexes prohibiting free and unrestricted intercourse. This wall of prohibition is a wall of “fornication” which keeps the two sections of mankind separated. But God did provide a way by which the two fleshs could rightfully, morally, justifiably, and legally unite: this provision is “marriage”. It is a door in the figurative wall between the sexes, the two fleshs, and was once and for all at the beginning *enjoined* upon mankind as the only institution by and through which God authorized sexual union. When God instituted marriage he knocked out the wall between the two fleshs and let male and female come together as one. Had he not done so, . male and female would have from the beginning remained morally and legally separate. Those who stood before Christ on this occasion had voided the meaning and benefit of marriage in their own hearts. (This is the *only* way man can void anything *God has done*).

Why Then Did Moses Command to Give A Bill of Divorcement?

“Moses for your hardness of heart suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it hath not been so.”

The original motive for marriage does not admit of divorce. It was because of carnality of the people and an inability to maintain a higher level of morality that Moses did not legislate against unrestrained divorce; but that God hated it cannot be denied (Mal. 2:14-16). Moses did not institute divorce. It was common long before Moses. Moses only gave the woman some measure of security in the form of a bill, or writing, of divorcement so that she could later prove that she owed fidelity to no man. The bill was no divorce of itself, but only bore testimony to the fact that she was free.

And I Say Unto You.....

“Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery.”

We know that it was Christ who spoke, and we know that he addressed this saying to those who stood before him on that occasion. Notice his preface: “And I say unto you”. The saying was directed to certain people who were living at a certain time, who were subject to a certain law, who were involved in a certain situation, who had just asked him a question, and who were seeking justification for action stemming from lustful motives. A basic rule to take into consideration when attempting to apply any scripture is the one that calls for a close analysis of both the situation and the subjects addressed. The time, the situation, the subjects addressed and the reason for the statement

all point to a limited application of this passage.

We know that this sentence is declarative in form: it is not a command or a law. Christ simply stated a truth about those to whom his saying applied. This saying does not demand or imply obedience from anyone - it simply states a truth *about someone*.

There are reasons why we know that the “put away - marry” action does not cause the adultery Christ mentioned. In the first place, the action is future in tense while the guilt is present; in the second place, we can know even from this one scripture of at least one case (allowed by the negative) where a man can “put away and marry another” without the guilt of adultery - it depends on the cause, or motive, for that action; and in the third place, we can by an understanding of terms determine that the act of adultery cannot be committed by the act of “divorce and remarriage”. Everything depends upon the “cause” or motive for the action; therefore the motive is the cause for the adultery - not the action.

There are a number of passages that indicate an existing condition by reference to future action. Notice: “Whosoever *shall* confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God *abideth* in him, and he in God.” (I John 4:15) The future act-ion of confessing evidences the existence of God within the individual. (See also verse 2). The presence of the spirit is the cause, the confessing is the effect. Divorce and remarriage described what the Jew did; the presence of adultery was thereby evidenced.

It was unfaithfulness to his wife that permitted a Jew to look to lust, to put away and remarry. “Every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath already committed adultery with her in his heart.” (Matt. 5:28) This is parallel to the saying that “Everyone that looketh on a bank to plan a robbery, hath already committed robbery in his heart.” If the robbery motive had not already been in a man’s heart, he would not have been casing the bank. It didn’t matter that what those Jews were doing was legal; it was nevertheless an expression of an evil motive.

The complete subject of the sentence is “whosoever *shall* put away ... and *shall* marry another”. The subject who “shall” do this is a subject that will or would do it. Those who were given to this pattern were those who were unfaithful of heart. But to *prove* that he was one who would do what Christ said, and to prove that adultery could be thus expressed, the Jew could prove his right to qualify for application by completing the expressed action. Thus the Jew to whom Christ referred completed the expression by divorcing and marrying another. But if it is possible for a man to marry without and before coming into physical contact with the second wife, it is obvious that he could prove his guilt without sexual union with a second woman.

And He That Marries Her

“....and he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery.” Adultery is unfaithfulness to one’s *own* spouse. Thus, Christ indicates that the man who marries the woman when she is released is also guilty of adultery. Why? Because he has married the wife of another man? No, for “adultery” is unfaithfulness to one’s own marriage partner, and has no bearing upon a man’s relationship to the obligations of some other man’s marriage agreement. I believe this saying dealt with the problem current to that time. They were trading wives, and the man who was waiting to pick up a new wife just as soon as she was released evidenced unfaithfulness to his own wife just as vividly as did the man who was going to divorce. It was a matter of *motive* for what they did. The woman was free after being put away, and could remarry. (Deut. 24:1-4). If the man who put away his wife became single (loosed in every sense), and the man who married the divorced woman was single, neither could possibly commit adultery by the act of getting married, for the unmarried cannot commit adultery. Therefore, the “adultery” was existant prior to the marriage dissolution and was “already” in the hearts of those who would so act.

If The Case of the Man Be So

“The disciples say unto him, ‘If the case of the man is so with his wife, it is not good to marry. The word that is translated “case” from the Greek in verse 10 is the same Greek word that is rendered “cause” in verse 3. “Aitia” (Thayer, p. 18) denotes “cause” or “reason” for action. “Aiteo” is and denotes “the request of the will”. Reason, or motive, for action is the subject, and the disciples are found wondering if it is good to marry, if a man’s motive, or reason, IS SUCH, regarding his wife. Remember, the Jew judged everything in terms of acts; Christ had just put the finger on divorce and remarriage as expressions of an existing evil, and the disciples (being Jews) were left wondering about the relationship of marriage to the evil described. This called for a re emphasis from Christ that it was a matter of motive.

But He Said Unto Them

“Not all men can receive this saying, but they to whom it is given.” There is no need to prove that Christ’s saying has a limited application. He here says that it cannot be received by all, but that it is for those to whom it is directed. And in the last part of verse 11 he places full responsibility upon the individual for application. “He that is *able* to receive it, let him receive it.” This proves that the application is circumstantial and that it does not apply to some people.

To whom would it not apply? To the unmarried? The idea that Christ meant to modify his application to exclude the unmarried, or those who cannot marry, is completely absurd! He is talking *about the married* and about things *the married* do. The unmarried are already excluded, automatically discounted, from *any* application of the saying, because Jesus never was talking about the unmarried.

Is He saying that it does not apply to those who have not, do not, and shall not divorce and remarry? Certainly not, for he is not talking about those who do not divorce and remarry: they are never included; they have nothing to do with the subject under discussion. Christ is talking about those who divorce and remarry, and he states that there are some to whom his saying (about divorce and remarriage) does not apply; and he gives a categorical example.

For There Are Some Eunuchs

“For there are eunuchs that were so born from their mother’s womb; and there are eunuchs that were made eunuchs by men; and there are eunuchs that made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven’s sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.”

We are told that “every scripture is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work:.” (XI Tim. 3:16) Now I’m satisfied that this 11th verse is no exception, and that the eunuch is a representative example of those who could put away and remarry for reasons other than fornication and yet not be guilty of the adultery Christ mentioned. I am persuaded also that Jesus had some good reason for going into a detailed explanation of the various reasons why (motive) some eunuchs have become eunuchs.

Those who cannot marry do not need somebody to represent them in order to be excluded from an application of Christ’s saying. They never were included in the first place. An example cannot qualify as an example unless it bears the characteristics of the class it is to represent. The class under consideration is the class that puts away and remarries for reasons other than fornication. Unless the eunuch can meet these qualifications, he cannot meet the qualifications for an example as an

exception, and Christ's saying in verse 11 would be utter nonsense.

The entire problem under consideration is MOTIVE for the put-away, marry again ..conduct. Christ's saying applied to those who had sexual lust and unfaithfulness in their hearts and were demonstrating their depravity by their divorce-remarry, divorce-remarry pattern. Who would be a categorical example of those who we know would not divorce and remarry for sexual lust? A eunuch, of course! Who can *know why* a man divorces and remarries? Looking, divorcing and remarrying *may express* adultery, but it does not *prove* that a man's motive is unholy. Christ is fair in showing that remarriage does not prove a lustful motive, for the eunuch surely would not be guilty although he may do the same thing typical of those who were acting from lust. Therefore, the eunuch is representative of all to whom this saying does not apply: those who do not have lustful and unfaithful motives for divorcing and remarrying.

Some eunuchs became such for a purpose; their reason had to do with their service to God. Some of these may have already been married at the time, and some may have been married but separated. There are a number of reasons why a eunuch might want to divorce and remarry - but lust would not be one of them.

The only thing that a person can have by and through marriage that he cannot have without marriage is holy (legitimate) sexual union. This does not mean that there is no other motive for marriage. There are many motives for marriage, and there are many things peculiar to marriage besides those mentioned. I personally know a married eunuch, and he has a number of reasons for being married. But he could have every one of them without a marriage covenant (he would have a guilty conscience, but this is beside the point).

Christ's saying of Matt. 19:9 had a limited application even in his own day, and would only apply to a man today to the extent that it would apply to the man's motive for putting away and marrying another. Jesus was not giving a new law; he was attacking the motive of lust in the hearts of the Hillite by calling their attention to what they were doing and then indicting them for the motive behind their action - in spite of the fact that it was legal conduct. Jesus did not attack either divorce or remarriage.

PART II: Answering Some Pertinent Questions About Matt. 19:9

1) Did the subject of this text actually "put away" the first woman and actually marry the second? (Negative says, "Yes")

The time that Christ spoke was a time when God's people were amenable to the law of Moses, and when his people came under its provision regarding marriage. I have shown that a divorce in Israel completely dissolved the husband-wife relationship and left the woman without a husband; she was loosed, single, unbound.

1. Every woman of Israel who had a husband was not free to marry another. (Deut. 24:1-4; Rom. 7:1-4)
2. The woman of Israel who had been divorced was free to marry another. (Deut. 24:2)
3. Therefore, the woman of Israel who had been divorced HAD NO HUSBAND. 2) If he actually did put her away, did he then become single? (Negative says, "Depends upon your definition of single").

We have not dealt candidly and faithfully with each other on the use of the term "marriage". The Negative has been playing around with a multiple meaning and has refused to come to grips with me on my use of the word. For his purposes, marriage is a relationship that can nevertheless be a husband-less-wifeless relationshipless affair; it can mean the "having" with or without the husband-wife relationship, as per the harlot case in I Cor. 6:16 et al. It can*mean "joining", "cohabita-

tion” and also the legitimate 1-2-3 set-up described in the first article. One thing it does not mean to the Affirmative is “an agreement”. He set me straight on that. He said it was a relationship, and to me this is the same thing as the marriage agreement.

Marriage is a validified agreement made to be married and this is a husband^wife relationship. To have a husband is to be married; no husband, no marriage. This husband-wife relationship allows but does not require or necessarily indicate subsequent sexual union. Marriage is not the having, or the joining, or the cohabitation that follows. One can have or join or co-habit without marriage. These are *characteristic* of marriage and are some-times loosely translated as “marriage” but are *not* marriage.

Probably one of the greatest of our difficulties in this discussion has been the different meanings applied to the word marriage. Had I used the loose connotation of the term as the Negative has done, I might just as well have quit the exchange, for I early admitted that there are many “havings” and “joinings” and “cohabitations” that are sinful. The issue is: are they sinful because there is something wrong with the marriage - i.e., the agreement, the covenant, the husband-wife relationship in existence between them? Did Christ teach that unless a Second marriage is dissolved by the death of one spouse or is presanctified by fornication, a subsequent marriage makes unholy the following cohabitation?

Let us say that the put away-remarriage course is followed. Two are said to be living in fornication because their marriage is unholy. What can they do to rectify the situation? Where, o where, is the evil????? If it is in the having, the physical union, and the cohabitation, the evil could be stopped by the separation of the two. If this means that they are not any longer married - just because they are separated - I will agree that the marriage was evil; because the evil was gotten rid of when the “marriage” (co-habitation) was affected. If being together is marriage, then many marriages are evil, as per the one (?) in I Cor. 6:16.

Now, on the other hand, let us say that they separated but that they were still married; there was still a husband-wife relationship even though they never came together again. Would the evil continue? Would they still be living in adultery? If the separation eliminates the evil in spite of the fact that they are still married, then the marriage is not causing the adultery.

The Negative has brought forth a number of scriptures and examples to break down the premise that all marriage is holy. But it is significant to note that every last example was an example of polygamy or a union without marriage - fornication. A man had his father’s wife; a woman had a man that was not her husband; *Herod* had a woman that belonged to another man, *she* had two husbands at one time; a woman is not to marry another man while her husband is alive (she is already married - is not to get two husbands) Rom. 7:1-4; a woman (I Cor. 7:11 who departs from her husband (how could this make her single?) and is told not to join, or marry, another, but is to return to her husband if she chooses not to continue alone, etc., etc. All these examples and scripture prove to the Negative that some marriages are unholy, and he cannot see how I can contend for a marriage and yet agree with him that it is possible for the cohabitation of two certain partners to be sinful; to him the two are synonymous.

Many things can make a cohabitation wrong. It may be illegal, it might be inexpedient, it might be hurtful to others, it might result in one partner committing adultery against an existing former husband: but as far as *fornication* is concerned, it is NEVER wrong *because* the two are MARRIED. And this is the issue. “He that puts away and marries”, Christ said. Did the man sin by getting married? Is the *marriage* the cause of the adultery? Is sexual union wrong *because* a *marriage* is wrong?

This is my last chance to make my position clear, so think carefully on the following: There is only one question involved in this discussion, and that is, can a man and woman dissolve their mar-

riage, become completely loosed, single, unmarried, and then marry someone else? Having done this, is the second marriage sinful? I am arguing only for the right to marry of those who are loosed from a wife, (this was specifically expressed and clarified in every affirmative article) and I am arguing that people may themselves dissolve their marriage at will. They cannot be scripturally told thereafter that they are living in fornication because they are still bound to the first mate and that cohabitation therefore is sinful. All the Negative needs to do is to show that people cannot dissolve their marriage and he will automatically *establish his case* against all second marriages (which I have defended) as a *case against polygamy*. If he can do this, he will have to get someone else to defend second marriages, because I will not raise my voice in defense of polygamy for anyone.

3) If he did not become single when he put her away, did he not then simply become the husband of two wives when he married the second woman? (Neg. says, "...divorce severs the marriage relationship; it does not necessarily affect the bond God recognizes).

If God considers a man still "bound" to his first wife, then when he marries the second wife he will be "bound" to two women at once. In this discussion we are only interested in what God has said about the matter; are they still bound or are they not? Where is a scripture that says they are still bound? Where is a syllogism? Marriage is basic, so I will accept for consideration any two syllogistic premises that can be produced from the entire Bible that bears directly on the making, breaking or binding of the husband-wife relationship. The hard facts are that there are no scriptures that justify this "loosed" but yet "bound" idea held by the Negative.

4) If he simply became the husband of two wives as a result of having married the second woman, why did Christ use "adultery" in referring to his behaviour? (Negative says, "I have already dealt with the word 'adultery'.")

Surely the line of reasoning must be clear to any careful observer. The man who put away his wife (as per Matt. 19:9) either became free from his marriage obligations or he did not. If he did, we have a case where a single man is contemplating marriage and we must go to the scriptures that answer a single man's question, "May I marry?" The answer to that question of course is in I Cor. 7:27-28. If he did not become free from the marriage relationship, we have a case of polygamy, and we must go to the scriptures that deal with polygamy and see if a man stands justified in that condition, or if he is condemned. If he is condemned we need to learn why. We need to know where the evil lies, what his-sin is called, and *how it* can be eradicated.

"Adultery" could hardly be applied to a man who had two wives during the time of Moses and Christ, for this was practiced extensively by those who could not support more than one, so he had to put her away in order to make room and food for the better one. Polygamy was practiced by the well-to-do of Christ's time, but we have not one word from Christ - or any other N.T. writer condemning polygamy for men*

Here is the point, and we should deal with it: did the Jew commit adultery by divorcing or was it committed by the marrying of additional women while the husband was still bound to a former wife or wives??? If "adultery" was committed at the point of the second marriage (at consummation), and if God still considered him bound to the first, then the fact that he had divorced the first would have nothing at all to do with why he committed adultery. Is there anyone who can't see this point? If a Jew who stood before Christ was going to commit adultery the moment he married the second woman, it would make no difference at all whether he had put away the first, or WHY he had put her away. The man who did not put his wife away, but yet who married a second wife would be guilty of adultery. The effect would be the same: while he is still bound to the first he marries the second. Now that this point is settled, the Negative has the problem of explaining why it was that Christ went into detail about putting away and even listed an exception, when in reality it does not make the slightest difference whether a man put away the first one or not (?): the second marriage

was the sin, and the fact of preceding divorce had no bearing on the case whatsoever. Is this right, Negative?

5) If this behavior was of itself “adulterous” conduct for the Jews (to whom Christ spoke) why was it not attacked simply as polygamy rather than as a specific action pattern? (The Negative says, “I asked ... if you placed this passage in the Jewish dispensation, or as part of the law of Christ for us today. Let us know and it will be dealt with).

Christ was speaking to the men of Israel who stood before him inquiring as to the legality of what they were doing. I assumed that everybody knew he was not speaking to the church, since it did not exist at the time and since it wasn’t asking the question.

6) Was polygamy adultery? If it was, why did Christ bring the act of putting away and the exception of fornication into the picture as contingencies? That is to say, would the man be justified in marrying another if he did not put the first one away? (Negative answer: “The subject of this whole incident is primarily the cause a person has for putting away his spouse.....the only rightful cause a person has for the ‘putting away’ is fornication. If he puts away for any other cause and marries another, he commits adultery. Your question doesn’t make sense.)

This answer indicates now that the reason a man commits adultery depends upon *WHY* the first wife was put away. I re-phrased the question for clarity, but it was avoided. The question is designed to pin-point the cause of adultery. First, let’s say that his cause for putting her away was “unacceptable”: did he commit adultery by getting married to the second woman? Now, let’s say that his cause was “unacceptable”, but it so happened that he had enough money and a big house so that he could keep her: he did *not* put her away - he simply married the second woman. Did he commit adultery? If he did, it does not matter that he did *not* put her away, and *divorce* is therefore immaterial to the cause of guilt, then it is utter foolishness for the Negative to talk about CAUSE for divorce - as he did in answer to this question - for it would make not one bit of difference anyway. If the man with money avoids adultery by not putting her away prior to marrying the second wife, then polygamy was not adultery for Israel and it is all a matter of *motive for divorce* rather than being a matter of whether or not there is a second marriage.

7) If, on the other hand, (see #s 2 & 3) he did become single as a result of having put her away for some small reason, how could he then commit adultery by entering into a subsequent marriage? (Negative: “Jesus said that if he put his wife away and married another he would commit adultery. That’s good enough for me”).

In the first place, Jesus did not say that if he put away and married he would *commit* adultery. This is not what Christ said. He said, “Whosoever *shall* put away and *shall* marry another *committeth* adultery.” Man has made adultery an effect of the “put away - marry” conduct; it wasn’t Christ.

It was Christ who said, “... he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved”. Many who are satisfied to hear only what they want to hear cite this passage and say, “Jesus said it, and that’s good enough for me.” What they fail to realize, or admit, is that this passage applies only to those who have *also* repented. What Christ said is also good enough for me, but that answer does not deal fairly with the question. If it is a Bible question, it has a Bible answer. If Matt. 19:9 is not a case of polygamy it is a case of a single man getting married; and since a single man cannot commit “adultery” this single man could not commit adultery by getting married to another.

CAUSE AND EFFECT

Most of the misunderstanding on this subject is due to confusion over the relationship of cause and effect. A second marriage *cannot* cause adultery. A man cannot *cause*, or force his wife to commit adultery by putting her away. Sexual union cannot *cause* people to become husband and wife.

When the rules of Bible study and sound logic are followed, the chance for error on these subjects will be greatly diminished. Human reason is essential to an understanding of this subject, and I am happy for sound logic; my condemnation of “human *reason*” was and is based solely on and against the premise that reason can serve as a basis for BINDING conclusions on others.

The tendency to error is exemplified in a Negative argument for the premise that although “consummation” is a cause of marriage, it does not have to precede establishment of the husband-wife relationship. Says he, “In Romans 6 we find out that it is in the act of baptism that one enters into Christ, and has justification of sins. How about your cause and effect relationship on this Affirmative?”

To him, this seems to prove an ageless axiom wrong. Why? Because he approached the scripture in Rom 6 with the preconception that one is “in Christ” “in baptism”. I cannot find that one is in Christ “in baptism”, but that is another question. I do know that every cause must precede its effect. Therefore, I know that if baptism is a cause of getting into Christ, then, whatever baptism is, it must become a fact prior to the fact becoming true that one is “in Christ”. There is no escape: if sexual union is a cause and marriage is an effect, fornication must precede marriage. This in truth is sanctification by fornication. We do not need to change the rules to fit our convictions; we need to disregard our convictions so that we can admit that there *are* rules, and that there *are* questions that must be given reasonable answers.

I misunderstood the Negative on his “Texas Jurisprudence” explanation. After restudying it carefully, I found that I had misread it and had consequently misrepresented him. For this I am sorry. It only serves to prove that I can also be wrong and that my study on this or any Bible subject will never be complete.

-Pkilip F. Lydic

Fourth Negative

This is the last article of the present discussion. The Affirmative has wrapped up his case, and it remains my task to do the same. The Affirmative has run the best he could, but I do not believe it has been good enough. It is obvious that one of us must be wrong, and both of us might be.

Phil is as able a man as I have seen in the defense of his conclusions. I appreciate his dealing with arguments and not personalities or sentimentalism. Although we have been abrupt with one another, I don't believe we have been harsh or nasty. This has added to the value of the discussion.

In his last article, Phil's key words still depend on Phil Lydic for their definition and meaning. You will note through the discussion that he just "asserts" the definitions. I have, on the other hand, shown dictionary-lexical definitions, and scripture usage, to demonstrate the meaning of the words involved. He has handled scriptures in the same way.

PART I: What Christ Taught

A great deal of what the Affirmative has to say about lust in the Israelites I will grant. Many men have lusted after another woman and divorced their wives to marry the object of their lust. No one can deny that. But, to say that this is what Jesus is dealing with in Matt. 19 is to say something else. *It does not necessarily follow.* To say that Jesus placed a great deal of emphasis on the "heart" of man does not prove therefore that he is dealing with motives, perse, as the Affirmative declares. The Affirmative now admits what I have said all along, that Jesus was talking about what a person does, in Matt. 19. Phil just says that what he *does* (put-away-remarry) is dependent on previous lust, viz., "adultery".

The Jews, by law, could be guilty of coveting their neighbor's wife. This was the law, Ex. 20:17. Phil says he doesn't find anyone who *coveted*, dying without mercy under Moses' law. So what? They still would answer to God. Heb. 2:2 says ".....• every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward;". So the Jew was interested in minute points of law. I say again, so what? Because the Jew was interested in legal justification, and lusted after other women and divorced and remarried because of their lust, does not prove that this is the sole subject and meaning of Matt. 19:1-12.

"Shall Put Away"

We are treated time and again in the fourth affirmative to the *tenses* of the verbs in Matt. 19:9. Phil says that since Jesus uses "shall" put away and "shall" remarry, it is future, and the "commits adultery" being present tense, that it means the "committing adultery" takes place *before* the putting away. This means that the person commits adultery in his heart by lust. *His* rendition of the passage then must go like this: "Whosoever lusts after a woman commits adultery with her in his heart, and shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry the woman he has lusted after". There certainly is no condemnation of lust in that rendition! It makes no sense in either context or by itself. This is what he says it must mean.

With a little checking, you will note that Jesus uses, not the future tense, but the aorist tense in the "putting away" and "marrying". The mood is *subjunctive*. There is no *indication of time element* in either aorist tense or subjunctive mood. The aorist tense simply denotes a single action, without reference to time. The point is that* whoever does put away his wife and marries another, *WHENEVER* that may be, they commit adultery.

Phil talks about all truth harmonizing. Let's see how he does on some parallel passages. In

Luke 16:18 TO THE PHARISEES, Jesus said, “Everyone that putteth away’ his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and he that marrieth one that is put away from a husband committeth adultery.” The verbs in this passage, a parallel to Matt. 19, are in the *present tense* in both English and Greek. And, there is no lack of harmony in meaning between the two passages.

The RSV of Matt. 19:9 reads: “Whoever divorces his wife, except for unchastity, and marries another, commits adultery”. Young’s Literal Translation says: “Whoever may put away his wife, if not for whoredom, and may marry another, doth commit adultery”.

Notice too the latter part of the verse.’ “... and he that marrieth her *when she is put away committeth adultery*”.

Now notice Matt. 5:31-32. “... but I say unto you, that every one that putteth away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, maketh her an adulteress: and whosoever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery”. The “putteth away” is the same as Matt. 19, aorist subj. “Maketh her an adulteress” (causes her to commit adultery) is present indicative, like the same in Matt. 19. What is Jesus saying Phil? “Everyone that makes his wife an adulteress, shall put her away, saving for the cause of fornication.”? No sense in that.

The means of expression used by Jesus here is a common one, even for us. If I should say, “Whoever robs that bank is a thief”, I mean by that that he is a thief because he robbed it. I could also say that “Whoever *shall* rob that bank is a thief”, and mean the same thing.

“God Had a Motive, When He Made Them”

The phrase “and the two shall become one flesh” is a statement of the molding of two lives together. The word “flesh” does not mean the muscles of a human body. Phil takes off on the “flesh” of I Cor. 15:39; the “flesh” of man, beast, fowl, and fish are not the same. It means “meat” there, and has no likeness to the word “flesh” as used by Jesus, though the words themselves may be the same. 1 Cor. 15:39 furnishes him a pretext for saying there are two fleshes of mankind- male and female, and they become “one flesh in physical union”. That doesn’t necessarily follow from the passage. I’m sure he doesn’t mean they become literal “one flesh”. Two in one flesh refers to closeness, the molding of their aims, purposes, and very lives as one. This is ‘what is wrong in I Cor. 6. To be one flesh with a harlot makes the man guilty by association. He knows she is a harlot, and is putting up with it.

The Affirmative says that the wall that separates male and female is “fornication” and the only door through it is marriage. No, what separates the sexes, sexually is *law*. Violation of that law is “fornication”. But sexual promiscuity by EITHER *married or unmarried persons* is unlawful. To say that “marriage” is what God enjoined on man at the beginning as the only lawful way the sexes can join doesn’t handle the case either. Some persons do not have any right or authority to marry. Phil accepts this. Herodias didn’t have the right to marry Herod, but she did. The woman of I Cor. 7:10-11 didn’t have the right to marry another, but she could have done so. The woman of Rom. 7:1-4 didn’t have the right to marry the second man, but she did, and was an adulteress for as long as her husband lived. God’s law does not allow some marriages. We have discussed this at length before.

Phil says, under this section, that the Jews had voided the meaning and benefit of marriage in their own hearts, then says, “This is the *only* way man can void anything God has done”, I find that man can and has “voided” God’s will in more ways than “in the heart”. Jesus condemned the Jews for some of their *practices* in Mark 7. In verse 13 he says “... making *void* the word of God by your tradition, which ye have delivered: and *many* such like *things* ye do.” Jesus was condemning what they were doing; it was contrary to the law. *Many* things they did voided God’s law.

“Why Then Did Moses Command to Give a Bill of Divorcement?”

The Affirmative tries to leave the impression that the allowance to put away wives was the doing of *Moses*, and God hated it. The Law of Moses *WAS* the Law of God. Moses couldn't have made such an allowance contrary to God's will. Whatever God said later, and how he felt, does not do away with the fact that he allowed it in the Law. And the fact is that the Law did allow divorce for nearly any reason. Phil accepts that.

Deut. 24:1-4 states the law on the point. The reason allowing divorce was if she find no favor in his eyes, because of some “unseemly” thing he has found in her. The term is “gervah” and is defined as “shame, filthiness, anything unclean (excrement), Deut. 23:14-15; any defect found in a woman, Deut. 24:1; also ignominy, dishonor, Isa. 20:4”. Gesenius, p. 653. The Sep-tuagint translates the word with “aschemon”. That Greek word is in I Cor. 7:36; “..... behaveth himself *uncomly* toward his virgin...” In I Cor. 12:23; “.... and our *uncomly* parts”. I Cor. 13:5; “Love doth not behave itself *unseemly*....”

Phil says that “Moses only gave the woman some measure of security in the form of a bill, or writing, of divorcement so that she could later prove that she owed fidelity to no man”. Look at the passage again. It wasn't given just to give security to the woman. It regulated divorce and remarriage. (Note that if the woman is put away by the second husband, because he hate her, it is an *abomination* to God for the first man to take her back to be his wife. This is a place where God *did* forbid some marriages. If the first man did take her back, would the marriage be holy? Phil says it would since it is marriage.)

Jesus was not changing the law of Moses, nor adding to it. The law was not changed until the priesthood was changed (Heb. 7:12), and that was after the death of Christ. Jesus didn't make any change in the Law of Moses to *take effect during his life time*. (Matt. 5:17-18)

What Jesus taught In Matt. 19 was different from what Moses taught. Deut. 24 allowed divorce for other causes than fornication. Jesus gave only the one. The Old allowed the man to put away his wife, and she could go and be another man's wife. Jesus said that “*whosoever* marries her *when she is put away*, commits adultery”.

“ Further, Jesus pointed out that Moses allowed them to put away their wives (for every cause), but “from the beginning it hath not been so. *And I say unto you.....*” The “And I say unto you” goes with the “from the beginning”. Jesus is restating God's intention *from the beginning*. This goes back before the Law of Moses and whatever allowances it made. For Jesus to put that into effect at that very moment, he would have had to destroy the authority of the Law of Moses which allowed what Jesus did not. The Jews certainly were to observe it, when Christ's law came into force.

65It is obvious that the Affirmative thinks that everything Jesus taught while on earth is either part of the Old Law, or at least not part of the New. However, many statements of Jesus were placed in the present tense, but had future application. In Luke 17:20-21 the Pharisees inquire of Him when the kingdom would come. Jesus said that the kingdom “is within you¹¹. Was it really in them at that moment? In John 3:3-5 He told Nicodemus that he had to be born of water and the spirit to enter the kingdom. You reckon he had to wait for the kingdom to come first? The sermon on the Mount: part of the Old or the ground-work of the New? Matt. 7:21-27: part of the Old or New? The parables, and innumerable other passages that speak of what is now, establish that Jesus laid down many laws during his lifetime that had a view to the coming kingdom. Hebrews 2:3 says “....how shall we escape, if we neglect so great a salvation? Which having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard”.

It is granted that many things Jesus said had immediate application. But, there are more rules to Bible study than just observing to whom a thing is spoken. If we refused to observe anything but

what is spoken to us living today, we would have to throw the whole Bible out. Apply all the rules of Bible study.

“And I Say Unto You.....”

“Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery:”.

Phil says this is declarative in form: “it is not a command or a law”. So it is declarative in form. That does not mean there is no law here. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved” is declarative in form. Is it law Phil?

He then says that “putting away and remarrying” cannot *cause* the adultery that Christ mentioned. I have pointed out over and over again that adultery is unlawful sexual intercourse involving a person that lawfully belongs to another. The sexual relation of itself is not wrong, but for some persons to engage in it is wrong. That is what Jesus is saying; the person who puts away and remarries, without the cause of fornication, has no lawful right to the sexual relations with the second woman. The putting away and remarrying puts a man in the position of committing adultery.

Certainly one can commit adultery without divorce and remarriage. A man can steal without robbing a bank, but he can’t rob a bank without stealing. So a man can commit adultery without divorce and remarriage, but cannot divorce and remarry without committing adultery. God’s law rules in the matter. Phil sure is trying to get “law” out of Matt. 19.

The rest of his points on this section is on the word “shall” which I have already noted.

“And He that Marries Her”

Phil *asserts* again his own definition of adultery. He says that it is just unfaithfulness to one’s own marriage partner. He has never offered any evidence of this meaning of terms except himself. We are to just take his word for it. Certainly adultery may involve unfaithfulness, but in what way? Adultery has to do with broken law. He affirms again here that the “adultery” must have taken place before the man married the woman who was put away. Jesus says “whosoever”. Secondly, Matt. 19:9 does not say “shall” marry her. Don’t outdistance your “shall” argument Affirmative. Jesus said that he “that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery.”

“If The Case of The Man Be So”

Vincent’s Word Studies, Vol. 1, p. 109, says of this: “Not the relation of the man to his wife, nor the circumstances, the state of the case, ‘aitia’ refers to cause (vs. 3), and the meaning is, if the matter stands thus with reference to the *cause* which the man must have for putting away his wife.” Jesus says the only lawful cause the man has is fornication. He only allows “fornication” to be the *cause* a man has for putting away his wife. Any other *cause* is wrong; whether it is burning the biscuits for breakfast, mental cruelty, or desire for another woman. If this is the only cause Jesus gives for a man divorcing his wife, there must be some penalty for not observing it. Jesus makes clear what it is.

“But He Said Unto Them”

“Not all men can receive this saying, but they to whom it is given.” The word “receive” is defined by Thayer (p. 674) as “to be ready to receive, keep in mind, and practice”. The word “able” in verse 12 is defined (p. 158) as “to be able, have power, whether by virtue of one’s own ability and

resources, or of a state of mind, or through favorable circumstances, or by permission of law or custom”. Hence, Jesus is saying that there are some people that do not have the ability to accept, keep in mind, and practice what he has just said. The eunuchs are illustrations of what he means.

You will note that verse 12 ends with “He that is able to receive it, let him receive it”. The phrase “let him receive it” is *imperative* in Greek. That means a command. What Jesus stated in verse 9 then is commanded to be observed, by those who can. Phil says Jesus didn’t state a command.

The Affirmative says again that the only thing that a person can have through marriage is legitimate sexual union. I still want to know what kind of husband-wife relationship could be established with a eunuch? Phil may know of a eunuch that has taken out a civil license with a woman for some reason, and is represented as married, but how could he actually be so? Phil has already talked about marriage involving the joining in physical union the man and woman as one flesh. How could a eunuch, by your use of terms, become one flesh with a woman?

Phil has done a lot of philosophizing on this eunuch subject. He has made it just a representative thing; the eunuchs just represent a class of people who are not necessarily eunuchs. He has no foundation for such ideas, but he doesn’t seem to need any.

After all is said and done, the Affirmative has not established his “in the heart” bit. He has asserted his interpretation of Matt. 19, but he has not proven it.

PART II: Reviewing “Some Pertinent Questions” on Matthew 19

1) “Did the subject of this text actually ‘put away’ the first woman and actually marry the second?” (I answered “yes”). Phil’s rejoinder on this is that it was stated to the Jews under the law and is confined to them. I have already shown this is not true.

2) “If he actually did put away, did he then become single?” (I answered “depends upon your definition of ‘single’.”) The Affirmative makes it difficult for me to answer his questions, then throws up his hands in exclamation when I don’t do so to his satisfaction. On many of his questions I’m not sure of the meaning to be attached to the important words used. A definite “yes” or “no” depends on what definition of the term is used.

The Affirmative “throws up his hands” on the word “marriage”. He has his own definitions, but they have been confusing, as he charges mine to be. I pointed out that they were so in my last article. He has slipped around on the use of this term. He now says that marriage is a relationship, but that the relationship is *the agreement to marry*. He makes no distinction between an agreement to establish a relationship and the relationship itself.

There are several words in the Bible for “marriage”. “Gameo, epigambreuo, and ginomai” are all three translated “marry”. “Ginomai” is also translated as “joined”. The word “have” (eko) is used also. I have a discussion of this in a previous article. Other words talk about being “bound”. There are some differences.

I have pointed out also that to be married does not necessarily establish that the two persons are “bound” to one another. One may “join” himself to another without being “bound” to them. The word “bound” in Rom. 7:2-3 means “to bind — to fasten with chains”, (Thayer, p.131). The word “joined” is translated as “married” in other translations and means just that. In Lev. 22:12 it says of the priests daughter that “if ... be married unto a stranger...” The same is expressed in Ruth 1:12 and Deut. 24:4 as referring to marriage. The Septuagint uses “ginomai” for the word. In Rom. 7 then, the woman may be married to a second man, but is still “bound” to her husband. (I have shown that this passage is not a part of the old law. Phil keeps asserting that it is). If “joined” doesn’t mean “married”, why would it be *alright* for her to be “joined” to the second man if her husband *were* dead? If “joined” here doesn’t mean “married” it would be wrong under *any* circumstances. In I

Cor. 7:10-11 I have shown also the fact that the woman, when she departed, was to remain “unmarried” or return to her husband. Phil, you replied to this, but you didn’t explain it. It doesn’t fit your premises so you just have to get around it. In I Cor. 7:39, it says a woman is bound as long as she lives to her husband, and if he is dead she is free to marry whom she will, only in the Lord. If her husband is still living, she is not free to marry whom she will. It does not say that she is bound to her husband as long as she is married to him; but as long as he lives. She could marry another, but she would become a sinner. But Phil says, if it is marriage it is holy. Two persons are not “chained” together in an adulterous relationship. It may be marriage, but not a “chaining”. My definitions have been exacting. I have tried to take all the evidence and arrive at a meaning of terms.

Concerning some of the examples I presented the Affirmative says, “But it is significant to note that every last example was an example of polygamy or a union without marriage - fornication.” I refer you back to the examples presented. One has been a real gnat in the orange juice to Phil. Herod and Herodias. It demonstrates that *his use of terms has been wrong*. Herod had married her. Phil says that if it is marriage it is holy. Yet John condemned Herod for having Herodias. Rom. 7 is the same.

Phil brings up I Cor. 7:11 again too, about the woman that *departs* from her husband. He asks “..... how could this make her single?” In a previous article he argued that she was single, and could remarry without sin, since she was “unmarried”. He has changed positions twice on this passage, and now wants to know how her *departing* can make her single. He also argued previously that the departing of the unbeliever in I Cor. 7:15 freed the believer to marry another. Same word used in both passages. Now, whatever the departing was it made her “unmarried”. Paul commanded her to “remain unmarried” or go back to “her husband”.

Phil says that he is arguing only for the right to marry of those who are loosed from a wife. I don’t disagree with that. I would argue for that also. What we have been trying to determine is *when* and *how* a person becomes loosed! Phil says it is by mutual agreement in one place and in another by just putting away. He further says that all I need do is show that people cannot dissolve their marriage and I will then establish my case. I have not denied that a person could dissolve their marriage. Look at my articles a-gain! I have denied that some who do, have a right to remarry.

3) “If he did not become single when he put her away, did he not then simply become the husband of two wives when he married the second woman?” (I answered “divorce severs the marriage relationship; it does not necessarily affect the bond God recognizes”).

I don’t know why I should keep going over the same material that I have presented before. If the Affirmative had paid close attention to my articles he would not have had to ask the most of these questions.

In such passages as Rom. 7:1-4 where does it say that the person is “bound” to the second person in the same way as to the first. The woman is “bound” to her husband as long as he lives; though she is married to another.

Phil chides me for not having a syllogism. Phil, I don’t need a syllogism, I have scripture.

4) “If he simply became the husband of two wives as a result of having married the second woman, why did Christ use “adultery” in referring to his behaviour?” (I said that I had already dealt with the word “adultery”).

The question of the Affirmative depends again on Matt. 19 not applying today. I have defined “adultery” and given its usage several times. As to the two wife bit, I have dealt with that also. I would not deny that polygamy was practiced under the Old Law, but I would deny that it is authorized for anyone now. The Affirmative has played around with the subject of polygamy all through the discussion. He says he wouldn’t defend it, but asserts again that neither Christ nor any N.T. writer ever condemned polygamy for *men*. So what? I want to know if they *authorized* it. He has continually emphasized that polygamy for *men* is not condemned in the N.T. It makes me wonder what he believes on the subject that he hasn’t brought out in this discussion.

5) This question has been dealt with on whether Matt. 19 is of Jewish application only. One smart little statement made by the Affirmative on this though is this: "I assumed that everybody knew he was not speaking to the church, since it did not exist at the time and since it wasn't asking the question." Well I suppose that Jesus' instructions in Mark 16 and Matt. 28 in no way apply to the church today, since it wasn't in existence then. Nothing Jesus said applies to us now; is that it Phil? Pshaw!

6) Was polygamy adultery? if it was...." (check back for this)

Even after the Affirmative talked about this question in his last article, it doesn't make much sense. He goes through a long line of reasoning; the purpose of which is to try making Jesus say something he didn't say.

The Affirmative wants to know the cause of adultery. "*Unlawful* sexual intercourse involving a person lawfully belonging to another" is adultery. The subject of polygamy is not in the passage of Matt. 19. Adultery doesn't depend on divorce or remarriage for it to exist; but Jesus isn't taking it from that end of the subject. Theft doesn't depend on robbing a bank in order to exist, but everyone that robs a bank is guilty of theft. The Jews question wasn't as to the ways they could commit adultery. They asked him about the cause of divorce. Jesus said there was but one, and then gave them the consequences of their act in any other instance.

7) I have dealt with this one before also.

Cause And Effect

The Affirmative charges me with trying to prove an ageless axiom wrong; that of cause and effect. No, I have proved the AFFIRMATIVES USE of the ageless axiom wrong. He charges that I exemplify ERROR by my use of Romans 6. We'll see who is using error on the passage. He maintains that baptism must be completed and a past fact before one can enter into Christ. Being a *cause*, it must precede in *entirety* the getting into Christ. Well, notice the passage. "Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore *with him* through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have BECOME UNITED WITH HIM in the *likeness* of his death, we shall be also in the *likeness* of his resurrection;". It is in THE ACT of baptism that we are united with Christ; come in contact with his blood. It is *in the act* that our sins are washed away. My argument still stands. Phil has shown through-out that he has set up his rules, and everything else, scripture included, must fit *his* rules. *His* premises come first.

This concludes our discussion. I hope you have been profited, and this will spur you on to further study,

-Maurice Barnett

