

02 HLH D&R 760918p3

Good afternoon to the morning church.

It was a request on behalf of the Imperial PM congregation to have a social function in the afternoon.

That was the basis for the twitching of time this day, and I hope that their occasion will turn out very helpful for those who are able to attend.

And therefore they wish to have the morning service time as possible.

I hope you are aware of the train of events taking place in the world, not merely one area, twice as many. I was commenting to my wife coming to the congregational meeting this afternoon that the extended trips of Dr. Henry Kissinger remind me of the efforts by Neville Chamberlain shortly before World War II to try to stop problems from developing into a serious explosion. There were problems in Spain, there were problems all through the Balkans, there were problems with Austria, with Czechoslovakia, with Poland, with which the Germans were involved. This man with an umbrella sought to prevent certain events from taking place that inevitably did occur.

Now we have Dr. Kissinger having succeeded in being there.

Makes you wonder what the intent and purpose was.

Anyway, we successfully lost that war.

Now we are involved in Southern Africa.

He says that the intent and purpose of course is not to enter into any area where he isn't asked to.

That's why he of course has not consulted with Mr. Smith of Rhodesia, but you know the British handed over Czechoslovakia to the Germans without really consulting the Czechs at all. What we should like to do would seem if Mr.

Kissinger's program is carried out would be to make a decision on behalf of a minority group in Rhodesia to have them all removed without ever consulting them. Now I would have to agree that he has some precedent. All you have to do is look through history and see how many people have been removed without consulting them and I am sure as a historian Kissinger looks at that rather than at anything else. The question is there's coming a time when the judgment we're going to sometime have a chance to ask those who were removed without being consulted.

But this is the part of our involvement and there is the Middle East with all of the nations that are there so it would pay you to beware of the train of events as people in Europe have been saying that these things remind one of 1937-1938, one to two years before the explosion of the Second World War. We had a very short fuse for the Second World War, a much longer fuse for the first and it would appear a much longer fuse for this one because we are in particular dealing with the Soviet Union which does not move any faster than it is sure of succeeding.

Today is the Sabbath before the Festival of Trumpets. Normally it would be appropriate to deal with a question of preliminary pertaining to the holy days or the holy days.

Since however I will not be speaking again for a little while on the program, Mr. George Meeker has invited me to be in Chicago for the Festival of Trumpets so I won't be here with you next Sabbath so I

will be here in the day of Atonement to pass with you. Is that any encouragement? We can start a day early if you wish some of you for the suggestion of Mr. Cotch and others.

Anyway, there is a subject that is essential and we just got.

Not because it pertains to everyone but because there is the need of clarifying certain things for this congregation and for others so we know what the responsibility of the individual of the ministry is.

I am going through a series handling each one perhaps a little differently pertaining to statements that were made during the conference this last year in May.

I would like to without reference to the papers discuss the question of marriage and divorce.

The reason I'm not making reference to the paper is that it tended to be a summary of the material that often on has been rather widely presented. You certainly may have the access to the paper that Mr. Cotch has a copy not necessarily with him and I'm not going to maintain that what I am discussing was in entirety the content of the paper. It would be too long to read and it was in some cases an analysis of the background material that was presented in this sense as far as the background paper in the summary and I'm familiar with the topic and in so far as the intent and purpose of the material I hope to be representing it appropriately though I will be going in some areas beyond what the paper said to clarify other areas and that's certainly the intent of the paper to lay a foundation. In this case there has been no reason for controversy. I do not presume that the ministry is an entirety on agreement in this subject but if I were in any way in doubt on a point or two and the marriage came up in which I was asked to participate I would merely step aside and have someone else. I think that there is a graceful way of doing it without departing from the church and accusing the church of error when there is none. There is a graceful way of handling any number of things whether you agree or not. It's one of the reasons why I don't appear in most socials for the church because I can't stand the loudness of the music. I'll make it known but I'm not here to prevent and to bar anybody from going whose ears are deaf to it.

I will extend only that much grace to that kind of thing which damages the ears of young people and then we wonder what happens later on in life. The subject of marriage and divorce probably affects most of us at one time or another. It may not in fact be a problem if we have had no problem in our personal life. Our example however is rather important and the council of many who may have been appropriately and properly and happily married certainly could have been listened to more by some who made mistakes and maybe some who were happily married gave very poor counsel to others and maybe shouldn't have been listened to in areas in which they have no confidence to give advice. I don't know but we've had a great many problems in the church pertaining to marriages performed in the congregation by people supposedly baptized or baptized but supposedly converted performed by the ministry asking God to be a participant where the marriage has either as they say gone up in flames or crashed in flames it depends on where the source of the trouble is I guess. We have to deal with the problem that in any number of cases it was the pressure of France on the one hand from the outside to put people together perhaps we all play a role in that one way or another and then there is on the inside of such a marriage very often the unwillingness to forgive. There is a way of approaching the topic and normally I'm just going to go through the Bible and show you what the Bible reveals as we go along but of necessity I must deal with the topic let's say from this end in time and then take a look through time to see what God made known and why. First of all we have to realize that as human beings we can be subject to error. It is God's purpose to lead and guide the church into all truth of necessity the concept of leading the Holy Spirit leading us into all truth presumes by the very nature of the verb itself that all truth has not been arrived at initially.

Now there are two things we must take note one one can go beyond Christ and introduce things that are in error. There are those who have left and have gone beyond what Christ teaches and there are those who do not on the other hand who have left who do not follow Christ where he leads.

It is unfortunate that some seek to get ahead of Christ and go beyond what he will teach and others fail to follow the light as he reveals it or at least have the wisdom to discover where the church is that Christ is using even though one may not perceive every point of doctrine or explanation to be correct in terms of reading one's own Bible but you have a responsibility to at least let Christ make certain decisions in terms of the body that he is working with and if he chooses to govern strictly as he did on some occasions and crackdown and if he chooses on others when people become black and indifferent and lukewarm enough to crack down that's Christ's own decision the same that is as it is a decision of every husband or wife in training of children as to whether they're going to be severe or whether they're going to be permissible and what Christ grants you as parents he happens to allow himself whether we realize it or not we're going to look back of course and discover that sometimes there's wisdom in giving permission to see what is in our hearts for there are times when people can form but do not really live it inside and that time is past and now of course many can do as they please and still have our fellowship for whatever that is worth but the time of judgment is coming in which we're all going to be examined in accordance with what is in the Bible and anybody else's faults are not going to be any excuse for you in this subject the church did make a mistake in times past by not comprehending the breadth and the depth of the mind of God as he revealed it in the scripture on this subject first of all having focused in on one verse which on the surface did seem so clear that what God has joined together man is not to put asunder a definition was placed on marriage which flew in the face of all other verses on the presumption that Christ was revealing a teaching which must of necessity since it contradicted others in terms of our interpretation must of necessity replace all the other verses in the Bible on this subject now the fact remains that we should take a renewed look at such a verse such as we find repeated on more than one occasion by Matthew and also by Mark and Luke I will turn first of all to a passing reference in Luke whosoever puts away his wife and marries another commits adultery and whoever marries her that is put away from her husband commits adultery and this is a simple statement the only one that Luke gives now we shall learn when we go through the scripture that no scripture is of its own interpretation we have to view the scriptures floral the writings in the light of one another why God reveals himself as he does then I think we shall have clarity now we do have an emphasis without any questions that whoever puts away his wife and marries another commits adultery but no reference to cause is given shall we assume that putting away is a blanket statement pertaining to all causes at all times that was in fact the teaching of the church and therefore whoever marries her also commits adultery now we must recognize that when scriptures are brought to our attention that clarify others we need a new look and it is unfortunate when some depart not really comprehending I will turn now briefly to another verse in Mark same subject slightly expanded but without all the statements that Matthew gives the Pharisees came to Jesus mark 10 beginning with verse two and asked him is it lawful for a man to put away his wife tempting him he answered and said what did Moses command you they said well Moses permitted suffered word permit to write a bill of divorcement and to put her away that doesn't happen to be the case Jesus asked what did Moses command now Moses gave a commandment in Juneronomy 24 but the Jews didn't like his reference to the word command and so they said Moses permitted a bill of divorcement to put her away let me correct my reading I skipped the phrase is critical to it Moses permitted you see or suffered to write a bill of divorce if you carefully look at Deuteronomy 24 what Moses commanded was that when there is a divorce it must be accompanied in terms of the biblical divorce by a written document to protect the innocent and all individuals involved that was not by way of permission that was by way of command the

statement is if you do this if you do that then the then explain what indeed was to be done let a bill of divorcement be written with a command to form and that was to protect individuals that was not legislating divorce but it was legislating the written form of a document to protect any individuals legally or illegally involved now Jesus responded and said to them for the hardness of your heart he wrote you this preset so we did perceive that there was hardness of heart for the writing of such a precept but from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female for this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife and they too shall be one flesh so then they are no more two but one flesh what therefore God has joined together let not man put us under I will stop at this moment although there's a little further discussion but I will interrupt here the thought to illustrate his point Jesus indicated that in response to the general question is it lawful for a man to put away his wife of course it was lawful was written in the law that a divorce exists as a means of severing a marriage but they were trying to trick him into taking sides between the various schools of Jewish thought on the subject Jesus did not then directly answer the question of which of the permissives or the non permissive schools of Jewish thought is involved he went right back to the beginning of marriage when he said that this idea of divorcing was for the hardness of heart why it was written in that form in Deuteronomy 24 now let's look at it he said from the beginning God made human beings male and female so that they would be attracted to one another now he says that in a successful marriage and here is a lot of counseling if people have ears to hear a man should leave father and mother not bring his wife to his father's or mother's house he should become the head of his own house so they are no more now two but one flesh it doesn't say free now by way of example we draw the conclusion that the marriage as God had planned it in the beginning involves one man and one woman not one man and two or three or four women or the reverse there is here an example there is no law only an example in this manner now we pick up the story what therefore God has joined together let not man put asunder and that is the summary and in fact the basis for what marriage should be in the beginning what God has joined together when God joins a husband and wife as one flesh man is told not to thunder the marriage and we interpret it this wrongly as if the reference were only to a form of divorce now let me explain something further when a man or a woman marry who both have been virgin it and if the man decide for whatever reason temptation intellectual vanity money I don't care what that he is going to live with some other woman or frequent a prostitute or become associated with a homosexual he does involve himself in the potential sundering in the actual sundering of such a mirror the reference here about sundering does not exclusively refer to divorce it can refer to any moral or I should say immoral conduct that can lead to the demise and breakup of a family it is a statement that God intended that when husband and wife exist as one flesh that there should be no act that would lead to the disruption of such a marriage that's the intent whether by divorce whether by adultery whether by homosexuality prostitution you name it anything that can wreck and thunder a marriage should not be done but human beings do it anyway now we have on this basis definitely a broader and a new light to the subject because let me tell you if a man's frequent after having been joined to his wife by God if he decides to frequent a prostitute bring home a venereal disease or decides to leave his wife he has funded the marriage whether there's any divorce or not so the reference is that man should not break up a marriage that God himself ordains in principle at the beginning but human beings do it anyway now in the house his disciples ask him again of the same matter and he said whosoever shall put away his life and marry another commits adultery against her this is the way the marriage should be from the beginning and if a woman shall put away her husband to be married to another he commits adultery now the reference in the first place was whether it is lawful to put away someone and so we discover that as God has ordained marriage in the beginning and his reference is clearly to the beginning whoever puts away his life and marries another commits adultery that is a general principle that governs marriage from the start Mark and Luke chose brethren to discuss what

marriage was like at the beginning and what marriage should be in the church if we are all willing and able to live with the kind of forgiveness that is grace that God can make possible but this represents only a part of the teachings of Christ you see as I have said before when the statement is made honor your father and your mother it is left up to you to a great extent by reading the scripture to decide what constitutes honor and in the same way when it comes to the question of marriage there are many other verses that point up matters that affect a marriage since the beginning and so we shall now turn to Matthew's account which in the sense is found in two separate places we'll start with chapter five since Matthew chose to begin with that two you have heard that it was said by them of old time 27 you shall not commit adultery I say unto you that whosoever looks on a woman to lust after her has committed adultery where they're already in his heart who doesn't say who looks at a woman who looks at a woman to lust after her there may be no deed but there is a need in fact an attitude of adultery Jesus is here pointing up the importance of the attitude and the two verses that follow illustrate on the basis of the typical punishment of the time that if you punish in the letter of the law like a face who has his hand removed his left one first and then is right so also you have to deal with the problem if there is an attitude and you have to get rid of the cause of such a wrong attitude but I want to point up one thing what does this commandment thou shalt not commit adultery really say first of all the ten commandments do not always define what you think they do unless you give it some thought the ten commandments don't really define what God is they do define his lordship his action as creator but beyond this the definition must be found elsewhere the commandment which says you shall not commit adultery does not define what adultery is it presumes that you have a knowledge of the meaning of the word furthermore and more important the commandment does not define marriage listen carefully the ten this one the seventh of the ten commandments which says you shall not commit adultery does not define what constitutes the marriage it only tells you that you are not to involve yourself in breaking up a marriage by the act that is called adultery you must go elsewhere to find what constitutes the marriage therefore Jesus did not go to Exodus 20 to define a marriage he went to Genesis to define a marriage by way of the first example I hope that is clear because this is important to understand further we read in verse 31 new themes whosoever you've heard it said shall put away his life let him give her a writing of divorce but that's the command that Jesus said the Moses issues of the people Moses didn't tell them or command them to divorce he commanded them that if a divorce occurs that a writing shall occur so that no one could be injured by any act it might not have been appropriate now I say unto you whosoever shall put away his wife and here Jesus is defining rather in the terms and conditions of the new covenant he is not entering into an argument with respect to the Pharisees at this point as already has been briefly alluded to in Luke and in Mark this is the basis of the new covenant because he shows you blessed blessed blessed that's the section beginning in chapter five those are the blessings that are promised as there were physical blessings under the old but here you learn and whosoever shall put away that means to divorce in the general sense of this term this under by way of a legal document saving for the cause of fornication translated from the greek fornia causes her to commit adultery and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced commits adultery and here we discover that this is not the message of Moses to the unconverted israelite before mount Sinai this is the message of Jesus Christ on the mount and top laying the foundation of the new covenant in which he says clearly whosoever shall put away his wife saving for the cause of fornia i'm using the greek word and we should have a general understanding of it after some of you've been this long in the church he causes her to commit adultery that is anything that is not the basis sorry anything that does not conform to the meaning of the word fornia is not a basis then for a divorce or a putting away which is the old king James wording i'm reading and does lead to adultery now two points shall be born in mind one we are dealing here with the question of the transgression of law we are not dealing with the performance of marriage within the institution of marriage we are dealing with the

question of transgression let me clarify this first when a man or a woman fails to live up to his or her part of the contract this has to do with the matter within the law sorry within the institution of marriage it has nothing to do with promiscuous sex outside of the institution of marriage the issue that Jesus is dealing with here is the issue of a divorce decrease with a putting away of wife for a particular matter which involves transgression fornication is transgression of some form it may be defined generally by such modern terms as sexual immorality I think that's the best general term so there isn't any doubt about it whoever puts away his wife that is right a decrease accepted be for some positive direct transgression of this nature that involves a sexual relationship that is not permitted by the marriage contract that person can be involved in adultery but if it does involve fornication then it is permissible to have a divorce this is important to be born in mind some who have left unfortunately have assumed that the church must have been inspired at a certain time and therefore needs not be led or corrected of Christ when new understanding comes along this verse is in reference to the new covenant relationship and shows that a divorce or a putting away and that's the basic word used in the King James period that is parallel with our use of the word divorce and it's interchangeably used in the New Testament whatsoever shall put away his wife saving for the cause of fornication this indicates that a divorce is possible and the basis for such a divorce is sexual immorality which is the general meaning the term fornication it may have specific meanings also having specific meanings it cannot exclude the general meaning because these is chose not to define it further nor was it an issue in the minds of the disciples we did not understand this correctly we assume that whosoever shall put away except for the cause of fornication meant that the marriage was irrevocably bound unless there was fornication and therefore fornication had to be before the marriage and we separated sexual promiscuity before marriage which the Greek word fornication does not do it merely means sexual promiscuity whether before or after marriage occurs King James usage of this word in the modern reference to fornication as distinct from adultery has led to did lead to that misunderstanding in part furthermore we concluded that this was an exception clause not for a divorce which it clearly is but was equivalent to the modern idea of annulment which it is not Jesus is answering the question of divorcing and he is showing that the one legitimate basis for a divorce in the biblical sense when a marriage has occurred that in God's sight should not be sundered but if there does occur fornication then it is permissible and Jesus here gives an exception for the simple reason that God didn't ordain at the beginning that there should be fornication he ordained that man should live according to every word of God and God was teaching Adam and Eve and marriage as it started out didn't involve any exception clause marriage as it started out involved people who should not get involved with sundering America in the beginning was Jesus reference but knowing human beings and the damage that fornication can cause Jesus does allow an exception he says that here is one and there has to be some valid basis here is someone who has sundered the happiness of the marriage by fornication whether before marriage and hit it whether during the marriage because the reference fundamentally has to do in Greek with involving oneself with a prostitute it can involve oneself with someone you don't pay for either it can involve homosexuality and it does involve adults all those thoughts are included because it has the general meaning of illegal sexual relationship so we're learning something that God ordained marriage in the beginning he didn't exclude the possibility of an exception but in the beginning says Mark and says Luke God did not include an exception clause because it wasn't any need there wasn't any fornication because it wasn't anybody else but Adam and Eve and so when Jesus is quoted by Mark and Luke he is quoted in reference to the nature of marriage at the beginning which did not include but did not exclude it just didn't address the question but now without any doubt looking into the future looking at the human family Jesus recognizes that this kind of a problem may exist a marriage that is otherwise valid can be so injured that in fact it is worse to live in a mental state of turmoil to live without peace than to get a divorce when fornication has occurred and to be free to be married because this is an exception that makes it free the individual free to remarry

you see god ordained that marriage should involve peace and too many do not but that's what it should involve will turn over clearly to a reference in 1st Corinthians if the unbelieving depart verse 15 of chapter 7 i won't expound on this accepted well in one thought let him depart a brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases that god has called us to peace now the purpose of life is to create peace for others but god does not intend that in terms of a marriage relationship that it should be other than a peaceful that's the intent i don't think anybody should argue with that point knowing that having been involved with a prostitute was almost sexuality with some other man's wife or some other woman's husband i don't care what the relationship is that a marriage can be so damaged that jesus built into the new covenant an exception clause this exception clause means a divorce is possible because he said this is an exception a favoring for or accept for means that this is a valid exception to the prohibition of divorce therefore this involves a permission to divorce and it is not excluded by the statement let not man put us under what god has joined this is an exception to that statement this we should have seen before but didn't the church heard at this mess and heard to the point of damaging individuals involved grievously and we acknowledge it and let those who want to leave who are unwilling to acknowledge it leave and live their own lives as they will we're going to look at the scriptures as god leads us and we're going to have it straightened out so that there can be no mistake now there is a prophecy about people who don't grow in this very matter as well as in other matters and i think we should take a look i've read a few before we'll turn to a statement that was found in paul's letter to timothy the first one he wrote he said chapter four the spirit speaks expressly that in the latter times and that is a term that does not exclude the day in which the apostles live to the return of christ some will depart from the faith giving heedlessly do things spirits and doctrines of demons speaking lies and hypocrisy having their conscience seared with a hot iron let this fit wherever it may but some things that people will do who depart from the faith this does not talk about the Australian Aboriginal of the man in new guinea who never had the faith this is not talking about the protestant in catholic world who have their own beliefs in the first place we're dealing now in terms of our time could be a reference to the middle ages anywhere where these things have occurred there will be some who depart from the faith forbidding taming as well as involving themselves with meats and other things now we have sex and groups in the middle ages and in modern times in the last century and in this but i want you to note that one of the things involved here is clearly the forbidding taming which presumes that there can be any number of approaches to the subject some might say don't marry at all some might say you're not free to be married when god says you are free to marry and unfortunately some have taken that approach the church itself made this mistake and was involved in it forbidding to marry when god himself had allowed it and we should acknowledge this mistake whether we knew it or not we fulfilled it now that we know it we correct it that's why it's still the church of god and unfortunately those who think they are the church who have left are involving themselves in this condemnation now let us understand in the beginning god intended that no deed or action should thunder a man but since human beings are what they are whether they are reared in the world or in church homes whether they're converted or not there is the great likelihood of cornea which can so damage a marriage that jesus said it is a valid call an exception to the faith that you're not to do anything to thunder a marriage that god has joined in the first place a marriage that god has joined in the first place divorce then with god hate we read in the book of malachi i think we read in the book of malachi i think we can all agree with that quickly clipped to it just before man he was the king james has it here the lord hates putting away 216 the lord hates divorcing putting away now if you can get along and live at peace and be so forgiving and you both are in such with such have such contact with god that porneia need not damage your relationship then the statement is clear let not man or woman put it asunder but if that act can so affect your marriage then you can divorce that is an exception to what god intended but it is a permissible one and you were asked in a sense to use it

judiciously because you're also asked to be forgiving but the ministry cannot try to force people to stay together where the marriage will explode later and it is better for the individual to make the decision whether or not to live with it but brethren we are still dealing with a question of transgression outside of marriage we are not dealing with the question of the state of affairs within the marriage contract itself i've been talking to you about a marriage that god has joined where there isn't any question that it is in conformity with the law of god so at this moment we're going to turn back to the earlier part of the bible and sometimes we'll look at the verse sometimes we won't but we'll take a general view we already know in the book of genesis that god set an example of the first marriage without defining it legally he sets an example now as we go on we come to an illustration of polygamy before the flood that's more than one wife but you will know that the man had two wives there isn't any question this is in the family of kings the law itself which by which we mean the book of genesis here in the whole first five books shows that a second woman can still be a wife because not that this is a perfect marriage but it is a possible marriage it is better for some women to be married than to live alone or to become prostitutes and beggars it is better to have when you have a state of war and nine out of ten men are dead it is better to have polygyny which is the more appropriate term that is more than one wife then it is to have sexual relations outside of a marriage contract and god's law allows that to the point that even in the new testament church in the roman world when young or older people were converted there was no requirement for a man who had more than one wife which was not uncommon in the roman world and is not uncommon in asia and africa today there was no requirement to put away a second wife who was legally married or a third no requirement i say we are further told that in ordaining the ministry in deacons however that a man should be the husband of one wife first timothy three two and the deacon should be the husband of one wife first timothy three twelve now you can read whatever meaning you want into that you're going to be judged for it but the clear implication in context is that a man who certainly could remarry after the first wife died has no reason to be excluded from the ministry but there would be a reason why a man who had three or four wives that is 234 should be excluded from this function by the very nature that his example is not the perfect example which is expected of the ministry in terms of conduct and rearing of children of alcohol of purity of faith and since god ordained a marriage to be between two as the a perfect example at the beginning this is not a perfect example if you have more than one at the same time the reference there would indicate that if there are some who have one wife there are also some who have more than one and we cannot forbid individuals to live with more than one wife if in societies where this occurs it already exists prior to conversion you have plenty of examples in the old testament it is not god's way in terms of the perfect example that we are asked to seek after now what people should choose to do if the one woman is not happy and she asked to be released there would be no prohibition in my estimation for her to be released of that contrast but that would be a church judgment and there would be my judgment that the unhappy wife in such a polygynous union or polygamy which is the common term but polygyny is the appropriate term if you find more than one wife as distinct from polygamy which can include more than one husband we're talking about this other situation the other where a woman has more than one husband is practically unknown in society anyway the new testament presumes it is possible on the basis of this example alone not to mention the example of abraham or david or jacob the prophet it is possible for a man who has lived faithfully with two or three wives with whom he had entered into a contract while they were each living to inherit the kingdom of gum so long as he did not commit adultery which was sexual is a sexual relationship outside of the marriage contract now he's not going to be perfectly happy any arab i talked to them in egypt he would say here was king baruch you know and his four wives pictures in the palace and he said you know he had these four wives but he loved this one now he lived with the others he should have loved them but it's a little difficult my wife would certainly agree there but it is possible Jesus

recognizes that people who inherit the kingdom of god are judged in accordance with the circumstances in many cases in which they live and societies where a whole generation of men nearly wiped out in war are better off with polygyny than they are with prostitution where a woman has to prostitute herself to make a living she's better off being the second or third wife having her own family and the man making the living than the other way so god allows it by way of many examples in the old testament as well as in the law and by the example of ordination in the new testament that is as a contrast of one wife versus the presumption that there are others who must have more you wouldn't have to single this out now we must deal with some other kinds of problems I'm going to read now for a moment a section of Leviticus which will perhaps enable us to better understand certain matters we will start with chapter 18 and take note that we are told none of you shall approach to any that is nearer tend to him to uncover their nakedness I am the lord now the purpose the statement here is in reference to sexual relationship here is here are a series or here is a series I should correctly which define prohibitive relationship that may be more broadly stated in terms of insects the nakedness of the father of the mother your father's wife who is not your mother verse 8 your sister verse 9 your son's daughter now initially the human family must have necessities been involved with marriages between brothers and sisters at the very beginning and then half brothers and half sisters later even after the flood Abraham and marrying Sarah married a half sister which is prohibited here in the law that's because genetically and biologically as time has gone on there are relationships that are no longer physically proper or emotionally proper let us suppose let me make it clear so you understand another facet of law suppose you have a sister whom you do not know and you marry her and you discover afterward that she is your sister this does happen it has happened in this country and of course and others at night also the sisters whether the daughter of your father or the daughter of your mother whether born at home or born abroad verse 9 so it can happen you see where you don't know is such a married subject to divorcing now let me clarify a point of law the implication of scripture is that such a marriage in the first place is not lawful now it was lawful for Adam's children it was lawful for Abraham but as God looks down in time it is no longer biologically and therefore spiritually now because it's defined in law it is no longer lawful in this sense any marriage of this nature that is not lawful does not have to have a writing of divorce me in terms of the law of God itself initially suppose the sister were a virgin suppose you were there's no cornea in that sense this marriage automatically is not lawful and should be discontinued today of course human laws govern certain matters such as this and the divorce would be involved in the biblical sense there is no such requirement now of course we're not dealing here with the obvious implication of sexual immorality when it was known i'm talking about something that can happen when you don't know this is the area that where we deal with marriages that are voidable by the very nature i should say excuse me let me correct that i want to get our legal terms correct when cornea is involved a marriage is voidable is not necessarily void voidable means subject to being void but not necessarily requiring it all of these relationships if no marriage occurred would just be classed under the category of cornea and using the greek term but should a marriage have occurred at any one of these points where you may not have known or where the law of man permits it but the law of god does not as in the case of a man who marries two sisters in one in the lifetime of the other these marriages in terms of the law are void because the law expressly forbids them and no divorce is presumed essential this was so understood in the church that is the congregation of israel as we have the history down through jewish periods because the law automatically spoke clearly on the subject there was no question and if it had happened then it was a mistake you could be forgiven if you did it intentionally that's another matter we have here then a whole series that in broadly speaking in broad terms would be in the category of cornea but if for instance one or two of these were done without the knowledge of the individual such a marriage in the first place would be presumed void even though it may exist and anyone so involved automatically has a right to leave in

such a case and we're not dealing with any violation of the law of god which says what god has joined together we are dealing with ignorance if it was done in ignorance again in the book of leuiticus just briefly looking at a whole area you have a section devoted to this in chapter 20 as well if a man take a wife and her mother verse 14 it is wickedness norman smith and i were involved in a case on our baptizing tour in 1953 where a man had taken a woman and married also her daughter one after the other in this case because our society doesn't allow it otherwise and this was indeed a very sad relationship i will not define it further but here we're not dealing with the question of where a divorce is necessary where god has joined someone together these marriages are in their very nature at the beginning illegal they are illegal i'm speaking biblically the law of the land might have allowed it the law of the land may require a divorce now we'll look at some other areas so we understand that how god's judgment is given in exodus 21 these are the judgments which we shall set before them in psalm 119 we have god defining the nature and the importance of the judgments and the statutes and the laws and the commandments of god what right do a man and a woman have we will take one that is directly applicable here in our society suppose a man were to acquire a woman beginning with verse seven if a man sell a daughter to be a maid servant and she she shall not go out as a men's servant she shall be treated differently now if she please not her master that is the man who has in a sense purchased her if she please him not sexually that's the implication this man who has betrothed her to himself then shall he let her be redeemed now what is interesting here is not that god wants people to sell others but if it occurs now remember the church of god must judge many matters that have transpired when people were yet unconverted in this very matter we do not judge in this case matters that are only occurring among converted people then he shall let her be redeemed but he is not allowed to sell her even though he owns her he has to allow her to be redeemed if she is not satisfactory to him now the girl had no choice her father made a decision but to protect a woman in a case like this where a man sells his daughter and another man who buys her is not pleased with her after his betrothed her the woman is to be protected in the sense that she cannot be sold by her husband to sell her to a strange nation he shall have no power now if he has betrothed her if the man who bought her instead of living with her gave her to his son he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters that is he must deal with her as his own daughter now if you take him another wife let us suppose the son has this woman and takes another wife we read clearly that her food her raiment her duty of marriage shall he not diminish this is in reference to food the general category of shelter and sexual relationship the three areas which any woman has the right to expect of a man whom she marries a woman has the right to expect that her husband will provide food for her will provide her with shelter whether in terms of a house or a mere bodily protection and sexual duty so that if he allows himself another wife he must not deny his first wife such rights even if she was bought by this man's father and if he do not these three to her then she shall go out free without money here is a case very clearly that expounds the whole area that is not even a question of pornea it is not a question of pornea it is not transgression of a marriage it is the failure to live up to the contract now in the world it may require a divorce in biblical law there's no reference here to divorce she has the right to go free she can leave him it would better be classified in the modern category of an annulment but unfortunately that term itself has its modern legal connotation what we perhaps best define this as that there are cases of fraud that do not involve pornea but involve the failure to live up to a contract and here marriage is presumed in its three fundamental areas that a man is responsible for any woman therefore who is married to a man who for either intentional or unintentional reason could not must but could go out free and the reference is not only to her freedom in terms of ownership it is referenced to her freedom in terms of the marriage itself of that there can be no doubt now in times past the church requires that if a man would not provide food or shelter but only demanded sex that the woman had to live with that man and the church provided her with the other needs that that was in hindsight asking a great deal of

the woman and not good for the man the law of god presumed in the bible a better vision than perhaps the church had when a man has no way to earn a living and cannot provide food or shelter the church has a responsibility to step in when the man has no way but seeks to do so this is why we are to take care of the widows and the fatherless and as the church is defined as those who are unable to accident to take care of a need in that case a woman has no such right but in this case a slave woman has a right and if a slave woman has a right how much more does a free woman so we conclude without any questions that there are cases where women have a right and in this sense we are not dealing with porneia we're dealing here with a situation of fraud of another nature all together that is not sexual transgression outside of marriage it has to do with the performance of a contract and when there is a marriage contract and one or the other fails to live up with it up to it then the other party has the right to claim that there was indeed a fraud which is another matter all together you see it's one thing to have a contract and then to go outside and violate it that is adultery that is transgression going outside to transgress to go beyond the border that's clear jesus said that if there is that kind of promiscuity then a divorce is permissible not required for reasons of porneia but a contract can also in this sense be recognized as not being fulfilled and we are not dealing with transgressions with the third party necessarily in such a situation a woman has a right equally a man god's law defines it here now if the woman decides that she can provide her own living her own raiment and her own duty of marriage and she just wants to have the man's name that's up to her the law doesn't forbid it if she doesn't act on freedom but the law clearly indicates that such freedom is permissible further it indicates that a man has such a responsibility to perform all of these areas now although the definition is not given it is obvious also when paul addresses the question in 1st Corinthians 7 he says defraud not one another now in this case it was intentional fraud the man decided not to take care of his first life he's going to take care of the other when he thought he liked better we're told not to defraud one another and the defrauding there means to deny sexual relationship now it is possible that there are women who want to live in a man's house but they refuse to cook and to have any sexual relations with him that is they want to food the raiment the shelter but not to submit themselves to their husband a man therefore has also certain right as the woman has to expect the other party to fulfill the marriage contract and when a marriage contract within the institution itself is not being fulfilled there is a fraud or a failure to live up to it and a contract is valid but can be set aside i'll use that term because divorce is not in reference to this matter it can be set aside at any point when individuals fail to live up to the terms and conditions of what the contract calls for you see marriage involves two things it involves requirements and prohibitions when you allow yourself the privilege of a marriage you enter into certain responsibilities or requirements that you do for another person and you also deny yourself the same outside of a marriage contract with somebody else that would be porneia if you did involve yourself with it when a contract is not proper and lived up to it when it comes to this kind of mess the individual has recourse on the basis of this example without any question and this is of course basically the same as the modern concept of an annulment the modern concept of an annulment in the sense refers to the incapacity intentional or otherwise the law of the land doesn't always judge those points there are cases where we bring matters to the world to make a judgment but when there's a divorce we're sorry we don't normally tell you why it's not our business to divulge confidences it's not your business to inquire of them on occasions we have to go to the court of the land for a divorce when an annulment might be better is when a man marries two sisters or marries a mother and a daughter in that case the biblical sense no divorce would have been required and either because the marriages were not lawful to start with in other cases a marriage might be lawful but there are factors which involve the question of food or raiment or duty of marriage and in such a case the law of the land not uncommonly grants the more graceful termination of a contract for other reasons altogether which have to do with the matter of the failure to fulfill either intentional or

otherwise a marriage contract in this case the word that we use an annulment is always a nicer term even in the world site it implies that there were some problems that could not be handled within the marriage some inability to live up to every part of the contract there's not a part of our business and in this case the reason I am giving this general emphasis here is that God has graciously made it possible that one of our brethren here or two ones who is no longer at this congregation but is elsewhere had a marriage contract terminated by an annulment even after a period of time and I would concur with the judgment of the court as a land in this case and we were very happy that God granted such a favor and that the word divorce was not used because it did not normally fall in that category therefore I do accept the responsibility of mentioning to you as brethren that Arthur Landings has had an annulment of the marriage that we are not evolving evolving involving on cells in a divorce and it is not in the area of pornea because that would clearly have required the biblical concept of divorce so we do have a number of examples that are significant through the Bible and I hope in looking at the number of these we have a general perception as one other at the time when we normally should be released I will just give a quick review because it shows how the New Testament view this matter in the book of Deuteronomy there were statements about not entering into marriages with the Canaanite sides that were in the land for they will turn away your son from following me or your daughter etc it doesn't matter verses three and four of chapter seven now again let me explain these marriages were unlawful but they were nevertheless married that is they were legal in the sense that the law recognized them as marriages but they were not lawful according to the law of God when we have the possibility of divorce sorry of a religion entering in as a divisive wedge now at a much later time Ezra and Nehemiah acted when the community had been so deeply rooted in such marriages to enter into a legal divorce procedure to protect the name of the Jewish community and above all to protect the Gentile women whom these Jewish men in general had married now Jewish law tells us and it would be correct that Ezra and Nehemiah were not required to issue divorce proceedings in written porn they however exercise on the basis of Deuteronomy 24 the right to do so in order to protect those women so there would be no question that those women who were divorced in the case of the time of Ezra and Nehemiah would be free you see hornea is not involved what is involved is the marriage that occurred that was legal and the children that were born were legal they were not bastard or born out of wedlock it was a situation where children had a legal marriage but it was not according to the law of God because it would jeopardize the religion and the culture the survival of the nation now necessarily when two people are both unconverted and one becomes converted and not the other the same time the question would arise should the converted person therefore thunder the marriage because he now finds himself living with an unconverted mate because you're told here not to contract marriages with someone of another religion now Paul's answer to the question is very simple now we'll end it because we could go on with other examples but we'll end it with this so that we have a clear insight into the question to the rest I'm picking it up in verse 12 not the Lord to the Lord had spoken you don't involve yourself with marriages with the unconverted but Paul says in terms of he believes he has the spirit of God and analyzing the law he said if a brother have a wife who believes not that if you're found to be married to an unbeliever here is a marriage that legally existed but in terms of the law of God as he was given in the letter of the law was something unlawful now he says if you man have a wife who believes not and if she'd be pleased to dwell with you now the concept of being pleased to dwell with you doesn't mean that she's the kind of person who makes marriage unbearable and anybody who would interpret that a believer who has an unconverted wife has to tolerate her under all circumstances merely because he's married to her is wrong she has to be pleased to dwell with him and that pleasure is not expressed by no sex no cooking but I'll take your house and your clothes you give me we need to get our heads screwed on straight so we understand what the law of God is talking about any woman like that is not pleased to taking advantage of her

husband and if a woman who has a husband who believes not and if he be pleased to dwell with her let her not leave him which means he must be willing to provide her with food and layman's and duty of marriage so here we have where the question of porneia is not involved necessarily at all you have a marriage that was in a tent in the letter of the law unlawful but it was legally existed and in this case if there is harmony between the two since the spirit of God is added which was not then promised in the case of heteronomy Paul says it is his judgment to let such a marriage stand even though the letter of the law might have excluded us and where the judge according to spirit and intent but and if someone turns out to be not of the faith is not baptized or departs from the faith and is not really pleased to dwell and doesn't make the home peaceful as verse 15 would indicate the intended purpose of marriage should be then such a marriage in this land would be set aside the divorce in the biblical sense doesn't require it all it says that's all it says let them depart because all that is necessary where a divorce wasn't required was merely to leave but in our land we have to be submissive to the laws of man and divorces would be required and divorces were initially not so when Jesus was addressing the question of divorce he was not addressing any other case but the matter of porneia he was not addressing questions of fraud within a marriage intentional or otherwise he was not addressing questions of marriages that were not lawful but exist and you have to put all these scriptures together to get the whole picture now it would be wonderful if we could have it as it was at the beginning where all believe all can forgive and no one marriage started out with that kind of a family but it didn't continue and these judgments have done reflect the fact of diversity of religion the influence of the intentional or otherwise physical mental emotions to fulfill man or the direct act of some faith and since those things exist the bible gives us examples and wisdom and teaches us how we can handle such cases in all parents one other that is a very simple one and I will merely refer to it because you should see that with no problem this is in Deuteronomy I won't hold you beyond this one 21 we have many cases excuse me where soldiers go abroad and marry someone in Deuteronomy 21 when you go force the war against your enemies and the Lord your God has delivered them into your hand and there you take the woman with another nation and she doesn't ultimately please you in verse 14 then you shall let her go wherever she will if you shall not sell her for money you're not to make merchandise of her and you can go on in the same area which is very interesting in this connection Deuteronomy 21 14 will clearly indicate that when we have in some cases women who are converted and husbands were soldiers and they just didn't like them after they got the living list the law of God recognizes that a woman who is not pleased in a situation like this which you had very little choice a conquering power both for you so to speak and you were taken back home you know what it means to be a conquered people you might understand the situation such a woman has right God recognizes that if the man is hard-hearted that a woman has the life therefore to leave to go wherever she wishes back to her own home or in your own land and there is no prohibition against her emailing because in the first place the marriage was entered in some form of duress now you can take a look at many other places and you need to have insight into why God says what he does because these are cases where pornea is not in itself necessarily a fact now it could include but not what you say that is this woman might have been involved in pornea before the presumption is she was not there's no statement about her uncleanness the implication is you humbled her she was not impure of before so there isn't any question that God recognizes when there is hardness of heart God hates putting away this man married it nevertheless God recognizes in the law and this is not what the Jews were challenging Jesus on they were challenging him on Deuteronomy 24 where no limit was placed on divorce but only the requirement of writing it out that these are all other cases involving marriages under duress fraud or something that could not occur because God has insight to say that this kind of a relationship is wrong and these are all outside of the area that Jesus had stuck probably better categorized in the modern concept of an omen though not necessarily equivalent to it I think we have to have that insight when

we read the law of God which is in this sense the mind of God is less than the circumstances you will find some of which are pale as today and others are with her not and if the church is going to be led by Jesus Christ he is going to have to let him lead up through this book to see what God's mind is on very serious situations such as on occasions he would curse