

Debate on Divorce and Remarriage

Four Propositions – 24 Articles



J.T. Smith



Robert Waters

First Proposition: (pages 3-20)

The Scriptures teach that Jesus' teachings regarding Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage were not applicable (except Matthew 19:3-8; Mark 10:2-9) until the Law of Moses was done away.

Affirm: J. T. Smith

Deny: Robert Waters

Second Proposition: (pages 21-39)

Jesus' teachings in the 'MDR' texts, such as Matthew 19:3-12, were applicable to the Jews.

Affirm: Robert Waters

Deny: J.T. Smith

Third Proposition: (pages 40-60)

Proposition: In the New Testament, the apostle Paul teaches that all competent adults, including the divorced, may marry.

Affirm: Robert Waters

Deny: J.T. Smith

Fourth Proposition: (pages 61-84)

Proposition: The teaching of the New Testament only permits the one who has divorced his spouse for fornication and one whose spouse has died, to remarry.

Affirm: J. T. Smith

Deny: Robert Waters

February 2011

Blank Page

Smith – Waters Debate

Smith's First Affirmative

(#1)

Proposition: The Scriptures teach that Jesus' teachings regarding Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage were not applicable (except Matthew 19:3-8; Mark 10:2-9) until the Law of Moses was done away.

Affirm: J. T. Smith

Deny: Robert Waters

Definition and explanation of the Proposition:

By “the Scriptures” I mean the sixty-six books of the Bible, the Old and New Testaments.

By “Jesus’ teachings” I mean the passages that set forth His instructions by statement, command, approved example and/or necessary implication.

By “not applicable” I mean that they were instructions to His disciples that were to become binding when Christ’s church (kingdom) was established.

By “except” I mean that Jesus’ teaching in Matthew 19:3-8 and Mark 10:2-9 was in reply to the questions of the Pharisees about the Law of Moses.

By Marriage I give God’s definition.

Matthew 19:5-6 And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?
6 Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

By “divorce” I mean, a recognition by the State (in which he and she reside) of their dissolving of the marriage relationship; giving each of them a legal right (according to the laws of the land) to marry another without being a bigamist. Just because it is “lawful - according to the laws of the land – does not make it lawful in the sight of God.

By “remarriage” I mean, the laws of the land allow anyone (regardless of how many former marriages they have contracted) who does not now legally have a spouse to marry another.

By “were not applicable” I mean that Jesus’ teaching on this subject (except where He was speaking directly to the Jews in reply to their questions) did not apply to those under the Law of Moses.

The Law of Moses was “... our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. ² But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster” (Galatians 3:24-25) Also in Colossians 2:14 “Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;”

Let’s observe all the passages (that are applicable to day) that were used by Jesus to teach His disciples on this subject.

Matthew 5:32 But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

Matthew 19:9 And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.

Mark 10:11-12 And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. ¹ And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.

Luke 16:18 Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery.

Definition of Words Used

Whosoever – would include all people regardless of race or religion.

Put Away – He/she explicitly declares to the mate that he no longer wills to live in marriage with the mate. He releases her; he declares her repudiated. Civil procedure is a process that follows this and often takes much time to complete. In the meantime, the two spouses are separated (unmarried--not living together).”

Except – Jesus gives a rule and then makes an exception to it. Example: Luke 13:3 “I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.” The rule: You

shall all likewise perish.” Then He makes an exception – which means if they repent they won’t perish.”

The same is true with the divorce question. The rule is, if you put away your wife and marry another, you commit adultery – except (unless) you put her away for fornication. Now if you put her away for fornication the exception Jesus gave is applicable. In which case, you can marry someone who is eligible to have a wife/husband.

Fornication, (from the Greek [porneia] in the New Testament is a general or generic term which means,” sex between unmarried people, homosexuality Jude 7; bestiality, incest, adultery (I Corinthians 5:1). (W. E. Vine’s *Dictionary of New Testament Words*).

Adultery, (from the Greek [moichois] in the New Testament is specific. It “denotes one ‘who has unlawful intercourse with the spouse of another’,” (W. E. Vine’s *Dictionary of New Testament Words*).

These definitions of fornication and adultery are the general definitions used throughout the Scriptures.

To whom was Jesus speaking in Matthew 5-7 in the Sermon on the Mount? Matthew 5:1 “And seeing the multitudes, He went up into a mountain: and when He was set, His disciples came unto Him: ²And He opened His mouth, and taught them, saying . . .” Thus, Jesus was teaching His disciples.

Who was Jesus teaching in the other passages (Matthew 19:9; Mark 10:11-12; Luke 16:18)?

As in numerous instances in the New Testament, you have to get all the accounts in order to get the entire picture.

Mark 10:10-12 “In the house His disciples also asked Him again about the same matter. ¹¹So He said to them, “Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery against her. ¹²”And if a woman divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery.”

Now in view of the fact that in Matthew’s account after He makes His declaration in 19:9, who questions Him concerning what He said? If you said His Disciples, you are correct. So in view of the statement in Mark’s account it is necessarily inferred that Jesus was speaking to His disciples in Matthew’s account also. Matthew 19:10 “His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry.”

Smith-Waters Debate

Waters' First Rebuttal

(#2)

“The Scriptures teach that Jesus' teachings regarding marriage, divorce and remarriage were not applicable (except Matthew 19:3-8; Mark 10:2-9) until the Law of Moses was done away.”

Affirm: J.T. Smith.

Deny: Robert Waters

I was reluctant to agree to deny the above proposition after brother Smith insisted on inserting the part in parentheses. I did so after realizing that this is his proposition, and his exclusion of these passages does not prevent me from using them to prove what I need to prove in defending the truth regarding who God allows to marry. That J.T. elected to exclude these texts is indicative of the fact that he recognizes that they very clearly establish the setting and context of the passages as well as the audience to whom Jesus spoke. What J.T. needs to prove is that, although Jesus clearly directed his teachings to the Jews, in the middle of that context (in which he pronounced THEIR practice as sin) he suddenly quit directing his words to them and began speaking to Christians at a later date, i.e. when the kingdom would come. J.T. needs this to be true; otherwise his teaching that Jesus changed the Law, which allowed the divorced to marry another, would have Jesus contradicting Moses, which J.T. recognizes would be sin.

Obviously, J.T. is trying to get around a serious problem inherent in his teaching. While trying to be hermeneutically correct he utterly fails in the end. He has deceived himself into thinking he can say Jesus' teaching regarding the sin of “putting away” did not apply to those to whom it was directed and continue to follow good hermeneutics. He actually goes against good hermeneutics in failing to observe and follow the *law of continuity, context and audience relevance*. J.T. will fail to prove his proposition and his doctrine will still have Jesus contradicting the Law, which he knows is an unacceptable consequence for any position.

Now, our differences are not over whether Jesus' teachings apply to us today. I believe that a woman today who is “put away” by her husband and marries another commits the same sin committed in Jesus' day. This debate is about, as far as J.T. is concerned, defending tradition—his teaching that goes back to his early years as a preacher and writer, that has Jesus condemning innocent “put away” women to a life of celibacy. Jesus was not condemning “divorce,” which is a process outlined by Moses (designed to protect the women of that time) that includes the *putting away* or *sending out of the house*, but was instead condemning the common practice of men (who could have more than one wife) who were *apoluo*-ing, or sending a wife out of the house. Without the divorce certificate, according to the

Law that was under discussion (Deut. 24:1-4; Matt. 19:3-8), she would commit adultery if she married or took up with another man. Brother Smith knows that many are learning of and accepting this position, which does not have hermeneutical problems and therefore must be the truth. (At least eight books by various authors of various faiths teach this truth.)

It is unfortunate that J.T. has not already given up his teaching of error that forbids marriage (1 Tim. 4:1-3) and has brethren teaching an unjust doctrine, which God not only does not condone but actually condemns in no uncertain terms. Perhaps this debate will be helpful in opening his eyes so he can, to the extent possible, undo the damage his teaching has done to the church through the years.

Let's now address some things J.T. wrote:

“By ‘not applicable’ I mean that they were instructions to His disciples that were to become binding when Christ’s church (kingdom) was established.”

Apparently, J.T. is going to try to prove that although the lesson and condemnation of Jesus was directed to the people to whom he spoke, it really was not for them to hear and apply, but was meant to be heard and applied only by people in the church. With this established, he hopes we will be able to forget about the problem that his position poses, which is that it forces Jesus to contradict the Law. Of course, his position has many other problems besides just this one.

“By ‘except’ I mean that Jesus’ teaching in Matthew 19:3-8 and Mark 10:2-9 was in reply to the questions of the Pharisees about the Law of Moses.”

Having admitted the setting and context J.T. has given up the farm. Yet he continues to endeavor to get us to agree with him that in the very next verse, with no indication whatsoever to his hearers, Jesus suddenly quits talking to these people and begins speaking to men and women who will later become Christians, most of which are not even present. Absurd! Of course, J.T. thinks that because Jesus elsewhere speaks words that are applicable to all—the Jews and Christians in the next dispensation--that proves that Jesus changed whom he was addressing in this passage (Matt. 19:9).

An important point that J.T. apparently fails to realize is that the “disciples” whom Jesus addressed were present when the Pharisees asked him the questions regarding putting away. The answer the Lord gave the Pharisees shut them up for good on that issue. But the disciples responded with a comment that was not questioning God’s marriage law or his divorce law. It was merely a statement that it would be better not to marry under the circumstance that Jesus had just addressed that related to the exception clause. In other words, it would be best not

to marry a woman if she was not free or if the marriage was not legal, such as incest, which would be *fornication*.

“Let’s observe all the passages (that are applicable to day) that were used by Jesus to teach His disciples on this subject.”

Indeed, but should we not also observe all the teachings of Paul who actually answered questions asked by Christians (1 Cor. 7)? Must we question the applicability of what he said? Can we have and teach the truth on divorce and remarriage if we ignore the teachings of Paul?

Question for J.T.:

Do we find any indication that the Pharisees who heard Jesus condemn their practice of putting away (Matt. 19:9), understood that it did not apply to them? If so, please elaborate.

Smith – Waters Debate

Smith's Second Affirmative

(#3)

"The Scriptures teach that Jesus' teachings regarding marriage, divorce and remarriage were not applicable (except Matthew 19:3-8; Mark 10:2-9) until the Law of Moses was done away."

Affirm: J.T. Smith

Deny: Robert Waters

In Robert's first rebuttal he challenged me to produce the proof that Jesus was not speaking to the Jews, but to His disciples concerning matters which would not be applicable until His kingdom was established.

First of all, According to God's original Law, putting away and divorce was not a part of God's plan. (cf. Matthew 19:3-8). And even though (because of the hardness of their hearts) God permitted it, It was a contingency law that was granted in order to protect the woman who had no rights (Deuteronomy 24:1-4).

Second, if the teaching of Jesus was applicable to those under the Law of Moses He would have been CHANGING THE LAW.

Under Moses' Law, the one taken in fornication (remember, the Greek word *porneia* translated fornication also includes those who are married - adulterers I Corinthians 5:1) was to be stoned.

John 8:3-5 And the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst, ⁴They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. ⁵Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou?

Notice what Jesus said in Matthew 19:9:

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

First of all, if Jesus was directing this to the Pharisees, He was changing the Law of Moses. Moses said the fornicator (adulterer) was to be stoned to death. How then could Jesus tell them to put her away and if SHE MARRIED ANOTHER – but how would that be possible if she had been stoned to death? You see, Jesus

would have been changing the law, for he said "whosoever marrieth her that is put away commits adultery."

Much of Jesus' teaching in Matthew, Mark, Luke and John was only to be applicable to the church or kingdom.

Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. ¹⁶But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. ¹⁷And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican (Matthew 18:15-17).

To whom was Jesus speaking? Matthew 18:1 "At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" He was discussing things that would be applicable to the church/kingdom of God!

John 3:3-5 Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. ⁴Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? ⁵Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

To whom was Jesus speaking? John 3:1 "There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews." Does brother Waters think that Jesus was speaking about one entering the Jewish Kingdom which was in existence during the lifetime of Christ?

In Matthew, Mark, Luke and John a number of accounts that pertained to the same subject are given – with different details regarding that subject.

Example:

Matthew 26:51 And, behold, one of them which were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest's, and smote off his ear.

Mark 14:47 And one of them that stood by drew a sword, and smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off his ear.

Luke 22:50 And one of them smote the servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear.

John 18:10 Then Simon Peter having a sword drew it, and smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear. The servant's name was Malchus.

Observe, please, that in Matthew and Mark's account, they only recorded the fact that the one of them that was with Jesus (Mark's account – "one of them that stood by") drew a sword, and smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off his ear.

Luke adds to this by saying, "...and cut off his right ear – thus adding another detail.

Then John adds to this by saying, The servant's name was Malchus. So, if we just read Matthew's account we would not know either which ear was cut off, or what the man's name was.

This same manner of Hermeneutics (which is nothing more than rules of communication which have been in existence since Genesis 1) – statement, command, binding example and necessary implication – help us to understand the text. Thus the statements concerning Malchus set the stage for our passages on marriage, divorce and remarriage in Matthew, Mark and Luke.

In Mark's account (in 10:2-9) of the Pharisees questioning Jesus about Moses' Law on putting away, Jesus gave almost word for word the same reply that is recorded by Matthew 19:3-9. However Mark also gives some ADDITIONAL information.

Mark 10:10-12 And in the house His disciples asked Him again of the same matter. ¹¹And he saith unto them, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. ¹²And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.

In Matthew 19, who replied to Jesus regarding verse 9? Matthew 19:10-12 "His disciples say unto Him..." Now, in view of the additional information we get from Mark 10:10-12, by necessary implication (because His disciples replied to the statement made) we understand this instruction was given to them for a time when the Law of Moses was done away.

Thus, my proposition is sustained.

Smith-Waters Debate

Waters' Second Rebuttal

(#4)

First, I asked a formal question—one that is highly pertinent to this issue--regarding whether the Pharisees understood that Jesus' words (in Matthew 19:9) did not apply to them. Isn't it generally accepted that, for example, when Bob addresses Joe, particularly when Joe first asks Bob a question, what Bob says in reply is applicable to Joe? And isn't this true regardless of whether Bob says the same thing to someone else on another occasion? Well, the discussion going on in Matthew 19:9 was the same situation as when Jesus told the Jews they were committing adultery against their women (Mark 10:11) by putting them away. What indication can we find in the text that would make us think the Pharisees did not understand Jesus' words to be applicable to them? The proposition J.T. is affirming is impossible to sustain. Nevertheless, even though he has not and cannot answer this crucial question, J.T. imprudently ends his second article by asserting, "Thus my proposition is sustained."

The proposition brother Smith is affirming is that Jesus' teaching was not applicable until the church was established. I did not challenge J.T. to prove that Jesus was not speaking to the Jews but to his disciples, as he charged. In fact, I made the point that his disciples WERE Jews, and no doubt many disciples were Pharisees. Thus, when Jesus spoke to his disciples he was speaking to Jews and they, like Jesus, were amenable to the Law. The issue in this discussion is whether or not Jesus' teaching in Matthew 19:9 was applicable to the hearers at the time he spoke them. I say, YES, it is obvious. J.T. says NO, the teachings would become applicable after the new law came into effect.

J.T. understands that "putting away" and "divorce" are not the same thing. (Few who seek to defend tradition recognize this fact.) He also understands that we must not accept a position that has Jesus contradicting the Law, which is another correct and important observation. Hopefully, J.T. will realize his failure to sustain his proposition and will come to accept the truth, which is that Jesus never said "divorced" people commit adultery, but instead said a woman "put away" (and still married) would commit adultery if she married another man. This is the only position that makes sense as it has God, Moses, Jesus and Paul in harmony. What reasonable gospel preacher would not be happy to learn that God does not, after all, require him to break up happy homes and impose celibacy on the divorced? When one learns the truth regarding what Jesus actually said it should then be easy to follow Paul's command regarding the "unmarried" (which includes the divorced) to "let them marry" (1 Cor. 7:8, 9).

Just what did "Moses suffer"? It wasn't divorce—that was commanded (Deut. 24:1-2; Mark 10:3) so the woman could "go be another man's wife." While it is a great sin to deal treacherously with a wife (Mal. 2:14) God authorized divorce. But he (wisely) suffered the "putting away" without the certificate, i.e. there was no policing or punishment for the sin. Imagine a world where all separations required immediate divorce proceedings. This would lessen the possibility of reconciliation, which God wants (1 Cor. 7:11).

J.T. wrote "...if the teaching of Jesus was applicable to those under the Law of Moses He would have been CHANGING THE LAW."

No, while J.T.'s position has this conundrum mine does not. It would be nice if he could actually consider the possibility that his belief, regarding what Jesus taught, is error and quit thinking of it as if it is the standard.

J.T., you should know better than to assert or imply that fornication and adultery are the same thing. Adultery is fornication, but not all fornication is adultery. An illegal/unscriptural marriage results in fornication, but the Law required no death penalty for it (Ezra 10:19; Matt. 14:4; 1 Cor. 5:1). The "exception" (Matt. 19:9) involved fornication--an illegal or illicit marriage, as it is sometimes so translated.

Regarding Jesus' teaching in Matthew 19:9 J.T. said, "...if Jesus was directing this to the Pharisees, He was changing the Law of Moses" because Moses said the "fornicator (adulterer) was to be stoned to death."

The above argument fails because Jesus was simply telling the Pharisees that the practice of putting away a wife was "adultery against her" (Mark 10:11) and caused her to commit adultery if (not being free) she married another. The fact that the "fornicator" in the exception clause (Matt. 19:9) wasn't put to death indicates that adultery was not the sin. The sin was an illicit/unscriptural marriage. "...If the case of the man with the woman is so, it is not good to marry" (Matt. 19:10; YLT).

The teaching found in Matthew 18 was applicable to the disciples (Jews) who lived under and were amenable to the Law. As J.T. pointed out, the teaching in the above text would apply "in the kingdom of heaven." But how can we say the text did not apply to those to whom it was addressed? J.T. needs Matthew 19:9 not to be applicable to the Jews because if it is applicable his position (not mine) has Jesus contradicting the Law.

In John 3:3-5, Jesus was obviously speaking to Nicodemus about how to get into the kingdom. Did it apply to him? Yes. Can we apply it today? Yes, because the text presents teaching regarding the kingdom that now exists--a fact that does not

require that we deny that Jesus addressed Nicodemus or that the text was applicable to him.

Just because one gospel account of an incident does not give all the facts, that does not mean we may disregard good hermeneutics. It is very disturbing that J.T. seems not to recognize that there is much more to hermeneutics besides “direct command, example and necessary implication.” His argumentation violates the *law of continuity, context and audience relevance*. Jesus’ teaching applied to the disciples, who were Jews and possibly guilty of putting away along with the Pharisees, who were Jesus’ enemies. This means J.T.’s effort to distinguish between Pharisees and disciples, and therefore establish that Jesus’ teaching in Matthew 19:9 did not apply to those who heard it, but would apply only when the kingdom came, is erroneous.

Smith – Waters Debate

Smith's Third Affirmative

(#5)

First, I will answer brother Waters' "formal question." "Did the Pharisees understand Jesus' words (in Matthew 19:9) did not apply to them?" Jesus' words were not spoken to them, so how could they apply? No they neither applied to them nor anyone else until Christ's law went into effect. I pointed this out in my last affirmative. Nothing Jesus taught in Matthew 19:9, Mark 10:11-12, Luke 16:18, John 3:3-5, or Matthew 18:15-17 would change nor add to the Law of Moses. Neither would these be applicable to the Pharisees, Nicodemus nor Christ's disciples at the time spoken.

Jesus taught the Samaritan woman in John 4:19-21.

The woman saith unto Him, Sir, I perceive that Thou art a prophet.
²⁰Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and Ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. ²¹Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father.

Was that instruction applicable then to the Jews? Were they to quit worshiping in Jerusalem THEN?

Brother Waters said, "What indication can we find in the text that would make us think the Pharisees did not understand Jesus' words to be applicable to them?" Again, I pointed out in my last affirmative that in order to know what is being said and to whom it is being said, we must consult the immediate and greater context. In the greater context in Mark 10:10 "And in the house His disciples asked Him again of the same matter." Notice that the text says, 'in the house His disciples asked him AGAIN --- about this matter.'" Surely we know what the word AGAIN means. The context shows that the question was asked a SECOND TIME by ANOTHER GROUP.

Also this corroborates the fact in Matthew 19:10-12 that Jesus' disciples made the statement regarding what He had just said concerning divorce and remarriage instead of the Pharisees. It is always appropriate and necessary to consult the immediate and the remote context of what happened as we pointed out in the last affirmative regarding the High Priest's servant whose ear was cut off by Peter.

Let's look at these facts again.

If we just read Mark's account we wouldn't even know if it was one of Jesus disciples. "...one of them that stood by" (Mark 14:47).

If we only read Matthew's and Mark's account, we wouldn't know which ear he cut off.

If we only read Matthew, Mark and Luke we wouldn't know WHO cut off the ear or WHOSE ear was cut off. But John apprises us of both answers.

I am not telling brother Waters anything he doesn't already know. He, no doubt, would consult all four gospels regarding any other subject (other than divorce and remarriage). He just can't afford to admit that Mark's account of this same occurrence shows conclusively that Jesus was speaking to His disciples and not the Pharisees as in the preceding verses of Matthew 19.

And, if the above arguments were not enough, Matthew 19:9 would have changed the Law of Moses which Jesus said He did not come to do.

Matthew 5:17 Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.

Let's see how the brother's reasoning in his last negative of Matthew 19:9 would read. He correctly says that "putting away" and "divorce" are not the same. He then says that Jesus was instructing the Pharisees concerning Moses' law on divorce and remarriage in Matthew 19:9. He surmises that because Jesus says *apoluoe* (puts away) his wife that she is being put away without a divorce. But what did Moses' law teach? It taught that he was to put the writing of divorce in her hand BEFORE he sent her out of the house. Now according to what brother Waters wrote in his last negative, Jesus should have said (IF He was speaking to the Pharisees and correcting them concerning Moses' Law), "Whosoever shall put away his wife (except he give her a writing of divorcement) and marries another commits adultery. However, there is no rhyme or reason that one can make *apoluoe* (puts away) equal to *porneia* (fornication). Yet that is exactly what Robert is trying to do.

Robert also said, "Just what did "Moses suffer"? It wasn't divorce—that was commanded (Deut. 24:1-2; Mark 10:3) so the woman could go be another man's wife." He says, "Just what did "Moses suffer"? It wasn't divorce." But let's turn back and read the passage.. Matthew 19: "He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so." In the commandment that Moses gave (which was contingency law – necessary to regulate an abuse which was already in existence) what was necessary BEFORE she could be dismissed from the house (put away) –

a writing of DIVORCEMENT! To try to make Jesus' teaching in Matthew 19:9 et al, be an explanation of the Moses' law on divorce and remarriage is ludicrous.

God, because of the hardness of their hearts (suffered – permitted) them to put away their wives. BUT FIRST, they had to give them a writing of divorcement, put it in their hand and THEN put them away (send them out of the house).

Brother Waters chided me for implying that fornication and adultery are the same thing. He said: "J.T., you should know better than to assert or imply that fornication and adultery are the same thing." Robert you have enough problems answering what I have said without putting up a straw man of something that I didn't say and knocking it down. In my first affirmative I defined the words fornication and adultery as:

Fornication, (from the Greek *αιενοροπ*[porneia] in the New Testament is a general or generic term which means," sex between unmarried people, homosexuality Jude 7; bestiality, incest, adultery (I Corinthians 5:1). (W. E. Vine's *Dictionary of New Testament Words*).

Adultery, (from the Greek *μοιχοισμ* [moichois] in the New Testament is specific. It "denotes one 'who has unlawful intercourse with the spouse of another'," (W. E. Vine's *Dictionary of New Testament Words*).

As a general rule, the word adultery is used to describe those who are married who commit sexual immorality. However, in Matthew 5:28 Jesus said, "But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." Does that mean that a single man can look on a single woman to lust after her without committing adultery with her in his heart? We look forward to brother Waters' first affirmative.

Smith – Waters Debate

Waters' Third Rebuttal

(#6)

My formal question, stated in my first rebuttal, was: "Do we find any indication that the Pharisees who heard Jesus condemn their practice of putting away (Matt. 19:9), understood that it did not apply to them?" By that I was hoping, if such an indication existed, that J.T. would point out something in the context of the conversation that would answer my question. But that did not happen. Also, my original question was different. He didn't quote my question right nor did he answer it. I pointed out that the Pharisees heard Jesus condemn their practice. This was not denied. Since Jesus condemned the Jew's practice of putting away, his condemnation obviously applied to them. Are we to suppose that J.T. would have us believe that those sinners, who committed adultery against their wives, didn't need to repent of that sin immediately after learning of the sin? Who can deny they needed to repent? J.T. didn't. He just avoided the point. He did assert (with no proof) that the Pharisees didn't apply it to themselves. And he accurately stated that nothing Jesus taught would change nor add to the Law. But he obviously had no answer for the argument.

J.T. makes an argument using John 4:19-21, where Jesus told a woman that "the hour cometh" when people would not worship in Jerusalem. J.T. asks, "Was that instruction applicable then to the Jews? Were they to quit worshiping in Jerusalem THEN?" The instruction was applicable to the Jews because it was said to them. They were not to quit worshiping in Jerusalem immediately because "the hour" had not yet come.

J.T. made an argument using Mark 10:10. He pointed out that the disciples asked Jesus "again" about the matter. J.T. has no valid argument here because the disciples were Jews who lived under the Law, and were amenable to it just as Jesus was.

J.T. tried to make an argument from Matthew 19:10--the disciples' comment. Again, the disciples were Jews.

Brother Smith made the argument that we don't get all the truth from one gospel account. That is true, but due to the fact that nothing else said in the other gospels helps him (because the disciples were Jews), this argument fails.

Next, J.T. asserts that I failed to consult other gospels in studying divorce and remarriage. That is so obviously false, based upon my writings in my recent book "Put Away But Not Divorced" and numerous other writings, the charge is hardly worth a reply.

J.T. wrote,

He just can't afford to admit that Mark's account of this same occurrence shows conclusively that Jesus was speaking to his disciples and not the Pharisees as in the preceding verses of Matthew 19.

Again, this is not true. Jesus was speaking to his disciples, but they were Jews and therefore amenable to the Law. J.T. needs them to be Christians, composed of Jews and Gentiles, in the church age.

J.T. said,

"...Matthew 19:9 would have changed the Law of Moses which Jesus said He did not come to do. Matthew 5:17 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.'"

This is true, and is a very powerful argument that I have used for years in convincing others of the error of the very doctrine that J.T. is trying to defend--that the divorced commit adultery when they marry. Of course, J.T. thinks this argument does not hurt his teaching; but since he has utterly and completely failed to sustain his proposition, this very argument, to which he has ascribed, demands he make a change in his teaching and practice.

J.T. admits that "put away" (*apoluo*) and divorce are not the same thing. This can mean only one thing; Jesus did not say a divorced woman commits adultery when she marries another. It simply means she does so if she is only "put away," which is what the text says and which makes perfect sense. J.T. then asserts that I'm trying to make "apoluo (put away)" equal to "*porneia* (fornication)." That is not true. *Apoluo* means to repudiate, send away and put away. This is something that commonly happens in marriage, especially in parts of the world where men treat the women like slaves. But after sending his wife away a man may decide to take her back, and may do so unless she married another man (Deut. 24:1-4). Fornication, committed when the marriage is unlawful, is the exception that Jesus gave. He was saying it is not wrong to put away in such cases--no certificate is needed.

Regarding my explanation of "what Moses suffered" J.T. said a "writing of divorcement" was necessary "before she could be dismissed from the house..." OK, that is true. That is what was "commanded." Therefore, something else must have been "suffered." J.T. then said, "To try to make Jesus' teaching in Matthew 19:9 et al, be an explanation of Moses' law on divorce and remarriage is

ludicrous." No, J.T.'s teaching is what is ludicrous. Jesus was speaking to men who were committing the sin of "putting away" and everything he said was in complete harmony with Moses.

Brother Smith, I thought you were implying that "fornication" in the exception clause was adultery, as many seem to think, but which is error. If you were not, I apologize for the misrepresentation and applaud you for getting it right.

I would like to note that J.T. did not reply to my comments regarding his failure to follow good hermeneutics. I shall go there in my affirmative articles.

The issue in this discussion is whether or not Jesus' teaching in Matthew 19:9 was applicable to the hearers at the time he spoke to them. J.T. needs the text not to be applicable--otherwise, by his own admission his doctrine is error. Yet he has presented nothing that supports his argument. My position on MDR does not have this problem, or any other problem, so why not give it up and teach the truth that Paul demands. For those who are "unmarried" Paul says: "let them marry."

Smith–Waters Debate

Waters' First Affirmative

(#7)

I am pleased to begin this part of the discussion with my friend, J.T. Smith, and to affirm the following: Jesus' teachings in the 'MDR' texts, such as Matthew 19:3-12, were applicable to the Jews.

Most who read the above proposition will wonder why we are debating it in view of the fact that it is obvious that Jesus addressed the Jews in Matthew 19:9 and that what he said was applicable to them. Maybe it will become apparent to you why J.T. has taken this stand.

First, brother Smith knows and admits that the Law allowed a divorced woman to “go be another man's wife” (Deut. 24:1-4).

Second, he knows that Jesus, being amenable to the Law, could not have contradicted it without sin, and that sinlessness is a characteristic and requirement of the Savior.

Third, he knows that the Greek word “apoluo,” that is translated “put away,” does not mean divorce because it is only part of the process of divorce—the “bill of divorcement” (given to the woman) being essential to a legal divorce that freed the woman.

But with all this knowledge J.T. is in a corner. He must either surrender or fight with the one weapon that he thinks is available to him. I have debated various opponents who use one or more of the above acknowledgments as an argument, but these weapons (the idea that Jesus contradicted the Law, etc.) are not available to J.T. because of his knowledge. His only hope to save his doctrine is to successfully affirm the idea that Jesus' teachings didn't apply to the Jews. In his three affirmative articles he tried, but was not successful.

To sustain the above proposition, all I need to do is show that Jesus addressed the Jews regarding their evil practice of putting away their wives, and it will follow that the teachings were applicable to them. We will use Matthew 19:3-12.

We see in verse three that “the Pharisees came unto him” and asked, “Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?” To the Jews who asked the foregoing question, Jesus expounded upon the Law regarding God's teaching about treatment of wives. Jesus said, “What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.” It is unfortunate that many have interpreted the foregoing statement to mean that Jesus, at that moment, changed the Law—and from that

point forward divorce was not allowed. So, in view of the fact that such would have been sinful we have to rule that idea out, and I'm happy that my opponent agrees. The men were putting asunder THEIR way, which was contrary to God's way (Deut. 24:1-2; Mark 10:5). Not fully understanding, at this point, "They say unto him, 'Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?'" Even these Jews acknowledged Moses' command, but then Jesus hit them hard by dealing with the sin of "putting away," which is what they asked about. And note whom is addressed.

He saith unto THEM, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered YOU to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so." (Emphasis added.)

Jesus went back to their original question, and his teaching was devastating to them. He dealt with their practice of "putting away." He said "Moses suffered" this practice. This does not mean Moses approved of it—he didn't, but there was no policing of the practice nor punishment for it. And how could there be in view of the judgments that man would have to make regarding husband and wife separations? The sin was between the sinner and God. But isn't it interesting how many men today are so eager to jump right in the middle of such situations?

Now note that in verse 9, the text that J.T. says does not apply to the Jews, Jesus still makes it very clear whom he is addressing.

And I say unto YOU, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery. (Emphasis added.)

This floored Jesus' enemies and shut them up on this issue. (Had they actually thought Jesus was contradicting Moses they would have charged him with sin; that they did not is telling.) But the disciples, who also understood Jesus' teaching regarding the failure to obey Moses' command to give the certificate to the woman to complete the divorce "so she could go be another man's wife," made an interesting comment. They said, "If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry." These disciples were also Jews who understood Jesus' teaching to be applicable to them. And since they were conscious of the need to follow the Law, to which they were amenable, they were interested and receptive of Jesus' explanation of the Law. They made the correct and applicable application. Certainly they did not take issue with God who said, "It is not good that man should be alone."

The text we have studied can be (and has been) used to support erroneous teaching if good hermeneutics are disregarded. But if we observe the *law of continuity*, *context* and *audience relevance*, the reader can then be certain that Jesus' teachings were applicable to the hearers at the time he spoke those words. That Jesus addressed the Jews through the entire "MDR" context is certain. This means J.T.'s efforts to defend his teaching, which is the idea that Jesus forbids the divorced to marry, have failed; he is now without a single weapon and the only course is to surrender to the truth. The truth is, a legal divorce, from the day God instituted that law (Deut. 24:1-4) to this very day, ends a marriage and does what it was intended to do--free the divorced to marry another. The apostle Paul, who answered "MDR" questions from Christians, said, regarding the "unmarried," which included the divorced, "let them marry" (1 Cor. 1:1, 2, 8, 9, 27, 28).

Smith – Waters Debate

Smith's first Rebuttal

(#8)

In order to disprove brother Water's position, I will examine all of the passages he says are applicable to prove his position.

Matthew 19:3-8 The Pharisees also came unto Him, tempting Him, and saying unto Him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? **4** And He answered and said unto them, 'Have ye not read, that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, **5** And said, "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? **6** Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." **7** They say unto Him, "Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?' **8** He saith unto them, 'Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so".

To the Jews (who were under The Law of Moses)

Pharisees' Question – "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?"

Jesus DID NOT impose on them His answer to their question. His Answer: ("what God has joined together, let not man put asunder"). If He had, He would have changed Moses' Law. It would have been a sin to put her away.

Moses Law – put a writing of divorcement in her hand+ put away – she could marry another – he could marry another. (Deuteronomy 24:1-4)

Jesus' Teaching in Matthew 19:3-8 was to the Jews who were subject to Moses' Law

Matthew 19:9 And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.

As you can see from the above, what Christ said either in Matthew 19:4-6 and/or verse 9 would have changed Moses' Law.

Let's ASSUME for SAKE OF ARGUMENT that what brother Waters says is true – that Jesus was trying to correct the Jews' practice by His statement in Matthew 19:9 and therefore it was applicable to them THEN!

Unless the Jew, who was living under the Law of Moses, put away His wife “for (Greek - *porneia* - *porneia*) fornication” – sexual immorality – and married another commits (Greek - *moichao* - *moichao*) - adultery.” So according to the Law of Moses, what was to happen to people who were committing adultery?

John 8:3-5 And the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst, 4 They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. 5 Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou?

If Jesus was correcting the Law of Moses of “putting away,” He was also changing the Law. For now, if they put away their wives without a writing of divorcement (as brother Waters says they were doing and Jesus was trying to correct) Jesus said unless they put them away for sexual immorality and married another they were both (husband and wife) committing adultery and the Law of Moses said adulterers were to be STONED TO DEATH.

Again, what did Jesus say in Matthew 19:9 about the wife who was “put away?” And whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.” So if Jesus was correcting the Law of “putting away,” He was also changing the Law. For now Jesus said the wife who had been put away and the man who married her were both committing adultery. What was to happen to adulterers? John 8:4-5 “...Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. 5 Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned...”

So any way you look at Matthew 19:9, top or bottom, inside or out, it contradicts and changes the Law of Moses.

As we have already shown in three affirmatives, Christ was not applying Matthew 19:9, Mark 10:11-12 and Luke 16:18 to the Jews who were subject to Moses' Law.

Much of Jesus' teaching in Matthew, Mark, Luke and John was to be applicable only to the church or kingdom.

Robert keeps citing the fact that Christ's disciples were Jews. Yes they were. But that doesn't help him. They were Jews subject to the Law of Moses. Much of

Christ's teaching to His disciples, who were Jews, was not applicable to them AT THAT TIME. I have pointed this out more than once to Robert, but to no avail

Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. ¹⁶But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. ¹⁷And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican (Matthew 18:15-17).

To whom was Jesus speaking? Matthew 18:1 "At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" He was discussing things that would be applicable to the church/kingdom of God!

What about Jesus teaching on the new birth in John 3:3-5. To whom was Jesus speaking? John 3:1 "There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews." Does brother Waters think that Jesus was speaking about one entering the Jewish Kingdom which was in existence during Jesus' lifetime? Was the teaching applicable to Nicodemus and the Jews at that time?

After the Law of Moses was done away, Paul said, Galatians 3:28 "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

Now that we have proved beyond shadow of doubt that Matthew 19:9, et al did not apply to the Jews who were subject to the Law of Moses, where will brother Waters go now? My guess is he will try to do the only thing that is left for him to do. HE WILL TRY TO CHANGE THE MEANING OF THE WORDS FORNICATION AND ADULTERY even though he made no effort to do so in his first rebuttal to my first affirmative. What's your guess?

Smith–Waters Debate

Waters' Second Affirmative

(#9)

This debate is basically limited to whether Matthew 19:9 was applicable to the Jews. Because I am the one that does not go along with traditional beliefs, most would assume that I would be the one denying the applicability of verse 9. That is not the case; because of the importance of truth I have never been inclined to deny what is obvious. In my first affirmative, I showed that the entire passage (3-12) was applicable to the Jews, including the disciples. And it is also applicable to any today who would be guilty of the same sin for which the Jewish men were guilty, which was adultery against their wives (Mark 10:11). Is it not strange that one would deny that verse 9 was applicable to the guilty whom Jesus addressed but affirm that it applies ONLY to people not present and in another age? Strange indeed.

My opponent began his first rebuttal by saying, "In order to disprove brother Waters' position, I will examine all of the passages he says are applicable to prove his position." But he then quoted only verses 3-8 of the text, separating it from verse 9. There is no logical reason for separating this text--it is all one passage directed to the same audience. In my first rebuttal I pointed out specific phrases and words showing who was involved in the discussion and that Jesus' entire response, through verse 12, was directed to Jews.

J.T. uses two arguments in his effort to show that verse 9 was not applicable to the Jews. The first is the assumption that Jesus would have contradicted the Law, which we agree is not acceptable. The second is that we learn from other gospel accounts that Jesus was speaking to his disciples, rather than the Jews, which J.T. says forces us to apply Jesus' teaching on the issue to the coming kingdom. I guess he thinks that when he puts these two arguments together he has actually reasoned out a way to defend his teaching that denies both men and women (who may need marriage to avoid fornication, 1 Cor. 7:1-2) the right to have a marriage. Look up the word "unmarried" used in verse eight. The divorced are unmarried, and Deuteronomy 24:1-2, just like 1 Corinthians 7:1-2; 7-8, 27-28, teaches that the divorced may marry. My opponent is laboring very hard to make his doctrine harmonize with Jesus' teachings, but he seems not to even be concerned about Paul's teachings. Paul says, regarding the "unmarried," "let them marry." Of course, J.T. believes it can't mean what it says because Jesus said the *apoluoed* commit adultery by marrying. But he has acknowledged that *apoluo* does not mean divorce, so what is the reason now for not understanding and obeying Paul?

The Jews asked, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" First, we must understand the question and to do that we must not read into it

something that is not there. They asked if it is lawful to "put away" (*apoluo*) a wife for any reason. Jesus, not willing to allow them to do him damage by dragging him into a controversial issue, not only delicately and subtly answered "no" but he turned the tables back on them by pointing out that their practice of sending away wives was adultery against the wives.

Where J.T. gets off the track is in his thinking of what the following text means: "what God has joined together, let not man put asunder." He evidently thinks Jesus was saying "let not man divorce." That can't be right because God gave the divorce decree (Deut. 24:1-4). Remember, the Jews asked about "putting away." Therefore, when Jesus said "let not man put asunder" he was saying, "You need to let God 'put asunder' (if the marriage is to be ended) by following his law." Man's way of putting asunder resulted in adultery, but God's way allowed the woman to "go be another man's wife."

J.T. said,

Jesus DID NOT impose on them His answer to their question...If He had, He would have changed Moses' Law. It would have been a sin to put her away.

Yes, to "put away" would have been a sin because, as pointed out above, that course was contrary to the Law that commanded the men to give their wives a divorce certificate.

J.T. quotes verse nine but he has no comment critical of my exegesis that observed three rules of hermeneutics: 1) *law of continuity*; 2) *context*; and 3) *audience relevance*. His comment was: "what Christ said...would have changed Moses' Law." But if you understand what Jesus really said you understand that it was in harmony with the Law.

J.T. makes the argument that Jesus' teaching could not apply to the Jews because adultery was a capital offense. Here is where we must understand the meaning of *adultery*, which is a bit different from Webster's definition. Jesus explained that the men's adultery was "against her" (Mark 10:11), which is different from illicit sex in another marriage. Under the Law, men could have more than one wife; therefore the adultery against her was non-sexual as was the case in Jeremiah 3:9, though both were marital adultery--nothing "spiritual" about it. Sexual adultery, a man's having sex with another man's wife, was a capital offense.

J.T. wrote:

So if Jesus was correcting the Law of 'putting away,' He was also changing the Law. For now Jesus said the wife who had been put away and the man who married her were both committing adultery.

First, let's not confuse the Law for divorcing a wife with the evil practice of "putting away." Jesus was not changing the former but was condemning the latter. Second, does it not follow that when a woman who was put away without a certificate married another she, as well as the man she married, would commit adultery, because she was not free from her husband who sent her away? Separation does not free one to marry another; therefore, adultery results--but not if there was a divorce along with the separation.

J.T. wrote:

"So any way you look at Matthew 19:9...it contradicts and changes the Law of Moses."

The above is not true if *apoluo* means "put away" rather than "divorce," and this has already been conceded.

J.T. says I keep "citing the fact that Christ's disciples were Jews." Yes, I have, because he made an argument (distinguishing Pharisees and Jews) that was based upon the assumption that the disciples were not amenable to the Law. He now acknowledges that they were Jews, but says, "Much of Christ's teaching to His disciples, who were Jews, was not applicable to them AT THAT TIME." I don't have to deny this statement because even if it is true it has no effect on my proposition.

Smith-Waters Debate

Smith's Second Rebuttal

(#10)

“Jesus' teachings in the 'MDR' texts, such as Matthew 19:3-12, were applicable to the Jews.”

Deny: J. T. Smith

Affirm: Robert Waters

Answers to paragraph 1

In the first paragraph of his 2nd affirmative, Robert tries to convince his readers that he “showed that the entire passage (3-12) was applicable to the Jews, including the disciples.” No! That was what you sought to show. However, in my first negative I showed how that would not only contradict Moses' Law, but would mean that the person who remarried would be committing adultery for which Moses' Law demanded the death penalty. How, then, as Moses' Law declared, would she be able to return to her first husband if she was DEAD – THAT'S GRAVEYARD DEAD.

Also in paragraph one brother Waters brings up Mark 10:11. Which says,

Mark 10:11 And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her.

Robert believes that the one against whom the husband commits adultery is the first wife. However, the rules of grammar will not allow his conclusion. The rules of grammar are that the antecedent of the pronoun is “another” (woman understood). The antecedent of “her” is “another woman.” But then, Robert has been known to argue with a Bible Dictionary as we are going to see before I conclude. In fact, Deuteronomy 24:1-4 has not one single thing to do with Matthew 19:9 or vise-versa.

Ans. 2nd para

Brother Waters says “he then quoted only verses 3-8 of the text, separating it from verse 9. There is no logical reason for separating this text--it is all one passage directed to the same audience.” The reason may not be logical to brother Waters, but it is scriptural. Read Mark 10:2-9 and you will see the same account that is in Matthew 19:3-8 recorded in Mark's account. Now look at verse 10ff. It may not be logical to brother Waters, but by necessary implication, in Matthew 19:9-12 Jesus disciples were commenting on what Jesus said, and He is speaking to His disciples- Robert to the contrary notwithstanding.

Ans. 3rd para

In his 3rd paragraph (2nd aff.), Robert says, “My opponent is laboring very hard to make his doctrine harmonize with Jesus’ teachings, but he seems not to even be concerned about Paul’s teachings.” I wonder why? Brother Waters, Paul’s teaching is not under consideration. Read your proposition. If you want to discuss I Corinthians 7, we can do that. But now, you have only one affirmative left to answer the arguments and questions I asked you in my last negative.

Ans. 4th & 5th paras

When Robert talks about Deuteronomy 24:1-4, he speaks of it as if this was a great gift that God gave to the Jews. It was a great gift to the women who were being put away with no means of support who were then forbidden to remarry. I stated in the first affirmative that it was a contingency law. It was given to correct the ungodliness of the Jewish men for the above reason. But Jesus makes two points that condemned the Jews. “Because of the hardness of your hearts” Moses permitted putting away” and “from the beginning it was not so.” It was because of the hardness of their hearts that God simply “permitted” it.

Ans 6th para

Brother Waters! You almost stumbled onto the truth. You said, “Therefore, when Jesus said ‘let not man put asunder’ he was saying, ‘You need to let God ‘put asunder’ (if the marriage is to be ended) by following his law.’ Man’s way of putting asunder resulted in adultery, but God’s way allowed the woman to “go be another man’s wife.” Robert, tell me what the difference is in the definition of ἀπολυο (apoluo – to loose, separate - Vine) and χωριζο (chorizo “to put apart, separate,” -*Vine’s Dictionary of Biblical Words*, page 296). As you can see, the two words mean basically the same thing. The truth of the matter is, I pointed out to brother Waters that if Matthew 19:9 was imposed upon those under Moses’ Law, the man who “put her away” without divorce and married another, they were both guilty of adultery. And in his 2nd affirmative he said, “Sexual adultery, a man’s having sex with another man’s wife, was a capital offense.” So as I said in the beginning of this paragraph that Robert almost stumbled onto the truth. Now Robert if you would just apply what Jesus said in Matthew 19:9, you would see that we are in agreement. If it applied to the Jews under the Law of Moses, according to you the man who put away his wife and married another committed adultery. Was Jesus discussing sexual adultery. Since you said “sexual adultery, is a capital offense” then if they adhered to Jesus teaching, Moses’ Law about her returning to her husband would have been nonsense – he and his new wife would be dead. You see, then, why Jesus’ teaching would have CHANGED the Law of Moses.

Next we come to the point that I knew, and warned you, was coming. Robert said, “Here is where we must understand the meaning of adultery, which is a bit

different from Webster's definition.” Didn’t I tell you that the next thing Robert would do would be to change the definition of adultery. He said it is, “a bit different from Webster's definition,” Who used Webster’s definition of fornication and adultery? I didn’t! So now after my three affirmative and his three negative articles, and his two affirmative articles, here it is. Now we are told that THE DEFINITIONS of the words fornication and adultery we have been using ARE WRONG. But our definitions are from W. E. Vine’s Biblical Dictionary of New Testament words (that means Mr. Vine is defining πορνεία *porneia* (fornication) μοιχεία *moichao* (adultery) and that without ONE WORD of opposition from brother Waters. But now that he sees his argument that Jesus’ teaching in Matthew 19:9, Mark 10:11-12 and Luke 16:18 is being blown higher than a kite, he wants to change the meaning of adultery. It’s too late now, Robert. You should have told us after my first affirmative that the definition of fornication and adultery were WRONG.

Robert, let me appeal to you as a brother in Christ. Your doctrine is going to lead people to involve themselves in adulterous relationships. Please give it up.

Smith-Waters Debate

Waters' Third Affirmative

(#11)

“Jesus' teachings in the 'MDR' texts, such as Matthew 19:3-12, were applicable to the Jews.”

My proposition in this debate (above) was affirmed when I showed the *context*, *continuity* and *audience relevance* of Matthew 19:3-12. Nevertheless, I must deal with J.T. Smith's questions and objections and make a few other observations.

J.T. made two arguments in his affirmative, and to resort back to them is about all he has to use to rebut my affirmative. In the first argument he asserts that Jesus could not have been talking to the Jews because this would mean he was contradicting the Law. In the second argument, which is valueless unless the first one is valid, he seeks to avoid the aforementioned consequence by asserting that Jesus switched from addressing the "Jews" to addressing the "disciples," and therefore Jesus' words didn't apply to the Jews. We are supposed to understand that Jesus did change the Law, but since he addressed his disciples on another occasion, the Law didn't apply until the new kingdom came. J.T. also argued that if we consider other gospel accounts his argument becomes apparent.

J.T.'s efforts to prove his arguments pose two huge problems. One, the disciples were Jews (Pharisees or Sadducees) who were amenable to the Law just as Jesus was, and therefore what Jesus said to them had to have been applicable. Two, Jesus addressed the enemies of Jesus in Matthew 19:9, but he had first addressed the "disciples" in Matthew 5. So, even if we were to grant the "disciples were not Jews" absurdity, J.T.'s effort to force Jesus' teaching to apply only in the new kingdom fails because Matthew deals with BOTH scenarios.

Mark 10:11

Now, I agree that sometimes we can get information from another gospel that helps explain the one we are considering. But instead of using and learning from the information found in the other gospel, J.T. instead seeks to explain it away. For example, in Mark 10:11, Jesus explained that the sin the men were committing was "against her." (See Jer. 3:9) But in his effort to make this text harmonize with his doctrine, J.T. abandons reason and scholarship [versions, commentaries (see *Henry*), etc.], and contradicts Jesus by asserting that "her" is referring to the woman the man marries. J.T. insists that the man commits sexual adultery with this new wife in the new marriage. That could not be the case because at that time the Law allowed men to have more than one wife. Thus, no adultery was committed whether *apoluo* means divorce or "put away." Furthermore, nothing in

any of the accounts, except this one, sheds any light on whether the men were committing adultery, and Mark's account says the sin is "against" the man's previous wife rather than "with" the woman in the second marriage. Let us look at the text closely and we will see that all of J.T.'s arguments, and his basic position on "MDR," are defeated by this passage.

First, we must not overlook the fact that in Mark 10:1-9 Jesus says basically the same thing that is recorded in Matthew 19:3-8. Mark's account has Jesus dealing with questions from Jews, who perhaps were not able to hear Jesus well, or who, not fully understanding, needed to hear further explanation. And it is here that Jesus made a comment that is exceedingly helpful. Keep in mind the fact that the disciples were Jews and Jesus' message was therefore applicable to them.

Mark 10:10 "And in the house his disciples asked him again of the same matter." These Jews asked about the SAME matter--the one that was directed to the enemies of Jesus. What did Jesus mean when he said the men who put away their wives and married another committed adultery? Jesus' response (verse 11) answers concerns about the "death penalty" for men who sent away their wives.

11 "And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her." Put away whom? His wife. Commits adultery against whom? Is the woman against whom adultery is committed the wife that was put away, the new wife, or someone else not alluded to by Jesus? If we are willing to cast aside error we will be willing to believe "her" is the woman who is put away, because that is what the text says. And since nothing sexual is involved in the evil action of putting away, Jesus' further explanation destroys J.T.'s thinking that adultery is only a sex act. But J.T. objects to this reasoning. He said, "The rules of grammar will not allow his [my, r.w.] conclusion." No, rules of grammar and common sense require us to understand that "her" (the wife who is sinned against) is the first wife, the one put away. The truth is, the rules of "defend tradition at all cost" are at play here.

Deuteronomy 24:1-4

J.T. asserted that "Deuteronomy 24:1-4 has not one single thing to do with Matthew 19:9 or vice-versa." Really? That might be true if it wasn't for the fact that it was the focal point of the discussion! Jews said, "Moses suffered," and Jesus asked, "What did Moses command you?" Ignore the relevance of this text and you break a very important rule for Bible study, which will always result in error. J.T.'s own statement about this text contradicts his accurate declaration that "It was a great gift to the women who were being put away..." What "gift"? The divorce law that J.T. says has nothing to do with Matthew 19:9. J.T. understands that "put away" is merely a part of this law and not THE divorce itself.

Death Penalty (John 8:2-9)

The men who were doing the putting away were not committing a capital offense, but if the put away woman married another both she and the man she married would commit sexual adultery, and this is true because she still belonged to the man who sent her out. If the Law was enforced these adulterers would face death. Men who were prudent would avoid marrying a woman put away but not divorced. After all, other women were available to them—women who could lawfully be their wives.

Let us now take a look at the text:

First, note that, "all the people came unto him"; thus, unbelieving Jews and believing Jews (disciples) were there to hear him. Second, enemies who sought "to accuse him" "brought unto him a woman taken in adultery." They said she was caught "in the very act," meaning sexual adultery. They stated that the Law commanded that she should be stoned, and then asked, "What do you say?" Jesus didn't deny the need to carry out the Law but replied, "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her."

J.T. sought to find inconsistency with my position saying,

Since you said 'sexual adultery, is a capital offense' then if they adhered to Jesus' teaching, Moses' Law about her returning to her husband would have been nonsense – he and his new wife would be dead. You see, then, why Jesus' teaching would have CHANGED the Law of Moses.

No, that part, Deuteronomy 24:4 (which, according to J.T., is not supposed to have anything to do with Matthew 19:9, cough! and grin), forbade men to take back a woman that had actually been divorced and had married another--"legal" wife swapping.

J.T. refuses to comment on Paul's clear teaching that I noted, yet he tried to make an argument from Paul's teachings regarding a word that Paul used that is similar to one Jesus used. I'll respond in kind and save my answer for the next debate, which will deal with Paul's teachings to Christians. We shall then see if J.T. will hold to his principles, or use his interpretation of Jesus' teachings to force Paul's teaching to harmonize with his doctrine.

I have no problem with J.T.'s quotation of the meaning of *fornication*. But he conveniently supplied only one meaning from *Vine's* definition of *adultery*. *Vine* notes that not all adultery is sexual, as I proved. Surely this observation does not make me guilty of "redefining words." (see www.totalhealth.bz/adultery.htm)

My current belief on “MDR” is the result of much study that involved the meticulous use of good hermeneutics. On the other hand, J.T. is determined to defend the error that has plagued the church in many ways, evident by the fact that he ignores some of the most basic Bible study rules. His doctrine, instead of helping women, as he asserted Jesus' teaching did for the Jewish women, does basically the same thing to women the Jews were doing, which Jesus said was sin. J.T.'s interpretation of Jesus' teaching is that a woman who is divorced will commit adultery if she marries another. Thus, he is guilty of "forbidding marriage" for a woman who has been freed by divorce and who needs marriage to "avoid fornication" (1 Cor. 7:2). His main argument is based upon what he sees as an evil consequence, yet he is willing to accept a consequence that is just as abhorrent--that Jesus gave a law that requires punishing the innocent who is divorced against his/her will (Prov. 17:26). The teaching I have presented in this debate does not have such problems, therefore it must be the truth. Human tradition enslaves but truth frees; therefore why must some preachers labor to keep us enslaved? J.T., why not obey God who says "let them marry"?
RobertWaters@yahoo.com

Smith-Waters Debate
(Paul's Teaching on MDR)
Smith's 3rd Negative
(#12)

Proposition: In the New Testament, the apostle Paul teaches that all competent adults, including the divorced, may marry.

Affirm: Robert Waters

Deny J.T. Smith

Brother Waters has spent a great deal of time trying to prove that Paul, in I Corinthians 7, is telling the divorced people that they can remarry without sin. In fact, as his proposition states, "all competent adults, including the divorced, may marry." Yet he has failed to produce one single case in I Corinthians 7 (or any other of Paul's writings) that mentioned one who is divorced. If you ask him to prove that a person is divorced, he says "they are unmarried – thus divorced."

Unmarried

Just who are those who Paul refers to as unmarried? There are three categories given in I Corinthians 7 of people whom Paul says are unmarried.

1. I Corinthians 7:34

There is difference also between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit: but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband.

Here Paul speaks of the virgin as unmarried. However, she has never been bound by God in marriage. Therefore it could not be said of her that she has been loosed.

2. 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: ¹¹But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.

Robert's position on this unmarried one is that she is NOT divorced even though the text says she is unmarried. He then uses several commentators (and takes up a lot of space) trying to prove that she is still bound to her husband though she is said to be unmarried. So for Robert's proposition to be true, it is absolutely necessary these men are correct in their exegesis of these passages. Of course if

they are not correct and she is absolutely, sho nough, uh huh, yes mam divorced, then he would have Paul condemning himself in I Timothy 4:4.

Let's carry this one step further. Even though Paul told her not to marry but to return to her husband, if she decided to spurn Paul's warning and get a divorce (if she is not already divorced) repent of the sin of disobeying Paul's warning and marry someone else she would be alright in God's sight according to Robert's position. Deny it Robert! And if she decided to do that every six months for the rest of her life, she would still be right in the sight of God.

3. I Corinthians 7:39

The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord.

This would include the widow of I Corinthians 7:8-9. In this chapter, the widow is the only one that is loosed and free to remarry.

This is the reason I have been trying to get Robert to give us proof that Paul is speaking of anyone in this chapter who is divorced. The only persons in this chapter that you can prove are the unmarried who have a right to marry is the virgin and the woman whose husband has died.

Robert says we must use Deuteronomy 24:1-4 in order to have a definition for divorce. He asked the question, "Where do we find the definition of divorce if we disregard this text?" The same place you got the definition of unmarried on page one of your last affirmative, *American Heritage Dictionary*.

Robert says he is cocked and primed and ready to discredit my argument on Romans 7:2-4 when I get in the affirmative. Well, until then, let's just stay in I Corinthians 7.

In I Corinthians 7:39 we read:

The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord.

This is the same argument Paul makes in Romans 7:2-3. Paul says that the wife is "bound by the law as long as her husband lives." This law goes back **beyond** the Law of Moses. It goes back to the beginning of time. "Matthew 19:4-5 "And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the

beginning made them male and female, ⁵And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?" Therefore according to God's law of marriage, a man and a woman who are married are bound to each other as long as they both shall live. If the either one dies, then the other is free to marry.

Now in the teaching of 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. ²⁸But and if thou marry, thou hast not sinned; and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned. Nevertheless such shall have trouble in the flesh: but I spare you.

Paul's teaching, according to the instructions given in this chapter, if a person is married (bound by the law) seek not to be loosed by divorce. As we will see in my first affirmative (which will be next) we will discuss the subject of bound and loosed in detail.

Smith-Waters Debate
(Paul's Teaching on MDR)
Waters' First Affirmative
(13)

Proposition: In the New Testament, the apostle Paul teaches that all competent adults, including the divorced, may marry.

Affirm: Robert Waters

Deny: J.T. Smith

I am happy to join with my friend, J.T. Smith, in this discussion of Paul's teachings that relate to who has a right to have a marriage. I believe if it were not for misinterpretation of Jesus' teachings, and the consequent obligation to "harmonize" Paul's teachings with what some assume Jesus taught, brethren generally would have no problem with Paul's precept to let the "unmarried" marry. Remember, in our previous debate, after I brought up some of Paul's teachings, brother Smith refused to answer because Paul's teachings did not relate to the proposition at hand. That was fine, but will he need you, the reader, to assume he won that debate as he explains Paul's teachings? Will he be forced to use what he believes to be Jesus' teaching as a foundation, which does not relate to the proposition at hand, to explain Paul's teaching? I predict that he will.

In at least three epistles Paul gives information that should help us fully understand the answer to the question, "Who may marry?" We shall show that the gist of Paul's teachings is "Let those who need marriage to avoid fornication, or who are burning in lust, marry if they are of age" (1 Cor 7:2, 9, 36). Paul's teachings are easily understood and easy to obey once a person learns that the errant view teaching that Jesus changed the Law allowing the divorced to marry (Deut. 24:1-2), is neither scriptural nor acceptable. Which is easier, doing nothing or "forbidding to marry"? The latter results in disaster for families, individuals, churches and those who are guilty of this unscriptural doctrine that benefits only Satan.

1 Corinthians 7

Paul addressed questions regarding who may marry. We might find some misunderstanding of Jesus' teachings to Jews regarding a specific and unique problem, but now Paul is addressing Christians. Christians today have the same responsibility to hear and obey Paul, who wrote by inspiration, as did the Corinthians.

Things to Observe

First, we must keep in mind that nowhere in Paul's teaching is he saying marriage is not good. Such would contradict God who said, "It is not good that man should

be alone." Paul also said, "Marriage is honorable...and the bed undefiled..." Thus, statements that might appear to be to the contrary must be understood in light of the context and the situation, which he describes as "the present distress." Therefore, we must understand that Paul gives advice that is applicable during the time of the "present distress" that was not intended to be applicable for all time, such as, "I would that all men were even as I." This is evident by the fact that he goes on to say that if marriage is needed to avoid sin, a person is to be allowed to marry.

Second, nowhere in Paul's teachings does he even hint that a divorce has to be for fornication before it frees the parties to marry. This is something that has been presumed that Jesus taught. But such teaching has Moses against God, Jesus against Moses, Paul against Jesus, Paul against himself and Christians teaching an unjust doctrine. If God had intended for us to understand that only those who initiate divorce for fornication may marry another, would he not have inspired Paul to teach the same in no uncertain terms? In view of the fact that such teaching encourages a race to the courthouse, can we not see the imprudence of it, and therefore understand that it is not from God?

1 Corinthians 7:1-2

Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me: It is good for a man not to touch a woman. Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.

In the above text, Paul not only commands any who would object to a man or woman's having a spouse not to do so, but he also gives the reason this is necessary, which should help us to understand and accept the command. Also note that the text says "every man." Thus, Paul does not exclude anyone who needs marriage "to avoid fornication" and he is very specific in his command.

Verses 7-9

For I would that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that. I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn.

Paul acknowledged that some do not have the gift of celibacy as he did, and therefore he commands any who would object to a man or woman's marrying to

"let them marry." And, once again, he gives the reason: "for it is better to marry than to burn in lust."

Now, notice whom is addressed: the "unmarried." Unless divorce does not do what God intended it to do, divorcees are "unmarried," i.e., they are "single" and without a spouse.

Verses 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; and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned. Nevertheless such shall have trouble in the flesh: but I spare you.

Paul advises those who are bound unto a woman (meaning married) to seek not to get a divorce (regardless of what the spouse may have done), and if you are loosed (divorced according to law) seek not to take another wife. But if you do (because of needs previously discussed) you do not sin in marrying, even though you could be spared trouble by remaining single.

Verse 36

But if any man think that he behaveth himself uncomely toward his virgin, if she pass the flower of her age, and need so require, let him do what he will, he sinneth not: let them marry.

Once again, Paul stresses the importance of marriage and the reason for it. Also note that he said "any man"--not just those who have never married, or those who divorce their spouse for some particular reason that is absent in Paul's writings.

1 Tim. 4:1-4

In this text Paul warns that in the future some would be guilty of "forbidding to marry," which would be a sinful activity. To whom this prophecy refers is not as important as the fact that anyone, from that point forward, who refuses people (who need marriage) the right to marry is committing the same sin.

Smith-Waters Debate
(Paul's Teaching on MDR)
Smith's First Rebuttal
(14)

Proposition: In the New Testament, the apostle Paul teaches that all competent adults, including the divorced, may marry.

Affirm: Robert Waters

Deny J.T. Smith

May I also say that I am happy to deal with brother Waters' arguments (?). According to his proposition two things are evident.

1. All of his arguments must come from Paul's teaching. According to our first discussion, the teaching of Jesus plays no part in what we are now discussing, **nor could it**. It was Robert's contention that Jesus' teaching was making correction of the Jews' abuse of Deuteronomy 24:1-4. These things were said and applied to the Jews under the Law of Moses. Therefore, according to this same apostle (Paul), they are no longer applicable.

Galatians 3:24-25 Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. ²⁵But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.

Robert said that Jesus was correcting the Jews who were in violation of the Law of Moses. According to Paul, we are no longer under the Law of Moses. Therefore, we are no longer under what Jesus said that corrected their actions regarding the Law. So, Robert, don't bring up the Deuteronomy 24:1-4 nor Matthew 19:9 et al, for according to your teaching they are not applicable.

2. As we shall see before this discussion is over, there can be NO SCRIPTURAL REASON given now for two people to divorce much less marry another. That would take us back to what Jesus told the Jews.

Matthew 19:4-6 And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, ⁵And said, 'For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?' ⁶Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

One man for one woman for life was God's arrangement from the beginning.

Also, according to Robert's teaching, if one is divorced he/she is then loosed and free to marry another. According to this teaching, it is inconceivable, but possible, for one to divorce and marry another every six months for the rest of his life and still be pleasing to God.

Things to Observe

Under the above subtitle, Robert begins to give his surmisings (they are not arguments).

First: Robert says Paul's teaching was for Christians and due to the "present distress" at Corinth. Does that mean that when the "the present distress" (whatever it was) was over that I Corinthians 7 would no longer apply? Does that mean that unless we are also being threatened by the same "present distress" the Corinthians were that I Corinthians 7 would not be applicable to us? Give us a little more light on that Robert.

Robert also said,

Second, nowhere in Paul's teachings does he even hint that a divorce has to be for fornication before it frees the parties to marry. This is something that has been presumed that Jesus taught. But such teaching has Moses against God, Jesus against Moses, Paul against Jesus, Paul against himself...

This is interesting and make for good reading, but the "proof of the pudding is in the eating." Let's see if he brings forth the proof. He didn't in his 1st affirmative.

If God had intended for us to understand that only those who initiate divorce for fornication may marry another, would he not have inspired Paul to teach the same in no uncertain terms?

Reply: If one has sinned against a brother, go alone and talk to him. If it is not resolved, take one or two with you and talk to him. If it is still not resolved, tell it to the church. (Matthew 18:15-17) Robert! Where did Paul or any other apostle or writer repeat this instruction after Pentecost? Does that mean it is not applicable today? (Remember, I didn't bring up putting away for fornication, you did).

I Corinthians 7:1-2

There is not a single word said in these two passages with which I disagree. Any responsible person who desires to do so should have his OWN wife or husband. He MAY NOT have someone else's as Herod did. Mark 6:17-18 "For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for

Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife: for he had married her. ¹⁸For John had said unto Herod, 'It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife'."

So, according to your proposition the questions become, "were they competent adults and were they divorced?" If so, according to your proposition they had a right to be married. Now did John the Baptist depart from the faith in what he said? Was he in violation of I Timothy 4:1-4 when he told them their marriage was not lawful (thus forbidding them to marry)?

The only other passages Robert gave that has anything to do with the proposition are verses 27-28.

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. ²⁸But and if thou marry, thou hast not sinned; and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned. Nevertheless such shall have trouble in the flesh: but I spare you.

God does the binding and the loosing.

Romans 7:2-3 For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. ³So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.

Although the word divorced is not in I Corinthians 7, Robert thinks that all that are unmarried are divorced. To the woman whom Paul said in verse 11 is unmarried, he says that she is to remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband. Is Paul contradicting himself in I Timothy 4:1-4 as he tells this woman not to marry but be reconciled to her husband? Was Paul forbidding someone to marry?
(all underlining and bold type mine for emphasis – jts)

Smith-Waters Debate
(Paul's Teaching on MDR)
Waters' 2nd Affirmative
(15)

In my first affirmative I listed a number of passages that clearly show the gist of Paul's teachings--"let them marry." But my opponent does not read this phrase and see the meaning as would one who had not been taught the traditional position and would readily understand. J.T. questions whether my arguments are even arguments. But if someone does not recognize "here is plain language from the Scripture, and here is what it means" as an argument then he does not know what an argument is.

If you have been reading these discussions you have observed that J.T. has done three things that are indicative of his failure to answer my first affirmative: 1) He built a strawman and proceeded to debate him; 2) He went into the affirmative mode (instead of using his space to answer my arguments) in his effort to defeat the strawman he concocted; and 3) He assumed what he wasn't able to prove in the last debate, which is what I said he would do. He assumed Jesus changed the law and is twisting Paul's teachings to harmonize with that idea.

The strawman believes that the teaching of Jesus is not applicable to us. I believe it is and so stated in the previous debate. J.T. tells this strawman that because of his belief he can't use Deuteronomy 24:1-4 because he doesn't believe any teachings before Paul are applicable. I have not used much space defending Mr. Strawman. Instead, I have pressed my points, and J.T. can respond as he wishes.

The idea of the debate's being limited to Paul's teachings has nothing to do with whether or not Jesus' teachings are applicable. My point in limiting this debate to Paul's teachings is to let his teachings stand on their own rather than interpret them in light of what may or may not be true of Jesus' teachings. Jesus dealt with the Jewish men's unlawful putting away of their wives, whereas Paul deals with actual questions from Christians regarding who may marry, and his writings are inspired of God.

J.T. tells the strawman he can't use Deuteronomy 24:1-4 and that since he can't use Jesus' teaching he has no Scripture condemning divorce--people may divorce and remarry as many times as they want to. (Nobody is saying it's GOOD to divorce—just that God forgives divorce, when it is a sin, just like He does anything else. Can J.T. prove God DOESN'T forgive divorce like He does everything else?) I'm going to help the strawman out here just to show how illogical my opponent, who is supposed to be defeating my arguments, has become. If Deuteronomy 24:1-4 is not applicable then we have no Scripture giving us the definition of a divorce.

Also, the strawman could show J.T. various passages that condemn divorcing a faithful spouse (See Eph. 5:22, 25; Col. 3:19).

Things to Observe

Under the above heading J.T. had some questions about “the present distress.” He insists Paul forbids the divorced to marry and would use certain statements that Paul made as support. For example: the encouragement to be celibate as he was, and for a separated couple to remain in that state (1 Cor. 7:11). J.T. will try to force this passage to support his view, but his use of it proves too much. If it is talking about divorce (it is not) then not even those who did the divorcing “for fornication” may marry because Paul made no mention of an exception.

I made the argument that Paul did not even hint that a divorce needs to be "for fornication" to be a divorce that frees the parties. Instead of providing the passage, or argument, that showed I erred, J.T. demands that I provide the passage. Remember, my argument was that THERE IS NO SUCH PASSAGE, as we would logically expect to find if we are to understand Paul to teach that the divorced may not marry. Here is how J.T. deals with such arguments as the one above: "they are not arguments." Nevertheless, I argued, “If God had intended for us to understand that only those who initiate divorce for fornication may marry another, would he not have inspired Paul to teach the same in no uncertain terms?” Now, we are studying Paul’s teachings. Will J.T. bring forth the proof? Will he show where PAUL said one has to have a reason for a divorce before God recognizes it? Where is it?

J.T. does not have a good answer for this VERY important observation, which I used as an argument. All he does is mention what he insists Jesus taught. But this is circular reasoning—he has no answer for what is in the texts that we are debating. The truth of Jesus’ teaching applies today, but J.T. is debating me, not a strawman, on Paul’s teachings regarding who may marry.

I Corinthians 7:1-2

J.T. says he agrees with the above text, yet he tells men who have been divorced and who have no wife that they must remain celibate. Paul says, "let them marry," but J.T. says, “No, you can't, it would be adultery.” We are not talking about having someone else's spouse; we are talking about legal scriptural marriages. John the baptizer judged a man who was illegally married to his brother's wife, which according to the Law he could not do while his brother was still living (Lev 20:21). John was never guilty of forbidding anyone to marry. But J.T. makes a practice of it, even in cases involving one who is innocent of marital sin, and teaches others to do the same. God’s condemnation of such evil evidently has no effect on J.T. (Prov. 17:26; 1 Tim. 4:1-4).

1 Corinthians 7:8, 9

J.T. says, "Robert thinks that all that are unmarried are divorced." No, that is not what Robert thinks. The above passage commands preachers to let the unmarried marry. Divorced people are "unmarried" and therefore, to obey Paul, we must let the divorced marry. But J.T. cannot believe and obey Paul until he gives up his false belief regarding Jesus' teachings, which has the Scriptures in conflict.

1 Corinthians 7:27-28

This text clearly states that the "loosed" may marry. But, instead of acknowledging this fact and obeying the command, J.T. says, "God does the binding and the loosing." How true this is! But it does not help J.T. God gave the law for how to divorce, as opposed to a man's simply sending a wife out of the house, which resulted in adultery. When a divorce is done God's way, the "loosing" is accomplished and the woman may "go be another man's wife" (Deut. 24:1-2).

J.T. quoted Romans 7:2-3 but gave no explanation. When he is in the affirmative and brings this up I will show it does not support his teachings, as most brethren already know.

1 Timothy 4:1-4

In this text, Paul makes it plain that "forbidding to marry" is sinful. In his effort to answer, J.T. misapplied 1 Corinthians 7:11. He asked if Paul was forbidding someone to marry. No, that would be contrary to the gist of his own teaching. This text speaks of "reconciliation," not divorce. This is a good time to remind the reader that J.T.'s doctrine (not the truth) has Moses teaching what God didn't want, Jesus teaching contrary to Moses, Paul contradicting Jesus and Paul contradicting himself.

Smith-Waters Debate
(Paul's Teaching on MDR)
Smith's Second Rebuttal

(16)

Proposition: In the New Testament, the apostle Paul teaches that all competent adults, including the divorced, may marry.

Affirm: Robert Waters

Deny J.T. Smith

In his second affirmative, brother Waters complains that because Paul said “let them marry” that he has proven his proposition. Robert you have not yet shown that Paul was talking to people who had divorced. Of course all competent adults who are eligible may marry – but where does Paul teach that the ones to whom Paul refers had been divorced? That’s the reason I said you had not made an argument. You not only need to show **what** is said, but **why** it is said in order to prove your assertion that **all divorced people may marry**. THAT’S WHAT YOUR PROPOSITION SAYS.

You accuse me of setting up a straw-man and “proceeding to debate him.” No, the “straw-man” is just a figment of your imagination as is your doctrine.

2) You said, “He went into the affirmative mode (instead of using his space to answer my arguments)...” That’s my point, Robert. You just made statements instead of making arguments. Examples: Paul said “Let every man have his own wife.” I don’t deny that. What was your argument on that passage? What does that have to do with people who are divorced remarrying?

Throughout his second affirmative Robert continues to talk about me teaching things that will support my view. The passages that I used in my first negative were to show that Robert’s view is false. But, this wrangling about who said what is not getting us anywhere.

Under his subheading “I Corinthians 7:8-9” I read: “J.T. says, ‘Robert thinks that all that are unmarried are divorced.’ No, that is not what Robert thinks.” Robert says I misrepresented him in saying that he believes that all that are unmarried are divorced. Let’s say it another way. Robert believes that all divorced people are unmarried. He applies this statement to I Corinthians 7:8-9 in his second affirmative. He refers to the above passage and says “Divorced people are “unmarried” and therefore, to obey Paul, we must let the divorced marry”. So, in these two passages Robert thinks that the word unmarried includes those who are divorced.

The word “unmarried” is used four times in this chapter – verses 8, 11, 32, and 34. If the word unmarried in verse 8 included divorced people, then the same word (unmarried) is used in verse 11 means that the wife was divorced from her husband. Now, in his last affirmative, Robert said, “When a divorce is done God’s way, the ‘loosing’ is accomplished and the woman may ‘go be another man’s wife’ (Deuteronomy 24:1-2).” If the woman in 7:11 is unmarried, (according to Robert she is divorced God’s way) she may go and be another man’s wife.

Now let’s get this straight according to “Dr.” Waters:

1. A person considered unmarried must be divorced according to Deuteronomy 24:1-4 and therefore loosed.
2. The wife in I Corinthians 7:11 is said to be unmarried. Therefore she was divorced according to Deuteronomy 24 and thus loosed and free to remarry – according to Robert.

This also places the husband in the position of being able to remarry without sin according to Deuteronomy 24. But Deuteronomy 24:1-4 was contingency law that was given by God through Moses to correct a mistreatment of wives BECAUSE OF THE HARDHEARTED JEWS (Matthew 19:8). Now it was contingency law, given to the Jews because of the hardness of their hearts and yet Robert wants to bring it over into the New Testament. WHY? Because he has to have it in order to sustain his doctrine – THAT’S WHY!

But now, let’s go back to the wife of I Corinthians 7:11. According to Robert’s theory, she is divorced, loosed and free to marry. Yet Paul said, **NO!** Do you mean to tell me that Paul contradicted himself? In his very last paragraph, Robert mentions “I Timothy 4:1-4. In this text, Paul makes it plain that ‘forbidding to marry’” is sinful.

I Timothy 4:1,3, “Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; ³Forbidding to marry...”

Now what did Paul say in I Corinthians 7:11? “remain unmarried – is that the same as “forbidding to marry,” Robert?

Now to I Corinthians 7:27-28 – *bound and loosed.*

Robert thinks that because I used Scripture to answer his argument that I am getting in the affirmative. Not so! I am simply allowing God to reply to Robert.

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. ²⁸But and if thou

marry, thou hast not sinned; and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned.
Nevertheless such shall have trouble in the flesh: but I spare you.

No doubt in the latter part of this passage Paul is having reference to the “present distress” he mentions in verse 26.

Marriage Does Not Equal Bound – Loosed Does Not Equal Divorce

Brethren have made this mistake for many years. But as I mentioned in the first negative, Paul discusses both the words in Romans 7:2-3.

For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. ³So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. (all underlining mine for emphasis – jts)

God’s law binds and God’s law looses. He looses one when his/her spouse dies.

Man’s law marries and man’s law divorces. Again I say, according to Robert’s theory one could divorce and remarry every six months for the rest of his life and still stand in favor with God. He has not denied it.

This is my second effort in which I have called upon Robert to show me where divorce is found in I Corinthians 7, but to no avail. Maybe he will tell us in his next effort.

Smith-Waters Debate
(Paul's Teaching on MDR)
Waters' 3rd Affirmative
(17)

To explain his unfounded charge that I have not made an argument J.T. says I have not shown that Paul, in saying, "let them marry," was referring to those who had been divorced. He says I need to show "what is said" and "why it is said." Well, I did that in both of my affirmatives. In my first affirmative I quoted the pertinent passages that tell us "what is said," and they very plainly support my proposition. Regarding the "why it was said" I wrote:

"...The gist of Paul's teachings is 'Let those who need marriage to avoid fornication, or who are burning in lust, marry if they are of age' (1 Cor. 7:2, 9, 36)."

And, I wrote:

Paul not only commands any who would object to a man or woman's having a spouse not to do so, but he also gives the reason this is necessary, which should help us to understand and accept the command. Also note that the text says "every man."

Thus, Paul does not exclude anyone who needs marriage "to avoid fornication" and he is very specific in his command.

So, since I have done what J.T. says I need to do to prove my proposition, my proposition is proven. But J.T. is not yet willing to give up human tradition. Even though my proposition is proven he still refuses to allow marriage for unmarried persons (which include the divorced). The justification is based on his assumption that they are not "eligible." But who tells him the divorced are not eligible? It certainly is not Paul. Paul says just the opposite! Certainly Jesus didn't say some were not eligible for marriage--his purpose was to make things better, not worse!

J.T. knows what "unmarried" means. No doubt he has looked it up and found nothing in the definition to help him. Thus, he needs to somehow get around the meaning. He finally has correctly stated what my belief is: "Robert believes that all divorced people are unmarried." But in his effort to get around the meaning of "unmarried" he pits Paul against himself, which is further discussed below. For the record, here is the meaning of "unmarried": "Not Married; having no spouse" (American Heritage Dictionary).

Even though J.T. has not straightforwardly denied the meaning of "unmarried," as I used it, he asserts that I have "not yet shown that Paul was talking to people who had divorced." Well, if "unmarried" includes the divorced, and it does, then Paul's statement (1 Cor. 7:8, 9) proves my proposition. It is that simple! Here it is once again: "I say therefore to the unmarried...if they cannot contain, let them marry..." (1 Cor. 7:8).

In his first rebuttal, J.T. accused me of not believing that Jesus' teachings are applicable. He took that false charge and set up a strawman and proceeded to debate him. Yet he denies he did it.

I noted that J.T. went into the affirmative mode. He replied, "You just made statements instead of making arguments." I didn't just make statements, I quoted clear statements from Paul, noting "what was said" and "why it was said" that proved my proposition. But J.T. is still in denial of what Paul said. He says he does not deny that Paul said "Let every man have his own wife" but he denies that it applies to those who are divorced. Once again, apply the word "unmarried," which everyone knows INCLUDES the divorced, and you cannot honestly assert that when Paul commanded "let them marry" he intended us to EXCLUDE the divorced in following his command.

The first thing Paul does in chapter 7 is give the reason for what he is about to say: "to avoid fornication." Now, who needs to avoid fornication and how can they do it? Everyone, to INCLUDE those who are "unmarried," and the divorced are unmarried. (Those who have been divorced are actually more susceptible to sexual temptation than one never married.) But J.T. singles out these singles and tells them they can't have a husband, or wife, even though this very action is exactly what Paul clearly teaches is sin (1 Tim. 4:1-4). He is forbidding one who needs marriage (to avoid fornication) the God-given right. Thus, he takes away the tool that God has provided to help us avoid sin. This explains why Paul puts such actions into the category of "doctrines of devils." Think about the number of potential Christians who have turned away because they were required to do something drastic that not only makes no sense but is simply wrong.

Maybe it will be helpful to J.T. to hear an explanation of the text (1 Cor. 7:2-3) from some noted scholars.

PNT

To avoid fornication. To prevent this sin, and the temptations to it in an unmarried state, especially in a vicious community, it was best for each sex that they be married; the normal condition of the sexes.

JFB

Let every man have — a positive command to all who have not the gift of continency, in fact to the great majority of the world (1 Cor. 7:5).

Barnes: Mr. Barnes says "Let every man..." means "Let the marriage vow be honored by all." That is what Paul is teaching, but J.T. refuses to do that. People have to meet HIS "eligibility" requirement--one not found in Paul's teachings.

Clark:

Let every man have his own wife - Let every man have one woman, his own; and every woman one man, her own." J.T. refuses to obey this text if one is divorced."

Henry:

He informs them that marriage, and the comforts and satisfactions of that state, are by divine wisdom prescribed for preventing fornication (1 Cor. 7:2), Porneias - Fornications, all sorts of lawless lust. To avoid these, Let every man, says he, have his own wife, and every woman her own husband; that is, marry, and confine themselves to their own mates.

Questions:

1. How can marriage help one avoid sin if he is taught that it is sinful for him to marry?
2. Is marriage God's main tool to help people avoid fornication?
3. Who would most likely promote the idea that marriage should be taken away, even if one is innocent in a divorce? God or Satan?

1 Corinthians 7:32b-33

He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord: But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife.

Would one who has been divorced fall into the category of one who "cares" for spiritual things? Certainly. But why? It is because he, being divorced, is not married and the unmarried cares "how he may please the Lord." On the other hand, the married cares "how he may please his wife." Now, does the "unmarried" of 1 Corinthians 7:8-9 have a spouse? Obviously not, and this is a problem for J.T. In his rebuttal he argues that "unmarried" in verses 10-11 means the same thing as "unmarried" in verses 8-9. But we shall show that this couple is still married and only separated. Those who are only separated are still bound to each other and, unless all love is gone, they still seek to please one another because they are married. They may in fact seek to please more in order to fix the relationship.

Verses 10-11

And unto the married I command...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.

It is important to observe that Paul is now talking to "the married." He commands the wife not to "depart." J.T. needs "depart" to mean, and refer to, "divorce." But "depart" means, "literally, "be separated from" (JFB).

Strong: (depart) From G5561; to place room between, that is, part; reflexively to go away: - depart, put asunder, separate.

RWP: "If, in spite of Christ's clear prohibition, she get separated."

Barnes: "Let her not prove faithless to her marriage vows; let her not, on any pretence, desert her husband."

Bloomfield [*The Greek New Testament*] explains verse 11:

From the use of καταλλ [reconcile] and the air of the context it is plain that the apostle is not speaking of formal divorces, affected by law, but separations whether agreed on or not, arising from misunderstandings or otherwise.

J.T. needs "unmarried" to mean the same thing here that it does in all these other passages, but we can see from how it is used in the context that it does not. Keep in mind Paul is talking to the MARRIED. What do the married people who are separated need to do? Reconcile. If they were *divorced* they would need to marry each other again in order to be right with God if their desire was to be together again. Divorced people can't just reconcile without a new marriage. Strangely, my opponent denies that "loosed" refers to divorced in the passage where Paul addressed the "unmarried," but where Paul is speaking to the "married" he contends that they are divorced.

J.T.'s own argument cuts both ways. If those separated (verse 11), who are told to remain "unmarried," are actually divorced, then "unmarried" in verses 8-9 means divorced. Thus, the best that J.T. can do is present a scenario that has Paul contradicting himself, and he seems content with that. J.T. also says Paul said "remain unmarried" and asks "is that the same as 'forbidding to marry'?" If they were actually divorced it would be, but they were not. Therefore, it is evident that Paul uses the word "unmarried" differently in verse 11 than the way he uses it in the other passages.

Versions that are helpful:

WNT "Or if she has already left him, let her either remain as she is or be reconciled to him; and that a husband is not to send away his wife."

NLB "But if she does leave him, she should not get married to another man. It would be better for her to go back to her husband. The husband should not divorce his wife."

NCV "But if she does leave, she must not marry again, or she should make up with her husband."

Deuteronomy 24:1-4

J.T. doesn't like me using God's teaching through Moses' on divorce. He tries to discount its importance by stating that "it was a contingency."

Questions:

- 1) When did men get over "hardness of heart"?
- 2) When did the divorce text cease to be true?
- 3) Where do we find the definition of divorce if we disregard this text? Can J.T. answer these questions?

I Corinthians 7:27-28

J.T. states that "Marriage Does Not Equal Bound–Loosed Does Not Equal Divorce" but makes no argument to prove it. When he is in the affirmative I will present sound reasons to show that his argument (?) using Romans 7:2-3 to evade Paul's command is errant.

For now, note the following comments:

Barnes: Seek not to be loosed - Seek not a "dissolution."

Clark: "...Dissolution of the marriage contract." How does a marriage get dissolved? (Deut. 24:1-4)

JFB: "Neither the married (those "bound to a wife") nor the unmarried (those "loosed from a wife") are to "seek" a change of state."

Things not answered:

"Every man" and "any man" (1 Cor. 7:2, 34) has to be interpreted to mean "those eligible."

I wrote:

J.T. will try to force this passage [1 Cor. 7:11] to support his view, but his use of it proves too much. If it is talking about divorce (it is not) then not even those who did the divorcing 'for fornication' may marry because Paul made no mention of an exception.

J.T. can't explain why Paul never hinted that divorce had to be for fornication. But it is simple. Such would have been out of harmony with the gist of God's teachings regarding justice and marriage.

1 Tim. 4:1-3: The usual argument is that this text does not apply to us. But J.T. has just ignored it. We may not know exactly who Paul had in mind, but we can be sure that if we do the same thing we are guilty of the same sin. Thus, Paul teaches not only that the divorced may marry but that we must "let them marry."

Smith-Waters Debate
(Paul's Teaching on MDR)
Smith's 3rd Rebuttal
(18)

Proposition: In the New Testament, the apostle Paul teaches that all competent adults, including the divorced, may marry.

Affirm: Robert Waters

Deny J.T. Smith

Brother Waters has spent a great deal of time trying to prove that Paul, in I Corinthians 7, is telling the divorced people that they can remarry without sin. In fact, as his proposition states, “all competent adults, including the divorced, may marry.” Yet he has failed to produce one single case in I Corinthians 7 (or any other of Paul’s writings) that mentioned one who is divorced. If you ask him to prove that a person is divorced, he says “they are unmarried – thus divorced.”

Unmarried

Just who are those who Paul refers to as unmarried? There are three categories given in I Corinthians 7 of people whom Paul says are unmarried.

1. I Corinthians 7:34

There is difference also between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit: but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband.

Here Paul speaks of the virgin as unmarried. However, she has never been bound by God in marriage. Therefore it could not be said of her that she has been loosed.

2. 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: ¹¹But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.”

Robert’s position on this unmarried one is that she is NOT divorced even though the text says she is unmarried. He then uses several commentators (and takes up a lot of space) trying to prove that she is still bound to her husband though she is said to be unmarried. So for Robert’s proposition to be true, it is absolutely necessary these men are correct in their exegesis of these passages. Of course if

they are not correct and she is absolutely, sho nough, uh huh, yes mam divorced, then he would have Paul condemning himself in I Timothy 4:4.

Let's carry this one step further. Even though Paul told her not to marry but to return to her husband, if she decided to spurn Paul's warning and get a divorce (if she is not already divorced) repent of the sin of disobeying Paul's warning and marry someone else she would be alright in God's sight according to Robert's position. Deny it Robert! And if she decided to do that every six months for the rest of her life, she would still be right in the sight of God.

3. I Corinthians 7:39

The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord.

This would include the widow of I Corinthians 7:8-9. In this chapter, the widow is the only one that is loosed and free to remarry.

This is the reason I have been trying to get Robert to give us proof that Paul is speaking of anyone in this chapter who is divorced. The only persons in this chapter that you can prove are the unmarried who have a right to marry is the virgin and the woman whose husband has died.

Robert says we must use Deuteronomy 24:1-4 in order to have a definition for divorce. He asked the question, Where do we find the definition of divorce if we disregard this text? The same place you got the definition of unmarried on page one of your last affirmative, *American Heritage Dictionary*.

Robert says he is cocked and primed and ready to discredit my argument on Romans 7:2-4 when I get in the affirmative. Well, until then, let's just stay in I Corinthians 7.

In I Corinthians 7:39 we read "The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord."

This is the same argument Paul makes in Romans 7:2-3. Paul says that the wife is "bound by the law as long as her husband lives." This law goes back **beyond** the Law of Moses. It goes back to the beginning of time.

Matthew 19:4-5 And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and

female, ⁵And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?

Therefore according to God's law of marriage, a man and a woman who are married are bound to each other as long as they both shall live. If either one dies, then the other is free to marry.

Now to the teaching of 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. ²⁸But and if thou marry, thou hast not sinned; and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned. Nevertheless such shall have trouble in the flesh: but I spare you.

Paul's teaching, according to the instructions given in this chapter, if a person is married (bound by the law) seek not to be loosed by divorce. As we will see in my first affirmative (which will be next) we will discuss the subject of bound and loosed in detail.

Smith-Waters Debate
(Paul's Teaching on MDR)
Smith's 1st Affirmative
(19)

Proposition: The teaching of the New Testament only permits the one who has divorced his spouse for fornication and one whose spouse has died, to remarry.

Affirm: J. T. Smith

Deny: Robert Waters

Definition of Proposition:

By **teaching**, I mean, that which was provided by God to assist humankind to be able to impart to other people the mind of God.

By **New Testament** I mean, the twenty-seven books from Matthew thru Revelation.

By **only permits** I mean, though one is divorced and loosed from his/her spouse according to the laws of the land, he is not scripturally loosed by God and free to marry another without sin.

By **divorced** I mean, that the laws of the land have given one a legal dissolution from his spouse so that he may legally marry another without committing bigamy.

By for **fornication** I mean, (from the Greek *πορνεία* [porneia] in the New Testament) a general or generic term which means, “sex between unmarried people, homosexuality Jude 7; bestiality, incest, adultery (I Corinthians 5:1). (W. E. Vine’s *Dictionary of New Testament Words*). Every kind of sexual immorality.

Simply put, unless one divorces his/her mate for sexual immorality or one’s mate has died, he may not, with God’s approval, marry another.

As I pointed out in the last negative, there was not a single person who was said to be unmarried that brother Waters proved was divorced. However, according to I Corinthians 7:27-28 Paul said, “Art thou bound unto a wife? seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a wife. ²⁸But and if thou marry, thou hast not sinned; and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned...” There were those who were told to not “seek to be loosed.” In this context, there is no doubt that this statement was talking about divorce. However we must understand that some were loosed from a husband or wife without being free to marry another. In other words, the word loosed must be understood according to context. In the immediate

context Paul said, “art thou bound to a wife, seek not to be loosed.” Art thou loosed from a wife seek not a wife. But if thou marry, thou has not sinned.

Now why would I make such a statement? Let’s look at verse 39.

The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord (I Corinthians 7:39).

Here Paul tells of a woman who is not only married to a man but also bound by the law to him AS LONG AS HE SHALL LIVE.

In Romans 7:1-4 I read,

Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? ²For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. ³So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. ⁴Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.

To what law were they dead?

Romans 7:7 What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.

What law said, “Thou shalt not covet”? It was the tenth of the ten commandments given to Moses at Mt Sinai.

The point of these passages is to show how long one is bound to the Law of Moses. He illustrates it by bringing to their remembrance what they already knew about the marriage law. He concludes it by saying, “ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ.” You will observe that he did not say the law was dead, but that they were DEAD TO THE LAW. He likened their “death” to the law to the death of the husband in verse 3, that they might be married to another, even Christ.

Paul said in Colossians 3:3, “For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.” The reason they were no longer under the Law of Moses is because when they were “dead in sins” (Ephesians 2:5); they were “crucified with Christ” (Galatians 2:20); “buried with Him in baptism” (Colossians 2:12); and are now “dead to sin” (Romans 6:2) by the “body” = death, burial and resurrection, of Christ. Hence they were no longer bound to the Law of Moses.

That one can be bound to one person and married to another is clearly shown in Mark 6:17-18.

For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife: for he had married her. ¹⁸For John had said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife.

Thus she was bound to one (still Phillip’s wife) but married to another (Herod).

According to Scripture, there are only two classes of people who are no longer bound by law to their first spouse. One whose spouse has died (Romans 7:2-3) and one who has put away his wife for fornication (Matthew 5:32 ; 19:9). All others commit adultery when they remarry – brother Waters to the contrary notwithstanding.

Smith-Waters Debate
(Paul's Teaching on MDR)
Waters' 1st Rebuttal
(20)

“The teaching of the New Testament only permits the one who has divorced his spouse for fornication and one whose spouse has died, to remarry.”

Affirm: J.T. Smith

Deny: Robert Waters

The above proposition cannot be affirmed unless it is assumed that Jesus taught the same (which has not been proven). J.T. knows this because he refused to affirm a proposition, like I affirmed, that limited the discussion to Paul's teachings. He knows Paul emphasizes the need for marriage to avoid fornication. But the very fact that J.T. inserted the words "for fornication" in his proposition tells us that he is not willing to allow Paul to settle the matter, as were Christians who asked him questions (1 Cor. 7:1, 2). He must rely on his interpretation of Jesus' teaching and labor diligently to make it appear that Paul's teaching harmonizes with his preconceived theory.

J.T. wrote "...Unless one divorces his/her mate for sexual immorality or one's mate has died, he may not, with God's approval, marry another." That is a very audacious assertion to make, especially in light of the fact that Paul's teachings are obviously to the contrary and that if Jesus taught this he contradicted the Law. This doctrine of J.T.'s has numerous problems and unacceptable consequences. The only time Paul even mentions fornication in 1 Corinthians 7 is in the context of allowing those who need marriage to marry so they can avoid this sin. Yet J.T. insists that Paul teaches the opposite for those who happened to have been divorced, even if innocent (Prov. 17:26). J.T.'s main argument (from Paul's teaching) is that one can be *loosed* but still *bound*, which is an obvious oxymoron. J.T. is not content with allowing God's divorce law to do what he intended for it to do. The result is that he has the Bible contradicting itself on every hand: Moses teaching what God didn't want, Jesus contradicting Moses, Paul contradicting Jesus and Paul contradicting himself. Is that not CON VO LOOTED?

J.T. says that in the previous debate I did not prove that "unmarried" referred to the divorced. Nevertheless, he did not object to the definition of "unmarried" that supports my argument. Furthermore, if Paul meant for us to conclude that he didn't really mean to let ALL the "unmarried" marry, why would he not have simply specified virgins and widows as having a right to marry and omit the word "unmarried"? That he included the divorced when speaking of the "loosed" is evident.

J.T. said, "...There was not a single person who was said to be unmarried that brother Waters proved was divorced." J.T., are you not supposed to be in the affirmative? Be that as it may, you insisted that verse 11 refers to a divorced couple, rather than merely separated, and that that they are "unmarried" regardless of the fact that the wife merely "departs." (You just brushed aside the fact that Paul exhorts them to "reconcile" rather than get married.) Therefore, if you are right about verse 11 then your assertion, that the word "unmarried" does not include all the divorced, is wrong.

I Corinthians 7:27-28

J.T. admits that Paul is talking about divorce, but without any reasonable justification he asserts that "...Some were loosed from a husband or wife without being free to marry another." He says that Paul told those "bound" not to seek to be "loosed," but this is no argument. All Paul was saying is, "Due to the 'present distress' if you are married don't seek a divorce, regardless of the circumstances." Outside of the "present distress" situation, if one had reason to get loosed, how would he go about it? Divorce and murder would be the options. J.T. has himself in a dilemma here because he has Paul condemning divorce and remarriage regardless of the reason, which he does not believe Paul taught.

Verse 39

"...Married to a man but also bound by the law to him AS LONG AS HE SHALL LIVE."

J.T. speaks of one "married...but also bound." What a redundancy! What word carries a stronger meaning for being bound than "married"? It is like saying "Frank got HITCHED," which simply means he got MARRIED, or he tied the knot, OR he is now bound. It is all the same thing. In view of the fact that J.T.'s proposition has "except for fornication" in it, it is evident that he does not really believe what he needs this text to teach.

J.T. says Moses' Law binds the wife to her husband. But this same law tells us the divorced woman may "go be another man's wife," which J.T. does not accept. Paul evidently was speaking of the marriage law that binds her to her husband, which may be dissolved by divorce (Deut. 24:1-4).

Barnes has some interesting comments pertaining to this "bound" but not married theory of J.T.'s (Romans 7:1-4).

Is bound by the law ...To her husband - She is united to him; and is under his authority as the head of the household. To him is particularly committed the headship of the family, and the wife is subject to his law, in the Lord, [Eph 5:23](#), [Eph 5:33](#). **She is loosed ...** - The husband has

no more authority. The connection from which obligation resulted is dissolved.

Barnes says (verse 4), "...Death dissolves a connection from which obligation resulted. This is the SINGLE point of the illustration..." [Emphasis added, r.w.] Indeed, but J.T. seeks to tweak the passage to support his proposition.

J.T. used a lot of space to show that death results in being unbound, but that is something nobody denies. He needs to prove his assertion that "some were loosed...without being free to marry another." Another unproven assertion is that one can be "bound" (hitched) but not married (hitched). J.T.'s doctrine that forbids marriage for the divorced (1 Tim. 4:1-3) is a lead balloon until he proves his assertions. His convoluted theory has Joe bound to Sue while Sue is free to marry another. He would have us believe there is such a thing as being bound (married) with no benefits. But Paul tells us to let the unmarried marry with benefits. To get around Paul's teachings J.T. invented a new and convoluted definition for "bound" and "loosed."

Herod (Mark 6:17-18)

The marriage was unlawful, not because someone was still "bound" but because the Law did not allow a man to marry his brother's wife (when divorced) as long as he was still alive. If Herodias was still bound to the brother why did John not say something to her about adultery and the need to either go back to him or remain celibate? Obviously, there is no biblical support for J.T.'s "bound but not loosed" theory, which he needs to be true in order to sustain his proposition.

RobertWaters@yahoo.com

Smith-Waters Debate

(Paul's Teaching on MDR)

Smith's 2nd Affirmative

(21)

“The teaching of the New Testament only permits the one who has divorced his spouse for fornication and one whose spouse has died, to remarry.”

Affirm: J.T. Smith

Deny; Robert Waters

Brother Waters complains about the proposition. He wanted me to affirm a similar proposition to his that limited everything discussed to Paul's teaching. Yet in his third affirmative he brought up "...Dissolution of the marriage contract." How does a marriage get dissolved? (Deut. 24:1-4). It seemed to me that whatever was right for him to use would be right for me. Did I miss something?

Robert criticizes my use of Bible language that one can be loosed (unmarried) and at the same time bound (by the law). He says it is an oxymoron, of which the definition is: "A figure of speech in which incongruous or contradictory terms appear side by side." However, brother Waters has mislabeled the situation. We use such language all the time. Example: The officer and the prisoner come into the courtroom bound together with handcuffs. The officer looses the prisoner, and leaves the courtroom. However, the prisoner must remain, because he is bound by the law to remain until the Judge pronounced his sentence. So here is a man who was loosed and bound at the same time. What did Paul say in I Corinthians 7:39?

The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord.

Also in Romans 7:2-3,

For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. ³So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.

Robert has, in three affirmatives, contended that the one who is said to be unmarried is divorced. Then, he took "back-waters" (no pun intended) when it was pointed out that Paul said that the woman of I Corinthians 7:10-11 was unmarried,

thus divorced. Robert said no. She was just separated from her husband and Paul commanded her to remain unmarried or return to her husband. I asked the question of Robert, what if she does not return to her husband. What if he refuses to accept her back and she gets a divorce. According to Robert, a divorce looses and frees one to remarry. She is unmarried and it is pleasing to God for her to get married. She could defy the instructions that Paul gave to her (“remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband”) and divorce him. She now being unmarried could, with God’s approval marry another, divorce him and marry another on and on. In fact, rather than burn with desire Paul would urge her to get married to avoid fornication, according to Robert. I have challenged brother Waters a number of times in this debate to deny it. He CANNOT and hold the position he now holds.

Herod as an example of bound and loosed – divorced and married (Mark 6:17-18) is easy to be understood.

For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife: for he had married her. ¹⁸For John had said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife.

There are two words here that I want to emphasize.

First, John said that Herodias was Philip’s wife. Would it not stand to reason in view of what Paul said in I Corinthians 7:39 and Romans 7:2-3 that referring to her as Philip’s wife meant that she was still bound to Philip?

Second she was married to Herod. So regardless of what the reason was that made it unlawful, she had divorced Philip and married Herod. But John said, she was still Philip’s wife. How could that be unless she was still bound by God’s law to Philip?

Now, let’s continue the affirmation. There are only two reasons in the New Testament that gives a person the right to marry another. One is “if one puts his spouse away for fornication (Matthew 19:9); the other is if one’s mate dies (I Corinthians 7:39 and Romans 7:2-3), Brother Waters disagrees.

Also, I might add that in our last discussion I agreed that the word *απολυο* (*apoluo*) translated “put away” generally means, to dismiss from the house – to separate. However, as with all words sometimes the context changes the meaning. For example, in Matthew 19:9a Jesus said, “And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery...” In this passage by implication Jesus is saying that whosoever puts away his wife for fornication and marries another does not commit

adultery. Obviously, in this context the word *apoluo* includes divorce or else he could not marry another without committing adultery.

What would have been the conclusion of Jesus' teaching in Matthew, Mark and Luke? If you do not put your wife away for fornication, remain unmarried or be reconciled to your husband/wife. Otherwise you would be committing adultery. This is in complete harmony with what Paul wrote as it relates to what Jesus said. Jesus' teaching on divorce and remarriage which was set forth by Paul in 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: ¹¹But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife."

This was that which was spoken by the Lord, Paul said. If you do not put your wife away for fornication, remain unmarried or be reconciled to your husband/wife (Matthew, Mark and Luke). Otherwise you will be committing adultery. Was the Lord violating I Timothy 4:2?

So you see, Robert, Jesus was not contradicting what Paul taught in I Corinthians 7.

Smith-Waters Debate
(Paul's Teaching on MDR)
Waters' 2nd Rebuttal
(22)

“The teaching of the New Testament only permits the one who has divorced his spouse for fornication and one whose spouse has died, to remarry.”

Affirm: J.T. Smith

Deny: Robert Waters

J.T. talked about a prisoner in a courtroom being "loosed and bound at the same time." This was supposed to illustrate how a man can be "loosed" (divorced) from a woman but still bound (by God) to her so that he may not marry another. But the man in the illustration was never loosed and bound by the same thing. One was a mechanical instrument, the other was law. A man and woman are bound by ONE thing--the marriage law--until it is undone by divorce or death. The illustration is really silly and shows J.T.'s desperation. It is like having a dog on a leash and when you let him go he is still bound by the fence around the yard. Well, the fence around the yard and the leash in your hand aren't anywhere near the same thing! J.T., do you really think "marriage" and being "bound" have nothing to do with each other? Isn't marriage what bound the person in the first place? THEY ARE THE SAME THING!

Once again, J.T. quotes 1 Corinthians 7:39 and Romans 7:2-3 as if they support his teaching. The "loosed but still bound" theory was invented in 1984 and reaches no higher in scholarship than J.T. Smith.

J.T. says I took "back-waters" on the term "unmarried" when he pointed out that Paul, in 1 Corinthians 7:10-11, spoke of the woman who departed as being "unmarried." But when trying to explain his flip-flop on the word "apoluo" he said, "...As with all words sometimes the context changes the meaning." Yet he won't accept the same principle when it is not to his advantage.

J.T. used 200 words to build a prejudicial argument in which he talked about how many times one could be divorced and remarried. First, we must not overlook the matter of the "present distress" and Paul's advice under those circumstances. Second, I've already answered this once by noting Ephesians 5:21, 25. Yet, whether it is J.T.'s position, mine, or someone else's that the parties believe, divorce happens and the results often are not fair.

Questions:

1. How many times will God forgive any sin of which one is penitent?

2. Whose teaching on MDR punishes the innocent, yours or mine?
3. Why do you have no problem with the innocent's being punished with celibacy?
4. How many good marriages do you suppose have been destroyed because of your doctrine that encourages one to get to the courthouse first, rather than work things out?
5. Was Israel, whom God divorced, allowed to marry another?

J.T. notes the text that speaks of Herodias as being Philip's wife, and would have the reader join with him in ASSUMING this proves they were still bound--meaning SHE could not marry. There are numerous problems with this. First, previously I asked: "If Herodias was still bound to the brother why did John not say something to her about adultery and the need to either go back to him or remain celibate?" Will J.T. answer? Second, in view of 2 Samuel 12:9b, it is obvious that the language used does not help J.T. "...Thou hast killed Uriah the Hittite with the sword, and hast taken his wife to be thy wife..." Obviously she was no longer his wife because Uriah was dead. Third, the problem was not between Herodias and John but rather between Herod and John because Herod had married his brother's ex-wife, which was contrary to the Law (Lev. 20:21).

Evidently my opponent has no confidence that he can show that Paul taught that the divorced may not marry. He not only resorts back to what he has asserted that Jesus taught (that was previously debated) but has now changed his view on the meaning of "apoluo," and for the first time makes an argument with it. Jesus used "apoluo" in the "general" sense. If he meant "divorce" he contradicted the Law, which J.T. should, after our first debate, understand is a problem for his doctrine.

J.T. now argues that in Matthew 19:9 Jesus is saying that whosoever puts away his wife for fornication and marries another does not commit adultery, and it is true. But then he says, "Obviously, in this context the word *apoluo* includes divorce or else he could not marry another without committing adultery."

No, as I have explained in a previous debate, the one "put away" is not sent away because of unfaithfulness. That was not what Jesus said. The sending away was because of fornication, i.e. incest or other illegal marriages, such as Herod's and Herodias'.

J.T. said, "If you do not put your wife away for fornication, remain unmarried or be reconciled to your husband/wife" and then asked what Jesus' conclusion would have been.

J.T., neither Paul nor Jesus taught what you are teaching. Jesus sought to HELP the “put away” women, as you have previously stated, because their husbands were not freeing them (with divorce papers) so they could “go be another man’s wife.” Jesus was merely giving the exception for when putting away (not divorce) wouldn't result in adultery "against the wife" or adultery if the wife married another. The putting away needed to be done because it was an illegal marriage resulting in fornication. J.T. is talking about legally divorcing one who has committed adultery. Jesus did not go there, and certainly he did not teach the divorced may not marry. Such would have him teaching against Moses, it would have him taking sides with the two Jewish factions, it would give his enemies a reason to kill him, it would have created a law that would punish the innocent and it would encourage divorce.

J.T. labored diligently to show that Paul taught what he insists Jesus taught. But Paul was not even referring to Jesus' teaching on the matter of putting away. He was speaking of “inspiration” as opposed to his opinion or judgment. (*Barnes*: “Paul here professes to utter the language of inspiration, and demands obedience.”) J.T.’s proof text speaks of the wife’s merely departing (leaving), rather than divorcing. Paul uses the phrase "for fornication" in the chapter only to indicate the reason why we must let people who have no spouse marry (1 Cor. 7:1, 2). Thus, from the context it is evident that in verse 11 *agamos* does not indicate the couple were divorced.

J.T. asks, "Was the Lord violating I Timothy 4:2?"

Both the teachings of Jesus and Paul were for the benefit of people who needed marriage to AVOID fornication. J.T., YOUR teaching not only forbids marriage but also actually encourages divorce and forces even the innocent to remain celibate, which is the very type of thing both Jesus and Paul sought to avoid.

J.T. ends by saying, "So you see, Robert, Jesus was not contradicting what Paul taught in I Corinthians 7."

I never charged that Jesus contradicted Paul. YOUR position (that is contrary to truth) has Jesus contradicting Paul, which is why your proposition is impossible to affirm and why your teaching on MDR should be rejected.

Smith-Waters Debate
(Paul's Teaching on MDR)
Smith's 3rd Affirmative
(23)

“The teaching of the New Testament only permits the one who has divorced his spouse for fornication and one whose spouse has died, to remarry.”

Affirm: J.T. Smith

Deny: Robert Waters

Robert continues to say that Smith's teaching on divorce and remarriage makes Jesus contradict the Law, Jesus contradict Paul and Paul contradict Paul. Let me show you that this is not true.

As I proved in our first discussion, Jesus did not contradict or change the Law of Moses with His teaching. In fact, as I showed in our first discussion Jesus was not discussing Moses' Law given in Deuteronomy 24:1-4, Matthew 19:9, Mark 10:11-12 or Luke 16:18. Instead, He was teaching His disciples His law concerning divorce and remarriage in His coming kingdom. Nothing about it involved Deuteronomy 24. In fact, all Christ's teaching to the Jews concerning the Law of Moses and their questions to Him was done in Matthew 19:3-8 and Mark 10:2-9.

The Jews questioned Him about putting away their wives for every cause. Jesus' reply was that God made them Male and Female and said a man should leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife and they shall be one flesh. What God has joined together let not man put asunder. The Jews replied, what about Moses' teaching concerning putting away? Jesus said it was because of the hardness of their hearts that Moses gave the law he did, but from the beginning it was not so. In both instances in reply to their questions Jesus taught them how God set things up for the man and woman in the beginning.

According to what was taught in Deuteronomy 24, the Jews had a practice of just dismissing their wives from the house with no means of support and without the right to be another man's wife. Later, they would decide to take them back. This was all in violation of God's original law – one man for one woman for life. In order to correct their abuse of their wives, God added a contingency law to regulate the situation.

1. In order to put away one's spouse he must put a writing of divorcement in her hand and send her away.
2. After he had done this and his ex-wife married someone else, she could not go back to the first husband if the latter husband put her away.

3. Jesus said this was done because of the hardness of their heart – but from the beginning it WAS NOT SO.

Robert has a problem with my illustration about being bound and loosed at the same time. Paul said in Romans 7:2-3,

For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. ³So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.

Of the illustration Robert said, “The illustration is really silly and shows J.T.'s desperation.” In fact he further said, “Once again, J.T. quotes 1 Corinthians 7:39 and Romans 7:2-3 as if they support his teaching. The "loosed but still bound" theory was invented in 1984 and reaches no higher in scholarship than J.T. Smith.” Should I be insulted by these remarks? Naw! That is just Robert’s way of trying to cover his ineptness to reply to the argument.

Romans 7:3 So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.

An illustration is just that – Robert. It illustrates! You yourself mentioned Ephesians 5:23 in regard to the illustration that Paul used of the husband and wife and Christ and the church. Are they identical in all of their ramifications, Robert? We both know they are not.

Robert says,

J.T., do you really think 'marriage' and being 'bound' have nothing to do with each other? Isn't marriage what bound the person in the first place? **THEY ARE THE SAME THING!**

Robert, if as you say, marriage and bound as used by Paul are the same thing, why did Paul say Romans 7:3 “So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress...” What you don't seem to comprehend is that there are two laws involved in marriage. There is God's law and man's law. In Romans 7:3, man's law allowed the woman to divorce her husband and marry another (as also in I Corinthians 7:27-28). However, though she is loosed from her husband according to man's law and free to marry another,

Paul (not Smith) said she is still bound by the law to her husband. Paul still calls him her husband.

I refuse to take the credit for originating the “loosed and bound” teaching of which Robert gives me credit. As I pointed out in my last affirmative, Mark did that in telling of Herod and Herodias. According to the law of the land, she married Philip, divorced him and married Herod. In man’s sight, she was Herod’s wife. In God’s sight it was an unlawful arrangement. The text says, “for he (Herod) had married her.” Yet John the Baptist said, “she is your brother Philip’s wife.” Twist it any way you want to, it still comes out bound to Philip, married to Herod.

All I am trying to show is that it is possible for a person to be loosed and bound at the same time. The illustration would not have to have a man in handcuffs for he is in the policeman’s custody. If one is under arrest, he is bound by the law to go and do whatever he is told even though the arresting officer leaves him in the courtroom.

Robert’s Questions:

Question - “1. How many times will God forgive any sin of which one is penitent?”

Answer – As many times as one is willing to repent – however, you cannot continue to live in an adulterous relationship and expect God to forgive you. Repentance is a change of will that results in a reformation of life. (Acts 3:19).

Question – 2. Whose teaching on MDR punishes the innocent, yours or mine?

Answer – The above question does not address the issue. I, therefore, will pose a question to you. If a husband has a nervous breakdown and has to go to a mental institution and the wife and children have no husband or father, what can she do? According to your doctrine, she can divorce him and marry another without sinning. I challenge you to say no – not that it will do any good, as I have challenged you in almost every address I have made that you tell us whether one could get a divorce and marry another every six months for the rest of his life and still be in favor with God.

And what did he say about that?

J.T. used 200 words to build a prejudicial argument in which he talked about how many times one could be divorced and remarried. First, we must not overlook the matter of the ‘present distress’ and Paul’s advice under those circumstances. Second, I’ve already answered this once by noting Ephesians 5:21, 25. Yet, whether it is J.T.’s position, mine, or

someone else's that the parties believe, divorce happens and the results often are not fair.

Answer: Let's look at Ephesians 5:21, 25 "Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God. 25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it;" With which I whole-heartedly agree. Yet you say, "divorce happens and the results often are not fair." With which I also agree. We also both know that there are many people who are not happy in their marriage. But can't you see, Robert, that instead of them being encouraged to try to work through their problems that what you are teaching is going to encourage them to get a divorce and marry someone else. Please, Robert, stop for a moment and think what you are doing.

Question - 3 "Why do you have no problem with the innocent's being punished with celibacy?"

Answer: I do have a problem with it Robert just like I have a problem with the person who is on his way to a gospel meeting having told his wife that he is going to be baptized. As he backs out of the driveway, a car hit him and kills him (true story). All I can do is say that he has not obeyed the gospel. Do I have a problem with that? You seem to think that I don't have any feelings or sympathy for anyone. What about the fact that God sent armies to destroy entire nations of men, women and children. I have an emotional problem with that. **BUT ALL OF THIS IS GOD'S BUSINESS.** I do not have the authority to change any of this but **THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT YOU ARE TRYING TO DO WITH THE DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE QUESTION.** We are not under the Law of Moses, Robert. Yet you want to try, with your theory, to weave in and out of Deuteronomy 24 as it suits your doctrine. Deuteronomy 24 is not applicable to us, Robert.

Question – 4 "How many good marriages do you suppose have been destroyed because of your doctrine that encourages one to get to the courthouse first, rather than work things out?"

Answer: I don't know who you have in mind, Robert, but it is not me. I have never told anyone that they have to be the first to the courthouse. You had better go back and listen to the debate I had with Tim Haile. I am not concerned with the race to the courthouse. I encourage people to work things out.

Question – 5 "Was Israel, whom God divorced, allowed to marry another?"

Answer: No, they were not. Now if you are going to Romans 7:4, just be reminded of what Paul told them and the illustration he used in verses 2-3. They had become

DEAD TO THE LAW by the body of Christ that they might be married to another even to Him who was raised from the dead. It was not because God had divorced them. Robert, you are grasping at straws.

Then Robert brings up David, Bathsheba and Uriah. Be careful, Robert, someone who is mentally deranged will read what you said and decide to kill someone in order to get their husband. Again, you are whittling on God's end of the stick. Were there any consequences to what David did? You had better read a little further in II Samuel 12.

Jesus said that if a man put away his wife for fornication that he could remarry without sin. When I pointed this out and said, "Obviously, in this context the word 'apoluo' includes divorce or else he could not marry another without committing adultery" Robert shows his "true colors" regarding the word fornication. He said, "No, as I have explained in a previous debate, the one "put away" is not sent away because of unfaithfulness. That was not what Jesus said. The sending away was because of fornication, i.e. incest or other illegal marriages, such as Herod's and Herodias."

In the first discussion we had I defined the word fornication. Here is the definition I gave and Robert had no objection nor tried to make any addition to it.

Fornication, (from the Greek *πορνεία* [porneia] in the New Testament is a general or generic term which means," sex between unmarried people, homosexuality Jude 7; bestiality, incest, adultery (I Corinthians 5:1). (W. E. Vine's *Dictionary of New Testament Words*). Yet now Robert says, "it is not because of unfaithfulness." He now says it was because of "incest or illegal marriages." But "illegal marriages" is not a part of the definition of the Greek word "*porneia*." Yet it seems not to bother Robert to add his definition to the Greek-English Dictionary's definition of a word.

Robert said:

J.T. labored diligently to show that Paul taught what he insists Jesus taught. But Paul was not even referring to Jesus' teaching on the matter of putting away.

Robert then goes to Barns Commentary to prove his point in I Corinthians 7:10-11. He continues to search and find some commentator that agrees with him so that he can no doubt soothe his conscience. Yet dozens of others could be cited that disagree. But that obviously doesn't faze Robert. Let's see again what Paul said.

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: ¹¹But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.

Paul said, “I command, yet not I, BUT THE LORD.” So the Lord commanded the same thing here as He did in Matthew 19:9, Mark 10-11 and Luke 16:18. If there is no fornication involved for which you put your spouse away, then if you remarry, you commit adultery and the person you remarry commits adultery. By necessary implication we conclude that the person in I Corinthians 7:10-11 had obviously not put her spouse away for fornication. Paul said that Jesus **COMMANDED**, remain unmarried or be reconciled. I have challenged Robert time and again to tell us if, according to his teaching, she could disregard the Lord’s command, divorce her husband (if she had not already done so) and marry someone else and be right in the sight of God. To this good moment in time, Robert has not answered. If he answers now, I will have no opportunity to reply.

It appears that Robert is going to continue to teach his God-defying doctrine. I hope I am wrong. For, if people believe and practice it, it is my studied conclusion that many people – along with Robert, will be lost as a result of his teaching.

May God have mercy on all of us as we strive to study and obey His Word to the saving of our souls regardless of what the cost may be.

Smith-Waters Debate
(Paul's Teaching on MDR)
Waters' 3rd Rebuttal
(24)

“The teaching of the New Testament only permits the one who has divorced his spouse for fornication and one whose spouse has died, to remarry.”

Affirm: J.T. Smith

Deny: Robert Waters

In our first debate, I emphasized the importance of using good hermeneutics in studying divorce and remarriage. Unfortunately, J.T. has been inconsistent in doing this. The result is that he learned a false doctrine and continues to teach it. The most obvious evidence that the above is true is that J.T.'s position has Jesus contradicting Moses, which J. T. knows is not acceptable. Yet, to get around this powerful argument, that destroys his teaching, he unsuccessfully endeavored to show that Jesus' teaching did not apply to those to whom it was obviously directed, but did apply to his disciples. Unbelievably, even after I pointed out that Jesus' disciples were Jews amenable to the Law, J. T. continued to make the argument.

One cannot successfully teach J.T.'s position on MDR using only Paul's teaching. Jesus taught the Jews regarding the sanctity of marriage and at the same time he condemned their evil practice of putting away without divorce proceedings. Paul answered questions from Christians on the subject. Yet where does J.T. go when he sets out to teach on the topic? He goes to Jesus' teaching, establishes a false foundation, makes up some illogical arguments, asserts that Paul taught the same and then misleads others. When Paul's clear teachings, such as "let them marry," are brought to light, J.T. executes his theory and deceives the unsuspecting who usually never see Paul's teaching.

J.T. said, "...Jesus directed them to how God set things up for the man and woman in the beginning." While this is true (and their hearts were hardened) it proves nothing. J.T. understands and admits the reason for the divorce law (Deut. 24:1-4) but contends that it was only a "contingency," merely temporary, and that Jesus changed it, making it not applicable. Yet J.T. was unable to answer my argument that the text gives the only scriptural definition of divorce that is practiced to this day, and he did not reply to the observation that men still have hard hearts, which means God's divorce law is still needed.

Before and during most of the debate, J.T. acknowledged the difference between "put away" and divorce. Yet near the end he recanted and began to use "put away" and "divorce" interchangeably. I refer the reader to my debates with Dr. Thomas

Thrasher and Pat Donahue, or my book, "*Put Away But Not Divorced*," that deal extensively with this issue: www.TotalHealth.bz.

J.T. ignored the gist of Paul's teaching regarding the question of "who may marry," and misused Romans 7:3 and 1 Corinthians 7:10, 11 to argue that being "married" and being "bound" are different, that one can still be bound even though he is "loosed" (divorced), and that Paul taught that unless one initiates divorce for fornication he must remain celibate.

J.T. asserted that two laws are involved in marriage: God's law and man's law. He contended that a man could be "loosed" by man's law yet "bound" by God's law. But "man's law," that allows divorce, IS "God's law." It came from God!

Herod and Herodias

J.T wrote,

According to the law of the land, she married Philip, divorced him and married Herod. In man's sight, she was Herod's wife. In God's sight it was an unlawful arrangement. The text says, "for he (Herod) had married her." Yet John the Baptist said, "she is your brother Philip's wife." Twist it any way you want to, it still comes out bound to Philip, married to Herod.

Obviously, J.T. is the one doing the twisting. Herodias was not still bound/married to Philip. I used 2 Samuel 12:9 to show that the language did not mean they were still married. J.T. replied,

Be careful, Robert, someone who is mentally deranged will read what you said and decide to kill someone in order to get their husband. Again, you are whittling on God's end of the stick.

The only reason I brought these characters up was to prove that the Scriptures' speaking of Herod's brother's wife was no proof that in God's eyes they were still married after divorce. Surely J.T. understood the point. But, once again, not having an answer, he had to avoid the argument. However, unwittingly he brings up something that is a conundrum for his teaching. His doctrine--the idea that only death and divorce for fornication releases one to marry--can be taken advantage of by one who is willing to do evil (murder). Thus, there is a loophole in J.T.'s doctrine, which is evidence that God didn't author it.

The marriage of Herodias and Herod was unlawful (Leviticus 20:21), period, and not just "in God's sight." J.T. invented the "loosed but still bound" theory in his efforts to harmonize Paul's teachings with his false idea of what Jesus taught.

Now, if Herodias had been married to someone besides Herod's brother, the passage would not apply and the marriage would not have been unlawful. Remember, Jesus was amenable to the law he was teaching. That law allowed a divorced woman to "go be another man's wife." Yet J.T. uses this text (Mark 6:18) to support the idea that John is teaching new law (the same law J.T. says Jesus taught, which he says wasn't applicable UNTIL the new kingdom), i.e. that Herodias was still bound in the eyes of God to Herod's brother. Of course, J. T. insists that his doctrine does not have Jesus contradicting the Law, but it does. To get around this conundrum, in the first debate he argued that Matthew 19:9 didn't apply to those to whom it was spoken, but would apply only in the new kingdom. We are expected to believe that Jesus' teaching didn't apply to those to whom Jesus spoke BUT JOHN'S DID? J.T. has John teaching what he says Jesus could not and did not teach the people, because it was contradictory to the Law. Did John's rebuke to Herod not apply to Herod, J.T.?

J.T.'s answers to my questions:

Question 1

J.T. said I did not answer his question regarding how many times one may be divorced and remarried. He also stated that if I answer in my final article he will not get to answer. But he has already answered. In fact, he answered for me when he said: "As many times as one is willing to repent..." Of course, he then brought up an irrelevant issue: an "adulterous relationship." But only if divorce does not do what God intended it to do (free the parties to marry another) is a subsequent marriage "adulterous." Now, we agree that God intends for people to keep their vows. But, for various reasons, marriages end in divorce. And sometimes it is best--God is a divorcee. But the theory that one must divorce his spouse for fornication to have the right to marry again is laden with problems. The only support for it is tradition that says Jesus taught it. It is rather obvious that PAUL didn't teach it. Nevertheless, J.T. labored very hard to make it so appear.

Question 2

J.T. knows his teaching punishes the innocent so he couldn't forthrightly answer this question. He knows that it is not consistent with God's character to punish a person for the sin of another. He also knows that God has never given a law that requires the punishment of those who are innocent.

Question 3

J.T. admits he has a problem with the "innocent's being punished with celibacy," but refuses to accept and acknowledge that HIS doctrine punishes them. He tried to justify his actions by saying it is GOD'S BUSINESS and accuses me of trying

to change the Bible. J.T. has made comments that make me wonder if it is even possible for him to question his doctrine as being anything but the standard.

J.T., you can't compare your practice of punishing innocent people, whose spouses divorce them, to things WE have no control over. We have control over what we determine to be truth. You made the decision to forbid marriage for some, but your conclusion and actions do not change the facts or truth. The problem this question presents for your doctrine will not go away.

Question 4

J.T., the very fact that you insist that only those who divorce their spouse for fornication may marry, is indication that getting to the court house first is a big issue. Your mention of how you encourage people to work out their problems and stay married was nothing but a dodge of my question. In cases wherein both spouses have committed fornication, the one who gets to the court house first and divorces "for fornication" is the only one that you say may marry. Even though you might do your best to help them work things out your teaching encourages divorce.

Question 5 "Was Israel, whom God divorced, allowed to marry another?"

J.T. answered, "No, they were not." He then explained that the reason they "might be married to another...was not because God had divorced them." Nevertheless, God DID divorce them and they WERE allowed to marry another. The section below deals with the text J.T. vainly sought to explain to his advantage:

Romans 7:1-4

Paul speaks to people who knew the Law—Jews who had become Christians. They would understand his teachings. Paul said, "The Law has dominion over a man as long as he liveth." Did Paul mean the Law could not be changed or ended and a man was bound by it till death? No, for the Law had already been changed by Christ (Eph. 2:14-16; Heb. 8:6-13, 9:17). Since Paul was not making the point that men would be under the Law until death, on what basis can we conclude that a woman is *bound* to a man by the law of marriage even when that marriage no longer exists? Is it because Paul speaks of *death* as destroying the bondage? Does this point negate the fact that *divorce* destroys the bondage? J.T. labored diligently to prove that the believer is still under bondage after divorce, if it was not "for fornication." But I prefer to believe what the text says. At any rate, Paul used "death" to make his point and the fact that he did not mention "divorce" in no way lends support to the idea that only death ends a marriage. Who but Catholics believes that anyway?

Indeed, if a woman *leaves* her husband or he "*puts her away*," and then she marries another man, she will be an adulteress. Why? Because she is under the law of her husband—the marriage covenant. Since this text is not about divorce and remarriage Paul merely makes his point about the change of law by comparing death in marriage to becoming dead to the law, which freed those that were under it to be “married to another” (Rom. 7:4; Gal. 2:19).

God was married to Israel (Jer. 3:14), but he divorced her for unfaithfulness and unwillingness to repent. Yet she could marry another even though her husband (God) was still living. If the passage teaches what some insist, then these Hebrews who had married Christ would be in an adulterous union with Christ. But the passage teaches the opposite—it teaches these Hebrews can “be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead.” So God’s previous wife, Israel, who was divorced for unfaithfulness, is now being given as a bride to another—Jesus Christ. Teachers who do not see and believe that a divorce does what God intended it to do have trouble accepting Paul’s statement: “For I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ” (2 Cor. 11:2b). This applied to all, including Hebrews who had been married to God but were divorced.

In the text under study, Paul’s intention was to get the Hebrews to come out from under the Law of Moses and to be married to Christ or come under the law of Christ. This is the same principle involved in Paul’s orders to let the “unmarried marry.” Those that could be married to Christ included the divorced who were unfaithful under the previous covenant.

In explaining what I believe to be the meaning of "put away" I said, "... The one 'put away' is not sent away because of unfaithfulness. That was not what Jesus said. The sending away was because of fornication, i.e. incest or other illegal marriages, such as Herod's and Herodias." In his reply, J.T. gave the definition again and asserted that "illegal marriage" is not part of the definition of *porneia*. He charged that I make up my own definitions. This is laughable because "incest" (in his definition) was/is an illegal union, whether the couple were married or not, and we have Bible examples in both cases.

I Corinthians 7:10-11

J.T. shamefully tried to make it appear that Paul taught what J.T. says Jesus taught. But Paul was merely saying that what he was teaching was by inspiration, rather than opinion, and Paul did not say anything about the need for a divorce to be for fornication before it was recognized. J.T. also continued to ignore that the woman had merely departed or left—she had not been divorced. And he admitted that words (like "unmarried") can have different meanings determined by the context.

J.T. wrote, "It appears that Robert is going to continue to teach his God-defying doctrine." The only thing my position defies is the tradition that J.T. has unsuccessfully sought to defend, which to him is the same thing as Scripture (the Standard), and any argument that contradicts it must be explained away or ignored.

If you have open-mindedly weighed the arguments in this debate then you are aware that J.T.'s "studied conclusion" has numerous problems that he was unable to solve. The following are some of the most devastating: 1) His position has Moses teaching what God didn't want, Jesus contradicting Moses, Paul contradicting Jesus and Paul contradicting himself; 2) In speaking of the unmarried (which includes the divorced), Paul said "let them marry"; 3) Paul classified J.T.'s doctrine that forbids marriage for some as "doctrines of devils"; and 4) J.T.'s doctrine, that punishes even those who are innocent, breaks up homes, destroys families, drives people away from Christ and his church and causes much discord and division--all while it is asserted that Jesus is the author of this confusion (1 Cor. 14:33). Is there any wonder God classified J.T.'s doctrine as he did (1 Tim. 4:1-3)? In view of the problems that I have noted how can J.T.'s doctrine possibly be true?

Debate completed: February 2011

Robert Waters
26140 Hwy 23
Huntsville, AR 72740

www.TotalHealth.bz

RobertWaters@yahoo.com