

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Matthew 5:32****Matthew 5:32, on: 2005/8/21 7:26**

A modern dictionary has thrown up these definitions of fornication and adultery. Particularly fornication, in not mentioning the unmarried status of one or both parties, reads like muddy water to me, when trying to make sense of Matthew 5:32.

fornication

(noun) : consensual sexual intercourse between two persons not married to each other ; compare ADULTERY

adultery

(noun) : voluntary sexual intercourse between a married man and someone other than his wife or between a married woman and someone other than her husband also : an act of adultery

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.

We all know that the modern church takes this use of the word 'fornication' to mean *after the consummation of the marriage has taken place*, but **my main question is**, how is it then, that this woman can be married by another and they are *not* committing adultery the same as if she has been divorced for some other reason?

Until last night, I was completely clear in my mind, that the reason it was ok to divorce the woman (and not be causing her to commit adultery) was that she had committed the fornication BEFORE she was married.

Help?

Re: Matthew 5:32, on: 2005/8/21 8:22

The basic consensus of most scholars, is that because she was not divorced for a 'Biblically legal' reason (fornication/adultery), then in God's covenant of marriage, the Divorce is not a legal divorce so, she is still married to this nut-job that dumped her, for no good Scripturally legal reason.

And if this ever happens to some poor lady out there ... I can guarantee you, that God will "WORK ALL THINGS OUT TOGETHER FOR THE GOOD TO THOSE WHO LOVE HIM AND ARE CALLED ACCORDING TO HIS PURPOSE."

He sees the beginning from the end, and he knows what's going to happen before it happens, and if this poor lady is right with God, then He has good reason to allow this situation to happen to her.... that only He knows, and we may not know 'why' until we see Him, but in the meantime ... this should draw her closer to the Lord, who is her Eternal Husband any ways.

Paul, had even said, "better not to marry", so you can more fully live for the Lord 1 Corth 7.

I guess for that poor lady (or man), that's where the "test of faith" would really come in and where the rubber meets the road on their staying pure before God.

I suppose it's a sad state, but knowing that marriage is just temporary anyway, and life is just a breath or vapor, then Looking for our Savior to spend Eternity with HIM, outweighs this earthly relationship with another human, by a million fold.

Single women or men, according to Paul, can have a deeper or more 'freed-up time' with the Lord.

Doesn't of course make marriage bad, but I think Paul explains it better himself in 1 Corth 7.

Worse things can happen, then not being able to get married again ;-)

Re: Matthew 5:32 - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/21 12:18

Quote:
-----A modern dictionary has thrown up these definitions of fornication and adultery.

a *dictionary*, and especially a **modern dictionary**, is always the last place to go when trying to understand biblical statements. ;-)

There has been some discussion on the topic previously in

(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id3334&forum36&post_id&refreshGo) Divorce and re-marriage; what does God say?

Re: Matt 5:32, on: 2005/8/21 12:35

Quote:
-----when trying to understand biblical statements

30 years ago, the definition in a 'modern dictionary' was different - I just couldn't find an old dictionary to quote...

The ease with which the Lord's words are repeated by Matthew, leads me to believe Jesus was not saying something new about marriage; although He doesn't specifically say public stonings should stop. That public stonings did stop, suggests to my mind that those early Christians understood forgiveness of one's past was total - 'but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified' 1 Cor 6:11.

Still, I need to be surer why Jesus separated fornication from adultery as a legit reason for divorce.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/21 12:47

Quote:
-----30 years ago, the definition in a 'modern dictionary' was different - I just couldn't find an old dictionary to quote...

I don't know that an older dictionary would have been much different. Fornication was usually defined as pre-marital sexual intercourse, and adultery as post-marital sexual intercourse. The point I was making is that, whatever the age of the dictionary, we cannot use them to define biblical words. That usually results in us getting our theology from a dictionary. The question is, as always, what does the Bible mean by these two words?

Re: Matt 5:32, on: 2005/8/21 13:58

Quote:
-----Fornication was usually defined as pre-marital sexual intercourse, and adultery as post-marital sexual intercourse.

I don't want to jump to any conclusions... In the Bible?

Quote:
-----The point I was making is that, whatever the age of the dictionary, we cannot use them to define biblical words. **That usually results in us getting our theology from a dictionary.** The question is, as always, what does the Bible mean by these two words?

Are you saying there **is significance** in the Lord's selection of the word 'fornication'?

EDIT added: sorry I missed the link in your earlier post. Will take a look, thanks. EDIT end.

Re., on: 2005/8/21 18:19

Dorcas,

Before you started this thread I gave you Thayer's definition of fornication.

We should NEVER look in Webster's for the definition of A Bible word.

It's the word, as I told ya, where we get our word "pornography".

I'll put it here again.

G4202

πορνεία

porneia

Thayer Definition:

1) illicit sexual intercourse

1a) adultery, fornication, homosexuality, lesbianism, intercourse with animals etc.

1b) sexual intercourse with close relatives; Lev. 18

1c) sexual intercourse with a divorced man or woman; Mar_10:11,Mar_10:12

2) metaphorically the worship of idols

2a) of the defilement of idolatry, as incurred by eating the sacrifices offered to idols

Part of Speech: noun feminine.

A Related Word by Thayer's/Strong's Number: from G4203

and being from 4203, here is that one ...

G4203

πορνεύω

porneuō

Thayer Definition:

1) to prostitute one's body to the lust of another

2) to give one's self to unlawful sexual intercourse

2a) to commit fornication

3) metaphorically to be given to idolatry, to worship idols

3a) to permit one's self to be drawn away by another into idolatry

Part of Speech: verb

A Related Word by Thayer's/Strong's Number: from G4204

And on it goes, from 4202, to, from this 4204 coming from 4205 and on .

Please get the e-sword or something, so you have a Greek/Hebrew quick dictionary and if anyone else ever gives you Webster's again

Pass this on to them. Webster's is not Greek, Hebrew or Aramaic. And "Hoy Vey !" :evil:

Love you friend,

me again

Gotta edit here, new info received.

If ya can't download e-sword, just go 'wherever' and at the least get/have a Strong's Concordance, with Dictionary in back.

Dictionaries and Concordances are NOT "Commentaries".

Love you !!! :-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/21 18:28

Quote:

-----EDIT added: sorry I missed the link in your earlier post. Will take a look, thanks. EDIT end.

I'll let you do that first, then if you want to ask the questions again, please do.

Re: Matt 5:32, on: 2005/8/21 23:11

EDIT: 1st sentence 2nd paragraph: added 'who' and the parenthesis.

Hi Annie,

The definitions I posted in this thread, are transferred from the thread 'divorce statistics'.

I needed to use them here, to show how Christians (me included) who aren't used to dealing in the original languages or culture, may inadvertently add many assumptions to a strong Bible concept.

MrBillPro kindly posted the aforementioned definitions and I'm not sure which dictionary he used.

The definition you sent me earlier, only proved I could not use either it, *or* an English dictionary, to justify the way I read that verse, in which I see Jesus upholding virginity as a starting place for marriage.

Re: Matthew 5:32 - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/8/22 8:19

Adultery is the undermining of God's plan. Any deviation is adultery of the heart. If you have gotten off His path, you are undermining, or adulterating it. Any sexual relationship outside the marriage of one man and one woman is adultery.

Webster was great, but his book is slowly getting corrupted. It's ridiculous some of the words being included.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/8/22 11:47

letsgetbusy

Quote:

-----Any sexual relationship outside the marriage of one man and one woman is adultery.

I may be misunderstanding what you are saying here but I don't think this is sustainable. While there is a case for arguing that 'fornication' (as used biblically) may include all sexual immorality inside or outside of marriage, 'adultery' would always mean the betraying of the marriage bond and hence really only applicable to someone within a marriage. So 'adultery' would be a sin 'within' marriage but 'fornication' could well include sin 'within and outside' of a marriage union.

Re:, on: 2005/8/22 13:18

Quote:

-----Re: Matthew 5:32
by letsgetbusy on 2005/8/22 8:19:18

Adultery is the undermining of God's plan. Any deviation is adultery of the heart. If you have gotten off His path, you are undermining, or adulterating it. Any sexual relationship outside the marriage of one man and one woman is adultery.

Hey Philo,

Letsgetbusy has the Idea of marriage etc. right.

Just because he didn't use the word of your choice (#'s 3431 or 3429 or 3430), doesn't mean that he wasn't using 4202, that was above his post.

Maybe "the 'Spirit' of the law" should be seen in other's posts more than the {your} letter of the law.

G4202

πορνεία

porneia

Thayer Definition:

1) illicit sexual intercourse

1a) adultery, fornication, homosexuality, lesbianism, intercourse with animals etc.

1b) sexual intercourse with close relatives; Lev. 18

1c) sexual intercourse with a divorced man or woman; Mar_10:11,Mar_10:12

2) metaphorically the worship of idols

2a) of the defilement of idolatry, as incurred by eating the sacrifices offered to idols

Philo ~

Could you or someone else tell me, were you appointed at one time or another to be an Overseer here ? I'm just curious, because I haven't seen any one else on here behave as you do ? I am still reasonably new here, so it is possible that I don't know all the 'inside' stuff yet, of who's who in the Zoo.

I know you have your own site and forum, but what exactly is your position here ?

Thanks if you or someone else could fill this half-newbie in.

Annie

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/8/22 13:53

Hi GrannieAnnie,

Quote:

-----I know you have your own site and forum, but what exactly is your position here ?

Thanks if you or someone else could fill this half-newbie in.

Ron is not formally an overseer of these forums but has contributed tremendously to the content and subjects over the last many months. I personally have greatly appreciated his insight into the various subjects and it has been of great personal help to me.

I have been watching you two go back and forth and wonder if you know each other some how? Based upon what I can see you have a pretty good grip on things but I think you are a little too defensive. I've been there with Ron myself. I have learned to just take things in stride and pretend we are discussing these issues over a cup of coffee or something (I don't drink coffee :-P).

Iron sharpens Iron. If we keep the dialogue at a lesser tone we can all learn from each other. If not- we don't accomplish anything.

Have enjoyed your contributions so far!

God Bless,

-Robert

Re:, on: 2005/8/22 14:20

Hi Robert,

Yes, I know you are on his Forum too.

It's more like 'years' more than months and I don't doubt that he's "contributed".

It was on the thread "Getting along with our Gifts" that Philo caused me the most hurt and grief and over something that had nothing to do with anything.

I'm sorry - I believe in speaking Openly as a "Family" and not through PMs, as I see it this way What is done out in Public, should be exposed or taken care of in Public, as Paul did with Peter.

Then on the Hunger for the Word thread, actually the title was "Teach a man to fish.....", he came after me again over something that was so silly I can't even fathom what ruffled his feathers, and no one else could either, but it blew the spirit of that thread also.

I could see if either of those threads were blatant Heresy, but the Gifts one was for the sake of Respecting each other and Unity and the Fish one was just to encourage folks to be Bereans so what was the problem with those two motives, if there was no Heresy in them ?

It not "defensiveness" for MYSELF that you are seeing, but for TRUTH.

I could care less what anyone says about me, as a person, I am nothing ... but when truth from "Anybody" is twisted and turned by hairspitting and the "heart or spirit" of the poster or the post is UNSEEN, that is what will cause me to get 'defensive' in "defense" of TRUTH and Unity.

I am learning a lot from many of the posters here and I agree, iron does sharpen iron, and I had done a big study on that one, because others on another forum were using that verse as an excuse to cut each other into pieces.

That's NOT what that verse was intended for.

No, we don't know each other as I believe you asked or wondered, but I may know you a little, if you're the same Robert from TF, years ago ?

I'll PM you on that one or you could me,,, but in any case, I also have enjoyed your posts.

I too will jump onto a thread with what seems to be a whip (ha) sometimes, but only if it is a Major issue that could do big harm to other's.

But not to "SPLIT-HAIRS" and destroy or distract from the "Heart or spirit of a thread" as Philo has done with me and others.

I am not talking behind his back, as some use PMs for ... which God DOES SEE ... but I believe to speak in public and before the Body, so that people like you can come on and shed light, as the way the Body 'should' function.

I love posts from certain brothers here and just Read and glean in silence, to let their posts sink in.

But though I've seen several posts where I didn't agree with Philo or others, I kept quiet.

I won't go around to split hairs with anyone, like I said, Unless it is Very crucial to protect another from hurt.

I HATE CONTENTION AND IT MAKES ME LITERALLY PHYSICALLY SICK BECAUSE I AM PHYSICALLY SICK.

HA - Not yelling brother, just wanted to be sure that was known, by others, not you. :-D.

I cry for UNITY more in my posts than anything, even asked for that with Philo on that Gifts thread, but

Anyhow, Thank you for contributing here and thank you for being upright and honest with me and in public.... as it should be.

Lord Bless.

Annie

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/8/22 15:11

Hi GrannieAnnie,

I understand. Yet, I know maybe sometimes Ron comes off that way, but over time I have learned that it is just how he responds to things.

My experience conversing with Ron has lead me to see that he has a good reason usually to challenge certain things we say even if to us it seems petty. I suppose he would call himself a 'pedant'. He especially has a history of being zealous over the use of biblical terms. This keeps the real meaning of those terms in step with scripture, and biblical concepts biblical.

At first, we had some majorly sharp exchanges. I have written tractates that took 4 hours to complete just the text and would log on and debate various topics. The insane thing is that I am shocked how closely we actually view topics once the **smoke** cleared. I felt horrible as I viewed him as hostile to my beliefs, when in reality we shared many the same views.

Topics we frequently discuss include what the biblical concept of the 'flesh' really is. He will tell you he does not give answers, but explanations. Therefore I still don't know where he stands on the issues, I only know we have dug it out to almost no end.

His eschatological views are not in step with mainstream Tim Lahay or Hal Lindsay.

He is very very learned. I have mistakenly underestimated him before on many occasions. I don't do that these days.

I have enjoyed his teachings on audio also. You will find one of my favorite messages (<http://69.44.157.77/sermons/SID1832.mp3>) here on 'justification'.

Say, I have to ask, where does the name 'GrannieAnnie' come from? My wife's name is Anna.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re:, on: 2005/8/22 17:33

Hi Robert,

Thank you for taking this time with me and for the sake of peace and the Body, in general.

I'm sorry to take so long to answer. The phone rang, the cats are crazy and things got going here.

I have to admit, I didn't know the definition of your word 'pedant', and had to look it up in the e-sword's Webster's. Here's what it says

Quote:
-----Pedant

PED'ANT, n.

1. A schoolmaster.
 2. A person who makes a vain display of his learning.
-

#1 ~ I'm cool with, and well, you can guess on #2 :-D .

I wish it weren't time for me to go get supper cooked, but I thought, I'd just re-post an appeal I made to Philo, from off of that 'Gifts' thread, to also show where my head/heart is at, as you've tried to do on his behalf here.

And again ... I sincerely thank you for your efforts on everyone's behalf here.
God Bless you !!

Quote of prior post

One more explanation.

I have no intent to start a thread where anyone can not reply to.
I love open discussion, I just am a bit burnt out on Debates.

When I first signed on here, I said I had been on a Theological Debate Forum, thinking it would be fun, because I was br and new to Computers and all.

Then I posted here that, some doctrinal debates went on for years, Greek and all, and I saw, that even with Greek, people would find they'd disagree on transliteration, grammar disputes, etc. etc. ad nauseum, so after only one year on Computers, I went off line for almost 2 years, to seek God in the matter, because the lack of Love, and Unity, caused by these "debates", caused my health to go down... in more ways than one.

I had a phobia of Forums ever since, because those "debates" were such a bad testimony or witness. Especially when it gets into Greek, etc. because it loses the general audience or leaves out too many Saints from the conversation and know from the past, that even with the Greek, folks won't agree.

If someone came on here and denied the Deity of Christ, I would hope you (Philo) and I could work together to dispute that heresy. Or any other 'Major' Doctrine within our general Statement of Faith, but to just banter over minors, I can't do anymore.

It's not against you Philo, I believe, but as I've stated, "I believe EVERY CHRISTIAN on this site has gifts that we all need. And Greek, etc. leaves too many out and I like talking with all here.

I need fellowship more than most, because as I've said, I am disabled and pretty much homebound ... so it's 'not' that I don't want anyone posting with me It's just the opposite, I 'want' fellowship and love it, more than words can say.

But a certain post was made recently on this forum from someone in charge, that moved my heart and I felt comfortable with.

I'll quote it here

Quote:

"These forums are not the best place to debate and look for controversy. But rather a place to come alongside each other and seek the face of Jesus."

That was just one of the type statements, that attracted me to this forum.

Only if it's a 'major' doctrine, do I feel we may need to get into so-called "debate".

I'm a Pre-mil-Post-trib believer, but I won't debate that, unless someone asked me to just "discuss it" with them. Just for one.

I don't hold the OSAS belief, but I won't get into that argument either. I don't think it's needed, but just that folks seek the Lord with all their hearts.

My burden is for Growth, Doctrinal Purity and Last Days stuff, but I pray to not battle on minors. I pray not to battle at all.

My only point here with this thread was, to encourage All posters, that they All have gifts (whether cessationist or not, they still have gift-burdens), and to encourage that we consider that when we disagree, that 'maybe' it's just their gift's burden that is causing the disagreement, and not to judge them, as anything less than ourselves.

I don't know how else to explain myself.

For a change (ha) I've finally run out of words.
(now that's a switch :)

I'd just rather encourage each believer in their own gift, and leave this with 1Corth. 12:14-27

End Quote.

And I thought of something funny for all of us, maybe even Philo too.

The very first post I typed on this Forum, on my first day here, I said, (about the bickering going on here, that they were discussing on Eli's thread under Announcements, I think) ... that we should have a "Locked thread" for those who bicker, so it wouldn't be out in the view of the general public.

Well, listen to this idea (funny) - How about we make some money for SI, and make a locked forum called the Philo-Annie Ring and if anyone wants to watch us, (do whatever it is that we do to each other), they can pay Greg \$20.00 bucks, to get the code to have access to that thread.

You could be the bell ringer between "rounds".

Ha ~ Now how's that for an idea ?

All in good fun, my friend.

Cherio, pip-pip, for now.

Love,
Annie

Re: - posted by Manfred, on: 2005/8/22 19:30

Quote:

-----Fornication was usually defined as pre-marital sexual intercourse, and adultery as post-marital sexual intercourse.

Ron,

That is my understanding too, but can it be substantiated by the Word ? I'd like to know.

Manfred

Re: Matt 5:32, on: 2005/8/22 21:41

Manfred,

Early in the thread, Ron gave a link, within which there are other links to previous discussions.

(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmode=flat&order=0&topic_id=3334&forum=36&post_id=&refresh=Go) http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmode=flat&order=0&topic_id=3334&forum=36&post_id=&refresh=Go

Re: Matt 5:32, on: 2005/8/22 23:47

Because Dorcas asked about Matt. 5:32, the word used in that verse was ...

G4202

πορνεία

porneia

Thayer Definition:

1) illicit sexual intercourse

1a) adultery, fornication, homosexuality, lesbianism, intercourse with animals etc.

1b) sexual intercourse with close relatives; Lev. 18

1c) sexual intercourse with a divorced man or woman; Mar_10:11,Mar_10:12

2) metaphorically the worship of idols

2a) of the defilement of idolatry, as incurred by eating the sacrifices offered to idols

Strong's G4202

πορνεία

porneia

por-ni'-ah

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

:-? the definition hasn't changed since page 1, has it ?

Re: Matt 5:32, on: 2005/8/23 1:19

Hi Annie,

I believed I had previously understood this verse correctly - in its cultural setting - to be a condemnation of pre-marital sex. Manfred has joined, with the same understanding, so I am not alone. Yay! 8-)

I will come back with questions if the links don't clear them up.

dorcas said

Quote:

-----the way I read that verse I see Jesus upholding virginity as a starting place for marriage

We know Jesus came to fulfil the law.

Re: Matt 5:32 - posted by Manfred, on: 2005/8/23 7:11

Quote:

-----We know Jesus came to fulfil the law.

I don't think that it means that Jesus came to keep the law. What I understand is that Jesus was the fulfillment of the law. Just like the cross was the fulfillment of the feast of the Passover, and Pentecost (Acts 2) was the fulfillment of the feast of Pentecost.

Manfred

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/8/23 8:13

Hi GrannieAnnie,

Quote:

-----Cherio, pip-pip, for now.

Sorry I didn't get this part?

Re: Matt 5:32, on: 2005/8/23 9:56

Quote:

-----I don't think that it means that Jesus came to keep the law. What I understand is that Jesus was the fulfillment of the law.

Manfred,

I know what you mean about the fulfilment of the law, but there was something else going on too, when He said this sort of thing:

Matthew 12

11 Then He said to them, "What man is there among you who has one sheep, and if it falls into a pit on the Sabbath, will not lay hold of it and lift it out?"

12 "Of how much more value then is a man than a sheep? Therefore it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath."

This is thrown into sharp relief by the arch-lawkeepers (or makers of man-made 'law') in their immediate reaction.....

14 Then the Pharisees went out and plotted against Him, how they might destroy Him.

He was 'keep'ing the law at a spiritual level which, was soo 'New Covenant', it showed up the state of heart of those Old Covenant keepers.

With regard to Matthew 5:32, if anyone was qualified to look another man in the eye and say something about fornication being unacceptable, it was Him. That's really all I was meaning by my mention of the law - to draw attention to the *fact* that He was indeed keeping it as well as fulfilling it.

Fornication prior to marriage had always been against the law for Jews, but if there is a good reason for Him to mention it here, it is to bring the Gentiles on to the same ground.

Another thing I've noticed in Matthew is his quoting from Isaiah, prophecies which spoke promises to the Gentiles. Until I understood Matthew is known for writing to the Jews, I didn't really 'see' this significance; it is as if he is saying to the Jews they need to grasp the truth now, for it has already been passed to the rest of the world.

Re: Mat 5:32 - posted by Manfred, on: 2005/8/23 11:04

You may have a point. But I note that the word "lawful" in Mt.12:12 does not come from the word "law" (nomimos), but is a composite word (exesti) of "ek" and "eimi" which should be better translated "permitted" as it is used elsewhere.

Manfred

Re: Matthew 5:32, on: 2005/8/23 11:44

Quote:
-----You may have a point. But I note that the word "lawful" in Mt.12:12 does not come from the word "law" (nomimos), but is a composite word (exesti) of "ek" and "eimi" which should be better translated "permitted" as it is used elsewhere.

Ah! Thank you for further insight, from your scholarly answer. :-)

I've just read the document recommended by RonB through a link which came a little way into the discussion he recommended. It can be found here.

(<http://www.rbc.org/ds/q0806/q0806.html#point5>) <http://www.rbc.org/ds/q0806/q0806.html#point5>

I would be interested in whether it answers your earlier question.

Quote:
-----Ron,

That is my understanding too, but can it be substantiated by the Word ? I'd like to know.

Manfred

What do you think?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/8/23 12:06

Quote:
-----Until I understood Matthew is known for writing to the Jews, I didn't really 'see' this significance; it is as if he is saying to the Jews they need to grasp the truth now, for it has already been passed to the rest of the world.

I understand this position, but it is helpful to realise that before Acts 10 the entire Church was comprised of Jews with the exception of some 'God fearing Gentiles' who had assimilated into Judaism. Jesus was teaching Jews primarily and pointed this out when he told the woman it was not meet to give that which was holy to the 'dogs.' Whether they be Samaritan or Greek, etc.

I believe it to be consistent with the whole of the revelation of the New Testament that Christ came to 'fulfill' the Law, not to destroy it. His 'life' put into practice what the letter was powerless to present. This is what I see in John 1. He was the embodiment of the Law. He is our example in all things. His life was an expression of the fullness of the Spirit- both in fruits and gifts. And as it is written, "... as many as are led by the Spirit THEY are the sons of God." The letter killeth- but the Spirit giveth life.

The doing away with the 'law' was not to open the floodgates to antinomianism. The reason being is that we were called up to a higher place of Spirit filled living- that flowed with the personality of God. This is the demonstration of the outwork

ing of the nature of God in the life of the Spirit filled believer. It is called 'fulfilling all righteousness'.

Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law. (Romans 3:31)

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

And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him.

Imagine that through our life of walking in the Spirit we are actually 'fulfilling' the law of God. In the life of Christ it was both a demonstration (fulfillment) of the Law in terms of the original intent of its requirements- in conjunction with 'fulfillment' of the 'predictive prophetic' aspect of certain prophecies within the law. I believe there to be a study here in that we cannot separate the one from the other. The 'prophetic' things of God consist both in fruits and gifts. In the sunful and deceptive world in which we live we need the gifts of the Spirit in operation so that we can fulfill the place that God has called us as believers. You need look no farther than the gift of 'discernment' to see how having that one gift in operation within the Church and our lives individually will keep us from much stumbling.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: Matthew 5:32, on: 2005/8/23 13:29

Quote:
-----I understand this position, but it is helpful to realise that before Acts 10 the entire Church was comprised of Jews with the exception of some 'God fearing Gentiles' who had assimilated into Judaism...

I believe it to be consistent with the whole of the revelation of the New Testament that Christ came to 'fulfill' the Law, not to destroy it. His 'life' put into practice what the letter was powerless to present. This is what I see in John 1. He was the embodiment of the Law. He is our example in all things. His life was an expression of the fulness of the Spirit- both in fruits and gifts. And as it is written, "... as many as are led by the Spirit THEY are the sons of God." The letter killeth- but the Spirit giveth life.

...In the life of Christ it was both a demonstration (fulfillment) of the Law in terms of the original intent of its requirements- in conjunction with 'fulfillment' of the 'predictive prophetic' aspect of certain prophecies within the law...'

'His 'life' put into practice what the letter was powerless to present.'

Robert, I enjoyed this exposition, thank you. :-)

Re: Matthew 5:32, on: 2005/8/23 14:14

"Jesus said that divorce is wrong "except for sexual immorality." The Greek word He used was *porneia*, a term covering a wide range of sexual sins. When used in a sentence alongside *moicheia* (adultery), **it denoted a sexual sin involving at least one unmarried person or a perverted form of sexual behavior.** The feminine form of this word *porne* means "prostitute." The masculine *pornos* denoted either a man who was promiscuous or who engaged in perverted sexual behavior. On rare occasions, when specified by the context, it referred to a marriage of close relatives...

In sanctioning divorce for sexual immorality, Jesus also permitted remarriage for people thus divorced. A careful study of the Bible passages dealing with divorce makes clear a principle that we can apply: **Whenever a divorce occurs on grounds God has declared valid, that divorce carries with it the right of remarriage"**

The above quote is from (<http://www.rbc.org/ds/q0806/q0806.html#point5>) <http://www.rbc.org/ds/q0806/q0806.html#point5>

philologos,

Is this reference to an 'unmarried' person, part of the reason Jesus may be referring to pre-marital misdemeanour by the lady in question?

Do you think He means ONLY pre-marital misdemeanour, for the New Covenant?

Re: - posted by Manfred, on: 2005/8/23 16:58

Quote:
----- I've just read the document recommended by RonB through a link which came a little way into the discussion he recommended. It can be found here.

<http://www.rbc.org/ds/q0806/q0806.html#point5>

I would be interested in whether it answers your earlier question.

Quote:

Ron,

That is my understanding too, but can it be substantiated by the Word ? I'd like to know.

Manfred

What do you think?

The word "fornication" appears but once in this whole article, so I didn't find the answer to my question there; that is why I asked Ron about it.

Manfred

Re:, on: 2005/8/24 0:15

I'm sorry but ~ "We interrupt this program to bring a special bulletin" ...

Hey Robert up there.... Actually I said it wrong, it's from an old english saying for "see ya later" sort of thing.

Should have been pip-pip-cheerio ... or something closer to that.

We now bring you back to your regular programming.

(sorry for interrupting here folks):

Re:, on: 2006/5/28 11:45

Quote:

philologos wrote:
Fornication was usually defined as pre-marital sexual intercourse, and adultery as post-marital sexual intercourse.

this is completely UNTRUE....lets look to even an early church father who saw them as one and the same...

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

Even these fathers knew fornication is not simply premarital sex but whoredom in general by anyone, married or not.

fornication (whoredom) is not necessary "adultery" (if neither is married to another) but Adultery is, by the act of **ILLICIT** (unlawful) sexual intercourse, 'fornication' (whoredom).

also..

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

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

Re: Matthew 5:32, on: 2006/5/28 22:15

When philologos wrote the above quote, he was referring to the limitations of a dictionary definition, no matter how old, and not endorsing them at all, as adequate sources for biblical theology. Later in the thread, he gently disputed an oversimplification of the definition of adultery, saying

Quote:
-----While there is a case for arguing that 'fornication' (as used biblically) may include all sexual immorality inside or outside of marriage, 'adultery' would always mean the betraying of the marriage bond and hence really only applicable to someone within a marriage. So 'adultery' would be a sin 'within' marriage but 'fornication' could well include sin 'within and outside' of a marriage union.

As I re-interpret this, he is agreeing with you, that **fornication includes sexual sin committed by a married person** - whereas adultery alludes to the breaking of the marriage bond ONLY (whether with another married, or an unmarried person).

Is this clearer?

I note that at this stage in this thread, we had not discussed what Jesus had to say about adultery being a sin of the heart only, in some guilty of it - in the same way as He said calling one's brother a fool made one guilty of murder.

Re:, on: 2006/5/28 22:49

thanks for the clarification, linn.

I guess I've become a stickler for detail....a conditioned response due to too many evenings spent in discussion with over zealous legalists...