A Book of Errors Revised (Marriage, Divorce)

By Hugo McCord
January 2000

My long time friend, John Edwards, in whose home in St. Louis I have been a guest, has a sympathetic heart toward people with marriage problems. But it is sinful to allow a sympathetic heart to alter Jesus' teaching, which he has done in his book An In Depth Study Of Marriage And Divorce. He sent me a copy, and I wrote to him to reconsider and to return to "the old paths" where he formerly walked.

Instead, in a second edition he has only revised the wording of his errors, saying that his book is intended to help those … involved in divorce to realize that God still loves them, and they do not need to live lonely, guilt-ridden lives (p. 13).

It is true that God still loves them, and will forever, but "fornicators and adulterers God will judge" (Heb. 13:4). It is also true that fornicators and adulterers do not need to "live lonely, guilt-ridden lives," for "the Son of man has come to seek and to save the lost" (Luke 19:10). When in penitence they hate adultery and turn from it, they will be perfectly forgiven (Acts 22:16; 1 Cor. 6:9-11) and will "rejoice in the Lord" (Phil. 4:4).

Everyone can go to heaven if he wants to do so, but Jesus said that some would have to "make themselves eunuchs" (Matt. 19:12). Apparently Jesus and John Edwards differ about that matter, for in a lengthy book of 203 pages John not once cited what Jesus said about eunuchs.

On page 15 John makes an admirable statement: "We need to search God's word for His answers." But immediately John

turns, away from His answers to an emotional appeal to the readers' heart to make them sympathize with the much married who have two or more sets of children, and wants the readers to despise any preacher who would refuse to baptize them. John the immerser refused to baptize those who did not quit their sinning (Matt. 3:8), but John Edwards will baptize those married and divorced for any reason. He makes preachers who respect Jesus' words about marriage and divorce worse than murderers, saying they are sending souls to hell!" He quotes a preacher as saying a woman who had had three husbands as having too many "to even think of going to heaven." The preacher was wrong. Any one can go to heaven who wants to do so, as I have already proved. I am sorry that John leaves the impression that the woman at Jacob's well who had had five husbands was on the way to heaven.

John calls undoing "past marital mistakes" an "Evil Tree, whose fruit is corrupt." But if, according to Jesus, a marital mistake causes one to "commit adultery" (Matt. 19:9), yes, to be living in adultery (Col. 3:5-7), what will make the tree and its fruit good? Paul tells how adulterers and homosexuals at Corinth made the tree and its fruit good: they "were washed were sanctified … were justified" (1 Cor. 6:11).

Though God allowed David to keep Bathsheba (2 Sam. 11:27), and though God tolerated (cf. Acts 17:30) divorce for any cause and remarriage in the Old Testament (Deut. 24:1-4), and though he tolerated polygamy (2 Sam. 5:13; 1 Kings 11:3) in the Old Testament, that Old Testament has now been nailed to the cross (Col. 2:14). Then, the one of whom God said, "Hear ye him" (Matt. 17:5), made it clear that he repudiated polygamy (Matt. 19:4-5) and divorce (except for fornication) and remarriage (Matt. 19:9). What he said was directed to non-disciples (Matt. 19:3), but his disciples understood his "whosoever" as including everybody, and they were shocked, thinking that if marriage and divorce have such a rule, "it is not expedient to marry" (Matt. 19:10). John would have said that the number of

times one divorces and remarries does not matter (on p. 16 he cites an example of a woman who had six husbands).

However, Jesus thought that even one divorce and remarriage makes a difference, and that under some circumstances one must refrain from marriage, or quit a legal marriage, and make himself a eunuch by will power (Matt. 19:12).

On p. 18 John writes that the Bible says nothing about "adulterous marriages" or "living in adultery," but Matthew 19:9 is still in the Bible, saying that a certain divorcee on remarrying commits adultery, and Colossians 3:5-7 is still in the Bible, saying that some Colossians had formerly lived in adultery (cf. also Rom. 6:2; Eph. 2:3; Titus 3:3; 1 Pet. 4:2 on living in adultery).

On p. 18 John writes that "adultery in the gospel passages" is not "the physical sex act in marriage," but only "a violation of a covenant" (p. 50, and often). However, a covenant is broken in the first part of Matthew 19:9, "whosoever shall put away his wife." At the divorce he has broken his vow and his covenant, but according to Jesus (not John Edwards) he has not yet committed adultery, and does not until he remarries. Adultery in Jesus' eyes is not covenant breaking but is something that occurs after marriage.

On p. 21 John begins a discussion of Greek words, which is an admission that he needs something besides English translations to find his manufactured meaning of adultery. If we need to know Greek to understand marriage, billions of people are helpless.

In chapter 6 (p. 49-57) John, after citing figurative (Jer. 3:6-10) and mental adultery (Matt. 5:27-28), calls attention to the passive voice of moicheuthenai in Matthew 5:31-32. It is true the wife now discarded has not committed adultery, but in Jesus' eyes she has been "adulterated." The husband's breaking his covenant with her, Jesus does not call adultery,

but the husband has used her sexually and abandoned her, leaving her “adulterated.”

On p. 51 it is strange that John holds that moichatai in Matthew 19:9 is in the passive voice, for the verse would say, “Whosover divorces his wife, except for fornication, and marries another, is adulterized.” Also he asserts that the same word in Mark 10:11 is in the passive voice, which would make the verse read, “Whosover divorces his wife and marries another is adulterized against her.” Those senseless renditions do not appear if one says that moichatai is in the middle voice, calling for an active meaning, “he commits adultery,” and “he commits adultery against her.” The parallel in Luke 16:18 uses the active voice, moicheuei, “he commits adultery.” If one wants the whole truth, and is not simply trying to prove what he believes, he will by all means check the parallel readings in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. There is a way, by looking to ambiguous Greek grammar, and by checking only Matthew and Mark, to assert Matthew and Mark meant for moichatai to be taken as passive (though the resultant English translation is senseless) but the Greek grammar is not ambiguous in the word Luke wrote, moicheuei, and even John would say it could not be passive.

Further, to say that moichatai in Matthew 19:9 is point action (do you know of a commentator who says so?) would make adultery two legal steps (divorce and remarriage), and would declare that sex acts with the new spouse are not adultery. It is strange that Jesus used a word that commonly refers to a violation of the marriage bed and makes it refer only to two legal ceremonies. If the disciples listening to Jesus had understood that adultery is legal ceremonies, would they have said, “It is not expedient to marry”? According to John, it would be expedient to marry, with no risks involved: marriage would be easy to get into and out of. Some have seen a difficulty in giving moichatai a linear or durative meaning, because the physical act in adultery is not continuous.

However, the present tense in Greek not only can refer to point action (punctiliar) as in Matthew 13:14; 27:38, and to linear action (durative) as in Matthew 25:8; John 5:7, but also to iterative action (repetitive) as in Matthew 9:11, 14; 15:23; 1 Corinthians 15:31. Obviously if one is living in adultery the word iterative or repetitive is the correct description.

In John's search to find some proof of his thesis that adultery is covenant breaking, not sexual activity, he refers to Luke 16:18, "Every one who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery." However, if only the divorcing and remarrying ceremonies are the adultery, then if an innocent spouse divorces a spouse for fornication and remarries, that innocent person has committed adultery, for he or she has gone through the legal ceremonies that constitute adultery.

On p. 67f John quotes Greek scholars as saying that sometimes the present tense is point or punctiliar action, but it is noticeable that he quotes no Greek scholar who says that such is true of moichatai and moicheuei in Matthew 19:9; Mark 10:11; Luke 16:18. Incidentally, John uses denominational terminology in saying that "Church of Christ teachers and leaders" take his position. One whom he quotes, Raymond Kelcy, says, "There's not a great deal to be had on the tense of that verb, Matthew 19:9," but John bases his whole thesis on the possibility that that verb might be punctiliar. Further, surprisingly, John quotes Kelcy, "A person who enters an illegal marriage, an unscriptural marriage, does continue to commit adultery," but according to John only the divorcing and remarrying constitute adultery, and that no one ever continues to commit adultery after marriage. Kelcy and John do not agree.

John quotes Carroll Osburn, but Osburn fails to say that Matthew 19:9 must be considered as punctiliar, yet John's thesis depends wholly on what Osburn does not say. Osburn holds that Matthew 19:9 is a "gnomic present," in which Osburn

says “continuity may or may not be involved.” A “gnomic present,” according to Ernest De Witt Burton, Moods And Tenses, p. 8, expresses “customary actions and general truths.” So, Matthew 19:9 expresses the customary action and general truth that a remarrying divorcee (except for fornication) commits adultery. Osburn fails to help John.

John also quotes from Jack McKinney, and got some help, for McKinney said that Matthew 19:9 expresses “point action” (p. 70). However, McKinney contradicted himself, for he also said (as had Osburn) that Matthew 19:9 is a “gnomic present.” He cannot be right both ways. If Matthew 19:9 speaks of “point action” it does not use the “gnomic present.” McKinney also misused the word aoristic, apparently thinking it means point action. But the word aorist says that an act is unspecified as to the kind of action (whether punctiliar, repetitive, or durative). A gnomic present can be aoristic (no specification of the kind of action), but it cannot be punctiliar.

John pleads his case that Matthew 19:9 must be punctiliar, for he says that “the best Greek scholars” are with him, but none that he quoted says that Matthew 19:9 must be punctiliar. Then John (p. 73) quotes a Greek grammar that “simultaneous action relative to the main verb is ordinarily expressed by the present,” but in the case of Matthew 19:9; Mark 10:11; Luke 16:18 the action of the main verb is not ordinary: the action of the main verb is not simultaneous with the divorcing and the remarrying, for those actions are only legal ceremonies, and no lexicon or dictionary defines adultery as a legal ceremony. Adultery, a violation of the marriage bed, is not committed by divorcing and remarrying, but later. To interpret the gospel verses as point action is to eliminate adultery, for it is not committed in two legal ceremonies.

How refreshing in John’s book to come to chapter nine, “Homosexual Marriages” (p. 75-79). He is clear how sinful they are. But he is inconsistent. Homosexuals and lesbian marriage partners can appeal to John in exactly the same way he pleads

with his readers to approve those divorced and remarried unscripturally. I can hear homosexuals and lesbians turning John's words against himself: "Are we condemning people whom God wants to forgive? … let love and compassion rule over legalistic rules and judgments". (p. 18). They would say the same thing that John says, "Far worse than taking someone's life is sending their souls to hell! Christians, are you prepared to answer for the fruits of your teaching (against homosexuality) that drives people to hell?" (p. 16-17).

John is certain (p. 83) that God wants monogamy, and that Jesus pointed back to monogamy, but John on the mission field today would not teach polygamists to go back to monogamy.

John (p. 89) asks does divorce break the marriage? Legally of course it does, but it does not nullify the vow one made at his marriage to his spouse "until death doth us part." John's words on p. 93 have relevance here: "Our oral words mean just as much to God as our written documents." Jesus, not John, taught that a divorced person is not as free as a single person, for if a divorced (not for fornication) person marries, he commits fornication. Single people and divorced people are equal legally, but not in Jesus' eyes. John and Jesus disagree.

John (p. 95) says that "God recognizes the marriage dissolved when the spouse deserts the marriage," but Paul did not say that. In Paul's inspired words a deserted spouse does not any longer have a sexual obligation (a voluntary bondage, cf. 1 Corinthians 7:3-4, 15) to the former mate, but to interpret a deserted spouse (no fornication involved) as free to marry again is to contradict the Lord Jesus. Jesus did not give two reasons for divorce and remarriage, namely, fornication and/or desertion. Paul gave a release from marital obligation but he did not give a remarrying privilege.

It is refreshing to come to John's chapter fifteen, as he exposes the sins of pornography. But in the rest of his book

(p. 123-203) he is even more determined to prove a non-dictionary, arbitrary, self-made meaning of adultery, a meaning that will give comfort and peace to people that Jesus said are living in adultery. I would not want to be in John's shoes in the Day of Judgment. To destroy a weak brother or sister, for whom Christ died, is no light matter (1 Cor. 8:11). The first part of Romans 16:18 is not true of John and Olan Hicks, but the second part is true: "By their smooth and fair speech they beguile the hearts of the innocent."

11625 SW Vacuna Ct.
Portland, OR 97219-8903

Come to Dinner

by George W. DeHoff
Vol. 106, No. 02

Matthew 22:2-14, Luke 14:16-24

This parable could be called "The Parable of the Great Invitation" or "The parable of Frivolous Excuses." It is a call to dinner. "All things are ready, come."

"The kingdom of Heaven is like unto" (Matt. 22:2). Then He describes certain things about the kingdom of God. This is a judgment parable and contains these central thoughts: (1) The guilt of the Jewish nation for rejecting God's word; (2) God will have a people nevertheless; (3) Since the Jews rejected the gospel message, his servants invited others.

Standing out clearly in the scripture is the importance of the call. In both the Old and the New Testaments, feasts denote spiritual blessings. The feast in this parable is the gospel of the kingdom of heaven. Since this is a call of God to accept the gospel message, it is all important. The certain king of the parable points to the great God of the universe, the King of kings and Lord of lords. Since it is the King's dinner, the invitation is tremendously important.

In the second place, this call is important because the feast honors the King's son. Christ refers to Himself. He is the son of God. If the king was giving a dinner in honor of a servant perhaps the call to attend would not be so important, but he is honoring his son. This makes the invitation all important. To refuse the invitation dishonors the son.

The Bible teaches every knee should bow and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God, the Father (Phil. 2:10-11). Since this confession and homage is inevitable, we must either make the confession here or hereafter. We should gladly accept this great invitation.

Third, this call to dinner is important because of the immense preparation, "all things are ready" (Luke 14:17). Nothing is undone. Can we not see the great banquet table groaning under the load of luxurious delicacies? Nothing is omitted. No expense is spared. Calvary is an accomplished fact. The blood of the Lamb of God soaked into the wood of the cross, and dripped to the ground beneath the accursed tree.

"All things are ready." Think of what the great spiritual feast cost the Father. It cost His only begotten son. The preparation was most elaborate but very necessary. There was no other way for man to come to God to be forgiven. It took the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, the very son of God. What an important call and how tragic it is to reject it.

Fourth, the punishment of those who refused the call shows the

importance of the call to dinner. If it seems drastic for the disappointed king to send his armies to destroy those who rejected his invitation, and killed his servants, consider the importance of the invitation. If you think the man found at the supper table without a wedding garment was too severely punished for his neglect, weigh the significance of this invitation he had slighted.

Those who heard the call and rejected the invitation suffered severe punishment. Christ's prophecy, for the Jewish nation, came to pass in the year A.D. 70, when the Roman armies, under Titus, laid siege to the city of Jerusalem and razed it to the ground. The terrible destruction of Jerusalem in the first century of this age is a kind of prophecy of the utter destruction that awaits the impenitent at the close of this age. Modern day people should take note, and shudder.

This call is universal—to the Jew first, and also to the Greek (Rom. 1:16). In the parable under discussion the elite received the invitation. They turned it down with scorn and frivolous excuses. The King's servants then went out into the highways and hedges looking for guests. The Jews rejected Christ and cried, "His blood be on us and on our children" (Matt. 27:25). At first, the offer of salvation was to the Jews. When they rejected it, the teachers turned to the Gentiles.

The call was to dine at the great banquet table of the Lord. It is universal, God is not a respecter of persons. "Whosoever will" is the language of the scriptures. His loyal servants are still delivering the message all over the world that whosoever will may come to Christ and obey His gospel. It is a message of love, and freedom. Thank God, everyone has an invitation to attend this great wedding feast.

This call is for preparation. Orientals wore long white robes at public festivals. Those who appeared with any other garments were culpable, and punished. The wedding garment is

the righteous deeds of the saints. If we obey the commands of Jesus to believe and be baptized the promise of salvation from past sin is ours (Mark 16:16). If we are faithful at all costs, we will receive a crown of life (Rev. 2: 10). Obedience to the plan of salvation, and clean living, and faithful service are the right clothes for this feast. N& one attended this banquet with improper robes. Common clothes would insult the king, and dishonor his son. If we are to enjoy the great blessings of God we must make preparation. Why should anyone appear in filthy rags when clean garments are available? “He that is unrighteous, let him do unrighteousness still: and he that is filthy, let him be made filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him do righteousness still: and he that is holy, let him be made holy still” (Rev. 22:11).

This call also contains a warning. Much of our Lord’s teaching is interspersed with warnings. Those first bidden began to make excuses—feeble, flimsy, foolish, frivolous excuses. Verse 7 tells the consequences of the refusal of the call to dinner: “But when the king heard thereof, he was wroth; and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murders, and burned up their city.” Verse 13 tells what happened to the poor fellow who tried to get by with unfit garb: “Bind him hand and foot, and take him. away, and cast him into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.”

These things are for our admonition. Transgression deserves severe punishment. Notice that these people “made light of it and went their ways.” Some took his servants and treated them shamefully, slaying them. One man came, “not having on a wedding garment.” These words speak disaster. The call of God contains a warning. It is tragical to go about your business as if nothing happened. You can enjoy a feast of good things at the Father’s table. It’s up to you!

The Blood of Christ (Outline)

By Victor M. Eskew
Vol. 111, No. 03

I. Introduction.

A. Jesus shed blood at Gethsemane, in the halls of Pilate, and at Calvary.

B. Christians remember his blood each Lord's Day.

C. Peter called it "precious" blood (1 Pet. 1:19).

1. The word precious means "dear, valuable, costly."

2. The blood of Jesus is invaluable.

II. The Precious Blood of the Lamb.

A. The blood was real.

1. While on earth, Jesus had a human body of flesh, blood, and bones (John 1:14; Phil. 2:5-8; Luke 24:39).

2. Jesus' blood, like ours, was composed of red cells, white cells, platelets, and plasma. It was real blood.

B. The blood was royal.

1. He was of the house and lineage of David, whose dynasty continues to the end of time (Isa. 9:7; Luke 1:32-33).

2. His kingship was mocked during his crucifixion (Mark 15:16-20).

3. Jesus was raised from the dead to sit on his eternal throne (Dan. 7:13-14; Acts 2:32-36).

4. Jesus is "King of kings and Lord of lords" (1 Tim. 6:15).

C. The blood was innocent.

1. Jesus did nothing wrong (Heb. 4:15; 1 Pet. 2:22).

a. Judas said, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed innocent blood" (Matt. 27:4).

b. The wife of Pilate said, "Have nothing to do with this just man" (Matt. 27:19).

c. Pilate said, "I find no fault in this man" (Luke 23:4).

d. Pilate also said, "I am innocent of the blood of this

just person" (Matt. 27:24).

2. The people who knew Jesus best could not convict him of sin (John 8:46).

3. If the enemies of Jesus could not convict him of sin, who can?

D. The blood was substitutionary.

1. Jesus gave himself for us (Titus 2:14).

2. Jesus "bare our sins in his own body" (1 Pet. 2:24).

3. Jesus "washed us from our sins in his own blood" (Rev. 1:5).

4. Jesus' stripes heal us (Isa. 53:5).

E. The blood is satisfying.

1. God is holy (holiness is a general term for moral excellence).

a. "The Lord our God is holy" (Psa. 99:9).

b. “Holy and reverend is his name” (Psa. 111:9).

c. His pure eyes cannot behold evil (Hab. 1:13).

d. Men fear God because he is holy (Rev. 15:4).

2. The holiness of God demands that sin be punished.

a. God is just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus (Rom. 3:26).

b. God cannot tolerate evil.

c. God must judge and condemn sin.

d. God can justify sin only by the merit of a substitutionary sacrifice.

e. God can only be just if he forgives by a blood sacrifice, because “the blood of it is for the life thereof” (Lev. 17:14).

3. Jesus' blood satisfied the demands of divine justice.

a. Jesus was made a sin-sacrifice for us, though he knew no sin (2 Cor. 5:21).

b. Jesus became an "offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour" (Eph. 5:2).

F. The blood of Jesus was effective.

1. It cleanses from sin (Matt. 26:28; 1 John 1:7).

2. It redeems from sin (Eph. 1:7).

3. It gives life to the dead (Eph. 2:4-5; 1 John 5:11).

4. It purchased the church (Acts. 20:28).

5. It was shed once, never to be shed again (Heb. 10:11-12).

III. Conclusion.

A. The blood of Jesus is precious.

B. His blood is real, royal, innocent, substitutionary, satisfying, and effective.

C. We remember his blood each Lord’s Day.