

*The Divorce and Remarriage Enigma Resolved
Setting the Captives Free!*

Introduction

By Roeben and Matsayah Shalom

From Matsayah:

When we consider matrimony we envision the jubilant couple standing at the threshold of their dreams on a quiet seashore hand in hand, as one—*echad* in the Hebrew, meaning “together; in unison.” As it says in Genesis 2:24, “*Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be (basar echad) one flesh.*”

Here we have Heaven’s proclamation to the whole wide world that matrimony consists of a male and female, as portrayed on the front cover of this booklet that you hold in your hands. Mankind in general has fallen to such low extremes that we now need to start again at the very beginning in order to understand the beautiful goal of matrimony and all that it encompasses. It always consisted of only a man and a woman. As you may have observed, the word man is found *inside* the word woman, and in like manner, the word male is also found inside of the word female. Why do you suppose this to be the case? Let us look into this mystery...

Genesis 2:7 And אֱלֹהִים Elohyim formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

Genesis 2:21-24 And אֱלֹהִים Elohyim caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; And the rib, which אֱלֹהִים Elohyim had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called **Woman**, because she was taken out of **Man**. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.

Take note that the man leaves his father and mother; here we have another witness to illustrate the sacred union which constitutes a male and female. And upon one further note, let us go back to creation and observe that not only were male and female human beings created but also male and female animals and male and female plants; all of this is a representation of the blueprint of Heaven. Romans 1:20 says, “For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, *being understood by the things that are made*, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are **without excuse**.” We are without excuse as to the origin of our beginning: it was not by blind chance mind you, but rather by an extremely Intelligent Designer. Read His initial verbal command to our first parents:

“And Yahweh blessed them, and Yahweh said unto them, ***Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth***, and subdue it: ... Genesis 1:28.

Here we have the example set before us of a union and the command of Heaven from our Commander and Chief Himself who made and fashioned us after His likeness and image that we may procreate and bring forth a righteous offspring. (Malachi 2:15).

Psalms 127:3 Lo, children are an heritage of אֱלֹהִים : and the fruit of the womb is his reward.

His ordained purpose for mankind was to bring forth innocent children that they in return would worship and serve the Creator of heaven and earth: the glad fruition of holy matrimony.

We have several attacks now upon the family unit which are being launched on a massive scale, and I will make mention of one which is twofold. First, it comes by women dressing immodestly which provokes the spirit of sexuality. We must choose which Eve we are going to portray: the Eve that led Adam out of the garden, or the Eve that will lead Adam back into the garden? This is my question to my sisters. To dress immodestly leads and draws the hearts of men away from the principles of righteousness, setting the stage for the younger generations of girls to follow. Some 75,000 unwed teenagers become pregnant every year just here in this country alone! For a woman to give birth to a child out of wedlock is a sin and a shame outside of marriage, yet now it is accepted as normal, but not so in the kingdom of heaven. We must cry aloud and let our voices be heard that the marital embrace is just that, a blessing reserved only for holy matrimony; to do otherwise is a sin. We must reeducate those who have fallen into the trap of hasatan. The attacks upon the family come in many ways and we need our Father's grace to withstand this tide of evil being swept upon the land, and must run to higher ground to stand fast in this warfare if we hope to protect our families from the onslaught of this destruction.

Let us glimpse for a moment into how Yahweh dealt with His spiritual bride Israel. How longsuffering He was with her; and throughout Scripture we see Him always wooing, guiding, and instructing His backsliding bride. The Old Covenant was a marriage contract of betrothal at Mount Sinai to Israel His bride; and to all that He said, they said "I do." Reading from the CEV:

Exodus 19:7, 8 After Moses went back, he reported to the leaders what יהוה had said, and they promised, "We will do everything יהוה has commanded." So Moses told יהוה about this.

Yahweh made His vow to protect, safeguard, prosper and bless His bride if she would obey Him, and this marriage covenant was the Torah of which they were to obey. However, we have seen throughout the historical ages how Yahweh was forced to deal with Israel over and over again because Israel failed to be true to the mandates of the covenant. Yahweh had to let Israel go at last because of her harlotry and idolatry, and He removed His protective hand from her because of her infidelity to Him.

Jeremiah 3:8 And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.

Marriage is a sacred institution which requires much effort in order to achieve success, and as with everything in life, the outcome is well worth the investment having the sanction of Heaven upon it, and all the blessings that come when we give fully of ourselves. That must be our mutual goal to make our homes a little heaven on earth in the here and the now.

Our hope is that none will need to make use of the information found in this little book, that all will put forth whatever effort is necessary to mend a broken marriage. It is written only for those who are in dire straits and are therefore in need of help. We sometimes use the phrase in this treatise, "*once married, always married,*" but please bear in mind the reason we address it as such is because it involves the pseudo-concept that the injured party can never hope for a solution to the devastation that divorce can bring, and does bring. Marriage was meant to be eternal, and the divine ideal is just that: eternal blissful marriages. That is what we hope for all who read our brief but to the point little book. It is meant to be a help to all who are in need.

From Roeben:

Divorce is not the grim reaper of marriage. Human abuse and injustice are the grim reapers of marriage. People, through the process of time, either change for the better or for the worse; some never change when change is necessary. At times one partner in the marriage will change for the better while the other changes for the worse. Sometimes they both get worse as the years roll along and once in a great while they both change for the better. This work you hold in your hands is written for the sake of the victims of abuse and injustice. The abuse comes from the offending spouse in some form or fashion, and the injustice usually comes from sincere people who are sure they know the Bible well enough to counsel the victim to remain single when the abuser departs as though this is the great will of the Almighty. The natural inclination however of every normal soul is to desire, and even hunger for the companionship of the opposite sex. This is the way we were created from the very beginning and there is absolutely nothing sinful about it. In fact, it is a righteous inclination instilled within our very being in the great work of creation. For this we can rejoice. When there is a deep appreciation for the fine definition of the opposite sex, this generates health of mind, body and soul. Out of all creation wherein the Creator pronounced everything good, the one thing He pronounced "not good" was the aloneness of man. "*It is not good that the man be alone.*" (Genesis 2:18)...nor the woman... "*I will make him a helpmate.*" There exists a poetic charm in the loving relationship of a man and a woman that nothing else on earth can compare with. That is the ideal worth striving for. When hope seems gone, if there is but a small percentage of good left in a mate who may have fallen into some sin, that is enough to work with and the thought of divorce should not even enter the mind except in the extreme adversity.

There are times when adultery ruptures the sacred and delicate membrane of marriage. Even this grievous insidious violation of trust, if both are willing to begin again, can be healed. This treatise, throughout the following pages is written for those sad cases wherein there is not a healing possibility. One of the strange phenomena of adultery is its nature of self-justification. While it is true that in most cases both partners contribute to the breakdown of the marriage, when one party betrays the sacred trust and consorts with a stranger, then the whole issue has dramatically changed. When an unlawful connection has been established and a deepening estrangement between the true partners has set in, adultery addiction becomes stronger, and the impenitent thief finally becomes incorrigible. We use the strong word thief because the adulterer or adulteress has robbed years of investment from the faithful spouse. Before this sad scenario develops, all who have entered troubled waters should seek some professional counsel just as they would in the case of any other type of sickness. But alas, the majority plunge headlong into deeper and deeper waters until their years of investment are thrown to the wind. The statistics for America alone, (as of 1999) reveal approximately 50% of all marriages end in divorce. And let it be perfectly clear from the outset, we are not herein promoting divorce by any means. To see a marriage come to an end is a lamentation beyond expression. We are simply defining the terms. We are, with this writing, exposing the true culprits that destroy marriages, and yea, even the precious lives of the innocent. We are simply clarifying what has been hidden.

The Divine Law was given to protect the innocent, and while the institution of marriage is sacred, we must not resort to worshiping marriage itself wherein our eyes will be blinded in the opposite direction to the condemnation of those who are innocent of any guilt. Some have been driven needlessly to suicide. Their trusted mate became unfaithful, perhaps taking their children with them and not allowing the children to communicate with the forsaken and faithful spouse now divorced. After a year or more of being alone, when someone new happens along, then the church moves in to "guide" the poor soul away from this "potential adultery" in their good mission to save another soul from the eternal lake of fire. Many, so desperately lonely already, now heavy-laden with an imposed burden of guilt (as an adulterer) and fear of eternal torture as penalty for these legitimate feelings of need for a new companion, do the unthinkable, and commit suicide. This author has personally known more than one such case. It is due to this very injustice and religious crime that we are driven to this work. The law of the land cannot indict and charge an entire church for their responsibility in the death of such a one but they are

guilty nonetheless. And though we cannot hope to stop them in their misguided work by this writing alone, we may be able to reach the oppressed that are the victims of these ecclesiastical crimes and thereby circumvent the misused authority of the church.

When the grim reapers of abuse and injustice have done their evil work to destroy the marriage, the victims have no other recourse than to seek a way of escape for the sake of sanity and the welfare of the children; they need to know the truth of the merciful doctrine of divorce and remarriage. It is a Hebrew doctrine as given by the eternal Lawgiver and upheld by the Messiah who came to magnify the Law and make it honorable (Isaiah 42:21). Contrary to the opinion of many, He did not stand in opposition to the eternal Law of His Father. He was in strict accordance with that Law and it was the only standard He knew of. In fact, He declared that whoever would teach men to break one of the least of the Almighty's commandments would be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven. (Matthew 5:19). With this understanding in mind, we shall build upon that premise of Messiah's loyalty to the Hebrew Law as we analyze the apparent enigma that has created so much confusion in regard to this important subject. It is the intent therefore of the author to unveil the truth that has been obscured by misguided translators and misinformed ministers, and thereby *set the captives free!*

For those who may have spent years dwelling alone, due to nothing more than the overwhelming influence of a malinformed majority, this is their opportunity to seek finally the good counsel of the Hebrew Scriptures. For therein lies the answer to the dilemma. Let it not be forgotten that the Scriptures the Messiah and the apostles always referred to in their teachings, were the Hebrew Scriptures, today known as the Old Testament. Though the Septuagint Greek Bible was written two centuries before the Messiah, it was written for the Greeks living in their native lands of Grecia and Macedonia just as the Spanish Bible was written for the Spanish speaking people of the world today. The people of Israel were Hebrew, both in their religion and in their speech. And though the English New Testament of today was translated from Greek manuscripts dating back to the second and third centuries after the Messiah, there yet remains those few places which verify they spoke the Hebrew language: (See Matthew 26:73; 27:46; Mark 5:41; 7:34; John 19:20; Acts 21:40; 22:2, & 26:14). Study these passages, for they reveal an important clue to resolving this difficulty.

As Matsayah has well stated our position, "*Our hope is that none will need to make use of the information found in this little book,*" we mutually hope that to be the case. Many will not need the information offered within these pages. However, though we may have a blossoming marriage, we probably know others who may not be so blessed. We encourage all to research the evidence set forth, and if it is found to be the truth, then share it with those who may be going through some difficult times.

The book is written also for the purpose of upholding the sacred institution of marriage as defined by the Almighty יְהוָה. Again, the Scriptural definition of marriage, as we all know, is the sacred union between a man and a woman: nothing more, and nothing less. A missionary from India once gave a presentation of the pagan religions of that country. One of the photographs he showed was of a marriage ceremony between a man and a dog. Probably most everyone would recoil in disgust at such an abomination and rightly so; the reason being that deep down in our soul, we intrinsically know the accurate definition of marriage. It is called Holy Matrimony. *Matri* means Mother: *it is holy motherhood*. Only through this union can a woman become a mother; and only through motherhood can we then "*be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth*" (Genesis 1:28). Only thus can we walk in the light of Truth and have fellowship with our great Creator. We celebrate Him in this writing.

ת Concerning the Name א

Throughout this writing, we'll employ the name of our Creator, who is the eternal One, written in only the Hebrew characters, יהוה. Read from right to left phonetically, these letters are sounded as ee-ah-oo-ay, and when combined, are pronounced as Yahweh. In like manner, we honor His son (John 5:23) who came in His Father's name (5:43), by sometimes utilizing the same Hebrew characters יהושע, with the suffix shua שיע, denoting the Messiah's important work of salvation as mentioned in Matthew 1:21, and Isaiah 53. This is also the name of the mighty warrior who led the children of Israel into the Promised Land (Joshua/Yahshua). The name Jesus is the Greek attempt to transliterate the Aramaic form of Yeshua, which appears 25 times in the Aramaic portion of the Scriptures, and is a valid name, but our conviction is to hold to the Hebrew form Yahshua. That name appears some 250 times in the Hebrew. The reason we feel strongly about this form of the name is due to the overwhelming evidence and the scholarly confirmation that the first syllable of the divine name as found in Psalm 68:4, as well as 52 other places is Yah, and not Yeh.

Most of the Scriptural quotes will be made from the King James Version, and when a Greek or Hebrew word is included, a reference number # will indicate that it is taken from the *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance* which is a common reference work. If the reference number is quoted from the Hebrew Scriptures one shall find the word in the corresponding Hebrew portion of the Strong's which is the first part of the Concordance while the Greek is the latter. As is nearly always the case, it is well-nigh impossible to avoid the use of certain words that shall be offensive to some. We apologize for this in advance. The term, Holy Spirit for example, is often replaced by some with the Set apart Spirit, but Set, being the name of an Egyptian deity, we, by the same principle, so not feel free to utilize that word in reference to the Spirit of Elohyim (Hebrew for the Almighty). It is our aim therefore to do the best we can with this poor English language with which we have to work and still address this very important theme. We pray that you the reader, will bear with us in this.

And finally, the text in Hebrew on the cover portrays the spirit of this writing. It is a quote from Isaiah 61:1. Below we quote it along with the following two verses in English:

Isaiah 61:1-3 The Spirit of Adonay יהוה is on me. יהוה has chosen me to tell good news to the poor and to comfort those who are sad. He sent me to tell the captives and prisoners that they have been set free. He sent me to announce that the time has come for יהוה to show his kindness, when our Elohyim will also punish evil people. He has sent me to comfort those who are sad, those in Zion who mourn. I will take away the ashes on their head, and I will give them a crown. I will take away their sadness, and I will give them the oil of happiness. I will take away their sorrow, and I will give them celebration clothes. He sent me to name them 'Good Trees' and 'יהוה's Wonderful Plant.' (Easy to Read Version).

The Messiah Yahshua, in His opening sermon at the synagogue in Nazareth, read these words from the ancient Hebrew scroll (Luke 4:16-22). He chose this text because it portrayed in verity, the Spirit that prompted His every word, deed, and thought. We will do well to exemplify Him in our own thoughts and words as well. This we have sought to do. It is our prayer that you the Reader of the following pages will be thus blessed as Messiah most assuredly seeks to bless you...*and set the captives free.*

*The Divorce and Remarriage Enigma Resolved
Setting the Captives Free!*

Table of Contents

| <u>Concept</u> | | <u>Page</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| One | <i>Some Sweet Thoughts on Marriage</i> | 1 |
| Two | <i>The Doctrines Compared</i> | 4 |
| Three | <i>The Boundaries of the Torah</i> | 9 |
| Four | <i>The Difference Between Divorced and Put Away</i> | 17 |
| Five | <i>The Key of Knowledge</i> | 19 |
| Six | <i>In the Final Analysis</i> | 24 |

www.strongholdinthestorm.org

The Divorce and Remarriage Enigma Resolved Setting the Captives Free!

Concept One

Some Sweet Thoughts on Marriage

Before discussing divorce, let us reaffirm our position on marriage. Some have said that *יהיה* hates divorce but this is a private interpretation never to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures. He did not say that He hates divorce; that would be comparable to having Him say He hates capital punishment, the very judgment He established in order to be the deterrent against murder, which is the thing He truly hates. In regard to divorce, we'll discover what it is He truly hates, but let us be clear that He loves marriage, and so should we. Let us take some time to praise the twin institution that came from Eden: the Sabbath and Marriage. The one thing out of all the creation that *יהיה* pronounced "not good" was the aloneness of man. An unknown poet, in describing the plight of Adam's loneliness before the creation of Eve, penned the following words:

*Still slowly passed the melancholy day, the garden was a wild;
And Adam wist not where to stray...
Yes, man the hermit sighed, until he saw the woman smile.*

According to statistics, single men are more prone to accidental death than are married men. Why would that be the case? Could it be because the wife is the stabilizing factor that helps to keep a man focused? When married men encounter troubles in life, they recover from them much easier than the single man. The wife is a comforter who keeps his self-respect alive, and when he enters his kingly little palace at the close of a trying day, all is well again, for he is in the presence of his dearest earthly friend. She encourages him and lifts him up as though he were the mighty conqueror. Yes, through myriad troubles we may sigh and sometimes cry, but then we see our woman smile. Marriage is the union of two spirits. Man is endowed with a strength of character that could otherwise become aggressive without the modifying influence of the sweet sympathy and tenderness that the woman can give. Marriage is a masterpiece from the mind and heart of the benevolent Creator from heaven brought down to humankind to ennoble the souls of both men and women.

Once, an elderly couple celebrating 75 years of marriage in their humble little farmhouse, sitting close to each other and holding hands, was being interviewed by the local newspaper. The reporter asked the gentleman to share the secret of his still romantic relationship of marriage to his lovely wife. The man pulled out of his pocket a golden pocket-watch, and said, "This is the secret." He explained that her father had given him the watch as a gift on their wedding day and inside was a picture of his bride. On the back was inscribed, "Say something nice to Sarah today." "Every time I look at my watch to get the time, I have my reminder...just in case I ever get too busy in the day." Praise to a virtuous woman is like sunshine to flowers. Of a truth, we could say that marriage is like a delicate flower; it must not be handled roughly. It grows in an atmosphere of kindness, cheerfulness and the gentle touch. Under these favorable conditions it will always blossom, and its fragrance will sweeten every stage of life—even as the sun is setting in the golden years. Such happiness between a man and a woman will require some sacrifice from time to time, but let it always be done in a cheerful spirit, with quietude, not even seeking recognition. As Frances Shaw so touchingly wrote,

*Who loves the rain and loves his home, and looks on life with quiet eyes;
Him will I follow through the storm and at his hearth-fire keep me warm.*

Her life-long companion and husband, George Bernard Shaw once wrote, "The whole world is strewn with snares, traps, gins and pitfalls for the capture of men by women."

Evidently, George, with his quiet eyes, had a playful sense of humor along with his love of rain and home. And let it never be forgotten that humor is a very important ingredient in the formula of a fruitful marriage. Abraham Lincoln once said, *"With the fearful strain that is on me night and day, if I did not laugh I should die."* True humor is neither a masquerade for sarcasm nor a podium for ridicule; it is always mingled with a sensibility of soul, and comes more from the heart than the head. We might say that its essence is founded in love. As the wise man well has said, *"A merry heart doeth good like a medicine."* (Proverbs 17:22). As we meet with life's adversities, let sincere humor bring its healing balm to allay the pain. For it surely will. But at the same time, let us not turn sound humor into foolish nonsense and boisterous revelry. It works an opposite effect, and wears out the sensitive soul of the woman.

We said that marriage is a union of spirits. The wisdom of the American Indian says that a man's character is but half formed till after he has joined unto his soul-mate woman. Through this blessed union of mind and soul, refinement is attained. For in that connubial oneness, a desire to please the other is nurtured and brought to maturity. It is an unending conversation between two endearing friends checkered with a few disagreements along the way. And one of the greatest lessons to be learned through the process of time is how to shun that infernal enemy of marriage, *The Last Word*. When disagreements come as they surely will, let each one be the last one to secure the last word. Give it to the other until both have thrown it away altogether. Then the union will be built on the foundation of trust from which respect can grow. Instead of pursuing the goal of winning an argument with your best friend, it is better to give way in order to secure the greater goal of an enduring bond. Better to lose a battle and to win the war. There are plenty of battles to fight and win outside that sacred medley, but never let a disagreement become a vexation of spirit to your soul mate. Then marriage will become a fortress of two, and no power on earth can rend it asunder. Author Sydney Smith said, *"Marriage resembles a pair of shears, so joined that they cannot be separated; often moving in opposite directions, yet always punishing anyone who comes between them."*

In view of the ancient wisdom of the Native American mentioned above, one can see that celibacy was not the way we were meant to be. It has never been good for the man nor the woman to live a life of aloneness. Men are prone to extremes: they either think it a virtue to be a hermit like a monastery monk, or else to be a polygamist. And if not living in open polygamy as some religious groups (as well as nonreligious) have been known to do, then in secret polygamy, otherwise known as philanderers. And for those who may not know the difference, philanderers are not philanthropists. *"Love thy neighbor"* is not exactly what some evidently think it means. The way we began in the Garden was one man with one woman. *And we began in a garden by the way*, not in a city, nor in an office building. Let not a career rob you of the greatest treasure you could ever hope to find in this brief little span of time we call life. The East Indian poet Rabindranath Tagore wrote, *"Let your life lightly dance on the edges of time like dew on the tip of a leaf."* The quiet life of marriage far exceeds the little ladder of illusory success.

Holy matrimony means sanctified motherhood. A sign once read, *"A woman's place is in the House...and in the Senate."* And humorous though the message may be, it depicts the trend of the day. Because of a failing economy seeming to require both husband and wife to be in the workforce, the institutions of family and marriage are now fading into a tragic obscurity. A six figure income today has the buying power of a five figure income of a generation back...or perhaps even less. A good quality loaf of bread today can easily cost four or five dollars as compared to a loaf of higher quality (less chemical contamination) costing about a dollar back in the '50's or even the '60's. In that era of time, one could purchase four gallons of gas for a dollar, and now it takes nearly four dollars to purchase a gallon. And so, with the career-mom off to the office, the day-care has become common place in the new American culture. But not so with the Amish. They wisely say, *"There are two ways to be wealthy: to have more, or to want less."* Eventually we'll all have to decide what is more important: our sacred union of marriage and family, or our treasured career? Growing up in the late '40's through the '50's, mothers were at home while the daddies went to work. Are families better off today sixty years later? Are marriages more stable? In saying this, we do not diminish the aptitude of the woman; as the old Chinese proverb says: *"Man who says it cannot be done should not stand in the way of the woman who is doing it."*

Life in the concrete jungle is a predatory life. To immerse oneself in the business world may produce an impressive portfolio, a nice two-story house in the better part of town, plenty of shiny toys for *Show and Tell*, but in the end, what has been the price that has been paid for all the cheap baubles? Marriage on the rocks? Failing health? Children and grandchildren wandering aimlessly through life, perhaps in the same conundrum of a superficial success?

There is a way that seems right unto a man but the end thereof is the way of death. (Proverbs 16:25). There is really only one true success story, and that is the man and woman who have made it their life's career to find the enduring and endearing path of marriage, family and happiness: a way that may seem wrong unto the world at large in this current age, but in the end will constitute the ways of life. As George Eliot said it so well,

“What greater thing is there for two human souls than to feel that they are joined for life—to strengthen each other in all labor, to rest on each other in all sorrow, to minister to each other in all pain, to be one with each other in silent, unspeakable memories at the moment of the last parting.”

So yes indeed, we cast our vote on the side of marriage any day...and every day. We no more promote divorce than the man in the moon. Divorce is not even in the vocabulary of the truly married man and woman. And by truly, we do not mean the ones with the marriage license; we're referring to every couple who have entered into a covenant relation with their Creator who ordained righteous marriage alongside the holy Sabbath. Like spokes on a wheel with the rim representing the world, and the hub at the center representing the great Father, the closer the spokes get to the center, the closer they get to one another...and the farther they get from the rim. That is the true secret of marriage. If only people could truly implement this ideal, and they can, we would find divorce eventually becoming a phenomenon of an age gone by; something far back in the corridors of a nearly forgotten history.

And like the elderly couple celebrating 75 years of marriage, perhaps if there were more courting throughout marriage, there would be fewer marriages in court. So we reiterate: we do not promote divorce by any means. But we, like the great Author of the Scriptures, recognize that sometimes our best laid plans can surely go awry. And if they do, as hopeless as things may seem to be at the moment, all is not lost: the Almighty Lawgiver has made a way of escape. The following is not a pipe dream but a virtual reality under the full scope of the Scriptures.

Even though some versions mistranslate Malachi 2:16, in quoting the great Lawgiver as saying that He hates divorce, what we are about to discover is quite the opposite. This time the King James Version is one of the few that has it correct:

Malachi 2:13-16 And this have ye done again, covering the altar of יהוה with tears, with weeping, and with crying out, insomuch that he regardeth not the offering any more, or receiveth *it* with good will at your hand. Yet ye say, Wherefore? Because יהוה hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: yet *is* she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant. And did not he make one? Yet had he the residue of the spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth. For יהוה, the Elohim of Israel, saith that he hateth putting away: for *one* covereth violence with his garment, saith יהוה of hosts: therefore take heed to your spirit, that ye deal not treacherously.

The challenge before us is to find out the difference between *divorce* and *putting away*. Upon this understanding everything hinges. No one and no version of the Bible is at liberty to place a private interpretation on the words of Scripture. The violation of this established rule is the very reason we have some 3,000 Christian denominations in the present time. Let us rightly divide the Word of Truth from man's erroneous views. Read 2nd Timothy 2:15:

(KJV) Study to shew thyself approved unto יהוה, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.

(ISV) Do your best to present yourself to יהוה as an approved worker who has nothing to be ashamed of, handling the word of truth with precision.

Concept Two

The Doctrines Compared

The burden of this research is to examine the Messiah's legislation on the issue of divorce and remarriage as found in His declarations of Matthew 5:31, 32; and Matthew 19:9. The Messiah was the only begotten Son of Elohim and He made it clear that He did not come to abrogate His Father's law, but rather to uphold and to amplify that law (Matthew 5:17-19). He expressed His approval of those who "*sit in Moses' seat*" teaching the Torah (Genesis through Deuteronomy) standard in all matters of judgment (Matthew 23:2,3). It says of Him in the prophecy of Isaiah 42:21 that "*He would come to magnify the Law and make it honorable.*" Certainly this would have to be true of every lesser commentator of the Law as given by the eternal Lawgiver who says of Himself, "*I am יהוה, I change not.*" (Malachi 3:6).

The apostle Paul (hereinafter *Rav Shaul*) commended the noble Bereans for their diligent searching of the Torah to verify the validity of every teaching that came across their path: his included. (Acts 17:30). By the same token, if we hope to come under his commendation and approval, we, like himself, and the very Messiah as well, must begin at the beginning, and that is to recognize the unchanging nature of the Torah standard of Law: the transcript of His character.

Much of Christendom promotes a concept that divorce as taught in the New Testament denotes separation *but not dissolution*. By dissolution we mean a total severance of the marital bond so completely that the divorced person is free to marry again as though he or she had never been married before, or as fully as though their previous spouse had actually died. Therefore, the issue of divorce centers upon the question of dissolution or non-dissolution. Does divorce as taught by Yahshua signify dissolution or merely separation (non-dissolution)? Does it signify the absolute cutting off of the marital bond making it null and void, the same as though the erring spouse had died? Many feel that the Messiah allowed the right to divorce upon the ground of fornication, *but did not allow remarriage*; in which case if true, amounts to a right with a penalty attached to it. They somehow believe that only death can sever the marriage bond, and though an offending spouse may become a whoremonger, a pedophile, incestuous, homosexual, or any other type of sexual pervert, the upright spouse is doomed to remain one-flesh with him or her until that person dies, even though such a one may divorce himself or herself from the upright spouse and marry another, or many others (serial polygamy). Often a carrier of venereal disease, a veritable enemy to the kingdom of Heaven, and abusive in every way conceivable to the innocent spouse and family; what is the solution to such a tremendous outrage against justice, if any? In our effort to find the truth of this matter we must rightly divide the Word of Truth from the lying pen of the scribes. The "supreme" statute of the Church is based on the following text:

Matthew 5:31, 32 It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: 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.

Let us analyze the Saviour's statement. In the first sentence two things are said: for the man who would "put away" his wife, he must also give her a writing of divorcement. Step one is the putting away of the wife (sending her away), *and step two is the writing* of divorcement. The latter must follow the former. In the present day and culture people usually separate for a while and then they divorce. Yahshua's following statement specifies the solitary condition for which a wife can be put away: that of something He called *fornication*, a word we'll discuss a little later. This is to say that if she is put away for anything other than this solitary cause, she is put away unjustly. If she is merely accused of this but not proven guilty and is still put away, she is punished for something unproven and for which she is in fact to be considered innocent. The point which follows in sentence number two is that if she is thus put away unjustly, he, the unjust husband, causes her to commit adultery. At first glance this seems to be a compounding injustice heaped upon an innocent victim. She is first put away through an unproven accusation; she is

then *caused* to commit adultery. Though innocent in the beginning, she is obviously driven to guilt in the end. Then finally, innocent though she may be of the charge, the closing criminal sentence pronounced against her is, “*Whosoever shall marry her that is divorced... committeth adultery.*” No qualifying stipulations are given. Whether innocent or guilty of the solitary cause of putting away and the divorce of any woman, whoever marries *her* commits adultery! All she needs to be is divorced...period. If such legislation were true, our sane and logical minds would declare such a thing to be an intolerable injustice! But as we shall see, it is simply not true; and we’ll see the reason why it cannot be true. *The problem is not in Yahshua.*

Perhaps it would be well for us at this point to ask a reasonable question: if indeed the woman is innocent of the charge of fornication, how could she then further be *caused* to commit adultery? Does she now give up her life of purity and righteousness just because she has been treated so unfairly? Nothing is said of what she does or where she goes from there. Are we to simply assume that the adverse set of circumstances drives her into a life of prostitution? There is no explanation given, which sadly, leaves it to our own imagination to decide what He could have possibly meant by His puzzling declaration. If she is divorced she is no longer married, unless of course Messiah expected us to understand His words divorced and married in the above text to mean exactly the same thing, as people seem to believe in the present day. But of course He didn’t. Divorced and married mean opposite things. And that being the case, for a divorced woman to become a prostitute in an effort to now support herself, that is sinful enough to be sure, *but it does not constitute adultery.* According to the Torah, the sin of adultery involves sexual infidelity from a *married* woman, not a single or divorced woman. The only way she could incur the guilt of adultery is if she were still married. Sexual intercourse outside of marriage is sinful in its own right, but the sin of *adultery* involves sexual infidelity from a married person.

Since Yahshua came to magnify the Law and make it honorable, we must involve ourselves in a little deeper investigation as to what He actually said and meant. Often the things left unsaid and unexplained have created an environment for confusion and false interpretation, and untold misery perpetrated upon the innocent victims of injustice. However, we do have another instance wherein the Master addressed this very same issue in which He made it crystal clear as to exactly what He meant. Thankfully, we are not left at the mercy of the merciless to interpret an isolated text for us according to a biased, slanted view of something as important as this. We have other places we can go. So let us now turn to Matthew 19:9. We’ll address the first part of His statement in that text now, and the last part in *Concept Three* of this study.

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.

Lo, and Behold! According to this text, the one found guilty of committing adultery is not the innocent wife who has unjustly been put away, but rather the lawbreaking husband who perpetrated this evil upon her. “*Whosoever,*” is the subject of the statement, “*and shall marry another,*” is the continuing action the subject is performing. His first action is unjustly putting away his innocent wife. His second wrong action is in marrying another, and his third action is in committing adultery with that other. This clarifies who is the guilty party of adultery both here in this text and in the previous one of 5:32. He is addressing the identical issue in both places, but here He is making it perfectly clear as to who is guilty of adultery and it is not the innocent wife by any means. Let us return to 5:32 that we may examine yet further evidence to see if we can verify this observation. We’ll now do a word analysis on that text.

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

Focusing in on the two key words, *his* and *her*: “*his wife,*” & “*causes her,*” let us see now what we can find, and discover if indeed, it is not saying the same thing as in 19:9. Reading from the *Greek Interlinear Bible* by Jay P. Green Sr., and using the Strong’s reference numbers to translate these two key words, we read:

“...*whoever puts away the wife of him*” #848: αὐτοῦ, pronounced *how-too*, self (in some oblique case of reflexive relation):-her (own), (of) him (-self), his (own).

Although, as we can see in the list of possible words to choose from, *her* is included, we know by the text that *her* is not the right choice, for then it would read, “...*whoever puts away the wife of her*...” The first choice *self* is the reflexive pronoun that holds true to the context, *him* (-self). Therefore, to say it more accurately, “...*whoever puts away the wife of himself*...” that is, “*his own wife*...” Reading onward now in the same verse:

“...*apart from a matter of fornication, makes her commit adultery.*” #846: αὐτός, pronounced ow-tos; (backward); the reflexive pronoun self, used (alone or in the comp. 1438) of the third person, and (with the prop. pers. pron.) of the other persons:- her, it (-self), one, the other, (mine) own, said, (Iself-I,the)same, (Ihim-, my, thy-I) self, etc.

Again, because of the nature of the reflexive Greek pronoun *auto* (*self*), both he, she, him, her, or it, are included in the list of the possible choices. As we saw above however, the context determines the choice. In case we are not aware of what a reflexive pronoun is, it denotes the self of the one perpetrating the action, such as in *causing oneself*, or *causing himself*. The first choice is backward, as a mirror reflects back the image of the one standing in front of it. In other words, a reflexive pronoun is a *reflective* pronoun: it reflects back upon the one doing the action. As we have seen throughout the context of both verses under examination, the innocent wife *is receiving* the unjust action *brought upon her* by the offending husband. His false accusations against her, his subsequent putting her away and ultimately his divorcing her cannot make *her* nor cause *her* to become an adulteress. It is by *his* own callous actions that he causes *himself* to become the adulterer by bringing grief upon his innocent faithful wife in sending her away upon false charges, and then marrying someone else in her place. To thus mistreat her in an unfair divorce bringing shame upon her, removing her from her honored position in the family and then replacing her with another woman, registers his second marriage as adulterous.

As can be seen, the best choice of words that could have been used in Matthew 5:32 is (backward); the reflexive pronoun self. In other words, the action is pointing backward to the subject of the sentence. In case it is unclear, the subject in 5:32 is the same subject as in 19:9, and that is the *husband* who is putting away his innocent wife unjustly. The only way one can be justified in putting away and divorcing his spouse is if she is actually found guilty of the charges. The translators either chose to ignore the context and elected to insert the word *her* in 5:32 instead of *himself* perhaps from a prejudice against women, or they were unaware that they were making the Speaker contradict Himself between Matthew 19:9 and 5:32. As we shall discover, they not only did this in regard to the one guilty of adultery in the first part of 5:32, but also in regard to the last part as well. But in reference to the first half of the verse, it should therefore read, “*Whoever shall put away his wife, except for the cause of fornication, [and himself marry another], causes himself to commit adultery.*” Both context and the word analysis substantiate this reading; only in this way do we bring the identical texts into harmony with each other thereby eliminating the contradiction as brought about by the translators themselves, and not by the Messiah who came *not* to contradict his own Father’s Law, *nor Himself*. Note Isaiah 42:21:

יהוה is well pleased for His righteousness’ sake; He will magnify the Law, and make it honorable.

Consider that when one puts a magnifying glass to something, he does not in the slightest degree alter what had been written. He amplifies its meaning without changing a thing within it. So it was with the Messiah. In His opening sermon on the mount of blessings, after pronouncing His wonderful beatitudes upon the people, He knew that sooner or later everyone would come to see that He would not be accepted by the religious leaders of His day. So how easy would it be for them to assume that He stood in opposition to the rabbinical teachings of the Torah? In the very heart of His solemn discourse He made it clear that He came to amplify the Torah and make it honorable. And this He did by both precept and example. Within that opening message He forbade any thought someone may have entertained that He stood in opposition to the Law. To the contrary; He said, “*I am come to establish My Father’s Law.*” (Matthew 5:17). And to prove

His point He cites six of the decrees as found in the Torah through the remaining portion of Matthew chapter five. Let us observe that out of the six laws He mentioned, only two are from the Decalogue—otherwise known as the Ten Commandments. The remaining four are from the so-called Law of Moses. But as we know, Moshe was but the penman for the eternal One who spoke His Law to the prophet Moshe. In *Concept Three* we shall examine the actual legislation regarding divorce and remarriage as given to the prophet Moshe while in the Holy Mountain. We shall see how the Almighty יהוה regards the divorced woman. Does He say that anyone who marries her commits adultery? If He doesn't, then the translators have Yahshua contradicting His Father's Law in the latter part of Matthew 5:32, which of course is impossible. To say it another way, if יהוה's Law exonerates the innocent party of a divorce, and Yahshua condemns the innocent, we would have a kingdom divided against itself.

יהוה's throne is established upon two wonderful foundations: justice and mercy. Messiah's message centered upon the character of His Father, and the foundation of His kingdom. It was all about the kingdom; every issue that He encountered had to coincide with the principles of that perfect kingdom of righteousness...including this one. Never did He stand in opposition to that perfect standard. We do not presume to judge the motif of the translators. Perhaps they did the best they could; perhaps they inculcated some of their own ideas thinking to "help" the Messiah look even better than He already did. Perhaps ministers today presume to stand upon a premise of their own production, thinking they are lifting the righteous standard to an even greater height by proclaiming divorcees as untouchables and adulterers if they remarry.

Thus far we have defended the innocent wife upon whom an unjust charge of fornication has been brought. We shall address the meaning of this word a little later, but for now, suffice it to say that only upon that ground (fornication) did Messiah declare a man's right to put away and divorce his wife. Assuming her innocence (since her guilt is unproven) an unjust divorce shifts the guilt upon the husband. So in his new marriage *he* is declared to be the adulterer. To force his faithful wife out of his house is registered in the books of Heaven as an evil act of violence (Malachi 2: 14-16), and his subsequent actions are therefore unacceptable.

Deuteronomy 22:13-19 If any man take a wife, and go in unto her, and hate her, And give occasions of speech against her, and bring up an evil name upon her, and say, I took this woman, and when I came to her, I found her not a maid: Then shall the father of the damsel, and her mother, take and bring forth *the tokens of* the damsel's virginity unto the elders of the city in the gate: And the damsel's father shall say unto the elders, I gave my daughter unto this man to wife, and he hateth her; And, lo, he hath given occasions of speech *against her*, saying, I found not thy daughter a maid; and yet these *are the tokens of* my daughter's virginity. And they shall spread the cloth before the elders of the city. And the elders of that city shall take that man and chastise him; And they shall amerce him in an hundred *shekels* of silver, and give *them* unto the father of the damsel, because he hath brought up an evil name upon a virgin of Israel: and she shall be his wife; he may not put her away all his days.

The nuptial cloth was the proof that she was indeed, a virgin, and therefore innocent of the man's accusation. But on the other hand, should the husband's charge of fornication be true, then he has the right to put her away and divorce her. That is the case of premarital sex which constitutes the sin of fornication, and of course the husband has the option of forgiving her and keeping the marriage intact. Adultery is a more serious charge involving sexual misconduct outside the sacred union of husband and wife; in fact it was serious enough to incur the penalty of death to the offenders. Sexual misconduct in the context of marriage need not always be outright adultery; it could be a flirtatious spirit, or dressing provocatively to attract the attention of others outside the sacred union. This reverts back to the sin of fornication, from whence comes the word *pornography* by the way. Forn and porn are synonymous. Again, the offended husband has the option of forgiving such a one. But if he elects to put her away and divorce her, whoever marries such a one thus guilty of the charge enters into an impure relationship with her. So clearly, we are not defending the guilty by any means. The law of the Almighty is given to protect the innocent, be they women or men. We just need to make sure we are not adding to the Law nor diminishing aught from it, of which both are a sin (See Deuteronomy 4:2).

It is often the case in today's western culture that married women dress in a seductive, immodest fashion exciting the lust of strangers, and this can lead to secret *lust* affairs which can turn into adultery. Men are fascinated with the beauty of women and that is why the faithful wife will protect her husband's right to her beauty alone. It is not for the pleasure of strangers to indulge in. By the same token, a faithful man will not betray his wife's invested interest in him. They have made vows of commitment to each other which are as important as life and death.

In the Hebrew manner of marriage, the one-flesh concept is not merely metaphorical, it is as real as one's right and left hands both belonging to the same body. If we fail in understanding this wonderful Hebrew concept, our marriage cannot achieve its full potential. We consider our children to be our own flesh and blood, and when they make mistakes or are rebellious, we do not take action to turn them over to an adoption agency. No, we bear long with them, striving to bring them to their senses. Why are we so long-suffering with our children, but not so with our mate? It is because the children have our own DNA: they are valuable to us. They are the product of our body, mind and soul. They look like us and even think as we think. Though they may rebel at certain times, we know they are still bone of our bones and flesh of our flesh. Because of this they will ever hold a special place in our hearts. But when the struggling sperm of man unites with the golden egg of his precious wife, they become a thousand-fold more one-flesh than in the parent-child relationship! There is a blending of the souls to become one soul, a blending of the bodies to become one flesh. Through the process of time when this concept is understood and believed and practiced, their thoughts and hearts become inseparably one. They mutually pull the *Love-Cart* together. They are equally yoked in splendorous marital bliss that only grows better with the passing of time. The love-cart acronym spelled vertically is a fit description of marital love that will prevent altogether the future need of divorce and remarriage. Study it well. Begin from the bottom which is the foundation, and build upward.

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Commitment..... | Commitment sets in stone (diamond stone) the relationship of love. |
| Affection..... | Affection is the golden reward of respect and loving-kindness. |
| Respect..... | Respect is gained when trust is firmly established. |
| Trust..... | Trust is built by honest dealings with one another, and all others. |

Concept Three

The Boundaries of the Torah

But if this thing be true, *and the tokens of virginity* be not found for the damsel: Then they shall bring out the damsel to the door of her father's house, and the men of her city shall stone her with stones that she die: because she hath wrought folly in Israel, to play the whore in her father's house: so shalt thou put evil away from among you. If a man be found lying with a woman married to an husband, then they shall both of them die, *both* the man that lay with the woman, and the woman: so shalt thou put away evil from Israel. If a damsel *that is* a virgin be betrothed unto an husband, and a man find her in the city, and lie with her; Then ye shall bring them both out unto the gate of that city, and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel, because she cried not, *being* in the city; and the man, because he hath humbled his neighbour's wife: so thou shalt put away evil from among you. But if a man find a betrothed damsel in the field, and the man force her, and lie with her: then the man only that lay with her shall die: But unto the damsel thou shalt do nothing; *there is* in the damsel no sin *worthy* of death: for as when a man riseth against his neighbour, and slayeth him, even so *is* this matter: For he found her in the field, *and* the betrothed damsel cried, and *there was* none to save her. If a man find a damsel *that is* a virgin, which is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, and they be found; Then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel's father fifty *shekels* of silver, and she shall be his wife; because he hath humbled her, he may not put her away all his days. Deuteronomy 22:20-29.

In today's limp culture, divorce, a lesser form of punishment to sexual misconduct, is not better than what had been given by ירה in the Torah, for it only perpetuates the sin of infidelity whereas the Torah standard eliminated the sin. To be unfaithful to the solemn vows exchanged between a man and his wife is the lowest form of treachery, and is deserving of the death penalty. But often, numerous other marital problems not deserving of death arise that need to be dealt with in order to maintain peace in the home and community: problems that may lead to divorce if a solution cannot otherwise be found. The Torah deals with multifaceted domestic disputes as in the case of the virgin's cloth which every Hebrew maiden laid underneath herself upon her wedding night. The covenant of marriage was sealed by the blood that betokened her virginity. This provided her immunity from the death decree under false charges of an unethical man, and the future guarantee of her marriage. Not only would the husband be chastised for his slanderous statements, he was further ordered to retain his bride forevermore. He forfeited his right of any future dismissal of the virtuous virgin that he took in marriage. Having thus taken her in the consummation act, then to lie about her virginity was a serious offence in the nation of Israel that held such a high ranking regard and respect for its virtuous young women who kept themselves pure for their future husbands.

In the Hebrew economy, the Torah standard not only protected the innocent, it set the parameters for one's conduct, explaining what was allowed and what was not. None were thus in confusion regarding marriage, divorce, or marriage after divorce. Christendom itself is not in agreement on this matter of divorce. Some believe that in the case of infidelity on the part of the offending spouse, *the innocent man* can divorce, but never remarry until his adulterous wife has died; others believe he can divorce her and remarry another though the offender yet lives. Most believe *an innocent wife* can never divorce an unfaithful husband, and certainly never remarry until he has died. They say she had her one chance at marriage and failed. Some believe the Messiah is the one who taught this. Others, a little more familiar with the New Testament, know that actually it was not from Yahshua Himself, but rather Paul in Romans 7:1-3. Of course, he said his teaching was given him directly from the Messiah, so indirectly the presumed teaching comes. In all honesty, we must recognize a few important points here: *If the Torah* grants both men and women the right of divorce for reasons other than unfaithfulness, such as abandonment, failure to support, refusal of conjugal rights (Exo. 21:7-11); or some uncleanness (Deuteronomy

24:1-4), *and then Messiah* doesn't include those same reasons from the Torah, but rather limits the ground of divorce to the solitary reason of unchastity; *and then Shaul* (Paul)....does not even include that in his divorce legislation, we are definitely confronted with some conflicting enigmas. If indeed, the Messiah said whoever marries a divorced woman thereby commits adultery, but the Torah says a divorced woman is free to remarry without being an adulteress, then it is *apparent* that Messiah is not in agreement with the Torah, which thing of course is not true, but only apparent; it gives a wrong appearance. His whole life was in strict harmony with the Torah. That being the case let us compare the statements that seem to conflict between the so-called "New" and "Old" Testaments.

Romans 7:1-3 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? 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. 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.

Some observations: Shaul states here in Romans 7:1 that the Hebrew man is bound to obey the Hebrew Law as long as he lives. We emphasize that point of the Hebrew man and Law because as we know, the writer is not referring to Roman law, nor American civil law here, but rather to the Torah standard alone. Otherwise if we think he is referring to all law, then we would have to include civil "no fault" divorce laws. No Fault divorces are mostly *No Reason* divorces. Verse seven reveals that he is talking about Divine Law, for there are no civil laws against coveting. The issue here is a man's obedience to the Torah standard of Law. In view of that fact, so long as he continues to obey Divine Law, he retains his good status as a citizen of Israel, and remains bound in covenant relationship to his Creator יהוה. *What if he decides to stop obeying that Law?* Does he still retain his status as a citizen of Israel, and remain in that covenant relationship with יהוה? The passage verily states that "...the Law ***hath [has]*** dominion over the man as long as he lives." People make mistakes, and should the Hebrew man sin, he has the option of repentance and restitution: he can make things right, bring a sin-offering and be forgiven; or he can refuse to repent and be *cut off* ...cast out, or disfellowshipped. Yahshua gave specific commandment of this matter in Matthew 18:15-18. The guilty party who refuses to repent is *cut off* from the body of believers and therefore becomes a heathen, or non-Israelite. When יהוה cuts him off, he is then free to live the life of a heathen, and is no longer under the Divine jurisdiction; he has thereby lost that covenant relationship with יהוה.

As the sins accumulated in the sanctuary throughout the year, upon the tenth day of the seventh month they were removed from the sanctuary and all believers upon that solemn day were to afflict their souls in fasting and prayer. Even though their sins had been forgiven earlier in the year, they were now to demonstrate their gratitude for that forgiveness and their sorrow for their past sins one last time in the year. It is what the Law requires as a reminder of the offensive nature of sin and a demonstration of the difficulty with which it is eliminated. If they refused to afflict their souls upon that day, even at that point, they were still *cut off* (conf. Leviticus Ch. 16, & Ch. 23:27-32). The Law no longer had dominion over the one who left its jurisdiction. When a man defects to Russia he is no longer bound by the law of America. Are Sunday-keepers somehow under the holy Sabbath Law? Do Buddhists, Christians, or Moslems call upon the holy name of יהוה, or do they violate the fourth and the third commandments? Do Catholics have any regard for the second commandment? We see that the Divine Law does *not* have dominion over those who refuse to obey it. As Messiah well said, "No man can serve two masters." (Matthew 6:24). He said that a man will serve the master he loves. To serve means to obey. People who do not love the Creator love another master, and they do not serve the one they don't love. The law of the one they refuse to serve has no dominion over them; they serve another. The important point to discern in this is the fact that *though the man was yet alive*...he was no longer under the dominion of the Torah: he was *cut off*. However: if he is not cut off, then he is bound to obey the Divine Law of marriage which outlines *his* list of duties to perform to his Law

abiding wife. If he wants a wife he is bound to obey that part of the Law pertaining to the duties of a husband. It is called *the Law of the Husband* (Romans 7:2).

Rav Shaul counsels us to not be unequally yoked together with an agnostic (2 Corinthians 6:14). Innocent ignorance of the one true faith is one thing but opposition to the faith is another matter altogether. In view of all that we have delineated in the preceding paragraphs, we need to consider that counsel well. If we are beginning to comprehend that this matter of divorce and remarriage concerns those who are in actual covenant bond with יהוה, then for a believer to be married to an unbeliever who mocks the Hebrew faith involves a serious question that must be resolved. Our Master said, “*What יהוה has joined together let no man put asunder.*” (Matthew 19:6). Does יהוה join Moslems with Mormons, or Baptists and Buddhists? Does He join Hebrews with Catholics? When a Sabbath-keeper enters a marital union with a Sunday-keeper under the terms of peaceful cohabitation, who becomes the spiritual guide for the children? And what about the diet? Is it all right for the one who is kosher minded to cook pork to serve to the gentile spouse who may also demand that it be served to the children? How will all this be registered in the books of Heaven? One can quickly perceive how complicated marriage to an unbeliever can become. But the question remains: does the Creator actually join together His separated, peculiar people with those of the world? In all honesty we must not overlook that the entirety of Scripture is primarily about our relationship to יהוה, and *secondarily*, involves our relationship with one another. If Mormons marry Moslems and Baptists marry Buddhists, there is no harm done, for they are not in a covenant bond with יהוה and He has no part in such unions. However, what happens when one of *His* children enters an unequally-yoked marital bond with someone who has no thought for the Almighty יהוה? *Did He join them together?* Do folks not reap what they have sown? To compromise one’s faith is catastrophic. Though He’ll make a way of escape for the repentant, if we insist on being independent from His righteous standard, we’ll surely reap what we have sown, and He will stand by and let us. So the answer is no—He does not join believers in marital union with unbelievers. That is contrary to His revealed will. His marital blessings are bestowed upon those who obey Him, not the rebellious. When a happily married heathen couple come into the Hebrew faith together, He can then bless their marital union. They are now citizens of the Paradise kingdom.

And so, the Hebrew woman who **has** a Hebrew husband is bound by the Hebrew Law to her husband as long as he lives; the merciful Law of divorce and remarriage is for *people living in the covenant*. According to Hebrew Law, when a living husband stops providing the things the Law requires of him, the innocent woman is free to go out from him and find a man who will provide. Under those circumstances, though the first husband is yet alive, he has plainly violated the *Law of the Husband*, thus nullifying his status as her husband, and she is no longer bound to him: she no longer **has** a husband even though the uncaring, irresponsible man is still alive. The only way she cannot enter another marriage is by having a living, law-abiding, full-providing, seldom-chiding, husband. The Law demands a good bit more of a husband *than him merely being alive* to keep the sweet wife bound to him. He is required to provide for her necessities as well. Surely common sense dictates that to our logical minds. Either people are misinterpreting the statements of Rav Shaul, or they are failing to test him by the standard of the Torah. In addressing those who “*know the Law,*” Shaul rightly assumed this to be general information that did not need to be so meticulously explained as has been done here in this writing. It is for the sake of those who do *not* know the Divine Law that we are bound to delineate this point. Not that such ignorance constitutes sin mind you, but to continue in ignorance would certainly bring a person down to the status of sin. Too much is at stake to be careless in this matter. When the destiny of souls is hanging in the balance we must be accurate in our conclusions. Now read the Divine Law of the Husband:

Exodus 21:7-11 And if a man sell his daughter to be a maidservant, she shall not go out as the menservants do. If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed: to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her. And if he have betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters. If he take him another wife; her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage, shall he not diminish. And if he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money.

We see by this that יהיה charges the man to assume full responsibility for the maintenance of his wife: her physical necessities as well as her emotional and cultural needs. Nothing is said (in Romans 7:1-3) about the Hebrew husband being bound by the Law to his wife (only the wife to the husband), and no exceptions such as fornication are given. Messiah, on the other hand, says that a Hebrew man is bound by marriage to his Hebrew wife with the one exception of fornication. Upon this ground he may divorce and remarry. He stated that His divorce law was in perfect harmony with the Law and the Prophets. The Torah grants divorce and remarriage on the grounds of non-support, abuse, withholding of conjugal rights, and uncleanness as we have observed. We are forced to face the fact that there is less than perfect agreement here between Shaul and Yahshua. But let us not jump to the conclusion that the disharmony is real; *it is only apparent*. As we shall see, the problems lie within the mistranslations and an ignorance of what the Hebrew Law actually says. This is not to cast a dark shadow on the Scriptures. If we were reading an English translation of a book written in Spanish, and came across what appeared to be a contradiction, we'd probably get ahold of a good Spanish dictionary and engage in a little necessary research. Whatever happened to private investigators? Can we afford to cast our fate to the wind and be tossed about with every wind of [false] doctrine at the sleight of men? (Conf. Ephesians 4:14). So what if our minister or the whole church condemns divorce and remarriage? Shall they dictate what is right or wrong when they evidently have no regard for the Law? Since when do we let outlaws teach us right from wrong? Even those who claim to be under the Law's jurisdiction are in collision with the Torah on this matter: cronies with criminals.

1st John 2:4 The person who says, "I have come to know him," but does not continually keep his commandments is a liar, and the truth has no place in that person. (ISV)

In view of the Messiah's statement that He did not come to abrogate the Law but rather to establish it, and Shaul's declaration that he received his teaching from the Messiah, the logical conclusion therefore should be: Shaul, Messiah, and the Torah should all be in perfect harmony. Even Shaul intimated the significance of conjugal rights being given to each other in marriage when he said, "*Defraud ye not one another...*" (1Corinthians 7:5). We often correctly refer to a fraud as a cheat, and we refer to infidelity as "cheating" on the innocent mate, so the intimation would be, *to withhold the conjugal right would be equivalent to infidelity*. Shaul states the reason for this as having to do with what he calls *continence*. In other words, to deny one's mate of sexual intercourse may eventually open the door to temptation which otherwise could be avoided. He or she is *cheating* the other spouse of their conjugal rights, practically driving them into the arms of another. Many times, withholding the marital embrace (intimacy) is used as a misguided effort to manipulate the other. While sexual conjugation is nearly impossible when there is discord, its denial should never be resorted to by either party for less than extreme situations such as infidelity or disease. Should a spouse be denied unjustly, he or she must earnestly pray for wisdom and Divine grace to endure the maltreatment, and then take the steps as outlined in Matthew 18:15-18. And before leaving this subject, we must include three other times when sexual temperance should be applied, and that is during pregnancy when there is a threat of miscarriage; postpartum, or right after the birth of a child; and *niddah*, during the menstrual cycle, at which time husband and wife should have no sexual contact: it is referred to in the Bible as *uncleanness* (Leviticus 15:19-27). During these sacred times the husband should not require of his treasured wife the same domestic duties she would otherwise perform. He should do them. The precious wife and mother is equivalent to an angel from heaven doing her mysterious work of creating a human life and nurturing it to maturity.

We find then that the Torah is the absolute legislation of the kingdom of יהיה; every word of it. Not a living soul on earth has, nor ever has had the right or the authority to change it (See Deuteronomy 4:2). Yahshua Himself stated clearly that such a thing was never His mission nor in His mind, and that whoever should presume to do so would be an apostate not to be trusted. It is a comprehensive legal document to settle all controversies. Think about it: had there never been a New Testament there would never have been a question about divorce and remarriage. The issue is unequivocal in the Torah. This faultless standard applies to every area of life: the mental, physical, emotional, and spiritual. It demands accountability for every citizen in the spiritual community. It is a sure hedge of protection for the innocent and a powerful deterrent to

the prospective criminal. It is a faithful guide for priest, king and judge, and all the common people in between. If there ever appears to be disharmony between the Torah and the New Testament, our goal should be to bring the latter into conformity with the former, and not the other way around. Until we come into harmony with Messiah's position on which standard we'll use in judgment, we'll never be able to judge righteous judgment (John 7:24). The irony of it all is that the Messiah told us to do that very thing. It was the only standard He knew of, and if the Greek New Testament has Him seemingly in opposition to His own Father's Law, (or even with Himself), we may rest assured that the difficulty is due to the Greeks whose definitions are not always in agreement with the Hebrew, and if we'll just be diligent enough to search it out and then research it out, we'll discover that indeed, the problem is in their mistranslation and nothing more, as we are going to demonstrate in this writing. So now, let us read the Hebrew Legislation on Divorce and Remarriage: reading from Deuteronomy 24: 1-4:

When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife. And if the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, and giveth it in her hand, and sendeth her out of his house; or if the latter husband die, which took her to be his wife; Her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled; for that is abomination before יהוה: and thou shalt not cause the land to sin, which יהוה thy Elohyim giveth thee for an inheritance.

The "uncleanness" mentioned here in the Hebrew is ערוה דבר: *ehrvath dawvar*, meaning some indecency. It was not adultery as this was a crime punishable by death as we have already observed. In Deuteronomy 21:10-14, we have the case of a warrior finding among the captives a beautiful young virgin and his right to bring her home, permit her a full month to mourn over the loss of her family in the war, and then afterwards go in unto her and take her to be his wife in marriage. This law demonstrates the benevolence of the Elohyim of the Hebrews in that He provides even for the destitute prisoners of war. As is often the case in war young women are left to wander homeless, starving, and subject to rape. But in the benevolent government of יהוה, although hardships do exist in the world, He provides a shelter for the innocent and the helpless.

The young virgin captive could have been of age to marry but totally ignorant of proper Hebrew social conduct, and more than likely ignorant of the Hebrew worship of their Elohyim. Therefore, she was in dire need of an education which the elder women of Israel provided. This did not ensure rapid learning however on the part of the young woman taken in marriage. Some of the things she would need to learn would be the proper preparation of the kosher diet; general hygiene; the laws of *niddah*: i.e. what she must do during menses and childbirth; how she should be properly clad in public (being extra careful to not expose herself to any watchful eyes), and the worship of יהוה Elohyim. Hopefully, the Hebrew man would be patient during this difficult time, but as we know, some men are hard-hearted and impatient. So rather than make the young woman's life miserable the great Lawgiver provided her a way of escape from an unkind spirit. If the intolerant husband hated her she probably hated him as well. In such a situation among the Moslem nations, a mere *verbal proclamation* of divorcement was sufficient to send a wife away, but there was no guarantee for her future care in this arrangement. He could later want her back, or deny that he had ever divorced her, thus bringing a charge of adultery against her should she contract another marriage and thereby incur the ensuing death penalty. In the government of Israel on the other hand, יהוה demanded a *writing* of divorcement to be placed into the woman's hand; this was her Letter of Freedom. With this necessary document in hand, she could go forth in righteous dignity to contract a valid new marriage with another prospective Hebrew man, a marriage recognized and honored by the eternal One Himself. Mind you, the second husband married a divorced woman and the new marriage was honorable to יהוה most High. Not a soul in Israel dared call her an adulteress in this second marriage, *nor in a third or a fourth* should such be the case. No one *thought* the succeeding marriage to be less than upright and honorable. She had the blessing of the great Lawgiver, and everyone else had better bless her too. It is His Law, and the Messiah said He came to establish this Law (Matthew 5:17-19). Somehow we must come to the realization that He was really being honest when He said He came not to destroy the

Divine Law! We must know that He really meant it when He said that *we* are to observe the Law of Moshe (Matthew 23:3). When He declared, “*All therefore, whatsoever they (the Pharisees, when quoting from the Divine Torah), bid you observe, that observe and do,*” do you suppose the religious Pharisees would have granted a woman the Letter of Freedom to go and honorably contract a new marriage? As long as they were reading from the Torah, of course they would; they could not do otherwise, it is the Divine Law of יהוה most High. Neither can Rav Shaul in any wise alter the slightest yod or keriah (jot or tittle) from the Torah till all be fulfilled. It must be remembered, the Master’s commission to His disciples as found in Matthew 28:19, 20: “*Go ye therefore, and teach all nations...teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*” This instruction, coupled with what He stated above, to observe everything that the Pharisees command from the Torah, constitutes the great Messianic Commission. And therefore, since we (at least in theory) recognize the Messiah’s harmony to the Torah, let us now consider the *apparent* difference between the Matthew statements and the divorce decree of Deuteronomy 24:1-4. How could a divorced woman, innocent of adultery, go forth into a second marriage and meet Yahshua’s approval? If her uncleanness was not adultery (and it wasn’t), what *defiled* her in the second marriage as we just read in Deuteronomy?

The reason יהוה forbade her return to the former husband was because she was defiled *to him*...not to any future husbands. The strong expression *defiled* is used in order to condemn the easy passage of a woman between one man and another, which would degrade the dignity of the woman. When we put our hand to the plow, we are not to look back (Luke 9:62). Hopefully the second marriage would become her final haven of rest. But if she winds up with another hard-hearted man in the second marriage, she still retains the Divine blessing in a third marriage. She is not permitted to look back however, only forward. The former husband had his one chance at marriage (to her) and the Divine Law maintains her honor. She is a moral personality, and not an object to be passed back and forth; the Law of divorce and remarriage carried this clause to protect her dignity. The only person commanded not to marry a divorcee was the high priest. The common priests could marry a divorced woman, but not a woman merely *put away* from her husband (see Leviticus 21:7-14). This demonstrates the strong difference between divorced and mere separation.

The word defiled is # 2930: טמא, *taw-may’; a prim. root; to be foul, espec. in a cerem. or mor. sense (contaminated):unclean.* It is the same word for unclean as found in many texts of Scripture, for example all of Leviticus 15 that addresses the issue of a man with a running issue, or the woman with her issue of blood during menses. Every word for unclean is the same word *defiled* as in Deuteronomy 24:4. Even a priest could become defiled, or unclean by attending a funeral of anyone other than immediate family members (Leviticus 21:4, 11). The Torah always sets the boundaries in regard to physical and moral and religious hygiene. At death, any parasites that may have infested a person is seeking a new host and people often handle, and even kiss a corpse “goodbye” as he lays there in his casket. The Torah forbids such a heinous practice. But notice, in every example given the defilement is primarily in a *ceremonial* sense. Though it can also be moral, as we can see by the examples given, we know that there is no moral defilement in sickness or menstruation. The idea that is portrayed therefore in Scripture is that the second marriage was not *morally* defiling.

In ancient times divorced women needed a new husband for a number of reasons. There were no welfare programs for single parents or divorcees. She was at the mercy of her father, or her brothers, or another and hopefully better marriage. This was the Divine Law. And besides, there were plenty of men who were just as glad to find a good divorced woman to marry as well. Let it not be overlooked that it was יהוה who said she could not return to her *former* husband. When she remarried she did not then have two husbands. The word former means *previous*. In the same way, when Messiah conversed with the woman at the well about the theme of salvation and asked her to go fetch her husband and return, she responded, “*I have no husband.*” At that Yahshua answered, “*You have had five husbands, and the man you have now is not your husband: that was truly said.*” (John 4:18 BBE). Yahshua had a most unique way of being direct without unnecessary offence. He was very sensitive to the circumstances of life that surrounded every case, always reaching out to the weary souls. We must not read more into this than is simply stated. Messiah was not condemning the woman for being married five times as many good folk would do today. What is stated is His acknowledgment of the woman’s

previous marital status as perfectly legitimate; and He made a distinction between her former marriages and her present condition of just living together with a man. This cannot be denied. Some have speculated that all five of her former husbands must have died, thus giving her the only legitimate ground for remarriage each time. But if that were the case, then the sixth man should have been her sixth husband. Why would she give up on the fine institution of marriage after such a good running record of valid marriages? There is not one mention of the death of any of her former husbands. When we use the descriptive words former or previous we all know that it means the one before the present. This acknowledgement of the woman's valid marital status is thus confirmed therefore by both the Almighty and the Messiah by use of the definitive word *former*, which therefore means that the current husband is indeed the current *husband*. It becomes obvious in this that we find a harmony after all between the Messiah and the Torah. And we shall find greater harmony still as we continue our exploration of this solemn subject.

Some have errantly thought that consummation of marriage somehow defiles *the woman*, and the first marriage of Deuteronomy 24:1 must not have been consummated, therefore the prohibition of her return to the former husband, since she was "defiled" by her second husband. But we read, [*Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled...* Hebrews 13:4.] We see by this passage that consummation of marriage is *never* defiling to the husband or the wife. Neither is it to the second husband and wife. In today's vernacular we often refer to a "second" marriage, or being *remarried*, but not so with the Scriptures. When יהוה's merciful law of divorce has been exercised and the injured party marries again, it is referred to in the Scripture as simply, *married*. This is because a so-called *second* marriage is considered as valid as a first marriage. The Lawgiver provides the law of div/rem as the next best thing to a stable one-time marriage, which is the way it was from the beginning in the Garden of Eden. That was the one-time ideal condition of the joyful marital institution which lasted until sin entered the picture; and as we all surely know, the beginning is now over. But we must demonstrate that the first husband of Deu 24:1 actually did consummate the marriage with the wife he had taken, and the secret is in the word *taken*.

"When a man hath *taken* a wife, and married her..." Hebrew לקח #3947 *lawkakh*: to take; accept; to buy; infold; to mingle. When a woman is accepted by a man, he offers her father a dowry: a bride-price. After the wedding ceremony he takes her to their new home and he infolds her in the intimate marital embrace, and mingles his seed within her in the holy consummation of marriage. Let us see if other Scriptures support this concept. Let us see if this is how the Hebrew word לקח is used throughout the Scriptures. The first passage is from the BBE Version.

Deuteronomy 20:7 Or if any man is newly married and has had no sex relations with his wife, let him go back to his house, so that in the event of his death in the fight, another man may not take her.

2nd Samuel 12:9 Wherefore hast thou despised the commandment of יהוה, to do evil in his sight? thou hast killed Uriah the Hittite with the sword, and hast taken his wife to be thy wife, and hast slain him with the sword of the children of Ammon.

1st Kings 7:8 And then he made a house like it for Pharaoh's daughter, whom Solomon had taken as his wife.

In every one of these instances cited, taken is *lawkakh*, and as can be seen, signifies consummation in the marital embrace. So the idea that a woman is defiled in a second marriage or any subsequent legitimate marriage at all is totally without foundation. In some strange twist of the mind, the sad pseudo-doctrine of sexual intimacy between a man and his wife as being something unholy and defiling has ruined many a marriage and many a mind. That special time is a religious experience as deep and wonderful as prayer itself, and it is only false religion that promotes celibacy to the denunciation of the sacred institution of marriage and yes, remarriage as it is now referred to. So-called celibate priests have been known to forcefully impregnate the monastery virgins, and even worse atrocities. Let us read from 1st 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; Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry...

As we have confirmed thus far in this writing, the ideal is that marriage between a man and a woman should last forever with never a discordant note in the symphony. And there are model marriages that run as smoothly as a symphony throughout. That is the ideal. However, we must face the cruel fact that sometimes things go awry, and since they do, we have to come to a Scriptural conclusion. Many have taken the position that marriage itself is infallible, and divorce is a sin; and that whoever marries a divorcee is committing adultery. Some versions even say it that way. Note how the English Majority Text Version renders Matthew 5:32:

But I say to you that whoever divorces his wife, except for a matter of sexual immorality, makes her commit adultery; and whoever marries a divorcee commits adultery.

The once married always married doctrine is not from the Hebrew Scriptures at all. But if not, then where do we find its origin? As we are about to discover, it comes from no where else than the corridors of Christendom. Despite the fact that many attribute this teaching to the Messiah, here is what we encounter in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1971, Vol. 14, Page 927:

“When followed by carnal consummation, this exchange of expressions of consensus maritalis would mature into the sacrament, and the marriage would thus become indissoluble. Such is the law of the Roman Catholic Church under the Code of Canon Law of 1917.” [art. Marriage].

It is evident by this that the non-dissolution of a bad marriage, be it the first, second, or fifth, is not found in Scripture. It certainly is not the doctrine of the great Lawgiver יהוה who made provision for all who were mistreated and abused. Thank goodness He has the wisdom to know our need of companionship and how things can sometimes go wrong. Poor floundering man, presuming to be spiritual guides, suppose they have the pure formula while rejecting the one and only pure formula as created by יהוה Himself. The Torah is a Masterpiece of justice and equity and compassion in perfect balance with each other, and everything that departs from this sanctified standard results in *inequity*, which is iniquity. Let us consider well that the apparent legislation on divorce and remarriage as found in the New Testament, seemingly in opposition to the Torah, should have raised some valid concern on the part of someone, somewhere. But we shall discover in *Concept Four* that the truth of the matter is, there is no opposing doctrine at all. The problem lies solely in ignorance and *fear of being honest*. Remember, fear is:

False..... False: not true; forged; feigned; fraudulent; treacherous; a lie.
Evidence.... Evidence is the clear, obvious, plain demonstration of proof in all controversies.
Altering.... Altering is the criminal act of changing the truth into a pernicious, harmful lie.
Reality..... Reality is the Truth as verified by the facts which constitute the evidence.

As the evidence continues to surmount, let fear disappear and evaporate into the air. Let there be joyful praise unto יהוה most High not only for the Torah evidence of the truth, but for its concomitant liberation of the innocent victims of injustice and abuse. This abuse comes from the offending spouse, and the injustice from the religious community who would consign the downtrodden to further torment by an imposed celibate life of a monastery monk or a convent nun. Be not afraid to assert your liberty in the Law that our benevolent Redeemer taught if you, dear Reader, are one of those victims of injustice and abuse. You shall know the Truth and the Truth shall set you free. (John 8:32).

If the Truth sets you free from man’s false ideas, do not keep this freedom to yourself: for such would be a crime. To the contrary, we are duty-bound to shout it from the rooftops! Not only for the sake of others who may also be under the yoke of oppression, but to exonerate the obvious disharmony between the two Testaments. Whether the translators were cognizant of the difficulties they set in motion or not, surely by now *we* are becoming aware of them. Let us not be found perpetuating the injustice. We must not hide our light under a bushel basket to thus enjoy the liberty alone when there are countless others who are in need of the light. Do not be timid Oh soldier of the Truth! Stand for the right though the heavens fall. Truth can stand up to anyone and anything. Arm yourself with the Truth...and stand!

Proclaim Liberty throughout the Land!

Concept Four

The Difference Between Divorced and Put Away

The following is a paraphrase of 1st John 4:8 reflecting the confused ideology that seems to lend “support” to the indissoluble marriage indoctrination: “*He that loveth not unconditionally knoweth not God: for God is unconditional love.*” Without a righteous standard, there can be no righteous judgment. In reality however, we surely know that from employment to marriage, to our covenant relationship with the Almighty, nothing is unconditional. The truth is, יהוה invites us into a covenant relationship with Himself. As we have revealed in Romans 7:1, there is a condition to the Divine Law having dominion over a man as long as he is alive: the man must perform *his part* of the covenant. And that is precisely why it is called a covenant, which means: *a formal, binding agreement between two or more parties.* And so, the statement in Romans 7:1 is conditional. In other words, the Law has dominion over a man all his life, but only as he chooses to remain under the Law’s jurisdiction. The living part is not the issue; *the choosing part is the issue.* And if we are able to discern that, then the same principle applies to the woman being bound to her husband as long as she liveth. It (the marriage contract) therefore is only binding *insofar as the covenant is mutually upheld.* The living part is not the issue: it is only an issue if they both remain faithful to their vows. A vow binds a person to his promise to perform certain agreed upon duties. The man’s vow is no less binding upon himself and to the marriage than is the woman’s vow. A man is bound by the Law to his wife so long as she liveth also...*so long as the covenant is mutually upheld.* A man cannot divorce his wife if she is not guilty of violating the covenant. But if she is, then he is not bound to her. *And if he* is guilty of violating his part of the covenant *neither is she bound to him, living though he may be.*

Peter began to speak: "I now realize that it is true that יהוה treats everyone on the same basis. (GNB). There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Yahshua the Messiah. (KJV). Act 10:34 & Gal 3:28.

In the clause, “there is neither bond nor free,” the word for *bond* is in the Greek, δοῦλος; doulos, which signifies subjection. A woman is commanded to be under subjection to her husband, *and he* is commanded to be under subjection to the Almighty. The point of the above text is that יהוה does not have a stern law for the woman and a lenient law for the man. The same laws of marriage apply to both men and women. There were slaves in the time of the Messiah, but in the Hebrew economy a bondservant or a bondmaid was to be treated with respect and dignity. A father could arrange the marriage of his daughter for a bride-price called *mohar* מוהר, as in Exodus 22:17. This was the dowry the husband gave to prove his commitment to her support. This was not a Hebrew fancy or some cultural notion they practiced in antiquity; it was a mandate of the great Lawgiver. Why would He command the young man to pay a dowry for his prospective bride? From the moment their eyes met they had the understanding that nothing in life is for free, and if anything is worth having it must be earned. Moreover, it demonstrated to the young lady and her family that this man was serious about his commitment to taking care of her the rest of their lives. She would save herself for him, and he recognized the treasure worth working for in her. Such was the bride-price. Perhaps there would be fewer divorces in this present age were there more of an investment to begin with.

Exodus 21:7-11 And if a man sell his daughter to be a maidservant, she shall not go out as the menservants do. If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed: to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her. And if he have betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters. If he take him another *wife*; her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage, shall he not diminish. And if he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money.

Herein is delineated the general principle of man's obligation to his wife, which involves support and the conjugal rights of sexual intercourse, thus giving her children and building the family structure. This is called Family Security. Large families ensured large and independent prosperity. Social Security is only social. As we can see, the Lawgiver commands that if he fails to uphold his part of the contract, she is free to go. Go where? As we discussed earlier in Concept Two, according to the same Torah regarding the same issue of marriage and divorce, as found in Deuteronomy 24:1-4, she is free to go and contract a new marriage. In that section of the legal code, hypothetically, the first husband is displeased with her, sends her away with the bill of divorcement; then the second husband diminishes his affection toward her, thus rejecting her also. By granting her the bill of divorce, *גט*, in His infinite mercy, does not require either party to live in misery but has called us rather to live a life of peace. The prohibition of her return to the former husband would cause that man to ponder deeply the value of his wife before sending her away, nevermore to return to him again. Usually, the dowry price was a heavy investment on the part of the husband: an entire year's wages. That being the case, he would incur a heavy financial loss in sending her away. He didn't get a refund. And the time she is put away prior to the writing of divorcement gave him some time to think it over, and perhaps reconsider his own faults that contributed to the breakdown of the marriage.

Some have argued that Exodus 21:7-11 is referring to a bondmaid and therefore has no application to the present time, but indeed, if *גט* requires such good treatment for a bondmaid wife, how much more do you suppose He would require for the free woman? The issue here is marriage not slavery; and the issue is accountability as well. The Divine Law provides standards of accountability. The superficial concept of "*once married always married*," come what may, is foreign to the Hebrew Scriptures and foreign to reason and logic as well. In the Law there are consequences to bad behavior. Modern Jews, still holding fast to the reasonable laws of divorce and remarriage as found in the Torah, have the lowest divorce rate of any people on earth—about 2%. Fear is the weakest of motives and cannot long hold its captives enchained. The principle of the Torah is that of love based upon sound reason and accountability. This fear tactic of Christendom regarding marriage is tantamount to the medieval doctrine of Dante's Inferno, the eternally burning hellfire story in which the wicked are allegedly engulfed in flames of fire, tortured throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity. The purpose of this horror story is to scare people into subjection to the priest-craft. So it is with the doctrine of imposed celibacy upon the innocent victims of marital abuse, *forbidding to marry* (1st Timothy 4:1-3).

In the Law, there are Consequences to Bad Behaviour.

To fabricate a religious sanctity around the pseudo-concept of "*once married always married*," pleading the case of the perfect marriage in Eden is no virtue. Anything that contradicts Divine Law is not grace; it is disgrace. Those who forbid an injured party to marry again are teaching men to break one of the Divine Laws. They shall be called least in the kingdom of Heaven. And since it is a doctrine of devils they're promoting, they won't be there to hear the denunciation. All who teach mankind *גט*'s merciful divorce law on the other hand, when there is a legitimate need, will be called great in the kingdom of Heaven, and of course, they'll be there to hear it.

There are many today who claim to love and obey the Torah, and yet denounce certain portions of the Torah such as the one we are discussing here. Will they be willing to stand one day before the Great White Throne of Judgment and denounce before *יהוה* His statute on divorce as found in Deuteronomy 24:1-3 in support of a translational lie? Sin is rebellion against the Torah. In order to promote the translational invention of Matthew 5:32, one has to condemn the divine Law of divorce and remarriage as found in the Torah. Where in all the Torah does *גט* state that the remarriage of the innocent victim of divorce is a sin? That is the question.

Concept Five

The Key of Knowledge

Luke 11:52 "How terrible for you teachers of the Law! You have kept the key that opens the door to the house of knowledge; you yourselves will not go in, and you stop those who are trying to go in!" (GNB)

The word divorce occurs only one time in the Hebrew Scriptures, and divorcement only three times. In all four places, the word is כְּרִיתוּת *kerithuth*: it always means divorce. *Put away*, on the other hand, never means divorce, but is sometimes used in connection with divorce. It is of utmost importance that we understand the difference between these two Hebrew words, for in the *misunderstanding* of them lies the secret to the false concept so prevalent in Christendom—a false concept that has literally destroyed many precious lives. The phrase *put away* in Hebrew is שָׁלַח *shalakh*, and means *to send away*. When Messiah told the religious leaders of His day that Moshe suffered (allowed) them to put away their wives, He made it clear that a man was not commanded to put his wife away but was *permitted* to do so. Although the word occurs a few hundred times in the Scriptures, it is used but seven times regarding the relationship of a man and woman. Should a woman fall into sin, a merciful man's first option is to send her away while he deliberates upon what course he should pursue from there. The option to forgive is never absent in the Divine will and always it would do us well to think the matter through. This was Joseph's plan when he learned of Mary's pregnancy. [*Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privately*]. What was just for Joseph in Matthew 1:19 did not become unjust in Matthew 5:31, 32. The condition of being *put away* is widely misunderstood today because of A), our unfamiliarity with the Hebrew Torah; B), the strong influence of the Roman Catholic doctrine regarding marriage; and C), the inconsistent translation of these key words כְּרִיתוּת *kerithuth* (writing of divorcement), and שָׁלַח *shalakh* (put away). In like manner, the Jewish courtship of a man and woman has been replaced in Western culture with the dating game. After courtship comes the betrothal wherein the dowry is paid by the prospective husband to the young woman's father. At this stage of the dowry the contract is drawn up between the father and the groom. Take notice that even though the sacred consummation had not yet sealed the marriage, Yosef is called by the angel of יהוה *Mary's husband*, and she is called *his wife* (Matthew 1:19, 20). All of this should reveal to us our great need to spend more time in studying the Scriptures from their original Hebrew language. It should reveal to us the shallowness of most other languages. Perhaps that is why Zephaniah 3:9 prophesies of a time when the pure Hebrew language would be restored to the people of יהוה. Let us now learn the difference between these two Hebrew expressions; for they bear the weight of Messiah's understanding of the Divine Law in the issue of divorce and marriage anew.

Isaiah 50:1 Thus saith יהוה, Where *is* the bill of your mother's divorcement, whom I have put away? or which of my creditors *is it* to whom I have sold you? Behold, for your iniquities have ye sold yourselves, and for your transgressions is your mother put away.

In asking, "*Where is the bill of your mother's divorcement?*" the implied answer is that there is none at this point in time. *She was only put away*, thus revealing the difference between divorcement and put away. It was a time of grieving and hopefully repentance on the part of the erring wife. Although יהוה allowed divorce, He introduced the putting away time to allow for repentance first because His Divine nature seeks to forgive our sins and backslidings. He is not willing that any should perish without first an offer for repentance, and so should it be with us. Repentance means a change of heart as evidenced by a reformation in the life. There should be a large place in our hearts for forgiveness to an erring spouse, but if there is a stubborn unrelenting refusal to repent then יהוה makes a way of escape for the innocent: be they male or female.

Isaiah 54:5-8 For thy Maker *is* thine husband; יהוה of hosts *is* his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; The Elohyim of the whole earth shall he be called. For יהוה hath called thee

as a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit, and a wife of youth, when thou wast refused, saith thy Elohyim. For a small moment have I forsaken thee; but with great mercies will I gather thee. In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith יהוה thy Redeemer.

A woman was put away temporarily during her menses as well. It was a normal situation during her time of ceremonial uncleanness. In fact, the only times she should be put away is during menses or if she contracts leprosy, or comes in contact with a dead person, or if she commits fornication. In this serious case, the husband may elect to put her away and divorce her at the same time. If she is innocent however, putting her away would be wrong. If she becomes cleansed, then she should no longer be put away. If she refuses to repent of her fornication then the only recourse left the husband is to give her a bill of divorcement. Some 83 years after Isaiah wrote his prophecy of apostate Israel, the prophet Jeremiah wrote his lamentable words.

Jeremiah 3:1, 8 They say, If a man put away (שָׁלַח) his wife, and she go from him, and become another man's, shall he return unto her again? shall not that land be greatly polluted? but thou hast played the harlot with many lovers; yet return again to me, saith יהוה. And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away (שָׁלַח shalakh), and given her a bill of divorce (כְּרִיתוּת kerithuth); yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.

Matthew 5:31, 32 It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away (שָׁלַח shalakh) his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement (כְּרִיתוּת kerithuth): But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away (שָׁלַח shalakh) his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is *divorced* (שָׁלַח shalakh) committeth adultery.

Perhaps the observant eye discovered right here the enigma. This is the focal point of the whole problem. The expression put away (שָׁלַח) in the Greek is ἀπολύω apoluo, #630 in Strong's Greek Lexicon. It is translated 69 times as put away or send away, **and once** as divorced here in this text under consideration. The crafty translators took the liberty to transform the Greek word which otherwise is always translated in the text as *to send away*, into the English word divorced, not from the Greek word apostasion ἀποστάσιον #647, which always means [the writing of divorcement] in the Greek, but from apoluo, which out of the 70 times it is found in the New Testament as put or send away, *only once is it used as divorced here in Matthew 5:32*. Their unfounded liberty has brought multitudes into cruel bondage. It should read, "...and whosoever shall marry her that is put away committeth adultery." The put away time is never the state of divorcement, unless the writing of divorcement is given at that time as in Deuteronomy 24:1. The woman is still married when she is only put away! Of course it would be adultery for that woman to marry again; she is not yet freed from her former husband in the shalakh/apoluo state of merely being put away; it's only a separation! This is a question of the Divine Hebrew Law. Neither Greek, English, nor Latin translations, nor their interpretations can change the Hebrew Law. It is to that Law alone that we must appeal for the true understanding. To do otherwise, as can be seen, puts the Messiah at variance with His own Father's Law, which thing can never be.

Psalms 119:126-128 *It is time for thee, יהוה, to work: for they have made void thy law. Therefore I love thy commandments above gold; yea, above fine gold. Therefore I esteem all thy precepts concerning all things to be right; and I hate every false way.*

It should be evident that by the use of the spurious word divorce the whole meaning is changed, giving an opposite understanding of what is stated clearly in the Torah. The Torah verily blesses the divorced woman or man in their following marriage! And Yahshua did not condemn such a marriage. The translators, in the last page of the Introductory to the 1611 KJV, *admit to changing the words*. A good example of their pernicious tampering with words is found in Acts 12:4, wherein they translated *pascha* (Passover) as Easter! Even the Roman Catholic Douay Version of 1610 did not take such a liberty as that; they left the word as Passover. It is very unlikely that the apostles were celebrating Easter.

We cannot overemphasize this: the Greek word divorce is ἀποστάσιον, apostasion. It is from this word that we get the English word apostasy: a renunciation or abandonment to a former loyalty (as to a religion). By the same token, the Greek for put away is ἀπολύω (apoluo). As can be seen, this is a different word than divorce. So, in the original Hebrew we have two differing words for divorce and put away, as well as in the Greek, and in the English, and in the Spanish, and probably every other language on the earth. And because a few misguided men conspired to change a very important word (in only one little place in the whole big Bible), multitudes have jumped over the abyss in following after them. Yahshua said, “*Not the slightest yod or keriah (jot or tittle) would in any wise pass from the Law till all be fulfilled*” (Matthew 5:18), and the Torah commands that we shall not add to nor diminish aught from its teachings (Deuteronomy 4:2). It is one thing for the translators to have committed this trespass; it is quite another for people today to endorse and perpetuate the sin. The evidence reveals that by use of the word divorce in the latter part of Matthew 5:32, there is created a contradiction between the Messiah’s words and His Father’s Law as found in Deuteronomy 24:1-4, which clearly blesses the divorced woman in her second marriage. And as we shall see, there is created the same contradiction between 5:32 and the identical statement as found in Matthew chapter 19. Let us cease being accomplices to the crime of the translators of merely four hundred years ago. Try as we may, we certainly cannot trace the problem beyond the 1611 so-called *Authorized Version*. If we have sinned through ignorance, we must not seek to let ourselves off too easily. If we have carelessly wounded some innocent soul who was injured enough already through harsh marital abuse by pronouncing them guilty in a second marriage while in truth they are innocent, we had better seek their forgiveness and be willing to make some public confessions as well. What gross hypocrisy is committed in accepting the tithes and offerings of these poor souls but denying them the office of a leadership role when so often they are more qualified than those pretending to fill the position! To declare someone guilty when יהוה declares them innocent is an abomination in His sight. As we read in Proverbs 17:15 from the (ERV),

יהוה hates these two things: punishing the innocent and letting the guilty go free.

Let us read Jeremiah 8:8 from three different versions:

(CEV) You say, "We are wise because we have the teachings and laws of יהוה." But I say that your teachers have turned my words into lies!

(GNB) How can you say that you are wise and that you know my laws? Look, the laws have been changed by dishonest scribes.

(ISV) How can you say, 'We're wise, and the Law of יהוה is with us,' when, in fact, the deceitful pen of the scribe has made it into something that deceives.

Let us examine a few of the 70 places wherein *apoluo* in the New Testament is used as “to *send away*,” and see if the idea of divorce could have any remote connection to that word. The translation of apoluo will be underlined.

Matthew 14:22 And straightway Yahshua constrained his disciples to get into a ship, and to go before him unto the other side, while he sent the multitudes away.

Matthew 15:23 But he answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, saying, Send her away; for she crieth after us.

Matthew 15:32 Then Yahshua called his disciples *unto him*, and said, I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me now three days, and have nothing to eat: and I will not send them away fasting, lest they faint in the way.

Matthew 27:15 Now at *that* feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would.

Luke 2:29, 30 יהוה, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: For mine eyes have seen thy salvation,

Luke 8:38 Now the man out of whom the devils were departed besought him that he might be with him: but Yahshua sent him away...

Luke 13:12 And when Yahshua saw her, he called *her to him*, and said unto her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity.

Luke 22:68 And if I also ask *you*, ye will not answer me, nor let me go.

Luke 23:16 I will therefore chastise him, and release him.

Acts 16:35 And when it was day, the magistrates sent the sergeants, saying, Let those men go.

It is doubtful anyone would try to construe the above accounts to mean divorce. Why didn't the translators use the word divorce in any of these passages? To be wise as a serpent means to be astute, to not only see what the text says, but to also uncover the truth by what is not said—especially when something was misstated in a solitary place. Let us notice the same issue of divorce and remarriage in the same book of Matthew, and see if the word divorce was used for the word *apoluo*, put away.

Matthew 19:3-9 The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away (*apoluo*) his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made *them* at the beginning made them male and female, 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? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore יהוה hath joined together, let not man put asunder. They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement (apostasion), and to put her away (*apoluo*)? He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away (*apoluo*) your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away (*apoluo*) his wife, except *it be* for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away (*apoluo*) doth commit adultery.

It is at this very point that the enigma is resolved. By comparing this identical text with the problem text of Matthew 5:32, we see that the translators here *correctly* inscribed the words *put away*, whereas in 5:32 they spuriously penned the word *divorced*. How can we be so sure? The entire theme of divorce and remarriage is consistent throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, and as we are about to discover, in the Greek writings as well. Contrary to what many believe, even Rav Shaul is in full harmony with the Torah on the matter as we shall see in Concept Four. Again, the Greek word *apoluo* occurs 70 times in the Greek New Testament: 69 times it means *to send away* as *shalakh* *always* means in the Hebrew. But once, and once alone, does it become “divorced” in Matthew 5:32. It is unsound reasoning for any to base a doctrine upon a one-time occurring, questionable Greek interpretation of a word *that 69 other times* means something altogether different. And yet upon such a shallow premise through the dark ages (which verily continue to this present moment) multitudes perpetrate a life of unjust misery upon the suffering and the innocent by condemning a future life of joy and fulfillment entitled to them in a valid subsequent marriage. This religious pomposity evaporates quickly away when their own secure marriages begin to fail. Then they usually seek “a deeper” understanding of this issue, as it now has come knocking on their own seemingly secure marital door. At this critical time of personal duress and abject loneliness perhaps to remarry may not be so sinful after all, they reason. Such opportunists shall not go uncondemned when they stand one day before the great White Throne of Judgment and the Ancient of Days, not to give account of an unsanctified second marriage, but for their condemnation of the innocent here and now. Again, Proverbs 17:15:

Exonerating the wicked and condemning the righteous are both detestable to יהוה . (ISV)

How is it that ministers and church goes so easily pronounce condemnation upon the innocent party of divorce who remarries, but they never offer the slightest explanation for the outright contradiction of Matthew 5:32? Are they without the knowledge of the truth? Are they guilty of rejecting that knowledge? There are even Messianic, Sacred Name versions of the Scriptures in this present time that perpetuate the fraudulence. Who is the father of lies?

Before leaving this subject, we need to state that the word *apoluo* carries the definition in the Greek as *divorce*, but totally apart from the Divine Law. Because it is sometimes connected with divorce, the Greek includes it as a minor definition...*in the New Testament*. So let us see if the Septuagint Greek Translation of the Old Testament uses the word *apoluo* as divorce. Let us return to the divine legislation of Deuteronomy 24:1:

When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement (apostasion), and give *it* in her hand, and send her (*exapostello*) out of his house.

G1821 **ἐξαποστέλλω** *ex-ap-os-tel'-lo*: to *send away forth*, that is, (on a mission) to *dispatch*, or (peremptorily) to *dismiss*: - send (away, forth, out).

Lo and behold! We now find a different word for send forth or put away. This word is in the Strong's Greek Concordance just like the word *apoluo*. Why didn't the translators of the New Testament use this Greek word as found in the Septuagint instead of the ambiguous *apoluo*? It means, "sent forth;" it is where we get the word *apostle*. There is nothing in it that intimates divorce! Notice the identical word in the following texts:

Jeremiah 3:1 They say, If a man put away (**ἐξαποστέλλω**/*exapostello*) his wife, and she go from him, and become another man's, shall he return unto her again? shall not that land be greatly polluted? but thou hast played the harlot with many lovers; yet return again to me, saith **יהוה**.
Jeremiah 3:8 And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away (**ἐξαποστέλλω**/*exapostello*), and given her a bill of divorce (apostasion); yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.

This word is found some 264 times in the LXX (Septuagint) and not once does it translate as divorce. It is found 11 times in the New Testament and not once is it used as divorce. The Greek word *apoluo* is found six times in the LXX, and not once does it have anything to do with divorce. [Genesis 15:2; Exodus 33:11; Numbers 20:29; Psalm 34:0; Isaiah 22:25; Jeremiah 1:10]. As mentioned previously, it is found 70 times in the Greek NT and is translated *only once* as divorced (in Matthew 5:32). Notice a couple verses from the LXX wherein *apoluo* is used:

Exodus 33:11 And **יהוה** spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend. And he turned again into the camp: but his servant Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man, departed not out of the tabernacle.

Psalms 34:1 A *Psalm* of David, when he changed his behaviour before Abimelech; who drove him away, and he departed.

Thus we find through diligent searching of the Scriptures a vast difference between the put away or sent away state, and the divorced state. They are not one and the same. When we consider that *exapostello* is used some 264 times in the LXX and 11 times in the NT, (275 times altogether), and *apoluo* is used only six times in the LXX and 70 times in the NT (76 altogether), that is a combination of 351 times *send away* is used in the Bible and *only once* was it translated as divorced. This of course exposes the subterfuge. We thus are compelled to face the fact that our Messiah did not stand in opposition to His Father's Law as if to say that whoever marries a divorcee commits adultery. He said that whoever marries someone *who is only separated* from their spouse commits adultery. Of course that would be adultery. The four sins of the hard-hearted husband in Matthew 19:9 are, A) unjustly putting away his innocent wife; B) sending her forth without her much needed Letter of Freedom; C) thrusting her into a life of poverty, and D) himself marrying another. Though he cannot force her into a life of sinful harlotry by all this injustice, he certainly can create a set of circumstances that could possibly drive her to enter another marriage and commit adultery because he refused to give her a writing of divorcement. But the sin lies upon him. Let us read what is really written in Malachi 2:16:

For **יהוה**, the Elohyim of Israel, saith that he hateth putting away; for *one* covereth violence with his garment, saith **יהוה** of hosts: therefore take heed to your spirit, that ye deal not treacherously.

Defiantly, many versions read, "*I hate divorce*" for this passage, but the truth is found in the original Hebrew as we have discovered, and even in the KJV: He hates the evil practice of men putting away their innocent wives without giving them their required Letter of Freedom; that is what He hates. Let us hear now the conclusion of the matter.

The Divorce and Remarriage Enigma Resolved Setting the Captives Free!

Concept Five

In the Final Analysis

Yahshua was addressing Hebrew men who knew the Torah. He endorsed their understanding of the Law and proclaimed allegiance with them to it including the divorce and remarriage law of Deuteronomy 24, and Exodus 21. The issue presented to Him in Matthew 19:3-9 was *a man's right to divorce and remarry*. Nothing at all is said *there* about a woman's rights: they have already been dealt with in the Torah and the Messiah is in absolute agreement with them as we know by His own testimony. The Hebrew term He used for fornication was זָנָה *zanah*, translated into Greek as πορνεία: *pornea*, which in turn, conveyed the full intent of the Law: all unchastity, uncleanness, and *all idolatry and false religion*. Any breach of the sacred covenant constituted grounds for cutting off. The Pharisees added a host of trivial "reasons" of their own to the actual list (Matthew 23:1-3), of which the Messiah did not endorse, and that is why He used the strong phrase, "...except it be for..." *davar zanuw* (*pornea*: fornication). This word had been used in the Greek Septuagint long before the earthly sojourn of the Messiah and He used the equivalent Hebrew expression which limited the grounds of divorce to only the breach of covenant to the Creator primarily, and to the offended spouse, thus cutting through all the vain decrees of men that He abolished at His death. *"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."* (Colossians 2:14).

Modern religionists endeavor to make the above statement say he nailed His Father's Law to the cross, but such is the nature of Babylon: confusion. יהוה however is not the author of confusion. There is perfect agreement between Father and Son, including the divorce and remarriage legislation. If a wayward spouse turns from serving the Almighty יהוה and becomes an idolater, or begins eating scripturally unclean foods (though never committing adultery) that constitutes grounds for divorce according to both the Hebrew and the Greek translations. We have the example of this in Ezra, chapters nine and ten, wherein the people of Israel, in covenant relationship with יהוה were practicing the abominations of their pagan spouses, and the solution was to divorce them and begin again. We find in 1st Corinthians 10:11 that all those incidents of antiquity were written for our admonition (our instruction) upon whom the end of the final age has come.

Whereas the ancient Pharisees of Judaism abused the divorce law claiming a woman could be divorced for trivial matters, modern-day Sadducees of Christendom abuse the marriage law, claiming an injured spouse cannot divorce and remarry for even colossal violations to the marriage covenant. That's why they're so sad you see, literally. Since misery loves company, they extend their sadness even upon the righteous and the innocent. But the sadness can end when the truth begins. *The Truth sets the captives free!*

Because with lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life: Therefore ye shall see no more vanity, nor Divine divinations: for I will deliver my people out of your hand: and ye shall know that I am יהוה. Ezekiel 13:22 & 23.

When they inquired about the matter of divorce, He did not say He objected to divorce. To the contrary; He said Moshe *permitted* divorce. And we surely know that Moshe was but the penman for the Divine Lawgiver: *"And Moshe said, Hereby ye shall know that יהוה hath sent me to do these works; for I have not done them of mine own mind."* (Numbers 16:28.) Moshe did not have the right to arbitrarily pen a few of his own laws into the Torah. Yahshua only repulsed the *amendments and additions to the Law*, made by the religious leaders of the day, not the Law itself. His statement brought them back to the specific reason for the divorce decree as opposed

to their *every reason*. He only answered their query on divorce which is to say that He endorsed the reason as given in the Torah. He then rebuked their obvious practice of putting away their wives *without* giving them the required bill of divorce thus pushing their wives, now put away and in need of support, to enter adultery by contracting a new marriage *without their Letter of Freedom*. The sin rests upon the treacherous husbands for this wicked practice. It had been going on for centuries as we read earlier: “*I hate putting away.*” יָהוָה didn’t say that He hated His own merciful law of divorce, *but rather their practice* of putting away their innocent wives for their trivial reasons (which He calls treachery against the wife of their youth), and adding yet more heavy burdens upon them by sending them out without their Letter of Freedom! This is what He hated. And the Messiah, in absolute harmony with His Father’s Law, proclaimed His mutual hatred of it as well. He made it clear that the divorce law is a last resort to be used only for serious matters, not foolish nonsense as they were doing.

The entire 23rd chapter of Matthew is a series of strong rebukes upon the proud and crafty Pharisees. When they brought the woman taken in adultery to the Messiah (John 8:3-11), it was not in righteous indignation with a deep sense of justice prevailing in their hearts. The fact that they did not also bring the guilty man as the Law required reveals their pernicious imbalance of justice. The Master, nauseated with their hypocrisy, refused to even answer them as to how He judged in regard to the woman; He only stooped down near her and began writing something in the dirt. The passage doesn’t say what He wrote that day, but perhaps He wrote in the Hebrew, אֵיפֹה הָאִישׁ: aifo ha’ish? “*Where is the man?*” As they drew near to read the writing in the sand, they began dropping their cruel weapons from their hands. *Perhaps they were the man.*

Regarding the matter of divorce, the Pharisees entered the arena by asking about putting their wives away for their innumerable reasons. Yahshua met their attack by addressing their solitary cause to put her away which involved only some violation of the established Torah, inclusive of the required written divorce that was their responsibility to provide. The *King James Version* has the Messiah saying, putting away is for the one reason of fornication, which in the English is defined as premarital sex. Most of us realize that adultery is a far more serious reason for divorce than mere premarital sex, and we properly replace the word fornication with adultery. But if we think Messiah limited the grounds for divorce and remarriage to adultery alone, we make Him contradict Himself regarding His stand upon every yod and keriach (jot or tittle—Matthew 5:18) of the Father’s Law. He therefore could not have said that whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery. That is *man’s subtle adulteration* of the Messiah’s words. His solid condemnation was against the putting away of their wives for reasons beyond the Law, without providing the writing of freedom, and their concomitant practice of marrying the put away women not yet divorced! The wicked husband sinned when he remarried upon such unjust grounds, and he was responsible for the sin of his put away wife if she had to resort to a new marriage in order to survive.

It is comparable to their hypocritical sin of Corban as found in Mark 7:9-13. Instead of honoring their father and mother as the Law commands, they made a “contribution” to the temple in the form of the Corban; then after the priest took out his “commission” he returned the remainder to the “donor.” This freed the “worshiper” from his responsibility to take care of his aging parents as the Law required, since after all, he gave his life savings to the good cause of maintaining the temple. This was just one more of their ingenious designs to break the Law while claiming to obey it: pretending to look righteous when of a truth, they were full of deceit and wickedness: “*whited sepulchers full of dead men’s bones*” (Matthew 23:27). Messiah met and overthrew the craftiness and cruelty of the ancient Jews for their altering of the Law while pretending to honor it. In like manner, in this age we are called upon to meet and overthrow the cruelty of Christendom that not only neglects to defend the innocent, but even joins in heaping painful (false) guilt upon them. All such evildoers will one day be judged without mercy.

But What of 1st Corinthians Seven?

Strangely, it begins with the words, *It is not good for a man to touch a woman.*” Of course, our heavenly Father says, “*It is not good for the man to be alone.*” That being the case, it *is good* for a man to touch a woman...after all. We must decide which of the two sayings we like the best. Perhaps a better version of Shaul would be, “It is not good for a man to touch a

woman *at all times.*” During the week of Niddah (menstruation: Leviticus 15), husband and wife should not even sleep in the same bed. Those who practice this wise law have happy and fruitful marriages. They have a new honeymoon every month, and they save their wives from endometriosis as well as a host of other female problems.

Verse two gives the antidote to fornication: happy, fruitful marriages. The counsel then states that marital partners should render unto one another “*due benevolence.*” This is called the Duty of Marriage in the Torah. Not only is it a benevolent act of loving kindness that marital mates should render to one another, it is a marital duty they owe to each other. And so, as we know that it is impossible to render this due benevolence without some touching, we see that Shaul either left his thought uncompleted or some tricky translator erased some of his words. Moreover, he makes it clear that neither the husband nor the wife have any say in this matter of due benevolence. Of course, both will be very understanding when there are rare times of ill health or some other circumstance out of the ordinary, but otherwise they must perform this joyful duty with loving kindness and tender affection. There should be no refusal except it be with mutual consent, and that for very brief times of fasting and prayer. As soon as those brief seasons are past they should immediately come together again “...*that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency.*” (1st Corinthians 7:5). He then says that he wishes everyone would be like himself. Upon reading his wise counsel, we can certainly agree that he is someone worth emulating...but not if he is referring to becoming a celibate monk: that is contrary to the Divine will. Plus, it is adverse to human nature: and we are speaking of sanctified human nature by the way. Let us not forget that we were created *in His likeness*; we are just like Him when we are born again. How is He? He loves company and companionship.

Shaul states in verse 9 of this famous chapter that it is better to marry than to burn. Some versions include the words, “*with passion.*” Probably Shaul had written these words originally anyway, so they are an appropriate addendum. Men and women are not evil animals for burning with passion for each other in the proper context. It is *benevolent* to thus burn with passion in the marital embrace of intimacy. The more passionate the better! The Almighty יהוה gave us a passion to procreate sweet little babies for the purpose of continually replenishing the earth with good people. And even if there are no babies, it is still a good practice...beyond procreation. As a gardener has an unquenchable passion to plant seeds in his garden and thus enjoy his glad fruition, so is it the same in bringing forth precious children and training them up in the way they should go, just as we would train the tomato vines and string beans in the way they should grow.

Lo, children are a heritage of יהוה and the fruit of the womb is his reward. As arrows are in the hand of a mighty man; so are children of the youth. Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them: they shall not be ashamed, but they shall speak with the enemies in the gate. Psalm 127:3.

The babies are the gift we bring to Him in gratitude for the great gift of life He has given to us. A Hebrew quiver held fourteen arrows, so we can see by this that the Scriptures even give us counsel about how many children we should plan to have. We might refer to this as Family Planning...*in the positive sense.* Most of us have fallen far behind in our quota.

The admonition for the wife to reconcile to her husband rather than depart from him as found in verses ten and eleven (of 1st Corinthians 7) is very needful in this present time. For the most part people in this age are much too fragile in their feelings and they run away at every little offence. So these verses support all that we have said thus far: *Divorce is the very last and final resort reserved for only the most serious offences.*

The counsel as given in the following verses (12-16), Shaul admits is not from יהוה, but rather from himself. This portrays a true spirit of humility and honesty, but what should one do when reading the Bible in which we trust is all inspired of the Almighty, and he then comes across the words, “*the following counsel is not from יהוה?*” I suppose he should read the counsel, and see if lines up with the Torah teaching (every jot and tittle), like the noble Bereans.

Acts 17:11 The people there were more open-minded than the people in Thessalonica. They listened to the message with great eagerness, and every day they studied the Scriptures to see if what Paul said was really true. (GNB)

Can we imagine the audacity of anyone questioning the veracity of Paul? The only Bible the Bereans had was the so-called “Old” Testament Scripture. How would one be looked upon today if he told his pastor who had just preached a lengthy sermon whose every text came from the famous writings of Paul, “*Well Pastor, that was a mighty fine sermon, but I’m going home now to search the Old Testament Scriptures to see if what Paul had to say was really true*”? Would he not be denounced as a blasphemer, and excommunicated? But can we imagine, on the other hand, the other extreme: testing the writings of Moses (the Torah) by the writings of Paul?

The counsel of Paul begins with the case of a believer married to an unbeliever. When an unbelieving spouse is pleased to dwell with his or her believer, this is fertile ground to gain a convert into the kingdom of יהוה . By all means, the believer should not put such a partner away! The key is in the word *pleased*: Strong’s reference #4909: συνευδοκέω , *soon-yoo-dok-eh’-o*; *to think well of; in common with, i.e. assent to, feel gratified with*. This precious unbeliever is learning and agreeing with the religious beliefs of the believer! Of course she should not be let go, or put away! They’re on the brink of eternal joy.

The unbeliever of verse 15 on the other hand, is apparently *not pleased* to dwell with the believer, because he or she departs. Shaul’s counsel then becomes,

But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but יהוה hath called us to a life of peace.

Question: When the unbeliever departs, according to Rav Shaul’s personal counsel, to what is the brother or sister not under bondage? Some have erroneously said, “*not under bondage to submit anymore to the unbeliever*.” Shaul never counsels any believer to ever submit to the unbeliever. And besides, the unbeliever is no longer around anyway. He left. Nonsubmission to a nonentity is absurd. By comparing similar verses, we shall discover the intent of the author’s words and we need not add any private interpretations to the good man’s private counsel. Noting that the salient word *bondage* is #1402. δουλόω , *doo-lo’-o*; *to enslave (lit. or fig.): - bring into (be under) bondage, become (make) servant*, let us now compare verse 39 of the same chapter:

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 יהוה .

What is the meaning of this word *bound*? #1210: δέω , *deh’-o*; *a prim. verb; to bind (in various applications, lit. or fig.):--bind, be in bonds, knit, tie, wind. See also G1163*. Though not the same word as in verse 15, it bears the same meaning: that is *bondage*, and it is the same word as found in Romans 7:2.

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. Romans 7:2.

As we have already addressed this verse, and found that the Hebrew woman is bound by the Hebrew Law to her Hebrew husband who is performing his required duties of marriage, let us now focus in on her actual bondage. Interestingly, the word for *handcuffs* in Spanish is *esposas*, the same word for wife in the plural. A husband and wife are in bondage to each other in every sense of the word. Only through a serious violation of the covenant agreement can they be loosed from that otherwise pleasant bondage. If the unfaithful or the unbeliever departs, the believing brother, or sister, is not under bondage *to that marriage* any longer. Thus is the private counsel (of Rav Shaul) right in harmony with Messiah’s teaching upon the matter, and they both therefore are in perfect harmony with the Torah’s teaching upon the matter. And further still, if that were not the case, we have the Rav Shaul (Paul) in contradiction to himself, for as we read his continuing counsel,

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. (1 Corinthians 7:27,28).

This word *bound* is the same one as used in the previous two passages, and they all three mean the same thing: *bound to the marriage*. If ever there were plainer words than these, where on earth would they be? In uprightness when all things are in order, our marital bondage must keep us bound to one another, and we should not seek to be loosed from our marriage. That is exactly what Shaul is referring to here and it is too plain to misunderstand. By the same token, when we are legitimately loosed from the marital bond, we should not seek a new mate. Why would that be? If we chose the wrong one the first time around, why not let our wise and discreet Father be the One to choose the right one the second time around? The Rav then says to those who are loosed from the bondage of a previous (*former*, Deuteronomy 24:4), spouse, be they a husband, or a wife, that if such a one should marry, "*Thou hast not sinned!*"

Does it not seem appropriate to end this study at this point? It is the hope of this humble servant of יהוה, that if you, the Reader, have been the victim of an abusive *former* spouse, and you have suffered untold anguish and grief from the ordeal, and that if you, dear Reader, have suffered even further abuse and injustice from so-called Bible believers, that you now shake the shackles from your mind, and shake the dust from off your feet of these cruel imposters and fly away. Though having not a trace of support from Scripture, these poor souls will tenaciously cling to their pernicious doctrine of devils until one day they all face the righteous judgment of the Almighty One together. For thus is the just end of all who presume to teach men to break one of the least of יהוה's commandments. The merciful Law of divorce and marriage anew, was thoughtfully given to protect the innocent and punish the guilty. As we can see by our closing text, the divorced person who marries again has no more sinned upon that new marriage than has the virgin. We have torn through the manmade prisons of paper. May His Amazing Grace attend you in the liberty wherein you may stand: this is our prayer both now and forever more.

Shalom from the Shalom's.

שלום

2nd Corinthians 3:17 ... and where the Spirit of יהוה is, there is liberty.