

DEFINITIONS

Objective: This lesson is designed to define four terms : “marriage”; “divorce”; “adultery”; “fornication.”

“Words are vehicles upon which thoughts travel.” If words connote different things to participants in a discussion, communication is in jeopardy at the outset. It is essential, then, to understand God’s thoughts communicated by means of the Scriptures, to ascertain the meaning of those words used to convey those thoughts.

The understanding of four terms—marriage, divorce, adultery, and fornication—is requisite to understanding God’s will concerning marriage and divorce. This approach seeks to determine the meaning of those words by *Biblical usage*.¹

(Note: Key to acronyms and sources at end of lesson.)

I. “MARRIAGE”

Biblically, “marriage” is a relationship² between a man and a woman, established by a covenant to “become one another’s” (intimate companion) for life and sexual consummation.³

A. To enter “marriage” is to “become one’s”

1. Used by the Holy Spirit as the equivalent of “marriage”

a) Write the phrase in the following verses that is equivalent to marriage:

(1) Dt. 24:2⁴

(2) Ezk. 16:8

¹ If question using Biblical examples of usage to determine meaning:

- Proof of other definition?
- This how TH defines!
- Q. is—what did the word mean TO THEM? Then we can talk about the application to us.

² “Relationship” refers to some kind of connection between people. What that connection is will be determined by each circumstance. For example, the “relationship” of “father” and “son” refer to a connection of blood, a physical connection of generation. The “relationship” of marriage of a man and woman refers to a connection by covenant to be one another’s intimate companion and consummation of that covenant.

³ I.e., the covenanted relationship of “marriage” is brought to completion or fulfillment in sexual union.

“Consummate” - “1.a. To bring to completion or fruition; conclude: *consummate a business transaction*...

2. a. To complete (a marriage) with the first act of sexual intercourse after the ceremony.” AHD00.

⁴ NIV, “she becomes the wife of another man” Caution: Cannot use the NIV to reliably define words by Biblical usage because 1) it does not italicize added words (“wife” here) and 2) in its effort to make it simpler for the reader it interprets at times rather than translates (“unmarried” in 1 Co 7:27 instead of “loosed” or “released”).

(3) Ezk. 23:4

(4) Jer. 3:1⁵

- b) For further study, see Rom. 7:3: If you have availability to a Greek lexicon, what is the fundamental meaning of the word translated “be married” in KJV or “be joined” in the ASV or “is joined” in the NASB?⁶

2. Nature of the case

- a) A woman is “” and “” in marriage. (Read the following verses in order to fill in the blanks.) Dt. 7:3; 24:1; Gen. 28:1,6,9⁷; 29:19; 34:8,9; Josh. 15:17; Jud. 21:7; Mt. 24:38

- b) Man “” and “” in marriage. Gen. 2:22-24, Mt. 19:5

- c) 1 Cor. 7:1-5 - belong to one another

(1) Because of fornications (NASB, “immoralities”), each man is to do what?

(2) Each woman is to do what?

(3) Define “due,” or “duty,” v. 3.

(4) Define “defraud,” v. 5 (KJV, ASV).

B. Two things people must do to complete a “marriage”

1. Enter into a covenant

- a) Ezk. 16:8

(1) What transpired between God and Israel before she “became his”?

(2) What is a “covenant”?

- b) Mal. 2:14

(1) What does “treacherously” mean?

⁵ NIV, “marries another man”

⁶ *ginomai*, Strong’s #1096.

⁷ Note NASB and footnote - same Hebrew word as in vv. 1,6 - #3947 (took) + #0802 (wife)

(2) What does “wife of thy covenant” (KJV, ASV) mean? (Compare NASB)

c) Gen. 2:18-24

(1) Why was the woman made?

(a) Note: what is the opposite of being “alone”, v. 18?

(b) What does “companion” mean? (Use dictionary)

(2) What is the man’s obligation?

(a) See also Mt. 19:5,6.

d) For further study:

(1) Gen. 24:3,4,51,56-58

(2) Must the vows be public? (ceremony) Num. 30; Acts 23:12-16
Gen. 28:20, ...31:13; 1 Sam. 1:11... 12-13 .

(3) Must the vows be sincere? Dt. 23:21-23; Ecc. 5:4-6; Pro. 20:25

2. Consummate the covenant in sexual union

a) “One flesh”

Compare Gen. 2:24 with 1 Cor. 6:16. What act is the phrase “they shall be one flesh” built on?

b) Joseph and Mary

(1) How is their relationship described

(a) before conception Lk. 1:27?

(b) three months (? - see Lk. 1:39...56) later, Mt. 1:18?

(c) after they began to live together (Mt. 1:18...20, 24) and just before Jesus was born, Lk. 2:5? *Note Matt. 1:25.*

(2) Called “husband and “wife before married? Mt. 1:18,20...25.⁸

⁸ “as thy wife” - Lit., “the wife of him.” ASV, KJV, “thy wife.” “take,” “took” vv. 20,24 = *paralambanō* -

- (a) Define “prolepsis”
 - (b) Mk. 15:2. As Jesus did not begin reigning as King until his ascension, how could he confess being “King of the Jews” *before* that?
 - (c) Lk. 2:11. Since we are saved by the death and resurrection of Christ, Rom. 5:9,10, how could the angel announce him as the “Savior” at his *birth*?
 - (d) Dt. 22:22-24. Verse 22 deals with unlawful sexual conduct of a woman “” to a man. Verses 23, 24 deal with unlawful sexual conduct of a woman “” to a man. This second woman is called, v. 24, “his neighbor’s.”
 - (e) For further study:
Dt. 20:7, KJV, ASV, “betrothed a wife”; Gen. 24:3,4,7,38,40,51, “wife”...67; Lk. 2:5, KJV, NKJV, “betrothed (KJV, espoused) wife”; Rev 19:7-9 (v. 7, “wife” - KJV, NKJV, ASV, NASB footnote).
 - (f) Note: “Husband” and “wife” may be used in regard to an *anticipated* relationship (as above), and *existing* relationship, or a *past* relationship (2 Sam. 11:26; 12:10) Context and harmony must determine.
- (3) How could he “put her away,” v. 19, if not married?
- (a) *apoluO* = “lit. to loose from (*apo*, from, *luO* to loose)” VN. “*to loose from, sever by loosening, undo...*” TH.
 - (b) used of:
 - (i) Releasing from a debt - Mt. 18:27
 - (ii) Divorce - Matt. 5:31,32; 19:3,7,8,9; Mk. 10:2,4,11,12; Lk. 16:18
 - (iii) Releasing a prisoner from bonds - Mt. 27:15; Ac. 3:13; 4:21, 16:35,36; 17:9; 26:32; 28:18.
 - (iv) Forgiveness - Lk. 6:37

so that the person is “along” or “with” you where you are. See ref., esp. Jn. 14:3 (“receive” = *paralambanO*), “that...” Did they live in the same house, he take care of her? See Lk. 1:56; 2:4,5.

- (v) Releasing from the bondage of infirmity - Lk. 13:12
- (vi) Being let go, dismissed, or sent away from one's company or association, dismissed - Mt. 14:15,22,23; 15:23,32,39; Ac. 15:30,33

Nothing in the word to imply "marriage." What bond or connection being released or severed must be gathered from the context.⁹

- (c) Here, the Holy Spirit says the woman was "engaged" - i.e. *promised* to Joseph in marriage. He determined to "put her away" - release her from that *promise*.

c) Matt. 5:32

- (1) If the one who marries the divorced woman commits adultery in so doing, and adultery is a sexual act, the marriage must involve what?
- (2) Note: "whoever" is universal. To assert exceptions is to *assume* them and needs *proof*.

C. Civil law, ceremony, neither make nor break a marriage

1. Mt. 19:4

Jesus, in discussing marriage as God ordained it, goes back to the "...". What civil law was complied with then? What ceremony was engaged in?

2. Ezra 9,10

- a) What problem was brought to Ezra's attention?
- b) Were these marriages lawful or unlawful according to the national law for the Jewish nation? See 9:10-14, 10:2,3.
- c) This Jewish law was both civil and religious.

3. Consider other patriarchal marriages. Read Gen. 24:3,4...51...56-58...67; 29:21-30¹⁰

⁹ Observe that even VN makes a difference: "is rendered to put away in reference to one who is betrothed, Mt. 1:19; a wife, 5:31,32" (under "Put," #16, *apoluO*).

¹⁰ The patriarchal marriages show that people were married without civil sanction (legal papers, certification by officials). Some say it is an error to equate entering marriage in such situations with

4. Rom. 13:1, Rom. 12:17

a) The fact that civil law neither makes or breaks a marriage does not mean no regard is to be paid to it. According to Rom. 13:1 we are to do what?

b) Likewise, because a ceremony is not essential to make a marriage, it does not follow that there is no value in one. Rom. 12:17 teaches we must do what in regard to all men? See Jn. 2:1.

c) Some argue that if civil law not complied with there is no marriage because God commanded us to obey civil law (Rom. 13:1) and there needs to be social recognition. But...

(1) True, the marriage covenant is not “ratified” *legally*, i.e. by civil law, until its requirements are met. But, civil law \neq God’s law. Q. is, when does God recognize the covenant as “in force” (ratified)? If civil law does not ratify a covenant between Christians to form a “church,” is it therefore not a church?”¹¹

(2) If not “provide for what is honorable” (Rom 12:17), are they married? *Both* are commands of God and have to do with social recognition.¹²

entering marriage in situations where civil government exists. The point is, *were they married?* If yes, then civil government sanction is not an *inherent* part of marriage. If it is where civil government has jurisdiction, then indeed the “nature” of marriage is changed.

¹¹ Some ask, for the sake of argument, what if the “nature of marriage” is changed in situations where civil government exists (see previous footnote) - so what?” Here are some “so whats”...

- a. People could be married in one country, but upon moving to another country who did not recognize the laws of the previous country, find themselves unmarried. If they have sexual intercourse now, is it sin? Since they did not divorce (the new government simply does not recognize their relationship as “marriage”), can they marry someone else? If the new government says it will only recognize people as married who are of the same race, and since to be married to someone of the same race is not contrary to God’s law, can these two people now enter into a relationship of marriage if they are of different races?
- b. If people are not divorced until civil papers are filed and the government recognizes it, then people may separate for any reason, then at any time thereafter that the other party commits fornication or remarries, whether ten minutes or ten years later, file for divorce on the grounds of fornication and be free to remarry according to Mt 19:9.
- c. Two people may covenant to live together as husband and wife, do so for ten years, have three children, and then decide to split up and have the freedom to remarry without being in sin in the new relationship because they never complied with the civil law in the previous relationship. If you say the government recognizes them as married after living together for a stated period of time, were they never married if they split up one day before that specified length of time?

These examples of “so whats” are not given to seek a solution to all these situations, but to show this issue does indeed have consequence.

¹² Some argue society has always had some means of recognizing who was married and who was not (Romans 12:17), e.g. Samson’s marriage feast, the wedding feast at Cana, the marriage feast parable, and the parable of the ten virgins. Society may accept these as a means to recognize who is married, but they do

- (3) If “marriage” is not marriage until civil law recognizes it, is “adultery” not adultery until civil law recognizes it as so? Would civil law call the second marriage of Mat. 19:9 “adultery?”¹³

5. Discuss:

- a) Difference in fornication, rape, and marriage
- b) Difference in a housemaid, concubine, and a wife
- c) “Common law” marriage

6. Marriage is a *relationship* - holy or unholy

Where these two things are present (covenant & sexual union), there is a “marriage” even though not approved by God.

- a) Mk. 6:17-18

(1) Was Herod’s marriage to Herodias approved by God?

(2) Did God consider them “married”? What does the *text* say?

- b) Mt. 5:32

Though it is adultery, those who enter the unlawful relationship are said by our Lord to be “.” Note that this is *God’s* terminology.

not create a marriage, nor are they requisite to it. If a couple covenant to marry privately, get a license, go to the justice of the peace, all without any ceremony or announcing it to people, *are they married?* If they now take off on an extended honeymoon, society may indeed raise their eyebrows, but *are they married?* We agree Christians ought to provide for things honorable in the sight of men, but if they don’t, *are they married?*

¹³ We must obey civil law as long as it does not violate God’s will, and since getting a marriage license does not violate God’s law, we should comply with that civil requirement. But, we must do that to be *obedient*, but not to be *married*. If the civil law says the church must own property to be recognized by the civil government as a nonprofit religious organization, is the church not a nonprofit religious organization if it does not own property? If the civil government passed a law that elders must be registered with the state to be recognized as leaders in that nonprofit religious organization, would they not be elders if not so registered? The ‘nature’ of marriage is not changed by civil law. Civil government has jurisdiction relative to that country’s laws. The church above without property would not be a church *legally* (i.e., would not be recognized to be such according to that country’s laws); the elder who is not registered would not be an elder *legally*; and a marriage that did not comply with civil law would not be a marriage...*legally*. But, *biblically*, the church would be a church, the elder would be an elder, and the marriage would be a marriage.

The *legal* aspect of marriage is regulated by civil government, just as the *legal* operations of a church are regulated by civil government. But the nature of marriage or a church as defined and recognized by God is not changed by civil regulations.

- c) See also Mt. 19:9; Rom. 7:3; Ac. 24:25. All these go to show the term “marriage” does not connote *approval*.
- d) Even people married contrary to God’s law are “married” in God’s eyes. God calls even unholy relationships “marriages.” Avoid the snare of speaking of people who are in an unholy marriage as “not married in God’s eyes.” Because it is not RIGHT does not mean it is not REAL; because it is not APPROVED does not mean it is not ACTUAL; because it is not PERMISSIBLE does not mean it is not POSSIBLE.¹⁴ One might as well argue the “fornication” is not really fornication because God doesn’t approve it as argue marriage is not really marriage because God doesn’t approve it.

II. DIVORCE

As “marriage” is a relationship between a man and a woman based on a covenant to “become one another’s” and consummated by sexual union, “divorce” is severance of that relationship, i.e., a “putting away” the other as “one’s own.”

A. To “put away,” “send out of the house,” “separate from”

1. Dt. 24:1-3. What phrase represents divorce in this passage?
2. Jer. 3:1. What phrase represents divorce in this passage? (KJV, ASV. Compare NASB)
3. Matt. 5:31-32
 - a) If you have the KJV, what word and phrase are used synonymously?
 - b) Compare the KJV with another version of the term “put away” in v. 32.
4. 1 Co. 7:10-15
 - a) What words and phrases represent divorce in this passage?
 - b) How do you know this is divorce and not mere separation by consent for a time as in v. 5?
5. Mt. 1:18-19
 - a) What was Joseph *thinking about* doing? Did he do it?

¹⁴ Terminology (caps) borrowed from Kevin Kay, *Is It Lawful?*, p. 330.

- b) While Joseph and Mary were not married, but only engaged, this text shows a difference in “planning” or “considering” (NAS95) to sever a relationship (“put her away”¹⁵) and actually doing it.
- 6. Compare also Ezra 10:3...9...11...17...19. Note that several months transpired between the *decision* to put away their wives and the *actual doing* of it.¹⁶
- 7. Note: While divorce implies a decision to sever the covenant relationship, it is more than a mental act. The divorced person is “sent out,” “separated from.” It is also more than simply saying one is divorcing their mate. It requires the *decision* to sever the covenant and the *action* of severing the relationship based on that covenant.

B. Requires only the will of one

- 1. In the case of Jewish marriages, is there any indication that the consent of the wife was required before she could be “put away”? Dt. 24:1-3; Mt. 5:31-32; 19:3-9; Mal. 2:14-16.
- 2. 1 Cor. 7:10-15. If one partner in the marriage “departs” or leaves, in what state does that leave the other partner?
- 3. Compare other covenantal relationships. E.g., Abimelech and Abraham’s covenant about the well, Gen. 21:27-32; Zedekiah and people’s covenant to set Jewish slaves free, Jer. 34:8-11. See Mal. 2:14,16, “dealt treacherously, though she is your companion and your wife by covenant ... I hate divorce ...”
- 4. Compare to being fired versus resigning. Both refer to termination of relationship. One is initiated by the company, and one by the employee. If fired, can you quit? If quit, can you be fired? If you know you are going to be fired, you may quit first; but, what if you do not know...? Is this “fair?”¹⁷

C. Divorce is the severance of relationship - right or wrong

Avoid the divorced “in God’s eyes” or not divorced “in God’s eyes” phrases. Like marriage, because it is not RIGHT does not mean it is not REAL;

¹⁵ The word for “put away” in Mt. 1:19 is *apoluo*, the same word used for the severance of the marriage relationship. Earlier in this lesson we saw that *apoluo* does not imply people were married, but is a term used of severing some connection and what that connection is must be determined from each context.

¹⁷ The scriptures do not speak of “dual divorce.” One “putting away” in a relationship is all that is ever mentioned.

because it is not APPROVED does not mean it is not ACTUAL; because it is not PERMISSIBLE does not mean it is not POSSIBLE.¹⁸

D. Civil law

As civil law does not make a marriage, neither does civil law break a marriage.

1. "Certificate of divorcement" Dt. 24:1-3

a) A Jewish practice¹⁹

b) Who wrote this certificate and who gave it to the woman?

¹⁸ Terminology (caps) borrowed from Kevin Kay, *Is It Lawful?*, p. 330.

¹⁹ It is questionable whether the certificate of divorce was initiated by God's law. According to Matthew's account, Jesus said "permitted" it, Mt 19:7-8 (in contrast to the Pharisees, "Why then did Moses...command?"). Dt 24:1-3 = protasis; v 4 = the apodosis. "protasis" - "2. *Gram.* the clause that expresses the condition in a conditional sentence." W.NWD. "apodosis" - "the clause expressing the conclusion or result in a conditional sentence: opposed to PROTASIS." W.NWD. KJV, ASV do not clearly bring this out. NKJV, NASB: "When...*then*" NIV: "If...*then*" Dt. 24 legislated that in such circumstances the first husband could not have her back.

However, in Mark's account, the Jews say "permit" while Jesus says "this commandment" (Mar 10:4-5). If the true order of the conversation (harmonizing Mat. & Mark) has Mat. 19:4-7 *between* Mark 10:4 ... 5-9 (after v. 4), then the Jews said "permitted" in their answer to Jesus question, "What did Moses command you?" and "command" in their rebuttal (Mat 19:7) to Jesus reference to Genesis (Mat. 19:4-6). While this solves the seeming discrepancy between the Jews saying "command" in Mat.'s account and "permit" in Mark's, it does not deal with the fact that Jesus is represented by Matthew as saying "permitted" but Mark has him saying, "this commandment" (Mat 19:8; Mar 10:5). One possibility is that Moses "permitted" by way of "commandment." If so, no emphasis should be placed on Jesus saying "permitted" in contrast to the Jews "command." An alternative suggestion: By "this commandment" Jesus referred to the *whole* of Deu. 24:1-4 (synecdoche). If Deu. 24 is translated as the later versions, v. 1 is not a sentence by itself. When Jesus said, "permitted" he specified "you to divorce your wives." When he said "this commandment" he referred to the whole injunction, including the prohibition against having the wife back again and thus bringing sin on the land (v. 4). SUGGESTION: *Both* "permission" & "command" due to how they were treating their wives and the "hardness of your hearts."

Suggested harmonies of Mt. & Mk.: FFG, **McGarvey**, Comm. on Mt/Mark - 1) Mt 19:3; Mk 10:2-4 2) Mt 19:4-7 3) Mk. 10:5; Mt. 19:8. "This last remark is quoted out of its original connection by Mark ... [Mk. 10:5, srf], because he condenses the entire conversation." - Comm. on Mark. 4) Mk 10:10-12; Mt 19:9-12. **Hendriksen** - (1) Mt 19:3; Mk 10:2 (2) Mk 10:3-5 (3) Mk 10:6-9; Mt 19:4-6 (4) Mt 19:7-9 Here, if Jesus spoke this twice, once to the Pharisees and later to the disciples in the house (5) Mk 10:10-12; Mt 19:10-12 While in the house with the disciples. **Lenski** - "In Matt. the question about Moses is placed after the exposition regarding the creation of male and female; Mark seems to have the true order." Mk 10:10-12 a repetition by Jesus of what he said to the Pharisees (Mt 19:9). **Foster**, *Studies in the Life of Christ* - (1) Mt. 19:3; Mk 10:2 (2) Mt 19:4-7 (3) Mk 10:3-4 "Mark's account shows that Jesus asked them to quote the law on the subject (10:3)" [Did he here give them a chance to correct their use of Moses, Mt 19:7, "Why did Moses command to give...?" - srf] (4) Mt 19:8; Mk 10:5 (5) Mt 19:9 "Matthew sing on divorce (v. 9), given in answer to the Pharisees, was spoken before the entire crowd." (6) Mk 10:6-9 (? - Foster not com on this. Did Jesus reaffirm what he had said earlier?) (7) Mk 10:10-12; Mt 19:10-12 "He [Matthew, srf] then records a conversation with his disciples concerning t teaching. Mark 10:10 shows that this discussion occurred in private after they had gone into the house of some disciple....Jesus repeated his solemn declaration that marriage was for life."

- c) What was the purpose of it?
 - d) Are civil courts or an appeal to them anywhere in the passage? ?
 - e) Did the failure to give the certificate mean that the person was not divorced? See also Isa. 50:1²⁰; Mk. 10:12.
2. Discuss: Is it possible to be legally “married” while Biblically “divorced,” or to be Biblically “married” while legally “divorced”?

E. Separation versus divorce. 1 Cor. 7:5

- 1. This separation takes place “” and is to last only “.”
- 2. What is the difference in this and the “divorce” mentioned in the other passages we have been studying?

III. “ADULTERY”

Adultery is unlawful sexual intercourse, in which one (or both) of the participants is bound by law to someone else.

A. A sexual act

- 1. A “wife that committeth adultery,” Ezk. 16:32 (KJV, ASV; “adulterous wife”, NASB, NKJV), is performing the actions of what kind of woman according to v. 30-33?
- 2. What phrase in Ezk. 23:44 is equivalent to “adulteries” in Ezk. 23:43?
- 3. In Jer. 3:8 it is said that Israel “committed adultery” and her sister Judah “ALSO” “.”
- 4. For further confirmation study Lev. 20:10 in the light of the context following that verse. Observe that there is a change of subjects involved - i.e., “neighbor’s wife”, v. 10 (“friend’s wife” NASB); “father’s wife”, v. 11; “daughter-in-law”, v. 12; etc. - but the section as a whole is dealing with unlawful sexual activity. Note the parallel phrase, “lie with”.

²⁰ Did the certificate indicate the woman was innocent of adultery, so that she could be another man’s? No - Jer 3:8.

²¹ NIV, “And they slept with her. As men sleep with a prostitute” - Nothing in Heb. text meaning “sleep with.” An example of “dynamic equivalence” translation - “in which the translator seeks to understand as fully as possible what the biblical writers had to say...and then tries to find its closest equivalent in contemporary usage.” *The Story of the New International Version* (Inter. Bib. Soc., East Brunswick, N.J., 1978), p. 12.

B. Not ceremony, legal state

1. Above definition
2. According to Job. 24:15-16, what is characteristic of the adulterer and his practice?
3. Is this characteristic of the ceremony or of satisfying legal requirements?
4. In John 8:4 a woman is said to be taken in the “very act” of adultery. What is this according to Lev. 20:10f and Dt. 22:22-24? ?

C. Figuratively used to denote spiritual unfaithfulness

Rule: Literal unless context and harmony demands figurative. Ignore this and confusion is the result. E.g. “body” is used figuratively of the church. Apply figurative meaning in 1 Co 5:3, 9:27, 15:35...!

D. Involves a person bound by law to another - Ro 7:1-3

1. The woman which has a husband is “” to her husband as long as he lives, Rom. 7:2.
2. What is the logical import of “so then if” in Rom. 7:3? (See a dictionary).
3. “So then if, while her husband is living (and she is thus bound by law to him, v. 2), she be joined to (married to) another man (thus, bound by law to one man, but married to another), she (for this reason, “so then if”) shall be called an “.” Rom. 7:3.
4. According to v. 3, a woman bound by law to one man while married to another is an adulteress. The first man dies. She remains married to the second man, but it is no longer adultery.
 - a) Why? what has changed?
 - b) Is it the marriage (her marriage to the second man), in and of itself, that makes the sexual act “adultery”? Why?
5. A person bound by God’s marriage law is not what? 1 Cor. 7:39. This defines what the apostle Paul means by “bound to.”

E. “Adultery” describes the sexual act . . .

1. Between two people unlawfully married to each other, Mt. 5:32.

Objection: If this is true, explain Thayer's definition: *moichaO* - "to have unlawful intercourse with ANOTHER'S WIFE" (caps mine, srf)." The argument is that a man cannot commit adultery with his OWN WIFE. But, "wife" is used in Bible, and by us, not only of present relationships, but of *past* relationships (2 Sa 11:26; 12:10). Why should Thayer be limited to present relationships? Both Rom. 7:1-3 and Mt. 5:32 show that adultery can describe an unlawful sexual act with the mate one is presently married to.

2. Between two people not married to each other, yet one of them married to a third party, Ezk. 16:30-34.
3. Between two unmarried people, at least one of them having been married before, yet still bound by law.
4. The point to be remembered is that in adultery at least one party is *bound by law to another*.

IV. FORNICATION

Fornication is unlawful sexual intercourse in general.

A. Unlawful sexual act

1. What phrases are used interchangeably with "committed fornication" (KJV, ASV; "played the harlot", NASB) in Ezk. 16:25,26?
2. What phrases are used interchangeably with "fornication" in Ezk. 16:28-30 (KJV)?)?

Compare how the ASV and NASB translate the phrase rendered "multiplied thy fornication" in the KJV.

3. 1 Cor. 6:13-18.
 - a) Fornication involves a man's
 - b) When a man commits fornication he is joined to what?
 - c) Instead of "fornication" the NASB translates "immorality". What is meant is clearly indicated in the context as the above questions show. The NASB "immorality" may suggest too broad a concept, for while all fornication is immoral, not all immorality (e.g., murder) is fornication. See the marginal note in the NASB at Matt. 15:19, Col. 3:5.

B. Used interchangeably with “adultery”

1. Ezk. 16:23-32. “Committing fornication”, v. 26 (KJV, ASV), is used interchangeably with what phrase in v. 32? ?

Note: “fornication”, “whoredom”, “harlotry” used to refer to the same thing in the Old Testament.

2. In Rev. 2:20-22 the Lord said that Jezebel seduced his servants to “commit fornication” (“commit acts of immorality”, NASB), v. 20, and that he would judge those that “” with her, v. 22.
3. Compare also Ezk. 23:43 with the context of that chapter.

C. But, has a broader meaning than “adultery”

1. According to Ro. 7:1-4, the adulteress is “” to a man.
2. In 1 Cor 6:13-18 is there any indication whether the parties involved are married, unmarried, or bound by the marriage law of Ro. 7:1-4
3. Thus, all “adultery” can be called “fornication,” but not all “fornication” is “adultery.”
4. Include bestiality, homosexuality, lesbianism? Jude 7²²

D. “Living in” adultery, fornication

1. Is it scriptural to speak of “living in adultery”? Read Col. 3:5-7.

²² “gross immorality and went after strange flesh” - if “and” used in ascensive sense it would be a case where fornication included homosexuality. Note “Sodom and Gomorrah.” Exam. of *kai* in ascensive sense, “even” in Mat. 5:46,47, Gal. 2:13.

“Intercourse” – Thayer and A&G both say *porneia* is unlawful “sexual intercourse.” “Intercourse” is not in and of itself a sexual word; it refers to some kind of “connection or dealings between persons or groups” (Merriam-Webster, 2003). What that connection or interaction is must be determined. Compare, “social intercourse” – exchange of thoughts, feelings, communication. Thus the need to add the adjective, “sexual.” Merriam-Webster further defines it, “physical sexual contact between individuals that involves the genitalia of at least one person” and then give examples of anal, oral and heterosexual intercourse. A&G says on *porneia*, “every kind of” unlawful sexual intercourse.

porneia is a action. *pornE* (female) and *pornos* (male) are persons who practice *porneia*. If a prostitute (*pornE*) engaged in sexual contact involving the genitalia of either herself or her paramour, yet without engaging in penetration, would it be *porneia*?

“The word *porneia* is used by the LXX and by the writers of the New Testament, in the latitude which its correspondent word hath in the Hebrew language, namely, to denote all the different kinds of uncleanness committed, whether between men and women, or between men, or with beasts. “ MacKnight, *Apostolical Epistles*, on 1 Co. 5:1. Barclay, in *Flesh and Spirit*, discusses homosexuality under the word *porneia*. In an article by Frank E. Hirsch in ISBE, he says, “Every form of unchastity is included in the term ‘fornication.’ “ (Eerdmans, 1956) Vol. II, p. 746.

2. What does it mean?

AHD00 = *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language*, Fourth Edition. Copyright © 2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company.

ASV = American Standard Version of 1901

Bullinger = E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible* (Baker Book House, Michigan, 1971)

FFG = J. W. McGarvey, Philip Y. Pendleton *The Fourfold Gospel*

ISBE = *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, James Orr, Gen. Editor (Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1956)

KJV = King James Version

LXX = Septuagint version (Greek version) of the Hebrew Old Testament, translated c. 150-250 years before Christ was born.

MW03 – *Merriam-Webster's 11th Collegiate Dictionary*, 2003 (CD-ROM)

NASB = New American Standard Bible

NIV = New International Version

NKJV = New King James Version

NT = New Testament

OB = Online Bible

OT = Old Testament

OX10 = *Oxford American Dictionaries* included with MAC OSX

Q. = Question

Strong's = *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*

TH = C. G. Wilke / C. L. Wilibald Grimm / Joseph Henry Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Zondervan Pub. House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962)

VN = W. E. Vine, Merrill F. Unger, William White, Jr., *Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words* (Thomas Nelson Pub., 1985)

W.NWD = *Webster's New World Dictionary*, Third College Edition (Zane Pub., 1992-1995)

MacKnight = James MacKnight (1721-1800), University of Glasgow | University of Edinburgh Doctor of Divinity | MA, DD Minister of Maybole 1753 – 1769 *The New Translation of the Apostolical Epistles, with a Commentary and Notes* (1795)