

## Divorce & Remarriage Binding & Loosing

Fred R. Coulter—July 11, 1993

Let's continue on with 1-Corinthians 7:15—notice the one who initiates the divorce. It is very clear by the command of God that the believing mate cannot initiate and put away the unbelieving mate—cannot! That was a perversion of what was done as a result of doctrine in the various Churches of God.

1-Corinthians 7:15: “But if the unbelieving husband or wife separates, let him or her separate....” It has to come from the unbelieving mate. Both of you were unbelievers in time past; all of a sudden God calls one; they repent, baptized, receive God's Spirit, and start following God's ways. Some mates would say, ‘Oh, that's wonderful, you're a better mate than you've ever been. I don't believe like you do, but I'm happy to live with you.’ The other one says, ‘Where did you get this nonsense!’ That's the unbelieving mate. I'm going to divorce you.’ They separate themselves. See the vast difference, one from the other.

That's why I brought up the example of the man who was married to this Baptist woman for 35 years. I would not count her an unbeliever. She believes in Christ. She believes in grace. Not perfectly; she does go to church on Sunday. I understand that. Is she going to be in the Kingdom of God? *I don't think she'll be in the first resurrection, but I think she'll be in the Kingdom of God.* She's not a non-believer and she didn't separate herself.

With a non-believer, we're dealing with the ones who believe in Venus and Zeus and Apollo and Mars and all this sort of thing, complete foreign and contradictory ‘religion’—demon religion. That's what Paul said when he came to Mars Hill. He said, ‘I perceive that you're superstitious’ (KJV), *that you are devoted to demons* is what it means. So, we're talking about something that is totally different than what we say is a non-believer today.

A non-believer today has to make it clear that they are a non-believer. You don't define their non-belief in your terms for your excuse to divorce. They define their non-belief by the profession and by their actions. Again, this is not a broad, open wide window for license to divorce and remarry. This is a very narrow case.

“...let him or her separate.... [middle voice verb—he does it himself] ...The believing brother or sister is not bound... [the Greek here is ‘ou’—which comes from ‘ooks’—which means *the denial of the*

*reality that it's a binding marriage.* Without a doubt, I'm not pulling any punches.

Question about the one who is the non-believer separating and the word ‘not bound.’ In the Greek it means *not under the bondage or not bound.* This verb is used in many cases; it is also accurately used for the noun form of the word ‘doulo’ which means *to be bound, to be enslaved* in the sense of a slave or *bound to sin* in the sense of enslavement to sin. It means *to bind or loose a contract*—we'll go from binding and loosing to what the disciples and apostles were given. They weren't given binding and loosing so they could change the whole world. They were given to answer questions like this.

It's the exact same word: ‘doulo’—a different form of the verb. A different form of the verb does not change the sense of the verb, but it changes the person and the tense, but not the meaning of the verb: I go, you go, they go. In English it's all spelled the same: he goes, she goes, we go—different forms of the verb, but it all means the same. ‘Doulo’ means the same regardless of the form, and it is used when a person is a slave, they are *bound*—whether by property rights or indenture to that person, they are bound! Totally! They're bought and sold.

It's hard for us to comprehend that, the way that they were. *Strong's Concordance* does not break it down analytically, it breaks it down from the Greek word as it is translated into the English. You would have to look up all of the related English words to it and you would find that the same word is used. There's the Achilles' heel of that.

Verse 15: “But if the unbelieving husband or wife separates, let him or her separate.... [same word—it does mean *separate for divorce*] ...The believing brother or sister is not bound in such cases...” That marriage with the non-believer, because the non-believer has left looses the marriage because the Greek there is ‘oo’ which comes from ‘ooks’—which means *the impossibility of the reality of what it's negating.* If it says they are not bound, it means it's not possible that they are bound in such cases.

What if the believer says, ‘I'm going to get rid of my non-believing wife by making it so miserable that they'll be forced to go on their own volition’? *Don't guarantee your heart before God!* That's a malicious twisting! That is not right and remember Rom. 14—the judgment seat of God;

you're going to have to give an account for that. I suppose that there are some people, in their stupidity, think that they can outsmart God and do it.

But God knows everything! God knows the heart! We stand before God naked and the Word of God is sharper than a two-edged sword. The covenant marriage between Christ and the Church is not the same kind of covenant marriage between two people. Between Christ and the Church there are no grounds for divorce. You either stay married or you die in the Lake of Fire. There are no two ways about it! Christ is not the One to be put to the test, He already passed it. We are the only ones.

Could this not mean enslavement instead of bondage? *You have to understand what kind of enslavement it is talking about.* You can't bring to it a 20<sup>th</sup> century thought of enslavement vs the kind of enslavement that they were in. When they were released from enslavement they had no obligation to anything to the one they were enslaved to previously—period!

Let's answer the question concerning slavery: If you are bound because of being bought or sold as a slave you belong to that person—today, it's the IRS!—if you are loosed, not bound; this is stronger than loosing. This is the impossibility of being bound. If you are unbound as a slave, there is no possibility that that person has any more jurisdiction, any more affect in your life forever. You're not only loosed, you are not bound—the impossibility—'ook' *The negation of the reality of the fact stated*—that's what 'ook' means. The facts stated is binding, you are not bound. This is pretty strong language.

The brother or sister in such cases is not under bondage, or bound, "...for God has called us to peace. But how do you know... [Here's the thing that you do not provoke what we just said, that you make it deliberately miserable for the non-believer to leave. Here's the warning: don't do that] ...O wife, whether you will save your husband?..." (vs 15-16).

Obviously you yourself cannot save them, but bring them to salvation because of your conduct and good example. Who knows? Who really knows? Maybe in most cases like that, instead of fighting it on a doctrinal front—which most people do and smash the doctrine in front of the non-believer's face. If they fought it on the *love* front, you would have far less occurrence of this ever happening. And you would never have the thought enter into your mind that you would be so devious as to do what some people have done. Some have done it! God is going to judge them for that!

I tell you what, if they do that, I can guarantee that God is going to make sure that their lives are going to have nothing but trouble until the point that they come to repentance of that, because you cannot, with the Spirit of God, practice sin. If you are practicing sin, until the point of death, God is going to prick your heart to repentance so that you may. In the case of those who have divorced and remarried, and again divorced and remarried, God is going to have to prick their heart. But they're going to divorce and say, 'God, I've been nothing but an adulterer and adulteress and I am going to remain unmarried because eternal life is worth more than my stupidity and vanity.

In this case how do you know? Maybe you're loving to your unconverted husband or wife, maybe they'll be so happy that they will say, 'I'm sure glad you're in that church. I don't agree with the doctrine, but, boy, I know you love me.'

Verse 16: "...Or how do you know, O husband, whether you will save your wife? Let each one walk only as God has apportioned to him, according as the Lord has called him; and this is what **I command in all the Churches**. Was anyone called being circumcised?... [Is that how you were called?] ...Do not let him be uncircumcised...." (vs 16-18).

That's a tough operation; some Jews did. Do you think that's bad, the hatred between the Jews and Samaritans was so bad that if a Jew converted to Samaritanism he had to be re-circumcised. If a Samaritan committed to Judaism he had to be re-circumcised. Both of them requiring the initial circumcision in the first place, so they had a second rite of circumcision.

The question is: How do we differentiate this between slavery? *You're not bound in such place!* He's not talking about the slave, he's talking about husband and wife right there. The binding is the binding of marriage. Has to be, could be none other. What on earth are we talking about? We're not talking about if the wife is a slave. Was she bought as a slave? Was the husband a slave? Was he bought as a slave for the wife? *No! It's not talking about that!*

"...God has called us to peace" (v 15) means *He has called us not to be in a constant improper legal association by being bound if the unbeliever leaves*. That's what it means. If you are not bound, you are on the other side of the coin, eligible to remarry. If you have a marriage which is not binding, you do not have the obligation to stay bound. If something is not bound, are we going to be self-righteous enough to say that it is still bound? So therefore, you can't remarry. Is that what we're

saying? *No!* We are not talking about Christ here, we're talking about brethren in the Church, in a physical, marriage relationship between a believer and a non-believer. Don't mix apples and oranges!

Is this a basis for a brother or sister who had an unbelieving mate who left them and their marriage was no longer binding, that this is a ground for remarriage. *Yes!* But as Paul defines it, it is again, a narrow window—it is not broad. What does he do? Verse 16: "But how do you know..." after 'God has called us to peace,' which could also mean many things in the situation. If you get along peacefully with your unconverted wife or husband, because how do you know that 'you may not save them'? He's not opening the floodgates for everyone to decide who's a believer and who's a non-believer, and then say the believer divorced the unbeliever. There's no allowance for that here. The unbeliever has to take the initiative and they do it. It has to be an unbelief which is unequivocal.

Just like I gave the example of the woman who was a Baptist and believed in Christ, believed in grace and the forgiveness of sin; married 35 years and didn't want to divorce. No way that marriage is loosed! None! I don't care what the court of the land says.

Where are all the examples? *God didn't want to clutter the New Testament with all kinds of stupidity!* That's why! He gave us a mind, He's given us His Spirit, He's given us His Word on which to make the judgment. Then He's covering this case here in this particular way so we would know. Why? *Because it's a question that comes up!*

Now then, we'll have to get to binding or loosing. Let's go through more of 1-Cor. 7, because you have to go through the whole thing. If you are not bound you are free to re-marry. It's not binding. Let's talk about a contract or fraud. No contract anywhere that is fraudulent is binding upon anyone, even in the law of the land in the United States. A contract is an agreement entered into with knowledge to which both parties agree. If there is fraud you cannot have a contract. It is void, even if that fraud is discovered subsequent to the fact of entering into the contract.

Why, when the Gibeonites came along and said, 'Utt oh, we're going to be killed by these Israelites, we'll take our worst clothes and driest food and we'll go 25 miles up the road and circle back another way' and come in and say, 'Oh, we're strangers from a far land, please don't kill us.' They entered into an agreement that they would not kill them. Joshua decided, after he discovered the fact that they had been defrauded, that the judgment would be, 'No, we're going to make you wood-

carriers and water-bearers; you and your descendants, forever.' That was his judgment! Plus, he did not want to make an open fool of those princes who agreed to it.

So, we have here a judgment and a political decision, which is of a different kind than we're talking about with marriage. In a contract of marriage where there is fraud, or a contract of business... If you, in your business signed a contract and then subsequently you found out the other person perpetrated fraud on you, you can take him to court and sue him for fraud. He cannot subsequently take you to court and sue you for non-performance because it's an invalid contract. He cannot, because there was fraud.

It's the same way in a marriage. If a person asks are you a virgin?—either male or female. *Yes, I'm a virgin!* I want a virgin for my husband or wife. *I fit that!* Subsequent to the fact of the marriage it is discovered that that was fraud, the choice has to be made at that time by the offended party whether they wish to continue in that marriage or not—at the time of discovery. If they accept it and say, 'Ok, I forgive,' you cannot go back and use that later because then it's something you know.

Again, every one of these things, when you get down to it, is really a very narrow particular definition. You're not dealing with great numbers of people. You have to make a judgment on that based upon the command that says *you shall not bear false witness*. If you bear false witness it is fraud! Therefore, whatever the false witness is, *it's fraud!* Therefore, it is breaking a commandment of God and is not a legal binding contract.

Is God going to bind someone to a lie in marriage? You're assuming God would bind it. You show me where, in the Bible, how you can either judge that you did, or that He does force it upon them. In the case of the Gibeonites I'm sure that God did—that's a thorn in the flesh. You cannot carry that into what we're talking about here because sometimes when you have fraud involved you change the circumstances. Where they said, since you didn't ask me I'm going to punish you—with the Gibeonites. Sometimes God will leave you to your own stupidity. Therefore, you cannot make decisions based on a scenario.

When we are talking about fraud in marriage, before the fact of marriage, we're not talking about the Gibeonites and what God did to them in Israel—we are not. Don't mix them together because they're not mixable. There are certain things you can learn from it, which may or may not apply; which may be good or not good.

We're talking about a marriage that has been

based on fraud. You can go to different places in the Old Testament—especially where there was putting away of the wife who was not a virgin, that’s fraud. If it was found subsequent to the fact that she was not a virgin, what were they to do? *Bring the evidence of the wedding night linen before the judges! If there is no blood, she stands convicted as a non-virgin!* Fraud! Put her away! That may or may not be hardness of heart; that is a judgment of law.

Verse 18: “...Was anyone called in uncircumcision? Do not let him be circumcised. *For* circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing; rather, the keeping of God’s commandments *is essential*. Let each one abide in the calling in which he was called. Were you called as a slave?... [‘doulos’—bondsman—now we’re talking about slaves, so there’s a clear example that in marriage he’s not talking about slavery. We’re talking about not being bound.] (The servant—‘doulos’—or the slave, if you were called being a servant or slave): ...Don’t let yourself fret. But if you are able to become free, by all means do so. For he who has been called in *the Lord*, *though he be a slave*, is a free man in *the Lord*. In the same way also, he who has been called as a free man is a slave of Christ; *for* you were bought with a price. Do not become slaves of man. Brethren, in whatever *state* each one was called, let him remain in that with God” (vs 18-24).

This is in relationship to slavery; that’s what it’s referring to. If you’re called in poverty does God say to stay in poverty? *No!* You can increase your ability by work. So this is limited to slavery and circumcision, which were two giant problems at that time.

Verse 25: “Now concerning virgins, I do not have a command from *the Lord*; but I give *my* judgment... [There’s a binding and loosing of judgment] ...as one who has received mercy from *the Lord* to be faithful. Therefore, I think this *judgment* is good because of the present distress: that *it is* good for a man to remain as he is.... [Even though he’s talking about virgins, he says *man* here, but it could be translated for that *person*. It’s ‘anthropos’ referring directly to virgins.] ...Have you been bound to a wife?... [There it is, the same form.] ...Do not seek to be loosed. Have you been loosed from a wife? Do not seek a wife” (vs 25-27)—because of the present stress.

Verse 28: “However, if you have married... [or you may marry—it’s in the subjunctive; it’s one of those possibility things] ...you have not sinned... [If you’ve been loosed you are not bound if you remarry; you have not sinned.] ...and if a virgin has married, she has not sinned. Yet... [because of the present stress] ...those *who marry* shall have distress

in the flesh, but I *wish* to spare you.” That is of anymore requirements; I don’t want to get into anymore details of this.

Verse 29: “Now this I say, brethren: the time *is* drawing close. For the *time that* remains, *let* those who have wives... [this is a tough one] ...be as if they did not have wives... [tending to the Lord rather than looking to the world] ...and those who weep, as if they did not weep; and those who rejoice, as if they did not rejoice; and those who buy, as if they did not possess; and those who use this world, as if they did not use *it* as their own... [but not abusing it] ...for this world in its present form is passing away. Now, I desire you to be without anxiety. The man who is unmarried is concerned about the things of the Lord... [in this present stress] ...—how he may please the Lord” (vs 29-32)—if he’s caring for the things of the world.

Verse 33: “But he who is married has concerns about the things of this world—how he may please *his* wife.” This is a matter of support and things like this—in the present stress. They didn’t have supermarkets to run to, to buy whatever they needed.

Verse 34: “There is *also* a difference in *attitude* between a wife and a virgin. An unmarried woman is concerned about the things of the Lord, that she may be Holy both in body and *in spirit*.... [Paul is personifying this on a spiritual level] ...But she who is married has concerns about the things of this world—how she may please *her* husband.... [she’s going to keep the house and take care of the food; the husband has to go earn a living and all of this] ...Now, I am telling you this for your own benefit; not to place a snare in your *way*, but to *show* you what *is* suitable, *so that you may be* devoted to the Lord without distraction. But if anyone thinks *that his* behavior toward his virgin is not right, and if she is in *the prime of life*, and so *thinks* he ought to *marry*, let him do as he desires; he is not sinning. Let them marry” (vs 34-36).

Verse 37: “However, he does well who remains steadfast in *his* heart, not having the need to *marry*, but has control over his own desire, and has determined in his *own* heart to keep himself chaste. So then, the one who marries does well, but the one who does not marry does better. A wife is bound by law for as long a time as her husband may live. But if her husband dies, she is free to be married to whomever she desires, (*but only in the Lord*).... [I’ve seen that happen where people run out and marry someone who is not in the Church, after they’ve been in the Church, and they create all kinds of problems.] ...However, she is happier if she continues to abide by my judgment; and I think *that* I also have God’s Spirit *in this*” (vs 37-40).

What are you going to do when you have a church that is so full of corruption that everybody is participating in the sinfulness of the decisions—beginning with the ministers at the very top because they are not really seeking to giving themselves wholly to God and to know what God says. And because of the hierarchical association or leadership which says you teach what the hierarchy does and therefore, you don't think and you don't make any judgments and the ministers on down the line do not study. When problems come up and members bring it to the ministers, they make decisions which are based in sin, because they're not based on God's Word—everybody is culpable.

If you are sitting in the congregation and the whole church is filled with adulterers and adulteresses and marginal adultery, and you are living there with people who are living in lies and cheating and defrauding and stealing and all this sort of thing, what are you to do? *Separate yourself!* If the church is so corrupt that it won't preach the Truth so that the people can correct their lives and repent before God, you must remove yourself from that fellowship, because it's not fellowship with God, it is a social association with people.

That's what Paul was saying here in 1-Cor. 5; this is the whole contingent of Paul. He says that 'because of the sin that was being done—of 'pornea'—that was so gross that even the Gentiles had a hard time with it. Then he brings it down and says that 'you put such a one out, that you're not to be in there fellowshiping with you. You put them out! You admonish them as a brother—estranged! In other words, whatever dealings you have with that person is going to be: you repent and I'm not going to accept you in fellowship until you repent. That's your fellowship with him—dealing with an estranged brother.

You are to be a witness against that sin on a personal level. He says, 'Know you not that a little leaven leavens the whole lump'—and hasn't that happened? The Church becomes filled with sin and sin then no longer becomes sin, because you live with it and you get comfortable with it and you are tempting God and His grace and His mercy, because God does not come down immediately and punish you with the pounding fist in the face. He's hoping that through His mercy that He will lead you to repentance if you don't harden your heart.

If you have a congregation that is so filled with sin, *you'd better leave!* They're not consenting to the wholesome words of Jesus Christ (1-Tim 6:3<sub>[transcriber's correction]</sub>). Paul also makes it clear here concerning fellowship.

1-Corinthians 5:6: "Your glorying *is* not good. Don't you know that a little leaven leavens the whole lump? Therefore, purge out the old leaven, so that you may become a new lump...." (vs 6-7). This refers

- directly to the Feast of Unleavened Bread
- directly to purging the leaven out of your home
- directly to your attitude
- directly to that sin within the congregation as a whole and all of them applies into this statement.

"...*even* as you are unleavened.... [That was the whole process of conversion and baptism and the receiving of the Holy Spirit.] ...For Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us" (v 7).

In other words, he's saying this behavior is effrontery to God and the sacrifice of Christ. How can you take the Passover and the unleavened, un-sinful flesh of Christ—symbolized by the blood; and take the unleavened, perfect blood of Christ—sinless, symbolized by the wine; and partake of that and have all of this sin going on? That, brethren, is happening in too many Churches of God! They no longer understand what sin is!

Verse 8: "For this reason, let us keep the Feast, not with old leaven, nor with *the* leaven of malice and wickedness... [Isn't it malice to go out and perpetrate the kind of 'pornea' that this man was living in—knowing better? Is it not malice, with forethought, to pervert the Word of God, to give license where God never spoke? *That's malice and wickedness!*] ...but with *the* unleavened *bread* of sincerity and Truth. I wrote to you in an epistle not to associate with the sexually immoral; and *yet, you can* not altogether *avoid contact* with the sexually immoral of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or idolaters, since you would then have to go out of the world" (vs 8-10).

He's talking about the world out here is in a different category. In business and working you're going to come across all kinds of people. But you're only interfacing with them on a business level. You are not brothershiping with them on a fellowship level as someone in the Church whom Christ brought together. Otherwise we would have to go out of the world. There are times down deep inside I wish that were possible! Just to get out of the world totally, but you can't!

Verse 11: "But now, I have written to you not to associate... [do not fellowship; do not have the coming together] ...with anyone who is called a brother, if *he be* either sexually immoral... [any kind of adulterous sin such as an adulterous marriage; accepting homosexuality within the ranks of the Church] ...or covetous... [Those that are still

covetous because all they're trying to do is reach out and grasp and greed.] ...or an idolater, or a reviler..." [Can get into the thing of politics, because they rail and rant. Look at the 'NOW gang,' all of those. They are railers, demonstrators.] ...or a drunkard, or an extortioner..."

This so-called 'college of God' where they blackmail the students, bug the rooms and the classrooms and then use that information against them. That is extortion! Rather, they should be hauled before God, accountable for their conduct. 'We're not going to police you as children and you'd better make your conduct honest and right before God, because if you don't, you're going to face God.' You're not going to eliminate all problems, but at least you can keep them down to a dull, manageable roar that you don't have to have betrayers and extortioners and double-speakers. It just gets to be a mess.

"... with such a person *you are* not even to eat." (v 11)—in the form of being a brother. Once you're brought into the Church and you're in that relationship with Christ and you are there because of God's Spirit, your relationship is not the same as those in the world, because God is not dealing with them. You can't get away from all the evil in the world, so it is true if you have a church that has people that are divorcing and remarrying back and forth, and there's nothing but a wicked and adulterous generation sitting there pretending it's a Church of God—**LEAVE IT!** You have no alternative! We're called OUT of the world, not to bring the world in—isn't that true?

If they're offended, then you tell them. They say, 'Why don't you fellowship with me anymore?' *That's a question that I'm glad you asked! The reason is that, as far as I understand God's Word, you'd better look into it whether you're living in adultery or not!*

**Are we going to make God serve with sins and say we have license to do evil? NO! Not going to! Absolutely not!** Sometimes that will make you lonely, but who was the loneliest man on earth? *Jesus Christ!*

(go to the next track)

1-Corinthians 5:12: "For what *responsibility* do I have to judge those who are outside the Church? Are not you yourselves to judge those who are within?... [that commit open sins. It's not a unilateral action by a minister to disfellowship and put out—the Church collectively] ...But God judges those who are outside. So then, put the wicked person out from among yourselves" (vs 12-13). When you get to the point that the whole church becomes corrupt, you have to leave. **God is putting**

***you out from them to preserve your righteousness!*** And He's going to deal with them.

If there were not things to judge, if there were not things bind or loose, there would be no reason for this. There would be none whatsoever. There would be no need. It's been given in two different ways. It's given directly of what you bind, will be bound. What you loose, will be loosed (Matt. 16). In Matt. 18 it is *what shall have been bound in heaven* shall have been bound on earth. That is a limiting factor that you don't have license to do anything you want to. That's why it's in the different tenses.

Matthew 16:19: "And I will give to **you...** [singular in person to Peter; not taking away from the rest of them] ...the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatever **you** may bind on the earth will have already been bound in heaven..." Notice what all of this is based upon:

- the fact that Christ was recognized as the Messiah
- the fact that Christ said He would build His Church on Himself

Those are also limiting conditions in what Peter could bind and loose—just the limiting context of itself. Of course, binding here is the 'desmeuo' which is a participle form of 'deo'—*to bind*. And loose is 'luis'—which is from the verb 'luo'—*to loose*. "...and whatever you may loose on the earth will have already been loosed in heaven."

You can't take one without the other. The whole principle of Bible study is the principle of addition or of inclusion vs the principle of exclusion and subtraction—meaning that when you go through the Scriptures you add it all together, including everything—not excluding anything. Otherwise you end up like the Protestants and other scholars taking one Scripture to divide and war against the other Scripture. The circumstances in both, though they appear to be the opposite, as you perceive them, are really talking about two different things and really not fighting one or the other, but all included together. That's the principle of inclusion or omission.

So, you can't take Matt. 16 and isolate that and say, 'I declare a cross is legal. I declare that you can divorce any number of times you want. And, God, You must bind what I bind.' **NO!** Is God going to bind anything against His law? **NO!** God is not the Author of sin—is He? **NO!** God will be merciful to forgive sin. God will be gracious to lead us to repentance. But God is not going to serve with our sins! When God serves with our sins, we're telling God what to do. **No man tells God what to do!**

With the principle of addition, we come to Matt. 18 and we have a whole different sense of it here. Matthew 18:18: "Truly I say to you, whatever you shall bind on the earth **will have already been**

bound in heaven...”—past tense; accomplished—meaning that you must base it upon:

- What are the laws of God?
- What are the commandments of God?
- What are the principles of the Word of God?

That’s what God has bound in heaven—isn’t it? Did not God speak those words? Did they not come from God? *Yes!* “...and whatever you shall loose on the earth will have already been loosed in heaven.”

Now, you’ve got a qualifying Scripture to add to Matt. 16, so that the two of them together means that in any circumstances that you make a judgment and bind and loose, God will do that, because you must know the Word of God to know what has been bound in heaven so that you make the right decision on earth. That’s what it means.

Sometimes you have to make a decision. Sometimes it’s not a positive decision. Sometimes it’s a very difficult decision. In divorce and remarriage it’s difficult because

- it involves people’s lives
- it involves children
- it involves love or the lack thereof
- it involves sex or the lack thereof—whatever it may be
- it involves property
- it involves money
- it involves business
- it involves reputations

So, it’s a pretty weighty thing! We should not go around and be binding and loosing and all that sort of thing and the way that it’s done.

We need to be careful, too, that one particular judgment of God for a specific set of conditions at a specific set time for that specific individual does not necessarily mean that you do it for everyone.

Scriptures from *The Holy Bible in Its Original Order, A Faithful Version*  
by Fred. R. Coulter

#### Scriptural References:

- 1) 1 Corinthians 7:15-18, 15-40
- 2) 1 Corinthians 5:6-13
- 3) Matthew 16:19
- 4) Matthew 18:18

#### Scriptures referenced, not quoted:

- Romans 14
- 1 Timothy 6:3

FRC:bo  
Transcribed: 7-2-11