
Subject: Marriage

Posted by [william](#) on Sat, 13 Sep 2008 05:08:34 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Again, this is just a starter message from my notes and I'm not even sure we want this type of format (I'll yield to a better one!)

First we need to define marriage and when it takes place.

Are you married when the clerk down at the court house says it's okay, or is it when the minister says "you may kiss the bride"?

Ceremony and pomp do not a marriage make.

Marriage can be defined as two people mutually coming together for the purpose of creating a family. It is as simple as that.

Many cultures place great emphasis on the ceremony, and I'm not saying that it is a bad thing, but that isn't what makes a marriage. It is especially helpful as a tool in letting everyone know what has taken place, but I suppose you could just tell them!

Don't get me wrong, the civil compliance does have its perks, (not to mention keeping your brethren from stumbling!<grin>) but it isn't an absolute requirement.

I believe that the consummation of the decision (to come together for the purpose of creating a family) is when the "two become one". Gen 2:24 Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.

Personally I don't need to bother myself too much with what the world's definition of marriage is, unless there is a clear law that says you must, for instance, take a blood test (which used to be the case--*I think*) before you could marry. In that case I would obey the governmental authority... which I would do in any case unless it was sin to do so. So if eventually the world redefines marriage it doesn't mean they have it right. Two men living together would be sin with or without government approval.

To take it a step further, if we as Christians look to the government for the definition of marriage, and make that the standard then there may come a time when that standard changes, therefore it is imperative that we understand marriage from a biblical standpoint and not add or take away from what is written.

I quoted the scripture Jesus used when referring to marriage:

Gen 2:24 Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.

I see no reason to add something to that just because we are accustomed to "doing it a certain way".

Marriage takes place between a man and a woman and a biblical marriage is as simple as the definition I used. If, in your mind, a person takes liberties with the simplicity of that definition, then it isn't the fault of the biblical definition, it is in the fault of the two people involved.

"Pre-marital s*x" is a term we have adopted, it isn't a biblical term. I don't have a problem with the term, but we need to realize that it doesn't necessarily follow that two people who "come together for the purpose of establishing a family" without the benefit of a civil ceremony, are automatically engaging in sin.

To be sure, there are good reasons why cultures establish marriage regulations; i.e. both parties must be of a certain age, etc., I've got no problem with following regulations if it doesn't cause us to sin.

I cannot prove this to be truth, but according to many scholars, Mary may have been only 14 years old when she became Joseph's wife... if it is true, and you accept our modern-day standards you find yourself in the untenable position of needing to prove this as not being "statutory r*pe". Our society would not have recognized this as a valid marriage.

Why should we as Christians want society making the rules of what is and what is not sin instead of sticking to what the Bible says is sin?

Two people burning in their lust for each other does not a marriage make... again, using the biblical principle that I gave.

Two people having relations apart from the biblical presentation of what marriage is, is clearly sin. For that reason Paul admonishes them that it is better to marry than to burn.

The fact that you can find a "marriage" ceremony in the Bible (the wedding at Cana) doesn't alter the basic definition of marriage in any way. In this case you also have pots of wine being served, does this mean that a marriage isn't valid unless pots of wine are served?

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Marriage
Posted by [william](#) on Wed, 17 Sep 2008 03:42:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Right, but the definition stills stands as the only one that is simple enough to encompass the whole idea of marriage.

The "espousal" period being viewed as marriage, to my mind, only shows how seriously they took their commitments. It cannot be equated with the light hearted manner that we view modern-day engagements.

Also, it should be noted that the "act" of marriage is only the consummation of the decision. The "espousal" period wasn't always apparent in the OT record. In one case you had the bride arriving on a camel (or whatever) and the marriage was quickly consummated in the tent! So the definition still stands. If you were to add an espousal period to the definition then you'd need to explain why it wasn't always followed!

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Marriage
Posted by [jsamazed](#) on Sun, 08 Feb 2009 21:54:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

moulder wrote on Sat, 13 September 2008 00:08Again, this is just a starter message from my notes and I'm not even sure we want this type of format (I'll yield to a better one!)

First we need to define marriage and when it takes place.

Are you married when the clerk down at the court house says it's okay, or is it when the minister says "you may kiss the bride"?

Ceremony and pomp do not a marriage make.

Marriage can be defined as two people mutually coming together for the purpose of creating a family. It is as simple as that.

Many cultures place great emphasis on the ceremony, and I'm not saying that it is a bad thing, but

that isn't what makes a marriage. It is especially helpful as a tool in letting everyone know what has taken place, but I suppose you could just tell them!

Don't get me wrong, the civil compliance does have its perks, (not to mention keeping your brethren from stumbling!<grin>) but it isn't an absolute requirement.

I believe that the consummation of the decision (to come together for the purpose of creating a family) is when the "two become one". Gen 2:24 Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.

Personally I don't need to bother myself too much with what the world's definition of marriage is, unless there is a clear law that says you must, for instance, take a blood test (which used to be the case--*I think*) before you could marry. In that case I would obey the governmental authority... which I would do in any case unless it was sin to do so. So if eventually the world redefines marriage it doesn't mean they have it right. Two men living together would be sin with or without government approval.

To take it a step further, if we as Christians look to the government for the definition of marriage, and make that the standard then there may come a time when that standard changes, therefore it is imperative that we understand marriage from a biblical standpoint and not add or take away from what is written.

I quoted the scripture Jesus used when referring to marriage:

Gen 2:24 Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.

I see no reason to add something to that just because we are accustomed to "doing it a certain way".

Marriage takes place between a man and a woman and a biblical marriage is as simple as the definition I used. If, in your mind, a person takes liberties with the simplicity of that definition, then it isn't the fault of the biblical definition, it is in the fault of the two people involved.

"Pre-marital s*x" is a term we have adopted, it isn't a biblical term. I don't have a problem with the term, but we need to realize that it doesn't necessarily follow that two people who "come together for the purpose of establishing a family" without the benefit of a civil ceremony, are automatically engaging in sin.

To be sure, there are good reasons why cultures establish marriage regulations; i.e. both parties must be of a certain age, etc., I've got no problem with following regulations if it doesn't cause us to sin.

I cannot prove this to be truth, but according to many scholars, Mary may have been only 14 years old when she became Joseph's wife... if it is true, and you accept our modern-day standards you find yourself in the untenable position of needing to prove this as not being "statutory r*pe". Our society would not have recognized this as a valid marriage.

Why should we as Christians want society making the rules of what is and what is not sin instead of sticking to what the Bible says is sin?

Two people burning in their lust for each other does not a marriage make... again, using the biblical principle that I gave.

Two people having relations apart from the biblical presentation of what marriage is, is clearly sin. For that reason Paul admonishes them that it is better to marry than to burn.

The fact that you can find a "marriage" ceremony in the Bible (the wedding at Cana) doesn't alter the basic definition of marriage in any way. In this case you also have pots of wine being served, does this mean that a marriage isn't valid unless pots of wine are served?

Blessings,
William

William,

I'm concerned about the implications of your perspective here.

There are many cohabitating couples who claim that a piece of paper does not make a marriage, and therefore they have the right before God to just shack up. It is an epidemic in most of western culture. Cohabitation increased 300% in the 1990's and is currently fashionable among the 20 to 30 somethings to the point that it is expected before marriage. In my field of work I have come to the conclusion that it is one of the most destructive trends in society, with far-reaching ramifications.

I Corinthians 7 is clear that sex is reserved for marriage. On that I'm sure we agree. The question is, at what point is it marriage as opposed to cohabitation? When does someone go from being single to being yoked together, from being two to being one?

Marriage has been an institution in every culture on the face of the earth, with a few small exceptions. Although the concept and ceremonies vary from culture to culture, there is a common element in all of them: marriage is to be recognized by the community of which the couple is a part. Societies recognized the importance of holding a couple accountable to their vows and supporting them. Otherwise, promiscuity would lead to a breakdown of the family unit and

confusion for the children. Chaos would ensue. This is true of cultures today in which the illegitimacy rate is extremely high (such as in Jamaica) and fathers have children by a number of women with whom they have no permanent relationship.

A marriage has to be formally recognized by the community. A couple cannot be married without that recognition. Otherwise you get people like Prince (the musician) who wrote a song called, "Let's Pretend We're Married", or people who are too afraid of commitment to make it legal, so they say that they are married even though they are just living together. Early Muslim jihadists used to practice the "15 minute marriage" in which they would spend that time with a girl in a tent, then annul the marriage when they were done. Of course, the girls were essentially treated as prostitutes, and it was not a marriage just because they said that it was. There does need to be some formal recognition of the union by the community, whether via ceremony and on paper or just on paper. Otherwise it is not a marriage, just cohabitation or sexual immorality.

There are several other reasons for this. Public vows help the couple to know that the community will hold them accountable, as I mentioned earlier. There are legal reasons, especially inheritance rights, that are at stake. Even in the OT a wife had legal rights that a concubine did not. The vows or ceremony define the line between single and married, fornication versus righteous sex (yes I went there).

Most of all, the covenant of marriage is to be an illustration of God's covenant with His people. The symbolism of it is overlooked sometimes, but I think that a good Christian marriage is a wonderful demonstration of the relationship between Christ and His bride. The groom gives himself for the bride, and she is completely devoted to him.

You probably agree with most of this, but I think that it is important to emphasize that marriage isn't marriage unless it is recognized by the community, whether civil, church or family.

Subject: Re: Marriage
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 09 Feb 2009 01:26:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Suddenly the culture is important!

Let's just stick with what the Bible says Jae... no need to get all concerned about what others think! Don't go soft on me!<grin>

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Marriage
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 09 Feb 2009 15:29:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wow! Deep thoughts there Hombre!

Muchos appreciation for helping me out of that jam. You guys are too deep for me... my response was just a celebration of the philosophy in the song "Gentle on my Mind."

It's knowing that your door is always open
And your path is free to walk
That makes me tend to leave my sleeping bag
Rolled up and stashed behind your couch
And it's knowing I'm not shackled
By forgotten words and bonds
And the ink stains that have dried upon some line
That keeps you in the backroads
By the rivers of my mem'ry
That keeps you ever gentle on my mind

It's not clinging to the rocks and ivy
Planted on their columns now that binds me
Or something that somebody said
Because they thought we fit together walking
It's just knowing that the world will not be cursing
Or forgiving when I walk along some railroad track and find
That you are moving on the backroads
By the rivers of my mem'ry
And for hours you're just gentle on my mind

Though the wheat fields and the clothes lines
And the junkyards and the highways come between us
And some other woman crying to her mother

'Cause she turned and I was gone
I still might run in silence tears of joy might stain my face
And the summer sun might burn me 'til I'm blind
But not to where I cannot see you walkin' on the backroads
By the rivers flowing gentle on my mind

I dip my cup of soup back from the gurglin'
Cracklin' caldron in some train yard
My beard a roughning coal pile and
A dirty hat pulled low across my face
Through cupped hands 'round a tin can
I pretend I hold you to my breast and find
That you're waving from the backroads
By the rivers of my mem'ry
Ever smilin' ever gentle on my mind

Subject: Re: Marriage
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 09 Feb 2009 16:16:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Here I am, thinking deep thoughts about what you said, and you, after
rising to such lofty heights, seem to only want to make wise cracks...
tsk, tsk.

Now, if you will restrain yourself for a few more moments I'll start a new
thread based upon your profound thoughts.

Subject: Re: Marriage
Posted by [james](#) on Mon, 09 Feb 2009 20:24:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Funny Hombre, I always pik-chured you as more of a " Rhinestone Cowboy"...you know, 'riding out on a horse in a star spangled rodeo'...always wanting to be 'where the lights are shining on me'...

Subject: Re: Marriage
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 09 Feb 2009 20:50:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That will change by the time he gets to Phoenix...

Meanwhile I'm cleaning my gun here in Galveston humming Homeward Bound.

And what about "Where's the Playground Suzie?" (I had the album... to me this is sacred stuff... you wouldn't mock Elvis would you?)

Subject: Re: Marriage
Posted by [william](#) on Mon, 09 Feb 2009 23:43:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:'Homeward Bound' ?

...you're kidding me, right?

...there's only one thing worse than a bad country singer, and that's one who steals other peoples music and sings them in their typically generic and un-soulful way.

That's a Simon and Garfunkel tune.

Now that is hard to prove when you are stoned... just ask the Beetles about the song "Yesterday".

Subject: Re: Marriage
Posted by [jismazed](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2009 02:08:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre wrote on Mon, 09 February 2009 08:44...ahhhhhh.....splitting hairs again I see.....

To encapsulate:

William is saying:

Marriage is about MORE than a piece of paper (The divorce statistics ought to be enough to tell anyone that)....but he (William) leaves it for us to determine/recognize/understand/ discern for ourselves what that is...he assumes that we know.

'.....For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;)... ' ~ Rom 2:14-15

..and indeed we DO know...even those who are NOT saved know. We should begin to stop this nonsense that those outside of the church (i.e. the unsaved/unregenerated) don't have minds to think with. They most certainly do, I have just quoted Gods' Word which declares that He Himself has already written His laws into their hearts ('by nature' : i.e. they are born with this intrinsic knowledge).

People CHOOSE to do what they do, and the consequences are a result of their choices. That is why those who reject Christ are competent to stand trial before God on that day: they KNEW what was right, yet they chose to reject it.

All of the moral laws that have been written, including those which God Himself has written into the hearts of unregenerate men have shown little evidence of being respected or followed because they exist. This is the lesson that God has attempted to teach mankind from the garden through the dispensation of Moses law. It is not about what one CAN or CAN'T do, it is about the heart and whether we will make choices based upon what we know to be good, righteous etc., for bigger reasons than simply and blindly following road signs, because they are there.

That does not discount however, the fact that the law in it's purpose was/is good.

William assumes that we understand that which is self evident.

Jisamazed is saying:

...that he believes that the civil union ceremony is of paramount importance in

1. Holding people societally accountable and establishing community order.
2. Formally recognizing the sanctity of the formation of such a union.
3. Avoiding sexual immorality.

I am saying:

1. William is right and so is Jis, however, Williams' thinking here is broader in context, and is a gentle prod asking us to consider the depth of our relationships, vis-a-vis the piece of paper...
2. I find that although Jis' statements in themselves are not incorrect, I think that perhaps he is misunderstanding Williams motives, and sees Williams' expression as a cloak for the flesh, in suggesting that the piece of paper is not what makes a marriage....which it is not (Williams' suggestion).
3. I find that misunderstanding to be somewhat disturbing, in that what William is saying is patently obvious to me, however, apparently it is not to Jis, who seems to be intent upon legalism achieving or supplanting that which actually holds a marriage together: the depth of the relationship.

...next hair/mote..or should I say LOG.

Dude, I can see I wrote way too much and provided you with too much fodder.

I only wanted to stress the importance of community recognition of marriage. A couple cannot get married on their own without any kind of public recognition. Maybe I went over the top a little in my response to William because I hear both colleagues and clients at work imply that God considers them married because they are shacking up. I instinctively respond to any implication of a "private" marriage with both guns drawn.

However, William's point is well taken and I certainly would not think that he is endorsing any kind of sexual immorality. I've been around long enough to know he wouldn't do that.

But the community thing still needs to be said...

As for your statement that I seem to be intent on legalism holding a marriage together, I'm not sure where you get that one from. Maybe it's one of your famous jumps.

Love, respect, servanthood, death to selfishness, etc... all of these are essential to a godly marriage. What's law got to do with it? However, God Himself ultimately holds a husband and wife together.

Subject: Re: Marriage

Posted by [jismazed](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2009 02:23:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre wrote on Mon, 09 February 2009 09:58...William....I fully expect that to be followed by an exhortation that will basically contain this sort of content:

'...For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables....'

Love?

What is love when law is involved?

...actually, that is quite strange, that I should be quoting the love doctrine to one* who is prone to that sort of diversion into marshmallow-ness.....

*Club Jismo

Actually, I don't like marshmallows much, unless they are roasted golden brown.

I never allow for the compromise of truth in the name of marshmallow love. That's something you got in your head somewhere along the way. Iron can't sharpen iron if it's gummed up with marshmallows all the time. I simply think we need to prioritize what is important and not stumble over offering plates or the use of medical science. If we dish out criticism of our brothers and sisters in Christ, we need be willing to take it according to the same standard.

*Careful with the "Club Jismo" moniker, my man. I think that's the name of a gay bar somewhere.

Subject: Re: Marriage
Posted by [jisamazed](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2009 02:32:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

moulder wrote on Sun, 08 February 2009 19:26 Suddenly the culture is important!

Let's just stick with what the Bible says Jae... no need to get all concerned about what others think! Don't go soft on me!<grin>

Blessings,
William

OK, maybe I responded more passionately than I needed to. I would say that the Bible supports the matter of community in that marriages still had to be recognized by the community in all the places it occurs in scripture. The author of Hebrews (whom I believe to be Paul, but whatever) told them to let marriage be honorable to all, and the bed undefiled. The Jewish Christian community seemed to have some role in recognizing the legitimacy of any given marriage among them.

I'm not concerned about what others think. Believe me, if I was I wouldn't be posting on this forum.

Subject: Re: Marriage
Posted by [william](#) on Tue, 10 Feb 2009 16:10:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:

On Tue, 10 Feb 2009, Hombre wrote:

>
>
> moulder wrote on Mon, 09 February 2009 17:43
> > Now that is hard to prove when you are stoned... just ask the Beatles about the song
"Yesterday".
>
>
> ...wow you really were stoned.... :lol:
>
>and just fyfi, the name 'Beatles' is spelled with reference to musical rhythm, not insects.... :lol:
>
>yes, I guess that 'yesterday' has been recorded by about a zillion people including a comic
character: 'Daffy Duck'....of course Homeward Bound doesn't have any significant 's' sounds in it
that would so meet the needs of Daffys' style as well as 'Yesterday' does.
>
> :lol:
>
>

Ouch, skewered by the spelling natsi... <grin>

Subject: Re: Marriage

Posted by [jisamazed](#) on Wed, 11 Feb 2009 05:31:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

[quote title=Hombre wrote on Tue, 10 February 2009 08:58]jisamazed wrote on Mon, 09 February 2009 20:08 I only wanted to stress the importance of community recognition of marriage. A couple cannot get married on their own without any kind of public recognition.

Maybe I went over the top a little in my response to William because I hear both colleagues and clients at work imply that God considers them married because they are shacking up. I instinctively respond to any implication of a "private" marriage with both guns drawn.

Sure they can....besides, eventually, there IS 'public recognition' at the point that everyone finds

out that these people 'eloped'. They are formally, in the minds of all who know, recognized to BE married...besides, there ARE ALWAYS other people involved, even if it is only the clerk at the government office, providing official recognition in the form of a piece of paper, and the pastor of Las Vegas' McMarriage Drive Thru.

...what are you, tied in with some wedding planning outfit and are afraid to see people get married outside of conventional methodology for fear that the mega-buck procedures may come to an end or something?

..or are you just so tied to your own idea of how a marriage should be 'performed' that you can't accept any other way?

..this all reminds me of a story that one related to me about an Amish sect, who eschewed the idea of sex, even in marriage as something that is so carnal that it is to be avoided at all costs. In this sect, the consumation of the marriage was performed with a sheet between the two so that they didn't have to confront one another or the idea that they were doing such.

..but hey...they were married, and they had the paper to prove it with.

A couple CAN get married outside of the confines of a traditional church wedding and it can last and be better than many who did it traditionally.

..and frankly, Jis, as one who has been through this whole ringer before, I really wouldn't care what anyone thinks of me, or would think of me if my marriage didn't work..that is the least of my concerns at that point.

Peer pressure didn't hold FA together, and it won't hold a marriage together either.

jisamazed wrote on Mon, 09 February 2009 20:08But the community thing still needs to be said...

Why?

People who want others to be there, will make the necessary arrangements for that to happen, and those who don't won't.

jisamazed wrote on Mon, 09 February 2009 20:08As for your statement that I seem to be intent on legalism holding a marriage together, I'm not sure where you get that one from. Maybe it's one of your famous jumps.

Famous to who?

You?

....you mean like the jump that you made with William over making sure that everyone was street legal, instead of seeing the depth and the heart of the matter that he was attempting to relate?

Jis, you ARE a legalist.

That IS where your mind goes.

When are you going to educate us on which sexual positions are defined as 'righteous' in the Bible anyway?

...and that term...'righteous sex'....

...sorry, but 'righteous' really doesn't belong in that descriptive, it actually reeks of biker slang.

...all of these things are beginning to fit together now.... a legalist who 'counsels' people and uses biker slang.....hmmmmmm....are you a motorcycle cop?

quote]

Yes, I'm a motorcycle cop.

Actually, "righteous sex" was a term used before it became motorcycle gang slang. LaHaye's book in the mid-70's discusses the matter at length. The idea is that what takes place in the context of marriage is "righteous", or right, whereas what takes place outside of marriage is "unrighteous". It's not rocket science. I think it's important to stress to young people that not only is sexual immorality unhealthy and destructive, but sex in the marriage context is good, healthy and "righteous."

I suppose we all still have some residual legalism left in us. From time to time I'm still discovering silly rules from those days that I hadn't recognized yet. Legalism refers to a works mentality, trying to live according to the letter of the law rather than the spirit of it. If that applies to my rambling response to William, but not to avoiding a church because they pass offering plates, then so be it.

Subject: Re: Marriage

Posted by [jisamazed](#) on Fri, 13 Feb 2009 02:29:03 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre wrote on Thu, 12 February 2009 10:12jisamazed wrote on Tue, 10 February 2009 23:31

Yes, I'm a motorcycle cop.

Good. I'm glad we cleared that up.

..while we're on this topic, look what I found: (don't worry, Jis, I'm not actually comparing you in any way to this guy)

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/ukfs_news/hi/newsid_4340000/4340591.stm

jisamazed wrote on Tue, 10 February 2009 23:31 Actually, "righteous sex" was a term used before it became motorcycle gang slang. LaHaye's book in the mid-70's discusses the matter at length. The idea is that what takes place in the context of marriage is "righteous", or right, whereas what takes place outside of marriage is "unrighteous". It's not rocket science. I think it's important to stress to young people that not only is sexual immorality unhealthy and destructive, but sex in the marriage context is good, healthy and "righteous."

...somehow, I find that the practice of worship and sex are not actually all that compatible simultaneously, unless someone is screaming ' O God '.

....I KNOW I'm gonna hear it from someone now.....but what did I say ACTUALLY, that was so offensive anyway?

...especially if My LaHaye has already sanctified sex as 'righteous'? *

..but anyway....on with the show.....

jisamazed wrote on Tue, 10 February 2009 23:31 I suppose we all still have some residual legalism left in us. From time to time I'm still discovering silly rules from those days that I hadn't recognized yet. Legalism refers to a works mentality, trying to live according to the letter of the law rather than the spirit of it. If that applies to my rambling response to William, but not to avoiding a church because they pass offering plates, then so be it.

....so do you or do you not avoid churches that pass offering plates...I am unclear on that.... I personally don't, in fact that was kinda the last straw after I had sat in one for about a year, and the pastor had as a part of his written credo the statement that 'tithing was an OT concept and that was why there was an offering box on the back for those who chose to give'.....then proceeded to allow his elders staff to run the show, who promptly started passing laundry baskets. No crime in believing for the abundant life, eh?

*.....I fully understand what you are saying Jis, but I'm sorry, I just can't imagine these two concepts (sex and religion) co-existing simultaneously in ones' mind.....perhaps they can with women, since they are better multi-taskers than we.....

I won't go there, Hombre... As Alanbook pointed out, there are probably some kids who read this forum.

Sex is holy and good within marriage, unholy outside of it. That's all I was saying. Every area of our lives are to be under His lordship, and that area is no exception.

No, I don't stumble over offering plates. Big deal. Sure I would prefer a box in the back. But it's not the measure of a church.

Frankly, I am quite suspicious of LaHaye. But at least at that time he had the guts to affirm sex in its Biblical context. In the appropriate time and place, sexual matters need to be addressed from the pulpit just like they are in the Bible. I've met people who have been warped and bound incredibly in that area but did not find help in their church because they had no teaching on it and no one wanted to talk about it when they brought it up.

Subject: Re: Marriage

Posted by [jisamazed](#) on Sun, 22 Feb 2009 21:46:45 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hombre wrote on Tue, 10 February 2009 08:58jisamazed wrote on Mon, 09 February 2009 20:08
I only wanted to stress the importance of community recognition of marriage. A couple cannot get married on their own without any kind of public recognition.

Maybe I went over the top a little in my response to William because I hear both colleagues and clients at work imply that God considers them married because they are shacking up. I instinctively respond to any implication of a "private" marriage with both guns drawn.

Sure they can....besides, eventually, there IS 'public recognition' at the point that everyone finds out that these people 'eloped'. They are formally, in the minds of all who know, recognized to BE married...besides, there ARE ALWAYS other people involved, even if it is only the clerk at the government office, providing official recognition in the form of a piece of paper, and the pastor of Las Vegas' McMarriage Drive Thru. Hombre, you are making my exact point here. Even when a

couple go before a judge or city clerk, there still have to be witnesses present, and the vows are still recognized by the community as being legitimate (unless, of course, it is one of those gay partnerships-- most of us don't recognize those, which is why it is so important to keep marriage legally heterosexual-- but I digress).

...what are you, tied in with some wedding planning outfit and are afraid to see people get married outside of conventional methodology for fear that the mega-buck procedures may come to an end or something? I know it, I'm in the wrong business. I could charge \$660 for flowers that cost me \$30, and \$250 for invitations that would cost \$40 to make myself.

..or are you just so tied to your own idea of how a marriage should be 'performed' that you can't accept any other way?

Vows must be made before God and man between a man and woman who are not married to anyone else, that's all. And a Christian should not marry a non-Christian. Otherwise there is a lot of latitude as to how it should be done (but they should never serve those mushroom things at the reception- tacky)

..this all reminds me of a story that one related to me about an Amish sect, who eschewed the idea of sex, even in marriage as something that is so carnal that it is to be avoided at all costs. In this sect, the consumation of the marriage was performed with a sheet between the two so that they didn't have to confront one another or the idea that they were doing such. They never read the Song of Solomon, which gets pretty graphic around chapter 5.

..but hey...they were married, and they had the paper to prove it with.

A couple CAN get married outside of the confines of a traditional church wedding and it can last and be better than many who did it traditionally. No argument here. My wife and I got married in her parents' back yard. The man who married us (a former FA teacher) prophesied over us and quite a few people who were there were not sure what to think!

..and frankly, Jis, as one who has been through this whole ringer before, I really wouldn't care what anyone thinks of me, or would think of me if my marriage didn't work..that is the least of my concerns at that point.

Peer pressure didn't hold FA together, and it won't hold a marriage together either. Ja, das ist richtig.

jisamazed wrote on Mon, 09 February 2009 20:08But the community thing still needs to be said...

Why?

People who want others to be there, will make the necessary arrangements for that to happen,

and those who don't won't.

jisamazed wrote on Mon, 09 February 2009 20:08As for your statement that I seem to be intent on legalism holding a marriage together, I'm not sure where you get that one from. Maybe it's one of your famous jumps.

Famous to who?

You?

....you mean like the jump that you made with William over making sure that everyone was street legal, instead of seeing the depth and the heart of the matter that he was attempting to relate?

Jis, you ARE a legalist.

That IS where your mind goes. Yes, I already said that I was a little reactionary. There's still a little FA in me, I guess. The important thing is that we admit it when it happens...

When are you going to educate us on which sexual positions are defined as 'righteous' in the Bible anyway?

...and that term...'righteous sex'....

...sorry, but 'righteous' really doesn't belong in that descriptive, it actually reeks of biker slang.

...all of these things are beginning to fit together now.... a legalist who 'counsels' people and uses biker slang.....hmmmmmm....are you a motorcycle cop?

jisamazed wrote on Mon, 09 February 2009 20:08God Himself ultimately holds a husband and wife together.

I see that you've gotten it right now, after thinking about it. Likewise. Interesting how we end up at the same conclusions sometimes, though from different presuppositions.