

Moses the biggest sinner and lawbreaker of all time

By WmTipton

Assertions/Conclusions of this article

To prove that this 'law of the husband' is a conditional law, lest Moses himself was profaning the will of his God.

Supporting Evidence

Moses was the biggest sinner and lawbreaker ever to grace this planet.

Think about it....read these passages...

Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.

So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.

(Rom 7:1-3 KJV)

The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord.

(1Co 7:39 KJV)

Firstly, bear in mind that this 'law of the husband' is not Mosaic law as that would mean Eve was not bound to Adam...nor would ANY wife be before the Mosaic economy, but in Romans there is being compared to the Mosaic covenant, this new covenant and our relationship to both.

Nor is this "law anything that Jesus has JUST created in this covenant, as again, Eve would not have been bound to Adam.

This law was a law GOD HIMSELF laid out in the beginning for marriage starting with the first man and wife
So what does Moses do?

He ALLOWS men to put away their wives. AND to do it frivolously.

He didnt create laws forbidding it, he actually permitted divorce, and THEN ends up creating a law (Det 24:1-4) that even laid out the specifics for putting away a wife for no reason and also shows them to give it to her in writing !
AND...he tells them if she EVER remarries...she can NEVER come back to her first husband !

Moses, this supposed 'godly' prophet, KNOWING that God had created marriage for LIFE....that the wife is 'bound by the law of the husband' until his death, turns right around and not only PERMITS men to put their wives away as far back as Leviticus 21, but then ADDS HIS OWN instruction into GODS LAW telling a man precisely how to go about breaking this law created by God in the beginning.

Any objections?

There should be plenty....

Now, let me continue...

Moses did not add 'allowance' for divorce to Gods word with Deut 24:1-4 as some try to teach . There is no 'immorality' clause given there.

Deut 24:1-4 isn't any allowance at all if you read it as it is written instead of inserting our own thoughts into it, understanding that putting away was already going on at this point, not being anything new (see Lev 21, the priests are forbidden to marry a woman 'put away' from her husband).

Deut 24 is Gods (thru Moses) attempt to put enough restriction on the husband so to discourage divorce. Frivolous divorce wasn't commanded in Gods law, nor was it given license therein. It was merely tolerated and regulated by Moses.

So the above is therefore modified (as it was meant to be from the start) in that we do believe that Moses, with Gods permission, allowed divorce for the safety of the wife whose hardhearted husband might even kill her to be rid of her. Frivolous divorce was tolerated because of sin and to prevent further and possibly more diabolical treachery from occurring.

So Jesus was right, Moses 'suffered' the act of putting away an innocent wife (ie. "for every cause") because of their hardheartedness...both towards her and towards God.

This 'law of the husband' presented in the passages above CANNOT be UNconditional or Moses himself is guilty of allowing men and women to break this law against God's will. Do you believe that Moses would have sent these women to hell by allowing them to RE marrying after being put away by a hardhearted husband? Moses was no such monster.

Those passages above show the intent of God that marriage is for life. The marriage covenant itself is not, nor ever has been an UNconditional one