

"Bound by law " vs "not in bondage"

a game of semantics

By WmTipton

Assertions of this article

In this article I'd like to show how some groups will distort the Greek to their own purposes, then reject the same rules of interpretation when it comes to having their own views brought into question. Here we examine a case of a Greek word that means 'bound' versus another that means to be in 'bondage', and how these words are used to the advantage of those who forbid remarriage while the former spouse lives. Yet we see that to have any sort of consistency in their views, that they would have to reject the very rules of interpretation they used to draw their previous conclusions.

This article may be harder to understand than many of the others. I apologize in advance if it is. Just remember as you read that we are comparing the use of 'bound' to 'bondage' in relation to the consummated wife versus the man who has married but not yet consummated his marriage.

Please feel free to email me if you have any questions about this article and the point I'm trying to make.

Supporting Evidence

Some say that this wife is bound to her husband unconditionally only after consummation. That during the betrothal period she can be put away for fornication.

They reject that God's word shows that the betrothed wife is still a covenant wife...fully bound in marriage to her husband both lawfully and religiously.

They reject arguments about the believer not being still bound to the deserting UNbeliever stating that it is a 'different Greek word' that means she is not in bondage, not in 'slavery', but she is still 'bound' to her husband by the terms of the Greek in 1 Corinthians 7:39 and Romans 7:2..

Here are the passages in question and the definitions of relevant Greek words.

"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)

And also in Romans 7:2

"For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.

(Rom 7:2 KJV)

The word 'bound' in 1 Cor 7:39 is "deo" (g1210)

bound

G1210

????

deo?

deh'-o

A primary verb; to bind (in various applications, literally or figuratively): - bind, be in bonds, knit, tie, wind. See also G1163, G1189.

The wife is 'bound' to the husband as long as he lives.

Versus this passage...

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

(1Co 7:15 KJV)

Bondage

G1402

douloo?

doo-lo'-o

From G1401; to enslave (literally or figuratively): - bring into (be under) bondage, X given, become (make) servant.

They say that since its not the same word that the believer may not be in bondage, but they are still 'bound' to the deserter.

Let us also play greek scholar here and go to 1 Corinthians 7:27, concerning virgins, and see if we can use their logic consistantly and still maintain consistency in the scriptures..

"Art thou bound unto a wife? seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a wife.

(1Co 7:27 KJV)

bound

G1210

deo?

deh'-o

A primary verb; to bind (in various applications, literally or figuratively): - bind, be in bonds, knit, tie, wind. See also G1163, G1189.

Here we see that this person is also 'bound' in the same manner as in 1 Corinthians 7:39 by the use of the word 'deo'. The greek word is the same in both instances.

Using same logic our friendly anti-remarriagers do, that the word must be the same to have the same meaning and intent, we see that this this virgin in 1 Corinthians 7:27 is 'bound' to his wife in the SAME exact manner that this wife is 'bound' to her husband in 1 Corinthians 7:39. and in Romans 7:2.

This means, if we do as these folk do, that this virgin in 1 Corinthians 7:27 is 'bound' for life already to his wife because the greek word is the exact same word as in 1 Corinthians 7:39 and Romans 7:2. where it shows she is 'bound for life' to her husband supposedly without condition.

The anti-remarriagers say that this betrothed virgin CAN be put away as per Jesus exception, for harlotry, But playing greek scholar here, we see that it is the SAME word that binds a wife to her husband in 1 Corinthians 7:39 and Romans 7:2 that binds this man to his wife in 1 Corinthians 7:27....thus meaning she CANNOT be put away because she is 'bound' already by the SAME greek word that binds the wife in 1 Corinthians 7:39...

They cant have it both ways.

They cant say the difference in the wording shows one thing in one case, then reject the wording in another case....*IF* this is how rendering and interpretation might be done.

Thank goodness it isnt.

My boss can 'fire' me....he can 'terminate' me.....he can 'let me go'.....in every case I am no longer his employee....the differences in wording are irrelevant...the intent, the 'meaning' is the same..

1 Corinthians 7:27 says 'bound' and calls her his 'wife'...as she lawfully was according to Jewish betrothal.

1 Corinthians 7:39 shows that a 'wife' is 'bound' by the law to her husband for as long as he lives.

NOTHING in scripture ever states that it only occurs AFTER consummation that she is bound to him.

That is because she is bound to him for life by the 'law of the husband' until his death from the moment she is betrothed, not only after consummation.

This law is not, nor ever has been, unconditional.

Conclusions:

-If the wife is bound by law without condition to the husband in 1 Corinthians 7:39 because of the word 'deo' then playing the the anti-remarriagers methods that means that the virgin in 1 Corinthians 7:27 is also 'bound' unconditionally to his wife there for life already..

-This clearly means that the exception clause would not apply to these betrothed virgins based simply on the fact that Paul used the same word 'bound' (deo, g1210) for both the "wife" and the virgin who is bound to a wife".....making Jesus exception both a contradiction and meaningless to even those of this doctrinal view.

We know that Jesus didnt give His exception to no one.

Thus this argument that the believer is still 'bound' even tho not in 'bondage' the the deserter is a mere game of semantics.

A freed slave no longer in bondage to his master is free indeed...he is not still "bound" to him...