

NTA 1

MATTHEW 19:1-12

(Patriarchal)

(Mosaical)

(Christian)

"BEGINNING"-----one man - one woman - for life

Moses "suffered" a change. (Not so from the beginning). v.8

Christ "gave" (one exception)

- (1) Original Plan. v. 4-6
- (2) Kingdom Age. v. 12
- (3) Violation - Adultery. v. 9
- (4) One exception. v. 9

"But from the beginning it was not so." v. 8

"And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and who marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery." v. 9

NTA 2

MARRIAGE CAN DETERMINE DESTINY

Matt. 19:9; 1 Cor. 6:9.10

NTA 6

A QUESTION OF INTEGRITY

After the debate, Tarbet wrote a distorted and biased review of the discussion and sent it to at least one "traditional" paper that thrives on "phoney" reports. One who was actually at the debate would reject Tarbet's nonsense and realize that he is only trying to prop up Carroll's inept arguments and failed efforts in the debate.

Tarbet's "traditional" half-truths and attempt at brotherhood deception is one thing that has given debating a bad rap in recent years. But one cannot expect more from brethren who's doctrine is not only unscriptural, -- but whose integrity is suspect. The simple truth is - Mathew 19 is not New Testament doctrine!

Dan Billingsly, TYING A KNOT IN DON TARBET'S TALE, p. 3

M9

FALSE STATEMENT IN BOOK

On Jan.28, 1993, Dan Billingsly learned for he first time in his life that the word "ervah" is used 54 times in the Old Testament.

He also learned that the DEFINITION for "ervah" is, Lit., nudity., Fig., disgrace, blemish. Trans. Nakedness, shame, uncleanness. He learned that "ervah" never one time in 54 times was used to mean "fornication". WHY DOES HE CONTINUE TO SELL THE UNREVISED BOOK? Over 7 months later we ordered the book, "THE DEVIL AND MATTHEW 19" and as quoted below, he continues to sell this book with his known error in it. WHY? WHY? WHY?

Page 18, "The Devil and Matthew 19" -- Dan Billingsly

" Some may also try to argue that the Hebrew word "ervah" can also mean something other than "sexual uncleanness" because of its use in Deut. 23:14. Let it be known that the word "ervah" is used "only twice" in the entire Old Testament law of Moses. Once in Deut. 23:14, where the context describes the unlawful "nakedness" of uncovered human waste within the camp of Israel; and once in Deuteronomy 24:1, where the context means the "nakedness, speading of oneself, nudity, uncovering , immoral and disgraceful behavior, personal shame." It is clear from both contexts that the Hebrew phrase "ervah debar" in Deut. 23:14 describes a "naked thing," and the word "ervah" in Deut. 24:1 describes "the perpetual immorality" of a person - the wife. In Matt. 19:3-12, Christ settles all arguments as to the meaning of "ervah" with its definition and cause for divorce in Israel as "fornication" or "adultery." (Note that Dan used "only twice". Billingsly whole doctrine rests upon his false false definition of "ervah". WHOSE INTEGRITY IS SUSPECT?)