

The Mind of Christ - Lesson 80

November 13, 2020

Section 54 The Sermon on the Mount

A. T. Robertson's Harmony of the Gospels

Welcome to another edition of The Mind of Christ. We are still on The Sermon on the Mount and we are working our way through that sermon. Today we are going to be in **Matthew 5:31-37**.

We will consider first verses 31-32 about divorce and then we'll be in verses 33-37 to talk about vows. I think we can do both of those today. I thank you for joining us. This is a serious, in-depth treatment of the mind of Christ and is based on a theme called "Challenger Deep". Challenger Deep is the deepest part of the Ocean and it's a great metaphor for the mind of Christ which is also *very deep* and we're going to be plunging into the depths of that today as we continue our study of The Sermon on the Mount.

Let's jump into it as I read the text that we'll be considering first, and then we'll be going to my journal that will give you **my** study that I did in 2011 on this particular part. Here's the reading for today.

Matthew 5:31-32

"Now it was said, 'Whoever sends his wife away is to give her a **certificate of divorce**';³² but I say to you that everyone who divorces his wife, except for the reason of sexual immorality, makes her commit adultery; and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery."

³³ "Again, you have heard that the ancients were told, 'You shall not make false **vows**, but shall fulfill your vows to the Lord.'³⁴ But I say to you, make no oath at all, either by heaven, for it is the throne of God,³⁵ or by the earth, for it is the footstool of His feet, or by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King.³⁶ Nor shall you make an oath by your head, for you cannot make one hair white or black.³⁷ But let your statement be, 'Yes, yes' or 'No, no'; anything beyond these is of evil."

Let's jump into our discussion of divorce in **Matthew 5:31-32** concerning divorce. The first question here is why is this wedged in between anger and lust on one side; and keeping our oaths on the other side? The answer should be obvious from experience. Anger and desire are probably the two big enemies of a faithful and loving marriage. One of the reasons marriages fail is because anger or tension or conflict within the home; and also because of marital unfaithfulness or adultery in the home. He follows those two treatments of anger and adultery, and looking at a woman as constituting adultery, with the teaching on divorce.

Keeping the peace and not letting one's frustration with the other person grow; and controlling our desires sexually or any covetousness that may be a part of our lives will stabilize the marriage. The other support is realizing how important our oaths are. Marriage is built on 'keeping our word' and so really, this treatment of marriage or divorce is appropriate in the place we find it, in the Sermon on the Mount.

Jesus begins by addressing their “**proof text**” in **Deuteronomy 24:1-4**.

It says, “When a man takes a wife and marries her, and it happens that she finds **no favor in his eyes** because he has found some **indecency** in her, and he writes her a certificate of divorce, and puts it in her hand and sends her away from his house, ² and she leaves his home and becomes another man’s wife, ³ and the latter husband turns against her, writes her a certificate of divorce and puts it in her hand, and sends her away from his house, or if the latter husband who took her to be his wife dies, ⁴ then her former husband who sent her away is not allowed to take her again to be his wife, after she has been **defiled**; for that is an abomination before the Lord, and you shall not bring sin on the land which the Lord your God is giving you as an inheritance.”

This is the statement that was in debate under the Law:

¹⁻²“When a man takes a wife and marries her, and it happens, if she finds **no favor in his eyes** because he has **found some indecency** in her, that he writes her a certificate of divorce, puts it in her hand, and sends her away from his house, ² and she leaves his house and goes and becomes another man’s wife...” A lot of this from **Deuteronomy 24:1** hinged on how you interpreted the idea of “**finding some indecency**” in the woman. The result is, ‘If she marries another man who divorces her, the first husband is not supposed to allow to even remarry her’ ... the reason being that she has been “defiled” which is an abomination.

So here we have a woman who has been ‘dismissed’ or ‘divorced’ by her husband because he finds ‘some indecency’ in her. She goes out and marries another man. If **that man** divorces her, then the first husband is not allowed to take her back **because** she now is an **abomination**. Now if the certificate of divorce given by the first husband freed him and her, then why would she have been **defiled** in the second marriage? That’s a good question because the second marriage would have been legitimate (I guess, assuming that the man who married her also had a legitimate reason to be remarried.)

Jesus answers this question. It is because the husband who sent her away **caused her** to commit adultery by marrying the second man. So if the husband who sends her away or divorces her ‘**not** for adultery’, but for some other reason, he **causes her** to commit adultery with the second man. Jesus has already taught much in the Sermon on the Mount about “causing someone to sin”. Just as the “hand” and the “eye” are occasions for stumbling, the husband who divorces his wife also is the occasion for her stumbling. It seems clear that the defilement is simply that she ‘remarried and had sexual relations’ with the second man since even if he, the second man dies, and she remarries the first she is **still** considered to be defiled.

I hope you’re following all this. It really hinges on how you interpret **Deuteronomy 24:1**; whether or not a man has a right to divorce his wife for practically **any and every reason**. And Jesus is saying, “**No**. The only reason you can divorce your wife is because of marital unfaithfulness.” This, for me, puts a whole new spin on the matter and shows how the Jews “proof-texted” Deuteronomy 24 by simply not applying the rest of the text to the “context”.

Now it is amazing that we can see only what ‘we **want** to see’ in a text. The “indecency” he finds in his wife is not specified, and in actual cases it becomes an ‘excuse’ for any trivial matter that he wants to say. He can just simply say, “I find her ‘indecent’ in ‘this’ area and say she has ‘lost favor’ with me.”

Divorce became easy under this interpretation of Moses' words. A better reading of the text shows that Moses was arguing for the *opposite* outcome. Jesus is very specific about the *indecent* the husband may see in his wife. *The indecency has to be unchastity* and the word is "pornea" (πορνεία) meaning *harlotry*, including *adultery* and *incest*. The word is *fornication*. This is a major indecency, not trivial at all, and the "exception" word makes this even **more** serious!

If a wife is 'released' for any other reason and is remarried, the *first husband* is the **cause** of her committing adultery! Therefore, the husband needs to be very careful about the grounds on which he divorces his wife. Jesus holds to there is only one indecency that allows him to divorce his wife, and that is 'fornication' or "pornea". The word "except" in this text means "apart from". In **Acts 26:29** Paul wishes Agrippa, and all there, were like him, with the exception of the chains that he was in ... so, it was apart from the chains. Here, we cannot miss the exception clause. Had he not put that in, he would have risked offending his audience because he was standing there before them in chains. In **2 Corinthians 11:28**, Paul, after speaking of the many dangers of his ministry, said 'apart from such external things, there is the daily pressure upon me of concern for all the churches.' He could have said, 'with the exception of these dangers, there is internal pressure and anxiety over the churches.'

So the "exception" clause is very limited in nature. It is limited to what is "specified" in the clause. That Jesus, here, is giving '*one*' reason for giving the wife a *certificate of divorce* is clear. There are two ways this woman can be defiled. **First**, is by committing fornication while married to her first husband, and **second**, by remarrying when she has been released by her husband for a cause other than fornication. Now, she's in double jeopardy. If she committed adultery or fornication then she is defiled. If she is divorced for *any other reason* other than fornication, and remarries another man, she becomes defiled with that other man because she has no *right* to remarry.

In this culture, women could not divorce their husbands; and divorce for a wife often left her completely vulnerable making it even more likely she would remarry just to survive; just to have food coming into the home, or taking care of her children. The consequence of the woman remarrying while being released from the first husband is that he causes her to commit adultery and indirectly, causes her second husband to commit adultery.

Now you cannot have only one party guilty of adultery without the other also being part of the adultery. So, the man who flippantly divorces his wife for some reason 'other than' fornication is setting up a sequence of events that could cause his wife to eventually be an adulterer herself because she would be marrying another man and committing adultery, and he would also be culpable for the adultery.

The word "divorce" here is "apoluo" (απολυω) meaning "to free fully", to relieve, to release, to dismiss, to let something die, to pardon or divorce. It means to let *loose from*, to *loosen* or *unbind* a person or a thing. Without the reality of fornication, the husband does not have authority to *release* or *loose* his wife. He is not authorized to untie the knot or to 'loose' what God Himself has 'bound'. **Matthew 19:6** makes clear "what God has bound together, let not man separate." The sin here is usurping the authority of God ... taking matters into our own hands.

If the woman and her second husband are both guilty of adultery, then what is the guilt of the one who set this whole thing in motion, the first husband? What is his liability? What has his guilt for releasing her while not authorized to do so? And what is his guilt for *his* marrying again? ***Jesus does not address the latter but He certainly implies the former.*** He is speaking to everyone; so this is something that has to do with everyone.

This confirms to me Jesus' strictness of 'marriage, divorce and remarriage'. Jesus was pretty strict about this, but it also indicates that the issue is a matter of the heart. As Jesus said in **Matthew 19:8** the basis of any certificate of divorce was hardness of the heart. "**Because of your hardness of heart Moses permitted you to divorce your wives; but from the beginning it has not been this way.**" Jesus is not discussing legalities in the Sermon; in fact, just the opposite. He is ***contrasting*** the Jewish tendency to do that without considering the matter of the heart involved. Jesus, if listened to, would have caused many of the Jews, and today, many of the Christians to get into a position where they would get a 'tightness in their stomach' because they would be thinking, "**Oh my. We've really messed up here.**"

And that's all I am going to say about the ***divorce and remarriage*** issue in this, because I just want to stick to the facts of this particular text. I understand that there are tons of questions on ***divorce and remarriage***, and I'm not here today to unravel all of that, but I'm just simply saying Jesus is addressing this "proof texting" that they were doing from Deuteronomy 24, He is saying you need to be careful how you interpret that Scripture because you have interpreted it in a way that is going to set up a sequence of consequences that's going to involve this woman in fornication and adultery ***and*** you're going to set up another man who may marry her in the same sin. So a man who divorces his wife needs to be very careful regarding the reason why he divorces her.

Now let's go to the next section on **vows**, which certainly is applicable to follow this section on marriage.

Matthew 6:33-37 "Again, you have heard that the ancients were told, 'You shall not make false **vows**, but shall fulfill your vows to the Lord.' ³⁴ But I say to you, make no oath at all, either by heaven, for it is the throne of God, ³⁵ or by the earth, for it is the footstool of His feet, or by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King. ³⁶ Nor shall you make an oath by your head, for you cannot make one hair white or black. ³⁷ But let your statement be, 'Yes, yes' or 'No, no'; anything beyond these is of evil."

The basis of marriage is one's 'vows before God'. The first question I have is in the Old Testament, did God through Moses command vows in certain circumstances, and was Jesus removing all 'oaths' although not removing commitments? He's not removing the commitments that we make, so is he just simply saying you are ***not obligated***, or you ***should not make an oath*** before God?

A brief mention is made in **Leviticus 19:12**. He says, "**And you shall not swear falsely by My name, so as to profane the name of your God; I am the Lord.**" Here, He does not ***command*** or ***prohibit*** oaths; but demands that they be ***truthful*** to reflect the true intent of the heart. If you are going to make an oath in the name of the Lord, you need to make sure that your oath is ***truthful*** and you ***fulfill*** the oath or you **profane the name of the Lord** by whom you swore.

Numbers 30: gives an extensive treatment of **vows**. Here are some of the main features of this text.

1. A man is **bound** to his oath ... period! If you make an oath you are bound to it (2).
2. A woman still under the authority of her father is bound by her oath **if her father** says nothing to **repeal** the oath. If the father **repeals** the oath, then she is **not bound** by it, but if he is silent, the oath stands and the woman is bound. So because she is under the authority of her father, he can rescind the oath and clear her of her obligation, but if he doesn't do that, then she's bound to the oath. (3-5)
3. A woman under the authority of her husband has the same situation. In other words, the husband **can repeal** the oath. (6-8)
4. The vow of a widow or divorced woman binds unless previously released by **her** husband. So if a widow or a divorced woman makes a vow, she **has to keep** the vow. (9-12)
5. When a husband annuls the oath, he also bears her guilt; but if the oath is not annulled, **she remains obligated**. **By the husband's annulling the vow and bearing the guilt, she is forgiven**. So he can "assume" the guilt for not fulfilling the oath on her part. (13-15)

It seems that Numbers 30 does not address swearing falsely directly.

Deuteronomy 23:21-23 teaches us not to "delay" paying your vow. To do so **is a sin** and God will surely require it of you. It is **not a sin** to **refrain from making a vow**. Promises must be performed or they should not be made! Vows are obligatory but they are voluntary. In other words, you don't have to make a vow, but if you do then you are obligated to fulfill it.

Note the nearness in the text between Moses' teaching on vows and the "marriage, divorce, remarriage" issue here in **Deuteronomy 24**. In **Deuteronomy 23** he talks paying your vows, and in **Deuteronomy 24** he's talking about **divorce** and **remarriage**.

Then in **Job 22:27** Eliphaz, one of Job's friends suggests that Job needs to return to the Lord and "pay his vows". Eliphaz is suggesting that that's why Job is in trouble ... he didn't meet the requirements of his vow.

In **Psalm 61:8** David promises to pay his vows day by day. "So I will sing praise to Your name forever, that I may pay my vows day by day." See Ecclesiastes 5 as well. One issue regarding vows is **impulsivity**. In order to make ourselves "look more credible" than we are, we might "swear" to a truth or commitment before we think it through. **Ecclesiastes 5:1-3** addresses this when looking at sacrifices. Verse 1 says we should first "draw near to listen" instead of just "rushing to sacrifice".

Remember, previously, Jesus said "if you are at the altar and remember you have offended a brother, you're to leave your gift at the altar and go be reconciled to your brother." (**Matthew 5:23-24**). In other words, take some time before you 'go to the altar' and make sure you don't have some obligation that you need to take care of.

In **Eccl. 5:2** he says, “Do not be hasty in ‘word’ or ‘impulse’ in thought. When we’re too impulsive and we say things or make promises or we swear an oath we sometimes get ourselves into trouble. We don’t just rush in before God! Let your words be few since God is God and we are mere mortals. We don’t rush in before God. So when you promise to do something, it’s an **obligation before God**; not just simply an obligation before the person that you’ve made the oath to. So we need to “go into the presence of God” with a lot of thought.

Regarding vows in **Ecclesiastes 5:4**, when you make a vow to God, “**Do not be late in paying it for He takes no delight in fools.**” So a man who makes an oath and doesn’t fulfill it is a fool! Pay what you vow! It is better that you should not “vow”, than you should “vow” and not pay. These verses make clear that it is a serious matter to make a vow before God and not keep it.

In **Judges 11:29** we see a case of an impulsive vow that had tragic consequences. **Jephthah** was a judge fighting the Amorites. He wanted God to give him success in battle, so he **vowed** to sacrifice as a burnt offering, the first thing that came “from the door of his house” after he returned from battle. God gave him success in the battle, and his only child, his daughter, **came out celebrating the victory**. We read in **Judges 11:35**, “**So when he saw her, he tore his clothes and said, “Oh, my daughter! You have brought me disaster, and you are among those who trouble me; for I have given my word to the Lord, and I cannot take it back.”** Well, I don’t know why he was blaming his daughter! He’s the one who made the stupid vow and he’s the one who obligated himself to something that was **impulsive**; the daughter didn’t have anything to do with it. He was impulsive, but **noble** in desiring to keep his oath...but foolishly noble! **Which was the greater sin** – to impulsively make an oath or to sacrifice his daughter? He would need to see God’s forgiveness for either one. But how serious it is to make a vow and not keep it!

And again, back in that text in Judges 11, some believe that instead of actually sacrificing her literally, killing her on an altar, that she just simply remained unmarried for the rest of her life and **that** was the consequence of the oath. So it is not clear if Jephthah actually killed his daughter, or she meely became a perpetual virgin. But the text, to me, strongly indicates the former; that he **did fulfill that vow**. The only connection to Jesus’ teaching is how vows can go seriously wrong if they are impulsive and if they are just stupid vows. It is almost as Jesus is saying that people cannot be trusted with oaths. They are not **reliable** enough ... or powerful enough to **back up** their yeses and no’s by “swearing”. Yet Jesus does say people can be trusted with “yes” and “no”. So, what does an oath do to change “yes” and “no”?

An oath implies some consequence to the object of the oath ‘if I do not fulfill the oath’. If a person swears on their mother’s grave, what does that mean? The object of the oath represents something important to the one who is swearing the oath ... almost like collateral on a loan. It backs up the oath, where if I do not keep it, I lose something. For example; a connection with my mother’s grave. I’m not sure, but if I don’t keep the oath, do I dishonor my mother’s grave or life? And since her honor is invaluable to me, **I would not** risk her honor. I would not risk disconnection from my mother.

Jesus mentions four objects of oath. He mentions *heaven, earth, Jerusalem* and *your head*. So I assume those are four common oaths that were given by the Jews. Are these merely “witnesses” to my oath? There does seem that these are not all equal. Did the Jews have a hierarchy of oaths ... each one progressively more binding? This is indicated in Matthew 23 verses 16 and following. A distinction is made between *swearing on the Temple* or the *‘gold’ of the Temple*. They believed that the gold was more important than the Temple! But Jesus says that the Temple sanctified the gold; not the gold the Temple.

The same is true about the altar in the offering. To swear by the Temple is to swear by **God in the Temple** and to swear by heaven is to swear by the **God of heaven!** All this means is that the Jews were playing games with oaths; binding and loosing as it benefitted them. The object of your “swearing” supposedly binds you to your oath. However, *what* you say and *how* you say it may, in fact, mean it doesn’t count! It’s like kids and they would promise something and they would ‘cross their fingers behind their back’ making it “null and void”. It was a game making our word not ‘mean’ anything.

The Jews did it with some system that they created. It was a man-made system, a tradition that nullified their word; the Word of God. In this section, **Matthew 23:16-22**, Jesus calls these folks “blind guides”, “fools” and “blind men”. The question seems to be one of relative importance. What is of ‘more value’ ... the altar or the gift on it; the Temple or the gold on it? This was a theme with the **hypocrites**. Importance ... whether their personal importance, or the importance of what they tithed versus what they observed as the “weightier matters of the law” (**Matthew 23:23**). In other words, they would have ‘relative’ importance. They would say they were going to ‘tithed milt, dill and cumin’ but they neglected the weightier matters of the law. They were setting up a lot of times, some kind of system that said, ‘this is really important and this is not really important’; so I’ll swear by something that’s not really important *in order to not be held to the obligation to fulfill my oath*.

Jesus is saying, “Enough games! God does not play games.” Jesus goes beyond this. He says ‘no oaths’; simply let your “yes” be “yes” and your “no” be “no”. We should be suspicious when someone tells us something and has to back it up with, “I swear”. The Hebrew writer explains the nature of an oath.

In **Hebrews 6:16** he says, “For men swear by one greater than themselves”, and with them “an oath” gives a confirmation as an end to every dispute. The word “confirmation” is a word that means “to establish”, “ratification”, “corroboration”, or “firm establishment”.

It’s used in **Philippians 1:7** where Paul speaks of the “defense” and “confirmation” of the Gospel. In **1 Corinthians 1:8** it is “God who confirms us to the end.” So all this is about how oaths confirm something. In **2 Corinthians 1:21** God establishes us with an anointing or confirms us. **Colossians 2:7** “being established in the faith” or “confirmed in the faith”. **Hebrews 13:9** it is “good for the heart to be strengthened by grace” or to be “confirmed” by grace. In **Mark 16:20**, the word was “confirmed” by signs and miracles. **Romans 15:8** says, Paul was sent to “confirm” the promises given to the fathers. **1 Corinthians 1:6** says that the testimony of Christ is “confirmed” in you. **Hebrews 2:3** says “confirmed by those who heard”. In other words, it’s the idea of confirmation ... that *oaths confirm* something.

The Hebrew writer quotes **Genesis 22:17**. But **Genesis 22:16** reads, “By Myself, I have sworn, declares the Lord.” In verse 17 it says, “Indeed, I will greatly bless you and I will multiply your seed”. So, why did God *swear* when Jesus tells us not to swear?

In the same way, God desired even more to show to His heirs ‘of the promise’ ... the unchangeableness of His purpose, so he interposed it with an oath. Now this is back in **Hebrews 6**. The word “interposed” here ... “he interposed it with an oath” is a go-between. It’s a reconciler, an intercessor or a mediator. So, in this case, with God, the oath served as a go-between between God and Abraham and his seed. For God’s part, He did not need a go-between, but for our sakes, we need all the assurance we can get for our faith’s sake. So the word is used here as to ‘Christ being a mediator’ and so forth, so it’s the same word. When God imposed or interposed the oath, He used it as a go-between ... us and Him in order to make more certain and more sure **for our benefit** so our faith could be rooted in that.

*Could it be that Jesus is God’s oath since He is the mediator, He’s the go-between that God, in order to make His purposes completely clear, and completely binding, He used Jesus, Himself as His oath ... Jesus was a living oath. Remember, it says that God swore by “Himself” ... and **Jesus is God!** So how do I get my head around this?*

Hebrews 6 says the oath was the mediator and *everywhere else* this means **Jesus**. Therefore, we could conclude that *the oath was Jesus. Jesus is God’s “yes”*. **2 Corinthians 1:20** says, *“All the promises are ‘yes’ in Christ!”* God’s “yes” is “yes” and God’s “yes” is Jesus. This is amazing. What a new insight! It’s another nugget on the way to the depths of Challenger Deep.

The unchangeable things of Hebrews 6:18, “...it is impossible for God to lie; we who have taken refuge would have strong encouragement to hold firmly to the hope set before us.” First, **God cannot lie**. And second, it must be the “Oath” itself. And since it is “by Myself” or by “Jesus” as the mediator, there will be this unchangeable nature of Jesus as well. And this was for us, His heirs, those of us who have fled to take refuge by laying a hold of the hope set before us, God wanted His children to have the “firmest assurance” that He could give to His children.

Back in Matthew 5 Jesus says to go beyond “yes” and “no” is evil. The word here is “perissos” (περισσος). It is something that is super abundant in *quantity*. It is superior in *quality*. The idea seems to be “excess”... something more than “yes” or “no” ... is to ‘go beyond’, to go to something that is super-abundant, that is in excess. The word evil here is the word “ponepos” (πονηρος). It means bad, unsound, evil, defective, it’s wrong, malignant, and it’s used in many places here. I’m not going to give you all the places where it’s used here, but let me just give you a couple that are found in the Sermon on the Mount.

In **Matthew 6:23** He says, “If your eye is bad ... evil or defective. In **Matthew 7:17** it says “every bad (or evil) tree bears bad fruit.” In **Matthew 5:11** he talks about men who saw all kinds of evil. In **Matthew 5:39**, it says “Do not resist him who is evil”. In **Matthew 5:45**, God causes the sun to rise on ‘the evil’. These are all places where the word “evil” is used in the Sermon on the Mount.

Also in **Matthew 7:22**, what proceeds out of man is what defiles a man and one of those is “envy”. **Matthew 7:11** says, “If you, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children..., so God knows how to give good gifts to those who He loves.

So the word for evil is used in a broad range of contexts, but it’s never good. Evil is evil; it’s never good. So when Jesus says ‘*anything beyond “yes” or “no” is of evil*, it indicates to me ... **motive**. To bolster our words with oaths is to ‘imply’ evil motives. If a person does not intend to do what they say, *no oath will change that*. If a person **does** intend to do what they say, *no oath will strengthen that word*.

The essence of **integrity** is to tell the truth even when it hurts and to follow through when we say we will do something. This is the big commitments of life as well as the small matters of life. Some will be *faithful* to show up on time, but *unfaithful* to their spouse!

Back in **Matthew 5:33**, where he says, “make fake vows” in the NASB, and the KJV says “to foreswear”, it is really to perjure oneself. It is **perjury** and it’s most associated with “court”. A person takes an oath to “tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth” with a hand on the Bible. Not so much these days ... “so help me God” we often say. In the presidential oath of Chester Arthur, he may have been the first to use “so help me God”. A distinction is often made between ‘*affirm*’ and ‘*swear*’.

Some who have a ‘conscience’ problem with the latter, in other words they don’t want to ‘swear’ an oath, they will ‘affirm’ their oath, but we often add ‘so help me God’. So it sounds like an acknowledgement of our need for God’s assistance in keeping the oaths when we add the phrase “so help me God”. We’re actually saying, “God help me keep this oath.” “So help me God” was prescribed for all U. S. Judges and officers other than the president in 1789 by congress, of all places.

A person under oath is obligated ‘under penalty of law’ to tell the truth on the witness stand or in a deposition. A tactic of some attorneys is to try to get a witness to *perjure* himself so as to *discredit* him and to cancel his testimony. If a court proceeding is to be valid, **truth** must be told. There is no justice where there is no truth. We also speak of “swear words”. We sometimes call these ‘profanity’. These include much more than pejorative words. The intent is to take something beautiful and *deface it* or *make it ugly*. To profane something is to bring it down to the level of the common. It’s the *opposite* of **sacred**.

Some words or phrases include God’s Name; and taking God’s name in vain is prohibited, obviously, in the Ten Commandments. Casually and non-serious uses of God’s name was so **detestable** to the Jews that they were *forbidden to ever even pronounce the name of God* lest they take it in vain. **Bottom line**: words mean something, and our words must be guarded as an extension of ourselves. So here we have two additional teachings; one on divorce and another on vows and how we are to maintain our vows.

I hope this has been useful to you and you will join us next time. For other material from our website, please go to <https://www.centalsarasota.org/> to find links to everything we have produced over the last several months. Until next time, we will continue our study of the Mind of Christ. God bless.