

1.1.1 /- 06B: Covenant Chart

As said, marriage is a covenant, not a contract, and begun by the couple, not by the church. What the church does is wed the married, playing third party witness to their covenant, proclaiming them husband and wife. The idea of covenant is important to grasp. It also relates to issues such as Sinai. Did Israelites and Judahites break that covenant? At what point, if any, was it broken? These questions use the language of contract, not of covenant. A covenant where there is a decidedly senior party (suzerain) is called a suzerain covenant. There are also parity covenants/alliances between friendly nations or people (for example David and Jonathan). I have covered this much more in my *Israel's Gone Global*. In brief, Israel violated Sinai, raising the question for Yahweh as suzerain to annul it. Christians who support the State of Israel usually have an idea that Sinai continues for ethnic Israel, and that Christian solidarity is therefore beholden. Consequently, Muslims often feel that injustice against Palestine is the injustice of Christianity. This can increase persecution and limit conversions. Evangelistically and politically, it's quite important to understand covenant, and to discount the idea that some covenants were conditional and some unconditional. And it can be personally important.

Now let's briefly reflect on a sad question some Christians have voiced. What if your spouse<sup>1</sup> betrays you by interpersonal sex with another? Have they *broken* the marriage. No, they could not. Are you obliged to? No, you cannot. What they have done is violate, seriously, the covenant, the intimate bridge between you both. You, taking the position of suzerain, are not obliged to annul the covenant, but you are permitted to do so. If you do, you and your former spouse would be morally eligible to marry again. And 'suzerain' here, IMO, applies in marriage equally to guys & girls – parity. This too I cover in *Israel's Gone Global*.

Texts

The texts are A (Lv.26:15: ISV); B (Dt.31:16: MSG); C (Ezk.17:19: REB); D (Hos.8:1: ESV); E (Zc.11:10: HCSB);<sup>2</sup> F (Mal.2:10: NWT). Each text has been allowed two plus two marks, a linking of covenant with either suzerain annulment or vassal violation. For terms like contract, promise, treaty, zero marks. For the term covenant, two marks. If the suzerain may annul, two marks. If the vassal may annul, zero marks. If the vassal can despise, violate, reject, profane, dishonour, prostitute, soil, etc, two marks, or simply one if the text doesn't link to the associated term, covenant. For the chart, see <http://mdtc.eu/wggc.html>.

Results

The highest version here is the REB, at 20 marks, and the lowest the CEV at zero. All scores have then been divided by 20%, turning them all into comparative percentages.

Covenant	A	B	C	D	E	F	T	%	
REB	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/2	2/2	2/2	20	100	A
ESV	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/2	2/2	18	90	A-
HCSB	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/2	2/2	18	90	A-
ISV	2/2	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/0	2/2	18	90	A-
MSG	2/2	2/2	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	18	90	A-
NWT	2/2	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/0	2/2	18	90	A-
VOICE	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/0	2/2	2/2	18	90	A-
NASU	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/1	2/2	17	85	B+
NIV	2/2	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/1	2/2	17	85	B+
CJB	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/0	2/2	16	80	B
KJ21	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/0	2/2	16	80	B
KJV	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/0	2/2	16	80	B
LEB <sup>3</sup>	2/0	2/1	2/0	2/1	2/0	2/2	16	80	B
MEV	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/0	2/2	16	80	B
NABRE	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/0	2/2	16	80	B
NET	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/2	16	80	B
NKJV	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/0	2/2	16	80	B
NRSV	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/2	16	80	B
TLV	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/0	2/2	16	80	B
EJB	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	2/0	2/0	14	70	B-
NJB	2/0	2/0	0/0	2/2	2/0	2/2	14	70	B-

<sup>1</sup> Or partner? No, that's Correctivism immorally merging marriage with long/medium/short-term living together! This said, some partners, though unwedded, will actually be spouses since effectively in a marriage (covenant), not in a contract. Bureaucracy is blind and corrupt.

<sup>2</sup> A broken stick can symbolise an annulled covenant – the connection is gone, but the covenant was not broken.

<sup>3</sup> Surprisingly, at least online the LEB lacks reference in Dt.31:16. I have cautiously guessed how it would otherwise read.

**Dr Steve H Hakes (mdtc.eu) © 2015 *The Word's Gone Global***

<b>WEB</b>	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	<b>14</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>B-</b>
<b>CEB</b>	2/0	2/0	1/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	<b>13</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>C+</b>
<b>NLT</b>	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/0	2/1	2/0	<b>13</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>C+</b>
<b>EOB<sup>4</sup></b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	<b>12</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>GNB</b>	2/0	2/0	0/0	2/0	2/0	2/2	<b>12</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>GWT</b>	0/1	1/2	2/0	0/1	1/0	0/1	<b>9</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>D+</b>
<b>NOG</b>	0/1	1/2	2/0	0/1	1/0	0/1	<b>9</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>D+</b>
<b>ERV</b>	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	2/0	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>E</b>
<b>NLV</b>	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/0	0/1	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>E</b>
<b>NCV</b>	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>E</b>
<b>CEV</b>	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>E</b>

<sup>4</sup>

*I per force* excluded the EOB, worked out a group average to the nearest whole number, and awarded that to the EOB as a realistic approximate.