

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Marriage/Divorce & Remarriage- What does God say about it?

Marriage/Divorce & Remarriage- What does God say about it? - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/10/15 15:32

Jesus Christ said "Whoever shall put away his wife, except for the cause of fornication, causes her to commit adultery: and he that marries her that is divorced commits adultery". -Matt 5:32

Paul said "The woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he lives; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband lives, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress"-Rom.7:2,3

Again Paul says in 1 Cor.7:39 "The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband lives; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord".

John the Baptist told Herod "It is not lawful for you to have your brothers wife". Mark 5:18

These words to me all seem to be straightforward and easy to be understood. If a person read the above statements and came to the conclusion that no man should marry any woman who has been previously married while the previous husband is still alive, I would think that they would be understanding exactly what God intended for us to understand when he inspired these words to be written. It seems that few heed this doctrine. For some reason which is a mystery to me it is perfectly acceptable in modern protestant Christianity for a man and woman to be married while the woman's previous husband is still alive.

The word does say to rightly divide the word of truth and I know there are cases in the word where it says one thing in one place and yet in another place there is another scripture that qualifies and sheds more light on the exact meaning of the verse. Here then is my question. What does the word of God say about marrying her that is divorced? Are there some qualifying scriptures that would make the above scriptures clearer? Jesus does say in Matt 5:32 "except for the cause of fornication". Whose fornication? It would seem that he is saying that if a man or woman is unfaithful to their spouse then their partners are justified in seeking divorce and that they will no longer be liable for what the other one does. However the injured in this case has been put away and it would seem, according to Jesus that to remarry would constitute adultery. In Matt 5:32 where he says "Whoever puts away his wife except for the cause of fornication causes her to commit adultery". Surely he is not saying that if you are sexually faithful to your wife but divorce her and she remarries then you have caused her to commit adultery but, if you are sexually unfaithful then put her away then she is free to marry and you didn't cause her to commit adultery. That doesn't make much sense. In 1 Cor.7:15 Paul says "If the unbelieving depart, let him depart, A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God has called us to peace". This could be understood to mean that a Christian is allowed to remarry if their unbelieving husband/wife depart. So that would boil down to this: If a man or woman leaves their husband/wife then they are not abiding in the doctrine of Christ and are not real Christians but unbelievers. If one takes that view then all Christians are exempt from Matt.5:32, Rom.7:2,3 and 1 Cor 7:39 that says that a man or woman who remarry after divorce commit adultery and that a woman is bound by the law to stay married to her husband as long as he lives. That doesn't make much sense either. I have also heard said in the case of a person who is married to a divorced woman and then becomes a Christian - "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called" 1 Cor 7:20. and again 1 Cor. 7:24 "Let every man wherein he is called, therein abide with God". Lets try to apply this to the case of John the Baptist and Herod. John reproved Herod for being married to another man's wife (in this case his brother's). What if Herod wanted to become Jesus' disciple, wouldn't he need to put away Herodias according to Moses, John, and Jesus and stop committing adultery or should he profess Christianity and abide in the calling wherein he was called and keep on living in adultery? Just doesn't make sense.

All of these justifications for being married to someone whose previous spouse is still alive seem pretty flimsy to me. So will someone please enlighten me as to what the deal is with the current state of marriage and divorce in the church today? Maybe I don't understand exactly what the Lord is teaching with these verses or maybe there are some other verses that I am overlooking that would make things make more sense. I have no formal bible training but I do read the bible prayerfully and seek understanding as to how it is that God wants us to live. I tremble to think that perhaps I am correct in this matter, but what would that mean? It would mean that people would need to be taking radical action and departing from spouses that have been married before. It is interesting to note that Matt. 5:32 comes immediately after Jesus counsels us to take radical action to get sin out of our lives even if it comes to plucking out our own eyes or cutting off our own hands -Matt. 5-29,30. It would certainly give new meaning to 2 Cor.6:17 Come out from among them and be separate says the Lord. Almost every church would have members of the congregation who paid a very weighty price (ended adulter

ous relationship with their wife/husband) to follow Jesus. In our concept of Christianity today this may seem strange, but look at what they did in the old days for the Kingdom of God: Abraham left Ur and offered up Isaac, Moses left Egypt and all of its riches, Ezra 10:3 says the Jews made a covenant with God and put away all of their strange wives, and how about Jephthah (Judges 11) who swore to his own hurt and changed not when he had to offer his own daughter as a burnt offering, but there he is in Hebrews 11 listed as a mighty man of faith. Jesus did say to count the cost of following him and that no man could be his disciple unless he hated his father, mother, wife, child, brother, and sister. Again Jesus said "No man has left wife for the kingdom of Gods sake". What was he talking about there, extended missionary work? Perhaps so, but could this issue of adultery also be part of what he was talking about? If I knew for certain the answer to these questions I would have no need to post this question. The bible seems clear to me, but on the other hand most spiritual leaders sound no warning on this subject so maybe I am missing something somewhere. I have only made brief arguments here and I know there is much room for elaboration. I remember taking a survey here at sermon-index a while back about bible reading and I noticed at that time that about half the people that took the survey had read the bible through 2 times or more. I thought this might be a good place to get some answers on this matter. I would appreciate any thoughtful replies. Thank you.

Re: Marriage/Divorce & Remarriage- What does God say about it? - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/15 15:49

Hi Noel

this isn't the first time we have looked at the topic, but as so often with this topic there seem to be honest, bible believing, Christians who have different outlooks.

See where the discussion went the first time by clicking [here](#) and [also here](#).

Re: - posted by disciplejosh (), on: 2004/10/16 2:24

Noel,

You are asking what God says about it...

I think you covered most of what He says in His word.

I'll be honest and tell you that I have had a rather difficult time in 'sorting' all this out as i am trying to deal with it all in my daily life. My Mom and Dad split up and then got divorced all in the last 5 years (after almost 28 years of marriage).

My mom hasn't remarried. My dad, on the other hand, was remarried to another woman he says he loves and the whole time this was/is going on still calls himself a brother (I was in 1 Cor. 5 at the time this all unfolded and took it literally for a time, wavered, and now am in the midst of returning to it's straight forward and literal approach).

I don't know what to do. There hasn't been any visible repentance as far as I can see. I would appreciate your prayers for me as I try to seek the Lord's will and what He would have me do in the situation.

I have read the other threads on this subject. I would appreciate straight answers, rather than semantics, etc. Noel is raising a great question. And I agree with Noel...

...I've heard Pastor's and laypeople's reponse...What does God say?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/16 14:48

Quote:
-----I have read the other threads on this subject. I would appreciate straight answers, rather than semantics, etc. Noel is raising a great question. And I agree with Noel...

...I've heard Pastor's and laypeople's reponse...What does God say?

Josh
Semantics, used in its derogatory sense, usually means 'playing with words'. There is a parallel danger which is not so obvious called 'playing with lives'.

Many pastors have struggled painfully and prayerfully with a bewildering array of relationships, and with a heartfelt resolution to be faithful to the scriptures and those for whose souls they watch. They have studied the scriptures and listened to the counsel of other godly men, understanding that ...in the multitude of counsellors there is safety.(Pro 11:14 KJV) They have not come to different conclusion because they lack courage or honesty or a love for the scripture. IF it were a decision between white or black we could all have the luxury of absolute views, but people's lives are involved here.

Let me illustrate my point from an extreme example. Many years ago I was teaching 2 teenage Bhutanese men some bible truths. As far as anyone may tell they were the first baptized native Bhutanese in gospel history. An American missionary who had spend over 25 years working with Tibetans and Bhutanese said 'when it is discovered what these boys have done, they will be poisoned'. I tell you that concentrates the mind for a Bible-teacher! I looked at these fine, brave young men and I thought 'am I sure that what I am teaching is worth these young men dying for?'

I have views about most things, as you will know if you have read these forums, but you have to be absolutely sure when other peoples' lives are on the line. In a different context something similar happens with a pastor when faced with divorce and remarriage. This is not a doctrinal nicety under discussion; this is whole life-times of pain we are handling.

When you hold a position on divorce and remarriage and discover that great and godly men hold a different position it behooves us to be gentle with each other, respecting each other's love for God and truth and being prepared to listen to each other.

If it were as easy to come to black and white conclusions as you suggest Christians would not have been struggling with the concepts for hundreds of years. The question is never as simple as 'what does God say?' The question is 'what did God say to whom and when and why and how do we apply that to the broken lives of this man and this woman?'

Re: - posted by disciplejosh (), on: 2004/10/16 15:18

Hey Ron,

Again we seem to have the problem of typing and not talking and not being able to grasp the 'tone' of someone's words.

I know that my wording might not have been the best of choices and I am not insisting that there be a 'black and white' answer to right the wrongs and deal with the pains of broken people.

I know God is patient. I know God is merciful. If He wasn't, we wouldn't be here. Being a pastor and involved in counseling, I understand the lifetimes of pain that are involved, the hurt, the brokenness, the sense of betrayal, the anger.

I did and didn't mean to use 'semantics'. In a sense I did, because seeing the questions posed by people and the posts that ensue are not addressing the question...they are more and more questions brought out, then they are further from answering the original question then when they began.

I am the first to admit that I ask questions and get distracted from the original question someone might ask. Correct me if I am wrong, but it seems that some get caught up in 'playing with words' rather than addressing the question. I know they need to understand where the question is coming from, but where is the answer? (I am saying this respectfully and calmly, not out of frustration).

I hear what you are saying, Ron, but I still think that the bottom line (not negating the who where why what and how) is 'What did/does God say.'

All that being said in an attempt to clarify...

is there an answer or some possible answers out there?

Re: Marriage/Divorce & Remarriage- What does God say about it? - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2004/10/16 16:10

Hi all,

Don't know if this is thoughtful or not, humble offerings away. From what I have read and been taught, these are the grounds for remarriage that applies for both male and female.

If in the previous marriage one of the parties was found to be committing adultery, it gives an opportunity for the one offended to remarry. This seems to be quite clear cut, but at the same time highlights if it is an offense it can be forgiven, then they should stay married. At the coal face, in the heat of battle to recommend that to someone could elicit some rather unique responses. God hates divorce he has said so, but to tell someone in that situation 'stay married, work the thing through' can only border on advice and council but never I believe, constitute a command from scripture. Interesting that Jesus said it was because of hard hearts initially that certificates of divorce were issued.

There is another situation in which remarriage is allowed. If one of the parties deserts the marriage, so in their hearts and by their actions they annul the marriage relationship. If God made the two one and one party refuses to be one, in fact separates themselves from that relationship then the spouse is free to remarry.

Re: Marriage/Divorce & Remarriage- What does God say about it? - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/16 16:31

Noel,

I think you hit the nail squarely on the head. It appears to me that more and more people these days are being led by the Lord to study this topic---not casually, but quite in depth. I too have come to exactly the same conclusions as you have due to exactly the same passages of scripture you quoted. Personally, I have found that to publically take a stance WILL guarantee backlash in some form---from other professing Christians. On one Christian site I have frequented for 3 years, the Admin threatened me to NOT "go there" anymore or risk being banned. I am far from disrespectful in my communications, so it wasn't for that reason. It was due to my stance on the topic of divorce/remarriage. They even went so far as to add another rule to their board---forbidding anyone to intimate that remarrieds should ever leave their current spouses.

I personally have never told anyone to do such a thing, only pondered the issue that if the sin of remarriage (adultery) were a continual state of sin (Rom. 7:2-3), the result of true repentance is to forsake the sin---as would be the case with all other sins. What I have found usually in my communications, the conversation does not stay on topic, but goes off into an emotional tirade: ie: spousal abuse, verbal abuse, drug abuse, etc.....as excuses to divorce AND remarry: "surely God wouldn't expect me to stay in such and such a relationship. I DESERVE to be happy". For me, really don't have a problem with separation when one's life is in danger. Remarriage, however, is a whole nother ball of wax. That point when discussed (whether remarriage is allowed and when it clearly is biblically defined as adultery)---then what to do--- gets ignored unfortunately in favor of inflammatory discourse. I've learned from such: When God's Word is not the focus and emotionalism is what is used to determine the rightness of a situation, I bail from those discussions because they are unfruitful.

My current church, (reformed based), pretty much takes the stances of John MacArthur and Jay Adams. I don't find their viewpoints to line up with scripture. None can answer what Rom. 7:2-3 means and IMHO, of one can't adequately answer what Paul appears to teach (the permanency of marriage until death), I'm not sure how they can truly feel confident with all assurance they are not leading people into sin.

When I think of this the scripture in Matthew comes to mind about causing the little ones to sin and also in Mal. 2 concerning those who call evil "good" and good "evil".....

Even with this in mind, though I now hold the viewpoint you do, I am also mindful that we as believers are to be careful about calling something sin that is not sin.....Job's friends come to mind. We must be careful in all our determinations to make sure we are not perverting the nature of God/His judgments to others as well as attributing sin to a person who is guiltless before God. It truly is important how we handle the Word of God and how we treat others in our discourses...
.....Blessings

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/16 16:57

http://www.rsglh.org/marriage_divorce_remarriage.htm

Hi Zeke,

I wrote a response back to you, but somehow I deleted it. Oh well. In any case, here is a site which I very much agree with and addresses your points very well. It's very long, but well worth the read, as it not only touches on what the Word of God teaches, but historically how it has been applied in the Church---though that part is not an exhaustive writing on the subject.

Blessings.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/16 18:24

Here is a link that someone posted last time around. It is a thoughtful and gentle consideration. Please click here

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/16 20:44

Re: Marriage/Divorce & Remarriage- What does God say about it? - posted by ravin, on: 2004/10/16 21:02

I wonder how it is we look at the word of God are we looking at God's word or the GOD of the word. I look too see am I looking at the word for my holyness or too make myself holy in my sight. My masters said "what is that too you, you just follow me". I think I will.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/16 21:19

Concerning this topic, I think Jesus answered that Himself: "Be ye holy as I am holy". You're right, it is not an option to question HOW He tells us to follow Him. He is God. The Book of Hosea speaks of the neverending faithfulness of a husband wronged.....Jesus being the husband illustrated----ever faithful in the midst of our continual "adulteries/fornications". "I will never leave you or forsake you".....is something we grab hold of as believers to apply to ourselves and our relationship with Jesus, yet we offend the Most Holy God because many rebel against Him by forsaking those He joined them with----many times making their faithfulness/longsuffering conditional on a spouse's "perfect" behavior---or at least behavior they can "live" with. It's a good thing Jesus does not deal with us in the same manner. We'd all be tossed aside.

Some say the "hard" stance is law without spirit, but IMHO, the hard stance is very much in lines with the Spirit of God and the examples He gave us in scripture. To "remain unmarried or be reconciled" is a hard thing to take, but those are His commands. It is the true picture of "dying to self" and living for Christ. We are to live for the Glory of God, not for ourselves and our fleshly desires. I humbly submit, when it comes to marriage, we need to discern what it is that GOD sees as a lawful marriage, not what we want to be a lawful marriage.

Re: Marriage/Divorce & Remarriage- What does God say about it? - posted by dohzman (), on: 2004/10/16 23:32

Read carefully ICor 7:25-28 note the following: I have no commandment of the Lord---yet Paul gives his judgement here after the mercy he received to be faithful. Note carefully vs27 this more fully explains vs 12-17. A born again believer is not responsible for the moral choices of the UNbelieving. In this case you can infer that the breach was made by the unsaved spouse who put away his wife or visa versa. Note however vs28---Never the less such shall have trouble in the flesh: but I spare you. Basically in a lawful remarriage the brother or sister will bring into that new marriage excess baggage from the past marriage. BUT they enter the marriage having been innocent in their prior marriage. And that assumes that they were Christians and the other party was not. And that the unbeliever was the one who left. Also a believer can divorce on grounds of violence as shown in Malachi.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/17 14:33

Hello dohzman,

I am in disagreement with you for differing reasons. One, I do not believe "not under bondage" relates to a dissolving of the marriage. If we take the entire verse in context, bondage is used in contrast to peace, so IMHO, the bondage must relate to that---a type of warring vs. peace. We are called to peace, not to war against those who are in darkness. To keep peace, we are to let them "go", not fight them.

Scripture also teaches that in whatever state one is called in (in this case married to an unbeliever), that is the state they are to remain in---verse 20. In the previous verses, Paul was addressing the conduct of those who were both believers in a marriage. In this he is addressing the conduct of the believer only and what is expected.

Concerning verses 27-28 we must remember that Paul would not contradict other passages in which he clearly states that God commands a husband does not put away his wife. If it be the case that he is allowing divorced men to marry again, he would be oking committing adultery per Mt. 19:9, 5:32. I don't believe that is what he is saying here.

It also doesn't appear to me that Paul is still speaking of those who have been deserted since he changes the topic from those deserted, to Virgins and then to those "loosed". Loosed in the first instance could very well be speaking of divorce (what he said the Lord prohibited in verse 11). Loosed in the second part of that verse could very well refer to the death of a spouse.

Paul was a big proponent of singlehood-----especially for widows/widowers and it appears to me that is what he is addressing in verse 28. We do know from Paul's other writings that when a spouse dies, one is free to remarry. There is no sin if one marries "in the Lord", verse 39. However, there really is no other scripture which can clearly be shown to say sin is not present in the remarriage outside of death. To me, saying that those deserted have a right to remarry is inferred doctrine as the right to remarriage outside of death is not anywhere in scripture explicitly taught by Paul. I'm just not comfortable with standing on inferred doctrine, no matter what topic it is.

In Malachi, I don't believe this is an OK to divorce for abuse either and surely doesn't give permission for remarriage in that case. Malachi is addressing the priests who have treated the wives of the covenant treacherously by DIVORCING them. After this, they married daughters of a strange God. They were committing adultery against their lawful wives. Malachi said that the Lord would "cut off" the men who did such. The Lord even rejects their offerings---covering the altar with tears and weeping.....

We see exactly this in Ezra 9-10. The Lord's judgment was on Israel for mixing themselves with the "heathen". When the realization finally hit why they were suffering God's judgments, they repented---giving up the heathen wives and children of those unions and returning to the Lord. This sin had been going on so long that even the priests were numb to it and even partaking in it themselves (Mal.2:7-9). They did not "see" until the princes were shown the error (Ezra 9:1-3). Even Ezra, when shown, finally saw their sin and rent his garment. Obviously he didn't see the sin until then.

IMHO, that is what may be happening today. Is it possible that many are blind to the sin of unbiblical remarriage? Since the days of our fathers (like Ezra 9:7), it has occurred and now has become so common that I think our eyes, like their, could be blinded. I have come to see like I said before, more and more people are being drawn to study this out like I was ---and many are coming to the same conclusions based upon God's Word. They are asking those hard things: ie; Is the remarriage/adultery a continuing sin needing to be left? If not, why is the nature of this sin different than other sins in relation to repentance? If Paul didn't really teach the indissolubility of marriage, why does he teach this in I Cor. 7:39, also using the same illustration of permanency in Rom. 7:2-3?

If adultery gives a marriage partner the right to divorce and remarry, why is the woman of Mt. 19:9 forbidden to remarry without committing sin herself---since her husband has entered into an adulterous second marriage? Just some things to ponder. Blessings.....

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2004/10/17 23:20

note Cor 7:10 his comments are made to the wife and her actions---period.This is from the Lord.vs12-16 This addresses the unbelieving person leaving the christian believer----its very straight forward.vs17-24 this is life,where we were in life ---literal.vs25-28 what was the present distress?The unbelieving in many cases was leaving the newly converted individual.Inferred?Brother---just read Christian history of the first century--Eusebius would be a good starting point.What I put forth is sound and practical and full of mercy and does bear good fruit.As to death or dead???Wasn't it Jesus' who said in the story of the prodigal son that he was dead?but of course in his story he is now alive.At what point do we die in the sight of God?Be very careful here because I don't need any OT references to show or prove that point-I'll show you from Jesus' own words.However as to 1COR7 I believe if you read it carefully and just let it say what it says it'll be clear.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/17 23:44

Yes, I am in agreement with you concerning I Cor. 7:10-11 and vs 12-16----who the passages are directed at. In each situation, they are spoken to believers and their conduct should separation occur. In the first case---believers married to each other. In the second--- a new convert married to an unbeliever. Yes, I understand why Paul had to address the believers in the second part-----THEY were deserting their unsaved spouses, probably due to "be ye not yoked with unbelievers.....". I don't believe it was the other way around predominantly.....

To me, remarriage being spoken of here is 'inferred' because Paul does not state that. IMHO, if it was a clear teaching, there would not be dissension over it and varying interpretations in commentaries. Concerning your viewpoint being "sound, practical and full of mercy", I'm not quite sure what you mean here. Are you saying that God's mercy is only extended to those who are deserted by unbelievers, but if one is married to another believer and they desert, God's mercy (remarriage I think you mean) is not offered to the one left? I don't see that as a persuasive argument for remarriage of the deserted believer by an unbeliever. It also seems to say that God does not honor a marriage between a new convert and their still unconverted spouse.

I think that passage shows exactly the opposite, so I'm not sure why this type of marriage would be dissolved while all other marriages God honors must remain intact.

I'm not quite sure what you are meaning concerning the "death/dead" statement. Could you expound on that? Thank you. Blessings.....

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2004/10/18 1:18

All marriage is honored by God.I was making the point that in the specific case where a non-believer leaves or deserts a believer that the believer is free to remarry.In a case where a believer deserts a non-believer the believer is not free to remarry.But in America we have such a loose standard of what a christian is it is sometimes very difficult to validate who is and who isn't a christian so the remarriage issue becomes very muddled.In the case where a christian leaves another christian they cannot remarry.But the question begs in the case of adultery or violence as to the if's in the marriage.Was the offender really saved?After divorce Should the offended or innocent party be allowed to remarry?I believe in vs25-28 Pauls cover all the bases in believers vs non believers and visa versa---believer leaves---and non believer leaves---both are put forward here.I don't think we basically disagree but its hard sometimes to put thought in print.Now as concerning that which is dead--in the parable of the prodigal son the father stated his son was dead and now is alive.lk 15 is the story basically Jesus was putting forth how heaven views those who walk away from God,in the case where the son was in a far away country he was dead ie. lost//in the case where a believer divorces another believer at what point do we still refer to the offender as still christian?I can't rightly answer that.But I'm watching christians divorce each other all around the country in order to find their "soul mate" --in such cases I have to believe the injured christian who stays in fellowship with Jesus and his Church has the right to remarriage only after their ex-spouse has already remarried.The offender or believing spouse who left for whatever reason and remarries is remarried outside of Christ since he has departed from the light/truth/way---and I draw a comparison between him/her to the prodigal son where his father called him dead.They are indeed dead again in their trespasses and sins.I hope you can follow my mind on this.I will look at the website you posted about the subject matter and if I need to change in doctrine I will.Thank you for your time and input---God bless

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/18 4:24

I have just done a quick scan through this most recent incarnation of the topic. Have we defined marriage yet?

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/10/18 5:19

We should define marriage.

I would start by saying that marriage is a union.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/18 7:45

Hi Nasher

A cat and a dog tied together by their tails would also be a union. ;-)

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/10/18 9:32

Quote:

-----A cat and a dog tied together by their tails would also be a union.

Perhaps it would be, but given the dictionary definition (as it is not a biblical word) of the word union I would say that marriage is much more of a union than a cat and a dog with their tails tied together:

union

1.
 - a. The act of uniting or the state of being united.
 - b. A combination so formed, especially an alliance or confederation of people, parties, or political entities for mutual interest or benefit.
2. Mathematics. A set, every member of which is an element of one or another of two or more given sets.
3. Agreement or harmony resulting from the uniting of individuals; concord.
4.
 - a. The state of matrimony; marriage: "The element that was to make possible such a union was trust in each other's love" (Kate Chopin).
 - b. Sexual intercourse.
5.
 - a. A combination of parishes for joint administration of relief for the poor in Great Britain.
 - b. A workhouse maintained by such a union.
6. A labor union.
7. A coupling device for connecting parts, such as pipes or rods.
8. A device on a flag or ensign, occupying the upper inner corner or the entire field, that signifies the union of two or more sovereignties.
9. often Union
 - a. An organization at a college or university that provides facilities for recreation; a student union.
 - b. A building housing such facilities.
10. Union The United States of America regarded as a national unit, especially during the Civil War.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/18 9:32

Hello Dohzman.

Thanks for the nice tone of your post. I know this can be a contentious topic from past experience. One thing I wanted to address is "God honors all marriage". I would humbly say I don't believe that to be the case. In the cases of the remarriages Jesus defined as adultery, I don't believe He honors those unions. At least I can find a scriptural precedent which says He does. It appears to me that that unions are viewed as sinful unions---unlawful relations with someone other than your spouse.

I believe you are quite right in how the remarriage waters have been muddied. Personally, I am not comfortable to say t

hat because someone left their spouse they are probably not saved. The leaving is a "sin" most likely, but where do we draw the line between which sins define a believer from a non believer. Even believers are capable of committing great sins when they give themselves over to the flesh and ignore the Spirit of God.

I just don't see Jesus making that differentiation when it comes to marriage and the permanency of it. In the case of the faithful Christian whose spouse has remarried being able to marry, I believe Jesus spoke to this as well. In Mt. 19:9 the "offended" wife was put away, husband remarries (Jesus defines this as adultery), yet Jesus also prohibits the offended wife from remarriage herself----unless she also wants to enter into adultery. It appears to me that just because our spouse sins against us, that doesn't give us right to sin against them in return and God-----at least that's how I read Mt. 19:9 as well as Paul's admonishment in I Cor. 7:10-11. Blessings.....

Re: what is marriage? - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/18 9:37

Well, biblically speaking a marriage is shown to occur when 2 people(edited to add: one eligible woman/1 eligible man); -) make a commitment of marriage to one another, taking vows and it is publically/civilly acknowledged. Some people seem to believe sex is what makes a marriage. I disagree as scripture shows that Joseph took Mary to wife BEFORE they joined together sexually (Mt. 1:18,24). Blessings.....

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/10/18 10:23

Quote:

-----scripture shows that Joseph took Mary to wife BEFORE they joined together sexually (Mt. 1:18,24).

Actually they were only betrothed...

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/18 10:33

You're correct in verse 18, but verse 24 shows that He then did take her to be his wife, but did not "know" her until after Jesus was born. Blessings.....

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/10/18 10:53

Quote:

-----You're correct in verse 18, but verse 24 shows that He then did take her to be his wife, but did not "know" her until after Jesus was born.

This is true, he may have "publically" "married" her, but I agree with Philologos who said there are three elements of marriage:

https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=1923&forum=36&start=10&viewmode=flat&order=0

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/18 13:32

Do you believe then that if a couple is unable to consummate their marriage, it is not a lawful marriage in the eyes of God?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/18 14:37

Quote:

-----Well, biblically speaking a marriage is shown to occur when 2 people(edited to add: one eligible woman/1 eligible man) make a commitment of marriage to one another, taking vows and it is publically/civilly acknowledged. Some people seem to believe sex is what makes a marriage. I disagree as scripture shows that Joseph took Mary to wife BEFORE they joined together sexually (Mt. 1:18,24). Blessings.....

Hi

'biblically speaking' a 'marriage' has no definition which is one of the things that makes it important to proceed with caution on this topic.

'biblically speaking' neither Hebrew nor Greek have a word for husband or wife. In each case the point is made with a possessive pronoun e.g. his woman, or her man. Jesus' exact words to the Samaritan woman were The woman answered and said, I have no man. Jesus said unto her, Thou hast well said, I have no man: For thou hast had five men; and he whom thou now hast is not thy man: in that saidst thou truly. (Joh 4:17-18 Lit Translation)

Originally the 'church' did not perform marriages, so the concept of a 'Christian Marriage' although clear to many Christians does not have a clear biblical foundation.

Re: - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2004/10/18 14:43

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Do you believe then that if a couple is unable to consummate their marriage, it is not a lawful marriage in the eyes of God?

Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ himself? Shall I then take the members of Christ and unite them with a prostitute? Never! 16 Do you not know that he who unites himself with a prostitute is **one with her in body**? For it is said, "The two will become one flesh."

It is not so much a fulfilling of God's law, but a joining to oneness. The word **one** is the same as the word used in Ephesians 5:31. I would liken it to same who is saved but not baptised. You got the whole package but something is missing. ;-)

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/18 15:03

There may not be a definition per se, but there are examples of marriage shown in scripture and which defines each. Personally, I do not define "christian marriage" as the only acceptable marriage to the Lord as some may. I believe that He acknowledges all first marriages as "lawful"/not sin (with the exception of a believer being married to an unbeliever---which is sin). I do not believe a marriage has to be performed "in the church" as is taught in the RC church. I don't see any evidence of that in scripture. It is remarriages which are up for question.

Concerning the use of "husband" in the greek, it appears that the usage depends upon the context of the passage---man, not being the only definition for ajnhvr as is shown below:

Strong's Number: 435 Browse Lexicon

Original Word Word Origin

ajnhvr a primary word cf (444)

Transliterated Word TDNT Entry

Aner 1:360,59

Phonetic Spelling Parts of Speech

an'-ayr Noun Masculine

Definition

with reference to sex

of a male

of a husband

of a betrothed or future husband

with reference to age, and to distinguish an adult man from a boy

any male

used generically of a group of both men and women

Here again, concerning "wife", the greek word "gunhv", can be used for either a woman or a wife, depending upon the context.

Strong's Number: 1135 Browse Lexicon
Original Word Word Origin
gunhv probably from the base of (1096)
Transliterated Word TDNT Entry
Gune 1:776,134
Phonetic Spelling Parts of Speech
goo-nay' Noun Feminine

Definition
a woman of any age, whether a virgin, or married, or a widow
a wife
of a betrothed woman

King James Word Usage - Total: 221
women 129, wife 92

Blessings.....

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/18 15:06

I agree that something in a marriage is missing when a couple doesn't share that level of intimacy and intimacy/connecti on of a very deep kind is what is being spoken of in I Cor. 6, yet we don't see that this connection is what marries. So in that, I can't see where sex is the fulfillment of marriage. It is something which brings further fulfillment in marriage, but d oes not make a marriage.....if I'm making any sense :-P

Edited: wanted to add another website to consider. When I started seeing the things I have spoken of in scripture, I tho ught I was crazy---especially since noone I know teaches this(the permanency of marriage)or even mentions the possibil ity that remarriage could be a continual state of adultery. So I started searching the web and found this site among som e others: <http://www.marriagedivorce.com/>

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/18 17:23

Quote:
-----lastblast writes; Concerning the use of "husband" in the greek, it appears that the usage depends upon the context of the passage-- -man, not being the only definitin for ajhnvr as is shown below:

The word is just the simple word for 'man' or 'woman'. Can you see we have got into a circular argument here? It is the context which has subsequently determined our English word 'husband' but the Greek word defines the sense by the po ssessive pronoun 'his' or 'her'. It is not the context, in the sense of husbands and wives, that determines the English tran slation but the presence of this possessive pronoun. What we can say here is that Christ seemed to acknowledge that th e Samaritan woman had had 5 men (and the implication is certainly that they were 'husbands) but the man she now had was not 'hers' and hence almost certainly belonging to someone else. It is in the sense of 'belonging' that we might begi n to develop a definition for marriage.

Quote:
-----lastblast writes;I believe that He acknowledges all first marriages as "lawful"/not sin (with the exception of a believer being married t o an unbeliever---which is sin).

What would the state be then of the believer's marriage to a non-believer. Would it be any less 'marriage' that if the bel iever were married to another believer? What would you do in the circumstances where such an 'unlawful' marriage pro duced a child? In a pastoral context I been faced with this circumstance, so I am not playing with ideas. Does the man 'c ontinue in sin' in maintaining that relationship or does he abandon the woman and so cease 'sinning'?

Quote:
-----ZekeO writes; Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ himself? Shall I then take the members of Christ and unite t hem with a prostitute? Never! 16Do you not know that he who unites himself with a prostitute is one with her in body? For it is said, "The two will beco

me one flesh."

It is not so much a fulfilling of Gods law, but a joining to oneness. The word one is the same as the word used in Ephesians 5:31. I would liken it to sa me who is saved but not baptised. You got the whole package but something is missing.

You know I am not trying to promote or to justify promiscuity but what is the something that is 'missing' that makes this casual encounter 'not a marriage'? A union is created. How lasting is that union? How many such 'unions' could exist at a single time? If the man is a 'husband' already does his encounter produce the same kind union as with a 'single man'.

The reason I ask these questions is because until we can define 'marriage' any conversation about divorce or 'second' marriage is a building without a foundation.

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2004/10/18 19:47

I just read Matt 19:9 and I have to admit it says what it says. I guess in regards to this matter I need to spend some considerable time on my face before the Lord of Glory until His Word Lives in me in regards to this issue. God Bless Bro.

Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/10/18 20:33

What's the greek for 'powder keg'? :)

True to form, however, ya'll are discussing such a historically fire-laden topic with a patient intensity that I can only ascribe to the grace of God.

I have deep, abiding respect for the position of "Let us let God's Word tell us the truth, and let us live by it, no matter what the consequences." As such, I am capable of accepting and living by even the most extremely "restrictive" (if that's the word) views of marriage/divorce/remarriage, if I am convinced that they are consistent with what God wants of us. Hopefully we're all at least there: whatever God wants of us, we're willing to do, even if it appears to mean a life of excruciating pain or whatever other horrible consequences we foresee as a result. If we disagree there, then that issue needs to be dealt with before we can address specific "hard teachings."

As for the matter at hand: taking the "conventional" (or at least common) approach, I think we end up with "The Bible may permit divorce in certain circumstances, but never explicitly gives permission for remarriage except in the case of the death of the spouse; therefore we should infer that permission is not granted" on one side and "Why should we expect that permission to be explicitly given? Remarriage after a valid divorce is not explicitly forbidden, and it could well be that the authors assumed the audience knew that divorce left the divorcees single in the sense that they could marry just the same as any other single person" on the other (and these are just arguments I've heard patched together with my own thoughts).

But I think we should follow Ron's line of questioning on this one: the common approach seems to leave us at a deadlock with both sides having to ultimately infer that last crucial step if they wish to actually reach a definitive "yes" or "no" conclusion.

What is the Biblical definition of marriage?

There's already some progress towards that here, so:

What is the Biblical definition of divorce?

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/18 22:10

Quote:
-----What we can say here is that Christ seemed to acknowledge that the Samaritan woman had had 5 men (and the implication is certainly that they were 'husbands') but the man she now had was not 'hers' and hence almost certainly belonging to someone else. It is in the sense of 'belonging' that we might begin to develop a definition for marriage.

Yes, Jesus said they were 'husbands/or men belonging to her', if that is how you prefer. However, even in the case of "unlawful" marriages, the women involved were called "wives" as illustrated in Ezra 9-10 and Mal. 2. I'm not sure if I could

d stand dogmatically on the 5 husbands being valid husbands-----I don't see those who are involved in remarriage as defined by Jesus as valid spouses, yet they would by many be called "husbands", "wives". It is also possible, though hard to believe, that the 5 could have all be legitimate husbands who had died while married. The text is just not clear on this. All any of us can do is speculate. We certainly cannot build a doctrine off that one unclear passage one way or the other. In any case, I do not believe as I've stated that sex is what marries two people. It is a "type" of joining, but it does not make someone "married" or as you say "belong to another". I believe it is a biblical concept to have vows agreed upon by both parties and the union be publically known as a marriage.

Quote:
-----What would the state be then of the believer's marriage to a non-believer. Would it be any less 'marriage' that if the believer were married to another believer? What would you do in the circumstances where such an 'unlawful' marriage produced a child? In a pastoral context I been faced with this circumstance, so I am not playing with ideas. Does the man 'continue in sin' in maintaining that relationship or does he abandon the woman and so cease 'sinning'?

You know, I'm not sure about this. I definitely see a prohibition on marriages between believer and unbeliever (not speaking of new converts who are already married to unbelievers). From the ECF writings I have studied on this topic, it would appear that the thought of a believer joining themselves in marriage to an unbeliever, was unthinkable. One teaching, (I'd have to dig it out again), was that if such did happen, the guilty would be removed from the church as a person guilty of continuing fornication. The marriage was not viewed as valid by the church. This stance would seem to agree with the position taken with God's people in Ezra 9-10 where the men who had taken heathen wives, put them and the children produced away in repentance. Concerning the children aspect of your question, though I know that is heartbreaking, we as Christians cannot let emotion lead our actions. The Word of God must stand and we must follow in spite of the terrible sadness which will be the outcome of our obedience. Many children have been produced from extramarital affairs, children are being adopted by homosexual men/women, etc. In each of those cases, the fruit of repentance of sinful lifestyles would be to leave those relationships----of course these men/women need to take care of any children they produce IMHO.

I think it all really boils down to is whether God joins that which He prohibits? Does He? Is God obliged to join that which we define as marriage or what He honors as lawful marriage? It seems to me, and this is verified by current marriage practices, that most do believe God is obliged to follow our lead---even if it is something He prohibits and names as sin. I am not so confident that we have the power nor the right to tell God what He must join. However, I still am in prayer and hope that what I now see in scripture is a view that may not be seeing Truth in the "full light".....Blessings

Re: - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2004/10/18 22:40

Quote:

KeithLaMothe wrote:
What's the greek for 'powder keg'? :)

keypow

Pronounced kay-pow.

a)Means to make lots of noise

b)A violent breaking apart of a certain substance. 8-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/19 4:11

Quote:

-----What is the Biblical definition of divorce?

That's much more easy; it is the ending of a marriage! :-D Now all we have to do is define marriage. :-?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/19 4:55

hi lastblast

Quote:

-----Yes, Jesus said they were 'husbands/or men belonging to her', if that is how you prefer. However, even in the case of "unlawful" marriages, the women involved were called "wives" as illustrated in Ezra 9-10 and Mal. 2. I'm not sure if I could stand dogmatically on the 5 husbands being valid husbands-----I don't see those who are involved in remarriage as defined by Jesus as valid spouses, yet they would by many be called "husbands", "wives".

Ah, now you have taken the argument around in a circle. The reason that all translations translate the word 'anEr' as husband is because that is the plain implication of the conversation; it is an interpretation rather than a literal translation, but it is a correct interpretation. What point would there be in saying this last one is not your man unless the previous five had been 'her man'. If it is true that 'those who are involved in remarriage' are not regarded by Christ as 'valid spouses' what do we do with When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife. And if the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, and giveth it in her hand, and sendeth her out of his house; or if the latter husband die, which took her to be his wife; Her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled; for that is abomination before the LORD: and thou shalt not cause the land to sin, which the LORD thy God giveth thee for an inheritance. (Deu 24:1-4 KJV)?

This passage actually forbids reconciliation because the second marriage is so valid as to have set aside any previous validity of the first marriage.

Quote:

-----I believe it is a biblical concept to have vows agreed upon by both parties and the union be publically known as a marriage.

But on what basis do you hold this belief? I am not arguing against the concept of such a marriage, I am only asking how can you call this a biblical concept when, as far as I know, there is no such concept in the Bible? The classic 'Christian' position has been that a marriage was created by consent, covenant and consummation. That definition is a great help to morality but my question is, is it biblical?

Quote:

-----I definitely see a prohibition on marriages between believer and unbeliever (not speaking of new converts who are already married to unbelievers). From the ECF writings I have studied on this topic, it would appear that the thought of a believer joining themselves in marriage to an unbeliever, was unthinkable.

The ECF first tried to insist that civil marriages of Christians should only take place if the partners were specifically endorsed by the 'bishop'; this was already a few steps down the slide to monarchical bishops. Later such 'bishops' actually conducted the 'marriage' and ultimately only such marriages were Christian marriages. By this point the circle was closing and church and state became indistinguishable. The ECF are always questionable witnesses; so much of the earliest records were from folk like Ignatius with a definite agenda of his own. It is not accidental that they are not part of the canon of scripture.

It is useful to remind ourselves that this section of 1 Corinthians was Paul's reply to questions which we no longer have. The answers were not given to 'elders' to create legislation within the church but were given to the whole church. In Paul's concept only the 'whole church' could effect ex-communication. It was never an imposition of the 'elders'. These instructions regarding marriage should be seen in the same light. They are not rules to be implemented by 'elders' but counsel given individually to all who read the letter. These verses are not a church manual on discipline but truth for the whole church to hear and respond to. Let each individual whose condition these verses touch come to the passages and listen for the word of God to their own heart. This has really been my purpose in joining this thread, to sound a caution in t

he face of legislating for others. While there is the slightest doubt I ought not to withdraw myself from another on the basis of a debatable interpretation. If there was not the slightest doubt as to what the whole scripture is saying on this topic I would take my stand irrespective of the opposition or apparent injustice, but where there is any doubt I should be extremely cautious in excluding anyone from enjoyment of the body of Christ on the basis of my interpretation of scripture.

Quote:
-----I think it all really boils down to is whether God joins that which He prohibits? Does He? Is God obliged to join that which we define as marriage or what He honors as lawful marriage? It seems to me, and this is verified by current marriage practices, that most do believe God is obliged to follow our lead---even if it is something He prohibits and names as sin. I am not so confident that we have the power nor the right to tell God what He must join. However, I still am in prayer and hope that what I now see in scripture is a view that may not be seeing Truth in the "full light" Blessings

I think this is the right attitude to these things and while there is the slightest possibility that we may not have the perfect angle on these things we need to be mindful of the 'people' whose lives our impartial understanding may affect. No, God is not obliged to accept our current definition of marriage, but what I am trying to say is that He is not obliged to accept our older definitions of marriage either. What we need is a biblical understanding of the implications of the 'one man and one woman' union. When we have established that we can begin to ask what circumstances, if any, can dismantle that union. In OT times such dismantling was specifically 'permitted' because of 'hardness of heart'. Has the New Covenant changed this?

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/19 21:57

Hello Ron, you said:

Quote:
-----What point would there be in saying this last one is not your man unless the previous five had been 'her man'. If it is true that 'those who are involved in remarriage' are not regarded by Christ as 'valid spouses' what do we do with When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife. And if the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, and giveth it in her hand, and sendeth her out of his house; or if the latter husband die, which took her to be his wife; Her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled; for that is abomination before the LORD: and thou shalt not cause the land to sin, which the LORD thy God giveth thee for an inheritance. (Deu 24:1-4 KJV)?

Do you believe living in fornication is marriage? I don't believe that to be the case and that very well could be what Jesus means by "he is not your husband", not that he belonged to someone else.

As to Deut. 24:1-4, for some reason, the husband is allowed to put away his wife. What uncleanness is unclear. The OT law forbade adultery AND premarriage sex (between a betrothed woman and another man) and the death sentence was carried out for breaking these laws. Beyond that point, what we see here is that a woman is given a writ of divorcement so she CAN lawfully marry another. When you break down this passage one thing we can find is that returning to the first marriage is forbidden-----EVEN IN THE CASE OF THE SECOND HUSBAND'S DEATH. If this were just a matter of the first marriage being dissolved and the second being in force, why couldn't she return to her first husband if the second had died? What if the second had given her a writ of divorcement which entitled her to be another man's wife as did the first husband?

IMHO, it is obvious there is more to this text than the popular interpretation of it. It appears to me that the 1st husband is prohibited from remarrying his wife because of his OWN fault. Scripturally speaking, it does not make sense that if her second "lawful" husband dies, she would be prohibited from marrying anyone who was free to marry---in the Lord. In my opinion, the 1st wrongly put his wife away, therefore the "punishment" is that he can never have her back---whether she is "free" or not. He put her away because she was defiled, now he wants to take her back when she is MORE defiled? Marriage is severely compromised by such attitudes. I don't believe this passage has anything to do with taking a woman back who has entered an adulterous second marriage, since it appears in Deut. 24:1-4 she has "permission" to get remarried---unlike the scenarios in Mt. 19:9, 5:32. Jer. 3:1 is an interesting passage to consider when looking at Deut. 24:1-4 and the issue of whether one who has become "another's" can return to the first.....

Quote:
-----The classic 'Christian' position has been that a marriage was created by consent, covenant and consummation. That definition is a great help to morality but my question is, is it biblical?

Well, I guess the biblical definition is what we are trying to find out, eh? :-? I can only go on what precedents are shown in scripture and it appears to me that there is a "covenant" agreed upon by two people and that is what God then "joins". I don't see a sexual union without this/some form of agreement as a "marriage" shown in scripture.

Concerning the ECF's writings, I find them interesting, but I don't equate them with scripture. I was just sharing how one ECF writer looked upon a confessed believer marrying an unbeliever. This viewpoint and the actions taken by the church do mirror Ezra's actions in regards to God's people mixing with heathen peoples.

Quote:
-----In Paul's concept only the 'whole church' could effect ex-communication. It was never an imposition of the 'elders'. These instructions regarding marriage should be seen in the same light. They are not rules to be implemented by 'elders' but counsel given individually to all who read the letter. These verses are not a church manual on discipline but truth for the whole church to hear and respond to. Let each individual whose condition these verses touch come to the passages and listen for the word of God to their own heart.

I disagree with you on this aspect. I believe all scripture is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.....(II Tim. 3:16) and I believe that if in fact many marriages are truly "adulterous", then church discipline should take place. Sin in the church is not a "personal" issue because as Paul so rightly states in I Cor. 5:13--put away from among yourselves that wicked person. The word "wicked" in the Greek refers not to the character of the person, but the effects or influence that person will have. We ARE to judge sin among ourselves. I believe it should be done in a gentle and kind way, but it should be done and that aspect of church discipline is sorely lacking. Many Pastors are just too afraid to offend, so they remain quiet or they preach the Truth but do not take actions to protect the sheep they are entrusted with by exercising I Cor. 5:11-13.

I just don't see how marriage, is supposed to be something so difficult to discern from fornication/adultery, etc. That's why in one of my previous posts I posed the question of whether because our sin has grown in regards to the disposal of marriage partners, sexual sin (fornication, adultery, homosexuality, etc), we are now fighting blindness in this area of discerning the Truths in God's Word. Surely, God did not intend for the Truth to be so difficult. For me, this whole issue has been one big headache/heartache. I don't want to see what I do. My "mind" does not want to fully wrap itself around what Jesus stated (without adding anything to it) and what I can plainly see written in Rom. 7:2-3 (without adding anything to it) as well as I Cor. 7:10-11, 39. Questions abound for me and like I said before I hope I am seeing things wrong. I am glad for such a forum where respectful dialogue can continue without emotions flaring. That is a nice change from what I've seen on some other Christian boards. Blessings.....

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/10/20 9:35

Quote:
-----when you break down this passage one thing we can find is that returning to the first marriage is forbidden-----EVEN IN THE CASE OF THE SECOND HUSBAND'S DEATH. If this were just a matter of the first marriage being dissolved and the second being in force, why couldn't she return to her first husband if the second had died? What if the second had given her a writ of divorcement which entitled her to be another man's wife as did the first husband?

I have always seen the implication of this verse as being God forbids a man from taking back the wife he divorced IF she had married again. She could have been reconciled to that husband had she not remarried. But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband (I Corinthians 7:11). If she were to marry and then return to him, even if her second husband died, it was an abomination to God. There seems to be something about this that strikes at the very foundation of what it means to be married. Why could she not go back- does something enter the equation that would make their reuniting wickedness or perversion? This is a bit of a mystery because a man was allowed to have several wives under the OT pattern, but a woman was only allowed to be married to one man at one time. Could it be a picture of the Church and the impossibility of a bride serving two masters? The bottom line for me has been if the woman did not marry she was free to be reconciled to her husband; if she did the deal is off.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/20 16:32

Yes, I understand your point Robert, but it seems to me that this woman of Deut. 24:1 was given permission to marry an other---through the divorce. There is no indication in the text, that the remarriage was an abomination-----just the returning to the 1st marriage.

In the NT writings of Jesus' on divorce/remarriage, the remarriages He spoke of were SIN----which doesn't appear to be the case with Deut. 24's woman. Jesus called the sin "adultery"-----if divorce (even due to hardheartedness) dissolved the marriage, there is no adultery. The divorce of Deut. 24 appears to be just such a divorce----because if she had been unfaithful----remarriage would have been adultery as it in Jesus' teachings, she would have been killed for her adultery, not remarried.

What do you think of Jer. 3:1 in relation to Deut. 24:1-4? I would like some differing input on that. Thanks and Blessings.....

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/20 16:48

Quote:
-----In OT times such dismantling was specifically 'permitted' because of 'hardness of heart'. Has the New Covenant changed this?

Hi,

I just wanted to address this point as I forgot to in my last post. These are my thoughts: There is NO room for "hardheartedness" on the part of a believer in Christ. Jesus taught that if we did not forgive, then our Father in heaven will not forgive us. We are also not to come with our offerings when we are at odds with a brother or sister and have not made it right. Divorce and then remarriage is the ultimate in unforgiveness. The mindset is that it shuts the door for any type of restoration/repentance and the unhappy person "moves on". God, when He spoke through His Word in Hosea, set the expectations for those who are spirit filled and that is: even when one is unfaithful, the other remains faithful. What I see is that most marriages which fall apart and a remarriage takes place, this is the reasoning: "NOW, I will try to be an example of Christ's abiding love in THIS marriage".....That is certainly not the example of Christ's love for the Church concerning faithfulness and longsuffering. The biblical phrase "it is no longer I" that live, but Christ who lives within me" is just not a popular thing. We like to say that verse, but do we really live it? Concerning marriage, the "Christ who lives in me" would follow the Hosea passage. But that's just how I see the unacceptable nature of "hardheartedness" in a believer.....Blessings

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/10/20 16:49

Quote:
-----In the NT writings of Jesus' on divorce/remarriage, the remarriages He spoke of were SIN----which doesn't appear to be the case with Deut. 24's woman. Jesus called the sin "adultery"-----if divorce (even due to hardheartedness) dissolved the marriage, there is no adultery. The divorce of Deut. 24 appears to be just such a divorce----because if she had been unfaithful----remarriage would have been adultery as it in Jesus' teachings, she would have been killed for her adultery, not remarried.

There has to be some dynamic in place that makes it an abomination for a woman to return to a former husband after she has been married again. I have no idea what it is other than it is a matter similar to seething a kid in her mother's milk. It seems that God is saying "You ought to know better than to do something so morbid!"- yet I cannot say with any real certainty.

From the studies I have done on this I am unaware of anyone who was actually stoned to death for adultery in the Bible. I won't argue from silence because God makes no idle threats. It does seem to have been an option to simply put away a woman privately as an alternative to putting her to death. We should remember that the nation of Israel was so locked up in sexual sin after Moses that adultery would simply have been one of many sins that were committed. Ashteroth was a favorite of the false gods to be served, etc.

The argument Jesus was making was between the two basic schools of thought in His day: Hillel and Shammai. One says divorce over anything- the other says divorce only in the case of sexual sin. Jesus words- saving for the cause of fornication- seems to at least allow for the offended party to remarry without adultery. Again, these are difficult words that I have wrestled with for years.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/21 12:12

Hi lastblast

sorry it has taken a while to get back to you...

Quote:

-----Do you believe living in fornication is marriage? I don't believe that to be the case and that very well could be what Jesus means by "he is not your husband", not that he belonged to someone else.

One of the difficulties in coming to a definitive answer to this question is that the word 'pornea' translated fornication and hence meaning pre-marital sex has a much wider use than that single word. In fact it means 'sexual sin'.

πορνεία - porneia

Thayer Definition:

1) illicit sexual intercourse

1a) adultery, fornication, homosexuality, lesbianism, intercourse with animals etc.

1b) sexual intercourse with close relatives; Lev. 18

1c) sexual intercourse with a divorced man or woman; Mar_10:11,Mar_10:12

2) metaphorically the worship of idols

2a) of the defilement of idolatry, as incurred by eating the sacrifices offered to idols

So your question is a little like saying do I believe sexual sin produces marriage? No, of course I don't, but there are some who equate the first consummation with the creating of a union. This would indeed mean that 'fornication', in its classical dictionary sense, had created a marriage. That's not my view, but is the consequence of a certain line of reasoning.

Quote:

-----IMHO, it is obvious there is more to this text than the popular interpretation of it. It appears to me that the 1st husband is prohibited from remarrying his wife because of his OWN fault. Scripturally speaking, it does not make sense that if her second "lawful" husband dies, she would be prohibited from marrying anyone who was free to marry---in the Lord.

You mean, I think, that it does not make sense within your predecided parameters.

The fact is we don't know why God built this prohibition into this expression of His permissive will. I have my own speculations, but that is all they are. I think it is good to remember that these things were permitted 'because of the hardness of hearts' nearly always... of men. So I would ask how would this ordinance protect the woman, and I can think of one possible scenario. That would be if the 1st husband divorced his wife for the monetary gain he might make by 'selling' her to another man; if the 2nd man died the 1st husband could not take his wife back. But it is only speculation; I don't know ... and I don't think anyone else does.

Quote:

-----Well, I guess the biblical definition is what we are trying to find out, eh? I can only go on what precedents are shown in scripture and it appears to me that there is a "covenant" agreed upon by two people and that is what God then "joins". I don't see a sexual union without this/some form of agreement as a "marriage" shown in scripture.

Can you tell me where, in scripture, you find the precedent that a 'covenant agreed upon by two people is what God then joins'?

Quote:

-----I disagree with you on this aspect. I believe all scripture is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.....(II Tim. 3:16) and I believe that if in fact many marriages are truly "adulterous", then church discipline should take place. Sin in the church is not a "personal" issue because as Paul so rightly states in I Cor. 5:13--put away from among yourselves that wicked person.

I also believe that 'all scripture' is profitable for the purposes you quote, but you need to note that it is 'all scripture' and not isolated verses which have been outbreathed by God. Satan once said, it is written; Jesus said, it is also written... That is to say the truth of scripture does not reside in a single text but in the whole comprehensive revelation. This is why it is essential to compare scripture with scripture and refuse to spit out any inconvenient bits.

Quote:
-----Sin in the church is not a "personal" issue because as Paul so rightly states in I Cor. 5:13--put away from among yourselves that wicked person. The word "wicked" in the greek refers not to the character of the person, but the effects or influence that person will have. We ARE to judge sin among ourselves.

I really have no idea where you have got your information from regarding the Greek of this verse, but it cannot be upheld. The word is *phronimos*. It is an adjective used in the accusative case and in the singular, masculine. It is the exact phrase as in used in And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one. (Mat 6:13 ASV) where similarly the 'one' or 'person' is said to be understood. That means you do not need it in the greek to make the full sentence. Most bible students agree that Christ's reference is not to 'evil' but to 'the evil one' ie Satan. The man in Corinth was to be excluded because he was 'the evil one' and contagious.

Quote:
-----I just don't see how marriage, is supposed to be something so difficult to discern from fornication/adultery, etc. That's why in one of my previous posts I posed the question of whether because our sin has grown in regards to the disposal of marriage partners, sexual sin (fornication, adultery, homosexuality, etc), we are now fighting blindness in this area of discerning the Truths in God's Word.

I can understand your frustration, but it is as well to remember that the world of the 1st century was very much like our own decadent conditions; with gross immorality and some very difficult person issues to sort out. The Corinthians lived in one of the most immoral cities in the ancient world where to be called a Corinthian was to imply that they lived without morals at all.

And my comments about needing the whole church to effect excommunication were not because I don't believe in church discipline but simply that according to Christ's words ex-communication had to be the act of the gathered church and not just their leaders; b>And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church: and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican. (Mat 18:17 ASV) In Bible days excommunication was exactly what it sounds like; it put a person out-ex of the community. As the community was not a sanctuary as so often today but a group of people excommunication could only work if the community 'ex-ed' the sinner. This was not just excluding 'the evil one' from the meetings but from the everyday society of the whole Corinthian assembly; for that to work it needed the full hearted approval of the whole church.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/10/21 13:54

Quote:
-----This was not just excluding 'the evil one' from the meetings but from the everyday society of the whole Corinthian assembly; for that to work it needed the full hearted approval of the whole church.

Hi Bro. Ron,

This is one of the great obstacles to real church discipline in our times; because when action is taken the one excommunicated just heads to the church down the street. This spreads the problem and incapacitates the ruling to no benefit, for either bringing the person to godly sorrow and repentance or protecting the flock.

Quote:

-----Sin in the church is not a "personal" issue because as Paul so rightly states in I Cor. 5:13--put away from among yourselves that wicked person. The word "wicked" in the greek refers not to the character of the person, but the effects or influence that person will have. We ARE to judge sin among ourselves.

Casual observation led me to think on your comments on this point that you both were saying essentially the same thing s though you may have arrived at the conclusions differently.

For me the great question become what should be done in circumstances such as John the Baptist's message to Herod: i.e. "It is not lawful for you to have her..." It seems that John was saying he must cease being with the woman.

Any thoughts on that?

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/10/21 14:46

Hi Robert

Quote:

-----For me the great question become what should be done in circumstances such as John the Baptist's message to Herod: i.e. "It is not lawful for you to have her..." It seems that John was saying he must cease being with the woman.

This is a good point, and I have no immediate answer to it. Barnes says

Mat 14:3-5 -

For Herod had laid hold on John ... - See Mar_6:17-20; Luk_3:19-20. This Herodias was a granddaughter of Herod the Great. She was first married to Herod Philip, by whom she had a daughter, Salome, probably the one that danced and pleased Herod. Josephus says that this marriage of Herod Antipas with Herodias took place while he was on a journey to Rome. He stopped at his brother's; fell in love with his wife; agreed to put away his own wife, the daughter of Aretas, King of Petraea; and Herodias agreed to leave her own husband and live with him. They were living, therefore, in adultery; and John, in faithfulness, though at the risk of his life, had reproved them for their crimes. Herod was guilty of two crimes in this act:

1. Of "adultery," since she was the wife of another man.
2. Of "incest," since she was a near relation, and such marriages were expressly forbidden, Lev_18:16.

While Barnes is technically correct here I feel sure that John's real point was the 'adultery'.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/10/21 15:06

Hi Ron,

No problem about getting back with me. We both have lives which need attending. :-) You said:

Quote:
-----So your question is a little like saying do I believe sexual sin produces marriage? No, of course I don't, but there are some who equate the first consummation with the creating of a union. This would indeed mean that 'fornication', in its classical dictionary sense, had created a marriage. That's not my view, but is the consequence of a certain line of reasoning.

I agree with that. I don't believe sexual sin produces marriage either.

Quote:
-----Can you tell me where, in scripture, you find the precedent that a 'covenant agreed upon by two people is what God then joins'?

As I said, I can only go by biblical precedents which I believe secular marriage is based upon---an agreement between two people to forsake all others (leave and cleave)----between 2 unbelievers or 2 believers. It also appears from Mary/Joseph scenario that they were man and wife before they "knew each other". As I said before, I find it difficult to understand and how God made the definition of marriage and the keeping of it so hard to discern. Also, if that is the case, how can anyone know what adultery is? Scripture does name adultery as a sin and scripture also teaches churchwide discipline of unrepentant adultery, so surely the church did understand the definition of marriage at one time at least.

Quote:
-----I would ask how would this ordinance protect the woman, and I can think of one possible scenario. That would be if the 1st husband divorced his wife for the monetary gain he might make by 'selling' her to another man; if the 2nd man died the 1st husband could not take his wife back. But it is only speculation; I don't know... and I don't think anyone else does.

Yes, I've read that interpretation before. It makes some sense to me as when I read that passage it seems the MAN is the one being punished for putting his wife away in the first place----not because she is really "defiled" after being remarried. But as you say, all these varying interpretations are just speculation. I asked before, but you probably missed it: What is your take on Jer. 3:1 in relation to Deut. 24:1-4?

Quote:
-----you need to note that it is 'all scripture' and not isolated verses which have been outbreathed by God. Satan once said, it is written; Jesus said, it is also written... That is to say the truth of scripture does not reside in a single text but in the whole comprehensive revelation. This is why it is essential to compare scripture with scripture and refuse to spit out any inconvenient bits.

Yes, I agree very much with this as well. MUCH scripture has been discussed concerning this topic from the OT as well as the NT. I think some people who are at odds with differing positions believe the others are only holding their position due to one or two verses, but for me, that is just not the case. There is a vast amount of scripture which has taken me to the point where I am now at. Like I said, I still have questions which I can't fully answer, yet the trouble I see in the Church as a whole is that Most Pastors/teachers skip right over those passages which are "harsh"----Jesus' teachings on remarriage = adultery and Paul's teaching on singleness after divorce. It's extremely sad to me because the saints are not being equipped as they should. There is way too much ignoring of the so called: "hot topics". I'm guilty of that myself because they do elicit strong response and some responses I just don't want to deal with.

Quote:
-----The man in Corinth was to be excluded because he was 'the evil one' and contagious.

As Robert said, I think we are essentially saying the same thing, though when I looked up in the Strong's concordance, it said another word 'Kakos' is a word used more for character (worthless), while 'poneros' dealt with the effects/influence of a person. Really though, that's a minor point of difference and I'm no greek scholar, so you could be absolutely right.

Also, wanted to clarify that I, in no way believe the leadership of a church is to "eject" an unrepentant believer from the congregation/community without proper action. You are correct, it must be brought before the whole church as scripture dictates. Not done much today in churches though and as Robert said, what many will do is just church hop when they are ejected and most pastors/elders don't check who is in the Church Body/congregation and where they came from....and so the evil influence/person, etc. infects another congregation. Thanks for the dialogue so far Ron. Blessings..
.....

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/11/2 0:52

Quote:

----- Jesus words- saving for the cause of fornication- seems to at least allow for the offended party to remarry without adultery.

Matt. 19:9

"And I say unto you, Whoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth a dultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away does commit adultery."

I have been thinking about this verse for a few days now. I have broken it down into 2 parts to keep it simple.

"And I say unto you, Whoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, commits adultery:"

I read it this way, Any man who divorces his wife and marries another woman commits adultery unless his wife committed fornication, it seems in that case that the wifes fornication does break the marriage covenant and that the man is free to remarry.

"and whoso marries her which is put away does commit adultery"

I believe it is safe to assume that "her" is the woman who has just been divorced by her husband when he left her to marry another. This womans husband committed fornication against her by marrying another and yet Jesus is saying whoever marries her commits adultery. Fornication doesn't appear to break the covenant for the woman like it did for the man.

What does Matt. 19:9 mean to you? I would like to hear what others think.

Thank You

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/11/8 9:19

Quote:

-----I read it this way, Any man who divorces his wife and marries another woman commits adultery unless his wife committed fornication, it seems in that case that the wifes fornication does break the marriage covenant and that the man is free to remarry.

Well, I guess if one believes that men have special privilege concerning the sanctity of marriage, then I can see it from his point of view. However, when I read the "prohibition/allowance" passage in Mt. 19:9 it appears to me that the only allowance is for "putting away" due to fornication, but the remarriage for the 'innocent' is not what is being allowed--- especially when compared to the corresponding passages in the Gospels of Mk (10:11-12) and Lk (16:18). I don't see any signs of "sexism" spoken in either of those passages.

Paul never addresses the "adultery" issue either except in Rom. 7:2-3 where it appears that adultery DOES NOT dissolve the 1st marital union. For those who say adultery dissolves the marriage (or gives the right of dissolution and to remarriage), I would say the teaching of indissolubility needs to be addressed in Rom. 7:2-3, I Cor. 7:39. Also, in the case of the husband committing adultery by remarriage yet the wife is still "bound" to him, thus prohibited from remarriage herself without entering into sin (Mt. 19:9). In order to have confidence that a marriage is indeed dissolveable outside of death, these passages need to be clarified. Blessings.....

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/11/15 15:48

Hello, I wanted to reply with 3 quick points.

1. You mentioned special privilege for the man. At present I believe that the man does have a special privilege in the remarriage situation by reason of Matt.19:9; 1Cor.7:39 and my conscience. This could change if my conscience at some time becomes enlightened by Gods Spirit on this matter, but for now all that I have is my conscience and the bible (I assume the Holy Spirit will agree with the bible) to go by and they tell me that according to scripture the man can remarry if the wife dies or commits adultery and that the woman can never remarry unless her husband is dead.

2. You mentioned the word "sexism". According to Websters dictionary this word first came into use in 1968 followed by the word "homophobia" in 1969. Personally I believe both of these words originated in hell and have the intent of moving the modern culture further away from Christ. The word sexism did for the 70's what the word homophobia did for the 90's - stigmatize Gods holy word. I wonder what new words bearing the same intent we will see in the next 20 or 30 years. To sum up, I have absolutely no problem with sexism, it is a good thing for a woman (because she is a woman) not to speak in church. 1Cor 14:34,35 - just like the Apostle Paul said. I guess if we are conditioned to believe that there is something wrong with sexism, then that could hinder us from seeing what the bible teaches in this matter.

3. You mentioned that Rom. 7:2-3 and 1 Cor. 7:39 need clarification. I would point out that there is no mention in either of these verses the case of the man, only the womans case is specified, which is: marriage is dissolvable only by death of the husband.

Like I said earlier, at present this understanding rings true with my conscience, I could be wrong, but all of the other explanations that I have heard up to now just don't ring true to me. I am certain that there is an absolute, correct understanding of Gods intent with these teachings on marriage, divorce and remarriage. I believe that when I fully understand the Lords intent that it will leave no room for guessing what the truth is on this subject. "That I might make thee know the certainty of the words of truth; that you might answer the words of truth to them that send unto thee." Prov.22:21

God bless

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/11/15 16:00

Quote:
-----At present I believe that the man does have a special privilege in the remarriage situation by reason of Matt.19:9; 1Cor.7:39 and my conscience.

Hello NP,

I'm not sure where you see this special privilege? In I Cor. 7:39 Paul speaks of a woman being bound until her husband's death. In Mt. 19:9 we see a husband entering into adultery after putting away his lawful wife. What we also see in that passage is that the wife (the one innocently put away) is prohibited from remarriage even though her husband has remarried (showing that adultery/2nd marriage does not sever the first marriage bond).

I'm not quite understanding your point of view here. Do you believe it ok for a man to enter into unlawful marriages (ie; Mt. 19:9), yet be able to stay in those, while his left wife is still "bound" to him (ie; polygamy, which appears to only allow for multiple wives, not multiple husbands)? Thanks for clarifying. Blessings.....

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/11/15 16:11

Hello,

"And I say unto you, Whoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery."

According to this text it seems that a man can marry another if he puts away his wife for reason of fornication.

God bless

Re: Remarriage - posted by revival9 (), on: 2004/11/15 20:25

Every reference to these verses in the pre-Nicene writings says that a divorced man OR woman who remarries another, is committing adultery.

The clause 'except for fornication', did not refer to remarriage, but to the divorce. Divorce was allowed only in this case. It provided a way for the faithful spouse to withdraw from the sinning spouse, so as not to share in the sin. The faithful spouse was to remain single, with the intent that if the adulterous spouse repented, the faithful spouse was to show forgiveness and take him or her back.

Many Christians follow those precepts today --- the Anabaptists (Mennonites, etc.), the Charity churches, etc.

See (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf02.ii.iii.iv.html>) The Pastor of Hermas, AD 150

Mrs. Fred

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2004/11/15 20:46

Mrs. Fred, I did not read all the posts on this subject, so what I may say will be redundant...

The exception clause has many using it to justify remarriage in the case where a spouse has committed sexual sin.

In the sermon on the mount Jesus is discussing OT law...In Matt. 5:27,28 Jesus says 'ye have heard...ye shall not commit adultery..but I say unto you....' and then proceeds to tell us what constitutes adultery:

1. Lust. v. 28
2. Divorce, unless the spouse has been unfaithful.v.32
3. Marriage to a divorced person. v. 32

Simple in my opinion. This will also explain the 'exception clause'.

Blessings

Quote:

revival9 wrote:

Every reference to these verses in the pre-Nicene writings says that a divorced man OR woman who remarries another, is committing adultery.

The clause 'except for fornication', did not refer to remarriage, but to the divorce. Divorce was allowed only in this case. It provided a way for the faithful spouse to withdraw from the sinning spouse, so as not to share in the sin. The faithful spouse was to remain single, with the intent that if the adulterous spouse repented, the faithful spouse was to show forgiveness and take him or her back.

Many Christians follow those precepts today --- the Anabaptists (Mennonites, etc.), the Charity churches, etc.

See (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf02.ii.iii.iv.html>) The Pastor of Hermas, AD 150

Mrs. Fred

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/11/15 22:45

Great post Ginny and I think those truths are what some forget when they try to label "porneia" as a justifiable reason not only to divorce, but to remarry. We have to remember that what Jesus was doing in fact was rebuking the religious for HARDNESS of heart, He was not excusing hardness of heart concerning forgiveness due to sin (the sin of adultery/fornication).

Mrs. Fred,

What you have shared is exactly what I have found in my research on Church practice concerning unrepentant adultery and divorce. I can find no evidence stating in the AnteNicene writings that adultery gave reason/allowance to marry and

ther.

NP,

I think the "allowance" passage is exactly what many dispute today as actually giving the allowance of remarriage. I did n't use the term "sexist" to cause a stir, only address the mindset/teaching that man is allowed more than one wife outside of death, yet woman is disallowed---even in the case of the guilt of the husband concerning adultery. This is exactly what Mt. 19:9 shows: the "innocent" wife cannot remarry, according to Jesus, even though her husband now is guilty of a adultery (remarriage). Many churches teach just the opposite of this: if your spouse divorces you and then remarries, you are free to remarry yourself because the marriage bond is dissolved. It appears to me that Jesus taught the exact opposite of this. Blessings.....

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/11/15 23:24

Hello,
Could you restate this question in simplest terms possible and I will try to answer. I don't think that I understand what it is you are saying here.

Quote:
-----Do you believe it ok for a man to enter into unlawful marriages (ie; Mt. 19:9), yet be able to stay in those, while his left wife is still "bound" to him (ie; polygamy, which appears to only allow for multiple wives, not multiple husbands)?

Do you mean by unlawful marriage marrying another woman because wife was unfaithful?

Yes, I believe this is acceptable. Matt. 19:9

Would previous wife still be bound to first husband? Yes 1Cor. 7:39

Please forgive me if I am missing your point. I am kind of tired but my mind isn't particularly agile to begin with.

Thanks

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/11/15 23:31

Quote:
-----my mind isn't particularly agile to begin with.

hahaha.....I can relate with that!

Quote:
-----Do you mean by unlawful marriage marrying another woman because wife was unfaithful?

Ok, now I understand you. You believe in freedom to remarry for the "innocent" party. My point is this: if there is freedom for the innocent party, then why is the "innocent" wife of Mt. 19:9 forbidden from remarriage due to her husband's adultery?

Also, getting back to my original point: Do you believe that men can commit adultery and the wife still has to remain, but

on the other hand, if a wife commits adultery, the husband is free to remarry? Thanks.....

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/11/15 23:55

Hello, here goes

Quote:
-----Ok, now I understand you. You believe in freedom to remarry for the "innocent" party. My point is this: if there is freedom for the innocent party, then why is the "innocent" wife of Mt. 19:9 forbidden from remarriage due to her husband's adultery?

I believe in freedom to remarry for the innocent Man. I agree that the innocent wife is forbidden to remarry.

Quote:
----- Do you believe that men can commit adultery and the wife still has to remain, but on the other hand, if a wife commits adultery, the husband is free to remarry?

The innocent wife could leave but must remain unmarried. 1Cor. 7:10,11 Matt.5:32

If the wife commits adultery the man is free to remarry. Matt. 19:9

I believe the bible clearly says that. It looks to me like there is a different deal for the man than there is for the woman. I have decided to ignore the commentaries for a while and just look at what the scripture is actually saying. I am saying all of this in the spirit of trying to figure out what it says for myself, not to teach others what they must believe to be saved etc.

N.P.

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/11/16 1:07

Hello,

I appreciate your input, thank you for taking time to reply. I have never studied the pre-Nicene writings so I can't knowledgeably respond in this area.

God bless,
N.P.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/11/16 23:01

Quote:
-----I believe in freedom to remarry for the innocent Man. I agree that the innocent wife is forbidden to remarry.

I don't see that. I see the freedom to divorce without guilt, not the right to remarry. In all the other Gospels having to do with this topic (Mk 10:11-12, Lk. 16:16-18), there is no allowance for remarriage. I don't believe Paul ever taught that either. It appears to me that what you are seeing is a form of polygamy----where men are allowed to have more than one living wife, but the wife is not.....she is forever bound to her husband until death. It seems to me that Jesus answered the makeup of marriage-----one man/one woman for life (Mt. 19:4-6, Mk. 10:8-9). As I said before, I don't see where Jesus or Paul ever taught that a man can be "unbound" through a means other than death, yet a woman was bound til death, no matter what. I believe since the creation intent was one man/one woman and that is what God joins, both are bound til death, no matter the sin of the other party.

Quote:

-----The innocent wife could leave but must remain unmarried. 1Cor. 7:10,11 Matt.5:32

I agree with this.

Quote:

-----If the wife commits adultery the man is free to remarry. Matt. 19:9. I believe the bible clearly says that. It looks to me like there is a different deal for the man than there is for the woman. I have decided to ignore the commentaries for a while and just look at what the scripture is actually saying. I am saying all of this in the spirit of trying to figure out what it says for myself, not to teach others what they must believe to be saved etc.

Believe me, I don't put my faith in commentaries. I do find it interesting to note who believes what and why scripturally they believe as they do. I also find some benefit in researching varying views because I acknowledge there are those who know much more than I do scripturally, so I do weigh what I read against the scriptures, knowing I am fallible and may not have the complete picture. There's a whole lot of contradiction though in many divorce/remarriage teachings today, which is grieving. I've even heard it taught that "we are no longer under the law concerning remarriage, those who have "sinned" by remarriage are under grace now and their marriages are sanctioned by God".

Even so, I still can't see it as you do. I believe BOTH husband and wife are bound. I do not believe if a husband commits adultery and his wife leaves or divorces him----he can then go ahead and marry if she commits adultery by remarriage. In Mt. 5:32, Jesus said, if a husband wrongly puts away his wife (which if he was being unrepentant in adultery, it can fit this scenario), HE is the one who is guilty of his wife's remarriage/adultery. He because of his own sin, is the CAUSE of her sin. I don't see where him causing her to sin would then give him the freedom to remarry. Do you understand what I mean? Blessings.....

Re: - posted by ravin, on: 2004/11/16 23:14

Quote:

-----In all the other Gospels having to do with this topic (Mk 10:11-12, Lk. 16:16-18), there is no allowance for remarriage.

It's called grace. Jesus didn't blot out the sin of the one, but wrote sin's in the sand of those who were trying to stone her. Jesus used a woman who had many husbands at the well, he didn't condemn her, yet she was used of the master, are we more wise than he who forgives and if not are we pharisees. Knowing more of the law than he who forgives???

Jesus set the standard. who am I to improve on it!

lastblast wrote:

Quote:

-----I believe in freedom to remarry for the innocent Man. I agree that the innocent wife is forbidden to remarry.

I don't see that. I see the freedom to divorce without guilt, not the right to remarry. In all the other Gospels having to do with this topic (Mk 10:11-12, Lk. 16:16-18), there is no allowance for remarriage. I don't believe Paul ever taught that either. It appears to me that what you are seeing is a form of polygamy----where men are allowed to have more than one living wife, but the wife is not.....she is forever bound to her husband until death. It seems to me that Jesus answered the makeup of marriage----one man/one woman for life (Mt. 19:4-6, Mk. 10:8-9). As I said before, I don't see where Jesus or Paul ever taught that a man can be "unbound" through a means other than death, yet a woman was bound til death, no matter what. I believe since the creation intent was one man/one woman and that is what God joins, both are bound til death, no matter the sin of the other party.

Quote:

-----The innocent wife could leave but must remain unmarried. 1Cor. 7:10,11 Matt.5:32

I agree with this.

Quote:

-----If the wife commits adultery the man is free to remarry. Matt. 19:9. I believe the bible clearly says that. It looks to me like there is a different deal for the man than there is for the woman. I have decided to ignore the commentaries for a while and just look at what the scripture is actually saying. I am saying all of this in the spirit of trying to figure out what it says for myself, not to teach others what they must believe to be saved etc.

Believe me, I don't put my faith in commentaries. I do find it interesting to note who believes what and why scripturally they believe as they do. I also find some benefit in researching varying views because I acknowledge there are those who know much more than I do scripturally, so I do weigh what I read against the scriptures, knowing I am fallible and may not have the complete picture. There's a whole lot of contradiction though in many divorce/remarriage teachings today, which is grieving. I've even heard it taught that "we are no longer under the law concerning remarriage, those who have "sinned" by remarriage are under grace now and their marriages are sanctioned by God".

Even so, I still can't see it as you do. I believe BOTH husband and wife are bound. I do not believe if a husband commits adultery and his wife leaves or divorces him---he can then go ahead and marry if she commits adultery by remarriage. In Mt. 5:32, Jesus said, if a husband wrongly puts away his wife (which if he was being unrepentant in adultery, it can fit this scenario), HE is the one who is guilty of his wife's remarriage/adultery. He because of his own sin, is the CAUSE of her sin. I don't see where him causing her to sin would then give him the freedom to remarry. Do you understand what I mean? Blessings.....

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/11/16 23:21

Quote:

-----It's called grace. Jesus didn't blot out the sin of the one, but wrote sin's in the sand of those who were trying to stone her. Jesus used a woman who had many husbands at the well, he didn't condemn her, yet she was used of the master, are we more wise than he who forgives and if not are we pharisees. Knowing more of the law than he who forgives???

I'm not quite sure of your point. Yes, Grace abounds, absolutely, but as Paul taught, Grace does not give license to sin--or in the case of remarriages which Paul and Jesus taught were adulterous, to stay in those sins. No saint should ever stay in a known sin or use God's grace to excuse sin.

The woman of the well, is a perfect example. Jesus exposed her sin to her. He did not condemn her, but left her to choose to follow after the "water" he was offering or to reject it. Also, concerning the woman caught in adultery, Jesus did not say to go on as she had been doing (committing adultery), He told her to go and sin no more.

Re: - posted by ravin, on: 2004/11/17 0:02

"What is that to you, you just follow me" Jesus
what makes me think I'm so high on the list that I can judge and sit in high places. I must follow him. If we are Christs, we must learn to follow. I am not a judge of the word, but I do follow the one who gave the word. I'll let him do the things that are his to do.

I sit with him (Jesus) in high places, by the grace of the father not by any thing of mine.
He has forgiven us of many things and yet we are here picking the law a part like we had good sense. we are to give the word not tell others how to receive it. Give the gospel, let others choose how to do with their will the things they MUST do.
When I first heard the good news of the gospel it changed my heart. since then It's been one christian after another with their law book. Oh to hear the good news. The life changing word

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/11/17 9:04

"What is that to you, you just follow me" Jesus
what makes me think I'm so high on the list that I can judge and sit in high places. I must follow him. If we are Christs, we must learn to follow. I am not a judge of the word, but I do follow the one who gave the word. I'll let him do the things that are his to do.

I sit with him (Jesus) in high places, by the grace of the father not by any thing of mine.
He has forgiven us of many things and yet we are here picking the law a part like we had good sense. we are to give the word not tell others how to receive it. Give the gospel, let others choose how to do with their will the things they MUST do.
When I first heard the good news of the gospel it changed my heart. since then It's been one christian after another with their law book. Oh to hear the good news. The life changing word"

Hello Ravin,

This isn't about salvation----at least not to me, but what it is about is defining sin---according to the Word of God. The scriptures very clearly teach the saints of God are to live Holy, separated lives. If we can't go to the Word and discuss what "being Holy" is, there's a problem. I agree with you that we are to share the Word with others, but none of us can "make" someone do what we see as biblically correct.

The thing I find very troubling in many Christian circles is that this particular topic is Taboo because so many people are unbiblically remarried. It's sad to see the Christian community gets all up in arms concerning the issue of homosexual marriage, yet remains silent for the most part concerning divorce/remarriage in the Body of Christ. We (the Body of Christ collectively) say "God does not recognize these "unholy" unions"--the homosexual ones.....yet, when a heterosexual couple enters an unbiblical union (remarriage/adultery), we say God's grace abounds. Does God's grace abound for the heterosexual who is in sin more than the homosexual who is in sin? I guess that's a very confusing stance. I see marriage as a "state" that God has either joined or a sin, that He has not joined---for I personally do not believe God is obligated to join that which HE deems sin. Blessings.....

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/11/21 21:48

Hello,

Quote:
-----I do not believe if a husband commits adultery and his wife leaves or divorces him---he can then go ahead and marry if she commits adultery by remarriage. In Mt. 5:32, Jesus said, if a husband wrongly puts away his wife (which if he was being unrepentant in adultery, it can fit this scenario), HE is the one who is guilty of his wife's remarriage/adultery. He because of his own sin, is the CAUSE of her sin. I don't see where him causing her to sin would then give him the freedom to remarry. Do you understand what I mean?

I agree with what you say here, Though I do not think that reading Matt. 19:9 to say that a man is free to remarry if the wife is unfaithful would necessarily lead to condoning the above (what seems to me)unjust situation.

God bless

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/11/21 22:04

Hello Ravin,

I know the Lord will be faithful to show both of us his way more clearly. We may not agree now, but if we both keep following him it is certain that one day we will agree on all things.

Sincerely

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2004/11/30 5:09

In the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5:31-33), Jesus spells out that the only acceptable condition for divorce is fornication (not adultery as many have claimed).

His statement is further solidified by referring to Deut 24:1-2. The situation presented by Moses is a woman marrying a man under false pretences, by claiming to be a virgin. Moses spelled out, that he may divorce her by writing a letter of divorce, simply to state that he is okay with anyone else marrying her.

The hair splitting continues by Jesus definition of extramarital sexual unions by married people (intentional careful choice of wording used here, on my part). After already having complicated the issue, by stating that a man who looks lustfully at a woman has already committed adultery, He presents a three-way sexual situation, and lays out their individual sin (which I'll put out of order, for purpose of emphasis).

Married woman with other man
Woman commits adultery.
Other man with Married woman
Man commits adultery

Married man putting off wife
Causing woman to commit adultery.

The common thread in the sin of adultery, appears to be the married woman. By this, an assumption could be made, that a man can only commit adultery by sleeping with someone else's wife. Thus allowing (by technicality) for polygamy. However, Jesus didn't leave us there, because He stated that the married man is equally guilty of his wife's adultery, if she goes off with someone else, do to his actions.

By this we are reminded of Peter's exhortation (1 Pet 3:7) to honour our wives. There is no honour in allowing another woman to receive affections that could promote unrighteous jealousy within her. It is also disobedience to the command to "love one another as yourself", as we wouldn't like it if our wives chose someone else over us.

The deeper understanding, as Ron mentioned, is that this really isn't about us, but about Christ and the church. This statement also explains the fact that Christ cannot accept a bride unless she is born again, or otherwise he be committing adultery to the wife of the law of sin and death (Rom 7:1-6).

The further deeper understanding is that it really doesn't matter whether we actually understand the mechanics of it (and that all this is), the point is two becoming one flesh. We need to obey this direction on face value, or we don't demonstrate faith (trust) in the One who is the rewarder of those who diligently seek Him, thereby rendering it impossible to please Him. We call Him a liar, claiming that he needs to repent of His previously stated ordinance.

Essentially obedience is better than sacrifice, and if we obey, simply because we are walled in by a technicality in scripture, we are giving our obedience begrudgingly to an 'unfair' God, who He delights in cheerful givers. This further proves that the Law is meant to bring death. The law is complicated to those who seek to justify sin. Faith in God, on the other hand, is simple, trust that God has your best interests at heart, and do what He asks, knowing He wants the best for you, regardless of outward appearances.

The other issue is that love covers a multitude of sins. I have encountered many a servant, being used powerfully of God, that have remarried after a divorce. Perhaps 1 Cor 7:9 could apply to someone that is divorced. But then again, the fact that there is an exhortation for divorced women to not remarry in v12. A very complicated issue. I guess it's best to not divorce and be done with it.

Bless you all.

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/12/2 3:06

Hello,

I would like to take a moment before responding to your reply to say a couple of things to the people who have previously posted messages in this thread. To all whose posts I didn't respond to, I meant no disrespect, I am new at this and it has only started to dawn on me lately that it is probably best to respond to a person's post and actually say hello to the person. Also as I was reading over some previous posts I noticed that when I finally did respond that I didn't even say hello and then directly contradicted what the person was saying. That was just wrong, please forgive me Mr. Wurtz. Also if I offended any women by my previous comments about sexism, I apologize for not taking a more considerate approach to expressing my view.

Ok now for my reply, you mentioned these 3 adulterous situations:

1. Married woman with other man
Woman commits adultery.
2. Other man with Married woman
Man commits adultery
3. Married man putting off wife
Causing woman to commit adultery.

Also we could add from Matt. 19:9

4. Man divorces faithful wife and marries virgin.

According to Jesus in Matt. 19:9 this case would still be adultery for the man though the woman is unmarried.

2nd point,

Quote:
-----Essentially obedience is better than sacrifice, and if we obey, simply because we are walled in by a technicality in scripture, we are giving our obedience begrudgingly to an 'unfair' God, we He delights in cheerful givers.

These kind of statements, though very common, have always struck me as a spiritual sounding way of saying

"I don't really need to forsake my sin until I am good and ready".

Contrast this attitude with the word of God written in Hebrews 3:14,15,17

14. For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end;

15. While it is said, Today if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation.

17. But with whom was he grieved forty years? was it not with them that had sinned, whose dead bodies fell in the wilderness?

I would think that if any person became convinced that they were committing any form of adultery that they would need to immediately flee from that sin and the threat of hell fire, regardless of their perception of God's fairness.

Galatians 5:19-21

19. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness...

21b...of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

I would think that this adultery issue certainly deserves to be fully searched out. I see nothing legalistic or wrong about earnestly trying to understand and obey God's commandments. Especially in light of Gal.5:19-21.

Mr. Yohannon over at Gospel for Asia made the statement:

"Americans seem to have the problem of confusing obedience with legalism."

I completely agree with that statement.

God bless,

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2004/12/4 8:35

NP,

Thanks for your comments. I hadn't considered Mat 19:9. I'm grateful for you presenting an error in my doctrinal thinking. One of the many things that I love about this place, is that there are constant challenges to the way one thinks, and therefore it is hard to remain confident in our own flesh (well at least that's the case of me and my flesh:-)). Just to clarify my statements (my apologies for the slight tangent), by mentioning that "obedience is better than sacrifice" I was referring to the concept presented in Rom 10:2-3. Here the Jews had established their own set of standards, due to their limited understanding of God's standards (righteousness), thereby presenting a complex set of rules. The appearance of all this is a situation, where they are more looking for loop-holes to allow "near disobedience" rather than the kind of obedience that Christ requires.

The real point is, if your married, stay married. If your divorced, well then be prepared to bear the consequences of your choices, from there. Who really cares what the "title" of the offence is, it's all "disobedience to the limitation set forth by Deity". To claim the ability to set a standard that either justifies or condemns, is to "eat of the fruit of the wrong tree", as this is God's right alone. What is right in one circumstance may be wrong in another, and vice versa. However, as Bro Ron has mentioned in several forums, the problem with these kind of discussions is that we are not talking about people's lives, not philosophical ideals.

The greatest reality, is that to claim ability to be sinless or humble, is the greatest expression of arrogance there is, as there is nothing we can do, or be without it's origin being in God (be it 'good' or 'evil'). This is where 'holiness' doctrine can fall over, as it often doesn't consider the grace of God. The real question is, where do we 'think' it originated from? This is what truly show our sin(ful/less)ness. As Katz puts it:

Quote:

"True humility is a walk with God of such a deference & such a softness that even when you're right, you're wrong. You act as if even when you're right, you're alive to the possibility that you're wrong."

What has this to do with the topic at hand? Simply this, always be prepared to consider the fact that no matter how much Scripture exonerates us from the guilt of our actions (divorce/remarriage), if you think you're right, you're probably not. That's a lot easier than trying to split hairs about what you can or can't do, because "do" has very little to do with it (Rom 10:5), it's all about the "being".

After all, how does this explain Hosea marrying the harlot....at God's command. Wasn't he committing adultery, by marrying someone who had previously formed a union with another man? There is much to consider, and we could go on for years on this one, without resolution of the issue. Only the conscience can truly tell us the right course, and then only Judgment Day the validity of the course chosen. Best of luck, I hope this helps someone.

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/12/10 23:59

Aaron I.,

God bless you brother but, I don't agree with a lot of what you said in your last post. May the Lord give both of us grace to walk in the narrow path that leads to life. I hope this scripture will bless you:

Luke 1:67-75

And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying,

Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people,

And hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David;

As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began:

That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us;

To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant;

The oath which he swore to our father Abraham,

That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear,

In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life.

~~~~~  
your servant

**Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/12/11 0:44**

Here is what I am aware of that God says in the new testament about marriage, divorce, and remarriage. If anyone knows of another verse that speaks to this subject please let me know. I have listed the verses here in the order that they appear.

Matt.5:32

But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

Matt.14:3,4

For Herod had laid hold on John, and bound him, and put him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife.

For John said unto him, It is not lawful for thee to have her.

Matt.19:6,9

Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

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

Mark 6:18

For John had said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife.

Mark 10:9,11,12

What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her.

And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.

Luke 3:19,20

But Herod the tetrarch, being reprov'd by him for Herodias his brother Philip's wife, and for all the evils which Herod had done,

Added yet this above all, that he shut up John in prison.

Luke 16:18

Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery.

Rom. 7:2,3

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.

1Cor.7:10,11

And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband:

But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.

1Cor.7:15,17,20

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.

But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all churches.

Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called.

1Cor.7:27,28,39

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

But and if thou marry, thou hast not sinned; and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned. Nevertheless such shall have trouble in the flesh: but I spare you.

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.

~~~~~

Some of these verses may not apply to this subject but I have included them because I have heard them used in previous discussions about remarriage.

Re: Divorce - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2004/12/11 7:28

NP,

Essentially, we shouldn't divorce because God hates divorce. What do we do about those who are already divorced? What can I say....what a mess.

My rationale behind my previous statements can be found at Righteous Submission vs Zealous Obedience to Principle. I'd hate to fill this thread up with something seemingly irrelevant....although, apparently the few words I have used haven't been sufficient.

Blessing.

Re: - posted by jeffpine, on: 2004/12/11 17:12

hi:

re: 1 Cor 7:27-8. i wish to state that original languages like greek and hebrew dont have periods and paragraphs. so one can read just as correct the following: art thou loosed from a wife seek not a wife but and if thou marry thou hast not sinned

THIS SOUNDS LIKE GRACE AND FREEDOM TO ME. BE FREE IN CHRIST MY FRIENDS.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/12/12 19:47

Concerning the "loosed" issue of I Cor. 7:27, there are two different words used there: lusi (3080, strong's) and luo (3089). Lusi, surely can mean divorce. In the first part of the passage when Paul states "seek not to be loosed"(lusi), he is not speaking of killing oneself or their partner in order to be free, he is speaking about divorce or some kind of loosening. The men are not to seek this type of loosening----which also relates back to Paul's teaching in verse 10-11----that men are not to put away their wives. Those who do put away their wives would be sinning should they remarry.....blessings in Him.....Cindy

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/12/12 23:56

Hello Aaron I.

I read your new post in the other thread, I think I will pass on any further comments on this subject, I guess I just see things a little differently from you. As for your question about what to do about those that are already divorced. This kind of question is exactly what I am trying to understand the answer to. What is good and what is evil? What does God's word direct us to do in these situations? Surely God's word has direction for us about matters so important as these. At least Jesus thought it was important enough to see that it was mentioned in three gospels and a few other places in the bible.

God bless

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/12/13 0:16

Hello jeffpine

If "loosed from a wife" means either the wife died or was unfaithful, then I agree with you and it looks like to me, though I am not certain, that Jesus' statement in Matt. 19:9 would allow it to be understood this way. I would appreciate any other observations you might have about this subject.

God bless

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2004/12/13 0:35

Hello again lb,

I find your comments helpful and appreciate your input.

Thanks

Re: Marriage & Divorce thread - posted by Berea14 (), on: 2004/12/13 2:24

Hi all and Hi there Aaron,

Yup, thought I would stumble upon this topic. Aaron, as you are well aware, this is a subject rather agonising in quite a few ways. The only thing that I can put in here is that when God moves on a person or couple and starts to shake things then the thread comes loose if and when the couple are not bound and secure in the foundation of Jesus Christ. There are many influencing factors of which at this point in time I probably won't go into. There are many pointers that God gives to keep a marriage. Unfortunately there is a very real and spiritual enemy to marriage. The attacks come from many a front and to be able to discern them all is impossible humanly speaking. The truth sets free and wounds are bound up. The only thing that ends a marriage is remarriage. Divorce is not permanent unless made so by taking another partner. Unfortunately we all commit sin enough that validates the legality of divorce. So, do we live by the law or by grace. The definition of these are extremely deep and yet are founded upon experience and revelation according to the extent that Christ is the throne of our lives. What does one do when one knows that these things are from God? God hates divorce but He has not said that He will not cause such. Secondly, was it not Him who divorced Himself from a nation in the Old Testament due to their disobedience etc. Please understand that this is not an excuse to commit this sin of hard heartedness. Hard heartedness comes from a loss of first love. The cooling of fires and the development of selfishness. This and the fact that people get stuck in developmental stages of love, all form part of a breakdown. I am rather convinced that when the wind blows on a marriage it is God trying to get each person to move into a deeper form of love by placing the other person before their own needs and desires whilst developing an awareness in each party to the needs and desires of the other. The important thing here is drawing people deeper into Him. Marriage is a covenant between two people and Jesus. A wedding is a ceremony of vow with Jesus. When Christians divorce then they are essentially divorcing/rejecting Jesus in their partner or the work that He is doing in that partner. Why do people only see the flesh side of their partner and not the work of God in them?

Well, it is a lot of thoughts and yet alas I do not feel as though I have contributed much as I haven't given detail.

Feel free to respond here or directly to me as I am keen to learn and serve if He deems fit.

God bless all and take care.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2004/12/13 15:58

Quote:

----- The only thing that ends a marriage is remarriage. Divorce is not permanent unless made so by taking another partner.

Hi Berea,

I'd have to disagree with you here. In Rom. 7:2-3 we see divorce/remarriage-adultery, yet Paul tells that the "bond" with her previous husband will continue until he dies.....then she will be free to be with another. This one passage is a real sticking point to me when I try to fit in all the arguments for marital dissolution that are taught. Some say adultery within a marriage dissolves the marriage---however, when pressed then they will admit it only dissolves the marriage if the innocent party wants it dissolved. So the act of adultery does not dissolve a marriage. Some teach as you do, when one is remarried, their previous union is dissolved. As shown in Rom. 7:2-3, that is not the case. I am left at this point of study only seeing death as dissolving a marriage and freedom gained through that to remarry. All other viewpoints seem to hold one contradiction with scripture or another.

Right now my husband and I are really struggling with what our church teaches on this topic. They believe and practice in their counselling that ALL divorce dissolves the marriage bond, yet if Christians divorce, they are counselled to remarry each other. We can't quite figure that one out. They also don't believe any remarriage is adultery---contrary to what Jesus taught.....So much confusion and ever changing stances in the church on this topic, which surely is not of God.

Quote:
-----When christians divorce then they are essentially divorcing/rejecting Jesus in their partner or the work that He is doing in that partner. Why do people only see the flesh side of their partner and not the work of God in them?

That is exactly my heart's cry too! Divorce/remarriage is nothing short of fulfilling the flesh's desires IN THIS LIFE. It speaks: "I do not want what I have been given. I want something different/better." When I think of standing in the gap for a spouse caught up in sin/rebellion this scripture comes to mind: It is no longer I that live, but Christ who lives in me. That is not just an ideal---one we can throw aside when life becomes difficult/tumultuous---it is what we have been called to if we are born again. There is no place in the life of a disciple of Christ's for unforgiveness or having the mindset of "moving on" or looking for "loopholes" or "allowances" and wresting scripture to do what one wants (flesh wise). WWJD? He would not desert any who are sanctified for His purposes. He would stand, knowing His Work will be perfected---in HIS perfect time.....As you can probably tell, biblical marriage is a passion of mine ;-)

Re: Marriage again - posted by Berea14 (), on: 2004/12/14 1:47

Hi there Lastblast,
Yeah, I certainly do agree with you on all counts. I sincerely apologise if I have not explained fully all that I intended. As regards marriage being ended by remarriage to another. I do not mean that it is dissolved by God. Commitment to another partner makes restoration of the original marriage near impossible. One of the reasons being that the partner is fulfilled by their new partner to approximately 70% emotionally. The odd thing is that the way that they are fulfilled is virtually identical in way but different in manner to their original partner. In other words, when remarrying, people normally choose someone nearly exactly the same!! Conclusion, there is less than 5% chance of success. This is a stat that is universal. The problem displayed is seldom the problem. Time also does not heal. The only advice I can give anyone is that there are a lot of contributing factors to a marriage breakdown. One of the most important is that a husband or wife did not break ties with his or her direct family and adopt the realisation that they are their own family. The breaking of this bond to move things into a higher level of growth in maturity is seldom done by either partner or their parents. There is a pull by parents and a resistance to not letting go by the child. The issue becomes an issue when the adults bear their own children but do not grow into the correct stage of love that Jesus wants us to. WWJD? I prefer WDJ! In other words, don't try and guess what He would do. What is He doing! Here is a mindset that will challenge us all if we meditate on that fact. Don't try and replace Him or mimic Him. The biggest issue I have come to grapple with lately is that I need to stop trying to live by the tree of the knowledge of good and bad. Right and wrong end up in the same basket. Choose life. If each person will humble themselves He will show His ways. People have a choice and we will be held accountable. This is all a heart subject, I have tried the right and wrong approach. It doesn't work. The only thing to combat the marriage break ups is seeking Him. Fast, pray and ask for humility. Pray mercy, truth and discernment for struggling couples. Repent on their behalf. Are you willing to pay the price? Do these things only if He directs you to. It is a hard topic and yes, I agree, it does have huge ups and downs. People need to remember that as in Rev 2 we are encouraged/admonished to get that first love back into our lives. We can fall in love again!! Totally opposite to the normal of "I don't love him/her anymore". Funny things happen when one or both start doing the little things that they did when they were madly in love in the beginning. You start to experience the same feelings. Call it body memory or whatever. How long will the other partner wait? How much is the other partner willing to pay? Marriage is worth it but it isn't our marriage. All that is ours is His. It belongs to Him and He is the covenant keeper. We, as believers, are ministers of reconciliation. I will ask that you receive a mantle for reconciliation if it is your desire and His will. If you agree then let me know. I only seek that His will be done before our own no matter what.
God bless and will look in sometime soon. :-)

Re: Marriage/Divorce & Remarriage- What does God say about it? - posted by npautsky (), on: 2005/1/21 23:05

Hello All,

It looks like I was on the wrong track after all in this thread. I read a book by Guy Duty "Divorce and Remarriage", for twenty years or so he believed pretty much what I have been saying, that adultery doesn't break the marriage covenant. Later in life he changed his mind, and started to believe that adultery does break the marriage covenant. I guess I am going to have to back off from this argument. Martin Luther and the reformation people believed adultery broke the marriage covenant, John Wesley, Matthew Henry, and Charles Spurgeon did too. I called Times Square Church and asked them for counsel on this subject and they recommended that I read the above book then get back in touch with them, so it looks like David Wilkerson and Carter Conlon believe the same. The bottom line is that they all say that the "whosoever marries her that is divorced commits adultery" is referring to frivolous divorce, divorcing because you are tired of your wife etc. I had read that in Matthew Henry a few years back but was a little suspicious, I admit at the time I wrote it off as the typical

al "watering down" I've become so used to hearing. Any one of the above men could be wrong on some point of the bible but it is very unlikely that I am right and they are all wrong on this point. The guy in this book makes a lot of good points and helped me to understand this difficult part of the bible a little better. I generally leave these kind of questions to better men than myself to figure out but this was a practical matter for me since my wife had been divorced before we were married. It always bothered my conscience when I read right there in plain english not to marry her that is divorced. I always told myself and my son when we read the bible together and came to that part that there were some other scriptures or some reason it was ok for me and mom to be married, I just didn't know the scriptures or the reason but knew most christians seemed to think it was ok. I remember telling my son "Gods going to help me to understand this". Looks like he's helping me again. I know ultimately God can always be trusted to show the right way if we patiently trust in him. Thanks for everyones thoughts on this subject.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/1/22 2:46

Hi Noel

thanks for this update

I'm glad you have come to peace of mind in this very difficult area. This is not to start disturbing things all over again, but does Guy Duty have a definition of what constitutes the 'marriage covenant'? Or from the other direction 'would there be such a thing as a 'frivolous' marriage?

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2005/1/22 13:10

Hello Ron,

I am not sure if he has a clear definition of the marriage covenant or not in the book, I would need to reread it in order to be able to tell you for certain. If I come across the answers to your questions I will let you know. I would certainly like to continue to search out this subject, I have no problem with looking further into this subject and trying to grapple with the hard questions. Here are a few quotes from Guy Duty's book that I found helpful on this subject.

Charles Spurgeon:

Marriage is for life, and cannot be loosed, except by the one great crime which severs its bond...a woman divorced for any cause but adultery, and marrying again, is committing adultery before God. Fornication makes the guilty person a fit subject for just and lawful divorce; for it is a virtual disannulling of the marriage bond. In the case of fornication, upon clear proof, the tie can be loosed. ... persons once married are in the sight of God, married for life, with the one exception of proven fornication.

~~~~~

John Wesley:

It is adultery for any man to marry again... unless that divorce has been for the cause of adultery; in that only case there is no scripture which forbids to marry again.

~~~~~

*Reference to Calvin removed to keep focus on only one controversial topic at a time.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/1/22 16:24

Quote:

-----John Calvin:

Though Christ condemns as an adulterer the man who shall marry a wife that has been divorced, this is undoubtedly restricted to unlawful and frivolous divorces. An adulterous wife "cuts herself off as a rotten member" of the marriage. It is the "duty of the husband to purge his house from infamy." "By committing adultery, he (the husband) has dissolved the marriage, the wife is set at liberty."

This is an interesting quotation. Calvin seems to consider divorce a 'duty' in the case of adultery. This was the exact attitude that the Lord opposed.

They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? He said unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. (Mat 19:7-8 KJV)

The Pharisees say 'Moses commanded'; Christ says 'Moses permitted'.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/22 17:18

Exactly my thoughts Ron. I saw posted on this site Luther saying something to this effect concerning marriage of the guilty party: "let them marry. Better to let them enjoy what life they have left here on this earth since they will spend eternity in torment"..... I have tried to find this supposed writing of Luther's which states this. If someone knows where I can find it, thank you for posting it.

If it is true that he said this, how troubling.... It supposes there is NO repentance available to those who are guilty of adultery. Yes, the early reformers did believe in 2 exceptions for the permanency of marriage---adultery and desertion by an unbeliever. However, from my own understanding, they did not believe in remarriage of the guilty party---only the innocent one. That seems to me inequitable. If the marriage is truly dissolved, then both parties should be free to remarry.

The early church did not practice the "exception" clause---except to separate from the adulterer and pray they would repent and return to their covenant marriage (see the Shepherd of Hermas' writings). That appears to me to be more in line with kingdom principles of longsuffering and honoring of covenant even when one party is unfaithful.

Noel, I am interested in what Guy Duty had to say concerning Rom. 7:2-3. Can you share what his point of view was concerning this since that passage deals with adultery which does not dissolve a marriage? Thanks. Blessings in Him, Cindy :-)

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2005/1/22 17:46

Hello Ron,

Maybe we could just strike Calvin from my list of helpful quotes. I don't know much about him but he seems to be somewhat of a lightning rod and this topic draws enough fire already.

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2005/1/22 18:17

Hello lastblast,

He has a whole chapter on Romans 7:1-4. You would pretty much have to read the book as a whole to get what he is saying though. This book has a very narrow scope, it seems his aim is solely to refute the arguments you and I have been making. Here is part of what he says, "If the law in Romans 7:2,3 is absolute then if a man's wife is a harlot, he must cleave unto her. Those married to sex perverts must be one flesh with them, unless an exception can be found. Hebrews 7:22 & 8:6 says that Christ gave humanity a "better covenant" than the Mosaic covenant; but Moses with an inferior covenant, killed the adulterers and sex criminals and set the guiltless mates free to remarry. So, if the better covenant requires the guiltless to be one flesh with sex offenders, then it seems that Moses gave the guiltless a better deal."

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/22 21:53

I guess in the "flesh" the Mosaic covenant would be better for the innocent, though I hardly think any marriage partner is "without sin".

I suppose I look at this from a kingdom mindset in that Jesus forgave the adulteress, who are we? The early church dealt with this issue in a very different way. They separated themselves from unrepentant adulterers(spouses) as scripture admonishes us believers to do (I Cor. 5)---in hopes they would come to repentance and the repentant would be restored to the covenantal spouse. That seems to me to be the way of a Christian---forsaking the "flesh"---what we think we are entitled to--- and allowing Christ to reign in our members. We must also remember that Paul did give an allowance---to separate, but, in that allowance, he also addressed God's command: the separated are to remain unmarried OR be reconciled with their spouse. Remarriage was not an option.

Personally, I can't look at Rom. 7:2-3 as a non-absolute because it appears Paul did teach it as an absolute. Clearly in his analogy, he shows not even an "innocent" husband is freed from his adulterous wife----she is bound to him while he lives----though she be with another man (in adultery). Paul again taught this in I Cor. 7:39---a woman is bound to her husband by law, until death, then she is free to remarry. Paul never discussed adultery as a dissolving force in marriage in all his teachings on marriage. As a matter of fact, if there were another dissolving force, his analogy in Rom. 7:2-3 wouldn't have made much sense. There would be another way through the law.....Christ being only one way. We know that is not true.

When it is taught that adultery dissolves a marriage in many churches today, here in Rom. 7:2-3 that type of teaching is clearly refuted by the Word of God---in my opinion. Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re: - posted by npautsky (), on: 2005/1/24 4:32

Hello lastblast,

In this situation in Numbers 5:11-31, Do you think this man was to remain bound to the adulterous wife or would he be unbound according to the law of Moses?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/1/24 9:47

Quote:
-----Maybe we could just strike Calvin from my list of helpful quotes.I don't know much about him but he seems to be somewhat of a lightning rod and this topic draws enough fire already.

you are very wise :-D :-D

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/1/24 14:47

Quote:
-----When it is taught that adultery dissolves a marriage in many churches today, here in Rom. 7:2-3 that type of teaching is clearly refuted by the Word of God---in my opinion

Hello Beloved,

Adultery in the Old Testament was punishable by death- so the issue is a moot point in the New Testament because the scenario is different. In the Old Testament the man was loosed from his wife for adultery because she was killed (though I know of no case where this was actually carried out). In the New Testament Jesus uses the exception "saving for the cause of fornication." This was originally an argument between the Rabbi's Hillel and Shammai. One said for any cause- the other said only for fornication (basically). The original purpose as I have studied this topic of the laws against adultery is to protect a man's posterity. Here is an excerpt from this study:

DIVORCE

As we mention previously, the liberty given to a man by the Mosaic law to put away his wife "because he found some uncleanness" or something offensive in her (Deuteronomy 24:1) was an accommodation to the hardness of the Jewish heart, and did not harmonize with God's original plan concerning the nature of marriage. The two schools of thought in Jesus day were based in the teachings of Hillel and Shammai. One believes divorce for any cause, the other believing only in the case of fornication. Jesus, being tested by the people answered this issue as follows: He, therefore, who puts away his wife, except on the ground of her fornication, and marries another, commits adultery (Matthew 19:9), and he who puts her away leads her to commit the same crime (Matthew 5:32). He who marries a woman that has been divorced commits adultery, and the woman who puts away her husband and marries another man (Mark 10:12) incurs the same transgression. This indicates that God did not acknowledge the divorce to begin with and still considers the originally parties married- otherwise the sin would not be adultery merely some lesser sexual crime. We may observe in regard to the passages pertaining to divorce (Matthew 5, 19, Mark 10, Luke 16), first, that Mark and Luke do not record the exception preserved in Matthew, "excepting for the cause of fornication." Hermeneutically, the plain reconciliation of the passages must be found in the principle that an exception in a fuller document must explain a briefer one.

Fornication for grounds of divorce is a sexual crime since the beginning of the betrothal period (see Matthew 1:19) committed by either of the parties with a third person. Fornication is a blanket term that covers all sexual crimes from adultery to homosexuality to bestiality to incest. The exception of fornication in Jesus' teaching is the SOLE exception as grounds for divorce. It cannot be said with any honesty that Christ, in saying "except it be for fornication," gives a sample of the causes which may dissolve the marriage union, as one of many which put an end to the state beautifully called "one flesh." Plainly but one cause of separation with remarriage is in his thoughts. Christ says, let not man put asunder. He gives a rule to his followers, who must follow it, whether the State allows larger liberty or not. To depart from this law of Christ is to set sail into a sea of confusion the likes of which there is no compass- nor map with which to navigate. Christ offered no contingencies for those who IGNORE this warning- to do so is to cast yourself into the hands of the Living God. (Some excerpts taken from McClintock and Strong Encyclopedia)

I Corinthians 7:10-15

But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife. But to the rest speak I, not the Lord: If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy. 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.

Pagan Marriage Laws

For 1500 years the teaching of Jesus we just studied kept divorce greatly at a minimum within the Church, because the Church and the State were one and the same and the Church would not act out of harmony with God in putting asunder what God joined together. The early American Colonial laws allowed the court to grant divorce for adultery, fraudulent contract, willful desertion for three years, or seven years providential absence without being heard of after due inquiry made and certified, and in all these cases the aggrieved party might marry again. This legislation remained almost unchanged for nearly two hundred years. In 1843 two new causes of divorce were added to the old, namely, "habitual intemperance" and "intolerable cruelty;" and five or six years afterwards the legislation on this subject reached its climax by the further addition to the causes of divorce of "imprisonment for life," "infamous crime," and any such "misconduct as permanently destroys the happiness of the petitioner, and defeats the purposes of the marriage relation." Now a vague subjective indeterminate cause was added to the determinate causes of former legislation. The law allowed immediate remarriage, does not forbid an adulterer or adulteress to be united after divorce to a partner in guilt, nor divorced persons to be remarried to one another. Divorces have, as might be expected, greatly increased with the new legislation. Now, society is suffering from a 50% or greater divorce rate and the Church is nearly the same. Without question, the family life and morals of a community once most religious, are being gradually undermined and poisoned by such a social evil (excerpts from McClintock and Strong Encyclopedia).

God Hates Divorce

The question that must be asked is "What has strengthened the hand of those seeking divorce that they would sin again?"

not God with such wickedness?" It has no doubt come on three counts 1) A state that puts asunder what God joined together- not knowing God is not subject to the state 2) A church that allows people to feel they can now get forgiveness for putting away unlawfully since they couldn't get permission. 3) An impenitent and adulterous generation that will do what they will IN SPITE of what God says or the ministers of the Gospel say. This is a sin that will certainly require an answer before God for EVERYONE involved. Especially when you consider the untold numbers of lives destroyed by such a practice. David Wilkerson writes "The servant of God, the layman, who is untrue to his wife, who cheats on her and finally abandons her to remarry another, is even now under God's anathema (curse)- especially if children are involved. God says to them... You cursed (your) children (II Peter 2:14)." God doesn't accept any offering when we deal treacherously with the wife of our covenant (Malachi 2:14). In Jeremiah 23 God says... "I found their wickedness." Verse 14... "I have seen also in the prophets of Jerusalem an horrible thing: they commit adultery, and walk in lies: they strengthen also the hands of evildoers, that none doth return from his wickedness: they are all of them unto me as Sodom, and the inhabitants thereof as Gomorrah." Let a renewed fear of God give rise to a renewed sanctity of marriage. "For I hate divorce!" says the LORD, the God of Israel. "It is as cruel as putting on a victim's bloodstained coat," says the LORD Almighty. "So guard yourself; always remain loyal to your wife" (Malachi 2:16 NLT).

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/26 10:16

Hello Robert,

Thank you for posting your study. I think the overall picture we are in agreement on---especially concerning the departure of God's commands and the ill effects of doing so. I think historically, if one were to study how marriage was practiced (as well as divorce and remarriage) they would see how far we have departed from the Lord in our current Western practices. I have done some research into the history of marriage/divorce/remarriage myself and it is quite amazing to see how quickly things have changed. Many believe unbiblical divorce and remarriage, though initially a sin, is then OK with God.....and further.....blessed by God. This mindset is troubling and explains why we are seeing divorce/remarriage in epidemic proportions in the confessing church.

Quote:
-----Adultery in the Old Testament was punishable by death- so the issue is a moot point in the New Testament because the scenario is different. In the Old Testament the man was loosed from his wife for adultery because she was killed (though I know of no case where this was actually carried out). In the New Testament Jesus uses the exception "saving for the cause of fornication." This was originally an argument between the Rabbi's Hillel and Shammai. One said for any cause- the other said only for fornication (basically).

I know I've been accused from time to time of focusing too much on two passages (Rom. 7:2-3 and I Cor. 7:39), but the teaching that adultery dissolves a God joined marriage(or gives permission to divorce, which then dissolves), is something I cannot reconcile with the two above passages. In scripture, we see Jesus calling unbiblical remarriage, adultery (joining yourself with someone who is not your lawful spouse). Most churches today teach/practice: if your spouse remarries, you are then free to remarry yourself due to the exception clause in Mt. 19:9.

One point I am stuck on is that Paul appears to teach a remarriage in no way dissolves the previous union (Rom. 7:2-3)--only death dissolves a marriage. It is my current belief (subject to change with revelation:-D) the analogy Paul uses here MUST fit perfectly with the point he is making. Also what needs to be considered is this: Rom. 7:2-3 does not stand alone. He also uses the same language when speaking to the Corinthian church (I Cor. 7:39). Paul never taught adultery dissolves a marriage bond. Another thing I cannot see beyond. Even when he references back to the Lord's teaching, he permits a separation from the spouse, yet forbids remarriage (I Cor. 7:10-11).

There are some who believe Paul was NOT referencing the Lord's teachings on this topic (Mt. 19:9), yet that doesn't make sense in light of the fact he then goes on to say "I, not the Lord".....giving the impression this next issue was not directly addressed by the Lord.....however, the preceding issue was addressed by the Lord-----Paul reaffirming His (the Lord's) teaching.

I think the whole "adultery" allowance hangs on interpreting what the word "fornication-porneia, in the greek" means. As you mentioned, a betrothed man could give a writ of divorcement to his bride to be (before the marriage bed). This was

what Joseph was going to do (for porneia/fornication). The betrothal was as binding then as our marriages are today. To get out of either (civilly, that is), one must get a divorce. So, when Jesus was addressing the Jews in Mt. 19:9, was "this" what He was speaking of? That would seem to not contradict what Paul teaches in Rom. 7:2-3 and I Cor. 7:39 as well as Jesus' teachings in MK. 10, Luke 16:18 (which were written to Gentile audiences who had no such "betrothal" custom, hence why some believe the exception clause was left out).

Also, as I have said before, if we are to interpret Mt.'s allowance as pertaining to adultery, even in the same text, it does not fit. Whether one is to interpret the woman to be the guilty or the innocent, the point shown is that she is not free to remarry---the one who marries her commits adultery (the divorce did not dissolve her previous union). If it is the innocent woman who is put away because her husband wants another---he has committed adultery--she is not free to remarry. If the allowance to remarry is due to adultery, she should be allowed to remarry without sin---that's not what Jesus said. If this woman were the one put away due to HER adultery---if adultery/then divorce dissolves, she should be free to remarry.

Another point I can't get beyond is the disciples reaction to Jesus' teaching. As I said, if Jesus were teaching that there is no more death penalty for adultery, now they can divorce their wives and remarry----I don't see how that would be a shocking teaching. They would still be able to remarry. Some have told me the disciples were of the "liberal" mindset. They believed in putting away for ANY cause, therefore were shocked at Jesus' restrictions. I have a hard time believing that---as some of Jesus' followers were John's followers first----and John certainly wasn't "liberal" in his mindset concerning the use of marriage (Herod/Herodias). Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/26 10:34

Hello Noel,

Well, I don't think the passage is clear as to what the husband should do. He is free from guilt if it is proven the wife has been unfaithful. What we can see from the text is she is now under a curse (swollen belly and rotting thigh). Earlier in the text, we see "unclean" persons were to be put out of the camp. Possibly that is what was done. I don't see the death penalty shown here nor does it address the husband's guilt when it is proven the wife was unjustly accused. Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/1/26 12:22

Hi Cindy,

I have certainly thought through the ramifications you have mentioned for years now. Personally, I believe that fornication is the sole means of 'putting away' without the non-guilty party committing adultery. I do not believe it is God's will that the people divorce if it is at all possible to work it out. It should not be an 'excuse' to rid oneself of their mate. As for the guilty party their condition has always been in question in my mind as to whether they commit adultery for remarriage. Moreover, I have always felt that what Jesus was really saying is that putting away does not exempt one from committing adultery should they seek to divorce for the cause of remarriage.

At this point I must stop and point out that the ramifications for this in my mind would be different than most others believe. I have a fairly strong Oberlin view of sin when it comes to sins listed in the New Testament as those who practice such things shall not inherit the Kingdom, etc. That would mean that if a person (in my view) is living in a perpetual state of adultery they are lost. If it was an act of adultery to get remarried and that sin is past tense and forgiven that would be a different story.

At this point we must consider that John Baptist told Herod it is not lawful for you to have your brother's wife. The implication, is that he should give her back. However, if he gives her back it would be an abomination for the brother to remarry her as she had now been another man's wife. She would be caught in a catch 22. She would have to remain unmarried and alone all her days under this scenario. If that were true, Satan would come perpetually to tempt her for her incontinency. That is what he does. We are warned in Scripture that we must not defraud our spouse of relations as it creates a device for the enemy to bring in great sin. Scripture acknowledges the physiological need. I cannot believe that God would

d send a person into this condition to be constantly tempted to fornicate. God has called us to peace. Any time we talk about divorce we are in biblically uncharted waters, because God never offers a plan 'B'. It is like murder- once they are dead they cannot be brought back. In as much as is possible we ought to make restitution and right past wrongs as the Holy Spirit leads. Some things simply cannot be fixed. Jesus told the woman at the well- go and sin no more. What did he mean? Go and live a life of celibacy? Certainly not; what I believe he was saying is get your life right with God in as much as is in you to do it and don't mess it up again. This is not a license- it must be the mercy of God.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/27 0:55

Quote:
-----That would mean that if a person (in my view) is living in a perpetual state of adultery they are lost. If it was an act of adultery to get remarried and that sin is past tense and forgiven that would be a different story.

Hello Robert,

Yes, this is an issue with me. In Rom. 7:2-3 it appears very strongly that Paul is stating the adultery is continual----until the death of her lawful spouse occurs, in which case, she would then be free from her lawful marriage.

Concerning :

Quote:
-----At this point we must consider that John Baptist told Herod it is not lawful for you to have your brother's wife. The implication, is that he should give her back. However, if he gives her back it would be an abomination for the brother to remarry her as she had now been another man's wife. She would be caught in a catch 22. She would have to remain unmarried and alone all her days under this scenario. If that were true, Satan would come perpetually to tempt her for her incontinency. that is what he does. We are warned in scripture that we must not defraud our spouse of relations as it creates a device for the enemy to bring in great sin. Scripture acknowledges the physiological need. I cannot believe that God would send a person into this condition to be constantly tempted to fornicate.

Philip did not put Herodias away, she divorced Philip to marry Herod, so the Deut. 24 scenario does not appear to fit. Also, for me, I do not see Deut. 24:1-4 as many interpret it---meaning the "uncleanness" occurs after the marriage bed. I believe it occurs before, during the betrothal period and a man could put away (give a writ of divorcement) to his betrothed wife. If he did so however, he could never have her back. I believe that "law" was against the man who put away his betrothed wife, not against the wife, but that's just my opinion. Concerning the remaining unmarried all the days of her life not being fair, I don't know what to say about that except, my mind's reasonings would say "yes, that's right, it is not fair and she will be tempted." However, scripture says what it does concerning those who do depart from their marriage (1 Cor. 7:10-11), they must (a command from the Lord) remain unmarried or be reconciled to their spouse. You're right that God did not give a plan "B". I think there is a very good reason for that. When we abide by His Will for our lives and submit to Him, we will not need a plan "B". It is only when we are disobedient/rebellious that we need/seek another plan. If people really believed they were "in it for life", no other avenues, they would humble themselves and abide by God's commands by loving their lawful spouses as God commands. Everyone would have their own wives and husbands, not those who belong to someone else.....in a perfect world :-) Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/1/27 8:03

Quote:
-----Philip did not put Herodias away, she divorced Philip to marry Herod, so the Deut. 24 scenario does not appear to fit. Also, for me, I do not see Deut. 24:1-4 as many interpret it---meaning the "uncleanness" occurs after the marriage bed. I believe it occurs before, during the betrothal period and a man could put away (give a writ of divorcement) to his betrothed wife. If he did so however, he could never have her back.

Hi Cindy,

If the above interpretation was originally the correct one, there is a pattern in scripture and history that it was not viewed in that light. The marriage of God to Israel is a prime example of this. We read in Jeremiah 3:1, They say, If a man put away his wife, and she go from him, and become another man's, shall he return unto her again? shall not that land be greatly polluted? but thou hast played the harlot with many lovers; yet return again to me, saith the LORD. This answers to Hosea in that God used Gomer as an illustration to the people of their unfaithfulness to him as His wife. Yet, though she played the harlot God sent Hosea to buy her back. Even though God did not put Israel His wife away the land was still in danger of pollution because of what she did. I used to believe that the reason why a man could not remarry a wife that was remarried was so that men would not try to 'win back' a wife after he saw her with another man. Yet, there are problems with this view.

It seems clear that God allowed 'putting away' to keep the men from physically abusing or killing their wives in order to be separate from them. I cannot accept a belief that God would forgive a man if he would kill his wife to be free from her and would not forgive him if he divorced her. I cannot believe that killing a woman can be construed as a man's salvation. Or vice versa. I have known women to be near to killing their husbands over unfaithfulness. Jealousy is as cruel as the grave. No number of gifts can cool the anger of a person who has been transgressed in this way. Proverbs makes that clear. Only God can heal something like that.

Going back to Gomer and Hosea, we know that the last baby they had was named Loammi, meaning "Not my child." Dr. J. Vernon McGee has an awesome sermon on this that aired recently in which he draws from this how Gomer had played the harlot until there were children that Hosea was raising that were another man's. Could it be that such a level of unfaithfulness could not warrant a divorce? could it be that such a train wreck in this man's life could warrant him remaining in that situation raising children not his own? What about if the reverse were true and a man had fathered children by other women while married? If either the man or woman would choose to put away from them such a bride or husband I believe it would be a merciful thing as to not have had them stoned to death. Again, I can never believe that killing a spouse would find forgiveness before simply putting them away in this context. It is a common saying in these parts that if a person is divorced they are painted the black sheep, yet if they had killed their spouse and repented they had received the right hand of fellowship.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/27 16:02

Quote:
-----yet return again to me, saith the LORD. This answers to Hosea in that God used Gomer as an illustration to the people of their unfaithfulness to him as His wife. Yet, though she played the harlot God sent Hosea to buy her back. Even though God did not put Israel His wife away the land was still in danger of pollution because of what she did. I used to believe that the reason why a man could not remarry a wife that was remarried was so that men would not try to 'win back' a wife after he saw her with another man. Yet, there are problems with this view.

Yes, I agree with that as the Lord clearly tells Israel.....return to me and as you said, the same occurred with Hosea/Gomer. Clearly the Lord shows that He WILL take back a person/people who are "defiled".

As for men being allowed to put away their wives so they wouldn't kill them? If that is the case, that a man would kill his wife because he doesn't want her, what kind of a heart towards God is that? Does God give an allowance to sin so that we don't do what appears to be a greater sin? I just don't see that presented in New covenant teachings. Jesus clearly said those who were putting away their covenant wives was due to their hardheartedness---and then, He responded to that. I just don't get the idea that Jesus was saying "well, ok, I know you're weak, so you can divorce and remarry, if you just can't live in your situation any longer. It seems whatever Jesus said was VERY hard to take---at least by the disciples reaction it appeared to be. What I do see is God, in His kindness, allowed for separation (I Cor. 7:10) due to unrepentant sin. However, what He didn't give an allowance to do is to take another's spouse as your own.

If adultery (remarriage) is being in a state of sinful relationship (because the previous is not dissolved by God), not a one time sin, then they are still in sin while in an unbiblical remarriage. There cannot be true repentance while staying in a sin, any sin and continuing to practice that sin. I cannot see any difference in the two forms of adultery presented in God's Word. Both situations are adultery (joining oneself with someone who is not your spouse), yet one seems to be accepted (unbiblical remarriage), the other rejected.

I think the point I'm trying to make is being lost here and we are getting off into the emotional justification realm to try and explain why men/women are sinning in disobeying the Lord. I think first and foremost the Word of God is what needs to be focused on, not the reasons why things are happening or allowing circumstances to rule over/contradict what God's Word states-----especially concerning believers. I think we can agree that "sin" is why people are doing what they are doing----either in sinning sexually, or in abandoning their covenantal spouse because they don't "like/love" them anymore---also probably due to sin.

I was kind of hoping you would address the Rom. 7:2-3/1 Cor. 7:39 issue since that is where I get "stuck". I think for many who are seeing the things I do, this passage is very hard to explain away-----especially for the one who holds the position on adultery or remarriage dissolves the previous marriage that God joined. Do you think it significant that in Rom. 7:2-3 Paul mentions adultery/remarriage, yet says the lawful(1st) marriage has not been dissolved?

Thank you Robert! In Him, Cindy

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/1/27 17:31

Hi Cindy,

Again the issue is that a woman is bound to her husband so long as she lives. This was the law as was given to Israel. Certainly the original intent of that law was that a woman could never be married to two men that were living at the same time. Yet there were writings of divorcement that were given by the man to the woman that allowed her to be married to another man. I know we are not in agreement of the 'who' was qualified to receive the writing of divorcement. And I will not try to convince you otherwise because that is not for me to do. I am not in the habit of loosening people's interpretation of God's word. If that is your interpretation, so be it.

I am reluctant to really go any farther in making a case for women to remarry who have been previously married. I will not make a case either that a man can marry a divorced woman. I will leave each to their own conscience and conviction of the truth by the Holy Spirit. It is my conviction that if a person were in perpetual sin God would warn them about their case by the means of great Holy Ghost conviction. There would be no peace for them. Yet, we do know that there were men who had more than one wife in the Pastoral epistles because a qualification for a bishop or deacon was "husband of one woman." Dr. Charles Weslake a local Greek scholar with the Assemblies of God interprets that passage as "one woman a man."

As for my comments on the why divorces were granted in the Old Testament I am quite sure that it is true. I agree that in the New Testament we should exercise great love and mercy as the Holy Spirit has come and we have great longsuffering and mercy if so be we are full of the Holy Ghost. I can't imagine a Christian killing his wife over adultery. Adultery is a very serious thing. Yet, here I am simply pointing out that when one chooses to commit adultery, Scripture is clear in that they have taken their life into their own hands. Actually it is more like suicide. Here we read: "Men do not despise a thief, if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry; But if he be found, he shall restore sevenfold; he shall give all the substance of his house. But whoso committeth adultery with a woman lacketh understanding: he that doeth it destroyeth his own soul. A wound and dishonour shall he get; and his reproach shall not be wiped away. For jealousy is the rage of a man: therefore he will not spare in the day of vengeance. He will not regard any ransom; neither will he rest content, though thou givest many gifts." (Proverbs 6:31-35) This does not condone anyone in their anger, it simply tells the offender what they can reasonably expect if they take this road. He that doeth it destroyeth his own soul. In the Old Testament the man could have had her and the other man stoned to death. Certainly there is emotion involved here, but the commandment came from the Lord under the Law. Praise be to God that we are no longer under the Law, but are under grace. Yet, that is why the law was added- was because of those types of transgressions.

So then what shall we say to these things? We are left to God dealing in our own conscience by His word and Holy Spirit. What about the woman who had 5 husbands (men)? What was she to do? If we can answer this question, we can solve this dilemma.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/28 14:15

Quote:
-----Again the issue is that a women is bound to her husband so long as she lives. This was the law as was given to Israel. Certainly the original intent of that law was that a woman could never be married to two men that were living at the same time. Yet there were writings of divorcement that were given by the man to the woman that allowed her to be married to another man.

Hello Robert,

I understand your point, but it seems to me an important point to note who Paul was addressing the "law" of marriage to. He was addressing the "law" to Gentile Christians in both Romans 7 and I Corinthians 7---not to Jews. Like I said, I can't get past this point that Paul did use adultery as an illustration and that it did not dissolve a marriage. Also to note, when Paul was discussing this, he was not discussing this in terms of HER death dissolving the marriage (as would be the case if she was guilty of adultery and were stoned to death). He was saying as long as her HUSBAND lived, she would be bound to him---in spite of her adulterous remarriage.

Quote:
-----I will leave each to their own conscience and conviction of the truth by the Holy Spirit. It is my conviction that if a person were in perpetual sin God would warn them about their case by the means of great Holy Ghost conviction. There would be no peace for them

I agree that the Holy Spirit WOULD bring conviction in a true believer. However, not all sin is revealed as it is being committed. My walk and most other Christians I know, have had progressive revelation of sin. Presently, I know of a woman who has just recently been convicted of such----through READING/STUDYING the Word of God. She said she felt like she was struck by lightning and just KNEW she was in adultery. She married a divorced man who has living ex-wives. Either she is wrong or those who have remarried unbiblically are. I have to believe God is not "gray" in this area---whatever the Truth is. Our understandings may be "gray", unclear, or subject to persuasion by man-- that's why it is a good thing to focus on the Word of God so that inconsistencies may be revealed----either now, or later. I am thankful for this board in that respect, there is free flowing discussion----respectful, loving discussion. That appears to be rare in the Christian community unfortunately.

Quote:
-----Praise be to God that we are no longer under the Law, but are under grace.

Amen. Though men may hold grudges, even when sincere repentance is evident, God does not hold this to our account. As Jesus said to the woman caught in adultery: Go and sin no more. He IS merciful----allowing a person to "live" and be transformed.

Quote:
-----So then what shall we say to these things? We are left to God dealing in our own conscience by His word and Holy Spirit. What about the woman who had 5 husbands (men)? What was she to do? If we can answer this question, we can solve this dilemma.

Ah, that is the question of the day, isn't it? I think if any of us had that answer, this discussion wouldn't even be occurring, would it ;-)? I agree also that we can discuss and show forth our concerns about this issue in the church, yet it will be God who will bring the Truth forth---as you said---by His Word and Holy Spirit.....Thank you Robert. As usual, you are a pleasure to speak with---even if we disagree on points. Blessings in Him, Cindy :-)

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/1/28 16:22

Hi Cindy,

Quote:
-----Presently, I know of a woman who has just recently been convicted of such----through READING/STUDYING the Word of God. She said she felt like she was struck by lightning and just KNEW she was in adultery. She married a divorced man who has living ex-wives. Either she is wrong or those who have remarried unbiblically are. I have to believe God is not "gray" in this area---whatever the Truth is. Our understandings may be "gray", unclear, or subject to persuasion by man-- that's why it is a good thing to focus on the Word of God so that inconsistencies may be revealed----either now, or later.

It would be my estimation that if the women were divorced for non-biblical reasons then it would have been adultery. The question then becomes, what should she do? This is the tricky part. God has not given clear direction here. If there are now children involved the situation gets even more complex and serious. Perhaps the women are all remarried now and they have children by their present husbands. It becomes almost a question like the one, "In the resurrection whose wife shall she be?"

The whole topic is filled with doubts and fears. It is the terror of walking in a dark place. There is simply no light to go on. I think it is fair to say that for me I would simply not know what to do. We are trying to piece together a puzzle and not one of the pieces really link together. What shall we do? What can we do when what we have done cannot be undone? Do we tear another family apart to try to mend a past wrong? Do we double up on our sins by trying to fix them?

There is no doubt that there was sin, but what is the path of repentance? Should they break their family apart and live alone with the kids without their parents? Would that jibe with God's revealed word? Would God say that a reconciliation of forgiveness should take place? Should there be apologies and confession of sin? The latter are reasonable steps as God would lead and allow. The former are steps that should not be taken in doubt in my estimation. This is a doubtful subject and I would take no steps in the dark. My old Sunday School teacher used to say, when in doubt, don't do anything. I think that is good wisdom.

I'm very big on repentance. I taught repentance for a solid year every where I spoke. But I know that there is an extent to which repentance can be done and then God's grace has to take over. We are all sinners. We have to agree with God on that and believe that the blood of Christ will cleanse us from all sin. This topic could cause folk to despair even of life. It can cause others to waver believing they are lost when God is not saying that at all. Again, God has called us to peace.

I hope to leave off from here. This topic really wears me down.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/29 10:08

Hi Robert,

I completely understand the weariness with this topic, so you don't need to respond to me, but I did want to address some of your points. As for repentance, I'm sure you would agree that repentance involves not only Godly sorrow, but leaving the sin behind---if one is still doing the sin. Concerning conviction, my husband brought up a good point: do those who confess Christ who unbiblically divorce their spouses feel conviction by the Holy Spirit in their sin of divorce? How about those who enter into adulterous remarriages? Do they feel the "sting" of conviction as they enter into a remarriage which is clearly forbidden by scripture? I believe this type of thinking is not correct: "a REAL believer would be convicted if they were either about to sin, have sinned or are "in sin""? That type of mindset, if consistent, would say that ALL believers are aware of ALL of their sin or the possibility of sin---and if they continue to go ahead, they are not REAL believers. I have a hard time accepting this. As I said, I believe a true believer can continue to sin if they do not know the Word of God AND if the culture has become such that the "sin" is not sin in that culture.

Righteous Lot was VEXED due to him being in a culture of great sin. It affected his thinking and his own actions. He was so affected that he was willing to sin himself (by giving his daughters up to be raped). I believe desensitization of sin has occurred in the Church due to the trends of society. A great movie which depicts just this is Time Changers. What

is now "no big deal" to Christians today would be shocking for Christians of 100 years ago to see/experience.

I am not condemning those who are in remarriages. Each of us have to reconcile our own actions with scripture and each of us will be responsible for how we handle the knowledge/revelation we receive and how we share that. I would hope more than anything concerning these discussions, those who are pondering a first marriage or even a remarriage, would get into God's Word and be fully convinced--- understanding what is pleasing to the Lord and what may be sin. We can not rely upon the "church" to decide what is pleasing to the Lord because much of the "world" has crept into the church. We need to stand on the Word of God as our sole source of Truth. Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/1/29 12:53

Hi Cindy,

I will muster enough strength for another post. I totally agree that a person who is truly born again had best not enter into the sin we are talking about. I would fear and tremble to do so. I have a teaching called "the fearsome sin of fornication." It is a sobering look at joining Christ with an harlot or any such sin. As we discuss this topic of divorce I would remind us that the worst issue here is not divorce, it is defilement of the Temple of God. That is what happens in fornication and adultery.

The Holy Spirit would bring great conviction to those moving apart from God's will. My concern is for those who are in a sort of ex post facto situation (they are born again now and they are discovering the truth of God's word) or for those who have been victims of such gross adultery (since born again) that there is no hope to salvage the marriage. In the last year I have dealt with some pretty serious situations in some peoples lives that make me to pause in these things. Moreover, if the position is taken that a person is bound no matter what their spouse does (harlotry, etc.), the door comes open from gross abuse of that spouse. This is not hypothetical, it happens all the time. What happens when the spouse it caught 3 times in 3 years with 3 different people? It is just as great of error to disregard what Jesus said in Matthew 5 and 19 (saving for the cause of fornication) than it is to add other reasons for divorce. We are not to add or take away from scripture. Paul would have assumed that his writers were familiar with the teachings of Christ on the topic of fornication in divorce so there is little need to be redundant there. It is a gross violation of the covenant to commit adultery. We cannot in our attempt to correct the madness of divorce in our lands over correct the problem by discounting the clear teachings of Matthew 5 and 19. Be assured, that many other problems would be created if we try to correct Jesus' teachings on this. Again, the door would fly open to spouses having to tolerate unfaithfulness.

To be consistent with an Oberlin view of sin we must also say that God will not stay bound to a believer if they become a postate. In other words, if we believe that adultery equals loss of salvation then we have immediately contradicted a belief that adultery could not call a marriage into question. There is a contradiction here if we do not let Jesus' teachings in Matthew 5 and 19 stand. It would be paramount to saying "once married always married" as we have heard "once saved always saved." In other words, if you believe marriage to be unconditional then salvation must also be unconditional, and that, because marriage is a picture of our relationship to God (Ephesians 5-6). We are not at liberty to serve false god's after our having been metaphorically married to Christ and are clearly warned about these damnable sins, in like manner, there are clear warnings against unfaithfulness in marriage that bring that covenant into question. So we see then that a belief in unconditional marriage, to be consistent, makes us immediately unconditional eternal security.

We also need to consider what Paul meant when he said, "a brother or sister is not in bondage" in such cases. There would need to be no teaching on the topic if it was understood that the person "simply walked out." Bondage is a slavery term. If the person walks out then they have loosed the spouse from their service. Surely the believers did not believe they were supposed to chase the departing spouse down under obligation to keep serving them. It is a moot point if they walk out if we consider the 'bondage' as simply their marital responsibilities. They don't want you around anymore. You are free. So what then did Paul mean? There are only a few options left.

Wheew! :-?

Maybe that can shed some more light on this whole topic?

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/29 16:55

Quote:
-----if the position is taken that a person is bound no matter what their spouse does (harlotry, etc.), the door comes open from gross abuse of that spouse. This is not hypothetical, it happens all the time. What happens when the spouse is caught 3 times in 3 years with 3 different people? It is just as great of error to disregard what Jesus said in Matthew 5 and 19 (saving for the cause of fornication) than it is to add other reasons for divorce. We are not to add or take away from scripture. Paul would have assumed that his writers were familiar with the teachings of Christ on the topic of fornication in divorce so there is little need to be redundant there.

Hi Robert,

I agree with you that we must NEVER add or take away from scripture. We must never allow circumstances/feelings/issues of 'fairness' to dictate how we interpret/apply God's Word though either. It is not apparent to me and many others that Paul takes it for granted Jesus taught 'porneia' was adultery within a marriage. It seems to me when people grab on to the "adultery" exception, they don't/can't explain how that can possibly fit with what Paul taught/showed in Rom. 7:2-3---that a remarriage(adultery) does not dissolve the previous one. The fact that Paul never taught adultery dissolved a marriage is more reason to look deeper into how Mt. 19:9 is popularly interpreted today. It should be studied, because if past/present social trends HAVE led the way for God's people to sin, we need to know it and do something to prevent it from continuing.

Quote:
-----We cannot in our attempt to correct the madness of divorce in our lands over correct the problem by discounting the clear teachings of Matthew 5 and 19. Be assured, that many other problems would be created if we try to correct Jesus' teachings on this. Again, the door would fly open to spouses having to tolerate unfaithfulness.

I agree. We must be very careful not to call sin what God has not called sin AND not to call "good" that which God has called sin. Concerning unbiblical remarriage, what Jesus called adultery, if there was some further scripture which validated these marriages---that God now joined them and they were no longer sinful (adultery), we would have no disagreement. However, scripture is silent after calling this sin a sin. Where scripture is silent, we must be careful not to add to or take away from what has already been stated. There's much more evidence to assume that the sin remains a sin, rather than evidence to say that it is no longer a sin and now God approves of these relationships. In my opinion, Mt. 19:9 is not a 'clear' teaching and that's why it is so hotly debated---especially because of Rom. 7:2-3's content as well as numerous other passages which seem to indicate the permanency of marriage til death.

As for unconditional salvation, I am an election proponent so I do believe in unconditional salvation (Jn. 6:37-44). What I don't believe in is the easy believism (OSAS) that is presented in churches today---there are many false converts---those who profess Christ, but have not truly been converted---the evidence of "tares" within the professing body is plain to see. I believe when Paul speaks of those who "do" the sins listed in Gal 5 and other passages, he is speaking of lifestyle sins---continual unrepented sin. I don't believe that a true believer will CONTINUE in sin once that sin has been revealed and they are FULLY convinced of it. Someone committing an act of adultery is not damned. The adultery can be repented of and the person restored to Christ. Christians can and do commit all types of sins---REAL Christians. However, the difference to me, is that they do not "continue" in sin. If they do continue in sin, there is a chance they will leave this earth early, but I don't believe they will lose their salvation. Big difference.

Quote:
-----We also need to consider what Paul meant when he said, "a brother or sister is not in bondage" in such cases. There would need to be no teaching on the topic if it was understood that the person "simply walked out." Bondage is a slavery term. If the person walks out then they have loosed the spouse from their service. Surely the believers did not believe they were supposed to chase the departing spouse down under obligation to keep serving them. It is a moot point if they walk out if we consider the 'bondage' as simply their marital responsibilities. They don't want you around anymore. You are free. So what then did Paul mean? There are only a few options left.

Well, there are varying viewpoints on this passage as well. One thing that should cause one to wonder is why a different greek word is used here if Paul meant the marriage bond was dissolved? Why didn't he use the word for "bound"---why

ch defined means tied together, wound, joined. Why did he use a word having to do with slavery or servitude? Could it be that Paul was not speaking of the dissolution of the marriage, but only that the believer was not indebted to continue serving this spouse---seeking out to restore the relationship, etc.? They were not to "war" to keep this spouse from departing. If Paul would have chosen the word for not "bound" as used in Rom. 7:2-3 and I Cor. 7:39 there would be no doubt what his intended meaning was. The early church did not see this passage as giving the right to remarry (before the establishment of the RCC and afterwards). The reformation church did to some extent, although they even struggled on this point. In my humble opinion when I look at this passage what I see is that the unbeliever is sanctified---due to the new convert's faith in Christ. What does sanctified mean? Does it not mean that this unsaved person is set apart for God to do a work in their life? What then when they decide---according to their sinful nature, to depart from their spouse? Does God then say---now they are not sanctified---I will give up on them? The union is now dissolved. That doesn't seem to agree with the person of God towards those who are lost. When I look at the interpretation which gives the right to remarry for the one deserted, it smacks of the believer FORSAKING the unbeliever----their higher call to work the works of God (being faithful to the one God joined them with)--- are put aside so they can fulfill the flesh's desire to be joined with another. I see many today abuse this passage taking it out of context just to allow a remarriage. A very well known Pastor teaches/practices if a professed believer departs from another believer and refuses to reconcile in a timely manner (I guess determined by the church), they are now looked at as UNBELIEVERS and this passage is used to allow a remarriage. That is very troubling to me. Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/1/29 18:05

Hi Cindy,

I understand your points as I have known this position for some time. In the end we may just end up having to agree to disagree. Yet, your position on sin makes things a little different for us because an oberlin view of sin disqualifies one from salvation for perpetual adultery.

Quote:
-----If they do continue in sin, there is a chance they will leave this earth early, but I don't believe they will lose their salvation. Big difference.

Yes, this is a very big difference.

Quote:
-----We must never allow circumstances/feelings/issues of 'fairness' to dictate how we interpret/apply God's Word though either. It is not apparent to me and many others that Paul takes it for granted Jesus taught 'porneia' was adultery within a marriage.

I agree here certainly. Our Christian lives are about interpreting our circumstances in light of God's word. According to Jewish tradition Matthew is the Oldest Gospel and was originally written in Hebrew. If this were true, it is conceivable how the people would have been aware of such a teaching. Certainly the arguments of Shammai and Hillel had to be dealt with by the clear teaching of Jesus within the Diaspora. Both Matthew 5 and 19 use the word 'fornication' or porneia as the exception to settle this Jewish argument. Porneia is a blanket term for sexual misconduct. Strong's reads "Including adultery and incest." It could mean anything from adultery to bestiality to incest. It is used of Paul when he describes the conduct of the young man that had taken his father's wife in I Corinthians 5:1. This was clearly an act of adultery against his father; yet Paul used the word porneia. It is my position that Jesus used the term porneia as a blanket term also to stop an unfaithful spouse from finding a loophole in his teaching. Adultery is the Greek word moichao and it means to have unlawful relations with a married woman. This is the Hebrew NeuM. It was used for a woman who broke wedlock or for Israel to lapse into idolatry.

To try to maintain a consistent view of the mirror relationship of marriage (between men and women) as relates to our relationship with God; if I take the position that if Israel committed Idolatry there were not the elect then I would have to say also that for a woman to commit adultery on her husband means they were never married. This again makes the point moot. Yet Israel was God's bride and did commit idolatry with all manner of heathen gods. If those Israelites who did that are in Heaven today then I can accept "unconditional marriage" because the relationships are a mirror of one another. If w

e say they are not in Heaven, then God has asked a mortal man to do what He would not. He has asked him to maintain that relationship unconditionally. That, I can never believe. Idolaters will have their part in the lake of fire just as sure as adulterers will.

As far as the betrothal period is concerned the information is a bit sketchy and the situation with Joseph and Mary does not give us enough to go on. Reason being, that if a woman had committed relations with a man as not to be able to produce the token of her innocence then she was to be stoned to death. (Deuteronomy 22:20) From the time of espousal, however, the woman was considered as the lawful wife of the man to whom she was betrothed: the engagement could not be ended by the man without a bill of divorce; nor could she be unfaithful without being considered an adulteress. (From McClintock and Strong Encyclopedia)

Some additional light as I have studied this a little deeper today. It has helped me sharpen up a bit on my understanding.

In the end I think we may just disagree, but I don't contend. My previous posts indicate that I believe we both greatly agree that divorce is a serious issue in the Church. I have taught on the topic in the last year and taken about the strongest stand of many I speak with. It is a bit odd to be on this side of the issue. ;-)

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/30 0:01

Quote:

-----an oberlin view of sin disqualifies one from salvation for perpetual adultery.

Hello again Robert. I personally believe that an adulterous relationship can be repented of. There are many who believe the passages in which Paul teaches "those who do such shall not inherit the kingdom of God" relates to unbelievers---those who have NEVER come to faith----the sins listed being the lifestyle (fruit) of such faithlessness and rebellion. This would be one of those things I look at and think "Paul said this to professed BELIEVERS". Was it to cause those who professed Christ to question their conversion to see if it were genuine? Possibly so as those who are the "elect" led and filled by God's spirit could not continue in sin----they can sin, but it's the continuance of it that would cause many to mark those who practice sin as unbelievers---and cast them out of the assembly. I look at the teachings that those who have been given to Christ (a done deal) will never be lost, but will be raised up on the last day. In other words, I think those who are listed are NOT believers, never were and the evidence of this is the fruit of their lives---sin.....practiced, continual, unrepentant----the mark of one who is not filled with the Holy Spirit.

I believe there are many sins we each are guilty of as I said.....and our sanctification is a process. I believe our right standing with the Lord is a done deal---through Christ, but we are continually being conformed into the likeness of Christ... ..which means dying more to self (flesh) and walking in His Will---having sin exposed and dealing with it as it comes to light.

Quote:

-----It could mean anything from adultery to bestiality to incest. It is used of Paul when he describes the conduct of the young man that had taken his father's wife in I Corinthians 5:1. This was clearly an act of adultery against his father; yet Paul used the word porneia.

Doesn't OT law speak of having relations with a step parent as incest, ie: fornication? There are those who interpret Mt. 19:9's 'porneia' to mean: incestuous relations----the only thing Jesus allowed divorce and remarriage for. That actually could explain His disciples' reactions being so extreme.....This would narrow the allowance much more than even Sham mai's position did----and one may well be better off staying single than being "stuck" with someone unbearable/unrepentant their whole life just because they weren't "blood relations or the like".

Quote:

-----Israel was God's bride and did commit idolatry with all manner of heathen gods. If those Israelites who did that are in Heaven today then I can accept "unconditional marriage" because the relationships are a mirror of one another.

But what did God say to Israel....."yet return unto me"----even after the divorce.....even in her 'adultery' God was ever faithful. He never took a different bride. He waited.....and waited. He is still waiting. All in heaven have sinned against God---idolatry being only one sin we all are probably guilty of. I guess when I look at Salvation, I believe works--neither good nor bad is how we attain our salvation. We attain salvation IN SPITE of our works---Purely by His Grace. The thing with a true believer is that sin affects us----even when we are trying to 'quell' the Spirit's conviction ---it is there. Whom the Lord loves, He chastises. There's no need to chastise if one does not sin----which means Christians do sin, sometimes not even realizing it---til the Word of God gets ahold of them and the Spirit brings conviction or at least "questions", which they feel compelled to seek the answers out to.

Quote:
-----As far as the betrothal period is concerned the information is a bit sketchy and the situation with Joseph and Mary does not give us enough to go on. Reason being, that if a woman had committed relations with a man as not to be able to produce the token of her innocence then she was to be stoned to death. (Deuteronomy 22:20) From the time of espousal, however, the woman was considered as the lawful wife of the man to whom she was betrothed: the engagement could not be ended by the man without a bill of divorce; nor could she be unfaithful without being considered an adulteress.(From McClintock and Strong Encyclopedia)

Scripture says of Joseph that he was a righteous man----because he was going to choose NOT to bring Mary's 'sin' to public light. He wasn't going to stone her. I'm not quite sure about the "adulteress" part though since in the betrothal period the marriage had not yet been consummated. That's one reason why many believe "porneia"(fornication before marriage) was used instead of "moichao" in the exception clause, because it did not pertain to what happens AFTER a marriage is complete. It related to sins before the final completion of the marriage.

Quote:
-----My previous posts indicate that I believe we both greatly agree that divorce is a serious issue in the Church

Absolutely and it's not going to get any better---only worse---unless Pastors stand up and preach the Word of God. Too many Pastors don't even want to discuss this issue, let alone dialogue on a deeper level with those who are studying this, so thank you for doing so. Blessings in Jesus, Cindy

Re: - posted by TonyS (), on: 2005/1/30 15:37

Quote:

I'm sure you would agree that repentance involves not only Godly sorrow, but leaving the sin behind---if one is still doing the sin. Concerning conviction, my husband brought up a good point: do those who confess Christ who unbiblically divorce their spouses feel conviction by the Holy Spirit in their sin of divorce? How about those who enter into adulterous remarriages? Do they feel the "sting" of conviction as they enter into a remarriage which is clearly forbidden by scripture?

Hello Cindy,

My, what words and insight your husband has brought up! In order for you to understand, you will need to endure with me as I relate my wretched tale. For two and one half years the heavens became as brass to me in my life, the sweet fellowship I had known since earliest childhood ceased to exist and all fellowship (not my eternal salvation) with Christ ended. See, I put away my wife for another. And this after having been a leader in Ministry for many years, having served as an assistant Chaplain at a county correctional facility (jail), after leading a Nursing Home Ministry since 1995, with scores of people who depended on me daily, I failed. I failed my Heavenly Father, I failed my family, friends, Ministry and Church.

Conviction? Is there a stronger word we might use? So to answer your husband's question, yes to both: overwhelming conviction, grief, sorrow and shame. First for an (unbiblical) divorce, and secondly for a (unbiblical) remarriage. And the important word here is decidedly unbiblical. In the same fashion God does not recognize a homosexual union, neither does He recognize an unbiblical union.

What finally brought me out, and allowed me to come to myself was one chapter of a book, no more than about twenty pages.

ages in length. "The Horrible Thing in God's House: Adultery, Fornication and Divorce." From David Wilkerson's book "Set The Trumpet To Thy Mouth." There are two statements from this book that contributed to my repentance and forsaking the sin more than any other, allow me to share.

He writes "Oh man of God-- tremble at this curse God prepared for priests and ministers who refused to forsake their immorality. The Lord will cut off the man that doeth this, the master and the scholar, out of the tabernacles of Jacob, (Malachi 2:12). Not only will God cut off the anointing, unction, and blessings: He will humiliate the offender, destroy his credibility, and cast his ministry aside. God has reserved the most fearful prophecies for ministers who live and preach in sin."

Think of it, written in 1985 and if for no one else it was for Tony Sexton in Kansas City 2001.

The second statement,

He writes "Saints of God, don't look at the way things appear. Servants of God cheat on their wives, then go on with new wives, apparently still enjoying God's blessings! No So! You do not see or hear of God's judgment on them. You know nothing of the sleepless nights, the despair and sorrow that floods in on them. To live under God's displeasure is a burden few can bear."

For the good part, on January 12, 2005 my wife and I were reunited in Marriage. God has performed miracles that time will not permit to tell with this post, but yes it is true to repent means to forsake and then restoration and forgiveness take root. Robert W., who you have been corresponding with on this thread spoke at the ceremony on the topic of "Remember Lot's Wife", it was a most incredible service, certainly unlike any other wedding ceremony attended before.

Stand true to your convictions Cindy, it has been because of these convictions held by those near and dear to us that we made it back to the Father's house.

Our best,
Tony & Dawn Sexton

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/31 8:27

Praise God Tony!!!

What a story of restoration, both with each other and in your relationships with the Lord. To walk in peace with the Lord is a GOOD thing. What has been revealed as truth to you has also been shown to me----though I was not even "in" the situation:

Quote:
-----And the important word here is decidedly unbiblical. In the same fashion God does not recognize a homosexual union, neither does He recognize an unbiblical union.

The enemy is surely waging a fierce battle concerning the preservation of and/or restoration of God joined marriages. Many of us who have come to believe in the permanency of marriage, through study of the Word, are ostracized and even in some cases politely (or impolitely, I'm sure) asked to leave the congregation they are a part of.

I know of another man who after 13 years of remaining "unmarried" was reconciled with his wife who had left him and married another. They were remarried last year----joyously. God is good and it is His Will for all those who He joined to walk together through this life until He calls us home. Blessings to you and your covenant wife!! In Him, Cindy :-)

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/1/31 8:39

Hi Bro Tony,

Thanks for sharing your story. I remember the vexation on your face when we met for the first time after those few years. For those who may have listened to the message titled (<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/viewcat.php?cid306>) The Love We Had At First this is the Tony that I speak about at the end.

God has done an awesome work. I tremble and fear for a Christian who would think to put away their spouse. I assure you that your nights could well become as it were a foretaste of Hell. I wish I could find that sermon of Dave Wilkerson called Vexing the Holy Ghost. Cast those thoughts down while there is still hope! Pray that God will hear your heart. And yes indeed, Remember Lot's wife.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/1/31 10:57

At some point you just have to cut to the chase and lay the cards on the table. When I came to Jesus I was as the old hymn says; "I was weary worn and sad." My life was like a steel cable welded into a knot. I was afraid that I could never be saved. I did everything I could possibly do to repent from all my sin. I wrestled for some time that I would ever be acceptable to God. I finally felt it would be God's will that I marry the woman I was with as we had children and 1 on the way. Reconciliation on the other hand was impossible and pursued. Not only that, in my mind would have been an abomination for reasons I gave back in 10/04 on this thread. I still sharply believe that. It is my conviction and I have been as honest before God as I can be. In 1992 I was married and I have 6 children total that breakdown between two families (4 live at home with me). They are all teens but 2 (12 & 4).

To read this thread at face value I would believe again that I was lost and that I must leave my wife and 4 kids in order to be saved. That I would send them away and in that it would 'well please' the Lord. By all rights, I have preached repentance and am lost myself. I have walked in the Spirit with the witness of the Holy Ghost leading others to Christ and to that same walk and have whist not that I am damned.

If God cannot save a weary worn and sad sinner in an impossible situation as I am in- what is the Gospel? If this is not God what is this glory in my soul? If this is not God why do I love His word and feast to do His will. Some would say, nay, but you have this stain on your garment. I cannot get the stain out. I have forsaken all for Christ and would gladly lay my life down right this second for Him. I would run through a burning building if the Holy Ghost said do it. If this is not God what is driving me to intercede for the lost? If this is not God what is compelling me to climb to the highest heights of a walk with Christ? What is this love for God I feel and this love for the lost? Why am I spending and being spent for Christ if I'm lost? If I concur with God and HATE divorce and suffer for what I cannot fix daily what is it?

What is my portion? And what hath the government of God reckoned unto me? I have taken my place as a teacher of the Gospel. The pastoral epistles have told me only a one woman man can be a deacon or a bishop. I sit my place and do what I can knowing that the mess I made greatly diminished what God could have done. I am where I am. God may have used me in a greater capacity. I seek no credentials from any organization for this cause. That is my plight- that is my portion. I take it gladly and praise God for the opportunity. And I will serve God all my days doing what I feel he has compelled me to do even if I go to hell at the end of the road simply because He is worthy. He is worthy and it is what I shall do. He made me I am His. I will do what He compels me.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by TonyS (), on: 2005/1/31 11:40

Blessings Robert,

How I shall never forget that fateful evening, December 2003.

There is one thought I shared that evening, that I remembered as I read your post. It is from Matthew 18, verse 6.

"But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a milestone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea."

Every parent who would ever contemplate leaving a spouse would do good to carefully consider this passage. As I know you have, and did so many years ago. Surely it has and should bring some level of peace, and assurance knowing that the moment you came to Christ "weary, worn, and sad in 1991? that all things became new!! And all that could be reconciled was.

Could it possibly be, from Heaven's perspective that all the Heavenly host are looking in vain to find this "stain"?

In Christ,
tony

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/31 16:42

Quote:
-----"But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a milestone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea."

Every parent who would ever contemplate leaving a spouse would do good to carefully consider this passage.

Hello Robert and Tony,

I truly do not mean to wrongly injure anyone by the discussion of this topic, but this topic does need to be discussed, no matter how uncomfortable. People need to know what the Word of God says BEFORE they sin and come to a place of despair due to their disobedience and sin. I too have had to do things in obedience that I thought would DESTROY my life---as a result of previous sin in my life. I don't doubt your love for the Lord Robert. However, each of us must rely up on the Word of God---that is the only thing that is non-changing, forever constant.

Consider the following situations
in which children are involved:

1. Two men (homosexual) father two children together through adoption. They have been together for 15 years, raising the children, loving each other. One comes to faith in Christ. What would be his response concerning repentance of his lifestyle/family makeup?
2. A married couple. The man has a mistress on the side. They have been involved for 10 years---unknownst to the wife. The married couple have no children. The man and his adulteress have 3 children (Terri Schiavo comes to mind here). What would scripture demand repentance be in this situation? Should the man divorce his wife and marry the woman he has children with or should he forsake his adulterous relationship and return to oneness with his wife?

Does the fact that people have children together change the nature of the relationship to God?

Again, it is not my desire to hurt anyone, but to reason together the scriptures and how they apply to our lives as believers. If there is error on my part, the Word of God WILL reveal it to me---I truly believe that. Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/31 17:12

Quote:
-----Reconciliation on the other hand was impossible and pursued. Not only that, in my mind would have been an abomination for reasons I gave back in 10/04 on this thread. I still sharply believe that.

Robert, It wasn't my intention to get personal with anyone, just to discuss scripture and generalities, however since you opened up, I must ask you a question. I didn't dig through the past posts on this, but by "abomination" do you mean Deut. 24:1-4 and how it is popularly interpreted today----that a person can NEVER return to a covenant spouse who has been remarried? If so, do you believe this abomination applies only to you or do you believe this abomination applies to ALL who would remarry their original spouses in repentance of adultery (remarriage)? Blessings in Jesus, Cindy

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/1/31 17:46

Hi Cindy,

I believe it only applies to men who would take back a wife that had married another man. It is mentioned also in Jeremiah 3. Under no circumstances in my mind could that ever happen. I believe the word of God is clear on it. If the situation with Tony had been such I would have warned him of that fact. It was not his case.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by TonyS (), on: 2005/1/31 18:04

Hello Cindy,

How many times I have pondered these questions, in my own circumstances I have no children, and so decisions made were not as torturous for me personally. Just when I have all my doctrines, beliefs and ideas in order along comes "people". If it were not for these "people", my how much less complicated it would be.

If indeed we could fix all our messes, there would be little need for grace, for mercy, for justification etc... I am certain this verse has been looked at in prior posts but it comes to mind now, Christ at the well with a woman who had been married multiple times. This would have been a great time for Christ to give direction to this woman as to which of her five husbands to return to.

We do not have a Holy Scriptures part 2, one that would give clear direction AFTER we have failed even multiple times. May it be said of me someday I surrendered all, all to Jesus I surrender, I surrender all. I am so thankful I don't serve a hard taskmaster that would cast me aside simply because I truly did not know what to do, and there was no clear direction except my conscience, that still small voice even.

Yes, uncomfortable are these topics. But much less uncomfortable than a guilty conscience that would condemn us.

In Christ,
tony

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/31 18:09

Robert,

Is the woman in Deut. 24:1-4 called an adulteress in her new marriage? The writ of divorcement given to her allowed her to remarry---it was even in the wording of the document given to her. It appears that the second marriage was viewed as lawful, not adultery. Jesus however, taught unbiblical remarriage=adultery---not lawful marriage. Adultery CAN be repented of/forsaken. One is not deemed "unclean" when they repent. A marriage CAN be restored. I see a big difference between what Jesus taught and what is being said there in Deut. 24:1-4. Besides, we are not Jewish nor follow Jewish customs----which back then, women had no rights concerning divorce---the husband's did the divorcing.

Jesus clearly showed that a woman COULD divorce and He forbade it. To make this only about a man not being able to take back someone "unclean/defiled", but a woman can take back a man who has been defiled doesn't make a whole lot of sense---biblically. Throughout scripture we see that God Himself continually takes back those who are "defiled"-----in the OT and especially in the NT. Blessings in Jesus, Cindy

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/1/31 18:31

Hi Cindy,

Quote:

-----Jesus clearly showed that a woman COULD divorce and He forbade it.

:-?

This is the confusion that ultimately comes in. There is no clear answer to these things. I hold to the Deuteronomy 24 passage with great fear because God said it would defile the land. That is my conviction based upon my revelation. I am not trying to compel anyone with it.

Again, we don't have a clear map and a compass with which to navigate. That is why in these things I WARN those with great warning not to take this path! For those who are in a quagmire of confusion you have to do what you feel right based upon honest revelation. I have walked this valley and I know what it is well. Before I came to terms with it in 1992, I may have never come to the Lord. I know that what has happened is sin and I have repented as much as is possible and it is behind me in grace. The government of God though is still in effect. It is a whirlwind. It adds to the urgency as to why I preach and teach repentance anytime God opens the door. People have to respond to the revelation of the word by the Holy Ghost. I don't know why one man is told to sell all and give to the poor and another is not. I just know this; whatever God tells you to do- you had better do. And that is what I have done and am doing. I can't get tied up in anything else. Not people slant on things or their conscience. I have to seek God on these things from His word. We can make a doctrine on this topic, but it would not be one of full revelation. Any presumptuous sin is dangerous. Marriage and divorce is one of many facets of our walk with God. Finney used to teach that doing things for the sheer pleasure was sin. I asked; then I can't salt my food or eat ice cream? Did Jesus teach that? No. It was a belief Finney had and could make a good case for. But do I believe eating candy is a sin? Absolutely not. This thread has worn me down; but it ain't nothing on what Finney has done to bring me to repentance. ;-) I don't agree with all his beliefs, but much of his stuff is very good. If I lived like he would have me live it would be in constant fear and with a brass smile. We have to learn that God will give grace and that we must walk in the Spirit. Repentance, absolutely. But in a lesson I taught titled "Survival of the Revival" I deal with how when people repent there is a tendency to keep pushing past what the Holy Ghost is doing and its off the rails. We need to walk in the Spirit with a clear conscience and get about the Master's business. If God can't save me I may as well quit preaching the Gospel. We need grace in our times. There are a lot of hurting people out there.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/1/31 22:54

Quote:

----- I am so thankful I don't serve a hard taskmaster that would cast me aside simply because I truly did not know what to do, and there was no clear direction except my conscience, that still small voice even.

Oh absolutely right Tony. None of us should ever do something we are not fully convinced of through revelation of the Spirit and Word. On that we completely agree. God is patient and longsuffering. ;-) I would never counsel someone to do what I see is correct. I would direct them to the Word and encourage them to seek out inconsistencies as they find them.

I am thankful He draws us to seek, places people in our path and then reveals as He pleases. Then and only then are we responsible to act on what we "know" Blessings in Him, cindy

Re: divorce/remarriage - posted by PastorPancho, on: 2005/2/2 1:46

I am working with a brother who has been married 3 times now. The first divorce happened when his wife, who is a practicing witch, tried to kill him after he accepted Christ.

The second divorce happened when his next wife refused to comply or support his desire to quit working at P&G, making the big bucks, and go into ministry. This was also complicated/exacerbated by the fact that she didn't support this little guy as he tried to discipline her disrespectful, unwieldy 16 year-old, 300 lb. son. Through all this, he has unswervingly sought to serve the Lord in profound ways.

He is now married to a very godly woman who has spent the last 15 or so years pouring out her life for Jesus.

He is determined to become a full-time pastor. He is highly effective in most every way, leading many to salvation, discipling them, sending them out to serve others, etc.

What is your take on all this, having received a short, inadequate glimpse of it?

Your servant,

PastorPancho

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/2/2 17:23

Quote:
-----The second divorce happened when his next wife refused to comply or support his desire to quit working at P&G, making the big bucks, and go into ministry. This was also complicated/exacerbated by the fact that she didn't support this little guy as he tried to discipline her disrespectful, unwieldy 16 year-old, 300 lb. son. Through all this, he has unswervingly sought to serve the Lord in profound ways.

If I were one who believed multiple marriages were ok, this part above would trouble me greatly. To serve the Lord unswervingly, yet be in contention with his wife? The Lord clearly says that if married couples are at odds, their prayers are hindered. If their prayers are hindered---him eventually divorcing this woman, I question how TRULY effective this man was in serving the Lord? It's easy to serve the Lord when things are "good". It's a much more effective testimony when one suffers for the cause of Christ and does the "good" thing in God's eyes----such as submitting one to another. Did he live the Eph. 5 example of loving his wife---even through her rebellion? That would be, in my opinion, serving the Lord unswervingly.

As for his desire to be a Pastor, I don't believe biblically he is qualified being 2 times divorced/3 times married---with living wives. A Pastor should be a living example of what God has called marriage to be.....As for being "highly effective"...only the Lord knows the truth of that. We must remember that God DOES use many different vessels to bring forth His Will---even those caught up in error and sin. I was drawn to Jesus through a cult. They were clearly in error, yet that is the means He used to bring me to His Son. Just a thought. Blessings in Jesus, Cindy

Re: - posted by Berea14 (), on: 2005/2/2 23:26

Hi there and a special hug to lastblast!

I just stumbled onto this one and must admit that it is a real tough one. The hardest thing I have had to experience in my life is rejection and the resultant divorce. All I can say is that I really had to take a deep look at myself and in so doing discovered a deep rebellion toward God and almost any other person. Being right doesn't get you there. What I have discovered is that asking Him to humble oneself leads to a place where you can accept that He might let you in on what He is thinking and the reasons behind some of these events that occur in our lives. From one perspective I am truly grateful for the experience of this divorce! Yet on the other hand I am truly ashamed because the revelation of my pride and selfishness has been revealed by the damage done in destroying a family unit. Yup, my beloved estranged half of whom I am is also responsible but that I cannot comment on. It is between her and Father in heaven. So, where and what is the reason and destination. Would I love to be in ministry? I used to have that desire until I realised the pride thereof. I have learned

ned the hard way of driving and striving for a goal. It chased a heart away. If I have disqualified myself then I seek the Creator's forgiveness for having obstructed his pre-ordained destiny for me. And yet a thought came the other day! Through this time of brokenness He has been faithful in that He has started to build me up! I am fearful of this for I know there is always another "fall" that will take me higher and closer to Him. In the breaking down of a person there is a process. Jeremiah 17? Where the potter made the marred jar of clay and the Lord speaks to Jeremiah. The thought was that isn't He going to do this with the relationships in my life? He indeed allowed the enemy to destroy almost every relationship I have held dear to me in my life! Despite all these things, He is God alone.

These are thoughts and I know He is speaking quietly to all at the moment. Will we take time to listen?

God bless you all and keep well.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/2/3 8:35

Quote:

-----Through this time of brokenness He has been faithful in that He has started to build me up! I am fearful of this for I know there is always another "fall" that will take me higher and closer to Him. In the breaking down of a person there is a process.

I'm seeing this in my own life as well Berea.....and I believe this is true with all true believers in Christ. The Lord allows situations in our lives to cause us to "fall" in order that we may "SEE" the wretchedness within ourselves and cry out to Him. We, as human beings like to blame others for our unhappiness/struggles, but the fact is, most of our struggles are due to our own sin---whether of pride, selfishness, covetness, adultery, etc, etc. Those sins impact other people and in turn, they sin against us.....It's a vicious circle it seems. This seems to be especially true in a marriage.

Until the Lord reveals OUR PART, we cannot have the love we need---His love, manifested to those around us. It's so much easier to walk by His Spirit in Love towards others when we fully realize our own wretchedness---AND know HE loves us and remains faithful to do the work He has promised to complete. Berea, I haven't forgotten about you. Still praying for restoration of your marriage, and for you---strength to walk according to His Will. Blessings in Jesus, Cindy

Re:, on: 2005/2/4 11:09

lastblast... are you CindyW?

Re: - posted by madmatg (), on: 2005/2/4 17:36

I have been having question about this topic lately and just stumbled on this topic.

From what I've come to understand, the verses from matthew 5 and 19 are addressed to the Jews. I believe this because...

First Matthew was writing primarily to the Jews, from what i understand. Second, the word fornication, which is used instead of adultery, means sexual acts outside of marriage. And wife is the same word used in the early chapters describing Mary, betrothed to Joseph. The Jewish betrothal process as I understand it seems to be a commitment in which the only way out was through "divorce". An example of this is In the story of Jesus birth in Matthew. Joseph being a righteous man was going to put her out quietly, because he had found out she had had sexual relations before the marriage. That would have had to be a divorce, so my belief is that the exception clause in Matthew is there to speak to the Jewish betrothal situation as a special case. And therefore does not apply to the Gentile Christian; which would explain why the other verses on the subject (Mark 10:1-12, Luke 16:18, and 1 cor. 7:10-11) (at least 1 Corinthians) is addressed to a Gentile crowd more than a Jewish one.

Tell me what ya think.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/2/4 18:35

Krispy.....I thought you knew that from the welcome and intro section.. :-P

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/2/4 18:37

I agree with you madmatg.

Re: - posted by madmatg (), on: 2005/2/5 20:58

Sorry, I dont think I stated my opinion from that statement I gave about Matthew. If the Matthew verses are therefore directed to the Jews only, then Gentile Christians, at least, cannot remarry no matter what the circumstance right?

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/2/6 0:57

Quote:

-----Gentile Christians, at least, cannot remarry no matter what the circumstance right?

I believe scripture teaches that no Christian can remarry after a divorce without entering into adultery (mt. 5:32, mt. 19:9, Mk. 10:11-12, Lk. 16:16-18). The death of a spouse is the only thing which frees one from a marriage joined by God(Rom. 7:2-3, I Cor. 7:39). Blessings in Him, Cindy

Re: - posted by madmatg (), on: 2005/2/6 9:31

I'm srry what I mean is for the Jew, breaking off a betrothal would be like a real divorce. And I would say (not sure about this) that they could get remarried if they had only "divorced" from the betrothal. Dont know whether a betrothal is permanent in God's eyes or just the eyes of Jews in the 1st Century AD. Again, I havent read enough OT to be sure about this.

Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2005/2/7 8:39

Hello Madmatg,

Yes, I understand what you're saying and that particular interpretation is disputed between the differing divorce/remarriage camps. Some believe Deut. 24:1-2 is speaking about AFTER the marriage has been consummated. There is historical evidence, shown in the bible as well (Mt. 1:18-24), that if desired, giving a writ of divorcement was necessary in the case of unchastity before the marriage bed. A man couldn't just leave the woman, he has to divorce her. The marriage, though not yet consummated was a legal marriage in every other way.

There's also another camp which believes the fornication (porneia) may have been speaking to incest---that being the only way a man could put away his wife---if it were found out that they were blood relations, a practice forbidden.

In any case, how His disciples reacted to this only "allowance" shows they were shocked. Jesus was teaching something very different, in my opinion, than what the 2 camps of that day were practicing: one, Hillel---divorce for ANY cause. Two, Shammai---divorce for adultery (which actually called for stoning according to the law). The disciples were well aware of both teachings/practices, yet they appeared to be taken aback by what Jesus taught---believing it better to never marry than taking a chance on transgressing His commands concerning marriage or being "stuck" for life with an undesirable spouse. Blessings in Jesus, Cindy :-)

Re: Marriage/Divorce & Remarriage- What does God say about it?, on: 2006/5/8 12:35

Herod and Herodias

Let us next discuss some of the evidences used to support their assertions.

Some assert that because John accused Herod of having his brother's wife, that ALL divorce and remarriage is adultery. But let's look at the facts that will show there is far more to this picture than many want to present.

The first thing to remember is that Jesus had not yet begun His ministry when John started accusing Herod and Herodias. (Luke 3:19-23)

John's ministry was the beginning of, the transition into, the gospel kingdom

Herodias was the niece of Phillip and Herod, the daughter of their own brother Aristobulus, and as such a close kinswoman

.....

Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's brother, thou shalt not approach to his wife: she is thine aunt.
(Lev 18:14 KJV)

....thus marrying her was unlawful for either Phillip or Herod as she was closely related.

Another sin that was committed was that Herod and Herodias met and conspired to put away their spouses for no good reason, then marry each other. (Josephus XVIII, 5)
Not that God approved of this incestuous marriage to begin with, but this frivolous manner in which they held the marriage covenant exposes just how morally corrupt they were.

Some will try to assert a point of 'while his brother still lived' that it was unlawful for Herod to have Herodias, but we see that "while his brother lived" is a moot point entirely.

IF Herodias had not been a neice, and *IF* Philip HAD been dead even, Herod STILL could not have her.
He was ONLY permitted to marry His brothers widow *IF* she was childless according to Gods WHOLE law.
A man is not permitted to marry his brother wife.
He could ONLY marry his brothers widow IF she was left childless...otherwise it was unlawful.

Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife: it is thy brother's nakedness.
(Lev 18:16 KJV)

"If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger: her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of an husband's brother unto her.
(Deu 25:5 KJV) (not dissimilar to Matt 22:25-28)

The Law does not say..."until your brothers death" as would be the case normally where a man can marry a widow.
Gods law is clear...you SHALL NOT marry your brothers wife. Plain and simple.
The only exception to this rule seems to be Deut 25:5 above.

Johns use of 'your brothers wife' in his accusation of Herod quite possibly is explained by the law showing that Herod could NEVER have Herodias as his wife, even if she wasn't his neice, simply because Herodias DID have a child with his brother Philip...thereby making it UNLAWFUL for Herod to EVER have her.

Of course, neither was Philip lawfully permitted to have this neice, so who knows what all John held against them?

=====

Now let's approach this from the NEW covenant pov.
My assertion is that Jesus has done away with frivolous divorce....let's see if that fits as well.

Josephus shows us a great deal on this matter in book 18.
Chapter 5

"ABOUT this time Aretas (the king of Arabia Petres) and Herod had a quarrel on the account following: Herod the tetrarch had, married the daughter of Aretas, and had lived with her a great while; but when he was once at Rome, he lodged with Herod, (15) who was his brother indeed, but not by the same mother; for this Herod was the son of the high priest Simeon's daughter. However, he fell in love with Herodias, this last Herod's wife, who was the daughter of Aristobulus their brother, and the sister of Agrippa the Great. This man ventured to talk to her about a marriage between them; which address, when she admitted, an agreement was made for her to change her habitation, and come to him as soon as he should return from Rome: one article of this marriage also was this, that he should divorce Aretas's daughter"

FRIVOLOUS DIVORCE !!

These two met and conspired to put away their spouses for NO reason other than they wanted each other.
Not to mention the fact that she was his own NIECE, and thus closely related.
In both the old and the new covenants this union was morally corrupt !

In either covenant these two were in opposition to Gods instruction for marriage and presented NO remorse at all for thier actions. They were led by lust, and put away spouses for no reason at all to have each other.

They would have been defying Mosiac law under that covenant, and been going against Jesus own exception in the new

In NO way does their vile incestuous affair NULLIFY our Lord Jesus' own exception.

Re:, on: 2006/5/8 12:38

The divorce/remarriage issue is one of the most argued topics today among christians. Among the remarkably varied beliefs there are a great many variances even within a given doctrine. An example would be the "fornication" (greek "porneia" (strong's g4202) issue.

Here are a few of the differing ideas on what "porneia/fornication" is believed to be by those of the anti-remarriage camp(S)....

- 1) Some of the anti-remarriage doctrines teach that this ONLY applies to Jews, even today, and that divorce was never permitted among the gentiles.
- 2) Some state the same, that it was for the Jews alone, but now has evolved into a matter of unlawful PREmarital sex for all people, Jew or gentile.
- 3) Other believe it only applies to a person who is either divorced and remarried themselves or married to a divorced person, that they are in "fornication" by Jesus' words and putting away is permitted under these conditions.
- 4) Another group actually claims that "fornication" is ONLY incestuous marriages for which Jesus is giving permission to divorce. But that would mean that in Acts 15 that the Jerusalem council was ONLY prohibiting sex with ones blood relatives and omitting the multitude of other sexual sins possible (bestiality, prostitution, etc).
- 5) One of the newest additions to the list of "fornicators" is one I just found where "fornication" is said to be "miscegenation", or the interbreeding of races (so now I guess God is sending folks to hell if one parent was Jewish and the other spanish (/sarcasm)
- 6) Even others admit that "fornication" in Matthew 5 and 19 is adultery, as we believe, but that Jesus isn't permitting remarriage under ANY circumstances..

IÂ'm sure we can add to the list above, but you get my point.

Re:, on: 2006/5/8 12:47

Quote:

lastblast wrote:
Hello Madmatg,

Yes, I understand what you're saying and that particular interpretation is disputed between the differing divorce/remarriage camps. Some believe Deut. 24:1-2 is speaking about AFTER the marriage has been consummated. There is historical evidence, shown in the bible as well (Mt. 1:18-24), that if desired, giving a writ of divorcement was necessary in the case of unchastity before the marriage bed.

and there is evidence that there WERE remarried divorcees alive and well and in fellowship in the church, not having been condemned..

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/15.html>

Quote:

A man couldn't just leave the woman, he has to divorce her. The marriage, though not yet consummated was a legal marriage in every other way.

absolutely.

which is why its preposterous to say that its 'hardheartedness' to put away a wife POST consummation, yet supposedly 'ok' to do it PRE consummation.....in BOTH cases a wife is a wife is a wife.

There is no difference....in BOTH instances she is a covenant WIFE !

Quote:

There's also another camp which believes the fornication (porneia) may have been speaking to incest---that being the only way a man could put away his wife----if it were found out that they were blood relations, a practice forbidden.

a preposterous assumption meant to perpetuate false doctrines.

If porneia isnt all inclusive of sexual immorality there are quite a few passages that dont make any sense....including the command to abstain from 'porneia' in Acts 15....I guess in the councils mind ALL sexual immorality would be fine except for 'incest', *IF* incest alone were the meaning of porneia...

Wrong...porneia is used to include ALL sexual sin, married or unmarried.

Quote:

In any case, how His disciples reacted to this only "allowance" shows they were shocked.

Thats right.

These jews had been permitted to divorce their wives for centuries for EVERY cause...and they did divorce for EVERY cause.

Now being told that they commit adultery now EXCEPT in a case of sexual sin when they divorce and remarry would have staggered any of them that were used to this frivolous divorce allowance for so long...no big surprise at all there.

Quote:

Jesus was teaching something very different, in my opinion, than what the 2 camps of that day were practicing: one, Hillel----divorce for ANY cause. Two, Shammai----divorce for adultery (which actually called for stoning according to the law). The disciples were well aware of both teachings/practices, yet they appeared to be taken aback by what Jesus taught---believing it better to never marry than taking a chance on transgressing His commands concerning marriage or being "stuck" for life with an undesirable spouse. Blessings in Jesus, Cindy :-)

What were the pharisees asking Jesus and what was His response?

Here is the account of Jesus speaking with the pharisees in Matthew.

This account is pretty much identical to Mark 10, except that the words "except for sexual immorality" are in this account and apparently not in Marks account of this story.

Firstly lets read it thru, then we'll break it down and see what is being discussed.

=====

"The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made

them male and female, And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.

His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry. But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.

(Mat 19:3-12 KJV)

=====
"The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him,"

RESPONSE:

As they had been with John, the pharisees were trying anything they could to incite the masses against Jesus. They would ask Him questions hoping His answer would cause the mobs to turn against Him and preferably kill Him.

=====
"and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?"

RESPONSE:

There are two main schools of thought on the passage in Deut 24:1-4.

Those of Shammai thought that it meant ONLY for an actual "unclean" act, and surely nothing less than an actual covenant breaking act committed by the wife gave a man the right to put her away.

Then there was the school of Hillel.

These believed that the man only needed to find some small imperfection in her...such as smelly breath or burning his breakfast....."for any cause" she could be put away.

What is VERY obvious here is that Jesus is being confronted by those of Hillel.... the pharisees of Shammai did not believe in divorce "for EVERY cause" only for legitimately breaking the marriage covenant, only those of Hillel would have asked our Lord this question in this manner.

Matthews account sheds much light on the entire conversation that Marks account neglects.

=====
"And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder"

RESPONSE:

Jesus response shows absolutely here that we ARE discussing the covenant of marriage...not premarriage and not "engagement" as we have it today.

He is clearly discussing a union that GOD Himself has joined together... that is shown conclusively.

He states that this man and woman instead of being two, become "one flesh" (see 1 Corinth. 6:16 as well on this issue for more context). That God has joined them together in HIS union and let no man (or woman obviously) put asunder.... or "separate".

Jesus is discussing the UNION of marriage, that is a fact from the text given.

=====
"They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?"

RESPONSE:

The pharisees invoke the words of Moses Himself, most likely hoping to help incite the mob at this point. They ask Him, can we divorce for any reason, a luxury the Jews had grown quite used to. Jesus response seems to be just what they're looking for, something they can anger the mob with....so they say to Him "hey, MOSES says we can do it".... trying to show that He is defying the law of Moses.

My thoughts are that they already had heard something on His views on marriage and knew to try this against Him. But they must not have heard all the details on the matter or they'd have known He wasn't totally going against Moses in this matter, only greatly narrowing the intent. At least, that is what I conclude based on the complete scriptural, cultural and historical study I've done on this the last year.

=====

"He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so"

RESPONSE:

Here is a key point that MANY abuse. They try to make it like ALL divorce is because of hardheartedness, but Jesus never states that at all. And a study of the history of the Jews and even this brief passage makes it clear.

Remember what the pharisees had just asked Jesus? "can we put away a wife FOR EVERY CAUSE" ? THAT is the hardheartedness Jesus is talking about. He is speaking to men who were putting away their wives for any reason they could come up with....leaving her to be destitute, without means to support herself...just casting an innocent wife out for no reason...THAT is their 'treachery'...

What Moses had dealt with was worse, but the same hardheartedness fueled it before as well. The reason Moses had permitted them to put away their wives without her breaking the covenant was because these horrible Jewish men would beat her or even kill her to be rid of her. So even before Deut 24 was penned, men were unjustly, savagely ridding themselves of an unwanted wife. for those who disbelieve me, please turn on your news or open a paper.... even today these brute beasts are tormenting their innocent wives.

Jesus is right when He says it was because of hardness of heart that Moses had permitted them to just put her away. Moses was trying to protect her from being hurt, abused or even killed at the hands of these monstrous men like we see even today and thus permitted them to put her away without just cause....then later REGULATED this allowance of easily putting her away by giving Deut 24:1-4 in a further attempt to protect her from him.

Jesus never states, nor implies, that ALL divorce by a man is over his hard heart. He was asked a DIRECT question by men trying to set Him up....tempting Him....and He gave them a clear response....except for fornication...unless she ACTUALLY breaches the covenant you commit adultery when you cast her out and remarry another.

The man who has been cheated on for years and finally deserted, who treated his wife like a queen and is completely devastated by her leaving can merely end up filing divorce over broken heartedness instead when he realizes she isn't coming back or going to change her ways. This is exactly how our God felt about Israel and having to put a covenant away with her over her continued whoredoms.

=====

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

RESPONSE:

Jesus has explained that from the beginning what the pharisees were permitted to do was not the way God intended. From the beginning it was not so. From the beginning God intended the man to love and cherish his sweet Eve-like wife as a symbol of our union to Him and to Christ.

From the beginning a man could not just feel like he wanted to be rid of his wife for whatever cause and just cast her out. From the beginning marriage was for life.

Jesus says clearly ONLY for actually breaking the marriage covenant can she be put away now. There will be no more of this "for any cause" divorce. If she doesn't actually break the covenant by fornication, then to put her away and remarry is to commit adultery against her (see Mark 10 "against her"). He "causes her to commit adultery when she remarries" as well as the covenant was not voided in God's eyes since she had done nothing warranting being put away...but was put away "for any cause".

As we have seen already, Jesus IS discussing a MARRIAGE with the pharisees.

Not some fantasy engagement that as that would make the entire discussion void of all meaning altogether. ONLY if they are discussing a lawfully binding, permanent marriage does the passage even make any sense at all....especially considering the pharisees bringing up Moses' words in Deut 24:1-4...the passage that speaks of a bill of DIVORCE.

=====

"His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry.

RESPONSE:

Jesus' disciples are Jews. The SAME Jews who knew that "for any cause" divorce was permitted.

They had grown just as used to the idea, being Jews, that they could end a marriage easily *IF* they found out that they didn't like a wife for whatever reason, as the rest of the Jews had done.

Jesus has just shown these men who had centuries of easy divorce that NO....you cannot do this now.

ONLY for actually breaking the covenant can she be put away.

Imagine today a man really is disgusted with his wife.

She doesn't cook like he wants her to and won't give him sex in the depraved manner he wants and she's put on a few pounds.

Under the Mosaic economy which permitted "for any cause" divorce as interpreted by many, the man could just send her packing with her bill of divorce.

But Jesus says NO.... ONLY if she actually breaks the covenant by whoredom can you put her away.

His disciples were used to the idea of "for any cause", that way if she did start to become annoying to him he could be rid of her. But with Jesus' words it wasn't that easy.

In truth, it IS better not to marry, as they said, rather than to end up stuck with a wife you're miserable with (most likely over your hardheartedness to begin with)

=====

"But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.

RESPONSE:

Jesus' response shows that there aren't many men who CAN go without marrying.

We see more men and women who cannot stay celibate than those who can.

Even God Himself says to us, "it is not good for man to be alone"

Jesus shows indeed, that *IF* one CAN accept it, it is MUCH better to be as a eunuch and never marry.

Some are this way by birth and some have decided to remain unmarried for the kingdom's work... but Jesus has shown that "all men cannot" receive this saying that "it is not good to marry"....only to whom it is given... those who have the ability. Most likely given by God Himself.

Re:, on: 2006/5/8 13:04

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Quote:

-----Gentile Christians, at least, cannot remarry no matter what the circumstance right?

I believe scripture teaches that no Christian can remarry after a divorce without entering into adultery (mt. 5:32, mt. 19:9, Mk. 10:11-12, Lk. 16:16-18). The death of a spouse is the only thing which frees one from a marriage joined by God (Rom. 7:2-3, I Cor. 7:39). Blessings in Him, Cindy

Then you find yourself calling Jesus a deceiver.

You have already claimed you believe that the betrothed IS within a lawful marriage...

Quote:

-----lastblast:

"The marriage, though not yet consummated was a legal marriage in every other way. "

...so even if you say Jesus is only refering to the betrothed wife in Matt 5:32 and Matt 19, you are making the claim that it is still adultery to put this wife away and remarry whom Jesus has made exception for.

Your doctrine seems very contradictory and makes Jesus seem as if He is confused or lying when He makes His exception.

Re:, on: 2006/5/8 13:10

Quote:

PastorPancho wrote:

I am working with a brother who has been married 3 times now. The first divorce happened when his wife, who is a practicing witch, tried to kill him after he accepted Christ.

The second divorce happened when his next wife refused to comply or support his desire to quit working at P&G, making the big bucks, and go into ministry. This was also complicated/exacerbated by the fact that she didn't support this little guy as he tried to discipline her disrespectful, unwieldy 16 year-old, 300 lb. son. Through all this, he has unswervingly sought to serve the Lord in profound ways.

He is now married to a very godly woman who has spent the last 15 or so years pouring out her life for Jesus.

He is determined to become a full-time pastor. He is highly effective in most every way, leading many to salvation, discipling them, sending them out to serve others, etc.

What is your take on all this, having received a short, inadequate glimpse of it?

Your servant,

PastorPancho

I think the qualifications for bishops would apply....'husband of ONE ("first") wife' (not unlawfully divorced/remarried while his former wife lived and also no practicing polygamist)for sure.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/15.html>

Re:, on: 2006/5/8 13:17

Quote:

-----Second, the word fornication, which is used instead of adultery, means sexual acts outside of marriage

Absolutely incorrect.

Porneia is all inclusive of sexual immorality, both by the married and the unmarried. Its historical use by the early church fathers who themselves use the word 'fornication' to describe the adulteries of a wife....and also its clear use in the NT....
.show absolutely that it is not restricted to sex by only unmarried folks.

Also, porneia CANNOT be restricted only to the Jews as it is used in Acts 15 in giving instruction, not to the Jews, but specifically for the gentile converts.

Heres a bit of my own studies on its use from Gods word...

=====

Porneia...aka 'fornication'

Some claim that fornication in Matthew is PRE marital sex alone and that divorce and remarriage for any other reason is not permissible.

But we see that conflicts with the use of the word throughout the NT.

Porneia is whoredom, harlotry, illicit sex of any kind.

This included every sexual sin of every nature.

Sex with men, women, animals or any other perversion in existence or any new ones that a person can come up with.

This can be committed by anyone. A husband or wife or a single person.

When porneia (any sexual sin) is carried out by the married, the crime of adultery is committed.

Even the current english definition of 'fornication' is against these false doctrine as it says NOTHING about Unmarried people, but only that the two engaging in 'fornication' are not married to each other.

Here is the current definition...

Main Entry: fornication

Pronunciation: "for-n&-'kA-sh&n

Function: noun

: consensual sexual intercourse between two persons not married to each other

Source: Merriam-Webster's Medical Dictionary, © 2002 Merriam-Webster, Inc.

Notice not a single word about either person being 'unmarried'.

One or both could be married to someone else, they just aren't married to EACH OTHER.

Or both could be single.

Fornication means just what porneia presents,...having sex with someone who ISNT your lawful spouse, whether you're married or not.

Here is the greek word rendered as "fornication" in your KJV bibles.

G4202

???????

porneia

por-ni'-ah

From G4203; harlotry (including adultery and incest); figuratively idolatry: - fornication.

=====

Also....

In Acts 15 and 21, four items are given for gentiles to abstain from as presented in the following verses.

Act 15:20 But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood.

Act 15:29 That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well.

Act 21:25 As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from strangled, and from fornication (G4202, same as the exception clause in Matthew).

1. Things offered to idols
2. blood
3. Things strangled
4. fornication (G4202 same as the exception clause).

I ask those who say fornication (porneia G4202) is premarital or betrothal sex only and not "adultery", why is it that the writer ONLY used "porneia" in Acts 15 and 21 and didn't seem to think it necessary to mention "adultery" as something to abstain from as well?

He's already on the topic of sexual sin here, why not mention the big one *IF* adultery is a separate sin?

The reason is "porneia" covers ANY sexual sin. Paul knew that as did whoever rendered Jesus' words in Matthew into Greek.

When it was used in Acts 15, he was laying out a blanket coverage for ANY sexual sin, that we abstain from ALL sexual sin. Just as Jesus meant all sexual sin in Matthew 19.

"Porneia" (whoredom, harlotry), by default, would be "adultery" within a marriage; there was no need to mention adultery, it was covered. And neither was there any need for Jesus to use the word adultery, which would have left a hole or two in His teaching (see "why didn't Jesus say 'except for adultery'").

=====

1 Corinthians chapter 5

We see in the following passage that only the fornicator is mentioned..

I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators:

Yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world.

But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat. For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person.

(1Co 5:9-13 KJV)

Now, *IF* adultery isn't included in 'porneia' or 'fornication', why on earth didn't Paul mention not keeping company with the adulterer?

Was Paul stating to not keep company with the fornicator...but hey, it's ok to hang out with adulterers?

Hardly.

Paul used a word that covers all sexual sin.

He mentions a "brother" and isn't it odd that the word he chose rendered as 'fornicator' here is the masculine form of porneia?

G4205

???????

pornos

Thayer Definition:

- 1) a man who prostitutes his body to another's lust for hire
- 2) a male prostitute
- 3) a man who indulges in unlawful sexual intercourse, a fornicator

Paul was clearly stating to not keep company with any man called a brother who is out having illicit sex.....married or not.

Porneia and its forms are all inclusive of sexual sin of the married and the UNmarried.

=====

In Ephesians and Colossians both we see references to Fornication, but none about adultery.

But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints; Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks. For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God.

(Eph 5:3-5 KJV)

(whoremonger being the masculine form ... pornos)

and

When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory. Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry: For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience:

(Col 3:4-6 KJV)

So if this porneia (fornication) does not include all sexual sin, then we would have to suppose that Paul is only directing these two churches to abstain from SOME sexual sins (incest, premarital sex, etc) , and surely not adultery (if it were the case that porneia is not all inclusive of sexual immorality)

=====

When Jesus' words were rendered as "porneia" in Matt 5:32 and 19:9, He was saying the same thing "Sexual Sin" or whoredom. Jesus did not mean just PREmarital sex, and neither does the definition of 'fornication' present that idea either.

He used a word, the same as in Acts 15, that covers ALL sexual sin....whoredom....as 'fornication' clearly shows as well.porneia even covers the possibility of bestiality if it has occurred.

We cannot divorce our spouse and remarry without committing adultery against that union, EXCEPT for any sexual sin... EXCEPT that this person we marry has had sex with someone they arent married to.

That is what is clearly conveyed with 'porneia' and what is also presented with the REAL definition of 'fornication' (not the Unmarried nonsense that some pass off on us)

HOME

Quote:

Re:, on: 2006/5/8 17:50

Fornication (porneia g4202) cannot mean illicit sexual activity only 'during Jewish betrothal' as some try to state.

The word porneia (rendered 'fornication') is directed SPECIFICALLY to GENTILE converts in Acts 15 to tell them to abstain from 'fornication' (porneia G4202).

=====
"Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God: But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood.
(Act 15:19-20)

fornication

G4202

????????

porneia

por-ni'-ah

From G4203; harlotry (including adultery and incest); figuratively idolatry: - fornication.

=====
Since betrothal is a Jewish custom, using this word 'porneia' to instruct the gentiles means that porneia cannot in any way specifically mean, and be limited to, sexual sin during the JEWISH betrothal period.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/fornicationnotonlyduringbetrothal.html>

Repentance from Sin - posted by JesusIsMyLrd (), on: 2006/5/9 9:15

Dear Brothers,

This is a very contraversial issue!! i am amazed every time it comes up, how hurt some get, and how offended it makes people. So with my post here, i want to be as gentle as a dove, yet speaking the truth.

We can clearly see that in God's Word, remarriage is wrong. Divorce, in some cases, is acceptable under the Jewish betrothal and such. But remarriage is not.

As for the "repent of the sin of remarriage, and then keep living together", this is a grave error. i say grave, because the Bible says that God will judge the unrepentant (Paraphrase there ;-)). Repentance is not only haveing a change of mind, but of action too. To say that a drunkard can repent of being a drunkard, and keep drinking is not right, so why would we say it is alright for two to stay together, who are in adultery? So, we see that it is (As John Baptist said) not lawfull to have her...

So, there is my post. i pray that God will be glorified, and that He will guid us all as we seek Him. i know that if i am wrong on this, because i seek Him, He will bring me to the truth. And if we all seek Him, He will bring us into the unity of His Spirit. May our flesh and persons be put down, and CHRIST be lifted up. Amen.

Re: Repentance from Sin, on: 2006/5/9 11:02

Quote:

We can clearly see that in God's Word, remarriage is wrong. Divorce, in some cases, is acceptable under the Jewish betrothal and such. But remarriage is not.

Divorce/remarriage is never in the 'plan', but I believe Ive refuted the absurdity that those who are remarried need to divorce or go to hell.

It has definitely been shown as errant this false doctrine that 'fornication' is only within Jewish betrothal...READERS see this link....

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/fornicationnotonlyduringbetrothal.html>

It doesnt matter what 'tone' you use friend, the truth of Gods WHOLE council shows a clear picture.

He doesnt like divorce, but someone who IS divorce and remarried isnt going to hell if they dont divorce the second time

Quote:

-----As for the "repent of the sin of remarriage, and then keep living together", this is a grave error.

Please.

My site shows conclusive PROOF that there were remarried divorcees in the church IN fellowship, not having been condemned.

Your doctrine stands refuted wholesale.

Calls to emotion are irrelevant...Gods TRUTH is all that matters here.

Quote:

-----i say grave, because the Bible says that God will judge the unrepentant (Paraphrase there ;-)). Repentance is not only having a change of mind, but of action too. To say that a drunkard can repent of being a drunkard, and keep drinking is not right, so why would we say it is alright for two to stay together, who are in adultery? So, we see that it is (As John Baptist said) not lawful to have her...

READERS please see my page here concerning Herod and Herodias.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/19.html>

This couple is NOT evidence for this doctrine.

Please take the time to even the dialogue with cindy as well, it also sheds some light on certain points.

Quote:

-----So, there is my post. i pray that God will be glorified, and that He will guide us all as we seek Him. i know that if i am wrong on this, because i seek Him, He will bring me to the truth. And if we all seek Him, He will bring us into the unity of His Spirit. May our flesh and persons be put down, and CHRIST be lifted up. Amen.

So brother, did you have any refutation to offer from Gods whole word?

Im only asking because even satan appears as an angel of light...we know what smooth sounding words he used with Eve to take her from Gods will.

False doctrines usually do the same.

I dont need smooth words because I am presenting an unrefutable truth from the WHOLE of Gods word. I dont need to call to emotions because the WHOLE truth stands on its own.

READERS.

Here is my homepage.

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/>

Ive spent the last two years in hardcore study, devoting time each and every day trying to put this ALL into proper context...fitting even the smallest details into their proper perspective to find the whole truth in this matter.

when Jesus says 'except for fornication (whoredom)' you commit adultery if you divorce and remarry, that EXACTLY what He means.

Anyone that tells you that you committed adultery if you remarried after your ex cheated is simply telling you that your Lord either lied to you or is completely without knowledge Himself (Jesus) on the matter.

The Lords exception does NOT apply only to Jews or premarital sex....my site exposes this fabrication from the pits for a ll to see.

Those of you who HAVE remarried please dont fall for smooth words and calls to emotions....please read my site and add it up for yourselves.

If you do and still dont believe, then go in peace and ignore me and my words.

If you can easily add it all up, as most who do read my site usually do, then praise God and stop worrying about going to hell simply because there is a mistake in your past.

You are not condemned to celibacy simply because you were/are divorced.

God bless
wm

Re:, on: 2006/5/9 12:16

There WERE remarried divorcees in fellowship in the church...

<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/15.html>

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2006/5/9 13:09

FOC, you have posted much material here and I haven't had time to read it all but I do wish to comment on one thing that I read from your comments on the 1 Timothy 5:9 verse...

Quote:
-----Wife of one man This requirement clearly is not speaking of a woman who had a man-harem. There is no real issue of women marrying multiple husbands given in the bible nor in historical accounts. This leaves either the remarried widow, or the remarried divorcee. It cannot be a remarried widow as no law forbade the widow to remarry. Paul even tells widows "I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn. (1Co 7:8-9 KJV) Paul would be setting these widows up to be rejected from this list later if she did remarry. Also, Paul even insists that younger widows REMarry here...

Your argument here seems to be putting the ending of a marriage by divorce on the same grounds as the ending of a marriage by the death of one of the spouses. Your argument mixes the two and I'm not sure we should do that.

Paul wrote the following general rules about marriage...

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)

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)

Paul would not contradict the verses above by condemning a widow that had remarried at some point after her husband's death. Therefore, could it be possible that he is saying in the 1 Timothy verse that she should not be someone who had put away her husband and then married someone else at some point in her life? This was also condemned by Jesus in the following verse...

And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. *And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.*

(Mar 10:11-12)

Also, it would seem from Scripture that the only exceptions to these rules of marriage are adultery (Matthew 19:9) and desertion (1 Corinthians 7:15).

In Christ,

Ron

Re:, on: 2006/5/9 18:32

Quote:
-----Therefore, could it be possible that he is saying in the 1 Timothy verse that she should not be someone who had put away her husband and then married someone else at some point in her life?

absolutely my point.
if she has put away or been put away and been remarried, she is not to be put on this list of widows.
If a man has been put away or put away his wife, then he is not to be considered for the position of bishop.

Altho, Im not sure yet that this is not modified by the man or woman who lawfully has put away a spouse for scriptural reasons.

I believe the phrase 'spouse of ONE spouse' is completely interchangeable as divorce and remarriage was a common problem at the time and since we know there was no issue with women having multiple husbands, the one logical conclusion is that Paul is addressing divorcees who had remarried...something not quite the example to live by.
This rule applied to a widow and also applied to those applying for the positions of overseer or others of authority in the church.

I believe its very easy to make ALL relevant scripture fit perfectly in this matter....I have yet to find any scripture that doesn't fit quite easily.

Quote:
----- And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.
(Mar 10:11-12)

Also, it would seem from Scripture that the only exceptions to these rules of marriage are adultery (Matthew 19:9) and desertion (1 Corinthians 7:15).

There are MANY contingencies not covered in scripture where the 'spirit' of the law should guide us when we have no clear words from our Lord.

Does a God who would permit divorce in a case of whoredom then turn and say 'you're stuck with your animal' when this man savagely beats and rapes his wife and even their own daughter ?

I think the spirit of the law is just as important as the letter of the law.
when i 'test' this scenario of abuse against God's whole word concerning marriage I see a God who surely would not tell his woman she was bound to this man till death, then release the woman who was simply deserted.

Re:, on: 2006/5/10 18:19

Quote:
-----lastblast:
"The Lord clearly says that if married couples are at odds, their prayers are hindered

uh, technically it says the man's prayers are the ones hindered (cut off) if he isn't treating her as a co-heir in Christ.

1Pe 3:7 Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered.

Very critical that we interpret that correctly.

Re:, on: 2006/5/10 18:44

Quote:

lastblast wrote:
Robert,

Is the woman in Deut. 24:1-4 called an adulteress in her new marriage? The writ of divorcement given to her allowed her to remarry---it was even in the wording of the document given to her. It appears that the second marriage was viewed as lawful, not adultery. Jesus however, taught unbiblical re marriage=adultery---not lawful marriage. Adultery CAN be repented of/forsaken. One is not deemed "unclean" when they repent. A marriage CAN be restored. I see a big difference between what Jesus taught and what is being said there in Deut. 24:1-4. Besides, we are not Jewish nor follow Jewish customs----which back then, women had no rights concerning divorce---the husband's did the divorcing.

Jesus clearly showed that a woman COULD divorce and He forbade it. To make this only about a man not being able to take back someone "unclean/defiled", but a woman can take back a man who has been defiled doesn't make a whole lot of sense---biblically. Throughout scripture we see that God Himself continually takes back those who are "defiled"-----in the OT and especially in the NT. Blessings in Jesus, Cindy

What you continually dismiss, cindy, is that in Romans 7 Paul is speaking to those who know the law in Rome, possibly Hebrews there.

These that knew the law would have understood that Paul's statement was comparing the Mosaic law to this 'law of the husband' he speaks of that is until death.

You seem to think Romans 7 has ADDED this dynamic that marriage is for life until death, it hasn't.

This 'law of the husband', as you full well know, was put into place 'from the beginning'...so Paul isn't introducing some N T 'until death' policy at all in Romans 7.

That being the case, we see that this 'law' cannot have been UNconditional or Moses finds himself being the greatest lawbreaker of all time by permitting men to divorce as far back as Leviticus 21, then not only that, but adding to God's LAW (Deut 24:1-4) actual instruction as to how to BREAK this supposed UNbreakable law of the husband.

Something is quite amiss in your belief system if this is your doctrine.

Since we KNOW Moses would not have defied God in such a manner, we know that his allowance for divorce had to have been within God's will.

Any serious study shows that Moses permitted EASY divorce so that a man could rid himself of this wife he no longer wanted, rather than have her who had done no wrong be victim to this animal's savage treatment of her.

Moses permitted EASY divorce, as evidenced both by Deut 24:1-4 and historical facts themselves, to protect this wife.

There is no allowance in the law to divorce an adulterous wife.
Her punishment was death according to Deut chap 22, very clearly.

When Joseph was about to put Mary away, consummated or not, she was his covenant wife, lawfully and completely bound in marriage to Joe.

He was not invoking some unwritten permission to put away a betrothed wife who had committed sexual sin....her punishment under the Mosaic law they lived under would have been death had she actually committed sexual sin against her husband (aka 'adultery').

Joe was going to put her away (divorce) quietly because he knew what the possibilities were for her.

Now we believe also that during this time that capital punishment was forbidden by the Jews in general due to Roman rule (evidenced by Jesus being put to death by the Romans and not the Jews themselves)...most of the time divorce, not death, was being used to deal with adultery as well.

Deut 24:1-4 clearly shows a divorce has happened and this wife given a bill of divorce.
A frivolous, yet lawful divorce has taken place.

In Romans 7, NO divorce is spoken of to these that 'know the law'....she apparently had not been lawfully released from the 'law of the husband' there and as such would be an adulteress if she remarried.

These that 'know the law' would surely know that *IF* she had been freed from this 'law of the husband' with a bill of divorce, that she would have been free to remarry and then could never return to her first husband under any circumstances.

I believe the reason you misunderstand Romans 7 is that you seem to reject that this 'law of the husband' that Paul refers to is NOT something new, nor is this idea of being bound for life to a spouse.

Re: Repentance from Sin - posted by lastblast (), on: 2006/5/10 19:22

Quote:

-----We can clearly see that in God's Word, remarriage is wrong. Divorce, in some cases, is acceptable under the Jewish betrothal and such. But remarriage is not.

As for the "repent of the sin of remarriage, and then keep living together", this is a grave error. I say grave, because the Bible says that God will judge the unrepentant (Paraphrase there). Repentance is not only having a change of mind, but of action too. To say that a drunkard can repent of being a drunkard, and keep drinking is not right, so why would we say it is alright for two to stay together, who are in adultery? So, we see that it is (As John Baptist said) not lawful to have her...

Amen brother. I think I've said my peace on this issue in this thread, so I won't add anymore. Blessings in Him, Cindy :-)

Re: A lot of questions - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/5/10 19:53

I'm interrupting a very interesting presentation with questions that has been on my mind for years. I haven't read the entire thread, so if these questions have already been answered, please let me know:

Can someone discuss the marriage vows: ex where did they originate, how biblical are they, (re saying vows...) What about saying vows that one has no ability to keep because of immaturity, or some personality defect?

"What GOD has joined together.. " Does this come from scripture? At what point does GOD join a union? And what unions might GOD not be joining - any? What about non-believers, rebellious sinners who marry for all the wrong reasons?

What about those countries where parents arrange marriages - sometimes even marrying children - sometimes against their will?

Does God join only state-licensed unions?

What power does the religious leader have from God in saying, 'Before God I now pronounce...' What about non-believing clergy?

Can the head of the household not do that - ex the father of the bride?

Feel free to ignore these questions if you believe they are off the topic. I'm just wondering if some of our traditions or our understanding of marriage may actually contribute to the issues surrounding divorce.

We need to be clear about the laws. After all, if something is law, then breaking that law a crime, and must be treated as such.

Diane

Re:, on: 2006/5/10 20:41

Quote:
-----What about those countries where parents arrange marriages - sometimes even marrying children - sometimes against their will?

Thats an interesting question.
Ill see what I can dig up if this is actaully against the persons will altogether.

Quote:
-----"What GOD has joined to gether.. " Does this come from scripture?

Absolutely.
both in Mark 10 and Matthew 19 Jesus uses the phrase.
altho, both of those accounts are one and the same event.
<http://www.geocities.com/divorceandremarriage/25.html>

Quote:

Does God join only state-liscenced unions?

Lack of a license does not relieve one of vows/oaths/promises made to another person and before God.

A license is a 'permission' to do something...only God has the authority to tell a man and woman they cannot be husband and wife before Him.

A license is surely a good idea to protect ones spouse and children from a godless state tho.

AS for these supposed 'laws of the land'...when the states begin prosecuting those who live together in a sexual union without a covenant before God, then we can assume it is 'unlawful' to live in the same manner, except having made a covenant of marriage before Him.

Quote:
-----What power does the religious leader have from God in saying, 'Before God I now pronounce...' What about non-believeing clergy?

None.
Isaac took Rebekkah without this nonsense.
who 'requires' it is the state.
and it is for their protection so that you dont use the protections they have offered your spouse for one woman this week and another the next.

The state, if you are claiming to be 'married' wants to be sure that your marriage is set in stone.
Otherwise things like insurance companies are going to be put at great risk.

Re:, on: 2006/5/10 20:44

Quote:

lastblast wrote:

Amen brother. I think I've said my peace on this issue in this thread, so I won't add anymore. Blessings in Him, Cindy :-)

stick around and lets discuss this topic for a while :-)

Re:, on: 2006/5/11 0:35

"Bound by law " vs "not in bondage"
a game of semantics

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 Gods 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

???????

doulou?

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 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 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 didn't give His exception to no one.

Thus this argument that the believer is still 'bound' even though 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...

Re:, on: 2006/5/11 0:47

Quote:
-----His statement is further solidified by referring to Deut 24:1-2. The situation presented by Moses is a woman marrying a man under false pretences, by claiming to be a virgin. Moses spelled out, that he may divorce her by writing a letter of divorcement, simply to state that he is okay with anyone else marrying her.

Absolutely incorrect.

The crime of a woman being found not a virgin is covered just two chapters before in Deut 22....her punishment is death, not divorce.

=====
If any man take a wife, and go in unto her, and hate her, And give occasions of speech against her, and bring up an evil name upon her, and say, I took this woman, and when I came to her, I found her not a maid:

Then shall the father of the damsel, and her mother, take and bring forth the tokens of the damsel's virginity unto the elders of the city in the gate: And the damsel's father shall say unto the elders, I gave my daughter unto this man to wife, and he hateth her; And, lo, he hath given occasions of speech against her, saying, I found not thy daughter a maid; and yet these are the tokens of my daughter's virginity. And they shall spread the cloth before the elders of the city. And the elders of that city shall take that man and chastise him; And they shall amerce him in an hundred shekels of silver, and give them unto the father of the damsel, because he hath brought up an evil name upon a virgin of Israel: and she shall be his wife; he may not put her away all his days.

--->But if this thing be true, and the tokens of virginity be not found for the damsel: Then they shall bring out the damsel to the door of her father's house, and the men of her city shall stone her with stones that she die: because she hath wrought folly in Israel, to play the whore in her father's house: so shalt thou put evil away from among you.

(Deu 22:13-21)

=====
The allowance in Deut 24 is exactly as the pharisees had presented it except that it was not a 'command' but a permission.

Moses clearly states in Deut 24 that "she find no favor in his eyes because he has found some uncleanness in her".

Jesus in no way corrects the pharisees understanding of the law meaning 'for EVERY cause'.

Deut was given over approximately 40 days.

That means that *IF* your doctrine were actually correct, then God made a law about this woman not found a virgin and her punishment being death in Deut 22.....then turned around in less than a month and supposedly AMENDED this law in Deut 24.

Oddly enough not many christians are going to believe that either Moses or God is that absent minded.

Also, *IF* your doctrine were correct, then according to the WHOLE law, the husband would be the ONLY person not permitted to put this woman to death.

Later in Deut 22 we see that this same betrothed woman is STILL to be put to death for willful whoredom.

=====

If a damsel that is a virgin be betrothed unto an husband, and a man find her in the city, and lie with her; Then ye shall bring them both out unto the gate of that city, and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel, because she cried not, being in the city; and the man, because he hath humbled his neighbour's wife: so thou shalt put away evil from among you.

(Deu 22:23-24)

=====

That is a fairly blatant contradiction.

Either this woman is to be divorced or put to death.

You say the husband is to divorce her, but since there is no AMENDMENT to Deut 22:23-24, this seems to make Gods word a complete mockery in this issue.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/11 14:01

So did yaw folks figure this one out? or are you more confused now more than ever? :-?

Re:, on: 2006/5/11 14:43

Quote:

MrBillPro wrote:

So did yaw folks figure this one out? or are you more confused now more than ever? :-?

Well, Jesus gives a CLEAR exceptoin for harlotry.

there 'should' be no confusion on this issue at all, except that some brethren cannot accept our Lords CLEAR exception and add their own confusing distortions into the mix... ("fornication = betrothal sex", Deut 22 was amended by Deut 24 a pprox 3.5 days later, "fornication = incest", "fornication = miscegenation", etc)

Id think that if one just accepts it as He stated it, then there'd be no need for folks like me to have to weed thru the details for two solid years just to finally conclude that, just as it appears, Jesus was indeed offering an exception that causes no adultery to be committed upon remarriage after the ex was put away for sexual sin.

Its actually the folks who cannot just take 'EXCEPT for fornication' (harlotry, illicit sex) as He stated it that pretty much cause ALL of the confusion in this matter.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/11 18:11

Quote:

FOC wrote:

Well, Jesus gives a CLEAR exceptoin for harlotry.

there 'should' be no confusion on this issue at all, except that some brethren cannot accept our Lords CLEAR exception and add their own confusing distortions into the mix...

150 Replies and over 7239 views that's pretty clear to me everyone totally understands:-? no distortions here, at least not on your posts, you cleared it up for all of us thanks for explaining all this to us great job!

Re:, on: 2006/5/11 20:48

Quote:

150 Replies and over 7239 views that's pretty clear to me everyone totally understands:-? no distortions here, at least not on your posts, you cleared it up for all of us thanks for explaining all this to us great job!

You know what's funny ?

You're the first person I've run into in these years since the internet came about that I'm completely lost as to your intent :-)

I can't tell if you're being sarcastic or stating how you feel :-D

do you feel I'm distorting anything?

If so, please show me where and I'll be more than happy to try to show how I drew my conclusions :-)

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/11 23:08

No sarcasm here just looks as if you have done your homework with 150 Replies and over 7239 views and no others here debating you, I was just kinda summing this thread up, sorry I know I can be confusing sometimes, even after being married 32 years my wife will tell you the same thing, but she says it keep her on her toes. :-)

Re:, on: 2006/5/12 0:46

Quote:

MrBillPro wrote:

No sarcasm here just looks as if you have done your homework with 150 Replies and over 7239 views and no others here debating you, I was just kinda summing this thread up, sorry I know I can be confusing sometimes, even after being married 32 years my wife will tell you the same thing, but she says it keep her on her toes. :-)

32 years....quite a long time....still got her guessing, eh ? ;-)

Well, I came into the thread rather late and I guess lastblast pulled out for some reason.

I'd bet there will be plenty of discussion as soon as folks digest my ramblings here :-)

Re: Marriage/Divorce & Remarriage- What does God say about it?, on: 2006/5/13 9:22

Hi Cindy,

I think FOC has this interpretation correct,

Quote:

-----technically it says the man's prayers are the ones hindered (cut off) if he isn't treating her as a co-heir in Christ.

Because of the shift from the plural pronoun 'ye', to the singular 'your', in the verse he quotes.

1Pe 3:7

Likewise, **ye** husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that **your** prayers be not hindered.

Perhaps the plural 'prayers' adds to the confusion, and possibly a modern version of scripture does not show clearly the change from an address to husbands in general, to one husband in particular.... but that's what Peter said.

EDIT: Obviously, if a husband's prayers are being hindered, there will be repercussions on the wife, but Peter is laying the responsibility with the man.

This is completely in keeping with the emphasis on masculine / male responsibility which Jesus puts in His re-statement of God's heart, even when making the exception in Matt 19:9. You will notice when comparing all the references to His statements, that all but a couple, are spoken to (the) men (who had asked the question).

Had He thought that women should take an equal share of the responsibility, that was His opportunity to include it in what He knew would go down in our scriptures, but He didn't change what had been said in the beginning, about a man leaving his father and his mother and **cleaving** to his (own) wife.

I'm sure this is another reason for the way Jesus dealt with the Pharisees in John 8. Not only did they know the law (and did not bring the man) but, Jesus knew that God places the *responsibility* on the man, for making the invitation in the first place - in this case, to someone else's wife - God *knowing* that He has created women to be responsive to such invitations.... (or no-one would ever get married!)... Further, He re-inforces this *order*, by phrasing the fate of a woman divorced for anything other than porneia - "and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."

This does not absolve women of the responsibility to say 'no' when it's appropriate, especially if she rightly wishes to be treated as an equal in every other way within a (Christian) marriage.

I believe that Jesus was underlining the truth in 'We love Him because He first loved us', which is the pattern to which Adam was made.

This whole teaching about the leadership of men in relationships with women, is counter-intuitive to fallen man*, and seeks to re-instate God's intended order. It gives 'Adam' the opportunity to redeem himself (in this respect), in the same way as Paul says women will be saved in childbearing if.... 1 Timothy 2:15 - where 'Eve' has an opportunity to redeem herself.

There are so many variations in the last three qualities mentioned in that verse 15, I'd be interested in comment from those who know Greek.

"Notwithstanding through bearing of children they shall be saved, so they continue in faith, love and holiness with discretion."

Thus Tyndale renders the verse, throwing the conditional feel of the 'if' (which is in many translations), completely in the other direction, and putting the emphasis on the *salvation* of the woman (as one would expect the Lord also does) - salvation (from physical death) being a pre-requisite to their being *able to continue* in showing forth *any* qualities of godliness.

EDIT * I think Adam *gave away* his instinctive leadership quality, when he chose to follow Eve rather than *insisting* that she follow him **into obedience to God**.