





C | Miles | http://www.sermonindex.net/

## **General Topics :: Marrying The Same Person Twice?**

## Marrying The Same Person Twice? - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/3/16 13:27

Ok guys, I am curious what ya'll think about this.

In our culture here in America, divorce is becoming more and more common place. And then also people getting re-married to another person similarly common.

It is completely obvious by the scripture that if you are divorced, and you marry another person, that you are committing adultery if your first spouse is still alive.

What I want to bring up, is the issue of people who get divorced, and then later re-marry each other. This practice seems widely accepted, even by churches, as though it is somehow good and holy for it to take place.

Now, the question I am asking about this issue is this, How is marrying the same person a second time any diff erent than going and marrying another person? Does anyone considered this to be adultery?

Now I have considered the fact that say the two people never marry anyone else, they just got a divorce, and then they I ater re-marry. I am not certain there is any problem with this situation. But what still seems to be embraced just as much, are situations where a couple divorces, one or both of them re-marry, divorce again, and then are re-married to each oth

Although in the first question, it may or may not be adultery, I believe it is most certainly adultery in the second example. Anyone's thoughts on this topic?

Re: Marrying The Same Person Twice? - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/3/16 13:41

#### Quote:

-But what still seems to be embraced just as much, are situations where a couple divorces, one or both of them re-marry, divorce ag ain, and then are re-married to each other.

The Bible tells us what it is if someone divorces, remarries, and goes back to the first.

Deu 24:1 ¶ When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, be cause he hath found some uncleanness in her: then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give in her hand, and se nd her out of his house.

Deu 24:2 And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's .

Deu 24:3 And the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, and giveth in her hand, and sendeth her out of his house; or if the latter husband die, which took her his wife;

Deu 24:4 Her former husband, which sent her away, may not take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled; for that abomination before the LORD: and thou shalt not cause the land to sin, which the LORD thy God giveth thee an inheritance.

## Re: Marrying The Same Person Twice?, on: 2007/3/16 14:03

Quote:	
It is completely obvious by the scripture that if you are divorced, an	d you marry another person, that you are committing adultery if y
our first spouse is still alive.	

This is not entirely true... go back and read scripture again. There are specific circumstances under which remarriage is ok according to scripture. (1 Cor. 7:15 & Matt 19:9)

## Quote: -----Now, the question I am asking about this issue is this, How is marrying the same person a second time any different than going and marrying another person? Does anyone considered this to be adultery?

In order for there to be adultry in the eyes of God, then God must not recognize the divorce as vaild. In other words, God is holding the couple to their original vows and not accepting their divorce as legitimate. Therefore, if they get a (worldly) divorce (other than when it is allowed in scripture) God still continues to consider them bound together. Their divorce me ans nothing to Him.

So, if they remarry... God never considered them divorced in the first place.

Simple as that.

Now, if they divorce, remarry someone else, divorce again, and then remarry the original spouse... that gets a bit sticky. But we can "what if" all day long. I would suggest that if this does not directly effect you... dont worry about it.

Krispy

## Re: - posted by blinx (), on: 2007/3/16 15:15

To the married I give this command (not I, but the Lord): A wife must not separate from her husband. 11But if she does, she must remain unmarried or else be reconciled to her husband. And a husband must not divorce his wife.

I Cor. 7:10,11

We can see by this verse that divorced wifes are encouraged by the Lord to re-marry their husband, or stay single.

### Re: Marrying The Same Person Twice? - posted by lastblast (), on: 2007/3/16 15:33

# Quote: -----Now, the question I am asking about this issue is this, How is marrying the same person a second time any different than going and marrying another person? Does anyone considered this to be adultery?

Hi Ben,

There is a world of difference in the scenerios. In the first, one is simply acknowledging their sin in divorcing their coven ant spouse----the "remarriage" is the FULL act of repentance publically. They are simply coming back to the relationship that God has ordained and joined as "ONE". It is NEVER adultery to come back to the One God joins you with. It IS h owever, adultery to join with one God has NOT joined together. In the case of remarriage (while your covenant spouse lives), it IS adultery because one is STILL joined to their covenant spouse.......and will be considered "ONE" to God un til one of them dies.

If one is in a relationship Jesus called "adultery", ie: remarriage to another person, it would NOT be adultery to forsake th at relationship and return to one's covenant spouse. Again, they are simply repenting from their sin (divorce and remarri

age adultery) and returning to their covenant spouse----the one God joined them to. There is absolutely no biblical evid ence that a remarriage is binding in the sight of God when that remarriage was termed "adultery" by Him.

### Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/3/16 15:46

My only contention would be that when Jesus met the woman at the well, he plainly said that she had more than on hus band. I would say if Jesus recongnized that they were husbands, rather than boyfriends, God may very well agree.

Not that what she did was good, no not at all, but none the less Jesus called them husbands.

This topic has been covered very well over the years so I will leave it at what has been said.

### Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/3/16 17:59

Quote:
PreachParsly wrote:

My only contention would be that when Jesus met the woman at the well, he plainly said that she had more than on husband. I would say if Jesus rec ongnized that they were husbands, rather than boyfriends, God may very well agree.

Not that what she did was good, no not at all, but none the less Jesus called them husbands.

This topic has been covered very well over the years so I will leave it at what has been said.

Did the have the term, "boyfriend" back then?

The Bible forbids remarriage. The world uses the term remarriage, but if it's called adultery in the Bible then it can't be a second marriage.

Jordan

## Re: - posted by Ekklesia1, on: 2007/3/16 18:26

Quote:	

blinx wrote:

To the married I give this command (not I, but the Lord): A wife must not separate from her husband. 11But if she does, she must remain unmarried or else be reconciled to her husband. And a husband must not divorce his wife.

I Cor. 7:10,11

We can see by this verse that divorced wifes are encouraged by the Lord to re-marry their husband, or stay single.

Notice that your passage is not in any disagreement with Deuteronomy 24:1-4, that PreachParsly presented in an earlier post.

Paul tells this woman to remain **unmarried** or reconcile knowing full well that if she does **remarry** against his command that it is abominiation, according to the law, before the Lord for her to ever go back to her former husband.

Paul telling her to remain **unmarried** is conclusive proof that she could indeed marry another in that it would be a **"marriage"**, even if it is not the right thing to do, otherwise Paul would simply have told her 'do not fornicate" as he had shown example of in verses 7:1-2 there.

If re-marriage weren't possible, then Pauls words to her there are pretty much meaningless.

Paul never tells a single person to divorce and reconcile anywhere because Paul knows that once remarried we are forbidden by God to return to that former spouse. Once remarried it is **abomination** to Him to ever reunite that former marria

ge.

Deuteronomy 24:!-4 is often mistaken as a 'permission' to divorce. It isn't.

It is Moses' (thus Gods) attempt to curb a practice already being carried out in Israel, the casting away of a wife for no ju stifible cause.

In an attempt to slow this down, Moses lays out requirements for the man that he must give it to her in writing, and he must put it into her own hand, and he must then send her out of his house.

In doing this Moses has made it so that a man would not act in a moment of rashness, but had to purpose in his heart to put this woman away. By the time he sat down and wrote out the bill of divorce he might have enough time to cool down and think about what he was doing.

It apparently didnt work because the practice only grew worse and the Jews even twisted this 'sufferance" to put away a wife for no just reason into a 'commandment' by Moses to put her away for these things so that finally they werent supp osedly guilty of anything since it was Moses who 'commanded' this divorce.

Moses also wanted them to understand something. If they put away their wives, if they found some uncleaness in her an d felt she was so worthy of being cast out over it, that once she remarried, once she was another mans wife, then she w as never under any circumstances to return to him as it would be abomination unto the Lord Himself.

Something quite peculiar that we see in this, is that under all normal circumstances a woman would be free to marry any eligible man if her husband were to die.

But in this situation where the this first husband had put her away finding her to be detestible, even if her new husband d ied this former man was one of the only men in Israel who was forbidden to ever have her again. In this case it was 'not lawful' for him to ever have her again.

That says quite a bit about how God sees this practice of divorce, especially for no real reason at all.

There isnt a single NT passage that ever shows that this part of Deut has changed where the woman cannot return to he r former husband once remarried.

Pauls saying 'remain unmarried or reconcile' goes hand in hand with it entirely.

:)

## Re:, on: 2007/3/16 19:57

Not that it is the same, but I am wondering...

I will be getting married May 5th, here in Korea and then 'again' in Canada, July 7th.

First, is there any thoughts on this?

Second, I said that I do not want to 'lay' together or have any type of 'honeymoon' until the second wedding. Any though ts?

Sorry, Ben if it is not exactly what you are asking, but it was the first thing that I thought of when I was reading this threa d...

God Bless those that stay married through thick and thin, Brian

## Re: - posted by Ekklesia1, on: 2007/3/16 20:35

Quote:

-----

BrianMira wrote:

Not that it is the same, but I am wondering...

I will be getting married May 5th, here in Korea and then 'again' in Canada, July 7th.

First, is there any thoughts on this?

Second, I said that I do not want to 'lay' together or have any type of 'honeymoon' until the second wedding. Any thoughts?

Sorry, Ben if it is not exactly what you are asking, but it was the first thing that I thought of when I was reading this thread...

God Bless those that stay married through thick and thin,

Brian

-----

Same woman?

What's the point?

Different woman?

Polygamy is not God's will for marriage.

Other than that, if it is the same woman, have at it. I dont see any scripture forbidding your renewing your vows or regist ering your marriage in two different countries.

Only if you divorced her, then she remarried and then became single again somehow, would you be committing abomin ation by taking her again as your wife.

#### Re:, on: 2007/3/16 23:45

Ekklesia1:

Yes, it is the same woman. The reason is that the first wedding will be in Korea with her family and friends, while the se cond will be in Canada with my family and friends.

My 'point' is that I am wondering if my first marriage is consecrated (is that the right word??), if we do not sleep together and wait until the second?

....and/or if anyone has thoughts about this action...

I was not looking for added questions... seeing that you have only posted twice on the site, it is obvious that you would n ot have read anything that I have written, so you have no idea that I am an English teacher in Korea, engaged to a Kore an.

Take that into consideration when replying to threads.

I thank you for your points.

May God Bless those that read more than what is in front of them, Brian ;-)

## Re: - posted by Ekklesia1, on: 2007/3/17 0:07

Quote:
BrianMira wrote:
Fkklesia1:

Yes, it is the same woman. The reason is that the first wedding will be in Korea with her family and friends, while the second will be in Canada with m y family and friends.

My 'point' is that I am wondering if my first marriage is consecrated (is that the right word??), if we do not sleep together and wait until the second?

Well, was Joseph's marriage consecrated to Mary when our Lord was born?

It had to be for Jesus to be born into a legitimate marriage, yet we know Joseph did not consummate the marriage at lea st up to that point.

So I'd say yes, your marriage is your covenant vow to your wife before God.

#### Quote:

I was not looking for added questions... seeing that you have only posted twice on the site, it is obvious that you would not have read anything that I ha ve written, so you have no idea that I am an English teacher in Korea, engaged to a Korean.

Take that into consideration when replying to threads.

I thank you for your points.

May God Bless those that read more than what is in front of them, Brian ;-)

-----

Yeah, I really dont know your story so I wasn't sure of the details :-)

I think it shows a lot of self-control on your part to wait until the second wedding'. Im not sure of your reasoning, but I don 't see it as anything wrong at all.

I'm sure if you knew my own story in my own marriage that you would see a very strong similarity between your situation and mine, from what you've presented.

I pray for many long, happy years for you and your bride to be :)

## Re: - posted by lastblast (), on: 2007/3/17 1:27

#### Quote:

-----There isnt a single NT passage that ever shows that this part of Deut has changed where the woman cannot return to her former hu sband once remarried.

-----

Can you find in the OT where such a wife was charged with adultery for marrying again, as you will find Jesus teaching?

What we can find in the OT is David's wife Michal becoming another man's wife and David taking her back to himself. Y es, she was not given a writ of divorcement, but she did become another man's wife.

In the NT, with or without a writ of divorcement, she would be guilty of adultery----because the Lord doesn't acknowledg e a divorce as dissolving what HE joins together. If it is adultery, it is not lawful marriage in the sight of God. At least th at's my take.

## Re: - posted by Ekklesia1, on: 2007/3/17 2:08

Quote:
lasthlast wrote:

Can you find in the OT where such a wife was charged with adultery for marrying again, as you will find Jesus teaching?

-----

Can you find in the NT a commandment for all remarried persons to leave their current spouse to return to the former? Remaining **unmarried** and reconciling is not the same thing as ending a marriage and reconciling as Ive already shown in this thread.

Also, Herod's marriage to Herodias was unlawful as she was his brother's wife and had a child by Philip. Herod was guilt y of taking his 'brothers wife' and so even if Philip had been dead, it was unlawful for Herod to have her. Not to mention t he other atrocity that she was the niece of both men.

And that isn't relevant to the point in any way. Im not interested in what you cannot find, but interested in what is present in His word. Deuteronomy showing that it is forbidden to return once remarried after a willful and purposeful divorce is n ot altered in the NT. Pauls says to remain unmarried or reconcile. That shows quite conclusively that if the person did do so anyway, that it is 'marriage' or otherwise he could not have said remain 'unmarried'.

## Quote:

------In the NT, with or without a writ of divorcement, she would be guilty of adultery----because the Lord doesn't acknowledge a divorce as dissolving what HE joins together.

Jesus said nothing that altered what a divorce does. The only thing He did was to disallow that Moses had suffered, divorce for no just cause.

Moses had made it so there was no actual crime being committed against the former spouse upon remarriage.

Jesus removed the 'for every cause' allowance and stated that adultery was committed against the spouse (Mark 10) up on remarriage after this type of divorce.

He did not redefine 'divorce' in any manner whatsoever. And yes, Paul shows in 1 Cor 7:10-11 that a woman can 'put as under' her marriage, what He 'joined together, so it is possible to carry out. The greek word used there for 'depart' is the exact same word "Chorizo" used for 'put asunder' in the words of Christ. Jesus did not say no man 'can' put asunder. Th at teaching is in error.

#### Quote:

What we can find in the OT is David's wife Michal becoming another man's wife and David taking her back to himself. Yes, she was not given a writ of divorcement, but she did become another man's wife.

The details of that issue are not any even remotely related to a careless, unjustified 'divorce' as Moses had tolerated and then tried to control in Deut 24:1-4. The woman was Davids wife and was not put away by him (as in Deut 24:1-4), so it is completely unrelated to this topic. Only if David himself had found 'some uncleaness' as he defined in her would Deut 24:1-4 be related.

David merely took back what he himself never put away but was stolen from him.

Scripture shows that David lived an upright life all his days and that the only thing against him was the issue of Uriah and his wife (1Kings 15:5).

So his taking back of what was his apparently was right in the Lords eyes.

On a side note, the point isn't relevant to begin with. David committed adultery with another mans wife. Is that ok to do u nder the law? How about the new covenant?

David committed murder as well. Is that forbidden by law? And in this covenant?

Even if it were unlawful for David to have had Michal back as his wife, apparently God isn't in the habit of forcing men to

obey. So even if she wasnt supposed to be his wife again, that she had wouldn't mean a single thing in this matter. Davi d was punished all the rest of his days for marrying the wife of Uriah (2Sa 12:9-10), so apparently he would have been a ble to also take yet another wife that wasn't his without God stopping him from doing it.

But, since Michal belonged to David and was stolen from him, this isn't remotely related to his willingly casting her aside for 'some uncleaness'.

David simply took back what was rightfully his that he himself had not 'put away'.

Under the law a man having sex with another man's wife is a punishable by death.

Michal could not have been seen as the wife of any other except David, since he didn't divorce her, or otherwise Gods w ord would have to say that David took another mans wife if this man Phaltiel, who still lived, was actually seen as her 'hu sband' in God's eyes.

No adultery charge is made against David for taking another man's wife, so we must conclude that God accepted Michal as David's wife regardless of what she is called or what occured.

"And Saul gave his daughter Michal, **David's wife**, to Phalti the son of Laish, who was of Gallim. (1Sa 25:44 MKJV)

And there you have it. David never divorced Michal. She was David's wife given to another man. David simply regained what was his own.

Just because some godless man like Saul gave her away, doesn't mean God is forced to accept it.

## Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2007/3/17 4:10

hi, a study of Hosea might help.jimp

#### Re:, on: 2007/3/17 5:39

Quote:
Ekklesia1 wrote:
Well, was Joseph's marriage consecrated to Mary when our Lord was born? It had to be for Jesus to be born into a legitimate marriage, yet we know Joseph did not consummate the marriage at least up to that point. So I'd say yes, your marriage is your covenant vow to your wife before God.

Thank you for that insight, although I felt that the vows themselves would be enough, I did not think of it in light of Josep h and Mary.

Quote:	
Yeah, I really dont know your story so I wasn't sure of the details	:-)

I think it shows a lot of self-control on your part to wait until the second wedding'. Im not sure of your reasoning, but I don't see it as anything wrong at all.

I'm sure if you knew my own story in my own marriage that you would see a very strong similarity between your situation and mine, from what you've p resented.

I pray for many long, happy years for you and your bride to be :)

Again, thank you for your sincerity. As for my 'details', in short: I was a horrible sinner, found the Way, moved to Korea after a few years of learning in my baptist church in Canada, dated many girls along the way, gave everything to the Lor d, and then 'some girl' walked into my life last June while I was sitting in church, which was only my second week there.

Within a month or so, we had our first date and spent everyday since together in prayer and/or in person. She and I atte nd morning church together everyday and end each day in prayer, either on the phone or when she sleeps over. This is

a far cry from ANY and EVERY relationship that I have EVER been involved.

For months I prayed for a woman just like her (see the thread about 'prayer lists'), but the Lord did not seem to answer, so I guit asking and let Him fulfil His will for me. After surrendering myself to the Lord, He seemed to answer my prayer.

After a few weeks of 'dating', she and I agreed not to have intercourse (easier for her than me because she is a virgin). We try not to kiss or 'make-out', but sometimes that gets the better of us.

The church where we met is where her family has been a member for over 16 years. I am the only foreigner and not on e other person speaks English, besides her, so I truly believe the Lord led me there.

The church welcomed me with open arms and have since invited me into the men's group and much attention is brought to me in most occasions. By September we were 'a couple' in church and they invited us to 'preach' to the youth every c ouple of weeks. The first 'sermon', we (she translates) were both extremely nervous, but for different reasons.

She was nervous about getting up in front of the people, but I was nervous about the surprising ending/conclusion to the 'message'...a proposal!

She obviously said yes and I believe that we 'set the stage' for our lives together; spreading the Good/Bad news all over the world.

Two weeks ago I was accepted into a master of divinity pastoral program back in Canada, so we are leaving the financia I part to God. We trust God will put us where we are needed.

As for my 'self control'...it's difficult. As I mentioned, she sleeps over sometime, probably more than she ought to, but we do not have 'relations'. The closer to the date, the harder it is getting for the both of us.

I chose to not have 'relations' until the second wedding, for a few reasons. The first, I would like to have known her for a year, before we 'jump into the sack'.

Over my lifetime, I have had over a hundred 'girlfriends', where she has NEVER had even a boyfriend (actually, she date d a guy for 2 weeks and kissed him maybe 5 times, but she said she was 'diappointed'...now she is quite happy ;-) ).

The second reason is that I was not sure if I would 'feel' completely married, without any friends or family to be witnesse s. I understand God is our witness, but it would be nice to have people around that I am somewhat familiar with.

The third reason is that the wedding will be conducted in Korean, so really I will not really know what is being said. That in itself will make me wonder about the vows. We will review what is said during a traditional wedding, but since my Korean (Hangeul) is poor, it would take me another 5 years, to fully understand it completely.

The final reason that I can think of now is that the church where I was baptized. I mentioned that I was a 'horrible sinner' and in search for truth I was led to an all black baptist church, where they welcomed me with open arms and treated me like a son/brother. Over a three year period they helped break my old self and showed me the Way to light, in a manner that I believe I would not have been able to accept, if it were at a different church. Eventually, I was in the mens' brother hood, youth bible teacher, asked to be in the choir, and offered a job before I left for Korea.

The Canadian wedding will be held at that church and I actually care more about my Christian family to be witness to how graceous and merciful the Lord has been to me, rather than my 'friends' and 'family' of my old life.

Other than that... I just would like to settle down and work for the Lord in ALL I do. Over the years I have changed so m uch that I am sometimes set back by who I am from what I once was. I have lost many 'friends and family' because of m y belief, but I have gained so much more.

There is so much to do and so little time. I hope and pray that all of us (SI members included) take our role as followers of Jesus seriously, because the world needs truth. There is much opposition, which we all have suffered, but in Him we are made strong. Let us not waste time.

Thank you again, I hope that I was not babbling too much...:-(

Again, Sorry Ben... but it is still about the two weddings... we shopped for a dress for her last week and we submitted the sample invitations yesterday... my life is funny and God is truly good.

God Bless those that wait...patiently, Brian and Mira:-)

Re: - posted by	y Ekklesia1, o	n: 2007/3/	17 8:42
-----------------	----------------	------------	---------

It is still a very honorable thing you're doing though.

and merciful the Lord has been to me, rather than my 'friends' and 'family' of my old life.

Quote:
jimp wrote: hi, a study of Hosea might help.jimp
A study of Hosea doesn't change anything. Hosea was directly instructed to marry this woman who was a harlot, can anyone other than Hosea say as much? If there is a single man who has been commanded to do so, to him alone does the example of Hosea have any bearing whats oever. If Hosea is to be a forerunner of todays marriages, then all marriages must be just the same from the start.
Hosea was told to marry this woman for a purpose. To show what Isreal had done to God, their continued cheating against Him, and His patience with them. But in the end with God and Israel, He ended the covenant He made with them. So Hosea isn't any evidence at all concerning anyone else's marriage other than Hosea's himself and Gods covenant to Israel. Hosea was not meant as some forerunner for marriage today or we all would need to marry a harlot intentionally.
Re: - posted by Ekklesia1, on: 2007/3/17 9:08
Quote:After surrendering myself to the Lord, He seemed to answer my prayer The similarities between your situation and mine to my wife are remarkable. :)
Quote: The second reason is that I was not sure if I would 'feel' completely married, without any friends or family to be witnesses. I understand God is our witness, but it would be nice to have people around that I am somewhat familiar with.
I can understand that :) Yes, God is the only witness required as far as a covenant before Him goes. But marriage is a public thing and unless there is a reason to not have witnesses at the time (a safety issue possibly) then we should have witnesses to our union if for no other reason than for accountabilities sake.
Quote:The third reason is that the wedding will be conducted in Korean, so really I will not really know what is being said. That in itself will make me wonder about the vows. We will review what is said during a traditional wedding, but since my Korean (Hangeul) is poor, it would take me ar other 5 years, to fully understand it completely.
That's pretty interesting. But God knows what is in your heart and why you are standing there with your bride to be. You just as married at the end of the first ceremony as you will be at the end of the second:)

------The Canadian wedding will be held at that church and I actually care more about my Christian family to be witness to how graceous

I can understand your sentiment. :) It is an honorable thing for you to do things the way you are, but also keep in mind that after the first ceremony that you will be married. You both understand why you are there and the covenant you are entering. You would be permitted to be ehave as man and wife in every regard at that point if you so chose to do so.
But I know precisely how you feel in wanting to do this in the way you have. I understand in a very personal way the desire to give your virgin wife who has never even had a single boyfriend plenty of time. My wife was in the very same situat on. When she was younger she tried to 'date' once, didnt like it and never dated or kissed again until me. :)
Quote:I have lost many 'friends and family' because of my belief, but I have gained so much more.
I understand what you mean. Many things change, some of them are kind of sad, but in the end you get so much more in return.
Quote:Thank you again, I hope that I was not babbling too much
Not at all. Im going to let my wife read this when she is up. The similarities between our stories is remarkable and I'm su e she will love to see that her story is a bit more 'normal' than she has been thinking:)
God bless you and your bride. I can't tell you how wonderful and uplifting your post was.
:)
Re: Marrying The Same Person Twice? - posted by rodge (), on: 2007/3/19 8:00
Hi Ben I believe the answer is determined very simply by asking the question 'Who does God consider you are married to?' I would suggest that subsequent remarriages, which are called adultery, imply that the first marriage is still intact and that the second marriage is both unlawful and unrecognised. Can you be committing adultery when having sex with the person God considers to be your wife? I don't think so. So, regardless of how many subsequent marriages you have, the first is the only one God recognises. So sex with the first spouse could not be adultery while sex with subsequent spouses couldn't be anything other than adultery.
Re: - posted by Ekklesia1, on: 2007/3/19 9:26
Quote:
rodge wrote:  I believe the answer is determined very simply by asking the question 'Who does God consider you are married to?' I would suggest that subsequent emarriages, which are called adultery,
Jesus offered an exception for this situation showing that there is condition whereby adultery is not committed upon remarriage.
Quote:

imply that the first marriage is still intact and that the second marriage is both unlawful and unrecognised. Can you be committing
adultery when having sex with the person God considers to be your wife? I don't think so. So, regardless of how many subsequent marriages you hav
e, the first is the only one God recognises.

-----

I'd like to see a chapter and verse that proves this assertion. Ive seen it stated many times but Ive never actually seen the passage that God only recognizes the first marriage.

In fact, "Having been the wife of one man" tends to lend to the idea that you are wrong seeing how widows remarrying w as not unlawful, and there were issues with women marrying multiple husbands, so it had to be a remarried divorcee. Y et there she was, in the church, in fellowship and not being called an adultress. Only being prohibited from the list of wid ows.

Quote:
So sex with the first spouse could not be adultery while sex with subsequent spouses couldn't be anything other than adultery

Sorry, but thats not what Jesus or Paul said.

## Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/3/19 14:20

### rodge wrote:

Quote:

-----

So then in that case, if someone gets a divorce, remarries another person, but during their second marriage they go hav e sex with their first partner, that is ok?

## Re:, on: 2007/3/19 17:43

This thread is getting absurd. I dont know if y'all have noticed that or not, but I see it. Can we possibly come up with any more wicked, debased and perverted scenarios??

My my... what more wickedness can a group of Christians come up with to debate over?

I believe this is what Paul condemned as idle chatter.

Here's a thought... if you're not personally faced with situation, dont worry about it. Stay faithful and married, and you wo nt need to concern yourself with it.

If someone is faced with this, and they ask for scriptural advice on this forum, I say share your advice... but so far this has been a contest to see how far out on the lunatic fringe we can get... and I say it is not honoring to God at all.

Krispy