In August 2007, high-profile â€œPentecostalâ€• evangelists Juanita Bynum and Paula White announced that they are leaving their husbands. While these tele-evangelists are not Apostolic and are not representative of the Pentecostal norm, it is troubling that their decisions have had little impact on their respective ministries. The Church is always vulnerable to cultural influences, and the divorce and remarriage question, which is thoroughly treated by Jesus Christ and the Apostles, continues to be interpreted and reinterpreted in the modern Church. Early twentieth century Pentecostals (both Oneness and Trinitarian) were vehemently opposed to Christian divorce, and their writings reveal the honest and sometimes controversial struggles to deter marital dissolution, to define the conditions for sanctioned separation, and to provide for spiritual reconciliation.

In The Apostolic Faith, William Joseph Seymour, leader of the Los Angeles Azusa Street Mission, describes new converts to the Pentecostal faith who believed that Godâ€™s call superseded their commitment to family and home: â€œMany today have been wrecked and brought to naught through false teaching. Wives have left husbands and gone off claiming that the Lord has called her to do mission work, and to leave the little children at home to fare the best they canâ€• (Seymour, â€œBible Teaching . . . â€• 3). He also admonishes others who â€œhave come to think that it is a sin for them to live as husband and wife,â€• concluding, â€œit is no sin to marryâ€• (Seymour 3). Incidentally, Seymourâ€™s own 1908 marriage to Jennie Evans Moore, a fellow worker at Azusa, precipitated the exodus of some workers, including Florence Crawford and Clara Lum who began a mission in Portland, Oregon (Sanders 110-113).

In an effort to clarify Azusaâ€™s stand on the issues of divorce and remarriage, Seymour took a catechetical approach in a January 1908 article. â€œOn what grounds did the Lord Jesus teach that a man and wife could separate?â€• Seymourâ€™s response admits that fornication constitutes biblical justification for divorce, however he posits: â€œ . . . but he has no right to marry another according to the Scripture, while she livesâ€• (Seymour, â€œQuestions . . . â€• 2). In answer to the question: â€œDo you have preachers and evangelists of the Apostolic Faith that have two wives or two husbands?â€• Seymour acknowledges a transition in his understanding of the issue. Initially, the mission did ordain converts who were divorced and remarried before their conversion, â€œthinking that everything was under the Blood.â€• However, he concludes: â€œBut after searching the Scriptures, we found it was wrong; that the widow was to be the wife of one man and the bishop was to be the husband of one wifeâ€• (Seymour, â€œQuestions . . . â€• 2).

Charles H. Mason, original presiding bishop of the Church of God in Christ, shared Seymourâ€™s view that conversion did not release a saint from marital entanglements before regeneration. In fact, Mason openly criticized â€œElder Câ€• , who was teaching that baptism in the Name of Jesus Christ remitted sins, including divorce and adultery:

. . . the anti-Christ also put into Elder C. to say that those who had other men and womenâ€™s husbands and wives before they came to light that they did not have to leave them that the water washed it all away, he would put before them 1 Cor. 6:9-11. But ye are washed now. That meant to him, any man that had another manâ€™s wife or another woman â€™s husband before they got washed, that the washing made it all right to stay on, one with another and go on doing the same things that they did before only the washing made it so they could do it and it would not longer be a sin. (Mason 181)

Here we have evidence of the primitive Pentecostal idea that divorce and remarriage could only be corrected by divorcing the subsequent spouse and returning to the first. Bro. Cook clearly opposed this interpretation for those who had so sinned before their baptism.

Like C.H. Mason, G.T. Haywood initially taught that converts to the Apostolic Faith must make restitution by returning to his or her original spouse, but he recognized the error of this teaching and is in agreement with Bro. Cookâ€™s assessment: â€œ . . . when a man repents and is baptized in â€œwater and the Spiritâ€• he is a new creature in Christ, which is the church, his body. The fact that God sets him in the body is a proof that God has judged his case and exonerated him from all sins and mistakes of the past . . . â€œ (Haywood 116).

While most Pentecostals believed that divorce was allowable in the case of fornication, there was a universal rejection of remarriage. Discussing the â€œexception clauseâ€• from Matthew 19.9, Seymour wrote: â€œJesus makes it very plain. If the innocent party marries, they are living in adulteryâ€• (Seymour, â€œThe Marriage Tieâ€• 3). Andrew F
raser, an Assemblies of God pastor from Chicago, wrote a very plain treatment of the issue in 1915:

The Bible then grants no permission to marry again while one’s companion is living. But some one asks, What about Matt. 5:32 and Matt. 19 :9? Doesn’t it say except for fornication? Yes, but the except for fornication pertains to the putting away and has absolutely nothing to do with any permission for the parties to marry again. We yield the point as to the putting away, but this fact stands forth clear and unquestioned that there was absolutely no permission given for re-marriage during the life-time of either party. No one can violate this express command without becoming an adulterer in the sight of God. (9)

Stanley Frodsham, another early AG pastor and historian, wrote similarly:

There is however a basis for the inference that adultery is a legitimate ground for divorce in Jer. 3:8 in which Jehovah says, â€œWhen for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce.â€ But there is clearly no ground for remarriage given in this scripture. God kept the door of repentance always open. (9)

Bishop Haywood declares: â€œIn the church if a brother and sister, being married separate and marry another while either of the other is living, they are living in adultery . . . When such as this takes place then it is time for the church to act. We could not stand clear before God and permit such to be carried on in the House of Godâ€ (Haywood 118). Yet more plainly, he writes: â€œthe church of God, there is to be no divorcing to remarry. In the world it is bad enough, but when we come into the Body of Christ, (1 Cor. 12.12-13) such practices are no longer to be toleratedâ€ (Haywood 123).

These early Pentecostals conscientiously divided the Scriptures, protecting both the souls of the flock from the stain of sin and the Body of Christ from reproach. While there are points of contention and disagreement in their writings, Pentecostal pioneers universally agreed that Scripture forbade divorced believers from remarrying during the lifetime of their first spouse. Despite their rigidity on the subject, all agreed that God’s mercy was extended to all transgressors, and the blood of Christ was powerful to save and cleanse. Stanley Frodsham wrote: â€œis there no hope for the adulterer? Yes there is hopeâ€ (9). While the Church must combat the worldly paradigm of dissolving flawed relationships, we must also extend to those without and within the Body of Christ heartfelt mercy as conduits of God’s healing and compassion, tempering the letter of the Law with the Spirit of Jesus Christ who absolved the sinful woman at the well saying, â€œNeither do I condemn thee: go and sin no moreâ€ (Jn. 8.11).
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from: https://oldlandmark.wordpress.com/2007/09/02/17/
Re: “Til Death Do Us Part: Early Pentecostals on Divorce and Remarriage, on: 2017/11/2 20:00
This has nothing really to do with the subject at hand but I wonder what our wonderful theologians would make of King David, taking for his wife, the wife of a man he had murdered after fathering a child with her outside of wedlock? And then, from that union, to have a child that would sit on his throne and build the temple. Just a thought........bro Frank

Re: brother Frank - posted by JFW (), on: 2017/11/2 20:24
Ha!!
I literally thought the exact same thing while reading this, apparently there are exceptions ...
Also there might should be a distinction made between people who identify as christian and those whom actually know Him~

Re: King David - posted by savannah, on: 2017/11/2 20:27

King David had six wives prior to taking Bathsheba as his seventh.

Re: , on: 2017/11/2 20:44
When it comes to rightly dividing the Word of God, there are things hard to understand. I have often wondered why the Lord allowed multiple wives to men in the Old Testament, and even blessed them. I cannot understand that. His ways and thoughts are so much higher than ours.

"This has nothing really to do with the subject at hand but I wonder what our wonderful theologians would make of King David, taking for his wife, the wife of a man he had murdered after fathering a child with her outside of wedlock? And then, from that union, to have a child that would sit on his throne and build the temple. Just a thought........bro Frank"
This is something I wonder about too. The Lord looked at David in brokenness repentance of heart and had mercy on him.

This is a question that troubles me for years. We have a remarried believing couple in our fellowship. Both were married before. I cannot see the legality of their marriage, but can I tell them to dissolve their marriage? What is the best way forward? Has anyone any experience in this matter?

Please refrain from mere opinions, thanks.

Re: , on: 2017/11/3 0:46
"Please refrain from mere opinions, thanks."
That's all we have on here Narrowpath. You must already know the Scriptures that pertain to marriage and divorce and the two broad camps that exist. Read them and see what they say to you about this subject, ask the Holy Spirit to show you. Ask ten people on this site or anywhere else and you may possibly get 10 different opinions.

My opinion, obviously based on the Scriptures that speak to this subject and if you don't know them or I have to quote them then you should not even be asking the question.

1. If people are divorced prior to being saved then this is not the unforgivable sin and if they get remarried as new creatures in Christ then that marriage in no way should be annulled.
2. If two professing Christians people are married, and one spouse cheats, does not want forgiveness, leaves and divorces their spouse, the innocent is blameless and is free to remarry.
3. If a man or a woman who is a Christian is married to an unbeliever (my case) then the that man or woman must stay...
with their spouse if the spouse is willing. If the spouse is not willing and divorces the Christian, then the Christian is no longer under bondage to that marriage. Now remember, these are my opinions based on what I believe the Lord has shown me by my reading of the same Scriptures that everyone else on here has read. You will get dissenting views, but the deal is, and here is what possibly could have saved tens of millions of lives over the last 2000 years the dogmatic theologian who will tell everyone that they must bow to their interpretation (and in previous centuries it would be under pain of death) Read the Word, be led by the Holy Spirit and follow the convictions that come from that and this is how we answer to God.........bro Frank

Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2017/11/3 3:16
You are right, Frank.
However, if a thief had stolen something prior conversion, should not he return the goods?

This view on remarriage cost John the Baptist his head.

David Pawson asked those who were remarried to read out aloud the related scriptures in front of him and to each other and leave it to them what they are going do about it.

I do not believe in the legality of remarriage but would stop short of asking couples to divorce.

Re: MDR - posted by savannah, on: 2017/11/3 6:50

"David Pawson asked those who were remarried to read out aloud the related scriptures in front of him and to each other and leave it to them what they are going do about it."

But David Pawson also believes that an eternal divorce is possible as well, to one who has been married to Christ.

Not only is he inconsistent regarding this, but is trying to get these couples to believe that they're living in adultery. The reason I say that is because it's well known that he thinks that the Scriptures teach that. His approach is sinister in my opinion.

Quotations are by Frank;

"1. If people are divorced prior to being saved then this is not the unforgivable sin and if they get remarried as new creatures in Christ then that marriage in no way should be annulled."

I agree.

"2. If two professing Christians people are married, and one spouse cheats, does not want forgiveness, leaves and divorces their spouse, the innocent is blameless and is free to remarry."

I agree.

"3. If a man or a woman who is a Christian is married to an unbeliever (my case) then the that man or woman must stay with their spouse if the spouse is willing. If the spouse is not willing and divorces the Christian, then the Christian is no longer under bondage to that marriage."

I agree.

One thing was left unsaid. In #3 no mention is made as to whether the believer may remarry, in the Lord. I believe that he may.

So, what is your opinion on #3. Is the believer free to remarry or not?
Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2017/11/3 7:25
Saints,

My reason for sharing the original post shows that in most if not all denominations there has always been a strong leaning towards "no remarriage" unless the spouse has died. Only in the last 50+ years this has been changed as well as allowing many other unbiblical things such as homosexuality, etc.

Sharing the view of the early pentecostals shows they were much more stricter and biblical in their view points then we might think they were.

Re: , on: 2017/11/3 9:19
Yes Savannah I believe the innocent spouse would be free to remarry. One last point, Greg speaks about the way pente costals and others used to act or feel about this issue, this, while instructional on how they use to feel about this issue, is irrelevant, what matters is what Scripture says less we stack error upon error and allow vicious little men to go around the country and heap condemnation upon saints who are indeed married in the sight of the Lord......bro Frank

Re: à€˜Til Death Do Us Part: Early Pentecostals on Divorce and Remarriage - posted by Lysa (), on: 2017/11/3 13:16
I'm going to just talk about the adultery and divorce issue first.

Romans 2:22 Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? ...

We all conveniently forget this Scripture
John 8:3 And the scribes and Pharisees brought to Him a woman caught in adultery. They made her stand before them and said, â€œTeacher, this woman was caught in the act of adultery. 5In the Law Moses commanded us to stone such a woman. So what do You say?â€•

John 8:7 When they continued to question Him, He straightened up and said to them, â€œWhoever is without sin among you, let him be the first to cast a stone at her.â€•

James 2:10 Whoever keeps the whole Law but stumbles at just one point is guilty of breaking all of it. 11 For He who said, â€œDo not commit adultery,â€• also said, â€œDo not murder.â€• If you do not commit adultery, but do commit murder, you have become a lawbreaker. 12 Speak and act as those who are going to be judged by the Law that gives freedom.â€•

We understand that Jesus got to the "heart" of the matter, correct? What about this Scripture spoken by Jesus?

Matthew 5:28 But I tell you that anyone who looks at a woman to lust after her has already committed adultery with her in his heart.

What if this verse if sooooo important that religious folk just like to overlook it because of their guilt?

I submit that if you are going to follow the Law (as in James 2), you need to follow it completely.
1. Men who are pastors / preachers who watch pornography are guilty of adultery and should step down.
2. Their wives are fully able to divorce them on adultery grounds.

That's how important this verse is. Let's hear what each of the redeemed has to say about this.

God bless,
Lisa
Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2017/11/3 13:25

Quote:
------------------------Lisa...Matthew 5:28 But I tell you that anyone who looks at a woman to lust after her has already committed adultery with her in his heart.
------------------------

Well I don't have that problem anymore, at 66 my lust has turned into dust. :-)

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2017/11/3 16:40

Frank, thank you brother, for I appreciate and agree with your post!

We must be people of grace instead of law.

I remember few months ago that my daughter told me about a lady at her work who was very depressed. Her Pastor, fri ends, and her husband could not seem to help her. She had read on the internet that she was living in adultery because she was married before and her former husband was still living. Her problem was that the man she was now married to was a fine christian man who loved her dearly, if you want to call this a problem.

Well, she was getting very depressed and people could see how unhappy she was even though they tried to help her. M y daughter told her to call me. She told her that my dad talks and walks with the Lord in the Spirit everyday and he will te ll you what he gets from the Lord and not what people want to hear. So after a couple of days the lady called me and tol d me who she was and that my daughter had asked her to call me.

I talked to her about 40 minutes and during this time God revealed some things to me to tell her that was a blessing. The re was so much improvement in her that her boss noticed it and came to my daughter to tell her what a difference in her since she had talk to me.

This is what I discovered about her. She was so depressed over thinking that she was going to go to hell if she didnâ€™t leave her wonderful Christian husband. I found out that her former husband was an alcoholic who was not a Christian and that he had left her.

I told her about the scriptures in the gospels and in 1 Cor. 7:1-15: I told her that Paul wrote this so she could have peace , and not be in bondage if the unbeliever departed. I said...and that peace is the very thing you donâ€™t have...when Go d wants you to have it. I told her that she was not in bondage over what decision her former husband had made, and tha t not being in bondage meant that she was free. That really means she is free. Now she can marry but only in the Lord a nd she had done that because her husband was a Christian. I told her the marriage, she was in now, was approved by t he Lord according to the scriptures.

I said to her, that it was a great blessing that her husband was a good Christian man who loved her and not to pay attent ion to the internet. I told her that some people donâ€™t care if they destroy a family that God has blessed. I donâ€™t ha ve the time to tell of everything I said, but God showed me the importance of the cross in dealing with our old life of sin.

Colossians 2:13-15
13 And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having f orgiven you all trespasses;
14 Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, n ailing it to his cross;
15 And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it.

One final word, brethren, letâ€™s not be so foolish to believe that every marriage has been put together by God. I would say that many marriages today are no more put together by God than those who are shacking up together without marri age. It has always alarmed me how these religious people who are nuts over being legalistic toward someone without a care about them at all. I mean to them a person can shack up with someone for a year and shack up with someone else another time, but later on get married and then commit adultery against their spouse but ask God to forgive them and stil I have a legitimate marriage. But now a person who was innocent and didnâ€™t do anything wrong, because their spou se left them, but later on they have a good Christian marriage, and they are told their marriage is not legit. Now go figure
...but thatâ€™s just being plain ridiculous!

Friends, the Jesus I serve paid it all! He died on the cross and shed His blood for the forgiveness of all sin. That means even a vow that you made but wasnâ€™t able to live up too...He is a wonderful and powerful Lord and Savior!

Blessings to all...rbanks

---

Re: , on: 2017/11/3 17:45
Praise the Lord bro Rbanks, you were used to free this poor woman from her bondage and the accusations, and we know where those accusations come from. Adding our own thoughts to the Scriptures is so dangerous, what the Scriptures tell us about marriage and divorce is simple enough for all to understand and God protects the innocent in all of that. Now look, the innocents freedom is spied out and legalizers or Judaizers, call them what you like, are bound and determined in their legalistic zeal to cause bondage and mayhem anywhere they go and all in the name of God's Word. Thank you again brother, my heart breaks for the spirits that are crushed by men like this, typically idle busybodies who should probably be making tents and putting food on their families table.

Now dont get me wrong, I detest the scourge of divorce that has ravaged America and now so much of the west, but it is not the innocents fault if they marry an unrepentant adulterer who then leaves them and divorces them. It is my firm opinion that two people who love Jesus with all of their hearts can work out any problem, including adultery. So many sweet, sweet women and men have forgiven their spouses for this horrific act of betrayal even although the Lord says "But I tell you that anyone who divorces his wife, except for sexual immorality, makes her the victim of adultery, and anyone who marries a divorced woman commits adultery." The Lord Jesus Himself gives the exception but the sweet saint who takes the high road and forgives is highly favored of God and their hearts are beautiful. But, when faced with an unrepentant spouse who leaves and divorces or continually violates the marriage covenant, the woman or the man is freed from this marriage and the innocent is not under bondage to this marriage, the marriage is annulled in the site of God.......bro Frank

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/11/3 18:02
Amen rbanks- awesome!

Frank I appreciate your wise words on this topic and I think you have summarized the biblical evidence on this topic correctly.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2017/11/3 18:07
Some testimonies to consider:

Marriage Permanence - Brett's Testimony
https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/myvideo/photo.php?lid=6033

Marriage Permanence - Jeremiah's Testimony
https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/myvideo/photo.php?lid=6031

Marriage Permanence - Jim Barger's Testimony
https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/myvideo/photo.php?lid=6030
Amen brother Frank! I also agree with your last post concerning those who forgive and even put up with an unbelieving spouse.

I have seen those who put up with sometimes an abusive spouse with the love of the Lord striving to win them to the Lord. I truly admire those who stay with an unbeliever hoping to see them come to salvation in Christ.

I listen to Brett’s testimony and was so grieved in my spirit that I don’t even want to listen to the others.

I really feel sorry for him. He is so high up on the obedience scale that in his eyes so few are even able to measure up to his standard of unhappiness that we should be striving for.

I hope he realizes that he is going to need a lot of grace before he leaves this world. I hope he realizes that he will also be judged according to the mercy he has shown to others.

I believe he needs a baptism of love and I don’t know if he claims the baptism in the Holy Ghost, but the Bible says he love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit.

One final note, the scripture says that the letter kills but the Spirit gives life. His testimony sounds like death to me put on by people who promote death instead of life in the Spirit.

Blessings to all!

Is Brett in a better position in a way that her marriage is actually invalid (as he presumed) and he can marry anytime he wants. But is his marriage not really acceptable that he can do nothing but abandon his wife.

I guess this complication in life was also pressing dilemma as Paul was writing his letter to Corintians. My take in this situation is this, 1cor7:24 “So, brethren, in whatever state each was called, there let him remain with God.” (RSV) From thereon, let the new life take its course.

We do not know just how much complications we made in the past, and the impossibility of fully restoring them if we will account them one by one.

My guess is, Brett's car the way he has is all dressed up with scriptures all over it, is very proud of himself. He probably could be a little happier in life, if he knew these scripture's were in the Bible, should we send them to him?

Romans 3-
10 as it is written:None is righteous, no, not one;
11 no one understands;no one seeks for God.
12 All have turned aside; together they have become worthless;no one does good,not even one.â€•

Matthew 12:31-32 says, "And so I tell you, every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven men, but the blasphemy against the Spirit will not be forgiven. Anyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but anyone who speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come."

By the way, I was only married once for 40 years, and my wife passed, so I guess I have to wait on a widow to come along if I want to marry again. Which I'm not at all interested in another marriage, but I will see what God's plans are, he might have different plans for me.
Re: , on: 2017/11/3 21:49
I listened to Brett's testimony. But I'm a bit hazy on the divorce. Did he divorce his wife or did she divorce him? Did he divorce her because she had previously been married? Were they happily married at one time and in love?

Hard to get the answers to these questions from a three and a half minute testimony. But do agree he does seem to be a pretty big on his obedience. But I don't think he really understands obedience in terms of martyrdom regarding the persecuted church. And obedience regarding self-righteousness which this is what this appears to be.

Anyway just my thoughts.

Bro Blaine

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2017/11/3 21:55
From what I heard, he found out after he was married, that his new wife had been previously married, so he asked for a divorce.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2017/11/3 22:25
Blessings brother Blaine!

-quote-
But I don't think he really understands obedience in terms of martyrdom regarding the persecuted church. And obedience regarding self-righteousness which this is what this appears to be.

-quote-
I agree....

Also, what if she really did love him, believing him to be a Christian. It sounds like he divorced her after he had made marital vows and had marital relations with her. How can he justify himself?

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2017/11/3 22:27
Blessings Mr. Bill

I agree...

Re: , on: 2017/11/4 1:02
I noticed two things about these anecdotal videos. One, there was no mention of the actual Scriptures that speak to divorce, what Jesus actually said, nor is there any mention of the Scriptures pertaining to the man or the woman who is married to an unbeliever. I believe this is deliberate. There are clearly a couple of different interpretations to be had.

For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were you 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. For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?(1Co 7:14-16)

Now clearly, one very plausible interpretation of this is that if the unbelieving spouse leaves, then the believing spouse is not under bondage, meaning they are free. Free from what and to do what? You can come down on one side or the other on that, what you cannot be is dogmatic when the Scriptures are not dogmatic, that is what theologians do. They add to Scripture then they demand that everyone agree with them under pain of hell, which is what we heard in those videos. Now, if a Christian man or woman divorces his husband or wife, apart from adultery then remarries, then that man or woman is an adulterer, but who among us would have the audacity to override the exception that Jesus Himself makes, because God always cares for the innocent party. If there were no exceptions, Jesus would not have spoken of the one, do we know better than Jesus, is the Scriptures broken? The Lord gave me a word the other day and I put it up on my webs
ight and facebook page, before even reading this thread. Here it is, take from it what you will.......

The freedom to do what is right, towers above the prison and the chains of commandments. One is initiated by love, the other is enforced by the whip. Holiness comes from freedom and freedom comes from love. And this love inspires and draws us and compels us to honor and respect and obey our Father in heaven because His love is the very air that we breathe and the air before the throne is rarified air and if we cannot breathe this air then we die.... bro Frank

Re: early Anabaptists on MDR - posted by savannah, on: 2017/11/4 5:26

"...in most if not all denominations there has always been a strong leaning towards "no remarriage" unless the spouse has died. Only in the last 50+years this has been changed...."
- Greg Gordon

Michael Sattler, ca. 1533.

"He who divorces without fornication, the only reason, and remarries, commits adultery; and he who takes a divorced woman causes her to commit adultery; for Christ says, "These two are one flesh". But he who cleaves to a harlot, as Paul says, 1 Cor. 6, sins against his own body and is one flesh with the harlot. Thus he is by this act separated from his own flesh, in that he has attached himself to the alien flesh of the prostitute, and thus the marriage is broken; for they are no longer one flesh, since the fornicator has become one flesh with the harlot. The one who finds herself thereby divorced may now marry, whom she will, only let it be in the Lord...."

From the book 'The Complete Writings of Menno Simons',

"These two, one husband and one wife, are one flesh and can not be separated from each other to marry again otherwise than for adultery, as the Lord says. Matt. 5:19; Mark 10; Luke 16. This is our real position, doctrine, and practice concerning marriage, as we here confess with the holy Scriptures. By the grace of God it will ever remain the position of all pious souls, let them lie and slander as they like. We know and confess truly that it is the express ordinance, command, intent, and unchangeable plain word of Christ. We know too that the bond of undefiled, honorable matrimony is so firm and fast in the kingdom and government of Christ, that no man may leave his wife, nor a wife her husband, and marry another (understand rightly what Christ says), except it be for adultery. We acknowledge, teach, and assent to no other marriage than that which Christ and His apostles publicly and plainly taught in the New Testament, namely, of one man and one woman (Matt. 19:4), and that they may not be divorced except in case of adultery (Matt. 5:32); for the two are one flesh, but if the unbelieving one departs, a sister or brother is not under bondage in that case. 1 Cor. 7:15"

From the 'Wismar Articles' of 1554, the result of a meeting of Dutch Anabaptist leaders, including Menno Simons, Dirk P hillips, and Leonard Bouwens;

"Article IV. In the fourth place, if a believer and an unbeliever are in the marriage bond together and the unbeliever commits adultery, the marriage tie is broken. And if it be one who complains that he has fallen in sin, and desires to mend his ways, then the brethren permit the believing mate to go to the unfaithful one to admonish him, if conscience all owing it in view of the state of the affair. But if he be a bold and headstrong adulterer, then the innocent party is free - with the provision, however, that she shall consult with the congregation and remarry according to circumstances and decisions in the matter, be it well understood."

Anabaptist Dirk Philips, in 'The Evangelical Ban and Shunning', from the Dietrich Phillip Handbook, wrote:
"The Lord desired and commanded that men should do this no more (freely divorce their wives for any cause), except in case of fornication, which is the only and true reason or cause for which a man may leave or put away his wife and take another."

From 'Martyrs Mirror', by Thieleman J. van Braght, written in 1660. Article 25 of a 'Confession of Faith, according to the Holy Word of God', written ca. 1600, that Christ was;

"...re-establishing marriage between one man and one woman, and inseparably and firmly binding the bond of matrimony, that they might not, on any account, separate and marry another, except in case of adultery or death."

In 1779, a conference was held by the conservative Anabaptists resulting in the 'Essingen Discipline' :

"Article One: Concerning the Christian Confession of Faith, just as our forefathers confessed and held to the 33 Articles Confession as it is found in Martyrs Mirror, so do we also hold to the same, together with the Word of God and the Christian Discipline, and each one shall diligently meditate upon the same and live up to it."

Re:, on: 2017/11/4 7:12
Frank writes...

"The freedom to do what is right, towers above the prison and the chains of commandments. One is initiated by love, the other is enforced by the whip. Holiness comes from freedom and freedom comes from love. And this love inspires and draws us and compels us to honor and respect and obey our Father in heaven because His love is the very air that we breathe and the air before the throne is rarified air and if we cannot breathe this air then we die......bro Frank"

So agree my brother. So agree. We are governed by the Holy Spirit working in our hearts and not by an external code. Paul consistently reminds us in his writings that the letter kills whereas the Spirit gives life. We have been freed from external codes but we are joined by the Spirit to the Lord Jesus Christ. And it is his Spirit of grace that works within our hearts that allows us to walk in His freedom and love. These are the greater motivations to holiness then the burden of an external code.

As usual, my brother these are my thoughts.

Bro Blaine

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2017/11/4 7:30
Saints,

Sadly in the Church now our main goal seems to be "self" what is best for us and Christian liberty what we can have. In stead of humbly lowering ourselves under the Scriptures to "deny self" as Jesus taught. When one is so occupied with being free he himself can be in the greatest bondage. Jesus taught freedom and liberty was to deny self, lose one's life in this earth.

To remain celibate and single to most believers today seems like bondage, but the scriptures say the opposite it is the better way and freedom to follow Christ's commands.

Brother has accurately posted some of the early anabaptist views on divorce and the exception clause of fornication. One has to ask what "except" fornication really means. In our day if one wants to remarry they just go out and commit adultery with another woman and then they are free to "divorce" as Jesus said. If they did not commit the adultery once then they would be perpetual adulterer if they remarried and the spouse was alive. But the interesting thing is Jesus called it fornication not adultery.
How many christians do you know are on their 2 and 3rd marriages, do you think the "exception clause" was valid in all heir cases? Is it wrong to believe that someone can be a perpetual adulterer as per the words of Jesus and quote in Romans?

Re: RCC and indissolubility - posted by savannah, on: 2017/11/4 10:29

If one believes in the RCC's errors of the indissolubility of marriage, and that it is a sacrament, then they also believe that all (except when the first spouse has died) remarriages are nothing more than a practicing of perpetual adultery.

"To remain celibate..."

To do so is spoken of as a gift. Don't attempt this unless it's your gift. Many Priests in the RCC have tried. Look where it has gotten many of them (as well as others). Because they follow men and their traditions rather than God and His Word of Truth.

Re: , on: 2017/11/4 11:30

Greg writes.........

"In our day if one wants to remarry they just go out and commit adultery with another woman and then they are free to "divorce" as Jesus said."

Greg, not sure how you can have been a Christian so long and make the above statement. You have focused on the adulterer and not the innocent party, which is always the way with the legalist. They are so blinded by their legalism and rules that they lose sight of what was written and why it was written. The exception Jesus gave was to the "INNOCENT" party. This is not difficult stuff. It is not an "exception clause, do you realize that these are the words of Jesus and that they should be hallowed?

Greg writes.........

"When one is so occupied with being free he himself can be in the greatest bondage. Jesus taught freedom and liberty was to deny self, lose one's life in this earth."

If that statement was in reference to the word the Lord gave me then I find it truly sad and only a baptism in Holy Spirit could ever give one insight into what it truly means to be free in Christ. The legalizers used to accuse Paul of promoting a license to sin, they did this because they were completely under the bondage of legalism and had no idea what Paul was writing about which is why Paul replied "God forbid." .... bro Frank

" The freedom to do what is right, towers above the prison and the chains of commandments. One is initiated by love, the other is enforced by the whip. Holiness comes from freedom and freedom comes from love. And this love inspires and draws us and compels us to honor and respect and obey our Father in heaven because His love is the very air that we breathe and the air before the throne is rarified air and if we cannot breathe this air then we die
Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2017/11/4 12:00

Great post...brother Frank!

We are under the law of love. We are not trying to harm to others.

Brother Greg,
Jesus hates divorce and does not approve of all these 2 and 3 marriages. That is not what I am saying and neither is brother Frank, Blaine, and others.

You want to talk about self denial...taking Brettâ€™s testimony. Where is his self denial. He dumps the woman he made a vow to and had marital relations with...because he found out about her past. How is this self denial...it sounds more like self righteousness.

The argument is not about getting married again. It is about...can God approve of a marriage after one becomes a Christian even though they were married before. Your argument and the video is saying that they must divorce again and go back to their first if possible or be unmarried. It is saying that Godâ€™s grace is not sufficient to cover them in their present marriage.

Your argument says that two people who are married, then later both become christians then realize that when they were in sin one of them was married before, so they now have to get a divorce. So you are saying that Godâ€™s grace is not strong enough to really forget their past sins. You are saying that a vow they made while in sin is stronger than Godâ€™s grace to forgive them of the unwise vow of their past...now that they are Christians. They canâ€™t undue their past. Now I believe that when God forgives He also forgets. We are under grace today and he does not breakup Christian families over something they did years ago while in sin.

Blessings to all...rbanks

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2017/11/4 13:10

Personally I don't understand a lot of this, and that's ok from my personal standpoint, I was only married once, my wife passed, and I never married again. But I did want to address Brett's video, and my opinion is not meant to be judgmental, it's just a personal opinion from listening to his video. Brett is one mixed up man, he needs to seek the God of grace, this will help him get his life back, his joy back, and be able to better understand that God did not send his son here in vain, that he sent him here because he knew NOT ONE of us can live the perfect life. Some Christians are way to hard on themselves, and I'm not condoning living in sin, but I am saying NO ONE can live and not sin "Ecclesiastes 7:20 For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not". When a person can take grace as serious as sin, I personally believe they're on their way to living the life Christ wants us to live.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/11/4 16:16

Good one Bill.

Re: , on: 2017/11/4 16:39

I went back and watched Brett's testimony. Again a short video so one has to read between the lines I It appears that Brett was married but found out his wife had been married previously. Seems like he separated from his wife for a time and she initiated the divorce against him. Anyway the video being short, a lot of assumptions are being made here on my part.

But what would have happened if Brett had made the decision to love his wife as Christ loved the church. Would not God have blessed this marriage. Also would his wife not been healed of two previous divorces. Again a lot of questions.

But I think we get the impression that Brett dumped his wife because she had been married twice before. And it seems like that as a result of this testimony that self-righteousness is coming out on Brad's's part.

One wonders if Brad might had a different testimony. Had he chosen to let Love cover a multitude of sins. Love his wife as Christ loved the church. Perhaps been an agent of redemptive healing in her life. And God blessing this marriage.
But then I am a child of the New Covenant. If I must err. I will err on the side of grace. So accuse me of being hyper grac e. Then one wonders why people are attracted to Joseph Prince.

As usual my musings.

Blaine

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2017/11/4 18:32

Maybe Brett needs to know this, â€œJesus Christ knows the worst about you. Nonetheless, He is the one who loves yo u the most. A.W. Tozerâ€”

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2017/11/4 21:22

1 Corinthians 7:39 King James Version (KJV)

39 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.

Re: , on: 2017/11/4 22:58

It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: 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 s hall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.
(Mat 5:31-32)

Now you see, when Jesus says " saving for the cause," or "except in the case of," He is carving out an exception to the c ommand He has just laid down. He carves it out to protect the innocent. In those days there were a couple of raging issu es, tax was one, divorce was another. The wife of a man's youth could simply be discarded by the man by the writing of a letter of divorce. She was simply discarded. Along comes Jesus and tells them, under no circumstances can you ever do that, accept in the case of adultery. Now Greg, you can quote all the Scripture you like but the Scriptures are not brok en, there are no contradictions in the Word. When Jesus carves out an exception in order to protect the innocent, you ca nnot then come along with a Scripture that contradicts that. The point of this Scripture is that any man who simply discar ds his wife, she is not, in the yes of God, discared at all. We are commended to love the wife of our youth. So, if any m an marries a woman who has been discarded, he is making himself an adulterer. This was a most powerful incentive not to allow the practice to continue for it was never God's will that a wife be merely discarded, He was protecting the inno cent. What a beautiful thing and it stood against everything these men practiced and had been practicing through their tradi tions.

So in conclusion, the woman who is divorced and remarries is an adulterer as is the man who marries her, unless there has been adultery which has broken the marriage vow. You do realize that vows and covenants can be broken Greg? O ne last thing, and it is a side issue. I have seen countless controlling men over the years use this scripture as a means of control. It goes something like this "I may have cheated on you, I may be cheating on you now, but there is nothing you c an do about it, you can leave me but you can never be with another man or you will end up in hell." We should let the pla in words of Jesus be adhered to and not add to it our own opinions and not " break the Scriptures," in an attempt to prov e out point............bro Frank

Re: MDR - posted by savannah, on: 2017/11/5 0:18

On Remarriage After Divorce

by John Owen (1616 - 1683)

It is confessed by all who accept Scripture as their authority that adultery is a just and sufficient cause for divorce betwe en married persons. However, a difference of opinion exists as to the extent of the effects of this divorce. Is the divorce a
full separation from the bond and mutual obligations of marriage, or is it only a separation from the mutual obligations of marriage?

Some teach that divorce consists in an absolute dissolution and termination of the bonds of marriage and thereby allows the innocent party the freedom to marry again.

Others teach that this divorce is only a separation "from table and marriage bed" and therefore the divorce does not actually dissolve or terminate the marriage relation. Instead, it merely relinquishes one from the duty of providing physically and sexually for their spouse.

I am convinced of the first opinion. I will show that the second view is unthinkable and unscriptural because of its many weaknesses and also give three reasons why the first view is true.

The second view is not true for the following reasons:

First, this divorce "from table and marriage bed" is not a true divorce according to the light of Scripture and the law of nature. This position is a late invention in the history of mankind. Even those in the Roman church that assert it is true grant that in the Old Testament and in other ancient cultures divorce was always a termination of the marriage bond. Yet the moral duties and God-honoring relations of the Old Testament are not abrogated by the New Testament, rather their motives and purposes are more clearly defined.

Roman Catholics come to this position because of their unbiblical view that marriage is a Christian sacrament and therefore since it carries the status of sacrament it is indissoluble. But if this is true, then marriage should only take place among believers and have no authority over non-believers and this is clearly not true. Marriage is a creation ordinance and thus is to be practiced by all mankind, not merely believers.

Secondly, a divorce which remains perpetually "from table and marriage bed" is hurtful and destructive to mankind. If this were true it would establish a new state of being, unknown to Scripture. In this new state a man would lawfully be obligated to have a wife and simultaneously obligated to not have a wife. Every man that is capable of marriage is and must be in one (and only one) of these two situations--whether he would like to be or not. God does not call any man into the state where he is bound by conscience to not receive back the adulterous partner and at the same time to not take another as his wife due to this divorce.

This unnatural and unlawful and unknown condition may--and probably will--cast a man under a necessity of sinning. This is what I mean when I say that this view is hurtful and destructive to mankind and to righteousness. For suppose that a man doesn't have the gift of celibacy. If this is the case then it is the express will of God that he should marry for his relief. Yet, if he does marry, he has sinned; and if he doesn't marry, he will sin.

Thirdly, this view is unlawful. For if the bond of marriage remains then the relation still continues. This relational bond is the foundation of all mutual duties and obligations in marriage. Therefore, while the bond remains, no one can lawfully refrain from carrying out the proper duties of marriage, nor prohibit their performance. In marriage, each partner has certain duties and obligations to each other that they are required to perform so that each partner is not their own, but one another's. Thus each partner may claim the duties of marriage from the other partner lawfully. They may separate for a time by mutual consent and this may hinder the actual execution of certain marital duties for a time. But to make such an obligation to one another completely void while at the same time the marriage relation continues is against the law of nature and the law of God.

Fourthly, the very light of nature and common grace among the nations never pointed to this kind of divorce. Marriage is a creation ordinance given by God and is thus practiced by all mankind. No mere man would ever have ordained such a relation. Yet in all of history there is never any mention made of a divorce that is merely "from table and marriage bed." The case has always been that those who justly divorce their wives might marry another. Some cultures, like the ancient Greeks and Romans, even allowed the husband to kill the adulteress. This was later changed by the Romans, but the offense still remained a capital offense. In these cases, divorce took place to purposely allow the innocent person the freedom to marry again. Therefore, the view that divorce is merely "from table and marriage bed"--from the duties and obligations of marriage alone and not from the bond of it--is a false view.

The first view--that divorce absolutely dissolves the marriage bond and allows for remarriage--is the true view. There are three reasons for this.
First, that which dissolves the structure (union) of marriage and thus destroys all the practices (obligations) of marriage does therefore dissolve the bond of marriage. If you take away the inherent structure and purpose and end of any moral relation, the relation ceases to be. And this is what is done by adultery and therefore calls for divorce. For the structure of marriage consists in this: The two persons become "one flesh" (Gen. 2:24; Matt. 19:6). But this union is dissolved by adultery, for the adulteress becomes one flesh with the adulterer (1 Cor. 6:16). Thus she is no longer one flesh in union with her husband, but rather she absolutely breaks the bond and covenant of marriage. And when she breaks the bond she also absolutely destroys all the obligations and duties which accompany that bond. For how can one talk of a bond that exists if at the same time it is broken? Is that still a bond? Or how can one speak of a bond that doesn’t bind? But isn’t this what the second view teaches?

Secondly, if the innocent party of a divorce is not at liberty to marry again then two things ensue:

1. The innocent party is deprived of their freedom by the sin of another. This is against nature. This gives the wicked greater power over the righteous for every wicked and unfaithful spouse then has it in their power to deprive their partner of their natural rights and freedoms.

2. The innocent party, if not allowed to remarry, is exposed to sin and judgment because of the unfaithfulness of another. Our Savior allowed divorce in the case of adultery as an option to the innocent party to allow for their liberty, advantage, and relief. But if one is not allowed to remarry, this liberty would be no liberty at all, but would only prove a snare and a yoke to them. For if one does not have the gift of celibacy, then he is exposed to sin and judgment.

Thirdly, our blessed Savior gives express direction in the case of adultery. "And I say unto you, whoever shall divorce his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, commits adultery" (Matt. 19:9). Thus it is evident and is the plain sense of the words that the opposite is also true: "He who puts away his wife for fornication and marries another does not commit adultery." According to Jesus, the bond of marriage is in the case of adultery dissolved, and the person that puts away his wife is at liberty to marry again. While Jesus teaches against divorcing the wife and marrying again for any cause whatsoever, the exception of adultery allows the husband to both divorce and remarry.

Every exception is a particular case that is contradictory to the general rule. The rule here in general is: "He that divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery." The exception here is: "He that divorces his wife because of fornication and marries another does not commit adultery." This could be stated another way. The rule in general: "It is not lawful to divorce a wife and marry another; it is adultery." The exception: "It is lawful for a man to divorce his wife for fornication, and marry another."

It is of no use to argue that the other gospel writers, Luke and Mark do not include the exception clause in their gospels (Mark 10:11-12; Luke 16:18). For even though they do not comment on it, it is used twice by Matthew (Matt. 5:32; 19:9) and therefore was certainly spoken by our Savior. Also, every good interpreter knows that where the same thing is reported by several writers, the briefer and shorter expressions are to be measured and interpreted by the fuller and longer accounts. And every general rule in Scripture is to be limited by any exception attached to it in another place of Scripture. Know for certain that there is hardly any general rule of Scripture that does not admit of an exception.

It is even more vain to argue that our Savior speaks here with respect to the Jews alone so that the exception clause only has application to them. In Jesus’ answer to the Pharisees he refers back to the law of creation and the original covenant ordinances which have authority over all mankind and not merely the Jews. He declared that the original institution of marriage was prior to the law of Moses and therefore is not limited to the Jews alone. This is a law, therefore, that is applicable to all mankind.

Also, when the Pharisees inquired of Jesus concerning divorce, they inquired of a divorce that was absolute and provide liberty to marry following the divorce. They had never heard of any other type of divorce. They had never heard of a mere separation "from table and marriage bed" in the Old Testament. Our Savior answers their query according to their understanding and therefore refers to the bond of marriage and not merely a separation from the duties and obligations alone. Therefore, Jesus denies the causes of divorce which the Pharisees allowed and then asserts fornication to be the only just cause of divorce. He therefore teaches that this divorce, of which they inquired about, was an absolute divorce from the bond of marriage. This is how the Pharisees would understand it and we cannot assume that Jesus does not answer them according to their understanding.

Furthermore, the Apostle Paul clearly states that the innocent party who is maliciously and obstinately deserted by their
partner is set free to marry again. This affirms that the Christian religion does not remove the natural right and privilege of men in the case of divorce. "If the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases" (1 Cor. 7:15). If a spouse departs—whether due to religious differences or otherwise—and refuses to live together with a husband or wife, the deserted party is at liberty to marry again. The deserted spouse is at liberty because all the purposes and obligations of marriage are frustrated by this condition of desertion. Therefore, what shall a brother or sister that is a Christian do in the case that they are deserted? The apostle says, "They are not in bondage, but are free and thus at liberty to marry again."

This is the constant doctrine of all Protestant churches in the world.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2017/11/5 4:42
1 Corinthians 7:39 King James Version (KJV)

39 "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."

Here Paul is using an example from the 'Law' to teach about our relation to Christ. What he in NOT doing is teaching about marriage and divorce.
If he were, then you would have to agree that the 'Law' also teaches that a man is not bound to a woman as long as he lives. He could divorce according to Moses! A one sided rule existed.

So to try and use this scripture out of context to establish New Covenant teaching is full of problems and contradictions on what Jesus and Paul taught on this subject.

Re: , on: 2017/11/5 8:18
Greatly great posts Savannah and Dave.........bro Frank

Re: - posted by dfella (), on: 2017/11/5 11:31

There is no exception clause for divorce in these scriptures whatsoever.

Mark 10:11-12 And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. Â (12) And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.

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.

Here are two very clear and unambiguous portions of scripture that give no exception clause for divorce so the question is why is there an exception clause in Matthew and not in Mark or Luke?

The gospel of Matthew's audience were Jews whereas the audience of Mark and Luke were written to Gentiles.

Matthew 5:32 and 19:9 both contain the exception clause which everyone uses to justify divorce and remarriage much like the abortionists and Pro Choice crowd like to hide behind keeping abortion legal because of incest and rape.

The reason the exception clauses are in Matthew to a Jewish audience is because of the betrothal custom of the Jewish people.

Mat 1:18-25 Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was ESPOUSED (betrothed, engaged) to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Â (19) Then Joseph HERUSBAND (please note that Joseph is referred to as her husband before the marriage ceremony and consummation of the marriage covenant), being a just man, and not willing to make her a publick example, was minded to put her away (gave here a bill of divorcement) privily. Â (20) But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeareth unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee MARY THY WIFE: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. Â (21) And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins. Â (22) Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Â (23) Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call hi
s name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. (24) Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him HIS WIFE: (25) And KNEW HER NOT (consummation of the marriage covenant) till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS.

In Jewish custom once a couple were espoused to one another they were referred to as husband and wife long before the ceremony and consummation sometimes as long as a year before.

In the case of Mary being found with child before her and Joseph actually got married and had sexual relations Mary was found with child.

In Joseph's mind knowing he was not the father of the child would of had grounds to divorce her for the sin of Fornicatio (sex between two unmarried people).

He would have been free to remarry because Joseph and Mary had not yet left their respective homes of their father and mother and had not yet fully entered into their marriage covenant being made ONE flesh by God.

It has been said that adultery is grounds for divorce. Old Testament punishment for adultery was being stoned to death but in John 8:11 Jesus did not call for the stoning of the woman caught in adultery but He rather forgave her.

Marriage covenant is a life long covenant which can only be separated through the death of the partner. When God (not the priest, justice of the peace, pastor) joins two and He makes them one they are no longer two but one.

Marriage is also a universal law that was instituted and defined from the very beginning by God in the book of Genesis and is binding upon all mankind not just Christians.

Just because someone gets saved does not wipe away the universal law of marriage. When one is saved their sins are washed away but no where in scripture is marriage ever referred to as sin that can be wiped away.

For those who are interested in the hundreds upon hundreds of couples testimonies whom God is restoring, reconciling, healing, and saving through faith, obedience, forgiveness, repentance, and unconditional love for their marriage covenants please visit Rejoice Marriage Ministries.

https://www.rejoiceministries.org/resources/testimonies/restored-marriage-testimonies/

The reason we are now getting same sex marriage shoved down our throats and is being widely accepted is because the church has failed miserably in upholding Gods definition of biblical marriage and are always looking to excuse adulterous unions which God has and never will recognize or take part in.

While there are thousands upon thousands of testimonies of people whose marriages are being restored they are yet a very narrow road as compared to the multitudes who are on the broad road of destruction.

I can tell you first hand the amount of people that were telling me I was an innocent party in my own situation was absolutely staggering!

It wasn't until the Lord Himself came and spoke to me personally and quickened His will and plan for my life and marriage which led to our restoration.

I am not sure why people are so hung up on the fact that when an innocent party in marriage might be faced with being alone the rest of their lives?

When my wife and I were divorced there was a supernatural peace and contentment between me and the Lord it was everyone else who seemed to have the problem with me being alone.

The fact is I was not alone and it was during that time that God and I had our most intimate time in our relationship. I had learned to look and rely upon Him and Him alone and it was God who had separated me unto Himself very much like Paul.

I could have chosen to listen to the multitudes that thought caring for and satisfying my flesh was more important than dr
awing nigh to God and finding out what HIS will was for my life.

Please don't get me wrong, I know these people meant well and were sincere in trying to help me but the truth is there woulde have been no glory to God in me choosing my own way and not Gods.

The miracle is in when God saves, restores, delivers, heals, protects, and provides for those whose hearts are perfect to ward Him. The question is are we willing?

---

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2017/11/5 12:33**

Thanks alot for your testimony, Dave.

You probably had the "L" (legalist) word thrown at you from other Christians.

Once you start making exceptions, everybody will try to force himself through the loophole.

There is not a single remarried person mentioned in the NT apart from King Herod.

The issue for me is how to deal with people in our fellowship who are remarried.

We must teach the proper standard of the bible and at the same time exercise wisdom.

May the Holy Spirit bring conviction to those couples.

On the other hand, if we do not address the issue, other Christians will think it is ok to divorce and remarry.

I once visited a brother from our church. He was involved in teaching and missions. He told me that he had a wife that suffered from severe post-natal depression. He felt that she was a hinderance to his life and divorced her, but made ample financial provisions for her livelihood. Then he married a formerly divorced women.

After he told me the story I was so shocked that I made my way home.

---

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2017/11/5 12:40**

Re: Reply To This Post | 1 Corinthians 7:39 King James Version (KJV)

39 "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."

Here Paul is using an example from the 'Law' to teach about our relation to Christ. What he in NOT doing is teaching about marriage and divorce.

If he were, then you would have to agree that the 'Law' also teaches that a man is not bound to a women as long as he lives. He could divorce according to Moses! A one sided rule existed.
So to try and use this scripture out of context to establish New Covenant teaching is full of problems and contradictions on what Jesus and Paul taught on this subject.

This passage in 1 Corinthians 7:39 is in fact in context talking about marriage. There is another passage in Romans 7 where Paul uses an illustration from marriage to illustrate redemption.

But see what it says there:
Rom 7:3 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.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2017/11/5 13:28
Lots of good posts and scriptures in this thread, for me personally, it's past the point of confusion. I really did appreciate Davidâ€™s post, in how during his divorce, his relationship with the Lord become more intimate, I can relate. I didn't divorce, my wife passed, but I personally believe I would not have the intimate relationship with the Lord as I do, if I would have remarried or even got into another relationship. Yes, sometimes things get a bit lonely for me as a single person, but I do know the Lord is here with me, I guess it's just human nature to want that physical touch. But I really don't think I could have the same relationship with the Lord as I have now, if I were to get into another relationship, but Iâ€™m hoping the Lord will prove me wrong.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2017/11/5 13:44
The John Owen article pretty well deals with the points JFW is asserting.

In addition, the point you make JFW seems an attempt to make the the clear teaching of Jesus made in Mathew as irrelevant for the Church today, the sort of stuff we hear normally from the dispensationist camp that would seek to rip out whole books and teachings from scripture as 'not for the church'.

Your reasoning sounds eloquent, except for the following points.

1/ The Mark account is clearly the same account as Mathew 19 and it is the same question by the same people. So why would Mark be relevant and not Matthew?

2/ If Jesus was speaking about betrothal, then He did not answer the question, which was clearly regarding a Husband being allowed to divorce His wife for any reason as taught by Moses.

3/ The argument to relegate the exception Jesus gave in Matthew to betrothal is wresting the scripture to make them say something just so it can be disregarded, because one holds a certain position.

The argument often used to relegate the statement Jesus made "except for fornication" to betrothal, is that 'fornication' only applies to pre-martial sex. Is that true? The word is 'pornia' and it is the general word for all types of sexual sins, including adultery. There is no justification for it applying only to pre-martial sex as claimed by those with an agenda.

If this is how you want to interpret this, then consider that what you are advocating is that if a husband finds that his wife committed fornication while betrothed and they are now fully married, he can divorce her and re-marry. But if she commits adultery during the marriage he cannot divorce her and re-marry. That makes sense???

As John Owen points out, there are many duplicate accounts of various events in the different gospels and some omit things stated in others, but the understanding is always that all the accounts together give the full account.

All this said, I do understand why people here are keen to establish the sanctity of marriage and stand against the current tide of casual divorce and re-marriage in today's society and even the church, but making harsh and un-scriptural rules...
s for every circumstance and laying heavy burdens on the victims of divorce is not the answer.

Re: - posted by JFW (), on: 2017/11/5 14:11
Brother Dave,

...seems you have me confused with someone else?

My personal views and experience in this are (for this discussion) irrelevant insomuch as it seems there is a defensivene
ss to most of them, meaning there is a lack of unity:(

But like most æœcontroversialæ• topics, everyone has their minds made up for the most part and arenæ™t æœteach
ableæ• on those subjects, so we just go round and round.

I do know this tho,... our common enemy has a definite interest in breaking down families with selfishness/hard hearted
ness being quite useful to his ends closely followed by a judgmental spirit. Together these leave untold destruction in the
ir wake:(

Re: JFW - posted by Heydave (), on: 2017/11/5 15:42
Fletcher, I do sincerely apologise, yes I was responding to Dfella's post and meant to address him. Must have been ha
ving a 'senior moment':) Don't know how I got you confused.
Sorry again!

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2017/11/6 8:09

Quote:
------------------------ The freedom to do what is right, towers above the prison and the chains of commandments. One is initiated by love, the other is e
nforced by the whip. Holiness comes from freedom and freedom comes from love. And this love inspires and draws us and compels us to honor and re
spect and obey our Father in heaven because His love is the very air that we breathe and the air before the throne is rarified air and if we cannot breat
he this air then we die
------------------------

I am not sure I have any comment on this thread that has not already been made, but I was struck by this quote, and ha
ve to say AMEN, AMEN, AMEN. This is it. This is righteousness. This is holiness. This is intimacy with the father. I ha
ve the freedom to NOT sin. I do not have to give in to lust of any sort. I have been set free, and it is the revelation of Hi
s love that opens the door to walking in His fulness (See Ephesians). Praise God!

Re: Response to Hey Dave - posted by dfella (), on: 2017/11/6 12:54

HeyDave wrote:

â€œYour reasoning sounds eloquent, except for the following points.

1/ The Mark account is clearly the same account as Mathew
19 and it is the same question by the same people. So why would Mark be relevant and not Matthew?â€•

Dave, those who are opposed to preserving the marriage for life agenda are the ones who only quote the verses in Matt
hew that include the exception clause and never quote Mark or Lukes account, so why are they not relevant and only M
atthews account is?

â€œ2/ If Jesus was speaking about betrothal, then He did not answer the question, which was clearly regarding a Husb
and being allowed to divorce His wife for any reason as taught by Moses.â€•

But He did answer.
Mat 19:4-6 And He answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, (5) 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? (6) Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

Marriage and the universality of it was defined by God in the book of Genesis which Jesus is quoting from and tells us whatever HE JOINS no man can separate. He further tells us why men choose to divorce was because of the hardness of their hearts which Moses, NOT GOD, allowed. But from the beginning way back in the Book of Genesis it was never God will.

Mat 19:7-8 They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? (8) 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.

Hey Dave wrote:

â€œThe argument often used to relegate the statement Jesus made ”except for fornication” to betrothal, is that ’fornication’ only applies to pre-marital sex. Is that true? The word is ’pornia’ and it is the general word for all types of sexual sins, including adultery. There is no justification for it applying only to pre-marital sex as claimed by those with an agenda.â€

That all depends on whether the Greek word for Fornication is used in a broad sense, narrow sense, or definitive sense. In Matthew it is used in a definitive sense to define premarital sex, if it was used in the broad sense to include adultery why is the Greek word for adultery Moichao also used? Wouldnâ€™t Jesus have used only the word Porneia?

As for an â€œAgendaâ€œ, Dave, Is desiring to see the God we all profess to believe in to restore, heal, and reconcile broken marriages a bad thing? When God saved us, set us free, delivered us, loved us, and forgave us we are very quick to point out what an awesome, loving, and forgiving God we serve but if we try to apply those same blessings to broken marriages weâ€™ve committed the unpardonable sin?

What is it that people really hate about seeing a husband or wife stand upon the vow, promise, and covenant they made before God, their family, and friends? When a husband or wife stands in the gap and makes up the hedge for a wayward spouse? Why is it that they attack them so ferociously?

Why do people only seek an exception clause when it comes to divorce and remarriage? Are there exception clauses for forgiving others, loving our neighbor, doing good to all men, obeying the commandments of God?

I think Jesus made it very clear it is because of the hardness of menâ€™s hearts. How can one read the numerous testimonies at Rejoice Ministries of healed marriages and not be filled with hope, joy, and blessing but only be left found seething in accusations, bitterness, and hatred. Is there complaint really with us who choose to see families, husbands, wives, and children restored and preserved or is their complaint with God?

Dave, I do not wish to argue, debate, or prove myself right. I do not have all the answers, what ifâ€™s, caveats to every situation but what glory is there for God when a marriage is broken and destroyed?

What about the damage divorce brings to children? Suicide, drugs, drinking, prison, prostitution? I donâ€™t know the stats but would be willing to bet many of the cases where children kill themselves, end up in prison, hooked on drugs, selling themselves just to find love and acceptance are from broken homes!

Has anyone considered what is happening when a spouse leaves, cheats, abandons, or commits adultery on their mate that they are actually being taken captive by the enemy?

Does anyone have a clue to the impact divorce and remarriage is having upon the church and body of Christ? If you believe that a man or a woman can divorce and be joined to someone else what assurance do you have that you yourself wonâ€™t accept or join yourself to another god or another Jesus?

I plead with you, please take the time and read some testimonies of hundreds of men and woman who chose to stand in the gap, make up the hedge, and love their wayward spouses and see how God has blessed, healed, and restored.
Here is the section on Q&A from Rejoice Ministries.

Please prayerfully consider God's heart and will on the matter of marriage. Those of us who seek to uphold, honor, and preserve it are not evil nor do we have an agenda other than to glorify the God we all profess to follow.

Re: Response to NarrowPath - posted by dfella (), on: 2017/11/6 13:56

NP wrote:

â€œYou probably had the "L" (legalist) word thrown at you from other Christians.â€

Yes I have but when I thought about it I guess I would rather be called a Legalist then an Illegalist. Truth be told, many Christians confuse obedience with legalism. When one chooses to obey God they are accused of being a legalist, they call it what they will be it is better to obey God rather than men.

NP wrote:

â€œThe issue for me is how to deal with people in our fellowship who are remarried.â€

â€œWe must teach the proper standard of the bible and at the same time exercise wisdom.â€

â€œMay the Holy Spirit bring conviction to those couples.â€

Like myself, many of those who are facing marital issues are being visited by God in their prayer closet as they are crying out to God in absolute desperation. God is faithfully coming alongside bringing comfort, hope, and divine guidance.

It is after God begins to speak, convict, and prick their conscience as to what His will is that they will then begin to seek out confirmation from others. It is then we need to be ready to offer help, guidance, and prayer.

I had a blessed and interesting situation last week. A man I never met before came to do a measurement of a kitchen I need to remodel and as he was measuring he kept looking at me and then stopped doing what he was doing and the next thing I heard was him prophesying over me and speaking life and blessing into my life.

Mind you this man did not know me from Adam and asked me to forgive him but that he felt that God's anointing and favor was upon my life and could not help but share that with me.

He then asked if he could pray for me and I agreed and said I will talk all the prayer anyone is willing to offer.

After he prayed I thanked him for stepping out in faith and being obedient to the Holy Spirit and that the things he was confessing and praying over me were indeed from God and were an answer to my own prayers and recent situations I was going through.

Then God had me share with him and the reason he was at our home and that it was the first home my wife and I ever owned many years ago. I then felt led to tell him a brief testimony of my wife and I and our divorce and subsequent remarriage and he began to weep. He confessed to me that he is in a Hosea kind of situation with his wife right now and had just prayed that morning as to what God's will was for him concerning his wayward wife.

He confessed what I shared was confirmation to what he prayed for that morning as God told him, â€œLove your wifeâ€ which is the very thing God told me. He then asked me to pray over him.
This went on for quite some time both of us praying for each other.

So NP, just love people where they are, pray for them, donât feel compelled to straighten everyone out. When God opens a door, faithfully and lovingly step through it, bless and curse not, and speak the words of life. People are not dumb, they know when one genuinely cares for their soul.

In the case above, here you have two men who undoubtedly love the Lord and had specific needs in our lives that only God knew of and to and behold God shows up and provides! There must have been a two for one sale that day.

NP wrote:

â€œI once visited a brother from our church. He was involved in teaching and missions. He told me that he had a wife that suffered from severe post-natal depression. He felt that she was a hinderance to his life and divorced her, but made ample financial provisions for her livelihood. Then he married a formerly divorced women.â€

NP, it is testimonies like this that men will throw out the exception clause in Matthew in order to justify their divorcing and remarrying and that is the problem with this â€œgo toâ€˜ exception/excuse clause.

Thank you for sharing your thoughts NP.

Re: - posted by TMK, on: 2017/11/6 14:18

Holy mackerel dfella you must not be reading these other posts. The exception clause is for the benefit of the aggrieved spouse, not the adulterer. How can you possibly think otherwise?? No one is arguing that the exception clause gives a adulterer license to divorce his wife and remarry. It gives the innocent spouse the right to divorce and remarry.

Of course the innocent party does not HAVE to divorce their wayward spouse if they donât want to. Jesus just says that if the innocent party wants to do so they are not committing adultery if they remarry. The situation is even more clear if the wayward spouse initiates the divorce.

Re: - posted by TMK, on: 2017/11/6 14:55

//Why do people only seek an exception clause when it comes to divorce and remarriage? Are there exception clauses for forgiving others, loving our neighbor, doing good to all men, obeying the commandments of God?

I think Jesus made it very clear it is because of the hardness of menâ€™s hearts.//

No- there is an exception clause because in Godâ€™s eyes when adultery/fornication occurs a legal marriage no longer exists.

Re: - posted by dfella, on: 2017/11/16 15:07

Matthew 19:9 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 (the innocent party) doth commit adultery.

Luke 16:18 Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband (the innocent party) committeth adultery.

Luke 16:18 It is a terrible sin for a man to divorce his wife and marry another woman. It is also a terrible sin for a man to marry a divorced woman.

1Corinthians 7:10-11 And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband: (11) But and if she depart, let her REMAIN UNMARRIED, or be RECONCILED TO HER HUSBAND: and let not the husband put away his wife.

Todd, when God makes two people one flesh they are no longer two but one and whatever God joins no man can separate. Divorce does not break the universal law of marriage as clearly defined in scripture. No twisting, no wresting, plain, clear, simple scriptures.
Marriage covenant can never be broken except through death of a spouse, you can violate it but never break it unless you die.

Yes I am reading the other posts and I disagree. God is the only one who joins couples and death is the only thing that separates couples.

There are only two places in scripture that uses the Greek word that says God Joins together G4801 "suzeugnumi" and that is found only in Matthew 19:6 and Mark 10:9.

The scriptures above clearly state that if a man divorces his wife whether he feels he is justified or not anyone who marries her commits adultery, Why? Because she is still one flesh with her husband.

Just read Mark 10:9,10 and Luke 16:18 these verses clearly state that any subsequent marriage after the first is adultery us. If one can first take these two accounts at face value there is a plausible explanation for Matthew and his exceptions.

As a Lawyer, you cannot say that Matthew, Mark, and Lukes accounts are in agreement. They are not, at face value, be cause Mark and Luke give no exception period.

I gave what I believe to be the reason. Also, I was being told I was the innocent party and yet God had a much higher way and I chose that route to Gods glory because by trusting and obeying Him He restored my marriage.

I love my wife, now more than ever and she thanks me almost everyday for forgiving her, loving her and taking her back. That was over 11 years now Todd, and God is not a respecter of persons if He did it for me and thousands of others He will do it for anyone.

Who in any marriage can truly claim they are innocent? Show me just one and I will show you someone who has never sinned and we know that is impossible.

Just like in NarrowPaths account of the man who divorced his wife for a ridiculous reason and married someone else. People want to shout innocent, innocent, exception, exception.

Man will never separate what God almighty the creator joins. They can marry all they want, marrying and marriage does not make two people one flesh no matter how many times they do it. God only shows up at the first one to Join.

If marrying made two people one flesh then all the same sex marriages are valid?

God is compelling people all over the world to stand in the gap, call them the innocent party if you will or so choose, but these people are doing Gods will and God is healing and restoring. For those who choose to not forgive and go after some one else that is between God and them.

All I know is that God is willing and able to restore any marriage for those who will believe Him.

---

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2017/11/6 15:16

Quote:
------------------------Does anyone have a clue to the impact divorce and remarriage is having upon the church and body of Christ? If you believe that a man or a woman can divorce and be joined to someone else what assurance do you have that you yourself won't accept or join yourself to another god or another jesus?------------------------

These are good questions to ask. It comes down to not "liberty" to do what we want. And also the Lord does not always want our perfect happiness or enjoyment in the earth but what is also good for our soul as we follow in the path of sufferi
ng to eternal life.

The new gospel preached with no cross and no narrow way also says "of course indulge yourself in 5 marriages, God is for you."

If true revival came would these things become sin and we have to deal with them before a holy God?

The same reasonings and feelings that revolt that someone in a marriage could be in perpetual adultery is the same feeling we get that God would send people to an eternal hell where there is torment and suffering unending. The mind of men revolt and say; "that is not fair" but the sanctified mind of Christ says, "Yes, God is worthy, He is the king, He makes the rules and does as He please, We will follow Him."

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/11/6 15:34

In regard to the Âœone fleshÂœ argument, many have taken JesusÂ™ words to teach the indissolubility of marriage, His statement actually affirms the danger, and possibility, of people dissolving what God has joined. If a mother says to her children, Âœspent all day cleaning the house. DonÂ™t mess it upÂœ, would the children be justified in taking her words to mean that it is impossible to mess up a house that their mother had cleaned? (The analogous statement would be Âœwhat mother has cleaned let no child mess upÂœ). JesusÂ™ statement is very misleading if it is not teaching that dissolution of marriage is possible, but not permissible.

Marriage is a covenant. Ideally covenants should never be broken but they sometimes are. A covenant broken by one party ceases to be binding upon the innocent party. Thus God Himself is released from His covenantal obligations to Israel because of her violation of her covenant. There is nothing in Scripture to suggest that the marriage covenant is a unique exception to this rule, and JesusÂ™ teaching on the topic in Matthew 5:32 and 19:9 explicitly confirms that there are extreme conditions under which the general permanence of marriage may legitimately be regarded as optional, i.e., when one spouse commitsÂœfornication,Âœ the other may choose to continue the marriage, or else to end it. In the latter case, the divorcing party is not Âœputting asunderÂœ what God has joined. The adulterous partner has already done that. The party seeking the divorce is simply formalizing what the other has made a reality.

Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2017/11/6 15:38

Hi Dfella,

thanks for your encouraging testimony. God can entrust hearbroken people to you, because you exercise grace.

As for this discussion about the exception clause, I think we all pulled our arguments. If people make up their mind to believe what they want to believe instead of going by what scripture says, there is little you can do.

Society in the western world is sick to the core because of divorce and remarriage. This leads to depression, violence, suicide, poverty, teenage pregnancies, we talked about it.

Marriage is bigger than a man in love with a woman. It is a life-long covenant before God. It is sanctified; even between unbelievers. God never breaks a covenant, and even keeps His part when man breaks their part. Should that not teach us something?

America has lost its upper moral ground in front of other nations. Many of your national leaders are divorced. Can you trust a covenant breaker with power? One day we may face the same fate as John the Baptist for daring to call a remarriage unlawful. Well, I think I better end my rant here, God bless!
Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2017/11/6 15:48

A covenant broken by one party ceases to be binding upon the innocent party. Thus God Himself is released from His covenantal obligations to Israel because of her violation of her covenant.  

This is not true. God will NEVER break his covenant with Israel. Statements like this open up a whole can of worms.

Judges 2:1 And an angel of the Lord came up from Gilgal to Bochim, and said, I made you to go up out of Egypt, and have brought you unto the land which I sware unto your fathers; and I said, I will never break my covenant with you.

Psalm 89:34 My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips.

Re: 4x - posted by savannah, on: 2017/11/6 19:20

"...marrying and marriage does not make two people one flesh no matter how many times they do it."

No, it does not!

According to the Scriptures what does?

What do these 4 Scriptures have in common?

Genesis 2:24
Mathew 19:5
1 Corinthians 6:16
Ephesians 5:31