

**General Topics :: Divorce and Re Marriage****Divorce and Re Marriage - posted by bigdaveusa (), on: 2004/5/3 13:36**

I have met a girl and we have become very close. She is 42 and never married and I am 39 and married briefly and then divorced when I was 19. I was not a christian at the time, or some would say that I was a carnal christian, however I am a christian now.

The question that I am faced with is: Am I allowed to re marry? This woman wants badly to marry me, and everyone is telling me that it's fine, but I have heard other views on the subject, and I really don't have a peace about it.

I am hoping that my brothers and sisters here at SI can help me find an answer to my dilemma.

Thanks....

:-?

**Re: Divorce and Re Marriage - posted by rocklife (), on: 2004/5/3 15:37**

Look up New Testament about that, and go with your conscience. We are disciples of Jesus, look up what Jesus says about that in his own words, like Matt 5:32, 19:8, Mark 10:2, Luke 16:18. The rest of the bible has other notes about God's perspective on divorce and remarriage.

Please, pray about this and research it yourself from the bible and Jesus. People will tell you what you want to hear, but Jesus is your Lord.

New Testament suggests being single is easier than marriage also.

I have researched this myself as I struggle in the divorce, remarriage issue also. You're not alone. I am living with the consequences for my actions, and am obeying what Scripture says about it. God will change circumstances in His time, He always does.

**Re: Divorce and Re Marriage - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/5/3 19:32**

That's quite a dilemma, I'm sorry you're put in this situation by a pre-conversion decision.

I'll be blunt about my own position: If a man and a woman marry, then divorce, neither can lawfully (by God's law) marry another person so long as both remain alive.

The only reason I believe that is because I believe the Scriptures teach it. If I had a good Scriptural argument for anything less harsh I'd probably leap for it.

Matthew 5

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

The clause "except for the cause of fornication" has been interpreted (reasonably) to mean that if either person commits adultery then divorce is lawful and presumably remarriage as well (of the non-adulterating person, at least). I've heard, however, that Jesus was referring to the Jewish custom where if the woman fornicating during the espousal period, the engagement could be called off lawfully; nothing to do with sexual misconduct after the marriage had taken place. I think there's support for that interpretation in that Matthew has a more Jewish audience than the other 3 Gospels (right?), and Jesus' other statements on the matter do not include this exception clause.

Mark 10

11 And He said unto them, "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her.  
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.

I'd put more time into investigating this, and I'll ask a friend of mine who has been researching it, but right now I have to finish up a term project. Will pm you if I have anything worthwhile.

Again, the Scriptural evidence is the only reason I hold this position, it's definately not my natural preference, but we must obey God.

I shall pray for you, at the least.

**Re: Divorce and Re Marriage - posted by HakkaMin (), on: 2004/5/3 21:18**

Hi Dave,

I so appreciate your openness and desire to follow Jesus in this tough area. You might want to check out some MP3 teachings by Steve Gregg at [www.thenarrowpath.com](http://www.thenarrowpath.com) (Go to the "Tape Download" page and look under his "Towards A Radically Christian Counterculture." Teachings # 14 and 15 concern this whole issue of divorce and remarriage.) I think you'll appreciate Steve's thoroughness and integrity in searching for truth in the Word of God.

Bless you!

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/5/3 23:57**

Quote:

-----  
You might want to check out some MP3 teachings by Steve Gregg at [www.thenarrowpath.com](http://www.thenarrowpath.com)  
-----

That appears to be an **excellent** site, thank you for the link.

I didn't listen to the mp3, but I read the (long) "topical article" on "Divorce and Remarriage". I'm going to think about it and discuss it some people more mature in the faith than I, but the author makes a very good Biblical case for permissible divorce and remarriage in a limited set of cases.

Some of the more conservative churches might not be so understanding, which is regrettably a necessary consideration, but one cannot generally please everyone else.

**Re: - posted by 5nva (), on: 2004/5/4 8:45**

I just wanted to pose a question to perhaps make us consider things a bit more on the subject.

If two people are married and have not been "saved", "born again", get divorced and then one or both get "saved", has not Jesus forgiven them of the sin of divorce as well and forgotten about it? Have they not begun a new life in Christ Jesus, old things passed away and all things made new?

If the sin of divorce hangs over a persons head after they have been saved then why wouldn't other sins.

Mike

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/5/4 8:53**

Quote:

-----Have they not begun a new life in Christ Jesus, old things passed away and all things made new?

If the sin of divorce hangs over a persons head after they have been saved then why wouldn't other sins.  
-----

That's something to clarify, yes, but the problem is elsewhere. If the first marriage was not actually (according to God's reckoning) dissolved, then marrying another person is adultery because it's being married to two people at once. The sin of divorce is forgiven (there's the matter of restitution, like when a thief gets saved and returns what he still has of the stolen goods, but I'll leave that alone for now), but entering into adultery is still a sin.

That article gives a pretty good Biblical case for a marriage in this situation being actually dissolved, though.

**Re: divorce/remarriage - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/5/4 9:04**

Also, did you read his own testimony (narrowpath)? He has been married 3 times. At first glance this seems like a tragedy but after you read the testimony you see that not all circumstances are the same.

In Him, chanin

**Re: - posted by earnestlycontend (), on: 2004/5/4 22:11**

Thanks for the link. I think he does a thorough, clear job in writing.

**Re: - posted by rocklife (), on: 2004/5/5 3:32**

Adding another scripture I came across today, is 1 Cor 7:10, the whole chapter goes over marriage, divorce. etc. Reading it shows me God does not support remarriage very much, but I am a woman, so maybe that can be a loophole.

I haven't found new testament scripture that does support remarriage outside of death and adultery. I could be wrong, but I have researched this quite a bit, and haven't found it, because of Mark 10:11 Jesus says something very clear "Anyon e who divorces his wife and marries another woman commits adultery against her. And if she divorces her husband and marries another man, she commits adultery."

Matt 19:9 Jesus says, "I tell you that anyone who divorces his wife, except for marital unfaithfulness, and marries another woman commits adultery."

That is the only provision besides death that I have found for godly divorce. It doesn't even mention if remarriage after a adultery is okay, I haven't found Scripture to elaborate on remarriage. But Mark says if you remarry, you're committing adultery, so that's what I think is right. There really isn't provision for remarriage, just divorce.

And Rev 21:8 says adulterers are going in the lake of fire, so this isn't a light thing. Please pray and follow God's teachings about this, He has some hard things to say about it.

**Re: - posted by riki (), on: 2004/5/5 15:10**

I must say I am impressed by the honesty of people here at SI. :-)

Dave, I understand that this must be a really hard situation for you, that is why I am so glad to see that you are prepared to ask such a tough question and to consider the answers.

The thing I noticed in your post was this:

Quote:  
-----The question that I am faced with is: Am I allowed to re marry? This woman wants badly to marry me, and everyone is telling me th at it's fine , but I have heard other views on the subject, **and I really don't have a peace about it.**  
-----

NEVER take such a step if you don't have peace about it. There is always some reason for the lack of peace inside, even if we may not know the exact reason. (Or maybe in this case you do?)

My heart goes out to you, brother! I can feel you anguish.

/Rikard

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/5/5 17:14**

Having thought about it and discussed it a bit with one of my friends, I don't see a Biblical justification of remarriage when the ex-spouse is still alive. If your spouse just up and leaves you (either heathen or acting like one), you aren't held responsible for the divorce, but to say the Scripture permits remarriage in such cases is probably stretching it.

It also seems that the position of the Church on the matter was pretty solid from early times until fairly recently, and we should always be wary (not necessarily dismissive-out-of-hand, but wary) of "new" doctrine, and place the burden of proof upon those proposing it. I'd like to know what you all know about the history of the Christian position on divorce and rem

arriage (if I weren't so lazy I'd go research it myself, and I probably will, just not at the moment). Sometimes it's right to turn from the historical position, but we have to be careful, and we had better not change only for compassionate or emotional reasons (i.e. there's a tremendous number of remarried people and people living in possibly/clearly adulterous remarriages, so there's a lot of pressure to be too lenient on the issue).

Aside from the general case, though, it's a very good point that we should never do anything (particularly so important) lacking a peace from God. Remember,

Romans 14:23

And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not from faith; for whatsoever is not from faith is sin.

That is: doubtful action is sin.

**Re: - posted by FireBaptizedPentecostal, on: 2004/5/6 0:21**

Hey Brother, Continue to earnestly CONTEND FOR THE FAITH of Jesus Christ our LORD and Savior.

HOBBY

**Re: Divorce and Re Marriage - posted by praise2him, on: 2004/5/6 2:36**

Hi,

I am entering this forum for the first time. I would like to say to bigdaveusa that I understand your problem. I am divorced although the difference being that I was married for 7 years and have 3 beautiful daughters. My children's mom decided to have an affair (we were saved at the time) she separated and I divorced after 4 years of prayer and hope. Anyway I have not remarried and do not feel as a Christian I have a right to as long as my children's mother does not remarry. Although I do not see myself remarrying anyway

Deuteronomy 24

1 If a man marries a woman who becomes displeasing to him because he finds something indecent about her, and he writes her a certificate of divorce, gives it to her and sends her from his house, 2 and if after she leaves his house she becomes the wife of another man, 3 and her second husband dislikes her and writes her a certificate of divorce, gives it to her and sends her from his house, or if he dies, 4 then her first husband, who divorced her, is not allowed to marry her again after she has been defiled. That would be detestable in the eyes of the LORD. Do not bring sin upon the land the LORD your God is giving you as an inheritance.

You see I believe Christians who marry divorce and remarry are bringing a curse upon the land that the Lord has given us. They are leading selfish and self-serving lives, the exact opposite of the life Jesus Christ called us to live. Now, that being said I also understand that you were not a Christian at the time of your 1st marriage, or maybe you were, that was kind of unclear. At any rate I do not see a great problem in your remarriage if your first wife has remarried and or if you were not saved at the time of your first marriage.

**Re: - posted by praise2him, on: 2004/5/6 2:49**

One final thing I seem to have noticed you saying how badly this woman wants to marry you,

Am I allowed to remarry? This woman wants badly to marry me, etc.,

but nothing is said about how badly you want to marry her although you said you have "become very close" that alone is not grounds for love that brings marriage.

Maybe the check you feel is not whether it is scriptural or not, maybe it is because you don't love her in the way that brings marriage into a relationship.

I am just reading from what was written by you, and I had to look at this very same topic with myself and a woman. I finally realized the "check" was because I really didn't love her that way.

P.S. we are still great friends, Thank God!!!!

**Re: Divorce and Re Marriage - posted by matthew (), on: 2004/5/6 9:06**

Though I am against divorce and remarriage in most every case, every case must be viewed individually. and as far as you are concerned, my thinking is this. We can do what we will here as we will (concerning divorce) but since he who marries a divorced person commits adultery, the divorce is not valid before God. therefore whatever the state decrees you are still wed before God.

In that case, (if my initial premise is invalid it destroys my argument) I would draw your attention to 1 Corinthians chapter 7 verse 14-15.

14 For the unbelieving husband is sanctified through his wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified through her believing husband; for otherwise your children are unclean, but now they are holy.

15 Yet if the unbelieving one leaves, let him leave; the brother or the sister is not under bondage in such cases, but God has called us to peace.

It seems here that if you were yet married and it was her desire to leave, you would not be under bondage...I think this is the counsel of the bible in this case...

matthew

**Re: - posted by 5nva (), on: 2004/5/6 9:18**

I would tend to agree with Matthew's latest post on this. (1 Cor 7:15-16)

Also 1 Cor 7:27-28 seems to indicate to me that when your spouse leaves you and divorces you that you are released. It says not to seek a wife but if you do should marry again that you have not sinned.

The real problem to me is when two people say they are Christians but one wants a divorce. To me this is an indication that one of them is unbelieving. God hates divorce and so do Christians.

Mike

**Re: - posted by bigdaveusa (), on: 2004/5/7 8:52**

I just want to say through my tears how much I love and appreciate all of you. Thank you for the tender words of understanding and encouragement. I knew that I could count on all of you, and could imagine that I could actually hear the pages of your bibles turning as you winnowed out the truth with me. I am shocked at the disparity of views concerning the matter. Scripture seems clear about it, and then I read this or that that leads me to the conclusion that the matter is not so clear but seemingly convoluted. I do know this: Jesus is the Author and Finisher of my faith. That the evil one is the author of confusion. I now merely wrestle with the hard truth it seems. God will not be mocked. He hates divorce. He is faithful even when we are faithless, but He does not excuse willful sin or causing another to sin. There are consequences...eternal consequences.....

This is where I am at on the subject. Please pray for me. Thank you.....

**Re: - posted by poetwarrior, on: 2004/5/7 14:48**

How is it that a person can remarry under any circumstance after a divorce, whether they were a christian or not at the time? It looks to me as though God's word is very clear on the matter. :-?

**Re: - posted by rocklife (), on: 2004/5/7 17:57**

Responding to 1 Cor 7 verse about letting them go. That seems to mean it's ok to separate or divorce, but the Scripture doesn't say then it's ok to remarry, that is being assumed, and that is dangerous to do. Reading the whole bible, scripture seems to lean towards staying unmarried if your first marriage is a bust. Reading the whole of God's word over and over, not just taking one scripture, is the best way to interpret God's word and understand God's will and His ways. Again, we follow Jesus, and He has some things to say about this. If one is going to twist and add on to what Scripture says, God will not hold you guiltless on the Day of Judgment. Jesus as Lord means do what He says to do, live life how He says to live it, otherwise, He is not your Lord.

**Re: - posted by rocklife (), on: 2004/5/7 23:49**

I looked up some other comments about 1 Cor 7:15, there is much debate about this, so I don't think this can be resolved on this site so easily. I have found other research that supports the context I believe this verse is referring to, that disagrees with other points of view here, that "not being bound in such cases" does not automatically allow for remarriage but it is only referring to letting them go in peace. God has not shown me Scripture to support remarriage outside of adultery, even then, only the offended party seems able to remarry, and not the other, as stated in Matt 19:9. This is a personal thing between God and each person, but these kinds of things should be at least given some thought before doing it. I pray God gives us wisdom about this subject, and His children will love their spouses as much as Christ loves the church.

**Re: - posted by ArtB (), on: 2004/5/11 1:37**

I've been following this thread with some interest.

The LAW of Moses clearly states that:

Lev 20:10

If there is a man who commits adultery with another man's wife, one who commits adultery with his friend's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death.

NASU

If this is so, why did Jesus violate the Law by preventing the stoning of a woman caught in adultery and He Himself letting her not be stoned?

Scripture says: "Lev 20:17-18

If there is a man who takes his sister, his father's daughter or his mother's daughter, so that he sees her nakedness and she sees his nakedness, it is a disgrace; and they shall be cut off in the sight of the sons of their people. He has uncovered his sister's nakedness; he bears his guilt."

NASU

How is it then that Abraham married Sarah, his half sister, and no guilt was laid on him for doing so. Also, did not the many children of Adam and Eve marry each other? How is it that it was not wrong in the eyes of God that brothers and sisters married each other back then? Indeed He instructed them to marry and multiply.

Did not Jacob bear children by Leah and Rachel, his two wives, and at their request he also bore children by each wife's personal maidservant, Why was this not adultery?

Both Abraham before the Mosaic Law, and David after the issuance of the Mosaic Law, were sexually active with multiple wives and concubines. Why was sex with the non-wives (i.e. concubines) not considered adultery or fornication? Though David is never admonished for having sex with concubines, yet when David had sex with Beersheba and had her husband murdered to cover-up their adulterous relationship, God took David to task for committing adultery and murder. Yet God does not invoke the Death penalty of "Stoning" on David and Beersheba, as is required by the Mosaic Law. How can this be?

There are some here who do not know scripture very well nor understand what Christ actually accomplished for us. The prohibition of marriage is a great burden to place on any two unmarried people who genuinely love and long for each other, even if one or both had been divorced. For guidance, here are other scriptures:

Matt 7:1-3

" Do not judge so that you will not be judged. For in the way you judge, you will be judged; and by your standard of measure, it will be measured to you.

NASU

And

James 2:12-13

Speak and act as those who are going to be judged by the law that gives freedom, because judgment without mercy will be shown to anyone who has not been merciful. Mercy triumphs over judgment!  
NIV

ArtB

Holiness is not the absence of sin in one's life, a rock is sinless. Holiness is the presence of God in one's life.

I will start a new thread called "Messiah" and hopefully clarify some of the above.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/5/11 10:02**

Sometimes we have to broaden an issue before we can narrow it. There are at least three issues affecting fellowship which the Church has struggled with for hundreds of years; repentant apostates, the marriage of divorcees, and taking up arms in war. Opposing sides have been taken by Godly men in their different persuasions. Often, as the saying goes 'we generated more heat than light'. It is easier to come to decisions about these matters in our studies than in our pastoral care of the saints. It is relatively easy to come to fixed position theologically; if we were dealing with boxes and not people life would be uncomplicated.

Before we can define 'remarriage' we have to define 'divorce', but before we define 'divorce' we have to define 'marriage'. For a couple of hundred years there has been a 'Christian consensus' for a definition; usually it would involve the notions of consent, covenant and consumation. It has been a bulwark for society and the family, but we are now living in a society which is much more like that of the first century and it would be good if we understood what that society was like.

As far as I can ascertain there are no Hebrew words nor Greek words for 'husband' or 'wife'. :-o Both languages use the simple words for 'man' or 'woman' and they add a possessive pronoun. eg Jesus says to the Samaritan woman "thou hast had 5 men and he whom thou now hast is not thy man". The question then is what makes 'a man' hers or 'a woman' his. and we are back to our need for a definition of marriage!

There are no marriage 'ceremonies' in the Old Testament. There is a wedding celebration in John 2 and we have a good idea of the pattern of betrothal and marriage in Jewish society. Some say that God authenticates the Jewish pattern, but do not usually say where or how.

At this point in history Roman wedding patterns were in transition. Roman family life with its rights and responsibilities is very complicated for folks brought up in our cultures. The Romans had 5 recognized forms of marriage! In some of them 'ownership' of the woman changed. In some it did not. The one closest to our traditional 'Christian marriage' was called 'Confarreatio'.

Confarreatio was an elaborate religious ceremony,

- \* with ten witnesses,
- \* the flamen dialis (himself married confarreatio) and
- \* pontifex maximus in attendance.
- \* Only the children of parents married confarreatio were eligible.
- \* The grain far was baked into a special wedding cake (farreum) for the occasion; hence, the name confarreatio.

It was only available for the patrician class. (the upper strata of Roman society) Technically this made the bride her father-in-law's possession.

Another familiar form of marriage was known as USUS and has similarities with what we would now call 'common law marriage'. This would have been the form of marriage for much of the lower 'strata' of Roman society. Under this form of marriage

- \* After a year's cohabitation, the woman came under her husband's manum, (authority)
- \* unless she stayed away for three nights (trinoctium abesse).
- \* Since she wasn't living with her pater familias, and
- \* since she wasn't under the hand of her husband,
- \* she acquired some freedom.

We have no records of Roman marriages being 'blessed' by Christians and it is most unlikely that early Christians were r

required to be formally married by 'Christian priests'.

One of the things we 21st Century Christians need to think through is the implications of all this. Is a common-law marriage between two faithful partners less 'valid' than a legal marriage in Las Vegas that lasts for an hour or two? Can someone live a life of promiscuity but still be regarded as 'unmarried' and therefore eligible for 'Christian Marriage'?

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

In particular we should notice

1. his change from 'command' to 'allow' in his statement regarding Moses,
2. that the original design (from the beginning) had been allowed to be 'modified'.
3. the reason for the modification was 'hardness of heart'.

The Moses commandment was part of a Law-Code which began at Sinai (and hence did not include Adam, Abraham, Jacob etc) and ended when the 'seed came to whom the promise was made'. (Gal 3:19). This means we must be very cautious about the way we use the Old Testament to understand the New Testament. The New Covenant contains a promise of a new-heart, so is there now any accommodation for 'hardness of heart' in the Church? are we back to 'as it was in the beginning?'.

In all these considerations we need a spirit of patience and love and, often, specific discernment. This is a plea from an old pastor who once had all this sorted out theoretically, but real people just kept getting in the way! :-)

Just one more comment by way of loving provocation; one of the reasons we have such difficulties with this issue is because churches have taken on the role of 'marriage facilitators'. Why do we 'marry' people? If we left this in the hands of the civil authority we might be able to see some of the issues more clearly. Just my thoughts... we know in part...

#### **Re: Jewish Marriage 1st Century AD - posted by ArtB (), on: 2004/5/11 14:14**

If the marriage was not an arranged marriage from infancy, the way for a man to obtain a bride can be done in 3 possible ways: the man's father could make arrangements for his son; an agent working on behalf of the father can make the arrangements; or the would be Bridegroom can make his own arrangements.

Once the arrangements are made with the potential bride-to-be's family, the two families gather at her father's home. The potential groom-to-be takes three things with him: a large sum of money to purchase his wife, a betrothal contract, and a skin of wine. The Bridegroom then meets with the bride's father/brothers and he shows them the betrothal contract, a glass of wine is poured out, and he then negotiates a price to be paid for the bride. If an agreement is reached, the bride is called in. The potential bridegroom drinks of the cup and offers it to her, if she agrees, she drinks of the cup of the wine, and in so doing she has made the marriage contract binding. They are legally married at this point and their union can only be dissolved by divorce. Still, their relationship at this point is that of betrothed, Bridegroom and Bride, and not that of fully married.

The groom then announces that he will go to his father's house to prepare a place for her. He returns to his father's house to build the chamber and honeymoon bed. The room is made beautiful and provided with every comfort. If the groom is asked when the room will be ready, his answer would be "no one knows except my father." This is because by custom, the father has to be satisfied that everything was just right before he gave his permission to the son to go get his bride.

The bride, having been bought with a price and having accepted the bridegroom's offer of betrothal, must spend time preparing to live as wife. Her days in waiting for her husband are spent in learning how to please her husband.

The groom enlists two close friends to assist him in securing his bride and to assist during the actual ceremony. Jewish custom calls these two "The friends of the bridegroom". They also function as the two witnesses required for a Jewish wedding. On the day when all preparations for the ceremony are ready, one of the two 'friends of the bridegroom' is sent to assist the bride and bring her to the ceremony. The other is stationed with the bridegroom.

At the wedding ceremony, the groom and bride sign a new contract, the Ketubah, which is witnessed by his 'friends', it contains his promises to the bride.



**Re: Divorce and Re Marriage - posted by shazbot, on: 2004/5/11 17:17**

Dave: I realize there have been other views on this subject expressed, but here's my *opinion*.

Don't let a mistake you made in your past life (you are dead to sin, that life is no more) affect God's plan for your life. If God is behind this relationship-- A fact which will be confirmed in you and her through the Spirit-- then I think you should get married.

Remember that God is a Spirit Being. He is outside of time. **If this is the person God wanted you to marry, then by marrying her you aren't committing adultery to your past spouse; on the contrary, by marrying your past spouse you committed adultery with the spouse God intended for you. And that sin was wiped away on the cross.**

I hope I have made this clear. Let me state this another way.

God designed you to be married to a specific person. By marrying someone other than that person, then marrying the person God wanted, you commit adultery against God's chosen spouse with the other person, regardless of which relationship came first (since God sees all time as one unit, and not as a progression of experiences like we do).

Hard to explain, but, you will agree, logical, if I am not mistaken.

**Re: - posted by matthew (), on: 2004/5/11 17:42**

Maybe I'm in the minority with this, but I don't think there is a biblical case that God's will for your life is a dot that you have to somehow find. So I don't believe there is ONE person for you to marry. (I don't see it in the bible).

Further, It is a danger for us to try to listen for the spirit apart from the word--though I don't think that is what was suggested--it's dangerous. When listening for the "voice" it is far too easy for our opinions and desires to get in the way. What must be done is to search the mind of God by reading the word of God...Many things are often done in God's name that God would never support. They ran after what THEY thought--not what God thought.

Anything more I'm sure has already been stated. Only be sure of this. The Spirit will never lead anyone into sin. His leading is never against what is taught in scripture.

I am not meaning any hostility (sometimes I'm frank at the expense of diplomacy) forgive me if that has happened here.

thanks

matthew

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/5/11 18:12**

Shazbot writes God designed you to be married to a specific person. By marrying someone other than that person, then marrying the person God wanted, you commit adultery against God's chosen spouse with the other person, regardless of which relationship came first (since God sees all time as one unit, and not as a progression of experiences like we do).

Hard to explain, but, you will agree, logical, if I am not mistaken.

Shazbot

This is more dangerous than you can imagine. I have known more than one gifted servant of God who has followed the 'logic' of this into adulterous relationships with their 'true, God-intended, spouses'.

**Re: - posted by KeithLaMothe, on: 2004/5/11 19:45**

Shazbot, you did say it was only your opinion, so I hope my responding opinion does not seem too harsh, but I would like to echo Ron's response and add my own thoughts.

Quote:  
-----If this is the person God wanted you to marry, then by marrying her you aren't committing adultery to your past spouse; on the contrary, by marrying your past spouse you committed adultery with the spouse God intended for you.  
-----

## General Topics :: Divorce and Re Marriage

I know of no Scriptural support for the ideas:

- 1) God has a specific spouse in mind for each person He intends to have marry. (Gary Friesen wrote a very good book on decision making and the will of God, which addresses this and other questions)
- 2) Even if He did, that God considers it adultery to marry anyone else. (As I understand it, in Scripture it's always if we marry, and **then** have sex outside that marriage that it is considered adultery)
- 3) That God would ever will us to do something that would be transgressing one of His moral laws (i.e. **if** divorce and re marriage in a given situation is such a transgression, God would **never** will us to divorce and remarry in such a situation)

Not that you're advocating #3, but it does clarify that the real question isn't which woman God intended Dave to marry, but rather if it is a transgression of one of God's moral laws for Dave to remarry in this situation.

Quote:  
-----By marrying someone other than that person, then marrying the person God wanted, you commit adultery against God's chosen spouse with the other person, regardless of which relationship came first (since God sees all time as one unit, and not as a progression of experiences like we do).  
-----

Are we held accountable according to the knowledge God has, or the knowledge we have? Certainly, if God told me to marry a specific person it would be sin (not adultery, but general disobedience to the known will of God) to marry someone else, but if He does not inform me I do not see Scriptural basis for it being sin to marry someone else (or not marry at all, for that matter).

This kind of concept would seem particularly dangerous when combined with Holiness (which I believe), because according to that adulterers go to hell. But I suppose you weren't intending to get anywhere near that conclusion.

May God guide all of us, in Spirit and in Truth,  
-Keith

**Re: Divorce and Re Marriage, on: 2006/5/8 13:30**

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

**Re:, on: 2006/5/8 20:38**

Quote:  
-----

KeithLaMothe wrote:  
That's quite a dilemma, I'm sorry you're put in this situation by a pre-conversion decision.

I'll be blunt about my own position: If a man and a woman marry, then divorce, neither can lawfully (by God's law) marry another person so long as both remain alive.

The only reason I believe that is because I believe the Scriptures teach it. If I had a good Scriptural argument for anything less harsh I'd probably leap for it.

Matthew 5

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

The clause "except for the cause of fornication" has been interpreted (reasonably) to mean that if either person commits adultery then divorce is lawful and presumably remarriage as well (of the non-adulterating person, at least). I've heard, however, that Jesus was referring to the Jewish custom where if the woman fornicated during the espousal period, the engagement could be called off lawfully; nothing to do with sexual misconduct after the marriage had taken place. I think there's support for that interpretation in that Matthew has a more Jewish audience than the other 3 Gospels (right?), and Jesus' other statements on the matter do not include this exception clause.

Mark 10

11 And He said unto them, "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her.  
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.

I'd put more time into investigating this, and I'll ask a friend of mine who has been researching it, but right now I have to finish up a term project. Will p

m you if I have anything worthwhile.

Again, the Scriptural evidence is the only reason I hold this position, it's definately not my natural preference, but we must obey God.

I shall pray for you, at the least.  
-----

Fornication (porneia g4202) cannot mean illicit sexual activity only 'during Jewish betrothal' as some try to state.

The word porneia (rendered 'fornication) is directed SPECIFICALLY to GENTILES converts in Acts 15 to tell them to abstain from 'fornication' (porneia G4202).

=====  
"Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God: But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood. (Act 15:19-20)

fornication  
G4202  
?????????  
porneia  
por-ni'-ah  
From G4203; harlotry (including adultery and incest); figuratively idolatry: - fornication.  
=====

Since betrothal is a Jewish custom, using this word 'porneia' to instruct the gentiles means that porneia cannot in any way specifically mean, and limited to, sexual sin during the JEWISH betrothal period.

\*\*\*\*\*

Matthew written to Jews, do the differences matter

Some state that because Matt. was written to Jews that the difference of the exception clause (Matthew 19:9 and 5:32...the part that says "except for fornication" (porneia) applied only to the Jews because of their betrothal customs. The assertion that because the exception clause is present in Matthew, yet not in Mark that it is only for Jews is absurdity.

Lets look at the example of the empty tomb and see the great differences there. between these two writers.

Mat 28:2-6 And behold, a great earthquake occurred; for an angel of the Lord, having come down out of heaven, came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat on it. (3) And His appearance was like lightning, and his clothing as white as snow. (4) And the guards were shaken for fear of him, and became like dead men. (5) But the angel answered and said to the women, "Do not be afraid, for I know that you seek Jesus who was crucified. (6) He is not here! For He is risen, just as He said. Come; see the place where the Lord was lying.

Mar 16:5-8 And entering into the tomb, they saw a young man sitting on the right clothed with a white robe, and they were alarmed. (6) But he said to them, "Do not be alarmed. You are seeking Jesus the Nazarene, who was crucified. He has arisen! He is not here! See the place where they put Him. (7) But go, say to His disciples, and Peter, that He is going before you into Galilee; there you shall see Him, just as He said to you." (8) And going out, they fled from the tomb, but trembling and amazement held them; and they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid.

See how Marks description of the Angel(s) is lacking greatly compared to Matthews?  
Marks writing seems many times to just be recording occurrences without adding a lot of detail.

Possibly why Mark is the shortest of the Gospels  
Mark doesn't even mention this "Great Earthquake" that Matthew tells about.

So WHICH is right....Mark to the Gentile, Matthew to the Jews ?  
Was it One angel or two?  
Did they appear like a young man in a white robe to Mark's audience, or like lightning to Matthew's?  
Do these record TWO different events or one ?

Did the great earthquake happen according to Matthew's account or not?  
Was the earthquake taught to Jews and not to Gentiles ? Some would have to say as much by the way they teach that Matthew is written to Jews and Mark to Gentiles.

ALL of them are right, we take the TOGETHER in CONTEXT and find the HARMONY between them.

=====  
We see other discrepancies, even among the SAME writer Luke in Acts.

And the men who were traveling with him stood speechless, hearing the voice but seeing no one.  
(Act 9:7 EMTV)

versus

"And those who were with me observed the light and became terrified, but they did not hear the voice of the One speaking to me.  
(Act 22:9 EMTV)

We have them hearing, but not seeing in chap 9, then just the opposite in chap 22.  
Which is correct?

Possibly it's meaningless as that isn't the point of the text, but we can clearly see that even when it's the same writer discrepancies can occur, let alone a writer simply not recording every detail that another has.

=====  
Matthew being written to Jews has NO bearing on this matter.  
There are other books such as Hebrews to those Hebrew converts and James being written to those of the twelve tribes scattered abroad.  
Will we say "these are written to Jew and therefore not for us gentiles" ?  
Will we cast aside ANY teaching we don't like if it wasn't written to us gentiles specifically?

Jesus didn't SAY it was only for Jews and their betrothal year. He made one clear exception for divorce and remarriage... ONLY for whoredom or you commit adultery when you remarry.

We know this, God gives His law to humanity. He wants all people everywhere to obey Him.  
When God distinguishes that a rule is for one group and not the whole, He states it clearly (below about Levitical priests forbidden to take wives "put away").

Since Jesus did not specify that this only applied to Jews, there is no reason to think that it did.  
Since Jesus also did not specify "espoused wife" but clearly the word for "wife" was used, He must have been upholding that, as it always has, the sexual sins of the guilty break the conditional covenant of marriage. Jesus states we can put away a wife for this reason alone.

So we know that when some proclaim that Matthew was written to Jews, that it is irrelevant, it was written for the followers of Jesus Christ.

The rules apply evenly to all, the Jews do not receive some special ability to protect themselves from a whoring spouse while the rest of His children are left open to abuse. To state as much would be an absurdity.

\*IF\* it made ANY difference that Matthew had differences, then to follow proper rules of interpretation, we would have to do the same with EVERY book in the bible. Anything that was written to Jewish Christians would NOT apply to gentiles.

christians if it were not repeated in a book written TO gentiles.

The fact is this is absurd.

The rules of Christianity are given to ALL of us, not some rules for this group and some to the other.

When you hear someone hand you a line like "Matthew was written to Jews and applies to the betrothal period" ask the m to PROVE it conclusively...keeping in mind all the other material in this site.

They have not a single clear verse that makes the assertion...all they do is fill in the gaps with thier own ideas, rejecting t he facts in the matter as we have discussed on this website. (ex. Porneia being ALL inclusive of sexual sin and NOT just premarital sex)

**Re: Divorce and Re Marriage, on: 2006/5/8 20:46**

Quote:

bigdaveusa wrote:

I have met a girl and we have become very close. She is 42 and never married and I am 39 and married briefly and then divorced when I was 19. I wa s not a christian at the time, or some would say that I was a carnal christian, however I am a christian now.

The question that I am faced with is: Am I allowed to re marry? This woman wants badly to marry me, and everyone is telling me that it's fine , but I ha ve heard other views on the subject, and I really don't have a peace about it.

I am hoping that my brothers and sisters here at SI can help me find an answer to my dilemma.

Thanks....

:-?

Well, your first error was to let some folks hear that you dont have peace about it.

They will inevitably state that this is God telling you 'no' when most likely it is the hearing the naysayers warn of hellfire if you remarry that is causing your discomfort.

Yes, you are allowed to remarry.

If you and your first wife both were christians, then scripture calls you to remain single or reconcile if possible.

God Himself has said it is not good for man to be alone.

Jesus shows that few are given the ability to live celebrate lives.

You made a mistake in younger years, you are not required to live alone the rest of your life over that mistake.

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/8 20:52**

Boy this is a touchy subject that has probably been review since 1 AD but again with most posts here we can all find scri pture pro and con on any subject "seen it hundreds of times here" if were looking hard enough, as I always say "if" the H oly Spirit resides in you go there first and you will probably get your answer, unless you like confusion then post and ask. We sometimes forget about the Holy Spirit has all the answers and he has never confused me, yes the Word is a wonde rful tool "if" you will let each scripture minister to "you" personally and forget what it's saying to someone else, if your rea ding scriptures and not letting them minister to you and are going by what someone else says it's ministering to them the n you reading is in vain, that is my personal opinion. It's sometimes tough to get out of the box, but when you do life is so much more enjoyable. :-)

Re:, on: 2006/5/8 20:53

Quote:

poetwarrior wrote:

How is it that a person can remarry under any circumstance after a divorce, whether they were a christian or not at tha time? It looks to me as though God's word is very clear on the matter. :-?

yes, it is clear in stating that adultery is committed upon remarriage EXCEPT where sexual sin was committed by a spouse to begin with....that much is VERY clear indeed.

what isnt clear is this 'perpetual adultery' idea.

Re: Divorce and Re Marriage, on: 2006/5/8 21:02

Quote:

bigdaveusa wrote:

I have met a girl and we have become very close. She is 42 and never married and I am 39 and married briefly and then divorced when I was 19. I was not a christian at the time, or some would say that I was a carnal christian, however I am a christian now. The question that I am faced with is: Am I allowed to re marry? This woman wants badly to marry me, and everyone is telling me that it's fine , but I have heard other views on the subject, and I really don't have a peace about it. I am hoping that my brothers and sisters here at SI can help me find an answer to my dilemma. Thanks....

:-?

God hates divorce, there is no getting around that fact. But it is also a fact that divorce happens, as does remarriage.

You are not condemned to a life alone over the sins of a man barely out of childhood.

Here is my study showing conclusively that there were remarried divorcees in the church. Limitations were put on these as this situation isnt the example to live by, but clearly they were in fellowship with the brethren.

=====

### Evidences of divorce and remarriage in the Church

Evidences that there were divorcees who had remarried in the church are found in the list of widows and the requirements for bishops.

- >-1Tim 5:9 Do not let a widow be enrolled having become less than sixty years old, the wife of one man,
- >-Titus 1:6 if anyone is blameless, husband of one wife, having believing children, not accused of loose behavior, or disobedient.
- >-1Tim 3:2 Then it behooves the overseer to be without reproach, husband of one wife, temperate, sensible, well-ordered, hospitable, apt at teaching,

#### Wife of one man

This requirement clearly is not speaking of a woman who had a man-harem. There is no real issue of women marrying multiple husbands given in the bible nor in historical accounts. This leaves either the remarried widow, or the remarried divorcee. It cannot be a remarried widow as no law forbade the widow to remarry. Paul even tells widows

"I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn.

(1Co 7:8-9 KJV)

Paul would be setting these widows up to be rejected from this list later if she did remarry. Also, Paul even insists that younger widows REMarry here...

But the younger widows refuse: for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry; Having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith. And withal they learn to be idle, wandering about from house to house; and not only idle, but tattlers also and busybodies, speaking things which they ought not. I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully. (1Ti 5:11-14 KJV)

He absolutely would be condemning this woman in later years to be rejected the churches help by forcing her to remarry now.

We know Paul was not so callous and uncaring by his instruction for the helping of widows he gave.

The ONLY possibility for this "wife of one man" is that she was divorced and remarried. That is the ONLY possibility from scripture. It is the only thing that is clearly corrected in Gods word.

and yet this woman is still in fellowship...not being cast out of the assembly such as the man who had his fathers wife and WAS living in fornication.

Her life was not exemplary, so she couldnt be added to the list of widows, but she WAS in the church and in fellowship.

The requisite for her to have been the wife of ONE man CLEARLY indicates that she COULD have been the wife of more than one husband in her lifetime....aka a remarried divorcee...a direct contradictoin to this lying doctrine that says second marriages arent marriages but 'affairs'...

husband of one wife

We see here that these are requirements of those in higher positions in the church..folks who are to set the EXAMPLE for the rest to follow.

We will discuss the possible meanings here of "husband of one wife"

It cannot refer to those who are widowed. as the remarried widow(er) was not prohibited or restricted in any manner I have seen, Paul even recommends that younger widows remarry. Paul would be purposefully making it impossible for a woman to later to be accepted to this list of widows for no good reason if he were speaking the remarried widow in 1 tim 5:9 above instead of a remarried divorcee.

To provide evidence from GODS word, lets see this..

"one ruling his own house well, having his children in submission with all reverence; for if one does not know how to rule his own house, how will he take care of the church of God? " (1Ti 3:4-5 EMTV)

This clearly shows that this man must be one who can maintain his own household, even the obedience of his children. A man whos been divorced and remarried MAY not be the best person for this job.

It is very unlikely that it ONLY speaks to polygamists as there is nothing in the NT that clearly condemns the act and Ive not found that the practice was as rampant as some try to assert...I suggest you do your own study to see if Im right or wrong.

We must see in scripture what meaning to put to this phrase 'husband of one wife'

Of all the possibilities, ONLY divorce and remarriage is corrected clearly in scripture. We can assume that frivolous divorce and remarriage would immediately bar one from the prominent position of bishop.

But Paul makes no distinction, so we must assume that he also means those who divorced an adulteress then remarried

as well (just to be on the safe side). Showing that these, although not the most prominent persons, were indeed still in fellowship with the rest of our brethren.

Some will state that this have put away these second marriages, but what I find very peculiar is that, if this matter were so crucial to salvation, Paul should surely have made a point of it. "Only if these second wives have been put away". The way its left, it sounds very much like they could have still been with the person.

Another issue is that those of the anti-remarriage camp state that this second "marriage" is not a marriage at all, but an adulterous affair.

The clear implication above is that the second marriage is a recognized one, if it weren't, then Paul would have simply called these people adulterers and surely they wouldnt even be in fellowship. Let alone being considered for the position of Bishop.

It is also notable that Paul nowhere states that these second marriages were invalid, nor does he state that these people were to have left this second spouse. In fact, in 1 cor 7 Paul tells these frivolously parted from their spouse to "remain U Nmarried or reconcile....." ...showing that REmarriage is quite possible indeed even if wrong to do.

Some folks will use a preposterous example of Paul also not telling gays to separate (or some other irrelevant distraction ), but Jesus offered NO exception to gay couples, did He ? His exception is clearly speaking of a MAN and a WOMAN... and husband and a wife when He made His exception for sexual sin.

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

**Re:, on: 2006/5/8 21:06**

Quote:

-----  
MrBillPro wrote:

Boy this is a touchy subject that has probably been review since 1 AD but again with most posts here we can all find scripture pro and con on any subject "seen it hundreds of times here" if were looking hard enough, as I always say "if" the Holy Spirit resides in you go there first and you will probably get your answer, unless you like confusion then post and ask. We sometimes forget about the Holy Spirit has all the answers and he has never confused me, yes the Word is a wonderful tool "if" you will let each scripture minister to "you" personally and forget what it's saying to someone else, if your reading scriptures and not letting them minister to you and are going by what someone else says it's ministering to them then your reading is in vain, that is my personal opinion. It's sometimes tough to get out of the box, but when you do life is so much more enjoyable. :-)

-----  
"Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.

(2Ti 2:15)

This is my personal motto as God has given us His word and knows our minds and spirits can be duped into believing things not quite true.

Going with 'feelings', even when we believe them to be from God, can be very dangerous...Satan himself can appear as an angel of light...ALL things must be tested by the word He has given us.

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/8 21:11**

As I said, we can all find scripture pro and con on any subject "seen it hundreds of times here" if were looking hard enough and you just proved it thanks. :-) Me I will go with the Holy Spirit before scripture if not why do I need him?

Going with 'feelings', even when we believe them to be from God, can be very dangerous. Going with feeling and going with the Holy Spirit is not even close and that is not what I meant sorry you took that wrong.



**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/8 21:47**

Might I add, If a person receives eternal salvation and the fullness of the indwelling Holy Spirit through wholeheartedly trusting in the crucified Christ, why in the world would he trade in supernatural power for human effort? That's what Paul wanted to know in Galatians 3. You cannot achieve a spiritual goal by natural means. The Holy Spirit produces spiritual life initially and He also sustains it. The Holy Spirit is to the Christian what the Creator is to the creation.

Without God the world would never have come into existence. And without His sustaining it, the world would go out of existence. Similarly, without the Holy Spirit none of us would ever become saved. And without His constant sanctifying, sustaining, and preserving work, the spiritual life of the Christian would drop back into the spiritual deadness whence it came. Paul said, "He who began a good work in you will perfect it until the day of Christ Jesus" (Phil. 1:6). Indeed, "we live by the Spirit" (Gal. 5:25).

In the evangelical church today so many are attempting to perfect in the flesh what was begun by the Spirit. Systematically and subtly, the Holy Spirit is being eliminated from the matter of sanctification. That poses a monumental threat to the church. Unless we are perfected by the Holy Spirit, all our efforts are in vain.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/9 11:34**

Quote:

MrBillPro wrote:

As I said, we can all find scripture pro and con on any subject "seen it hundreds of times here" if we were looking hard enough and you just proved it than ks. :-) Me I will go with the Holy Spirit before scripture if not why do I need him?

You do know that the SPIRIT is where those scriptures came from, right?

Your comment is frightening indeed for all of us who cherish the word God has given us for the TESTING of SOUND doctrine....WE will "test" the word you supposedly have from this spirit against His whole word....as we must.

Quote:  
-----Going with 'feelings', even when we believe them to be from God, can be very dangerous. Going with feeling and going with the Holy Spirit is not even close and that is not what I meant sorry you took that wrong.  
-----

If you're not testing everything you hear from any spirit against God's WRITTEN word, you may well be living on a very thin lake of ice dear friend.

He gave us His written word for a very necessary purpose.

God bless  
wm

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/5/9 11:57**

Well you have your opinion as I have mine, but as proven here the word can be confusing as we "all" have proved here we scripture fight "that is what I call it" so yes before I will get caught up in the scripture fighting I personally need something solid in my life I can totally depend on and that is the Holy Spirit. You said where did the Word come from? you said the spirit and you're exactly right so why would I feel ashamed to listen to something that the Word came from "originally"? I am clueless why you even made this statement. I have made no statements that "anyone" should take the Word with a grain of salt, as I interrupt what you're saying I said,

Yes the Word is here for a reason but if someone doesn't understand it that well and reading here only confuses you more I choose to live by the spirit and I don't think I will go to hell from living by the spirit. Bottom line "We All" have to work out our "own" salvation and that is exactly what we should do and not let your family or friends work it out for you, me I choose to listen to where the Word originated from the Spirit and no I still read and study the word, but I do it privately and keep my comments on what that scripture ministered to me to myself and not force my opinion of the scripture on anyone because that is pure wrong, not to mention just more confusing maybe some like to live a confusing life me I like to be on solid ground and the Holy Spirit has proven to me many, many, times it can keep me there.

You said:

Your comment is frightening indeed for all of us who cherish the word

My question is what has happened to the Holy Spirit has he been put on the back burner of todays Christian?

**Re:, on: 2006/5/9 18:38**

Quote:

My question is what has happened to the Holy Spirit has he been put on the back burner of todays Christian?

Why would the Spirit contradict Himself ?

He wouldnt.

So there should be no fear in testing everything against the word He inspired.

No one is putting Him on the back burner.

We are admitting our own weakness that even as Eve, we can be easily manipulated into believing something that isnt true.

Our only true way of testing what we 'believe' to be from God is against His word.

We are both free to believe what we wish.

I will continue to hold His word as the final authority in all matters of our faith.

**Re:, on: 2006/5/13 19:24**

sorry wrong thread..

**Re: - posted by bib, on: 2006/5/14 12:52**

Hi there I'm new to this community but I just wanted to offer some words of encouragement. God does say that a man should not divorce his wife except for unfaithfulness. Now I do understand that your new girlfriend so wants to marry you. My advice would be Go ahead and marry because God does not want us to be alone. The only thing I can say is that God is a God full of LOVE and FORGIVENESS.