[Sunday, May 25, 2014] Mt. 19.1-12; 1Co. 7.1-16, Christian Divorce and Remarriage, Part 2 – Craig A. Thurman

Let's begin with some introductory comments and lead into todays' message.

The reality of the Christian life is that we shall endure a great many unpleasant experiences in our lifetimes. Part of that unpleasantness involves divorce and remarriage. This makes it necessary for us to discover the exhortations of Scripture concerning it. There are times when some of the saints of God will sever or will be severed from the marriage bond between them and their spouse? That is the cold, harsh fact of life. Husbands and wives divorcing one from the other, and if there are children, the effects of this inflicts a hurt that is immeasurable. What does the Bible say about divorce and remarriage?

In Ge2.21-24 the Lord instituted marriage. Its importance cannot be overemphasize: the LORD God, Jehovah Elohim, brought the woman to the man. In marriage the Lord provided for this couple the necessary and intimate companionship, help and fulfillment that they needed. A man is to leave, that is, forsake his parents and cleave to his wife. To some extent, this means he is to leave his parents as a family unit, where all of his goals, his efforts, his support were the contributions that he made to his father as head of his house. Now he is to join with his wife and they begin contributing to the good of their new family unit. The husband and the wife are to be *cemented together* as one in essence; two people in one subsistence; two people living as if they were one person; like the necessity for skin to cleave to the bones; loving one another. One man said it like this:

John Gill, *The Baptist Commentary Series*, vol.7, p.212 (Mt.19.5), '... not that upon this new relation between man and wife, the former relation between parents and children ceases; nor does this phrase denote an entire separation from them, so as to have the affection alienated from them, or to be disengaged from all duty and obedience to them, and care and regard for them, for the future; but a relinquishing [of] *the house of his father and mother's bed*, ... she shall quit his father's house, and not bed and board there, and live with him as before; but having taken a wife to himself, shall live, and cohabit with her ...'

We saw in Moses, that because of sin, it became necessary to regulate the negative side of marriage: putting away of the wife. (Deu. 22.13-29; 24.1-4) (It is always interesting to note that good behavior doesn't need regulating; it is the evil that must be regulated. [1Ti. 2.9, 10])

Donald Barnhouse, vol. 3, p.193, said, 'If man had remained perfect, it would have continued without difficulty. Every man would have loved his own mate and there would never have been separation or divorce.'

Marriage was instituted before the fall of our first parents. Thus marriage united the first and only two morally upright male and female. After the fall the entire creation of God was subject to the abuses of sinful humanity and stood in need of law. The service of the law would slow or restrain the disastrous effects of sin. (Gal.3.23, 24) The first few chapters of the book of Genesis show us that the first two millennia were marred by great depravity and lawlessness, and that because of a very limited revelation of law to sin-fallen mankind.

Ge 6:11 The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence.

12 And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.

13 ¶ And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and, behold, I will destroy them with the earth.

After the giving of the law of Moses to Israel, mankind began to be restrained in their consciences from doing freely what they otherwise would have done. (Lev. 18.1-5) Concerning marriage, law was given to magnify the sin of putting away (a particularly dastardly sin of men abusing women) thus restraining them so that they would remain married. This legislation was given to hinder the prevalence of the act of putting away, so that when *putting away* became necessary it was to be done in accordance with the law of God. That portion of law we referred to in our last session in Deu. 24.1-4.

Here, for the first time, legislation for divorce was instituted in the nation of Israel. When a matter arose causing a breech in the marriage relationship

between a man and his wife, he could put her away by giving her a writ of divorcement. (Under the law a woman had no such clearly expressed prerogatives. But she may have gained some protections by the time of our Lord's personal ministry. Mk.10.12)

It has been thought by some that Deu. 24.1-4 exclusively involves those who have not yet come together in marriage by the conjugal act. That is not true. The serious commitment of the betrothal is presented in Deuteronomy chapter 22.13-29. Both the betrothal commitment and the actual, consummated marriage took a writ of divorcement to separate the two as husband and wife. And I might add that the writ of divorcement in Deuteronomy 24.1-4 is in this place implemented against the married, not the betrothed. This writ was the rule used by Israel for putting away the husband's married wife in instances that may have been less than for fornication.

I have had to reconsider my thoughts on this from our last lesson. As fornication involved all sexual transgressions: adultery, homosexuality, premarital and bestiality sex (all terms included in the word *fornication*.) These were sins all punishable with death by stoning. Therefore I have had to conclude that this divorcement was for lesser infractions; something in the woman that was distasteful, despicable, loathsome, and intolerable by the husband.

With this in mind, let's briefly reconsider Matthew and Mark's accounts as it relates to Deuteronomy chapter 24. The Lord, in both places, acknowledged that Deu. 24.1-4 had nothing to do with sins under the broad definition of the word fornication.

Matthew's account brings to light that our Lord Jesus Christ was not interpreting the rule for divorce in Deu. 24.1-4 as having been for fornication, but rather He was resetting the matter entirely. Regardless of the abuses of this Deuteronomy rule He discounts every occasion formerly practiced in Israel for divorce and reset it in this one statement: Mt.19.9

And I say unto you, (mark the authority that Christ weilds over the law of Moses) Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is

put away doth commit adultery. Keep this in mind: this applies to the people of God alone, who are of the nation of Israel. He is not concerned with all that the nations do.

The violation of the marriage bed is an act which our Lord Jesus HIMSELF states, *divides* the union or oneness of the two so that there is justifiable reason for the dissolution of the marriage, should the innocent party choose this course of action. AND THEY USUALLY DO! (If this is not what our Lord said, then I do not understand it.) This sin that broke the marriage covenant between these two, under the law warranted the death penalty in the guilty party. Could it be that this is the reason that the marriage can be put asunder? Because the guilty lay under the sentence of death. This person's life should have been removed from the earth? And therefore he was reckoned as dead.

Mark's (as well as Luke's account [Lk.16.18], which has no mention of the fornication clause, *except it be for fornication*) account gives us our Lord's interpretation of Deuteronomy chapter 24 so that we understand the **error** of either spouse (Notice that Mark also mentions the woman's right to put away her husband.) when they chose to *put away* the other, under this rule, because it deviated from the original command of God given in Gen.2.24; Mt.19.5. (Again, He reset the standard to the LORD's original intent for marriage. So, to be clear, fornication was never the issue for *putting away* a spouse in Deu.24. (Joseph, in Matthew chapter one, was applying putting away of Deu. 24 to chapter 22. Mary, should have been stoned if it she had been discovered to play the whore in her father's house.) Our Lord Jesus disallowed the continuance of divorce for these lesser infractions.

Mr 10:11 And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her.

The LORD's original pre-sin rule for marriage was universal. It touched every human being over all the earth and spans all of time. The rule of Moses, though inspired and inerrant, was given specifically to Israel. What Moses gave to the Israelites was neither applicable to all men, nor was it for all time, and was not

the Lord's original intent. Moses gave Israel this rule *because of the hardness of their hearts.*

Ps 81:12 So I gave them up unto their own hearts' lust: and they walked in their own counsels.

J-F-B Bible Commentary, vol.3, p.97 (Mt.19.7), says '**8. Moses ...suffered you to put away your wives**—tolerated a relaxation of the strictness of the marriage bond—not as approving of it, but to prevent still greater evils.'

Matthew Poole's Commentary on the Bible, vol. 3, p.88, 89, says, '... to restrain your extravagancies of cruelty to your wives, or disorderly turning them off upon any occasion ...'

Our Lord Jesus Christ personally addressed the matter of divorce and remarriage. He gave it the clarity that no other man had ever done.

Jn.7. 46 ... Never man spake like this man.

So far we have discussed the two instances for a **lawful** dissolution of marriage between a husband and wife: they are death and fornication. (Mt.5.32; 19.9; Lk.16.18) The sins of fornication, under the law of Moses, brought the punishment of death by stoning. Our Lord was dismissing the 'free-for-all reason' of divorce and remarriage being practiced among His people once and for all. He *bore* with their sins and He *bare* our sins.

H. A. Ironside, *Addresses on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p.201, says, 'We can quite understand that in the early church there were great many irregularities to be corrected in regard to this entire subject. There was a certain laxity permitted in Israel under the law which our Lord Jesus Christ forbade in the dispensation of grace.'

Acts 13.17 The God of this people of Israel chose our fathers, and exalted the people when they dwelt as strangers in the land of Egypt, and with an high arm brought he them out of it.

18 And about the time of forty years suffered he their manners in the wilderness. {suffered ... : or **bore**}

Deu.1.30 The LORD your God which goeth before you, he shall fight for you, according to all that he did for you in Egypt before your eyes;

31 And in the wilderness, where thou hast seen how that the LORD thy God bare thee, as a man doth bear his son, in all the way that ye went, until ye came into this place.

- 32 Yet in this thing ye did not believe the LORD your God,
- 33 Who went in the way before you, to search you out a place to pitch your tents in, in fire by night, to shew you by what way ye should go, and in a cloud by day. }

Was our Lord excusing these sins by not requiring the just punishment of death? Absolutely not! Israel stood condemned before God for sins. Frankly, we have enough evidence to suggest that, insofar as Israel is concerned, the laws of capital punishment were applied with laxity and great partiality.

Joh 4:18 For thou hast had five husbands; and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband: in that saidst thou truly.

Joh 8:4 They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act.

But know this, Christ was not here to correct their socially tolerant program. He came to die for sinners, to give His life a ransom for many. The law kept the nation of Israel together as a people, God could judge them, chasten them often, and by that bring through them the promised Seed, our Lord Jesus Christ.

Wouldn't it have been better if there had never been divorce and remarriage? Of course. I suppose we could say the same, 'Wouldn't it have been better if there had never been sin?' But he directs the lives of His people through ALL of life's land-mine fields-of-sin so that we might continue to be used in the service of the God.

Some saints will experience a marriage gone bad. Saints are confronted with problems in their marriages like incompatibility or abandonment, mental or physical abuse, and as many ills as the world experiences. Few, but for the grace of God are spared these evils. So what about those that are not spared? Are they not Christian? Are they excluded from being able to be restored to the Lord's churches? Can they never enter into the Christian walk and serve again with other brothers and sister in Christ?

Ro. 7.1-3 The intent of the original marriage covenant before God.

The apostle Paul is not ignorant of our Lord Jesus' teaching on marriage and divorce. Rather, in this text he is using marriage to illustrate the jurisdiction that the law has over a man as long as he lives unless somehow the law can be made without effect to him. So the primary interpretation of this portion of Scripture is that, it is impossible that men can ever be released from the condemnatory scope of the law except through Jesus Christ. Furthermore, and this is Paul's real purpose for using this analogy: it is illegitimate, perhaps this is the truest sense of phrase *spiritual adultery*, for N.T. believers to expect that they should bring forth fruit to God, to the glory of Jesus Christ, while living under the rule of the old covenant. We are either married to Christ who died for us or else we are still in bondage under the condemnation of the law of God. This is an either/or, not a this/and proposition.

With that in mind, **an application** can be made showing us the original intent of the marriage covenant. Aside from the death of our spouse, there is no dissolution of that original marriage covenant aside from death. So to break this covenant otherwise would be to commit sin. Sin creates the atmosphere that leads to separation and/or divorce. This truth is set forth here very clearly. Read,

- 1 Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law, a likely appeal to those Jewish saints in Rome that are confused on the matter of the law's jurisdiction over the saints.) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?
- 2 For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed

καταργέω, KJV abolish 3, bring to nought 1, destroy 5, loose 1, make of none effect 2, make void, et al.

from the law of her husband.

3 So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man (lit. 'if she becomes another man's), she shall be called an adulteress:

Clearly a woman that is guilty of adultery has committed an act of treason against her husband. This is a very clear-cut case of adultery. She stands condemned before God under the law and before the husbands law

Donald Barnhouse, vol. 3, p.181, 'But the chief importance of this illustration is the reminder that the marriage relationship is dissolved by the death of one party and the way is opened for the survivor to enter a new relationship.'

but if her husband be dead, she is free

 $\dot{\epsilon}$ λε**υ**θ $\dot{\epsilon}$ ρα, root $\dot{\epsilon}$ λ**υ** $\dot{\epsilon}$ θερος, KJV free 18, at liberty 1, as noun freeman 1, free woman 3.

from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.

According to the original intent of God in the marriage covenant, death of the spouse was the only means for dissolving a marriage before God without the necessity of the commission of sin. In other words, God alone should be the one who determines when the marriage relationship is dissolved. How few truly comprehend that death dissolves the marriage relationship. But while it dissolves the marriage, it does not negate the fact that we had been married before. That fact cannot be undone. That is like saying, when I lost all of my baby teeth and my new teeth have now come in I had never had baby teeth. It simply is not true. But the marriage covenant to that spouse who had died is severed when they died.

1Co.29 But this I say, brethren, the time is short: it remaineth, that both they that have wives be as though they had none ... (In other words the marriage relationship is limited to this time, and does not continue into eternity.)

Mt.22.30 For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.

Now let's enter into that portion of Scripture that cites one other instance for the divorce and remarriage. What have we seen so far? That death is dissolved because of either death or fornication. We must consider one other instance of divorce and remarriage presented in Scripture: the abandonment by the unbelieving spouse. From the outset, we believe that this additional revelation from the Lord is in light of the increase of the saints that come to Christ among the nations, beyond the borders of Israel and Jewish society. So, we have instruction from the Lord going to a heathen church, the Corinthian church; the saints there, and they need this Word of God for their unique standing among the gentiles, far away from Israel, without any influence of the law of Moses, under the law of Christ in the New Covenant. That is how we account for this additional information being given to them by the apostle Paul.

1Co. 7.10-16

Verses 10-11

The permanency of the <u>Christian</u> marriage is upheld.

10 ¶ And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord,

Let not the wife depart (χορίζω, also put asunder, separate) from her husband: 11 But and if she **depart** χορίζω, <u>let her remain unmarried</u>,

depart, χωρισθῆναι, root χορίζω, KJV put asunder 2, separate 2, middle depart 8. We have seen this word used and defined already in Mt.19.6; Mk.10.9. There man or mankind is not to dissolve (put asunder) the union, that is the what, of a husband and wife, because the union of these two is a union made before God, and therefore by God.

Mt 19:6 Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

Mr 10:9 What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

Some read these texts as if it says, That God only acknowledges marriages between Christians. God would never join an unbeliever and a believer together. Therefore, say they, such marriages can be lawfully dissolved as if they had never been because God would never join a believer with an unbeliever. But that makes no sense in light of what remains in 1Corinthians chapter 7. It is clear all marriages are binding before God, but here He instructs the marriage between two that have professed that they are Christ's.

So, what we can say is that the believing wife can *put asunder*, **not her relationship** with her husband I marriage, but she can put away **her place** with him in that marriage. In the O.T., provision was made for a woman whose husband took to him **another** wife.

Did the Lord ever sanction polygamy? No? Did he regulate it? Yes. Does this mean that polygamy is right? No?

He was required to support his first wife as much as he would any other wife that he might take to himself. (Ex.21.10, 11) His failure to continue providing for his first wife (or wives) appropriately resulted in her being set free. That is, she was the *guiltless* party in the dissolution of the marriage covenant. Why? Because he had abandoned or deserted her. (And the subject of desertion is in the next few verses of our text in 1Corinthians.) And so, it is mandated by the Word of God that if the wife, in 1Co.7.10, 11, departs her husband she has the burden of caring for herself, and she is to remain unmarried ...

or be reconciled to her husband:

Reconciled, καταλλάσσω, KJV reconcile 6; (Ro.5.10) Make our lives as one again. (cf. peace, KJV at one, in verse 15)

and let not the husband put away his wife.

The Christian husband, whose wife separates from him is not allowed to put away his believing wife. In other words there has been no infidelity, therefore no putting away is allowed. That is the sum of the matter very clearly stated. Remarrying in this circumstance would result in the commission of the sin of adultery. Isn't this a restatement of:

Mt 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 doth commit adultery.

The goal of the Word of God for married Christians is reconciliation.

Verses 12-15 This portion of Scripture addresses the marriage of a believing spouse to an unbelieving one. That this is true can be seen by these Scriptures:

Verse 12 If any brother hath a wife that believeth not ...

The implication in verse 13 And the **woman** which hath an husband that believeth not ...

Verse 15 A brother or a sister (in the Lord, not sibblings) is not under bondage in such cases ...

4 Cases that could be considered:

1. This mixed marriage could have been the result of the Lord bringing to life only one of the spouses in this relationship.
(Based on verse17, I believe that this is the case that is being

discussed. The following two other cases it would seem to say that this believer would be obliged to honor the marriage as if to a believer, on account of the overt act of disobedience.)

1Co.7.17 ¶ But **as God hath distributed** to every man, **as** the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all churches.

- 2. This mixed marriage could have been the result of deception on the part of a professed believer. Where an apparently professed believer has renounced faith in Christ and admitted himself to be an apostate and/or proven himself to be an antichrist. It is my opinion that this case could be characterized as a matter equal to the first issue in that the believing did not wilfully choose to marry an unbeliever, but was deceived. Therefore our opinion is that the believing should remain married until such a time that the unbelieving depart. At which time, the believing is freed to marry only in the Lord. Or,
- 3. A believer, not being taught the Word of God, and marrying an unbeliever. Or,
- 4. Rebellion against the Word of God on the part of the believer to marry one who is in unbelief.

To cases 1 & 2 we argue, that the believer is obliged to continue married to the unbeliever and use this as an opportunity to witness Jesus Christ in this special ministry **in which God has called them to serve**. (1Co.7.17-21)

Was deception unknown to God? No. Therefore we must conclude that this must be part of the will of God for this one to witness Jesus Christ in this peculiarly painful circumstance.

The *things* here listed, (marriage to an unbeliever, circumcision, indentured service) are such that need not be changed, and should be used, not avoided, for serving Christ.

New Testament Scriptures do not so much admonish believers to marry as much as it admonishes believers who are married to remain married; and that those who have become loosed from marriage, don't desire to be married; but, if desiring marriage again to marry only in the Lord.

1Co 7:39 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.**

1Co.7.27 <u>Art thou bound unto a wife? seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a wife.</u>

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

1Co 7:11 But and if she depart, let her **remain unmarried** (meaning, remain married to your only husband), or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.

There are ample O.T. examples that we could use to make application of the principle of marrying only in the Lord and the troubles for choosing to do otherwise. (O.T. references: Ge.6.1, 2; Ge.34.9; Le.22.12; Deu.7.3, 4; Deu.25.5; Jos.23.11-13; Jud.14.1-4; 1Ki. 11.1-4; Ne,13,25)

We now enter into this portion of Scripture that deals with the dissolution of the marriage because of the desertion, abandonment, forsaking of the unbelieving spouse.

12 But to the rest speak I, not the Lord:

In other words, Paul the apostle, has no O. T. passage, nor a specific reference to our Lord's own words to cite for proof. It is an original

understanding granted by the Spirit of God because of the uniqueness of that gospel day. We understand this as a peculiar revelation specially for the benefit of the gentile and Jewish, N. T. saints as they move into the word as the Lord's churches.

H. A. Ironside, *Addresses on The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p.210, This did not come up in the Lord's time on earth for He came to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Now Paul is speaking to gentiles, and it was a common thing for one member of the family to be converted and the others not.

If any brother hath a wife that believeth not

απιστον, meaning unbelief; KJV faithless 4, that believeth not 6, unbelieving 5, which believe not 1, as noun infidel 2 and unbeliever, et al.

and she be pleased

συνευδοκέι, root συνευδοκέω, συν, with, together + ε $\dot{\mathbf{v}}$ well + δοκέω to account, suppose, think, reputation; ε $\dot{\mathbf{v}}$ δοκέω, well pleased; συνευδοκέω KJV allow 1, be pleased 2, consent unto 2 (Acts 8.1 consenting unto; 22.20 consenting unto), have pleasure in (Ro. 1.32).

to dwell with him (the believing husband), let him not put her (the unbelieving wife) away ἀφίημι.

The believer has not the option to **put away** the marriage covenant because of the unbelief of the spouse. The burden and, I would add, the sin to dissolve this marriage prematurely falls upon the unbeliever.

Verse 12, 13 $\mathring{\alpha} \mathring{\phi} \acute{\eta} \mu \iota$, KJV forgive 47, forsake 6, leave 52, let go 1, let alone 6, put away 2, et al.

13 And the woman (the believing wife) which hath an husband that believeth not $\mathring{\alpha}$ πιστον, and if he be pleased συνευδοκει to dwell with her, **let her** not **leave** him $\mathring{\alpha}$ φίημι.

14 For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.

Consider the effects of a believer when among those who are in unbelief.

Ac 27:43 But the centurion, willing to save Paul, kept them from their purpose; and commanded that they which could swim should cast themselves first into the sea, and get to land ...

Even more so is it with a believing parent. The effects of the obedient Christian who lives for Christ in the home cannot be measured in terms of gold and silver, and temporal things; rather, this must have more to do with the whole preserving influence of the godly in an otherwise pagancontrolled house. Where, without Christ, the house would be void of prayers and devotions to God.

Two reasons are given to us why the believing is not to leave an unbelieving spouse.

1. The unbelieving are set apart to the Lord. Even as the apostle Paul says:

1Co 7:16 For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife? (Who knows whether this believing spouse might be used of the Lord to bring about the conversion of unbelieving one? Bringing to life we know is absolutely of the Lord without any means, but should God be pleased to reveal His Son in them, who better to use to bring to Christ than this faithful servant?)

The Christian has affect upon the unbelieving much like Christians have a *salt* influence in the world.

- 2. This is to be used by the believer as an opportunity to witness Jesus Christ.
 - 1Co.7.17 ¶ But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all churches.
 - 18 Is any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised.
 - 19 Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God.
 - 20 Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called.
 - 21 Art thou called being a servant? care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather.
 - 22 For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant. {freeman: Gr. made free}
 - 23 Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men.
 - 24 Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God.
- 15 But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart.

<u>Depart</u>, let him <u>depart</u>, χωρίζω, same as verse 10, 11, puts asunder, separates.

The is the unbelievers condemnation. They are not free from judgment for desertion. God will call them into account for their sin. But the believer is free.

A brother or a sister is not under bondage

Is not in bondage, $\delta_0 \mathbf{v} \lambda \delta_\omega$, enslaved, KJV bring into bondage 1, make servant 1, pass. be brought in bondage 1, become servant 2, be under bondage 1, partic given to 1, in bondage 1.

in such [cases]:

... in such [cases], not meaning as in Mt. 19.19 if the case of the man be so... that is, the accusation. This means $\tau o \iota o \acute{\upsilon} \tau o \iota \varsigma$, such, such like, of this or sort; Mt.18.5 such; 19.14 such. 'Case' is italicized in our text so that we could read this: A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such.

but God hath called us to $[\hat{\epsilon}v, in]$ peace.

εἰρήνη. KJV peace 88, rest 1, quietness 1, at one again.

The believer is at one again, at peace, and can move on in the Lord. (This must be synonymous with verse 11, reconciled.)

Ac 7:26 And the next day he shewed himself unto them as they strove, and would have set them **at one again**, saying, Sirs, ye are brethren; why do ye wrong one to another? (The reconciling of brethren.)

The burden, sin, and judgment for forsaking the spouse falls to the unbeliever. And if the unbelieving departs the believing is freed. (But, how painful and experience this must be for the Christian! And what if there are children?)

Ac 7:6 And God spake on this wise, That his seed should sojourn in a strange land; and that they should **bring** them **into bondage**, and entreat them evil four hundred years.

Very interesting it is that the nation of Israel presents a good example of this as they were in Egypt. As long as Egypt wanted the Israelites to remain in the land the Israelites remained. But as soon as Egypt expels them, they are freed to flee.

Ro 6:18 Being then made free from sin, ye **became** the **servants** of righteousness.

Ga 4:3 Even so we, when we were children, were **in bondage** under the elements of the world ...

Tit 2:3 The aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not **given** to much wine, teachers of good things ...

2Pe 2:19 While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he **brought in bondage**.

The Christian is not [en]slaved to the to the world's judgments, or of unbelievers'. We are free, but we are to *use it*, not abuse it. (1Co.7.21)

Charles Hodge, An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, p.113, 'The wife had no right to leave her husband; nor had the husband the right to repudiate his wife. But although the marriage bond cannot be dissolved by any human authority, because it is, in virtue of the law of God, a covenant for life between one man and one woman; yet it can be annulled, not rightfully indeed, but still effectually. Adultery annuls it, because it is a breach of the specific contract involved in marriage. And so does, for the same reason, wilful desertion, as the apostle teaches in a following verse.

...

There are cases undoubtedly which justify a woman in leving her husband, which do not justify divorce. Just as there are cases which justify a child leaving, or being removed from, the custody of a parent. The apostle teaches, however, that in such cases of separation, the parties must remain unmarried.

Ibid. p. 118, It is a passage of great importance, because it is the foundation of the Protestant doctrine that wilful desertion is a legitimate ground of divorce.

...

There is no conflict here between Christ's command and Paul's instructions. Both say, a man cannot put away his wife (nor of course a wife her husband) on account of difference of religion, or for any other reason but the one above specified.

...

On the one case the marriage contract binds him; in the other case it does not bind him. This seems to be the simple meaning of the passage.

16 For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?

H. A. Ironside, *Addresses on The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p.212, 'There is now somebody in that home to pray, somebody who loves the Word of God, somebody to live the Christian life, and let the others see what it means to be regenerated.

Mixed marriages (saved after marriage, deception by the spouse as to their faith in Christ) are as binding as the above stated instance (death and fornication), except in this instance, if forsaken by the unbeliever is freed to marry only in the Lord.

In closing I want to make some statements that might settle our minds better on the Word of God. At least, you might better understand what it is that I am trying to say, and let the Word of God persuade us of the truth.

Marriage is the same for every man and woman, believing or not. It is binding upon them. However, the people of God have received clear instructions about marriage, divorce, and remarriage. Two instances that release Christian spouses from the marriage covenant are fornication and death. Those whose marriages comes into trouble for less than infidelity, can be separated, but they should remain unmarried or be reconciled. But what if they can't. Paul said, *1Co 7:9*

But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn. Remarriage is in most cases inevitable.

Mt.19.10 His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry.

11 But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given.

12 For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.

What should a church do then? We do not minimize sin. Moses nor our Lord Jesus minimized it. In order for one to remarry while the other spouse is living necessitates the commission of sin.

Mt 5:32 But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

But the sin committed in remarriage was allowed by Moses because of the hardness of the hearts of the children of Israel.

Mt 19:8 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.

In the Scriptures there was never a divorced and remarried person to receive death by stoning, capital punishment. The remarried were not condemned in any way in the nation of Israel. That doesn't mean that sin wasn't committed, but that the sin was not such to be judged & condemned in the nation. The adultery that the law punishes is that which takes his neighbors wife. The law speaks against those that commit illicit, promiscuous acts against another.

Le 20:10 And the man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbour's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death.

Remember, as we have already stated, it was because of the hardness of their hearts of Israel that remarriage was ever allowed. Neither Moses nor our Lord Jesus condoned sin, but admitted the necessity of remarriage in order to prevent the people of God from falling into illicit and promiscuous activity. So the urges between a man and a woman were preserved to the *marriage bed*.

With that in mind, how should the churches of Jesus Christ treat those who have experienced the misfortune of divorce and remarriage? Well, why would a church treat them any differently than Moses did? Since Moses did not judge and condemn them why would we? We should extend to them the liberty to freely and privately resolve this issue of sin with the Lord in just the same way that we all do with our own sins that do not reach to the level of publically shaming Christ and his church. (cf. 1Co.5.10-13).

That is my judgment concerning divorce and remarriage. Only recently has the Lord, I believe, given a greater understanding on this issue. (Jan. 31, 2019) My prayers are that the Scriptures will bring comfort and good hope to all of the saints of God. Those which have had to taste the issue of divorce and that have since remarried have every right to walk with Christ in one of His churches. They should have the boldness of faith as every other member should have. All sin has consequences. Some sins carry more consequences than others. This has its consequences. That said, every child of God may come together in full assurance of faith, serving God unto the coming of the precious Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ. This is where I stand by the grace of God.