

# Evidence of divorce and remarriage in the Church

By WmTipton

## Assertions/Conclusions of this article

This article is to show evidence that there were remarried divorcess in the early church who were in fellowship, neither being cast out, nor condemned by the brethren. There were restrictions placed on these individuals, but they were in the church.

## Supporting evidence

*1Ti 5:9-14*

*Let not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years old,*

*having been the wife of one man, (10)*

*Well reported of for good works;*

*if she have brought up children,*

*if she have lodged strangers,*

*if she have washed the saints' feet,*

*if she have relieved the afflicted,*

*if she have diligently followed every good work.*

*(11) But the younger widows refuse: for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry; (12) Having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith. (13) 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. (14) I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully.*

## "Having been the 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 prohibited the widow from remarrying. 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 REarry 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 as 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...yet not condemned to hell or cast out of fellowship.

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 as we see in a relevant area of scripture.

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 UNmarried or reconcile....." ...showing that REmarriage is quite possible indeed even if wrong to do in cases of frivolous divorce.

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.

Nowhere in any portion of scripture do we ever see same gender pairings deemed as anything other than sinful abomination and disgraceful.