

## Evidences of Remarriage II

Husband of ONE wife

by Wm Tipton

### Assertions/Conclusions of this article

Here we briefly show that since polygamy has not been banned outright in scripture, it supports that it is the divorce / putting away that is the main issue with divorce/remarriage, not in the taking of a second living wife.

### Supporting Evidence

These passages below are probably the only thing in the NT that could be used to prohibit polygamy outright. We can say God created one woman for one man or use other passages to try to find the spirit of Gods word concerning the taking of multiple wives, but there really doesnt exist any outright prohibition to polygamy in Gods word.

If we try to outright condemn polygamy, we end up condemning some very upright men of God in the OT and God Himself for not prohibiting the act entirely.

*This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach; Not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)*

*(1Ti 3:1-5 KJV)*

*If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children not accused of riot or unruly. For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God; not selfwilled, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; But a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate; Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.*

*(Tit 1:6-9 KJV)*

If taking of a second wife while the first is living is 'adultery' in and of itself, then polygamy should be condemned entirely in the law and surely there should be CLEAR prohibition in both covenants about taking a second wife while the first is living.

If it is the second marriage that is the 'sin' in divorce and remarriage, then surely this marriage to a second women while the first one lives would absolutely be 'adultery' as well.

It would be illogical and entirely inconsistant for scripture to assert that one is in a "state of adultery" in a second marriage AFTER a lawful divorce for a just cause, then to not condemn men taking of second wives while yet STILL married to the first.

Under the old covenant we see that this may not have been Gods will for marriages, but He absolutely permitted and in at least one case would have commanded the taking of a second wife (A dead mans childless widow being taking by his only brother who is already married).

Would this not be 'adultery' if simply taking a second wife is defined as this sin ?

We can do as we wish to try to work around the facts, but it simply is fact that God has tolerated and even condoned polygamy and regardless of what some say, there is no outright prohibition against it for all men anywhere in scripture...not even in the NT which only has the two passages above that could be understood as placing such a restriction.

But those passages, if they are actually about polygamy, would prove that polygamy DID still exist otherwise restricting SOME men from taking a second wife while still married to the first would be a bit meaningless. \*IF\* this passage is in any way dealing with polygamy, then it is very clear evidence that other men in the church might have taken second or third wives and yet go uncorrected.

So why is it that a man who has divorced for say sexual sin of the wife is condemned by some in the church for his actions when he takes a second wife ?

If he was in a country that permitted polygamy, the church there would say nothing about his taking a second wife and as long as he was not applying for one of the positions listed in those scriptures above, he would not be sinning against God who has seemingly permitted polygamy from a very early point.

\*IF\* the problem were actually about taking a second wife while the first one still lived, then polygamist should be the FIRST to be condemned in scripture. Yet it was entirely tolerated by God, never being deemed as unlawful or sinful as far as we have seen in scripture (and believe me, I'd like nothing more than to find something that does prohibit polygamy).

This leaves us seeing that taking a second wife isn't the issue with even divorce and remarriage.

Gods CLEAR words in the matter show where the actual problem is "I HATE putting away" by His very own words is what He "hateth".

It is the breaking apart of an existing marriage that is GODS issue with man. The taking of a second wife whether still married to the first, or if one has divorced, is quite secondary, otherwise EVERY polygamist should be called an adulterer in BOTH testaments.

When Jesus speaks about divorce and remarriage in the gospels, He also is condemning the divorce, the breaking of the marriage by these hardhearted Jews who were casting away their wives for just about any cause one wanted to. Moses had dealt with the same issue in the desert, having laid out regulation to this frivolous putting away in Deut 24:1-4 as the younger generation of Hebrews was about to enter the promise land.

Jesus is condemning the sinful act of casting out a wife for no just cause. Showing the men that even though they think themselves sinless in the matter because Moses had assigned no sin to the act, that they DO commit adultery against when they cast her out for no reason and they also draw her and anyone she marries into their sin as well, since Christ knew that this woman would have to remarry in almost every case because that society made it pretty hard for an unmarried woman to make it on her own. Especially since the Hebrew men had perverted the law of Moses and its intent.

Now, we personally do not believe that the passages above are meant for polygamy directly, possibly indirectly. But instead we believe that it is about something that IS corrected in Gods word...divorce and remarriage.

Our personal opinion is that these passages are more in line with "having been the wife of ONE man" concerning remarried widows and their not having been divorced and remarried (since it is not unlawful for a widow to remarry). If our view is correct, then again it is cemented that there WERE remarried divorcees in the church in Pauls lifetime, not having been cast out, but simply being restricted to some extent so as to not set a tone in the church that divorce and remarriage is to be the norm.

And if our view is not correct, and those passages are indeed about taking of a second wife not only while the first is living, but even still married to her, then this conclusively shows that taking of a second wife is not the core issue (otherwise ALL men should have been forbidden to take second wives), but instead is, as we conclude ourselves, the hardhearted casting away of a wife who has done no wrong.

The Lord has said "I HATETH putting away".

And to that, we completely agree.

When we bring in such points as 'the wife is bound by law to the husband for as long as he lives' this sort of passage even further solidifies our stance. This 'law' existed from the very first couple, as our Lord Himself shows and logic also dictates, and so if taking of a second wife while the first lives inherently is sinful or adulterous, then this perpetual law of marriage would definitely cause adultery to be an absolute fact ESPECIALLY with polygamy where we are STILL married to the first wife.

Passages such as Exodus 21 show conclusively that polygamy was not only NOT prohibited, but that passage very clearly shows that taking of second wives WAS condoned as long as the first wife was cared for in the same manner as she had been prior to the taking of the second wife.

The 'law' of marriage that was from the beginning combined with Gods tolerance and even permission of polygamy is absolutely evidence that taking a second wife while the former lives is not the real issue here at all, but as we have already presented from Gods own words, it is instead the PUTTING AWAY that He 'hateth'.

Conclusion:

It is not the taking of a second living wife that is the issue with remarriage...otherwise polygamist should have been condemned outright in scripture.

It is the CASTING ASIDE of one spouse to TAKE another that is the sin.

If this SAME man who was divorcing to remarry had simply taken a second wife while keeping the former, then we would have NO claims against him under EITHER covenant....thus it is NOT the taking of a second living wife that is the issue

But because he is DIVORCING the first without cause, Christ shows that he DOES commit adultery against her in doing so EVEN tho he is lawfully divorced from her.

Christ is revealing to them that even tho they believe they are innocent in these frivolous divorces to remarry someone else, they arent. And their own sin is affecting everyone in its path.