

"Let not man Put Asunder" vs "let the unbeliever depart"

Jesus versus Paul ?

By WmTipton

Assertions/Conclusions of this Article

Here we will show that not only can one put asunder a marriage (that its possible), but Paul even gives instruction to do just that in certain cases. These seemingly different statements ("Let not man Put Asunder" vs "let the unbeliever depart")are actually about the same exact thing...putting asunder/Chorizo...as proven very conclusively by the greek.

Supporting Evidence

1.0

There is an errant teaching out there that claims that when Jesus said 'let not man put asunder' regarding marriage, that He 'meant' man CANNOT put asunder.

L: "When God joins two together, they are now ONE. What GOD joins, man CANNOT separate"

What we will show briefly in this article that there IS an occurrence in scripture where it is shown absolutely that man can indeed 'put asunder' what God has joined together.

See 'put asunder' in each of these passages?

So then, they are no longer two but one flesh. Therefore what God has joined together, let not man separate(G5563-CHORIZO)." (Mat 19:6 EMTV)

(Mar 10:9) 'and the two shall become one flesh'; so then they are no longer two, but one flesh. Therefore what God has united together, let not man separate(G5563-CHORIZO)." (Mar 10:8-9 EMTV)

Bear in mind that, in the context these are in, Jesus and the pharisees are discussing putting away of a wife there in BOTH of those passages. The context of 'put asunder' is putting away of a marriage/wife, nothing less. Jesus is CLEARLY discussing not putting asunder of this 'one flesh' that is being spoken of there.

The word is (G5563)chorizo and it only appears a few times in scripture.

G5563

χωρίζω

chōrizō

Thayer Definition:

1) to separate, divide, part, put asunder, to separate one's self from, to depart

1a) to leave a husband or wife

1a) of divorce

1b) to depart, go away

That word 'put asunder' is the EXACT same word for "depart" in 1 cor 7:11

(1Co 7:11) But and if she depart(G5563), let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.

...in other words, Paul has just said this woman has done the exact thing that some claim that Jesus said men CANNOT do....'put asunder'.

Notice Paul makes no claim that she 'cannot' put asunder (depart), but clearly presents that IF she DOES do so, then this is the situation....she is to remain "agamos" (literally "UNmarried").

IF putting asunder were IMPOSSIBLE for man to do...then why doesnt Paul REstate (*IF* that were Jesus actual meaning) this fact ?

WHY does he simply say *IF* she puts asunder then ?

IF no man can put asunder, then Paul makes absolutely no sense here whatsoever. He should have simply stated that it was impossible to do so.

The word in question pretty much just means to "place room between", "depart" or to "separate"...its not some magical phrase that Jesus used to make a marriage bond unbreakable...

What I find striking is that Paul could have used a number of other choices in demonstrating that this woman had left her husband...but chose the one word that was used in rendering Jesus' words about putting asunder.

Was it coincidence or intentional? Was Paul literally reaching out and using the one word that would make it clear that putting asunder IS indeed possible?

We wont know until that day, for sure...but we do know now that regardless of what some say, that Paul has shown that man CAN 'put asunder'....that is factual.

Certainly a call to reconcile is made to the believers...but this doesnt negate what is clearly presented in Gods word....man CAN indeed put asunder (separate) by Pauls own words.

2.0

Now that its been established that man can indeed 'put asunder' (chorizo) a marriage, we move on to something even more astounding. Clear instruction for the believer to actually allow the unbelieving spouse to 'put asunder' the marriage.

Heres a very remarkable passage that blows L's statement above, that man CANNOT separate right out of the water. And not only that, it is our very own Paul giving INSTRUCTION for this believer to let it be so.

1Co 7:15 KJV But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace.

Remember "chorizo" G5563 our word from above ? Can you guess what greek word 'depart' there is rendered from ? You got it...the very same 'chorizo' (put asunder from Jesus' statement 'let not man put asunder") is right there in Paul own instruction to let the unbeliever do.

So we not only see absolute proof that man CAN put asunder a marriage, but we now have Paul even telling the believer to let the unbeliever do so !

This hardly sounds like a 'cannot' situation to me.

Now, of course this is not our Lords desire for marriage that it would ever have to be ended, but clearly He had enough foresight to show Paul to let the believer do EXACTLY what He Himself had told man not to do.

Why?

Because Jesus knows that no matter what we do as believers, there will always be unbelieving spouses who will not honor the covenant of marriage.

3.0

As we can see here in this passage, the believing wife who has **departed (chorizo)** her believing husband is considered 'agamos'.....'unmarried'.

*(1Co 7:10 KJV) And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife **depart(chorizo)**from her husband:*

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

Logically carrying this 'agamos' over to this passage where this unbeliever also has departed the marriage its quite easy to conclude that this person would also be deemed as 'agamos' (unmarried)

*(1Co 7:15 KJV) But if the unbelieving **depart(chorizo)**, , let him **depart(chorizo)**, . A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace.*

in the former case where both are believers there is commandment to remain UNmarried or reconcile.

In the latter case tho, where one is unequally yoked, Paul clearly states that he is speaking, not the Lord, in this matter.

To these Paul gives concession not given to those who are equally yoked with another believer.

"BUT to the REST"....to these who are unequally yoked, Paul says quite plainly that they are not in bondage to that union where it has been put asunder.

4.0

Another point of interest is in verse 7:11 where it says 'let her remain unmarried or reconcile to her husband" the actual greek means 'let her remain unmarried or to the man let her be being conciliated"

It is often pushed that the use of 'her husband' there means that she is still married to the man, but that is not proven from the actual Greek at all. The greek word for 'man' is also used for 'husband'.

Paul used 'agamos' to describe this woman for a reason.