

## Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage – Perversions of 1 Corinthians 7

Ted Thrasher

Ted and his wife Julia have 2 children. Ted is a graduate of the McCloud School of Preaching and has labored with churches in Oklahoma and Missouri. He currently preaches at the church in Olathe, Kansas. He is a fellow laborer with the work in the Mid-West School of Biblical Studies, International Bible Studies Lectures and the Mid-West Lectures. He is an instructor in the Online Academy of Biblical Studies as well as being involved in its administration.

TEXT: 1 CORINTHIANS 7:8-24

### INTRODUCTION

The seventh chapter of 1 Corinthians can be divided into three areas dealing with questions which the brethren at Corinth had asked. Our concern with this lesson will focus on the first of these areas in **Verses 1-24**. In this area, Paul replied to their questions concerning marriage: Was it good to marry or be celibate? What was the husband/wife responsibility? Should a person leave his or her spouse? What was the responsibility of the Christian married to the non-Christian — should they remain married or divorce?

We recognize that this chapter should be understood in the light of the circumstances of what Paul termed the “*present distress*” in **Verse 26**. This was a reference to the persecution which the saints of the first century were undergoing before the destruction of Jerusalem. Some of the statements concerning choices in marriage were aimed at sparing the Corinthians some of the troubles of the flesh and this life in the midst of a period of persecution of Christians.

There are some general principles we should recognize when we study this chapter.

1. We cannot interpret these passages in any way that would minimize or depreciate the marriage relationship and the honorable institution of marriage (Hebrews 13:4). Marriage is an honorable institution before God, but not all marriages are honorable in the sight of God. Some are nothing more than adulterous unions. Thus, we cannot equate any and all marriages as the same in God's sight just because man may recognize them as such (Mark 6:17-18).
2. We cannot interpret these passages in any way that would contradict the truth of God's Word in other passages. We correctly interpret passages such as **Matthew 5:31-32; 19:1-9; Mark 10:11-12; and Luke 16:18** to teach God's law on marriage, divorce and remarriage to be: one man and one woman joined together in the sight of God for life, with one exception for divorce and remarriage — fornication — and in this case, only the innocent party putting away a guilty fornicator has the right to remarry another scripturally eligible person. Thus, we cannot interpret **1 Corinthians 7:1-24** to teach something contrary to that or allow exceptions to the one exception taught in **Matthew 19:9**. Though we teach the concept of additional revelation, yet we must reject the concept of additional contradictory revelation.

3. We cannot interpret these passages in any way that would minimize the responsibility of all men to be subject and accountable to the law of God today — the New Testament. We cannot interpret these passages in such a way that would make them apply to non-Christians differently than Christians. God's law applies equally to all accountable people today.
4. We cannot interpret these passages in any way that would lessen the force of the application or loose where God had not loosed, in an effort to accommodate certain “hard” situations because of various consequences of life. To do so would constitute a form of situation ethics which would say that for some people they can, essentially, live in some sin if it would produce a conflict in a family or cause the disruption of an adulterous marriage.

In this lesson, we propose to study some of the perversions of **1 Corinthians 7** regarding marriage, divorce and remarriage. There are basically two predominant perversions which are associated with this chapter:

1. A perversion of **1 Corinthians 7:15** which teaches that a deserted Christian has the right to remarry. The attempts to support this are two-fold: (1) Some deny the force of **Matthew 19:9** by making it a “covenant” passage which applies only to Christians married to Christians, and then affirm that this passage is supplemental revelation concerning Christians married to non-Christians, so that **Matthew 19:9** does not apply. Another variation of this is to deny that the accounts of the Gospel are included in the law of Christ and thus **Matthew 19:9** does not apply to Christians. (2) Some teach that the word “*bondage*” is a reference to the marriage bond, and affirm that when the non-Christian departs from the Christian, the marriage bond is broken and the Christian can scripturally remarry.
2. A perversion of **1 Corinthians 7:20** which teaches that whatever marriage situation one is in when they become a Christian, even an adulterous marriage, that they should continue in it or abide in that calling. The attempts to support this are two-fold: (1) Some deny the force of **Matthew 19:9** by making it a “covenant” passage which applies only to Christians married to Christians, and claim that man is not subject or accountable to it before being baptized into Christ. Thus, you can marry, divorce and remarry numerous times before baptism, and then baptism cleanses or sanctifies the current marriage. (2) Some teach the application of God's law is not perfect. Therefore, there are some circumstances where we should show tolerance and not apply God's law in situations where it might work hardship on a family and especially children.

## I. THE CONTEXT

In **1 Corinthians 7:1-6**, Paul discusses the general responsibilities of the husband and wife in marriage. In **Verses 8-24**, Paul gives some special attention to the various marital groups in Corinth. In these passages, he answers some of the questions which they had asked concerning those who were single or widows and those who were married.

In **Verses 10-11** Paul begins to deal with some questions concerning the married. We should keep in mind that he is talking to all married people — Christians married to Christians, Christians

married to non-Christians and non-Christians married to non-Christians. In **Verses 8-9** he had set forth what was permitted, since whether one marries or not is an optional matter. But now Paul commands with the authority of an inspired apostle. There are no options for these people, one either obeys or stands in rebellion to the Lord's will.

Paul appeals to what the Lord had revealed concerning marriage while here on earth. Those teachings are found in **Matthew 5:31-32; Matthew 19:9; Mark 10:11-12 and Luke 16:18**. In **Matthew 19:9** we read, *“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.”* That's what Jesus said directly about the subject of marriage, divorce and remarriage. It can be established and maintained from this passage that Jesus intended in the marriage arrangement for one man to have one woman for life, with one reason or exception for divorce and remarriage — fornication — and then only the innocent person who puts away a guilty fornicator has the right of remarriage to another eligible person.

What Paul teaches here and what Jesus taught while on earth are in perfect agreement. Paul says *“Let not the wife depart from her husband.”* The same also applies to the husband: *“let not the husband put away his wife.”* The union of marriage cannot be viewed on a “trial run” basis. Marriage is for life in the sight of God and those who honor God. The married woman has made a commitment to her husband which she must honor. She can't just walk out. But, Paul says, if she does depart, then there are two alternatives: (1) Remain single; (2) Be reconciled to her husband.

The reason for this should be obvious from the commandments of Jesus. If she joins herself to another man, she is guilty of adultery. Thus, she cannot marry another man - or the husband marry another woman. Even though civil laws, and some brethren, may allow for divorce and remarriage for reasons other than fornication — the only reason Jesus allowed — they have only legalized an adulterous marriage.

We should recognize there are differences in divorces. There are those divorces which God allows, such as **Matthew 19:9**, where an innocent person divorces a guilty fornicator and the innocent person is free to scripturally remarry. There are divorces which occur for reasons other than fornication and where one party does not want a divorce and is free from sin — not that they have a right to remarry — but have been deserted by the other party (1 Corinthians 7:15). And there are divorces where both parties want the divorce and there is no fornication involved, they just want to be free from being married to each other. They are still not free to remarry. Why? Because they have not met the exceptional condition of **Matthew 19:9**. Sin has always taken place whenever a divorce occurs, either in one or both parties, but at least in one.

The same is true in marriages. There are marriages that are called marriages (even in the Bible) but they are not acceptable marriages in the sight of God (Herod and Herodias, Mark 6:17-18). So there are basically two types of marriages: Those God approves of and those He does not approve of — those which are scriptural and those which are not scriptural. Any marriage which is terminated or entered into on the basis of something less than what God approves is sinful. The guilt must be attributed to the person(s) who instigated or caused the divorce or marriage. The doctrine of Christ does not allow divorce and remarriage for any other reason than fornication. A

scriptural marriage cannot be dissolved acceptably, except in the case of death (Romans 7) or fornication (Matthew 19).

In **Verse 12**, Paul says, *“To the rest speak I.”* The “rest” refers to the rest of the questions which they had asked and which related to specific cases dealing with marriage. What if a Christian man is married to a non-Christian woman who is content to dwell with her? Should the Christian leave his wife? Paul replies, *“Let him not put her away”* or as the ASV translates this *“leave her.”* What if a Christian woman is married to a non-Christian man who is content to dwell with her? Should she leave him? Paul replies, *“Let her not leave him.”* So, these verses prohibit the Christian from being the instigator of a divorce. In cases where the unbeliever is content to dwell with the believer, the Christian must remain with his or her companion.

To understand **Verse 14** properly we must understand the Old Testament law concerning marriage. It forbid intermarriage with the heathen because of their idolatry (Exodus 34:16; Deuteronomy 7:3-4; Joshua 23:12). After the captivity, the Jews began to intermarry with non-Israelites on such a scale that Ezra and Nehemiah had to take hard actions to stop the mixed marriages. They also demanded that they put away their foreign (unauthorized) wives (Ezra 9:1-15; Nehemiah 13:23-31).

Not only did Ezra and Nehemiah require that the wives be put away, but also the children of those mixed marriages were excluded with the woman (Ezra 10:3,44; Nehemiah 10:31). Perhaps some at Corinth were urging this law upon the Corinthian brethren, which would make them divorce their unbelieving wives and forsake their children.

Paul has shown that they should not divorce an unbeliever. Now he shows that the situation has changed from the Old Testament law. Now, the marriage of the believer to the unbeliever is made legitimate under the Gospel of Christ and the children of such a marriage were to be considered as clean. Under the law of Christ, the unbeliever does not make the believer unclean — the believer sanctifies — sets apart and makes holy and legitimate — the marriage relationship. Thus, the children of the mixed marriage are also holy. This does not teach, however, the false idea of automatic salvation of the unbeliever without baptism, or that an adulterous marriage is automatically sanctified when one partner becomes a believer. It does not refer to sanctification in Christ, but to the marriage being sanctified and the children being legitimate.

## II. NOT UNDER BONDAGE - 1 CORINTHIANS 7:15

What about the Christian married to a non-Christian who decides to depart from the Christian? Paul answers: *“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.”*

It should be clear from this, that if a brother or sister departs, he or she is in violation of God's law. This passage does not sanction the departure of a believer from an unbeliever.

However, does this passage teach that the deserted believer, from whom an unbeliever has departed, has the right of scriptural remarriage? Absolutely not! Why? Because the scriptures

clearly teach only two reasons for remarriage: (1) The companion dies (Romans 7); and (2) An innocent party puts away a guilty fornicator (Matthew 19).

There are at least four views by which some affirm that the deserted believer may scripturally remarry. (1) Some teach that **Matthew 19:9** applies only to Christians married to Christians. So, it does not restrict cases of mixed marriages, but **1 Corinthians 7:15** allows the deserted believe to remarry in these cases. (2) Some teach that **Matthew 19:9** does apply to all marriages, but that Paul revealed an additional reason in **1 Corinthians 7:15** as additional revelation to that of Jesus. (3) Some practice the view that **Matthew 19:9** applies to all marriages, but one can marry, divorce and remarry — for reasons other than fornication — but upon confession of the believer or baptism for the unbeliever the sin is forgiven and one can stay in the marriage. (4) Some teach that **Matthew 19:9** applies to all marriages and is the only reason for divorce/remarriage, but that **1 Corinthians 7:15** presupposes that fornication has taken place upon the part of the unbeliever and the believer is free to remarry.

***The first view is based on the concept of Matthew 19:9 not applying in all cases***

The “covenant” passage view has been advanced to falsely teach that it applies only to those who are Christians or in the covenant of Christ. It is asserted that it only applies to Christians married to Christians and since **1 Corinthians 7:15** applies to Christians married to non-Christians, then it allows the deserted believer to scripturally remarry.

The other position in this area of **Matthew 19:9** not applying in all cases is to falsely teach that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John are not part of the law of Christ. Both views of this can be shown to be false by showing that all men today are subject to the Gospel of Christ and the doctrine of Christ — in fact, these terms refer to the same thing — the New Testament.

There is no distinction in God's Word between the Gospel of Christ and the doctrine of Christ, as if one applies to the non-Christian and the other applies to Christian. There are several passages which show this to be the case.

Paul affirmed in **Acts 17:30-31**, *“And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent: Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.”* According to this there were two periods of time: (1) The *“times of ignorance”* (no universal law for all men) and (2) *“now”* (universal law for all men - the law of Christ). Peter also recognized this time as he spoke to Cornelius and his household (Acts 10:34-35).

The great commission extends to all men until the end of time (Matthew 28:18-20; Mark 16:15-16; Luke 24:46-47). Notice: (1) This commission is given in the accounts of the Gospel, which shows that the accounts are included in the law of Christ, certainly not the law of Moses or patriarchal law; (2) The language is universal — *“teach all nations” “observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you” “into all the world” “to every creature” “among all nations”* and (3) It is to extend until the end of time.

There is one faith now — one Gospel system of salvation (Ephesians 4:5). We are to contend for it (Jude 3), Paul preached it (Galatians 1:23) and it can be obeyed by all men (Romans 16:26). Thus, the faith is the same as the Gospel which is to be preached to every creature. It includes all things commanded of Jesus and is to be taught to all nations and every creature. Thus, it must be true that there is not a separate doctrine or teaching of Jesus — one for the believer and one for the unbeliever. All men, whether they are Jew or Gentile, Christian or not, are subject to the Gospel of Christ. There is only one faith or system of faith and that is the Gospel of Christ which is enjoined upon all accountable men everywhere. Therefore, all that Jesus taught concerning marriage, divorce and remarriage applies to all accountable people, whether sinner or saint.

***The second view, whether intended or not,  
makes the Word of God contradict itself***

If Jesus in **Matthew 19:9** gave the one and only exception — fornication — for divorce and remarriage, then any other passage that teaches another exception is a contradiction. If **1 Corinthians 7:15** gives another reason for divorce and remarriage — the desertion of a believer — then the word “*except*” in **Matthew 19:9** doesn't have any significance at all. It is a violation of the law of Parsimony to state that our Lord uttered idle and unnecessary words or that there are words of no significance in the New Testament.

Jesus said “*except*” and that rules out all other reasons. Just as the word “*except*” in **John 3:5** rules out other ways to enter the kingdom of God — because it specifies that “*Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*” — just so the word “*except*” in **Matthew 19:9** rules out any other reason for divorce and remarriage than fornication. **1 Corinthians 7** does give additional revelation to that given directly by Jesus while here on earth, but it does not give *contradictory* additional revelation to that given by our Lord directly.

Further, this view asserts that the word “*bondage*” in **1 Corinthians 7:15** is a reference to the marriage bond. The word “*bondage*” is translated from the Greek “*dedoulotai*” the root of which is “*douloo*” which occurs in one form or another one hundred and sixty five times in the New Testament. One hundred and forty four times it is translated as servant, do service, become servant or serve. Not one time (unless this is the sole exception) does it refer to the marriage bond.

The Holy Spirit inspired Paul to use a word that refers to the marriage bond in **Verse 27 and 39** — “*deo*” — the same word could have been used in **Verse 15**, but it was not. Instead a word that refers to slavery is used. According to Vine it, “signifies to make a slave of, to bring into bondage” (Vine, 141). It is a reference to the lowest term in the scale of servitude, thus not a word that accurately describes the marriage bond.

The perfect tense of the word “*dedoulotai/bondage*” is also significant. The perfect tense refers to past action with lingering results. In the positive use of a word, this means that the action has taken place and continues to have effect. Used in the negative (as in this passage “*not under bondage*”) it means that the action has not taken place and continues to not take place. It means that the deserted Christian has never been in this type of bondage and will continue to be free

from this kind of bondage. If it referred to the marriage bond, then it would mean that a deserted Christian was not married to the unbeliever and continues to not be married to the unbeliever.

The importance of the perfect tense when considered with the definition of the word “*bondage*” as slavery, means that a Christian has not been under the bond of slavery to an unbeliever and continues not to be under the bond of slavery to the unbeliever. It means that a Christian is not to be so bound to an unbeliever that they must forsake Christ to stay with the unbeliever. A Christian is not under that kind of bondage to any man or woman. We must serve Christ not man.

This verse teaches that a Christian is not required to subject himself to all kinds of abuse from an unbeliever who does not wish to married to him. The Christian is not commanded to live with an unbeliever who does not wish to live with him. He is not under an obligation to continue in the marriage when an unbeliever refuses to live with him.

Does that mean that the person is no longer married and therefore free to remarry. No! If we view this verse as allowing a divorce (something which may be a moot question) this verse still does not authorize remarriage. There is no mention of it in this verse.

However, more needs to be said concerning this view. The Greek word translated “such cases” means, “of this kind or sort, such.” What kinds of cases are “such cases?” Some have treated this as if it applies to mere desertion. The context seems to indicate that the desertion occur on the basis that one is a Christian and the unbeliever deserts the Christian because of their faith and possible persecution brought on by the marriage.

The whole subject of **Verses 12-16** is mixed marriages. Some unbelievers were inclined to live peaceably with their believing spouses, in these cases they were to remain married. But, in **Verse 15**, the application is made to those cases in which the unbeliever is *not content* to dwell with the believer and the context seems to indicate because of that believer's faith in Christ. If one should argue that this allows remarriage to the deserted believer they must assume: (1) The word “*bondage*” means freedom from the marriage bond (which we have shown is not the case) and (2) Remarriage is approved of God in these cases (which makes this passage contradict **Matthew 19:9**).

To misapply this passage to refer to remarriages in which a companion has left because of incompatibility, irreconcilable differences or other marital failures other than fornication is to greatly abuse this passage. Far too many people today use this verse to excuse themselves from obedience to **Matthew 5:32; 19:9; Mark 10:11-12; Luke 16:18**. Paul did not give a second exception to what Jesus gave.

The latter part of **Verse 15** and **Verse 16** says, “...but God hath called us to peace. 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?” This simply means that the believer is not to place himself in a position where he must live a life of bitterness and strife in the hope that at some point he will be able to convert his spouse. That is a hope that Paul indicates we don't know and is not certain to be fulfilled. This would be especially true during the times they were living and the present distress or the persecution of Christians. God has not called us to maintain relationships in which

we must beg and plead, fight and strive to maintain a marriage which the unbeliever does not want to keep. And certainly we are not to give up Christ and faithful service to Him, in order to serve a spouse who demands us to be unfaithful (Acts 5:29; 2 Cor. 6:14). We are not under that kind of bondage. If the unbeliever departs, let him depart.

***The third view is the practice of some who do not fully uphold the Biblical doctrine of repentance, which demands a change in heart that brings about a change in life produced by godly sorrow (2 Corinthians 7:10).***

Repentance requires that one bring forth fruits meet for repentance (Matthew 3:8) and that one shows that he has ceased his evil activities (Acts 19:18-19). One who remains in an adulterous marriage has not repented of that sin. Why is it that some think that Zacchaeus practiced repentance when he restored four-fold his ill gotten gain (Luke 19:8), but they can keep an unlawful wife or husband and be right with God by saying “I’m sorry?”

***The view that 1 Corinthians 7:15 presupposes fornication has taken place is nothing but assumption, which proves nothing***

Paul does not reveal this in **1 Corinthians 7:15**. It is simply not there. If one is free to remarry, the authority is not found in this passage. If fornication exists, then one must turn to passages which deal with that, not here.

### **III. ABIDE IN THE SAME CALLING - 1 CORINTHIANS 7:20**

This perversion of **1 Corinthians 7** asserts that one can stay in whatever marital state one is in when he becomes a Christian. This would be fine if all were scriptural marriages. However, the major effort is to defend adulterous marriages as being honorable by twisting this passage to include any and all current marriages as being acceptable before God.

Inasmuch as we have dealt with the false teaching that some are not accountable to the Gospel before being baptized and thus one can stay in his current marriage arrangement, we will not cover this again. Further, this is not the usual argument used to defend this view.

The usual approach is to affirm that men are accountable to the Gospel before baptism, but we cannot apply God's law so strictly or perfectly as to require those in adulterous marriages to dissolve that marriage. Further, some affirm that it is required by this passage that they *must* remain in the current marriage when they become Christians.

What Paul taught in **1 Corinthians 7:17-24** is that the calling of the Gospel was no reason for changing one's outward relationships, as long as those relationships would not affect one's repentance and service to God. Since both the context before and after this passage deals with the subject of marriage, the application of the principle — that the calling of the Gospel is no reason for changing one's outward relationships — must be related to the subject of marriage. The two examples Paul cites to prove his argument are circumcision and slavery. The main point, however, is that a person who is married should not feel compelled to put away his companion

because he became a Christian. However, this should not be perverted to teach that we can ignore God's law on repentance and continue to live in an unscriptural marriage.

Several false concepts have been set forth in an effort to support the view of continuing in an adulterous marriage after becoming a Christian:

1. Paul gave supplemental revelation to loosen His standards concerning marriage, divorce and remarriage and to allow formerly adulterous marriages to continue after one becomes a Christian.

In answer to this we know that whatever revelation Paul set forth was done by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and thus, it would not contradict what Jesus revealed in person.

2. There are two laws at work: (1) The primary law of divorce, and (2) The secondary law of divorce. Another way of putting it is that we cannot perfectly apply the primary law of Christ under imperfect conditions.

The only thing at work here is the desire to approve the practice of adulterous marriages. As we have noted, there is one faith, one Gospel and one universal law for all men everywhere today. God does not have a primary and secondary law of divorce. Further, whatever application is made must be made uniformly to all. We cannot pick and choose the application of God's law depending on the current situation. This is a form of situation ethics and it is blatantly false.

3. All marriages are honorable or marriage is in honor among all. Some marriages are considered scriptural while some are considered honorable. But all would become honorable at the time one is baptized into Christ.

Even though marriage is an honorable institution before God (Hebrews 13:4) not all marriages are honorable or acceptable in the sight of God. In order for a marriage to be honorable it must be scriptural. Otherwise, it is an unlawful marriage and certainly not honorable in the sight of God and godly men. If a marriage is scriptural it is honorable, since it honors both God and both husband and wife.

4. We are called in peace, thus becoming a Christian shouldn't cause us to abolish our relationships with others because becoming a Christian would sanctify the existing marriage.

This is a play on words from **1 Corinthians 7:14-15**, which in the case of sanctification refers to the children of a scriptural marriage between a believer and unbeliever. In the case of being called to peace, this has reference to a believer not fussing and fighting with an unbelieving companion in an attempt to convert them to Christ.

5. We cannot undo some trespasses of God's law. Therefore, we must let a person stay in his current marriage because to require a change would be too hard upon the couple and any children of that union. It would be unreasonable to dissolve an adulterous marriage.

If we consider the scriptures reasonable, then it would be unreasonable to allow an adulterous marriage to continue and especially so if there are children involved. Children learn by example and the example of an adulterous marriage teaches them that adultery is acceptable. So the argument “you will hurt the children if you dissolve this marriage” is really an emotional plea based upon the ties of the flesh, rather than considering the spiritual welfare of all involved.

Paul certainly taught that it was possible for the Corinthians to repent in **1 Corinthians 6:9-11** where he wrote, *“Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, 10. Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. 11. And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.”* The fact, that “*such were some of you*” indicates that they had repented and were no longer living in these things. Did Paul change his teaching on repentance from Chapter 6 to Chapter 7? No! These folks repented *before* they were baptized into Christ otherwise they could not have been called sanctified and justified before God.

This doctrine leads to the false view that repentance is not necessary before one becomes a Christian, but is necessary after one becomes a Christian. A Christian would have to repent (cease adultery - 1 Corinthians 5) as a condition of being forgiven. But, a non-Christian does not have to repent (cease adultery - 1 Corinthians 7:20) as a condition of being forgiven. This eliminates repentance (or redefines repentance) in the plan of salvation in the cases of adulterous marriages.

One of the logical consequences of this false doctrine leads to the ridiculous situation where one can enter an adulterous marriage *before* they are baptized and be right with God, but he cannot be baptized first and then be married and be right with God. How would one who teaches this view counsel an unbeliever put away for fornication, who wants to become a Christian and also wants to marry another? The only logical thing he could tell this person is to marry first and then be baptized. If he was baptized before his marriage, then he would be in sin. If he was married before he was baptized, then he could just continue in the adulterous marriage!

Preaching the gospel does involve teaching some things which are hard to do. That is not new (Matthew 19:10-12). Thus, we must not give in to situation ethics, teaching ungodly tolerance, or a doctrine which redefines and minimizes true repentance to appease those who want to continue to live in an adulterous marriage.

### Conclusion

These perversions of God's law of marriage, divorce and remarriage in **1 Corinthians 7** cannot be allowed to prevail among God's people without reaping the terrible consequences of the church and families being morally weakened and spiritually destroyed. Unfortunately, false doctrines are believed and followed because some people think they can “have their cake and eat it too.” They believe that they can live in an adulterous marriage and at the same time enjoy the approval of

God now and an eternity in Heaven. Let us make sure that if they believe this false doctrine, it is not because we have failed to teach them the truth of God's Word and refute these attacks of the devil's workers to destroy the home, the church and the souls of those involved in these perversions.