**Marriage**

God has arranged a special interrelationship between the genders, that is, between men and women, called marriage. Since this relationship plays such a key role in an individual’s life, we will devote substantial attention to its study.

**а. Premarital Relationships**

We will begin by studying the biblical view of proper relations between the genders before the marriage covenant is enacted. The Bible takes a positive view of love and romance. It is one of the many gracious gifts of God to humanity in general. The Scriptures actually describe several engaging romances, such as between Jacob and Rachel, David and Michal, Boaz and Ruth, and others.

In the book of Proverbs, Agur expresses amazement at the wonder of romantic love. In Proverbs 30:18-19, he writes, “There are three things which are too wonderful for me, four which I do not understand: the way of an eagle in the sky, the way of a serpent on a rock, the way of a ship in the middle of the sea, and the way of a man with a maid.” In addition, the entire book of Song of Solomon is devoted to romantic love. In Ecclesiastes, Solomon speaks again about marital bliss:

Two are better than one because they have a good return for their labor. For if either of them falls, the one will lift up his companion. But woe to the one who falls when there is not another to lift him up. Furthermore, if two lie down together they keep warm, but how can one be warm {alone}? (Ecc 4:9-11).

It will interest us to know how people in the cultures of biblical times approached marriage. We will examine premarital customs in Greco-Roman and ancient Jewish cultures.

Greeks and Romans of New Testament times considered the family subservient to the state. The institutions of marriage and family existed to produce strong and able bodies to serve the state. Men sought wives who could most likely produce such offspring. We also note that for men, engaging in sex outside of marriage was common and acceptable, yet it was a disgrace for women. In general, women occupied a lower rank than men in ancient society – on the level of servants.

Clearly, this approach runs contrary to the biblical norm. First, the woman is deserving of equal respect in marriage and society. Additionally, the Bible values family relationships over one’s service to the state. Finally, Scripture categorically forbids sex outside of marriage for either gender. Therefore, there is little in Greco-Roman culture that is worthy of imitation.

In Jewish culture, the parents arranged the marriage. Sometimes they chose the bride or groom themselves (Gen 24:1-4), while at other times, they allowed a son to choose a wife within set boundaries (Gen 28:1-2). Another practice was to simply approve the son’s choice or a bride (Judg 14:1-3).

Before the wedding date, a representative of the groom negotiated with a representative of the father of the bride concerning the match. In Rebekah’s case, her father asked her approval as well. The groom conventionally worked for his father-in-law for a period of time. The daughter received a wedding gift from her father – possibly some land or a servant. Marriages with Gentiles were forbidden (Ezra 9:2), as well as with a close relative (Lev 18:6-8).

After the marriage covenant was agreed upon, the prospective groom proposed to the prospective bride. Their relationship from that point was considered a legal marriage. It could only be annulled by a legal act and for reason of adultery. The engagement period lasted 12 months, during which the groom prepared a home for his future bride, and the bride prepared her wedding garments. The bride’s parents prepared the wedding feast.

This system has both pluses and minuses. On the positive side, it employed the wisdom and counsel of the parents, who may well know their children better than they know themselves. Also notable is that Israel practiced this system many years and never received rebuke or correction from the Lord concerning it. On the other hand, this approach: (1) failed to allow the couple to develop an acquaintance beforehand, (2) created marriages not always based on love, and (3) empowered parents to potentially abuse the system in order to personally gain from the match.

Let us attempt to glean from Scripture wise counsel on preparation for marriage. First, many mistakenly believe that God has chosen only one special mate for each individual. There are examples where God indeed plays the “matchmaker,” such as the case with Isaac and Rebekah. In most cases, however, the individual himself or herself is left to make their own choice. In 1 Corinthians 7:39, we read, “A wife is bound as long as her husband lives; but if her husband is dead, she is free to be married *to whom she wishes*, only in the Lord” (also see Num 36:6). Here, Paul also highlights a key principle for Christians seeking a mate – they must marry only other true believers.

Although God grants each believer freedom in choosing a mate, certain guiding principles can aid us. Again, we stress that the union must be between fellow followers of Jesus (2 Cor 6:14). It is also desirable that: (1) they have a common denominational affiliation, (2) they enjoy freedom in fellowship together and open communication, (3) they share a common vision for the future, (4) they are physically attracted to each other,[[1]](#footnote-1) and (5) they relate well with their potential in-laws.

God’s only command for the single believer is to abstain from sex before marriage, i.e., fornication (1 Thes 4:3). One might wonder, though, why people are physically ready to marry and reproduce before they are mentally, emotionally, and financially ready to do so. The reason may well be that temptations to sexual sin happen not only before marriage, but in marriage as well. Therefore, God arranged this period of time between physical readiness for marriage and the actual marriage union for individuals to learn self-control over sexual desires, which may enable them to better resist sexual sin in marriage. A person who successfully resists such temptations before marriage may well resist them more successfully during marriage as well. Consequently, Paul urges young Timothy, “Flee youthful lusts” (2 Tim 2:22).

**b. Marriage relationships**

The Bible is very positive about the marriage relationship: “He who finds a wife finds a good thing and obtains favor from Yahweh” (Prov 18:22). Wayne Grudem makes an insightful comparison of the marriage relationship with that which exists in the Trinity.[[2]](#footnote-2) We will employ his insights in our study.

The Scriptures present the Trinity as a plurality in unity. One God exists in three distinct Persons: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. A proper understanding of the Trinity affirms that all Members of the Godhead are equal in nature and dignity. One Person is not greater than the others. In addition, the Persons of the Trinity differ in function among themselves. Each has a specific role to play in accomplishing God’s plan.

It is interesting to note that all these features present in the Trinity find correspondence with the marriage union. First, the couple is obliged to preserve unity in their diversity. Before God, they are “one flesh.” Second, before God, they are equal in importance and dignity. One is not superior to the other. Finally, husband and wife differ in how they function in the marriage bond. Some responsibilities lie with the husband, while others are incumbent on the wife. So then, the example of the Trinity serves as an excellent model for a successful marriage. Let us examine these features in still more detail.

Both Old and New Testaments affirm unity in marriage (Gen 2:24; Eph 5:31-32; Matt 19:5-6). Husband and wife are one flesh. Therefore, adultery is forbidden (Deut 5:18; Heb 13:4). This unity, however, is often not actualized in married life. Divorce is the tragic result.

In the Old Covenant, Yahweh allowed divorce and remarriage under certain circumstances (Deut 24:1). Nonetheless, His basic attitude toward divorce was negative. Through the prophet Malachi, God revealed, “’I hate divorce,’ says Yahweh, the God of Israel” (Mal 2:16).

We must also consider a key verse in Deuteronomy 24:1: “When a man takes a wife and marries her, and it happens that she finds no favor in his eyes because he has found some indecency in her, and he writes her a certificate of divorce and puts {it} in her hand and sends her out from his house…” The key term here giving grounds for divorce is “indecency.” This word translates the Hebrew עֶרְוַת דָּבָר (*davar ervath*).

The rabbis differed in their interpretation of this phrase.[[3]](#footnote-3) Shammai thought that it referred to some sexual misconduct by the wife, while Hillel considered it to be anything that displeased the husband. In the latter’s view, then, the husband could demand a divorce for any reason.

Shammai’s view finds support in the literal meaning of the Hebrew terms, which is, “a matter of nakedness.”[[4]](#footnote-4) Moreover, in Deuteronomy 23:15 the phrase is again associated with uncleanliness. We also see affinities between Shammai’s view and Jesus’ teaching, who taught that divorce and remarriage is permissible only for reason of adultery. On the other hand, Hillel’s view is supported by Deuteronomy 22:22, where adultery results not in divorce, but in the execution of the offender. In addition, Deuteronomy 24:2 allows divorce simply if the husband hates his wife.

Advancing to the New Covenant, several key passages underscore Jesus’ teaching on the topic. In Mark’s Gospel, we read, “Whoever divorces his wife and marries another woman commits adultery against her; and if she herself divorces her husband and marries another man, she is committing adultery” (Мk. 10:11-12). Matthew adds, “Everyone who divorces his wife, except for {the} reason of unchastity, makes her commit adultery; and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery” (Matt 5:32). We may assume that the opposite case would also be true – if a wife divorces her husband, except for the reason of unchastity, she makes him commit adultery, and whoever marries a divorced man commits adultery. We find the same conditions in Luke 16:18 and Matthew 9:9. We note here that Jesus did not so much forbid divorce, as He forbade remarriage.

Jesus made an exception, however, in the case of adultery. According to Matthew 19:9 and 5:32, He allowed remarriage in that case. We base our claim on the assumption that if one is *guilty* of adultery for divorce and remarriage *not because* of adultery, then one in *not guilty* of adultery for divorce and remarriage *because* of adultery.

The word translated here “adultery,” that is ποрνεία (*porneia*), deserves special comment. It is defined as “unlawful sexual intercourse, prostitution, unchastity, fornication.”[[5]](#footnote-5) The question arises, “Does ποрνεία (*porneia*) refer to sex before marriage (fornication), of which the other partner was not aware before the wedding, or sex outside of marriage (adultery)”? A third option is also possible – Jesus could be referring to both transgressions.

In support of the interpretation of ποрνεία (*porneia*) as fornication, Matthew 15:19 lists ποрνεία (*porneia*) separately from adultery. We see the same in Mark 7:21. In support of ποрνεία (*porneia*) as adultery, some non-canonical books use it in this way (*Sirach*, 23.23; *Hermas*, *Com.* 4.1). Although neither Sirach, nor Hermas are biblical books, they are nonetheless valuable since they were written about the time of the New Testament and may well reflect the common usage of ποрνεία (*porneia*) at that time.

Moreover, in Matthew 5:32 we learn, “Everyone who divorces his wife, except for {the} reason of unchastity (ποрνεία), makes her commit adultery.” Most likely, the opposite proposition also holds true, “Everyone who divorces his wife for {the} reason of unchastity (ποрνεία), does not make her commit adultery.” This is so because the wife has already committed adultery when she committed ποрνεία (*porneia*). Therefore, in this verse ποрνεία (*porneia*) is adultery.

Finally, in defense of the position that both fornication and adultery are in view, we may argue that if the Evangelists had wanted to specifically identify adultery, they could have used the common Greek term for that act, namely μοιχεῖα(*moicheia*). The choice of ποрνεία (*porneia*) over μοιχεῖα(*moicheia*) may indicate that Jesus meant more than simply adultery. It is also insightful to compare this verse with Deuteronomy 22:20-22, where both fornication and adultery are addressed in one context.

In light of the evidence presented, we are more convinced by the final theory – that both a previously unconfessed act of fornication before marriage, or adultery in marriage gives grounds for divorce and remarriage to the offended party.

This interpretation coincides well with the principle of “one flesh,” of which Jesus spoke in Matthew 19:6. Whenever two people, married or unmarried, enter a sexual union, they become one flesh. Even relations with a prostitute constitute this union (1 Cor 6:16). Therefore, in line with this principle, remarriage is permitted in those cases when the husband or wife violates or had violated that principle by fornication before marriage or adultery in marriage. Such a disruption of the “one flesh” union with the marriage partner liberates the offended party to divorce and remarry.

The apostle Paul informs us of yet another exception to the ban on divorce and remarriage. To the Corinthian church, he writes, “Yet if the unbelieving one leaves, let him leave; the brother or the sister is not under bondage in such {cases,} but God has called us to peace” (1 Cor 7:15).

Not all agree that Paul is permitting remarriage in this verse. Some debate the meanings of “bondage” and “peace.” To clarify the matter, we consider similar expressions in 1 Corinthians 7:39 and Romans 7:2, where Paul specifically permits remarriage after a husband’s death.

- A wife is *bound* as long as her husband lives; but if her husband is dead, she is *free* to be married to whom she wishes, only in the Lord (1 Cor 7:39).

- For the married woman is *bound* by law to her husband while he is living; but if her husband dies, she is *released* from the law concerning the husband (Rom 7:2).

We also note that Paul acknowledges that a single person may well “burn {with passion}” (1 Cor 7:9), which may correspond to his use of the expression “God has called us to peace” in 1 Corinthians 7:15 as referring to satisfaction of sexual desire through remarriage.

Another observation reinforces our conviction that Paul was permitting remarriage in 1 Corinthians 7:15. In 1 Corinthians 7:10-16, he creates a parallel between divorce between believers, and the believer being divorced by an unbeliever. Concerning the former, we read, “But to the married I give instructions, not I, but the Lord, that the wife should not leave her husband (*but if she does leave, she must remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband*).” In the latter case, however, Paul makes no qualification such as “she must remain unmarried,” which one might expect to see if he was not allowing remarriage in that case either. Instead, he writes, “The brother or the sister is not under bondage in such {cases}, but God has called us to peace,” which implies the opposite – remarriage is permitted.

In church history, we witness examples where Christian confessions have adopted unbiblical views on divorce and remarriage. On the one hand, the Roman Catholic Church teaches that only death of a spouse can nullify the marriage covenant. Those who divorce and remarry are denied participation in the Eucharist.[[6]](#footnote-6) On the other hand, from the tenth century on Eastern Orthodoxy allows divorce and remarriage (up to the fourth marriage).[[7]](#footnote-7) Meyendorff explains the Orthodox position:

Remarriage of the widowed was only tolerated by them, as was the remarriage of the divorced. But this “toleration” did not mean approval. It implied repentance, and remarriage was allowed only to those men or women whose previous marriage could be considered non-existent in practice.”[[8]](#footnote-8)

He justifies this view as follows:

Like all sacraments marriage requires a free response and implies the possibility of human rejection and human mistake; and that, after a sinful such rejection or human mistake, repentance always allows a new beginning. This is the theological basis for the toleration of divorce in the early Christian Church, as well as in Byzantium.”[[9]](#footnote-9)

The second comparison between the Trinity and the marriage relationship concerns the equality of husband and wife in value and dignity. They both enjoy free and equal access to God through Christ. Paul comments on this, “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free man, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Gal 3:28). It is notable that in the Old Testament, the sign of one’s covenant with God, circumcision, applies only to males. In the New Covenant, though, both genders receive water baptism.

Finally, just as in the Trinity, the Bible reveals that each partner fulfills special and complimentary functions and carries certain responsibilities. Ephesians 5:25-33 instructs the husband to love his wife, and then goes on to define this love – he should love her as his own body and as Christ loves the Church. The wife stands in need of the husband’s protection, provision, attention, and affection.

In Colossians 3:19, Paul again instructs husbands to love their wives, but adds, “Do not be embittered against them.” The husband is called to exercise patience toward his wife and not to focus on her shortcomings. Peter admonishes the husband in a similar manner: “You husbands in the same way, live with {your wives} in an understanding way, as with someone weaker, since she is a woman; and show her honor as a fellow heir of the grace of life, so that your prayers will not be hindered” (1 Pet 3:7).

We may sum up the biblical teaching on the husband’s responsibility to the wife with the words “care,” “patience,” and “respect.” The godly husband handles his wife like a precious vessel, which he looks after with great care and tenderness. It is no surprise, then, to discover that a common complaint made by wives about their husbands is neglect or lack of attention. This failure by the husband is directly addressed by the Scriptures quoted above and can be corrected by their observance.

The Scriptures also address the wife’s role and responsibilities. Both Ephesians 5:22 and Colossians 3:18 declare, “Wives, be subject to your husbands.” Peter echoes this injunction (1 Pet 3:1). This is the primary charge to the wife found in Scripture – being subject to one’s spouse. Therefore, we are not surprised that a common complaint by the husband is a lack of respect and cooperation from his wife. It is difficult for the husband to lead if the wife refuses to follow. Since the biblical teaching of the wife’s submission is very controversial in today’s world and Church, we devote more attention to this issue in Appendix A.

In conclusion, we must address certain practices that were widespread and well-accepted under the Old Covenant, but are not applicable in the New Covenant, namely, polygamy and levirate marriage. The latter refers to a man’s obligation to marry his brother’s widow if she is childless (Deut 25:5-10; Ruth 4:5, 10). This practice was instituted so that a man’s “name will not be blotted out from Israel.” Yet, since in the New Covenant salvation and inclusion in God’s people does not depend on physical descent, this practice has lost its relevance.

Concerning polygamy, God allowed multiple wives in the Old Testament. Nevertheless, this arrangement led to many complications, for example, bitter envy and jealousy between a man’s wives (see Gen 16, 29-30; 1 Sam 1:1-6). Polygamy also resulted in Solomon falling away from the Lord (1 Kin 11:1).

New Covenant believers observe the principle of “one flesh,” which Jesus emphasized in His teaching on divorce: “For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh” (Matt 19:5). In this same context, Jesus clarified that divorce (and, by implication, polygamy) was formerly permitted because of “hardness of heart” (Matt 19:8). The apostles’ teaching confirms the New Testament standard – bishops and deacons are to be husbands “of one wife” (1 Tim 3:2, 12).

**c. Singleness**

In discussing marital relations, we must not neglect to touch on the issue of singleness. Not all people marry or desire to marry. First of all, though, we must qualify that, unlike certain trajectories in the Church and religion in general, the Scriptures never decry marriage (Prov 18:23). Forbidding marriage, in fact, is classed as a “doctrine of demons” (1 Tim 4:1-3).

Nevertheless, from a practical point of view the unmarried state boasts some advantages, which Paul highlights in 1 Corinthians 7:32-35. The primary benefit is devoting more undistracted attention to the Lord and the things of God. The book of Acts gives an example of the four virgin daughters of Phillip, who prophesied (Acts 21:9).

The Bible reveals that the ability to remain single is a gift from God (1 Cor 7:7; Matt 19:11). The natural human tendency is to desire intimate relations with the opposite sex. Therefore, to counteract that tendency God must provide supernatural grace in order for one to live comfortably in that state.

The Catechism of the Catholic Church also affirms that “virginity for the Kingdom of God come(s) from the Lord himself. It is he who gives (it) meaning and grants (it) the grace which is indispensable for living (it) out in conformity with his will.”[[10]](#footnote-10) Yet, Catholics err in supposing that the grace of celibacy “is an unfolding of baptismal grace,”[[11]](#footnote-11) and in requiring celibacy of their clergy.

A person can determine whether he or she has the gift of celibacy by discovering how well he or she can handle sexual temptation in the unmarried state. If a person lacks self-control, then Paul’s counsels, “Let them marry; for it is better to marry than to burn {with passion}” (1 Cor 7:9). Paul advises young widows to marry for the same reason (1 Tim 5:11-15). On the other hand, Jesus advises those who are endowed with the gift of celibacy to employ it (Matt 19:12).

Certain Church Fathers held to an errant view on celibacy that some Orthodox writers have echoed. They felt that God’s original plan was not to divide the human race by genders. It is thought that such distinctions would violate the unity that creation was intended to display. This preservation of unity was an important feature of patristic theology due to the dominating influence of Neoplatonism on many of the Fathers (see Appendix B).

Consequently, it was thought that God originally intended for human reproduction to take place in a non-sexual way. Maximus the Confessor comments,

It was widely held that procreation through the union of man and woman had not been the original will of God. God would have devised another method of procreation if man had not fallen to the level of the animals, and he would have abolished the difference between male and female.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Originally man had been created for “a mode of propagation that was deifying, divine and nonmaterial,” but his fall into sin meant that this divine plan was replaced and that man would be trapped in a material mode of propagation, one dominated by sexual passion.[[13]](#footnote-13)

However, according to this theory God allowed the separation of the genders since He foreknew humanity’s fall into sin. Thus, sexual distinctions were a condescension by the Lord. Bulgakov comments, “(The body) was imperfect and incomplete, but made fleshly reproduction possible…. This division along with affinity of the earth with the body testifies of the body’s imperfection.”[[14]](#footnote-14) Drawing from Maximus the Confessor, Lossky asserts,

The first human was called to unify in himself the entirety of the created order; he was to attain complete union with God and at the same time communicate deification to all creatures. First of all, he was to overcome the division in his own nature between the sexes by means of a life without passion in accordance with the Divine Architype.[[15]](#footnote-15)

John of Damascus believed that the Fall resulted in people becoming attached to earthly things. This necessitated reproduction by sexual means:

But since God in His prescience knew that man would transgress and become liable to destruction, He made from him a female to be a help to him like himself… if he transgressed and inclined the rather to what was material, and tore his mind from the Author of his being, I mean God, his fate was to be corruption, and he was to become subject to passion instead of passionless, and mortal instead of immortal, and dependent on connection and unsettled generation.[[16]](#footnote-16)

Clement of Alexandria thought along the same lines. On the one hand, he affirmed the institute of marriage and considered it God’s gift. Nevertheless, he believed that the married couple should abstain from sexual intimacy, except to have children.[[17]](#footnote-17)

Commenting on the teaching of Gregory Palamas, Mantzaridis defends celibacy, arguing that it reflects eschatological life:

Man imitates the Kingdom of heaven and participates in the life to come…. Marriage, inaugurated on earth because of the disobedience of our progenitors, is forgiven by God and has His blessing; but it is not the ideal way for man to achieve perfection, because it binds him to a life of cares and renders more difficult the attainment of virtue.[[18]](#footnote-18)

The Western Church at times joined the Eastern Fathers in lauding the celibate life. Jerome, for example, writes,

Virginity is natural while marriage only follows guilt [the fall] … I praise marriage – because it gives me virgins. I gather the rose from the thorns.[[19]](#footnote-19)

However, this teaching has no biblical basis. The Scriptures speak positively of the marriage state. This theory is merely another attempt to adapt Christianity to the Neoplatonic worldview by which many of the Fathers were deceived. It results in a disparaging view toward our material nature and has affinity with Greek philosophy, but is contrary to sound Christian doctrine.

**d. Homosexuality**

Our final topic for discussion is homosexuality and the related issues of trans-sexuality. Although alternative lifestyles are gaining support and acceptance in society, they have no biblical justification. The Scriptures consider such behavior abominable (Lev 18:2; 20:13) and errant (Rom 1:26-27). 1 Corinthians 6:9 states that those who practice it “will not inherit the kingdom of God.”
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