Put Her Away*

Matthew 19:3-9 (3) The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?
(4) And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female,
(5) And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?
(6) Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.
(7) They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?
(8) He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.
(9) 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.
How does one get "whosoever divorces his wife" out of those places where Jesus literally said "whosoever puts away, or dismissed his wife"? The Pharisees did not ask about divorce untill caught in their own trap. Q-So what was Matthew 19:3 about? A-People that were still married, but the wife had been abandoned-put away. Q-How could that happen? A-When no letter of divorcement is provided to a wife as comanded by the law of divorcement in Deuteronomy 24:1. Another thing to keep in mind is the 2 part question asked in 19:3. Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? *The two parts question to consider are,*
(1) The first part of the question, is it lawful? This indicates the Pharisees were asking a question concerning the Jewish

marriage law ordinance, but not concerning the gospel.
(2) The second part, to 'put away' a wife for ever cause, indicates the question was about abandoning a wife. Put away, send away, set at liberty, dismissed, ect. translated from the Greek word 'Apoluo' does not mean divorce (Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament), however 'divorce' and 'put away' can be tied together as in 19:7-8.
In Hebrew, 'k'reethooth is same as Apoluo,' (Englishman's Hebrew Concordance of the Old Testament).
To the best of my knowledge there are only 3 reasons why a Jewish man could 'put away his wife.'
(1st) Deuteronomy 24:1 then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. *Giving her a bill of divorcement is one of the stipulations to 'put her away.' If he does not give her a writing of divorcement when he 'dismissed her,' that is abandonment and a remarriage would be adultery.*
(2nd) Matthew 19:9 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. *The second reason he can 'put her away' is for fornication. The reason for the exception clause is that the guilty should be stoned to death (Lev 20:10), allowing remarriage of the innocent party. Divorce in this case is not required because the marriage would end at death of the guilty party.*
(3rd) Matthew 1:18-25 (18) Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.
(19) Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a publick example, was minded to put her away privily.
(20) But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou

son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.
(21) And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins.
(22) Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying,
(23) Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us.
(24) Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife:
(25) And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS.

Had Joseph 'put away' Mary privately, did that mean neither he nor Mary would be allowed to marry someone else, because they would commit adultery? I ask that only to reveal the problems that may arise when one does not rightly divide the word. In the case of Joseph and Mary, had he 'put her away' privately, both could have married someone else because they were never married, but engaged. In such a case the engagement may be broken without a writing of divorcement. In Matthew 1:19, Joseph was minded to 'put her away.' The Greek word 'Apoluo' is the same word in Matthew 1:19, Matthew 19:9 and Matthew 5:32. Apoluo or 'put away' of itself does not mean divorce in Matthew 1:19 where Joseph was minded to 'put her away' and does not mean divorce in other instances as well. In the KJV Matt 5:32, the word apoluo is translated divorce and crossreferenced as divorce in Strong's concordance, but Strong's is coded to the KJV. In the ASV apoluo is translated 'put her away,' not divorce. The Greek word Apoluo of itself cannot be taken to mean divorce therefore a dismissed wife lacking divorce papers would be abandonment.

Adultery has always been considered a crime of a very heinous nature. In Egypt, it was punished by cutting off the nose of the

adulteress; in Persia, the nose and ears were cut off; in Judea, the punishment was death by stoning, (Leviticus 20:10; Ezekiel 16:38, Ezekiel 16:40; John 8:5.) This punishment was also inflicted where the person was not married, but betrothed, (Deuteronomy 22:23-24). In Mary's case, therefore, the regular punishment would have been death in this painful and ignominious manner. Yet Joseph was a religious man - mild and tender; and he was not willing to complain of her to the magistrate, and expose her to death, but sought to avoid the shame, and to 'put her away' privately. Joseph and Mary were engaged, but a marriage was not consumated. In Luke 2:5 she is called his espoused wife. Because of her being with child, he planned to 'put her away' which would break the engagement. Joseph was kind and considerate, yet was conscientious and unwilling to ignore the moral law. He had such a high regard for Mary that he was not willing to expose her to public disgrace and the penality for adultery, which was stoning to death. Now the Greek word translated 'put away' in Matt 1:19, is 'apoluo,' which means send away, release, let go, depart, loosed, put away ect, but not divorce. Yet apoluo has been misapplied or imputed as (considered guilty of) divorce. Apostation is the Greek word that means a writing of divorcement, it is used three times in the new testament, Matt 5:31, Matt 19:7, Mark 10:4.
(Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament).
In the Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament, *the word Apoluo, appears 63 times. Out of the 63, Apoluo was translated divorce only 1 time, that being Matthew 5:32, coded by Strong's to the KJV. To enhance our understanding of Apoluo, some verses where Apoluo appear need to be analyzed, turn with me to;*
Matthew 14:15-23 (15) And when it was evening, his disciples came to him, saying, This is a desert place, and the time is now past; send (apoluo) the multitude away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves victuals.

(16) But Jesus said unto them, They need not depart; give ye them to eat.
(17) And they say unto him, We have here but five loaves, and two fishes.
(18) He said, Bring them hither to me.
(19) And he commanded the multitude to sit down on the grass, and took the five loaves, and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake, and gave the loaves to his disciples, and the disciples to the multitude.
(20) And they did all eat, and were filled: and they took up of the fragments that remained twelve baskets full.
(21) And they that had eaten were about five thousand men, beside women and children.
(22) And straightway Jesus constrained his disciples to get into a ship, and to go before him unto the other side, while he sent (apoluo) the multitudes away.
(23) And when he had sent (apoluo) the multitudes away, he went up into a mountain apart to pray: and when the evening was come, he was there alone.
In the Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament, *the Greek word Apoluo is listed three times in this reading, verses 15, 22 and 23. Verse 15 is 'send away', verses 22 and 23 is 'sent away.' Judge for yourselves, would 'divorce the multitudes' make any sence in these verses? Turn with me to;*
Mark 15:1-15 (1) And straightway in the morning the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council, and bound Jesus, and carried him away, and delivered him to Pilate.
(2) And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answering said unto him, Thou sayest it.
(3) And the chief priests accused him of many things: but he answered nothing.
(4) And Pilate asked him again, saying, Answerest thou nothing? behold how many things they witness against thee.
(5) But Jesus yet answered nothing; so that Pilate marvelled.

(6) Now at that feast he released (apoluo) unto them one prisoner, whomsoever they desired.
(7) And there was one named Barabbas, which lay bound with them that had made insurrection with him, who had committed murder in the insurrection.
(8) And the multitude crying aloud began to desire him to do as he had ever done unto them.
(9) But Pilate answered them, saying, Will ye that I release (apoluo) unto you the King of the Jews?
(10) For he knew that the chief priests had delivered him for envy.
(11) But the chief priests moved the people, that he should rather release (apoluo) Barabbas unto them.
(12) And Pilate answered and said again unto them, What will ye then that I shall do unto him whom ye call the King of the Jews?
(13) And they cried out again, Crucify him.
(14) Then Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath he done? And they cried out the more exceedingly, Crucify him.
(15) And so Pilate, willing to content the people, released (apoluo) Barabbas unto them, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged him, to be crucified.
In the Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament, *the word Apoluo appears four times in this reading. Verses 6, 9, 11 and 15. Verses 6 and 15 is released, verses 9 and 11 is release. Judge for yourselves, would Apoluo mistranslated, 'the people divorced Barabbas,' make any sence? Turn to;*
Acts 4:18-23 (18) And they called them, and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus.
(19) But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye.
(20) For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.
(21) So when they had further threatened them, they let them

go (apoluo), finding nothing how they might punish them, because of the people: for all men glorified God for that which was done.
(22) For the man was above forty years old, on whom this miracle of healing was shewed.
(23) And being let go (apoluo), they went to their own company, and reported all that the chief priests and elders had said unto them.
Acts 16:35-36 (35) And when it was day, the magistrates sent (apoluo) the serjeants, saying, Let those men go.
(36) And the keeper of the prison told this saying to Paul, The magistrates have sent (apoluo) to let you go: now therefore depart, and go in peace.
In the Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament, *the word Apoluo appears four times in these two readings. Verses 21 and 23 of chapter 4, and verses 35 and 36 of chapter 16. Apoluo is translated 'let go.' Judge for yourselves, would Apoluo mistranslated divorce make any sence?*
We could go on and on until all 63 appearances of the Greek word Apoluo have been analyzed, however one more reading will be enough at this time.
Hebrews 13:22-24 (22) And I beseech you, brethren, suffer the word of exhortation: for I have written a letter unto you in few words.
(23) Know ye that our brother Timothy is set (apoluo) at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you.
(24) Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints. They of Italy salute you.
In the Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament, *the Greek word Apoluo appears one time in this reading. Verse 23 is translated 'set at liberty.' Timothy is believed to have been in prison and 'set at liberty.' If Apoluo is not divorce in Hebrews 13:23, then why does it mean divorce once out of 63 times in the gospels? Judge for yourselves.*
Now turn to;

Matthew 19:4-6 (4) And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female,
(5) And said, For this cause shall a man leave (apoluo) father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?
(6) Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.
Did you notice a man shall leave father and mother, not divorce father and mother and cleave to his wife.
The Bible records one divorce and the Lord said he did it. In Jeremiah 3, God reminded Judah that she was heading for trouble. Israel had already been taken captive. God told Jeremiah to warn Judah that she had witnessed her sister Israel's infidelity and had seen God give her a bill of divorce and send her away; and yet she did not fear. Let's read;
Jeremiah 3:8 And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.
I am curious, What would supporters of the Council of Trent traditional theory, that prohibit divorce and remarriage, have done with the Lord after He divorced Israel and put her away? Now there are people who use the example of Herod and Herodias to support the traditional theory of divorce and remarriage. However it is clear that Herodias was still married to Philip. John had told Herod that he could not marry his brothers wife, she was married to Philip.
Turn your Bibles to;
Mark 6:17-19 (17) For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife: for he had married her.
(18) For John had said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife. (see Leviticus 18:16)
(19) Therefore Herodias had a quarrel against him, and would

have killed him; but she could not:
Luther said; Through the Mosaic Law, adultery was punishable by death. *Therefore, an adulterer "has already been divorced, not by man but by God Himself, and separated not only from his wife but from this very life." Do not be mistaken, Jesus knew adultery was punishable by death when He said,* whosoever shall put away his wife and marrieth another commiteth adultery. *The problem Jesus was answering was 'putting away' a spouse apparently without a divorce, in which condition, a subsequent remarriage would be adultery punishable by death. It must be observed the Pharisees were questioning ordainces of the law, not the gospel.*
The meaning of the Greek word 'Apoluo' and its usage in scripture has been the thrust of this message, and also being clear that it was the ordainces of the law under consideration. We are to, rightly divide the truth (2Timothy 2:15). *Listen, the gospels have a unique place in the Bible. They are crucial in revealing the 'fulfillment of the ordiances of the law' unto the 'beginning of the gospel' (Mark 1.1). From faith in the law of ordiances to faith in the gospel (Romans 1:17). Rightly dividing the truth, is paramount in correctly understanding what is past in the law and what is present in the gospel.*
Now in case you may think that I condone divorce, I do not. I do not know of anyone who would condone such violent ripping apart of a marriage and family. My purpose is that scripture be properly understood. Listen, divorce should not happen; Turn with me to;
1Corinthians 7:27-28 (27) Art thou bound unto a wife? seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a wife. (28) But and if thou marry, thou hast not sinned; and if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned. Nevertheless such shall have trouble in the flesh: but I spare you.
There are 3 propositions given by Paul in this reading. Proposition1; if are you married do not seek divorce.
This is so simple it could be compared to the command God

gave Adam, do not eat of that tree. So many things could have been avoided had Adam obeyed; sorrow, heartache, death, disease, wars and so much more. So also in a divorce, so many things could be avoided; sorrow, heartache, financial distress, separation from children, shame and so much more.
Proposition 2; if you are divorced, seek not a mate.
Again, so simple a command, and if obeyed would eliminate distress in this life, such as an object of gossip, old wives tales and disbarrment of Christian duties and fellowship.
Proposition 3; but if you do remarry you do not sin.
Proponets of the Council of Trent traditional theory of divorce and remarriage have a problem with this third proposition of Paul. They cannot accept a remarriage even tho Paul says they do not sin in doing so. Now if the divorced does not seek a mate as Paul suggests, how and why could a remarriage happen? That is in the realm of God and He will provide a mate, or not, at His own pleasure.
Jesus came to earth because of the many problems the people had brought upon themselves beginning in the garden of Eden by disobedience which continues to this day. The problem of sin is abounding more and more, but Jesus provided a way to salvage ones soul. God has promiced salvation by grace through faith. But faith in what? Faith in Christ that is the effect of belief in the gospel including obedience to the ordaince of baptism; one must first believe the testimony of God, and by faith repent of their sins, and by faith confess Jesus is the Son of God, and by faith be baptized into His death for remission of sins to gain the full and explicit testimony of pardon. This is the gospel. Please take advantage now? Are there any prayer requests for other reasons?, in either case come while we persuade with song.

This message approved by
Jack Warford
a minister for Christ

The Council of Trent
The Twenty-Fourth Session
The canons and decrees of the sacred
and oecumenical Council of Trent,
Ed. and trans. J. Waterworth (London: Dolman, 1848), 192-232.

Hanover Historical Texts Project
Scanned by Hanover College students in 1995.
The page numbers of Waterworth's translation appear in brackets. [Page 193]
SESSION THE TWENTY-FOURTH,
Being the eighth under the Sovereign Pontiff, Pius IV., celebrated on the eleventh day of November, MDLXIII.

DOCTRINE ON THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY
The first parent of the human race, under the influence of the divine Spirit, pronounced the bond of matrimony perpetual and indissoluble, when he said; This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh. But, that by this bond two only are united and joined together, our Lord taught more plainly, when rehearsing those last words as having been uttered by God, He said, therefore now they are not two, but one flesh; and straightway confirmed the firmness of that tie, proclaimed so long before by Adam, by these words; What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. But, the grace which might perfect that natural love, and confirm that indissoluble union, and sanctify the married, Christ Himself, the institutor and perfecter of the venerable sacraments, merited for us by His passion; as the Apostle Paul intimates, saying: Husbands love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered himself up for it; adding shortly after, This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church. Whereas therefore matrimony, in the evangelical law, excels in grace, through Christ, the ancient marriages; with reason have our holy Fathers, the Councils, and the tradition of the universal Church, always taught, that it is to be numbered amongst the sacraments of the new law; against which, impious men of this age raging, have not only had false notions touching this venerable sacrament, but, introducing according to their wont, [Page 194] under the pretext of the Gospel, a carnal liberty, they have by word and writing asserted, not without great injury to the faithful of Christ, many things alien from the sentiment of the Catholic Church, and from the usage approved of since the times of the apostles; the holy and universal Synod wishing to meet the rashness of these men, has thought it proper, lest their pernicious contagion may draw more after it, that the more remarkable heresies and errors of the above-named schismatics be exterminated, by decreeing against the said heretics and their errors the following anathemas.

ON THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY.
CANON I.-If any one saith, that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the evangelic law, (a sacrament) instituted by Christ the Lord; but that it has been invented by men in the Church; and that it does not confer grace; let him be

anathema.
CANON II.-If any one saith, that it is lawful for Christians to have several wives at the same time, and that this is not prohibited by any divine law; let him be anathema.
CANON III.-If any one saith, that those degrees only of consanguinity and affinity, which are set down in Leviticus, can hinder matrimony from being contracted, and dissolve it when contracted; and that the Church cannot dispense in some of those degrees, or establish that others may hinder and dissolve it ; let him be anathema.
CANON IV.-If any one saith, that the Church could not establish impediments dissolving marriage; or that she has erred in establishing them; let him be anathema.
CANON V.-If any one saith, that on account of heresy, or irksome cohabitation, or the affected absence of one of the parties, the bond of matrimony may be dissolved; let him be anathema.
[Page 195] CANON VI.-If any one saith, that matrimony contracted, but not consummated, is not dissolved by the solemn profession of religion by one of the married parties; let him be anathema.
CANON VlI.-If any one saith, that the Church has erred, in that she hath taught, and doth teach, in accordance with the evangelical and apostolical doctrine, that the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved on account of the adultery of one of the married parties; and that both, or even the innocent one who gave not occasion to the adultery, cannot contract another marriage, during the life-time of the other; and, that he is guilty of adultery, who, having put away the adulteress, shall take another wife, as also she, who, having put away the adulterer, shall take another husband; let him be anathema.
CANON VIII.-If any one saith, that the Church errs, in that she declares that, for many causes, a separation may take place between husband and wife, in regard of bed, or in regard of cohabitation, for a determinate or for an indeterminate period; let him be anathema.
CANON IX.-If any one saith, that clerics constituted in sacred orders, or Regulars, who have solemnly professed chastity, are able to contract marriage, and that being contracted it is valid, notwithstanding the ecclesiastical law, or vow; and that the contrary is no thing else than to condemn marriage; and, that all who do not feel that they have the gift of chastity, even though they have made a vow thereof, may contract marriage; let him be anathema: seeing that God refuses not that gift to those who ask for it rightly, neither does He suffer us to be tempted above that which we are able.
CANON X.-If any one saith, that the marriage state is to be placed above the state of virginity, or of celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity, or in celibacy, than to be united in matrimony; let him be anathema.
CANON XI.-If any one saith, that the prohibition of the solemnization of marriages at certain times of the year, is a tyrannical superstition, derived from the superstition of the [Page 196] heathen; or, condemn the benedictions and other ceremonies which the Church makes use of therein; let him be anathema.
CANON XII.-If any one saith, that matrimonial causes do not belong to ecclesiastical judges; let him be anathema.

DECREE ON THE REFORMATION OF MARRIAGE

CHAPTER I.

The form prescribed in the Council of Lateran for solemnly contracting marriage is renewed.--Bishops may dispense with the bans.--Whosoever contracts marriage, otherwise than in the presence of the Parish Priest and of two or three witnesses, contracts it invalidly.

Although it is not to be doubted, that clandestine marriages, made with the free consent of the contracting parties, are valid and true marriages, so long as the Church has not rendered them invalid; and consequently, that those persons are justly to be condemned, as the holy Synod doth condemn them with anathema, who deny that such marriages are true and valid; as also those who falsely affirm that marriages contracted by the children of a family, without the consent of their parents, are invalid, and that parents can make such marriages either valid or invalid; nevertheless, the holy Church of God has, for reasons most just, at all times detested and prohibited such marriages. But whereas the holy Synod perceives that those prohibitions, by reason of man's disobedience, are no longer of avail; and whereas it takes into account the grievous sins which arise from the said clandestine marriages, and especially the sins of those parties who live on in a state of damnation, when, having left their former wife, with whom they had contracted marriage secretly, they publicly marry another, and with her live in per-[Page 197]petual adultery; an evil which the Church, which judges not of what is hidden, cannot rectify, unless some more efficacious remedy be applied; wherefore, treading in the steps of the sacred Council of Lateran celebrated under Innocent III., it ordains that, for the future, before a marriage is contracted, the proper parish priest of the contracting parties shall three times announce publicly in the Church, during the solemnization of mass, on three continuous festival days, between whom marriage is to be celebrated; after which publication of banns, if there be no lawful impediment opposed, the marriage shall be proceeded with in the face of the church; where the parish priest, after having interrogated the man and the woman, and heard their mutual consent, shall either say, "I join you together in matrimony, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" or, he shall use other words, according to the received rite of each province. But if upon occasion, there should be a probable suspicion that the marriage may be maliciously hindered, if so many publications of banns precede it; in this case either one publication only shall be made; or at least the marriage shall be celebrated in the presence of the parish priest, and of two or three witnesses: Then, before the consummation thereof, the banns shall be published in the church; that so, if there be any secret impediments, they may be the more easily discovered: unless the Ordinary shall himself judge it expedient, that the publications aforesaid be dispensed with, which the holy Synod leaves to his prudence and judgment. Those who shall attempt to contract marriage otherwise than in the presence of the parish priest, or of some other priest by permission of the said parish priest, or of the Ordinary, and in the presence of two or three witnesses; the holy Synod renders such wholly incapable of thus contracting and declares such contracts invalid and null, as by the present decree It invalidates and annuls them. Moreover It enjoins, that the parish priest, or any other priest, who shall have been [Page 198] present at any such contract with a less number of witnesses (than as aforesaid); as

also the witnesses who have been present thereat without the parish priest, or some other priest; and also the contracting parties themselves; shall be severely punished, at the discretion of the Ordinary. Furthermore, the same holy Synod exhorts the bridegroom and bride not to live together in the same house until they have received the sacerdotal benediction, which is to be given in the church; and It ordains that the benediction shall be given by their own parish priest, and that permission to give the aforesaid benediction cannot be granted by any other than the parish priest himself, or the Ordinary; any custom, even though immemorial, which ought rather to be called a corruption, or any privilege to the contrary, notwithstanding. And if any parish priest, or any other priest, whether Regular or Secular, shall presume to unite in marriage the betrothed of another parish, or to bless them when married, without the permission of their parish priest, he shall-even though he may plead that he is allowed to do this by a privilege, or an immemorial custom,-remain ipso jure suspended, until absolved by the Ordinary of that parish priest who ought to have been present at the marriage, or from whom the benediction ought to have been received.

The parish priest shall have a book, which he shall keep carefully by him, in which he shall register the names of the persons married, and of the witnesses, and the day on which, and the place where, the marriage was contracted.

Finally, the holy Synod exhorts those who marry, that before they contract marriage, or, at all events, three days before the consummation thereof, they carefully confess their sins, and approach devoutly to the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist.

If any provinces have herein in use any praise-worthy customs and ceremonies, besides the aforesaid, the holy Synod earnestly desires that they be by all means retained.

And that these so wholesome injunctions may not be unknown [Page 199] to any, It enjoins on all Ordinaries, that they, as soon as possible, make it their care that this decree be published and explained to the people in every parish church of their respective dioceses; and that this be done as often as may be during the first year; and afterwards as often as they shall judge it expedient. It ordains, moreover, that this decree shall begin to be in force in each parish, at the expiration of thirty days, to be counted from the day of its first publication made in the said parish.

CHAPTER II.

Between whom Spiritual Relationship is contracted.

Experience teaches, that, by reason of the multitude of prohibitions, marriages are ofttimes unwittingly contracted in prohibited cases, in which marriages either the parties continue to live on, not without great sin, or they are dissolved, not without great scandal. Wherefore, the holy Synod, wishing to provide against this inconvenience, and beginning with the impediment arising from spiritual relationship, ordains, that, in accordance with the appointments of the sacred canons, one person only, whether male or female, or at most one male and one female, shall receive in baptism the individual baptized; between whom and the baptized, and the father and mother thereof; as also between the person baptizing and the baptized, and the father and mother of the baptized; and these only; shall spiritual relationship be contracted.

The parish priest, before he proceeds to confer baptism, shall carefully inquire of those whom it may concern, what person or persons they have chosen to receive from the

sacred font the individual baptized, and he shall allow him or them only to receive the baptized; shall register their names in the book, and teach them what relationship they have contracted, that they may not have any excuse on the score of ignorance. [Page 200] And if any others, besides those designated, should touch the baptized, they shall not in any way contract a spiritual relationship; any constitutions that tend to the contrary notwithstanding. If through the fault or negligence of the parish priest any thing be done contrary hereto, he shall be punished, at the discretion of the Ordinary. That relationship, in like manner, which is contracted by confirmation shall not pass beyond him who confirms the person confirmed, his father and mother, and him who places his hand on him; all impediments arising from this kind of spiritual relationship between other persons being utterly set aside.

CHAPTER III.

The impediment of public honesty is confined within certain limits.

The holy Synod entirely removes the impediment of justice arising from public honesty, whensoever espousals shall be, for whatsoever cause, not valid; but, when they are valid, the impediment shall not extend beyond the first degree; forasmuch as any such prohibition can no longer be observed, without injury, in more remote degrees.

CHAPTER IV.

Affinity arising from fornication is confined to the second degree.

Moreover, the holy Synod, moved by the same and other most weighty reasons, limits, to those only who are connected in the first and second degree, the impediment contracted by affinity arising from fornication, and which dissolves the marriage that may have been afterwards contracted. It ordains [Page 201] that, as regards degrees more remote, this kind of affinity does not dissolve the marriage that may have been afterwards contracted.

CHAPTER V.

No one is to marry within the prohibited degrees: in what manner dispensation is to be granted therein.

If any one shall presume knowingly to contract marriage within the prohibited degrees, he shall be separated, and be without hope of obtaining a dispensation; and this shall much the rather have effect in regard of him who shall have dared not only to contract such a marriage, but also to consummate it. But if he have done this in ignorance, but yet has neglected the solemnities required in contracting matrimony, he shall be subjected to the same penalties. For he who has rashly despised the wholesome precepts of the Church, is not worthy to experience without difficulty her bounty. But if, having observed those solemnities, some secret impediment be afterwards discovered, of which it was not unlikely that he should be ignorant, he may in this case more easily obtain a dispensation, and that gratuitously. As regards marriages to be contracted, either no dispensation at all shall be granted, or rarely, and then for a cause, and gratuitously. A dispensation shall never be granted in the second degree, except between great princes, and for a public cause.

CHAPTER VI.

Punishments inflicted on Abductors.

The holy Synod ordains, that no marriage can subsist between the abducer and her who is abducted, so long as she shall remain in the power of the abducer. But if she that has been

[Page 202] abducted, being separated from the abducer, and being in a safe and free place, shall consent to have him for her husband, the abducer may have her for his wife; but nevertheless the abduced himself and all who lent him advice, aid, and countenance, shall be ipso jure excommunicated, for ever infamous, and incapable of all dignities; and if they be clerics they shall forfeit their rank. The abducer shall furthermore be bound, whether he marry the person abducted, or marry her not, to settle on her a handsome dowry at the discretion of the judge.

CHAPTER VII.

Vagrants are to be married with caution.

There are many persons who are vagrants, having no settled homes; and, being of a profligate character, they, after abandoning their first wife, marry another, and very often several in different places, during the life-time of the first. The holy Synod, being desirous to obviate this disorder, gives this fatherly admonition to all whom it may concern, not easily to admit this class of vagrants to marriage; and It also exhorts the civil magistrates to punish such persons severely. But It commands parish priests not to be present at the marriages of such persons, unless they have first made a careful inquiry, and, having reported the circumstance to the Ordinary, they shall have obtained permission from him for so doing.

CHAPTER VIII.

Concubinage is severely punished.

It is a grievous sin for unmarried men to have concubines; but it is a most grievous sin, and one committed in special contempt of this great sacrament, for married men also to live in this state of damnation, and to have the audacity at times to [Page 203] maintain and keep them at their own homes even with their own wives. Wherefore, the holy Synod, that it may by suitable remedies provide against this exceeding evil, ordains that these concubinaries, whether unmarried or married, of whatsoever state, dignity, and condition they may be, if, after having been three times admonished on this subject by the Ordinary, even ex officio, they shall not have put away their concubines, and have separated themselves from all connexion with them, they shall be smitten with excommunication; from which they shall not be absolved until they have really obeyed the admonition given them. But if, regardless of this censure, they shall continue in concubinage during a year, they shall be proceeded against with severity by the Ordinary, according to the character of the crime. Women, whether married or single, who publicly live with adulterers or with concubinaries, if, after having been three times admonished, they shall not obey, shall be rigorously punished, according to the measure of their guilt, by the Ordinaries of the places, ex officio, even though not called upon to do so by any one; and they shall be cast forth from the city or diocese, if the Ordinaries shall think fit, calling in the aid of the Secular arm, if need be; the other penalties inflicted on adulterers and concubinaries remaining in their full force.

Ref. REFLECTIONS by Al Maxey The Council of Trent

Second, the shepherd in Texas writes -- "I understand that the 'traditional' view on MDR is almost directly from the Council of Trent. I have looked at this manuscript online, but cannot wade through it to get a clear picture of this teaching. Do you have any help or references on this?" It has oft been said that the Council of Trent was the official Roman Catholic response to the public burning of the June 15, 1520 papal bull, Exsurge Domine, of Pope Leo X, condemning the teachings of Martin Luther (1483-1546), although the council did not actually convene for another two and a half decades. Although multi-faceted in scope, it is fairly safe to state that Martin Luther's teachings were far more faith/grace-centered than the Roman Catholic leadership of his day. Luther, through his prolific writings and his many public proclamations, was having a tremendous influence upon the thinking of the laity (as well as some within the clergy). This could not be tolerated by the powers that be in the Papal See. This rogue clergyman was filling the hearts and minds of the people with notions of freedom in Christ from the dogma of institutionalized religion and its attendant oppression. Thus, the Council of Trent was convened to solidify traditional Catholic theology and doctrine, thereby officially countering, it was hoped, the growing "heresy" of "change agents" like Martin Luther. The Council of Trent actually occurred over a period of 18 years (1545-1563), and spanned the reigns of five popes. It took the Catholic leadership 25 years to even convene the first session, for the more they looked into the teachings of Luther (and others like him), the more they realized how difficult it was going to be to rationally counter these arguments. Thus, delay after delay took place as they tried to figure out how to justify their dogma in the face of his challenges. The result of the 25 sessions, in three separate sittings (which took over four years), "was a greater volume of legislation than the combined output of all the previous 18 general councils recognized by the Roman Catholic Church." Many of the disciplinary reforms required by this legislation were born of fear of the teachings of Luther, who was seeking to turn men's minds back to what the Bible actually said, rather than what the Church said it said. Thus, the Council declared that the curriculum in all Catholic seminaries was to be scholastic rather than biblical. Thirty-three canons were issued condemning Luther's "error" on justification by faith. The sacraments were given more time in the Council than any other doctrinal matter. Seven sacraments were instituted by Christ, it was affirmed: baptism, confirmation, communion, penance, unction, orders, marriage. With regard to communion, transubstantiation was confirmed as the official church doctrine, thus condemning the various views of Luther, Zwingli, Karlstardt, Calvin and others. Church tradition was declared to be equally authoritative with Scripture; the Church leaders alone were divinely invested with the authority to correctly interpret the Bible, not the laity; the Vulgate was to be used exclusively in all public readings and writings. Sound familiar?! No version but the KJV? No interpretation correct but ours? Tradition equal to Truth? Like Martin Luther, we're still having to fight for freedom from bondage to religious regulation; we're still struggling against the Institution to bring a grace-centered, Jesus-focused worshipful experience into the lives of His people. We are still wandering through a desert of tradition to find that refreshing oasis of Truth.

As was already noted somewhat in passing, the Council of Trent was the 19th

Ecumenical Council of the Roman Catholic Church, and is easily considered to be by far the most important and influential of them all. It convened three times, beginning on December 13, 1545 and ending on December 4, 1563. The rulings and regulations of this council would remain for several centuries. Indeed, it would be over 300 years before the next Ecumenical Council was convened. The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church states: "The Council of Trent was the most impressive embodiment of the ideals of the Counter-Reformation." Martin Luther knew a council was being prepared [indeed, Pope Paul III (1534-1549) had called for it almost a decade earlier, but his cardinals were unanimously opposed], and so he'd been preparing for this assault on his teaching [he wrote the Smalcald Articles, which defined those areas where he felt some compromise could occur, and those areas of faith, doctrine and practice where such compromise should never occur]. Sadly, the continual delays in convening this council were so numerous that by the time it finally began Martin Luther only had two months left to live (he died on February 18, 1546). Thus, for the next 18 years the Roman Catholic Church would seek to counter the influence of a man who was no longer alive to defend his teaching.

That portion of this council that most concerns us here, however, took place near the very end of the third meeting (which adjourned on December 4, 1563 with the proclamation, "Anathema to all heretics, anathema, anathema!"). Session 24 was held November 11, 1563, and it was in this session that the sacrament of marriage and problems associated therewith (such as divorce) were addressed. This occurred under the reign of Pope Pius IV (1559-1565). Twelve canons were issued at the end of this session regarding "The Sacrament of Matrimony." In Canon #9 the primacy of the celibate state was reaffirmed. Polygamy was condemned in Canon #2. Various additional matters were also addressed. However, it is Canon #7 with which we are specifically concerned in this present study. This particular canon declares that both spouses who are party to a divorce (when the cause of divorce is the adultery of one spouse), "even the innocent one who gave not occasion to the adultery, cannot contract another marriage during the lifetime of the other; and that he is guilty of adultery who, having put away the adulteress, shall take another wife, as also she, who, having put away the adulterer, shall take another husband." Here we see that remarriage is denied to all parties in a divorce ... even the party innocent of the sin of adultery ... as long as the other spouse is alive. Needless to say, this goes significantly beyond the teaching of the New Covenant writings, as I have sought to demonstrate within my book. This is also considerably more restrictive than most traditionalists within Churches of Christ teach, since generally they will allow the right of remarriage to the spouse not guilty of adultery (true in most other conservative Christian groups as well). So, to answer this elder's question -- yes, the traditional position is based somewhat on this canon (though they would say it's based only upon the Scriptures), but over the past several hundred years that canon has been softened somewhat in favor of the innocent party (at least by most traditionalists, although some do indeed adhere totally, at least in practice if not in profession, to the decree of the Council of Trent).

Geneva Bible Marginal Notes

Finally, this brother writes, "I have read that in the margin notes of the Geneva Bible it is written that apoluo does not mean 'divorce.' Wal-Mart does not have a copy of this

manuscript. Any help or resource on validating this?" Ahhhh ... yet another failing of the Wal-Mart empire!!! Seriously, though, I'd be surprised if they did have a copy. It is not very common today, and many have probably never heard of it, but in its day it was the most beloved of the English versions. It was easily the most widely read and most influential English Bible of the 16th and 17th centuries, and was especially beloved by the Puritans. Indeed, it was often referred to as The Puritan's Bible, and was brought with the Pilgrims as they set sail on the Mayflower. From 1560 to 1644 it went through over 200 different printings, and was the version of choice for many of the greatest theologians and writers of that time (including such men as John Bunyan and John Milton). When Queen Mary ("Bloody Mary") banned the printing of the Scriptures in English for the common people, many fled to Geneva where they began work on an English Bible for the people (thus the name The Geneva Bible).

One of the great features of this Bible, a feature that certainly made it popular with the common people, was its extensive use of marginal notes, all written by some of the great Protestant Reformation leaders of that time; men like John Calvin, John Knox, Miles Coverdale, William Whittingham, Anthony Gilby, William Keithe, Thomas Sampson, Thomas Wood, and many others. These extensive notes were designed to help the common reader better understand the Scriptures, something that infuriated the Roman Catholic leadership who believed the interpretation of the Scriptures was not the responsibility or right of the laity, but only of the clergy. These notes run almost 300,000 words, and make up almost one third of the length of this version. For many, many decades these marginal notes aided the people in better understanding the Word of God. These notes were also the ultimate reason for the demise of this version, as King James considered them "seditious," and thus made ownership of this version a felony. Thus, to quiet these "seditious" teachings of the Protestant Reformers, King James demanded an "authorized" version be produced that would forever replace it, and which would retain the use of certain words and phrases approved by him. This would, in the course of time, come to be known as The King James Version. It would be promoted with such fervor (while The Geneva Bible was defamed with equal fervor) that the final printing of the latter would occur in 1644. For those interested, The Geneva Bible may be read online in its entirety, with all its notes (both the 1560 and 1599 printings). It is quite interesting to study.

With regard to the question by the elder from Texas -- "I have read that in the margin notes of the Geneva Bible it is written that apoluo does not mean 'divorce.'" -- actually, that is not true. In the Matthew 5:32 text there are no notes dealing with the topic, and in the Matthew 19:9 text there are only two notes, one from the 1560 version, the other from the 1599 version. The latter note simply makes the observation regarding the passage in general that there would be no need of divorce if those committing adultery were treated as the Law required: i.e., they were to be put to death! It does not suggest divorce didn't exist, it merely suggested that if the Law of Moses was observed strictly then it would never occur (at least not for the cause of adultery). The other note, from the 1560 edition, is the one that might have caused some to think what the brother suggested in his question. This note opines, with respect to the covenant of marriage: "For this band cannot be broken at man's pleasure." The point of this statement is clearly not to suggest

the impossibility of divorce, but rather to stress that these covenants were entered into with God as witness, and they were not subject to disbanding on a whim. During the time of Christ, marriages were cast aside and new ones entered into "at man's pleasure," and the Lord condemned the practice in no uncertain terms! "One woman for one man for life" was the IDEAL, and the selfish wishes of men were never to be elevated above this eternal IDEAL of our God. Does it happen? Yes. Are marriages too often terminated "at man's pleasure"? Yes, to man's shame. Such is sin, and we should call it no less.

Quote: {How did we ever begin to read “whosoever divorces his wife” into those places where Jesus literally said “whosoever puts away, or abandons, his wife”?
There are passages, other than Luke 16:17-18 where Jesus spoke on this matter. They include Matt. 19:9, Mark 10:10-12 (where Mark records that Jesus laid down the same law for women as for men), and Matt. 5:32. Jesus used a form of the word apoluo eleven times in these passages. In every passage he forbade apoluo, putting away. He never forbade giving apostasion, written divorce, required by Jewish law.
Should the Greek word apoluo be translated divorce? Kenneth S. Wuest in the New Testament, an Expanded Translation always translated it “dismissed” or “put away,” never “divorced.” The old, and very literal American Standard Version always translated it “put away.” The King James Version translated it “put away” ten out of the eleven times Jesus used it. That eleventh instance seems to be the source of the problem. In 1611, in ONE place the King James translators wrote “divorced” instead of “put away.” In Matt. 5:32, they wrote, “and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.” The word is not the Greek word apostasion (divorce), but is a form of that same Greek word apoluo which did not include a writing of divorce for the woman. Unquote:
Divorce, The Law, and Jesus Walter L. Callison}

Quote: {Her husband - The word in the original does not imply that they were married. It means here the man to whom she was espoused.
A just man - Justice consists in rendering to every man his own. Yet this is evidently not the character intended to be given here of Joseph. The meaning is that he was kind, tender, merciful; that he was so attached to Mary that he was not willing that she should be exposed to public shame. He sought, therefore, secretly to dissolve the connection, and to restore her to her friends without the punishment commonly inflicted on adultery. Adultery has always been considered a crime of a very heinous nature. In Egypt, it was punished by cutting off the nose of the adulteress; in Persia, the nose and ears were cut off; in Judea, the punishment was death by stoning, Leviticus 20:10; Ezekiel 16:38, Ezekiel 16:40; John 8:5. This punishment was also inflicted where the person was not married, but betrothed, Deuteronomy 22:23-24. In this case, therefore, the regular punishment would have been death in this painful and ignominious manner. Yet Joseph was a religious man - mild and tender; and he was not willing to complain of her to the magistrate, and expose her to death, but sought to avoid the shame, and to put her away privately. Unquote:
Barnes' Notes on the Bible.}

'Put her away' presented to;