

# VILE FACELESS MODERATOR

## CONTACT

[Email Vox](#)

## VOXOLOGY

[About Vox Day](#)

[RULES OF THE BLOG](#)

[VD on](#)

[Amazon](#) | [Voxiversity](#)

[Darkstream](#) | [Castalia](#)

[Bookstore](#)

[Castalia Books Direct](#)

[Castalia Book Club](#)

[signup](#)

[Daily Meme Wars](#)

[signup](#)

[Dark Lord Consulting](#)

- Blog Archives - ▾



## VOXIVERSITY

[001 Immigration & War](#)

002 Sink the Ships  
(coming soon)

[On the Existence of Gods](#)

[Team Calvin: Five Questions](#)

[Dissecting the Skeptics](#)

[The Non-Dilemma of Euthyphro](#)

[The Fifth Horseman](#)

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2015

## Girls Gone Wild

Work it out here.

POSTED BY MATTHEW @ [SEPTEMBER 10, 2015](#)

386 COMMENTS:

1 - 200 of 386 [Newer>](#) [Newest>](#)

1. **SirHamster** September 10, 2015 at 5:48 PM

I don't think the framework comment was directed at you, and the back and forth after that did not convince the moderator the thread was worth keeping alive.

The quoted statement invites artisanalload to make a response to defend himself, and it's outside your initial summary of your position.

Almost 40 posts since moderation requirements were laid out, and it wasn't converging to the conclusion of Stage One, where everyone agrees on where the debate is and what each person's position is.

All it means is that we're back to non-moderation. Can finish up your project here in a fresh thread, or do it off-line.

2. **SirHamster** September 11, 2015 at 8:17 AM

[simplytimothy said:](#)

Starting next week, I have a promotion at the day job and will be able to dedicate 5 am to 9 am for

PRINT AND AUDIO



CRYPTOFASHION



CASTALIA  
BOOKLISTS

[Audiobooks](#)

[Hardcovers](#)

[Paperbacks](#)

TOPICS

[mailvox](#) | [writing](#)

[economics](#) | [free trade](#)

[cartoons](#) | [immigration](#)

[atheism](#) | [science](#)

[books](#) | [evolution](#)

[vibrancy](#) | [sports](#)

[trainwreck](#) | [McRapey](#)

[Rules of](#)

[Writing](#) | [SFWA](#)

[Book Reviews](#) | [Lions Den](#)

[Banned Trolls](#) | [Fifth Horseman](#)

[Umberto Eco translations](#)

[Selenoth](#) | [Quantum Mortis](#)

[Vol 1.1](#): Ian Fletcher

[Vol 1.2](#): Karl Denninger

[Vol 1.3](#): Nick Novello

[Vol 1.4](#): John Julius Norwich

[Vol 1.5](#): John O'Neill

[Vol 1.6](#): Rep. Thad McCotter

[Vol 1.7](#): John Hawkins

[Vol 1.8](#): Steve Keen

[Vol 1.9](#): James Delingpole

INTERVIEWS

study. I will be using that for mathematics (relearn, I have forgotten too much) and my daily Bible reading.

Congrats!

Sure, you can use my gmail. Do the obvious to get the addy.

I really doubt this will get shut down. It's explicitly given to us as a comment dump for testing purposes. We might get moved to new threads, but that's about it.

I forgot, this place has a copy-pasta feature that is pretty neat. No more adding tags to quote people usefully.

### 3. WaterBoy

September 17, 2015 at 4:13 PM

Tip to simplytimothy:

The @ tag for comments does not work across separate posts; it is only designed to work within the same post. If you want to include a link to a comment in another post, as you twice did in your comment @8, you need to copy-paste the URLs yourself.

Depending on your browser, it might be as simple as right-clicking the timestamp of the relevant comment, then selecting 'Copy shortcut' from the popup menu.

On the other hand, you answered the question I had about dead-end comment links, so thank you for that. :)

### 4. SirHamster

September 17, 2015 at 10:46 PM

[simplytimothy said](#):

**FWIW, if you are up to it, give**  
<http://voxday.blogspot.com/2015/06/bow-not->

[Umberto Eco](#)  
[Jonah Goldberg](#)  
[Daniel Hannan](#)  
[Moshe Feiglin](#)  
[Ian Wishart](#)  
[Dinesh D'Souza](#)  
[James Delingpole](#)  
[John Derbyshire](#)  
 (.Doomed).  
[John Derbyshire](#)  
 (.NRO).  
[Jonathan Haidt](#)  
[John Romero](#)  
[John Williams](#)  
[David Frum](#)  
[Thomas Woods](#)  
[Rep. Ron Paul](#)  
[Rep. Thaddeus](#)  
[McCotter](#)  
[Max Keiser](#)

---

#### INTERVIEWS OF ME

[Speculative Faith](#)  
[Talking to the Devil](#)  
[Strike the Root](#)  
[Ilana Mercer](#)  
[Alt Investors](#)  
[John Brown interview](#)  
[Counter-Currents](#)  
[The Ranting Room](#)

---

#### SITES OF INTEREST

[Fred Reed](#)  
[James Delingpole](#)  
[Dr. Helen](#)  
[Ilana Mercer](#)  
[John Derbyshire](#)  
[Ritely News](#)

---

#### VOXONOMICA

[before-caesar.html?commentPage=2 @220](#) by  
**Mark Call** a re-read and read it conservatively. I  
 am curious what you think of it.

First pass didn't see anything wrong with it. Second  
 pass, noticed that the claim is that God has  
 completely defined all sin, so that saying anything  
 wrong outside of what God explicitly said was wrong  
 is "changing Scripture".

His main point:

**"Sin" is what YHVH says it is. Period. No more and  
no less.**

That sounds true by tautology. But if we search the  
 Bible to see where God defines sin ... we find it's  
 not so useful.

For example - where did God define murder as sin  
 before Cain went and murdered his brother? It's  
 certainly not that murder was acceptable for the  
 hundreds of years before God gave the Israelites the  
 10 Commandments. Should we assume that God  
 gave a complete set of the Deuteronomic law to  
 Adam and Eve and their children? That's adding a lot  
 to Scripture where it is silent.

God's law is perfect, yet the revelation of it and His  
 works to man was in bits and pieces over time. Were  
 not the Jews in Jesus' time deserving of greater  
 judgement than Sodom and Gomorrah? And that is  
 despite them having the Mosaic Law and putting  
 great care into following it!

So I find its use in the discussion was to obfuscate  
 rather than to clarify. Why would Paul need to write  
 so many letters clarifying the Christian walk to the  
 churches if sin were a finitely defined number of  
 transgressions? When Paul wrote believers about  
 eating meat offered to idols, he pointed out there  
 was another dimension to consider besides the act  
 of eating meat - the dimension of Christian  
 community and how our actions affect others. And  
 this without a command that eating idol-offered  
 meat is a sin!

I'm tempted to write a lot more on the subject, but

Voxonomics 1-

1: [Robert Prechter](#)

Voxonomics 1-

2: [Peter Schiff](#)

Voxonomics 1-3: [Dr.](#)

[Frank Shostak](#)

Voxonomics 1-

4: [Passport](#)

[321 Gold](#)

[Von Mises Institute](#)

[Mish's Global](#)

[Economic Analysis](#)

[Steve Keen's](#)

[Debtwatch](#)

---

ALL BLOG POSTS AND  
COMMENTS  
COPYRIGHT (C) 2003-  
2018 VOX DAY. ALL  
RIGHTS RESERVED.  
REPRODUCTION  
WITHOUT WRITTEN  
PERMISSION IS  
EXPRESSLY  
PROHIBITED.

it's getting late. There's a criticism in there that I haven't quite drawn out yet, I'll sleep on it.

5. [SirHamster](#)

September 18, 2015 at 11:31 PM

[Related thought](#), from a Biblical scholar:

*"The usage here is not a single Hebrew word or idiom which can refer to any sex acts between the same gender. Rather, the texts clearly say, "if a man lies with a man as with a woman." There is no leeway in these texts to include lesbian acts in this pronouncement. This is important, because it does not seem consistent to condemn male homosexuality and not female homosexuality, if the point of condemning homosexuality is because it is "unnatural."*

Townsley is falling into the same trap as Skeptics: Ancient law codes, being didactic, do not need to be "consistent" with our modern, precision-oriented expectations; the condemnation of male homosexuality applies by extension to female homosexuality, just as laws that say "If a man..." do not mean a woman can get away with the same act with no punishment. (It's also questionable how widespread such behavior would have been anyway, given how closely guarded daughters would have been in the ancient household.)

Somewhat related to your point #5, the focus on "Scripture does not prohibit" is that it turns the focus from "what should we do?" to "where is the line I'm not supposed to cross?"

We're called to be holy and perfect and to do what is right; not to avoid doing wrong.

When we consider that the gate to life is narrow and the gate to destruction is wide, that also implies that there are a lot more ways to do wrong than to do right. Focusing on avoiding wrong is going to be fundamentally less effective than focusing on doing right.

6. [Mark Call](#)

September 21, 2015 at 7:05 AM

This has already been addressed, ST. And you evidently missed the point:

[simplytimothy said:](#)

Christ wrote "27 You have heard that it was said, 'You shall not commit adultery.'

28 But I say to you that everyone who looks at a woman with lustful intent has already committed adultery with her in his heart."

ALL you have to do is see what He is saying, in context!!!!

There are TWO commandments in the 10 "Debarim" here! You forget the second of them, He was clarifying!!!!

It's not JUST 'Lo tanaf' (No adultery). He also said you were not to "covet" (lust after) your neighbors' wife (or ANYTHING that's his)! And if that wasn't clear before, hopefully when you read Him in full, it is now.

Back to the rest of the problems, then:

**The implications for The Law Is Complete (as written, don't add or subtract etc...) is several things.**

**1. A Jew prior to Christ who claimed that lustful intent *was* adultery would, under the MC/Toad model be claiming that "God got it wrong"...**

Please. First, His INSTRUCTION is NOT just for "jews". It's for those who would like to be "grafted in" (like Kalev/Caleb was in Exodus) to 'kol Israel'. (ALL of His sons of the promise.)

And it's COMPLETE if you learn to CONNECT THE DOTS. He expects us to use the intellect He gave us, to read His instruction as "teaching" and not "LAW". My point all along, and EXACTLY what Yahushua was teaching (among other things).

[SirHamster \(#201\) said:](#)

**Why would Paul need to write so many letters**

clarifying the Christian walk to the churches if sin were a finitely defined number of transgressions?

For the reason you see directly above. People weren't reading what was already Written (look up phrases like "failed to teach My people"...the difference, between tahor and tameh, clean and unclean, holy and profane, etc, etc.)

They were, of course, warned, and in Deuteronomy 31 told AGAIN it would happen. And this was BEFORE the roman pagan church declared it a capital offense for a 'lay' person to have a Bible, and Gutenberg made that harder to enforce.)

Furthermore, most of Shaul's letters were written to pagans, who were dealing with a WHOLE lot of peer pressure to return to paganism.

(See II Cor. 11:4!!) "If someone comes preaching 'another jesus', whom we HAVE NOT PREACHED," I'm afraid you might just get sucked into it.

Indeed, how right he was.

Look at the logical gyrations they'll spin just to eat things He said were "not food".

7. SirHamster

September 21, 2015 at 11:18AM

@ Mark Call:

I'm still waiting on you to retract or back up your assertion that my [stated logic](#) is wrong.

As for your latest response - basic reading comprehension, please. There was a point to that paragraph, and you are looking at a rhetorical question without looking at the example I brought up in light of that question.

*"When Paul wrote believers about eating meat offered to idols, he pointed out there was another dimension to consider besides the act of eating meat - the dimension of Christian community and how our actions affect others. And this without a command that eating idol-offered meat is a sin!"*

For anyone who is unaware of the context of this discussion, Mark Call made a [criticism](#) of the following statement:

"therefore, girl-on-girl [sex] is sin"

He started with a principle that God has defined all wrongdoing already with his Perfect Law. "girl-girl sex" is not explicitly forbidden in the Bible, and Mark criticized calling it a sin. I came up with examples from Scripture that undermine the position that God has exhaustively defined wrongdoing.

In his latest post, Mark Call says that God's law is "COMPLETE if you learn to CONNECT THE DOTS." So now I have no clue what Mark Call thinks he is disagreeing with anyone about, besides not feeling sufficient deference to his Expertness on Law.

#### 8. Mark Call

September 21, 2015 at 1:09 PM

Sadly, I was merely correcting a comment from ST, and copied the entire section, but interrupted the tag sequence where he, in turn, quoted from SH.

Having made the same point from Scripture repeatedly, and been ignored, it's obvious why Moses, quoting the Creator, referred to those who would not listen to YHVH as "stiff-necked":

**[SirHamster \(#201\) said:](#)**

I'm still waiting on you to retract or back up your assertion that my [stated logic](#) is wrong.

Sigh.

Sadly again, that followed this travesty. Ignoring the whole thesis that His Word is True, and Deuteronomy 4:2, Deut. 12:32, and the whole thesis of Matthew 5:17-19, and the easily-verified Truth that the Torah NOWHERE forbids 'female-on-female' relations as such (ie, outside of bestiality, etc) -- this was claimed:

**[SirHamster \(#201\) said:](#)**

**He started with a principle that God has defined all wrongdoing already with his Perfect Law.**

Bull\$#@!. Your terms, your twisting. It's why I have responded to ST, who seems genuinely inclined at least to STUDY, and ignored mere pontification.

I have NEVER claimed that the human heart isn't desperately wicked (Jer. 16:19) and that people who can so twist Paul and even Moses, can't do the same to lesser writers like me. It's why I QUOTE Scripture, and often in the Hebrew.

SirHamster (#201) said:

In his latest post, Mark Call says that God's law is "COMPLETE if you learn to CONNECT THE DOTS." So now I have no clue what Mark Call thinks he is disagreeing with anyone about...

True to type, the key element of understanding was ignored:

Mark Call said:

*He expects us to use the intellect He gave us, to read His instruction as "teaching" and not "LAW". My point all along, and EXACTLY what Yahushua was teaching (among other things).*

At least this part -- "now I have no clue" -- rings true.

Yahushua addressed the same stiff-necked self-righteous contempt for His Word this way in John 5:46-47:

*For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of Me.*

*But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe My words?*

9. Mark Call

September 21, 2015 at 3:13 PM

simplytimothy said:

What you wrote is mistaken. The reason is the BUT . It is clear from the grammar that the



**Sadducees/Pharisees did NOT equate coveting with Adultery.**

And that proves WHAT? That He needed to come and straighten them out? Shouldn't that be obvious?

Well, no more so than it would be today. Or it wouldn't be necessary for us to have this discussion, or for us to teach, "saying, know YHVH"...because it's equally obvious the 'renewed Covenant' of Jeremiah 31 isn't "finished" yet either!!!

**Furthermore, where in Jewish Antiquities was a man ever stoned to death (the penalty for Adultery, yes?) for looking at another man's wife?**

Aargh. That's just SOOO wrong that it shows how far short the 'church' has fallen!

Do I know another man's heart? Come on! Why does He say that NO ONE will die (or for that matter, ANYTHING is 'confirmed') but on the testimony of two or three witnesses? Why did He teach about "by their FRUIT" you will know?

This is not even Torah 101-level stuff! "Show me your FAITH by your works" is elementary, and fundamental. The essence of a "Hebraic mindset" (as opposed to a pagan, Greco-Roman-American one, is the concept of hear, obey ('shema') and then DO.

Thought (like coveting) LEADS to action. ("Take every thought captive," right?)

Amerika kills people for pre-crimes now, evidently...but YHVH tells us that ACTIONS matter. WE are supposed to recognize and 'take captive' our OWN thoughts BEFORE they lead to Evil.

Capish?

**10. Mark Call**

**September 21, 2015 at 7:28 PM**

Good grief. What does "covet" mean????  
Is it an "action" or a thought?

Tell me about a "plain reading of the ten commandments" when you figure out what "nonsense" really means.

11. SirHamster

September 21, 2015 at 10:06 PM

Mark Call said:

SirHamster (#201) said:

He started with a principle that God has defined all wrongdoing already with his Perfect Law.

Bull\$#@!. Your terms, your twisting. It's why I have responded to ST, who seems genuinely inclined at least to STUDY, and ignored mere pontification.

I have NEVER claimed that the human heart isn't desperately wicked (Jer. 16:19) and that people who can so twist Paul and even Moses, can't do the same to lesser writers like me. It's why I QUOTE Scripture, and often in the Hebrew.

Not twisting, simply following through from your previous quote:

""Sin" is what YHVH says it is. Period. No more and no less."

Except, it turns out that you think that sin includes things of which God has not explicitly said, but which can be extrapolated. In which case the statement should be amended thus:

"`Sin' is what YHVH says it is, no less, but also including things where we CONNECT THE DOTS."

The thing is, this completely undermines your criticism of "girl-girl sex is sin".

Maybe you feel this is perfectly consistent, but I don't find it to be so, and will point it out for others

to consider. I'd think if you're going to demand the precision of Hebrew language meanings, you'd deliver the same level of precision in English.

But from my experience, you make mountains out of mole hills in other's words, while making contradictory claims like the one noted above. Contradiction not being compatible with a correct understanding of God's word.

I'll also note that your thoughts on the desperate wickedness in men's hearts are irrelevant as to whether Sin is "what God says it is, no more and no less", or "what God says it is, as well as what's logically extrapolated". Why bring up red herrings? Either you are confused in thought, or you wish to confuse others - or perhaps it is even both.

#### 12. Mark Call

September 22, 2015 at 6:49 AM

You both ignore the obvious, and the repeated. "Torah" is INSTRUCTION, not "law".

And while you're doing "definitional work", ST, you might attempt to understand the distinction between "choice" and "mandate". It might help you to understand just WHO is supposed to learn to connect a few dots.

When YHVH intends to make something a "statute," a "judgment," or a "commandment," He says so. Instruction is to help us use the brains He gave us.

"Connect the dots" for yourselves, dammit! I do NOT allow some 'pope', or a pharisee, or even a pharaoh, to connect them for me! Yahushua showed you how it's done, and STILL did so without adding to, or subtracting from What He Wrote. Either you call Him a liar or not, but "don't call me "Lord, Lord, and not do what I say!" was how He put it.

For ME to conclude (by 'connecting the dots') for "me and my house" what I/we will not do, is consistent. (You call it 'sin' -- I suggest for obvious reasons that 'sin', too, is an xtianized term far too conflated with men's tradition to be of much use.)

You don't want your wives to see each others' nakedness? Fine. I'm not about to impose "halacha" on YOUR house!. It's none of my business. But for you to interject your xtian twisting of what you call 'sin' into my family, in "addition to" what YHVH has laid out in the form of explicit chuqqim, mitzvot, and mishpatim, is -- well, forbidden, by the Most High Himself.

That hasn't stopped the "church" and the state church from doing so, of course. Rebellion has been around since Genesis 3.

There are still plagues to be had, however, for eating pork. And they have nothing to do with me declaring it "sin" or not, or whether you remain ignorant of His Word or not. He says so, whether you like it or not. The consequences are written in the "Laws of Nature", by their Creator, Who changes not.

13. SirHamster

September 22, 2015 at 8:54 AM

Mark Call said:

You don't want your wives to see each others' nakedness? Fine. I'm not about to impose "halacha" on YOUR house!. It's none of my business. But for you to interject your xtian twisting of what you call 'sin' into my family, in "addition to" what YHVH has laid out in the form of explicit chuqqim, mitzvot, and mishpatim, is -- well, forbidden, by the Most High Himself.

I objected to artisanaltoa's commanding wives to perform sexual acts on each other. Mark, you twister of words - the objection is not to seeing, but to sexual acts.

And so in his latest post, Mark Call devolves to artisanaltoa's core point - Don't judge me.

So quick to abandon what is **instructed** in the Bible:

*"It is actually reported that there is sexual immorality among you, and of a kind that even pagans do not tolerate: A man is sleeping with his father's wife. And you are proud! Shouldn't you rather have gone into mourning and have put out of*

*your fellowship the man who has been doing this?"*

*"What business is it of mine to judge those outside the church? Are you not to judge those inside? God will judge those outside. "Expel the wicked person from among you."*

[1 Cor 5:1-2, 12-13](#)

I will emphasize the key verse here: "Are **you** not to judge those inside?" How do you think Paul meant to answer this rhetorical question when he tells the Corinthian church to expel the wicked?

You love your personal wickedness so much that you are willing to reject clear teaching to justify it to not just yourself, but to everyone else. If you were innocent, you would recognize and follow Paul's instruction to the idol-offered-meat eaters. What is not sin is not sin, but take care of your brother's conscience. We are not individually autonomous units, but one body and one community of believers. But that is part of your polygamy argument - that each of us is a law unto himself, and only answer to God alone. Wrong.

Considering how much emphasis you put on the nature of words, I will call out your use of the name Saul - you are rejecting his identity and authority as the Apostle Paul. Stop your twisting and repent.

14. SirHamster

September 22, 2015 at 9:00 AM

ST,

I am sickened by what these "polygyny" polygamy supporters are doing to Scripture in service of their sexual desires.

I would have conceded "polygamy is not prohibited" before the discussion with artisanalload - but I believe it is not a coincidence that both he and Mark Call generate such slimy and disgusting fruit.

If my hand causes me to sin, I must cut it off. If love of "polygyny" creates such results, I won't hesitate to do likewise for the sake of other believers.

## 15. Mark Call

September 22, 2015 at 1:45 PM

At first, I thought perhaps 'reCaptcha' was acting up again; it wouldn't be the first time, even today.

But when unmitigated crap like that directly above is left, while the Scripture-based, and not only utterly deserved, but undeniably EXPECTED, response that has now been deleted (and this time confirmed, so it's not a posting glitch) twice is removed...

the conclusion is obvious, even if the perp is too cowardly to admit it, much less leave a note this time.

Either "man up", or ban me. But at least have the guts to be honest about it. Because I call out **hypocrisy**.

Why is name-calling and "personal wickedness" by Self-Titled Assholes acceptable, but calling them out for blind idiocy not?

And just exactly what WAS it, O Vile Faceless Hypocrite, that so bugged you about my references to the Sermon on the Mount that it was over the top THIS time? It can't have been my being "disgusted" by his fruit, 'cause I didn't even go so far as use a term like "slimy" -- much less demean his sexual proclivities, un-Biblical or not.

SJW's will whine "it's not fair". I could care less about *fair*, because I believed in the integrity of the system. As for even continued discourse, which is clearly not productive, that's why I wrote.

But if you're NOT the hypocrite I now call you out for -- you'll delete the crap from comment 26 on. And if you're just a coward as well as a hypocrite, we both know how you can delete the evidence of THAT fruit.

As I wrote - I've got better things to do with my time than earn dusty shoes.

Just so there's no doubt, although you should already know where to find me:

mark@markniwot.com

**16. MycroftJones**      **September 22, 2015 at 7:01 PM**

Where is the context? Where did this thread come from? I don't see any posts by Artisanal Toad. I have no interest in girl-on-girl action. I've advised other brothers before that it will only lead to trouble. And all this calling of "slimy fruit"; where is that? I see nothing here in this thread to support the name-calling. Girl-on-girl is a legitimate exercise in Torah interpretation.

1000 posts to figure out that we have to extrapolate from Torah? Wow. You should have realized that from the first post. Living Torah is all about connecting the dots. Otherwise it wouldn't have commanded in Deuteronomy 6 to meditate on them day and night, when you stand up and when you lie down.

**17. SirHamster**      **September 22, 2015 at 10:27 PM**

@ Mycroft  
Other [thread](#). Tangential discussion fires off around 145 and goes on for 900 odd comments. Hope you find it entertaining, at least.

**18. SirHamster**      **September 22, 2015 at 10:42 PM**

I invited Mycroft to this thread to expound on polygamous advantages. Alpha Game [thread](#).

Starting posts for context below.

**SirHamster said:**

**[Polygamy is] an interesting topic and thought experiment, but mostly irrelevant to the daily living of the vast majority of Christians. Given roughly even sex ratios, you're going to build up a social system for polygamy for one generation, and then forced to dispose of excess males or**

jettison the system in the very next generation.

If we end up in a system where male life expectancy is low enough to make it inevitable and continuous ... the males who "win" are going to be the ones who focused on developing into strong men, not the ones fantasizing about their future harem.

-----

Mycroft said:

SirHamster: your presumptions about the practice of polygamy would take a lot of words to correct. In short, the problems you see with polygamy don't exist in practice. And there are a lot of hidden benefits and positive social effects that you'd never predict. In polygamous societies (not Mormon) more men get married, and there are more women to marry. Higher birthrate. And other side effects. Only firsthand experience and practice reveals them. I've known men and women from Africa and Arabia and China, all polygamous societies, and made observations, asked relevant questions. I have training in direct and cross examination. If you were interested, I can go over your concerns one item at a time in private, since this is apparently not the venue for it.

I haven't tried to research historical numbers to it, but given that males are born at roughly a 1:1 ratio with women, every 2nd wife to a polygamist is going to mean a corresponding male goes without. Either that deficiency is fixed by the male dying to wars/scarcity, or that society raids wives from elsewhere, again killing males in the process.

That happens to match the pattern of ME and Africa where polygamy is practiced and Islam is present - we have Boko Haram stealing girls and selling them, and we have young men in large numbers joining Islamist groups for the promise of wives, or moving north to prosperous societies for similar goals.

Fire away.

19. MycroftJones

September 22, 2015 at 11:33 PM



Now that I've read Artisonal Toads original comment about girl-on-girl IN CONTEXT, I have to say i agree.

20. MycroftJones

September 22, 2015 at 11:46 PM

Alright Hamster, I have to sleep and work tomorrow; should be back within 24 hours. But in the meantime, I don't know your capabilities. If I suggest an experiment, can you run the math or do a simulation?

Here is the experiment: just simulate the fecundity of a polygamous society. When there are more younger people than older people, a man may have to marry at a slightly older age than the females, but every man will have a wife that wants one. Then factor in that incest is disallowed. And that in a polygamous society, women value marriage more; they are more eager to marry the betas and gammas on offer rather than be single. So what if 1 man in 5 has a second wife, or one in 20 has a large harem. It all works out.

150 years ago, the Mormons practiced polygamy, and an amazing thing happened; the percentage of female births went way up. There are a lot of factors that increase the percent of female births. So fixating on men having to die in a polygamous system; don't do that. Not necessary. The Asians artificially create a surplus of males, yet the birth rate is so high that polygamy is still practical. The differential between adults and youths in a population; run the numbers. I don't remember the scientific words for it. But you look at the curve for each age group, and you will see that after a certain age, a man can always find a younger woman to marry in an expanding population.

My personal experience of Africa and Asia is that the women in polygamous societies were so open that no game was needed. Hello is sufficient.

Another thing; I only have one wife. But the fact that polygamy is allowed for me, turned my marriage around and saved it. Under the Christian system of enforced monogamy, and a Catholic system of no divorce ever, I was headed to an early

grave from heart attack. The shenanigans women get up to when they think you can't divorce them... or have another wife. Going Biblical put things where they needed to be for everyones health and sanity. It gives the wife the uncertainty, dread, and drama that she craves.

**21. Mark Call**

September 23, 2015 at 9:38 AM

Not too bad, ST. (However, the wife is NOT the only guilty party in adultery.)

But you left out the fact that it has NOTHING WHATSOEVER to do with the topic at issue. ;)

And even the pagans recognize that.

**22. Mark Call**

September 23, 2015 at 5:19 PM

No, ST, the comment I made dealt with the fact that a quote from Shaul

(yes, he STILL used that name all his life! Even Yakov after being renamed Israel appears repeatedly in Scripture and prophecy; there's a reason for it!)

about a particularly vile adultery has NOTHING to do with polygyny, or what happens in a "*marriage bed, which is not defiled,*"

re: the 'finer points of Leviticus' [et al]

Here you simply have to read what it says, and pay attention to details. History is helpful, too. (Eg., the "stone a rebellious boy" claim that is often trotted out. It is a great THREAT, and therefore deterrent, but the mitzvah is often referred to as the only one which has NEVER been done! A rabbi once told me, "yes, but that doesn't mean every young boy I ever knew didn't get threatened with it at least once!")

To put someone to death requires the testimony of at least two, or more, witnesses. (Unlike today; a nod from the Oval Office can send a drone and wipe out a whole bunch of "collateral damage.") Many

sanctions apply only under other very specific circumstances, and often only "in the Land".

My point (again, sometimes a bit of logic, or connect-the-dots is vital) -- there are some things you simply CANNOT DO. (From things that apply to kings only, Levites only, to temple sacrifices given no temple, etc.)

That does not mean there is not LOTS of value (the Bible says "blessings") in obedience to His "statutes, judgments, and commandments," even when we can't "keep" them completely. (Example: Yom Kippur, coming up by my reckoning -- sighted new moon -- starting tomorrow evening at sundown.)

Try listening to this when you have time:

<http://hebrewnationonline.com/blog/come-out-of-her-my-people-show-mark-call-weekly-95/>

It's about the feasts in progress now, and why 'Christians' should keep what He said to keep "forever". ("If you love Me, keep My commands.") They are NOT "jewish" feasts, they are His!

Want a real shocker? Read what He says will happen to those who FAIL to honor His "Day of Atonement"! (And, yes, there's NO DOUBT that applies NOW, and in the Millennial Kingdom, too.)

23. SirHamster      September 24, 2015 at 12:25 AM

[MycroftJones said:](#)

Alright Hamster, I have to sleep and work tomorrow; should be back within 24 hours. But in the meantime, I don't know your capabilities. If I suggest an experiment, can you run the math or do a simulation?

Here is the experiment: just simulate the fecundity of a polygamous society. When there are more younger people than older people, a man may have to marry at a slightly older age than the females, but every man will have a wife that wants one. Then factor in that incest is disallowed. And that in a polygamous society,

women value marriage more; they are more eager to marry the betas and gammas on offer rather than be single. So what if 1 man in 5 has a second wife, or one in 20 has a large harem. It all works out.

150 years ago, the Mormons practiced polygamy, and an amazing thing happened; the percentage of female births went way up. There are a lot of factors that increase the percent of female births. So fixating on men having to die in a polygamous system; don't do that. Not necessary. The Asians artificially create a surplus of males, yet the birth rate is so high that polygamy is still practical. The differential between adults and youths in a population; run the numbers. I don't remember the scientific words for it. But you look at the curve for each age group, and you will see that after a certain age, a man can always find a younger woman to marry in an expanding population.

Modeling and sim is not my strong suite, but I'll take a stab at it.

Using a rough first order linear model, looking at the ratio of marriageable men to eligible single women. + for factors that increase relative male ratio, and - for factors that decrease it.

- + natural birth bias in favor of males
- "natural" higher death rate of males
- + unlimited polygamy
- growing population combined with positive age gap between husband and wife
- factors increasing female birth rate (wiki: paternal age, nutrition, etc)

First two factors should roughly cancel out at marriage age, so we're basically looking at if population growth and naturally increased birth rate factors can keep up with the higher demand for women.

Say that 10% of men have an extra wife, then we need 10% more women.

Wiki says higher paternal age is a factor for lower

male ratio. No clue what the other Mormon factors you're talking about are, but I'll give this factor a wild guess value of 2%, which leaves 8% for population growth to deal with.

If natural population growth is 2%/year, then a 4 year age gap between husband and wife would satisfy the higher demand for women. At 1%/year, 8 year gap.

Does that model satisfy your question?

24. MycroftJones

September 24, 2015 at 12:42 AM

As a first order approximation, that can be a start. But "unlimited polygamy" is never unlimited. It is a rare one man in 1000 who is so attractive that women will marry him and "bake their own bread" as the Scripture says. Even in societies that ALLOW unlimited polygamy, your average attractive man can't sustain more than 2 or 3 wives. And the statistics in polygamous countries bear this out; maybe 1 in 10 men have 2 wives; if a man has more than that, he is 1 in 100, or 1 in 1000. Simple economics.

If you were to get more complex and factor in economics, you would really start to get a good grasp of how polygamy acts as a great economic leveler. Under monogamy, attractive men have one wife, and a series of mistresses, using up the most beautiful women in their prime and dumping them on betas once they've hit the wall. Under polygamy, you fuck her, you keep her. And the financial burden quickly takes the attractive man off the sexual market. Leaving a much MUCH higher number of virgins available for regular men. Win win all around.

A Puritan writer, Martin Madan, wrote a whole treatise on the problem of these "dumped" mistresses and fatherless children created by monogamy. He had first hand experience; he ran an orphanage. The solution? Polygamy. No child should ever be illegitimate. Monogamy is a form of cruelty to children. Martin Madan's book explains all. He was a gifted lawyer and Bible scholar; his book is

worth reading.

As for the age gap, you may have noticed the 4-8 years is what women even today find the most attractive. And in older societies, women marrying men twice their age is not uncommon or frowned on. The greater age of the man gives him more time to develop in strength, providing a power differential in the marriage that stabilizes it tremendously.

**25. MycroftJones**

September 24, 2015 at 12:45 AM

In the case of the Mormons, I don't know what the factors were. Just that the female birth rate went way up. Older age of fathers is plausible, and surely there were others. Airplane pilots have a lot of daughters from the stress of G-forces. Perhaps there were societal stresses that affected men's sperm among the Mormons.

**26. SirHamster**

September 24, 2015 at 8:19 AM

Unlimited in the sense that no one in the system is actively trying to limit it. Not in the sense that scarcity and economics do not apply.

Going forward, I'd like to see some of the links supporting your assertions. Bearing in mind that I don't know whatever you think is common knowledge regarding polygamy. Ex: Statistics in polygamous countries on how many wives the polygamists end up with.

Or the Mormon percentage of female births. What numbers are we looking at?

The numbers matter - the US pop growth rate this year is around 0.75%. Now that 8% of polygamy demand needs 10 years of population growth difference to satisfy. And that is based on a wild-guess estimate of 10% polygamy rate. If polygamy rate is actually 15%, then the years go up accordingly.

I gave you a model as you asked, now what points did you think I made, and how are they addressed?

[MycroftJones said:](#)

If you were to get more complex and factor in economics, you would really start to get a good grasp of how polygamy acts as a great economic leveler. Under monogamy, attractive men have one wife, and a series of mistresses, using up the most beautiful women in their prime and dumping them on betas once they've hit the wall. Under polygamy, you fuck her, you keep her. And the financial burden quickly takes the attractive man off the sexual market. Leaving a much MUCH higher number of virgins available for regular men. Win win all around.

Posiitive side effects on sexual behavior are irrelevant to the question of whether there are enough women to make polygamy work. The economics here do not create more women. You could argue this increases the effective marriage supply in a steady state situation compared to the modern cock carousel and damaged women, but my concerns with polygamy are not addressed by that.

27. Mark Call

September 24, 2015 at 1:58 PM

While you are correct, Mycroft, that polygyny is a superior system to enforced monogamy (now being joined by the equally-pagan system of licensed homogamy) -- that doesn't directly bear on the questions associated with what Scripture REALLY says, as opposed to what fallen men say it SHOULD have said, if only God were as smart as they are.

However, there is at least an interesting point in there. Just as people are undeniably much healthier (and suffer fewer of the promised "plagues"!) if they eat what our Creator designed to be "food" and avoid what He says is NOT...

they have better, more productive (undeniably) marriages if they honor what He says about marriage, vows, and Covenant.

As Gomer Pyle used to say, "Surprise, sooprise, SUPRISE!"

So, perhaps, then, the fact that He might just be able to adjust birth rates to reflect His will should NOT be such a shock. (After all, chicken breeders will tell you they've even seen some pretty amazing changes in unisex flocks.)

Makes me wonder how many of the 'marriage deniers' have ever read Isaiah 4:1... :)

**28. MycroftJones**

**September 24, 2015 at 6:41 PM**

Mark, you and Artisanal Toad already established 100% that Scripture describes polygamous marriage. I was addressing other things that Hamster raised. At times, I've tried to explain to atheists some of the benefits of keeping Torah... sometimes they appreciate it, batting average is the same as it is for "Christians".

**29. MycroftJones**

**September 24, 2015 at 9:21 PM**

Christianity was corrupted at a very early stage; therefore any attempt to "revive" it carries the seeds of its own destruction. It needs a clean sweep, back to the Bible. The key date in history is 113AD. That is when it all went down. Three books are illuminating and relevant here: Rabbi Akiba's Messiah, by Daniel Gruber. The Worship of Augustus Caesar, by Alexander DelMar. And Shattering the Conspiracy of Silence, by Nehemiah Gordon.

The Bar Kokhba rebellion in 136AD was THE turning point from the point of view of Torah keepers. The Sacred Name was hidden, the Sabbath and New Moon were taken away as prophecied in Hosea and Lamentations, the daily offering ceased (most people don't know that; it continued after 70AD) initiating the start of the 2300 day count in Daniel 8.

In the Bar Kokhba rebellion, pretty much all the Jewish Christians were killed by Rabbi Akiba's crowd. After the rebellion was crushed, the remaining Christians were Greeks and Romans who



tried to distance themselves as far as possible from anything Jewish, lest they suffer a similar fate. As pagans without thorough grounding in Torah, they accepted perverted "saints" like Augustine. Ungodly man, he drove his concubine to suicide after using up her prime years, and his homosexual history comes from his own pen. If he'd accepted Torah, he'd have married the woman his mother chose, while continuing to do his duty to his concubine, and his son probably would have lived, instead of dying shortly after.

**30. MycroftJones**      **September 24, 2015 at 10:13 PM**

Hamster, what are your "issues"? In a previous post you already acknowledged that when age gap is taken into consideration, there are enough women in a polygamous society. What yet remains to address?

**31. SirHamster**      **September 25, 2015 at 1:07 AM**

@Mycroft,  
I see. You think that asking me to create some theoretical models answers the issues I raised.

You told me this:  
**In short, the problems you see with polygamy don't exist in practice.**

You have claimed to understand my position and that all points raised can be addressed "in practice". I asked you to post in this thread so that you could do so That means going through each problem I raised, and then telling me how it's addressed. A model is not "in practice".

[MycroftJones said:](#)

**Hamster, what are your "issues"? In a previous post you already acknowledged that when age gap is taken into consideration, there are enough women in a polygamous society. What yet remains to address?**

I did not acknowledge that when an age gap is taken into consideration that there are "enough women". I gave you a crude model with a list of inputs but zero real world numbers. I was expecting you to provide some numbers to elaborate how the factors balance out, since you are so well researched on polygamy.

You said statistics and other numbers support your position. Please share.

**32. SirHamster**      **September 25, 2015 at 1:18 AM**

@simplytimothy:

It is highly unlikely that any moderation is going on in this thread. This is a throwaway blog for testing website code, not a moderated forum. Perhaps Mark needs to exorcise his computer of Internet gremlins. Saving a copy of a long post in a text editor is good practice for unreliable browsers + websites.

As for your simulated response, good job. It does sound like them. Including missing the point. :P

**33. MycroftJones**      **September 25, 2015 at 10:48 AM**

Even if the Church has the right to judge (I believe it does), then we get down to the question of what/who is the Church.

**34. Mark Call**      **September 26, 2015 at 12:21 PM**

re: "the church"

Here's how the BSNV Bible ("Besorah of Yahusha, Natserim Version", retaining the "original Hebrew Names") puts it:

" 'Church' derives from "Kirke", or Circus, the original Greek term for a pagan temple, or place of worship... also derived from the name of a witch, Circe." (for those who remember Shakespeare).

The Hebrew term for a called-out assembly is "Qahal".

There is more than a casual similarity between the pagan words and the pagan customs, not limited to changing the Sabbath of YHVH to Constantine's "sun-god day".

**35. Mark Call**

September 26, 2015 at 3:30 PM

Which proves what, precisely? That the Greek word was NOT pagan in origin? Check a few more, lie 'christos,' and 'theos'...

oh, and don't forget "easter"  
(ashteroth/astarte/ishtar, etc).

If you haven't yet, try reading Ezekiel chapter 8 and 9, and ask just WHAT are those "abominations" He is so upset about, and which 'circe' still promotes them.

"These things I HATE..." says YHVH, over and over again. Like it or not, there's a reason that the TWO wives of Yah were both "put away" for cause: Idolatry/adultery.

And there really is "nothing new under the sun."

**36. Mark Call**

September 26, 2015 at 3:45 PM

PS> If it's not obvious, ST, you mapped it BACKWARDS. (Same problem with "torah" and "nomos" and "law". They map one way, not the other. "Kahal" -- however you choose to spell it phonetically and "edat"-- may be translated INTO a word like 'church', but they're really more properly 'assembly,' or community or congregation.)

The point is that the self-appointed "universal church" has combined the "holy" with the "profane" in direct violation of Scripture. It is, I contend, exactly that which Yahuchanon in Revelation says we must "come out of" (My people) IFF we want to avoid the "plagues" that He says come from

rebellion to His Torah. (Rev. 18:4)

**37. MycroftJones**      **September 26, 2015 at 5:37 PM**

Great way to derail the topic, Mark. Every time people start up with that "pagan words" nonsense I grit my teeth. Have you ever read "Origin of Speeches" by Isaac Mozeson? Nit picking "church" vs "qahal" vs "ecclesia" gets us absolutely nowhere.

**38. MycroftJones**      **September 26, 2015 at 5:43 PM**

Also, the "coming out of her" is nonsense. Revelation says coming out of Babylon happens AFTER Babylon falls. Are you claiming Babylon has fallen? Define your terms; what is Babylon, where when and how did she fall.

Being holy is the important thing; YHWH is holy, and said we should also be holy, for he is holy. Keeping Torah is a means to sanctification. Salvation is by grace; Sanctification is by torah.

It sounds like you are saying we can't use the Septuagint to map the New Testament backwards and link it to the Old Testament Hebrew; this is such a useful technique, you can't really understand the New Testament without it. Attacking the New Testament as being full of "pagan words" because it is in Greek, you might as well throw it away entirely.

**39. SirHamster**      **September 26, 2015 at 6:34 PM**

[MycroftJones said:](#)

**Great way to derail the topic, Mark.**

Wouldn't be the first time.

**40. MycroftJones**      **September 26, 2015 at 8:17 PM**

simplytimothy: In my tradition, sanctification is by the Holy Spirit

Sanctification by Obedience to God's Law Word. It is a concept expounded by Rushdoony. It doesn't nullify sanctification by the Holy Spirit, but is an important part of it. The difference you see is that your sanctification by the Holy Spirit doesn't (yet) seem to include obedience to the Law's originally given by the Eternal unchanging one.

**41. MycroftJones**      **September 26, 2015 at 8:20 PM**

Also, sanctification is a Latin way of expressing the process of becoming Holy. Sanctus, Holy, same concept. Becoming Holy is done by actions. Keeping the Laws of God make you holy; that is their intent and purpose.

**42. SirHamster**      **September 27, 2015 at 3:49 PM**

@Mycroft:

Are you planning to respond to [@49](#) from me, or are you done?

**43. MycroftJones**      **September 27, 2015 at 4:12 PM**

Hamster, your post ably outlined the mechanism by which a man had no need to fear a shortage of women. I thought you could see it, yet you suddenly call it "hypothetical". Check out population statistics for yourself. No moving goalposts. Outline your standard of proof. I'm willing to work with you, but there has to be a stopping condition on this iteration process. My lifespan is limited, and no man can be convinced against his will. If you don't want to accept polygyny as a Godly gift for righteous men, then no facts will be sufficient.

**44. SirHamster**      **September 27, 2015 at 6:38 PM**

If you think it's already addressed, you ought to say. You didn't answer. This is disappointing. Let me dissect my own posts to show you what you missed.

SirHamster said: (recapped in [@31](#))

It's an interesting topic and thought experiment, but mostly irrelevant to the daily living of the vast majority of Christians. Given roughly even sex ratios, you're going to build up a social system for polygamy for one generation, and then forced to dispose of excess males or jettison the system in the very next generation.

If we end up in a system where male life expectancy is low enough to make it inevitable and continuous ... the males who "win" are going to be the ones who focused on developing into strong men, not the ones fantasizing about their future harem.

Claims:

1. Polygamy mostly irrelevant to majority of Christians
2. Polygamy generates excess males which either (a) creates social instability, or (b) forces new system
3. Polygamy discussion not a very productive topic for men. (context: developing manhood for Deltas/Gamma/Omegas)

You have made no effort at all to extract my points or attempt an organized response, but your current posts offer the following counterpoints.

- A. You said that having polygamy as an option on the table can improve single marriages.
- B. You think that the mere existence of my crude mathematical model proves that there are no excess males
- C. You could argue A again, though it's not a very direct response.

[@31](#) also adds that ME/African young males invading Europe are an example of excess unmarried men from polygamous societies creating instability. No attempt was made to explain or negate this observation.

[MycroftJones said:](#)

Hamster, your post ably outlined the mechanism by which a man had no need to fear a shortage of women. I thought you could see it, yet you suddenly call it "hypothetical".

As the creator of the model you want to use, do you actually think I'm too stupid to recognize its shortcomings? Yes, it's entirely hypothetical. Because I created it from your hypothesis, and have not validated it against any "in practice" societal numbers.

You also completely ignore the factor that my ME/Africa example hinted at: Young unmarried men have nothing to lose - and you acknowledge that age gap of marriage must increase to make polygamy balance the numbers.

So young men must wait several more years before they can find a wife, so that older established men can enjoy more wives. Does that sound stable to you? Not to me. The effect will be tiny if it's 1, 2 years.... but if 5? 10? 20?

If there is an excess of young unmarried males in the system creating instability, this is confirming, not refuting my point #2.

45. MycroftJones

September 27, 2015 at 6:38 PM

@Hamster specifically, you said there were no "real world" numbers for the models. The ones you plugged in yourself were pretty good approximations. If you want better ones, go through the CIA world factbook, etc. However, that isn't necessary: the model accomodates a wide range of ratios between men and women. The marriage age gap is not only the natural order for humans, it enables polygyny. Since the model shows polygyny is workable at variables levels, where is the need for real world numbers, since they fall within the limits of the model?

46. SirHamster

September 27, 2015 at 7:29 PM

[MycroftJones said:](#)

Since the model shows polygyny is workable at variables levels, where is the need for real world numbers, since they fall within the limits of the model?

Because the ability of a human system to reach an equilibrium was never in question. That you treat it as such is a category error. That you assume that was my "issue" is misreading my position entirely.

The point of bringing up "excess males" is that a polygamous society is more violent and unstable than the same set of people in a monogamous system, because young men are unable to find a wife until later in their lives.

If there's a 10 year gap, the 20 year old man is "waiting" for his 10 years old match to grow up in 10 more years. Is that a reasonable price to pay for some other guy to enjoy a few extra wives? For the 90% of males who only enjoy one wife, late in their life?

The numbers matter. You were challenged to provide an example to prove your points, but you would rather make noise about "moving goalposts", "limited lifespans" and other nonsense.

47. [MycroftJones](#)

September 27, 2015 at 9:03 PM

I see. You see violence and instability; I see vigor and strength. Have you ever owned livestock? Worked with livestock? Your answer will affect how I develop this theme with you.

As for the age gap, that happens regardless. Your choice is between vigorous and excellent men who wait until they can marry virgins and form stable families. And the other choice is weak and effeminate men who wait the same length of time, until they can marry cock carousel riders who have enjoyed alpha cock but never extracted the price from the alphas. And then their wives despise them and 50/50 odds they divorce rape them after a few years.



Monogamy always devolves into massive whoredom and matriarchy. Polygyny requires and sustains patriarchy.

Vigorous "violent" men raised by their patriarchal fathers tend to contain themselves. I'm often impressed by the self-control of the young men from polygamous Africa compared to their fatherless counterparts in the USA.

I've spent time with young men from Arab, Chinese, and African countries. They may be ready to beat up outsiders, but in their own social environment, they are polite and respectful. Because the alphas would rip their heads off if they act out. Polygamous patriarchy is self-policing, and is more effective at it than any monogamous society.

If you want your males weak so outsiders can steamroller them, great. Monogamy. If you want a vigorous force of defenders and even colonizers... polygamy. The Mormon fundamentalists don't have a problem with "violent" young males either. And it was the polygyny period that saw Mormonism's fastest and greatest growth.

Polygamy is the cure to dearth. And the entire West suffers a dearth of birth right now.

48. SirHamster

September 28, 2015 at 8:01 AM

If you could have simply said, "That's not a bug, that's a feature" 40 posts ago, I'd have more respect for your position.

As it is, I had to step you through it myself, on top of unnecessary rhetorical snipes about "moving goalposts", "do your own research", "limited lifespan", and "convinced against his will".

This is why Alphas hate Gammas. So wordy. So much to say. So little substance.

49. MycroftJones

September 28, 2015 at 9:31 AM

simplytimothy: two wives, two marriages. In the Hebrew Bible, "marriage" isn't a word. A man merely "takes" a woman, and she is his, if there are no prior claimants.

Hamster: enough snark. it took you this long to clarify that your beef with polygamy is "oh, all the violent dangerous young unmarried men!" which sounds like the fear talk of some feminist lesbian. It isn't the reality.

In polygamous societies, beta male behavior helps you get along with males; and since patriarchs choose their daughters husbands, beta behavior is actually a benefit. Preselection by the patriarch more than offsets the tingle-killing of beta behavior.

50. SirHamster

September 28, 2015 at 9:44 AM

[MycroftJones](#) said:

Hamster: enough snark. it took you this long to clarify that your beef with polygamy is "oh, all the violent dangerous young unmarried men!" which sounds like the fear talk of some feminist lesbian. It isn't the reality.

Gamma projection. "No you!"

If you're reading Vox Populi, you'll notice that violent dangerous young unmarried men from polygamous societies are invading Europe. Calling that imaginary is a bold Gamma lie.

I can't say I had no warning. You were impressed with artisanaltoad's monomaniac textdump in a mildly related thread.

51. MycroftJones

September 28, 2015 at 9:56 AM

I thought maybe Gamma grandiosity would allow you to grasp the Biblical benefits of polygyny. I might have been wrong.

These "violent dangerous young unmarried men" invading Europe; well, that is what they do. Back

when Europe was vigorous, they deflowered the populations of the world in the same way. You missed the point: in their home environment, they are well behaved betas who almost all get married before the age of 40. They come to the west where patriarchy is suppressed, their behavior is a natural consequence. Not the fault of polygamy but of Western weakness. You hate foreign men doing what you allow the local men to do? Sounds hypocritical. Western weakness is because it has rejected the Torah of the Creator.

52. SirHamster

September 28, 2015 at 11:06 AM

[MycroftJones said:](#)

I thought maybe Gamma grandiosity would allow you to grasp the Biblical benefits of polygyny. I might have been wrong.

Gamma is posturing weakness. No one listens to Gamma.

You missed the point: in their home environment, they are well behaved betas who almost all get married before the age of 40. They come to the west where patriarchy is suppressed, their behavior is a natural consequence. Not the fault of polygamy but of Western weakness. You hate foreign men doing what you allow the local men to do? Sounds hypocritical.

Shifting goalposts. First the problem doesn't exist. Then the problem is actually a desirable feature. Now the problem is someone else's fault.

Funny how you pre-emptively accused me of shifting goalposts and wanted a "standard of proof". Gamma posturing and projection.

Gamma doubling down on the lies, too. ISIS is undoubtedly very well behaved. Arab Spring demonstrates stability of ME societies!

53. MycroftJones

September 28, 2015 at 1:50 PM

The Gamma is strong in this one.

54. MycroftJones

September 28, 2015 at 2:18 PM

simplytimothy: I have to get back to work. No specific "on verse that spells it out". If you look for "marry" and "marriage" in Strong's concordance, that will get you a good deal of the way there. Then look up "take" and "taketh" to see the verses that describe a man "taking" a woman to be his wife.

When there are words that don't occur in the Bible, like "marriage" or "homosexual", I really see no point in quibbling over definitions. Those words can mean whatever you say they mean; but it isn't relevant, because they aren't in Scripture.

55. MycroftJones

September 28, 2015 at 8:00 PM

I double checked Strong's Concordance. "Marry" does occur as the Hebrew word "yebom". This is translated once as marry, but otherwise as "duty of the husbands brother". Then there is the time "marry" is translated from Hebrew "issha" which means "woman" or "wife". That is, let the girls "wife" themselves to who they choose. Then there is "khutz" translated as "marry" once, "marry without/outside the tribe". But khutz literally just means "outside/abroad". The final occurrence of "marry" in Hebrew is actually the Hebrew word "Ba'al" or "master". It talks about a man "lording" or "mastering" a woman.

In other words, the online tools appear to put the word "marry" in the Old Testament, but when you look at the italics of your King James Bible or a print version of Strong's Concordance you get a lot of NIH (Not-found In Hebrew). And where the word actually exists in Hebrew, you find it has a different meaning not specific to "marriage" in the modern sense.

The other word for "married" in your King James is Hebrew "laqach". Which means... "taken, to take".

Finally, the word "marriage", once it occurs as the

word "ownah" which means "duty of marriage". Since the word only occurs once in the Bible, even the true meaning of it is disputed by Rabbis. But it doesn't mean "marriage" per se. Some translate it as "furrows", or sexual cohabitation in general. And the only other use of "marriage" in the Old Testament is in Psalms, where the word is "halel", which means "praise, rejoicing". As in, Hallelujah. So translating halel as "marriage" is a bit of a stretch.

If you are familiar with Strong's Concordance Timothy, let me know; this is the type of thing you can verify for yourself quickly, with very little training.

Most occurrences of a "married" woman in the Old Testament is a "ba'aled" woman; one who is mastered, who is under the lordship of a man.

Finally in the Greek New Testament you will find Greek "gameo" a few times, and that does imply to wed or marry, but it is used in a way that assumes a pre-existing knowledge of how man and women are meant to come together. That is, Greek "gameo" isn't used in a way that defines it. For that we turn to Hebrew; closest thing you find is "Ba'al"

The word "wed" occurs not at all, and "wedding" only a few times in the Greek New Testament.

So when I say the word "marriage" doesn't occur in the Hebrew Bible, you can find it in your King James. But turning back to the Hebrew, the words either don't exist, or have a different meaning.

**56. Mark Call**

**September 29, 2015 at 9:07 AM**

You will find the "Law of the Levirate" described in Deuteronomy 25:5-10, ST, although that expression is NOT used in the text. [[@84](#), [@82](#), etc ]

And although the fit is not exact, the principle appears in places like the story of Judah and Tamar, and of course Boaz and Ruth. (And, as I have noted many times, it is one of TWO places in Scripture where polygyny may be REQUIRED.)

And the Scripturally-correct ENGLISH term is "polygyny," and not polygamy. (The description is a non-issue in Hebrew, where the latter term is simply "adultery".)

The reason is simple (and has nothing to do with my 'tradition', which comes not from tradition at all).

Polygyny means "one man, with one or more wives."

The broader term "polygamy" can refer to, and INCLUDES, both polygyny and polyandry (one wife, multiple husbands). Since the English words "polygamy" conflates what Scripture permits with what it forbids, it is categorically incorrect. To a "church" which seems to prefer hiding the truth, the reason for selecting the term is obvious.

There's another reason I reject the word (kinda like "Law" in lieu of 'Torah', since it conflates and causes confusion by imprecision) ---

if you call yourself a supporter of "polygamy," people will immediately TEND to ignore Scripture and focus instead on Mormonism. Another distraction.

57. MycroftJones

September 29, 2015 at 9:17 AM

@ST

I have now read up to post 600 in the previous thread. I agree with toad's distinction between polygyny and polygamy. Where-ever I have used polygamy, please consider it the same as toad's definition of polygyny. In common usage polygamy doesn't include polyandry or serial marriage, so I have used polygamy and polygyny interchangeably. Since we're going to get into precise definitions, know that polygyny is my intended meaning; if there is some other meaning, I'll be explicit about it.

When a man "goes into" a woman, his DNA blends with hers. Even if no child results. They literally become "one". Forever after, his DNA can be found in her body. Two women can't become one. It is an impossibility. For two men to become one is a

perversion.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/science/science-news/11133203/Could-previous-lovers-influence-appearance-of-future-children.html>

Given this fact, polygamy is not a problem for "two becoming into one". That is, when you understand the mechanism, you see that a man can "become one" with more than one woman. But if a woman is with multiple men, she is only "one" with the first man; after that she is mingled and mixed and divided. And this is what the word adultery means in Hebrew and Greek; mingled, mixed.

Let's talk about covenant too. Covenant in Hebrew "bris" literally means cutting or parting of flesh. A circumcision is literally a covenant. When a virgin woman has sex, that too is a covenant. Her flesh is parted and blood comes out. In the most literal of ways, sexual congress between a man and a virgin IS a covenant. So, although Scripture doesn't really speak about a "covenant" between a man and a woman, just as it doesn't speak of "marriage", there is in proper circumstances, a covenant. And that covenant is between one man and one woman. And that covenant has nothing in it to limit a man from making another covenant.

In a Biblical marriage, there are actually six parties: it is done under mandate and authority from God (Genesis 1). It is done in the presence of two witnesses. And finally there is an agreement between the husband, the father, and the woman to transfer ownership of the woman from the father to the husband so she can build up his family.

**58. MycroftJones**

**September 29, 2015 at 9:23 AM**

To clarify "becoming one" a bit more; Apostle Paul talks of "becoming one" with a whore. A man will add his DNA to whichever woman he sleeps with, like a fingerprint, mark, or claim. But the believer has now mingled his holy seed with unholy. He became one with her, but she isn't fully "one" with him.

1 Corinthians 6:16

This verse shows that a man can be "one" with more than one woman.

**59. MycroftJones**      **September 29, 2015 at 9:43 AM**

Here is a much better link about telegony or "becoming one". The last link only talked about fruit flies; this one shows it happens in humans too.

<http://www.returnofkings.com/70425/research-suggests-that-a-womans-body-incorporates-dna-from-the-semen-of-her-casual-sex-partners>

**60. MycroftJones**      **September 29, 2015 at 3:28 PM**

The Levirate is one. There are three other places in Scripture where polygyny is commanded/required. One in the New Testament, two in the Old.

**61. MycroftJones**      **September 29, 2015 at 5:16 PM**

Also, given that polygyny creates "violent, dangerous young men", I'm waiting for Hamsterhead to call for evicting all those violent, dangerous young Chinese men who are going around looting, stealing, and raping Western women. ...

**62. Mark Call**      **September 30, 2015 at 6:33 AM**

I'm pretty sure I've mentioned this, ST. 'Brit chadasha' is arguably better understood as RE-newed covenant. The easiest place to see (and compare to 'xtianity') is Jeremiah/Yermeyahu 31.

It is "in progress", but without question not "complete" (perfect? :) for obvious reasons.

Just read it. (OK, hint: focus on v 31-34, especially in the context of the words of both Jeremiah 3 preceding and also Ezekiel 23.)



Is His *torah* (check the word for yourself in the concordance!) really written on the hearts of 'xtians'? Is it still necessary for ANY man to teach?

Why, then, are we having this discussion?

PS> I tried this correction twice; was having Captcha issues --

"...and I should have said "at LEAST two places"..."

Two places mandatory; others mandated based on voluntary actions of a man (such as lying with a virgin).

**63. MycroftJones**      **September 30, 2015 at 11:45 AM**

*This comment has been removed by the author.*

**64. MycroftJones**      **September 30, 2015 at 11:48 AM**

timothy:

Paul said that now we see many things as if through a mirror darkly. That is, a muddy and rippled reflection in a puddle.

Mark Call derails the discussion yet again. The whole "new vs re-newed" covenant is pointless and provides no new information. A covenant is the shedding of blood, the parting of flesh. Jesus certainly shed blood and was pierced; his flesh was parted by the spear that went in his side.

Other examples of covenants in the Bible involve cutting an animal in half and walking between the pieces. Such as the covenant YHWH made with Abraham, promising his seed would be like the stars of the sky for multitude.

Now, a covenant is the act of ratifying an agreement. The covenant itself doesn't say WHAT the agreement is. In Jeremiah 31, it spells out the terms of the New Covenant. The Law remains the same. Even Hebrews doesn't speak of new Laws, but rather better promises, better covenant. The covenant ratifies in blood the agreement or

contract; both parties have their end to fulfill. But in the New Covenant, since YHWH will put his Law in our hearts, it is indeed a better covenant; the burden of performance is taken from us; we will automatically do the right thing.

Simple observation shows that the promise has not come yet, even though the covenant is 2000 years old. The New Testament speaks of this when it talks of Abraham, who had the covenant, but did not live to see its fulfillment, his descendants taking over the land of Israel and being like the stars in the sky, impossible to number. This is why there is a need for faith; the promises are yet future.

**65. MycroftJones**      **September 30, 2015 at 11:51 AM**

If you take into account seducing a virgin, that brings us to 5 required situations of polygamy in Scripture. Good catch, Mark Call.

**66. MycroftJones**      **September 30, 2015 at 1:06 PM**

Like marriage and homosexual, "sex" isn't really a word you find in the Hebrew Bible. A man can "know" a woman, he can "humble" her, he can have "relations" with her... but nothing specific to sex.

I personally don't like lesbian sex; in real life it is generally ugly hags trying to be men, competing for the young lovelies, and getting all jealous and backstabby about it. Lesbians are some of the biggest underminers of marriage you could imagine.

Toad's scenario of an attractive man with two wives together wanting to pleasure him, seems more likely, and possibly harmless. But... is it sustainable long term? I see three examples in Scripture showing that a Godly man has HIS own living quarters, and each wife has HER own living quarters. Those examples are Abraham, King David, and I forget the third one. Probably Jacob.

I agree wives in a polygynous arrangement don't have a covenant with each other. They have

covenant with their husband only. The "everyone married together in one marriage" is a Mormon idea, and it messes up proper reasoning on divorce.

As a lesser status male, I've never had women so into me that threesomes were easy to swing. I'm emotionally neutral on the topic. If God allows it, then good for our more attractive brothers, I wish them every happiness and enjoyment.

Since "sex" and "marriage" aren't found in the Bible, can you restructure the logic of your question? Are relations limited to people who have a covenant with each other? Girl-on-girl doesn't create a covenant. Nor do they "become one" with each other. Therefore, if both are in covenant with the same man, does it threaten the man-woman covenants?

Sarah did give Hagar to Abraham. But Sarah and Hagar (and Abraham) each lived in separate tents. Doesn't sound like much girl-on-girl. Rachel and Leah were sisters; their rivalry rules out girl-on-girl. No indicator one way or another about Lot's daughters.

Now, there is a verse in the Song of Solomon where the virgin tells the King's wives, "don't rouse love in me until it is time". How were the women of the harem "rousing love in" (making lustful) the virgin? That is probably as close to girl-girl as you will get in Scripture, but isn't conclusive either way. Groups of girls can use the pre-selection effect to make one of their member lust after a man easily, so actual congress (kissing, fondling, etc) isn't required.

Then we come to queen Esther and her full year of massages every day, with perfumes and oils. The Persian harems were famous for women having sex with their eunuchs, and with each other. No word on what happened during that year. She was still a virgin for the king.

**67. MycroftJones**

**September 30, 2015 at 4:27 PM**

I believe toad outlined it fairly well; girl-on-girl isn't specifically forbidden.

If we're going to use the non-biblical word "sex", sure, I'll call girl-on-girl "sex". In Scripture, "harlotry" or "whoredom" is when a woman has sex without her masters consent. A daughter having sex without fathers consent is a harlot. A wife doing it is an adulteress. Now, if a man is married to two women, and encourages or authorizes them to do the carpet-munching thing, how is this different from encouraging his wife to use a dildo while he is on a business trip? I don't think dildo sex is forbidden. If done outside marriage it would definitely remove her proof of virginity, and open her up to charges of harlotry. If a lesbian rapes a woman by sticking her fingers up the vagina, the woman would have a legitimate cause for action, since that also removes her proof of virginity.

I recognize the Biblical definitions of fornication and adultery, but not the Christian ones, which are perversions passed down from Rome.

My understanding at this time, is that girl-girl is allowed under the direction and authorization of the husband. Here is one for toad: two men each have one wife; can they command their wives to munch each other while they watch. Sounds perverse to me, but I know a man who used to do something similar with his friend.

However, given that in the Bible, wives had sexual "property" in their husbands, this implies the husband didn't have the ability to say when sex would happen; only when it wouldn't. Look at the story of Rachel, Leah, and the mandrakes for proof of that. So, even if a man is allowed to direct his wives to entertain him with girl-on-girl, he'd have to convince them. A few men could manage it. Most couldn't; wives hang onto their rights and properties jealously. Why would she share her night with her husband? New car maybe...

68. SirHamster

September 30, 2015 at 4:57 PM

[MycroftJones said:](#)

Also, given that polygyny creates "violent, dangerous young men", I'm waiting for

**Hamsterhead to call for evicting all those violent, dangerous young Chinese men who are going around looting, stealing, and raping Western women. ...**

Oh, Gamma sniping. How'd I miss that?

No, I said polygyny causes a surplus of males. Maybe those surplus males peacefully take up homosexuality or porn or something. I haven't talked about eviction, or rape.

So you concede that "polygyny" is a factor in ME/African immigrant trouble, but really, it's the West's fault for being weak, and this violence and instability is just a feature of "polygyny" awesome virile masculinity.

On the other side of the world, I'm sure China's neighbors are all very trusting of a society with a huge population of surplus males. It's not like Japan is re-arming, or Vietnam is making nice with the US, or anything. China is very stable. So very stable. Got some investments in Chinese stocks?

Coincidentally, I live in California, and people from China are really driving up real estate prices around here. Wonder why they would put their money in the US, of all places?

**69. MycroftJones**

**September 30, 2015 at 6:34 PM**

Timothy: I didn't endorse the two husbands two wives scenario. I put it forward out of curiosity to see how Toad would analyze it. He seems absent from this thread though.

Consent is only one key word; the context is the rules already outlined in scripture. The only scenario where an owner may give consent is if she hasn't been to his bed; then he can give her to any man under his authority. If she has come into sexual covenant with him, Toad shows that there is one possible scenario, the girl-girl scenario, where husband could give consent. It is possible someone will find a Scripture that closes that loophole; time will tell.

Fornication is all types of sexual uncleanness, including adultery. Adultery is more specifically mingling or mixing of seed; a married woman mingles with another man. Sowing a field with two different kinds of seed, is adultery. Gendering thy cattle with a diverse kind, is adultery. Hebrew being what it is, Adultery has the broader meaning of "pollution"; even dumping chemicals in a stream is adultery. And harlotry/whoredom has the broader meaning in Hebrew of "rebellion against authority". Not necessarily sexual at all. Since Scriptural wives are given a monetary allowance, in modern language, a good righteous wife is a whore. Our modern language has turned the meanings of things upside down. In Scripture, even if a woman doesn't charge a single penny, she is still a harlot. She has rebelled against her father.

What is not "fornication": a man of any marital status, having sex with an unowned woman.

Hambone: I never conceded polygamy as the "cause" of ME/African trouble. Now you retreat, calling it a "factor". I don't concede that either. Your vague aspersions about Chinese people have nothing to do with polygamy, unless you are saying that polygamy makes societies strong in every way; financially and intellectually as well as the "loot and plunder" of the Boko Haram crowd.

**70. MycroftJones**

September 30, 2015 at 7:13 PM

Timothy: on further reflection, the two husbands/two wives scenario doesn't need Toad's analysis. If your wife is prettier than the other man's, such a situation entices him to covet your own wife. Torah says not to put a stumbling block in front of your brother, and coveting is a stumbling block. This would also answer the question of whether the owner has a right to make his wife strip in front of others (no)

**71. SirHamster**

September 30, 2015 at 7:59 PM

**Hambone:** I never conceded polygamy as the "cause" of ME/African trouble.

You've only completely ignored it, in favor of changing the topic to anything else. In this case by bringing up the "polygamous" Chinese.

You've completely avoided any numbers that would allow your claims to be evaluated further on merit, instead relying on Gamma tactics. I humored your request for a mathematical model, you have not honored any of my requests for details.

As far as I'm concerned, your behavior is a complete surrender on the topic; I'm just mocking you for my amusement at this point.

**Your vague aspersions about Chinese people ...**

Gamma liar. I denigrated the nation of China's stability and peacefulness, which bears some relation to its large male surplus. That had nothing to do with disparaging Chinese people.

**72. Mark Call**

**October 1, 2015 at 7:20AM**

(For a guy who is quick to criticize any aspect of language that he can't understand as "pointless", MJ certainly engages in a lot of *pointless* SPECULATION.)

And while I understand that speculation about things one's wife, or church *master* won't permit anyway might be titillating, it certainly SEEMS pointless as well. But that's just me; I guess it depends on who makes 'law' for one's house. (Romans 6:16 again.)

If it's NOT prohibited by His Instruction, and His instruction clearly says (Deut 4:2, 12:32, and repeated at the very End of the Book again) that NO ONE is to "add to" or "subtract from" -- one would think the answer is obvious, even without having to 'connect any dots':

Such actions (whatever you call 'em) are not PROHIBITED. (Definitions on that word?) YHVH did

NOT rule them out, false masters have no authority to claim to do so in His stead, and HUSBANDS, however, still have His authority over THEIR houses, and wives.

Shaul, 'rightly dividing the Word' (ie, connecting the dots via midrash) put it this way, the "marriage bed is not defiled."

However Yakov moved his 'couch' around was up to him.

The important point about "connecting the dots" is this, ST:

"Study, to show yourself approved." Exercise righteous authority over your own house, your own children, your own wives. Midrash, express your opinions. Just make sure you understand the difference between interpreting His Word in YOUR life with the authority He gave you, and "making law".

Babylon didn't, the Pharisees didn't, the US 'supreme' court doesn't, and the romanized 'catholic church' doesn't.

Unless, that is, you make a "deal with the devil," and decide to submit to "another master." About which Yahushua gave fair warning.

### 73. Mark Call

October 1, 2015 at 7:35 AM

PS> Lest I be nit-picked, Yakov WAS criticized in Scripture for showing favoritism; Scripture does say that a man is to meet his wives needs (and the use of language TENDS to say that requirement is sexual, and arguably thus also spiritual).

So, while it is not quite pointless, and I certainly wouldn't want to "derail" anything AGAIN by pointing out what actually is consistent with Torah, if a man's wives were to point out privately to him (in whatever way he/they have come to understand one another) that those needs might be met in a time of being "echad" as a house (look it up) -- who are any of us to say that is prohibited?



QED.

**74. MycroftJones**

October 1, 2015 at 1:25 PM

MC: where in Scripture is Jacob "criticized" for loving one wife more than the other. If you want to translate the Hebrew word "ownah" as "spiritual" duties of marriage, back that up; it only occurs once in the Bible and even Rabbi's disagree on its exact meaning.

Two women can't be "echad" with each other. Women don't produce sperm, so the DNA transfer doesn't happen. So what is this talk of "being echad as a house"? A house divided against itself is NOT talking about a house where the wives refuse to sleep with each other!

I can think of one scenario where girl-girl makes sense. A husband's biggest headache is when his wives are at each others throats. When the wives show they are in sweet agreement, it makes his life easy and pleasant. Girl-girl could potentially be the most dramatic way a pair of women can demonstrate to their husband that they are his and will make his life as easy and pleasant as possible, not bickering and poisoning each other. As an ongoing, regular type of sex act, I don't know any man who has a relationship where girl-girl has been sustainable.

MC: we "connect the dots" when we say that women aren't allowed to kidnap. Why suddenly stop connecting dots in the matter of girl-girl intra-marriage sex? The only question is, what is the correct way to connect the dots. Connecting dots by using words and definitions that aren't even in Scripture, is hazardous.

**75. MycroftJones**

October 1, 2015 at 1:40 PM

Stick to Torah, MC, and you'll be fine. No Sacred Name stuff, none of this interpretation of end-times prophecy and "type and shadows" symbolism, and

you'll be welcome.

Timothy: thanks for taking the effort to agree on common terms so we can communicate. I spent a lot of years, first with Strong's Concordance, then learning Hebrew itself, so I could see what the Bible really said. I was a bit surprised at first, how many modern Christian concepts and ideas just aren't in the Bible. Fornication, for instance, is Greek "porneia", but in the Hebrew there is no "fornication" concept, although there is an "adulteration/mixing" concept and an "uncleanness" concept which covers much more than sexual conduct.

How do you currently understand Law/Torah? For myself, since "Torah" includes life and death instructions, I see no issue with calling it Law; calling the Torah "instructions" is an attempt to soften the language for people who are in rebellion against God's law. Such softening of terms hasn't won over anyone I know; when the "instruction" includes stoning to death, noone is fooled by such word games.

Hambone: the way to victory is just announcing that you've won, huh? You haven't demonstrated that polygamy creates a surplus of angry violent young men who destabilize society. China has a stock collapse; so do all the monogamous countries. You're blaming China's current stock market situation on angry violent young surplus men created by polygamy? Really? Rich Chinese are buying up prime California real estate and driving up the prices. This is the fault of angry violent young surplus men created by polygamy? Huh.

**76. Mark Call**

**October 1, 2015 at 2:06 PM**

Stick to what you've been told more than once privately, "MJ", and YOU'LL be fine. No, come to think of it, you'll still be a self-important asshole. You don't really want answers anyway.

You know damn well I'm done with your crap, and you know why.

**77. MycroftJones**

October 1, 2015 at 2:09 PM

Timothy: doing it a little at a time over a period of weeks sounds good to me.

Instead of marriage, "mastery", "ownership" would be appropriate, based on the Hebrew "ba'al" being used so often. Or "wifing/wifehood/wifeness", to refer to a woman who is sexually owned.

**78. Mark Call**

October 1, 2015 at 2:40 PM

@ST --

civil discourse and honest inquiry is still appreciated, and welcome. The point is to be like the Bereans. We can, and often will connect the dots differently. It's when somebody wants to pretend they can connect the dots for another man's house that I have a real problem.

And when people split hairs when it suits them, ignore the important distinctions and context, and then pompously talk about 'word games' when their bogus generalizations and outright distortions come back to bite them, that I draw the line. The word is "obtuse."

Then they'll tell you THEY alone are Enlightened Enough to connect those dots "correctly."

Sometimes I wonder if Humpty and MJ are really just Evil Twins.

**79. MycroftJones**

October 1, 2015 at 2:43 PM

*This comment has been removed by the author.*

**80. MycroftJones**

October 1, 2015 at 2:43 PM

MC: I know why. You can't accept that someone would understand what you believe... and still disagree with you.

81. SirHamster

October 1, 2015 at 3:07 PM

Note well how the Gamma throws out nonsense attacks in hope that one sticks. When "Your vague aspersions about Chinese people ..." fails to bear fruit, he continues on the attack in the hopes that something else will stick.

That he just threw away his credibility on a nonsensical attack is ignored, because establishing truth is not important, "winning" the argument is the only priority.

The truth content of the accusation? Irrelevant - all you need to know is that the Gamma is Winning, because he is posturing like a Winner. Very good, Gamma. You have Won teh Internets.

Since Gamma boy will have no further contributions to this aspect of the polygamy discussion, I had to look up the following data myself.

In [Polygyny and Poverty](#), the researcher collected data on polygynous countries around the world. He found that "all but two of the countries with high levels of polygyny are in Sub-Saharan Africa", where high levels is defined as, "more than 10% of married men have multiple wives". The two exceptions are Kuwait (ME) and Bangladesh. (Asia)

Honorable mentions for "Polygynous countries where less than 10% of all marriages are polygynous are Iran, Algeria, Syrian Arab Republic, Egypt, Pakistan, Morocco, Libya, Lebanon, Jordan, Tunisia, Yemen, India, Bahrain, Iraq, United Arab Emirates, Oman, and many Sub-Saharan African countries."

Missing from all of these lists is ... China. Which prohibited polygamy in [1953](#).

Hrm...

**I've known men and women from Africa and Arabia and China, all polygamous societies,**

Even though Gamma boy hasn't evinced any commitment to Social Justice, applying "SJWs Always Lie" has worked quite well.

I suspect polygamist advocates will be the best force at dissuading its adoption. If not for the Scriptural abuse, I wouldn't even consider them enemies, but I shall repeat [Vototter's Prayer](#).

**82. MycroftJones**

October 1, 2015 at 3:41 PM

SirHumpty: you're confusing facts in a book with facts on the ground. Mormons kept practicing polygamy for a long time after they officially outlawed it. Just like the Chinese.

**83. SirHamster**

October 1, 2015 at 3:51 PM

"Trust me", says Gamma Boy, after lying away his credibility in previous posts.

"I got facts on the ground that trump your statistics."

"Can't show you them. But you gotta believe me when I call China a polygamous society."

No.

**84. MycroftJones**

October 1, 2015 at 3:52 PM

MC: you have a problem with "connecting dots for another man's house". Yet, Scripture says it is "of no private interpretation". And also that we are to "consider one another to provoke to love and good works". You have a problem with Torah. Torah says in several ways in several places, that are are responsible for each other, to keep each other on the right path. That is why we are even having this discussion here, why I'm overlooking the name calling for now.

**85. MycroftJones**

October 1, 2015 at 4:23 PM

If Toad ever shows up here, another thing for him to weigh in on: take the situation of an infertile man.

Does he have the authority to send his wife to another male for impregnation? Is infertility the same thing as failing in "duties of marriage" and therefore gives the wife the right to divorce? Catholics allow infertility and impotence as causes for annulment.

<http://www.gq.com/story/how-to-have-babies-sperm-donor-ed-houben>

**86. MycroftJones**

**October 1, 2015 at 6:05 PM**

Timothy: believe it or not, YHWH himself is referred to as "Ba'al". It is a generic term like "god". It means "Master". So no, I'm not getting you into "Ba'al" worship. In Israel today, "ba'al" is the generic word for husband.

Meditating a bit more; I don't want to redefine things for you. Since "marriage" doesn't occur in the underlying Hebrew, I just don't use it. We can still speak of the covenant. There is a "marriage contract" or "agreement". Many examples of such contracts have been found from ancient Egypt, and they are illuminating. Generally they involved a perpetual trade of food and clothing for sexual fidelity and ownership of offspring, just like in Scripture.

If a word isn't Biblical, how about I just mention that, and we speak in Biblical terms. A man can "take" a woman, "master" her, be her "owner", and when he has sex with her he "uncovers her nakedness" and "knows" her and "humbles" her. "humble" comes from the Hebrew "anna" which also means "to stoop". Which is fairly graphic, and it shows that the Catholic "missionary position" is an inversion of the more Godly form of sex: standing up, taking her from behind. Coincidentally, there is an ancient Egyptian scroll showing exactly this method of coition. "anna" can also mean "bring low, lower" so it could also apply to missionary. Or doggy style. But the point remains, like so much else that is Catholic, missionary is the exact opposite of the Biblical norm.

If they understood this, British Israelites would have

a field day, given that until recently British women were known for preferring this standing up, taken from behind position.

Ok, I exaggerated slightly: another way "sex" is expressed in the Bible is for someone to "lay" with someone. Hence our English expression "get laid".

If ba'al makes you too uncomfortable, you could spell it b'al and I'll know what you mean.

**87. MycroftJones**

October 1, 2015 at 6:08 PM

The wording of Leviticus 18:23 tends to support the "standing up from behind" position as the norm. Found while I was looking up examples of "to lie with" as euphemism for sex.

**88. MycroftJones**

October 1, 2015 at 6:14 PM

Interestingly enough, the Wall Position, or "The Frisk" as it is sometimes known, is the easiest way to hit a woman's G spot for maximal pleasure. The nuggets you find in the Bible...

**89. Mark Call**

October 2, 2015 at 6:06 AM

You just got taken from behind, ST. Being misled should make you 'uncomfortable'. Don't believe everything you read, especially when it comes to pagan names and how they're jes wunnerful.

Check out Hosea 2:16 for yourself, and read it IN CONTEXT:

*And it shall be at that day, saith the LORD, that thou shalt call me Ishi; and shalt call me no more Baali.*

Ba'al is pagan. Yes, there are many words with pagan roots in Scripture, and common usage, but if you understand the context of what Hosea is saying about his whoring wife (and so is Yah, about His) then it makes sense.

Much of the world's church will deny it vehemently, of course, if they even had a clue. Which is a big part of the point. (Hosea, exactly 2 chapters later.)

Those who claim words don't matter are liars, and the truth is not in them. There is a very good reason why idolatry and adultery are virtual synonyms in understanding the Bible, the church, and even the Babylonian roots of much of Jewish mysticism and tradition. Some things He really does "hate".

**90. Mark Call**

October 2, 2015 at 6:25 AM

PS> And, yes - I left it in. Generally the pagan name is rendered "lord".

Here's how the line from Hosea 2:16 should be:

*And it shall be at that day, saith YHVH, that thou shalt call me Ishi; and shalt call me no more Baali.*

If we deep-sixed all the pagan words in English, even, most people wouldn't know what day it was. (And most would get 'Sabbath' wrong; which is why I DO kinda like using "sun-god-day" in the proper context. ;)

I do believe that HIDING His Names was a cruel hoax, and served more than merely nefarious purposes. And, just as importantly, that Scripture repeatedly tells us the time is coming when those who "seek His face" [panim] WILL come to know [yada] Him, and His Name.

**91. MycroftJones**

October 2, 2015 at 8:52 AM

MC has progressed from calling English words pagan, then to Greek words in the New Testament. Now he is even saying that the Hebrew Bible is full of "pagan" words. What is the point of this? Follow that road to its completion, MC. Take the final step. Using your methods and procedures, YHWH is also a "pagan" name. Lots of inscriptions have been found, showing the Canaanites, Syrians and desert tribes



also worshipped YHWH by that name, even if they didn't keep His Torah, even if they incorporated His worship with that of other gods.

What is your end game MC? What are you trying to accomplish with your pagan names material?

As for Sabbath, not only is there no "Saturday" or "Sunday" in the Bible; the Bible doesn't even have the word "week". Yes, I know, you'll find "week" once or twice, possibly three times in your King James bible. But the underlying Hebrew word isn't "week". Where there IS an underlying Hebrew word.

Hiding the name YHWH happened at the same time the Sabbath was hidden and the daily offering was taken away. This wasn't a nefarious purpose or cruel hoax by men; it was the hand of YHWH himself, beginning the prophecy in Daniel 8.

**92. MycroftJones**

October 2, 2015 at 8:58 AM

Words very much do matter. That is why I grit my teeth at Mark Call and his unnatural use of words, just as I grimace when women change the natural use of themselves. Since language comes from YHWH himself, to pervert this gift is to go against our Creator.

**93. MycroftJones**

October 2, 2015 at 9:01 AM

I suggest MC go through the Hebrew Bible and "deep six" all the "pagan" words from it and see how much he is left with. How did those "pagan" words get there in the first place? Surely the Bible is a Holy book, fit for teaching and instruction? Maybe those were pagan words too...

Sacred Namism/Pagan Namism are derivatives of Egyptian magic, and related to some of the mentalities found in Kabbalah.

**94. MycroftJones**

October 2, 2015 at 9:27 AM

Another point, often missed by Pagan Namers, the Hebrew word for "name" also means "power, authority". Just as when we English people say "stop, in the Name of the Law". What is the Name of the Law? Jerry? Fred? Bob? Section 8 Subtitle 3? Yet, people stop... without knowing the Law's personal name. They understand it is about power and authority, not spelling and pronunciation.

95. Mark Call

October 2, 2015 at 9:30 AM

Lest anyone else be deceived:

...[Mark Call said](#):

...there are many words with pagan roots in Scripture...

There are people who CAN'T read, and those who will NOT.

The latter are rightfully called "liars".

The rest can read both Scripture and quotes from it, IN CONTEXT, for themselves. And then it'll be quite obvious, "where I'm headed."

Same place YHVH tells us to -- *"return to Me, says YHVH."* That means, (Rev. 18:4) *"Come out of her, My people"...*

don't participate in HER sins, so that you do not partake of HER plagues.

Who is that "her"? Some folks here (and on TV) will lie to you about that, too!

96. MycroftJones

October 2, 2015 at 5:04 PM

MC: I showed you in private. Jeremiah 29:5 gives the instructions of what we are to do in Babylonian captivity. It is the exact opposite of "come out of her"! Revelation gives instructions specifically for AFTER Babylon falls.

MC: you do people wrong when you call on people to repent (which is good) but then tell them it means

to "come out of her". This is premature. Like the Israelites in Numbers 14. They jumped the gun, and were slaughtered. Where do you seek to lead Yah's sheep with such interpretation of prophecy?

**97. MycroftJones**

October 2, 2015 at 5:09 PM

MC: it is possibly you have erred in your prophetic interpretation because of misunderstanding "sin". Literally, sin just means "loss" or "failure". A sinner in Hebrew is literally a "loser" or a "failure". If a righteous person is keeping Torah, it is still possible to be a part of the "losses" and failures of Babylon when it falls. Look back on Jeremiah 29. Your financial life is and will be intertwined with the economy of Babylon. Remain in a city that is falling, and your property will also be looted. This is a "loss", but it isn't "sin" in the sense of "breaking Torah" or "rebellious" that needs teshuvah/repentance.

**98. MycroftJones**

October 3, 2015 at 4:38 PM

Until Toad came along, I did count girl-on-girl as "unnatural". In the narrow circumstances that he defined, it seems natural and harmless. I've read up to post 800 in the old thread now, and now that I've read Toad's experience with Mandy and the other M, that sounds exactly like the scenario I predicted where girl-on-girl would/could happen. Only sin there was that Toad didn't keep them around and turn them into concubines or wives. Hebrew "pilyegesh" or "concubine" literally translates as "fucktoy" or "one who gets speared". What is the difference between a pilyegesh and a wife/issah? I don't know. Scripture specifies that the offspring of a concubine get equal inheritance with a wife's children. There is a small remnant in Israel I plan to ask; if that doesn't pan out the last place I can think of looking is in Egyptian sources. Where the Bible doesn't say otherwise, you can assume that Egyptian customs were followed. And where Egyptian customs weren't followed, Akkadian (from when Abraham came out of Nippur)

So, my definition of the "natural use" of the woman?  
It is to belong to a man, to become "one" with him,  
to produce children for him, and generally be his  
"helpmeet", which is a term I'm also hazy on, like  
pilyegesh.

99. MycroftJones

October 4, 2015 at 1:41 AM

I thought back to earlier years. One of the exercises  
I posed to people is this: how do you prove that  
lesbianism is a sin, without reference to the New  
Testament?

I concluded that this verse applies: Deuteronomy  
22:5 The woman shall not wear that which  
pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a  
woman's garment: for all that do so are abomination  
unto the LORD thy God.

In a lesbian "relationship", at least one woman is  
taking on the role of man, violating the law.

In the narrow circumstance described by Toad, both  
girls simultaneously trying to please him, is one of  
the women taking on the role of a man?

100. MycroftJones

October 4, 2015 at 9:57 AM

Thanks for those links. That is a bit beyond my  
scholarship at the moment; they are quoting  
Plutarch and Lucian (among others) as Greek  
sources; I don't have them at hand in Greek to  
compare.

If "use" is specifically "sexual use", then that raises a  
whole load of other questions; what about specific  
sexual positions? sex toys?

Definitely, to "use" a woman includes sex. But... my  
laundry maid isn't used sexually. I looked at the root  
word that is used, and it is used as "use" in a wide  
variety of contexts. If only the word occurred more  
than once, to see it used in a wider array of  
contexts.

You linked to "chresis", which is a form of "chraomai"  
<http://biblehub.com/greek/5530.htm>

Ok, maybe there is another way to go about this:

Let us look at the word "likewise". The man had unnatural lusts towards each other, and LIKEWISE the woman... Or in the literal word for word version, we get that the natural use of the women had been changed or abandoned, and then LIKEWISE, the men were lusting after each other.

In Toad's scenario though, the women never left their natural use; they were focused on the man, on his pleasure. They were competing for his grace, which is natural.

**101. MycroftJones**

**October 4, 2015 at 10:02AM**

To summarize: does "chresis" denote "sexual use" by itself, or is it the surrounding context that does? I know for sure the surrounding context gives it a sexual meaning.

If Rachel and Leah were deciding what nights Jacob got to sleep with them, that is a strong indicator against girl-girl; the women were maintaining their personal boundaries.

**102. MycroftJones**

**October 4, 2015 at 10:03AM**

In other words, a Biblical marriage contract would spell out the sexual arrangements. This would remove a source of competition and uncertainty, and in fact the wife would see girl-girl as encroaching on her personal territory.

**103. Mark Call**

**October 5, 2015 at 7:17AM**

I know you think you've included THE primary argument there, ST, but it's a bit more glaring.

Paul of course KNEW the Torah. And he would NOT have added to, nor subtracted from it. (ESPECIALLY

after being so dramatically "called out" for doing so on the 'road to Damascus'.)

But do you note how he very regularly cites Scripture to makes his arguments?

Unless, perhaps, he realizes it's obvious to the reader!

104. [MycroftJones](#)

October 5, 2015 at 1:30 PM

SimplyTimothy, very busy today, I'll go over your links more carefully tomorrow. Thanks.

Two comments for now. Sexual morality swings like a pendulum; 200 years ago it wasn't too different from how it is now. From reading Roman primary sources, including the Satyricon from Nero's time, and the Marquis de Sade, I can say "there is nothing new under the sun", we are just now approaching the depravity of Nero's time. Tiberius and Augustus Caesar were pretty depraved too.

As for "natural", ever been in a barnyard? Female cows mount each other all the time. Mind you, in a barnyard, even cross-species humping is common. And if you believe some of the hybrid evidence, cross-species happens a fair amount even in nature. I saw a video of a wild baboon kidnapping a young dog, then humping her.

105. [Mark Call](#)

October 6, 2015 at 7:13 AM

@ST -- I'll admit it -- I don't follow this:

[simplytimothy said](#):

**Before the 'connect the dots...' admission (see [@15](#) ), I assumed that you had a case and that sexual norms where radically different, common and culturally accepted that it was imperative on me to put myself into that frame of thinking and see it from the STRICT do not add/subtract view that I assumed you where arguing from.**

So far, so good. That is true. And Shaul/Paul is making a point FROM Torah, not trying to rewrite it.

**Now that we know that heuristics are part of your reasoning too, then the STRICT view is kaboshed. We share a '..dot..dot..dot..' view of what God intends us to do on this earth (yes, we get it wrong sometimes, that is not the point)**

Fine. I don't see the conflict (but I do MAYBE see the issue!)

Rule over your house, as head of house. Connect the dots for your family. If we disagree over what you do in your house, the problem is mine.

The romanized 'church' declares that laity (the peons) do NOT have the Right, or the ability to actually read Scripture for themselves. They play god, and tell Him what He got wrong. Polygyny, easy example. Xmas, Ishtar, sun-god day, and so on. Adding and subtracting all OVER the place.

Paul says, "*You are his slave whom you submit yourself to obey.*" (Romans 6:16) -- whether to YHVH and His Torah, or idolatry, or the Biggest Brother you can imagine.

My point remains. There have ALWAYS been things that are NOT prohibited in Torah. Just NOT.

NO MAN has the authority from YHVH to then prohibited those things (adding to, or subtracting from) for another except BY THEIR ASSENT.

Covenant is one way. There are other types of agreement (including slavery by contract). And coercion exists, too -- but it is not of Him.

When it comes to "connecting the dots" -- it's VITAL to know Who we serve. And by what Authority someone claims to connect them FOR YOU.

106. SirHamster

October 6, 2015 at 10:09 AM

*This comment has been removed by the author.*

107. SirHamster

October 6, 2015 at 10:10 AM

[simplytimothy said:](#)

As for "natural", ever been in a barnyard?

I live among pastures, I have yet to see it.

Also note that "natural" is being used in different senses. Natural Law isn't defined as the things men "naturally" do, or it would just be called Natural Behavior.

108. Mark Call

October 7, 2015 at 6:16 AM

@ST...sorry....bzzt:

[simplytimothy said:](#)

Let me try to clarify; here is an example of strict reasoning that does not allow '..dot..dot..dot..'

*The Law does not specify that women are prohibited from kidnapping a man and selling him into slavery.*

Wrong. The use of the male gender in Hebrew is GENERIC. Thus, PEOPLE are prohibited from ...

Example fails.

-----

And you missed the point.

"Dot connection" is what we are supposed to do. Use the brains He gave us. (I have no problem calling it "direction from the Ruach HaKodesh" if you prefer.) BUT it is YOUR 'direction' from the Holy Spirit.

It confers no Authority to command OTHERS (unless by Covenant, such as a wife) to follow your understanding. And it confers no Authority to BREAK commandments from Him, in Writing.

109. SirHamster

October 7, 2015 at 8:50 AM



[simplytimothy said:](#)

I don't see that interpretation given the Strong's definition: <http://biblehub.com/greek/5446.htm>

Wasn't looking at the Greek, but how "natural", the same word, is being used with different meanings in this discussion.

"Natural" was being used as "happens in nature" by one of sentences I quoted. (Everything is natural in that sense)

I do not think that is the meaning of Paul when he condemns both male and female abandonment of "natural" sexual relations, exchanged for un"natural" sexual acts such as male homosexuality. How can what happened by human desire be "outside of nature" by that first definition? It can't; so the meaning of "natural" is something else.

NLT uses "normal" for that verse. Homosexuality, in animals or humans, is definitely abnormal.

**110. Mark Call**

October 7, 2015 at 9:27 AM

And before the response comes...yes, like in English the male gender conjugation is used for mixed groups, but we still somehow manage to know the difference when a reference is specific to ONLY men. (As in, a "man lying with a man as with a woman." The fact that there ARE explicit prohibitions concerning incest and bestiality, but NOT " a woman lying with a woman" is in fact telling. Numbers 30, likewise, makes the distinction clear, and so on. )

**111. MycroftJones**

October 7, 2015 at 5:26 PM

@ST interesting, tonight a local study group is discussing this very topic of "covenant" and what it means. I pointed out a few weeks ago it just means "cutting or separation of flesh", then touched on Jeremiah 31:34, so tonight we'll be looking into the ramifications. The very concept of "covenant" and

"Testament" affects how we relate to Jesus in a major way.

112. MycroftJones

October 8, 2015 at 7:59 PM

More on marriage in the Bible. A friend last night pointed out the word "cleave", Hebrew "dabaq". A man shall leave father and mother and cleave to his wife. So I looked it up. It is used once in a way that could mean "marriage". And a bunch of times it is used to indicate following God, being loyal to God. At heart, the word means "chase", and "overtake", with the implication "follow closely, stick to".

Is a man supposed to chase his wife around all the time? No... I believe "cleave" describes the process. The man leaves father and mother. Chases a woman until he catches her. Then they become one. At that point he should be leading her, not following her.

113. MycroftJones

October 8, 2015 at 8:01 PM

As per the Bible, I don't believe in marriage; I believe in cleavage. :) (Genesis 2:24)

This page shows the different usages of "dabaq" in the Bible; it is illuminating.

<https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/Lexicon/Lexicon.cfm?strongs=H1692&t=KJV>

114. SirHamster

October 9, 2015 at 11:53 AM

[MycroftJones said:](#)

These "violent dangerous young unmarried men" invading Europe; well, that is what they do. Back when Europe was vigorous, they deflowered the populations of the world in the same way. You missed the point: in their home environment, they are *well behaved betas* who almost all get married before the age of 40. They come to the west where patriarchy is suppressed, their behavior is a natural consequence. Not the fault of polygamy but of Western weakness. *You hate*

*foreign men doing what you allow the local men to do? Sounds hypocritical. Western weakness is because it has rejected the Torah of the Creator.*

Can't resist. From [VP](#).

*"Many Muslims are refusing treatment by female staff and, we, women, are refusing to go among those animals, especially from Africa. Relations between the staff and migrants are going from bad to worse. Since last weekend, migrants going to the hospitals must be accompanied by police with K-9 units.*

*Many migrants have AIDS, syphilis, open TB and many exotic diseases that we, in Europe, do not know how to treat them. If they receive a prescription in the pharmacy, they learn they have to pay cash. This leads to unbelievable outbursts, especially when it is about drugs for the children. **They abandon the children with pharmacy staff with the words: "So, cure them here yourselves!"** So the police are not just guarding the clinics and hospitals, but also large pharmacies.*

*Until now, the number of unemployed in Germany was 2.2 million. Now it will be at least 3.5 million. **Most of these people are completely unemployable.** A bare minimum of them have any education. What is more, their women usually do not work at all. I estimate that one in ten is pregnant. Hundreds of thousands of them have brought along infants and little kids under six, many emaciated and neglected. If this continues and German re-opens its borders, I'm going home to the Czech Republic. Nobody can keep me here in this situation, not even double the salary than at home. I went to Germany, not to Africa or the Middle East.*

*Even the professor who heads our department told us how sad it makes him to see the cleaning woman, who for 800 Euros cleans every day for years, and then meets young men in the hallways who just wait with their hand outstretched, want everything for free, and when they don't get it they throw a fit.*

*I really don't need this! But I'm afraid that if I return, that at some point it will be the same in the Czech Republic. If the Germans, with their nature cannot handle this, there in Czechia it would be total chaos. Nobody who has not come in contact with them has no idea what kind of animals they are, especially the ones from Africa, and how Muslims act superior to our staff, regarding their religious accommodation."*

To be clear, Liar, I don't "allow" any of this. I don't control society or its rules. But faced with evil and injustice, I do not lie about it for the sake of "polygyny".

I genuinely invited you to this thread to make a case for the positive benefits of polygamy. The pile of lies you have left behind instead are a damning indictment. Instead of wondering about your reasoning and thinking process, I have to step back and recognize the big picture: these lies are your best argument.

Well then.

115. Mark Call

October 9, 2015 at 1:19 PM

So stick to Scripture!!!!

The Patriarchs of YHVH, and examples like Moses and King David, should be enough to prove that His Instruction beats the hell (literally!) of the pagan traditions of men.

And if THAT's not enough, look and see what "the church" has done with licensed 'marriage'.

116. MycroftJones

October 9, 2015 at 1:24 PM

Mark Call, the licensed marriage thing began because interracial marriage was illegal. So a license was a special permit to marry interracially.

However, all marriages today do need a license, for

a simple reason: slavery was outlawed. Since ownership of humans is illegal, the government put a special "license" in place so a man could have a wife. However, even those ownership rights have been stripped over time, just leaving a meaningless "license" in its place, a status marker for women to show off that they have a man.

117. **MycroftJones**

October 9, 2015 at 6:17 PM

HamsterDance: I heard that if you insult someone enough times, Jesus lets you straight into Heaven and gives you 40 virgins.

118. **SirHamster**

October 9, 2015 at 6:29 PM

**I heard that if you insult someone enough times**

...

Calling you a liar is an observation.

I guess if you have a time machine, you could indeed have personal experience with China's polygamous society. Back when it was the sick man of Asia, dominated and colonized by the non-polygamous Western world.

Should have told them to stay the course on polygamy. That would have fixed everything.

119. **MycroftJones**

October 9, 2015 at 9:33 PM

A time machine back to yesterday. Fuck, do your own field research man. Putting your trust in books is the road to perdition. Stories like this don't happen without some surrounding context:  
<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/peoplesdaily/article-3219690/Welcome-sex-capital-China-Inside-sin-city-s-normal-one-man-girlfriends-pay-carry-dating-them.html>

Try this one:

<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/04/14/china-s-concubine-culture-lives-on-in-mistress->

villages.html

If you like Asian women, just drop the "shouldn't first wives treat mistresses nicely?" line into your game. Watch how they respond. Women from a monogamous culture don't respond that way.

120. SirHamster

October 9, 2015 at 10:52 PM

So your evidence of a polygamous society is Chinese men having multiple girlfriends, and rich men having mistresses.

Says such a mistress from your second link: *"It is a good way to save money, and when I finally go home I can get married and start my own business. We like each other, and I think he's proud of me, but I'm not a xiaosan, so I know it will end some day."* Xiaosan is literally "third person," or a home wrecker."

Does "home wrecker" imply acceptance or permanence? She's little more than a prostitute, performing sexual favors for money to invest in her own separate future.

So this is your grand discovery from personal experience? That some Chinese men have multiple girlfriends, like any Western PUA? And that China has prostitutes? And this makes China's entire 1.3 billion population polygamous?

Here's a thought experiment for you, to demonstrate some cognitive capabilities. What might I know about Chinese culture as a college educated Californian? Describe the possibilities.

121. MycroftJones

October 10, 2015 at 12:16 AM

Are you a college educated Californian? Your snide tone... straight out of Berkeley. Are you from UCB?

122. SirHamster

October 10, 2015 at 8:19 AM

[SirHamster said:](#)

So this is your grand discovery from personal experience? That some Chinese men have multiple girlfriends, like any Western PUA? And that China has prostitutes? And this makes China's entire 1.3 billion population polygamous?

Well?

[MycroftJones said:](#)

Are you a college educated Californian? Your snide tone... straight out of Berkeley. Are you from UCB?

That's all? The only thing of interest to you is how you can use it to disqualify me personally?

What might I know about Chinese culture if I were from UCB?

123. [MycroftJones](#)      October 11, 2015 at 12:30 AM

*This comment has been removed by the author.*

124. [MycroftJones](#)      October 11, 2015 at 4:57 PM

Finally finished reading the other thread late last night, all 970 posts.

ST: if a woman touches another woman sexually, can it be said that she is "wearing the garb of a man"? Of course it can; but can we get some scripture to back it up.

It seems to me that the girl-girl scenarios Toad brings up, involve unmarried women. Women who are insecure in an uncommitted relationship will do anything to keep their man around, even be with another woman. If the man is performing his "duty of marriage" as per the Bible, and the woman has the "marriage contract", that gives her a lot of stability; she has no need to win her husband over with girl-girl; she already has him.

Notice Leah didn't offer to do a night of girl-girl

with Jacob; she purchased one of Rachel's nights with her son's mandrakes. Rachel already had Jacob's love; she had no incentive to share.

The larger harems are said to have girl-girl. As are nunneries. This doesn't threaten the succession, since no children can be born.

A woman cannot become "one" with another woman (DNA transfer), so there is no "garb of a man" violation there. How about that word "cleave/cling/overtake". This overtaking or clinging to a woman, that is the garb of a man. Can we say girl-girl is forbidden based on that? Can we legitimately say that girl-girl involves one woman clinging or overtaking (dabaq) another? If so, then problem solved, case closed.

Girl-girl strikes me as the female equivalent of masturbation. It is a sin, in as much as sin means "failure"; failure to breed, failure to fit bolt A into hole B. But not the same type of sin as adultery, rebellion, or witchcraft.

Girl-girl to please a husband is unnecessary in a Biblical cleavage, since the written contract spells out an arrangement fair to both, so the woman's sexual needs are met in a secure and stable manner.

Girl-girl in a large harem, because the women are sexually deprived... this seems to me a natural response to a larger problem of a man biting off more than he could chew. King David kept his harem down to 20; he managed it well. Solomon may have had girl-girl going on in his harem. He doesn't say. As long as they didn't breed with other men, he probably didn't care.

125. SirHamster

October 12, 2015 at 4:29 PM

**I don't know. I do not see a way to make this about anything other than lesbian sex.**

There's bestiality. (Lev 18:23). I think both AT and MC have attempted to make that case with their interpretation. (as well as disputing the use of the word "lesbian")



126. MycroftJones      October 12, 2015 at 10:22 PM

T, I see "natural relations" being broken when women sleep around without intent to marry, and when they use "the pill" to prevent a foetus from growing. That is, they practice sex without being owned by a man or submitting to him.

127. SirHamster      October 13, 2015 at 9:47 AM

[simplytimothy said:](#)

**So, how do I go about showing that is true? What evidence is there for these being the case?**

This interpretation relies on examining the practice of a people/culture 3,000+ years ago; assumes that our culture is so alien that what we now think is wrong was right to them; but that their standard of right/wrong is more correct than ours (at least on this particular topic).

If it isn't already written down and available for examination, we're not likely to find any evidence at all. At some point, it is impossible to know it because the historical traces has faded away.

There is also the possibility that common practice got it wrong. After all, Israel has a long track record of "doing evil in the eyes of the Lord", which suggests that it was not evil in the eyes of men.

128. SirHamster      October 14, 2015 at 2:44 PM

**Did you read the Seneca link?**

I had not, thank you for bringing it to my attention. Interestingly, I've been reading about Seneca in another context. I cannot help but find this of interest:

*Men say: "The happy life consists in upright conduct; precepts guide one to upright conduct; therefore precepts are sufficient for attaining the happy life." But they do not always guide us to upright conduct; this occurs only when the will is*

*receptive; and sometimes they are applied in vain, when wrong opinions obsess the soul.*

Some other recent reading of interest:

*For people will be lovers of self, lovers of money, proud, arrogant, abusive, disobedient to their parents, ungrateful, unholy, heartless, unappeasable, slanderous, without self-control, brutal, not loving good, treacherous, reckless, swollen with conceit, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God, having the appearance of godliness, but denying its power. Avoid such people. For among them are those who creep into households and capture weak women, burdened with sins and led astray by various passions, always learning and never able to arrive at a knowledge of the truth. Just as Jannes and Jambres opposed Moses, so these men also oppose the truth, men corrupted in mind and disqualified regarding the faith. But they will not get very far, for their folly will be plain to all, as was that of those two men. (2 Timothy 3)*

129. MycroftJones

October 15, 2015 at 12:20 PM

Wedding feast is different from a marriage ceremony. As practiced today, you have the exchange of vows. That is the ceremony. Then you have the "reception", eating drinking and dancing. This is the "wedding feast". In Genesis, the ceremony was very simple; it was no more or less than the negotiating and agreeing to a contract between the man and the woman's owner. In the case of David and Abigail, it appears she owned herself once her husband died.

I didn't say bris or cleaving is all there is. Nor did I say that bris and cleaving are the same thing. I thought I distinguished them: bris is the parting of flesh. cleaving is the "chasing/overtaking". cleaving happens first, then the "becoming into one", of which the first becoming into one is also a bris.

130. MycroftJones

October 15, 2015 at 12:21 PM

When salesmen sign a big contract, don't they party?  
When a man finds a wife, why not hold a feast? Of course Jesus would attend such a natural function.

**131. MycroftJones**      **October 15, 2015 at 12:23 PM**

I use different terms from Toad. I tried to contact him in private, but communication is spotty, so I don't see convergence happening at the moment. I don't believe in marriage, I believe in cleavage.

**132. MycroftJones**      **October 15, 2015 at 12:29 PM**

All sex involves a relationship. Not all relationships involve sex. Thanks for the Seneca quotes. When he described women "acting as men in male company", that sounded exactly like women "wearing the garb of a male".

I think this is the crux of the matter:

Is it possible for a woman to sexually touch another woman without ONE of them (possibly both) taking on the garb/position of a male?

The two situations where girl-girl happens naturally, are actually ruled out by scripture. I refer to the harem/sexual deprivation scenario, and the "two women competing for one man" scenario. Scripture regulates polygamy so as to prevent both of those scenarios.

As for girl-girl outside of a Biblical cleavage, it is generally a situation where there is no male contact, and young women's hormones are raging. Such as old time nunneries, and modern day Arab countries. Or there was some type of sexual interference at a young age that twisted the young woman and led her to man-hating.

**133. MycroftJones**      **October 15, 2015 at 5:58 PM**

More about the Arab countries: once they are officially married, men and women gratefully give

up both anal sex, and homosexual relationships. As a general rule. 9 times out of 10. I think this is an argument for early marriage.

134. SirHamster                      October 16, 2015 at 7:14 AM

[simplytimothy said:](#)

The silence of the dykes speaks loudly.

Well put. Ha!

135. Mark Call                        October 16, 2015 at 11:48 AM

[simplytimothy said:](#)

A quick thought experiment. Suppose lesbianism was rampant in the time of Rome.

I say again: Where was the Isle of Lesbos?

Stick to what His Written Instruction actually says!!!

And I really can't help but wonder:

If you guys keep insisting on wanting to "*twist Paul*" --

when are you gonna get around to banning *oral sex*?

136. MycroftJones                    October 16, 2015 at 5:45 PM

MC, they can't ban oral sex. It is in the Bible (Song of Solomon). Also, in nature, oral sex is a type of foreplay for many species.

137. MycroftJones                    October 17, 2015 at 10:11 AM

ST

Only a sexual act between man and woman where there is a sperm exchange, can possibly "become into one flesh". Paul says you even become one flesh when you go into a harlot.

Since sex is an act of submission for a woman, and noone can slave for two masters, she must limit all her romantic affections to her husband.

138. MycroftJones

October 17, 2015 at 2:06 PM

I'll try to answer [@191](#) more clearly.

cleaving/overtaking can include courtship, but is any means by which you take a woman as your own property. Think of it like lassoing a heifer at a rodeo. Since owning humans is illegal today, this is a quite difficult process.

bris isn't marriage. bris means "covenant", or "parting of flesh". circumcision is a bris. sacrificing an animal and eating it with another person can be a bris, as it was for Jacob and Laban. So, penetrating a virgin so she bleeds, is a bris. Shedding of blood indicates something is meant to be "to the death".

wedding feast is just modern translation; but it does fit. When there is a cleavage between man and woman, it is celebrated and thus acknowledged by the community, followed shortly by the covenant itself. Cherry on top, as it were.

I could speak of a "cleavage celebration", that would clear up any baggage associated with "wedding feast".

139. Mark Call

October 18, 2015 at 7:03 AM

**RE: History and 'where does the word LESBIAN come from', and,**

**"If you guys keep insisting on wanting to *"twist Paul"* --**

**when are you gonna get around to banning *oral sex*?**

**...Duh... can you not even spot "irony" when it smacks you in the face?**

“Lesbos” is where the name comes from, nothing more. A quick rejoinder, like asking someone who suggests a thought experiment about sodomy if he's ever heard of a place called “Sodom”. Yes, there IS history on the subject.

As for this idiocy [yes] -

[simplytimothy said:](#)

**Specify the twist. I do not have time for any more riddles and guessing games. I wasted a month on the plain reading "Do not add or subtract" and I do not want to waste any more time.**

**There is no reasoning stronger than what I have seen from the plain grammar of St. Paul's passage on this matter.**

So we are forced to conclude you would ban oral sex, or anything else that doesn't fit YOUR reading of the "plain grammar" of a multiply-translated 'Paul'?

...dot-dot-dot...

Pull off the blinders!!!!

I GUARANTEE you there are *Xtian Fathers* who can twist the “plain grammar of St. Paul” (as Kefa warned against!) in IGNORANCE of the rest of “Torah” to forbid “oral sex” because THEY say it's not the natural use of the woman. Or a dozen other excuses to PROHIBIT something YHVH does NOT.

Because, as Kefa said (II Peter 3:15-16) said, the “unlearned and untaught” twist something they didn't bother to read “to their own destruction”. And, as Yahushua condemned, they heap burdens on others they aren't even able to bear themselves. Can't connect dots for YOURSELF? No wonder you don't understand parables.

Forget Seneca, man. You wanna understand Shaul? His mindset was Hebraic, not pagan. Read a guy named Yahushua.