

VILE MODERATOR

FACELESS

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](#)

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

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2015

Girls Gone Wild

Work it out here.

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

386 COMMENTS:

«[Oldest](#) [Older](#) 201 - 386 of 386

201. [MycroftJones](#) October 18, 2015 at 10:16 AM

MC, your behavior is uncalled for. May YHWH be merciful to you.

202. [SirHamster](#) October 18, 2015 at 5:19 PM

Appealing to Oral Sex has got to be the strangest argument in favor of interpreting Scripture in a certain way that I have ever heard. Telling, too.

Congrats on breaking 200 comments. Hopefully that will be useful for comment system improvement.

203. [Mark Call](#) October 19, 2015 at 2:03 PM

[SirHamster](#) said:

Appealing to Oral Sex has got to be the strangest argument in favor of interpreting Scripture in a certain way that I have ever heard.

It's an argument AGAINST the "adding to" that characterizes the idiocy here. The fact that you two are blind to it is far more telling. But no longer the least bit surprising.

204. [SirHamster](#) October 19, 2015 at 3:00 PM

[Mark Call](#) said:

It's an argument AGAINST the "adding to" that characterizes the idiocy here. The fact that you two are blind to it is far more telling. But no longer the least bit surprising.

No one here has argued against oral sex. What are you using my non-position on oral sex as evidence for? Since when has oral sex been a litmus test for qualification to handle Scripture?

But rather than answer those questions, I'd rather you retract or back up your previous assertion that my [stated logic](#) is wrong.

How is it a man proud to advertise his own teaching via podcast and website is afraid to back up his own words?

205. [MycroftJones](#) October 19, 2015 at 3:55 PM

MC: I tried to reason with you in private. You are making a fool of yourself in public. You are mixing good Bible interpretation with girly whining and doctrinal junk. As Timothy said, you've wasted more than a month of his time. From reading your posts, I realize how bad Hebrew Roots is; I thought it was aligned with theonomy and Reconstructionism. Instead, it is like the retarded kid brother who wants to be King of the Castle.

[Vol 1.8:](#) Steve Keen
[Vol 1.9:](#) James Delingpole

INTERVIEWS

[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

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.

206. Mark Call

October 19, 2015 at 4:34 PM

You are an asshole in private, which is why I quit even trying to "reason" with you in public OR private. As you said, you have no interest in dialog. But your posturing is beyond belief.

Timothy is presumably a big boy; he can decide for himself how to spend his time. I've made it clear to you that I will waste no more of mine on you.

But you and the hamster do seem made for one another. He can't follow even simple logic, you refuse to.

207. Mark Call

October 19, 2015 at 4:50 PM

@SH - since you are just too dense to figure it out:

Except for incredible flatulence like the above, I have successfully tried to ignore you on this entire thread. No, I don't use any of your appropriately described 'non-positions' for ANYTHING.

The only reason I've sorted through the Vile Faceless Tripe here has been for an occasional reasonable question from ST. If that is at an end, so is my participation.

208. SirHamster

October 19, 2015 at 5:02 PM

He can't follow even simple logic

So you say. That's 3 challenges from me to elaborate it that you have fled from.

I also have not accused the blog admin of secretly censoring me to explain the absence of my response(s). And you continue to use his platform even now.

Feeling too lonely on your own blog?

209. Mark Call

October 19, 2015 at 5:29 PM

@ST:

Since perhaps you missed the point amidst all the[stuff]... in here:

[simplytimothy said:](#)

[Romans 1:26-7] For this reason God gave them up to dishonorable passions. For their women exchanged natural relations for those that are contrary to nature; 27and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, men committing shameless acts with men and receiving in themselves the due penalty for their error.

...

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

Later, you added: [simplytimothy said:](#)

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

as 'girl-on-girl' was the only possible reading of that "plain grammar."

I pointed out that, when it comes to PROHIBITING THINGS not prohibited by His Instruction, that just doesn't fly.

If you IGNORE the Torah, and re-read that Romans text, it's not difficult AT ALL to concoct a rationale for prohibiting ALL KINDS of things, INCLUDING, but not limited to, "oral sex".

I'd've thought that was pretty damned obvious. And so is my point, repeated ad

nauseum. And so is Yahushua's, and Paul's.

But I'm disgusted with the flatulence. And since I've already said repeatedly all that matters regarding the "twisting" of Shaul (as did Kefa, also quoted more than once), the "words in red" that get ignored, and "prior arguments do not cut it" anyway --

I'm done wasting my time.

210. SirHamster

October 19, 2015 at 5:46 PM

[Mark Call said:](#)

No, I don't use any of your appropriately described 'non-positions' for ANYTHING.

Forgetting what you said already?

[Mark Call said:](#)

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

when are you gonna get around to banning oral sex?

In this thread, there is me, ST, MJ, and yourself. "you guys" is plural and in the context of this thread following @193, referring to me and ST. Continuing the context of the sentence, "when are you" would also be plural, again referring to me and ST.

The logic you used is that (1) twisting Paul results in banning oral sex ... and (2) I and ST are twisting Paul, and thus (3) I and ST want to ban oral sex (or are logically inconsistent and not credible)

So you said that if I and ST were logically consistent in how we twist Paul, we'd support banning oral sex, with a logical implication that that's an unimaginable conclusion to any right thinking Bible-believing God-fearing man.

So no, you did make a claim that I'd have a certain position on oral sex and used it as an attack on my credibility. Which also makes a lie of your claim about "successfully trying to ignore".

Is it asking too much of you to own your words, Mark Call? How do you think yourself to have credibility to handle God's words when you can't even handle your own?

211. MycroftJones

October 19, 2015 at 7:08 PM

MC: you say you quit trying to reason with me in private; I reviewed our correspondence. You can't quit what you never started. As for me refusing to dialog... not in private correspondence. Find the comment where I specifically said that, without some sort of qualifier. Or stand forth as a liar. You are one of those who destroy the Gospel by mixing it with leaven.

212. MycroftJones

October 19, 2015 at 9:52 PM

ST: I read the PDF link. Sounded pretty much like today, except that today there is fisting.

213. Mark Call

October 21, 2015 at 12:48 PM

[simplytimothy said:](#)

It is not the only possible, just the plainest reading of the text, supported by cultural references from Seneca and the pdf I linked to.

What do you think it is and why?

Do you agree that toad's "to be a helpmeet to her husband" is utterly wrong? (I do)

thx.

P.S. Please answer in declarative sentences and not with further questions.

The absolutely, positively, ONLY "plain reading of the text" supported by Scripture, AND without question the words of YHVH and ALL of those who "came in His Name" is that Shaul was not "adding to" commandments in Scripture!

Is that declarative enough?

Bestiality is forbidden to both men AND women explicitly in Torah, and thus "against nature," and one obvious plain reading of the text that doesn't require Paul to be a false prophet and a liar. But I cannot DECREE for another man's house that if that husband decides for his wife/wives that nothing but "PIV" is "natural" that he cannot make that determination for himself. Neither can I declare for another man (although 'the church' in myriad papal incarnations and now thousands of denominations has done EXACTLY that) just what he can NOT do with his helpmeets, notwithstanding other obvious strictures such as murder. I would have hoped that point by now was beyond obvious. But Scripture uses terms like "blind" and "stiff-necked" for a reason.

I submit that the following (from the "King's Covenant Word of Yah", OSE1 edition) is a much better rendering of the letter to the Romans (1:26-27). Verse 22 fits here, too, and sets the stage properly:

"Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools...

therefore YHVH gave them up to uncleanness...

...who exchanged the Truth of YHVH for a lie and worshiped and served human idols rather than the Creator...

FOR THIS REASON, YHVH gave them up to vile passions. For their women exchanged their natural relationship into those which make war against the natural.

Break there. What Scripture says and SHOWS, repeatedly, (any non-fool can connect THOSE dots!) is that the natural relationship is for a woman to cleave to her husband, flourish under his covering, and bear his children. This - like all of His Instruction for us - is "not too hard" (Deut. 30:10-15) .

Do I "agree" with toad's characterization? In general, I almost always would have stated things differently.

Is it "utterly wrong" to say a woman is to "be a helpmeet to her husband"? You've GOT to be kidding!

Declarative: A statement claiming that it is utterly wrong for a woman to be a helpmeet to her husband is downright asinine. And Scripturally ignorant.

Do you or I have the authority to tell another man's house what that means for him and his wife? Declarative: Hell, no! Does the 'church'? (Even though they have done exactly that for centuries?) Likewise, hell no. And those who understand that heresy should "come out of her," and "partake NOT of her plagues."

...continued...

214. Mark Call

October 21, 2015 at 12:52 PM

...continued... (again)

Back to verse 27:

Likewise also certain men, leaving the natural relationship with woman, burned in their lust one toward another, men doing what is against even nature with other men and receiving disease into themselves as due punishment of their sin.

Gee, that's pretty darn clear. Some pretty plain text that ought to somehow at

least emphasize just how dramatically different that what Paul is talking about here is from whatever he meant about women. Just *MAYBE* that's because Scripture is. And you don't have to connect ANY dots at all if you just read the text he is referencing. No, it wasn't Seneca, or the current issue of Redbook. It was Leviticus 18:22, with consequences in Leviticus 20:13, with reinforcement at least twice more outside of his letters.

This is NOT hard, ST. It is 17 centuries of twisting that have obfuscated the once-obvious.

Why did Yahushua teach in parables? Isn't it about getting "stiff-necked people" to study, show themselves approved, and LISTEN to what He said, not what "servants of vipers" say He SHOULD have said, if He was as smart as they are?

Uh oh. More questions. Guess where I learned that?

I tire of repeating myself. You say you tire of wasting time 'connecting dots' - while you spend that time correlating things HERE, rather than being "like the Bereans" and just going to read even the obvious things like Deuteronomy 7, 12, 13, and finally 30. THEN read Matthew 5, Mark 7, and John 14. Luke 6:46-49, too! If you have specific questions that I haven't already given specific Scripture for, ask. But do it soon. The stench here from those who have "eyes, but WILL not see" is stultifying. I've wiped the dust off my feet already, but dislike wading through \$#!+.

215. SirHamster

October 23, 2015 at 11:02AM

@ST:

Did you have a category of argument about CHURCH'S AUTHORITY TO JUDGE A MAN'S HOUSEHOLD? I felt inspired to tear this one down.

The argument is that the Church is only given authority to judge a part of a man's life. The Church is NOT to intrude within a man's household and judge how he instructs his wife (and presumably children).

This is obviously contradictory to Scripture.

The Church is instructed to judge

"What business is it of mine to judge those outside the church? Are you not to judge those inside?"

The Church is to judge all things of the world:

"Do you not know that we will judge angels? How much more the things of this life!"

Marriage is a thing of this world (and by extension, related concepts like household, a man's authority over his children, and so on)

"When the dead rise, they will neither marry nor be given in marriage; they will be like the angels in heaven."

The Church has instructions for how husbands and wives are to behave in their own household

"Wives, submit yourselves to your own husbands as you do to the Lord."

"Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her [...]"

The Church even dares to "intrude" on how parents instruct their very own children!

"Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right."

"Fathers, do not exasperate your children; instead, bring them up in the training and instruction of the Lord."

None of this is a surprise to the Bible-believing Christian. Christ lays claim to every aspect of our life - even our very thoughts. All things are to be brought in submission to Him; and the Church has been given the authority, the instruction, and the ability to judge all things - starting with the world now; and to judge even the angels in the end.

What is laughable is a self-proclaimed teacher of the Torah being blind to these

teachings. I wondered if he would reject Paul as an authoritative teacher when he said that "Paul was [twisted](#)". I was surprised to see him generally accept Paul as an authority and cite him.

I suspect the nonsense about Paul needing to be referred to as "Saul" was to set the stage for rationalize away any of his teaching as a mistranslation of the "True Hebrew Meaning".

216. MycroftJones

October 23, 2015 at 11:37AM

In the other thread, Toad narrowed his "church can't judge my private business" statement. He qualified it with "except in cases of sin". That is, if the Word doesn't forbid girl-girl, the Church can't either. If the Word does, then the Church can.

To that I would add, Jesus did give Peter the "keys" to the Kingdom. The apostles had the right to interpret the Law, so if they said "the Word clearly does mean no girl-girl", you had to follow the delegated authority, which came directly from Christ.

As of today, it is... murky, to know who has the keys to the Kingdom. There are multiple claimants, Catholicism, Orthodoxy, and among the Protestants, their "priesthood of all believers" concept.

217. MycroftJones

October 25, 2015 at 5:07 PM

timothy, what is TOBE?

218. MycroftJones

October 26, 2015 at 3:34 PM

Reading your post [@221](#), I am astonished.

The way you are reading Paul, the Law that God gave to Israel, actually aroused them to sin, caused them, led them, tempted them to sin. That reading flatly contradicts the entire old testament which spoke of how perfect and wonderful the Law is, a Law of LIFE, not death.

Read Paul and be a Good Christian, just as Marcion was. As for me, I will serve the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Your faith is based on Christian tradition; mine on the Bible.

ST, I have one question: have you ever read the Bible from beginning to end, in order.

219. MycroftJones

October 26, 2015 at 3:35 PM

On what basis do you say that the Saducees rejected the book of Deuteronomy?

220. MycroftJones

October 27, 2015 at 11:09 PM

Quote from Bart Ehrman, gives insight into what Paul meant by "natural use of the female". Gives credence to Toad.

The domestic nature of a woman's virtues generally required her to keep out of the public eye – at least this is what the Roman men who wrote moral essays for women urged them to do. This meant that they were not to speak in public debates, they were not to exercise authority over their husbands, and they were not to be involved with other men sexually, since this would mean that one man was dominating the wife of another, calling into question the husband's own power and, consequently, his honor.

For this reason, women who sought to exercise any power or authority over men were thought to be "unnatural." When women did attain levels of authority – as was happening with increasing regularity in the Roman world during the time of the New Testament – they were often viewed suspiciously and maligned for not knowing their place of submission, for not maintaining properly female virtues,

and for being sexually aggressive, even if their personal sex lives were totally unknown.

<http://ehrmanblog.org/male-domination-antiquity-members/>

221. Mark Call

October 28, 2015 at 9:08 AM

You missed the WHOLE point.

Torah is "instruction", not "Law". His Instruction is complete, and sufficient, for those with "ears to hear," and "eyes to see".

It is downright idiotic to deny that the purpose of "instruction" is to enable those who seek to "follow Him" to use the BRAIN He gave you to "connect the dots."

And if you allow some "man" or "traditions of man" to do it for you, instead of "studying, to show yourself approved" to "rightly divide the Word" (ALL of it!) --

well, connect the dots.

I think I'm done here. II Peter 3:15-16 still applies.

222. MycroftJones

October 29, 2015 at 12:25 AM

simplytimothy, your "natural use" argument doesn't quite fly; it is based on a dictionary definition that adds "sexual" in brackets. But where did the dictionary get its definition? The (sexual) in brackets looked speculative to me. I just quoted Bible scholar Bart Ehrman with regard to "natural use" of the woman, and it had a different meaning than sexual use. Women wanting to be men (dominant, masculine), and men wanting to be women (effeminate, gay) sounds exactly like a good understanding of Paul.

If we can argue that a woman kissing a woman is taking on the "garb of a man", then the argument is won, girl-girl is forbidden. I notice on Toad's latest blog entry, he specifically ruled out kissing between the women from his girl-girl scenario. He also ruled out female contact without the husbands presence and permission. Almost as if he anticipated this argument. The more that Toad specifies and narrows down his scenario, the harder it gets to attack it on Scriptural grounds. Or even on emotional grounds.

In reply to @228 thank you for the mention of Grant Horner's method. Fascinating. I came up with something similar, that uses 3 tracks instead of 10. I use it as a 3 year reading cycle for use in home study groups.

I understand Christianity 101. I enjoy CS Lewis writing. Screwtape letters, Great Divorce, etc. I find him more emotional and mythological in his writing, than factual and scholarly. He started out as an atheist, and a pagan. The stories of his dalliance with a married woman call his intentions into question. I believe his conversion was a social convenience, a way of signalling to the hierarchy that he is willing to play ball and submit his brain to the intellectual absurdities they impose.

What is more important, is that from the earliest days, Christianity has swayed in many winds, a faith different from the Bible.

That whole "Jesus was the Perfect sacrifice" is Christian doctrine, but it isn't what the Bible says. It is a reference to the book of Hebrews, which says something else; it says the purpose of the animal sacrifices NEVER WAS to make you perfect. Ergo, they were for something else.

If you were to skip Jack Horners method for one cycle, and hold this question in your mind: "Is the Law good, bad, done away with, and when" while reading from beginning to end, you would have to change your view. Preponderance of evidence. What came later can't nullify what came before. When you find a tiny handful of verses that seem to preach against the Law, when the bulk of the New Testament speaks favorably of the Law, it is not good procedure to prefer Christian tradition over the Word itself. This is the thing Jesus condemned the Pharisees for.

On the role of women, you brought up the Talmud. I didn't. Since it is irrelevant, let us mention it no more.

223. MycroftJones

October 29, 2015 at 12:25 AM

[@229](#)

Regarding Godel, my own procedure has been to identify areas of ambiguity. Over time, sometimes they resolve. Other times they don't. Where things are ambiguous, I condemn no one. That is why, even though my gut first told me Toad is wrong, I can't condemn him; he pointed out that there is some genuine ambiguity. Amiguity meaning we can read it his way; and we can read it against his way. Until those who have the "Keys to the Kingdom" are clearly identified (it isn't you, Timothy, and I make no such claim myself), the discussion has gone as far as it can unless we can find some fresh scripture that sheds light on the matter.

The Law of God is perfect; but not in the Godel sense. It is sufficient for God's purposes; perhaps not for ours.

I didn't realize you were applying Godel to the Law of God. In fact, as in every religion, the Law of God has escape clauses for situations of ambiguity. For instance, at the mouth of two or three witnesses someone will be stoned. Or "the priest shall consult the Urim and the Thummim" Ambiguity and incomplete knowledge are facts of life; God made it that way. We are mortal. It doesn't make God's Law any less beneficial or perfect.

Hebrew Roots has a lot of false doctrine. But the core premise, elucidated by Bivin and Blizzard in their foundational book "Understanding the Difficult Words of Jesus: New Insights From a Hebrew Perspective", is correct. To understand the New Testament, we need better understanding of the Hebrew context. There are some quite dramatic differences found when you tie things back to the Old Testament, using the Septuagint as the linguistic linkage.

It boils down to this: Is the Bible the word of God. If it is, Christianity must go.

Civilization is degenerate and over-rated ;) You can have hot showers and hot meals without it. In fact, Christian civilization is hypocritical, unkind, endorses whoredom, adultery, and sinfulness of all sorts, oppresses the fatherless, widows the seduced maid. Oh, not in word. Not in word. But in deed. It is built into the structure. Trying to be holier than the Law of Moses, Christianity has laws and rules that are too heavy, that push people into sin. This is the opposite of what Christ preached; his burden was light, not heavy.

As for you chalking it up to competing "dot-dot-dot" systems, that doesn't work either. If you start from a common set of facts and reason it out, you won't come to conflicting views. You will find points of ambiguity. Which we can only assume is God's intention; if something matters, he tells us. How many times does Scripture tell us to keep the sabbath and not eat fat? More than any other commands.

Then there is the whole question of "what about people who never even had access to the Bible, how did they do God's will, were they just animals, to live and die the natural way?"

224. SirHamster

October 30, 2015 at 7:29 AM

@ST

Agreed that there is nothing superior to what we have already known. The posturing of "better" understanding proves empty and is reminiscent of snake in Garden.

See how void of reference to Christ's practice and priorities either were. They freely judge Christians while simpering "don't judge me!"

Stand firm and the devil will flee.

225. MycroftJones

October 31, 2015 at 1:02 AM

Not that it is relevant, but I looked up the Maimonides quote. He did forbid lesbian acts, but also stated that it was not punishable, and that he couldn't find a prohibition against it in Torah.

https://books.google.ca/books?id=xOmU5q1x8HsC&pg=PA89&lpg=PA89&dq=maimonides+lesbian&source=bl&ots=kKqBklrMopG&sig=ApBZGL32qt5hLf_tpT96FJzB7wM&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0CCKQ6AEwAmoVChMlyJXG0

226. MycroftJones

October 31, 2015 at 4:48 PM

ST, girl-girl and polygyny are very different issues. On the topic of polygyny, I can find 5 scenarios in scripture where it is positively COMMANDED. Including one in the New Testament.

As for connecting dots, the connections should be reasonable and logical. I've had a lot of Hebrew Roots folk back of to the "you are blind, you should know better" type of rhetoric; this is not logic.

On the girl-girl topic, this isn't connecting dots. Toad pointed out that Christians have connected dots that may not actually be connected. It takes great restraint to refrain from connecting dots.

As for why should you trust Maimonides? You mentioned him, not I. But when I read the quote, I found reason to trust his analysis: he has the same discomfort and dislike of lesbian sex as I do. And for the same reason. Even Toad restricted and limited it severely to avoid the pitfalls that Maimonides was warning about.

As Paul said, All things are lawful (which aren't forbidden), but not all things are profitable.

227. MycroftJones

November 3, 2015 at 4:48 PM

Timothy, if even Maimonides couldn't claim "weight of evidence", how can you? In your own time, and thanks for taking the time.

228. MycroftJones

November 8, 2015 at 10:19 AM

When you say you "begin and end with Him", that sounds very pious, but it is also meaningless, unless you mean "I have a direct telephone line to Him via the Holy Spirit, so I will just go with whatever my gut tells me".

Since the Torah comes from Him, and is His expressed Will in Law-Word form, Torah keepers also begin and end with Him.

As to Colossians 2:16-17, he doesn't invert the message at all. Read it for yourself. Let no man just you ... except the Body of Christ. In matters of practice, of Law, of food and drink, sabbath and New Moon, the Church has the authority to judge you, but those outside the Church do not. Because the King James adds in the word "is", which isn't in the underlying Greek, they changed it to read "but the body is of Christ", which, in context, is absolute gobbledygook and makes no sense. Remove the added word, and suddenly you get the original meaning: Let no man judge you, except the Body of Christ.

229. SirHamster

November 8, 2015 at 9:14 PM

[simplytimothy said:](#)

I think I have the key to how these guys think.

That may be useful ammunition, but I think it is a mistake to treat it as something where one key makes it understandable. The way they use words is shifty, and (dot. dot. dot.) filter is inconsistently used. Thinking to information theory, noise corruption does not carry meaning the way that the message content does.

See how AT, MC, and MJ have disagreed vehemently with each other. Their unity is only in attacking the church for being insufficiently righteous by their standard;

with love of polygamy of all things being a key litmus test.

The way I'd put it is that there are an infinite number of wrong answers, so each error can be unique; but there are common types of errors. As far as the error types go, I think the "don't judge me" responses of both AT and MC are indicators that this is not an intellectual error but a spiritual one. The intellectual nonsense flows from the spiritual rebellion.

As for the rest, I shall mimic your example and get started on my procrastinated Bible study homework.

230. MycroftJones

November 9, 2015 at 12:03 AM

@246 Yes, Barnes does match your interpretation. It is a gravely flawed interpretation, aimed at nullifying God's Law. Just because it has been the standard Christian position for a long time, doesn't make it right. The Barnes interpretation omits the "except the Body of Christ" clause at the end. But it makes all the difference.

Galatians 3:10 is a particularly bad translation. People read it to say that if you observe the Law of Moses you are under a curse. The translators omitted one tiny "not" from the Greek text, which has it saying, that those are NOT under the Law, are the ones under the curse.

231. MycroftJones

November 15, 2015 at 12:53 PM

Very well. Maybe look into "inclined bed therapy". I've been trying it; very positive results. Sleep becomes sweeter.

232. MycroftJones

November 15, 2015 at 3:53 PM

No need to skip to Galatians until the Colossians item is cleared up; that "except the Body of Christ" clause at the end really makes a big difference.

233. MycroftJones

November 19, 2015 at 5:56 PM

I had a restful (Lunar) Sabbath; I hope your day was also.

234. MycroftJones

November 22, 2015 at 1:07 PM

As you will.

235. MycroftJones

November 22, 2015 at 1:07 PM

Rest well.

236. MycroftJones

November 24, 2015 at 1:39 PM

Such a good neighbor, I need one like that.

237. MycroftJones

December 2, 2015 at 7:01 PM

Colossians 2:16-17

Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:

Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body (is) of Christ.

238. MycroftJones

December 3, 2015 at 5:25 PM

[@263](#) How can both interpretations be correct, when the standard interpretation makes no sense at all? Let no man judge you, blah blah blah, but the body is of Christ. "but the body is of Christ" has no relationship to the "Let no man judge you" part. So the only interpretation remaining is "let no man judge you... EXCEPT the body of Christ"

239. MycroftJones

December 4, 2015 at 3:34 PM

How can you say "the subject was not Torah". What are "matters of eat and drink, holy days and new moon and sabbath", if not matters regulated by the Torah? It was saying "Let noone outside the body of Christ judge you in these matters (of Torah)"

240. MycroftJones

December 5, 2015 at 12:48 PM

The ESV prelude is mere commentary, by men who were anti-Torah, and who didn't dig deep into the topic. Since the Torah position wasn't one they even took seriously enough to research, why is their commentary of value?

241. MycroftJones

December 6, 2015 at 3:46 PM

Strong... and justified.

242. MycroftJones

December 8, 2015 at 3:04 PM

The obvious interpretation was that people were doing the Catholic thing of "ignore the Law if it offends someone", letting the conscience of unbelievers dictate how they followed their faith. Or using the unbelievers as an excuse to abstain from the Faith. Muslims and Catholics alike do this; Colossians is explicitly saying not to.

243. MycroftJones

December 10, 2015 at 11:18 PM

You say my statement isn't supported. You hilighted "why ... do you submit to regulations". But you didn't hilight the qualifier that came after: "according to human precepts and teachings". The Law of God is NOT human precepts and teachings. Verse 18 already spelled out the human precepts: asceticism and worship of angels. Abstaining from pork and blood is not asceticism.

Finally, you quoted a bunch of English translations of Colossians, as if that refutes the correct interpretation. Being anti-Torah is deeply embedded in Christianity for almost 2000 years. You could quote 100 translations, and it wouldn't help your case. You would be better off to go to an Interlinear, so you can see how the English and Greek words map. I have done this myself, and is why I confidently say:

Therefore let no one judge you (in eating and in drinking, or in respect to a feast or new-moon or Sabbath, (which are a shadow of the coming things)) but the body of Christ.

This is the only translation which is also consistent with the rest of Scripture. The other translations just tack on the "body is of Christ" bit, out of context, which doesn't add any useful or actionable information.

244. MycroftJones

December 12, 2015 at 11:04 PM

Actually the translations are consistent; they put the word "is" in italics, to show that it isn't in the original language. Just try reading it without that added word "is".

245. MycroftJones

December 14, 2015 at 4:38 PM

See, if Christ is the object which casts the shadow, then the whole phrase falls apart; Christ already came, but it says sabbath new moon etc are shadows of things YET TO COME. So basically, if you want to interpret it the standard Christian way, you might as well become a Jew; they believe Messiah is still to come, but hasn't already come.

But then if you become a Jew, you are back to square one: Torah is still valid, it never become invalid.

"Body of Christ" is a common idiom for the congregation of believers. In Colossians, it is the only interpretation that is consistent and makes sense.

246. MycroftJones December 14, 2015 at 4:40 PM

Then we get to Matthew 5:18; if you believe Torah has passed away, then point out when and where "heaven and earth" passed away. Any interpretation of Colossians must be consistent with Jesus own words.

247. MycroftJones December 15, 2015 at 12:08 PM

@285 No.

248. MycroftJones December 21, 2015 at 1:23 AM

Your assertion leaves out the crucial bit, "let no one judge you". The subject is people judging you in these matters.

249. MycroftJones December 26, 2015 at 4:31 PM

The Torah doesn't distinguish between legal, moral, and ceremonial. It is one law.

How does Jesus death and Resurrection fit? Like this. In Luke, he said "If they don't listen to Moses and the prophets, then they won't listen to one who returns from the dead.". If you ignore Moses and the prophets, you are deluded if you think you are following Christ. (Luke 16:31)

Acts 21:23,24 shows that years after Jesus Resurrection, the apostles, even the apostle Paul, participated in animal sacrifices.

250. MycroftJones December 26, 2015 at 6:17 PM

The law was a "tutor" leading to Christ. The tutor was the one who accompanied the child to class to make sure he got there. If you didn't follow the tutor, you'd end up somewhere else. If you don't follow the Law, you won't be led to the true Christ. Look at the household of Cornelius, the righteous Gentile; he kept the Law, and then Jesus came to him, even though he was not a Jew.

251. MycroftJones December 27, 2015 at 9:56 AM

If you can establish monogamy, then you win on the wife-wife sex, true. :) Hope you're having a good Sunday.

252. MycroftJones December 28, 2015 at 2:18 PM

Yes, really restful. Been focusing on my honeybees. When spring comes, if any are still alive, they will have a lot of work to do.

253. MycroftJones January 5, 2016 at 2:55 PM

Alright.

254. Artisanal Toad

January 8, 2016 at 9:40 PM

I can't believe you guys are still going on and on about this. Simple Tim surrendered before the other thread got closed and this one opened, when he admitted he really really wanted for girl-girl sex to be a sin, but nothing in the Bible said it was, and then asked the magic question:

"How can I get the Bible to say it's a sin when it doesn't?"

Welcome to the Catholic Church, Tim.

So, one more time.

Polygyny:

Jesus said, quoting the Prophet Isaiah in Matthew 15:19 said: *"And in vain they worship Me, teaching as doctrines the precepts of men."*

We must start with the place this stinking pile of shit came from.

The church invaded the family, usurped the headship and authority of the husband and even went so far as to regulate the marital bed. In doing so it planted the seeds for feminism. This was contrary to the woman's curse in Genesis 3:16, which says *"your desire shall be for your husband and he shall rule over you."* The husband is to rule over his wife, not the church, and within the parameters of God's Law, *how the husband rules over his wife is up to him*. Unfortunately, the church was engaged in a struggle with the nobility and decided taking control of marriage was their best strategy. This was a violation of the church's mission, which is to go forth and make disciples of all men, but it also ignored God's instruction in the curse (the husband is to "rule over" his wife) and created conflict between husbands and wives in order to allow the church to stand in the middle and judge (exercise power).

Then the church violated God's Law by declaring polygyny to be wrong and a sin (Deut. 4:2). In all likelihood this was a direct response to Luther's advice to Philip of Hesse to not divorce his barren wife but instead to take a second wife in order to get a heir. Luther was uncomfortable with that advice but judged that according to Scripture divorce was wrong but there was no prohibition or condemnation in all of Scripture on a man having more than one wife.

The RCC continues to this day to claim the authority to police the moral and sexual behavior of husband and wife within marriage according to its own rules and definitions, rather than the regulations God gave, which are further violations of Deut. 4:2 and 12:32.

Let's be clear about how God feels about polygyny:

1. God does not regulate unrighteousness (sin). Observe that God regulated the practice of polygyny in His Law (Exodus 21:10-11; Leviticus 18:18; 20:14; Deuteronomy 21:15-17; etc.) and even commanded it in what is known as the levirate marriage: Deuteronomy 25:5-10.

2. God does not condone unrighteousness (sin). Notice that in 1st Samuel 12:8 God took credit for giving David multiple wives and said if it hadn't been enough He'd have given David more.

3. God does not command unrighteousness (sin). In Deuteronomy 25:5-10 we find the law of the levirate marriage. In that case, if a man died without a son, his brother was commanded to marry his dead brother's wife and when she had a son, that son was to carry on the dead brother's name that his name might not be blotted out from Israel. The levirate marriage made no provision for whether the living brother was married or not. If he was, he now has two wives.

4. God does not practice unrighteousness (sin). Yet, observe that in Jeremiah 31:31-32, God said He was the husband of two wives, Israel and Judah. For her many harlotries God gave Israel a certificate of divorce and sent her away (Jeremiah 3:8). Judah did the same and eventually God sent her away without a certificate of divorce.

Anyone claiming polygyny is unrighteous (sin), is claiming that God regulates, condones, commands and practices unrighteousness (sin). That is blasphemy.

255. Artisanal Toad

January 8, 2016 at 10:06 PM

Female - Female Sexual Contact

Romans 4:15 and 5:13 say clearly that **where there is no Law (referring to the Mosaic Law) there is no transgression and no sin is imputed.**

Moving right along, we notice that there is (as Tim has already admitted) nothing in the Law that forbids or condemns female-female sexual contact. Therefore, per Romans 4:15 and 5:13, it is not a sin.

Deuteronomy 4:2 and 12:32 both forbid adding to the Law or subtracting from the Law. With that in mind, we don't even need to read the text of Romans 1:25-27, because IF Paul forbid female-female sexual contact, then Paul was guilty of violating Deuteronomy 4:2 and 12:32. Since Paul was a Pharisee of Pharisees, he certainly was aware of the prohibition on adding to or subtracting from the Law, and Paul is the Apostle who (in the same letter a few chapters later) that where there is no Law there is no transgression and no sin imputed.

Ergo, either Paul was an untrustworthy and unreliable Apostle who violated God's Law by adding to the Law, or Paul did not in any way prohibit or condemn female-female sexual contact.

We actually have even more evidence for this, because under the Law there is no prohibition on women working as simple money-for-sex prostitutes and no prohibition on men (married or otherwise) using their services. Notice the Law of the Nazerite (Numbers 6) required the Nazerite to remain clean and holy. Notice that Samson (a Nazerite) had the Spirit of the Lord with him, but his use of prostitutes (Judges 16:1-3) did not violate his Nazerite vow and the Spirit of the Lord remained with him. The Spirit of the Lord did not leave him until his Nazerite vow was violated with the cutting of his hair.

So, with that in mind, it is interesting that in 1st Corinthians 6 Paul instituted a specific prohibition, only for Christians, forbidding the use of prostitutes. Did Paul violate the Law? No. The Master has the right to set the rules for His own house, and Master has forbidden the use of prostitutes to His bondservants. We know this is a specific prohibition that applies only to the House of the Lord because ONLY a Christian can join the members of Christ to a whore.

There is one other specific restriction on Christians, this one direct from the Master Himself, which is found at 1st Corinthians 7:10-11. I used to think this was Deuteronomy 24:1-3 being overturned, but now I know better. Paul is specific, saying the command is from the Lord, and only for believers. The wife is not to separate from her husband, but if she does she is to remain single (chaste) or be reconciled to her husband. The husband is not to separate from his wife (which includes any form of sending her out or divorcing her). There is no "exception" for porneia (sexual immorality).

So, under the Law, non-believers (not Christians) have the right to use the services of prostitutes whether they're married or not (it isn't adultery unless the prostitute was married) and the men have the right to divorce their wives for reasons of sexual immorality. In Christ, the use of a prostitute (by men or women) is forbidden and divorce between two married believers is forbidden. These are specific restrictions that apply only to Christians, they are not changes to the Law.

Now, with that in mind, we go back to Romans 1:25-27, where we see Paul being descriptive (not proscriptive), describing the wrath of God being poured out on people who refuse to acknowledge, honor and worship Him. Even an improper reading of the text (Hi Tim!) still cannot fit within the narrow framework of a specific prohibition that applies only to Christians because Paul makes it very clear he is describing the wrath of God being poured out on unbelievers who do not acknowledge, honor or worship Him.

There is no Biblical prohibition on female-female sexual contact, period. Anyone claiming there is such a prohibition is a liar and trying to teach false doctrine.

256. Artisanal Toad

January 8, 2016 at 10:12 PM

We would now all do well to remember [Tim's confession](#):

"I believe what I have been taught, that all homosex is sin."

*["And in vain they worship Me, teaching as doctrines the precepts of men."
Tim cares more about the doctrines of men than what Scripture actually says.]*

"Attacking artisanalloadshall's position cannot be made by showing a prohibition against woman-woman sex as no verse does so."

[Correct. Romans 4:15 and 5:13 clearly say "where there is no Law, there is no transgression and no sin is imputed." By your own admission, in light of Scripture, you lost the debate way back then on August 29, 2015. All you've done since then is prove you don't give a rat's ass about what God said on the subject.]

"The question then becomes, how do I make a Biblical case that it is sin absent such a verse?"

[The answer, Tim, is you can't without lying. Romans 4:15 and 5:13 pretty much kills that for you. The best you can do is say it's a sin for YOU (Romans 14:23- "that which is not of faith is sin") because your faith is weak (obvious to everyone who can read, since you can't handle what the Bible actually says). However, you don't get to say it's a sin if one of your sisters does it because then you're in violation of Romans 14:4 "Who are you to judge the servant of another?" and all the other passages that command you not to judge.

Tim, accept the fact that God is not like man, as He said "My ways are not your ways, O Man." God doesn't care about how people connect their plumbing nearly as much as He cares about the relationships of the people connecting their plumbing.]

257. MycroftJones

January 10, 2016 at 4:33 PM

Timothy, [@302](#) is bad reasoning. There is no conflict between the Holy Spirit and the Law, since the Law was delivered to Moses BY the Holy Spirit. And Jesus Christ upheld and affirmed the Law. The Church was corrupted early on, leading to schisms. Matthew 5:18. Read what Jesus himself said about Moses and the Law. Look at Acts 21:23-25, all the apostles going to the Temple and sacrificing animals, according to the Law. Do you know Jesus better than the apostles did? Does anyone living?

If Leviticus is no longer relevant, why is it still in your Bible? Doesn't the New Testament say, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and forever"? Christianity is continually pumelled and weakened, because it ignores the Law, and doesn't walk in Jesus paths.

If you give preference to church tradition over the Bible, then we are done here.

258. MycroftJones

January 10, 2016 at 4:36 PM

[@301](#) Toad, it is simple. Timothy has narrowed it down to the polygamy issue. If he can disprove polygamy, wife-wife sex is also forbidden. Since he can't disprove polygamy from the Bible, I'm just waiting for him to realize it and join the brotherhood. He's been dragging his feet since September. I am patient.

259. MycroftJones

January 10, 2016 at 4:38 PM

Timothy, using loaded terms like "under the law" is theology. You need to dump that overboard and just read the Word. "Justified by grace" and "under the law" have meanings in their scriptural contexts. But you've grabbed a bunch of these snippets that come from Christian theology, not from sound Scriptural study. Sounding scriptural doesn't make it so. Your position has a lot of false conflicts, that don't exist in the Bible.

260. MycroftJones January 10, 2016 at 4:43 PM

@302 Timothy, everything Toad wrote was on point. Nice attempt to disqualify him. No go.

261. MycroftJones January 10, 2016 at 4:45 PM

@303 yes, you are correct. The Law still stands. Sacrificial and purity laws also. The daily offering will resume at a future date.

262. MycroftJones January 10, 2016 at 4:46 PM

And beyond that, don't change the topic. Go ahead and try to disprove polygamy as you promised. If you achieve that, your point is won.

263. SirHamster January 11, 2016 at 11:03 AM

We are now at the point of "which idiom is the correct one" (As I allude to in my reply to MycroftJones). This, I will leave to my betters. From this extended exploration I see no reason to switch.

From the extended conversations, I see reasons not to switch.

Multiple false accusations, a disregard for understanding, developing holiness, or building up those who God has saved through Christ.

Not that I am less of a sinner, but the teachings of these "teachers" does not resemble good fruit.

I started that previous thread with, "Polygamy is permissible", but now I see its promotion as a red flag of one chasing his sensuality. If this is a constant, it illuminates why there was NT instruction on church leadership having one wife.

One aspect I think this discussion has not touched on is the authority delegated to a community's leadership:

"Then Jesus said to the crowds and to his disciples, "The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat, so do and observe whatever they tell you, but not the works they do."

Note how they are not instructed to second-guess or ignore the teaching of their leaders.

If a church discourages or even forbids its members from practicing slavery - who has the authority to judge that church as acting contrary to God's wishes?

Now draw some "... " between slavery, a Biblically regulated practice and ...

264. MycroftJones January 11, 2016 at 11:22 AM

Yes, you are choosing the word of the Church over the Words in the Bible. Now I know that is your stand, there is no use of further discussion.

265. Mark Call January 12, 2016 at 8:47 AM

That assumption was disgarded [sic] when Mark Call admitted that heuristics are needed for things the Law doesn't account for. i.e. "instruction" is needed.

You're a blithering idiot. Torah MEANS "instruction", and without some instruction you wouldn't even be able to read English. Maybe that explains everything, however.

If you are under the Law, then you are under the Law. If you are under Grace, then you are under Grace.

And if you're under Deception...ditto.

@ST:

Wow. The only thing that makes me just a bit happy that I checked this thing again was to see that AT laid out a pretty good case. (He still gets 'divorce' wrong, though. We - and that means ALL who serve Him - are to keep our vows. Period. But as Yahushua explained, a wife who 'breaks wedlock' and commits adultery is ALREADY an adulterer. QED, and the rest follows right from His Word. Note that Hoshea understood that.)

You don't follow "christ" - well, certainly not Yahushua HaMeshiach Who Is the Torah Made Flesh. You don't even read "Paul" for comprehension, but instead follow "*another jesus, whom we have NOT preached.*"

And again you asked me a question, as if you'll read this answer when you won't read His!

"What is the role of Christ vis-a-vis the law and salvation in your view?"

WHY would I again assert the undeniable? Because you persist in taking ONE verse utterly out of context (so that you "keep your traditions," as that Messiah you persistently ignore said more than once) about not being "under the law" while ignore literally EVERY other admonition and claim to the contrary. (And they've been quoted at length already, from Matthew 5:17-19 and the recently reiterated Deuteronomy prohibitions, to what Yahushua said ABOUT them to the Other Hypocrites, etc, etc, etc.)

Have you NEVER wondered why it was a capital offense for a "lay" person to even possess a copy of Scripture for much of 'church' history? And why the Dagon Fish Hat-wearer-in-chief still insists that those sheep who he leads astray should try it at home still?

"What is the role of Christ vis-a-vis the law and salvation in your view?"

You obviously mean "Paul", because you utterly IGNORE the "words in red" of the Messiah!!!

"Why do you call me, "Lord, Lord," and not DO what I say!"

Even Paul says 'work out your own 'salvation' with fear and trembling," for a reason. Yahushua (Whose Words you ignore, so that "in vain you might keep your own traditions") warns that "many" will miss the mark and hear "I never knew you, depart from Me, you who are WITHOUT TORAH."

How are you gonna really understand what Shaul means by a term like "schoolmaster" of the Torah if you don't know what INSTRUCTION means?

This is NOT too hard for you, Tim. Deuteronomy 30:1-10 even says so clearly, with no small amount of well-warranted sarcasm. But as you continue to deny Him, and the literal entirety of His Word (as Isaiah warned and that Torah Made Flesh quoted) you still have "eyes, but WILL not see."

266. MycroftJones

January 12, 2016 at 6:42 PM

This whole "saved by grace" thing is a red herring. God can save you, with or without the Law. But when you are saved, you show it by your works. Since your heart rejects the Law, it shows that the God you are in the hands of, isn't the Almighty described by the Bible. You worship some spirit being, and have had some supernatural experiences. I don't doubt or question it. But your heart is far from the God of the Bible.

267. MycroftJones

January 12, 2016 at 8:20 PM

The real root is, do you view the Bible as the Word of God, or as a mere subsidiary to the elders in your church.

268. MycroftJones

January 13, 2016 at 2:03 PM

The fruit that Christ sought was repentance. Repentance is a course of action, not mere feelings. The Law is a plan of repentance. You say you are "not convinced". It is the Scripture, not I, that has failed to convince you. You claim to belong to no church, but you always refer back to your elders and mentors.

269. Mark Call

January 13, 2016 at 2:20 PM

@ST:

"This process is consistent with what I read in His Word.
[...what I choose to pay attention to, that is...]"

So, try this then: (1 John 2:3-7)

And hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep His commandments.

[Which? The ones the 'elders' and 'church fathers' say weren't "done away with"?
Or the ones He said wouldn't change?]

He that saith, I know Him, and keepeth not His commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.

But whoso keepeth His Word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in Him.

He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also so to walk, even as He walked.

Blessings, and may you learn to walk in obedience to Him.

270. MycroftJones

January 13, 2016 at 7:33 PM

Quit dodging the question, Timothy. What role does the Bible have in your walk with Christ.

271. Mark Call

January 14, 2016 at 11:04 AM

Quoting @ST:

"Mark Call notes that He never changes when it comes to admonishing me that it is time to sacrifice a goat and spend the day in ritual uncleanness--i.e. adhere to the Mosaic law..."

Bullshit!!! I guess if you can ignore what He says, I'm not surprised you'll lie about my words, too.

Are you so BLIND to His Word that you can't even figure out WHY that idiocy is NOT POSSIBLE today, since the place "He chose to put His Name" does not even EXIST now? Are you blind to the exile that RESULTED from the kind of disobedience your rebellion to His Word exemplifies?

I try to show you a sine wave, that repeats cycle after cycle, and is the same "yesterday, today, and tomorrow," and you tell me the voltage changes. Solomon got it, you refuse to see. There's a reason Shaul said, "let THIS mind be in you, which was also in HaMeshiach." (hint: it's Hebraic, not greek or roman! "Frequency domain", not linear.) Yet you persist (Luke 6:46) in calling him, lord, lord, but NOT doing what He SAYS!

And this is just inexcusable, more-than-Simple Timothy:
I am a layman, I have no training in the Bible..."

And "since I refuse to be like the Bereans, refuse to work out my OWN salvation with 'fear and trembling," refuse to study for myself, refuse to even read the words in Red, much less try to understand what He was quoting and Who He Is, I guess I'll just ask those elders, popes, priests and false shepherds who lie to me to stand for me at that great white throne judgment."

Face it, man! Jeremiah 16:19 SHOULD be about YOU! And the "great abominations" committed in the 'house of the lord' in Ezekiel chapters 8 and 9 - AND the lessons! - still apply to the pagan church! That cycle repeats over and

over again too! NONE of this is "too hard for you," ST.

But I can't force you to have "ears to hear," or "eyes to see". You could ask Him to show you His Truth, however. It's right there for you, Written in genuine print.

272. Mark Call

January 16, 2016 at 7:30 AM

Like my Savior, I could care less about "doctrine".

You don't want to "reason together"...you want to ignore Scripture and RE-build a twisted 'doctrine' on the back of words you can't even be bothered to study IN CONTEXT!

"perfect",
"law".

Been there, done that. A waste of time with you, clearly.

You don't even understand "korbon".

There are no doubt "better minds" out there who have been duping you. Why not let "His mind" be in you? That's why He Wrote it down for you.

273. Mark Call

January 17, 2016 at 7:13 AM

Contrasting "the law centric" [sic] and the "Christ centric" [sic] interpretations of Scripture..."

You miss the whole point. And YHVH. And His Word, as Written.

But at least your priorities are honest.

274. MycroftJones

January 20, 2016 at 12:19 PM

And your worldview, Timothy, your "Christ-centered" worldview, is to reject the very words of Christ himself.

Matthew 5:18, the Law will not pass away, not one jot or tittle, until heaven and earth pass away. (They never passed away)

Luke 13:27, I know not whence you are, depart from me you workers of Lawlessness (referring to the people who say Lord Lord! I prophesied in your name!)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GKwbbzrEiw4>

275. Mark Call

January 20, 2016 at 4:20 PM

I put it this way:

If you reject His Word, as Written, and claim to 'follow christ' -- you may well have a 'spirit' in you. Teaching you.

But it sure as hell ain't holy.

276. SirHamster

January 20, 2016 at 4:41 PM

Mycroft:

And your worldview, Timothy, your "Christ-centered" worldview, is to reject the very words of Christ himself.

False accusations reflect poorly on your credibility. Who said something about logs and motes and eyes?

Mark:

If you reject His Word, as Written, and claim to 'follow christ' -- you may well have a 'spirit' in you. Teaching you.

If.

277. Mark Call

January 21, 2016 at 6:37AM

Funny. I've already noted I John 2 (esp. 3-6) repeatedly. But ALL of it depends on knowing what "keep His Word" means, and Who it Is that Wrote it, says it does NOT change, and then came in His flesh to teach it, precisely as Written.

Understand this: (and Yahuchanon makes it clear, here, too!)

If someone is NOT keeping His Sabbaths, His Appointed Times (even if making the sacrifices is impossible, for obvious reasons), eating what He says is "food", honoring their marriage Covenant(s), and seeking to "walk as He walked" (much less "teaching others to violate" even the LEAST of His commandments!) -- "the Truth is NOT in him."

He said it was "not too hard for you," LONG before He came in the flesh to prove it.

278. SirHamster

January 21, 2016 at 9:54AM

If someone is NOT keeping His Sabbaths, His Appointed Times (even if making the sacrifices is impossible, for obvious reasons), eating what He says is "food", honoring their marriage Covenant(s), and seeking to "walk as He walked" (much less "teaching others to violate" even the LEAST of His commandments!) -- "the Truth is NOT in him."

Brings up many regulations ... leaves out circumcision.

279. MycroftJones

January 23, 2016 at 7:30 PM

Acts 15 does not rebut or contradict anything of the sort.

280. MycroftJones

January 23, 2016 at 7:45 PM

If you aren't qualified, then shut your mouth, timothy. You've been blathering on and on about how wrong we are, and now you confess how unqualified you are.

You have also confessed that your source material is "the entirety of Christianity", versus the Bible. My source material is the Bible above and beyond any "Christian" writings.

There is nothing productive that can come of this.

281. Mark Call

January 24, 2016 at 5:44 PM

You're correct about one thing, ST. You're moronic, and REFUSE to use the brain He gave you to read the WORD He gave you for yourself!!!! You prattle about Paul but refuse to DO what even he said: "study to show yourself approved," much less be like the Bereans.

But this shows how intent you are to ignore Scripture, ignore what has been written here, and ignore even your own "notes"!!!!

[to MC] @335 Acts 15 completely rebuts your argument...

Bull\$#@%! But it proves you won't read. (Same goes for your Col. Flatulence, which I addressed long ago. Just who was Paul writing to, Simpleton?)

Been there, done that. Acts 15 (AFTER Acts 11:7, note!) concludes by defining four minimum, "necessary but not sufficient conditions" (which most of xtianity STILL ignores!) Why? Because if those who seek to "turn to Him" will just get

themselves even MINIMALLY “cleaned up”, then the Torah is taught, “in every synagogue, in every city” every SABBATH! So they can learn the REST.

What an incredibly asinine, willfully blind, but ultimately outright unsurprising statement.

Let the dust from my feet be a witness against the kind of idiocy that is well-described as “having ears, but WILL not hear.”

282. SirHamster

January 25, 2016 at 11:44 AM

[@337](#):

Precise summary of the root of contention.

If you aren't qualified, then shut your mouth, timothy. You've been blathering on and on about how wrong we are, and now you confess how unqualified you are.

Qualification to judge Hebrew->English translation is separate from qualification to judge Artisanal Toad, Mark Call and MycroftJones's credibility as Biblical teachers.

The former requires specialized knowledge in ancient language and history of the ancient Middle East.

The latter can be evaluated with any number of common tools: knowledge of the Bible, logical skills to dissect the presented arguments, and simple judgement - what does a man's words reveal about his priorities and character?

In short, the latter requires only an application of Jesus' heuristic: "By their fruit you will know them".

Is it difficult to tell if fruit is salty, sweet, sour, or bitter? All one has to do is take a bite, and God's given taste will tell the rest.

283. MycroftJones

January 25, 2016 at 12:31 PM

[@337](#) wrong translation isn't the main part of our argument; the problem is people not reading the Bible from beginning to end and just letting it say what it says. Instead, you have to read all the Church fathers, etc. But the Bible itself speaks of the great falling away. That already happened. 136 AD marks its beginning point.

284. SirHamster

January 26, 2016 at 11:11 AM

From [Acts 15](#):

*Then some of the believers who belonged to the party of the Pharisees stood up and said, “**The Gentiles must be circumcised and required to keep the law of Moses.**”*

*The apostles and elders met to consider this question. After much discussion, Peter got up and addressed them: “**Brothers, you know that some time ago God made a choice among you that the Gentiles might hear from my lips the message of the gospel and believe. God, who knows the heart, showed that he accepted them by giving the Holy Spirit to them, just as he did to us. He did not discriminate between us and them, for he purified their hearts by faith. Now then, why do you try to test God by putting on the necks of Gentiles a yoke that neither we nor our ancestors have been able to bear? No! We believe it is through the grace of our Lord Jesus that we are saved, just as they are.**”*

[...]

Then the apostles and elders, with the whole church, decided to choose some of their own men and send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas. They chose Judas (called Barsabbas) and Silas, men who were leaders among the believers. With them they sent the following letter:

The apostles and elders, your brothers,

To the Gentile believers in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia:

Greetings.

We have heard that some went out from us without our authorization and disturbed you, troubling your minds by what they said. So we all agreed to choose some men and send them to you with our dear friends Barnabas and Paul—men who have risked their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore we are sending Judas and Silas to confirm by word of mouth what we are writing. It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us not to burden you with anything beyond the following requirements: You are to abstain from food sacrificed to idols, from blood, from the meat of strangled animals and from sexual immorality. You will do well to avoid these things.

Farewell.

Perhaps Mark Call and Mycroft.Jones consider themselves of higher authority than Peter, Paul, and other leaders of the early Church. Or perhaps this is yet another example where English words conspires against the One True Hebrew Meaning.

But it is telling that in Acts 15, the Church is agreed that the Gentiles have become brethren without the Law of Moses. They did not accuse them of following foreign spirits or not having Christ. Peter testifies that they received the HOLY SPIRIT.

Acts 15 does not state the 4 requirements are a Starter Package, to be upgraded to the Law of Moses at the earliest opportunity.

How many false teachings does it take to be a false teacher?

285. Mycroft.Jones

January 26, 2016 at 12:48 PM

[@343](#) Hamster conveniently left out the part of Acts 15 that does talk about the upgrade package to the Law of Moses.

286. Mark Call

January 26, 2016 at 1:19 PM

You're a liar and an ass#o%e as well as an idiot, Little Unclean Animal, because -- true to form, anyway -- you IGNORE the "minimum condition" bottom line, and twist both the tense and the intent. Even though it's in there TWICE! (v 20, 29)

Still more reprehensible, however, you left out the key verse, 21. And **even though I just quoted it!**

Your shameless perfidy is why you don't deserve a response. But there MIGHT be others who will someday read this, and THEY deserve far better than your twisting and omissions.

Those with a desire to "search out the truth for themselves" will read the whole thing, and then see the point:

When you enter via the 'strait gate', the WALK down His "narrow path" is just beginning!

And His Instruction ('torah') -- ALL of it is the "lamp to our feet."

Faithless shepherds seek to teach others to walk in darkness.

Clearly, the Messiah Whose Word some here try to ignore was right: FEW there be that find it, because they prefer to "believe a lie".

Il Peter 3:15-16 still applies.

287. SirHamster

January 26, 2016 at 1:46 PM

Still more reprehensible, however, you left out the key verse, 21. And even though I just quoted it!

Is there any possible reason why I chose to quote the parts surrounding verse 21 after your post brought it up? You speak so much about connecting dots and reading things in context ... and now you are angry with me for quoting the context that you left out.

I have never gotten angry at someone for quoting scripture. I delight in it being brought up and studied and learned from. Perhaps if your teaching was actually in line with what the Bible plainly teaches, you would not be shamed by a mere quotation with selective highlighting.

Now go dust off your feet once again. Try not to return to your vomit this time - say what you mean and mean what you say.

288. MycroftJones

January 26, 2016 at 10:03 PM

Hamster keeps dodging Matthew 5:18. Until he addresses it, everything else he says is blah blah blah.

289. SirHamster

January 27, 2016 at 10:42 AM

@Mycroft:

I am pointing out what Acts 15 actually says, after both you and Mark Call claimed that Acts 15 does not contradict your position. I made an on-topic investigation of what is in Acts 15.

You are the one dodging by trying to change the topic away from this explicit instruction to the Gentile believers:

*"It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us not to burden you with **anything beyond the following requirements: You are to abstain from food sacrificed to idols, from blood, from the meat of strangled animals and from sexual immorality. You will do well to avoid these things.**"*

Quit your Gamma projection and sniping, and start making correct judgements.

290. MycroftJones

January 27, 2016 at 12:19 PM

You are still dodging Matthew 5:18, the entire Old Testament, and most of the New Testament. Worse, you are reading Acts 15 incompletely and out of context, and using a biased translation to boot.

Address Matthew 5:18, the very words of Jesus Christ himself.

291. SirHamster

January 27, 2016 at 2:02 PM

Worse, you are reading Acts 15 incompletely and out of context, and using a biased translation to boot.

Who said this?

"Acts 15 does not rebut or contradict anything of the sort."

Does Acts 15 talk about Gentiles and whether they need to follow the Law of Moses?

What did Peter say in response? What did the Church leadership instruct the Gentiles to do?

You lied about the content of Acts 15. And now your only escape is a bald assertion of mistranslation and bias.

Earlier, you said, "the problem is people not reading the Bible from beginning to end and just letting it say what it says."

We are agreed on that point. It just so turns out that we have very different ideas of what "letting it say what it says" actually is.

Address Matthew 5:18, the very words of Jesus Christ himself.

Back up your accusations of "out of context" and "biased translation" with your interpretation of Acts 15, and you will earn a response on that point.

292. Matthew

January 27, 2016 at 2:06 PM

You guys want to see something cool? When you want to reply to a comment, click on the number to the left of the commenter's name. It should change color and have a little message.

Any text you now copy from that comment will be magically wrapped in some HTML that back links to the comment. Paste it in the comment box, then write your response below.

293. SirHamster

January 27, 2016 at 3:58 PM

Young Heaving Bosoms of Liberty wrote:

Any text you now copy from that comment will be magically wrapped in some HTML that back links to the comment. Paste it in the comment box, then write your response below.

Testing. Pale moon 26.0

294. MycroftJones

January 27, 2016 at 9:12 PM

@350 Only a handful of verses are twisted against the Law, while the whole Bible is full of verses urgently pushing people toward keeping the Law. You address THAT, starting with Matthew 5:18. Until you do, your misinterpretations can wait.

@351 Thank you, I'll try that out soon.

295. MycroftJones

January 28, 2016 at 12:18 PM

You keep on twisting and dancing timothy. Jesus said "Until heaven and earth pass, NOT ONE JOT OR TITTLE shall be done away with". Do heaven and earth still exist Timothy? Don't link me to some commentary that blathers a thousand years of Christian heresy. Explain from Scripture why Jesus said something He didn't mean.

296. SirHamster

January 28, 2016 at 1:10 PM

Mycroft Jones wrote:@350 Only a handful of verses are twisted against the Law, while the whole Bible is full of verses urgently pushing people toward keeping the Law. You address THAT, starting with Matthew 5:18. Until you do, your misinterpretations can wait.

Highlighting text from a quotation cannot be misinterpretation, dimwit.

You lied about the content of Acts 15, and I quoted the relevant parts of Acts 15 that contradict your claim. An entire quotation of Peter, and an entire letter from Church leaders to Gentile believers.

I'm not changing the subject until you address it. Either back up your assertion that the quoted chunks are out of context or mistranslated, or concede that Acts 15 says what it says about Christians and their need to follow the Law of Moses.

I don't expect any intellectual integrity from your established pattern of posturing Gamma-tude ... so you have a great chance to surprise me.

297. MycroftJones

January 28, 2016 at 2:47 PM

Address Matthew 5:18, the words of Jesus himself. "Until heaven and earth pass away, not one jot or tittle will be removed from the Law." Acts 15 has been addressed ably by others long since. Focus on Matthew 5:18. You avoid it, because you can't. Jesus did not do away with the Law. Acts 21:24 shows He didn't even do away with the sacrificial system.

Time to call in the moderator and shut this thread down. Timothy and Hamster have both shown that their source is Christian tradition and tradition overrules the Bible for them.

298. MycroftJones

January 28, 2016 at 4:04 PM

Matthew 5:18, Jesus said the Law would not pass away as long as heaven and earth exist. He also said not one jot or tittle would change.

Now timothy says Jesus did change the Law. Without quoting scripture. timothy calls Jesus a liar. Is that it, Christians worship a God who lies?

All your other blather about grace and justification and "not under the law" is irrelevant to the fact that God gave us the Law for our good, it existed from creation, and it is his continuing will that we follow it, and when we follow it we show thereby that we Love him. (1 John 5:3)

299. MycroftJones

January 28, 2016 at 4:04 PM

Challenge failed; timothy calling Jesus a liar, is not an acceptable rebuttal of Matthew 5:18.

300. SirHamster

January 28, 2016 at 4:18 PM

[MycroftJones wrote](#):Acts 15 has been addressed ably by others long since.

Yet another bald assertion. You say I pulled out of context but do not say what context.

You asserted bias and mistranslation, without stating what bias, nor what correct translation.

Now you appeal to a nebulous consensus that exists ... somewhere. Is it in this thread? On some other website? MycroftJones asserts it exists, and what can we do but take his word for it?

All I can say is that I'm not surprised. You have lived up to expectations, "Mycroft". My condolences.

Time to call in the moderator and shut this thread down.

This isn't a moderated forum, you dimwitted moron. But thanks for displaying yet another SJW trait - fleeing the debate to cry to an amenable authority, in hopes of censoring the opposition.

If you think you can appeal to the Rules of the Blog posted in the upper left, did you not notice it requires that you back up your assertions when challenged?

Timothy and Hamster have both shown that their source is Christian tradition and tradition overrules the Bible for them.

Do you know which denomination I belong to, and why your accusation is stupid?

301. MycroftJones

January 28, 2016 at 4:49 PM

And still the Hamster avoids addressing Matthew 5:18.

302. SirHamster

January 28, 2016 at 5:18 PM

[MycroftJones](#) wrote: And still the Hamster avoids addressing Matthew 5:18.

Back up your assertions about context and bias/mistranslation on the Acts 15 quotes and you can have a response on Matthew 5:18.

You are confusing a requirement for basic intellectual integrity with something else.

303. MycroftJones

January 28, 2016 at 9:14 PM

Matthew 5:18 Hamster. Waiting.

304. Mark Call

January 29, 2016 at 7:54 AM

This is beyond merely asinine:

OK, let's try again.

Jesus is the fulfillment of the law. Galatians 3 refutes you... [followed by Crap Mislabeled 'logic'...]

So now SimpleTon calls Paul a liar, too.

You WILL NOT read, so this will be brief. The entirety of Deuteronomy chapter 13 is about liars and false prophets, who try to "entice you from the way that YHVH your Elohim commanded you to walk." It says you "shall not consent to him nor listen to him," at BARE MINIMUM.

Had Yahushua NOT said what He did in Matthew 5:17-19 that you so pointedly ignore and deny, He would have been a liar, and a false prophet, and EVERY SINGLE FOLLOWER would have known it. In other words, "another jesus, whom we have NOT preached." Paul was right about that prediction, too - you idiots drank the Kool-Aid.

The 'jesus' you claim to follow, while ignoring EVERYTHING he said that contradicts your idolatry, could NOT have been the prophet foretold by Moses!

"Well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying 'this people honor Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me! And in vain they worship Me, teaching as doctrines the commandments of men.'"

I read the idiocy last night about how you wouldn't give Matthew 5 more than a "quick scan" - much less read the "bedrock" foundation on which He built it, preferring your own house of sand, and decided a reply was obviously fruitless.

'So why even bother now?' I ask myself, and certainly not for the first time. Because I intend to publish and teach this interaction, in the prayer that others who DO have "eyes to see," and "ears to hear", might benefit from your attempts to twist and ignore the Word Made Flesh, as Written.

You blind guides are the reason I am careful to distinguish between Yahu-shua, the Savior of Yahuah, and some 'jesus' who could NOT be the Messiah foretold by all the Scripture that you call "old" and "done away with".

You want it 'clear'? Since you will not read Scripture in context and for comprehension, try this:

Yahushuah HaMeshiach is NOT the same as "another jesus, whom we have not preached." Paul was right, you bought the lie.

And for the capper? You don't even get Galatians. Chapter 3 follows what? Chapter 1? Here's how THAT begins, and only a few decades after His teachings in the flesh:

*"I marvel that you are turning away so soon from Him... (!)
...to a different gospel..."*

[do you think he was talking about you here who "want to pervert the gospel?"]

So read this carefully: (yeah, I know - who am I kidding?)

But even if we, or an angel from heaven, preacy ANY OTHER GOSPEL to you than what we HAVE...then let him be accursed.

But he's not done (guess he knew what to expect from the pagans he was already familiar with!)

...I say AGAIN, if ANYONE preaches any other gospel to you than what you have received...

[and isn't it obious? What "Scripture" does he constantly quote? What was the ONLY Scripture they universally acknowledged and based their arguments on? Good grief!]

...LET HIM BE ACCURSED!

The Yahushua ignore warned that those who violate the LEAST of His commandments, and "teach others to do so," IF they repent, and turn from that wickedness (and, yes, I'll bet your copy leaves that part out, huh?) will be "least in the kingdom."

This is "not too hard" even for a self-professed Simpleton. (Self-absorbed rodents may be another matter, though.) There's a reason that fellow Shaul, who you tend to ignore when he says something you DON'T like, but do enjoy 'twisting', says "work out your OWN salvation with fear and trembling." Don't let liars, false shepherds, popes, and blind guides tell you it's 'too hard'. They are "*liars, and the Truth is not in them.*"

SO: Return to YHVH.

305. SirHamster

January 29, 2016 at 9:34AM

Like a dog returning to his vomit, so Mark Call once again dusts up his feet after shaking it off.

3 times in this thread alone, and I remember a few instances in the previous one. Why make promises you won't keep?

306. MycroftJones

January 29, 2016 at 1:12 PM

[@370](#) timothy, you haven't addressed Matthew 5:18 sufficiently. You tried to "pit scripture against scripture" And you still have Jesus coming out as a liar. One moment he says "the law won't pass away until heaven and earth", then in the next he says he came to "complete" the Law, and you jump on that, as if "completing" the Law meant he added to it... and once he added to it hurry! Now it is done away with! Fantastic logic, timothy (that was sarcasm) Fulfilling/completing was part of a Hebrew idiom that Rabbi's used when they were debating the interpretation of the Law. Destroying the Law was bad interpretation; fulfilling/completing the Law was interpreting it correctly.

In what world does is "completing" something the same as throwing it in the trash?

Mark Call pointed out several other verses where Jesus was very clear about his attitude toward the Law. Those who break the LEAST commandment and teach others to do so, will be LEAST in the Kingdom. If you are throwing out the commandments altogether... what place is there for you in the Kingdom of Heaven?

James in addition said "faith without works is dead". James 2:17. Jesus already said what "works" those are.

Still waiting on Matthew 5:18.

307. MycroftJones

January 29, 2016 at 1:21 PM

timothy, you said the "earthly practices" of the Law have changed, but that doesn't mean God has changed.

You assert, but don't prove any change in "earthly practices". In fact, the Law is entirely about "earthly practices" that the Father wants us to do. Take away the earthly practices, and there is no law.

308. MycroftJones

February 13, 2016 at 1:03 AM

Christianity says the Bible is the "Word of God". That being the case, the Word is what reveals the corruption that has spread among those who say "Lord, lord!"

309. Mycroft Jones

June 30, 2016 at 12:48 PM

Someone denied that Japan and China were polygamous. In 1864, the Royal Anthropological Society had this to say:

Of course, in polygamy, few men have more than one wife. But why repeat the trite old trash of strong-brained and hard-headed Paley about the superior prolificacy of monogamy? I am weary of recounting the rule, and thought that my City of the Saints* had to a certain extent established it. But I must do it again for the benefit of Mr. Owen. In monogamy, ours for instance, there is a slight preponderance of male births; in polygamy female births become greatly in excess; in polyandry male births are enormously numerous, as many, for instance, as 400 boys to 120 girls.** We sometimes read that polygamic lands are thinly populated: true, but it is their population which causes polygamy, not vice versa. Moreover the two most populous empires in the world, China and Japan, are eminently polygamic.

Credit to Toad for finding that reference, link to his post with surrounding context here: <https://artisanaltoadshall.wordpress.com/2016/06/30/polygyny-and-the-beta-apocalypse-fantasy/>

[«Oldest](#) [.Older](#) 201 - 386 of 386