

VOX POPOLI

#RabidPuppies INFOGALACTIC #GamerGate

CONTACT

[Email Vox](#)

VOXOLOGY

[About Vox Day](#)

[Castalia](#) | [DevGame](#)

[Amazon](#)

[VD](#) | [Brainstorm](#)

[Dark Lord Consulting](#)

[Dark Lord Designs](#)

[RULES OF THE BLOG](#)

NEW RELEASE MAILING LIST

Email Address

Subscribe

- Blog Archives - ▾

1652 readers
BY FEEDBURNER

PRINT AND AUDIO



CRYPTOFASHION

THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 2015

Bow not before Caesar

Unlike the Episcopalians and Anglicans, the Southern Baptists are standing strong against government-imposed abomination and the legal parody of marriage:

Jack Graham, pastor of Prestonwood Baptist Church in Texas, said American Christians should be prepared for massive fallout if the Supreme Court legalizes same-sex unions.

“We want to stay in the system,” Graham told me in a telephone interview. “We want to work in the system. We want to support our government. We want to obey its laws.”

But.

“But there’s a coming a day, I believe, that many Christians personally and churches corporately will need to practice civil disobedience on this issue.”

The foundation for such a possibility was laid Wednesday morning in Columbus, Ohio where the current and former presidents of the nation’s largest Protestant denomination sent a strong message to the country.

“We strongly encourage all Southern Baptist pastors, leaders, educators and churches to openly reject any mandated legal definition of marriage and to use their influence to affirm God’s design for life and relationships,” the statement declared.

While affirming their love for all people - regardless of sexual orientation, the former Southern Baptist presidents said they “cannot and will not affirm the moral acceptability of homosexual behavior or any behavior that deviates from God’s design for marriage.”

“Our first duty is to love and obey God, not man,” they emphatically stated.



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

VOXIVERSITY

It has become abundantly clear that the U.S. federal government is increasingly opposed to the U.S. Constitution, the Bible, and Jesus Christ. And like every other government that has been foolish enough to take on the Body of Christ throughout history, it will demand obedience in vain.

Of course the lukewarm and the nominal believers will fall in line and fall away, that is what they always do. But as the pressure mounts, the faith of the faithful will grow harder and stronger, until their oppressors break upon it like a pane of glass striking a diamond.

Labels: [Christianity](#), [law](#)

POSTED BY VD @ 6/18/2015 08:00:00 AM

971 COMMENTS:

«[Oldest](#) · [Older](#) 201 - 400 of 971 [Newer](#) · [Newest](#)»

201. Gen. Kong

June 18, 2015 4:06 PM

Mark Citadel:

I was just reading how the pathetic heretical Church of England has said that there is no place in British schools for 'homophobia'. What a disgusting display! And this attitude is reflected in some idiotic troll comments here from Leftists such as GermanyGuy.

Vox, there has been an exciting development in Eastern Ukraine with the revival of the old Tsarist organization, the 'Black Hundreds' which was a radical Orthodox paramilitary force before the revolution. I have said for a long time now, if you want to actually influence policy and affect political change in this world, you have to look overseas to successful groups. Essentially, we need a Christian version of Hezbollah, which is massively influential in Lebanon as a legitimate organization, but is not actually part of the Lebanese army. It's actually BIGGER than the Lebanese army. The way they control Lebanon, this is how Christians should control weakened states in the West. The revival of the 'Black Hundreds' is perhaps a step in this direction for Eastern Europe. People thinking about giving up now are idiots. We are on the verge of a new era.

When your enemy is at his most insane, his burn out is not far off.

I often see statements to this effect, and yours is nicely made to be sure. Nevertheless, we have a long record of underestimating the abilities of both the Banana Empire's

[The Landmark](#)[Thucydides](#)[America's Great](#)[Depression](#)[Liberal Fascism](#)[The Divine Comedy:](#)[Inferno](#)[On the Existence of](#)[Gods](#)[Team Calvin: Five](#)[Questions](#)[Dissecting the Skeptics](#)[The Non-Dilemma of](#)[Euthyphro](#)[The Fifth Horseman](#)

INTERVIEWS

[Umberto Eco](#)[Jonah Goldberg](#)[Daniel Hannan](#)[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](#)[Reaxxion](#)[Talking to the Devil](#)[Strike the Root](#)[Ilana Mercer](#)[Alt Investors](#)[John Brown interview](#)

counterfeiting machine, the lying talents of the Ministry of Truth, and the idiocracy's endless appetite for more lies, grape-drunk and turd-tacos with their bakkaball games and TV (bread and circuses).

While the push-back in the Eastern Ukraine is a good thing, keep in mind that Soros and his Banana-Empire toadies engineered the Putsch in Ukraine to begin with. Putin didn't engineer a coup in Canada or even in a minor EUSSR province like Greece after all. He's playing defense against the Banana Empire's minions. When you have a machine to print money which most folks accept as real, you can pretty much buy whatever, or whomever, you want. Yes, your basic point is a good one. Likewise the Romanian Iron Guard in the WW II era.

202. Rip**June 18, 2015 4:07 PM**

Jart - you're the one that actually said it, I never made any such statement. Again, stop pulling words out of your ass and trying to put them in my mouth, and learn to friggin' read.

203. Rip**June 18, 2015 4:10 PM**

"Abortion rates are at their lowest point since Roe. There's been a long term decline since 1990, and that decline has accelerated since 2000.

That's progress."

True and yes, it is progress. A third time, what does any of that have to do with the SBC flipping its previous position or whether it's still not at all difficult to get an abortion should you so desire?

204. Josh**June 18, 2015 4:14 PM**

True and yes, it is progress. A third time, what does any of that have to do with the SBC flipping its previous position or whether it's still not at all difficult to get an abortion should you so desire?

Who do you think those SBC members are voting for?

[Counter-Currents](#)
[The Ranting Room](#)

SITES OF INTEREST

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

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) 2003-2016 VOX DAY. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. REPRODUCTION WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION IS EXPRESSLY PROHIBITED.

205. Gen. Kong

June 18, 2015 4:19 PM

Yes, Josh, I understand the concept of sets and subsets. I believe the organization making the pro-forma statement has what we might refer to as a 'credibility-problem'. They'll fold on gay marriage in due time because they've already bowed the knee. As I mentioned, they already suckle from the Banana Empire's swollen teat. They'll do what they're told when the time comes. The die is already cast. What good is salt which has lost its saltiness, except to be tossed into the flames? The church's former god summed it up rather nicely, no?

206. JartStar

June 18, 2015 4:20 PM

Jart - you're the one that actually said it, I never made any such statement. Again, stop pulling words out of your ass and trying to put them in my mouth, and learn to friggin' read.

I know you didn't say that and I didn't try to put that into your mouth, I pointed out that it's a logical read of what you have written. Now I might be wrong, and you may be right and I can't read, but I'm more than happy to let the readers here decide on who's right about that.

But even I'm wrong about the above I know I'm right about about two things: all you have to offer is pessimism, and even if I dismantled each of your propositions you'd retort with even more pessimism and defeatism.

207. Rip

June 18, 2015 4:27 PM

Jart - worth less /= worse, and realism /= pessimism

Josh - again, you can't even show that the laws passed at the state level are the reason for the reduction in abortions any more than someone can show that the introduction of mass vaccination is the reason for the drop in measles. Yes, those laws have made it slightly more inconvenient, but abortions aren't difficult to get if one wants one, and the "other side" would argue that sex education has had more to do with said reduction than any of the laws passed. Correlation does not equal causation in either case.

208. JDC

June 18, 2015 4:29 PM

Nothing is said about women with women as a physical act.

Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural sexual relations for unnatural ones. (Rom 1:26)

Your statement is incorrect.

209. artisanaltoadshall

June 18, 2015 4:32 PM

SirHamster.

Let's go back to the garden. There was only ONE restriction on Adam and Eve. They were not to eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. That was all. Everything else was up to them.

Think about that. No matter what they chose, as long as it was not specifically forbidden it was permitted and they were within God's will for their lives if they chose it. That's called "Free Will."

I really don't think scripture needs to explicitly state "this is sin" for us to have some inkling that there's something wrong here...

You need to read forward to Romans 14 and meditate on that. The issue of which day to observe (Saturday, the end of the week; or Sunday, the beginning of the week; or every day) was a huge issue as was meat sacrificed to idols (the butcher industry at that time). That which is faith is not sin.

The Law only contained two restrictions on the marital bed. First, there was to be no marital relations when the wife was menstruating for she was unclean. Second, there were to be no marital relations after the birth of a child, 40 days for the birth of a male child and 80 days after the birth of a female child (Leviticus 12). That's it.

If you back up and look at the big picture, it appears as if God isn't so interested in how the plumbing is connected as He is in the relationship of who is connecting the plumbing. All the prohibitions are based on relationships, not sex acts.

It isn't a case of "don't do *this* but rather don't do *anything sexual* with someone whose presence would constitute a proscribed relationship. OTOH, within a licit relationship, there are only two restrictions which I have described above.

Polygyny was a regulated, as opposed to a proscribed, relationship. Therefore, what happens in a polygynous relationship must devolve to the rest of the Law and we find that girl-girl sexual relations are not specifically prohibited because in a polygynous marriage they occur under the authority of their husband. Instead of getting upset about the possibilities you should rather be nervous about the amount of authority you've been given as a husband.

Again, it isn't about how the plumbing gets connected, it's all about the relationship. Spiritualize this and consider:

"Lord, Lord, we cast out demons and performed miracles in your name!"

"Depart from me, I don't have a relationship with you, you who practice lawlessness."

Get it? It isn't what happens within the relationship, it's all about the relationship.

210. JartStar

June 18, 2015 4:34 PM

realism /= pessimism

Just like every other pessimist.

211. Josh

June 18, 2015 4:37 PM

Josh - again, you can't even show that the laws passed at the state level are the reason for the reduction in abortions any more than someone can show that the introduction of mass vaccination is the reason for the drop in measles. Yes, those laws have made it slightly more inconvenient, but abortions aren't difficult to get if one wants one, and the "other side" would argue that sex education has had more to do with said reduction than any of the laws passed. Correlation does not equal causation in either case.

The abortion rate is almost as low as it was before Roe. That's not "slightly more inconvenient." That's not "aren't difficult to get."

Fighting abortion isn't just about laws. That's one arena. It's also about crisis pregnancy centers and adoption. That's a cultural battle, and the SBC and other evangelicals have been on the frontlines. Are you really to tell me that the various SBC resolutions didn't play a role in mobilizing the baptists?

You can continue to shout "doesn't matter" and "worthless" and "correlation is not causation."

212. Rip

June 18, 2015 4:45 PM

Josh - what was that again about goalposts? Seriously, you made a statement that a specific repudiation by the SBC has done a noticeable amount of good with respect to reducing abortion rates, and have since done a helluva jig dancing all around that assertion while completely avoiding actually backing it up. You didn't just move the goalposts, you completely switched sports.

Just damn.

You're the one that brought up laws, BTW. All I've asked (and you still haven't answered) is how the aforementioned repudiation actually did any meaningful good.

213. Rip

June 18, 2015 4:52 PM

Jart - I deal with what is, not what I wish were true. If you think that is pessimism, I can't help it, but your opinion doesn't change the fact that realism /= pessimism.

214. Beau

June 18, 2015 4:53 PM

Again, it isn't about how the plumbing gets connected, it's all about the relationship. Spiritualize this and consider

You are a liar with a seared conscience.

You want to *spiritualize* it so you can play with plumbing.

Your whole argument encapsulated, "Ignore plumbing so I can play with plumbing." Vile reptile.

215. SirHamster (#201)

June 18, 2015 5:01 PM

@ artisanalloadshall

None of that long post is relevant to what I'm actually disagreeing with you about - that you claimed to read my mind, and wanted me to confess to desiring a thought I do not have. Own your error.

I don't actually have a strong Bible-based objection to polygamy being legal, or even being practiced by some within the church (though leadership is restricted from it) - but your inability to grasp the actual point of disagreement is doing your position no favors.

I think you've made arguing for polygamy a higher priority than more useful and fruitful aspects of the Christian walk. That should give any Christian pause.

216. Mark Call

June 18, 2015 5:02 PM

@ artisanalloadshall and CM --

re: things LIKE, "therefore, girl-on-girl is sin" [sic]

While you are making the point, arti, I don't think CM gets it.

And a big part of the reason is something that has been demonstrated repeatedly here, not only in this thread but countless others before it.

(And -- to address a snipe that otherwise merits no response --

it's something I've been teaching consistently since before there even was a "Dread Ilk", both here and on countless radio shows and now Torah teachings. For those that aren't aware, check out:

www.markniwot.com

http://www.waytozion.org/teachings/mark_call/2014.htm

http://www.waytozion.org/teachings/mark_call/2015.htm

(etc)

and a whole lot of shows at

www.hebrewnationonline.com, from news shows and the "Torah Teachers' Round Table," to "Come out of her, My people" -- which is my consistent theme just about anywhere.)

Our Savior (Yahushua, or the nickname Y'shua) said in His VERY FIRST public address (Matthew 5-6-7) that He did not come to change ANYTHING in His Word ("TNKH", Hebrew acronym for Torah, Writings, and Prophets) so long as "heaven and earth" still exist.

Since they DO, He DIDN'T. (And He could have hardly been the "Word Made Flesh", otherwise. Isn't that obvious?)

Shaul/Paul, and all the others (like Kefa/aka "Peter" who walked with Him) certainly knew that.

And as you correctly pointed out, His Word is "perfect" (complete; doesn't need to be "added to," or "subtracted from". Indeed, not ONLY does Deuteronomy 4:2 and 12:32 make that clear, but so does the "VERY LAST commandment in Scripture. Hint: end of Revelation.)

SO -- the ONLY way to read the Writings of Paul (that Peter, in HIS last published warning, II Pe 3:15-16, said were "difficult to understand," and therefore often "twisted" -- by the "unlearned and untaught", even "unto their own destruction") is with that understanding:

IF Paul, or anyone else, is APPARENTLY changing Scripture (check out II Tim 3:16 if in doubt!) then EITHER the translator blew it, or the reader is! Paul knew better, but evidently most "church fathers" missed that lesson, just like the Pharisees did, and were rightly called (Matthew chapter 23, et al) "hypocrites" for it.

"Sin" is what YHVH says it is. Period. No more and no less. Is "His arm so short" that He can't say what He means, and mean what He says?

You are free to interpret all you want. But teachers are held to a higher standard, and those would IMPOSE THEIR WILL on others (like "forbidding to marry," even ;) are in another camp altogether.

Yahushua came to "teach with Authority" EXACTLY what was Written. (Among other things, obviously; but He would not have been Messiah if He had done exactly what He correctly called others "hypocrites" for doing!)

All of those who really WERE His "apostles" knew that, and behaved accordingly.

The message is this: the Bible is what is Written, and in the original language, if there's any question -- not what men say He SHOULD have written, if He was only as smart as they were.

217. BGS

June 18, 2015 5:08 PM

I fail to see how girl on girl gets anyone knocked up?

One of the ways is for the lesbian that wants to get preg is to go to a bar near a military base and get knocked up by a guy who will have money taken from his paycheck but lack the ability to fight for child custody.

218. artisanaltoadshall

June 18, 2015 5:13 PM

SirHamster

(I thought I'd posted this about 30 minutes ago. Obviously I didn't)

I rejected your claim that I (and other men) can confess a secret desire to have multiple wives and to have sex with them all at the same time.

I will accept your word that this is true, but based on all evidence available to me it puts you several standard deviations from the norm. There is a reason why lesbian porn is so popular with men...

As for your reasons, the passage in question doesn't say what you think it says, but that's a different argument.

219. Titus Quinctius Cincinnatus

June 18, 2015 5:15 PM

'splain?

Wild guess to get your goat.

220. Mark Call

June 18, 2015 5:19 PM

@ artisanaltoa shall and CM --

re: things LIKE, "therefore, girl-on-girl is sin" [sic]

While you are making the point, arti, I don't think CM gets it.

And a big part of the reason is something that has been demonstrated repeatedly here, not only in this thread but countless others before it.

(And -- to address a snipe that otherwise merits no response --

it's something I've been teaching consistently since before there even was a "Dread Ilk", both here and on countless radio shows and now Torah teachings. For those that aren't aware, check out:

www.markniwot.com

http://www.waytozion.org/teachings/mark_call/2014.htm

http://www.waytozion.org/teachings/mark_call/2015.htm

(etc)

and a whole lot of shows at

www.hebrewnationonline.com, from news shows and the

"Torah Teachers' Round Table," to "Come out of her, My people" -- which is my consistent theme just about anywhere.)

Our Savior (Yahushua, or the nickname Y'shua) said in His VERY FIRST public address (Matthew 5-6-7) that He did not come to change ANYTHING in His Word ("TNKH", Hebrew acronym for Torah, Writings, and Prophets) so long as "heaven and earth" still exist.

Since they DO, He DIDN'T. (And He could have hardly been the "Word Made Flesh", otherwise. Isn't that obvious?)

Shaul/Paul, and all the others (like Kefa/aka "Peter" who walked with Him) certainly knew that.

And as you correctly pointed out, His Word is "perfect" (complete; doesn't need to be "added to," or "subtracted from". Indeed, not ONLY does Deuteronomy 4:2 and 12:32 make that clear, but so does the "VERY LAST commandment in Scripture. Hint: end of Revelation.)

SO -- the ONLY way to read the Writings of Paul (that Peter, in HIS last published warning, II Pe 3:15-16, said were "difficult to understand," and therefore often "twisted" -- by

the "unlearned and untaught", even "unto their own destruction") is with that understanding:

IF Paul, or anyone else, is APPARENTLY changing Scripture (check out II Tim 3:16 if in doubt!) then EITHER the translator blew it, or the reader is! Paul knew better, but evidently most "church fathers" missed that lesson, just like the Pharisees did, and were rightly called (Matthew chapter 23, et al) "hypocrites" for it.

"Sin" is what YHVH says it is. Period. No more and no less. Is "His arm so short" that He can't say what He means, and mean what He says?

You are free to interpret all you want. But teachers are held to a higher standard, and those would IMPOSE THEIR WILL on others (like "forbidding to marry," even ;) are in another camp altogether.

Yahushua came to "teach with Authority" EXACTLY what was Written. (Among other things, obviously; but He would not have been Messiah if He had done exactly what He correctly called others "hypocrites" for doing!)

221. Josh

June 18, 2015 5:24 PM

Wild guess to get your goat.

Well done.

222. Mr. Rational

June 18, 2015 5:26 PM

Even a little bit of abortion (which generally leads to a lot of abortion) is clearly s [sic] ungodly

This is irreconcilable with Exodus 21. Inducing abortion, even against the will of the woman and her husband, only incurs a civil fine so long as the woman sustains no lasting harm.

Yes, yes, "abrogation". This is code for writing your prejudices into the Bible, which is what got me to leave the faith I was raised in. I just couldn't stand the hypocrisy any more.

Reality check: where in the Bible, if anywhere, does it say what is to be done with defective children? I never found

anything, which is not to say that it isn't given. Other societies of the time left them to die by exposure. It's hard to believe that herders living on the ragged edge of existence were not just as harsh by necessity.

The fact that something is presented in narrative does not mean that something is prescribed by the text.

What does the prescription to sleep with one's brother's widow mean, then?

Our new mayor in Anchorage is on the record defending a father marrying his son.

The subtext of a lot of pleas for gay marriage is that it's a way to pass estates along untaxed (and keep them away from blood family).

As for girl-on-girl, if swapping orgasms keeps peace between the women it's a GOOD thing, no? Disclaimer: I'm an outie and have no bitch... er, dog in this fight.

223. SirHamster (#201)

June 18, 2015 5:31 PM

I will accept your word that this is true, but based on all evidence available to me it puts you several standard deviations from the norm.

A man can channel his desires. Why do you think I referenced the concept of setting minds? This is a serious question I want you to answer.

Speaking of norms... which norm are you comparing to, and what norm are you trying to develop?

There is a reason why lesbian porn is so popular with men...

Because men don't want to look at other men's genitals, because most men aren't gay. And as people watch graphical lesbian porn, their desires are tuned in that direction, and the culture is pushed towards more licentiousness.

As far as you're trying to sell Polygamy to Christians because "Licit Lesbian Sex!" ... you have wandered very far from the Christian's purpose. You'd have foolishly traded something worthwhile for something worth nothing at all.

224. artisanaltoadshall

June 18, 2015 5:34 PM

@Beau

You are a liar with a seared conscience.

*You want to spiritualize it so you can play with plumbing.
Your whole argument encapsulated, "Ignore plumbing so I
can play with plumbing." Vile reptile.*

Wow. Now I'm a reptile because Beau says I am. Child,
child. You are so very confused.

*I said "You have not studied to show yourself approved.
Carefully check Leviticus 18 and Leviticus 20.*

- 1 Men with men is prohibited and condemned.*
- 2 Men with animals is prohibited and condemned.*
- 3 Women with animals is prohibited and condemned.*
- 4 Women with women... *crickets**

Nothing is said about women with women as a physical act.

You have yet to offer one shred of evidence that I'm wrong
and we both know you can't because I'm right. Yet, you cling
to your cultural delusions.

If a person can cast out demons and perform miracles in the
name of Christ (exercising power through His name) that
would seem to me that they have the appearance of a close
relationship. Yet, for some of these people He says "Depart
from me you who practice lawlessness, I never knew you."
In other words, they did not have the proper relationship
(they lacked a relationship) and He rejected them.

It isn't about how the plumbing gets connected, it's about
the relationship in which the plumbing gets connected. Go
back and study. You want it to be all about the plumbing
because you're a legalist.

225. SirHamster (#201)

June 18, 2015 5:36 PM

**Wow. Now I'm a reptile because Beau says I am. Child,
child. You are so very confused.**

You are worth no further words. Repent of your foolishness.

226. artisanaltoadshall

June 18, 2015 5:54 PM

SirHamster

We both know that if you could refute me you'd be quoting chapter and verse. You can't. God said "My ways are not your ways, oh man" and it seems to me that really, really bothers you. You and others here want to play God, stepping in where He was silent and "fixing" His supposed error. I'm not the fool, you are; and you're the one who needs to repent. You are making the claim that you know better than God how things are to be, for all time and all people.

You can't respond because the only thing you can do is attack me. I have cited the relevant Scripture and made my case. Your choice is either to accept the message or shoot the messenger. Heh. It's OK. I forgive you. However, I'm not the saint that Stephen was. If you actually shoot at me I'll shoot back. Then I'll mock you.

227. JaimelnTexas

June 18, 2015 6:03 PM

Going bawk to the SBC, I will believe them in gheir threats the day they start removing the flag of these uSA from the worship area. A huge improvement if the SBC would just move the "Christian" flag to [our cutural] preeminent position.

228. simplytimothy

June 18, 2015 6:42 PM

Let's go back to the garden. There was only ONE restriction on Adam and Eve. They were not to eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. That was all. Everything else was up to them.

You conflate Sin with sins. Sins are the fruits of sin. The Law was given by God to make man aware of Sin by showing man his powerlessness to stop sinning.

Having conflated sins, with Sin, you turn to law and weasel like a pharisee.

Let's turn now to the Holy Spirit and His action in us. Does He turn us toward or away from sin?

Now let's look at your heart and to whence it turns.

229. JaimelnTexas

June 18, 2015 6:49 PM

simplytimothy. I do not follow what you are saying.

Genesis 2: 16 the LORD God commanded the man, "You are free to eat from any tree in the garden; but you must not eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, for when you eat from it you will certainly die."

230. Tar Heel (VFM# 4906)

June 18, 2015 6:50 PM

I am a Southern Baptist, and today, I am proud to be one.
Hail Christ the King!

231. Giuseppe

June 18, 2015 6:51 PM

98. Beau June 18, 2015 12:47 PM

Storm the Forts of Darkness

Beau,
may I steal this and/or quote you? I will google...but where is this from?

PS: Thank you. Your messages are invariably instructive.

232. Chiva

June 18, 2015 7:02 PM

Wow. Now I'm a reptile because Beau says I am.

Beau I know. You I don't know.

233. Tar Heel

June 18, 2015 7:05 PM

PS: Thank you. Your messages are invariably instructive.

I agree, Giuseppe. Beau is such a blessing when it comes to commentary.

By the way, the Minion number I used was incorrect. Please don't unleash the hounds, Dark Lord!

234. simplytimothy

June 18, 2015 7:30 PM

Hi Jamie,

Scripture speaks of sin as a thing--"sin is enmity with God" for example.

We also have "the fruits of the Spirit" and "the fruits of the Flesh" (which artisanalloadsall ["did God *really* say] is trying to sell us)

Those fruits come from our "nature" and pre-fall our nature was of the Spirit. Having eaten of that tree, our nature became not of Him and went to war with Him. We became sinful.

The "thing" that perverts our nature from its rightful state is sin. The fruits of sin are sins (i.e. the fruits of the flesh)

Now, I may be stating this incorrectly or using 'sin' as a synonym for 'flesh' and I am certainly open to a proven elder to correct me on this.

As Stickwick pointed out that "darkness' is a thing, so 'sin' is a thing separate from the fruits of sin--sins.

I stand to be corrected by a competent, christian scholar, but I think my take is correct.

I also alluded to the work of the Holy Spirit in us, which is Sanctification. We are redeemed by Him and then on our faith in Him, He begins the process of transforming us from our sinful nature (or old man) to the ways of Adam pre-fall.

Rebelling against that work, as artisanalloadsall is doing on this comment thread bears fruit too. The pharisee Paul in Romans 1:18 lays out the counter-case to artisanalloadsall and gives the progression of Sin's effect on us into ever increasing sins starting in verse 24

Romans 1:24 *Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another*

Romans 1: 26 *Because of this, God gave them over to*

shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural sexual relations for unnatural ones.

Romans 1: 28-32 *Furthermore, just as they did not think it worthwhile to retain the knowledge of God, so God gave them over to a depraved mind, so that they do what ought not to be done. 29 They have become filled with every kind of wickedness, evil, greed and depravity. They are full of envy, murder, strife, deceit and malice. They are gossips, 30 slanderers, God-haters, insolent, arrogant and boastful; they invent ways of doing evil; they disobey their parents; 31 they have no understanding, no fidelity, no love, no mercy. 32 Although they know God's righteous decree that those who do such things deserve death, they not only continue to do these very things but also approve of those who practice them.*

Note well the progression from shameful desires to shameful lusts to total depravity. Note also the Pharisee of Pharisees' Paul description of the hot-babes doing Lesbian Porn as exchanging natural sexual relations for unnatural ones. Do they enjoy it? sure. Did I enjoy watching them once? sure. Is it right? nope. Am I still attracted at it? no. His work in me has changed me the other way.

And then there is artisanalloadsall.

Hmmmmm. St. Paul or artisanalloadsall. That's a tough one. Well, no its not.

The progression of Sanctification works the other way. You start with a sick fuck like artisanalloadsall and progress from depraved mind out of the grip of Sin. As Sin loses its grip in you due to the work of the Holy Spirit, the sins become boring and un-natural and we progress in Him back to what we where created for.

my 2 cents.

235. MendoScot

June 18, 2015 7:57 PM

Amen, Beau, and Amen.

236. Giuseppe

June 18, 2015 8:07 PM

Beau, TarHeel and any others who can comment on it:

Being as I am basically an ignorant heathen regarding Christianity and not well-read enough in it to know the ins and outs of it, please take this humble request for clarity as being genuine. I am not here to sow division, but to learn. If I ask a stupid question assume it's because I am ignorant, not necessarily stupid or intentionally ignorant to satisfy some base desire.

That said, the duel between **Beau** and **Artisanaltoadshall** is interesting to me, and no, not for the lustful reasons you may think. It is honestly interesting. I'd like to see clearer on this topic as it goes to the root of many things, regardless of sexual desires etc. etc.

Currently, it seems to me that Artisan has indeed made a case based in scriptural works. He has done so in a way that may be arrogant, uncharitable and confrontational, but then, if anyone on VP clutches at pearls on that basis they are probably not ilk, so I am not concerned with style, other than it's sometimes more effective at getting people to pay attention as a rhetorical device, but it speaks nothing one way or the other towards the truth itself.

I have not seen a scriptural or even logical refutation of his points to date. This may be because they are so obviously wrong, but unless I have missed something it seems to me that he has refuted the only two arguments presented:

- That the OT is superseded by the NT (this is a tricky one, and I keep being confused by it so I tend to leave it as unresolved in my mind. I can't be convinced by something I don't fully understand after all or at least accept if not understand. Jesus does say the old law is surpassed, but he does also refer to the OT. My interpretation so far is the OT has no real change from the NT but the way it was interpreted and the level of "monkeyness" of humanity back then required stronger direction) he has refuted this to a certain extent that I find plausible.

- The passage in Romans 1:26, which according to my Aramaic translation and Greek translation can indeed be read as...women who become unnatural in their sexual practices will be doomed as much as men who do...but it doesn't exactly follow that those unnatural practices are simply eating pussy. It seems to me they mean that if a woman becomes so infatuated with whatever lusts that she stops behaving as a woman to a man (presumably her

husband) then she is doomed.

As for my current position, I don't have one. I really am trying to see what the intent of scripture and God is here (and one is not necessarily 100% = to the other, but it seems to me to be a good indicator at the very least once understood properly).

As a general tendency, I think that... I probably have more experience with women than a lot of men in general, and I certainly have spent time with a couple of them who would not have objected to other women joining us, in fact, at a couple of points even encouraged it, even so, I never did indulge. It seemed to me something that at best would be temporal enjoyment only and as such not a high priority activity, and one that would seem to involve multiple points of failure potential, beginning with the very real one of one of the two girls in question feeling more or less left out/cared about etc than the other, which would be...rude/hurtful etc. unless it was agreed beforehand that one was just there as a fucktoy...so yeah...at a practical sense, I see it impractical at best.

Anyway, I will check in. hopefully so will the relevant duellists.

237. JRL

June 18, 2015 8:08 PM

artisanalloadsall....Scripture does not expressly forbid woman on woman marriage either. By your teaching, lesbian marriage, including lesbian sex is fine.

238. Giuseppe

June 18, 2015 8:12 PM

simplytimothy.

THANK YOU!

Your comment was posted as I was posting mine so I only saw it after my request for clarity. Your take on it is very helpful.

239. IM2L844

June 18, 2015 8:19 PM

"Do not love the world or the things in the world. **If anyone loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world—the desires of the flesh and the desires of the eyes and pride in possessions—is not from the Father but is from the world.** And the world is passing away along with its desires, but whoever does the will of God abides forever." ~ 1 John 2:15-17

"Set your minds on things that are above, not on things that are on earth." ~ Colossians 3:2

"**Do you not know that friendship with the world is enmity with God? Therefore whoever wishes to be a friend of the world makes himself an enemy of God.**" ~ James 4:4

"For the grace of God has appeared, bringing salvation for all people, training us to **renounce ungodliness and worldly passions**, and to live self-controlled, upright, and godly lives in the present age," ~ Titus 2:11-12

"Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that by testing you may discern what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect." ~ Romans 12:2

"Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you?" ~ 1 Corinthians 3:16

"As we look not to the things that are seen but to the things that are unseen. For the things that are seen are transient, but the things that are unseen are eternal." ~ 2 Corinthians 4:18

"But I say, walk by the Spirit, and you will not gratify the **desires of the flesh.**" ~ Galatians 5:16

240. Mark Call

June 18, 2015 8:21 PM

I stand to be corrected by a competent, christian scholar, but I think my take is correct.

Would Joel Osteen do? Or maybe Rick Warren? Barry Soetero? (He's a competent Constitutional Scholar, too! Just ask 'im...)

The problem is as outlined above. You quote Paul without understanding that he was a "consummate Torah scholar"

(and he says so) who KNEW that the Messiah didn't change a WORD of it!

And yet *competent, christian scholars* [sic] have lied about exactly that for centuries...saying 'the law is done away with' and we are no longer "under the law" without having a CLUE what "law" Paul was talking about!

(Hint: NOT the "instruction of Yah" but the 'law' of MEN. The Hebrew word "torah" really means "instruction" -- YHVH uses other words like mitzvot, chukkot, mishpatim to mean legal terms like commandments, statutes, and judgments; the misleading Greek term "nomos" conflates ALL of 'em together!)

(They lie about Romans 13, too. How's the SBC gonna deal with THAT?!)

The answer is simple - and it doesn't take an "xtian scholar" to explain it. Yahushua did a downright dandy job:

"If you love Me, keep My commandments." (John 14:15)
Which? ALL OF 'EM, the ones He said He wouldn't change!
And if some 'xtian scholar' says otherwise, guess who's lying?

This seems apropos:

"Not everyone who says to Me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of My Father in heaven.

Many will say to Me in that day, 'Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Your name, cast out demons in Your name, and done many wonders in Your name?'

And then I will declare to them, 'I never knew you; depart from Me, you who practice lawlessness! [torah-less-ness]'

The problem that the SBC, the RCC, and just about all of the paganized, corporate, licensed 501c(3) 'church' has is that they've already made the "deal with the devil."

(They've ignored lessons like Judges 2:2, Exodus 34:12-15, Romans 6:16, etc, and the whole story from Ezekiel chapters 8 and 9.) The Supreme Court is about to do the old game show Education Thing:

"Don Pardo -- TELL 'EM what they've WON!"

IM2L844,
Thank you.
That basically gave the scriptural context to what simplytimothy said and does indeed make things much clearer.

As an aside, I have long been curious about your chosen handle. Is it something you care to elaborate on? PM if public reply is not something you wish to do, and ignore my question if PM is also not something you wish to do.

242. JaimelnTexas

June 18, 2015 8:48 PM

Ok. I think you are mostly correct. There is but one sin, unbelief, "believe in the LORD Jesus Chtist." As Scripture states

Jesus told them, "This is the only work God wants from you: Believe in the one he has sent."

In that sense, I understand your differentiation and is what, IMO, is the unpardonable sin.

243. Stg58 / Animal Mother #225

June 18, 2015 8:49 PM

Mark Call,

Christians are not under The Law. It is obvious what you are getting at. You are telling us we must keep His commandments, and then going right into the Old Testament. Jesus fulfilled The Law in our stead. Why are you asking us to take on a yoke that we not our fathers could bear? If we could keep The Law Jesus wouldn't have had to die for us. The Law shows us we are sinful, a schoolmaster to lead us to Grace. We can not keep it. Mark Call, how does Hebrews factor into your thinking? The Old Covenant is folded up as a garment. We are of the New Covenant.

244. JaimelnTexas

June 18, 2015 8:58 PM

A good way to approach sexual issues, drinking issues, really, any issue of life is this:

Mathew 6:21

Wherever your treasure is, there the desires of your heart will also be.

What pleasure do we pursue above God? What our defining character?

245. Mark Call

June 18, 2015 9:03 PM

@Animal Mother -- re: **Christians are not under The Law.** and similar lies (based on "twisting Paul", already addressed.)

Maybe you'd better try reading what He actually SAID, rather than what "xtian scholars" tell you he SHOULD have said.

How the same *^&! idiots who prattle about "Romans 13" on the one hand and being slaves of the Almighty State can turn around and say they're not "under the law" is DAMNED funny, if you think about it. Yes, they truly "have their reward."

Worse, however, they "preach another jesus, whom we have not preached," said that VERY SAME guy, Paul. Kinda helps explain what Yahushua meant when He said He would tell them, "I never knew you."

246. SirHamster (#201)

June 18, 2015 9:04 PM

I have not seen a scriptural or even logical refutation of his points to date. This may be because they are so obviously wrong, but unless I have missed something it seems to me that he has refuted the only two arguments presented:

I don't find artisanaltoa's core points to be wrong - that is, that polygamy was allowed in the OT, that polygamy is generally not forbidden in the Bible (For both OT + NT), or even that legalized polygamy may have some use for modern society.

I take issue with what he appeals to: "all of you guys secretly want to watch your multiple wives have lesbian sex". First off, not true.

Second, it doesn't fit the purpose of the Christian. We are called to be representatives of God - light in a dark world,

holy in a vulgar place. In Galatians 5, Paul points out that the Christian is in between a struggle of our spirit and our flesh:

"16 So I say, walk by the Spirit, and you will not gratify the desires of the flesh. 17 For the flesh desires what is contrary to the Spirit, and the Spirit what is contrary to the flesh. They are in conflict with each other, so that you are not to do whatever[a] you want. 18 But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law.

19 The acts of the flesh are obvious: sexual immorality, impurity and debauchery; 20 idolatry and witchcraft; hatred, discord, jealousy, fits of rage, selfish ambition, dissensions, factions 21 and envy; drunkenness, orgies, and the like. I warn you, as I did before, that those who live like this will not inherit the kingdom of God."

Do you think "Lesbian Sex!" is an appeal to our spiritual or fleshly natures? Is it a Biblical ideal?

Earlier, I obliquely referred to this verse: "Set your minds on things above, not on earthly things." (Colossians 3) Is watching a personal sex show a heavenly thing or an earthly thing? Bearing in mind that heavenly things are eternal, while earthly things age, wrinkle, rot, and perish. (Matthew 6:19-21)

Tangential to that, artisanal toad is dismissive of Beau, who we know as a prayer-warrior who ministers to the homeless. Does that speak well of his judgement, when Christians are called to have a spirit of peace and unity with each other (Ephesians 4), and to judge by fruits (Luke 6:43-45)?

Overall, his behavior misses the point of the perfect standard laid upon Christians - sanctified living that points others to God. It's related to the difference between the letter of the law and the spirit of the law. (Except that he is breaking the Law; not on polygamy, but in personal conduct)

For a related rule of thumb for judging ideas, consider "Be careful not to practice your righteousness in front of others to be seen by them. If you do, you will have no reward from your Father in heaven." (Matthew 6:1)

As Christians, we're pursuing eternal heavenly rewards - and those are things that often fail to give earthly rewards. So all the sexual pleasure we can want from polygamy is its

own, earthly reward. That's nice for the polygamist in the now if he gets that without crossing Biblical lines. But there is something better:

"Truly I tell you," Jesus replied, "no one who has left home or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or fields for me and the gospel will fail to receive a hundred times as much in this present age: homes, brothers, sisters, mothers, children and fields--along with persecutions--and in the age to come eternal life." (Mark 10:29-30)

The celibate man, voluntary or involuntary, who uses his life to serve the Kingdom of God will get something far better than sexual pleasure - and that's something to set our minds on.

247. artisanalloadshall

June 18, 2015 9:20 PM

I knew where this was going when I started the argument. I threw in the girl-girl stuff early because it so clearly illustrates the inability of many in the church to take out of the Word what it says instead of reading into it what they want it to say. Eisegesis v Exegesis. Ultimately you're trying to claim God didn't get it right. That God's Law isn't perfect and therefore God is a liar because the Word clearly says All Scripture is God-breathed and the Law of the Lord is perfect. Take a look at the points I've made:

1. There is no Biblical prohibition on polygyny. It was permitted and regulated under God's Law and not forbidden in the New Testament.
2. Homosexuality is literally restricted to men with men and does not include women with women.
3. Marriage belongs to God and recognizing any authority of the state over marriage is idolatry. It is literally giving to Caesar that which belongs only to God.
4. Marriage is a covenant entity (there are three- the family, the state and the church) in which God is a party to the marriage.
5. A corporation is the creature of the state, therefore it is idolatry for a church to incorporate.
6. Individuals have a right to marry and are not required to get a license in order to do so. Therefore, it is idolatry for Christians to obtain a license to marry.
7. There are only two restrictions God placed on the marriage bed: no sex during menstruation and no sex after the birth of a child; 40 days for a boy and 80 days for a girl. Therefore, regardless of the number of wives and in light of

points one and two, what happens in the marriage bed falls under the authority of the husband.

8. There are no specific sexual acts forbidden in Scripture, but many examples of forbidden relationships that involve sex. Ergo, God cares more about the relationship of people connecting the plumbing than how the plumbing gets connected.

You people are trying to conflate a sexual act with a relationship. Fornication is any sexual contact and is wrong because the individuals involved are not married. Adultery is any sexual act and is wrong because at least one of the individuals is married, but not to the person they are having sex with. Homosexuality is wrong because regardless of the sexual act, it's men with men and God has condemned all such relationships.

What is the natural function of women? I quoted the relevant passage: 1st Timothy 2:15. The only legitimate childbearing is done within the bounds of marriage. Can a woman who is married to a man with more than one wife fulfill the natural function of a woman by submitting to her husband and bearing his children (or at least trying)? Yes. Can two women who abandoned God and neither honor Him or obey Him, rejected His plan, rejected men and marriage fulfill the natural function of women? No.

I don't know what translation simplytimothy is using, but the text of Romans 1:26 does NOT say "natural sexual relations for unnatural ones." To make that claim you have to demonstrate that the Apostle Paul was inserting a new violation into the Law, something God chose not to do. The text is best defined as the NASB has it: They "exchanged the natural function for the unnatural" which brings us back to the question of what the natural function of the woman is and I already cited 1st Timothy 2:15. But, when you read it, perhaps you should start at verse 12.

IM2L844

Your comments represent the classic position of the medieval church, informed by the opinions men like Augustine of Hippo ("Lord make me chaste, but not yet") who viewed sex within marriage as an unfortunate but necessary evil.

All of the passages you quoted are great, but what you're trying to do is subtly claim a man's desire for his wife and his desire for sexual gratification within his own marriage is

somehow worldly. No. Just, No. The Song of Solomon is a luridly erotic description of the relationship between a husband and wife. Is that wrong?

248. Mark Call

June 18, 2015 9:22 PM

re: all the self-righteous anti-porn posturing in lieu of anti-polygyny Scripture

C'mon, guys. Good grief. If you can't refute the thesis from Scripture, then just latch onto something else. If it's not "lesbian porn" (and we're all SOOOOO much better'n dat!) then it'll be the tired ole line, "well, polygyny may be PERMITTED by the Bible, but it's ALWAYS BAAAAaad!". (Come to think of it, somebody already gave up and already trotted that BS out today.)

AND - before someone trots out that lame excuse for lazy scholarship out again...suffice it to say "it's not true." (After all, why does the SAME GUY, Paul, also say ALL marriage is a hassle, so, "I would spare you," in I Cor. 7? At least he was honest enough to admit that celibacy was just his personal opinion, rather than doing what so many 'xtian scholars' do, and claim to speak for God Himself.)

I'll say it again. On second thought, I'll just quote Scripture, since YHWH already said it. "I change NOT." (Malachi 3:6) Somebody above tried to twist Paul (again) and asked about Hebrews. How 'bout 13:8? He's the "same, yesterday, today, and forever."

Does that sound like the "Old Testament" was "done away with"?

Or is it just possible "God IS True, and every man a liar."? As Jeremiah so correctly put it (16:19) -- we have, indeed, "inherited lies from our fathers."

Read Romans 6:16 again. You can't say Paul didn't warn ya. (But he was just commenting on earlier, NOT-done-away-with things like the story of Joshua 9, and warnings from Ex. 34:12-15, Judges 2:2, etc.)

There really is 'nothing new under the sun.'. And, no, xtians need to learn they cannot "serve two masters." Caesar, by any name, is a duplicitous dude! Yahushua put it this way, in Luke 6:46:

"Why do you call me, 'Lord, lord,' and **NOT DO the things I say?**"

249. Mark Call

June 18, 2015 9:26 PM

re: all the self-righteous anti-porn posturing in lieu of anti-polygyny Scripture

C'mon, guys. Good grief. If you can't refute the thesis from Scripture, then just latch onto something else. If it's not "lesbian porn" (and we're all SOOOOO much better'n dat!) then it'll be the tired ole line, "well, polygyny may be PERMITTED by the Bible, but it's ALWAYS BAAAAaaad!". (Come to think of it, somebody already gave up and already trotted that BS out today.)

AND - before someone trots out that lame excuse for lazy scholarship out again...suffice it to say "it's not true." (After all, why does the SAME GUY, Paul, also say ALL marriage is a hassle, so, "I would spare you," in I Cor. 7? At least he was honest enough to admit that celibacy was just his personal opinion, rather than doing what so many 'xtian scholars' do, and claim to speak for God Himself.)

I'll say it again. On second thought, I'll just quote Scripture, since YHVH already said it. "I change NOT." (Malachi 3:6) Somebody above tried to twist Paul (again) and asked about Hebrews. How 'bout 13:8? He's the "same, yesterday, today, and forever."

Does that sound like the "Old Testament" was "done away with"?

Or is it just possible "God IS True, and every man a liar."? As Jeremiah so correctly put it (16:19) -- we have, indeed, "inherited lies from our fathers."

Read Romans 6:16 again. You can't say Paul didn't warn ya. (But he was just commenting on earlier, NOT-done-away-with things like the story of Joshua 9, and warnings from Ex. 34:12-15, Judges 2:2, etc.)

There really is 'nothing new under the sun.'. And, no, xtians need to learn they cannot "serve two masters." Caesar, by any name, is a duplicitous dude! Yahushua put it this way, in Luke 6:46:

"Why do you call me, 'Lord, lord,' and **NOT DO the things I say?**"

250. Mark Call

June 18, 2015 9:34 PM

PS, artisanalloadshall...

Good job (your comments came in while I was trying to pick food questions for "I am not a robot") -- but the problem remains. Men continue to do what Yahushua condemned in Mark 7. They **STILL** twist His words, and it's the summary for this whole thread:

"By your traditions you have made the commands of Yah of no effect."

251. simplytimothy

June 18, 2015 9:36 PM

@Mark Call,

St. Paul (the ex-Pharisee) wrote to the Hebrews contrasting and comparing the old covenant under your laws to the new covenant under grace.

The same St. Paul in several epistles warned repeatedly about men like you who worked to enslave free men in Christ under the yoke of your rule-book.

Chapter 1 of Romans which I quoted from above demolishes your claim that 'it is ok'.

So, from my mere-Christian understanding, that satisfactorily demolishes your claims.

However, you claim that Christian Fathers misled us and purposely mistranslate Paul so as to further a lie. Furthermore, scholars such as C.S. Lewis, G.K Chesterton, Tolkien never caught the lies either.

So, let's run with that.

It would be helpful if you would state your premises and conclusion in a standard logical syllogism.

Since it is you who are making a new claim, politeness requires that you do the work of constructing that syllogism for us.

(Yes, you have made an argument in these threads, but extracting them, examining them and deriving your premises and conclusions is time consuming work that, given the apparent lack of credibility of your claim, I have no desire to do it so its either you or somebody else you can enlist for the task)

252. Titus Quinctius Cincinnatus

June 18, 2015 9:38 PM

Mark Call - Do Christians need to be circumcised to obey God?

253. Matthew 22

June 18, 2015 9:41 PM

Marriage at the Resurrection

23That same day the Sadducees, who say there is no resurrection, came to him with a question. 24“Teacher,” they said, “Moses told us that if a man dies without having children, his brother must marry the widow and raise up offspring for him. 25Now there were seven brothers among us. The first one married and died, and since he had no children, he left his wife to his brother. 26The same thing happened to the second and third brother, right on down to the seventh. 27Finally, the woman died. 28Now then, at the resurrection, whose wife will she be of the seven, since all of them were married to her?”

29Jesus replied, “You are in error because you do not know the Scriptures or the power of God. 30At the resurrection people will neither marry nor be given in marriage; they will be like the angels in heaven. 31But about the resurrection of the dead—have you not read what God said to you, 32‘I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob’? He is not the God of the dead but of the living.”

254. Nobody

June 18, 2015 9:56 PM

228. Jaimelntexas

They were naked and not ashamed.

Who told you that you are naked.

255. simplytimothy

June 18, 2015 9:59 PM

@artisantoadsall,

You submitted your points as I was typing my comment. I will look at it tomorrow when I have time.

I agree with many of them.

However, my request that you present a syllogism stands as extracting your argument is not something I want to do.

The part of your comment for which I make my request is this:

"You people are trying to conflate a sexual act with a relationship. Fornication is any sexual contact and is wrong because the individuals involved are not married. Adultery is any sexual act and is wrong because at least one of the individuals is married, but not to the person they are having sex with. Homosexuality is wrong because regardless of the sexual act, it's men with men and God has condemned all such relationships.

What is the natural function of women? I quoted the relevant passage: 1st Timothy 2:15. The only legitimate childbearing is done within the bounds of marriage. Can a woman who is married to a man with more than one wife fulfill the natural function of a woman by submitting to her husband and bearing his children (or at least trying)? Yes. Can two women who abandoned God and neither honor Him or obey Him, rejected His plan, rejected men and marriage fulfill the natural function of women? No.

I don't know what translation simplytimothy is using, but the text of Romans 1:26 does NOT say "natural sexual relations for unnatural ones." To make that claim you have to demonstrate that the Apostle Paul was inserting a new violation into the Law, something God chose not to do. The text is best defined as the NASB has it: They "exchanged the natural function for the unnatural" which brings us back to the question of what the natural function of the woman is and I already cited 1st Timothy 2:15. But, when you read it, perhaps you should start at verse 12."

If you could please condense that into one or two arguments using standard premises and conclusions it would save a lot of time.

On its face it look ridiculous, but again, the work of extracting your claims into its premises and conclusions is hard work I do not want to do and I would rather not argue about ill-defined things.

Let's look at Romans 1:26 in its immediate context. I use the ESV as it is my printed version. <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Romans1&version=ESV>

26 For this reason God gave them up to dishonorable passions.

For their women exchanged natural relations for those that are contrary to nature;

27 and 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.

Bold mine.

We see a comparison. In the vernacular, *God gave them up to dishonorable passions. The men started banging men and likewise the women started humping women.*

My vernacular version I reversed the compared things around the **likewise** to make my point; namely that your interpretation is looney on its face. However, I may be missing something.

So, I await your formal argument(s)

thx.

256. dfordoom

June 18, 2015 10:00 PM

Tom Joad said:

Polygamy is a distraction that has nothing to do with same-sex marriage or the effort to deny consenting adults the right to marry the person of their choice.

So do you agree that polygamy should be legalized? It's a

simple question requiring a yes/no answer. If your answer is no, why not?

257. artisanaltoadshall

June 18, 2015 10:10 PM

SirHamster

Except that he is breaking the Law; not on polygamy, but in personal conduct...

The celibate man, voluntary or involuntary, who uses his life to serve the Kingdom of God will get something far better than sexual pleasure - and that's something to set our minds on.

First, you don't know me so I'm at a complete loss as to how you can accuse me of misconduct. I made an argument that you admit you agree with. Second, your position here is very similar to what I described and was exhorted by the medieval church: procreation and not recreation, chastity and celibacy over all. And for those women that really liked sex? Well, waste not want not. The church ran a string of brothels using such women with the profits going into the church coffers.

I don't buy it. If sex *within marriage* wasn't supposed to be enjoyable God would not have given women a clitoris.

You have also misstated what I wrote. You even put it in quotes. **"all of you guys secretly want to watch your multiple wives have lesbian sex"**

That isn't what I said and you know it. That's your perception of what I said. This is what I really said:

C'mon guys, fess up. If you had more than one wife I'm thinking I'm correct when I say that sooner or later you'll want all of them in bed with you at once. Put a pile of naked, sweaty, sexually aroused people in bed together and things happen. Maybe that's why God didn't prohibit or condemn girl on girl action, because it could be legitimately exercised/satisfied in a polygynous marriage. This drives most Christians nuts and scares the living bejeezus out of Christian women.

There's your perspective and my perspective.

Many years ago (we're talking about BC days), two in my

bed was not unusual and three at once happened a few times. (Three on one gets real complicated, real quick. First, you can't do it on a bed because there isn't enough room. That means the floor and there's never enough pillows. Second, they're competing to try to wear you out like it's a game of musical chairs. Third, if you don't keep a firm grip on what's happening they start sniping at each other. Fourth, shall we say "performance anxiety" plays a role there? Keeping everybody involved was simply self-defense, along with spanking. You cannot believe the effect turning one woman's ass cherry red had on the other women. But we're talking about a LOT of work. Today, I'd rather run a marathon. Seriously, make it the Pike's Peak marathon.) I'm not going to try to describe what it's like to have multiple women competing with each other to give pleasure, but trust me when I say that if a bedroom symphony is called for, it has to be the man conducting it and self-defense necessitates keeping all of them occupied doing *something.* It's enough to make a man monogamous.

258. simplytimothy

June 18, 2015 10:18 PM

@artisanalloadshall and @Mark Call

While I cannot state or defend it clearly, I am aware of a teleological argument against polygamy and wonder if you are aware of it too.

It goes something like this.

Man was consumed by Sin and God set out to redeem His creation.

God took the situation at hand, chose His people and set them on His path.

His people, at that time, practiced polygamy (and probably some other things that Adam never would have)

Over time, the bad practice of polygamy was replaced by the original plan of monogamy.

Again, that is just my outline of it (I am not making the case; it seems plausible on its face)

We also have, at present, the teleological process of Sanctification. That is here, now.

Since we have a current teleological process underway, it is plausible that others were employed by God with His people in OT times.

Furthermore, the teleological process is from sin to redemption. i.e. the state of the Adam and Eve (Singular,

btw) pre-fall and not the process from The fall to polygamy. Surely you concede that polygamy is a post-fall phenomenon?

Anyway, that's the gist of the teleological case I am familiar with.

Are you aware of it? Do you reject that? If so, why have you rejected it?

thx.

259. simplytimothy

June 18, 2015 10:20 PM

Also, Insty is fond of the future holding virtual sex and robotic sex.

Since a Robot is not technically an animal, would it be Godly for men and women to copulate with a robotic cow?

If not, why not?

Also, what if Bruce Jenner joins your Harem?

260. simplytimothy

June 18, 2015 10:24 PM

So do you agree that polygamy should be legalized? It's a simple question requiring a yes/no answer. If your answer is no, why not?

See my teleological "argument" above for my "No". Depending on your formal sylogisms, I may have others.

261. JRL

June 18, 2015 10:28 PM

Artisan...

Nothing you've said precludes marriage between women and their subsequent bearing and raising children together.

262. MendoScot

June 18, 2015 10:40 PM

- 1 Men with men is prohibited and condemned.
- 2 Men with animals is prohibited and condemned.
- 3 Women with animals is prohibited and condemned.
- 4 Women with women... *crickets*

So, you are a woman without children, would be my guess. Followed by, you have a position in some church. And finally, you hope to use the arguments about polygamy to justify your own sexual perversions.

Have at it!

But stop treating us like idiots.

263. simplytimothy

June 18, 2015 10:41 PM

C'mon guys, fess up. If you had more than one wife I'm thinking I'm correct when I say that sooner or later you'll want all of them in bed with you at once. Put a pile of naked, sweaty, sexually aroused people in bed together and things happen. Maybe that's why God didn't prohibit or condemn girl on girl action, because it could be legitimately exercised/satisfied in a polygynous marriage. This drives most Christians nuts and scares the living bejeezus out of Christian women.

I agree with this logic.

Also, well played on your argument from sexual arousal.

I look forward to your scriptural argument presented in syllogistic formas I requeste previously.

264. SirHamster (#201)

June 18, 2015 10:45 PM

First, you don't know me so I'm at a complete loss as to how you can accuse me of misconduct. I made an argument that you admit you agree with. Second, your position here is very similar to what I described and was exhorted by the medieval church ...

By what you said in this thread. What else? Specifically, you accusing Beau, of all people, of being a child in thinking. When I quoted what you said, I assumed you would get the hint that that was what I was responding to.

Strangely, you responded as if that had something to do with rejecting polygamy. You are so fixated on polygamy, that you failed to understand I wasn't disagreeing with you on it. You may have missed what I said in post 215:

"I think you've made arguing for polygamy a higher priority than more useful and fruitful aspects of the Christian walk. That should give any Christian pause. "

I don't buy it. If sex *within marriage* wasn't supposed to be enjoyable God would not have given women a clitoris.

No one here is arguing that sex in marriage is not supposed to be enjoyable.

You have also misstated what I wrote. You even put it in quotes. "all of you guys secretly want to watch your multiple wives have lesbian sex"

I did not mean that as a quote but as a mocking paraphrase, since you put so much emphasis on how unrestricted "girl on girl action" is within polygamy in one post, and how the popularity of lesbian porn demonstrates that most men want multiple wives in another.

I did extrapolate there - that men who have multiple wives because they like lesbian porn would use said wives for lesbian acts. And per you, acceptable and a plus for polygamy:

"Maybe that's why God didn't prohibit or condemn girl on girl action, because it could be legitimately exercised/satisfied in a polygynous marriage."

It was not meant as a quote though, and I assumed it wouldn't be confused for such. Sorry for the confusion.

265. zen0

June 18, 2015 10:59 PM

Using scripture to justify lust over love.

Remarkable.

Words upon words upon words, all to justify woman on woman sexual relations for prurient interest.

Simple idolatry at its finest.

266. Servant June 18, 2015 11:04 PM

@ Zeno

Thank you!

267. artisanaltoa shall June 18, 2015 11:09 PM

MendoScot

Obviously you haven't looked at my blog. I've probably killed more people than you've laid. If you can't take an argument based solely on Scripture and deal with it, you're the idiot.

I lay out exactly what God's Law says and you call me an idiot and say I'm perverted?

268. zen0 June 18, 2015 11:18 PM

@ 257. artisanaltoa shall

Many years ago (we're talking about BC days),

What do you mean by BC?

For instance, I live in BC... British Columbia.

What do you mean?

269. automatthew June 18, 2015 11:24 PM

zen0, what's the other famous expansion of B.C.?

270. zen0 June 18, 2015 11:28 PM

@ 269 automatthew

> zen0, what's the other famous expansion of B.C.?

Lets see if the newbie, presumably filled with the Holy Spirit, who advises pagans on his blog how to have sexual relations can bring himself to answer.

271. Giuseppe

June 18, 2015 11:29 PM

Sirhamster,

Thanks. Your comment makes sense and I generally agree.

In other words, if your purpose is to try to have multiple wives for sexual titillation then you're kind of missing the point.

If on the other hand, like ends up such that having multiple wives is a thing, well, so be it as long as your intent and actions are in accordance with divine will.

272. artisanalloadshall

June 18, 2015 11:30 PM

@zen0

BC = Before Christ. Back when I was a heathen. Back when I thought I was the captain of my fate and the guardian of my soul. Fool that I was.

273. zen0

June 18, 2015 11:34 PM

272. artisanalloadshall June 18, 2015 11:30 PM

@zen0

BC = Before Christ. Back when I was a heathen. Back when I thought I was the captain of my fate and the guardian of my soul. Fool that I was.

Who is this "Christ" you speak of?

274. zen0

June 18, 2015 11:56 PM

It seems my "refresh" button is not functioning properly. I think I will retire.

275. Michael Z. Williamson

June 18, 2015 11:57 PM

"But there's a coming a day, I believe, that many Christians personally and churches corporately will need to practice civil disobedience on this issue."

By refusing to marry people of their own sex? I don't think anyone will mind.

276. maniacprovost

June 19, 2015 12:03 AM

The only legitimate purpose of having multiple wives is so that you can have more children. Otherwise, hire a maid. They're cheaper and they leave when they're done cleaning.

Whether polygamous orgies are condoned by scripture is an interesting topic, but it sounds like a bad idea.

277. maniacprovost

June 19, 2015 12:04 AM

By refusing to marry people of their own sex? I don't think anyone will mind.

By refusing to bake cakes. Which apparently causes people to go batshit insane.

278. Mark Call

June 19, 2015 12:34 AM

@simplytimothy --

"...The same St. Paul in several epistles warned repeatedly about men like you who worked to enslave free men in Christ under the yoke of *your* rule-book."

First, it's His instruction, YHVH. Until you understand that simple truth we have nothing to discuss. And either He IS in fact, the same, yesterday, today, and tomorrow, or one of you is lying.

And chapter 1 of Romans demolishes WHAT, exactly? The idea that the 'law is done away with?' Because otherwise who could know what "sin" is? You can't have it both ways.

As for a "simple syllogism" that you can follow, asked and answered. Read Yahushua's very first public address. Focus on Matthew 5:17-19. (How often do I have to repeat that?) Read Deuteronomy 13 while you're at it, too. They fit.

Do "heaven and earth" still exist?

Therefore, "not one yod or tiddle" (ie, not the TINIEST BIT)

of His 'torah' (instruction, again) has or WILL pass away.

Is the "law" done away with? Who are you gonna believe?
The One you CLAIM to follow as "Christ", or ANY other man,
PERIOD?

QED.

**" ...you claim that Christian Fathers misled us and
purposely mistranslate Paul so as to further a lie."**

I quoted Kefa (Peter). He predates all those guys, and said this, concerning those who, EVEN THEN, were already doing what you still don't want to see:

"...in all his [Shaul/Paul's] epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction."

If somebody SAYS what Paul means is that the "law is done away with" -- either the Savior is lying, or Paul is, or Peter is right.

QED.

Finally, re: **circumcision**. It's a sign. One of many. Are you REALLY gonna tell me that people who can't be bothered to even keep His Sabbaths and Appointed Times (that Yahushua ALWAYS kept, that Peter, and Paul, and EVERY other man who walked with Him ALWAYS kept) and that He said to keep "forever", in "all your houses" and "all your generations", and who won't even read what He said about marriage...
...are gonna whack on something they clearly treasure more than His Word?

Gimme a break!

Paul's point, put bluntly, was "who are you trying to kid?" If you aren't walking in obedience, that kind of posturing "avails nothing".

Yahushua was blunt, too. (Matthew 7:23) -- *"I never knew you, depart from Me, you who practice 'torah-less-ness'."*

This is not difficult (see Deuteronomy 30). It's just NOT what we have been taught, because -- AGAIN! -- Jeremiah 16:19 is correct, and fits NOW:

"Oh, YHVH, my strength and my fortress,
My refuge in the day of affliction,
The pagans ['gentiles', nations] shall come to You
From the ends of the earth and say,
"Surely our fathers have inherited lies,
Worthlessness and unprofitable things."

Believe it. And wake up while there is still time.

279. Stg58 / Animal Mother #225

June 19, 2015 12:47 AM

So deceptive, Mark Call. Jesus and the disciples kept The Law because a) they were Jews and b) Jesus came to keep the law for us. He kept the law because we could not. God required the law to be kept perfectly to be justified. Jesus did it for us.

Mark, is the Book of Hebrews in your Bible? We will not be saddled with the yoke of the law. If we have to keep the law, why did Jesus even bother coming here?

280. Mark Call

June 19, 2015 12:51 AM

@simplytimothy

"...a teleological argument against polygamy [sic] and wonder if you are aware of it too."

Yes - it's inane, and based on unsupported assumptions. (Like "monogamy" -- a Greco-Roman-pagan concept -- being "god's original plan". Says who? And based on what? Scripture-as-Written, or assumption?)

Why not just READ WHAT HE SAYS!?? If "monogamy" was His Plan All Along, why didn't He just SAY so?

Good GRIEF, this is silly. Can't you people see that it is NOT WHAT He Wrote that is the issue? It's what He SHOULD HAVE WRITTEN if He thought your Blessed Traditions were as important as YOU do!

I repeat AGAIN, read what the Savior you CLAIM to follow actually SAID, in many place, but Mark 7 is easy for those of you who can't be bothered to follow *difficult syllogisms*

It starts like this, with Him saying about THEM, THEN, what I repeat to those of you here, now, who regard your

traditions as more important than His Word:

*"Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, for it is
Written:*

*'This people honor me with their LIPS, but their heart is far
from Me,
and in VAIN do the worship Me,
TEACHING AS DOCTRINES the COMMANDMENTS of MEN."*

And He was just getting started. (And, sadly, even THAT message has now been twisted by 'the church', too. But that's Another Thread.)

281. Stg58 / Animal Mother #225

June 19, 2015 12:58 AM

"Why not just READ WHAT HE SAYS!?? If "monogamy" was His Plan All Along, why didn't He just SAY so?"

HE DID SAY IT WAS HIS PLAN FROM THE BEGINNING.

Genesis 2:24 Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.

Matthew 19:4-5 And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?

282. SirHamster (#201)

June 19, 2015 12:59 AM

Huh. Is someone's Bible missing the Book of Acts?

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.””

Anyone who believes that Christians are Jews+ should go and sacrifice in the Temple according to Deuteronomy. Wouldn't want to arbitrarily do away with any parts of God's law, now.

283. Mark Call

June 19, 2015 1:11 AM

@animal mother

"He kept the law because we could not. "

You don't even bother to READ Scripture, do you? Yes, I lose patience with people who parrot stuff they don't understand, and can't be bothered to "study, to show yourself approved," much less, be "like the Bereans" (Acts 17:11)

You ignore the 'words in Red' that I've put in this thread at least three times already, from Matthew 5:17-19.

DO YOU CLAIM TO BELIEVE "Jesus" - or NOT?

Why worry about a letter to "Hebrews" if you won't even listen to HIM!?

Good grief. And no WONDER you won't bother to check out Deuteronomy 30. It would rock your world, and blow your "traditions of men" all to smithereens.

Since you won't BOTHER to "study for yourself," -- here goes:

Deut 30:11-14

For this commandment which I command you today is not too mysterious for you, nor is it far off.

For this commandment which I command you today is not too mysterious for you, nor is it far off.

"It is not in heaven, that you should say, 'Who will ascend into heaven for us and bring it to us, that we may hear it and do it?'"

“Nor is it beyond the sea, that you should say, ‘Who will go over the sea for us and bring it to us, that we may hear it and do it?’

*“But the word is very near you, in your mouth and in your heart, that you may **do** it.”*

Anybody tells you unmitigated BS like "it's for jews only" and "it's TOO HARD! [WAAAAAaaaaah!]" and "NO ONE could POSSIBLY keep The Law!" is a *LIAR AND THE TRUTH is NOT IN HIM*. (Paul, again!)

If we have to keep the law, why did Jesus even bother coming here?

Why indeed? You ignore His Words!

Since I've already quoted Mark 7 -- and you ignored that -- let's go with Luke 6:46 AGAIN:

*" But why do you call Me ‘Lord, Lord,’ and not **do the things which I say?**"*

Why indeed?

Time for me to go to bed. I weary of people who can't be bothered to do what they claim to believe, by those they claim to follow.

284. Stg58 / Animal Mother #225

June 19, 2015 1:14 AM

Mark, you're a snake in the grass. No other way to put it. You're a liar.

285. Josh

June 19, 2015 1:29 AM

28For it has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay on you no greater burden than these requirements: 29that you abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from what has been strangled, and from sexual immorality. If you keep yourselves from these, you will do well. Farewell.”

QED

286. Beau

June 19, 2015 1:31 AM

@ Artisanalloadshall

Why thank you for calling me a child. I am, of my Father in heaven, the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. I spoke with him this morning. He invited me into His sweet presence, for which I am grateful indeed.

Now to address your comments. Since you have declared preemptive victory, *"You have yet to offer one shred of evidence that I'm wrong and we both know you can't because I'm right. Yet, you cling to your cultural delusions."* I note in passing two favorite SJW tactics, a) declare victory before examination and b) disqualification by assignation of your opponent to cultural backwardness. Nevertheless, for the sake of those others attending:

In Genesis 1:26-28, God declares what is normative human behavior, a man cleaves to a woman. period. full stop. Artisanalloadshall admits the Law of YHWH is תְּמִימָה - perfect, nothing more nothing less; therefore, anything beyond this, according to Artisan's line of reasoning is "More" and therefore wrong.

I note too, that God provides the one man a relationship to ease his loneliness, one woman. Artisan seeks to expand the definition of divinely approved relationship, but his enticement beyond what God calls *very good*. is outside of the set of God's definition of normal human relationship - wrong.

Artisanalloadshall refers us to Leviticus 18 & 20 admitting homosexuality is sin and always wrong. But since Leviticus doesn't mention lesbian sexual encounters, Artisan claims lesbianism is not condemned. Artisan neglects that the perfect law of YHWH has previously defined normative human behavior as a man and a woman, nothing more nothing less. Artisan argues female homosexuality is permissible, while simultaneously confessing homosexuality is always sin. This is absurd.

(Continued)

287. Beau

June 19, 2015 1:36 AM

@ Artisanalloadshall (Continued)

Artisan claims we quote Saint Paul incorrectly. Paul condemned sin. In contrast, Artisan is brazenly enticing us

to join, *C'mon, fellas*. Even a child can see through Artisan's evil.

We are assured by Mark Call that the apostle Paul was a scholar of the Hebrew scriptures of the highest caliber. I agree. The apostle did not relax, change, or abrogate the perfect law of the YHWH. Like his master Jesus of Nazareth, who restated permissible marital relationships, (c.f. Matthew 5:31-21), Paul affirmed and restated divine condemnation of homosexuality. Unlike Artisan who advocates female homosexuality,

In Romans 1:26, where is the condemnation? Where is the penalty? Contrast that with Romans 1:27, in which the men are also exchanging the natural for the unnatural.

Saint Paul condemned the practice in both men and women. ὁμοίως - (in English *likewise*) is a coordinate comparative conjunction linking two actions 1) female homosexuality, and 2) male homosexuality. The consequence of divine wrath applies across both legs of the comparative, even though it stated on only one leg of the comparative. In light of Paul's use of ὁμοίως (homoiōs): adv.; ≡ Str 3668—LN 64.1 similarly, likewise, **in the same way** (emphasis mine, from the Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Greek. n.b. See, I studied to show myself approved to God.) Artisan, too, commits an egregious rookie mistake of using verse divisions of the text to separate the continuation of the epistle's line of reasoning. Good scholarship - not. Yet you posture as a knowledgeable teacher of God's truth. You're a joke.

Indeed, the burden of proof is squarely on Artisanaltoadshall to explain why the apostle's discussion of divine condemnation of homosexual acts beginning at verse 1:24 and concluding at verse 1:32 **does not** apply to a subset specifically called out as sinners - women committing sexual acts with other women - as sinners in the course of Paul's argument. Saint Paul restates normative male/female relationships. Artisan specifically rejects this.

Artisanaltoadshall urges us to *spiritualize* our reading of Romans 1:24-30, substituting a subjective *feel good* enticement aiming at separating ourselves from moral consequences for actions committed in our bodies. We are urged to cast exegesis aside. Genesis 1 defines and blesses normal relationships. Leviticus condemns homosexuality among men. Romans restates normal relationships, condemns homosexuality among men - and women, the

penalty applying to both sexes. Romans agrees with the Hebrew scriptures. Artisan does not. Artisan echoes her/his father's tactic, "Hath God said?"

Why do you not hear my words, Artisanalloadshall? It is because you are of your father, the devil, the father of lies. Oh, and you're wrong about one final thing too. You're **not** a Reptile because I called you one. You are a reptile because:

- 1) You entice others to sin. *C'mon fellas.*
- 2) You lie. *Nothing is said about women with women as a physical act.* Read Romans 1. It sure does.
- 3) You slander the elect, Just as your father is the accuser of the brethren.
- 4) You promise excitement, but are instead nothing but a waterless cloud willfully remaining in bondage to your lust.

All these you did to deserve God's wrath before you ever came across me. Even a child can see this, odd that you cannot.

Your condemnation will be horrible beyond all imagining. You've earned it. God pays wages due.

288. Josh

June 19, 2015 1:38 AM

Beau: /micdrop

289. The CronoLink

June 19, 2015 1:51 AM

That was brutal, Beau. I applaud you.

290. Stg58 / Animal Mother #225

June 19, 2015 1:52 AM

Damn

291. Bard

June 19, 2015 3:10 AM

Beau,
I have been reading here for 10 years. I have never once (that I can recall) remember seeing you attacked. He is deceived on this issue and I get the impression it is a huge area of temptation and personal struggle. Maybe in time he will grow out of it.

292. Giuseppe

June 19, 2015 4:01 AM

Bard, Beau, Artisan, Mark,
Well as an ignorant heathen and having read Artisan's website a bit, though I am far from certain, if I were forced to bet money on it I would say that Beau and Sirhamster have it right. At least in spirit it seems to me their way is closer to God.

Artisan is not stupid, but I do think he is...deceived? Lost? Still in the dark anyway. His pain is also great and if he deceives I am not sure it is intentionally. Bard may be onto something. That Artisan is wounded is a fact, and I relate to his wound too.

But I don't think he is right. He is fighting. In a similar way to how the main protagonist of the film Jacob's Ladder was fighting.

Beau on the other hand is not fighting. He's just actively at war with the enemy. In calm, true crusader style.

That's my heathen 2c anyway.

293. Tupla-J

June 19, 2015 4:29 AM

I'm not much of a Bible scholar, having not read it all the way through, but I see not only Beau's wisdom but also remember the guideline "by their fruits you shall know them". As far as I can tell, every time polygamy happens in the Bible, a terrible thing directly follows it. That's not very encouraging, expressly forbidden in the letter of the law or not. The spirit is not vague here.

294. simplytimothy

June 19, 2015 6:36 AM

@Mark Call,

Write your syllogism here so all can see your argument in simple form. Do not expect us to gather your data for you.

comment 247. artisanal toad shall laid out some premises 1 through 8.

I request that you lay out your argument in the same form so that we can skip the defining terms and deal directly with a nice clean argument that all can use for a reference point.

Your argument goes something like this:

1. Polygamy existed under scripture.
2. There is no condemnation of lesbianism in the torah
3. St. Paul said we must embrace the whole of the torah.
4. St. Paul advocates lesbian orgies under a polygamous marriage.

See how easy that was? Now, its your argument, so I am trying to state it back to you in terms you understand so that you and others are convinced that we fully understand your premises and conclusion(s).

I asked that you do this out of politeness since it is you making an extraordinary claim.

295. simplytimothy

June 19, 2015 6:50 AM

heh. I made my comment before reading Beau's comments.

Beau, I would respond with a "FCKING-A" but that would offend you, so "well done" will have to suffice.

Beau, thank you for expanding the effort to gather the premises and examine them.

The claim that "You ignore His Words!" can be safely put aside as unmitigated b.s.

What we look for are arguments from His word, which in fairness, Marc Call and artisanalloadsall attempted to do; you provided such an argument here. thank you for doing that labor.

.

Given your patient exegesis, they have a tough row to climb to make a biblical case for their claim that passes the sulphur-smell test.

You see where Beau took each one of the given premises, stated it clearly responded to them.

This was a gem: *ὁμοίως* - (in English likewise) is a coordinate comparative conjunction linking two actions 1) female homosexuality, and 2) male homosexuality.

Them coordinate comparitve conjunctions will get you every single freaking time.

Marc and artisanalloadsall, Beau just upped the quality of the game.

296. Matamoros

June 19, 2015 9:03 AM

Mando: a - there are Orthodox (older than the church in Rome) and Ethiopian (sic) churches in the West. probably some Oriental (also ~2000 years old) churches as well. no one has EVER considered them 'protestant'

They are not protestant. The original protestants are heretics. These Eastern churches are schismatic, not protestant, because they maintained their priestly orders and sacraments.

The protestants all threw sacraments, orders (yes, including Anglicans by defect of rite), and purity of scripture to the winds. (Current protestants are material heretics, rather than actual heretics.)

b - the RCC has been killing people who have read the bible and derived Baptist principles for ~1000 years, well before Luther.

Hilarious.))))) The Catholic Church has only objected to those who alter, change or pollute the sacred Scriptures. Apoc. 22:18

Everyone has always been free to read and study scripture. -- "A man who is well grounded in the testimonies of the Scripture is the bulwark of the Church. St. Jerome"

297. Dexter

June 19, 2015 9:40 AM

Bruce Charlton:

CHINOs = Christians In Name Only

*

I propose the acronym of CHINOs as shorthand for the usual situation with self-identified Christians in the West - especially among the leadership (e.g. bishops, pastors, ministers, priests and priestesses) of the mainstream self-identified Christian denominations.

They are Christians in name only, by a fairly exact

definition: they name themselves Christians, but their fundamental allegiance is to the secular mainstream mish-mash of Leftist ideology.

They name themselves Christians, and they use Christian language and concepts - but they use it to rationalize and defend an ideology that is derived from modern, mainstream secular culture: the usual range of politically correct concerns such as equality, diversity, social justice, socialist economics, feminism, antiracism and sexual revolution.

Instead of missionary work, CHINOs have social work and foreign economic aid, and international projects; they worry about global warming and reducing their carbon footprints instead of worrying about sin and repentance; instead of Bible study, they have seminars on patriarchy, racism, the environment; instead of learning Christian history, they research other religions.

CHINOs are placid about attacks on Christians and the (almost complete) extermination of Christianity in the Middle East; but 'passionate' about their politics.

CHINOs are 'inclusive' with respect to anti-Christian ideologies and lifestyles, but support for anti-Left groups is regarded as the ultimate evil ('fascism') and is absolutely forbidden among CHINO leaders. Failure actively and explicitly to support the CHINO progressive agenda (especially wrt the sexual revolution) is regarded as an anti-Christian act of hatred.

For CHINOs, the main priority is not the collapse of Christian belief and increasing persecution of (real) Christians in the West - nor even the extermination and ethnic cleansing of Christians and Christianity in the Middle East, Sub Saharan Africa, South Asia... but that the Western church bureaucracy needs to catch-up with the post-sixties sexual revolution by being more 'inclusive' (= 'acceptance' moving-towards positive encouragement of sexual activity out-with traditional marriage, including whatever laws and policies are necessary to support this).

The rapid growth of (real) Christianity in Africa, South America, and China is either ignored or regarded with something akin to horror - since these new Christians oppose the progressive ideology to which CHINOs are primarily loyal. When Christianity and political correctness come into conflict - for CHINOs, Leftist ideology and

progressive politics is always the winner.

There are far more CHINOs than real Christians nowadays, especially in England. Official Christianity is run by CHINOs and for CHINOs. CHINOs have the power, the money, the status and honours, the teaching positions; CHINOs publish most of the most prominent books about Christianity, and CHINOs are holding the mass media megaphone.

Indeed, subtract the CHINOs and 'real Christians' are a tiny minority - just a few percent - and many of these few are in small churches which are often regarded as heretical by the adherents of the (at present) larger and more powerful denominations^.

Anyway, CHINOs is here presented as a shorthand for something real Christians know well.

298. Mark Call

June 19, 2015 10:06 AM

@simplytimothy

Write your syllogism here so all can see your argument in simple form.

I thought it was pretty simple. But evidently the urge to "believe men rather than God" is pervasive.

1 - "I change NOT." (Malachi 3:6, repeated in Hebrews 13:8)

2- "I AM Who I say I AM" ('ani YHVH" in the Hebrew; repeated countless times, notably in Exodus.) He keeps His promises, His Word, and does not change. Men, however, break Covenant over and over again (whether "old" or re-Newed, or re-re-newed.)

3- so here's the deal: Keep My commandments. (because, #1, "I AM...")

[They are repeated, 'cause we seem to be more able to ignore stuff that isn't repeated. There are more than "ten", and they are never "done away with."]

4 - And doing that [keeping My commandments] is NOT 'too hard' for you.

(Deuteronomy 30. He gets downright sarcastic about it..."it's not in heaven, it's not across the sea, you don't hafta ask someone else to bring it to ya...no it's in your

OWN Li'l mouth and your heart, so you can DO IT!!!!"]

And, yes, liars have been denying Him and His Word ever since.

5 - He follows that up immediately twice (Deut 30:15, and then 30:19) with the most critical warning of all:

"I have laid before you LIFE and DEATH, blessing and cursing." Choose!

(No, you can't serve two masters, either.) Read the next verses. The choice is clear, and stark.

The SAME two witnesses ("heaven and earth") that are called then are the SAME two witnesses that Yahushua invokes AGAIN at the very start of His earthly ministry! (Matthew 5:17-19) NOT ONE of you "law is done away with" back-slappers has bothered to refute His initial premise, although you twist the livin' hell outta "Paul" to ignore those words. (Aside: you can't read Acts 15 without that understanding. Note that those four "minimum necessary but NOT sufficient conditions" [v20, 29] to go hear "Moses read in every synagogue every Sabbath" [v21] aren't even mentioned anymore! What does that tell you?)

6 - If "heaven and earth" (last time I checked) STILL obviously exist, and therefore stand as witnesses that His torah ("instruction", remember, not "law") still applies to His people (all of 'em, at least, all who CHOOSE to follow Him) - - then "shall we sin more, that grace might abound? HEAVEN FORBID!" (Romans 6:15, etc, and the whole point of the "difficult to understand" and oft-twisted point Paul is trying to make. Don't just pull out the sound-bites.)

ANYone who claims that the "law is done away with" in spite of Paul, and in spite of what Yahushua so clearly said, and repeated, and ("line by line, precept by precept") built upon the Rock that begins in Genesis 1 and consistently builds through Revelation, is a "liar, and the truth is not in Him." Paul says that, too. "...let God be true, and every man a liar."

6a - Deut. 30:19 repeats the message:

"I call heaven and earth as witnesses today against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both you and your descendants may live..."

So - full circle -

7 - He says He is the same, yesterday, today, and always. His instruction, for our blessing, still stands. Paul agrees (and tells you not to put Him to shame again, either, by going right back and making the same torah-less mistakes).

8 - Yahushua put it simply, in John 14:15:
"IF you love Me, keep My commands."

I could add 'QED', but instead it'll be Dirty Harry:
 "Well, do ya, PUNK?"

...to be continued...

299. Mark Call

June 19, 2015 10:08 AM

... continued ...

The rest are easy follow-ups, but I doubt those who already prefer the twistings of the 'church fathers' to what He Wrote will 'get it':

- "You can't serve two masters." [So why are you asking permission from a false master to "marry", if NO ONE in Scripture EVER got a license? And why license your "church", fer cryin' out loud? Don't you KNOW there are strings attached? Read Ex. 34:12-15, Judges 2:2, and the story of the lyin' Gibeonites in Joshua 9!]

- And, marriage (!!!) Yahushua was asked about divorce, and talked about it several times. (the KJV mistranslates even the Greek in Matt. 5:32; do NOT be fooled! There is a difference between "divorced" and merely "put away" in the Hebrew, even the Greek.)

This is subtle. Why would people who don't read Him read me? But here goes:

A man can take more than one isha [wife], 'help-meet' [etzer kenegdo]. (And he has to meet the 'minimum conditions' in Exodus 21:10, too.) We are to KEEP our vows! (Numbers 30, but esp 30:2) Yahushua said if you can't do that, don't bother. (yes, I paraphrase, for effect. ;)

People lie, and fall short, and kill one another...so "because of the hardness of your hearts" there was a provision in there for "putting away" wives. But we "shouldn't outta do it!" Paul was NOT the first in the Bible to observe that there are things permitted by YHVH that 'are not profitable' for us. He thought that about marriage in general; I do not.

So here's the punchline:

Yahushua was talking about DIVORCE in that line that everybody wants to quote and apply to multiple wives instead! WOULD THAT people were serious about not breaking Covenant as they are about posturing for "monogamy"!!!!!!

300. Mark Call

June 19, 2015 10:12 AM

@simplytimothy

Write your syllogism here so all can see your argument in simple form.

I thought it was pretty simple. But evidently the urge to "believe men rather than God" is pervasive.

1 - "I change NOT." (Malachi 3:6, repeated in Hebrews 13:8)

2- "I AM Who I say I AM" ('ani YHVH" in the Hebrew; repeated countless times, notably in Exodus.) He keeps His promises, His Word, and does not change. Men, however, break Covenant over and over again (whether "old" or re-Newed, or re-re-newed.)

3- so here's the deal: Keep My commandments. (because, #1, "I AM...")

[They are repeated, 'cause we seem to be more able to ignore stuff that isn't repeated. There are more than "ten", and they are never "done away with."]

4 - And doing that [keeping My commandments] is NOT 'too hard' for you.

(Deuteronomy 30. He gets downright sarcastic about it..."it's not in heaven, it's not across the sea, you don't hafta ask someone else to bring it to ya...no it's in your OWN Li'l mouth and your heart, so you can DO IT!!!!!!"]

And, yes, liars have been denying Him and His Word ever since.

5 - He follows that up immediately twice (Deut 30:15, and then 30:19) with the most critical warning of all:

"I have laid before you LIFE and DEATH, blessing and

cursing." Choose!

(No, you can't serve two masters, either.) Read the next verses. The choice is clear, and stark.

The SAME two witnesses ("heaven and earth") that are called then are the SAME two witnesses that Yahushua invokes AGAIN at the very start of His earthly ministry! (Matthew 5:17-19) NOT ONE of you "law is done away with" back-slappers has bothered to refute His initial premise, although you twist the livin' hell outta "Paul" to ignore those words. (Aside: you can't read Acts 15 without that understanding. Note that those four "minimum necessary but NOT sufficient conditions" [v20, 29] to go hear "Moses read in every synagogue every Sabbath" [v21] aren't even mentioned anymore! What does that tell you?)

6 - If "heaven and earth" (last time I checked) STILL obviously exist, and therefore stand as witnesses that His torah ("instruction", remember, not "law") still applies to His people (all of 'em, at least, all who CHOOSE to follow Him) - - then "shall we sin more, that grace might abound? HEAVEN FORBID!" (Romans 6:15, etc, and the whole point of the "difficult to understand" and oft-twisted point Paul is trying to make. Don't just pull out the sound-bites.)

ANYone who claims that the "law is done away with" in spite of Paul, and in spite of what Yahushua so clearly said, and repeated, and ("line by line, precept by precept") built upon the Rock that begins in Genesis 1 and consistently builds through Revelation, is a "liar, and the truth is not in Him." Paul says that, too. "...let God be true, and every man a liar."

6a - Deut. 30:19 repeats the message:

*"I call **heaven and earth** as witnesses today against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore **choose life**, that both you and your descendants may live..."*

So - full circle -

7 - He says He is the same, yesterday, today, and always. His instruction, for our blessing, still stands. Paul agrees (and tells you not to put Him to shame again, either, by going right back and making the same torah-less mistakes).

8 - Yahushua put it simply, in John 14:15:

"IF you love Me, keep My commands."

I could add 'QED', but instead it'll be Dirty Harry:
"Well, do ya, PUNK?"

301. CM

June 19, 2015 10:13 AM

Beau -

Thank you! That was awesome.

ST - you, too.

I'm glad y'all were equipped for this.

302. Mark Call

June 19, 2015 10:15 AM

... continued ...

The rest are easy follow-ups, but I doubt those who already prefer the twistings of the 'church fathers' to what He Wrote will 'get it':

- "You can't serve two masters." [So why are you asking permission from a false master to "marry", if NO ONE in Scripture EVER got a license? And why license your "church", fer cryin' out loud? Don't you KNOW there are strings attached? Read Ex. 34:12-15, Judges 2:2, and the story of the lyin' Gibeonites in Joshua 9!]

- And, marriage (!!!) Yahushua was asked about divorce, and talked about it several times. (the KJV mistranslates even the Greek in Matt. 5:32; do NOT be fooled! There is a difference between "divorced" and merely "put away" in the Hebrew, even the Greek.)

This is subtle. Why would people who don't read Him read me? But here goes:

A man can take more than one isha [wife], 'help-meet' [etzer kenegdo]. (And he has to meet the 'minimum conditions' in Exodus 21:10, too.) We are to KEEP our vows! (Numbers 30, but esp 30:2) Yahushua said if you can't do that, don't bother. (yes, I paraphrase, for effect. ;)

People lie, and fall short, and kill one another...so "because of the hardness of your hearts" there was a provision in there for "putting away" wives. But we "shouldn't outta do it!" Paul was NOT the first in the Bible to observe that there are things permitted by YHVH that 'are not profitable' for

us. He thought that about marriage in general; I do not.

So here's the punchline:

Yahushua was talking about DIVORCE in that line that everybody wants to quote and apply to multiple wives instead! WOULD THAT people were serious about not breaking Covenant as they are about posturing for "monogamy"!!!!!!

303. Titus Quinctius Cincinnatus

June 19, 2015 10:22 AM

@ Mark Call - *Finally, re: circumcision. It's a sign. One of many. Are you REALLY gonna tell me that people who can't be bothered to even keep His Sabbaths and Appointed Times (that Yahushua ALWAYS kept, that Peter, and Paul, and EVERY other man who walked with Him ALWAYS kept) and that He said to keep "forever", in "all your houses" and "all your generations", and who won't even read what He said about marriage...*

...are gonna whack on something they clearly treasure more than His Word?

Actually, I don't think they will, for the simple reason that this Paul of whom you speak so much, yet know so little, said they didn't need to, and in fact, if they did out of some misguided effort to "keep the law," then they were rejecting grace, and therefore rejecting Christ.

"But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised: And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage." (Galatians 2:3-4)

Paul flatly rejected the demands of Christ-denying Judaizers to have Titus, a Gentile Christian, circumcised. Paul even went so far as to say, "I would they were even cut off which trouble you" (Gal. 5:12), speaking of the sort of Judaising buffoons who taught circumcision and keeping the law. In effect, Paul was saying they ought to just go all the way and emasculate themselves. Note that emasculating yourself would get you cast out of the congregation of Israel (Deut. 23:1), so what Paul is essentially saying is that those Judaizers who advocated law-keeping, and made circumcision the outward sign of such, had no part in the congregation of Jesus Christ.

"For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." (Romans 10:4) - "end" = *telos*, the end result, the fulfilled purpose. Christ fulfilled the Law. Christians are not bound by these ceremonial laws that the Jews kept in the OT. Christians do not need to keep the sabbaths and the festivals, and indeed, Paul (the consummate Jewish scholar, remember), specifically told the Colossians that they should not allow any Judaizing heretics to judge them for not keeping those OT shadows (Col. 2:16).

Indeed, James' judgment for Gentile believers was specifically that they NOT be bound by the law,

"Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" (Acts 15:10)

Indeed, as James points out, the Jews themselves couldn't keep the Law. *Every single one* of them failed to keep the whole law (and thus were condemned by it - Deut. 27:26). YOU certainly are not going to be able to keep it perfectly. As for actual Christians, we don't *need* to. We need to obey the commandments of God, *as these are systematically and contextually presented in the entirety of Scripture* (not cherry-picked from here and there such as you do), so as to please God AFTER salvation, not FOR salvation.

Sorry Mark, but you are a fool. Not only because you don't really know the Scriptures, but also because you're trying to bind yourself with something that you neither need to, nor even will be able to, ever, no matter how hard you try.

And as a side note: The "Yahoshua" stuff is nonsense. In the NT, God tells us that His Son's name is *Iesous*, transliterated as *Jesus* in English. God revealed this to us in Greek, and we have a perfect preservation of it in the English language. God NEVER calls His Son "Yahoshua" in the NT.

304. Mark Call

June 19, 2015 10:32 AM

Good grief, Cincinnati...what a load of BS. You sound like one of those "KJV-only" idiots, who really believe "jesus" spoke the King's English. Do you even have a CLUE how to say "Yah Saves" in Hebrew? (or what name His parents were told to give Him, and why?)

Enuf wasted time...

305. Donn #0114

June 19, 2015 10:36 AM

Beau - Thank you for taking your time to pull the curtain back on this 'not so wonderful' wizard. The toad clearly is serving the master of the pit. He entices others to sin literally saying, 'you're afraid you'll enjoy it' and that it 'is biblical'. The serpent can quote scripture.

For those who cannot smell the sulfur through their computer screens, I am sorry. This creature is literally enticing others to sin. It may be because sinners always love their sin and secretly wish for others to love their sin and join them or it may be worse and that he is spiritually oppressed to the point he cannot stop himself either way I believe engaging with him is spiritually dangerous.

306. Titus Quinctius Cincinnatus

June 19, 2015 10:36 AM

4 - And doing that [keeping My commandments] is NOT 'too hard' for you.

(Deuteronomy 30. He gets downright sarcastic about it..."it's not in heaven, it's not across the sea, you don't hafta ask someone else to bring it to ya...no it's in your OWN Li'l mouth and your heart, so you can DO IT!!!!!!")

Actually...that's not what that says. Deut. 30:11-14 is not saying that the commandment was not TOO HARD for them to keep, but that it was not UNAVAILABLE for them to have access to and learn.

Huge difference, and one which completely destroys your whole syllogism.

As for the law being "too hard" to keep, James as much as says that this was the case in Acts 15:10. Indeed, the fact that no one CAN keep the whole law is the whole basis of Romans 3:23 ("for ALL have sinned, and come short of the glory of God"), and indeed, is the whole basis for Paul's entire chapters-long argument in the book of Romans in which the law itself is what shows us that we CANNOT keep the Law perfectly, and therefore our efforts are ALWAYS insufficient to bring ourselves righteousness by the Law, and which led Paul to say,

"Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." (Romans 3:28)

"For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not

under the law, but under grace." (Romans 6:14)

"Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God." (Romans 7:4)

"For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." (Romans 10:4)

Paul's whole doctrine regarding law and grace is the precise opposite of what you're attributing to him. You seem to be having some difficulties understanding even the basic points he makes in the source epistles.

Is the law good and holy? Yes. Does keeping the law give righteousness to someone? Certainly not, for the simple reason that it can't be done.

"I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." (Galatians 2:21)

Paul precisely states the issue here - if we could keep the law and be righteous by that, then there was no need for Christ's sacrifice. Ergo, it stands to reason that if God provided a NECESSARY sacrifice, then we are unable to be righteous by trying to keep the Law.

Your syllogism is utterly refuted, whether or not you have the wits to recognise this fact.

307. Titus Quinctius Cincinnatus

June 19, 2015 10:38 AM

Enuf wasted time...

I agree - you peddling your Hebrew Roots garbage is a waste of time. And utter waste of time that does nothing but show us your tremendous ignorance of the Scriptures and even of logic. But tell you what, why don't you try to actually deal with the arguments instead of ducking and hiding like some little rabbit.

308. Titus Quinctius Cincinnatus

June 19, 2015 10:41 AM

You sound like one of those "KJV-only" idiots

BTW, if I were making an argument from KJV-Only, then would I be drawing a point from the Greek NT text?

309. Mark Call

June 19, 2015 10:46 AM

PS> @simplytimothy

...since it's clear that a lot of folks here don't understand concepts like "necessary but not sufficient conditions", much less the fallacy of "arguments from silence" or outright assumptions.

(Case in point: Genesis. One man (sperm) + one woman (egg) == baby.

The fact that the minimum necessary conditions are set out does not mean they are the ONLY ones for "marriage". ESPECIALLY when the Creator says otherwise! It would be no less fallacious to argue that He wanted to show us that MONOGAMY results in Original Sin, followed by murder, since that is precisely what Scripture tells us followed. :)

This does NOT effect the "logic" -- but it does impact the DECEPTION.

Here goes:

The Hebrew word "torah" (do a word search -- it appears many hundreds of times, David talks about it a LOT in the Psalms) is NOT properly translated only as "law". Particularly in a language where most "Amerikans" don't have a CLUE any more what the "Supreme Law" is anyway!

It is better rendered as "instruction", as I have said here already.

"nomos", however, is a different story in the Greek.

And the problem is called "conflation", resulting in confusion. Because there is a *difference between what men call 'law' and the TORAH of YHVH!*

Guess which one Yahushua was REALLY critical of? And guess which one Paul was contrasting?

OK - final question:

Is a marriage license REQUIRED by LAW? Or just "tradition"?

(I guess it all depends on which Master you serve, and whose "bennies" you really value!)

310. IM2L844

June 19, 2015 11:11 AM

Your comments represent the classic position of the medieval church, informed by the opinions men like Augustine of Hippo ("Lord make me chaste, but not yet") who viewed sex within marriage as an unfortunate but necessary evil.

I made no comments. Those comments were from God.

Now, I'm not as clever or as patient as zen0, so, because we've been told: "Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are from God, for many false prophets have gone out into the world. By this you know the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is from God, and every spirit that does not confess Jesus is not from God. This is the spirit of the antichrist, which you heard was coming and now is in the world already. Little children, you are from God and have overcome them, for he who is in you is greater than he who is in the world. They are from the world; therefore they speak from the world, and the world listens to them.", I'll just ask you a simple question outright. Do you plainly confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is from God?

311. Rabbi B

June 19, 2015 11:19 AM

This comment has been removed by the author.

312. Rabbi B

June 19, 2015 11:22 AM

"Enuf wasted time.."

@Mark Call

Because I am Jewish and can't help myself, I have some unsolicited advice to offer you. Please be patient and bear with me.

To be blunt, your overall approach sucks. You can't come in here slinging insults and expressing your exasperation and impatience every time someone has the temerity to respond to and challenge your arguments. You might have the most airtight argument in the world and the Scriptural arsenal to back them up, but if you can't make your case in

a more measured, well-reasoned, fashion with at least a modicum of equanimity in your tone, you will be thought wiser and saner if you were able to simply restrain yourself and keep your mouth shut.

You would do well to spend a great deal more of your time listening and trying to build a rapport here with the commentators (especially the regulars and old-timers) rather than barging in and preaching the good news according to Moses and then expressing frustration when everybody doesn't magically fall in line with your way of thinking.

Your arguments will ultimately stand and fall on their own merits, but it is your job to articulate them and to remember that you are articulating them to people who will actually answer back and may actually have an argument of their own to offer, which will only help you hone and sharpen your own. Win-win, if you are mature and magnanimous enough to see it that way.

Most of the people here are valiant for the truth and recognize the truth (and the Truth for that matter) as the highest good. They are very committed to it as I sense that you are. But if you truly and sincerely want to reach people with the truth that you possess, you need to settle down and re-consider your approach, most especially when you are challenging well-established paradigms.

In the presence of God and of Christ Jesus, who will judge the living and the dead, and in view of his appearing and his kingdom, I give you this charge:

Preach the word; be prepared in season and out of season; correct, rebuke and encourage—WITH GREAT PATIENCE AND CAREFUL INSTRUCTION. (You might take your cue from Beau).

If you are only here to sharpen the iron of others and not your own, there are any other number of venues where you can do so elsewhere. But, I hope you stick around, and patiently work to build some relationships and enjoy the great discussions that often take place here.

Enough wasted time? I couldn't agree more. There is a great learning opportunity here and I think your iron could use some sharpening.

313. SarahsDaughter

June 19, 2015 11:35 AM

Out of curiosity, do you all vehemently oppose and deliver righteous admonishments to men who would marry (have married) a woman whose first husband is still alive? What about a Christian woman who has divorced her Christian husband? Are they from their father, the devil?

314. artisanalloadshall

June 19, 2015 12:18 PM

Beau, et al

(This is a bit long, but I'm trying to respond to several of your posts)

Saint Paul condemned the practice in both men and women. ὁμοίως - (in English likewise) is a coordinate comparative conjunction linking two actions 1) female homosexuality, and 2) male homosexuality.

Actions, or relationships? You want it to be about sex and thus you're trying to restrict this to sexual acts. The context of the passage is the wrath of God is being poured out on people who have rejected God, refuse to honor and worship Him and for that, they receive His abandonment. The first point was God abandoned them to impurity. The result was the defilement of the relationship He created, marriage, through fornication, adultery and divorce. They didn't repent so God gave them over to depraved passions, the result of which was the formation of unnatural relationships.

Both the women and men mentioned in Romans 1:26-27 "gave up the natural function of women" so maybe some focus should be placed on what the natural function of women actually is. The first covenant entity God created was the family. Their mission is to be fruitful and multiply, fill the earth and subdue it and take dominion over it. That mission takes place within the bounds of a covenant called marriage, to which God is a party. That is the natural function of both men and women, but the sex between men and women is only a part of it. What the women are doing in verse 26 is rejecting God's plan and thus rejecting men, children and motherhood. It is the rebellious relationship being condemned, nothing else.

Likewise the men gave up the natural function of women, but unlike the women they burned with lust for each other.

Lust is a desire that cannot be legitimately obtained or fulfilled. The result of this lust was the men committed indecent acts (forbidden acts) for which they receive the due penalty in their own bodies (AIDS?). Both the men and women are in an unnatural relationship but within that illicit relationship the men are compounding their error by engaging in prohibited sexual activity. The women are not.

Some sexual activity is unilaterally forbidden, meaning there is no possible relationship in which such acts can be licit:

1. Men with men.
2. Men with animals.
3. Women with animals.

Other sexual activity may be licit depending on whether the individuals are married. Thus, the fact God chose not to unilaterally condemn or forbid sexual acts between women indicates they would be licit within marriage. Marriage, however, requires a husband, thus the only way sexual acts between women would be licit is within a polygynous marriage. I'm sure that bothers you, but to say otherwise is to say God got it wrong.

(Continued)

315. Mark Call

June 19, 2015 12:19 PM

@ SarahsDaughter

Good question, and one I've written about a lot. Links are here:

<http://markniwot.com/?cat=4> (including Torah teaching MP3s)

But here is the specific answer to your question:

<http://markniwot.com/?p=281>

"Who gives this woman?"

THIS one is a summary that fits this thread (and might be a response to Rabbi B -- beyond "been there, done that", since I'm one of the original Dread Ilk. Yes, I do tend to be more blunt here than any other forum, including daily radio shows and other Scripture teachings. "Time draws short" -- and over many years I've come to realize that some people do have a heart to study His Word, while others have neither "eyes to see" or "ears to hear. Honest questions will

get answered.)

<http://markniwot.com/?p=873>

"Three Hot-Button Traditions"

and this one, too -- on "Creeping Paganism"

<http://markniwot.com/?p=694>

Blessings and shalom,

Mark

316. Rabbi B

June 19, 2015 12:32 PM

" . . .Yes, I do tend to be more blunt here than any other forum."

Bluntness was the least of your problems . . .

" . . .since I'm one of the original Dread Ilk."

Ah, so you know better. I didn't know . . .

317. artisanaltoadshall

June 19, 2015 12:32 PM

Beau, et al

Beau, hopefully you can agree with me that your sexual acts with your wife are licit but you should also agree your marriage is not defined by sexual acts with your wife. Likewise, the relationships Paul is describing are not defined by sexual acts that occur within them but rather by the fact they are unnatural relationships in rebellion against God. Sex that occurs within the relationship is only a facet of the relationship and does not define it.

Beau, your problem is you're trying to make this all about sex. This is to be expected, given the culture we live in. The society prospers when the relationships are correct and honored. God's "defense of marriage act" was making adultery and fornication death penalty offenses. The society suffers when unnatural relationships are permitted and begins to crumble when they are tolerated. A society that embraces unnatural relationships and honors them on the same level as natural marriage will be destroyed.

Your error is in trying to twist Romans 1:26-27 to make it all about sex. "Female homosexuality" is a contradiction of

terms because “homosexual” is any sexual act between men, which are unilaterally forbidden. Women aren’t men, thus “homosexual” anything is impossible for women. What you’re really trying to do with your interpretation (whether you realize it or not) is go back and “correct” God by defining the relationship according to the sexual acts in order to condemn sexual acts that God chose not to.

The term “lesbian” defines a relationship which is unnatural and not in accordance with God’s plan; not any particular sexual act that might take place within such a relationship. Therefore, it is impossible for multiple wives to have “lesbian orgies” within the context of their marriage. Beau, what happens within your marriage bed is nobody’s business but yours. Likewise, no matter how many wives a man has, what happens in their marriage bed is nobody’s business but theirs. With respect to this, Romans 14:4 speaks loudly:

“Who are you to judge the servant of another? To his own master he stands or falls; and stand he will, for the Lord is able to make him stand.”

I realize this is really difficult for you; but you aren’t God, you aren’t an apostle and you don’t get to redefine the terms to get God’s Word to say what you want it to say. God said that His Law is perfect. Trying to go back and “correct the record” means you’re saying God got it wrong, thus God is a liar. As I’ve stated previously, that’s blasphemy.

Let us further presume some gentle soul shared her testimony with a lesbian couple and after sharing the Gospel they became Christians. I think we can agree that their current relationship is sinful and they need to repent of that. In order to repent of their sin, it seems to me these two women have two choices: They can choose to marry a man and make babies or choose to dedicate themselves to the Lord and thereafter live a chaste life.

What is the sin they are repenting of? Is it the sexual acts they’ve engaged in together or the fact they did so in an unnatural relationship (rejection of men) outside the bounds of marriage?

Would choosing a polygynous marriage in order to maintain their relationship under the headship of their husband be wrong? If you believe its wrong please cite the authority you’d use to counsel these women.

318. artisanaltoaadshall

June 19, 2015 12:56 PM

IM2L844

I'll just ask you a simple question outright.

Do I believe and plainly confess that Jesus, the Word, who was God and was with God from the beginning, gave up His glory and according to the will of His Father became flesh? I do.

That in fulfillment of prophecies He was born of a virgin, lived a righteous life without sin, was crucified on a cross and died? I do.

That God raised Him from the dead after 3 days, after which He appeared to many and later in the sight of many ascended to heaven where He was seated at the right hand of the Father? I do.

That the Lord Jesus Christ is God the Son? I do.

That through His propitiating work on the cross, with the payment of His shed blood He made the ultimate act of redemption to save those who are dead in trespasses and sin? I do.

That salvation is only through Christ Jesus and there is no other way a man might be saved? I do.

That we are saved by grace, through faith, and not by works? I do.

That faith without works is dead? I do.

That when we place our faith in Christ our sins are forgiven and we are justified before God the Father, covered with the righteousness of Christ and as children of God are able to boldly go before the throne and call Him Father? I do.

That a Christian doesn't get a savior without getting a Master who is to be obeyed? I do.

That those who are in Christ are His bondservants? I do.

Yes, I do believe and confess that.

319. IM2L844

June 19, 2015 1:44 PM

Thanks. That gives me a clearer perspective. Now, would you elaborate on what you believe constitutes sexual immorality in the bible since it is ambiguously mentioned many times?

320. Tupla-J

June 19, 2015 1:56 PM

artisanaltoadshall:

“Female homosexuality” is a contradiction of terms because “homosexual” is any sexual act between men, which are unilaterally forbidden. Women aren’t men, thus “homosexual” anything is impossible for women.

What an odd thing to lie about. "Homo" means "same", not "male". There's nothing contradictory there. Women can be homosexual just like men can.

321. artisanaltoadshall

June 19, 2015 3:59 PM

IM2L844

Now, would you elaborate on what you believe constitutes sexual immorality in the bible since it is ambiguously mentioned many times?

Beyond the homosexuality (men with men) and bestiality (men or women with animals), what constitutes sexual immorality gets pretty much decided as to which side of the marriage line one is standing on. Licit sexual acts occur within marriage, illicit sexual acts occur outside marriage.

Marriage is to be honored by all and let not the marriage bed be defiled; for we know that fornicators and adulterers will not enter the kingdom of heaven.

I see adultery as sex (any act) by the married outside the bounds of their marriage and fornication as sex (any act) by the unmarried who are not bounded by marriage. God didn't describe and prohibit specific sexual acts, he proscribed relationships. With that in mind I truly don't know that I can restrict sexual immorality to sexual acts. What about birth control (God said He is the one who opens and closes the womb) or what is known today as an “emotional affair”? (note to self: the slope gets slippery)

Within marriage God placed two restrictions on the marital bed: no sex during menstruation and no sex after the birth

of a child: 40 days for a boy and 80 days for a girl. Other than that, the husband is the head of the wife and she is to submit to him in everything. Yes, everything, including *that* (whatever that may be). **(NB: The lack of a prohibition on any particular thing does not speak to the wisdom of doing it simply because it's allowed.)**

Specifically including women in the prohibition of bestiality highlighted the fact God did not prohibit sexual contact between women; and the restrictions God placed on the marital bed highlights the fact He chose not to prohibit multiple wives in bed at the same time. Or any sexual act they might come up with in that bed.

That's extremely difficult for a lot of people to deal with. The early church viewed celibate service to the Lord as a higher calling than marriage and while there is significant Scriptural support for that, I believe it must be taken within context. The family, the state and the church are all covenant entities, each with a different mission. Just as the state was not given the authority to dictate doctrine to the church, the church was not given the authority to dictate policy within the home.

At some point that attitude caused the church to invade the family. A marriage wasn't a marriage until the church said so. One could not be married without the permission of the church and within the marriage they went so far as to regulate the marital bed. Husbands and wives were exhorted to chastity and sex within marriage was viewed as a necessary evil only for the purposes of procreation. Couples were told to have sex only in the missionary position and only on certain days and at certain times; that any act that did not deposit "true semen" in the vagina was unnatural and therefore was a sin.

I believe only God has the authority to declare that something is always wrong for all time and all people. We know what right and wrong are subjectively because God gave us His Law and it's perfect. As Christians we know what right and wrong are situationally through the ministry of the Holy Spirit and His Word. But what might be wrong for one might be OK for another. Romans 14 speaks very clearly to this subject.

My final thought on sexual immorality returns to the beginning. The family was commanded by God to be fruitful and multiply, fill the earth and subdue it and take dominion over it. Much like Adam and Eve in the garden, He placed

His restrictions on marriage. Within those boundaries and with the mission of the family in mind, I do not believe the issues of marriage, divorce and polygyny can be viewed separately.

322. artisanaltoadshall

June 19, 2015 5:04 PM

IM2L844

Marriage is described as a type for the relationship between Christ and the church. In my opinion, divorce between believers is the ultimate marital immorality and a major causative factor in adultery, idolatry and the destruction of the culture and society.

In Matthew 19 the Pharisees asked Jesus a question: What are the grounds for divorce? Jesus responded first with a slap in the face "Have you not read" and then said there were no grounds for divorce "What therefore God has joined together let no man separate."

The Pharisees then asked Him another question: Well, if divorce is forbidden, why did Moses tell us we could? Jesus said that because of the hardness of their hearts Moses permitted it, but from the beginning it wasn't that way. Again, no divorce. Who is speaking here? Jesus, the man, born of the house of David of the tribe of Judah and He was (at that time) under the authority of Moses. Deuteronomy 24:1-4 was a judgment of Moses, which is why Jesus said "Moses permitted you..." It wasn't part of His Law and He obviously didn't like it.

His first answer was "no divorce" but that put Him in opposition to Moses. In answer to the second question He interpreted the judgment of Moses in the strictest of terms.* *"And I say to you anyone who divorces his wife for any reason other than immorality and marries another woman commits adultery."* Verse 9 did not change His answer in verse 6. Different questions, different answers.

(*NB: Verse 9, some early manuscripts read "makes her commit adultery" and some others add "and he who marries a divorced woman commits adultery.")

When His earthly ministry was complete, Christ ascended into Heaven where He was seated at the right hand of the Father. There are only two places in the New Testament in which the Ascendant Lord speaks directly to His

bondservants. In the book of Revelation Christ tells the Apostle John to write to the seven churches. In those letters He offers both praise and rebukes, even threatening to kill some of them if they do not repent. The other place is in 1st Corinthians 7:10-11.

Notice Paul takes care to say *“To the married, I give instruction, not I but the Lord, that the wife is not to separate from her husband; but if she does she is to remain single or be reconciled to her husband. And the husband must not divorce his wife.”* Notice this is the Risen Lord speaking, no longer under the authority of Moses and there is no “except for immorality” justification for divorce. The issue of divorce between believers is now perfectly in line with His answer to the Pharisees, “What therefore God has joined together let no man separate.”

If a wife disregards the command not to separate, her husband is under no requirement to suffer sexual starvation and loneliness because he has the right to take another wife. She, as a separated wife cannot legitimately remarry regardless whether some state court judge gives her a certificate of divorce and uses the badge gang to extract money from him to support her in her rebellion against him. Any man who marries such a separated wife commits adultery because she’s still married.

What we see today is corporations claiming to be churches filled with adulterous relationships claiming to be marriages, men with multiple wives, singles and separated wives going from one adulterous dating relationship to another as they raise their children without a father. They claim polygyny is wrong even though God didn’t say that, divorce is regrettable but justifiable (overlooking the fact God said He hates it and Christ forbid it to his married bondservants) and they’re so blind they can’t even recognize their own hypocrisy.

323. IM2L844

June 19, 2015 6:20 PM

Okay, the explicit prohibitions, of course, are pretty clear, but there are implicit prohibitions as well that concern things like lasciviousness and gratuitous ego-centric carnal indulgences. The reality of marriage (becoming “one body”), as far as I can tell, is actualized by sexual intercourse regardless of how societies or governments feel about it. Not any old intermingling of body parts or orgasmic endeavor will suffice. I may have a lot of wives, in Gods

eyes, and it may cost me, in the long run, for not respecting them as such. I don't have a justification hamster: Only the promise of forgiveness.

324. SarahsDaughter

June 19, 2015 6:21 PM

Your last paragraph, AT, is what has me perexed by the words spoken against you. Who among us has not watched or experienced this thing that God hates? Are those people consistantly delivered a stern rebuke? Do we drive out those evil doers from our homes or association? Yet a hypothetical conversation among grown adults about something that is at worst unclear, has brought about some very disappointing behavior and vile accusations from men I've respected for years. I'm having a hard time understanding all of this.

325. Cail Corishev

June 19, 2015 6:40 PM

I'm having a hard time understanding all of this.

I decided there must have been something in the water yesterday. I stayed out of it for fear it might be catching.

326. SirHamster (#201)

June 19, 2015 7:23 PM

@ SD:

Your last paragraph, AT, is what has me perexed by the words spoken against you. Who among us has not watched or experienced this thing that God hates?

You do not understand what was said. It is not a judgement against someone who has watched/experienced sin in the past.

On a very specific topic, AT was tempting others by appealing to the flesh. No matter how orthodox one may be in other Christian aspects, one bit of sin, one bit of yeast spoils the bread. Beau and simplytimothy have both done a thorough job pointing out where he erred, Scripturally.

Note how Peter, zealous and loyal as he was, was still rebuked as Satan by Jesus. (Matt 16:23)

""Get behind me, Satan! You are a stumbling block to me; you do not have in mind the concerns of God, but merely

human concerns."

What you witnessed is something similar, and the harsh words are given as a cleansing fire, offered in love, not vileness.

Yet a hypothetical conversation among grown adults about something that is at worst unclear, has brought about some very disappointing behavior and vile accusations from men I've respected for years. I'm having a hard time understanding all of this.

If you disagree with the judgement of the men you respected, you are welcome to point out their Biblical errors, rather than offering a vague and indirect **feeling** of disappointment.

@Cail:

I decided there must have been something in the water yesterday. I stayed out of it for fear it might be catching.

Men fight because we like it. And there is no higher cause than a proper understanding of Scripture to guide our decision making process.

327. Cail Corishev

June 19, 2015 7:31 PM

And there is no higher cause than a proper understanding of Scripture to guide our decision making process.

Uh huh. Whose proper understanding of Scripture did you settle on?

But I wasn't actually talking about the topic itself or the discussion, but the way everyone involved went for the throat almost immediately. It wasn't just that discussion either; everything seemed a bit weird yesterday. Like I said, something in the water.

328. simplytimothy

June 19, 2015 7:32 PM

@artisantoadsall

I just scanned your response and wanted to jot down my thoughts as they occurred.

First, I share much of your antipathy to organized

christianity in the U.S.

Three items.

First:

Your argument is:

1. Lesbian sex is not a sin per the Torah as it is not explicitly stated as being one.
2. However, no woman may have sex outside of marriage with a man.
3. Therefore, withing polygamous marriage, God approves of lesbian sex
4. Therefore lesbian sex within a monogamous marriage is adultery and therefore sin
5. Therefore woman/woman marriages are sin.

If this is incorrect, please let me know.

Second: (forgive me if I missed this, I am just back from my day's labor)

You take polygamy as a given good while Christianity does not.

Beau's statement mirrors mine and it derives from the narrative of the Bible.

1. Man was created good.
2. Man was given one wife--Eve
3. Man's sinful nature introduced the sin of polygamy.
4. God decided to step in and established His covenant with Abraham. Polygamy was practiced then.
5. God introduced the law with attendant rules on polygamy.
- 6...etc

Where we differ is we start at 1 and you start at 5. Your argument is that since there are laws regarding polygamy, polygamy must be ordained of God rather than God working with the material at hand and beginning the process of redeeming the world.

Third:

Below I attempt to extract the general principle behind your argument by removing lesbian sex from your case and inserting within [brackets] the general thing.

Here is your (as opposed to Mark Call's) argument with the sins generalized.

You state

Some [sins] are unilaterally forbidden, meaning there is no possible relationship in which such acts can be licit:

1. *forbidden thing A*
2. *forbidden thing B*
3. *forbidden thing C [all things listed in the Torah]*

Then argue [in the general case]

*Other [sins] may be licit depending on [the nature of the covenant relationship]. Thus, the fact God chose not to unilaterally condemn or forbid [this particular sin] indicates [that sin] would be licit within [this particular covenant relationship]. [This covenant relationship] however, requires [a prerequisite defined by God], thus the only way [this sin] would be licit is within a [variation of a covenant relationship]. I'm sure that bothers you, but to say otherwise is to say **God got it wrong**.*

This Third area is probably not a new argument and probably has a name. It is either a "Doctrine of such and such" or "The such and such Fallacy"

Your explosive argument is in **First**.

First given the premises is a valid argument. You make no logical mistake there. If there is a problem it rests within the premises.

However it rests upon **Second** and **Third**

Formal names for **Second** and **Third** would be useful here. Identifying **Fourth**, **Fifth** etc (if they exist) would be useful too.

FWIW, I think your argument is moot given the narrative used in **Second**, in that you completely misconstrue the use of "the law" in God's hands.

Third is interesting in that it seems true-ish. The sin of eating certain foods in the covenant of the law was not a sin in the covenant of grace.

What was sin in the former is not sin in the latter. However, note that the progression I make here exactly mirrors the narrative in **Second**

329. SirHamster (#201)

June 19, 2015 7:47 PM

Uh huh. Whose proper understanding of Scripture did you settle on?

Well gee, I guess we should just stop debating anything Scriptural because unless we have a group hug and have Settled Science! at the end, there's no point.

We fight because the stakes are worth it. Who wins is for someone else to figure out.

330. artisanaltoadshall

June 19, 2015 8:20 PM

IM2L844

there are implicit prohibitions as well that concern things like lasciviousness and gratuitous ego-centric carnal indulgences. The reality of marriage (becoming "one body"), as far as I can tell, is actualized by sexual intercourse regardless of how societies or governments feel about it.

Within the marriage the wife is to be subject to her husband. Whether his behavior or her behavior that he permits rises to the level of "[lasciviousness](#)" (is that even possible in a Christian marriage between husband and wife?) or "gratuitous ego-centric carnal indulgences" is the husband's call to make. Period. For as it is written... the husband is the head of the wife just as Christ is the head of the church...

If your wife, wearing a pair of boots and a raincoat (and nothing else), walks down the street and flashes random people, that's lasciviousness and "gratuitous ego-centric carnal indulgences." If you come home after work and she greets you at the door wearing nothing but heels and a smile, that sir, is NOT lasciviousness. If sex with your wife has moaning, crying, hair-pulling, back-scratching, biting, screaming for God orgasms that leave both of you exhausted, amazed that it happened and wondering how soon you can do it again, congratulations, that's sex the way God designed it. **And it's nobody's business but yours.**

SirHamster said

On a very specific topic, AT was tempting others by appealing to the flesh. No matter how orthodox one may be in other Christian aspects, one bit of sin, one bit of

yeast spoils the bread. Beau and simplytimothy have both done a thorough job pointing out where he erred, Scripturally.

No. Not only have they not pointed out where I've erred, all I've seen so far is a re-definition of terms. Simplytimothy has an interesting argument I'm about to dissect, but so far it's quibbling over semantics. But, to your point. Can a man be "tempted" by his wife's charms? Really? Tempted to do WHAT? And what happens if the husband "takes the bait" so to speak. Is a sweaty roll in the hay within the bounds of marriage somehow now defined as sin? Is it now doubleplus badpoint feelbads for enjoying what God created within the bounds of marriage?

The level of ad hominem attack I'm subjected to (by people who normally don't do that) for telling the truth (which cannot be refuted without re-defining the terms) is an indication I've hit a nerve. Why? **Because it threatens the status quo.**

What if, instead of the "Man up and marry that slut" campaign that some churches are waging, they instead said "Girls, get together in groups of two to four, move in together, get your houses in order and then find the greatest guy you can and offer him his own personal harem." Which is more likely to increase the stability and economic security of those single mothers and their children? Is it sin? No. Is it unbiblical? No. Why do they go snakeshit at the idea? Because the idea some guy has a sexual smorgasbord available when they're stuck with a monogamous marriage drives the men nuts. The men AND women go nuts because they KNOW that sooner or later the girl-on-girl thing will come up and NOTHING in Scripture forbids it. "Wives, submit to your husbands in everything."

And Christians who scream with outrage at me for suggesting such a thing (Toad is appealing the flesh) don't bat an eye at the percentage of divorcees or the number of women in their pews that have already filed the paperwork to destroy their families, impoverish their children and cause their men to leave the congregation.

It's business as usual.

"Hi! Welcome to our church! Remember, Jesus loves you, God forgives you and don't forget to tithe!"

331. artisanalloadshall

June 19, 2015 8:26 PM

Men fight because we like it. And there is no higher cause than a proper understanding of Scripture to guide our decision making process.

Well said, sir. Now get back in the ring.

332. simplytimothy

June 19, 2015 8:51 PM

Uh huh. Whose proper understanding of Scripture did you settle on?

We Christians all have our own understanding of Scripture. If our faith is worth a darn, then we should/must approach our doubts and ignorance forthrightly and mature in the knowledge of our faith. If we do not know, we should say so while reserving the right to refuse based on conscience and the Holy Spirit.

artisanalloadshall has made an argument **from** scripture. It is an argument that challenges some core axioms of my faith and either my existing theological framework is sufficient to rebut him or it is not. If it is not, then the problem is either my lack of understanding of the tenets of my faith, or the tenets of my faith are wrong/incomplete.

artisanalloadshall used an excellent rhetorical device to force the discussion.

He took the Christianity 501c3 opposition to homosexual marriage as an emotional, primal wedge to make a case. Sex is primal and emotional and God's laws attending to it are explosive on any side of the issue. To argue from scripture as artisanalloadshall has for homosex in this environment is a masterful rhetorical ploy.

We are (I was) **tempted** by his argument because sin is tempting; part of me wants what he is selling and my walk in the Spirit is telling me no way.

Now, I think artisanalloadshall is wrong for reason Beau has given; however, I am not at the point where I can make artisanalloadshall's case **for** him and that is foundational to a good rebuttal (As VD wrote in the Keynesian post a few days ago).

Furthermore, Rabbi B's comment intritues me. Is artisanalloadshall looking at things the way a Rabbi B would? How does that differ from the way Beau and I look

at things? What are these things named? Have these things been pondered previously?

333. simplytimothy

June 19, 2015 9:01 PM

Whether his behavior or her behavior that he permits rises to the level of "lasciviousness" (is that even possible in a Christian marriage between husband and wife?) or "gratuitous ego-centric carnal indulgences" is the husband's call to make. Period. For as it is written... the husband is the head of the wife just as Christ is the head of the church...

This is wrong.

Marriage is a covenant before God. In any covenant relation there are behaviors that breach the covenant and the aggrieved party is not to be bound by it.

An example of a covenant relationship is the ordained-by-God covenant of government.

Now, God is always God. However the other parties, the citizen or the state can and do break the bounds of the relationship.

The same principle holds in the covenant of marriage.

Your assertion that the husband, as head, is not bound by God to behave in a Godly fashion is false.

For as Christ is the head of the Church, so the husband is head of the wife...

So, tell me, when Has Christ but a bull-whip up your ass and told you to lean forward and enjoy it?

Answer: never. He never will. He cannot. He is God.

By parity, the husband should never do such a thing; he should not; he is the husband.

Its 'tells' like this in your discourse that show a spirit that is 'bent'.

334. simplytimothy

June 19, 2015 9:06 PM

artisanaltoadshall

Are you arguing from a GAME perspective? This has the feel of the reaction of men to feminists (and the feminized church) to it. Your 'retreat to polygamy' reads as a power-move. "I am the head, I will enjoy my harem, I am not like those pussies in the SBA and I have Scripture on my side" is what I see in your words.

Is that a fair observation?

thx.

335. SirHamster (#201)

June 19, 2015 9:07 PM

@AT

No. Not only have they not pointed out where I've erred, all I've seen so far is a re-definition of terms.

Let me remind you of what you said:

"C'mon guys, fess up. If you had more than one wife I'm thinking I'm correct when I say that sooner or later you'll want all of them in bed with you at once. Put a pile of naked, sweaty, sexually aroused people in bed together and things happen. Maybe that's why God didn't prohibit or condemn girl on girl action, because it could be legitimately exercised/satisfied in a polygynous marriage. This drives most Christians nuts and scares the living bejeezus out of Christian women."

What are you appealing to here, for people to agree with your interpretation of Scripture?

When pressed on the point, you added this:

"I will accept your word that this is true, but based on all evidence available to me it puts you several standard deviations from the norm. There is a reason why lesbian porn is so popular with men..."

Again, what are you appealing to, here?

I have previously asked you questions that you have skipped over.

"A man can channel his desires. Why do you think I referenced the concept of setting minds? This is a serious question I want you to answer.

Speaking of norms... which norm are you comparing to, and what norm are you trying to develop?"

But, to your point. Can a man be “tempted” by his wife’s charms?

That is not my point. You are selling an interpretation of scripture on the basis that it will satisfy the desire of men to see lesbian porn, a desire you try to sneak in as “the norm”.

It’s not about the polygamy. It’s how you’re selling it, and your emphasis.

Speaking of semantics:

“The term “lesbian” defines a relationship which is unnatural and not in accordance with God’s plan; not any particular sexual act that might take place within such a relationship.”

So you want to find the fine line between lesbian relationships and lesbian sex. You want to define lesbian sex as not homosexual and not unnatural as long as the two women share a common husband ... (I’ll presume you think that wives of two different men are not allowed to enjoy sexual acts together)

And this is the big selling point of your proposal on why Christian churches should accept polygamy. Because this is how we advance the Kingdom of God - advertising “not-lesbian”, “not-homosexual” girl-on-girl sex shows to the men. To the Glory of God! Can I get an “Amen, Brother?”

Do you recall saying this?

*“If sex *within marriage* wasn’t supposed to be enjoyable God would not have given women a clitoris.”*

Aside from attacking a position no one made ...

“Food is meant for the stomach and the stomach for food”—and God will destroy both one and the other. The body is not meant for sexual immorality, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body. (1 Cor 6:13)

That is why I call you a tempter. While I am reluctant to use Beau’s language, you have done precious little to prove his judgement wrong.

336. SarahsDaughter

June 19, 2015 9:27 PM

What you witnessed is something similar, and the harsh words are given as a cleansing fire, offered in love, not vileness.

That makes sense, and if it's true of Beau, my apologies.

If you disagree with the judgement of the men you respected, you are welcome to point out their Biblical errors, rather than offering a vague and indirect feeling of disappointment.

It isn't for me to disagree, I'm sorry if I was out of line. Though, I'm obviously persuaded by the one whose understanding aligns with my husband's. What appears to be happening is a disagreement over definitions. I've run in to that type of thing a lot, on a different issue, with defining the word "everything".

Because AT's understanding (not his presentation of it, though I'm aware of why he presents it that way), aligns with my husband's, it is difficult to read the accusations. I know it is possible to have an understanding of what is permissible without a desire to partake.

I, at one time, would have had an emotional reaction similar to what AT describes is common from women. But years ago on this very blog,, in the midst of a polygamy discussion, I learned a lot about my own irrational fears about it. Having given up those fears and confronting the extent of my obedience to God in submitting to my husband in everything, I realized this too was something to be "not afraid with any terror" as Sarah was in her obedience to Abraham.

337. artisanalloadshall

June 19, 2015 9:41 PM

First:

simplytimothy, this won't let me use any form of strikethrough so I'm deleting the stuff I'd have left up with a strikethrough otherwise.

My poor grasp of your argument is:

1. sex between two women is not necessarily a sin according to all of the Bible as it is not explicitly stated as being one.
2. However, no woman or man may have licit sex outside of

marriage with anyone.

3. Therefore, within **polygynous** marriage, God approves of sex because we were commanded to be fruitful and multiply. More buns in ovens means more multiplication.

4. Therefore sex within a **lesbian relationship** is either fornication or adultery and therefore sin

5. Therefore **exclusive woman/woman relationships** are sin because marriage is a covenant entity requiring a man and at least one woman and sex is only licit within the bounds of marriage.

If this is incorrect, please let me know. If this was a quiz in a seminary class, you'd have already flunked.

Second: (forgive me if I missed this, I am just back from my day's labor)

You take **marriage** as a given good while Christianity shits all over it with the sins of idolatry, fornication, adultery and divorce.

Beau's statement mirrors mine and it derives from the narrative of the Bible.

1. Man was created good.
2. Man was given one wife--Eve
3. Man's **disobedience** brought sin into the world. You err when you **pre-emptively** identify polygyny (not polygamy) as a sin. If you want to play the game, the first monogamous marriage introduced sin into the world. The offspring of the first monogamous marriage committed the first murder. The first recorded case of incest (a two-fer!) was the result of a monogamous marriage. Want me to go on about how wonderful monogamy is?
4. God decided to step in and established His covenant with Noah. In doing so He killed everyone else on earth, and if some of the creation research people are to be believed, that was literally ***billions*** of people. Many centuries later God established a new covenant with Abraham. Polygyny was practiced then by Abraham and his descendants and God didn't have a problem with it or He'd have said so. After all, He's God.
5. God introduced the law with attendant rules on polygyny.
6. The fact that God regulated the practice of polygyny, did not prohibit female-female sexual relations (while doing so with men) and the fact that He did not include a prohibition on more than one wife in the marital bed at the same time pretty much destroys my arguments about

polygyny being sinful.

Third:

This Third area is probably not a new argument and probably has a name. It is either a "Doctrine of such and such" or "The such and such Fallacy"

Enough. This is what I was saying to SirHamster: Rather than taking what the Bible actually says, you're trying to define the terms in such a way as to make the text say what you want it to say. The word for that is eisegesis.

Your false premise that wrecks your entire argument is that *sexual acts between women are unilaterally sinful in the same way as any sexual acts between men*. God never said that and you cannot point to a single passage of Scripture to justify this premise. In spite of my repeated efforts to be as clear as possible, you mischaracterize and twist what I've said in order to fit your paradigm, which is that polygynous marriage is sinful and any sexual acts between women within such a marriage are sinful. You are wrong.

The ball is in your court. Cites, please.

338. simplytimothy

June 19, 2015 10:12 PM

In spite of my repeated efforts to be as clear as possible, you mischaracterize and twist what I've said in order to fit your paradigm,

I do neither. I have started the process of understanding your argument so that I can repeat it back to you. I expect it to take several iterations. If that is too much for you to put up with, then I don't care. I am interested in the argument, not you or your opinion of me.

Due to this iteration, I am now aware that there is something called "polygyny" vs "polygamy". Which I will examine in the a.m. and begin round two in my attempt to understand your position.

Your false premise that wrecks your entire argument is that *sexual acts between women are unilaterally sinful in the same way as any sexual acts between men*.

That is an outstanding claim. I know sexual acts of any kind

among bonobo's are not sinful, and now you reduce women to the level bonobos.

After all that, we get to your conclusion which is

polygynous marriage is NOT sinful and any sexual acts between women within such a marriage are NOT sinful

Now that we finally have a clear statement of your conclusion, I will start the process of identifying your premises from this comment thread.

339. Bird on a Wing

June 19, 2015 10:18 PM

@Sarah's Daughter

This is a very good example of Cult Recruitment 101. The man is a nascent cult leader who is trying his pitch on what he thinks to be fertile grounds. He really, really likes the Church Girl type. He's a smart man. In 10 years he will have a compound of "families" where he has carnal knowledge of all the women, regardless to whom they are supposedly "married". Because by that point, the rules will have changed. They always do.

The best liars always use truth to draw in the target. The proportion of truth to lies starts out with quite a lot of truth, and one or two small lies, but over time, it changes. More lies are added and the truth becomes smaller and smaller.

Mohammad. Joseph Smith. David Koresh. Charles Manson. Jim Jones. Those are some of the more famous ones. There have been countless other small fish, but they all begin their swim in the cult pond, and their true father knows them all by name.

You say you know and respect Beau. I respect Beau, but I don't comment very much. Beau is right.

340. artisanaltoadshall

June 19, 2015 10:43 PM

simplytimothy

Marriage is a covenant before God. In any covenant relation there are behaviors that breach the covenant and the

aggrieved party is not to be bound by it.

No. Marriage is a covenant, which by definition means that God is a party to the covenant. In the marital covenant both husband and wife make vows to each other and to God. As believers, they are bondservants of the Lord. Think of a triangle with God at the top and husband/wife at the bottom. Christ is in the center making intercession. Both husband and wife make vows to each other (across the bottom of the triangle) and to God (upwards to the top). Read comment #324 for a discussion on divorce. As bondservants of the Lord, regardless of whatever violations take place between husband and wife the covenant holds between them because God is a party to the covenant. The covenant cannot be broken unless the servant leaves the service of the master and refuses to be a bondservant. The bondservant cannot leave and the master has forbidden divorce.

Your assertion that the husband, as head, is not bound by God to behave in a Godly fashion is false.

I never made that assertion. You projected it. However, since you brought it up, I will clearly state that the husband is ALWAYS bound by God to obey His Law and behave in a Godly fashion. Whether the husband is a Christian or not, the standard does not change.

So, tell me, when Has Christ but a bull-whip up your ass and told you to lean forward and enjoy it?

Answer: never. He never will. He cannot. He is God.

By parity, the husband should never do such a thing; he should not; he is the husband.

For the record, I did not bring this up. It has not been on the table until now but I will respond.

simplytimothy, a husband is told to love his wife as Christ loves the church. What does that mean? What are some Scriptural examples of Christ loving His church? Here's one that causes most modern day Christians to run for the exits and (kind of) resonates with your obnoxious reply. Revelation 3:19 *"Those whom I love I reprove and disciple, be zealous therefore and repent."*

I've had relationships with women in which I disciplined them. Physically. Most of them enjoyed it as long as it

had a playful vibe. About 10% demonstrated they wanted serious discipline. They *liked* being manhandled, being grabbed by the hair and yanked around, being pinned against the wall and such, and being put over my knee. Paul compared the marital relationship with the relationship between Christ and the church but he also said it was a mystery. I really think you need to leave this one alone.

Its 'tells' like this in your discourse that show a spirit that is 'bent'.

The discourse demonstrates that you mischaracterize and twist what I say. Giving you the benefit of the doubt I don't think you're doing it in a malicious manner, but you do. Polygyny is NOT a sin because GOD didn't say it was. What happens within the marital bed in a polygynous marriage is NOT a subject for you or anyone else to comment on because other than the published restrictions on all marriages, what happens is between God and those involved.

If that bothers you then you need to examine your heart and figure out why. If you had to counsel a woman who had been raised within an environment in which she'd been told all her life that sex was only for making babies and sexual desire was sinful, what would you say? What does 1st Corinthians 7:4 say on the subject? Should she "honor" Christ by giving her husband what is rightfully his grudgingly, without any enthusiasm, doing all that she can to show him she finds it a distasteful imposition? Or should she do all she can to meet his needs cheerfully and with enthusiasm?

341. Wait, What?

June 19, 2015 10:44 PM

Comment 267. Casually mentioning you've killed people. What are we talking about, dune coons overseas? Niggas in the skreets? Abortions from the ho's you banged in your "pagan" days?

342. SarahsDaughter

June 19, 2015 10:51 PM

The man is a nascent cult leader who is trying his pitch on what he thinks to be fertile grounds.

This doesn't fit with the correspondence I have had with

him. I've known him (from blogs and emails - shared with my husband) for a couple years now - know his story etc. In fact the last question I asked him (about his understanding of the story of Sapphira and Ananias), he deferred to my husband - I had already asked RLB about the story and presumed based on what I knew of AT that they were on the same page. But I appreciated AT's integrity in that. Not a lot of men are willing to support marriage in that manner and refer women to their own husbands for teaching. Most are all too concerned about instructing the women, which is fine, except when they are married and it is especially concerning when it is a matter that falls under the husband's authority.

343. Mark Call

June 19, 2015 11:13 PM

"Here is your (as opposed to Mark Call's) argument.. re -- lesbianism... [@simplytimothy]

My argument is probably simpler:

The Scriptural condemnation of male-on-male homosexuality is repeated multiple times (at least 5 in total) and, moreover, called "abomination" ['towebah'] in the Hebrew (Lev. 18:22, etc). Furthermore, it carries a death penalty (Lev. 20:30)

In stark contrast, there is simply no mention in Torah at all of a corresponding situation with females, nor anywhere else in the TNKH (what Yahushua referred to as the Torah, Writings, or Prophets; the 'Hebrew Scriptures'.)

It is an "**argument from silence**". And the silence, in comparison, is practically deafening.

We are not to "*add to*," nor "*subtract from*" (Deut 4:2, Deut 12:32, and that's repeated as the "last command in Scripture", too) what is Written.

So here comes the part that I contend is the "big deal" that so many here have a problem with:

PAUL KNEW THAT.

And he would not have violated Torah by "adding in" a commandment where Scripture was SILENT.

Ergo, if it APPEARS that some English rendering, translated

in turn from Greek, makes it seem he did...it is the TRANSLATION (and the interpretation, aka, as Peter said, the "twisting") that is the problem.

Paul knew better. He would simply NOT have done what his Master Yahushua said He Himself would not do either.

344. Bird on a Wing

June 19, 2015 11:35 PM

@SarahsDaughter

I've never interacted with him, and I won't ever interact with him. Whatever his past, it doesn't justify what he is trying to do right now. He is going down a twisted path.

People who run cons are successful because they choose their targets carefully and cater to the individual prejudices.

Cail Corishev mentioned the weird vibe. It's a weird vibe because it's a religious con game, and AT is his own first target.

Beau is right.

345. IM2L844

June 19, 2015 11:56 PM

The offspring of the first monogamous marriage committed the first murder. The first recorded case of incest (a two-fer!) was the result of a monogamous marriage. Want me to go on about how wonderful monogamy is?

What? Monogamy was the causal agent? What a bizarre thing to imply.

346. artisanaltoadshall

June 20, 2015 12:35 AM

SirHamster

Again, what are you appealing to, here?

Appealing? What is this appealing you speak of? I made a bald statement of fact based on my observations with literally thousands of men. Does he want one chick in his

bed or two? Survey says- he wants two. I'm sure there's an element of maturity here because the men I dealt with were almost universally between the ages of 18 and 22 and had self-selected to join the Marine Corps. That also implies a certain level of sociopathy, but this isn't the place to discuss the pre-selection tendencies of the Marines for sociopathy.

In every culture I've been in men showed a remarkable desire to bed more than one woman at once. I put this down to the male desire to conquer, a character trait endowed by God and reflected in His command to the family: *"Fill the earth and subdue it, take dominion over it."* Men perform. Men build things. Men create things. Men do battle and strive to conquer.

"A man can channel his desires. Why do you think I referenced the concept of setting minds? This is a serious question I want you to answer."

Speaking of norms... which norm are you comparing to, and what norm are you trying to develop?"

Sorry, I missed that question. I'm going to guess you were referring to conforming ourselves to the likeness of Christ. Focusing on His kingdom and not the cares of the world. Am I right?

As to which norms, norms refer to the concept of "normal" (a committed Christian is definitely NOT normal- narrow is the gate that leads to life and few find it) in which a general population of sufficient numbers is compared and contrasted according to any given standard. As to which norms I'm trying to develop, the answer is easy. I'd like a church in which:

- *The sin of divorce within the church is eliminated.
- *No child of Christian parents has to suffer the destruction of their family because selfish hypocrites in Church leadership care more about where the money comes from than their duty to preach and teach the Word. Leaders who are too cowardly to enforce the church discipline of another church. Men who cower in fear of the women in their congregations.

You want the truth? You probably can't handle the truth.

**I can't talk about divorce because nobody cares anymore.
I have to support and defend an esoteric practice called**

polygyny and dangle the bait of girl-on-girl sex in order to get the self-righteous hypocritical assholes off their seats and into the fight where I can then cut them off at the knees. Then, when they're laying there bleeding I use polygyny as the lens to highlight in a spectacular fashion their hypocrisy when it comes to divorce. You see, in the modern church, divorce is all about women's empowerment and money, to hell with the children. I'm not looking for converts here, I'm just sharpening my sword in preparation for a battle I'm about to engage in. Last time I did this was 2 years ago on SSM's blog. That thread ran to over 700 comments. This is fairly tame in comparison.

It's not about the polygamy. It's how you're selling it, and your emphasis.

In other words, you can't come up with a cogent argument to counter me, so you'll complain about the "sales pitch?" Doesn't that about sum it up?

Do you recall saying this?

*"If sex *within marriage* wasn't supposed to be enjoyable God would not have given women a clitoris."*

As a matter of fact, I do. Do you care to argue the point? Are you claiming sex within marriage should be less than pleasant for both the men and women? Or are you subtly acknowledging that women know far more about what to do with a clitoris than men? Like that's somehow wrong? Not sure what your point is.

The body is not meant for sexual immorality, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body.

Please explain how sex within the bounds of marriage approaches the threshold of sexual immorality.

347. SirHamster (#201)

June 20, 2015 3:00 AM

AT:

Appealing? What is this appealing you speak of?

You appeal to men's lusts and physical desires. That's why you bring up girl-on-girl, and evoke the imagination on a pile of "sweaty", "aroused" human beings. That's why you bring up lesbian porn - because that's what you've set your mind upon, and that's what you are drawing other men's

minds towards. That's why I call you a tempter - because you are creating temptations for others by appealing to their flesh.

Sorry, I missed that question. I'm going to guess you were referring to conforming ourselves to the likeness of Christ. Focusing on His kingdom and not the cares of the world. Am I right?

Correct. And knowing what the Scripture instructs the Christian to set his mind upon, where do you think lesbian porn fits in?

In other words, you can't come up with a cogent argument to counter me, so you'll complain about the "sales pitch?" Doesn't that about sum it up?

In the process of arguing for polygamy and how it will satisfy men's physical desires ... you have neglected care for Christian brothers.

"Be careful, however, that the exercise of your rights does not become a stumbling block to the weak. ... so this weak brother or sister, for whom Christ died, is destroyed by your knowledge. When you sin against them in this way and wound their weak conscience, you sin against Christ. Therefore, if what I eat causes my brother or sister to fall into sin, I will never eat meat again, so that I will not cause them to fall." (1 Cor 8:9-13)

Christian living is not merely the practice of what is acceptable to your own conscience, but taking into account the weaknesses of fellow Christians.

What I have observed is that you love your ideas more than your love the souls of others. You think more about satisfying physical desires than developing and satisfying spiritual ones. In this thread your focus is on, "this is NOT Wrong!", rather than, "this is Holy!" In your responses to those who disagree with you, you are quick to tear down others as if that will buttress your own position.

You are confused as to why I am arguing with you despite agreeing with you on polygamy. Because your words are thoughtless and you are fixated on minor things over major things.

If you think Beau is a child in his Christian thinking, you claim to be spiritually mature. A spiritually mature Christian

would not choose to trample a spiritually childish Christian, yet that is what chose to do with your words.

348. SirHamster (#201)

June 20, 2015 3:01 AM

@ AT, continued

As a matter of fact, I do. Do you care to argue the point? Are you claiming sex within marriage should be less than pleasant for both the men and women? Or are you subtly acknowledging that women know far more about what to do with a clitoris than men? Like that's somehow wrong? Not sure what your point is.

Yet again, you miss the point. I shall spell everything out for you going forward.

Your appeal to the physical existence of the clitoris as justifying the things you want to do with it; such as observing two wives pleasure each other in "girl-on-girl" sex that you take great care to disassociate from lesbian sex. Rationalize it however you want, everyone else would label it lesbian sex, just as they call it lesbian porn.

Paul, is quoting contemporary thought when he brings up, "Food is meant for the stomach and the stomach for food". After pointing out that the stomach will perish in God's judgement - Paul uses that to condemn sexual immorality. The quote is not about food, it's about sex, a rationalization used by the heathens to justify all activities that fill the sexual appetites. Those activities, and the physical desires they feed, will perish. They are not eternal things.

So when you appeal to the existence of the clitoris, you are echoing the arguments of people judged by God. A wiser man would reflect on the implications of that, but you are so blind to it that I need to spell it out.

In the process of building an argument on the clitoris, you repeatedly attack a strawman. I will tell you a third time: No one here objects to sexual pleasure between husband and wife within marriage. I and others object to your glorification of female homosexual sex within a polygamous "marriage", and your continuous attempts to substitute one position for the other is dishonest. That is a behavior of the father of lies.

You will not surely die. Doesn't this fruit look appetizing? It will taste so sweet.

349. artisanaltoadshall

June 20, 2015 3:25 AM

Simplytimothy

Sorry, I missed this one.

Toad used an excellent rhetorical device to force the discussion.

It's sad when telling the truth is referred to as a "rhetorical device."

*Sex is primal and emotional and God's laws attending to it are explosive on any side of the issue. To argue from scripture as Toad has for **homosex** in this environment is a masterful rhetorical ploy. We are (I was) tempted by his argument because sin is tempting; part of me wants what he is selling and my walk in the Spirit is telling me no way.*

There you go again. You're using the pejorative "homosex" in order to tar my argument with a forbidden sexual act and you combine it with the victim ploy: "I was tempted!" You call what I wrote a "masterful rhetorical ploy." No, you're the one trying for a rhetorical ploy; I'm the one telling the truth. Regardless of what you're tempted of, that's your cross to bear. But I felt sorry for you anyway and looked in my sympathy bowl to toss some your way but it's empty; I guess I gave what I had to some kids whose Mom divorce raped their father so now he's no longer a part of their lives. Sorry. Your problem isn't your temptation, it's you've yet to cite me chapter and verse or even give me anything reasonable to refute the following.

1. God's Law is perfect, containing no more and no less than perfection. Claims that God got it wrong is to call God a liar, which is blasphemy.
2. The silence on God's part in not forbidding or condemning female-female sexual acts speaks very loudly in light of His inclusion of women in the prohibition against bestiality.
3. Polygyny is a valid and licit form of marriage regulated by God in the Law which was not prohibited or condemned in the New Testament.

4. The silence on God's part in not forbidding a man from entertaining more than one wife in the marital bed speaks very loudly in light of the restrictions He did place on the marital bed.

5. The only licit sexual activity occurs in marriage. Any sex outside of a legitimate marriage is either adultery, fornication or incest. It isn't about the acts themselves, it's about the relationships in which they occur. My vanilla PIV sex with my wife is licit. My vanilla PIV sex with your wife is adultery.

6. We find three classes of sex acts are unilaterally prohibited and condemned in God's Law: men with men, men with animals and women with animals. God did not give us lists of specific acts, just a blanket prohibition. All other prohibitions are based on relationships.

7. In Romans 1:26-27, the natural function of the woman, used in regard to both the men and women, refers to marriage and baby-making. I cited 1st Timothy 2:15 in support. It follows that the unnatural for women is to reject men, marriage and motherhood under the headship and in submission to a husband. Beau argued the "natural function of women" is a reference to sex and you're trying to equate girl-girl sex with guy-guy sex in order to condemn the girls, something God didn't do. I claim it's about relationships. So let's go back to Genesis and see what Eve was created for. Wouldn't that help us understand the "natural function of women?" It follows that if Eve was created to be Adam's sex toy, I'm wrong and it's all about sex. If Eve was created to be a helpmeet to Adam, to be his wife and bear his children within the bounds of marriage, you're wrong and it's about relationships.

Aside from point 6, it isn't the act itself, it's the context of the act: the relationship. In light of points 1-5 I make the claim that IF the women in Romans 1:26 were within a lawful marriage to a man, any such sex acts would be licit. Further, not being in a lesbian relationship (rejection of men and marriage) you can't even call it lesbian sex or homosex without slandering them.

350. Tupla-J

June 20, 2015 4:48 AM

Two very simple questions. 1) Does "by their fruits shall you know them" apply to polygamy? 2) If so, judging by their

fruits, is polygamy a thing to be avoided or not?

My answers to these are 1) of course, and 2) it is a wise thing to avoid, expressly forbidden or not. This makes me wonder why would anyone advocate such a foolish thing as that. It's like advocating the eating of sand because it is not expressly forbidden in the Bible.

351. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 9:29 AM

One foundation claim to artisanaltoaadshall's (many) arguments is

polygynous marriage is NOT sinful and any sexual acts between women within such a marriage are NOT sinful

The second half of artisanaltoaadshall's assertion ...**any sexual acts between women within such a (polygamous*) marriage are NOT sinful** depends on the validity of the first assertion. So, I will focus there.

Focusing on the first half of that statement **polygynous marriage is NOT sinful**

I freely admit that I have not derived a counter-argument from primary sources. I am a mere Christian, a layman and unschooled in theology.

I rely on what I have been taught and what I read in my Bible.

Having stated my ignorance up front, I turn to the argument presented in my ESV translation notes on page 2544 on the subject of polygamy and the critiques given there are:

1. Nowhere in the Bible did God command polygamy.
2. Nowhere in the Bible did God tell anyone to marry more than one wife.
3. God temporarily allowed polygamy to occur (the teleological process I referenced earlier)
4. God **never** gave any general prohibition against it.
5. God **never** gave polygamy any explicit moral approval.
6. Whenever a man has two or more wives, it seems to lead to trouble citing
 - 6.a Genesis 16
 - 6.b Genesis 29-31
 - 6.c 1 Samuel 1
 - 6.d 1 Kings 11

6.e The prohibition in Deut. 17:17**

7. Polygamy is horribly dehumanizing for women for it does not treat them as equal in value to their husbands, and therefore it does not recognize that they share fully in the high status of being created "in the image of God" and the worthy of honor as "heirs with you of the grace of life" (1 Pet. 3:7)

8. The requirement that an elder be "husband of one wife" (1 Tim 3:2)

9. A discussion on the existence of polygamy among the Jews in 1st Century

10 A discussion on missionary work to places where polygamy is practiced and advice to a man with multiple wives on divorcing one of them (don't)

11. An observation that polygamy was abolished from the church in a generation or two.

I am assuming the above are *facts* because they are presented as such in my ESV notes. I have not done the research myself.

I will now start the process of extracting artisanal toadshall's and Mark Call's scriptural arguments for polygamy and examining them more closely. I will then attempt to present them in the way I just presented the ESV's case against polygamy.

The ESV also has a discussion section on homosexuality that I will not delve into now except to note that it too assumes the prohibition of lesbian sex (**not** relationships, sex) based on arguments similar to the ones given for the nature of marriage being monogamous vs polygamous. If needed, we can turn to those arguments later.

*I revert to the use of 'polygamy' instead of 'polygyny' as the latter is a type of the former; I do this not out of rudeness but because typing "polygamy" is easier than typing "polygyny".

***Deut. 17:17 And he shall not acquire many wives for himself, lest his heart turn away, nor shall he acquire for himself excessive silver and gold.*

352. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 9:57 AM

Re bullwhip up the ass, artisanal toadshall wrote

Whether his behavior or her behavior that he permits rises to the level of "lasciviousness" (is that even possible in a Christian marriage between husband and wife?) or "gratuitous ego-centric carnal indulgences" is the husband's call to make. Period. For as it is written... the husband is the head of the wife just as Christ is the head of the church...

To which I asked

So, tell me, when Has Christ but a bull-whip up your ass and told you to lean forward and enjoy it?

Answer: never. He never will. He cannot. He is God.

By parity, the husband should never do such a thing; he should not; he is the husband.

You then wave your hands and avoid the question saying that you never asserted such a thing. Really? Sticking a bullwhip up another's ass is the very definition of "gratuitous ego-centric carnal indulgences" that you assert "is the husband's call to make. Period"

I call bullshit.

*I've had relationships with women in which I disciplined them. Physically. Most of them enjoyed it as long as it had a playful vibe. About 10% demonstrated they wanted serious discipline. They *liked* being manhandled, being grabbed by the hair and yanked around, being pinned against the wall and such, and being put over my knee. Paul compared the marital relationship with the relationship between Christ and the church but he also said it was a mystery. I really think you need to leave this one alone.*

I will be back, dark one. count on it.

353. Mark Call

June 20, 2015 10:03 AM

@Tupla-J

Two very simple questions.

...including ...is polygamy [sic] a thing to be avoided or not?

No, arguably illogical ones, with the self-destructive point of trying to prove you know better than God, Who just

happened to Write some rules of which you clearly don't approve.

I've already sarcastically made the point that that such a claim is a no less asinine argument than this one:
"It would be no less fallacious to argue that He wanted to show us that MONOGAMY results in Original Sin, followed by murder, since that is precisely what Scripture tells us followed. :)"

But you seem incapable of making such connections.

So let me ask a question I've asked people who trot out that arguably asinine (and Scripturally-deficient) argument before: OK, can you name a bona-fide "monogamous marriage" (that alone is tough - because the Biblical Hebrew doesn't even HAVE such a term) about which NOTHING bad is said?

There's a reason Paul says (on his own behalf, not attempting as here to speak for the Creator) that he advised against ALL marriage; a position I disagree with, certainly.

And there are at least as many such examples of polygyny.

But it proves nothing. Has it ever occurred to people who trot out inanities like that -- there is a REASON the Bible consists mostly of examples of fallen men, the best of whom struggle to return to Him?

354. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 10:37 AM

No, arguably illogical ones, with the self-destructive point of trying to prove you know better than God, Who just happened to Write some rules of which you clearly don't approve.

Where, in the OT did God establish polygamy?

355. Tupla-J

June 20, 2015 10:53 AM

Mark Call, I claim not to know better than God. I simply draw logical conclusions on the material I've read. When X invariably results in misery, death and/or separation from God, then X is seldom a good idea, a common practice of

the day or not. You know me not nor do you understand my motivations. Do not pretend to know more than you do, you only end up looking like an ass.

As for your strawman question, I can. Mary and Joseph.

356. Mark Call

June 20, 2015 11:01 AM

@simplytimothy

This is EASY! ...and won't take long.

1. Nowhere in the Bible did God command polygamy.
2. Nowhere in the Bible did God tell anyone to marry more than one wife.
3. God temporarily allowed polygamy to occur (the teleological process I referenced earlier)
4. God never gave any general prohibition against it.
5. God never gave polygamy any explicit moral approval.

Wow.

This was some alleged 'scholarly publication'? Get a new Bible!

1. Nowhere in the Bible did God command polygamy.
!!!!!!!!!!

"The law of the Levirate" -- Deut. 25:5-20.
QED.

That alone is sufficient to not only refute the entire premise, but demonstrate that it's time to find another Bible provider.

More in a minute...

357. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 11:07 AM

One other working precept from the ESV which I will use is under the section "What is Marriage" on page 2543.

The ESV calls it:

1. The fundamental institution of all human society
2. As established by God at creation when He

- 2.a Created the first humans as male and female (Gen 1:27)
- 2.b Commanded them to be fruitful and multiply (Gen 1:28)

Notice that this definition precedes "The law" or "torah".

I presently know of no reason to reject this definition as false.

Ok, that should do it for definitions of what I hold to be marriage and polygamy.

Again, I did not derive these myself from first-principles and from original sources.

I am a lay Christian, not a scholar.

I will turn to the task of itemizing Mark Call and artisanalloadshall later in the day, time permitting.

358. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 11:10 AM

"The law of the Levirate" -- Deut. 25:5-20.

QED.

Polygamy exists at this time, yes?

if so, you are providing laws for an existing institution, not establishing a new one.

359. Mark Call

June 20, 2015 11:11 AM

@simplytimothy

This is EASY! ...and won't take long.

1. Nowhere in the Bible did God command polygamy.

!!!!!!!!!!

"The law of the Levirate" -- Deut. 25:5-20.

QED.

That alone is sufficient to not only refute the entire premise, but demonstrate that it's time to find another Bible provider.

For those that can follow Scripture and connect dots better than the "Evidently Silly Version" -- look at Paul's commentary (midrash) in I Cor. chapter 7.

v 10. "A wife is NOT to DEPART from her husband."
 ...but (hmm...) IF she does, SHE is to remain unmarried.
 (Why? Obvious. She is still married, "has a living husband.")
 v 11. HE, OTOH, is not to 'divorce' her. (Actually, not to "put her away" is a better rendering, but that doesn't matter in this case.)

SO - can he take another wife? OBVIOUSLY.
 Is such a wife an "unbeliever", or just rebellious? What matters is that the husband is "not under bondage".

If such a husband remarries...what if the wife does as she SHOULD -- and repents, and returns?

QED. For case #2.

360. Mark Call

June 20, 2015 11:23 AM

@simplytimothy

1. Nowhere in the Bible did God command polygamy.

Good grief!

2. Nowhere in the Bible did God tell anyone to marry more than one wife.

He DID, however, give David Saul's wives (plural).
 (II Samuel 12:8)

3. God temporarily allowed polygamy to occur (the teleological process I referenced earlier)

Who says 'temporary'? THIS is the point that I think is such heresy, but SO consistent with this anti-Scriptural argument. Malachi 3:6 or Hebrews 13:8, take your pick. And YHVH says "ani YHVH" (Hebrew, mistranslated as

5. God never gave polygamy any explicit moral approval.

Good GRIEF!!!!!! Unless you count little things, like calling HIMSELF a husband of more than one wife!!!!

(Jeremiah 3, Ezekiel 23...oh, and didn't Yahushua tell a parable about a marriage with 10 virgins, FIVE of whom go in to be with the Bridegroom? But they REALLY don't like that, do they?)

Wow.

Find a better reference, simply...

361. artisanaltoadshall

June 20, 2015 11:28 AM

You appeal to men's lusts and physical desires.

I should probably go back and count the number of times you've used the phrase "lesbian porn" but I guess the point is I hit a nerve. It wasn't the discussion of polygyny, it was my sales approach!

In the process of arguing for polygamy [sic] and how it will satisfy men's physical desires ... you have neglected care for Christian brothers.

Thanks for confirming.

You are confused as to why I am arguing with you despite agreeing with you on polygamy. Because your words are thoughtless and you are fixated on minor things over major things.

Actually, I gave a great deal of thought to what I said. I also don't recall you agreeing with me on anything. What I see is you acting like a SJW, not addressing the issues but rather complaining about how the issues were presented.

He gave feelbads!

Your appeal to the physical existence of the clitoris as justifying the things you want to do with it;.

No. The clitoris comment was in the context of over a thousand years of church teachings that sex, even within marriage isn't something from which pleasure should be derived. You're projecting.

such as observing two wives pleasure each other in "girl-on-girl" sex that you take great care to disassociate from lesbian sex

Still projecting. But that's normal.

Rationalize it however you want, everyone else would label it lesbian sex, just as they call it lesbian porn.

And because everybody does it, that makes it right? No. But

after you got your feelbads out of your system you finally got around to what is really bothering you and when you did you lied.

I and others object to your glorification of female homosexual sex within a polygamous "marriage", and your continuous attempts to substitute one position for the other is dishonest.

Look at comment 351, points 1-7. My assertion is that in attempting to frame this as a sexual issue rather than a relationship issue for the women, you and any others who do so are attempting to play God, speak for God or correct God.

“6. We find three classes of sex acts are unilaterally prohibited and condemned in God’s Law: men with men, men with animals and women with animals. God did not give us lists of specific acts, just a blanket prohibition. **All other prohibitions are based on relationships.**”

That prohibition means there is no relationship in which any homosexual act can be licit. However, there is no such prohibition on sexual acts between women. You are being dishonest, characterizing any sexual act between women as being under the same prohibition against sexual acts between men. This is not true because God gave no such prohibition on women. That makes your characterization of *female homosexual sex* a lie and you double down on the lie with shaming language *your glorification of female homosexual sex* directed at me.

You and Beau are trying to frame this as a sexual issue **for the women** rather than a relationship issue in order to propagate a lie. Because feelbads about what the Bible actually does and does not say. Double-plus feelbads.

In a polygynous marriage, wives are not “lesbians,” are not in a “lesbian” relationship and are not having “female homosexual sex.” **In fact, whatever might happen in the marital bed is nobody’s business but theirs.** They are under their husbands headship covering and to the extent they’re trying to make babies, in accordance with God’s plan according to the natural function of women.

Apparently, you and Beau can’t handle that so you respond with lies and slander in the midst of trying to call me out for my lack of consideration for my Christian brothers. Typical SJW stuff. I expected better of you.

Isn't it interesting how this is breaking down? I think you and Beau realize you can't claim polygyny is wrong so you're reframing to sex and making appeals to emotion. On the other side is simplytimothy who is trying to find a way to show polygyny is wrong.

362. Mark Call

June 20, 2015 11:30 AM

Error correction: (I hate those silly sushi pix...)

3. God temporarily allowed polygamy to occur (the teleological process I referenced earlier) (@simplytimothy again)

Who says 'temporary'? THIS is the point that I think is such heresy, but SO consistent with this anti-Scriptural argument. Malachi 3:6 or Hebrews 13:8, take your pick. And YHVH says "ani YHVH" (Hebrew, mistranslated as "I AM the LORD your God") countless times. It means His CHARACTER does NOT CHANGE, and His Word will "not return void". If that is NOT true, what "gospel" do we have?????

363. artisanaltoadshall

June 20, 2015 11:35 AM

Simplytimothy

1. Nowhere in the Bible did God command polygamy.

Wrong. Law of the levirate, same for #2

3. God temporarily allowed polygamy to occur (the teleological process I referenced earlier)

I think you make two errors here. First, I have yet to find anywhere in the Bible where God differentiated between monogamous and polygynous marriage as different classes of marriage. Your teleological argument is founded on the presupposition that such a distinction exists and this is an eisegetic error. I assert marriage is a covenant relationship regardless of the number of spouses.

In addition, take a look at Isaiah 4:1-2. The "branch of the Lord" makes the passage an end times prophesy, which argues against your "temporary" argument.

4. God never gave any general prohibition against it.

Nor is there any specific prohibition.

5. God never gave polygamy any explicit moral approval.

Wrong. In his rebuke to King David, after he committed adultery with Bathsheba and then murdered her husband in order to cover it up, Nathan the prophet said:

“Thus says the Lord God of Israel, It is I who anointed you king over Israel and it is I who delivered you from the hand of Saul. I also gave you your masters wives into your care and if that had been too little I would have added to you many more things like these!” 2nd Samuel 12:7-8

Note that God is describing the good things He has done for David. God is taking credit for *giving* David multiple wives and said that if it hadn't been enough David would have received more. God cannot do anything immoral so God taking credit for David's many wives must therefore carry with it God's moral approval.

6.

6.a

6.b

6.c

6.d

6.e The prohibition in Deut. 17:17**

6 through 6d are fallacious arguments. Mark Call covered that.

The multiplying wives argument fails with the response to #5 because we don't know what the word multiply means. David ultimately had eight wives (Michal, Bathsheba, Avital, Haggith, Maacah, Ahinoam, Abigail, Eglah) but they didn't turn his heart away from the Lord. In contrast we know that his son Solomon had 700 wives and 300 concubines and they turned his heart away from the Lord. Therefore, eight wives isn't multiplying wives but 700 wives is. Where the proscribed number actually is we don't know but since God took credit for David's wives we must conclude that eight wives doesn't reach the threshold of multiplication

7. Polygamy is horribly dehumanizing for women for it does not treat them as equal in value to their husbands, and

therefore it does not recognize that they share fully in the high status of being created "in the image of God" and the worthy of honor as "heirs with you of the grace of life" (1 Pet. 3:7)

Your opinion doth not a doctrine create.

8. The requirement that an elder be "husband of one wife" (1 Tim 3:2)

Doesn't mean what you think it means. The exact same phrase is translated elsewhere as "wife of one man." It speaks to the moral character of the men to be administrators of the church and widows to be put on the widows roll. The better translation is "not a ladies man" and "not a flirt." By the standard you're claiming the Apostle Paul (many assume him to have been unmarried) would not qualify as an elder and Elizabeth Elliot would not qualify to be placed on the widows roll.

9. A discussion on the existence of polygamy among the Jews in 1st Century

Your point?

10 A discussion on missionary work to places where polygamy is practiced and advice to a man with multiple wives on divorcing one of them (don't)

Again. Your point?

11. An observation that polygamy was abolished from the church in a generation or two.

Cite, please. This sounds like somebody's prejudiced opinion. The church doctrine of 1 man with 1 woman was officially enshrined at the Council of Trent, 1563, I believe.

364. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 11:37 AM

From my ESV, Deuteronomy is Greek for "second law" and records what Moses wrote down.

A quick search reveals that the first recorded instance of polygamy in the bible is Genesis 24:23-24 by the murderer Lamech

23Lamech said to his wives:

*“Adah and Zillah, hear my voice;
you wives of Lamech, listen to what I say:
I have killed a man for wounding me,
a young man for striking me.
24If Cain’s revenge is sevenfold,
then Lamech’s is seventy-sevenfold.”*

So, as Lamech the murderer’s polygamy predates the law handed down to Moses, so polygamy predates your commands concerning it.

Where did God command polygamy ? We know where He commanded Marriage--He did it in the creation account.

What you are conflating is God instituting the thing (what I wrote as God commanding polygamy, perhaps a bad word choice) and God super-imposing laws on an existing, institution.

We see the first instance of Polygamy is in the account of Lamech. Where did God command that institution into existence?

He commanded the Light and the Darkness.
He commanded the creation.
He created Adam and Eve.
Where in the OT did God create polygamy?

It had to be pre-Lamech, yes?

I need to do some work on the ranch and will return to the conversation

365. Mark Call

June 20, 2015 11:44 AM

@simplytimothy

These are literally so pitiful that they say a lot more about the 'scholars' than Scripture:

6. Whenever a man has two or more wives, it seems to lead to trouble citing... [highly selective list, ignoring other examples both pro and con]

Asked and answered, and a bad argument besides, BECAUSE

they ignore all the OTHER examples in Scripture... notably Genesis 3, which precedes all the others, and the marriage by which "sin entered the world." Is there a WORSE example of a failed marriage in all history. :)

But -- this is particularly grievous:

6.e The prohibition [sic] in Deut. 17:17**

Sounds like they don't even know the difference between 'add' and 'multiply' -- much less read for comprehension.

366. artisanalloadshall

June 20, 2015 11:45 AM

simplytimothy asked

Where, in the OT did God establish polygamy?

Genesis 2:24. That's the grant of authority for the man (not the woman) to initiate marriage. It is not restrictive to any specific number of wives.

You call me **Dark One**?

Given that this is the Evil Dark Lord of Hate's blog, I feel honored. Thank you.

simplytimothy, SirHamster has caused me to be convicted that I'm not showing enough consideration to my Christian brothers here. Therefore, I must counsel you on this bullwhip up the ass fetish you've got going, though. Stop. Just, stop. If you keep it up you'll wind up with a torn sphincter.

And thanks again for your generous comments.

367. Mark Call

June 20, 2015 11:50 AM

@simplytimothy --

A simple request. Having demonstrated that the Extremely Stupid Version is incompetent wrt texts that have to do with polygyny -- please don't cite that as an 'expert source'.

Gimme Rick Warren, or Joel Ostein, or Hiltery Clinton, or whats-er-name Jenner instead, please...

at least they are less pretentious on THAT score... ;)

368. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 11:50 AM

artisanaltoadshall

Thank you for your detailed response.

I will reply in kind when I get up to speed on your argument. My goal is to be able to repeat it to you in terms you agree with so we are both confident that I understand it.

Regarding 9,10,11 my source is the commentary in the ESV as I note in the comment; the entire point of the comment is to show the source of my information. I have had no reason to doubt what I have read. Yours and Mark Call's claims are the first scripturally based arguments I have encountered and hence, the first instance to question what I have been taught.

It is there for others on the comment section so that they will know what my source of knowledge is. It is apparent you reject it.

In the same way that we reduced your assertions to the core assumptions namely:

polygynous marriage is NOT sinful and any sexual acts between women within such a marriage are NOT sinful

so, I will attempt to condense your rebuttals of the my/ESV position into a similar declarative statement.

369. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 11:56 AM

Where, in the OT did God establish polygamy?

Genesis 2:24. That's the grant of authority for the man (not the woman) to initiate marriage. It is not restrictive to any specific number of wives.

Ok. Genesis 2:24 reads

24 For this reason a man shall leave his father and his

mother, and be joined to his wife; and they shall become one flesh.

I will save this data point as one of your assertions. I prefer to review and consolidate your argument before discussing this one. We will return to it.

370. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 11:59 AM

simplytimothy, SirHamster has caused me to be convicted that I'm not showing enough consideration to my Christian brothers here. Therefore, I must counsel you on this bullwhip up the ass fetish you've got going, though. Stop. Just, stop. If you keep it up you'll wind up with a torn sphincter.

I repeat, when you tear one of your multiple wives a new one, will you call it Godly and good? Yes, you will.

You are advocating evil using Scripture as the basis for it.

371. Mark Call

June 20, 2015 12:02 PM

I have a Sabbath day teaching to do in a minute...so this will be 'it' for a while...

I'll skip over the Feminist BS (#7) for MANY reasons, including its utter Scriptural ignorance. But, most importantly, because it is blasphemy against YHVH Himself, implying He hates and degrades women. Enough said...

(Although I am working on a book which will include that heresy.)

This, however, is a common Twisting. Articles can, and have been written (I'm pretty sure I have one up on www.markniwot.com in the marriage section.)

8. The requirement that an elder by "husband of one wife" (1 Tim 3:2) [sic- what, they missed Titus?]

However, very briefly:

I, for one, do not believe Paul wrote that in Greek originally. BUT, even in the Greek, the error is easy to spot.

"*mia* wife" is ambiguous.

"*mia*" can mean first, one, or "a". (article adjective) -- and is used elsewhere by Paul in those ways.

Try this, see if it's not obvious:

"*The [bishop, elder, overseer -- whatever, but not EVERYONE, clearly] should be... the husband of his first wife.*" (or, "a wife", if you prefer. Both are better, or at LEAST equally good, renderings.)

OOPS - can't have that first one. "Husband of his first wife", while VERY consistent with Biblical history, tradition, and certainly the idea of vows and COVENANT, is verboten nowadays: It would DQ FAR too many "elders" in the 501c3 church! :)

Guess that makes the point.

372. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 12:16 PM

Hi Mark Call,

Where, when and to whom was Paul talking?

Christ had just redeemed the world. Of *course* the old order is fading as the world is remade into the image of Him. In the same way it took generations of Israel to come out of Egypt and be set apart, so the changes set in place by Him take time. This is true of individuals and groups.

Keep saying this stuff though, you are very helpful to me in understanding you.

373. artisanalloadshall

June 20, 2015 12:52 PM

Mark Call

Your thoughts on comment 324?

Simplytimothy

If you want to understand what I'm arguing, read post 351

very carefully. Each of the seven points is laid out as clearly as possible.

my source is the commentary in the ESV as I note in the comment; the entire point of the comment is to show the source of my information. I have had no reason to doubt what I have read.

I'm also going to reiterate Mark's request. Please stop using your ESV notes. They may be printed in your Bible but they aren't part of the Bible. They are not authoritative, they are merely opinions of other men.

Instead of trying to reinvent the wheel, again, focus on the seven points in comment 351.

If you are a sincere Christian it shouldn't take very long to confirm that points 1-6 are irrefutable. That leaves us with point 7. If you want to overcome my assertion you'll have to convincingly demonstrate that the natural function of women is to be a male-female sex toy and the unnatural function is to have girl-girl sex. And the preponderance of evidence is on my side.

Keep in mind you have serious biases, prejudices and cultural conditioning based on lies. The **Dark One** will mock you mercilessly when you insert your foot in mouth just as he currently mocks you for the bullwhip up your ass. Which reminds me, since Greece is in the news, do you know what the motto of the Greek army is?

Never Leave Your Buddies Behind

374. SirHamster (#201)

June 20, 2015 1:08 PM

@artisanltoad

That prohibition means there is no relationship in which any homosexual act can be licit. However, there is no such prohibition on sexual acts between women.

Liar. Sexual acts between two women are homosexual acts. It doesn't matter if they are married to the same man, or to different men, or not married at all. But I thank you for laying out your self-contradiction so plainly.

What would motivate a God-fearing man to sell such a lie to Christians? I know none.

Isn't it interesting how this is breaking down? I think you and Beau realize you can't claim polygyny is wrong so you're reframing to sex and making appeals to emotion.

Liar. I am not arguing that polygyny is wrong. I am pointing out the small lie you sneak into your otherwise truthful claims on the Bible's stance on polygamy.

That small lie is this: That a husband watching lesbian, homosexual, girl-on-girl action between his multiple wives is something desirable for a Christian, and something to encourage and call Biblical.

You twist and twist and twist words to try to remove the accurate label of "lesbian" and "homosexual". You add lie on lie to turn the discussion towards polygamy and "pleasure in marriage" so that this small lie will be passed in unnoticed.

Repent, before you receive your just reward.

"I have the right to do anything," you say--but not everything is beneficial. "I have the right to do anything"--but not everything is constructive. No one should seek their own good, but the good of others." (1 Cor 10:23-24)

375. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 1:34 PM

If you want to understand what I'm arguing, read post 351 very carefully. Each of the seven points is laid out as clearly as possible.

I will start there.

I'm also going to reiterate Mark's request. Please stop using your ESV notes. They may be printed in your Bible but they aren't part of the Bible. They are not authoritative, they are merely opinions of other men.

I will consider this when/if I am convinced I should do so.

f you are a sincere Christian

That is the province of the Holy Spirit, not you

it shouldn't take very long to confirm that points 1-6 are irrefutable. That leaves us with point 7. If you want to overcome my assertion you'll have to ...

I will examine your argument and decide if it has merit

and/or if it is in fact your point. It took some prodding to get you to assert that polygamy is not a sin and any sexual act within is not a sin.

Keep in mind you have serious biases, prejudices and cultural conditioning based on lies.

Which is the point of my investigation.

The Dark One will mock you mercilessly

Your mocking means nothing to me. It is you who argue that it mocking is permitted in marriage, I am sure you can find multiple wives who are into that sort of degradation and will buy your assertion that it is holy.

376. Beau

June 20, 2015 2:11 PM

Brothers,

Focus. The stated purpose of this thread is to differentiate the course of lukewarm and nominal believers, who will fall away, versus the faith of the faithful, which will grow strong under pressure. It is a call to consider the state of one's soul on the eve of battle. It suggests we count the cost of discipleship to gain the prize.

As usual, whenever our host posts such a call to commitment to Christ, the usual suspects emerge to peddle their pet distractions, releasing a school of red herrings. Wisely, the *Vile Faceless Moderator* put the kibosh on one of these, the catholic/protestant intramural kerfuffle. The purveyors of these red herring seek to set aside the call to gird up one's mind for action by driving the discussion into their own favorite muddle puddle. It allows them to talk religion without answering the call to stand up and fight the good fight.

In the case of this specific thread, we have a new interlocutor, artisanalloadshall, who has introduced a new red herring, conditional female homosexual acts are blessed by God. Why? Stated bluntly, artisanalloadshall's argument serves one purpose, *I want to pleasure myself*. Our host calls us to be faithful to Christ in the face of anticipated pressure, and artisanalloadhall responds, *I want to pleasure myself*.

(continued)

377. artisanalloadshall

June 20, 2015 2:19 PM

SirHamster

You claim I m a Liar. Sexual acts between two women are homosexual acts. It doesn't matter if they are married to the same man, or to different men, or not married at all.

I have defined homosexual acts as male-male only, which has a blanket prohibition and condemnation of any such acts. You, according to what I've previously stated are trying to conflate male-male sexual acts (universally forbidden) with female-female sexual acts, a subject upon which the Bible is SILENT. You are subtly making the case that it's all the same. They are most assuredly not because God chose not to classify them as the same with a blanket prohibition for both. You call me a liar for pointing this out.

Prove I'm a liar. Show me where God prohibited or condemned sexual acts between women in His word.

You claim That small lie is this: That a husband watching lesbian, homosexual, girl-on-girl action between his multiple wives is something desirable for a Christian, and something to encourage and call Biblical.

Cite, please.

You Claim You twist and twist and twist words to try to remove the accurate label of "lesbian" and "homosexual". You add lie on lie to turn the discussion towards polygamy and "pleasure in marriage" so that this small lie will be passed in unnoticed.

Go back and read post 351. That is my argument as simply and concisely as I can make it. It is as free from inflammatory language as I can possibly make it. Given that I am making a Scriptural argument based solely on Scripture, I have clearly defined my terms based on what Scripture says or does not say.

If your complaint is true about me "twisting" words, then you should have no problem demonstrating how "my" definition does not comport with Gods Word. Let's hear it.

From where I sit, it appears you are in violation of the clear commandment in Hebrews "Let marriage be honored by all." You slander your brothers and sisters in Christ who are in polygynous marriages by insinuating they are involved in

lascivious and unseemly conduct without one shred of evidence from God's Word that what *you think* they might be doing is wrong.

As minion #201 you should know the rules of the blog and I'm calling you out. Answer the questions.

1. Prove I'm a liar. Show me where God prohibited or condemned sexual acts between women in His word. That, or do a rhetorical dance around the definitions so I can mock you.
2. Cite where I said "a husband watching lesbian, homosexual, girl-on-girl action between his multiple wives is something desirable for a Christian, and something to encourage and call Biblical."
3. If your complaint is true about me "twisting" words, then you should have no problem demonstrating how "my" definition does not comport with Gods Word. Let's hear it.

I even gave you the answer to the parable but you are so blind by your anger and lust that you couldn't see it. In doing so, you support my premise and illustrate Vox's observation: MPAl. I don't expect you to agree, I don't even expect you to understand. You are arguing like a woman.

378. Beau

June 20, 2015 2:31 PM

What pressure might we face as we embark into the good fight? artisanalltoadshall provides us one, exposure to the depraved. Lukewarm and nominal believers will flee or fall prey to these blatant enticements to commit sexual sin. The faithful in contrast will contend manfully for the faith delivered once and for all to the saints.

Our host might simply be busy elsewhere arranging the siege engines; but, I suspect he has graciously allowed the ilk opportunity to engage artisanalltoadshall's statements to get us used to combat. As such, there is value in examining artisanaltoaadshall's slurs, deceptions, and dishonesty.

(Continued)

379. Beau

June 20, 2015 3:07 PM

At the moment, it's a bit too early to conduct a post-mortem, as artisanalloadshall is still actively advocating, so I will have to settle on vivisection, without anesthetic. We begin:

The first incision:

1. God's Law is perfect, containing no more and no less than perfection. Claims that God got it wrong is to call God a liar, which is blasphemy.

The first sentence cited from Psalm 19 is true. The second sentence is also true; however Artisanalloadshall's claim that we are calling God wrong /= we are calling God wrong. Indeed, in effect, artisanalloadhall calls Jesus of Nazareth wrong, who taught,

"You have heard that it was said, 'You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' (Leviticus 19:18) But I say to you, love your enemies, bless those who curse you, do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who spitefully use you and persecute you, that you may be sons of your Father in heaven; for He makes His sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust. (Mt 5:43-45).

The law of the lord is perfect, Leviticus 19:18 tells us to hate our enemies. Yet Jesus commands us to love our enemies. The law didn't change. Yet the difference in our directed practice is so stark, hate to love. Following artisanalloadsall's hermeneutic, Jesus is a blasphemer. Either Jesus is a blasphemer or artisanalloadhall's method of interpretation has gone way off the rails.

380. Mark Call

June 20, 2015 3:09 PM

@simplytimothy --

Where, when and to whom was Paul talking?

In which letter? Yes, it IS important to know the intended reader (which most Xtians manage to forget). Some were new to Torah, and obedience to YHVH and His Son, (Galatians an obvious example, for which reason I sometimes call it the Bible's 'most twisted Book') others (like Timothy) not.

381. IM2L844

June 20, 2015 3:12 PM

I would be interested to see responses and opinions on the following essays, with respect to what is "natural" and what is "unnatural" regarding sex:

[HERMENEUTICAL ISSUES IN THE USE OF THE BIBLE TO JUSTIFY THE ACCEPTANCE OF HOMOSEXUAL PRACTICE](#) by Guenther Haas

and

[Not out of lust but in accordance with truth: Theological and philosophical reflections on sexuality and reality](#) by Alexander Pruss

They're pretty short.

382. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 3:18 PM

@Mark Call

In which letter...

I think time is better served by studying your and artisanalloadshall's argument rather than responding now. We can return to this specific question/answer after that.

383. artisanalloadshall

June 20, 2015 3:30 PM

Hey Beau

Before you get too carried away with your parallel argument, please review my comment at #324 and consider who Jesus was speaking to in Matthew 19 as opposed to Matthew 5.

In the Law there were 10 commandments given. Jesus said "One new commandment I give to you, love one another." It may well be said that the entire new testament is the implementation of the laws, statutes and ordinances to implement the Law of Love. Yet, you miss one central point. Jesus, as WORD who became Flesh, had the RIGHT to modify, alter or rescind His own word. This does not name Him a blasphemer, it is the simple recognition that HE is God.

Thus, my position stands and makes Matthew 19 come into stark contrast to His comments to the people in Matthew 5. In Matthew 19 (per Matthew 23:1-3) Jesus was before those who were seated in the seat of Moses. In Matthew 5 He was not. In other words, He had a lot more flexibility to say what He wanted in Matthew 5, but you have to keep in mind that HE had the authority as the Word Become Flesh to make any changes He wanted to.

384. artisanaltoaadshall

June 20, 2015 3:34 PM

OOOPS

"Make any changes He wanted to" should be "Say what He wanted to." There were still authority issues at that time.

385. Beau

June 20, 2015 3:43 PM

The second incision:

2. The silence on God's part in not forbidding or condemning female-female sexual acts speaks very loudly in light of His inclusion of women in the prohibition against bestiality.

This argument from silence cuts both ways. artisanaltoaadshall has offered not a shred of evidence that God approves of female on female sexual acts. Oh, conjecture is presented as proof, but, but, but, look at polygamy! Cite the scripture that demonstrates explicit woman-on-woman approved sex acts, even in a polygamist marriage. You cannot.

By the way, here again is artisanaltoaadshall's true intent and focus revealed. *I want to pleasure myself.*

386. artisanaltoaadshall

June 20, 2015 3:44 PM

IM2L844

Your first link:

"I am interested in those biblical interpretations which

claim that an acceptance of the authority of the Bible does not require the conclusion that homosexual relations between adults are wrong."

In other words, "I don't want to hear from anyone who disagrees that 'homosexual relations between adults are wrong."

"And if a man lieth with a man as with a woman, it is an abomination."

Nothing, anywhere in Scripture to contradict that. But in keeping with the tone of this thread, there is also nothing in all of Scripture that says 'women with women' is like or equated with the sin of the men mentioned. Just sayin.

387. Mark Call

June 20, 2015 4:07 PM

1. God's Law is perfect...

what your critique DOES demonstrate is the importance of understanding the original Hebrew:

(Hmm. I tried, couldn't get the comment checker to accept the Hebrew characters.)

so - instead, "hatorah yvh tamimah"

Note that it's 'ha torah' -- meaning the INSTRUCTION, better, of YHVH (the Real Name - the 'Tetragrammaton') is "tamim" -- which also means complete.

(Like, among other things, it doesn't need to be added to, or subtracted from.)

And while Psalm 19:8 is clearly True, and VERY important, the next verse adds clarity.

"The statutes of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes."

The word 'mitzvah' (commandment) is the thing that hones in from all "instruction" (torah) to things of a more "legal" tone; ie, commandments, 'mitzvot.'

Where you go next however, is just plain silly. "Jesus" may have changed "the Law", but Yahushua (literally, Yah's Salvation) was TEACHING what He Wrote. With Authority.

(end of Matthew 7!)

There's a big difference, and it ALSO involves understanding Hebrew (the language He spoke when quoting Hebrew Scripture) and idioms.

Note that He also said to "hate your parents." Oh, really? Maybe there's a parable goin' on here...

(It's called "the great and the small", or a form of compare and contrast, among other command Hebrew-mindset ways of teaching; Paul did it, too.)

It is, in large part, why it is SO important to understand His torah (instruction) and why He said it didn't change, any more than He does.

388. Beau

June 20, 2015 4:08 PM

My youngest son just returned from camp. I will continue at a suitable time.

389. IM2L844

June 20, 2015 4:15 PM

Ya didn't read it did ya?

I don't know how you get, "I don't want to hear from anyone who disagrees..."

from, "I am interested in those biblical interpretations which [disagree with my position]".

390. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 4:34 PM

@ IM2L844

Links saved. I just scanned them. thank you.

Do you know offhand if Mark Call and artisanalloadshall's arguments fall into one of the categories addressed in the https://www.phc.edu/gj_haas_hermen.php link ?

It may come in handy as a cross-reference later.

thx

391. Mark Call

June 20, 2015 4:41 PM

I had some MAJOR 'food picture' issues...
here's #389 as it SHOULD have been:

Sorry, Beau, but Bzzzzttt.

1. God's Law is perfect...

what your critique DOES demonstrate is the importance of understanding the original Hebrew:

תּוֹרַת יְהוָה תְּמִימָה

Note that it's 'ha torah' -- meaning the INSTRUCTION, better, of YHVH (the Real Name - the 'Tetragrammaton') is "tamim" -- which also means complete. (Like, among other things, it doesn't need to be added to, or subtracted from.)

And while Psalm 19:8 is clearly True, and VERY important, the next verse adds clarity.

"The statutes of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes."

The word 'mitzvah' (commandment) is the thing that hones in from all "instruction" (torah) to things of a more "legal" tone; ie, commandments, 'mitzvot.'

Where you go next however, is just plain silly. "Jesus" may have changed "the Law", but Yahushua (literally, Yah's Salvation) was TEACHING what He Wrote. With Authority. (end of Matthew 7!)

There's a big difference, and it ALSO involves understanding Hebrew (the language He spoke when quoting Hebrew Scripture) and idioms.

Note that He also said to "hate your parents." Oh, really? Maybe there's a parable goin' on here...

(It's called "the great and the small", or a form of compare and contrast, among other command Hebrew-mindset ways of teaching; Paul did it, too.)

It is, in large part, why it is SO important to understand His

torah (instruction) and why He said it didn't change, any more than He does.

392. Beau

June 20, 2015 5:08 PM

The third incision:

artisanaltoaadshall said,

*He had a lot more flexibility to say what He wanted in Matthew 5, but you have to keep in mind that HE had the authority as the Word Become Flesh to **make any changes He wanted to.***

And There-It-Is: You say the law cannot change, then, here you say Jesus can *make any changes He wanted to.* Bravo.

...but, but, He's teaching with authority! Yes, and your point is what? He can change what cannot be changed. So you. artisanaltoaadshall, arrive at what cannot be changed can be changed. (And yes, Mark Call, I am aware of your desire to interject your spin here - but I am addressing artisanaltoaadshall's seven points at present.). Clearly, you are not a reliable exegete.

393. Beau

June 20, 2015 5:27 PM

I note now three comments of mine on this thread disappeared down the memory hole. It could be a software problem. It could be the work of the moderator putting yet another red herring to death. I don't know, but, my participation is ended in this discussion.

394. SirHamster (#201)

June 20, 2015 5:46 PM

As minion #201 you should know the rules of the blog and I'm calling you out. Answer the questions.

None of the points listed were questions. But I will answer the challenge nonetheless.

1. Prove I'm a liar.

From earlier in the same post:

I have defined homosexual acts as male-male only, which has a blanket prohibition and condemnation of any such acts.

You have no power or authority to define "homosexual". Note here how AT appeals to *HIS* definition, as opposed to God's definition, or the Biblical definition. That is one lie - that the word "homosexual" excludes girl-girl sex because AT says so.

2. Cite where I said "a husband watching lesbian, homosexual, girl-on-girl action between his multiple wives is something desirable for a Christian, and something to encourage and call Biblical."

"Maybe that's why God didn't prohibit or condemn girl on girl action, because it could be legitimately exercised/satisfied in a polygynous marriage."

You said this to Christians who would not practice such things, to encourage them to accept such things. You describe perversion and tempt Christians to practice it.

Facing criticism on this point, you rebutted it with this:
"You and others here want to play God, stepping in where He was silent and "fixing" His supposed error."

That is why I have gone beyond "unprohibited by the Bible" to "Biblical" - because of your zealous defense of your position that men's lusts should be fed to the fullest extent possible.

This is no Gospel at all.

3. If your complaint is true about me "twisting" words, then you should have no problem demonstrating how "my" definition does not comport with Gods Word. Let's hear it.

You are not reading my posts if you can respond to my post without seeing the example laid out.

"I think you and Beau realize you can't claim polygyny is wrong so you're reframing to sex and making appeals to emotion."

You twisted *my* words. Somehow, despite my repeated insistence that polygamy is not prohibited by the Bible, you reliably treat my posts as anti-polygamy. My words are small

things - but what you do with the small things shows what you will do with greater things, such as God's own words.

Your insistence on these lies, a pattern demonstrated over multiple posts, is why I simply call you liar as your behavior deserves.

395. IM2L844

June 20, 2015 5:58 PM

Do you know offhand if Mark Call and artisanaltoadshall's arguments fall into one of the categories addressed in the https://www.phc.edu/gj_haas_hermen.php link ?

It's all relevant and interrelated. That's why I think the God's silence on the matter is somehow instructive argument falls flat. There's a whole bunch of stuff that God didn't explicitly prohibit. Consider all the ramification of the deadly sin called gluttony. It's not simply about eating and drinking too much. Consider entire lifestyles and subcultures build around various idiocies that aren't explicitly prohibited by God, but.

Anyway, it's not a deal breaker for me. They know what they're doing and the consequences if they're wrong. I'll choose another route.

396. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 6:41 PM

@IM2L844

thx. I am re-reading the comment thread and annotating all the arguments by both Mark Call and artisanaltoadshall (I am at 37. artisanaltoadshall)in an attempt to understand their arguments.

Some of what they write is solid stuff, some very debatable.

While not tightly defined yet, I see three areas of discussion so far

1. the reliability of Scripture translations (which I am not qualified to debate)
2. The definition of marriage
3. The non-prohibition of polygamy vs the definition of marriage

But, I am only at a's second comment. Lot's of work to do....

397. artisanaltoadshall

June 20, 2015 7:41 PM

Beau

artisanaltoadshall has offered not a shred of evidence that God approves of female on female sexual acts.

This is a classic.

Adam was in the Garden and he went to God and said "Lord, what should Eve and I eat for dinner tonight?"

God looked at him and said "Adam, all the fruit of the garden I've given to you to eat except for the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil."

Adam nodded his head and said "Yes, I understand Lord. But Eve and I want to be within your will for our lives and we want to know what you want us to eat for dinner."

God raised an eyebrow looking at Adam. "Adam, I already told you. As long as you don't eat the fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you are welcome to eat what you want. Take, give thanks, eat and enjoy."

It's the anklebiters who ask the question "Where did God specifically approve of this?" God's Law is pretty simple. Some things were commanded and other things were forbidden. Do the things you were commanded to do, don't do the things you were commanded not to do and at all times obey the golden rule. Everything else is a matter of what we call "Freedom in Christ."

This quickly becomes a "that which is not specifically forbidden is allowed" versus "that which is not specifically permitted is not allowed" argument.

I have pointed out that God's silence speaks loudly in several areas because these are areas in which God gave significant regulation. Two of the commandments speak to family and the regulation of sexual activity is extensive.

In examining the issues with respect to female-female sexual acts, I'm tempted to say that God didn't really care, but I can't say that. The issue of female-female sexuality

within a marriage is a delegated responsibility. "For the husband is the head of the wife, just as Christ is the head of the church... wives are to submit to their husband in everything."

There are those feminist Christians who believe that Ephesians 5:21 is the "context" in which to take the following verses to the effect that it nullifies the headship of the husband. The argument goes something like this;

"We're equal in Christ and to submit to one another in fear of Christ. Who are you to lord it over me?"

That particular argument got shot down in flames by God in Numbers 16.

The setup: A man was found gathering sticks on the Sabbath. The Lord said to Moses: stone him to death. He even ordered tassels to be tied to the corner of the garments to help them remember the commandments of the Lord.

(Question. Seriously. Does anybody here have any doubt what the reaction of the women was to that action? We don't know what time of the year it was, but either they needed the sticks to keep the family warm or to cook with when the Sabbath was over. Tending the fire was womans work. I'm pretty sure the guy was gathering sticks because his wife nagged him into doing it.)

Chapter 16, verse 1: "Now Korah... took action."

Verse 3: "They assembled together against Moses and Aaron, and said to them, You have gone far enough, for all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is in their midst; so why do you exalt yourself above the assembly of the Lord?"

I'm reminded of Monica Lewinski's famous comment about her father. "You're not the boss of me!"

Both of these cases illustrate a challenge to God's ordained structure of authority. Read Numbers 16 to find out how God decided the challenge to HIS structure of authority.

The point of bringing this up is God delegated the decisions about sexuality within the marriage to the husband. God is busy ruling the universe. How the plumbing gets connected is up to the husband.

398. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 8:05 PM

@Mark Call

Your comment 86. is a good one and of much depth. You reject the teachings of the Christian Church (Church fathers, you derisively call them) on scriptural grounds.

Your glee is the comeuppance on the 5014c Church for their apostacy which you see as rooted in the very founding of the Christian Church. (as opposed to the union with caesar provided by others)

I do not, cannot, accept your point of view because of The Holy Spirit, which is God, who is alive in His church and who works to bring all things into conformity with Him. This is not (yet) a rebuttal from Scripture. I see where Church elders (Luther, for example) have wrestled with this issue.

However we are to test the spirits against the word of God and you have offered a good faith argument from Scripture. One I have never encountered until yesterday.

I will not complete this task in one day, but I will persevere.

Good luck.