

# VOX POPOLI

#RabidPuppies INFOGALACTIC #GamerGate

## CONTACT

[Email Vox](#)

## VOXOLOGY

[About Vox Day](#)

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

[Amazon](#)

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

[The Darkstream](#)

[Dark Lord Consulting](#)

[RULES OF THE BLOG](#)

## NEW RELEASE MAILING LIST

Email Address

Subscribe

- Blog Archives - ▾

1648 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](#) 401 - 600 of 971 [Newer](#) · [Newest](#)»

401. [simplytimothy](#)

June 20, 2015 8:24 PM

*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."*

We also have plenty of examples of husband's screwing that up, starting with Abraham and Sarah.

*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.*

Yes, Abraham connected the wrong pipe to the plumbing didn't he? But that is up to him. I don't think so. Men err. big time. I think (but have not made the scriptural case for it, yet) that you err as well.

Mark Call has an in-depth argument and this will take time to get around to, but your arguments seek to justify your desires and it appears you have found a line of thought that will allow you to indulge them with a veneer of scriptural justification.

Perhaps your foundation is solid and the example of Abraham degrading Sarah is something a Christian man

[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](#)

should aspire to; I don't think so.

Your arguments are built on a foundation (that you say you have provided--fair enough) so I will continue with that study. As of now, It **appears** that Mark Call's rejection of the Church Fathers is very convenient for your degeneracy.

I will retract that when/if I see otherwise.

**402. Mark Call****June 20, 2015 10:00 PM**

... **Mark Call's rejection of the Church Fathers [sic] is very convenient for your [?] degeneracy.**

"Let Elohim be True and every man a liar" still applies. When they call Him a liar, and claim He changed things He says He did not an will not, it's an easy choice.

Come to think if it, maybe there's a reason he advised "call no man 'father', too....

**403. artisanalloadshall****June 20, 2015 10:11 PM**

SirHamsterhead

*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.*

1. Yes, I'm free to cite my terms and define them when I make an argument. It's called clarity.

2. You, however, claim I'm not in keeping with the "Biblical" definition. **Care to cite that, given that male-male is prohibited and female-female is not? Two different classes, obviously. Yet you continue, for your own perverted purposes, to continue to attempt to conflate the two.**

If God left the issue of girl-girl fun to the husband, who are you to judge? Perhaps you need to meditate on Romans 14:4. Or maybe you're just a mysogynist with an addiction to lesbian porn, frustrated with a wife who refuses to give you sex and driven over the edge by a frank discussion of polygyny. I don't know. But I do know you're calling me a liar

[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.

and providing zero evidence to back it up.

**I said: "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."**

*Hamsterhead said: "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."*

**I respond: God described women approaching an animal to mate with it as a perversion. You claim I'm inciting perversion. Cite me chapter and verse where God described/prohibited/condemned any form of girl-girl sex as a perversion or gave instruction to husbands concerning such. That's strike two, BTW. You continue to slander me but you fail to justify it. Then, on top of the lies, good SJW that you are, you doubled down:**

*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.*

Lust is a desire that cannot be legitimately obtained or fulfilled. *That is why I have gone beyond "unprohibited by the Bible" to "unBiblical."* Right. Can't win the argument based on the facts, so let's muddy the water. Blinding with brilliance didn't work, now it's time to baffle him with bullshit. Hamsterhead, it isn't working. You have now freely admitted to moving the goalposts. FAIL.

**I said: 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 got nothing but blah, blah blah. No definitions, no discussions of definitions, nothing. No mention of God's Word. Nothing but blah, blah, blah.

I'll give you one more chance to prove you've got a backbone.

404. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 11:23 PM

... *Mark Call's rejection of the Church Fathers [sic] is very convenient for your [?] degeneracy.*

Thank you for clarifying.

The statement: "Relying on Christian Fathers (tradition) is degenerate" is a valid premise in your view. Correct?

What are your views on the Holy Spirit working on His people perfecting them and sanctifying them? Is this a doctrine to you?

BTW, I am on my first run-through on this entire thread attempting to classify the arguments I see. I am up to comment 209

405. simplytimothy

June 20, 2015 11:25 PM

To the pro-mogonomy camp, namely:

- 90. Quartermaster June 18, 2015 12:14 PM
- 94. collisioncat67 June 18, 2015 12:28 PM
- 105. Red Bane June 18, 2015 1:05 PM
- 106. Red Bane June 18, 2015 1:08 PM
- 107. Titus Quinctius Cincinnatus June 18, 2015 1:08 PM
- 116. Titus Quinctius Cincinnatus June 18, 2015 1:20 PM
- 130. JaimelInTexas June 18, 2015 1:39 PM ME:(I Like this)
- 151. SirHamster (#201) June 18, 2015 2:21 PM
- 158. Beau June 18, 2015 2:34 PM
- 164. Kentucky Packrat June 18, 2015 2:46 PM
- 167. SirHamster (#201) June 18, 2015 2:53 PM

Thanks. I learned a lot. Kentucky Packrat, kudos on the point-by-point rebuttals.

406. Mark Call

June 20, 2015 11:39 PM

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](https://www.phc.edu/gj_haas_hermen.php) link ?

Not mine, certainly. While I don't necessarily object to the conclusion, the differences are obvious. He treats Shaul/Paul's Greek as if it is somehow independent of the Hebrew Scripture he cites.

**407. simplytimothy**

June 20, 2015 11:45 PM

Here is a quick working draft, I expect revisions/deletions.

1. The judgement of God is upon the Church for the sin of existing outside the Torah (?) .(Mark Call)
2. Since the Torah(?) rules, the Church should embrace all of it as it is perfect.
3. Polygamy is endorsed by the Torah(?).
4. The Church can solve some of its problems by embracing polygamy.

Again, just a loose draft of the combo-punch of Marc Call and toad gleaned from filing the pro-con comments into buckets for further examination.

Toad's argument rests on MC's foundation.

**408. simplytimothy**

June 20, 2015 11:48 PM

*Not mine, certainly. While I don't necessarily object to the conclusion, the differences are obvious. He treats Shaul/Paul's Greek as if it is somehow independent of the Hebrew Scripture he cites.*

Thank you.

**409. artisanaltoadshall**

June 20, 2015 11:57 PM

simpletimothy

*Toad's argument rests on MC's foundation.*

No, it doesn't. Mark Call can make whatever arguments he wants but he does not speak for me and I based nothing I've said on anything he's said.

Everything I've said is based on Scripture. Which is why you're trying so hard to obfuscate the issues.

And look what you're doing. You can't handle discussing the issues I brought forward, so you're using Mark Call's comments to shift the discussion elsewhere. Pull the bullwhip out of your ass and go back to comment 351 and deal with it.

Dark One

410. simplytimothy

June 21, 2015 8:07 AM

*Everything I've said is based on Scripture. Which is why you're trying so hard to obfuscate the issues.*

A man does not obfuscate by classifying the arguments pro and con in order to weigh them in judgement; the correct word is "elucidate". Why the fear? Perhaps my work scares you in that it will bring to light your sin?

My task continues. (although slower today, as I have family obligations)

There are several discussion I have identified so far; among them are:

1. Polygamy is not prohibited in the Bible. (yes. I need to state the case clearly)
2. Polygamy is a positive good, created by God (leaning no, I need to define the argument in positive terms)
3. Polygamy is a sin (tentative no, the arguments for God never ..xyz.. presented by you and Mark Call need careful exposition)
4. Polygamy, like the law, circumcision, restrictions on foods is no more; Pauls "how much moresoe's" of the Book of Hebrews are relevant here. (my current view)

There may be more questions brought to the fore as I continue my study. But for an unstable boaster like yourself to accuse me of lying and shifting is quite the tell.

I do not give a whit for your judgement of me, but for the honest souls reading this, look at my work and judge if I am ".. trying so hard to obfuscate the issues."

Tell me, Christian, what does The Holy Spirit say when you pray for clarification on this matter?

When I pray about stepping into this fight, He says, "Go for it and Godspeed".

When you pray about establishing your harem, what does He say to you?

4. The Church Fathers are liars (Mark's view)

411. simplytimothy

June 21, 2015 8:28 AM

Oops, the 4. *The Church Fathers are liars (Mark's view)* was from a draft of the comment and I missed removing it before posting. It should be on the list as 5.

412. Mark Call

June 21, 2015 9:36 AM

to Mark Call

...Your thoughts on comment 324?

I assume you mean concerning "divorce". I contend (and have taught at length) that the KJV rendering of Matthew 5:32, in particular, contains a major error (obvious even in the Greek, since 'apuolo' is rendered correctly from Hebrew "shalach" as "put away" in once place, and "divorce" (NOT the same) in another, in the same verse. Compare Deut 24:1-3.

Here's a link to a longer article; the problems won't fit in a single post anyway. (And it's too late to retype. ;)

Marriage, Divorce, Vows, and Authority:

<http://markniwot.com/?p=650>

I'll have to find the explicit (and a bit lengthy) article on Matthew 5:32 in detail, because most people who think He was 'changing the law' therefore get the 'exclusion clause' backwards, too.

413. Beau

June 21, 2015 9:49 AM

A new day, . *morning by morning new mercies I see*, renewed strength; I'll rejoin later in the day.

414. Mark Call

June 21, 2015 9:49 AM

simplytimothy to MC --

**The statement: "Relying on Christian Fathers (tradition) is degenerate" is a valid premise in your view. Correct?**

I definitely would not have phrased it that way. ANY traditions of men which purport to replace Scripture are to be rejected, as Yahushua did. And that is particularly true



for those that are pagan, and condemned utterly in Scripture.

Yahushua (as I've quoted multiple times in this thread) was unequivocal. Witness His exposition from the "Sermon on the Mount" (Matt 5) where the repeated pattern (rhetorical device) is "You have HEARD it SAID...but I tell you" -- whereupon He teaches correctly what is Written "as One having Authority"... (Since He Wrote it) ...rather than the "tradition of men" (in this case, usually what the Pharisees pushed as "law" ("halacha").

He calls them "hypocrites!" (and worse) over and over again, particularly in places like Matthew 23, and Mark 7, etc. The signature line is *"By your traditions you have made the commandments of God of no effect!"*

The Pharisees (modern rabbinism) specialized in "adding to" His commandments (the 'burdens' that Yahushua despised, and the elements that are conflated in the word "nomos" by those who misunderstand Paul's discussion of just which "law" we are not under, and whose burden/yoke is "light".

It's MEN'S 'law' that is the issue. (Just look at somethings simple like the 2nd Amendment. 20K+ gun control 'laws' in spite of "shall not be infringed." Who, REALLY, is "under the law"? !!) As I like to put it, if we can't understand how the "Law of God" has NOT been "done away with" what possible PRAYER does a mere Constitution and Bill of Rights of MEN have?

Three centuries after Messiah, the Romanized 'church' went into the other "other ditch" surrounding that "narrow path" and learned to specialize in "subtracting from" what is Written. From Sabbath and His Appointed Times (note: they're ALWAYS called "My moedim" by YHVH - in the first person, never "Jewish holidays") to "forbidding to marry" (first polygyny, about the 8th century, followed only a few decades later by priestly celibacy) to food and later 'money' -- the pattern is the same.

**What are your views on the Holy Spirit working on His people perfecting them and sanctifying them? Is this a doctrine to you?**

Not when any such spirit denies the Written Word!!!

When I teach, I put it this way: 'Yeah, there's a spirit at work there, but it sure as hell ain't holy.'

(And just to make the distinction clear, I prefer the Hebrew term there - Ruach HaKodesh.) Few "christians" seem to understand now that the word translated as 'holy' (kadosh) really means "set apart". There's a simple message there.

415. artisanalloadshall

June 21, 2015 11:10 AM

*Yes, Abraham connected the wrong pipe to the plumbing didn't he?*

What incredible arrogance. Abraham was 86 when Ishmael was born and it wasn't until 14 years later that he was told that the child of the promise would be through his wife Sarah. You are attempting to claim Abraham did something wrong, so tell us what sin you are laying at Abraham's feet.

*Perhaps your foundation is solid and the example of Abraham degrading Sarah is something a Christian man should aspire to; I don't think so.*

There you go again. You take the foundation (the grant of authority to the husband) and conflate that with abuse of said authority and then deduce that because the authority exists and under such authority abuses occur that we should aspire to the abuse.

Scripture clearly says the wife is to submit to the husband in everything. Taking the passage in Ephesians 5 with 1st Peter 3:1 (submit to the husband even if he is disobedient to the word) and you have pretty much a complete grant of authority. Yes, men err, but that does not negate the grant of authority nor the responsibility such a grant of authority places on the shoulders of men.

I think what frightens you is the responsibility God has placed on you as a man. In placing you in command of your family God has placed the responsibility for the outcome of your family squarely on your shoulders. I have pointed out how far that authority and responsibility goes using the example of polygyny and your reaction is to attack me.

*But for an unstable boaster like yourself to accuse me of lying and shifting is quite the tell... Perhaps my work scares you in that it will bring to light your sin?*

You claim you have not completed your study and have made no decisions on this. Yet by your own admission not

knowing, not having full understanding, you call me an unstable boaster, a liar, a degenerate, name me the Dark One, and claim I am in sin. You seem upset that Mark Call claims (at least some of) the early church fathers were liars but you speak against Abraham, the man God called "my friend."

The arrogance is breathtaking but what I don't think you can see is you are attempting to negate the authority God gave all men because the resulting responsibility scares you. Yes, I accused you of lying and showed you what you were doing. I note that you have not responded to that.

Beau is frightened by the possibilities of pleasure available: *Stated bluntly, artisanaloadshall'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 artisanaloadhall responds, I want to pleasure myself.*

Stated bluntly, Beau is wrong and Beau is simply continuing anti-pleasure line of teaching from the ascetics of old.

**Charge:** Sex is only for procreation, not for recreation. Anything other than PIV sex is therefore wrong, regardless whether or not God specifically forbid it, because it doesn't lead to procreation.

**Response:** That's an interesting opinion, but the church does not have the authority to regulate the marriage bed. Further, to speak where God was silent in His Law (adding to the Law) is to say that God got it wrong. That's blasphemy.

**Charge:** Sex is an act of the flesh, a necessary evil that regrettably must be done for the purpose of procreation and any sex act that is performed solely for pleasure is the pursuit of worldly pleasures of the flesh and therefore wrong.

**Response:** Eating is an act of the flesh, but there is a great difference between taking pleasure in eating food and focusing on food to the point of gluttony. Now, didn't I tell you people to get out of my bedroom? You have no authority here.

416. Tupla-J

June 21, 2015 12:35 PM

artisanalloadshall

I think what frightens you is the responsibility God has placed on you as a man. In placing you in command of your family God has placed the responsibility for the outcome of your family squarely on your shoulders.

I think you should project less and try a little humility sometimes.

Abraham was a sinner. Just like you and me. Understanding that he gave in to his wife's idea of another wife and not trusting God to handle the matter like he promised is not arrogance but wisdom. You, on the other hand, continuously stick to your fantasy that your opponents here are frightened, while claiming them arrogant, all the while selling your view like some sort of a power trip. You should take the log out of your eye.

I'm really having a hard time even imagining a situation where loving one's wife as oneself would constitute taking another one. You time and again remind us that the wife's duty is to obey. The husband's duty is to love her. When is it an act of love towards your wife to take another one?

417. artisanalloadshall

June 21, 2015 1:21 PM

Mark

*I assume you mean concerning "divorce".*

I asked for your comments because after reading a couple of your articles it appears that you believe two married believers can legitimately divorce. As I see it:

Only the man was given the authority to initiate marriage (Genesis 2:24) and that authority was not limited to a single wife.

Under Moses only the man had the authority to end his marriage (Deut. 24:1-3). Jesus reinforced this when He said "let no man separate."

From a Biblical perspective, neither the state nor the church has authority over marriage, only God, who delegated headship authority to the man.

The believing wife who violates her instruction and departs from her husband cannot in doing so force him into sexual starvation and loneliness because he can take another wife.

Because divorce is forbidden to believers (1st Cor. 7:10-11), the separated wife is still his wife, commanded to remain single or be reconciled to her husband.

Some churches still teach the correct doctrine of “Once married, always married” but deny polygyny is licit. In doing so they usurp the authority of the man, the head of the marriage. This dates back to the invasion of the family by the church when they usurped the authority of the husband and claimed the authority to regulate the marital bed.

The state took control from the church and now claims authority over marriage, requiring the permission of the state to marry. It also claims the authority to end a marriage and issue a certificate of divorce for any reason at all (no fault divorce) if one of the parties wants to leave the marriage. **Women love this arrangement.**

Following the departure of their wife, husbands may take another wife but in keeping with the teachings of the church they refuse to acknowledge they now have two wives. A desire on the part of the separated wife for reconciliation would be rejected after he takes a second wife.

The wives with their state granted certificates of divorce that God won't honor then proceed to engage in adultery. At best, the church is silent. At worst the church gives its active support to the women destroying their families.

At the same time the church refuses to hold accountable the burgeoning population of sluts who enter their doors with their illegitimate children in tow, applauding these “single mothers” for their “courage” in not getting an abortion. Veterans of the cock carousel, they are almost completely unsuitable for monogamous marriage.

The separated wives and their children, along with the sluts with their bastards are (as a rule) low income “families” at the bottom of the economic ladder and in need of support. The divorced men, bled by child support and alimony payments, are not in much better shape. Many of them go from one pseudo-marriage (dating) to another, further polluting the church with their adultery and fornication.

**That, I contend, is a crisis that is literally destroying the church**

Why not tell those brave sluts to partner up in groups of 3 or 4 and offer themselves as a package deal? They've already trained themselves to share a husband during their years on the carousel and polygyny has major advantages over monogamy in this legal climate.

Why not rebuke the adulterous wives with their so-called second marriages, directing them to stop committing adultery with their fake husband and exhort them to return to their real husband? Why not preach the truth to the husbands with multiple wives that if the prodigal wife comes back they're commanded to be reconciled with her and live with her?

Why not?

Because the church would rather have what it's got now than admit a man can legitimately have more than one wife at the same time.

I think the prophet Isaiah was speaking to the modern church when he said (paraphrasing) *your women rule over you and those who guide you lead you astray and confuse the direction of your paths. Isaiah 3:12*

418. simplytimothy

June 21, 2015 3:43 PM

@toad 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.

*We also have plenty of examples of husband's screwing that up, starting with Abraham and Sarah.*

@toad What incredible arrogance

No, fact. The other plumbing belonged to another man.  
Genesis 12: 18-20

<https://bible.org/seriespage/2-yes-my-lord-story-abraham-and-sarah>

So, Christian, will you be like Abraham and whore out your wife to another man because you are afraid like Abraham

was?

Nothing in your bravado leads me to believe that you would not. I think that you would do that evil and call yourself good because you do not love.

By what principle do you say, "what Abraham did is wrong" when all you know is that "you are the head and Sarah must submit"?

419. simplytimothy

June 21, 2015 3:53 PM

June 21, 2015 9:49 AM

*simplytimothy to MC --*

*The statement: "Relying on Christian Fathers (tradition) is degenerate" is a valid premise in your view. Correct?*

**I definitely would not have phrased it that way. ANY traditions of men which purport to replace....**

Mark, since you know the underlying Hebrew, I will (probably) not be able to engage you on those terms as the learning curve is too steep.

However, I will continue to work to consolidate your argument(s) into positive statements that you agree represent your point of view. (this work will train me to think as you do)

At that point, I will probably have to ask for help from elder Christians on the matter. It is beyond me. I admit, that I trust what I have been told. I trust it because of the work of the Holy Spirit in me and the process of sanctification that God is doing in me.

If your view is the correct one, then the Holy Spirit will guide me to the Truth, as that is the nature of God.

Fwiw, I call myself a "mere-Christian" after the work of C.S. Lewis in Mere Christianity and am neither RCC or Protestant affiliated; I see beauty in both traditions and I too see the cowardice and the bowing of the "Christian Inc 501c3" tradition on the Protestant side and some B.S. on the Catholic side.

Do you have a tradition you belong too? Are you a practicing

Jew?

Thank you again for your forthright replies.

420. simplytimothy

June 21, 2015 3:58 PM

Long day at the family reunion and too much fried chicken and banana pudding, and ....so commenting will probably have to wait until tomorrow (which is a work day)

421. artisanaltoadshall

June 21, 2015 4:26 PM

Tupla-j

A parable:

Everyone knows a mechanic sometimes over-tightens a nut. That causes problems because the over-tightened nut breaks things. One day a bunch of feminist nuts came up with the idea of taking away the mechanic's wrenches. Many argued that was wise so they took away the mechanic's wrenches. Later, when a nut loosened and came off the bolt due to time and stress, the result was the thing the bolt held together fell apart. Sometimes a mechanic was able to quickly find another nut for his bolt, but once things fell apart it was bad. The wreckage was piling up and people noticed.

Mechanics were then exhorted to submit to the nuts, love them even more and be servants to the nuts, but not to even think about finding a wrench and tightening things up to stop the squeeks and rattles. That wouldn't be loving.

Everyone could see there was a huge problem and knew 70% of the time it was the nut that caused it. But they said no, it wouldn't be loving to tighten up your nut when appropriate.

One mechanic was puzzled and said "But wait a minute. I've got a pretty big bolt with plenty of thread, but my nut causes problems and you're telling me I'm not supposed to tighten up my nut when needed. So, why can't I add 2 or 3



more nuts from the collection we have here in the congregation? I read back in the old days they used to do that. Seriously. Look at all the loose nuts we've got around here, vibrating and causing problems."

And the congregation rose up and said "Vile serpent! Dark One! You must not speak of such things for more than one nut on a bolt at the same time is sinful. Even worse, the two or three nuts on the same bolt might get so close and hold your bolt so well that you enjoyed it. Other mechanics would come under great stress knowing you got pleasure from the many nuts on your bolt. Depart from us."

So the mechanic departed and found another congregation where he discovered wrenches were allowed. Things were much better but one day he got tired of tightening up his nut. Taking his wrench he looked around the congregation, found a pair of nuts with no bolt over in the corner and added them to his bolt. All the congregation was astounded and many whispered darkly that it would not end well.

But then an amazing thing happened. All the nuts in the congregation began to whisper together, saying, "we must be careful to hold tight to our mechanic's bolt so that he does not get tired of tightening us and add another nut."

And it came to pass that the unbolted nuts in the congregation were occasionally added to a bolt where the nut tended to come loose and all the bolted nuts exhorted each other to be diligent and hold fast to their bolts.

Now some of the nuts screwed a variety of bolts in their youth and some even had washers. (This was usually because they were raised in a house by a nut with no mechanic) As a result of screwing around they were loose and no longer able to truly bond with a bolt, so mechanics didn't want them. They were counseled to get together in groups of two or three, find bolts with a lot of thread and offer themselves as a "package deal." This also worked out well because mechanics who rejected a loose nut as unsuitable (especially one with washers) found that two or three loose nuts worked as well as one good nut and the washers were kept in place between the nuts and didn't cause problems.

422. Mark Call

June 21, 2015 4:40 PM

@artisanalloadshall to --- Mark

I assume you mean concerning "divorce"....

I asked for your comments because after reading a couple of your articles it appears that you believe two married believers can legitimately divorce.

Let me just stop right there...

(And, obviously, the definition of 'believer' is a ready stumbling block...I doubt there'd be much agreement in general on this forum today.)

To reiterate:

1) There is a difference between "shalach", or 'put away, send out' and "divorce", which includes all the process elements of Deut 24:1-3, and which were correctly re-iterated with some valuable exposition by Yahushua, most completely, albeit with translation problems, in Matthew 5:32 (the discussion starts in v 27 for completeness).

The question I am almost ALWAYS asked, and was addressing most articles I've done has to do with wives ALREADY 'divorced', or with women who "lived with a man" for however long, but don't have Caesar's license, but "broke up": "Can I remarry?"

The point is - make SURE you have a 'get' from the former husband, whether it was "just sex" or state-permitted.

"As for me and my house..." -- of course I am concur with the premise that Covenant is for life. "To whom much is given, much is expected," and that goes for knowledge of His Word and Covenant. There is no excuse for "divorce" (or "putting away a wife") once we come to know that.

...perhaps more later...

423. artisanalloadshall

June 21, 2015 4:46 PM

### The parable of the mechanic, continued

As the years passed the quality of the nuts in the congregation improved, as did their ability to bond to a bolt. Visitors noticed very little in the way of wreckage caused by the feminist nuts in other congregations. All was peaceful, washers were well cared for and the mechanics

were content because the nuts were doing their job.

They asked "How can this be?"

The old mechanic responded "We train our young men how to use all the tools in their toolbox to ensure the nuts stay tight so that together the nuts and bolts can hold things together."

They noticed he had three nuts sitting very close together and said "Oooohhh. This is wrong!"

He shook his head sadly and said "We mechanics here decided the old paths were best and we believe in the proper use of our wrenches. We train our young men and teach them how to keep their nut on their bolt. We also recognize that not all nuts are equal and sometimes the best solution is to hold the bolts in place by putting two or three nuts on the job that could have been done by one good nut."

Our nuts have learned the value of holding tight to their own bolt and as the washettes grow up into nuts they are taught not to screw strange bolts, but to wait for the right mechanic and bond to his bolt. Mechanics here love their nuts and tighten them up whenever they need it. Rather than throwing out a cracked or broken nut that isn't doing a good job, we add as many nuts as is necessary to do the job. There are special rules for multiple nuts but it isn't that difficult."

"Compare the work of our mechanics to the mechanics in other congregations. Observe the lack of wreckage here, compared to others. Listen. You don't hear the squeaking and grinding noises here that you hear in other places because our nuts have learned it's better to hold fast to their bolt than force the mechanic to tighten them up or even add another nut. All this has happened because we listened to the Master Mechanic instead of feminist nuts, put all the wrenches back in the toolbox and aren't afraid to use them."

Some of the visitors decided to stay but others went about the community claiming the congregation of the Master Mechanic were mysogynuts and wouldn't allow their nuts to squeak in the assembly of the mechanics. That, ghasp, the mechanics had wrenches and actually used them to tighten the nuts. Not only that, but some of the mechanics have more than one nut on their bolt!

The authorities came to see if this was true, but not a single nut would make a complaint. When they found that some bolts had multiple nuts they questioned those nuts very closely to see if they could bring a charge against any mechanic who did that. But when those nuts said "Oh no, we like being together and we're on the same bolt but when we rub against each other it feels good."

When they heard that the authorities turned to the feminist nuts and said "You did not tell us this was a liberal congregation. They even have lesbianuts." They turned and left.

Some of the nuts were about to tell the authorities they were definitely NOT lesbianuts, that they were Christianuts who shared a bolt under the headship of their mechanic, but their mechanic shushed them and said "Do not cast your pearls before swine. Let them think what they wish as long as they leave us alone."

424. Mark Call

June 21, 2015 9:37 PM

@simplytimothy -- to MC

**Do you have a tradition you belong too? Are you a practicing Jew?**

No, to both.

I teach a number of Torah and Scripture classes on radio and the web --

([www.hebrewnationonline.com](http://www.hebrewnationonline.com), podcasts of Shabbat teachings at

[http://www.waytozion.org/teachings/mark\\_call/2015.htm](http://www.waytozion.org/teachings/mark_call/2015.htm),

and similarly for previous years) and have links

at [www.markniwot.com](http://www.markniwot.com) --

and lead a fellowship we call Shabbat Shalom Mesa in the southern Colorado mountains. Those services are live on both Erev Shabbat and Bokker Shabbat (Friday evening, Sabbath morning) on Paltalk in the "Walking Torah" room.

I "came out of" protestant xtianity about 20 years ago, not long before I started doing radio in a variety of venues, and once used terms like "Messianic" or "First Century Christian", or even Hebrew Roots. Now I prefer the term "TOBe" (too-bee) for "Torah Observant Believer" and use the phrase "we are the church of NO traditions...."

Not that "all traditions" are necessarily bad, but we have learned to be careful. When traditions supersede Scripture -  
- they become exactly what YHVH warned about: a snare.

Blessings,  
Mark

425. Mark Call

June 21, 2015 9:48 PM

@artisanaltoadshall to --- Mark  
re -- "divorce"....

**I asked for your comments because after reading a couple of your articles it appears that you believe two married believers can legitimately divorce.**

So - brief summary of what Scripture says:

Deut 24:1-3 (Yes, you are correct; Biblical 'divorce' must include a 'sepher keritutah' for the then ex-wife, otherwise she still has a "living husband".)

I don't like Caesar's license (and encourage people to read Exodus 21:1-15; not only are the three "minimum conditions" outlined there, and one obvious sanction of a man taking another wife, but the warning about giving the Almighty State the children is clear, too).

BUT - the 'divorce certificate' at least does meet the requirements from Deut 24, so a woman with Caesar's marriage, and Caesar's divorce...can learn from those mistakes...

The Bible says that there IS provision for divorce (so those 'churches' which FORBID are wrong) --- and Yahushua told us the 'why'.

Here's the bottom line: We should NOT make vows we cannot keep. Nevertheless, fallen people do, and murder or adultery is arguably worse than the provision made.

So - I have NO AUTHORITY to FORBID someone from divorce. I do have the ability to warn about adultery, from failing to heed Scripture, and do.

And ALWAYS, I advise as you seem to:  
Marriage is a Covenant. For life. (And, yes, a man may have

more than one Covenant, and to say he cannot love his wives is no less offensive than telling him he cannot love a second, or third, child.)

426. SirHamster (#201)

June 21, 2015 9:55 PM

@artisanltoad

1. Yes, I'm free to cite my terms and define them when I make an argument. It's called clarity.

2. You, however, claim I'm not in keeping with the "Biblical" definition. Care to cite that, given that male-male is prohibited and female-female is not? Two different classes, obviously. Yet you continue, for your own perverted purposes, to continue to attempt to conflate the two.

1. You have no freedom to make anyone else accept your definitions. Call a dog a rose - it still won't sprout roots or flowers. Muddying the definitions of words is the opposite of clarity, especially when you bait-and-switch word definitions.

2. Let me clarify - instead of appealing to how your definition is the Biblical definition, you appealed to it being YOUR definition. You yourself chose to point out how men look at LESBIAN porn, as opposed to GIRL-GIRL porn. Would you like to argue that porn is defined by the relationships? You find fine distinctions between GIRL-GIRL/LESBIAN when convenient, and drop them when you aren't paying attention.

**But I do know you're calling me a liar and providing zero evidence to back it up.**

A lie is an untrue statement. For example, calling a cat a dog is a lie, even if I try to redefine the words "cat" and "dog".

Likewise, saying "girl-girl sex is not homosexual or lesbian" is also a lie - one so blatant that it doesn't need further refutation. If you reject plain definitions, words cannot change your mind.

**Cite me chapter and verse where God described/prohibited/condemned any form of girl-girl sex as a perversion or gave instruction to husbands concerning such.**

Here, you try to move the focus away from your lie - that girl-girl sex is not homosexual. That you have lied, and attempt to decieve Christians to accept your lie, is enough evidence to call you a liar. Note also how you have changed the standard from YOUR definition to GOD'S definition. If you want to use YOUR definition of words, on what basis do you deny me the right to use MY definition?

That, and anyone else who has not embraced lies can figure out that "girl-girl" sex is unnatural. A man who watches that, whether online or as a live-action show from his wives, is engaging in perversion.

I have already cited all the chapters and verses I need. On how a Christian is to set his mind on heavenly things and not earthly things. On how a Christian is to interact with fellow Christians. You have demonstrated a mind fixated on earthly things, and you mistreat Christians - ones who were redeemed and saved by the one you claim to be your savior, Jesus Christ. Why you would denigrate his work for the sake of lesbian sex, I cannot fathom - but that in of itself condemns you far more than any words I could add.

Repent, and seek what is noble, true, and lovely.

"By this everyone will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another."

I am not the one who judges men, artisanalload. But I will encourage you to learn to love your enemies, starting with your "enemies" in this thread.

427. IM2L844

June 22, 2015 12:05 AM

One has to wonder what the initial impetus was for such extensive research into a rather abstruse subject.

428. Mark Call

June 22, 2015 12:44 AM

You mean marriage? Or how we got to the place where Caesar redefines what God has Written? And most xtians no longer even notice?

429. Tupla-J

June 22, 2015 3:13 AM

Artisanalload,

If I've ever read a worse parable I don't remember it. What you're peddling is not unclear and I don't need a story to understand that you believe in a polygynous utopia that would be a reality if men only weren't afraid of feminists.

What you didn't do was tell me in what scenario fucking another woman constitutes as love towards your wife. I'd like to hear what you think love is. So far it sounds a lot like you think love is "what I want" instead of "what is good for the loved".

So...

What is love?

How does that love towards your wife that is your duty fit in with taking more wives?

Is not Bible full of examples of taking several wives and the result being a tragedy directly following from the polygamous relationship?

I'd really like answers to these instead of story telling.

430. artisanalloadshall

June 22, 2015 5:58 AM

Tupla-J

You ask what love is and the context of your question is loving your wife. How does Christ love the church? Start with Rev. 3:19. Some translations have "reprove and chasten" and others have "rebuke and discipline." It's all the same, the first is verbal, the second is physical. Taking it up a notch, look at what Christ said to the church at Ephesus in Rev. 2:5. He threatens to remove His lampstand.

I've pointed out repeatedly that the man's authority to marry is granted in Genesis 2:24 and it wasn't limited to once. The problem with women is found at Genesis 3:16. They're cursed. For what Eve did she and all her daughters were cursed. For what Adam did the ground was cursed. Salvation in Christ doesn't remove the curse, although the Holy Spirit gives women the power to overcome the curse.

Scenario 1. Your wife comes to you after hitting menopause and says "I've been a good wife to you. I've followed you, kept house for you, warmed your bed, bore your children and stood by your side through thick and thin and helped raise the kids to be successful adults. I don't know why at your age you still want sex, but I'm' done. No more.



The way of the world is for you to divorce for sexual incompatibility and find another wife. 1st Cor. 7:4 says she's not allowed to say no, that her body belongs to you. Of course, we all know how well that works. So, if she won't do her job, your options are to suffer in silence or find a merry widow, marry her and let her do the job wife #1 won't. The world and the church will tell you that you have to divorce in order to do that... but that's not God's way.

Scenario 2. In violation of the command in 1st Cor. 7:10, your oh-so-Christian wife "departs" from you, files for divorce and milks you for chilimony until they are adults. No matter what a judge says, as far as God is concerned, you're still married. You take another wife, you now have two. One with you, the other separated from you. If the prodigal wife comes home... Doesn't Christ always welcome the repentant sinner and forgive them? One of the consequences of wife #1 violating the command not to separate herself was you taking another wife. Your expression of love is taking her back if she ever shows up again. Again, you have two wives now and are required to love them both and provide them with equal food, equal clothing and equal conjugal rights.(Exodus 21)

But, what about wife #2? The problem is #2 thought she was signing on for monogamy. Surprise, surprise, surprise!

Scenario 3: "Reformed" carousel riding sluts, some with babies, can't find a man willing to marry them. Why? Because they're seriously damaged goods and now because of their choices and actions almost completely unsuited for monogamy. The "Born Again Virgin" thing doesn't pass the sniff test. The "Man UP and Marry a Slut!" campaign isn't going very well. These girls have a libido and they never learned how to keep their legs crossed and in repentance of their sin they want to marry but as far as the men are concerned they're nothing but pure pump and dump. How should the church deal with this?

Package them in groups of 2, 3 or 4 and they'll get a guy to marry them. See Isaiah 4:1-2.

Scenario 4. Former lesbians who rejected men and marriage become Christians but have awakened desires that God didn't prohibit or condemn, but even the thought seem to drive the Christians here quite over the edge. Solution? Polygyny. How are you loving each of them? By husbanding

them. By fathering their children. By holding them accountable and if necessary disciplining them.

431. artisanalloadshall

June 22, 2015 6:11 AM

There is only one standard for Christians, and that's the Word. When Christians deviate from the Word and make a mess of things, the solution is to repent. Read the story of King Josiah, the greatest king of Israel and Judah.

What about the women like the one in scenario #2 in cases in which the husband refuses to be reconciled to his prodigal wife?

Watch carefully, because this gets interesting. Paul, speaking in Romans 14 tells us not to judge a brother. James says the same thing. Yet, Paul wrote to the Corinthians and told them to judge their brothers and with the immoral so-called brother not to even break bread. How to make sense of that? Easy. In 1st Cor. 5-6 Paul is speaking to the church as an entity and the subject is church discipline. In Romans and James the instruction is to individuals.

1st John 2 tells us that if someone claims to be a Christian but does not keep His commandments and walk as He walked, they are a liar and the truth is not in them. That's the standard.

Scenario 5. Professing Christian man marries a slut who turns into an adulterous wife. Eventually she divorce rapes him. At some point she comes to her senses, is convicted of her sin and seeks reconciliation with her husband. Her husband, wounded and scarred from all she's done refuses to be reconciled to her, telling her no, it's over.

Reflect on the story of the prodigal son for a moment. Is the husband walking as Christ walked? Is he keeping His commands? The answer is obviously no. The wife goes to the elders, presents her case and asks them to render judgment. They go to the husband, who tells them the story of how she turned him into an incel, committed adultery over and over again before finally ruining him financially in divorce court. He says he will not under any circumstances be reconciled to her. He's fully MGTOW, she pissed in her bed and now she can lay in it.

What should the elders do? I don't know how you'd answer, but my answer is excommunicate him and declare him to be

the unbelieving spouse who departed from her. That leaves her free to marry again, but like the reformed sluts in scenario 3, she's an adulteress, a divorce court veteran and pretty much damaged goods. The church has lots of these women on the pews. Most of them are low income and struggling to make ends meet.

Look around in your church and you'll see plenty of women in situations like these that have made a wreck of their lives and polygyny is a structure that fixes the problem for a significant number of them. Put 4 women with one man. One wife stays home and cares for children and the house. With 4 incomes coming into the family, the standard of living will be much better than any of them could manage on their own or in monogamy. Someone losing their job isn't the crisis it would be in a monogamous marriage.

Polygyny is very similar to corporal punishment of wives. Both have significant textual support in the Bible. Neither are forbidden or condemned. Both have significant historical support. Both are sometimes necessary and surprise! Feminism HATES both of them.

Are you married to a Godly woman who sincerely desires to be a good wife? Congratulations. Unfortunately, marriage 2.0 means you're totally screwed the moment she decides to stop being a good wife. The feminist church doubles down on that by teaching the perverse doctrines of "mutual submission" and "servant leadership" to husbands, telling them to supplicate to their wives. All that does is make the wives seethe with contempt, hastening the progress to a nuked family.

Amidst all the wreckage is a generation of children who are the victims of all this. Polygyny is an obvious solution for many of those most in need, but the xians tut tut tut and say, "That's sinful!"

432. artisanaltoadshall

June 22, 2015 7:38 AM

IM2L844

*One has to wonder what the initial impetus was for such extensive research into a rather abstruse subject.*

I'm sure they said the same thing of Isaac Newton :)

It isn't actually that difficult of a subject at all. Sin

corrupts, kills and makes a mess of things. People, in their arrogance, want to play God. They say "I don't think that's right, and therefore it's a sin if you do it" instead of asking "What did God say about that?"

It's really sad that some Christians can get themselves worked up over the idea that their neighbor's wife gives him the occasional BJ. "She lets him put it in her mouth? OMG! Really?"

Expand that scenario to two wives and the self-righteous hypocrisy explodes in indignation over the possibilities of what might happen once the bedroom door closes. And we can look around the sanctuary on Sunday morning at all the single mothers and divorced mothers and see the wreckage caused by sin, but nobody seems to notice...

**Hey guys, why don't we start fixing the problem using polygyny?**

No, no, no, you can't do that. That would be way too much fun.

**Right. Have a bad day, offend one wife and get home to find that you've got multiple blocks of ice to thaw because offending the one offended all of them.**

No, seriously. we think it's all about pleasure. Pleasure is fleshly so we can't have this polygyny stuff.

**Right. Tell me all about how pleasant it is to adjudicate their squabbles and petty attempts at drama with more than one wife in the house. Did you know that once they're living together they all start cycling together? Ever been in a house full of women with PMS?**

Well, we don't know about that, but we don't want you to talk about it. This is too controversial.

**But you're in favor of MGTOW right?**

Not all of us, but, yes. It's a better solution to the problem than your perverted polygyny stuff.

**Really? MGTOW is a rejection of marriage and family because it's just too dangerous. It seems to me that it's the masturbatory equivalent of homosexuality, substituting occasional bouts of fornication and adultery for the buggery. The natural function of women is to**

marry and make babies. So, if you've given up on that it's the same as the guys in Romans 1:27, minus the gay sex.

I mean, really. How is it any different? Both groups are rejecting God's design and giving up the natural function of women, one out of fear of getting screwed and the other out of the love of being screwed.

[Toad runs for the exit as they start to gather stones.]

433. Tupla-J

June 22, 2015 7:44 AM

You really like your strawmen.

434. Tupla-J

June 22, 2015 7:44 AM

You really like your strawmen.

435. artisanaltoadshall

June 22, 2015 9:02 AM

Tupla-J

*tell me in what scenario fucking another woman constitutes as love towards your wife.*

*How does that love towards your wife that is your duty fit in with taking more wives?*

The standard is what would Christ do. He praised, exhorted, corrected and threatened to rebuke and discipline. He also threatened to remove His lampstand if they didn't repent. Because Christ is doing these things, they must be examples of love. It's all about accountability and refusing to hold your wife accountable for her bad behavior is an unloving thing to do.

Your question assumes that loving wife #2 is somehow an unloving act toward wife #1.

Implied is that adding a wife to the marriage is an unloving thing to do and I'm supposed to prove it isn't. Also implied is that a husband can't love multiple wives equally.

Gee, where have we heard things like this before?

How is deciding to add another child to the family a loving

thing to do to child #1?

It's a matter of discretion that engenders the responsibility to love all of them equally.

How is giving child #2 a hug and a kiss considered a loving thing to do to child #1?

Child #1 knows that if #2 is getting a hug and a kiss then it will be their turn soon.

Do parents sometimes treat their children unequally and have favorites?

Yes.

Does that justify restricting families to a single child?

No.

Why not?

Because parents have just as much right to add children to the family as the husband has to add another wife.

Where did that come from?

The same place all your other rights come from: God.

I ignored your strawman argument and gave you 5 examples in which polygyny is a reasonable and workable solution to a real problem.

436. Mark Call

June 22, 2015 9:23 AM

@ artisanalloadshall and SirHamster

re: trying to apply Greek language to Hebraic concepts:

**You, however, claim I'm not in keeping with the "Biblical" definition. Care to cite that, given that male-male is prohibited and female-female is not?**

It seems clear, guys, that while you may have done an excellent job in laying out the problems and divisions, you have evidently failed at a resolution,.

Please allow me to suggest that you have definitely outlined

the source of confusion, however.

The prefix "homo" applied to a concept like "sexuality" is a language issue. And language CONSTRAINS THOUGHT patterns.

This is why Paul's good advice to "let this mind be in you," which was also in Him, is so apropos. The Biblical mindset is that of YHVH, and it is inherently far closer to a "crossed over" and "Hebraic" one than any that most of us have grown up with. And Greek is inherently a language that is "poly" - meaning 'many', to them - "theistic" - which, means, well, something not even REMOTELY similar to the concept of YHVH is "echad".

Men and women are not "homo"-geneous. And while there are in Scripture no doubt men who had "mono-" Covenant relationships with only one 'isha' -- the Greek concept of "monogamy" is foreign to Scripture. As you both know, there is only just "marriage" in Scripture, and Yah does not prescribe a number, nor a numerical limit. That "addition to" what He Wrote, which is (Psalm 19:8) "tamim" ('perfect', and certainly complete, even with *enhancement* by fallen men).

So please allow me to suggest that your argument is with the error introduced by trying to misapply a Greek concept to a Hebraic prohibition. Conflation, and then confusion is the result.

The Greek word has a Greek meaning. ("it's all Greek to me" makes more and more sense, don't it?) But it is misapplied, when both of you recognize that the prohibition on sexuality is not, NOT "homogeneous". Male-on-male "sodomy" is expressly and repeated prohibited, sanctioned via the death penalty, and called by the strongest possible negative term. Meanwhile Scripture is very silent (unless the Greek confusion is included) about the very different female situation.

Maybe that's why Scripture makes a point of saying, "male and female He created them." They are NOT the same, although that, too, is another "modern" deception, also often based on conflation of the language.

I suspect the point is made.

And perhaps it is a bit more clear as well why I contend that Kefa ("Peter") was right (II Kefa/Peter 3:15-16) in warning

about how Paul was twisted. Trying to fit Hebrew thought patterns into multiple translations of pagan languages will do that. Especially when "the foundations be destroyed."

Blessings,  
Mark

437. Mark Call

June 22, 2015 10:09 AM

@ -- anybody that makes a stupid, Biblically-incorrect statement like this:

**Is not Bible full of examples of taking several wives and the result being a tragedy directly following from the polygamous [sic] relationship?**

NO!!!!

You should read it some time, for comprehension!

And quit with the cognitive dissonance:

If "monogamy" is The Model for marriage, then why is The First Monogamy the most famously failed example in **ALL HUMAN HISTORY?**

Not **ONLY** the Monogamy By Which Sin Entered The World, but the progenitor of the First Murderer.

The point should be made, unless the blindness is complete.

The term "mono" applied to marriage is a pagan, western, Greek, Roman term, applied out of context, not a Biblical one. And the contradictions introduced by trying to force fit pagan traditions where they do not belong are what results in "tragedy."

438. Mark Call

June 22, 2015 11:04 AM

PS> As should be obvious by now, I'm not a big fan of the Greek concept of "monotheism" either - which inherently presupposes there are LOTs of gods, but just some who prefer "only one".

Which doesn't seem to matter, since there are plenty of "monotheistic" false religions that fit the still-pagan bill,



from "Gaia" and the "Queen of Heaven" and similar 'mother earth' worship to the head-whacking moon god.

If 'monotheism' is the goal, just like Mono-Gamy, there are plenty of fakes that'll fit the bill.

439. IM2L844

June 22, 2015 1:23 PM

No, I don't think it's difficult at all. Extrinsic, aberrant or deviant would've been a better choice of words rather than abstruse, but that's niggling. The initial spark of motivation is the interesting thing. God doesn't simply judge actions only, but the true intentions of the heart. The old saying should say, "The road to hell is paved with feigned intentions.

440. Tupla-J

June 22, 2015 2:05 PM

**artisanalloadshall:**

**It's all about accountability and refusing to hold your wife accountable for her bad behavior is an unloving thing to do.**

Who the fuck here claims to not hold their wife accountable for bad behavior? I'm the one here who is not advocating leading her straight into temptation and sin by bringing another woman into the marriage.

**Your question assumes that loving wife #2 is somehow an unloving act toward wife #1.**

Yep.

**Implied is that adding a wife to the marriage is an unloving thing to do and I'm supposed to prove it isn't.**

It would help your case if you did that, yes.

**Also implied is that a husband can't love multiple wives equally.**

A human can't. In theory, maybe, in practice - never.

**Gee, where have we heard things like this before?**

You apparently want to tell me.

**How is deciding to add another child to the family a loving thing to do to child #1?**

Strawman. "Be fruitful and multiply" didn't end with "your wives".

**Because parents have just as much right to add children to the family as the husband has to add another wife.**

You should read the Bible every now and then and then read again the silly shit you write. You might notice something.

**I ignored your strawman argument and gave you 5 examples in which polygyny is a reasonable and workable solution to a real problem.**

My strawman? Do you know what a strawman is? I read scenario 1 and laughed. The wife has given her consent and her duty is to obey. She is not done and that's that.

441. Mark Call

June 22, 2015 2:22 PM

I can't help but notice you just ignore arguments that you can't handle.

442. Tupla-J

June 22, 2015 2:41 PM

**Mark Callous:  
NO!!!!**

**UH-HUH!!!!**

**You should read it some time, for comprehension!**

I'm working on it, with the benevolent help of father McGee's *Thru the Bible* program and the Holy Spirit. I freely admit I haven't read the whole Bible and might have some glaring errors in my theology, being a novice Christian. I assume I will have some even after I've read it all. Presumption of inerrancy leads to hubris, which tends to be a prologue to a fall from a great height.

**And quit with the cognitive dissonance:**

**If "monogamy" is The Model for marriage, then why is The First Monogamy the most famously failed example in ALL HUMAN HISTORY?**

**Not ONLY the Monogamy By Which Sin Entered The World, but the progenitor of the First Murderer.**

...and polygyny would've been better there how? Every time multiple wives are mentioned in the Bible it would've prevented a world of death, sin and alienation from God if the marriages had been monogamous. If you want, I can mention a few examples.

**The point should be made, unless the blindness is complete.**

There are reasonable people who might disagree with you, unless the pride knows no bounds.

443. Mark Call

June 22, 2015 3:05 PM

re: ignoring uncomfortable Truth:  
and ...**The point should be made, unless the blindness is complete..**  
which seems to be obvious.

@T-J

If that constitutes 'rebuttal', you prove only that at least you are correct, when it comes to "...**some glaring errors in my theology**"

And your logic, too:

"...polygyny would've been better ['Adam n Eve'] there how? Every time multiple wives are mentioned in the Bible it would've prevented a world of death, sin and alienation from God if the marriages had been monogamous. If you want, I can mention a few examples.

QED. No. They are immaterial, when the point is already refuted. And, as you just admit, your 'knowledge' is limited to what you've been told...and you ignore any OTHER examples, from Gideon, to Joash, to the "men of Issachar" that don't fit your preconception. And I'd be willing to be your don't understand Jeremiah chapter three, or Ezekiel 23, or the "parable of the TEN virgins," or ...well, the point should be made there, too, unless...

And, most obviously, you ignore the **IN YOUR FACE** contradiction of the Most Famous Monogamous Marriage in

ALL History.

So please quit insulting our intelligence.

444. Tupla-J

June 22, 2015 3:35 PM

Sorry I've insulted your intelligence, Satan.

445. Mark Call

June 22, 2015 3:53 PM

Typo: *And I'd be willing to **BET** your don't understand Jeremiah chapter three, or Ezekiel 23, or the "parable of the TEN virgins," or ...well, the point should be made there, too, unless...*

OK, no 'bet' involved. Ignorant of Scripture fer sure, and "Blind it is."

You were wiser to have kept silent, rather than now "removing all doubt".

446. simplytimothy

June 22, 2015 4:38 PM

@Mark Call

*If "monogamy" is The Model for marriage, then why is The First Monogamy the most famously failed example in ALL HUMAN HISTORY? Not ONLY the Monogamy By Which Sin Entered The World, but the progenitor of the First Murderer.*

The marriage did not sin, the woman and the man committed the sin. To blame the marriage for the sins of the individuals is akin to blaming the Republic for the crimes the men who failed to husband it.

An institution does not replace human volition.

447. simplytimothy

June 22, 2015 4:51 PM

@artisanaltoadshall

Also, when a man marries multiple wives, how many

marrriages are there? With one man one woman, there is one marriage.

With one man, ten women how many marriages?

thanks,

448. simplytimothy

June 22, 2015 5:07 PM

@:Mark Call

*Do you have a tradition you belong too? Are you a practicing Jew?*

**No, to both.**

Thank you for your reply.

I will bookmark your links and visit them another time.

449. simplytimothy

June 22, 2015 5:31 PM

@Mark Call

**I can't help but notice you just ignore arguments that you can't handle.**

If you don't know the language, you cannot argue. This is true when the language is mathematics, it is true when the language is Hebrew. The best I can do individually is to understand your arguments logically and check of logical flaws. There is not shame in that.

What I can also do is ask elders and experts on the language for their advice on what you say. You would do the same if the language where Chinese with its idioms.

450. simplytimothy

June 22, 2015 6:37 PM

@artisanoadshall in response to @Beau

**You have not studied to show yourself approved. Carefully check Leviticus 18 and Leviticus 20. Men with men is prohibited and condemned. Men with animals is prohibited and condemned. Women with animals is**

prohibited and condemned. Nothing is said about women with women as a physical act.

*Deut 24:7*

*"If a man is caught kidnapping any of his countrymen of the sons of Israel, and he deals with him violently or sells him, then that thief shall die; so you shall purge the evil from among you."*

Ergo there is no penalty if a woman kidnaps artisanoadshall and sells him into slavery, there is no penalty. To argue there should be is blasphemy. Hell, what will happen is that @artisanoadshall will piss off one of his concubines and she will kidnap him and sell him into slavery. Maybe we should fund a kickstarter.

*Deut 24:16 "Fathers shall not be put to death for their sons, nor shall sons be put to death for their fathers; everyone shall be put to death for his own sin."*

Women are not mentioned here. Therefore, since the law is perfect, it follows that Mothers may be put to death for the sins of their daughters and daughters for the sins of their mothers. Right?

451. simplytimothy

June 22, 2015 6:46 PM

For any of the ilk who want to go through Deuteronomy or Leviticus and find the passages that reference only men and then look at the flip-side for women, feel free; this could get entertaining.

452. simplytimothy

June 22, 2015 7:07 PM

@artisanoadshall wrote:

It is written:

*Wives, be subject to your own husbands, as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the church, He Himself being the Savior of the body.*

*But as the church is subject to Christ, so also the wives ought to be to their husbands in everything. Ephesians*

5:22-24

Husband says: "Hey girls! Put the kids down by 9:00, I'll be out till 10:15. When I get home I want to find all of you clean and in my bed, naked.

Bring the baby oil cause we're gonna play a game of naked twister when we're done."

Every wife is thinking "submit to your husbands in everything. OMG! What if he wants me to... wants her to...

Curious, where is it recorded in Scripture that a married man was in bed with more than one of his wives at a time?

453. Mark Call

June 22, 2015 7:21 PM

@simplytimothy --

re: my "reducto ad absurdum" response to the asinine claim that polygyny "always leads to problems" in the Bible...

If "monogamy" is The Model for marriage, then why is The First Monogamy the most famously failed example in ALL HUMAN HISTORY? Not ONLY the Monogamy By Which Sin Entered The World, but the progenitor of the First Murderer.

Your comment, while correct, is exactly part of the point I was making:

The marriage did not sin, the woman and the man committed the sin. To blame the marriage for the sins...

...yeah, is silly. QED, and we agree.

454. Mark Call

June 22, 2015 7:31 PM

QQQ -- ...when a man marries multiple wives, how many marriages are there?

"Marriage" is a Covenant between a man and a woman. (This is the subtle issue that the Monogomy Church cannot dismiss.) A woman has a single "covering" (see Numbers 30), and a man may have more than one woman under his covering, subject to the standard minimums, like Exodus

21:10.

Thus, if there are three wives, there are three Covenants, and he has three marriages.

455. artisanaltoadshall

June 22, 2015 7:41 PM

SimpleTim

Please cite me an example of women kidnapers getting off scott-free. Likewise any other example of the strawman you're trying to create.

Israel (Jacob), OTOH, was one man with two wives and two concubines. From him came the Nation of Israel. Abraham had multiple wives, as did Moses and numerous other patriarchs. As you've so helpfully pointed out, sins within their marriage were the fault of the individuals involved and not the product of the marriage itself.

*Curious, where is it recorded in Scripture that a married man was in bed with more than one of his wives at a time?*

Scripture is pretty much discreet when it comes to describing what happens in the marital bed. But it's really telling in your case that your focus is so much on the "OMG! Are they allowed to do THAT!" kind of thing when God had every opportunity to regulate or prohibit it and chose not to. SimpleTim, consider the great number of relationships God specifically prohibited. It is obvious God cared a great deal about the process and results of procreation activity.

God the Father is omniscient. He knows all, sees all and hears all. Even if I was the FIRST MAN ON EARTH to come up with the idea of multiple wives in bed at once, God knew that when He gave mankind His Law and chose to either prohibit it, regulate it or leave it to the judgment and wisdom of the husband.

What does the text (not) say?

Personally, I think you're on really dangerous ground. You have claimed that because you have the Holy Spirit, you know that certain things are a sin, yet God never said they were a sin. The Holy Spirit, being an inseparable part of the triune Godhead, cannot testify against God the Father. To claim such a thing is to either call God the Father a liar (blasphemy) or to blaspheme the Holy Spirit, saying the



Holy Spirit is a liar. Blaspheming the Holy Spirit is the only unforgivable sin...

At best you can say "The Holy Spirit has convicted me that this would be a sin for ME."

456. artisanalloadshall

June 22, 2015 7:45 PM

Tupla-J

***How is deciding to add another child to the family a loving thing to do to child #1?***

*Strawman. "Be fruitful and multiply" didn't end with "your wives".*

Like compared to like argument from authority, explained, which you ignored. Ignoring your error, you refuse to admit that "be fruitful and multiply is best done with multiple production units. You even prove my point by claiming "be fruitful and multiply didn't end with "your wives." It didn't end with "your wife" either. The command completely left out the number of wives.

Now, assuming you have a grasp of math, you recognize a man can double his fruitfulness by adding one wife and triple his fruitfulness by adding two wives, although there is a certain point at which the means of production boggs down when considering refractory time and the number of production units.

Your strawman was shifting the argument from "What did God say about it" to "how does wife #1 feel about it." Wife #1 is not God.

457. Mark Call

June 22, 2015 7:47 PM

@simplytimothy -- one more, then...

**f you don't know the language, you cannot argue. This is true when the language is mathematics, it is true when the language is Hebrew...**

...check of logical flaws...

...You would do the same...

In fact, that is exactly what I DID, many years after rejecting Xtianity for the pile of inconsistencies between what I could read "for myself", even in the English. (Like -

Friday to 'sun-god-day' is "three days and three nights?!!!  
Turns out He was SPOT ON, IFF you understand the "Hebrew idioms", and Shabbat, and His feasts, and so on.)

But your point is correct. Is it what I urge others to do, once they have the hunger to "search out the truth for themselves, see if these things are True."

What God REALLY Wrote about marriage was one of the "Big Three" things that initially forced me to realize it was NOT the Bible that had problems -- it was what MEN said He SHOULD have said if He was as smart as they are.

Blessings,  
Mark

PS> Prophecy, particularly the "Mark of the Beast" was another, given what I already knew about engineering, Constitutional law, marketing, and "commerce". And the other was what is "food", and what is not. Turns out He knew better'n "Science" a long time ago. Whould'a thunk it?  
:)

458. simplytimothy

June 22, 2015 7:54 PM

*...yeah, is silly. QED, and we agree.*

Largely in principle, maybe. However when I quoted what my ESV Bible's commentary had to say about this issue, you dismissed it without providing counter-examples or context. This is a claim, not an argument. (which is fair, I make a claim, not an argument too)

I also think that the issue will be resolved along other lines of argument.

459. artisanalloadshall

June 22, 2015 8:57 PM

Mark

*Thus, if there are three wives, there are three Covenants, and he has three marriages.*

I have to disagree with you here. According to covenant theology, a covenant is an agreement or contract to which

God is a party. The husband, as the federal head in his marriage, covers the wives. One family, regardless of the number of wives. Many marriages implies many separate families.

I take pains to differentiate between polygamy (many marriages) and polygyny (many wives) because of the tendency toward serial monogamy (polygamy) in the west, in which there are literally many marriages with the previous ones being broken prior to establishing the next one.

When I asked for your commentary on divorce, I was specifically asking about the instruction in 1st Cor. 7:10-11, which I contend overturned the judgment of Moses at Deut. 24:1-4. (I believe that was comment 324) One further argument there is that it had to be overturned because God describes Himself as having two wives, Israel and Judah. He said He divorced Israel but also said that Israel would be redeemed.

Under the specifics of Deut. 24:4, God would not be able to redeem Israel to Himself without overturning that judgment by Moses.

460. simplytimothy

June 22, 2015 9:04 PM

@artisantoadshall asks

**Please cite me an example of women kidnappers getting off scott-free. Likewise any other example of the strawman you're trying to create.**

And in the same damn comment thinks that this will fly...

**Scripture is pretty much discreet when it comes to describing what happens in the marital bed.**

You retreat to discretion when it suits you. Absolutely pathetic.

It is you who laid out the principle that when scripture says men it means men and when it omits women it means not-women.

This argument from silence is a core tenet of your position. Now man up and face the consequences of your tenet.

Arguing that women cannot kidnap and sell your ass into slavery is BLASPHEMY. How dare you go against the word of God!

The prohibition is specifically made that men may not do such a thing. Therefore, per your rules, it follows that women can do it.

I will go through every freaking edict in both Leviticus and Deuteronomy where the command is given in the masculine and make you defend the opposite case for the feminine. Every freaking edict.

If your perversion ever goes mainstream, I will start funding your kidnapping and marketing on the slave market. I will do it because it is the word of GOD and you have no recourse to God because the woman is not in violation of His Laws. When you are in chains, I will quote you scripture and verse where you are to remain a slave and submit to your master.

I expected this. You hide behind bluster and dare anybody to shine the light of truth on your sin and all it is taking is a careful, persistent look at your position to start to peel back the scriptural and spiritual error of it all.

Your reliance on an argument from silence has failed. Utterly and completely failed.

With that nonsense out of the way, let's move onto another flaw in your egregious attack on the Christian faith.

answer this.

If one man to one woman = one marriage.  
One man to 100 women = how many marriages?  
1? 100? 101!?

461. artisanaltoadshall

June 22, 2015 9:17 PM

SimpleTim

When you quoted your Bible commentary you were making an appeal to authority. An INFERIOR authority compared to God's Word. Given that the original argument was based on an appeal to the authority of Scripture, I think I can safely say that both Mark and I were asking you to stick to the ultimate authority, God's Word, the authority cited in the

original argument.

What most modern churchians do when they get into an argument about the meaning of a particular passage is find a commentary that agrees with their point of view, wave it around and claim victory. It gets very old very quickly.

462. simplytimothy

June 22, 2015 9:29 PM

*Thus, if there are three wives, there are three Covenants, and he has three marriages.*

I have to disagree with you here. According to covenant theology, a covenant is an agreement or contract to which God is a party. The husband, as the federal head in his marriage, covers the wives...

@athiestoadshall does not recognize that the women are the party to the covenant. He thinks that marriage is a pool and the husband is the guy on the floating reclining chair and the women just jump in to the covenant without actually getting married.

Here is his problem. If the women are married, who are they married to? The man? Or are they married to the other women too?

If they are only married to the man, then if, per toady's horny fantasy, the women have sex with each other, then they are having sex outside the marriage. If the women are married to each other, then ....toady has jumped the shark swimming in his pool.

As an aside, It is interesting to see @athiestoadshall contradict his own statement that "A man can do **anything** he wants with his wives" by admitting that God is a party to the marriage. Or is @athiestoadshall contending that a husband can do things to his wives that God would not do? I think the safer answer is that toady is a horny toad who let's his balls dictate his actions and theology is his prophylactic for his troubled conscience that he wears when it suits him.

I think this takes care of toady's fantasy romp argument and we can move onto the case of polygamy itself. Given Mark's assertion that Luther himself could see no prohibition against it, we should grant that position and ask if it is wise to bring it back from the days of Moses and Solomon and Abraham.

Poor, toady, though. His fantasy of hot lesbian marital sex is dashed and all he can do is service his playthings one at a time, plus pay for their keep and ....then one may decide to sell him into slavery and pocket the cash! Progress!

463. simplytimothy

June 22, 2015 9:41 PM

@artisantoadshall

SimpleTim

When you quoted your Bible commentary you were making an appeal to authority. An INFERIOR authority compared to God's Word. Given that the original argument was based on an appeal to the authority of Scripture, I think I can safely say that both Mark and I were asking you to stick to the ultimate authority, God's Word, the authority cited in the original argument.

What most modern churchians do when they get into an argument about the meaning of a particular passage is find a commentary that agrees with their point of view, wave it around and claim victory. It gets very old very quickly.

I agree in principle. I am not a Bible Scholar and I do not know Hebrew or Greek. The reliability of the translations of the Bible is a separate subject than your desire to have your multiple wives pervert themselves for your pleasure..

I have granted the 'polygamy is not prohibited' case minus your perversion. If polygamy is to be biblically sanctioned then it is one man, many wives, one woman at a time.

I have not granted the 'polygamy is good' case. You both make the case that not having it is the source of God's judgment on the Christian Church. That is interesting.

One thing made evident in the evisceration of your 'argument from silence' for lesbianism within your marriage is the fact that we do make moral inferences from God's word. Of course it is ridiculous that a woman should sell somebody else into slavery and not be punished for it. It is on this principle of careful moral inferences that a good case against polygamy will be made. There may be other avenues of argument as well.

In either case, I am confident the Christian will stand firmly on His Truth and it will be good.

464. simplytimothy

June 22, 2015 9:48 PM

I am done for today. I have little progress summarizing the arguments from reviewing the comments and will continue that tomorrow. I have a day off on Wednesday, so I hope to tighten this up and turn to Mark's perspective at least to get the outline of it.

@Beau, I was looking forward to your vivisection along the lines of the inside-out, exploded pig-lizard in Galaxy Quest. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nW-NiGp1gys>

(:

465. artisanalloadshall

June 22, 2015 9:57 PM

SimpleTim

*Here is his problem. If the women are married, who are they married to? The man? Or are they married to the other women too?*

Marriage is a type for the relationship between Christ and the church. Who is the master who redeemed you? Christ, or did the church have something to do with that?

Because of the typology involved, I'm making differentiations that you probably don't understand. Is it one universal church? If so, why are the seven epistles of Christ written to seven different churches? Why is it repeated over and over "Let he who has an ear hear what the Spirit says to the churches." The question of one covenant (shed blood) with respect to one church or multiple churches is beyond the purview of this discussion but it becomes relevant in my choice of semantics. I don't expect an anklebiter like you to understand.

You claimed I said "**A man can do anything he wants with his wives**". Cite please. You quoted me, I want the comment number. Let's see where I said that or whether you're a liar.

Now, before we discuss where your bullwhip handle in the

ass fetish came from, I must say that if you really wanted to overcome the arguments I've made, you'd focus on the summary in #351 and leave off with the histrionics.

We see a class of prohibited sexual practices grouped together.

men with men, prohibited and in the very next verse we see men with animals prohibited and then we see women with animals prohibited. The inclusion of women within this class specifically speaks to the absence of women with women. **Context, class, subject.**

You're getting way too worked up about this and it's fascinating how hard you are working to wiggle your way out of this, so I'm going to attempt to be as ridiculous as you are to show you just how silly you sound.

Let's say the early church fathers claimed that PIV (that's penis in vagina) sex is a perversion [In reality they called it a "necessary evil," but that speaks to their foolishness].

Given the chaste living we are called to in the New Testament, under the new covenant it is no longer appropriate for a man to have sexual congress with his wife because it might result in pleasure and we all know pleasure is worldly and fleshly and to be condemned.

Therefore, under the new covenant, it should be the custom of those in the church for the man to ejaculate into a clean and holy vessel and present it to his wife. In order for the man to not receive any pleasure from ejaculating, it will be accomplished by one of the elders (symbolically taking the place of the Lord) jamming the handle of a bullwhip into his ass with great vigor (in order to cause great pain) massaging his prostate to stimulate the ejaculation.

The wife will receive the seed in the holy vessel and then privately (for fear anyone might see her girl-parts and become inflamed with passion) insert his seed into her vagina with a turkey baster or whatever is at hand, taking care that it is done rapidly and without giving her any pleasure. To ensure no pleasure results from this she has several of her sisters in Christ on hand to scourge her while she does it.

The lame argument you are making right now is in support of the BS I just wrote. God did not prohibit, condemn or regulate PIV sex. Anywhere. Which puts it exactly in the



same class as any girl-girl activity that might happen in the marital bed under the authority of their husband.

Your attempt to claim the right of the church (corporately only) to judge such things gives them the right to regulate the marital bed with respect to PIV sex, prescribing authorized positions, times, dates and acts; as well as forbidding all others and punishing such offenses. Ready to go back to the dark ages, Simple Tim?

466. artisanaltoaadshall

June 22, 2015 10:08 PM

Oops. Copied the wrong piece of the draft.

*God did not prohibit, condemn or regulate PIV sex*

should be

God did not prohibit or condemn male-female sex except as in the two regulations on the marital bed and the prohibition on fornication and adultery. Other than that, it's all about proscribed relationships. Nothing else.

467. automatthew

June 22, 2015 10:50 PM

500 comments! Y'all can do it!

468. Tupla-J

June 23, 2015 12:37 AM

**Mark Callous:**

"Marriage" is a Covenant between a man and a woman.

What BIBLICAL IGNORANCE! QED. You're a fucking idiot to pretend God has no part in marriage.

469. Mark Call

June 23, 2015 12:42 AM

@ artisanaltoaadshall

Let me see if I can do this briefly -- it's getting late here, and I still have a radio show to prep for...

In response to MC, "Thus, if there are three wives, there are three Covenants, and he has three marriages:"

I have to disagree with you here. According to covenant theology, a covenant is an agreement or contract to which God is a party...

So far, so good...

...The husband, as the federal [sic - what does THAT mean?] head in his marriage, covers the wives. One family, regardless of the number of wives. Many marriages implies many separate families.

One family, sure. "Echad", even, in Him. But I don't see why you make the final claim. There are simply three Covenants. Each woman has a Covenant with her husband.

Ultimately, I don't break fellowship over math, however. My wives are unique, so are the Covenants.

I take pains to differentiate between polygamy (many marriages) and polygyny (many wives)...

Here, however, I go, 'huuunnh?' The reason I differentiate between those words is because polygamy is INCORRECT, so far as Scripture is concerned. The definition includes BOTH a 'man with more than one wife (polygyny, just fine according to Scripture)

-- AND --

a wife with more than one husband (polyandry, also called "adultery" in the Bible).

Since ONLY polygyny is correct according to Scripture, there is only one truly correct ENGLISH word for what Scripture simply calls "marriage".

Serial monogamy, however, is the inevitable consequence of Western rebellion to what is Written about 'marriage' -- in almost every sense.

When I asked for your commentary on divorce, I was specifically asking about the instruction in 1st Cor. 7:10-11, which I contend overturned the judgment of Moses at Deut. 24:1-4.

No, in no uncertain terms. (Been there, done that. Mal 3:6; Hebrews 13:8; Deut. 13 en toto; Matthew 5:17-19, etc, etc, etc.) If Paul (as some suggest) did so, then (by his own letters) he was a liar, and the truth not in him.

...it had to be overturned because God describes Himself as having two wives, Israel and Judah. He said He divorced Israel but also said that Israel would be redeemed.

Under the specifics of Deut. 24:4, God would not be able to redeem Israel to Himself without overturning that judgment by Moses.

Read Deut. 24:1 carefully. If a wife is 'put away,' and even given a get, but does NOT REMARRY ANOTHER, she can still do what YHVH repeatedly tells Israel: "Return to Me!"

And since "beside Me, there IS NO OTHER," just what other Husband is there for Israel? (Whoring yes, idolatry/adultery no question. But there is NO ELOHIM beside Him.)

470. Mark Call

June 23, 2015 12:54 AM

@simpletimothy

I suspect by now you understand this, but just in case:

**However when I quoted what my ESV Bible's commentary had to say about this issue, you dismissed it without providing counter-examples or context.**

Yes, it had already been addressed in the thread, shortly before. So I dismissed it 'for cause' as a bogus bit of flatulence. Since then, I've addressed the "First Monogamist" contradiction to put a wooden stake in that foolishness.

T-J: Good grief. This whole thread has been about Who we serve, Who we "bow before" and who we do NOT. (You didn't read Numbers 30 either, did you?) Are you truly that desperate? Get a life. And unless I see some indication of integrity on your part, I won't respond to you again.

471. Mark Call

June 23, 2015 1:05 AM

Food for thought re: Marriage as a relationship metaphor

This is one that I have written at length on, and incorporated in audio MP3 teachings more times than I can recall. (No -- it is not a "proof". Closer to a parable, it is

nevertheless a primary way that Scripture teaches.) But I suggest that those who find the Instruction (torah) that YHVH has for marriage in all its richness "disconcerting" -- consider the following:

**EVERY** single form of description that is used throughout Scripture to describe the relationship between our Creator (YHVH, God, Elohim, He is Unique, and 'echad') and us (plural, there are many of us)

is of the TYPE that a mathematician would call "One-to-Many".

One of Him, Many of us.

**THUS:**

One King has many subjects  
One Master has multiple servants  
One Father has multiple sons, multiple children  
One Husband may have multiple wives.

Why would the picture He has so carefully painted for us be inconsistent?

472. Tupla-J

June 23, 2015 2:23 AM

MC,  
You never should have started on the first place. I didn't address you nor wanted anything to do with the aspergery abuse you think passes for conversation. If I want directions I'll ask someone who can see beyond his ego, something you're totally incapable of.

473. Mark Call

June 23, 2015 9:30 AM

Oooh! I stand corrected. So in that case, you'd better refrain from making unsupported Biblical assertions, or false claims that might mislead others.

You should know by now you will not get away with that here.

474. artisanaltoadshall

June 23, 2015 10:30 AM

Mark

My point was that Deut. 24:1-4 was a judgment by Moses, not part of the Law that God gave to Moses. This isn't a case of God changing because a judge's ruling can always be overturned by a higher court and I believe that's what happened.

The text of Matthew 19:6 indicates that 1) the first question referred to Deut. 24:1-3 and 2) in the second question both Jesus and the Pharisees identified it as a judgment of Moses, as opposed to a part of the Law that God commanded Moses to give to the people; and 3) this was not a case of God changing (from the beginning it was not this way) but rather the judgment was in error.

I was taught years ago that this was a case of stating the general rule (verse 6) and then the exception to the rule (verse 9). That Matthew 19 and 1st. Cor. 7 were in harmony because Jesus had already stated the exception and didn't need to restate it.

Later, I studied a lot closer and realized there was a problem with that interpretation. The statements about divorce being legitimate only in cases of immorality in the Gospels were not in harmony with 1st Cor 7 and the key was Matthew 19.

In the Gospels Jesus was under the authority of Moses and in Matthew 19 He was speaking to the keepers of the Law. In 1st Corinthians Jesus was no longer under the authority of Moses and He was instructing His bondservants.

You have made the distinction several times between the informal "sending away" and the formal process of issuing a certificate of divorce.

In Matthew 19 Jesus first said "Have you not read" and then cited the Genesis account before stating "What therefore God has joined together let no man **separate**." By saying what He did and in the way He did, He predated the Law. That effectively bound all forms of dissolution of marriage into the word separate, both the informal sending away and the later formal judgment of Moses. And forbid all of it.

Then, when He interpreted Moses in verse 9, He used the word "divorce" which made it specific to the Deut. 24:1-3 ruling. While that didn't negate His answer in verse 6, it satisfied His obligation to be obedient to Moses.

However, in 1st Cor. 7:10-11, the word "separate" is again used, applied to both the wife and the husband. Taken in conjunction with His instruction in Matthew 19:4-8, this effectively overturned the judgment of Moses and forbids all forms of marital dissolution for the bondservants of Christ, with one exception: the unbelieving spouse who departs.

1. Because God changeth not, the statement by Jesus that "from the beginning it was not this way" means it wasn't part of God's plan. Overturning Deut. 24:1-4 did not take away from God's Law because it was never part of it in the first place.

2. Deut. 24:1-4 addressed only men and did not provide any authority of the wife to divorce her husband, but Exodus 21:11 provided the "just cause" for the wife to force the husband to "unbind" her. With this view a wife could "divorce" her husband. This is reflected in Mark 10:12. The "separated" wife is instructed in 1st Cor. 7:11 to remain single or be reconciled to her husband. I view this as another indication that there is no divorce permitted for the Lord's bondservants. A further indication is found in 1st Peter 3:1, which effectively removes the "just cause" for women found in Exodus 21:11.

3. Marriage is a type for the relationship between Christ and the church. A marriage scheme that allowed divorce would imply that it is possible for Christ to be separated from the church.

3. In verses 12-17, Paul restates the Law of the bondservant as it applied to marriage. As long as the unbelieving spouse was content to stay with the bondservant, they were sanctified under the protection of the Master. If they chose to leave they left the "service" of the Master and the bondservant who stayed with the Master was free to marry another bondservant.

475. Mark Call

June 23, 2015 12:27 PM

@artisanaltoadshall

Suffice it to say, yes, I've heard those arguments before, and reject them utterly and ENTIRELY. Ironically, for the same reason that you in this thread have correctly rejected similar theses (or feces ;) -- for the reason that they call

Him a liar, and amount to, as you also put it, "blasphemy".

To wit: Either Yahushua (as opposed to "another jesus whomi we have not preached") IS the 'prophet spoken of by Moses, or He is NOT.

Moses, in Deut chapter 13 and other places (as did Yah through other prophets) described how to distinguish a "false prophet". Had 'jesus' done what you say above, He fails that test -- regardless of how many other miracles are cited.

Matthew 5:17-19 is unequivocal. AND consistent with His character, and His Word. Since "heaven and earth" still exist, He can NOT have changed so much as the 'smallest part' (English, Hebrew is even more dramatic) of EITHER the Torah of Moshe OR 'the prohpets' (TANAKH, in modern Hebraic parlance.) QED.

There are, of course, many other witnesses. John 5:47, certainly: "If you had believed Moses, you would believe Me, for he Wrote about Me. But if you do NOT believe his Writings, **HOW WILL YOU BELIEVE MY WORDS?**" Matthew 7:71-23 is a real warning (including the "scariest verse in Scripture, for those who are 'torah-less'.)

Finally, most English translations of Matthew 19 in that sequence are just plain LOUSY. (Including the word "divorced", the redundant (for those who read Scripture 'exception clause', and the 'addition'.) They're not even consistent with Matthew 5:32. The only resolution is to read Him as the Author of Torah, and then trust that He is telling the Truth. In which case the problems with the Greek are glaringly obvious, and easy to resolve.

(For example: "causes HER to commit adultery" is correct, and easy to see, and fixes the exception clause reading, too. IF a wife has ALREADY committed adultery - like both Israel and Judah DID -- then she doesn't DESERVE a 'get', and a husband is justified in "putting her away." NOTE that justification does NOT mean he must, or that he cannot forgive -- as in Judah's case. WITH a get, the husband annuls her marriage vow, and "bears her guilt. [Numbers 30:15] If he sends her away UNJUSTLY, then guess what'll happen? Yup, he causes HER to commit adultery, and bears her guilt. Note v 10, too, when His taught ones realized how serious the commitment was: Hmm. Maybe it's better NOT to marry.)

There are things that are permitted that we should not do; violating Covenant (and thus 'putting away') chief among them. Paul, for example, famously said don't marry at all.

And - as I presumed you knew - if He just kept changin' His mind and rewriting "Moses" - why NOT outlaw polygyny? That's the usual twisting, of course.

So - summary. He corrected a LOT of errors, and pointed out REPEATEDLY how those who violated Deut. 4:2 and 12:32 (Moses, again, right?) were guilty of "by your TRADITIONS making the commandments of Yah of no effect." He clarified, as One "having Authority" (Matt. 7:29) exactly what He Wrote, and how to walk it out. Either He taught and kept His own Word - all of it, as Written, or he was a "liar, and the truth not in him." No in between!

476. artisanalloadshall

June 23, 2015 2:39 PM

Mark

*Suffice it to say, yes, I've heard those arguments before, and reject them utterly and ENTIRELY. Ironically, for the same reason that you in this thread have correctly rejected similar theses (or feces ;) -- for the reason that they call Him a liar, and amount to, as you also put it, "blasphemy".*

Please don't think of me as a malcontent with an agenda. I believe you to be in error and seek to win you over as a brother.

My assertion: Deut. 24:1-4 was a judgment of Moses, not a command by God. Everything in my argument hangs upon that.

It is assumed by many that all judgments of Moses were inspired by God and they point to Deuteronomy 1:3 in support. According to that passage:

*Moses spoke to the children of Israel, according to all that the Lord had command him to give to them.*

However, we know that Moses did the same thing I just did. He left some stuff out. An example is Exodus 21:11, which isn't included in Deuteronomy. He did not repeat all of the Law God gave him and he also included judgments he had made "according" to the Law while he sat as judge for Israel. The question is, were these judgments commanded



by God?

One example is found in Numbers 36, which Moses chose not to include in Deuteronomy. Moses specifically stated in verse 6, *this is what the Lord has commanded...*" Here, we can plainly see that Moses is making a judgment according to the Word of the Lord.

Some would say "That doesn't matter, it was covered in Numbers 36 and Moses didn't need to restate it. But, what about the judgments that have no corresponding record in the text where God was commanding Moses to speak to the people?"

The problem is Moses was not always faithful to obey the Lord when he was commanded to execute a judgment. I think the best example was in Numbers 25, where Moses disobeyed God and instead of killing the leaders of the people before the assembly (God's command) he went to the very leaders he had been ordered to kill and commanded them to kill any of their people who had joined themselves to Baal Peor.

Because God's command was not carried out, the anger of the Lord burned against the children of Israel and He sent a plague into the camp. 24,000 people died before Phineas (who was zealous for God's Law) executed one of the leaders Moses should have put to death. For this, Phineas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the High Priest, was given God's covenant of peace and a new and everlasting priesthood was established in his name.

**(Note- I do not speak against Moses, the meekest of men, unlike one simpleton here who has arrogantly reviled Father Abraham. I merely point out that he didn't always get it right.),**

I think the answer to the question hinges on Christ's statement: Speaking directly on point to the Pharisees in Matthew 19, Jesus said "Moses permitted you... but from the beginning it was not that way."

ERGO:

1. This was a judgment of Moses.
2. Moses got it wrong.

You said:

*Either He taught and kept His own Word - all of it, as*

*Written, or he was a "liar, and the truth not in him." No in between!*

I agree completely. What I want to know is why you believe Deut. 24:1-4 was Christ's Word and not a wrong judgment of Moses, which is what the text of Matthew 19 and 1st Corinthians 7:10-11 supports.

477. artisanalloadshall

June 23, 2015 2:53 PM

While awaiting the return of the ankle-biters, I will briefly outline why polygyny is a better structure of marriage in today's legal environment.

Assume: A marriage with more than one wife utilizing a Marital Covenant without any marriage licenses contrasted with a monogamous marriage in any form (statutory, common law, covenant, etc).

- 1) The State cannot recognize a union of one man and more than one woman as a marriage and thus there can be no divorce court drama. With monogamy (in which the man and woman hold themselves out to be husband and wife) the State will recognize such a union to be a marriage and thus no-fault divorce rules apply.
- 2) The marriage contract for a polygynous marriage can only be viewed by the State as an enforceable co-habitation agreement because the State cannot recognize the union as a marriage. With monogamy the statutory rules apply and the husband can get divorce-raped, lose his kids be forced to pay and that's all she wrote.
- 3) In polygyny, if one of the wives decides to walk, the father has a far greater chance of getting custody of the children (especially if he has children by the other wives and they all live together) and the terms of the contract can be enforced in terms of property (the extent of this can vary, state-by-state). With monogamy, if the wife decides to walk she'll get cash, prizes and most likely the kids, he gets to pay.
- 4) In polygyny multiple wage-earners and a SAHM means a higher standard of living than any of the women could expect on her own or in a monogamous marriage. Multiple wage earners means more security in the event one of them loses their job. With monogamy, a SAHM means only one income. If both parents have to work, the kids are in school/day care and somebody else is raising the children. If the sole bread-winner loses his job it's an instant crisis.
- 5) In polygyny the incentives reward staying in the marriage (higher standard of living in the marriage than out, no cash

and prizes for leaving and a high probability the dad would get the kids if she did leave). With monogamy the wife's incentives are to leave in order to get cash, prizes, the kids and a regular check from the ex-husband for several decades.

6) In polygyny, if one of the wives did decide to walk and got custody of her children, child support can only be based on his income, not on the income of the wives who remained in the marriage. No dividing assets and no alimony. With monogamy the wife has a high probability of getting the kids, child support and alimony (if it's an alimony state). If the husband's income increases, the ex can go to court to get his support levels raised. If he loses his job and can't pay the alimony, he stands a good chance of going to jail.

7) In polygyny, intersexual competition between the wives automatically places the husband in a more dominant (attractive) position and the women can get their emotional needs (attention) met from each other. His attention has to be divided between all wives, there is less available to any individual wife. That makes his attention the prize they have to compete for and that makes him more attractive. In monogamy, the wife can withhold sex and sentence her husband to sexual starvation by using sex as a weapon. If he's serious about his vows, she can use sex as a weapon any time she wants. She will still want him to meet her emotional needs, provide for her (and any children) and "open up" emotionally which actually damages the relationship.

8) For polygyny, there are a large number of women to choose from who have already preselected for this lifestyle (sharing a man) by being carousel riders. For those who desire a monogamy, there ain't a lot of virgins out there that are marriage material because of their feminist upbringing. As others have pointed out, trying to wife up a slut in monogamous marriage (even a "reformed" slut) is risky business.

I could go on, but this is enough for a start.

**478. Mark Call**

**June 23, 2015 4:35 PM**

Moses was a man, and one who was held to perhaps the highest standards in Scripture. No doubt he made mistakes, since he did not enter the land.

However, here goes, artisanal toad shall:

**My assertion: Deut. 24:1-4 was a judgment of Moses, not a command by God. Everything in my argument hangs upon that.**

Agreed. And it's incorrect. ;)

I think the answer to the question hinges on Christ's statement: Speaking directly on point to the Pharisees in Matthew 19, Jesus said "Moses permitted you... but from the beginning it was not that way."

**ERGO:**

1. This was a judgment of Moses.
2. Moses got it wrong.

Not so fast. There is a much more Torah-consistent explanation. (And why would Elohim ALLOW such a thing - kol Ha'torah - to be preserved as arguably the most error-free ancient text in all history?)

*"From the BEGINNING it was not so."* What notable event happened in Genesis 3 to change what was done "B'reshit" - in the Beginning? Answer: 'the Fall'. Rebellion. Which, since YHVH "knew the end from the beginning," He ALREADY had a plan and remedy in place for. And there were ALL kinds of ramifications and related fallout from that. Yes, our hearts are STILL hard.

His instruction (not 'law', again) has not changed because WE have not changed (and, again, those two witnesses from Deuteronomy 30 AND the 'Sermon on the Mount" still confirm).

We never SHOULD, now or in the past, "put away wives." But, yeah, just look around. There are are LOT of hard hearts, and put-away women out there.

Finally, **"What I want to know is why you believe Deut. 24:1-4 was Christ's Word and not a wrong judgment of Moses...**

- 1) Because He said so.
- 2) Because EVERYTHING He taught (including those verses, and EVERY other one as well, once the lies, mistranslation, and cultural baggage is accounted for, supports that He IS exactly Who He says He is, and any other explanation makes Him a liar:

*"If you had believed Moses, you would believe Me, for he Wrote about Me. But if you do NOT believe his Writings, HOW WILL YOU BELIEVE MY WORDS?"*

When, then, did Moses, and Yahushua, decide to start telling the whole Truth? You simply can't have it both ways. (And He already told us WHY Moses CORRECTLY 'allowed' that provision!)

Sorry, Arti - no sale. Either He is the "Torah Made Flesh," or YHVH is a liar. Again, no sale.

So - then what? We're still hard of heart, and still in exile - for cause. Still Bowing before Caesar and his 501c3, State-charted, faith-based corporate church of another god, too.

My focus generally takes the form - yes, we have ALL screwed up ("fallen short", etc) -- so the question is, what do we do NOW?

Answer: Make t'shuvah ("repent" in English, but the Hebrew really means, "Hey, you're goin' the wrong way, so TURN AROUND.") Study, to show yourself approved, so do really do NOT "sin more, that grace might abound."

And honor your word, and particularly your covenants to your wives (regardless of the quantity.)

479. simplytimothy

June 23, 2015 7:27 PM

@artisantoadshall

You claimed I said "A man can do anything he wants with his wives". Cite please. You quoted me, I want the comment number. Let's see where I said that or whether you're a liar.

comment 209

quote (bold mine):

*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 who's 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*

So, you point out two restrictions, then state there are no restrictions. I will assume you mean two restrictions. So I retract "Anything he wants" and replace it with "anything he wants except for two things."

My point stands.

**"A husband can do anything he wants with his wives except for two things"**

Now you affirm it or retract.

Will you affirm that you can shit in your wife's mouth?

Will you affirm that you can break her arms?

Will you affirm that you can throw acid on her face?

Remember, **"A husband can do anything he wants with his wives except for two things"**

Affirm or retract.

In any covenant relationship the head is limited by God. The King is limited by God. The Federal Government is limited by God, The State is limited by God, the Governor is limited by God, the Preacher is limited by God. The

husband is limited by God.

A husband is limited in what he can do as a husband by God. God will not sin. God will not shit in your mouth. God will not throw acid in your face. God will not have you commit abomination with a man and God will not have you ordering your wives to commit abomination for your pleasure.

Your argument that since the command against homosexuality specifically only mentions males ignores the scores of other commands that reference only males. To use **your principle** that an edict that specifically references males must not apply to females is stupidity on its face.

Let me repeat that.

To use **your principle** that an edict that specifically references males must not apply to females is stupidity on its face.

You are stuck on stupid. I am not. Neither is the Church.

I will return to this thread tomorrow. I have not read your comment in depth but have just scanned them noting another of your TL;DR; parables , your disagreement with Mark Call over the number of covenants in a polygamist marriage and you switching to why polygamy is better in this legal environment.

480. artisanalloadshall

June 23, 2015 7:57 PM

Mark

*I said: Finally, "What I want to know is why you believe Deut. 24:1-4 was Christ's Word and not a wrong judgment of Moses...*

1) Because He said so.  
2) Because EVERYTHING He taught (including those verses, and EVERY other one as well, once the lies, mistranslation, and cultural baggage is accounted for, supports that He IS exactly Who He says He is, and any other explanation makes Him a liar:

1. Where did He say so? His comment in Matthew 19:8 casts a great deal of doubt on that. The fact that there isn't any mention of divorce certificates in the Law that God gave

Moses (Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers) adds to that.

I'm sure you're more of a scholar when it comes to the Hebrew than I am, but I'm more than a little acquainted with the Greek of the NT and I know what I'm looking at.

2. Without a definitive answer to #1, irrelevant to this discussion. I am in no way denying that He was who He said He was. The question is whether Deut. 24:1-4 was of God or of Moses.

**You have effectively sidestepped my entire argument without citing anything on point.**

This is not a minor issue. In fact, it's far more of a major issue than whether a man can have multiple wives because the destruction of families within the church is a crisis that is destroying the church.

Let me ask you another question, Mark. You've already observed the visceral reaction of the people in this thread who are struggling with their cultural conditioning that is contrary to God's Word. Because of what they've been taught, they believe a lie. In the early years of my marriage I led my family to worship at a Messianic Synagogue because it was the only church I could stomach. About the time it got taken over by towel-wearing Baptists we moved out of state, but arguing with Rabbi Schmitt was a lot like arguing with you and I've got an appreciation of the rabbinical mindset.

Given what Christ said in Matthew 19, what evidence can you show me that this wasn't a bad call by Moses?

481. Mark Call

June 23, 2015 9:40 PM

@simplytimothy -

Ask and answered, I think. See my comments in a similar vein directly above. (#478, most recently, following #475, 469. but also earlier. No need to repeat the extensive list. Yahushua was VERY consistent. And, WHY, oh why, would YHVH let Moses get away with twisting Him? Of ALL the texts in Scripture, the Torah is without question THE most 'vetted', reliably copied, and even containing an ancient equivalent of 'parity checks'.)

Again, Yahushua repeatedly said He didn't come to change



ANYTHING, and warned those who tried ("I never knew you...") and, while He (John 5:46-7 again) invoked Moses for His Authority. If you see a problem (such as with the Greek, or a twisting of Matt 19:8) start there, rather than by denying He meant what He said everywhere else.

The key (again!) is that IF ANY of what Moses penned (especially Deuteronomy, since it is most 'extensive') is rejected, then by what claim can we even know who He is? "If the FOUNDATIONS be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"

It is very much like taking plane geometry and denying all of the primary postulates. What's left rests on nothing.

482. artisanaltoaadshall

June 24, 2015 6:47 AM

Mark

The issue rests with authority.

*WHY, oh why, would YHVH let Moses get away with twisting Him?*

Let's take that question seriously, and I'll ask another one. How could He correct the record if He wanted to?

Moses was Moses, but Moses didn't always get it right. All prophets after Moses were under Moses and could not overturn a judgment of Moses without doing what you've spoken of. Jesus, as a Man, could not do so because He also was under Moses, but He made it clear that judgment was not in keeping with God's plan. Only the Ascendent Christ could do so, and He did. Correcting a wrong judgment by Moses did not change the Law in any way.

That's the only way Matthew 19 and 1st Corinthians 7 make sense.

483. simplytimothy

June 24, 2015 8:49 AM

@Mark Call

I \*should\* have toad's argument that "lesbian sex within a marriage is not prohibited in Scripture" dispatched from Scripture today.

When I am done with that, I look forward to returning to your p.o.v. and your arguments.

484. Mark Call

June 24, 2015 9:17 AM

**How could He correct the record if He wanted to?**

Good question indeed, since people STILL won't listen to Him!!!

(Easy rebuttal: How can He even correct His Sabbath? Moses didn't mess that up, the 'church' lied, changed "times and seasons", and STILL doesn't get it! No wonder they screw up Covenant, too!)

And forget just those two. There are countless more! Again, "once the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" (The root word there, tzadik, as to do with study and understanding of His 'torah' as well.)

Back to THIS twisting of Scripture.

Even the Greek (note the plural possessive masculine and female singular forms; ἑαυτοῦ heautou, and ἴδιος idios, respectively) for 1 Cor 7:2 are consistent with Torah. In other words, even the Greek makes clear that a man's wife may be plural, but 'her own' is singular. English has no similar possessive form.

And Matthew 19 just doesn't make sense at ALL, if you compare Matthew 5, and ask, was he lying then, or later? What makes sense is to realize that UNLESS He is consistent, changes NOT, and "is the same, yesterday, today, and always," there is no "Gospel".

IOW, if Yah was careless enough to let Moses lie about breaking Covenant, and then Yah Himself did the same thing (compare Isaiah 50, Jeremiah 3, and Ezekiel 23 -- THREE witnesses) -- something is just plain Hideously Wrong.

And, as He said, "FROM THE BEGINNING it was not so." Breaking Covenant was NEVER His plan, but the Solution was! The provision for man's wickedness, and the remedy in His Instruction, was in place, and still is, because He "knew the end from the Beginning."

I repeat what Yahushua Himself said, in John 5. PLEASE go

read it, the whole thing!

It starts with one of Yah's Appointed Times, where He does what the church later forbade. (!) EVERYTHING that follows next is a violation of "man's traditions" (the 'law' according to the Pharisees) but NOT His Torah! Then He says He comes as the 'agent' of YHVH the Father (modern terminology, as 'legal representative', power of attorney, Good and Faithful Servant, what any Hebrew would know as "in His Name.")

And HOW DO THEY KNOW? ONLY ONE WAY!!!!!!

"If I testify about Myself, My witness is NOT VALID." Get it?

See v 37. YHVH sent multiple witnesses. But, v 38 "you won't listen!"

But then see v 41, and on to 43. (Maybe you'll listen to some priest or pope or pastor, when he changes the 'law', the Sabbath, the rules about food, or marriage, or...)

Nah, there's one who ALREADY makes the point: "Moshe, in whom you trust!"

'Cause if you'd listen to him, you would believe Me, for He Wrote about Me."

***But if you do not believe His Writings, HOW can you believe My Words!?***

If Moses can't be trusted to get it right, you got a HELL of a big problem.

Do not sell Him, or His Word, short.

485. Mark Call

June 24, 2015 10:00 AM

OH, and very briefly, re: "lesbian" sex:

the very word there is pagan. (And much could be said about how His people have not been taught the difference "between the set-apart ['holy', qadosh] and the profane." The reason why this sex issue is so 'charged' is that it literally has to do with WORSHIP; the question is, who?)

BUT, when it comes to 'whatever' a man and his wives do, one thing is undeniable: Scripture is silent. (And, as some later commentator observed, the "marriage bed is not defiled." ;)

Ergo, the Scriptural grant of authority to a husband over his house STANDS.

It's not MY business, it's not some pagan 501c3 'faith-based corporate' business, and it's not up to some pope, priest, preacher, or president, or pretender. (I know, I repeat myself. ;)

That is why Yahushua called the meddling Pharisees "hypocrites."

486. artisanaltoadshall

June 24, 2015 11:19 AM

Simple Tim lied and claimed I said "A man can do anything he wants with his wives".

I said "Cite, please. You claimed I did so in comment 209, the exact wording of which was:

**within a licit relationship, there are only two restrictions which I have described above.**

Simple Tim, you are a liar.

You claim:

*My point stands.*

Then you repeat the lie:

*"A husband can do anything he wants with his wives except for two things"*

I wonder if you even realize you're creating a strawman argument here. Given the way you argue, I don't think you're doing it intentionally but rather in the same way a woman argues. It may also be that you simply aren't intelligent enough to even recognize a dialectic argument.

I **didn't say** "a husband can do anything he wants with his wives except two things."

**I said God only placed two restrictions on the marital bed.**

There is a world of difference between the two statements because God's Word places negative commands

(restrictions) **AND** it also places positive commands. Within the body of Christ we are commanded to love one another and within the marriage husbands are commanded to love their wives as Christ loves the church. Your lie assumes only the restrictions apply.

I say that because then you wrote.

*Now you affirm it or retract. .*

*Will you affirm that you can shit in your wife's mouth?*

*Will you affirm that you can break her arms?*

*Will you affirm that you can throw acid on her face?*

*Remember, "A husband can do anything he wants with his wives except for two things"*

**This, Simple Tim, is the very definition of a strawman argument. You lied about what I said, took the lie to the point of absurdity and then demanded that I affirm the absurd statements or retract what I actually said.**

**You argue like a female SJW**

You also claimed:

*Your argument that since the command against homosexuality specifically only mentions males ignores the scores of other commands that reference only males. To use your principle that an edict that specifically references males must not apply to females is stupidity on its face.*

**Except... I didn't say that either.** That's your interpretation of what I said and you rightly call your own interpretation stupid. **This is another strawman argument.**

You were already going off the rails so I **clarified exactly what I was saying** in comment 465, which you ignored in order to create your strawman. In that comment I explained:

**We see a class of prohibited sexual practices grouped together.**

**Men with men, prohibited, and in the very next verse we see men with animals prohibited and then we see women with animals prohibited. The inclusion of women within this class specifically speaks to the absence of women with women. Context, class, subject.**

That is one of the few areas of the Law in which women are specifically listed and as with Numbers 30 (the law concerning vows) we notice that women and men are treated differently. Another example is Leviticus 15. It is obvious to me the reason for the inclusion of women in these passages is because the men and women are being treated differently. In all the other passages a prohibition against men doing something applies to women as well, such as your example of kidnapping.

( Did you notice that nobody else was stupid enough to join you in this argument, even after you invited them to? )

You have not responded to that in any way but instead have claimed I said something I never did. Again, **you have proved yourself to be a liar.**

487. SirHamster (#201)

June 24, 2015 1:32 PM

**This, Simple Tim, is the very definition of a strawman argument. You lied about what I said, took the lie to the point of absurdity and then demanded that I affirm the absurd statements or retract what I actually said.**

**You argue like a female SJW**

You appealed to the rules of the blog before, now obey them. ST asked you direct yes/no questions, and you should answer them directly without the butthurt.

What's funny, is that your "on the martial bed" clarification does not help your position at all. Re-read all the questions and add "... on the marital bed" to them, and consider what your answer might be.

"Will you affirm that you can shit in your wife's mouth ... on the marital bed?"

By the way, you're new here and you're using the word "SJW" like it's a magical incantation that wins an argument. It's not.

( Did you notice that nobody else was stupid enough to join you in this argument, even after you invited them to? )

You should consider the possibility that everyone else got

bored and moved on, rather than taking their silence as an actual position.

Like how you shouldn't take God's silence on a specific perversion as permission to engage in it.

"Since, then, you have been raised with Christ, set your hearts on things above, where Christ is, seated at the right hand of God." (Col 3)

**488. artisanaltoadshall**

June 24, 2015 1:58 PM

Hamsterhead

*You appealed to the rules of the blog before, now obey them. ST asked you direct yes/no questions, and you should answer them directly without the butthurt.*

I did. I answered completely and fully. He lied. He took his lies to the level of absurdity and then demanded that I agree with his absurd lies or retract what I actually said. It wasn't a "yes or no" set of questions, it was rather an agree with my lies or retract what you said situation.

Got a problem with reading comprehension? Try reading it again. I'm not gonna look to see if your lips are moving. Don't like the answer? Appeal to Vox.

If you had said "Within the church, priests are in authority over altar boys" and I twisted that, lied and said "Hamsterhead claims "Priests can do anything they want with altar boys" and then demanded you agree with the absurdity "Hamsterhead claims God allows Priests to bugger altar boys" or retract your original statement, you'd be completely within your rights to refuse to take the bait.

Yet, you're demanding I take the bait from simple tim? Absurd.

**489. artisanaltoadshall**

June 24, 2015 2:10 PM

Vile Faceless Hamster and Simple Tim

I broached the subject, but neither of you touched it. I think I'd like an answer, so I'll lay the question before you.

Within the context of forbidden sexual practices, neither

female-female sexual acts or masturbation is prohibited. So, if a man is desirous of a wife but has not found one yet and satisfies his sexual urges through masturbation, is he in sin if he does so? Likewise, if a pair of women, desirous of marriage to a man but not having found one yet, satisfy their sexual urges with each other... are they in sin?

Please note that there is absolute silence on God's part with respect to either of these.

Is the guy in sin if he chokes his chicken?  
Are the girls in sin if they munch rug?

Note that this question goes further than I go in my arguments. Also note that I haven't lied, put words in your mouth or anything like that. I stated a scenario and I'm asking the two of you to answer the questions based on what God said.

490. SirHamster (#201)

June 24, 2015 2:50 PM

**I did. I answered completely and fully. He lied. He took his lies to the level of absurdity and then demanded that I agree with his absurd lies or retract what I actually said. It wasn't a "yes or no" set of questions, it was rather an agree with my lies or retract what you said situation.**

I'll repeat the questions because you did NOT answer them:

Will you affirm that you can shit in your wife's mouth?  
Will you affirm that you can break her arms?  
Will you affirm that you can throw acid on her face?

I will now add on these questions, which you can answer or not as you wish:

Will you affirm that you can shit in your wife's mouth ... in the marital bed?  
Will you affirm that you can break her arms ... in the marital bed?  
Will you affirm that you can throw acid on her face ... in the marital bed?

The actual answers matter because they are related to your previously stated positions.

**I broached the subject, but neither of you touched it. I think I'd like an answer, so I'll lay the question before**



you.

You were the first to cite the rules of the blog to demand answers. Answer questions according to the rules of the blog, and then you demonstrate the intellectual integrity to get answers to your own questions.

By the way, your modification of online handles is petty and earns you no points.

491. SirHamster (#201)

June 24, 2015 2:53 PM

@ ST, post 405:

Just noticed that list. Thanks for the mention.

492. artisanalloadshall

June 24, 2015 4:03 PM

Vile faceless Hamster

*By the way, your modification of online handles is petty and earns you no points.*

I'm soooooo sorry. I felt it to be descriptive rather than petty. The more ad hominem attacks I suffer on this subject, the more convinced I am of that.

*I'll repeat the questions because you did NOT answer them:*

Since you aren't intelligent enough to understand the answers I gave and since you want to be anal about this, I'll respond to the absurdities. Read carefully.

I previously stated, Simple Tim created a strawman argument and wanted me to respond to his strawman. He lied, then he wanted me to respond to his lies according to his lies.

I made the point that actions on the part of husband and wife are not limited to the restrictions but also must encompass the positive commandments such as the command to the husband to love his wife as Christ loved the church.

*Will you affirm that you can shit in your wife's mouth?*

Of course I can because I'm stronger than she is and I can

tie her down and hold her nose until she's forced to open her mouth. Should I? I don't know. Would it be loving to do so? I suppose that if we can imagine a situation in which the only form of nourishment she can get is my shit and she'll die without it then perhaps it would be.

*Will you affirm that you can break her arms?*

Again, I'm stronger than she is and I'm quite sure I'm capable of doing so. Should I? I don't know. Would it be loving to break her arms? If she had previously broken her arms and they'd knit back together incorrectly and it was necessary to re-break them in order to set them correctly, certainly. In any situation in which breaking her arms is for her good or betterment, the answer is yes, but that answer has to be tempered with wisdom.

*Will you affirm that you can throw acid on her face?*

I'm quite sure I can because superior strength isn't needed, only surprise. But, again, would it be loving? Again, I don't know. Is there any scenario I can imagine in which it would be good for her? Maybe if her face was already covered with a strong base solution and I wanted to neutralize it with the acid... but like the two previous questions, we're talking about how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.

The answers would be the same with respect to the marital bed because the questions are equally absurd regardless of the marital context.

493. SirHamster (#201)

June 24, 2015 4:33 PM

Interesting. I didn't expect you to take that direction, AT. simplytimothy, have at those answers.

And since I offered an answer for an answer, here's mine to your previous question.

**Within the context of forbidden sexual practices, neither female-female sexual acts or masturbation is prohibited. So, if a man is desirous of a wife but has not found one yet and satisfies his sexual urges through masturbation, is he in sin if he does so? Likewise, if a pair of women, desirous of marriage to a man but not having found one yet, satisfy their sexual urges with each other... are they in sin?**

**Please note that there is absolute silence on God's part with respect to either of these.**

Neither are explicitly prohibited, but sexual immorality is prohibited. If either activity falls under the category of sexual immorality, they would be prohibited as well, and it would not be "absolute silence on God's part". Your claim that such is the case begs the question.

So, are the two activities sexual immorality?

In my experience, masturbation does not sate the lust but increases it, both in intensity and its perversity. So for me it leads to sexual immorality, and while I cannot say that is true for all men, I know I am not unique, judging by what's in the Internet's "fap banks". Perhaps it is like alcohol - some can use it without crossing a line; for others it leads to drunkenness and lack of self-control.

In light of that, trying to figure out how acceptable masturbation is is missing the point. For those who burn with passion, we ought to marry. For those who do not, they ought to be careful not to encourage others to stumble.

As for the lesbian sex question, I'll leave the answer to someone else who already offered an opinion:

"The term "lesbian" defines a relationship which is unnatural and not in accordance with God's plan;"

I do know this: it would be most unnatural for two sisters to do that to each other. It would be no more natural if two unrelated women did it. No father would tell his daughter, "go have sex with your sister Elisa, or your neighbor Jenny while you wait for Mr. Right to carry you off in his arms."

Natural vs. unnatural is amply covered by Paul's letter to the Romans.

494. simplytimothy

June 24, 2015 5:22 PM

@SirHamstger (#201)

Thank you for your contributions, much appreciated.

There are at least four lines of attack that will bear fruit. I am back late from my day-trip, so it will be either the a.m

or Saturday before I present the 'bullet' point rebuttal of toad.

**Line of attack #1** toad's reliance on 'an argument from silence' regarding women and homosexuality if we apply his principle to the rest of Leviticus and Dueteronomy. Toad argues that since scripture only references men for the prohibition of homosexual 'union' that women are allowed this within the marital bed.

Things get very humorous very quickly when we take toad's argument and run with it through the rest of Leviticus and Duet. See my comments 450 and 460 for this line of attack. Last I checked, toad changed the subject and did not engage the argument.

**Line of attack #2** How many covenants are in place withing a marriage is another line of attack. Toad is presently discussing this with Mark Call. In a monogamous marriage there is one covenant and one husband and one wife. In a polygamous marriage with one husband and two wives there are how many covenants?

Let's look at the perumutations for AHusband, BWife, CWife we have

1 Covenant where AHusband<->{BWife and CWife}. Here there is one covenantal marriage and there is one covenant linking AHusband to the {BWife CWife} pair. BWife and CWife are not married to each other. Ergo, any sex is adultery since they are not married to each other and since argument 1 holds above, they are both guilty of homosexuality.

2. AHusband<->BWife and AHusband <->CWife. Here there are two covenants. Note that BWife and CWife are not in a covenant with each other. Sex with each other is sin.

3. AHusband<->BWife, AHusband<->CWife, BWife<->CWife where the two wives are in a covenant relationship. Can this be? is it? Or is the simple answer that toad has his head up his ass?

**Line of attack #3** The duties of a 'head' in a covenant relationship require the 'head' whether governor, judge, or husband to remain within the boundaries God lays out. By inducing his wives to sin under 1, the covenant is void. One cannot bind a party to a broken covenant. This is the line of attack for the "can a man do anything (except two things)

line of argument. (Thank you for pressing the matter, btw).  
If sexual relations between two women is a sin, (and it is per argument number 1) then toady, as husband, is in violation of his covenantal vow by leading his 'underlings' to sin against God.

**Line of attack #4** There are zero mentions (that I am aware of) in Scripture of the husband in a marriage being in bed with more than one wife at a time. zero. Where is the scriptural basis for toady's desires as he laid out in his comment 145.

That should put the kabosh on 'Toadies Lesbian Polygyny Dreams In Church!' porn fantasy. The discussion can then move onto the more interesting points of contention, namely:

1. The reliability of the common translations of Christian scripture (per Mark Call)
2. The desirability of polygynous marriage (assuming it is not prohibited, which even Luther admitted)
3. The argument for monogamy.
4. (Some others I may have in my notes)

I will concede that minus the sin of homosexuality between women, that toady has an interesting perspective. It is the logical extension of the 'game' counter-reaction to feminism branching out into Christianity. Toady has started to discuss his rationale, but I have not paid attention to it as it is important that toady recognize the sin he is advocating.

Thanks again for your contribution. Much appreciated.

495. SirHamster (#201)

June 24, 2015 5:46 PM

@simplytimothy

**I will concede that minus the sin of homosexuality between women, that toady has an interesting perspective.**

If he only sold polygamy on the quantity/quality of sex, I'd have NOTHING to disagree with him about.

"2x wives leads to 3x or more sex because they compete with each other!"

I can buy that fitting inside a Christian context. (though it glosses over the potential downsides)

It is trivially easy to drop the argument for homosexuality ... but he can't. And that bares the truth of Beau's judgement - a seared conscience attempting to rationalize sin instead of seeking God's holiness and His heart, or developing the same holy desires in Christians.

I've been there myself with masturbation and porn, and that's why I cannot stomach it - I see the broken glass shards mixed in the candy.

"But as for you, O man of God, flee these things. Pursue righteousness, godliness, faith, love, steadfastness, gentleness." (1 Timothy 6:11)

1 Timothy 6:3-5 also has some bearing on this discussion as well.

You've chosen an interesting project, may it bear fruit for you.

496. Mark Call

June 24, 2015 6:17 PM

re: "How many covenants?"

Sorry, ST, but I think you miss the key point. (And here I clearly disagree with artisanaltoadshall, but explained why elsewhere, but ESPECIALLY in #471, relative to your "lines of attack".)

The key is our relationship to YHVH. Whether it's the King, Master, Father, or eventual Husband relationship (no doubt that is much harder for us men to grasp, ESPECIALLY if we don't understand His Instruction for marriage and covenant!) -- if we do not understand "one-to-many", we don't get it.

How many xtian 'deonominations' are there? 20,000? Many, fer sure... and yet how many claim "there can be only ONE Bride, and it's ...[fill in One and Only Bride Denomination Here].

Sound familiar yet?

Who gets to decide? Once you realize "it's the King/Master/Husband" and Him ALONE (He is 'echad', after all) then things get simpler.

The ones who desire to be Brides had better understand Who the Head of His house is! (And there are 'many mansion' in there; but at least two, Judah and Israel, appear prominently in Scripture.)

How many Covenants? One with each of us. (No doubt Roman Xtianity and Orthodox Pharasaism would say they're different, too.)

Here comes the punchline. If we will let Him be Boss...Husband, Father, King, Master... can we eventually be made "echad" in Him, even with one another?

I say again, if we stick to the "there can be only one Bride - and it's me, me, ME..." no wonder we miss the point. And maybe the 'wedding feast', too.

497. Beau

June 24, 2015 6:56 PM

Fascinating, most of my posts on this thread are now deleted, not removed by the Vile Faceless Moderator, just gone. I realize *Vox Popoli* has been under a sustained DDoS attack for awhile. Perhaps this is another form of attack? I wonder who else's ideas in this thread have been disappeared into the night and fog?

498. simplytimothy

June 24, 2015 6:59 PM

@Beau, mine are all here.

499. simplytimothy

June 24, 2015 7:00 PM

This should be 499. 500 is up to the next person. God bless.

500. Beau

June 24, 2015 7:05 PM

@ Mark Call,

You were asked earlier in this thread a question about circumcision. You replied. Both of those comments appear to be disappeared too. As a courtesy please provide your answer again, your explanation that circumcision is a sign

among others is what you were pleased to reveal; however, I ask you now:

Is circumcision necessary for salvation, yes or no?

@ artisanaltoadshall

Since you and Mark have both expressed your arguments do not depend on each other, I ask you too:

Is circumcision necessary for salvation, yes or no?

Whatever explanation you both feel pleased to provide is, of course, welcome - but *yes*, *no*, or *I don't know* are sufficient for the purpose of the question asked.

501. artisanaltoadshall

June 24, 2015 7:20 PM

Simple Tim

*Things get very humorous very quickly when we take toad's argument and run with it through the rest of Leviticus and Duet. See my comments 450 and 460 for this line of attack. Last I checked, toad changed the subject and did not engage the argument.*

Humorous, but probably not in the way you thought.

I dealt with your "argument" in comment #465. In comment 486 I called you out for lying and went into greater detail on your supposed "argument," but like a true SJW, you refuse to respond.

Timothy. It's time you dealt with your lies.

Are you ready to admit that you lied, put words in my mouth (in quotes) and then created an argument based on those lies?

Either I said exactly what you quoted me as saying and you're telling the truth or I didn't and you lied about me. By your own admission, I didn't say what you claim I said. Yet, you have not apologized or even remotely admitted your sin in this. I guess that makes you a serious bible-thumper.

From the beginning you have tarred with the same brush, engaged in ad hominem attacks, created strawmen and in general used just about every dishonorable technique of



debate available to lie about my argument, lie about me, slander me and shift the goalposts in order for you to claim "victory."

**502. SarahsDaughter**

June 24, 2015 8:36 PM

@simplytimothy

*Line of attack #3 The duties of a 'head' in a covenant relationship require the 'head' whether governor, judge, or husband to remain within the boundaries God lays out. By inducing his wives to sin under 1, the covenant is void. One cannot bind a party to a broken covenant.*

In the situation where the phone rings and from the bedroom the husband yells to his wife, "Answer it and tell my boss I've already left for work!" the husband has commanded his wife to lie. Her choices are to rebel against her husband and therefore God or submit to her husband's urgent command. She chooses to submit and says exactly what he wants her to say to his boss.

According to what you've stated here, their covenant is void and she is no longer bound to the covenant with her husband and God.

Is that what you are saying or am I reading it wrong?

**503. simplytimothy**

June 24, 2015 9:01 PM

502. SarahsDaughter

My term is inadequate and I withdraw it.

Let's take a larger example.

Caesar passes a law saying Christians must offer a pinch of incense to another demi-god. Christians refuse as Caesar has broken the covenant with God and asked them to do the same.

Two things can happen:

The Christian's are consequently fed to the lions.

The Christian's revolt and feed caesar to the lions.

Is the same thing at play in your example? yes.

Let's up the example, the husband asks the wife to shoot the boss.

Two things can happen,  
The wife obeys the husband and commits murder.  
The wife disobeys the husband as the husband has egregiously disobeyed God.

I repeat, my phrase "Null and void" cannot capture the nuance of these and I withdraw it.

504. simplytimothy

June 24, 2015 9:25 PM

@toad

*Are you ready to admit that you lied, put words in my mouth (in quotes) and then created an argument based on those lies?*

Absolutely not.

My argument worked. It finally got you to admit that you are restricted by the attributes of God himself within a covenant relationship.

It took extreme examples to finally get it through to you that there are things which a Christian does not do to another human being even if there is no written law against it.

Let me repeat that:

**there are things which a Christian does not do to another human being even if there is no written law against it.**

It took the examples of shit in mouth, acid in face and break arms to get you to admit that you are **restricted** in your behavior based on your walk in Christ.

God himself has restrictions placed on Him based on His holy character. Here is one :**God cannot lie**

That is a **restriction** placed on God not by any law, but by his very nature as Truth.

Similarly, for the Christian, there are restrictions placed on him that are not in any law, but are wrong by their very nature.

Now, having admitted the principle, let's look at it in Scripture.

It is just as wrong to punish the daughter for the sins of the mother as it is to punish the son for the sins of the father. It is just as wrong for a woman to sell you into slavery as it is for a man to do it.

(I will go through the rest of Leviticus and Deuteronomy collecting these edicts if you persist)

**it is just as wrong for a woman to lie with a woman as it is for a man to lie with a man**

You know these restrictions exist because they are put on you by your nature as a child of God.

You evade these restrictions because in this one case because you want to.

505. simplytimothy

June 24, 2015 9:50 PM

@Toad, you accuse me of lying and refer me to the summary of 351 for your 'rebuttal'

351 summary:

*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 homosexual without slandering them.*

You claim they are licit because they are in the marriage relationship.

Yet, you have now admitted that there are sex acts--shit in mouth, acid in face, broken arm--that are not licit even if they are in the marriage relationship.

You acknowledge that things that are contrary to the nature and character of God are not licit.

Yet you claim that women lying with women is in line with the nature and character of God when it is done in a polygamous marriage but not licit outside the marriage.

toad's rule.

If toad is husband and toad gets to watch two women get it on, nobody is sinning.

If toad is not husband and toad gets to watch two women get it on, everybody is sinning.

Tims rule.

Toad is an idiot.

506. SarahsDaughter

June 24, 2015 10:36 PM

simplytimothy,

I can't understand why you continue to make this about AT and some sort of perversion. In a polygynous marriage, two (or more) wives will live together, share equal provision, and in being helpmeets to the husband will work together. They will raise children together and likely be closest confidants with each other. I think of why Sarai chose Hagar, her servant, and think who would it be that I would choose to mother another of my husband's children - likely someone I loved dearly and someone I thought well of. Sarai, being the first wife, gave Hagar to Abram to be his wife. Now, two wrongs were done here, but neither were Abram's. The first was within Sarai's heart and her harsh treatment of Hagar, the second was Hagar's fleeing. The Angel of the Lord commanded Hagar to return to her mistress and submit to her. I say that just to point out the significance of how the relationships were established. It wasn't Abram insisting that he have some variation in sex. It was Sarai, she desired it and she chose the woman.

It is far more likely that two wives would desire to bed together with their husband than a husband commanding it against their will. Having separate households (as we've seen in things such as that show "Sister Wives") sounds ludicrous and burdensome - why would a wife want to live alone, without her husband on off days? Taking turns having your husband in your bedroom equally so. If a wife is part of the process of choosing another wife, loves that woman, is compatible with her (which she likely would be, a husband giving provision to two women would not tolerate bickering, fighting, and jealousy), why is it so awful to believe that an intimate relationship would proceed from that?

507. automatthew

June 24, 2015 11:15 PM

*Fascinating, most of my posts on this thread are now deleted, not removed by the Vile Faceless Moderator, just*

gone.

Beau, that's really weird. Not to be patronizing, but are you sure they're gone? If you were tracking them by their numbers, for instance, be aware that the numbering system is very unreliable. Any time we delete or spam a comment, everything shifts.

508. Beau

June 25, 2015 1:44 AM

OT

O, what a marvelous evening. First, two men graduated from our drug and alcohol rehab program; which means in part, they have stable housing, employment, and their sobriety. Their immediate families were in attendance too.

Following that, we went out to find the homeless, "Good evening; soup, socks, sandwiches, salvation!"

We arrived back singing.

*What can wash away my sin?  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus;  
What can make me whole again?  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus.*

*Oh! precious is the flow  
That makes me white as snow;  
No other fount I know,  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus.*

*For my pardon, this I see,  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus;  
For my cleansing this my plea,  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus.*

While out on the route we exchanged warm hugs with our friends, the alcoholics, thieves, prostitutes, addicts of many substances. I mentioned to Lisa at one point, "That unless you got married today or had a baby today, we are happier than you. We three are the happiest people in San Francisco right now. And we know it." This was Lisa's first time out with us. She said, "This wasn't scary, I was told this was scary." It isn't.

Lord Jesus, thank you for another day of life. Thank you for pardoning a rebel like me. Thank you for plunging me

beneath that cleansing flood. Thank you for making atonement for me by your blood. Praise our Lord Jesus Christ.

509. Beau

June 25, 2015 2:09 AM

*Not to be patronizing, but are you sure they're gone?*

No offense taken. I'm using the pale moon *find* function. Before going on outreach this evening *circumcision*, *incision*, & *reptile* showed nothing. I came home, et voilà, all so far appears well. The easiest solution to the solving the problem, applying Occam's Razor, is ID10T operator error. It's not hard to admit error in the presence of the King.

510. artisanalloadshall

June 25, 2015 9:15 AM

Beau

You asked if circumcision was required for salvation. I've already answered this question in comment 320, but I'll reiterate it here.

Circumcision has nothing to do with salvation.

Since you work with the homeless you certainly know that as the economy continues to deteriorate the fastest growing group of homeless is homeless families. As a rule they are women with their children. In other words, families in which the children's father is not living with them.

The homeless advocates I know tell me the number one cause of homeless families is a catastrophic vehicle breakdown. It starts with a low income single or divorced mother who doesn't have the time or the money to do the maintenance required on the vehicle. Eventually the vehicle fails and when it does there is no money to either fix it or replace it. With no vehicle there are problems getting to work and soon there is no job. Eviction follows.

This problem is a symptom of a larger problem, the destruction of the family through widespread divorce. This problem is pervasive, infecting the church in roughly the same percentages as the secular community. The oft-quoted

figure that 70% of the divorces filed are by women seems incorrect to me with respect to the church, because anecdotally it appears to be over 80%. The effect of divorce on the church is the women tend to stay and the men leave, either to find another congregation or drop out completely. The reason appears to be because of the widespread support within the church for women who divorce their husbands. Of course, the church also has plenty of never-married sluts with children as well.

A generation of children is growing up without a father in low-income households. Many of these are living on the edge. The plethora of social pathologies these children are subject to as a result of an absent father is astounding, and equally astounding is the fact that it's ignored. The result of the legal climate in which marriage is a one-sided power trip for women is we now have over 70% of men between the ages of 24 and 35 unmarried.

Anyone with half a brain knows a political solution is impossible. Why? Because women vote. Who would willingly give up the kind of power they have? But due to the internet, men are talking. They are sharing their observations and experiences. As a result, as Dr. Helen Smith has pointed out, men are choosing not to get married.

In comment 348 I responded to SirHamster's question about my motivations. He asked me what I wanted to see. I told him:

***\*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.*

SirHamster was not complaining about the issue of polygyny so much as the way I was "selling" it.

Continued

511. artisanalloadshall

June 25, 2015 9:18 AM

Continued

You talk about your work with the homeless, which means you're part of the clean-up crew. There are far too few of you and you're stretched way too thin with very few resources available. And, yes, I know that throwing money at the problem of homelessness isn't the solution, but I also know that the solutions to the mess often require resources that aren't available. The greatest problem is the condition of the heart.

Your work with the homeless has assuredly brought you in contact with the self-righteous bigots who claim the solution to homelessness is simply "get a job!" As if the vast majority of them want to be homeless or wouldn't want a job that paid a living wage. I'm sure you've seen the process of eviction, in which a person's worldly goods are thrown out onto the sidewalk to be picked through by whoever comes by and later what is left is hauled off as trash. Which is worse: the humiliation and feelings of helplessness it causes, or the requirement to replace those goods if they could get back into housing? Do you know of any church that has a ministry to help people in this situation? All it takes is a storage facility and some men with trucks. I've seen churches spend over \$80k on a "living Christmas tree" cantata, but I don't know of any church with a serious ministry to help with crisis eviction.

I am working on the other side of the divide with respect to homelessness. I want to see children being raised in a secure environment with both mother and father present, training, disciplining and loving them. I'm also a pragmatic realist. Sluts are gonna slut, hypergamous women are gonna nuke their marriages and men are waking up saying "Why on earth would I want to get married if it's like that?"



There is a solution that meets the parameters of the problem, offers (in this legal environment) a more durable structure of marriage, arranges the incentives to reward staying in the marriage and penalizes leaving the marriage. The women have their emotional needs met and have the comfort of security. The men have the assurance they won't get divorce-raped and are pretty much guaranteed they'll get all the sex they want. The children have both mother and father raising them. The solution is called polygyny.

But any discussion of polygyny always devolves to sex, and there are always self-righteous bigots like Simple Tim. I don't know what you'd call someone who considers whip handles in the ass, shitting in the mouth, breaking bones and throwing acid in the face of his wife to be sex acts, but "pervert" and "degenerate" don't even come close. He admitted polygyny sounded really good, then claimed I was "tempting" him and since then he's worked hard to call sin that which God did not. He wants it, he can't have it so nobody else should be able to.

He is an excellent example of the kind of reaction that occurs within the church as a result of the envy and fear from men who can't stand the idea that some other guy is getting what they can't. This, of course, is in direct violation of the instruction in Romans 14. Who are you to judge the servant of another master?

The latest statistics I've seen (SBA) say that women are baptized into the church at a rate of 3:1 over men. I've asked around and people tell me the number of unmarried women outnumbers the number of unmarried men in their church by at least 3:1 and goes as high as 8:1. Divorce, adultery and fornication are at epidemic levels within the church. I offer a realistic solution and you say it's all about my pleasure. That's like me telling you that the solution to homelessness is for the homeless to get a job and it's a sin to have a soup kitchen because the Bible says "Them that don't work don't eat."

512. Mark Call

June 25, 2015 9:42 AM

re: Posts, "but are you sure they're gone? "

No - I've seen on this thread posts of mine that SAID they were published, and then later weren't there. Later still,

they were. #278 was the one you referenced re: circumcision, Beau.

513. Mark Call

June 25, 2015 10:11 AM

I was gonna add a quick comment to the 'circumcision' request, but this fits better first:

**...there are things which a Christian does not do to another human being even if there is no written law against it.**

Which is why I keep hammering the ERROR of what Xtianity wants to call "LAW" and then say is "done away with"!

(Ie, confusing, literally "conflating" His TORAH with the "traditions of men" (which they try to call "law". Hell, just look what that has done to the Bill of Rights!)

In the Hebrew, the word "torah", used countless times, means "instruction". The torah says "do not steal," and even has written proscriptions (now UTTERLY ignored by the Federal Reserve, world banksters, etc) against "dishonest weights and measures". It says "do not covet," too, since "lusting after" your neighbor's stuff demonstrably precedes related things, like theft, adultery, and voting him out of all of it.

Do we have to have 1000 pages of additional "law" to make a point that should be obvious? 'Don't steal' OUGHT to be enough (OK, it's not; but no wonder "love your neighbor as yourself" is too hard, then!)

The point, again, is torah means "instruction". Does it makes sense now why Yahushua taught so often with parables (so did the existing Scriptures, too - why the stories about Abraham, Moses, David, Solomon, et al, otherwise) and said, essentially, most of you are still gonna miss the point? (Look around - they still do, and that certainly includes Caesar's 501c3 'church'.)

I have NO problem with "connecting the dots", teaching my children, and making sure that in MY HOUSE my understanding of His torah, His feasts, and how WE all "walk" is in accord with ALL of what is Written, and what it means to "me and my house". When it comes to things that are NOT explicitly Written, I have no more authority to rule over another man's house than he does over

mine...regardless of what title he claims.

On briefly to 'circumcision' (maybe more later, but I have a radio show to do)...

And no "yes, no, IDK," makes sense if I'm not sure many here even agree on what "salvation" means. (They took it OUT of the Savior's NAME, even).

It's NOT a "once and done" so-called "sinner's prayer", any more than it's a "once and done" snip.

SHOW me your faith by your works. What else does Paul mean by "work out your OWN salvation with fear and trembling?"

514. Mark Call

June 25, 2015 12:12 PM

Bottom line: Most xtians will NOT read Acts 15 for comprehension, or even really grasp what the argument was about.

Read it again. Certain folks wanted to establish 'preconditions' for bringing people to 'the gospel' -- as mandates based on THEIR "halacha". (Nothing's changed on THAT score!) "No small discord" arose. (again, "nuthin' new under the sun.")

SO - what was the 'yoke' that was the issue? (WHOSE 'law'? Man's or YHVH's, which Yahushua "taught with Authority" and confirmed would be the same until "heaven and earth" passed? And which He said, confirming Deut. 30!, "was easy" -- unlike the burdens of the "hypocrites" -- then and now.)

They agreed on four minimum, "necessary but not sufficient" conditions which would allow new converts to get "cleaned up" enough to enter the synagogues on Sabbath and learn the rest (His "torah", instruction). After all, it WAS taught "in every city, in every assembly, every Sabbath". (Acts 15:21)

Funny how those who focus on NOT doing something (circumcision) manage to ignore the real lesson of the story, which was the things TO DO, in order to learn the rest! (No wonder we're still in exile! Can you not see that circumcision was always a prerequisite for [re]-entering the Land? That regathering hasn't been fulfilled yet either.)

So here's a question: How many 'churches' today teach even those four MINIMUM concepts any more?

515. artisanalloadshall

June 25, 2015 1:45 PM

(Don't worry Simple Tim, I'll be getting to you soon)

SirHamster

*In my experience, masturbation does not sate the lust but increases it, both in intensity and its perversity.*

How do you define lust?

My understanding of lust is that it's a desire that cannot be legitimately obtained or fulfilled. Thus, my desire for sexual congress with my wife cannot be lust because she's my wife, while any desire on my part for sexual congress with your wife would be lust.

Are you defining lust differently?

I ask this because (relevant to this topic) there was a time when the church taught that "inordinate passion" toward one's wife or husband was lust.

It seems to me that you are sidestepping the act itself (masturbation) and focusing on the mental state of the person doing it. What about the married man whose wife is sick, but knows that even though she feels horrible she's SOD and if he asks for it she'll put out and probably even feign a little enthusiasm. He wants it but he loves her and doesn't want to bother her because she's sick. Is he "lusting" if he rubs one out thinking about her?

Isn't that between him and God? Because God didn't say anything about masturbation. Therefore it's an issue to be decided between the Master and the masturbater.

516. SirHamster (#201)

June 25, 2015 1:51 PM

@artisanalload

SirHamster was not complaining about the issue of polygyny so much as the way I was "selling" it.

Got tired of calling me a hamsterhead, already?

You appealed to man's sinful nature. And I would know, being the target audience of those words.

"If anyone causes one of these little ones--those who believe in me--to stumble, it would be better for them to have a large millstone hung around their neck and to be drowned in the depths of the sea." (Matt 18:6)

So yes, of course I objected. It was for your own benefit. Selling sin does not lead to holiness, whether in the seller, or the deceived. If you are Christian as you say, your conscience should be reminding you of your true purpose.

And that true purpose has nothing to do with promoting polygamy to solve homelessness. (WTF, mate)

517. SirHamster (#201)

June 25, 2015 1:55 PM

Isn't that between him and God? Because God didn't say anything about masturbation. Therefore it's an issue to be decided between the Master and the masturbater.

Reading comprehension, please.

" Perhaps it is like alcohol - some can use it without crossing a line; for others it leads to drunkenness and lack of self-control.

In light of that, trying to figure out how acceptable masturbation is is missing the point. For those who burn with passion, we ought to marry. For those who do not, they ought to be careful not to encourage others to stumble. "

518. artisanaltoadshall

June 25, 2015 2:15 PM

SirHamster

I asked you "Are the girls in sin if they munch rug?"

You responded (quoting me out of context)

***"The term "lesbian" defines a relationship which is unnatural and not in accordance with God's plan;"***

*I do know this: it would be most unnatural for two sisters to do that to each other. It would be no more natural if two unrelated women did it. No father would tell his*

*daughter, "go have sex with your sister Elisa, or your neighbor Jenny while you wait for Mr. Right to carry you off in his arms."*

I asked you about a female-female sex act. You didn't answer the question. Instead of speaking to the sex act, you equated the sex act with a relationship and out of context used my definition of a specific relationship to condemn the act. You are conflating an act with a relationship. I addressed this in comment 351.

*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.*

Interestingly, you mentioned sisters having sex together as unnatural (that is, wrong). A man is specifically forbidden to have (living) sisters as wives. I have posited that sexual contact between women is licit within the confines of a polygynous marriage in which they are married to the same man. Maybe that's the reason God forbid a man to marry sisters.

You also said it would be just as unnatural if two unrelated women did it. The problem is God didn't say that. You guys have not come up with anything close to a reasonable argument against it **within the confines of a polygynous marriage.**

So as not to be a stumbling block the man who eats meat does not do so in front of the guy with weak faith who only eats veggies. You might claim that means nobody should have more than one wife, but that doesn't fly because you've already admitted that you don't have a problem with polygyny. So, it really comes down to what might happen behind the bedroom door in a home with multiple wives.

On a purely moral level a married man self-stimulating because his wife is sick is no different from one wife helping her husband stimulate another wife. Same goes for fellatio and cunnilingus between husband and wife. All of

these are purely for pleasure and God did not forbid any of it.

If you had two wives and one night you told hamsterette #1 to get behind hamsterette #2, hold her and tickle both of you with her whiskers while you were busy inseminating #2; and both #1 and #2 were OK with that and enjoyed it, are you saying that physical act would be morally wrong even though God didn't say it was wrong? What if hamsterette #1 can't climax without having her fur licked? Is it wrong if you lick her fur? It can't result in procreation and it's solely for the purpose of pleasure. Is it wrong if hamsterette #2 licks her fur? What if she loves to put your tail in her cheek pouch because she likes the way your toes curl when she does it? Is that wrong?

Within the marriage what happens between the husband and wives is between them and God. It's nobody else's business. Not being twisted like Simple Tim, I don't consider scat, breaking bones and throwing acid on the face to be sex acts, but look at what he's really doing with that argument: He can't stand the idea of somebody else getting something he wants but can't have so he piles absurdity upon absurdity in order to create a special situation in which he might be able to claim "That's wrong!"

It's a reaction of envy, fear and jealousy.

519. simplytimothy

June 25, 2015 3:59 PM

506. SarahsDaughter

Toad is arguing for a fundamental change to established Christian doctrine. Do you really think he is going to get that without some pushback?

The first step in establishing my argument is defining the role of the head in a covenant relationship. It has taken since comment 176 to wrestle out of toad that a covenant head is limited by God in what he can do and be.

He did this in comment 492 when he wrote:

*I made the point\* that actions on the part of husband and wife are not limited to the restrictions **but also must encompass the positive commandments such as the command to the husband to love his wife as Christ loved the church.***

Wrestling that out of him took some very evil examples of degenerate behavior; I had upped my rhetoric purposefully to force the issue.

It worked.

God is good; the husband should be good too. Toad admits this.

With the covenant head limited by Godliness, we can now turn to the next issue. Toad claims (I have not studied his claims yet) that it is Godly for two women to have sex in the marriage bed. I will turn next to studying these claims.

Now if you want to sin on libertarian or utilitarian grounds, that is your business and it is between you and God. If, however, you want to call good evil and evil good, then I will step into the breach and fight.

\*toad says he made the point, if he did, I missed it. had I seen it, I would have noted the comment number and confirmed this.

520. artisanalloadshall

June 25, 2015 4:09 PM

SirHamster

*Got tired of calling me a hamsterhead, already?*

No, I decided that while I think you're being petty and legalistic, you really haven't risen to the level of a true ankle biter like Simple Tim. You haven't lied or otherwise thoroughly dishonored yourself the way he has.

521. SirHamster (#201)

June 25, 2015 4:33 PM

@artisanalload

I asked you "Are the girls in sin if they munch rug?"

[...]

I asked you about a female-female sex act. You didn't answer the question.

I did. I even used the same definition of lesbian as the one who said, "*There is a reason why lesbian porn is so popular*



*with men..."*

Lesbian sex -> Unnatural sex -> prohibited by God -> sin.

If you do not like my use of the word lesbian, you best take it up with the one who brought up lesbian porn.

**You are conflating an act with a relationship.**

There is no such thing as a sex act without a relationship. The very act of a sex creates one if none yet exist. Two girls having sex, whether in or out of marriage with the same man, creates a lesbian relationship.

If a man has sex with a woman, it is a heterosexual relationship regardless of any other factors. When a woman has sex with a woman, it is a lesbian, homosexual relationship regardless if they have a common husband.

**It's a reaction of envy, fear and jealousy.**

Again and again you lie. It is a reaction of disgust, and a zealousness for God's holy Truth.

I envy not your pettiness, your perversion of Scripture, or your fixation on watching lesbian sex.

Enough with the lies. Enough with perverting Scripture for your own ends. Put it away and repent.

**522. simplytimothy**

June 25, 2015 4:50 PM

You talk about your work with the homeless, which means you're part of the clean-up crew. There are far too few of you and you're stretched way too thin with very few resources available. And, yes, I know that throwing money at the problem of homelessness isn't the solution, but I also know that the solutions to the mess often require resources that aren't available. The greatest problem is the condition of the heart.

LOL!

Who knew? Satan is a concern troll.

**523. simplytimothy**

June 25, 2015 5:30 PM

*He can't stand the idea of somebody else getting something he wants but can't have so he piles absurdity upon absurdity in order to create a special situation in which he might be able to claim "That's wrong!"*

heh.

In comment 351 you claimed that lesbian sex acts in a polygamous marriage are licit. I hate to break it to you, but that is an astounding claim.

It was imperative to set an upper limit on your depravity. My comments on "bullwhip up your ass" and "broken arms, acid in face and shit in mouth" were designed to see if you in fact had a limit.

There are those who don't; You do.

You are now on record as saying that the limit exists and it exists because of God.

With that established, it is now time to address the rest of your claims. I will look at your scriptural arguments in detail when I have the time.

524. artisanalloadshall

June 25, 2015 5:32 PM

SirHamster

*There is no such thing as a sex act without a relationship. The very act of a sex creates one if none yet exist. Two girls having sex, whether in or out of marriage with the same man, creates a lesbian relationship.*

Your comment begs the question of what a relationship is.

In my argument which you continue to ignore, I asked if Eve was created to be Adam's sex toy (one does not have a "relationship" with a toy) or whether she was created to be his helpmeet, his wife and the mother of his children. You still have not answered.

1st Corinthians 6 tells us not to join ourselves to a whore, for in doing so we become one flesh with her. If a man can become "one flesh" with a whore through the simple act of inserting his penis in her vagina, how can he not become one flesh with multiple women whom he has married and

committed his life to?

You are claiming that a sex act for money constitutes a relationship? If so, you're claiming that any sex act constitutes a relationship. By that logic Eve was a sex toy and you slander her and all her daughters. You are saying she (in relationship terms) is no different from a whore because the defining act of the relationship is sex rather than the commitment, what that commitment represents and what the commitment and the sex act produce: LEGITIMATE children.

You err in assuming relationships are defined by sex and that all relationships are equally licit. God did not do so and in fact, God said no bastard shall enter the assembly of the Lord, even down to the tenth generation. God does not define relationships by sexual acts and He places a great deal of emphasis on the legitimacy of the relationship in question.

525. artisanalloadshall

June 25, 2015 5:50 PM

Simple Tim

Your entire argument has boiled down to "I think it's unnatural and therefore wrong."

My response is "Great. Don't do it. But God didn't say it's wrong so don't try to tell others it's wrong for them too."

God prohibited entire classes of sexual acts such as men with men; men with animals and women with animals. Then He got specific and prohibited a bunch of specific relationships in which no sex act could be licit. So, even if you're "married" to your sister, your aunt, your 1st cousin, your daughter, etc., no sexual act within such a relationship would be licit because they are forbidden.

There were even a couple specific to polygyny: a man is forbidden to marry sisters, a mother and her daughter, and a mother and her granddaughter. Yet, in the midst of all the instruction about sexual relations, God never once said anything about girl on girl action.

And the reaction is interesting. As if GOD, in the middle of all those prohibitions and restrictions, somehow \*forgot\* to say "The rule is boy parts with girl parts. No girl parts with girl parts allowed." God was silent on that. Likewise, except for two exceptions, God was silent on what constitutes licit

sex between a husband and wife within the marital bed. So, anyone who looks at a marriage with multiple wives and says "any sexual contact between the wives is wrong" is also saying "and I also have the right to judge what happens between you and your wife."

That's you, Simple Tim.

That's a trip straight back to the dark ages, when it was "PIV in the missionary position only, the man must ejaculate inside the vagina, only for the purpose of procreation, never on a feast day or holy day, only between the first hour after dark or the first hour before dawn with as little clothing removed as possible. The act must be done with the minimum passion and enthusiasm or we'll call it lust."

#### **At the same time the church was telling the people that...**

The church, out of consideration that some wretched women were quite enamored of sex, had a special order of women who performed religious duties part of the day and received indulgences from the church to allow them to service clients in the church's brothels in other parts of the day or night. (Of course, there were no such restrictions on sexual practices in the brothels as there were for marriage. Doggie style? Girl on top? The 'forbidden fruit' of 'oral sodomy?' "*There's an extra charge for that, sir.*") Their rationale was that running brothels was necessary to combat the rampant homosexuality in the community. That it put enormous sums into the church coffers didn't hurt.

Honestly, you just can't make stuff like this up.

My response is simple: Simple Tim, take your lies and deceptions and get out of my bedroom. You have no authority here. The authority lies first with God, then with me, then with my wives. Your unsolicited opinions are unasked for and equally unwanted.

You lied about me, twisted what I've said and when called out on it you proved Vox's axiom and like a true SJW you doubled down. Then you lied again. You are a degenerate who considers shoving a whip handle in his wife's ass, scat, breaking her bones and throwing acid in her face to be sex acts. Out of your mouth comes the contents of your heart.

526. Mark Call

June 25, 2015 5:59 PM

**When a woman has sex with a woman, it is a lesbian, homosexual relationship regardless if they have a common husband...**

Please, guys, at LEAST know the etymology of words like "lesbian" before you go making assertions contrary to Biblical Truth. Even Wicci-pedia admits that "lesbianism" is steeped in Wicca, 'modern paganism', and the 'divine femine'.

No Torah-observant husband I know, REGARDLESS of how many wives he might have, or even whether he has studied the issue very much, is going to want anything to do with ANY wife engaged in such pagan practices, or even having the term applied to a marriage that SHOULD be "set apart" to YHVH.

I say again: (and "search out the Scriptures for yourself") that Scripture is specifically, even conspicuously, silent on female-with-female sexuality, EXCEPT in the obvious and undeniable cases where it crosses into idolatry, or arguably perhaps the denial of patriarchal headship (as we see so rampantly today, but perhaps I repeat myself.) And on THAT score, there is no doubt.

527. artisanaltoadshall

June 25, 2015 6:02 PM

Simple Tim

*In comment 351 you claimed that lesbian sex acts in a polygamous marriage are licit. I hate to break it to you, but that is an astounding claim.*

Perhaps to a simpleton like you. What I actually said was that they were NOT lesbian or homosex. You, however, are free to rebut with my own words and show once again that you've lied.. You have already acknowledged you are a liar but claimed you lied for just cause. As if someone can believe a proven liar when they "explain" why they lied.

One of the interesting things about SJW's is they claim other people are doing what they do. And they lie. And then they double down. You are proving over and over in this thread that you're a SJW because that's what you've been doing.

You claim I'm a degenerate, yet YOU are the one who thinks whip handles in the ass, scat, breaking bones and throwing

acid in the face of your wife are sexual acts. You brought it up, you are the one who identified such as sexual acts. Out of your mouth comes the contents of your heart. And you claim I'm a degenerate. Well, you're a proven liar so I guess that's par for the course.

528. [simplytimothy](#)

June 25, 2015 6:40 PM

*. What I actually said was that they were NOT lesbian or homosex.*

It is you who are redefining the term.

Do not assume that I am going to use your definitions merely because you hold them.

I have not even defined all your premises yet and you expect me to grant them legitimacy?

heh.

Step 1. you have stated that God's character is a limiting factor in what we as Christians can do and what we can be.

We are remade into His image and the result of that is we, over time, become like Him. We call this **sanctification** Perhaps you have heard of it? It is the work of the Holy Spirit in all who are saved. Spurgeon argued that justification without sanctification is heresy. I agree.

What that means is that somebody who used to get his jollies doing despicable things will stop doing them. Furthermore, he becomes completely remade and the old-man is discarded and the new-man is who he now is.

I now move on to Step 2.

529. [SirHamster \(#201\)](#)

June 25, 2015 6:48 PM

@ Mark

**Please, guys, at LEAST know the etymology of words like "lesbian" before you go making assertions contrary to Biblical Truth. Even Wicci-pedia admits that "lesbianism" is steeped in Wicca, 'modern paganism', and the 'divine femine'.**

You who create unnecessary burdens, you can butt out. artisanaltoa offered the terminology and standards, and I will tear his ideas down with his own words.

God's word does not contradict itself - but artisanaltoa's words do. Why do you try to salvage his position, rather than correct his errors? No flattering reason comes to mind.

530. SirHamster (#201)

June 25, 2015 7:12 PM

@artisanaltoa

Your silence on your own use of lesbian == girl-girl sex is noted and treated as a concession of the point.

**In my argument which you continue to ignore, I asked if Eve was created to be Adam's sex toy (one does not have a "relationship" with a toy) or whether she was created to be his helpmeet, his wife and the mother of his children. You still have not answered.**

I answer the questions directly asked of me, not vague general questions on irrelevant topics. Ask me the question you want an answer to, if you actually want an answer.

**You are claiming that a sex act for money constitutes a relationship?**

Have you not heard of a business relationship? Sex for money creates a shallow and ungodly one, yes.

**If a man can become "one flesh" with a whore through the simple act of inserting his penis in her vagina, how can he not become one flesh with multiple women whom he has married and committed his life to?**

And now you contradict your previous position without a moment's hesitation. Yes, sex can create a relationship. Yes, the marriage relationship is supposed to be one flesh. I'm not entirely sure how that translates to multiple wives, however, and I suspect you want to make a ridiculous leap of logic from here.

**You err in assuming relationships are defined by sex and that all relationships are equally licit. God did not do so and in fact, God said no bastard shall enter the assembly of the Lord, even down to the tenth generation. God**

does not define relationships by sexual acts and He places a great deal of emphasis on the legitimacy of the relationship in question.

I made no such error. The relationship of father-son or mother-daughter is not defined by sex. The relationship of close friend or acquaintance is not defined by sex.

On the other hand, two strangers can choose to have sex and thus create a relationship where there was none - one of adulterer or fornicator.

Thus, sexual actions can create a relationship. So can non-sexual actions, such as the exchange of words leading to emotional intimacy. If one were to take your position seriously, it is IMPOSSIBLE to have relationships, because no action can create one! Yet, we know relationships are created and destroyed, closely linked to actions, or even inaction.

So once more, your assertion of what my position is, is wrong. You contradict yourself casually ... and do not care. Yours is not a reasoned position. It is a rationalized one.

531. artisanaltoa shall

June 25, 2015 7:19 PM

SirHamster.

*God's word does not contradict itself - but artisanaltoa's words do. Why do you try to salvage his position, rather than correct his errors? No flattering reason comes to mind.*

**Please cite the contradictions, with the comment numbers. Quote only what I actually said.**

Unflattering to whom? Hm m m m m? You claim I lie. You claim I am not arguing Gods Word. PROVE IT. Cite it or you're a liar. Was Eve created to be a sex toy or a helpmeet? What did God say?

Second point. I don't know Mark Call. I have not asked him for his support in this argument. He jumped in of his own accord for his own reasons and did so because he has the right to do so. Who are you to tell him to butt out? He has not lied, slandered and born false witness like Simple Tim, but I have heard not one peep from you over Simple Tim's egregious behavior.



You claim Mark creates unnecessary burdens, but you have not rebutted a single argument he's made. I understand everything he's said because for a number of years I worshiped in a Messianic Jewish congregation with my family. I think I can reasonably say that you don't understand where he's coming from or what he's saying.

Don't you think you should consider the fact that you're reviling and slandering a point of view you don't even understand?

532. Mark Call

June 25, 2015 8:16 PM

...and, I interject, using WORDS you don't understand. But you seem to prefer to call names and wallow in ignorance. As a result, your arguments are self-refuting, even impotent.

533. SirHamster (#201)

June 25, 2015 10:49 PM

...and, I interject, using WORDS you don't understand. But you seem to prefer to call names and wallow in ignorance. As a result, your arguments are self-refuting, even impotent.

I used the words artisanal toad used. Words that have well known English meanings that everyone here knows. Words defined in a dictionary, and used consistently with that definition.

Your call to drop usage of the word on the basis of vague references to "Wicci-pedia" concepts is noted and denied.

If my use of the words make my arguments self-refuting and impotent, what does that imply for artisanal toad? Yet, you single out one side, rather than chastising both equally. "Seems", indeed.

534. artisanal toad shall

June 26, 2015 8:45 AM

Simple Tim

*It is you who are redefining the term.*

*Do not assume that I am going to use your definitions merely because you hold them.*

I define for the sake of clarity. I cited the authority of God's Word as the source of the definitions. That which God says is wrong I identify as wrong. That which God did not say is wrong I refuse to describe in pejorative terms.

*Step 1. you have stated that God's character is a limiting factor in what we as Christians can do and what we can be.*

Actually, I didn't state that. I think a more accurate statement would be:

God's Word is the defining factor in what we as Christians should or should not do and His will for our lives encompasses what we should or should not be.

From the very beginning of this debate you have operated from the position that something God was silent on is wrong. I have repeatedly pointed out that it is arrogance and even blasphemy for you to claim the authority to condemn where God chose not to.

That silence is particularly instructive because God had a great deal to say about sex and relationships, but we see ONLY prohibitions and restrictions. Like the Garden of Eden, God placed a restriction and left everything else up to Adam and his wife, Eve.

So, by what authority do you condemn an act that God chose not to condemn? In doing so you are claiming the authority to condemn sisters in Christ and the husband they are married to. By what authority do you claim the right to invade their marriage and exercise authority over their marital bed?

The Apostle Paul, speaking in 1st Corinthians, said *"it is actually reported that there is immorality among you, and immorality of such a kind that does not exist even among the Gentiles, that someone has his father's wife."*

You see, Simple Tim, the Apostle Paul had the authority to condemn that union because GOD said *You shall not uncover the nakedness of your father's wife, it is your father's nakedness.*" The prohibition is found at Leviticus 18:8 and Deuteronomy 22:30, then condemned at Deuteronomy 27:20. Oh, and just as a side note, the text does not say he had his mother, so his father had more than

one wife...

Again, Simple Tim. By what authority do you speak where God was silent, claiming that what God was silent upon is sin, not just for yourself, but for everyone?

We know that in the absence of instruction ***"that which does not proceed from faith is sin"*** and ***"whoever knows the right thing to do and fails to do it, for him it is sin."*** Since your faith is obviously weak, why, in defiance of your instruction, do you judge he whose faith is strong? For it is written ***"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."***

SirHamster, same question.

535. artisanalloadshall

June 26, 2015 1:20 PM

Mark

The ankle biters seem to have settled down, so lets return to the question of separation/divorce.

My take on this is this: Based on Matthew 19, 1st Cor. 7 and 1st Peter 2-3, the master has commanded that His married bondservants are not to separate. Biblically speaking, I see four elements to marriage: The permission of the father, the agreement of the man and woman, the consummation of the marriage (penetration) and subsequent cohabitation as man and wife. The context of these elements is a commitment to marriage, which is to be for life. I question whether absent the commitment there is a marriage but that is not relevant to the discussion.

I hold the position that Christ effectively overturned the judgment of Moses at Deut. 24:1-4 with His instruction at 1st Corinthians 7:10-11. You have disagreed with me.

In this thread I have argued that salvation means we become children of God, but we also become bondservants of the Lord, who redeemed us with His shed blood. He therefore has the right to command us. He said "One NEW commandment I give to you, that you LOVE ONE ANOTHER." I have heard numerous teachers say that the New Testament contains the laws, statutes and ordinances implementing the 11th Commandment. I find it difficult to disagree.

Given that the Master has the right to command His servants, do you believe that the judgment of Moses concerning divorce, as elucidated by the Lord in Matthew 19 (only for immorality) is an available option for married bondservants? The discussion isn't about who is a bondservant or what makes them a bondservant, if the shoe fits it must be worn.

The most compelling argument (to me, at least) you made in response to my contention that the judgment of Moses had been overturned was this:

*"Do not think that I will accuse you before the Father; the one who accuses you is Moses, in whom you have set your hope. For if you believed Moses, you would believe Me, for he wrote about Me. But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe My words?"*

The relevant portion of that is *if you believed Moses, you would believe Me, for he wrote about Me* but the judgment of Deut. 24:1-4 is not about Christ. It's administrative. We see that in Matthew 19 Jesus twice disagreed with his judgment.

So... in the passage quoted above, was the Lord referring to \*everything\* Moses wrote, or only those things he wrote about Him?

Does it matter?

It is clear that the Lord forbid separation to His married bondservants, but do the unbelievers still have the option of divorce for reasons of immorality? That is, a permanent separation according to the ritual?

536. Mark Call

June 26, 2015 4:42 PM

@artisanaltoadshall --

First, that 'new' commandment is obviously RE-newed (as is the REnewed Covenant, aka "Brit Chadasha") in Hebrew. I know you are aware some prefer that to the term "New Testament". (For the same reason; it implies the "old" is "done away with," which attempts to make God a liar.)

But, this is literally "asked and answered:"

**"So... in the passage quoted above, was the Lord referring to \*everything\* Moses wrote, or only those things he wrote about Him?**

If Yahushua was telling the Truth, in His VERY FIRST public address (I contend that He was, of course, or He'd be a liar and also disqualified as the Messiah, and "prophet foretold by Moshe")...

...then He absolutely, positively HAD to be! (Matt. 5:17-19, quoted many times here already. "Heaven and earth" still exist, so "NOT one yod or tittle" have passed from Torah. QED.)

ANYTHING less means there's NO "Gospel," and no "good news" because He can't be trusted!

And that TOTALITY of Scripture testifies that is it MEN who lie, not YHVH or those He sends to speak His Word, in His Name.

=====

That is enough to make the strongest case, although there's plenty more.

These I'll address briefly anyway:

**"It is clear that the Lord forbid separation to His married bondservants..."**

NO! To 'shalach' (put away) is NOT the same as a temporary "separation". Husbands had to travel, etc. Sometimes separation for a while (as Paul writes, remember?) can be helpful to a marriage. It MUST be understood that what Yahushua was condemning (Mattnew 5:32, the more disjointed translation in Matthew 19, and other places) is "putting away" a wife by sending her out of his protection, "covering", *to the wolves*, if you will. In THAT, he "causes her" to commit adultery, for obvious reasons.

**... but do the unbelievers still have the option of divorce for reasons of immorality?**

Yes, but SO do His people! They suffer for it, and should NOT do it. But there are still 'hard hearted' people in the world. Did Yah Himself NOT send BOTH His wives, Judah and Israel, Aholah and Aholibah, Jerusalem and Samaria (etc, Jer. 3 and Ezek 23) away FOR CAUSE?!!!

(It's OT, BUT...Torah's primary metric is "*choose life!*"  
Sometimes that choice is ugly. What choice does a man  
make with a wife who tries to kill his children ,or something  
else equally unthinkable? The point of "torah" is  
INSTRUCTION. We are to "walk as He would have.")

Finally,

**"That is, a permanent separation according to the ritual?**

It's a process, not merely a ritual. The point is, WITHOUT a  
'get', *sefer keretutah*,, "certificate of divorce" the isha  
(wife) STILL HAS A LIVING HUSBAND. (Paul gets it - see  
Romans 7:2, although he's making a different point in the  
illustration even if "law" is mistranslated. Try 'torah' there.  
;)

Malachi 2:6 doesn't say He hates DIVORCE, it says He hates  
"putting away!"

The point of the GET is a written "second witness" (she is  
the first) from her FORMER husband. WITHOUT it, a wife is  
still a wife, and any sex is adultery, not 'marriage'! (I Cor.  
7:10, Matt 5:32, etc, again)

All of these are things that the 'church' which claims that  
'the law' is "done away with" has made a horrid, wretched  
mess of today.

What you need to recognize, arti, is that your point here is  
bigger than you've been making. IF God's Word, ALL of it,  
isn't True, so long as heaven and earth witness that it  
is...well, just look at the mess.

Blessings,  
Mark

537. simplytimothy

June 26, 2015 5:05 PM

*I define for the sake of clarity. I cited the authority of  
God's Word as the source of the definitions. That which  
God says is wrong I identify as wrong. That which God did  
not say is wrong I refuse to describe in pejorative terms.*

Well and good.

I hope to have time to examine your argument in detail and  
explain it back to you. Hopefully Saturday and Sunday. I  
cannot definitely budget the time as I have an elderly  
friend who needs care, but if things are stable, I will get it

done.

*repeatedly pointed out that it is arrogance and even blasphemy for you to claim the authority to condemn where God chose not to.*

Based on your character I do not trust your judgement. I will examine your claims.

Here is what I see.

I see feminists.

I see secular mano-sphere as revolt against feminism. In secular terms it is successful. If the country goes Pagan, then men will dominate women as in all times past and your harem will be a common thing again.

I see the same lame-ass Church inc. 501c3 "Christianity" that you and Mark Call see.

My response is radically different than both of your guys and I am genuinely interested in that your positions are (in part) a revolt against Church inc.

I expect your position (I do not understand Mark Call's theology, I will attempt to understand him after I grok what you are saying) will become a movement withing Church Inc in an attempt to masculinize it and to deal with the divorcee surplus. I.e. Church Inc, will again do the wrong thing from the wrong motives and dig itself into a deeper hole.

What I do want to do is to protect the sheep as I sense you are advocating evil.

Or, I could be wrong and you are correct.

We will see.

**538. Mark Call**

**June 26, 2015 7:58 PM**

Woah, woah, ST! THIS sure raised my eyebrows!!!!

**If the country goes Pagan...**

Say WHAT? IFFFFF?

Where you been? ;)

**539. Mark Call**

June 26, 2015 8:14 PM

PS> While that may have sounded whimsical, I really was NOT kidding. However, read Ezekiel 8 and 9 sometime, and consider this:

EVERY "abomination" that the prophet is shown is something that should SEEM familiar. Because all of those pagan abominations have been adopted by 'the church'. No wonder He says, "begin at My sanctuary" and whack everyone who isn't "sighing and crying" at all the ABOMINATIONS being done "in his name".

**540. Beau**

June 27, 2015 2:51 AM

Mark, I will be happy to answer the two questions (below) you asked of me **after** you answer my question posed you:

**Is circumcision necessary for salvation, yes or no?**

I'm in no rush; I'll check back later, but I do expect you to answer, per the rules of the blog, which I know you know as you were commenting here long before I arrived at Vox Popoli.

Mark's two questions:

*SHOW me your faith by your works. What else does Paul mean by "work out your OWN salvation with fear and trembling?"*

*So here's a question: How many 'churches' today teach even those four MINIMUM concepts any more?*

Awaiting your reply.

**541. simplytimothy**

June 27, 2015 8:43 AM

@Mark Call

*if this country goes Pagan*

I concede that now.

Two days ago, I would not have but the Robert's "However" put the stamp of state power on rebellion against Truth.



We are now in a clash of Christianity vs Pagan here on American shores. They went Pagan; I remained Christian and it is there where my loyalty lies. So, the fight turns to my people in my civilisational against the Pagan hordes.

(looks under chair for battle axe...)

I concur that Christianity Inc (501c3) sucks. It is the nature of God to crank up the heat in order to clarify and purify--wheat/chaff gold/dross--etc. From Scripture, we know that some will call themselves of Him and He will not know them.

I look forward to your reply to Beau.

542. Mark Call

June 27, 2015 9:44 AM

@Beau -

**Is circumcision necessary for salvation, yes or no?**

My first response (no, so far as I can see, NOT deleted) was in #278. Later I added, in response to this phrasing, that "yes or no" is NOT a logical response, for many reasons:

1) I doubt we agree on what "salvation" is. Since "Yah's Salvation" or similar in English is literally what His given Name, Yahu-shua, makes clear...if some preach, as Paul correctly foretold, "another jesus, whom we have NOT preached," and 'you might well fall for it'...well, many HAVE. Any 'christ' who did away with his own Word is not the Salvation of YHVH.

The Real One said, "If you love Me, keep My commands," (John 14:15) and made an even more ominous warning in Matt. 7:22-23 (quoted above) to those who claim "his name" but -- "*I never KNEW you!*"

Where do YOU think THEY stand? (Not that it truly matters. I admit that is "above my pay grade." All I can say is what Yeshua (#1) did, "*As for me and my house, we will serve YHVH.*")

2) If someone pushes you out from in front of a train, you are "saved". What does mouthing the words of a 'sinner's prayer' and then failing to "follow Him" accomplish? (See #278 again.)

3) Circumcision is a sign of obedience, and a 'mark'. It was 'necessary' in Scripture as a condition for two things that I can see:

- to keep His Pesach (Passover)
- to enter the Promised Land (see Joshua, also, BTW, "Yah's Salvation").

It was MEN who tried to make it a precondition for making t'shuvah to Him.

(And we are STILL in exile, 'for cause'. But we can 't'shuv anyway!)

543. Mark Call

June 27, 2015 10:10 AM

Re: Pagan Amerika

The former Constitutional Republics have been quite pagan for a long time. What the SCOTUS did was to teach Amerika who they SERVE. (I call 'em "Black-robed priests of ANOTHER god" for a reason!)

Read "Held" on page 1 of the decree. Since Caesar licenses 'marriage' -- he will define that term for those who are his.

SO: "Choose this day Whom you will serve." And, IFF you serve YHVH rather than the 'traditions of men' -- "come out of her".

PS> In 103 pages of decree, NEITHER the word "Bible" nor "Scripture appears even once, in spite of all the crap about "tradition". Clarence Thomas (dissent) is the only one who even uses the word "God".

This thing speaks volumes - but only to those with "ears to hear" and "eyes to see".

544. Mark Call

June 27, 2015 10:24 AM

@Beau -

**Is circumcision necessary for salvation, yes or no?**

My first response (no, so far as I can see, NOT deleted) was in #278. (THIS one, though, has now disappeared TWICE!)

Later I added, in response to this phrasing, that "yes or no" is NOT a logical response, for many reasons:

1) I doubt we agree on what "salvation" is. Since "Yah's Salvation" or similar in English is literally what His given Name, Yahu-shua, makes clear...if some preach, as Paul correctly foretold, "another jesus, whom we have NOT preached," and 'you might well fall for it'...well, many HAVE. Any 'christ' who did away with his own Word is not the Salvation of YHVH.

The Real One said, "If you love Me, keep My commands," (John 14:15) and made an even more ominous warning in Matt. 7:22-23 (quoted above) to those who claim "his name" but -- "*I never KNEW you!*"

Where do YOU think THEY stand? (Not that it truly matters. I admit that is "above my pay grade." All I can say is what Yeshua (#1) did, "*As for me and my house, we will serve YHVH.*")

2) If someone pushes you out from in front of a train, you are "saved". What does mouthing the words of a 'sinner's prayer' and then failing to "follow Him" accomplish? (See #278 again.)

3) Circumcision is a sign of obedience, and a 'mark'. It was 'necessary' in Scripture as a condition for two things that I can see:

- to keep His Pesach (Passover)
- to enter the Promised Land (see Joshua, also, BTW, "Yah's Salvation").

It was MEN who tried to make it a precondition for making t'shuvah to Him.

(And we are STILL in exile, 'for cause'. But we can 't'shuv anyway!)

545. Mark Call

June 27, 2015 10:55 AM

@Beau -

**"Is circumcision necessary for salvation, yes or no? "**

My first response (no, so far as I can see, NOT deleted) was in #278. Later I added, in response to this phrasing, that "yes or no" is NOT a logical response, for many reasons:

1) I doubt we agree on what "salvation" is. Since "Yah's Salvation" or similar in English is literally what His given Name, Yahu-shua, makes clear...if some preach, as Paul

correctly foretold, "another jesus, whom we have NOT preached," and 'you might well fall for it'...well, many HAVE. Any 'christ' who did away with his own WORD is not the Salvation of YHVH.

The Real One said, "If you love Me, keep My commands," (John 14:15) and made an even more ominous warning in Matt. 7:22-23 (quoted above) to those who claim "his name" but -- "*I never KNEW you!*"

Where do YOU think THEY stand? (Not that it truly matters. I admit that is "above my pay grade." All I can say is what Yeshua (#1) did, "*As for me and my house, we will serve YHVH.*")

2) If someone pushes you out from in front of a train, you are "saved". What does mouthing the words of a 'sinner's prayer' and then failing to "follow Him" accomplish? (See #278 again.)

3) Circumcision is a sign of obedience, and a 'mark'. It was 'necessary' in Scripture as a condition for two things that I can see:

- to keep His Pesach (Passover)
- to enter the Promised Land (see Joshua, also, BTW, "Yah's Salvation").

It was MEN who tried to make it a precondition for making t'shuvah to Him.

(And we are STILL in exile, 'for cause'. But we can 't'shuv anyway!)

BTW - note other things, too. There are "brides", and wedding guests, and those who stand outside gnashing their teeth. Salvation? Or is there more?

The goal of my ministry is to convince folks not ONLY to "come out of her," but that the REAL goal is to hear, "Well done, good and faithful servant!"

546. artisanaltoadshall

June 27, 2015 12:22 PM

Mark, Beau

Continued

---

"The indwelling of the Holy Spirit was part of the free gift

of life. The filling of the Holy Spirit will come at a cost. There will be a cost, a price you have to pay, a sacrifice you have to make. That price will be something, not for yourself, but for the Lord. Revelation 3:18 says we should buy three things from the Lord Jesus. Gold, refined by fire, white garments and eye salve. The gold refined by fire is what you get by suffering for His name's sake. It happens when your faith is put to the test and you were not found lacking. The white robes represent the perseverance of the saints, the clothing of righteousness which we receive from Christ as we persevere in our service to Him. The salve for the eyes is that filling of the Holy Spirit which allows us to see as the Lord would have us see, from His perspective. It is this focus on Christ that allows us to sacrifice for Him and even suffer for Him, and in doing so we become filled with the Holy Spirit."

"The foolish ones didn't have the extra that was necessary to keep the lamp burning brightly after midnight. However, being told to go out and purchase more implies there might still be time. That is one of the central messages of this parable to those who have not had that filling of the Holy Spirit: there's still time. Ephesians 5:18 is a command: 'Be filled with the Holy Spirit.' So they went out to buy more and while they were out, the bridegroom came and 'those who were ready went in with Him to the wedding feast, and the door was shut. Later, the foolish, having purchased their oil, came to the door and called out 'Lord, Lord, open up for us. He answered and said 'But, Truly, I say to you, I do not know you.'"

"We need to look at this very carefully. There are two words for 'know' used in the New Testament. We know from 2nd Timothy 2:19 and Galatians 4:9 that the Lord knows all those who are saved. In those passages the word 'ginosko' is used. Ginosko is an objective knowing. The word used in Matthew 25 is 'oida' which is a subjective knowing, implying a deeper knowing than just the objective knowing. In John 1:31 John, speaking of his cousin Jesus says he did not 'oida' him. As a cousin he would have ginoskoed him, but he says he didn't oida him. It refers to a deeper knowing. When the bridegroom replied 'I don't know you' what he was really saying was there was a distinction between the two groups."

"They were all Christians, but some were not ready. They were all called out, but not all went in to the feast. They were not punished, but they weren't rewarded either. This is sometimes interpreted as the foolish virgins weren't

saved. No. They were. They are all referred to as virgins, right up to the end. They all had lamps, they all yielded light and all the lamps had oil. Those five foolish virgins had purchased their oil when they came to the door. The only difference between the two groups is the five prudent virgins were prepared ahead of time. When the foolish ones had the chance, they didn't do all they could have done, and for that, they were denied access to the celebration."

"Why should they be treated the same as the prudent ones who did all that they could when they could? Christ is just and holy and righteous. Is your focus on the things of this world, or on your home? Where is your heart? Jesus said that where your treasure is, that's where your heart will be. If you store up your treasure here, it will be burned and you'll suffer the shame of being poor and blind and naked when that day comes. He said to be watchful, for you do not know the hour or the day of His return. If the ten virgins represent the church and the church is the bride of Christ, why are half the Christians locked out of the marriage feast?"

547. artisanaltoadshall

June 27, 2015 12:30 PM

Mark and Beau

Continued

---

"You may be thinking this is tough, but what came next was the parable of the talents. In that parable, all were servants of the master and each was invested with talents according to their ability. The one who was given five talents went to work and produced an increase of five more. The one who was given two went to work and produced two more. The one who was given one talent buried it in the earth and never used it. When the master returned He demanded an accounting. The first two servants made their accounting to the Lord and He said 'Well done, my good and faithful servants, enter into the joy of your master.' However, look at what happens to the third one."

"The servant with only one talent says 'I knew you to be a hard master, reaping where you did not sow and gathering where you had scattered no seed. And I was afraid and went away and hid your talent in the ground; see, you have what is yours.' People, what do you call someone who takes a

crop that he didn't plant? This servant told the Lord He was a hard man and a thief. Think about that. Look what happened, because this is also widely misunderstood. The Lord is saying 'Oh, so I'm a hard man and a thief, is that it? Well if I'm such a lawbreaker, why didn't you put my money out at usury so I'd have the money back plus interest when I returned?' The master wasn't offering a suggestion on what the servant should have done, this was part of the rebuke. If he was such a lawbreaker, why didn't the servant violate the law in his masters name by putting it out at usury?"

"The third servant was a legalist. He describes the master as 'hard' or 'strict' and said he was afraid. This is the one who is saved, but who looks at this as rules and regulations instead of a relationship. His characterization of the Lord is equally telling: 'reaping where you did not sow' and 'gathering where you scattered no seed.' The master condemns him by saying you ought to have put my money with the moneylenders because if the servant truly thought his master to be a lawbreaker, he would have done so. Had the servant put the money out at usury, the master would have been at fault for that violation. The rebuke proves the servant was merely making excuses for not doing what he should have done."

"Keep in mind, please, we're talking about servants. These are Christians who will inherit eternal life. Yet the master says 'You wicked, lazy slave.' The other two were told 'well done, my good and faithful servant.' Which one do you want to hear? Jesus said 'Those whom I love I rebuke and chasten, be zealous therefore and repent.' I have seen with my own eyes the chastening that some Christians have received as a result of their sin, and this passage indicates there will be rebukes and chastening for some when the master returns. Then the master said to take away that which he had been given and give it to the one who had ten and cast him into the outer darkness. No, that worthless servant didn't lose his salvation, but he will not enter the joy of his master. He will be cast into the outer darkness, outside the light and joy of the master."

548. artisanalloadshall

June 27, 2015 12:54 PM

Mark, Beau

Continued

---

“Picture the wedding feast under the pavilion. It’s bright and well lit. Outside the pavilion is the near darkness, where there’s still light from the pavilion even though that area isn’t lit. The outer darkness is the area outside that. From the outer darkness you can see into the pavilion where it’s lit, but that servant isn’t allowed to approach and enter into the joy of his master. The term ‘outer darkness’ is used three times, in Matthew 8:12, 22:13 and 25:30. What follows being cast into the outer darkness is described as wailing and gnashing of teeth.”

“There is a period of 1000 years known as the Kingdom of Heaven in which Christ will rule in Jerusalem and serve as the High Priest in the temple. Satan will be bound and unable to tempt the people on the earth during that time. It is this period of 1000 years in which we will rule and reign with Him. Those who have proven themselves faithful will be given authority and responsibility. Some won’t. The Parable of the Virgins discusses the Holy Spirit and the Christian’s attitude of faithfulness. The Parable of the Talents discusses the Christian’s works. Those two aspects are each issues you’ll be judged and rewarded for. We will be judged on what we’ve done as well as on what we could have done. We see the prudent virgins and the faithful servants entering the wedding feast but other believers are shut out.”

“Wailing and gnashing of teeth. At that time, the realization that it’s too late will set in and there will be many regrets, with weeping and wailing. Following that will be self-blame as that person goes over in their mind all that they could have done and didn’t. What have you done with what you’ve been given? Have you worked hard and used the talents He gave you in His service? The worthless servant hid his talent in the earth... in the world. Are your talents working for your master, or are you allowing the world to cover them and hide them? What will the Lord say to you when you stand before Him one day?”

“We know we are judged in what we do, and the consequences of sin become apparent here on earth in our lives, just as surely as they will when final judgment occurs. Sin destroys, sin causes pain and sin makes a mess of things. Sometimes we hurt ourselves and sometimes we hurt others with our sin. Sometimes we are hurt by the sin of another. Nowhere is this more clearly seen than in the family. I can look out across this congregation and see families that are working well, families that are struggling and the remnants of families that have been broken.”



---

End of excerpt

Nowhere in Scripture does it say that the "bride of Christ" is the church.

What Scripture actually says is that the bride of Christ is the new city of Jerusalem.

And what about the passage that says it is given to man to live, to die and then judgment?

How do all those aborted babies fit into that? Do they get a free pass, or will at some point in the 1000 year reign of Christ they have the opportunity to grow up and make a decision to follow Christ or not? And what about the Christians? Where do they fit into all that during the Millennial Kingdom? We don't have answers but the Master has a plan.

549. artisanalloadshall

June 27, 2015 1:06 PM

Well, it was there and now it's gone.

The first part of what I posted was obviously eaten by blogger, so I'll try again. This should have been (and was) comment 544.

---

"When we pick up our cross and follow Him, we will have conflict because the message of the cross is an offensive message to the unsaved world. A son will be set against his father and a daughter against her mother. Remember Adam's sin: he knowingly transgressed, effectively saying to the Lord: 'I'd rather die with my wife than live with you.' Adam shouldn't have taken a bite of that thing, but rather trusted in God to make it all work out. There comes a point at which you may be forced to choose between family and faith. Don't follow in Adam's footsteps. Jesus is saying to focus on Him and follow Him wherever He leads you. It isn't that maybe you'll suffer, because you will. Jesus said if the world hated Him, it would hate you also. Suffering for the Lord's sake isn't an option; He says it's going to happen. As history shows us, sometimes it even happens within the church."

“Not only is He saying to take up your cross and follow Him, but you’ll have to stand before Him one day and give an account. Wives and Husbands, I told you last year the husband will give an account one day for his family. Not the wife, but the husband. Today, I want to examine that a little closer. Turn in your Bibles to Matthew Chapter 25. That’s Matthew Chapter 25, beginning with verse one.”

“In the parable of the ten virgins and the parable of the talents, Jesus is teaching the disciples, not the people. This is one of the teachings that apply to the New Covenant and believers. Notice that the text begins “Then the Kingdom of Heaven will be compared to ten virgins.” This applies to believers, not to the unbelieving world. All ten have oil in their lamps, but the prudent ones have an extra flask of oil. The foolish ones have only that amount that is within their lamps. Jesus said we are to let our light shine before men, and the oil that fuels that light is the Holy Spirit and we should understand that all ten virgins are Christians. The traditional explanation is that the ten virgins represent the bride of Christ, but we need to be very careful in saying that. You’ll see why in a moment.”

“Time passes because the bridegroom was delaying, and they began to sleep. Sleep, in this context could be that some have died, and it could mean some have fallen away. The spiritual interpretation would probably include both. Suddenly, there’s a shout that the bridegroom approaches, come out and meet Him. The bridegroom, obviously, is Christ. Then all of them rose. This demonstrates that when the trumpet sounds, those in Christ will all rise at once and the graves will be opened for those who died in Christ.”

“They all rose and all trimmed their wicks. The foolish ones who didn’t have the extra oil said to the prudent ones, give us some of yours, our lamps are about to go out. Once again, they are all Christians. They all have the Holy Spirit. The prudent ones, however, say to the foolish ones ‘No, go buy your own.’ Since we’ve already seen that the oil is the Holy Spirit, we need to understand what this passage is talking about. When we become believers we receive the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. If we received the Holy Spirit, why are we commanded to be filled with the Holy Spirit in Ephesians 5:18? It can only mean there is an indwelling of the Holy Spirit and later a filling of the Holy Spirit. The implication in the prudent ones telling the foolish ones to go buy their own means they paid a price for theirs.”

550. simplytimothy

June 27, 2015 1:24 PM

@artistantoadshall,

I know you addressed Mark and Beau, but I will ask anyway.

I have just now set down to study your case from Scripture and this appears to be a part of it.

Are you saying that because God uses imagery from polygyny that we should practice it?

"yes", "no" or "completely off base" is sufficient.

551. simplytimothy

June 27, 2015 3:03 PM

I will be posting toady's claims as I encounter them in my review of this comment thread. FWIW, I will post my initial (largely un-examined) thoughts on his claims so that others can suggest errors in my thinking.

**COMMENT 37 it is idolatry for a Christian to seek permission from the state in the form of a license to marry. Marriage is God's**

( I largely agree. I think the idolatry charge /could/ be overstated given that Christ created government CITE. Furthermore it is often stated that the family is the basis of the civilisation and the smallest unit of government. Furthermore, if the family is the smallest unit of government we have the institution of asking a father's permission to date and marry his daughter. I.e. the Christian must ask the government (the father) for permission.  
)

552. Mark Call

June 27, 2015 3:20 PM

@ST - see if this rephrasing helps:

**Are you saying that because God uses imagery from p.... [MARRIAGE] that we should practice it?**

No. You're not required to 'practice' it. (Paul says he'd rather you didn't at all anyway... ;)

BUT - you need to UNDERSTAND what He Wrote about it, AS He Wrote!

553. simplytimothy

June 27, 2015 3:50 PM

Hi Mark Call,

I cannot engage directly with you as I work on toad's arguments. I will engage your ideas later as time permits. Please continue to interject but please do not expect an in-depth conversation.

554. simplytimothy

June 27, 2015 4:07 PM

#### COMMENT 140

"There is no way to get around the fact that Psalm 19 states "The Law of the Lord is perfect" and that means it is perfect. Nothing more or less than needed. "

There are two instances of the word "perfect" in Psalm 19.

The first is in the title. "The Law of the Lord Is Perfect"

The second is in verse 7

Psalm 19:7

The law of the Lord is perfect,[c]

reviving the soul;

the testimony of the Lord is sure,

making wise the simple;

<https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Psalms+19&version=ESV>

The footnote [c] states "Or blameless"

artisanaltoa shall uses the term "perfect" as "complete, total, nothing else needed".

I have a call out to some friends asking how to see the translation of the title.

This premise will take some work to verify and define.

Beau in comment 381 had a response that puts the kabosh on "complete" which is the sense that toady seems to be using it.

@Beau, if you have time, a lesson on how to use an online concordance to check the meanings of the words in greek and hebrew in both the *title* of the psalm and the verses would be helpful.

555. artisanalloadshall

June 27, 2015 5:07 PM

I made the case for polygyny being a Biblical form of marriage. I even went so far as to say that sexual contact between wives in a polygynous marriage was licit. I laid out my premises in comment #351.

In comment #430 and #431 I responded to Tupla-J and gave five scenarios in which polygynous marriage is appropriate.

In comment #477 I outlined why polygyny is a more durable structure in today's legal environment than monogamous marriage.

You have stated that you see no problems with polygyny, but if the husband has all his wives in bed at once and he's busy banging away on #2, it's somehow wrong if he tells #1 and #3 to do [xyz] with #2 so that as a group they really ring her bell. I have the impression that it doesn't matter what the details are, your position is that

1. sexual contact between wives
2. within a polygynous marriage
3. in bed with their husband
4. under his authority
5. at his command or with his permission

IS WRONG.

God didn't say it was wrong, and I asked in comment #534 "by what authority?" do you claim it's wrong?

Remember the typology of marriage being a type for the relationship between Christ and the church? We have individual time with the Lord, in prayer and devotions. We also come together as a body for corporate worship. He said "where two or more are gathered in My name, I am there also." The husband gives the wives his name, so they shouldn't be together in bed unless he's there also. Yes, the wives have a privileged relationship, but only because of their husband.

God did not command the husband to take more than one wife. Just like God did not command that the husband physically discipline his wife to deal with her rebellion and disobedience. Yet, commanded to love the wife as Christ loves the church, we take note that He said *"Those whom I love I rebuke and chasten."* Chastening is done with a rod. If you can admit that the relationship is permitted you must admit the privilege exists and God did not place prohibitions, boundaries or condemnations upon that privileged relationship.

556. artisanalloadshall

June 27, 2015 5:31 PM

Simple Tim

Simple Tim said

*Beau in comment 381 had a response that puts the kabosh on "complete" which is the sense that toady seems to be using it.*

Simple Tim, you got it wrong. Leviticus 19:18 says

*You shall not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the sons of your people. but you shall love your neighbor as yourself. I am the Lord.*

Beau claimed *The law of the lord is perfect, Leviticus 19:18 tells us to hate our enemies. Yet Jesus commands us to love our enemies.* Where, o where, do you see a command to hate your enemies in Leviticus 19:18?

This is perfect. Jesus is identifying the twisting of the Scripture. *"You have heard that it was said, 'You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy. Only the first part is found in the Scriptures, the second part about hating your enemy was commentary added later.*

Lies, lies, lies.

557. simplytimothy

June 27, 2015 6:24 PM

556. artisanalloadshall

I am patiently working through your argument such that it can be stated in syllogistic form using your stated premises. The task is to avoid jumping from comment to comment

and to condense your case such that it can be examined without having to do so.

Your point on Leviticus 19:18 appears to be spot-on (I did not check Beau's reference).

<https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Leviticus+19%3A18&version=ESV>

18 You shall not take vengeance or bear a grudge against the sons of your own people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself: I am the Lord.

And Beau's comment 381.:

“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 artisanaltoadhall's method of interpretation has gone way off the rails.

@Beau do you have a response? Leviticus 19:18 does not say to hate your enemy; which blows up your argument in comment 381

@artisanaltoadshall, where do you get "complete" from the word "Perfect"? Is that from the hebrew text of the title of the Psalm or of your own making or is the translation in verse 7 wrong?

558. simplytimothy

June 27, 2015 6:44 PM

@artisanaltoadshall,

let me repeat. I am patiently working through your argument such that I can make (your) case that

1. *sexual contact between wives*
2. *within a polygynous marriage*
3. *in bed with their husband*
4. *under his authority*
5. *at his command or with his permission*

Is right.

I.e. I am doing you the courtesy of taking the time to fully understand your argument such that when I make your case you agree with everything that I say.

Once I get there, I will weigh the evidence and the work done will help sundry and all.

Also, there is a possibility that as I work at recreating your position from first principles that we will find a premise that is wrong. This work has already borne fruit in that it appears @Beau's rebuttal is based on a verse that does not say what he says it says.

559. Beau

June 27, 2015 8:52 PM

@ Simpletimothy

**@Beau do you have a response? Levicticus 19:18 does not say to hate your enemy; which blows up your argument in comment 381**

Indeed it does. Good catch. I should have double-checked it. You caught an error in my reasoning based upon what is actually written, rather than what is not. Good for you. I stand corrected on this point. Thank you.

560. Beau

June 27, 2015 9:46 PM

@ Mark Call,

Thank you for your answer. It leads to a need for clarification of the terms *salvation*. But, I'll happily answer your first question now:

*SHOW me your faith by your works. What else does Paul*



mean by "work out your OWN salvation with fear and trembling?"

Paul wrote:

μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε

James wrote:

δεῖξόν μοι τὴν πίστιν σου χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων, κἀγὼ σοι δεῖξω ἔκ τῶν ἔργων μου τὴν πίστιν.

Anyone, even those unfamiliar with the original language, can see these two statements are not equivalent. Imposing the meaning on the first from the second is a terrible error. Now, your answer; Paul's statement means exactly what the grammar says it means from its author to its original audience. That's it.

μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε

with fear and trembling your own salvation (here's the rub, I'll explain)

As you are well aware pagan languages convey pagan ideas to pagan audiences, just so in this case. Who were these goyim? Gold had earlier been discovered in the vicinity of the mining town that sprung up to support the mines and to secure the fruits of their mines. The original population was overcome and annexed into Roman society, settled by veterans of the legions, yet what remained was they understood technical mining terms. Paul utilized this. By employing the term *κατεργάζεσθε* (a miner's term for getting the most out of the mine you already own) instead of *τῶν ἔργων* used by James to make his separate point. what is revealed is that Paul is telling miners to get at it, you already possess it, mine that vein!

That's what it means, straight from the grammar.

I would note in passing we employ different techniques:

I say the text speaks for itself, conveying the meaning of the author in a language clearly understood by his audience. You say the meaning of the grammar of the NT is secondary to your systematic theology derived from the text (or absence of text) of the OT. I'll stick with, "It says what it says," which is exegetical theology, systematics come into play *after* the exegetics are done. Exegetical

theology is the building blocks of Systematic theology, not the other way around.

Since Paul employed the term *σωτηρίαν*, I'll look it up in a credible dictionary, let's use *σωτηρίαν*. It was good enough for Paul speaking to pagans.

561. Beau

June 27, 2015 9:49 PM

*σωτηρίαν* = salvation

562. artisanaltoaadshall

June 27, 2015 9:59 PM

Beau

*It was good enough for Paul speaking to pagans.*

You jackass. When Paul wrote to the church at Rome, was he writing to the pagans? What about the church At Corinth? Ephesus? Thesolonica? Colosus? The Galatians? You Jackass. How dare you slander those believers, calling them pagans.

Paul wrote in the lingua fraca of the day so that everyone could understand him. Your latest post coming on the heels of your Leviticus 18:8 blunder, is not meant to inform so much as to pridefully set yourself apart Jackass.

563. simplytimothy

June 27, 2015 10:19 PM

uh-oh.

I read in Opera and post in firefox because of the captcha issue.

In opera, post 560 and 561 reads as such (wearas here, 561 has been over-written by toads.

560. Beau June 27, 2015 9:46 PM

@ Mark Call,

Thank you for your answer. It leads to a need for clarification of the termsalvation. But, I'll happily answer your first question now:

SHOW me your faith by your works. What else does Paul mean by "work out your OWN salvation with fear and trembling?"

Paul wrote:

μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε

James wrote:

δειξόν μοι τὴν πίστιν σου χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων, κάγώ σοι δείξω ἐκ τῶν ἔργων μου τὴν πίστιν.

Anyone, even those unfamiliar with the original language, can see these two statements are not equivalent. Imposing the meaning on the first from the second is a terrible error. Now, your answer; Paul's statement means exactly what the grammar says it means from its author to its original audience. That's it.

μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε

with fear and trembling your own salvation (here's the rub, I'll explain)

As you are well aware pagan languages convey pagan ideas to pagan audiences, just so in this case. Who were these goyim? Gold had earlier been discovered in the vicinity of the mining town that sprung up to support the mines and to secure the fruits of their mines. The original population was overcome and annexed into Roman society, settled by veterans of the legions, yet what remained was they understood technical mining terms. Paul utilized this. By employing the term κατεργάζεσθε (a miner's term for getting the most out of the mine you already own) instead of τῶν ἔργων used by James to make his separate point. what is revealed is that Paul is telling miners to get at it, you already possess it, mine that vein!

That's what it means, straight from the grammar.

I would note in passing we employ different techniques:

I say the text speaks for itself, conveying the meaning of the author in a language clearly understood by his audience. You say the meaning of the grammar of the NT is secondary to your systematic theology derived from the text (or absence of text) of the OT. I'll stick with, "It says

what it says," which is exegetical theology, systematics come into play after the exegetics are done. Exegetical theology is the building blocks of Systematic theology, not the other way around.

Since Paul employed the term σωτηρίαν, I'll look it up in a credible dictionary, let's use σωτηρίαν. It was good enough for Paul speaking to pagans.

561. Beau June 27, 2015 9:49 PM

σωτηρίαν = salvation

564. simplytimothy

June 27, 2015 10:23 PM

@Beau

Your 560 comment disappeared. The one with the greek in it. No wonder why you got frustrated earlier.

Your 561 comment appears as 560.

Something is up with the comments. .

565. artisanalloadshall

June 27, 2015 10:28 PM

Maybe God gave him the chance to pull his head out of his ass.

566. simplytimothy

June 27, 2015 10:31 PM

Toad writes:

*Paul wrote in the lingua franca of the day so that everyone could understand him. Your latest post coming on the heels of your Leviticus 18:8 blunder, is not meant to inform so much as to pridefully set yourself apart Jackass.*

To @Beau who argued (in a disappeared comment, *italics mine*)

The original population was overcome and annexed into Roman society, settled by veterans of the legions, yet what remained was *they understood technical mining*

*terms. Paul utilized this. By employing the term κατεργάζεσθε (a miner's term for getting the most out of the mine you already own) instead of τῶν ἔργων used by James to make his separate point. what is revealed is that Paul is telling miners to get at it, you already possess it, mine that vein!*

Which is Beau saying that Paul wrote in the lingua franca of the day (and place, btw); which, according to toad makes Beau a Jackass .

(sigh)

567. simplytimothy

June 27, 2015 11:09 PM

*Maybe God gave him the chance to pull his head out of his ass.*

Comment 560 is back as originally posted..

568. artisanaltoaadshall

June 27, 2015 11:12 PM

Beau's comment now appears at 560.

569. artisanaltoaadshall

June 27, 2015 11:17 PM

Simple Tim,

You have some questions to answer. I'll give you a hint: "By what authority?"

570. SirHamster (#201)

June 28, 2015 12:48 AM

(sigh)

As Vox's lessons have pointed out, some people are not working from dialectic, and so use of it is wasted on them.

I'm only following this thread for your and Beau's follow up comments.

**571. Beau**

June 28, 2015 1:50 AM

*You jackass.*

Unable to respond to the substance of my post. *artisanatoadshall* thinks he can deflect attention from the substance with a slur.

And yes, I graciously acknowledged my previous error. Believers need not fear correction, unlike yourself. You who entered this thread calling people blasphemers, as\*holes, etc, etc., ad nauseum. You entered by deceptive means to drag the subject to your pet saw, pleasuring yourself. You who intentionally started this argument. You, a man bound in the gall of bitterness and his own seething lust. You, whose destruction is not asleep.

Did you acknowledge your error when I pointed out how fallaciously you mishandled Romans 1:26-27, by attempting to parse the meaning of the text from the verse numbers? No, you did not. You didn't know the first Bibles printed with standard number verses occurred circa 1545 A.D. The numbers weren't in the original epistles - and weren't added for 1,500 years. Yet your reliance on numbering for parsing grammar revealed your deep abiding ignorance. Do you admit your misfire? No, you brazenly rush forward pell mell like an animal born to be caught and killed.

Around here, when we make mistakes we own them.

בְּזֶה לָךְ לְעֵגָה לָךְ בְּתוֹלֵת בַּת-צִיּוֹן

**572. artisanatoadshall**

June 28, 2015 4:51 AM

Beau

*Around here, when we make mistakes we own them.*

Care to state, specifically, what my mistake is?

**573. Mark Call**

June 28, 2015 10:31 AM

This is just plain silly, Beau --

...need for clarification of the term salvation...

...Anyone, even those unfamiliar with the original language, can see these two statements are not equivalent. Imposing the meaning on the first from the second is a terrible error.

Gee, ya think?

The posts had to do with how a paganized church has UTTERLY twisted the clear story of Acts 15, to the point that they don't even get the four "minimum necessary conditions" that were at issue.

And thus a distraction. FURTHERMORE,

the Name "Yahushua" is HEBREW. The meaning of 'shua', and the related Y'shua, is Hebrew. Thus the English "Salvation of Yah", which is totally obfuscated in a Greco-Romanized replacement. And the rhetorical question there had to do with an off-topic distraction about circumcision. And my response was about demonstrating the fallacy of mistranslating a Hebrew word like "torah" (*instruction*) through pagan Greek so that it could be conflated with a word like "nomos" with all kinds of OTHER so-called "law" of mere men, and then on into English.

And now they're so ignorant of the FOUNDATIONS that they can't begin to read what Paul wrote, even to pagans.

This is the only thing in the post that is germane:

**As you are well aware pagan languages convey pagan ideas to pagan audiences, just so in this case.**

Which is the only thing you said that has anything to do with my point. (Post #513-514)

But even your attempt at obfuscation makes the case, intended or not. Much of 501c3 xtianity is still so pagan in thought process that the TRUE original language of Scripture is nothing but Greek to them.

574. artisanalloadshall

June 28, 2015 11:42 AM

What is the natural function of women, Beau?

Better yet, what is the natural function of man?

God created them in His own image, male and female created He them.

**What is the natural function of a woman, Beau?** Do you introduce your wife as your fuck toy? Or as your wife? Does your wife say "I used to lick pussy but God saved me from that. Now I'm Beau's personal cum dumpster." (Bright smile!)

You have not responded to my argument in #351. Was she created to be a walking collection of orifices in which you could poke your penis; or was she created to be your helpmeet? We all know that poking her pussy with your penis is a pleasure, but is that why she was created? Or is she something more than your fuck toy?

575. simplytimothy

June 28, 2015 12:42 PM

*You have some questions to answer. I'll give you a hint: "By what authority?"*

In the post titled "How To Teach Evolution" our host wrote:

*If you have read RGD, then you will know that my description of Keynesian economics, which I consider to be utter bollocks, is nevertheless so complete and correct that people have described it as one of the better summaries of it that they have ever encountered. My belief is that if something is false, the best way to understand its falsity is to know it better than its advocates. So read the sources and read the current champions, then critique it.*

Which I believe is an admirable way to think; don't you agree? I will answer your questions when I understand your argument and have it defined, in syllogistic form, to your satisfaction.

576. simplytimothy

June 28, 2015 12:51 PM

*As Vox's lessons have pointed out, some people are not working from dialectic, and so use of it is wasted on them.*

*I'm only following this thread for your and Beau's follow up comments.*



I am working on this for my own satisfaction and the knowledge that it may save labor for others in the future.

It turns out that this is not a new argument and other threads address the theme along different lines but with the "same" players as we see on this thread.

You may find these discussions informative

<http://triablogue.blogspot.com/2011/11/polygamy-and-bible-literary-approach.html>

<http://triablogue.blogspot.com/2006/09/polygamy-is-condemned-by-scripture.html>

Since I do not currently completely understand the 'pro-polygyny' side, I have not analyzed the pro-monogamy side (beyond what I was taught, which toady has challenged). A scan of the articles was interesting.

Furthermore, this argument will become mainstream sooner rather than later given current trends.

I apologize, but my style is very slow and plodding. Smarter men than me can and do "swoop in" with fundamental insights that I lack.

577. simplytimothy

June 28, 2015 12:55 PM

@Beau,

Thank you for your witness. blessings.

578. simplytimothy

June 28, 2015 1:33 PM

toady's premises so far are:

1. It is idolatry for a Christian to seek permission from the state in the form of a license to marry.
- 2\*. Nothing more or less than The Law of The Lord is needed per Psalm 19 .

\* indicating a serious problem in the statement

1.in my comment 551 I give some off-the-cuff thoughts on

why it may not be idolatry.

2 In my coment 554 I note some definitional problems with this statement.

2\* The problem with 2 is important in that the the term "Perfect" is rendered "blameless" in Psalm 19:7 and I don't know if the word is a different work in the title of the Psalm. If it *is* the same word, then toady's definition is wrong.

On to the next premise...

579. simplytimothy

June 28, 2015 1:47 PM

Repost of 578 with comment number

toady's premises so far are:

1. It is idolatry for a Christian to seek permission from the state in the from of a license to marry. (COMMENT 37)

2\*. Nothing more or less than The Law of The Lord is needed.(COMMENT 145)

\* indicating a serious problem in the statement

1.in my comment 551 I give some off-the-cuff thoughts on why it may not be idolatry.

2\* In my coment 554 I note some serious definitional problems with this statement.

On to the next premise...

580. simplytimothy

June 28, 2015 2:09 PM

In comment 145 toady introduces another premise.

**"If you claim that something God permitted is wrong for everyone then you're calling God a liar and that's blasphemy."**

This rests on the Law is Perfect (i.e. complete) claim of premise 2\*.

Let's see if we can state this cleanly in terms toady agrees with.

a) If God did not explicitly condemn an action then it is

permitted and humans condemning it is blasphemy.  
b) God endorses everything that is not explicitly condemned in the Bible. It is blasphemy to condemn that which God did not condemn

Toady, do you have a positive declaration you would like to see? Remember, we are just in the process of clarifying your premises and conclusion.

Does anybody else see anything obviously wrong in those two statements?

thx.

\* indicating a serious problem in the statement

581. simplytimothy

June 28, 2015 6:25 PM

@Beau

You wrote:

*Did you acknowledge your error when I pointed out how fallaciously you mishandled Romans 1:26-27, by attempting to parse the meaning of the text from the verse numbers? No, you did not. You didn't know the first Bibles printed with standard number verses occurred circa 1545 A.D. The numbers weren't in the original epistles - and weren't added for 1,500 years. Yet your reliance on numbering for parsing grammar revealed your deep abiding ignorance. Do you admit your misfire? No, you brazenly rush forward pell mell like an animal born to be caught and killed.*

If you have the time could you please explain the argument for me in simple terms? It may come in handy as a time-saver later.

thx.

582. SirHamster (#201)

June 28, 2015 7:29 PM

**I am working on this for my own satisfaction and the knowledge that it may save labor for others in the future.**

Was meaning that more as an encouragement, to remind you that you have an audience beyond those who do not listen.

I know I've seen this same argument pop up on Dalrock's blog, between artisanalload and a different set. I remember thinking that artisanalload's polygamy points seemed okay when skimming ... yet he too drew ire from posters I considered solidly Christian. I now know why.

It is worth sighing over ... yet that is what they choose.

583. Beau

June 28, 2015 7:45 PM

*If you have the time could you please explain the argument for me in simple terms?*

Sure. The Bibles we read today have chapter and verse numbers. This helps us locate passages quickly. The first man to provide numbers was Robertus Stephanus around 1545 A.D. No chapter/verse numbering was present in any OT or NT text before Stephanus; therefore, the original audience did not receive or rely on these numbers to understand the author. This is a very common mistake many people make, thinking the numbers influence the meaning, they do not.

-----  
 Aside to artisanalloadshall. You asked me, *Care to state, specifically, what my mistake is?* Yes, it is compound I) You incorrectly separated two clauses based on the verse number 1:27.

a) αἵ τε γὰρ θήλειαι αὐτῶν μετήλλαξαν τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν

27

b) τε καὶ οἱ ἄρσενες ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν τῆς θηλείας ἐξεκαύθησαν ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρσεσιν τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι καὶ τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν ἣν ἔδει τῆς πλάνης αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀπολαμβάνοντες.

When, in fact, what connects these two clauses is the word *ὁμοίως*. in English - likewise, - in the same way; the actions occurring in a) receive the same divine penalty as in b) as for one, so for the other:

a)

ὁμοίως - applies to both

b)

This is the grammar of the text. This yields the original meaning conveyed by the author to the original audience. This is Exegetical (sometimes called Biblical) theology, that which deals directly with the status of its text and meaning.

II) You compounded the above grammatically incorrect separation of 1:26-27 by asserting an article of your Systematic theology as overriding the meaning of the Paul's text. This too is a common error.

III) You further the error by mistaking a sub-set as outside the set:

Set: Women who commit sexual acts with each other.

Sub-set: Women who commit sexual acts with each other, while married.

The sub-set is clearly part of the set. If the set is under divine condemnation, then all sub-sets are also.

Thanks for asking,

Balaam's Jackass

584. simplytimothy

June 28, 2015 8:46 PM

*Was meaning that more as an encouragement, to remind you that you have an audience beyond those who do not listen.*

Much appreciated, thank you.

FWIW, what I am doing is collecting each "premise" stated by toady and examining it and getting agreement on its meaning before adding it to the list of premises.

If you see any problems or answers, *please* chime in. I will add your work to the criticisms of the premises etc.

Once the premises are collected and we (i.e. toady) agrees that they are stated correctly, we will see if his conclusion follows.

Currently the work stands here:

1. *It is idolatry for a Christian to seek permission from the state in the form of a license to marry. (COMMENT 37)*

2\*. *Nothing more or less than The Law of The Lord (Psalm 19) is needed. (COMMENT 145)*

3\*. *If you claim that something God permitted is wrong for everyone then you're calling God a liar and that's blasphemy. (COMMENT 145)*

*etc*

**THEREFORE**

1. *sexual contact between wives*
2. *within a polygynous marriage*
3. *in bed with their husband*
4. *under his authority*
5. *at his command or with his permission*

*Is right.*

*\* indicating a serious problem in the statement*

If you feel like doing the research on the problems on 2 or 3, that would be great.

The problem with 2 is today's definition of the word "perfect" (from my notes)

*"There is no way to get around the fact that Psalm 19 states "The Law of the Lord is perfect" and that means it is perfect. Nothing more or less than needed. "*  
(COMMENT 145)

*There are two instances of the word "perfect" in Psalm 19.*

*The first is in the title. "The Law of the Lord Is Perfect"*

*The second is in verse 7*

*Psalm 19:7*

*The law of the Lord is perfect,[c]*

*reviving the soul;*

*the testimony of the Lord is sure,*

*making wise the simple;*

<https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Psalms+19&version=ESV>

*The footnote [c] states "Or blameless" which is not the*

*same as toady who uses the term "perfect" as "complete, total, nothing else needed".*

So, on 2 the polite thing is to see if the word Perfect in the title of Psalm 19 matches toady's definition. I do **not** know how to do that. If you do, it would be a big help.

The issue with 3 is I do not know if it is true. It seems reasonable on its face and I will accept it as true unless shown otherwise.

thanks again for your encouragement.

585. simplytimothy

June 28, 2015 8:48 PM

@Beau,

Thank you. That is the reading of the text that I see too. I have entered your comment in my notes for reference when I get to toady's claim.

Could you please provide the link from which you get those greek translations?

thx.

586. Mark Call

June 28, 2015 9:08 PM

@ST -

**2\*. Nothing more or less than The Law of The Lord is needed per Psalm 19**

**\* indicating a serious problem in the statement**

Yes, ST - there is more than one serious problem with the statement, and you didn't catch the biggest one.

A simple on-line tool like "Blue Letter Bible" will help you a LOT:

(Here's the link for Psalm 19:7 and the Hebrew, just to make it clear:

[http://www.blueletterbible.org/Bible.cfm?b=Psa&c=19&t=KJV#s=t\\_conc\\_497007](http://www.blueletterbible.org/Bible.cfm?b=Psa&c=19&t=KJV#s=t_conc_497007) )

תורת יהוה תמימה

Transliterated, the first three words (L --> R ) read "Torot YHVH Tamim-ah"

Click on the "C", or "Tools", or each word after bringing up the verse text

and you can see how EACH of those words is used, and what they mean.

And there is a misunderstanding of EACH that 'colors' the English!

1) His Name is hidden by the Pharasaic and RCC 'tradition'. It is NOT 'capital - LORD'. It is YHVH, and is essential to understand. (Why else would YHVH literally hundreds of time, in thousands of usages, say "I AM YHVH"? And confirm repeatedly through His prophet that there would come a time (Now???) when *"They will KNOW that My Name is YHVH!"*)

2) Torot is plural of "instructions" (torah) -- not singular, and NOT "law"!!!!

3) The first meaning of "tamim" (fem form of the adjective, tamimah) is "complete, whole, entire, sound"; then, "having integrity", entirely in accord with Truth". Check out the usages for illustrative examples with one click.

Doesn't THIS make a whole lot more sense, and pretty well summarize what you find difficult in my "theology"? (Yeah, I hate that word. It's just "True", or not.)

**"The Instructions of Yahuah are complete, whole, sound, True, and, yeah, even perfect...**

...especially if you read 'em as Written, in context! After all, He doesn't change, and His Instruction for us hasn't either!

Blessings,  
Mark

587. simplytimothy

June 28, 2015 10:11 PM

@Mark Call,

Thank you for the link. Please be patient. I am starting to get the gist of what you are saying and I will lend an ear to



it when I am done with my stated task with toady.

If you click on the word perfect, you get to here:

<http://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strongs=H8549&t=KJV>

under the Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon image that the word is translated as complete for 19:7. and as "blameless" in other places etc.

The ESV has a footnote to consider the word "blameless" as an alternate(?) usage, which I interpreted as the meaning of the word "perfect" in that context. That made me question if the title (in the ESV, a title may not be a part of the original hebrew) was a different word.

It now appears that...

1. the titles are an ESV construct
2. based on the Strongs, the usage of "complete" is correct.

Sount about right?

(done for the night, will revisit tomorrow time permitting)

thx.

588. Beau

June 29, 2015 3:37 AM

*Could you please provide the link from which you get those greek translations?*

No link, sorry. These came from e-books in my library. Originally, and still, have dead tree, but e-books are far easier to search:

*The Greek New Testament, United Bible Societies, 4th revised edition, B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C. M. Martini, and B. M. Metzger, editors. 1993.*

*Nestle Aland, 26th Edition Greek New Testament Morphological Edition, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993*

You can find the UBS4 and NA27 offered for sale at the below link:

<http://www.ubs->

[translations.org/cat/biblical\\_texts/greek\\_scriptures\\_and\\_reference/new\\_testament/](http://translations.org/cat/biblical_texts/greek_scriptures_and_reference/new_testament/)

You can find them in electronic publishing at <https://www.logos.com/>. Or, even easier and far more affordable, ask a local pastor, he probably has them.

589. Mark Call

June 29, 2015 9:12 AM

Your glee is the comeuppance on the 5014c Church [sic] for their apostacy which you see as rooted in the very founding of the Christian Church. -- ST

You confuse 'the christian church' with the First Century followers of Yahushua HaMashiach. By 325 AD, most of those (and those who openly kept His Sabbaths and Instruction) were already being explicitly excluded; later, tortured and executed.

Can the Ruach reach, teach, and touch others even in apostacy and idolatry? Of COURSE. (Which is part of the whole point, again, of why He Wrote it DOWN for us!) It is happening now, and if you are being led to "study for yourself" then that True Spirit is at work here.

We are seeing Jeremiah 16:19 play out now, as those who are His "come out of" (Rev 18:9) a false system that is not. Ultimately, what I now call the "greater Babylon metro area" is all around us. And SCOTUS just gave Pagan Amerika a wake-up call:

"Do you know know that you are that one's slave whom you submit yourselves to obey?" (Romans 6:16) What else is a license but permission from a false master?

Wanna test your concordance? Check out this Extreme Warning:

Prov. 28:9 --

*"One who turns away his ear from hearing Torah,  
Even his prayer is an abomination."*

590. simplytimothy

June 29, 2015 4:08 PM

@Beau,

Thank you.

@Mark Call,

When I am finished parsing toady's argument, I will examine your claims and attempt to understand your P.O.V.

cordially

st

591. artisanaltoadshall

June 29, 2015 5:48 PM

Beau

In your excitement about verse numbers, you seem to have missed my point, or perhaps you haven't been able to address it. Thus, the verse number thing.

What is the natural function of women?

Was Eve created to warehouse Adams willie? Or was she created to be his helpmeet?

The woman that's put up with you for the past 33 years... that used to munch rug? Doesn't she have a value that goes beyond her various orifices? Is she your helpmeet or your fuck toy?

Is it a relationship that encompasses a sex act, or a sex act that defines the relationship?

592. Beau

June 29, 2015 6:48 PM

@ artisanaltoadshall

Do you think to make your case by coarse language?

You asked me, *Care to state, specifically, what my mistake is?* I did. Your further obfuscation is irrelevant. You remain committed to a gross error of logic:

The Set: Women who have sexual relations with other women.

The Sub-set: Women who have sexual relations with other women - while married.

The Set is condemned in Romans 1:26-27. The grammar is correct. You insist that a marriage relationship removes the sub-set from the set. It does not. Do you admit you got the grammar wrong? Do you admit the flaw in your logic?

593. simplytimothy

June 29, 2015 7:34 PM

fwiw, I may not pick up the work until tomorrow or Wednesday due to work..

594. artisanaltoadshall

June 30, 2015 4:13 AM

Beau

What is the natural function of women?

*The Set: Women who have sexual relations with other women.*

*The Sub-set: Women who have sexual relations with other women - while married.*

No, Beau.

You're trying to make it all about sex. It isn't.

I don't need to admit a flaw in my logic because you don't even understand the argument.

If anything is condemned in Romans 1:26 it's a relationship in which men are rejected, marriage is rejected, God is rejected.

595. SarahsDaughter

June 30, 2015 8:30 AM

*When, in fact, what connects these two clauses is the word ὁμοίως. in English - likewise*

Is this also true for the uses of the word "likewise" in 1 Peter 2-3? Is it that same word "ὁμοίως"? If so, then wives, when reading 1 Peter 3, should also refer back to 1 Peter 2:18-25.

However, could you explain the use of the word "likewise" in 1 Peter 3:7? To what is it referring, "as for one, so for the other?"

**596. artisanaltoadshall**

July 01, 2015 11:51 AM

Its an interesting question.

The wife is referred back to 2:18-25 because she is under her husband's authority. As the wife is under his authority, he, likewise, is under Christ's authority. The relationship of Christ to Christian is a master-servant relationship. The text makes clear, however, that the husband-wife relationship is a special master-servant relationship.

For the husband is the head of the wife just as Christ is the head of the church. As she is under authority, likewise he too is under authority.

**597. SarahsDaughter**

July 01, 2015 3:39 PM

So the "likewise" is in reference to a concept - being under authority but different instruction with wives than husbands. Which then would be consistent with what you've said regarding the "likewise" in Romans. Reference to a concept and then further description applying to the men specifically.

**598. simplytimothy**

July 01, 2015 5:00 PM

@artisanaltoadshall

I have parsed COMMENT 176 and extracted a few more premissis from it.

The asterisks are reminders to myself to look deeper into your claim.

Let me know if I misstate them.

1. It is idolatry for a Christian to seek permission from the state in the form of a license to marry. (COMMENT 37)
2. Nothing more or less than The Law of The Lord (Psalm 19) is needed. (COMMENT 145)
- 3\*. If you claim that something God permitted is wrong for everyone then you're calling God a liar and that's blasphemy. (COMMENT 145)
4. When tradition directly contradicts God's Word it's wrong (COMMENT 145)
- 5.\* Romans 1:26 does not explicitly condemn girl on girl action (COMMENT 176)
6. The Context of Romans 1 is the rejection of God and a

refusal to recognize His authority. (COMMENT 176)

7.\*\* Because Leviticus 18 and Leviticus 20 Do not explicitly prohibit lesbian sex, it is permitted in marriage.(COMMENT 176)

8.\* Any "plumbing connection" is licit in a marriage. (COMMENT 176)

9.\* "The Natural Function" for men is to be a husband and a father. (COMMENT 176)

10.\* "The Natural Function" for women is to be a helpmeet to her husband. (COMMENT 176)

11.\* The wives are in a covenant relations with each other, not just with their husband. (COMMENT 176)

THEREFORE

1. sexual contact between wives
2. within a polygynous marriage
3. in bed with their husband
4. under his authority
5. at his command or with his permission

Is right.

\*' indicating a serious problem in the statement

\*\*\* Requires analysis

Premise 8\* has been rebutted in our back our previous back-n-forth. You have one idea of "plumbing connection" and the Marquis De Sade had others. You rejected the extreme examples I gave and admitted the character of God is a limiting factor in how we choose to behave.

599. simplytimothy

July 01, 2015 5:30 PM

@Beau @SirHamster,

I am going to continue to collect toady's premises for examination before I turn my attention to each. However some things strike me as low-hanging fruit.

On premise 5 and 6, looking at the whole of Romans 1 toady asserted in COMMENT 176 that the women did not receive the penalty that the men did. This means that the women are not included in ....

*28 And since they did not see fit to acknowledge God, God gave them up to a debased mind to do what ought not to be done. 29 They were filled with all manner of*

*unrighteousness, evil, covetousness, malice. They are full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, maliciousness. They are gossips, 30 slanderers, haters of God, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, 31 foolish, faithless, heartless, ruthless. 32 Though they know God's righteous decree that those who practice such things deserve to die, they not only do them but give approval to those who practice them*

is farcical.

**On premise 7** Toady asserts that the absence of the feminine pronoun means "it does not apply to women" In COMMENT 450 I gave one example of the ridiculousness of this claim. The entirety of Leviticus 18 and 20 and Deut are ripe for this treatment.

**premise 11** the "How many covenants" question. In COMMENT 176, toady wrote:

*If a man and a woman have sex, is that licit? The answer is it depends on their relationship.*

*If they're married to each other, it's cool. If they aren't it's either fornication or adultery.*

*Same answer if women have sex with women. If they're married to the same man and he wants them both in his bed, no problem.*

*If they've decided to reject men and live for their own pleasure, it's either fornication or adultery.*

My thoughts are as such.

Marriage is a covenant relationship with God. Husband submits to God, Wife submits to God by submitting to husband.

Sex between the husband and wife is good in this covenant relationship and is only allowed in this relationship.

Where is the marriage *between* two women? If there is no marriage between the two women, then they cannot have sex *together*

Toady gets into a discussion with Mark Call later in the comment thread and I will examine that when I come to it.

Thanks for your help guys.

@ simplytimothy

*If you feel like doing the research on the problems on 2 or 3, that would be great.*

Would be a pleasure.

*So, on 2 the polite thing is to see if the word Perfect in the title of Psalm 19 matches today's definition. I do not know how to do that. If you do, it would be a big help.*

The title is from that particular English translation and is not part of the original text. Look at the same passage in NIV or KJV; it does not have the title. It's a Bible study aid for English readers by echoing/summarizing the main point of the overall passage.

On to the word meaning. BibleHub provides tools for looking up the Hebrew [text](#). That page also provides links to the word's Strong's [concordance](#), and a list of [references](#) in several translations.

"Without blemish" is how one translation likes to use it, which also matches one of the dictionary definitions for 'perfect': "make (something) completely free from faults or defects, or as close to such a condition as possible."

On to the 2 points and possible issues:

**2\*. Nothing more or less than The Law of The Lord (Psalm 19) is needed. (COMMENT 145)**

For 2, what does one mean by, "needed"? The Bible doesn't give us directions for things like exercise regimes or how to identify and cook food - yet those are necessary parts of daily existence. Is developing and passing on that sort of knowledge going beyond the "Law of the Lord"?

Looking at perfect as "without defect", that answers that question - the Law of the Lord is about man's relation to God and his place in the universal hierarchy. It is not a defect for any document to be silent on tangential matters; one does not expect a cooking recipe from the US Constitution.

That said, one can still link the US Constitution to something as mundane as a cooking recipe - the publication of a cooking recipe may be protected by Freedom of Speech; but Freedom of Speech does not protect the practice of a cooking recipe that uses human meat. One is not adding to subtracting from the US Constitution by



analyzing and applying it in this way.

In a similar fashion, it is not adding to or removing from God's word to see how it is applied to daily practical matters; in fact, that is what Bible study is for.

**3\*. If you claim that something God permitted is wrong for everyone then you're calling God a liar and that's blasphemy. (COMMENT 145)**

What is permissible and what is desirable are two different things. "Wrong" and "forbidden" are also different things.

Example:

Divorce was permitted by God for the Israelite community.  
(Deut 24)

God hates divorce, and so it is wrong. (Malachi 2:16)

Divorce was permitted by God under certain circumstances, but it is still wrong for everyone. Is that statement blasphemy?