

# VOX POPOLI

#Arkhaven INFOGALACTIC #Castalia House

## CONTACT

[Email Vox](#)

## VOXOLOGY

[About Vox Day](#)

[Ebooks &](#)

[Ecomics](#) | [Audiobooks](#)

[Castalia Direct Store](#)

[Arkhaven Direct Store](#)

[Darkstream](#) | [BitChute](#) | [YouTube](#)

[Rules of the blog](#)



**VOX DAY**

- Blog Archives - ▾

950 readers  
BY FEEDBURNER

## VOXIVERSITY

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.”

[012 The SSH: GAMMA](#)[011 The SSH: ALPHA](#)[010 Rhetoric and  
Dialectic](#)[009 The Socio-Sexual  
Hierarchy](#)[008 Why the West  
Needs Christianity II](#)[007 The Madness of  
Jordan Peterson](#)[006 The Last Closet](#)[005 Why the West  
Needs Christianity I](#)[004 Tariffs & Trade  
with China](#)[003 Trade War](#)[002 Sink the Ships](#)[001 Immigration &  
War](#)[All the  
videos | YouTube](#)

## CRYPTOFASHION



## CASTALIA BOOKLISTS

[Audiobooks](#)[Hardcovers](#)[Paperbacks](#)

## TOPICS

[mailvox](#) | [writing](#)[Jordanetics](#) | [Voxiversity](#)[Arkhaven](#) | [comics](#)

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

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](#) 801 - 971 of 971

**801. Anonymous**

**August 10, 2015 5:01 PM**

Hi Mark Call, I will read when I get time, possibly tomorrow.

@toad

*I do not agree that you've answered the questions. I made it clear I wanted Biblical cites.*

You will get my argument when I am done understanding your position.

I have now collected your claims and (tentatively) filed them under categories that convey the principle behind your claim.

I will--on my time, not yours--work through each principle and understand it.

As I do that, I will, when I encounter a claim, address it. Not before.

**802. Anonymous**

**August 10, 2015 5:06 PM**

[economics](#) | [free trade](#)  
[cartoons](#) | [immigration](#)  
[atheism](#) | [science books](#) | [evolution](#)  
[vibrancy](#) | [sports trainwreck](#) | [McRapey](#)  
[Rules of Writing](#) | [SFWA Book Reviews](#) | [Lions Den](#)  
[Banned Trolls](#) | [Fifth Horseman](#)  
[Umberto Eco translations](#)  
[Selenoth](#) | [Quantum Mortis](#)

---

[Vol 1.1](#): Ian Fletcher  
[Vol 1.2](#): Karl Denninger  
[Vol 1.3](#): Nick Novello  
[Vol 1.4](#): John Julius Norwich  
[Vol 1.5](#): John O'Neill  
[Vol 1.6](#): Rep. Thad McCotter  
[Vol 1.7](#): John Hawkins  
[Vol 1.8](#): Steve Keen  
[Vol 1.9](#): James Delingpole

---

## INTERVIEWS

[Umberto Eco](#)  
[Jonah Goldberg](#)  
[Daniel Hannan](#)  
[Moshe Feiglin](#)  
[Ian Wishart](#)  
[Dinesh D'Souza](#)  
[James Delingpole](#)  
[John Derbyshire](#)  
 ([Doomed](#))  
[John Derbyshire \(NRO\)](#)  
[Jonathan Haidt](#)  
[John Romero](#)  
[John Williams](#)  
[David Frum](#)

@SirHamster,

I now have a birds-eye view of toad's argument and will be working from that 'roadmap' in a structured way one category at a time.

Is it ok if I bounce ideas off of you?

thx

803. Anonymous

August 10, 2015 5:12 PM

Toad in [@145](#) you wrote:

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.** As has been pointed out, God does not regulate sin, He prohibits it and condemns it.

What does that non-sentence in bold supposed to mean?

You have rejected this: Nothing more or less than The Law of The Lord (Psalm 19) is needed. (COMMENT 145)

Or Is it this:

The Law Of The Lord Is Perfect, there is not too much of it nor to little.

804. Anonymous

August 10, 2015 7:03 PM

Simple Tim

Perfection. Simple definition: "Nothing more or less than needed." To say that God's Law is perfect is to say that He got it right, for all time and for all people. The magnitude of this is reflected in Romans 4:15 and Romans 5:13.

*You have rejected this: Nothing more or less than The Law of The Lord (Psalm 19) is needed. (COMMENT 145)*

[Thomas Woods](#)[Rep. Ron Paul](#)[Rep. Thaddeus  
McCotter](#)[Max Keiser](#)

---

#### INTERVIEWS OF ME

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

---

#### SITES OF INTEREST

[DevGame](#)[Military Strategy  
Magazine](#)

---

#### 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-  
2020 VOX DAY. ALL  
RIGHTS RESERVED.

That's because you took a \*description\* of the perfection of the Law, twisted it and turned it into a commentary saying the rest of Scripture was unnecessary. You completely changed what I said. You do that a lot.

I'm aware you don't comprehend, but the subject I've been arguing is the headship doctrine and the authority of the husband. The issue has been polygyny and sexual contact between wives. As I've already pointed out "wives submit to your husbands in everything" means \*everything\* and not "wives submit to your husbands in everything except [that]"

In comment 792 and 793 I addressed some of your arguments, with 793 being a comprehensive rebuttal of Beau's argument about Romans 1 compared to Romans 4:15 and 5:13. That's new for you. In 791 I neglected to put the links to your previous failed attempt to apply "principles" from one covenant entity to the entity of marriage. You tried to say that a "violation" of the covenant rendered it null and discovered that wasn't so.

I am very curious about one thing: I have repeatedly summarized my argument here. Why do you ignore MY summations of MY argument when I'm giving you what you claim to want? I'll admit, going back over Romans 1:25-27 (something I haven't done in years) and looking at it through the lens of Romans 4:15 and Romans 5:13 caused me to reconsider some of the points I've brought up in this thread.

At the moment I no longer think it's an "argument made from silence" so much as an "argument made from **directed silence**." Then, when I considered that the unnatural relationships were a punishment, how does one condemn the punishment of God? That throws a further twist on the Romans 1 argument leaving \*nothing\* direct.

Food for thought.

You have stated repeatedly that you want to be able to state my case in my words. Yet, you are time and time again mis-stating my position and misquoting me. Why can you not accept my summaries and use them? You

REPRODUCTION  
WITHOUT WRITTEN  
PERMISSION IS  
EXPRESSLY  
PROHIBITED.

have repeatedly misquoted me, intentionally, and when called on it you have refused to correct your position. After displaying an unacceptable level of dishonesty in a way that contradicts your own stated goals, I am forced to conclude you are now striving for intellectual dishonesty with your present methodology.

Care to comment on that?

805. Anonymous

August 10, 2015 7:31 PM

*Perfection. Simple definition: "Nothing more or less than needed." To say that God's Law is perfect is to say that He got it right, for all time and for all people. The magnitude of this is reflected in Romans 4:15 and Romans 5:13.*

The words are not in the Psalm and your statement is unclear.

1. Heuristics and not needed.
2. Interpretation is not needed.
3. There are exactly enough laws--say there are 7 laws. 6 would be too little, 8 would be too many. 7 is perfect.

*To say that God's Law is perfect is to say that He got it right, for all time and for all people fits for all three interpretations.*

*That's because you took a \*description\* of the perfection of the Law, twisted it and turned it into a commentary saying the rest of Scripture was unnecessary.*

Your grammar is wrong. State the thing clearly.

As for the rest of your comment. You are repeating yourself.

If you have something new to add, bring it up when I get around to the appropriate category.

*Why can you not accept my summaries and use them?*

I want to think through the ideas myself and come to my own conclusions. At each step I want to be able to state *why* a claim is true or false and state counter-claims.

I will write my own summaries.

*You have repeatedly misquoted me, intentionally*

"intentionally"

heh..

You have hundreds of claims and hundreds of comments. Mistakes will be made. It is the nature of the work. There *will* be more.

806. Anonymous

August 10, 2015 8:33 PM

*Toad said: You have repeatedly misquoted me, intentionally*

*Tim says: "intentionally"*

*heh..*

*You have hundreds of claims and hundreds of comments. Mistakes will be made. It is the nature of the work. There will be more.*

Yes, intentionally. I know this from your behavior when I call it out on misquoting me. Or putting words in my mouth that I didn't say.

When called on it you refuse to own it. An honest man admits his mistakes. As Beau said **"Around here, when we make a mistake, we own it."**

You have shown a remarkable unwillingness to do so, except in the case of the kerfuffle with Hamster I'm replying to above.

807. Anonymous

August 10, 2015 8:41 PM

*Your grammar is wrong. State the thing clearly.*

I did. If you have a problem understanding what I said,

ask questions. At no point in this discussion have I been reticent about explaining what I said. Having said that, please explain where and why my "grammar is wrong."

You made the charge, you explain it.

**808. SirHamster**

August 10, 2015 9:28 PM

[@802](#)

simplytimothy,

Of course.

**809. Anonymous**

August 11, 2015 6:45 AM

Having said that, please explain where and why my "grammar is wrong."

Look at this *Nothing more or less than needed.*

It is not a sentence. There is no verb, there is no subject. It is meaningless twaddle.

That is where you are wrong.

Your first claim out of the box is meaningless.

**810. Anonymous**

August 11, 2015 6:47 AM

*Yes, intentionally. I know this*

No you do not. You assume it. You are wrong.

**811. Anonymous**

August 11, 2015 6:55 AM

[@808](#) Awesome! Should be a lot of fun and there is much to learn, we will be asking ourselves "What does X" mean.

While not my intent, Toad's baseless charge against you led me to do the very thing I intend to do for all of toad's claims.

"The Law of the Lord is Perfect" What is David(?) saying here?

What is "the Law of the Lord?"

Is it every commandment in the O.T. the O.T. and N.T.?

Is the Law of the Lord something higher than both?

What about the Deuteronomy/Leviticus discrepancy toad discussed with Mark Call? If both are "the Law of the Lord" Then "perfect" cannot mean "recorded correctly"

What about St. Peter busting out of jail in direct opposition to his command that we are to obey government authority?

Stuff like that.

Now, God may have blessed us in that the very first thing we can turn our attention to is the very first thing we *should* turn our attention to. I think that is the case.

To expand that, that is the purpose of the collection of claims and the tentative/first-draft sort of claims into 'categories' .

I am *really* looking forward to this and am very glad you will be along for the journey.

812. Mark Call

August 11, 2015 4:27 PM

@arti --

re: "I'm surprised, Mark. You were quite gentle with him, not comparing that gentile dog of a Centurion with modern American Christians."

He's trying, arti...and I know from experience and long teaching history that most 'xtians' have a LOT of baggage to let loose of. I expect Jeremiah 16:19 to matter nowadays.

It's those who are willfully blind, "stiff-necked", and foolish (re: Solomon in Proverbs) and furthermore reject knowledge as per Hosea 4:6 that I have the real problem with. (As did YHVH; hence, "I will reject you



for being priest for Me, and will also *forget your children.*")

813. Mark Call

August 11, 2015 4:38 PM

@ST, and @arti...

You guys are too "wrapped around the axle re: Psalm 19, especially about that Hebrew word that means 'complete,' or "perfect" in context.

But you miss the bigger error, from the KJV: "LAW".

"Torah" means INSTRUCTION, which INCLUDES His "law" (statutes, judgments, and commandments). When He means those things, He says "chuqqim, mishpatim, mitzvot..."

His "instruction" (torah) -- which is complete, and indeed perfect as Written, includes a whole lot of stories and parables, too.

So here's the kicker! You want the verse that REALLY nails the issue?

Check out Proverbs 28:9!

And, yes, the word in there is "torah". It reads like this:

*"He who turns his ear from hearing torah, even his prayer is an abomination."*

If they'd really read it, that ought to get more than a few people reading this to thinking...

814. Anonymous

August 11, 2015 5:18 PM

Hi Mark Call,

Thanks for the input.

I will keep an ear open for your p.o.v., but I am a Christian, not a torah follower. I am saved by grace through faith and God HAS heard my prayers and redeemed me. This is non-negotiable. Fwiw, my experience is much like J.C.

Wright's <http://voxday.blogspot.com/2014/04/the-testimony-of-john-c-wright.html>. This is non-negotiable.

That said, I enjoy your insights, patience and civility; it is much appreciated.

His "instruction" (torah) -- which is complete, and indeed perfect as Written, *includes a whole lot of stories and parables, too.*

That is informative.

What of the stories and commands in the N.T. ? Do they count in your worldview? Or is it strictly O.T?

**especially about that Hebrew word that means 'complete,' or "perfect" in context.**

It is very important.

Since you mentioned stories and parables, then both interpretation and heuristics are *required* for you p.o.v. (they certainly are for mine)

So, "perfect" and "complete" cannot mean that the words on the page--submit to government authorities, for example-- are "it", rather, we have to look at the nature of authority and government in meeting the requirement of the "instruction".

As for the "number" of laws...then that needs some clarification too, but let's hold off on that for now.

Before moving on, I want this defined and stated in declarative form. I also want to see if other traditions (Roman Catholic, Protestant..) have a different take.

In summary, in your view, is it true that.

God's Perfect Law (Instruction)

- (a)...requires interpretation and heuristics.
- (b)...is completely defined in Scripture alone
- (c)...is defined in the N.T. as well as the O.T.
- (d)...is *not* defined in any church tradition or magisterium, because (b)

**815. Anonymous**

August 11, 2015 5:23 PM

@SirHamster,

Do you see where I am going with this? It is basically *definition of terms* before proceeding. If there are multiple definitions, we should know what they are so that we can refer back to them.

I think you will agree it is a fascinating topic.

Once we get "The Law of the Lord is Perfect" defined, we can look at the categories and proceed carefully and logically.

**816. Anonymous**

August 11, 2015 5:33 PM

[@523](#) "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."

Actually, more astounding is your claim is that such acts are illicit. You have yet to demonstrate that God forbid such acts in any way, arguing rather that some things are just wrong even if God didn't specify it.

Let's try this using the subject of cannibalism.

Cannibalism is mentioned several times in Scripture (Leviticus 26:29; Deuteronomy 28:53-57; Jeremiah 19:9; Lamentations 2:20; 4:10; Ezekiel 5:10), but in each case, the practice is regarded as a curse and an act of complete desperation. Moses and other prophets predicted that if the Israelites forsook God, they would fall into such dire starvation as to eat their own children. These prophecies were fulfilled during the siege of Samaria during the reign of King Jehoram (2 Kings 6:28-29). However much of a curse it might have been, lacking a prohibition in the Law we do not see any condemnation for the acts or punishment.

You may well see cannibalism as being morally wrong, and the examples in Scripture point to the absolute degradation resulting from disobedience and idolatry that leads to such acts. Yet, in more modern times we

have examples such as the Donner party and the 1972 plane crash in the Andes in which the survivors remained alive by eating the flesh of those who died (they didn't kill them to eat them).

**My question for you is whether these people in the modern examples did something wrong in staying alive that way, and more to the point, is what they did (not prohibited in the law) worse than if they'd eaten unclean food (specifically prohibited in the Law) in order to stay alive?**

That many people would claim it's better to starve rather than eat human flesh (always described in Scripture as a curse, although not sin), but at the same time eating ham and shellfish (violations of the law, i.e., is a sin) wouldn't even be mentioned, is similar to what I've been arguing. Let's illustrate the point:

A husband, wife and their month-old baby are the only survivors of a plane crash in the mountains. Everyone else is dead. They survive for a week on the food they found in the plane but it isn't enough. The husband orders his wife to eat cooked human flesh in order that she might live and continue to nurse their child.

1. Does the husband have the authority to order his wife to do such a thing?
2. Should his wife obey her husband even though she thinks cannibalism is wrong?
3. Should the wife refuse, knowing that will sentence their baby to death by starvation?

**817. Anonymous**

**August 11, 2015 5:55 PM**

*[@811](#) "What about St. Peter busting out of jail in direct opposition to his command that we are to obey government authority?"*

*[@814](#) "So, "perfect" and "complete" cannot mean that the words on the page--submit to government authorities, for example-- are "it", rather, we have to look at the nature of authority and government in meeting the requirement of the "instruction"."*

Wrong again. BEFORE you take the command "obey the government" as an absolute and look at the "nature of

authority and government,” you study the Word because “We must obey God rather than men” (Acts 5:29) modifies the “obey government” rule. Thus, you cannot say the command to obey the government is an absolute.

Second, you got your example wrong. Peter wasn't “busting out of jail” of his own accord in either of the recorded instances. The first time, the gate was opened by an Angel who commanded Peter to leave the jail and go preach in the synagogue (Acts 5:19-20). The second time an Angel appeared, the chains fell off Peter and the Angel told him to get dressed and commanded Peter to get up and come with him. Peter did so and was led out of the prison and into the street (Acts 12:7-11).

Note that it was Herod who imprisoned Peter. What happened next is that an Angel struck Herod and he died (Acts 12:20-25). With the death of Herod Peter was no longer a fugitive.

Similarly, Paul experienced the prison doors opening and the chains falling off, but we do not see an Angel commanding him to leave. So, Paul stayed in the prison even though he could have left. The end result was Paul had his injuries treated and the Jailer and all of his household were saved. Notice that Paul stayed and the next day the city magistrates ordered him released. Again Paul refused to go, this time until the magistrates came in person to release him (Acts 16:22-40)

So, the question could be asked, to what extent are we to obey the government? In my opinion...

1. Obey God rather than man when the issue is laid squarely before you. That requires a thorough knowledge of God's Word (study to show yourself approved) and wisdom.
2. When you're in prison and an Angel opens the doors and tells you to come with him, you do it knowing God's got your back.
3. Hope and pray you're never put in the position where you have to make that decision.

818. Anonymous

August 11, 2015 6:55 PM

@toad

I do not want to engage with you on these latest two comments because we are still on definitions for your initial case. Rest assured, your examples will come up as we progress.

in [@814](#) (a) through (d) is a question to Mark Call regarding "The Law (instruction)". Based on your reasoning in your previous two comments it is evident you agree with (a) and (b) and possibly (c).

Furthermore, if you have additional *principles* (not stories, principles--one liners such as I show there) regarding the nature of "The Law" then submit them for consideration.

**819. Anonymous**

August 11, 2015 7:22 PM

[@814](#) needs this addition in light of Hebrews 8:10

"For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts."— Hebrews 8:10.

The Law of the Lord is Perfect..."and is in His people's mind and written on their Hearts" or , in view of the Christian process of sanctification, "Is being formed in His people's minds and being written on their hearts"

God's Perfect Law (Instruction)

- (a)...requires interpretation and heuristics.
- (b)...is completely defined in Scripture alone
- (c)...is defined in the N.T. as well as the O.T.
- (d)...is not defined in any church tradition or magisterium, because (b)
- (e)...is written (being written?) in the hearts and minds of Christians.

**820. Mark Call**

August 11, 2015 7:35 PM

@ST --

Let's start with the EASY one...

**What of the stories and commands in the N.T. ? Do they count in your worldview? Or is it strictly O.T?**

Of COURSE they count! Just remember what Yahushua was teaching, from His very First Public Address on, in Matthew 5-7. (The "Sermon on the Mount")

One of the major rhetorical devices He used is the continuing theme, "You have HEARD it said," but - "I tell you" -- ***EXACTLY what is Written!***

And that is where I (and, I think is undeniable, the Messiah too) part company with the paganized 'church'. (Mark 7, etc: "By your traditions you have made the commandments of YHVH of no effect!")

He used parables, and history, and Scripture as Written (indeed, just Who Wrote it, after all?) to INSTRUCT in His own 'torah' -- INSTRUCTION.

Of which, since He IS the same "yesterday, today, and forever" He did NOT CHANGE the smallest part ("yod or tiddle"). And -- as this discussion highlights -- that includes marriage, too! (And food, too, BTW - as Peter knew, said himself in Acts 10:28, and NEVER varied from!)

His 'instruction' is complete, 'perfect' in the Hebrew sense, and we are not to "add to," nor "subtract from." (BTW, "perfect" in the legal sense means "completely sufficient for His purposes," or "as designed," to do EXACTLY what He intended. It does "not return void," either!)

That's a start (and I teach this week's Torah portion this week, too --

"Re-eh", or "See!" which includes all that, from Deuteronomy chapters 12 and 13 -- and which PROVE that IF He HAD done so, He could NOT have been the Messiah!)

821. Mark Call

August 11, 2015 8:14 PM

@ST (@814)

In summary, in your view, is it true that.

#### God's Perfect Law (Instruction)

- (a)...requires interpretation and heuristics.
- (b)...is completely defined in Scripture alone
- (c)...is defined in the N.T. as well as the O.T.
- (d)...is not defined in any church tradition or magisterium, because (b)

I'll just rephrase as I would state it, since I think that may be more clear:

#### *YHVH's Complete and Sufficient Torah (instruction)*

(a)...requires us to "study to show yourself approved" ...and, since there has been a lot of "added baggage", even in the KJV, that means go to the original language when there is any doubt. There's Proverbs 25:2, as well: *It is the glory of God to conceal a thing: but the honour of kings is to search out a matter.*

Is it JUST POSSIBLE that there have been things "sealed" (Daniel, Revelation, etc) that are now being revealed to those who diligently "seek His face," and make "t'shuvah" from the pagan world? Especially if we claim to want to be "kings and priests" of the order of Melchizedek. (Torah, again...one of those "parables".)

(b)...MUST be completely CONSISTENT with "all Scripture".

...IF we read it IN CONTEXT, including the history and original language.  
("Sola Scriptura" is problematic; most people who claim it don't really remotely DO it.)

Case in point: marriage. It's what is Written -- NOT what 'the church' says it just has to be, and certainly not what so many men claim God WOULD have written, if He was as smart as they are.

(c)...is redundant, IFF we understand (b).

(And I don't like the words "old" and "new" -- for obvious implications, including that they're somehow different



or, worse still, INCONSISTENT.)

822. Mark Call

August 11, 2015 8:18 PM

----- continued -----

(d)...is not defined in any 'church', or 'traditions of men'.

BECAUSE Yah said so, over and over and over again: In Deuteronomy chapter 7, 12, 13, etc, etc, and as the Messiah Himself pointed out repeatedly, in Matthew 5, 23, Mark 7, John 14-15, etc, etc.

He called such folks "hypocrites" (or worse) for a reason!

And so, no - I reject (e) utterly.

Read Jeremiah chapter 31, and especially verses 31-34:

"I will put My TORAH in their minds, and will write it [My Instruction] on their hearts..."

Ask yourself, honestly, just one question:

Is it STILL NECESSARY for a "man to teach his neighbor," or not?

Can anyone TRULY claim that that "*they shall ALL know Me, from the least of them to the greatest,*"????

Hell, most of xtianity doesn't even know His NAME (YHVH) or what that means (His unchanging, Covenant-keeping character) -- much less that His Instruction has NEVER been "done away with".

THIS is the RENEWED Covenant! ("My Covenant, which THEY BROKE, even though I was a Husband to them," says YHVH!)

Then read the rest of that section, and note words that are NOT rendered accurately in the English by our xtian 'baggage'. Words like "ordinances" (and the implication there in v 35 and 36!)

Honestly, ST, it's that claim (e) -- that a "law" they reject and NEVER studied is somehow "written on our

hearts" that any even remotely honest reading of Jeremiah 31:31 et al shreds utterly.

And what about those TWO wives/houses? (Israel AND Judah) I believe beyond any shadow of doubt that those days are STILL COMING. And it won't happen until we DO what He says, as Written.

(Show me your 'faith' by your ACTIONS, IOW. Don't tell me "I said the sinner's prayer and got my 'get outta hell free' card, so now I can go back to beer and football." Not you personally, but metaphorically, of course... ;)

SO -- for (e) -- there is a reason people like me, and MANY others, are returning to our "Hebrew roots", and saying "come out of her!" (Rev. 18:4) Because the 'church' that has adopted paganism and "traditions of men" in LIEU OF His 'instruction" is, by definition, practicing "adultery" (idolatry) and 'whoring'. Just as BOTH of Yah's two wives (Jer 3, Ezek 23, Aholah and Aholibah, Israel and Judah, Northern and Southern kingdoms) did, and are STILL DOING.

It's why we STILL need to teach His "instruction". All of it.

823. Anonymous

August 11, 2015 8:19 PM

Simple Tim

I'm not your dancing monkey. Your job is to rebut my argument. To do that you are required to make a counter argument. If you don't understand my argument, say so.

I have carefully summarized my argument for you, several times. You ignored it.

I just asked you another on point question, which you are refusing to answer. I am aware you don't want to answer it, but I insist. I did not make an "initial case," rather I have been making the same argument all along. I have asked you to answer a basic question and CITE YOUR AUTHORITY.

**This isn't about sex, Simple Tim. This is about authority. Either show me where God said sexual contact between wives married to the same man is**

sin, or show me your delegation of authority that allows you to arbitrarily step into another mans' family and declare something to be a sin when God didn't.

In comment [@786](#) your refused to do so, saying "*I am doing neither.*"

Your opinion of my argument is irrelevant. Your characterization of my argument is irrelevant to my argument... because you have yet to meet the most basic criteria of rebuttal, which is to counter my argument, which started on July 16th. It's now August 11th.

Just to recap some of your silliness, in comment [@504](#) you said:

*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.*

Why then are Rahab and the Hebrew midwives listed in Hebrews in the "hall of fame" when the significant act that got them there was telling lies?

I can point to numerous passages in which lying is, at the very least, frowned upon (God says He hates lying lips). However, there is no command not to lie except in the case of giving testimony against another. If God cannot lie, why did God not forbid telling lies and make it a sin? Maybe, just maybe, God recognized that we are not gods...

In the same comment you said:

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

Three problems with that statement. First, it does not agree with God's Word. We've been over this before. Second, in making that statement you are trying to add to the Law, which is strictly forbidden and a sin in and

of itself. Third, throughout this argument I have posited a scenario in which the women are lying with their husband, not solely women with women.

Given your admission of a problem with porn and sexual sin, I can see this is an emotional issue with you. I thought about it, came up with a parallel argument in [@816](#) and while I realize you don't want to answer, I insist.

You can hold an opinion of "I believe this is wrong."

I won't argue that, because that's the Holy Spirit working in you. If you think it's wrong it's wrong for you.

However, when you say *"Similarly, for the Christian, there are restrictions placed on him that are not in any law, but are wrong by their very nature"* you are assuming the prerogatives of God. You don't have that authority. You may consider something wrong for you and thus it is wrong for you, but you do not have the authority to claim it's wrong for everyone.

Answer the questions. Last chance.

**824. Mark Call**

August 11, 2015 8:25 PM

Hmm? What happened to part 1 of 2???

It'll probably show up some time in the future.

Meanwhile:

=====

@ST ([@814](#))

In summary, in your view, is it true that.

**God's Perfect Law (Instruction)**

- (a)...requires interpretation and heuristics.
- (b)...is completely defined in Scripture alone
- (c)...is defined in the N.T. as well as the O.T.
- (d)...is not defined in any church tradition or magisterium, because (b)

I'll just rephrase as I would state it, since I think that may be more clear:

*YHVH's Complete and Sufficient Torah (instruction)*

(a)...requires us to "study to show yourself approved" ...and, since there has been a lot of "added baggage", even in the KJV, that means go to the original language when there is any doubt. There's Proverbs 25:2, as well: *It is the glory of God to conceal a thing: but the honour of kings is to search out a matter.*

Is it JUST POSSIBLE that there have been things "sealed" (Daniel, Revelation, etc) that are now being revealed to those who diligently "seek His face," and make "t'shuvah" from the pagan world? Especially if we claim to want to be "kings and priests" of the order of Melchitzedek. (Torah, again...one of those "parables".)

(b)...MUST be completely CONSISTENT with "all Scripture".

...IF we read it IN CONTEXT, including the history and original language.  
("Sola Scriptura" is problematic; most people who claim it don't really remotely DO it.)

Case in point: marriage. It's what is Written -- NOT what 'the church' says it just has to be, and certainly not what so many men claim God WOULD have written, if He was as smart as they are.

(c)...is redundant, IFF we understand (b).

(And I don't like the words "old" and "new" -- for obvious implications, including that they're somehow different or, worse still, INCONSISTENT.)

----- To be continued -----

**825. Mark Call**

**August 11, 2015 8:31 PM**

@arti -

Are you SERIOUSLY claiming that "cannibalism" is not UTTERLY and clearly prohibited in Torah?????????????????

Surely I didn't read what it seems you wrote in @816.

(And I won't digress to the other fallacies that follow, other than to say the answer is in Deuteronomy 30, "choose life!")

Do you know anybody who has cloven feet and chews their cud?

:)

**826. Anonymous**

August 11, 2015 8:32 PM

@toad,

You have made your case and you are repeating yourself.

The rebuttal will come on my time on my terms.

**827. Anonymous**

August 11, 2015 8:38 PM

Hi Mark,

Thank you for your considered reply. I will study your comments tomorrow. I am beginning to see where we differ and I will attempt to articulate it so we both understand it.

I am tired from my days work and have to tend to the property tomorrow. Hopefully, I can give it some more thought. If not, by this weekend. I look forward to this.

Also, thank you for your kind comment [@731](#) I got distracted and did not respond.

**828. Mark Call**

August 11, 2015 8:41 PM

----- continued -----

[@821](#) should go HERE.

**829. Mark Call**

August 11, 2015 8:51 PM

It's a good thing these comments are now numbered.  
Given what this tool has done to my own comment sequence, no WONDER people can be confused! ;)

Thanks, ST -- will look forward to it. (PS -- I always post my Torah teachings up on WayToZion.org and often other places, like Hebrew Nation Radio where I do a lot of teaching. This thread, the "torah" part and 'come out of her' anyway, will no doubt be a big focus this Sabbath.

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

As for those 'differences', you might find last week's Sabbath teachings, "Ekev", interesting; perhaps even inflammatory. ;)

[http://www.waytozion.org/teachings/mark\\_call/2015/SSM%208-7-15%20Ekev.mp3](http://www.waytozion.org/teachings/mark_call/2015/SSM%208-7-15%20Ekev.mp3)

[http://www.waytozion.org/teachings/mark\\_call/2015/WT%20CooH%208-8-15%20Ekev.mp3](http://www.waytozion.org/teachings/mark_call/2015/WT%20CooH%208-8-15%20Ekev.mp3)

**830. Anonymous**

**August 11, 2015 9:22 PM**

@Mark

*Are you SERIOUSLY claiming that "cannibalism" is not UTTERLY and clearly prohibited in Torah?????????????????*

I may have missed something. If so, please cite.

*Do you know anybody who has cloven feet and chews their cud?*

Gotcha.

That was an instruction specific to animals, not humans.

If you see other fallacies, please expound. I'd love to hear it. Arguing with you is like arguing with Rabbi Schmitd (leader of a congregation I used to attend). You both have that slipperiness that requires me to nail everything down hard.

## 831. Mark Call

August 11, 2015 10:31 PM

There's nothing slippery about observing that cannibalism is explicitly prohibited because people are "NOT FOOD."

(Neither are pigs, and 'science' will tell you their DNA is similar enough that EVERY single pandemic in history has come through swine to man, by "jumping the species barrier.")

Scripture is specific (at least twice). If it walks on land, unless it has a split hoof and chews the cud...it *ain't food!*

## 832. Anonymous

August 12, 2015 9:04 AM

Hi Mark,

One other component of "the Law(instruction)" I want to nail down in this definition is in addition to your sentence;

**His "instruction" (torah) -- which is complete, and indeed perfect as Written, includes a whole lot of stories and parables, too.**

That is "literary 'forms'" (I will get a better term for this, please bear with me)

For example :

*Chiasm is a literary form from Scripture having from A B B' A'*

*One use is its utility as a memory aide .*

*The Chiasm's utility as a memory aide makes it a very useful indeed!*

*The form A B B A' is a Chiasm, a literary form from Scripture*

Another is one I presented is the use of the Archetype. where the seventh thing in scripture is considered Archtypical.

I do **not** know this is true, but if it is, then it is there for our "instruction" and therefore when we consider the archetype, we must *see* it and recognize what is being said to us by this *literary form*



I have included this comment so that when I get time to study your [@820](#), [@821](#), [@822](#) and summarize them, I can bring this into the mix.

Remember, we are only working on *definitions* here. There is the distinct possibility that there will be several differences on what constitutes "The Law (instruction)". However, the very exercise of specifying those differences will bear fruit when we move on to toad's later claims.

Plus, its fun.

Cheers!

833. Mark Call

August 12, 2015 12:33 PM

@ST --

**One other component of "the Law(instruction)" I want to nail down in this definition is in addition to your sentence...is "literary 'forms'..."**

...e.g., chiasms ("ATbash" in the Hebrew, for nested reference to first and last letters), etc.

Yes, examples abound, including "first use" of a Hebrew word, and multiple uses. (I am significantly more suspicious of the so-called 'archetype', since it's often so darned SUBJECTIVE...or even twisted. ;)

If you want the "creme de la creme" of such, don't overlook "PARDES (PRDS)" (do a search) - which is an acronym for the Hebrew words describing the 'depth' of an understanding, from 'peschat' (the "plain meaning" of the text) through "sod" (the deepest hidden level). The key remains that no "hidden meaning", however, can contradict the peschat.

I very much enjoy studying the 'midrash' (and that includes commentaries not only of people like Rashi, but Shaul/Paul!)- but never forget, it can NOT contradict what Scripture SAYS. (And one would hope that applies ESPECIALLY to the "words in red" -- first-person quotes from the Author -- but that's clearly NOT how much of the 'church' seems to like things twisted.)

Bottom line: There are still no contradictions in Scripture, as Written, in the original language. Most that appear such are the fault of men, accidental (translation error, cultural bias) or deliberate distortion (the 'divine right of kings' - and the Official 501c3 Church Dogma of Romans 13!).

And the few that are not (see Rashi for these, among others) are often the true gems, where diligent study will reveal the subtle distinction the Creator put there for us. It is often, albeit not exclusively, in those places where tools like you reference are most useful.

So I'll conclude this way, relative to the thread topic: You can NOT really understand the nature of marriage, Covenant, "divorce" [putting away, with or without 'get'] and RESTORATION of right relationship without shedding the pagan doctrine of 'Monogamania' and the related goddess worship.

"In My Father's house..." are many mansions, and TWO houses! BOTH of 'em with "whoring issues."

834. Anonymous

August 12, 2015 5:32 PM

Hi Mark

Busy day today and I have not had time to study. However(!) thank you for the information on the literary forms;

The fact that they exist is important and the fact that considering them is *normative* is good (in many senses of the word).

BTW, what about Bullinger and his numbers? The structure of the Hebrew alphabet? Are these common tools in your world too? (just yes/no is fine, I don't have time to study now, thx)

I will add them to the list when I get time to turn my attention back to this argument. (hopefully tomorrow)

Keep in mind, that I am not addressing the polygyny argument (I am not conceding it either); Rather, I am addressing the woman-woman sex in house-of-toad under toad's authority argument.

God willing, you and I can take up the polygyny topic another time. This sort of definitional work will bear fruit there, too.

If/when we have differences, at least we will know why they exist and we can point to the source of disagreement w/o arguing from different definitions.

thx again.

835. Mark Call

August 13, 2015 10:33 AM

@ST, and re: lots of ways of "tools" for studying Scripture, from "Numbers in Scripture" to others.

So, "yes," will suffice. Bullinger, of course, nicely compiled what others had written before him, and it's a good reference.

But don't let the tools substitute for the study, or twist the 'peschat'. Commentary ON Scripture (including midrash, and claims from tools) does not replace what is Written. (And, in particular, the "words in red", from YHVH via those who "come in His Name.")

The easy example in this case remains this:

**"Keep in mind, that I am not addressing the polygyny argument (I am not conceding it either); Rather, I am addressing the woman-woman sex in house-of-toad under toad's authority argument."**

No tools needed. There are "difficult teachings" in Scripture (the Apostles cited "eat My flesh, drink My blood") but polygyny is NOT one of 'em.

There is NO prohibition whatsoever. And YHVH clearly does not give Rules for what He forbids. (Others do it for him, though.)

And there are many examples of the practice, from men "after His own heart" to Yah Himself.

So it's literally a no-brainer. Dealing with the Xtian Baggage (Jer. 16:19 again!) is the problem.

As for the "other" arguments, hopefully by now it's clear

that you can't possibly grok that without seeing the easy part. Don't make it harder than it is. (Remember that the first lie in all of Scripture boils down to adding to what Yah said!) Again, there is simply no prohibition from HIM...and the rest is all "doctrine of men" baggage.

Blessings...

**836. Anonymous**

**August 13, 2015 6:06 PM**

Hi Mark,

I saw your "it ain't food" comment while eating a pork sandwich, so I expect this will come up. Where in the N.T. does it say that we Christian's are under O.T. law?

Another example is the punishment for adultery. In leviticus "the law" says "stone em" and in John 8:1 "the law" says "don't stone em".

I am starting to get the feeling that this TOBe stuff is a pull back to O.T. law and an abandonment of my liberty in Christ.

My apologies if you have covered this already, I have been knee deep in toadisms and haven't paid attention to your posts due to overload.

Cordially

t.

**837. Anonymous**

**August 13, 2015 7:43 PM**

@SimplyTimothy

Throughout this thread you have repeatedly made claims that sexual contact between two wives married to the same husband is wrong and sinful.

I said "Show me where God said sexual contact between wives married to the same man is sin, or show me your delegation of authority that allows you to **arbitrarily** step into another mans' family

and declare something to be a sin when God didn't."

You responded, [@786](#) saying: "I am doing neither."

**That isn't true.** As the record shows, you have described sexual contact between women as evil, a perversion, a sin, and contrary to the will of God.

[@372](#) "*You are advocating evil*"

[@460](#) "*If your perversion ever goes mainstream...*"

[@463](#) "...*your desire to have your multiple wives pervert themselves for your pleasure.*"

[@494](#) "*If sexual relations between two women is a sin, (and it is per argument number 1)*"

[@504](#) "*it is just as wrong for a woman to lie with a woman as it is for a man to lie with a man*"

[@519](#) "*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.*"

[@537](#) "*you are advocating evil.*"

As to point two of my question, you also claim the authority to invade someone's family in order to judge what takes place in their marital bed.

[@755](#) Referencing comment [@525](#) where I said 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."*

Tim's response was "**(ME: yes we do. You cannot be immoral you cannot do evil. You are still under God)**"

That might be overlooked as a casual "note to self" by tim, but later he doubled down on it.

[@779](#) "*As husband, if you are like Caesar and commanding your wife to do that which is*

*against the will of God, then somebody has to intervene if the wife cannot help herself."*

Thus, you are doing both, claiming sexual contact between two wives married to the same man is wrong AND claiming the right to invade (intervene) another man's marital bed and regulate it.

Tim, you claim "it is just as wrong for a woman to lie with a woman as it is for a man to lie with a man". We know it is wrong for a man to lie with a man as with a woman because God said it is wrong and called it an abomination (Leviticus 18:22). I made an argument from silence (a negative claim) but you are making a positive claim, that God did forbid such a thing. To support this claim, Tim:

**Cite where God said it is wrong for a woman to lie with a woman, or withdraw your claim.**

I have repeatedly asked you to answer this question. You say you're working on an answer. **The problem is if you don't have an answer, why did you make the claim?** The funniest part of all this is I could give you the answer you're (at least partially) looking for, but I won't until you're capable of honest debate and willing to answer these questions you don't want to answer. I've even given lots of hints, but it's probably so "simple" that you can't see it.

[Continued]

**838. Anonymous**

**August 13, 2015 7:44 PM**

[Continued]

**Ephesians 5:22** says "*Wives, be subject to your own husbands as to the Lord*"

**1st Corinthians 7:4**, speaking to the subject of sex within marriage, says "*The wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband does.*"

**1st Peter 3:1** says "*You wives, be submissive to your own husbands so that even if any of them are disobedient to the Word...*"

Notice the wives are commanded to submit to their own husbands, even if the husband is not acting in a Godly manner. (This argument is about sex, Tim. If a wife is injured by her husband doing the weird stuff you consider to be sex, she has recourse to civil authorities.)

You, however, are claiming the authority to intervene in another man's marriage if a husband commands the wife to do "that which is against the will of God".

So, Tim, to back up this astonishing claim, **cite where you (or the church) are delegated the authority by God to regulate a man's marital bed and require his wife to violate her instruction to submit to her husband.**

Likewise, **cite where you (or the church) get the authority to determine God's will for another man's wife**, given that she is commanded to submit to him in everything.

Your claim is so astonishing I'd like you to flesh this out a bit, given that you are claiming the authority to judge.

1. If a husband wants oral sex, is it God's will that his wife comply?
2. If a husband wants anal sex, is it God's will that his wife comply?
3. If the wife wanted oral sex from her husband, is it God's will for him to comply?
4. If the husband isn't able to give his wife as much sex as she wants, can she demand he get a prescription for Cialis/Viagra? Would your answer change if he couldn't get it up was because she was grossly overweight?
5. Does the husband have the authority to order his wife to lose weight if she's fat, and would that be God's will for her?
6. If he did so, would she have the right to demand that he shed his spare tire?
7. If a husband orders his wife to use

a [kegelmaster](#) device to tighten up her vagina, is that God's will for her?

8. Does the husband have the authority to demand that his wife have some cosmetic surgery to get bigger boobs? Would his desire for that make it God's will for her?

9. If a wife wants her husband to use a [Bathmate](#) because he has a little dick, does she have the right to demand that of him?

If it came to your attention through informal means such as your wife saying "*You will not believe this. Toad actually ordered his wife to lose weight and then he gave her this medical device and told her to exercise her vagina because she wasn't tight enough for him!*"

You made the claim that you (or the church) have the authority to intervene if a husband is commanding his wife to do something outside God's will for her. I'm waiting for you to show me where God gave you that authority.

However, intervening is not the same as judging a case brought before the church by one of the individuals, because if the case is brought to you, the individuals have given you the authority to judge the case. In the example of 1st Corinthians 5, Paul is preemptively judging the public violation of Leviticus 18:8. The marriage bed, however, is private.

Answer questions 1-9 as if you were an elder of the church and either husband or wife brought the issue before you. These are not trick questions, the point is not what the answer is but rather how you arrive at the answer. Keep in mind that the wife has rights of her own.

**839. Mark Call**

**August 13, 2015 8:59 PM**

Been there, done that, ST. Do we believe Him, or what men said He should've said?

**Where in the N.T. does it say that we Christian's are under O.T. law?**



- That's why it's "instruction", and not something that doesn't exist, "OT Law". To paraphrase Shaul (Paul) -- just because the 'Schoolmaster' isn't here any more, do we disregard His teaching? (instruction)
- "Instruction" means "Owner's Manual," among other things! Do you deny the Designer outta know what's good for our still-mortal bodies?  
(If you wanna "die to Jesus" -- fine. But don't twist Paul and blame him for that.)
- Matthew 5:17-19, obviously.
- And read Matthew 7:22-23!
- And Isaiah 66...especially v 4, and then v 17!!!
- Either He's the same, yesterday, today, and tomorrow, and meant it when He said so, or he's a liar.
- And are you REALLY so hung up on that "old" testament-is-done-away-with lie that you'll ignore what His Word actually says? READ Romans 6, fer cryin' out loud, and forget what you've been TOLD it says.

As a friend of mine likes to say, "Did Jesus die on the cross so you could eat a ham sandwich?"

The problem is this: NOWHERE does it say anything like, "pork is now OK." And here's the issue I like to point out (not because we know WHY He Wrote what He did, but BECAUSE WE CAN STILL SEE THE CONSEQUENCES!)

Pigs are Yah's 'garbage processors of the land.' They don't sweat, and every poison they eat stays in 'em. (Ever seen their 'effluent tubes,' though, that run down their legs and dump out puss? Yuk. And the enzymes He put in there to digest dead stuff are STILL in the meat; they have names like "putrescene" and "cadaverene".)

"Pig DNA is the closest to human," says 'science'. Thus, things which infect pork will infect humans.

Every single pandemic in human history has come through swine.

All of Scripture warns of the plagues to come (including Rev. 18:4) and the diseases He promises NOT to bring on those who "obey my statutes, judgments, and commandments" but WILL visit on those who do not.

Is it just possible that, since His Word is SOOOO

consistent about what is food (this week's parsha - Deut. chapter 14 included) and what is not, that there is still an important message for us in there?

I truly believe, ST, that His plagues are coming, from Ebola and other engineered diseases, to "God-alone-knows-what". He will protect those who listen to Him, and walk in His ways. I hope you can be convinced to listen to Him, rather than men who teach rebellion to Him, and lead their 'flock's to destruction.

840. Mark Call

August 13, 2015 9:12 PM

PS, @ST --

You're a pilot, perhaps my "Law of Gravity" teaching (abbreviated, since I usually do it live) may help.

I was once "under a flight instructor". I did not "know the law" (instruction) of aviation, or aerodynamics, or rules of aviation, or any number of other things that were literally a matter of "life and death, or blessing and cursing."

I had a "schoolmaster of the law" [CFI] who flew in the right seat with me for a number of hours.

One day, though, he got out, shut the door behind him, told me to "remember what you have learned of that instruction," and to take the plane around the pattern, solo. I understood the importance of practicing that instruction, even though I was at that point not "under" him. Still later, I learned more of the 'statutes, judgments, commandments," and even parables and history of flight, and about weather, and other "Laws of Nature."

I am no longer "under an instructor". And, thousands of hours, and much experience later, I know how important that "instruction" -- in so many ways! -- still is.

But am I "under" the Law of Gravity? Does aerodynamics still apply to me, too, or am I "above the law"?

Any pilot that forgets the Instruction, which is literally a matter of life and death, will eventually, even

perhaps inevitably, see that Law "rise up and smite him." Aviation is unforgiving of "lawlessness."

Please do not confuse being able to UNDERSTAND His Instruction, and His "Law" (especially of Gravity, physics, and weather!) with not still understanding the importance of continuing to walk in obedience to the INSTRUCTION about all of it!

841. Anonymous

August 15, 2015 12:02 PM

toad [@826](#)

842. Anonymous

August 15, 2015 12:34 PM

Simple Tim.

Reading comprehension, please.

Support YOUR claims. You made them. Answer the questions.

843. Anonymous

August 15, 2015 12:41 PM

toad [@826](#)

844. Anonymous

August 15, 2015 12:50 PM

Mark

I am parsing your comments.

In [@820](#), you write:

*His 'instruction' is complete, 'perfect' in the Hebrew sense, and we are not to "add to," nor "subtract from." (BTW, "perfect" in the legal sense means "completely sufficient for His purposes," or "as designed," to do EXACTLY what He intended. It does "not return void," either!)*

1. "perfect' in the Hebrew sense means 'complete' in our sense. Correct?
2. In Mathew 5:7 with the "You have heard it said...but I say to you..." pairs it is evident that the O.T. readers did not have access to the entirety of His law, rather a subset.
3. One intent of the O.T. law was to reveal the impossibility of abiding by it; the law shows us of our sin.

Short yes/no's only please for now. We can focus on the no's as we build the definition(s).

thx.

**845. Anonymous**

August 15, 2015 2:08 PM

Hi Mark,

Re: [@839](#), I will pray about this and consider it further. I made a semi-snide comment about it and do not want that to color our conversation.

**846. Anonymous**

August 15, 2015 2:21 PM

Hi Mark Call. Below is a summary of your comments. Lets call it a first draft of your definition..I will revise per your reply.

*Law/Torah/Instruction*

**INCLUDES:**

statutes/chuqqim  
 judgements/mishpatim  
 commandments/mitzvot  
 stories  
 parables  
 O.T  
 N.T.  
 midrash(<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Midrash>)  
 peschat(?)  
 Literary forms including  
 chiasms/ATbash  
 archetype/suspicious of

"first use" of a Hebrew word

"multiple uses" of a Hebrew word

PARDES (PRDS)

Peshat (פֶּשֶׁט) – "surface" ("straight") or the literal (direct) meaning.[1]

Remez (רֵמֵז) – "hints" or the deep (allegoric: hidden or symbolic) meaning beyond just the literal sense.

Derash (דְּרָשׁ) – from Hebrew darash: "inquire" ("seek") – the comparative (midrashic) meaning, as given through similar occurrences.

Sod (סוד) (pronounced with a long O as in 'sore') – "secret" ("mystery") or the esoteric/mystical meaning, as given through inspiration or revelation.

"hidden" matters that require searching out.

(possibly) "Sealed" now being revealed to those who

"diligently seek His face" and make "t'shuvah"

Number per Bullinger

**IS:**

Completely sufficient for His purposes (synonyms: 'complete', 'perfect')

**IS NOT:**

Defined in any traditions of church or men. (how does this square with midrash?)

Written on the Hearts and Minds of men by the Holy Spirit.

Erroneous faults introduced by translation error

cultural bias

Deliberate distortion (divine right of kings or Official 501c3 Church Dogma of Romans 13!(me: Which part? submission to authority or fulfilling law through love?).

**REQUIRES:**

Study

Internal consistency

?? And the few that are not (see Rashi for these, among others) are often the true gems,

where diligent study will reveal the subtle distinction the Creator put there for us.

It is often, albeit not exclusively, in those places where tools like you reference are most useful.

The goal is a *definition* such that as the debate goes forward we don't talk past each other. There *will* be disagreements, however, we can take note of them and agree to disagree for the time being.

I have a few ?? in there regarding:

peschat (google yields nothing)  
 midrash (it is commentary/derived doctrine, yes? i.e.  
 Canon? and therefore not instruction?)  
 Which section of Romans 13 do you take issue with?

Blessings.

t

847. Anonymous

August 15, 2015 2:32 PM

Mark Call,

Under your definition of "The Law (Torah) of the Lord is Perfect" is the following statement possibly true?

"Moses (Writing in Deuteronomy, part of the Tanakh) got it wrong"

My reasoning is this. Since it is Tanakh and Tanakh is part of Torah, and *not* midrash then by definition it is Perfect and cannot contradict itself. Since Moses wrote it, it stands that only two things can be true:

1. Moses got it exactly right.
2. An error by Moses should be instructive.

I have not studied your dispute with toad (but will, if required) . I seek only if you think my logic is correct with your definition.

thx.

848. Anonymous

August 15, 2015 2:39 PM

@Mark Call

Regarding [@822](#)

*(d)...is not defined in any 'church', or 'traditions of men'.*

*BECAUSE Yah said so, over and over and over again: In Deuteronomy chapter 7, 12, 13, etc, etc, and as the Messiah Himself pointed out repeatedly, in Matthew 5,*

23, Mark 7, John 14-15, etc, etc.

I will be reading these passages within the next few days to get a better idea of how you are thinking. However, please see my question in [@846](#) (at the bottom) regarding midrash.

thx.

849. Anonymous

August 15, 2015 2:51 PM

Apologies for the cut-n-paste, but I omitted a preliminary category of toad's claims that I posted for reference beginning with comment [@745](#) . I have not condensed toad's claims, yet based on the definition work we are presently doing, I guess we can trim as we define.

-----  
 THE LAW IS PERFECT  
 -----

73. *God's Law is perfect, containing no more and no less than perfection. Claims that God got it wrong is to call God a liar, which is blasphemy. (COMMENT [@351](#))*

*ME:(Moses got it wrong? no. So....)*

74. *The silence on God's part in not forbidding or condemning female-female sexual acts speaks very loudly in light of His inclusion of women in the prohibition against bestiality. (COMMENT [@351](#))*  
*Per Malachi 3:6 or Hebrews 13:8 Polygyny is here to stay because God never changes. (Mark Call COMMENT [@361](#). referenced in COMMENT [@365](#))*

*My assertion: Deut. 24:1-4 was a judgment of Moses, not a command by God. Everything in my argument hangs upon that. (COMMENT [@476](#))*

*It is assumed by many that all judgments of Moses were inspired by God and they point to Deuteronomy 1:3 in support. (COMMENT [@476](#))*

*Moses 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? (COMMENT [@476](#))*

*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. (COMMENT @476)*

*Deut. 24:1-4*

- 1. This was a judgment of Moses.*
- 2. Moses got it wrong. (COMMENT @476) ME:(By what principle did they get the laws on polygyny right? The no restrictions cited in Genesis seems weak to me.)*

*Christ's comment in Mathew 19:8 coupled with no mention of divorce certificates in the law that God gave Moses supports the claim that Jesus thought Moses erred. (COMMENT @480)*

*165. The question is whether Deut. 24:1-4 was of God or of Moses. (COMMENT @480)*

*166. 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. (COMMENT @480)*

*235. There is a tremendous difference between the One who gives the Law and one who interprets the Law and renders a judicial decision.*

*You rightly know that a legislature can and occasionally does react in righteous indignation when courts "interpret" the law they wrote in ways they never imagined.*

*You do err when you claim this decision of Moses is part of the Law as given.*

*We have the testimony of Jesus in Matthew 19 to that effect. "Moses PERMITTED you." Shall the righteous witness testify against Himself?(COMMENT @660)*

*236. He is God and He does not change. His Word will never change. Moses, however, was not so reliable. (COMMENT @660)*

*237. I notice you didn't touch Numbers 25. Arguendo, I am a son of Phineas. (COMMENT @660)*

*238. Mark, it is well settled that silence equals consent. Is that how you want to play it? (COMMENT @660)*



239. *Deut. 24:1-4 was a judicial decision by Moses.*  
 (COMMENT @663)

850. Anonymous

August 15, 2015 3:08 PM

To the best of my knowledge, here are toad's claims regarding The Law of The Lord is Perfect. They were found by searching toad's comments for 'Psalm' , 'law' , 'perfect'. If I missed any, let me know.

(COMMENT @145) *You Christians (of whatever flavor) miss the point about polygyny.*

*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. As has been pointed out, God does not regulate sin, He prohibits it and condemns it.*

COMMENT @189) *If you don't like it the best you can say is*

*"This is not for me" ("That which is not of faith is sin") but if God didn't say it was wrong then you are saying God got it wrong when you claim this is wrong (for everyone) because that means God's Law isn't perfect. God said His Law is perfect, ergo, you're calling God a liar. That's blasphemy.*

(COMMENT @247) *I knew where this was going when I started the argument. I threw in the girl-girl stuff early because it so clearly illustrates the inability of many*

*in the church to take out of the Word what it says instead of reading into it what they want it to say. Eisegesis v Exegesis.*

*Ultimately you're trying to claim God didn't get it right.*

*That God's Law isn't perfect and therefore God is a liar because the Word clearly says All Scripture is God-breathed and the Law of the Lord is perfect. Take a look at the points I've made:*

(COMMENT @319) *I realize this is really difficult for you; but you aren't God, you aren't an apostle and you*

*don't get to redefine the terms to get God's Word to say what you want it to say.  
God said that His Law is perfect. Trying to go back and "correct the record" means you're saying God got it wrong, thus God is a liar.  
As I've stated previously, that's blasphemy.*

*(COMMENT @323) I believe only God has the authority to declare that something is always wrong for all time and all people.*

*We know what right and wrong are subjectively (ME:??) because God gave us His Law and it's perfect.*

*As Christians we know what right and wrong are situationally through the ministry of the Holy Spirit and His Word.*

*But what might be wrong for one might be OK for another. Romans 14 speaks very clearly to this subject.*

*COMMENT @351) 1. God's Law is perfect, containing no more and no less than perfection. Claims that God got it wrong is to call God a liar, which is blasphemy.*

**851. Anonymous**

**August 15, 2015 3:15 PM**

@SirHamster, @Beau

Any thoughts on the (ongoing) Mark Call definition of The Law of The Lord?

After Mark get's his in place we can present our own and note the areas of disagreement, etc.

**852. Anonymous**

**August 15, 2015 6:11 PM**

*After Mark get's his in place we can present our own and note the areas of disagreement, etc.*

Timmy, we're all waiting for you to support YOUR claims. You are not immune to being called on the astonishing bullshit you've asserted. I've asked questions and according to the rules around here you're

expected to respond. These are YOUR claims. Respond, please.

853. Anonymous

August 15, 2015 7:41 PM

toad [@826](#) [@712](#)

854. Anonymous

August 15, 2015 8:24 PM

@SirHamster, @Beau @Mark Call

When we get to the category of THE NATURAL FUNCTION, there is an interesting discourse between Beau, SarahsDaughter and toad in comments

[@594](#) beau,

[@595](#) sarahsdaughter,

[@596](#) toad

[@597](#) sarahsdaughter regarding

1 Peter 2:18-25 1 Peter 3:1-7

That I did not study at the time. Just now I browsed it a bit, and it relates to @Beau's "likewise" argument with toad.

By my reading, the flow of "likewise" flows as such:

1 Peter 2:13 Be subject for the Lord's sake to every human institution

1 Peter 2:18 Servants, [Be subject for the Lord's sake to every human institution

1 Peter 3:1 In the same way, you wives [Be subject for the Lord's sake to every human institution],

1 Peter 3:7 You husbands in the same way [Be subject for the Lord's sake to every human institution],

1 Peter 3:8 To sum up [Be subject for the Lord's sake to every human institution]

This has direct bearing on [@288](#) and [@583](#) as the "likewise" applies to the same subject throughout the flow of the narrative.

Let's keep this in mind for when we get to THE NATURAL FUNCTION category.

@toad, I do not want to hear anymore of your

arguments before we get to the formal discussion. Frankly, I have read about 700 comments worth of your thinking and anything you say now will only continue to distract from the task of examining what you have said. You can rebut after we examine. What you WILL NOT DO is dominate the discourse with your hyper-threading where we respond to your whims.

Any demand by you will be met with: [@826](#) [@712](#)

855. Anonymous

August 15, 2015 8:37 PM

Simple Tim

Have you read the rules of the blog recently?

**2. You are expected to back up your assertions, so don't be surprised if you happen to get called on them. If you fail to back up an assertion when called on it, but refuse to retract the statement, understand that I reserve the right to delete the relevant comment and all subsequent comments you attempt to make. If you are asked a direct question relevant to the topic, then you will be expected to answer it in a straightforward and non-evasive manner**

Shall I ask for active moderation?

856. Anonymous

August 15, 2015 8:59 PM

Tim

**The questions I asked were about YOUR assertions. Answer them.**

*You claim "What you WILL NOT DO is dominate the discourse with your hyper-threading where we respond to your whims."*

It is you (like the good little SJW you are) who are making the unsupported assertions and refusing to support or defend them. In making the claim I am attempting to dominate the dicourse, you accuse me of

doing what you are doing: demanding it take place at your leisure, according to your own schedule and according to your whims. It's been a month, Tim. Surely you could have come up with something by now...

You've lied, then doubled down on your lies, and you've been projecting throughout this discussion. You're the definition of a churchian SJW white knight.

Support your claims or retract them.

**857. Anonymous**

**August 15, 2015 9:05 PM**

Dear Moderator.

It is my wish to answer toad's claims logically, decisively, truthfully.

To do this, I have had to revert to first principles of logical discourse as interaction with toad over these near 855 comments has not produced a coherent response to his claims and argument.

In order to fully understand toads argument I have:

1. collected them toad's claims.
2. sorted them into tentative categories covering the main ideas of his claims claims.
3. Am now reviewing each category one-by-one with other commenters.
4. Defining terms and seeking clarification for each one of toads claims in each category.
5. Working to understand toad's argument from first principles.
6. State toads argument, correctly and concisely (toad has done this, but I do not find him convincing)
7. present toad a chance to clarify any claim
8. rebut toads argument using agreed upon definitions and claims and argument form.

This approach is necessary due to toad's "command/response" expectations have not lead to productive discourse.

This approach is bearing fruit, in that it has given us

1. situational awareness of the scope of toads claims
2. a rational approach to investigating and defining, starting from basic principles to toad's extraordinary claims.
3. a means of referring to past definitions and claims in

context so that meaning and argument are not hindered by following threads.

It is toad's "command" that I answer "now" it is my response that I will answer after necessary work is done per [@801](#) [@826](#) [@712](#) (and other similar replies to toad's "answer now" commands)

In summary I am in the process of "backing up my assertions" and am more than willing be called on them when the assertions are properly made per the rules of the blog.

**858. Anonymous**

August 15, 2015 9:06 PM

@toad,

I contacted the moderator. In the meantime [@801](#) [@826](#) [@712](#)

**859. Mark Call**

August 15, 2015 9:45 PM

@ST:

"In [@820](#), you write:

'His 'instruction' is complete, 'perfect' in the Hebrew sense, and we are not to "add to," nor "subtract from."

(BTW, "perfect" in the legal sense means "completely sufficient for His purposes," or "as designed," to do EXACTLY what He intended. It does "not return void," either!)

1. "perfect' in the Hebrew sense means 'complete' in our sense. Correct?

No. Close, no cigar. I stick by what I wrote, based on what He Wrote. ("does not return void," completely SUFFICIENT for His purposes, as designed for us. This is why He says - over, and over, and OVER again, that there are blessings for obedience, curses for rebellion. It is NOT TOO HARD for you (Deut. 30)

2. In Mathew 5:7 with the "You have heard it said...but I say to you..." pairs it is evident that the O.T. readers did not have access to the entirety of His law, rather a subset.

NO! He was VERY critical of what THEY, in rebellion to His Word, had ADDED to it. They had "burdens" galore. Read Matthew chapter 23.

3. One intent of the O.T. law (*no, no, NO!*) was to reveal the impossibility of abiding by it; the law shows us of our sin.

No!!!! Utterly, horribly, wrong!!!!!! One of the worst twistings, in fact, HERESIES in Xtianity!!!!

Read Numbers chapter 30, and try to let the sarcasm in verses starting in v 10 sink in.

The WHOLE POINT of the section is to say it is NOT, repeat NOT, "too hard for you." NOT What He Wrote, and taught. What Yahushua made utterly clear was that it was MAN'S "Law" that is the burden...all of that crap added by "religiosity" and the burdens of the "traditions of men". THAT is what Yahushua said is the problem!

If He says it's NOT too hard, and lying men say it is, just who ya gonna believe?

860. Mark Call

August 15, 2015 9:54 PM

@ST - there's a lot more. Re: Moses got it wrong, the answer is simple, albeit repetitive: Hell, no. Moses made a big mistake, and paid for it by not entering the land. But it wasn't what he Wrote in YHVH's Name.

You wanna hear what will answer a whole bunch of questions?

Listen to these, from today (my Sabbath teachings).

Last night is the complete overview, from Deut 11:26-16:17

(Torah parsh, "Re-eh"; "Behold!")

[http://www.waytozion.org/teachings/mark\\_call/2015/SSM%208-](http://www.waytozion.org/teachings/mark_call/2015/SSM%208-)

14-15%20Re-eh.mp3

But the one that will answer the questions, and perhaps send you into apoplexy or revelation, is the more "in-depth" session from this morning:

[http://www.waytozion.org/teachings/mark\\_call/2015/TT%20CooH%20-15-15%20Re-eh.mp3](http://www.waytozion.org/teachings/mark_call/2015/TT%20CooH%20-15-15%20Re-eh.mp3)

No, not for the Bible beginner, but it will challenge you. Comments welcome.

Oh - one more thing:

"Midrash" is commentary, in a discussion form. Where "iron sharpens iron."

This forum should be 'midrash'.

**861. Anonymous**

August 15, 2015 9:57 PM

Hi Mark Call

Thank you for the response.

I will parse your response tomorrow. Based on a quick reading of your comment, it appears we will have to settle on an acknowledged difference in definitions. The good news, is that this work is showing why we could be talking past each other.

I will attempt to get the formal Christian doctrine of 3. stated

Besides studying this, I need to read as stated in [@848](#)

I cannot give a time estimate on this, I am thinking by next Sunday, but hopefully by Wednesday.

Thanks again

t

**862. Anonymous**



August 15, 2015 10:09 PM

With respect to [@857](#)

You have to answer your own claims.

I said nothing about refuting me. Justify your OWN claims.

Answer the questions.

**863. Anonymous**

August 16, 2015 7:51 AM

*I said nothing about refuting me. Justify your OWN claims.*

At my pace, my way. on my time. In the meantime, shut up and wait.

**864. Anonymous**

August 16, 2015 7:55 AM

@Mark Call

In [@820](#) you wrote this: *It does "not return void," either*

As a computer programmer, I think "function"

```
VOID foo(int bar){  
bar:= VOID  
return bar;  
}
```

I do not comprehend what you are trying to convey here. Could you please elaborate on this statement?

thx.

**865. Anonymous**

August 16, 2015 8:16 AM

@Mark Call

In [@859](#) point 2

**2. In Mathew 5:7 with the "You have heard it said...but I say to you..." pairs it is evident that the O.T. readers did not have access to the entirety of His law, rather a subset.**

*NO! He was VERY critical of what THEY, in rebellion to His Word, had ADDED to it. They had "burdens" galore. Read Matthew chapter 23.*

I cannot agree with you here as the plain text of Christ's words in Mathew 5 form this pattern:

You have heard it said [subset]...I say to you [superset]

Your reference to Mathew 23 is not germane to this. I cannot concede this point and I would rather not argue it now.

It will suffice that in our definition of terms that we note this difference.

I will attempt to get a positive statement of this doctrine; it is in essence that the New Covenant "supersedes" the Old Covenant in a manner analogous to the [set]/[superset] example. I know you disagree so we will have to agree to disagree on this matter.

The acknowledgement of a difference in definitions will serve for argument purposes later on in my task. Let's leave it there.

**866. Anonymous**

**August 16, 2015 8:26 AM**

Hi Mark Call

In [@859](#) point 3 we see:

**3. One intent of the O.T. law (no, no, NO!) was to reveal the impossibility of abiding by it; the law shows us of our sin.**

*No!!!! Utterly, horribly, wrong!!!!!! One of the worst twistings, in fact, HERESIES in Xtianity!!!!*

*Read Numbers chapter 30, and try to let the sarcasm in verses starting in v 10 sink in.*

Two things.

1. You recognize established Christian doctrine and call it heresy. I am not going to debate this point. We will have to agree to disagree and will note it in separate definitions which we can refer to as the source of any future disagreements as we review toad's claims.

2. I read Numbers 30 and do not see sarcasm. Here again, I think we should acknowledge the disagreement in definitions and leave it at that.

Re: [@860](#) and your links. Thank you, but I do not have the time. I have your site bookmarked and may return at a later date.

cheers.

t

**867. Anonymous**

August 16, 2015 8:34 AM

@SirHamster, @Beau

Based on this definitional work of "The Law of The Lord is Perfect" it is clear that Mark Calls thinking is not mine, nor do I suspect it is yours.

I will review and get Mark Call's agreement on his definition in [@846](#) either later today or this week. I will be working on a declarative statement of "The Law of The Lord Is Perfect" that reflects our Faith and Christian teaching;

I suspect that it will contain most elements of [@846](#) with differences gleaned from [@859](#).

If either of you would like to do this, please jump in. I am constrained by time so the pace is slow.

Blessings,

t

**868. Mark Call**

August 16, 2015 9:55 AM

@ST -- For some reason, my typo correction did NOT appear; not the first time that's happened.

Anyway, I meant DEUTERONOMY chapter 30, not Numbers.

Read Deut. 30; the sarcasm in the "it's NOT too hard for you" line is there.

(BTW, the word for Torah portion is "parsha", too. The last 'a' got dropped when I typed, too.)

Finally, w.r.t. to 'your thinking is not mine,' remember that Yah also says OUR minds are not His. You can't fix that. But when Shaul says "*Let this mind be in you, which was also in Yahusha Hamashiach,*" we can work on that. He's not talking about a modern Amerikan or western or greek pig-eating sun-god-day-keeping attitude contaminated with pagan traditions and non-Hebraic thought patterns. Yahushua taught Torah as Written. In fact, He WAS the "Torah Made Flesh".

Finally, to repeat again...  
you leave out some of the most important aspects. The fact that His Torah is complete, perfect, is a STATEMENT (by David, correctly) and NOT a 'definition'.

Those other things you mention are a list, like study aids. My list would emphasize the importance of study IN THE ORIGINAL Hebrew when there has been (as demonstrated) 'twisting' of the original meaning, by whatever mechanism.

But if you want my agreement that even your study list is complete, it had better include the observation of the "wisest man who ever lived" on the issue!

Proverbs 28:9 again:  
*One who turns his ear from hearing Torah, even his prayer is an abomination.*

869. Mark Call

August 16, 2015 10:11 AM

@ST

Finally, when it comes to "established xtian doctrine" --

the reason I participate in threads like this, and indeed the point of Yah having called me to this ministry, is that much of 'established xtian doctrine' is adulterated paganism and abomination to Him. That is why He called the Pharisees and similar "hypocrites" (for "adding to") and why romanized Constantinianism (which does even more "subtracting from" than they did) is what we are to "come out of".

It's why He sent BOTH wives into exile, too!

From "Monogamania" and the goddess-worship it supports, to xmas and sun-god day, and calling Him a liar in so many ways that He has again "put away" those of His people who practice abomination...there's a lot of 'established xtian doctrine' which amounts to (to again use His metaphor) "filthy menstrual rags."

Again, is YHVH Himself says something is "not too hard for you," while some false prophet says "no, you can't POSSIBLY do what that God that we claim to serve, but won't even Name correctly says, much less worship as He commands..."

...I'll go with His Word, as Written.

**870. Anonymous**

**August 16, 2015 11:34 AM**

Hi Mark,

*Anyway, I meant DEUTERONOMY chapter 30, not Numbers.*

Thank you for the clarification. I will be away the rest of today. I will try to read up later tonight or tomorrow.

The rest of your comment looks very interesting. I am looking forward to parsing it.

This work is very profitable and yielding good fruit on multiple levels.

Blessings,

t

871. Anonymous

August 17, 2015 5:31 PM

@Vox

SimplyTimothy claims he's asked for moderation, and I'm now joining him. Writing to the moderator, [@857](#) Tim said:

*"I have had to revert to first principles of logical discourse as **interaction with toad over these near 855 comments has not produced a coherent response to his claims and argument.**"*

I stated my core argument [@351](#) and provided critical definitions [@682](#) and summarized my argument in [@700](#) [@701](#) and [@702](#). He admits he can't make a coherent response, but he blames me. *"This approach is necessary due to toad's "command/response" expectations have not lead [sic] to productive discourse."*

Tim didn't start trying to understand my argument until June 19 [@330](#). He began his critique with his first comment [@228](#) the day before.

**The problem actually results from Tim's attempt to emulate you, Vox.** [@575](#) he quoted you but didn't notice the sequence in the last sentence: *"So read the sources and read the current champions, then critique it."* Tim decided to critique first and read later.

Distilled to its essence, all he has to do is answer this:

**"Show me where God said sexual contact between wives married to the same man is sin, or show me your delegation of authority that allows you to arbitrarily step into another mans' family and declare something to be a sin when God didn't."**

I asked Tim to answer that in comments [@680](#) [@681](#) [@706](#) [@709](#) [@718](#) [@724](#) [@732](#) [@735](#) and [@743](#) starting on July 13th. He responded on August 9th [@786](#) but refused to answer.. [@826](#) Tim stated *"The rebuttal will come on my time on my terms."*

With 'read, then critique' in mind, meet Simple Tim, in his own words:

[@234](#) *I stand to be corrected by a competent, christian scholar, but I think my take is correct.*

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

[@353](#) *"I freely admit that I have not derived a counter-argument from primary sources. I am a mere Christian, a layman and unschooled in theology. I rely on what I have been taught and what I read in my Bible. Having stated my ignorance up front, I turn to the argument presented in my ESV translation notes on page 2544 on the subject of polygamy... I am assuming the above are facts because they are presented as such in my ESV notes. I have not done the research myself."*

[@463](#) *"I am not a Bible Scholar and I do not know Hebrew or Greek."*

[@576](#) *"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)."*

[@717](#) *"The case for polygyny is viable and the case of the "absoluteness" of husband headship is very strong. The latter, if I am reading the verses correctly, much stronger than I ever imagined. The case for the state having no say in marriage is iron clad."*

In comments [@837](#) and [@838](#) I quoted Tim's assertions and questioned him. His response was: "At my pace, my way. on my time. In the meantime, shut up and wait." However, to the moderator [@857](#) he said "I am in the process of "backing up my assertions" and am more than willing be called on them **when the assertions are properly made per the rules of the blog.**"

Tim has failed to make a coherent response, refused to back up his assertions, and, when asked direct

questions he's refused to answer. In subsequent requests for a response he cites his own refusals [@712](#) [@801](#) [@826](#) and at [@863](#) said "shut up and wait."

I suspect one of us doesn't understand the rules here. Care to clarify things?

872. Anonymous

August 17, 2015 6:24 PM

@Mark Call,

The good news is that I did not detect any sarcasm in Numbers 30. Had, we should both probably be worried.

As for Deuteronomy 30, this is standard in what you call the Christian heresy which you remarked on in

[@859](#) point 3 where the exchange was:

***3. One intent of the O.T. law (no, no, NO!) was to reveal the impossibility of abiding by it; the law shows us of our sin.***

*No!!!! Utterly, horribly, wrong!!!!!! One of the worst twistings, in fact, HERESIES in Xtianity!!!!*

As it stands Deuteronomy 30, in my tradition is exhibit 1 in the argument for 3. (:

I have to ask around to get the formal name for this "heresy" and once I get that, I can declare my formal definition of "the Law"

While working today, it occurred to me that your use of "the law" is similar to the discipline of formal symbolic logic.

Here is a short example:

1.  $(V \rightarrow W) \vee (X \rightarrow Y)$
2.  $\neg(V \rightarrow W)$
- $\therefore X \rightarrow Y$

Symbolic logic is "Perfect and Complete" for the domain over which it rules. This implies that only defined



operators ( $\rightarrow$ ,  $\forall$ ,  $\sim$  ...)  
are allowed no matter what variables (V, W X and Y....)  
are introduced. One does not bring the Integral or the  
derivative into formal symbolic logic. To do so is  
"heresy"

The "instruction" is "perfect and complete" in that its  
operation is "not too hard" and covers all human  
behavior.

The "instruction" is a "math" for those who diligently  
apply themselves and learn its rules and operations.

Does that sound about right?

**873. SirHamster**

August 17, 2015 6:31 PM

AT, you are tiresome.

You should be more appreciative of someone who's  
taken this much time to understand your position. He  
has more respect and patience for you than I.

"In subsequent requests for a response he cites his own  
refusals [@712](#) [@801](#) [@826](#) and at [@863](#) said "shut up  
and wait.""

What part of "wait" is difficult for you to understand?  
ST acknowledged that you should get a more detailed  
response and is working on it. What do you expect a  
moderator to do? Declare that A Winner is You? Force ST  
to concede the argument and adopt your belief system?

You know how I don't like your personal conduct? This is  
one aspect - treating the rules as a weapon of  
coercion.

[@simplytimothy](#), [@867](#)

I'll take a stab at God's perfect Law when I'm not at  
work. Probably later in the week, if not the weekend.

**874. Anonymous**

August 17, 2015 7:00 PM

@SirHamster,

Thanks. This definitional work is paying dividends. Its coming together. Mark Call's way of reasoning from Scripture is becoming clear and it differs from how I (and apparently you and Beau) reason from Scripture.

When it is clear, I will name that difference and we can use it going forward.

One 'hint' was the discussion between toad and Mark over "moses got it wrong". If I am correct about how Mark Call reasons from Scripture it would be an impossibility for Moses to get "the instruction" wrong because it *is* "the instruction" and by definition "right" and "perfect" and "complete". If there is a problem, we have to change ourselves to fit it, we cannot add or subtract from what is there. Torah is a 'moral Calculus' or a 'moral formal logic' perfectly designed for us.

We will see what Mark Call says when he checks back in.

good stuff.

cheers.

t

875. Anonymous

August 17, 2015 8:26 PM

@SirHamster @Mark Call.

I asked a friend and he pointed to the chapter 19.

[Westminster Confession of Faith](#)

in Chapter XIX Of the Law Of God

This is the 'heresy' to Mark Call and fundamental doctrine to me.

I will try to get the first draft of the "WCF" definition of "The Law of The Lord Is Perfect" up by Wednesday. We will then have a reference point for acknowledging differences going forward.

SirHamster, if you or Beau have a different "confession of faith" you prefer to use as a baseline, let me know.

I am curious what the Catholics got on this issue.

blessings,

t

**876. Anonymous**

**August 17, 2015 8:37 PM**

@Hamster

*You know how I don't like your personal conduct? This is one aspect - treating the rules as a weapon of coercion.*

Coming from you, with the memory of you demanding I answer an absurd straw-man argument in which Tim lied, created an argument based on his lies and then demanded I answer his absurd questions based on his lies... and you supported him... you're pathetic.

Simple Tim has pissed in his own bed and he can lay there. He reversed Vox's advice and instead of reading and learning first, then contradicting, he decided to step out into the arena and contradict an issue he was clueless about. You want me to feel sorry about that? You're nuts.

He led with charges he didn't understand. He engaged in ad hominem attacks before he knew what he was attacking. When he finally realized he was in over his head he tried to play it off as a feature rather than incompetence. And when called on it, you want me to feel sorry for him? The rules are the same for everyone around here.

The fact you don't call out Tim for his violations says a lot about your lack of integrity. I've asked the questions, on point, and you sit silent allowing him to ignore the rules you'd freely apply to me. I use the rules for coercion? No. Your silence proves you don't have the integrity to engage in intellectually honest discussion.

877. Anonymous

August 17, 2015 8:56 PM

*Coming from you, with the memory of you demanding I answer an absurd straw-man argument in which Tim lied, created an argument based on his lies and then demanded I answer his absurd questions based on his lies... and you supported him... you're pathetic.*

What you label a "lie" was a direct result of your stupidity. Stupidity for which you still owe SirHamster an apology.

In comment [@145](#) you wrote:

*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.***

You will note that the **bold** text is NOT a sentence as there is no subject.

Taking your hokum nonsense grammar, I summarized your stupidity as:

*Nothing more or less than The Law of The Lord (Psalm 19) is needed. (COMMENT [@145](#))*

That is not a lie. That is a summary of your statement that I concluded was what you meant by your nonsense.

SirHamster then took my work and used it in comment [@600](#).

Your statement (which I repeat)

*Coming from you, with the memory of you demanding I answer an absurd straw-man argument in which Tim lied, created an argument based on his lies and then demanded I answer his absurd questions based on his lies... and you supported him... you're pathetic.*

Is completely out of line given the sequence of events, especially given the STUPIDITY that is your written words in [@146](#)

You have NOT apologized for your role in that .

Your behavior here, in this comment, is emblematic of your "debate" throughout this discussion.

I am tired of your fscking drama, drama-boy.

Your argument is going down. In flames. I will, in my time, in my style, obliterate it and spoon feed it to you..

I think you are scared. You should be.

*SimplyTimothy claims he's asked for moderation, and I'm now joining him. Writing to the moderator, [@857](#) Tim said:*

For the record, I contacted him with my intentions so as to preempt your whining. I don't want moderation as things are going swimmingly and I am enjoying this.

878. Anonymous

August 17, 2015 9:20 PM

@Hamster

*What part of "wait" is difficult for you to understand? ST acknowledged that you should get a more detailed response and is working on it. What do you expect a moderator to do? Declare that A Winner is You? Force ST to concede the argument and adopt your belief system?*

Read comments [@837](#) and [@838](#). Those are HIS assertions, not mine. The rules of the blog say you have answer relevant questions. You, for example, have demanded that I comply with those same ruled. Is Tim different?

*You should be more appreciative of someone who's taken this much time to understand your position. He has more respect and patience for you than I.*

As I already pointed out, he reversed Vox's advice and got it wrong. He critiqued before he even understood what he was critiquing. He's now trying to understand the argument he opposed and learning it isn't so simple. I notice you don't call for Timmy to obey the rules of the blog, even when you called me on them.

Hypocrite.

He can take as much time as he likes trying to rebut my arguments. That isn't the issue. The issue is HIS assertions, and I've called him out but like any SJW he refuses to answer. But, perhaps it seems like I'm picking on Tim. You've got plenty to answer for yourself and as you've already acknowledged, the rules of the blog apply to you as well.

Hamster, let's have you set an example for Tim.

*@426 you said "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 deceive Christians to accept your lie, is enough evidence to call you a liar.*

Is "homosexual" wrong, i.e., a sin? Yes or no. If it is, cite your authority with respect to female-female sexual contact being forbidden or condemned by God. If you can't, please explain why you're using a pejorative term to tar the girls with the same brush as the guys.

*@487 you said "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 answer the questions, so you should have no problem answering these questions as well.

*@515 I asked you a question you did not answer:*

*You said "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?*

[@521](#) You said "*Lesbian sex -> Unnatural sex -> prohibited by God -> sin.*"

Please cite where God condemned sexual contact between women under any circumstances. Before you bring up Romans 1:26, you may want to look at Romans 4:15 and Romans 5:13. Just saying...

[@521](#) You said "*There is no such thing as a sex act without a relationship.*" Please explain the relationship between a rapist and his/her victim. It appears you are saying a coercive act done without consent creates a relationship.

[@534](#) I asked both you and Simple Tim a question:

*"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."

You didn't answer, although the question was specifically addressed to you.

You have yet to answer.

Care to obey the rules of the blog?

**879. Anonymous**

**August 17, 2015 9:21 PM**

@SirHamster,

Let's shift gears to air combat. Pretend this debate is a dogfight.

You have heard of the OODA loop, yes? If not, google it.

Prior to the collection of toad's claims, we where outside toads OODA loop.

We where, being polite, responding to his actions every time he demanded it.

This kept focus off of the target and forced us into irrelevancies.  
Dealing with temper-tantrums became hard work and the focus on the merits of toad's argument faltered.  
We were responding to toad instead of forcing him to respond to us.  
This went on for over 600 comments.  
We were getting tired of reading and tired of toad.  
Tired of toad, because if you step back and look at his verbal weapons, they are obnoxious.

The collection, cross referencing and initial categorizing of toad's claims broke that dynamic.  
We do not need toad.  
His claims and argument are there to be analyzed.  
Tactically speaking we have air superiority.  
He is inside our OODA loop.  
We Observe, We Orient ourselves, We Decide, We Act.  
He is still fighting his battle his way, but his tactics are useless given the strategic view that we have of the argument.  
He can OODA all he wants, but we are looking DOWN on him from altitude his aircraft cannot reach.  
Strategically, he is fucked.

If his argument is shit (and it is, the claims are starting to fall, I will post them once the definitions are complete and each claim is meticulously examined) then he is powerless to divert the counter-claims and he will have to dodge the bombs that we will be dropping on him when WE are ready.

Its fun.

**880. Anonymous**

**August 17, 2015 9:28 PM**

Simple Tim

*What you label a "lie" was a direct result of your stupidity. Stupidity for which you still owe SirHamster an apology.*

**When did Hamster demand I comply with the rules of the blog in response to YOU?**

Cite the comment numbers. You once again prove you



aren't paying attention and don't understand what's being discussed. Truly I call you "Simple Tim." You lied, then you doubled down and called it "upping your rhetoric."

**881. Mark Call**

August 17, 2015 10:03 PM

@ST - just have a second, BUT...  
what is missing from your summary is "for His purposes!" (again).

His Torah is complete ... for His purposes.

That is NOT the same as saying it is not possible that He would have more to teach us, or that it includes all that can be known. ("Our mind" is not His...we might not be able to comprehend anyway.)

Again - His Torah is perfect/complete/"tamim" [ תָּמִים ]  
*for the purposes for which He gave it to us.*

PS> Another element of the tautology: He (Yahushua) is the "Torah Made Flesh". Ergo, there is no conflict. (Else He would not be Who He Is.)

**882. SirHamster**

August 17, 2015 10:32 PM

@simplytimothy

I think he's being upset about when I pressed him to answer your questions following from his assertion on what is permitted in the marital bed.

Somehow uncomfortable questions are a "strawman argument". When basic categories are confused like this, I don't expect any intellectual engagement.

@AT,

Re: Questions. You should look closer at the rules of the blog. They don't mean you get any kind of answer you happen to demand. Also,

**1. You will be addressed in the style you choose.**

Starting from [@215](#), I noticed that you were not reading what I typed. It only went downhill from there.

Recently in [@736](#), [@738](#), and [@740](#), I requested and did not receive a retraction of your false summary of what I had previously said.

Given my consistent experience with you in this thread, I have no interest in engaging you in discussion on your chosen topics, as I have stated in [@795](#).

This is your answer, by the way. You're not worth the intellectual horsepower.

### 883. Artisanal Toad

August 17, 2015 10:47 PM

Simple Tim

The question is whether you're truly an SJW or not. You have made multiple references to obedience to authority during the course of this discussion. Yet, on this blog, you are under the authority of the rules of this blog.

At the moment, you are in violation of those rules and you are willfully violating those rules by refusing to reply. That doesn't say much for your integrity, does it? Your own behavior is making a statement about you.

**"If you are asked a direct question relevant to the topic, then you will be expected to answer it in a straightforward and non-evasive manner"**

In comments [@837](#) and [@838](#) I asked you to respond to 12 points, relevant to not only the topic but also your assertions. Will you obey the rules of the blog and answer them, or wait for the threat of the ban-hammer, proving you are incapable of submission to authority? Keep in mind, this has nothing to do with me. It's your integrity on the line.

**"You are expected to back up your assertions, so don't be surprised if you happen to get called on them."**

You have made several assertions that you made all on your own and I've called you on them. I quoted you and asked that you back them up. You have thus far refused to do so. Again, understand that your integrity is on the line. You can engage in all the name-calling you want,

but nobody forced you to make the assertions you made that I quoted in comments [@837](#) and [@838](#).

You are attempting to hold me to a standard of authority you can't yet describe, but at the same time you are failing to answer your OWN CLAIMS according to the published rules of this blog. What's your integrity worth, Tim?

I think we'll find out soon enough.

You may want to read that through again. ;)

The test of integrity is one that every SJW fails. How will you respond, Tim? Are you an SJW or not?

@Hamster. I have asked you questions as well. Integrity check. Man up or publicly sacrifice your balls.

#### 884. Artisanal Toad

August 17, 2015 11:05 PM

*1. You will be addressed in the style you choose.*

*Starting from [@215](#), I noticed that you were not reading what I typed. It only went downhill from there. Recently in [@736](#), [@738](#), and [@740](#), I requested and did not receive a retraction of your false summary of what I had previously said.*

Quite simply, you're full of shit. You made the argument of "heads I win, tails you lose." Nothing meets your approval unless you author it, yet when you do, you do so in such a way as to put words in my mouth. I reject that. I tried retracting according to what I WAS ARGUING, but that didn't suit your desires. You wanted me to retract according to your reframe of what I was saying. FAIL.

**"The regulars, who have been commenting here for years and know each other reasonably well, often engage each other in a vicious and vituperative manner that you should not try to imitate because you are not an accepted part of the group yet. Take your best shot, by all means, but attack the idea, not the individual."**

I have been commenting here for years, Hamster. As a

rule, only on those areas that interest me. Vox can confirm that easily. I addressed you as you chose until you proved yourself to be just another arrogant, egotistical asshole. Deal with it. You have made it almost impossible to separate the idea from the individual. Hmmm. You want a title of nobility (Sir)? Earn it with your grace, unflappability and wit. At this point the jury says "FAIL."

885. Anonymous

August 18, 2015 8:03 AM

**When did Hamster demand I comply with the rules of the blog in response to YOU?**

Its a foreign concept to you, I know. We humans call it "civility" . When we make a mistake and our mistake causes somebody else time and trouble, we do something we refer to "apologizing for wasting their time".

In [@877](#), I outline the flow.

1. Your lousy grammar and non-definition.
2. My paraphrasing of your non-sentence that imbued it with meaning it lacked.
3. SirHamster quoting my paraphrase of your lousy grammar and non-defintion
4. etc...

Enough. You are not worth the time, drama-boy.

*In comments [@837](#) and [@838](#) I asked you to respond to 12 points,*

Without bothering to read your comments, as you are a broken record by now, my canned reply for about 200 comments now has been variations of , "I am working on it" and "I will reply when the argument is defined" and "I will repeat your argument to you, using your definitions such that we both know I know it better than you do" and "my time, my way".

Being an uncivil toad, you pay no intention and continue hoping I will rejoin your battle on your terms. OODA is a bitch .

As to the importance of taking the time to define one's terms, the competent reader is invited to search <http://voxday.blogspot.com/search?>

[q=socrates+definitions](#)

There they will learn a lesson I learned from our host. Namely that in any debate, definitions are the *second\** thing one does when starting a debate.

I am doing that second thing now. The uncivil toad objects. tough.

I have taken our hosts advice to heart and the uncivil toad objects. In [Answers for MJ2](#), Vox wrote:

*As for **definitions being the seeds of deceit**, well, we have certainly seen that in the series on the Fifth Horseman. While I am a fan of utilizing the Socratic method, I believe it should be used honestly, to better open men's eyes to the truth, not deviously in order to trap people into confessing falsehoods in which they do not believe. As I demonstrated in The Irrational Atheist, Socrates is not above cheating and moving the goalposts, taking his opponent's agreement and applying it to something to which Socrates himself admits the other man did not agree.*

*I vastly prefer Aristotle to either Socrates or Plato. And Aristotle correctly identified "**ambiguity**" in definition as being one of the chief rhetorical tactics of the sophists. And indeed, we see that very **ambiguity** utilized on an almost daily basis by intellectually dishonest interlocutors here on this blog and elsewhere. The sophisticated manual of the Street Epistemologist is nothing but **one long exercise in rhetorical ambiguity**. (bold mine)*

Money quote:**Aristotle correctly identified "ambiguity" in definition as being one of the chief rhetorical tactics of the sophists**

It is no surprise that the uncivil toad appeals to the letter of the 'rules of the blog' rather than the spirit of the 'rules of the blog' as his argument depends on 'rules' and not on 'spirit. Ambiguity is the friend of toad's argument, clarity its enemy. No wonder toad objects, clarity frightens him.

Proving that point requires "definitions" and doing the work of definition, is *fundamental* to any debate. It takes work, it takes time, it takes care and attention to

detail.

toad, objects to that which our host plainly advocates. and for that, he appeals to "the letter of the rules' and not 'the spirit of the rules'

**I do not ask for moderation as I am having too much fun. If the moderator decides this warrants more answers from me, I will happily provide them.**

Continued.....

**886. Anonymous**

**August 18, 2015 8:06 AM**

....Continued.....

The work in demolishing the uncivil toad's argument proceeds. The progress is as such.

1. Collect toad's claims (done)
2. Categorize toad's claims (initial categorization is done. This is an iterative process as categories and categorization will change)
3. Define terms (in progress along with 2)
4. Construct the arguments such that all parties agree that we have the argument correctly.
5. Reply to toad's argument and claims. (its not looking good, toad, not good at all drama-boy)

The iterative process of 2 is driven by the work in 3. In a category (currently, THE LAW IS PERFECT which you can view at [@849](#) is being worked on) each of toad's claims will be examined and defined. After the initial category is parsed, other, fundamental categories are parsed working from foundational claims to the esoteric.

Currently, the definition of "the law" is coming into view. A nearly complete draft of Mark Call's definition is viewable at [@846](#)

My definition of "the law" is straight out of the Westminster Confession of Faith 19.

Toad's comments containing the terms 'Psalm', 'law' and 'perfect' on "the law" are viewable in [@850](#).

Every claim contains an '@link' to the corresponding comment where it was asserted by toad. This will

reduce error and the noise that toad is so fond of injecting into this discussion. Any errors in interpretation can therefore be reviewed in light of the original comment and the task can proceed.

It is to this process that toad objects, demanding like a little girl that I drop this work to respond to him. drama-boy don't like it. tough.

\*definitions are the second thing. The first is to judge whether the debate is worth one's time.

#### [MailVox: Improving Dialectic](#)

*"The first question I always ask myself is if the argument is primarily factual, logical, or rhetorical in nature.*

*The second question I ask myself is if the author is likely to have any idea what he's talking about or not.*

*And the third question is if I regard the author as being trustworthy or not, or rather, if I believe him to be fundamentally intellectually honest or not.*

*These three questions determine how carefully I read through an argument and whether I presume the author is more likely to make a simple mistake or whether any apparent mistakes are actually intentional attempts to sneak something past the insufficiently careful reader in order to make a flawed argument look convincing. "*

The uncivil toad's argument is primarily logical in nature. Given premises and a conclusion that are foreign to my faith. (The Westminster Confession being a good example of what I believe).

Having no ready answer, I took up the challenge to address this logically.

Toad objects that his argument is coming under logical analysis. The first step of which is "definitions". My only reply to the uncivil toad's objection is "heh" (:

SirHamster, if you or Beau have a different "confession of faith" you prefer to use as a baseline, let me know.

I am curious what the Catholics got on this issue.

Coming from a Southern Baptist background, I see the TIA differentiation between "high church" and "low church" more clearly. One paragraph on [Scripture](#). Not asking that be used for the baseline, just noting the difference.

Found a [catechism](#) from the Catholic church on the subject, which looks roughly as detailed as the Westminster one.

I'm not sure I've got anything to add to the Westminster, Baptist, or Catholic statements. Definitely have nothing to object to. Mark Call will likely object to 1963 from the Catholic catechism:

*"According to Christian tradition, the [Old] Law is holy, spiritual, and good, **yet still imperfect**. Like a tutor it shows what must be done, but does not of itself give the strength, the grace of the Spirit, to fulfill it. Because of sin, which it cannot remove, it remains a law of bondage. According to St. Paul, its special function is to denounce and disclose sin, which constitutes a "law of concupiscence" in the human heart. However, the Law remains the first stage on the way to the kingdom. It prepares and disposes the chosen people and each Christian for conversion and faith in the Savior God. It provides a teaching which endures for ever, like the Word of God."*

888. Mark Call

August 18, 2015 2:57 PM

I object to pretty much all of such 'catechisms' which transparently deny the Word of God, and replace it with men's tradition\*...  
from xmas and sun-god-day and similar pork, to licensed marriage.

It's more and more obvious just exactly here it leads.

-----

\* So did Yahushua! Mark 7:5-13



889. Anonymous

August 18, 2015 7:38 PM

Hi Mark Call,

We agree that we start from different baselines. That is enough for the purpose of dissecting toad's argument. For the time being, we can agree to disagree and acknowledge the different definitions.

Since this definition is one of the fundamental ones, it is bound to effect arguments which build upon it.

@SirHamster,

Thank you for the links. I have purchased but not yet read TIA (sorry vox). I am unfamiliar with the distinction between High Church and Low Church. Could you please clarify?

The Catholic statement closely mirrors the WCF. Since there are not Roman Catholics participating in the discussion, we need not include it.

*1981 The Law of Moses contains many truths naturally accessible to reason. God has revealed them because men did not read them in their hearts.*

*1982 The Old Law is a preparation for the Gospel.*

*1983 The New Law is the grace of the Holy Spirit received by faith in Christ, operating through charity. It finds expression above all in the Lord's Sermon on the Mount and uses the sacraments to communicate grace to us.*

*1984 The Law of the Gospel fulfills and surpasses the Old Law and brings it to perfection: its promises, through the Beatitudes of the Kingdom of heaven; its commandments, by reforming the heart, the root of human acts.*

*1985 The New Law is a law of love, a law of grace, a law of freedom.*

*1986 Besides its precepts the New Law includes the evangelical counsels. "The Church's holiness is fostered in a special way by the manifold counsels which the*

*Lord proposes to his disciples in the Gospel" (LG 42 § 2).*

So, this has work has borne fruit.

Thank you both for your help and patience.

I am dog-tired from my days work and have to do some errands tomorrow. I should have a completed version of the definitions posted and referenced by tomorrow night.

From there, we can move on to another of toad's claims; we should (in my opinion) tackle them from the most fundamental categories up to the esoteric ones.

Furthermore, looking at the categories (posted with raw claim count by toad in [@791](#)) it is now apparent that the most fundamental three will be condensed. They are:

*17 THE LAW IS PERFECT*

*10 PRIMACY OF SCRIPTURE*

*3 STORY vs VERSE*

(The number preceding the name is the number of claims filed in the category).

Just looking at the category names, we see we have discussed some of this in this definition process for "the law".

Anyway, that is the "fundamental" definitional roadmap.

I am enjoying this. Thank you both.

@Mark Call, btw, As we proceed, I will endeavor to understand your positions in light of your definitions as we continue and attempt to make arguments as you would make them. I ask only that you stifle your laughter as best you can. (:

cheers,

t

890. Anonymous

August 18, 2015 8:18 PM

Here is the present list of initial categories.

The number to the left of the category name is the number of claims that I filed into the category .

That number will shrink as we examine each claim and discard duplicates.

The links to the right link to where I copy-n-pasted my notes into the comment section.

Within the category details, each claim contains a link to the comment from which it was copied (COMMENT XYZ)

This gives us access to the original context where the claim was made.

\*\*\* 20150709 categories with comment/claim count [@791](#)

50 AUTHORITY COVENANT AND

HEADSHIP [@753](#) [@754](#) [@755](#) [@756](#) [@757](#)

35 DIVORCE [@759](#) [@760](#) [@761](#) [@762](#)

35 POLYGYNY [@765](#) [@766](#) [@767](#)

23 PROHIBITIONS and PERMISSIONS [@769](#) [@770](#)

19 ITS ALL ABOUT RELATIONSHIPS [@774](#) [@775](#)

17 "ROMANS 1" [@752](#)

17 THE LAW IS PERFECT [@849](#)

13 THE NATURAL FUNCTION [@771](#) [@772](#)

12 MARRIAGE [@763](#)

10 PRIMACY OF SCRIPTURE [@768](#) ([@745](#))

10 ??? [@750](#)

5 MONOGAMY [@764](#)

3 STORY vs VERSE [@773](#)

2 ASCETICS [@751](#)

Here is an example of usage.

Under PRIMACY OF SCRIPTURE click on the [@768](#)

Within that comment is this claim by toad:

*ME:(Fixed per Toad's comment 758)*

*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.*

*As has been pointed out, God does not regulate sin, He prohibits it and condemns it. (COMMENT [@145](#)) (ME See comment 600)*

Within that claim, click on the [@145](#) and we get to (one

of) toad's claims:

*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.*

So folks, there is our initial context.

As we define and reduce/condense the claims, we can re-sort them into different categories with better names etc.

It should not take too long to get to a robust, documented statement, with references to the initial comment.

Cheers!

t

891. SirHamster

August 18, 2015 8:18 PM

From TIA, p.19 of the free PDF:

*"After the Protestant Reformation fractured Christendom, the various Christian churches were deeply divided as to the proper way to worship the Lord Jesus Christ. Because the Reformed Church, better known to us today as the Puritans, rejected the Catholic Church's priestly model of worship, it saw no need for the liturgies, vestments, and ceremonial trappings that had become an integral part of Catholic ceremony over the centuries. Churches that retain these formal elements, such as the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, and the Church of Sweden, are today known as High Church, while Puritans, televangelists, snake-handlers, Billy Graham crusades in football stadiums, Jesus freaks, and Southern Baptists can all be described as Low Church."*

The Westminster and RCC statements on the Law have an academic feel to them in their precision and language, reflecting CoE/RCC High Church culture.

SBC's simpler paragraph in turn reflects its Low Church culture.

TIA translates that high/low church distinction to atheism, and makes some interesting points.

**892. Anonymous**

August 18, 2015 8:23 PM

One other thing.

Looking at the numbers to the left, we get a "rough" weight of the importance of the category to toad's argument.

Those numbers will reduce as toad repeats himself quite a bit.

From that we can make an educated guess as to what claims toad thinks are important to his argument.

cheers again!

t

**893. Anonymous**

August 18, 2015 8:32 PM

[@891](#) SirHamster,

I will have to crack open that book. I started it some time ago and got busy with something else. Thank you very much for the information.

**894. SirHamster**

August 19, 2015 9:17 PM

I should add that the High/Low Church distinction predates TIA; that just happens to be where I first saw it in use.

According to Wikipedia, it has been generally but imprecisely replaced with Anglo-Catholic vs. Evangelical, which explains why its use sounds novel.

**895. Anonymous**

August 20, 2015 8:24 AM

@SirHamster. Thank you for the info. This is why I love being an American. We can strut into either High or Low and have a conversation and look and have friends

in High and Low places. There are good people in both.

Yesterday was a busy day so I did not get any work done. I will try to get the next draft of definition for "THE LAW.." done today. There is then work to nail down "PERFECT" and make sure there are no differences in what we think when we see that word.

However, when I got home, I did do some light reading on Mark Calls take on St. Peter's vision in Acts 10 and the corollary verse in Mark 7:19.

<http://messianicpublications.com/robert-roy/a-hebraic-perspective-on-peters-vision-acts-10/>

<http://messianicpublications.com/robert-roy/did-jesus-declare-all-foods-clean/>

This is the vision where God declares all foods clean. Mark Call argues it is all about people. The case is interesting and worth knowing about. It is not part of our current definition work, just some light reading for a bit of down-time.

The argument relies on a distinction between the words "common" and "clean".

The gist of it is

St. Peter, as a practicing Jew could not mingle with 'common' gentiles or 'common' things.

This was a tradition of men, not of the law.

God was declaring the 'common' as 'clean' while in no way contradicting the dietary restrictions of the law.

I thought you would find it interesting.

My own take is that both interpretations are correct as Christ is risen and we are in the new Adam.

I have not fleshed out this argument, but I sense it follows from our freedom in Him.

Stating that difference in a positive declaration (ala, WCF style) should become easier as we gain knowledge of our terms.

(@Mark Call, we can debate later I prefer to focus on the definitions. we will come back to this. (; )

God willing, I will be back on the definition work tonight.

thx again.

t

**896. Mark Call**

August 20, 2015 10:19 AM

There's no 'debate' there, ST. Scripture remains unequivocal.

The only question is historic. Was the BS saying, "thus he declared all foods clean" *added to* the story before or after the mandates surrounding 'Ishtar ham'? And consider the irony: You're not so much eating pork today because you're "free in christ" but because your ancestors - equally 'free' - were well aware that THEIR choice was "eat it or DIE."

No, I really don't wanna rehash the undeniable. Figure out what Proverbs 28:9 means first. Either He is Who He says He Is, and is the "same, yesterday, today, and tomorrow," or SOMEBODY's lying.

**897. Mark Call**

August 20, 2015 3:34 PM

PS> This is, however, a logical error that it is important that you understand, ST:

**The argument relies on a distinction between the words "common" and "clean".**

No, it does NOT!

(In fact, the error was blatant enough that I almost didn't bother with your link. After all, what kind of value could there be in some "messianic publication" that overlooked the obvious in favor of an argument that hinged on the greek?)

The argument relies on Scripture. What you overlooked was that the author makes a fine point, but it is ADDITIONAL to the undeniable one, to help explain the

milieu. He uses that distinction to point out AGAIN how it is that Scripture and the later 'Acts' teach just what Yahushua (as opposed to some "other jesus, whom we have not preached") did.

Their traditions, again, were a "stumbling block."

His Torah is "tamim." As for the flawed, defiled, and in so many cases forbidden, "traditions of men"...not so much.

**898. Artisanal Toad**

August 20, 2015 8:19 PM

Mark

I've had 4 semesters of Greek and 4 semesters of Hebrew 18-20 years ago, but you'll see me farting rainbows and skittles before you hear me claim that gives me any great understanding of those languages. At the end of the day all those courses did was give me a good understanding of how to figure out what the original language had to say and what tools to use.

That said, please review my comment to Vox ( [@871](#) ), in which I quoted some of Simple Tim's protests that he isn't a scholar. Please consider that your arguments would be far more powerful if you either spoke in the vernacular (with references to the original language) or provided translations for the words you use in the original language.

While you've really pissed me off from time to time, at the same time you've made some of the most cogent points in this thread and I have appreciated that. I should have said that earlier. I suspect I'll be citing stuff from this thread for years to come because it's such a perfect example of an SJW churchian trying to argue a position he doesn't even understand. However, if you could "dumb down" your arguments into more understandable language I'd appreciate it.

I truly don't think Tim understands even half of what you say. Just look at his responses. Even when I think I get what you're saying, I'm not always sure.

**899. Anonymous**



August 20, 2015 8:29 PM

Hi Mark

*(In fact, the error was blatant enough that I almost didn't bother with your link. After all, what kind of value could there be in some "messianic publication" that overlooked the obvious in favor of an argument that hinged on the greek?)*

Ok, thanks. You make a different case than what is presented at the links I submitted. Fair enough. I still found the argument interesting. If I make time to revisit this I will attempt to understand yours.

*Figure out what Proverbs 28:9 means first.*

I do not pin my salvation upon one proverb in the Old Testament. We disagree on some fundamental matters, what they are will be made clear as we progress.

I am done for today as I am dog-tired. Hopefully I have some cycles to spare before work in the morning.

cheers.

t

900. Artisanal Toad

August 20, 2015 8:35 PM

Simple Tim said:

***When did Hamster demand I comply with the rules of the blog in response to YOU?***

Hamster has never demanded you comply with the rules because he's supporting your SJW behavior so I guess the VFM have been infiltrated. [Hamster] demanded that [Toad] comply with the rules of the blog in response to [Simple Tim], and it happened right here: [@487](#) [@490](#)

There's actually a good argument YOU violated the "spirit of the law" because you intentionally lied and misquoted me, and on the basis of that lie you created an absurd strawman and demanded I answer. Hamster also demanded I answer. In keeping with Vox's rules, I

responded here: [@492](#)

Simple Tim said *It is no surprise that the uncivil toad appeals to the letter of the 'rules of the blog' rather than the spirit of the 'rules of the blog' as his argument depends on 'rules' and not on 'spirit. Ambiguity is the friend of toad's argument, clarity its enemy. No wonder toad objects, clarity frightens him.*

Oh, Tim, you poor child. If clarity frightened me, I would not have condensed my argument down to the specific points I am arguing, repeatedly. But, like a good SJW, you are projecting. At first I couldn't understand the charge of incivility and I was about to suggest you have a glass of warm milk before going nighty-night, but then it hit me.

OF COURSE it's uncivil to demand that an SJW comply with rules! Rules are for other people because for SJW's, there's the "spirit of the law" which justifies the SJW breaking the rules in order to achieve what they want. SJW's always define the spirit of the law to mean anything they want it to mean.

You quoted Vox, then did the opposite of what he said, which was to **“So read the sources and read the current champions, then critique it.”**

Since you've stated several times my argument is new to you (astonishing), it comes as no surprise that you require significant study to understand it. I've done my best to help you understand it.

**Your own statements are YOURS, not mine.** I have asked you repeatedly to explain YOUR claims, especially the astounding claim that you have the authority to determine and define God's will for another man's wife. ( Notice that unlike you, [@837](#) and [@838](#) I quoted you exactly and questioned you about your claims.) If you require study to explain your own assertions, that's the prima facie evidence you're just pulling arguments out of your ass; but I can see how an SJW would think it's uncivil of me to keep pointing that out.

Why won't you back up your own claims Tim? Are you afraid? Or is it because as an SJW, you can't admit you're wrong?

It's easy for you to answer, Tim. You claimed a woman lying with a woman is just as wrong as a man lying with a man; you've called it sin, a perversion and evil. Romans 4:15 says "*where there is no law, neither is there violation.*" Romans 5:13 says "*sin is not imputed when there is no Law.*"

Show us where the law says a woman lying with a woman is sin and you're done!.

Your other one is a bit more complicated.

[@779](#) "As husband, if you are like Caesar and commanding your wife to do that which is against the will of God, then somebody has to intervene if the wife cannot help herself."

The implication of your claim is someone (YOU) have the authority to 1) determine when another man's wife is in God's will; and, 2) define what God's will for that wife is. I asked you 10 questions about that claim at [@838](#) Are you scared to answer?

You have called on the rules of the blog and demanded I comply, it's your turn. Don't worry about looking like an idiot at this point, you've already accomplished that and given what you've claimed these are not unreasonable questions.

901. Anonymous

August 20, 2015 10:02 PM

toad

My time, my way.

902. SirHamster

August 21, 2015 12:19 AM

Hamster has never demanded you comply with the rules because he's supporting your SJW behavior so I guess the VFM have been infiltrated. [Hamster] demanded that [Toad] comply with the rules of the blog in response to [Simple Tim], and it happened right here: [@487](#) [@490](#)

There's actually a good argument YOU violated the "spirit of the law" because you intentionally lied and misquoted me, and on the basis of that lie you created an absurd strawman and demanded I answer. Hamster also demanded I answer. In keeping with Vox's rules, I responded here: [@492](#)

I would like to correct the record and point out how artisanaltoa glosses over details unflattering to himself.

In [@209](#), artisanaltoa claimed

*"First, there was to be no marital relations when the wife was menstruating for she was unclean. Second, there were to be no marital relations after the birth of a child, 40 days for the birth of a male child and 80 days after the birth of a female child (Leviticus 12). That's it.*

[...]

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

In [@479](#), simplytimothy summarized that position as "A husband can do anything he wants with his wives except for two things" and asked toad if he would affirm the assertion of "only two restrictions" in a set of hypothetical situations.

In [@486](#), artisanaltoa violates the Rules of the Blog by not answering the questions related to his own assertion. Claims that he is being strawmanned.

In [@487](#), I note that artisanaltoa had previously appealed to the Rules of the Blog ([@379](#)), and ought to obey them himself.

In [@488](#), artisanaltoa claims that he had answered the questions.

In [@490](#), I point out that artisanaltoa has not answered the questions and repeat the request that he answer them. (the claim they were answered was a lie)

In [@492](#), after being prompted TWICE, artisanaltoa finally answers the questions in accordance with the Rules of the Blog.

Note that artisanaltoa's pattern of ignoring the Rules

of the Blog is not isolated. My request for a retraction, raised in [@736](#), has been ignored by artisanaltoa despite reminders in [@738](#), [@740](#), and [@882](#). This, even as artisanaltoa has appealed to the Rules of the Blog again for both myself ([@878](#)) and simplytimothy.

I also note that artisanaltoa has a fanciful idea of what constitutes misquoting. Original quotes from artisanaltoa and simplytimothy are provided above to demonstrate what toad's idea of a "strawman", "lie", and "misquote" is.

### 903. Anonymous

August 21, 2015 7:38 AM

Here is are definitions of THE LAW IS PERFECT\* [@849](#)

We start with Toad's claims.

We then note the different definitions we are arguing from.

toads claim: Psalm 19 states "The Law of the Lord is perfect" and that means it is perfect. Nothing more or less than needed. [@247](#), [@319](#), [@323](#), [@351](#).

Westminster Confession of Faith

[http://www.reformed.org/documents/wcf\\_with\\_proofs/Chapter XIX Of the Law Of God.](http://www.reformed.org/documents/wcf_with_proofs/Chapter%20XIX%20Of%20the%20Law%20Of%20God)

Catholic Catechism:

<http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccs/archiv/catechism/p3s1c3a1.htm>

Souther Baptist :

<http://www.sbc.net/bfm2000/bfm2000.asp>

Mark Call (TOBe?)

Law/Torah/Instruction

INCLUDES:

statutes/chuqqim

judgements/mishpatim

commandments/mitzvot

stories

parables

O.T

N.T.

midrash(<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Midrash>)

peschat(?)

Literary forms including

chiasms/ATbash

archetype/suspicious of

"first use" of a Hebrew word

"multiple uses" of a Hebrew word

PARDES (PRDS)

Peshat (פֶּשֶׁט) – "surface" ("straight") or the literal (direct) meaning.[1]

Remez (רֵמֵז) – "hints" or the deep (allegoric: hidden or symbolic) meaning beyond just the literal sense.

Derash (דְּרָשׁ) – from Hebrew darash: "inquire" ("seek") – the comparative (midrashic) meaning, as given through similar occurrences.

Sod (סוד) (pronounced with a long O as in 'sore') – "secret" ("mystery") or the esoteric/mystical meaning, as given through inspiration or revelation.

"hidden" matters that require searching out.

(possibly) "Sealed" now being revealed to those who "diligently seek His face" and make "t'shuvah"

Number per Bullinger

IS:

Completely sufficient for His purposes (synonyms: 'complete', 'perfect')

IS NOT:

Defined in any traditions of church or men. (how does this square with midrash?)

Written on the Hearts and Minds of men by the Holy Spirit.

Erroneous faults introduced by translation error

cultural bias

Deliberate distortion (divine right of kings or Official 501c3 Church Dogma of Romans 13!(me: Which part? submission to authority or fulfilling law through love?).

REQUIRES:

Study

Internal consistency

?? And the few that are not (see Rashi for these, among others) are often the true gems, where diligent study will reveal the subtle distinction the Creator put there for us.

It is often, albeit not exclusively, in those places where tools like you reference are most useful.

IS COMPLETE

for His purposes. (which is NOT the same as saying it is not possible that He would have more to teach us, or that it includes all that can be known. ("Our mind" is not His...we might not be able to comprehend anyway.))

\*some these claims are accessible via the category THE

PRIMACY OF SCRIPTURE [@745](#). The categories are drafts, I expect that as we examine toad's claims, the overlap between categories will disappear and we will get to a cleaner expression with new category names. This will be an *iterative* process--think of it as a refactoring cycle.

904. Anonymous

August 21, 2015 7:48 AM

In my notes, I have added a new DEFINITIONS category. [@903](#) is the first entry.

Mark Call.

Please feel free to restate your definition; I have taken your comments and extracted those principles from your work.

When you are done, we can restate your definition if you like.

@Beau, if you are tuning in, I am curious what your definition would be.

@SirHamster thank you for the links to the WCF, Catholic Catechism and SBC statements.

905. Anonymous

August 21, 2015 8:02 AM

Next up is the next claim in one of the basic categories.

For a reminder they are

17 THE LAW IS PERFECT [@849](#)

10 PRIMACY OF SCRIPTURE [@768](#) ([@745](#))

3 STORY vs VERSE [@773](#)

Under THE LAW IS PERFECT [@849](#) is the dispute between toad and Mark Call. I am thinking stating the difference in interpretation between toad and Mark Call would be illuminating for *definitional* purposes. Revealing to all how they think and reason from scripture.

Upon review the topics (not claims) of STORY vs VERSE @773 are more esoteric,

@SirHamster, if you see anything definitional in any of those, and would like to examine those, we can do that.

I will review the claims in the categories when I get back from work (if I can keep my eyes open)

cheers.

t

is the

906. Mark Call

August 21, 2015 10:24 AM

@ST -- is it your intent to summarize me to have said what this LOOKS like?

**Torah**

**IS NOT:**

**...Written on the Hearts and Minds of men by the Holy Spirit. ???**

If so, the shorthand is at fault, because that is not what I have said, since His Torah has been (examples in Scripture abound), and certainly can be. Perhaps you misunderstand my reference to Jeremiah 31 -- which is clearly NOT FULFILLED YET.

Because obviously not ALL men have it "written on their hearts," and it is equally clearly still necessary for it to be TAUGHT.

This, too, I thought had been addressed:

**Defined in any traditions of church or men. (how does this square with midrash?)**

"Midrash" includes simply discussion. About many things. It can be right, iron can sharpen iron, and it can be wrong.

907. Artisanal Toad

August 21, 2015 6:37 PM



Hamster

You have pointed out that when asked to do so, even over objections to the issue, I complied with the rules of the blog.

You, having had questions put squarely before you, are refusing to do so.

Your partner in crime, Simple Tim, is likewise refusing to do so.

Thank you for making the point. SJW's want others to obey the rules, but they are a law unto themselves.

You claim a self-endowed title of nobility "SirHamster." Prove it. Answer the questions that have been squarely laid before you and demand that Simple Tim answer the questions that have been laid before him regarding his OWN claims. Simple Tim claims he has the right to regulate your marriage bed. Doesn't that make you at least a little uncomfortable? Yet, you hold your silence.

What are you whining about Hamster? I did what I was asked to do. Have you? Up til now, the answer is a resounding "NO."

**908. Anonymous**

**August 21, 2015 6:56 PM**

Hi Mark,

Could you please copy and paste it as a comment with your changes? If not , I can parse your comment and make the changes int he morning.

**909. SirHamster**

**August 22, 2015 1:49 AM**

You have pointed out that when asked to do so, even over objections to the issue, I complied with the rules of the blog.

I have pointed out that your summary of previous events is misleading. You portray yourself as dutifully following the rules of the blog while unjustly treated,

when the reality is that you have to be backed into a corner before you will even consider doing so.

I told you, you are being treated in the style you CHOSE.

For example, even as you yet again demand I give you an answer ... I have reminded you 5 times that you have not retracted a false statement of what I claimed, and it is still not retracted.

If you believe I do not have the intellectual consistency to be authoritative on what my own claims are, why does it matters so much to you if I answer your questions or not?

I also note that while I have given you your answer (I'm not interested in discussing polygamy with you), you have yet to LISTEN to what I asked you to DO. Great job proving my point.

I had no ill will towards you before this thread. Now, I think that if polygamy attracts men of your caliber, that the idea itself generates bad fruit and should be shunned in a God-fearing church. (which may be a motivation behind the one-wife rule for overseers/deacons)

#### 910. Anonymous

August 22, 2015 8:28 AM

I am reviewing the basic categories, and just finished doing a second pass on THE PRIMACY OF SCRIPTURE [@768](#)

You can see two meta-claims in my reorganization. Here is the work:

-----  
*PRIMACY OF SCRIPTURE*  
 -----

*DEFINED: Nothing more or less than The Law of The Lord (Psalm 19) is needed. (COMMENT [@145](#)) (ME See comment 600) (ME: On the Lam For Jesus)*

*SCRIPTURE IS SILENT:*

*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. (COMMENT [@534](#))*

*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. (COMMENT @534)*

*(ME: kidnap)*

*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. (COMMENT @415)*

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

*(COMMENT @436) (ME: Song of Solomon. One woman.)*

*That silence is particularly instructive because God had a great deal to say about sex and relationships, but we see ONLY prohibitions and restrictions.*

*(COMMENT @534)*

#### **THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE**

*When tradition directly contradicts God's Word it's wrong (COMMENT @145)*

*There is only one standard for Christians, and that's the Word. (COMMENT @431)*

*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.*

*(COMMENT @534)*

*When Christians deviate from the Word and make a mess of things, the solution is to repent. King Josiah is instructive here. (COMMENT @431)*

Looking at this, I don't see anything that needs defining except maybe the name of the meta-claims

You can see the two meta-claims in ALL CAPS under the category. Perhaps the SCRIPTURE IS SILENT could be ARGUMENT FROM SILENCE. I don't know. We can examine it later. I don't see anything that requires definition.

I will be doing the same organizing for THE LAW IS PERFECT @849 when I get home from work and post those results.

If there is nothing remaining to define in that category, then perhaps this organizing by meta-claim should continue.

Remember, the goal is to *define* at this point. There

may be nothing left to define. However the sorting into meta-claims is a task in its own right and part of a refactoring sweep.

This shouldn't take more than a few days to get done, unless we hit another major definitional difference.

More later,

cheers.

t

911. Artisanal Toad

August 22, 2015 11:27 AM

Simple Tim

You have left out a few things.

*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. (COMMENT @534)  
(ME: kidnap)*

You left out the point that Romans 4:15 says "where there is no law there is no violation" and Romans 5:13 which says "sin is not imputed when there is no law." It appears you are trying to resurrect the argument that Leviticus 18:22 applies to both men and women in spite of the fact that the very next verse mentions both men and women when prohibiting sex with animals.

This has been dealt with repeatedly and YOU have made no response. When God was prohibiting, unilaterally, certain sexual acts, He proscribed men with men, men with animals and women with animals. Are you still trying to say God got it wrong when He did not proscribe women with women? We await your argument, because this is the crux of the entire argument.

You made the claim (which you have refused to expand on or explain) that "women lying with women is just as wrong as men with men"

Again, the crux of the entire argument. But look at

what has been done, instead.

Why? Because you can't admit you're wrong.

#### 912. Artisanal Toad

August 22, 2015 6:11 PM

Simple Tim, you are a lying SJW cuckservative.

I started with a simple premise: God was specific in not mentioning any form of prohibition or condemnation of women's sexual acts with each other. Therefore, in light of Romans 4:15 and Romans 5:13, such acts are not sinful.

Based on this, I made the argument that in a polygynous marriage, any sexual contact wives might have while in bed with their husband is licit.

Simple Tim declared he would oppose this because God told him to "go for it." Interestingly, it took him over a month and hundreds and hundreds of comments before he could bring himself to say: *"It is just as wrong for a woman to lie with a woman as it is for a man to lie with a man."* Yet, even though he believes he's acting on orders from God, he refuses to back up his claim. This is a statement in complete opposition to the original premise, so given that God told him to "go for it" surely he'd have something to back it up with.

His only hope was the Romans 1:26-27 argument of conflating the prohibited acts of the men with the women. Unfortunately, that argument cannot withstand the scrutiny of Romans 4:15 and Romans 5:13, because God did not prohibit or condemn women's sexual acts with women.

SJW's like to claim authority they don't have.

Observe: [@779](#) *"As husband, if you are like Caesar and commanding your wife to do that which is against the will of God, then somebody has to intervene if the wife cannot help herself."*

When repeatedly called on to answer this and other claims, he refused, saying he will get to it on his time and on his terms. This is a typical tactic of the SJW-hijack the discussion to end the discourse.

Notice also how Sir Hamster the white knight rushes to defend Simple Tim with the typical double standard of all SJW's: We obey the spirit of the law, you must obey the letter of the law, and we decide what the spirit of the law is. SJW's always rely on their white knights to run interference for them.

SJW's always project: [@854](#) Simple Tim said *"What you WILL NOT DO is dominate the discourse with your hyper-threading where we respond to your whims."*

Simple Tim demands that I not do what he has already done: he hijacked the thread and is doing his best to dominate the discourse by spamming the thread with his cut and paste of previous comments and refusal to respond to his own statements, much less to the original argument.

Notice that a call for Simple Tim to respond to his own statements is a "whim" and an attempt to "dominate the discussion." Pure projection. As part of his strategy to hijack the discussion, Simple Tim has spewed comment after comment with detailed, arcane, irrelevant and spurious "definitions" designed to drive people away and shift the focus from the original argument to a question of "definitions."

We see in this thread constant attempts to reframe the argument, lies, doubling down on the lies, projection, the refusal to respond and the hijacking of the discussion to prevent any meaningful discourse. **This is how SJW's do it.** Given that Vox has been writing a book about SJW's he probably allowed this to go on just to have a textbook case of what SJW's are really like.

Probably the most classic is Simple Tim quoting Vox while doing exactly the opposite of what Vox instructed... and using that as an excuse to hijack the discussion and violate Vox's rules of the blog. This is something you'll see time and time again when arguing with an SJW: an appeal to authority while simultaneously rejecting the authority they cited.

At the end of the day, the argument is so dirt-simple it could have been settled in a dozen back and forth comments. Observing the process on something so simple one can understand how it works with more

complicated subjects, so I suppose this thread could be a constructive, if painful experience for the reader.

913. Anonymous

August 22, 2015 8:12 PM

toad.

My way, my time.

UPDATE: I have done nothing but scan your comments since I completed the collection phase. Do not waste your breath.

I will engage you after I complete what I set out to do, not before.

914. SirHamster

August 22, 2015 9:31 PM

Taking a stab at

-----  
*STORY vs VERSE (The letter of the law vs the spirit of the law. aka idiomatic antithesis.)*  
 -----

Not sure how [@436](#) from Mark Call on Greek vs. Hebrew language is linked to the concepts listed in [@773](#) relating to marriage. Is that reference wrong, or were you meaning to give Mark's post its own item?

In [@640](#), artisanaltoa refers to various scriptures to support his position.

From Leviticus, he claims that the lack of explicit condemnation of "girl on girl sexual acts" (letter of law) is non-condemnation. (toad's take on intent of law)

Referring to Roman 1's use of "natural function" for woman, artisanaltoa defines that "The natural function of a woman is to be married to a man and make his babies, to be her husband's helpmeet."

Not directly related to Scripture, but included for context:

*"I made a distinction between sexual acts between women who were in an anti-man, anti-marriage relationship (LESBIANS) and sexual acts that might happen between wives sharing the bed with their husband."*

lesbian - "women who were in an anti-man, anti-marriage relationship (LESBIANS)"

subset of girl-girl sex - "sexual acts that might happen between wives sharing the bed with their husband"

Note here that he is drawing a distinction between a relationship and sexual acts. One gets ... interesting results with categorical substitution here. Make a distinction between friendship and throwing a baseball and treat that as illuminating to a rational adult.

artisanaltoa also speculates that

*"Perhaps the degrading passion isn't the lesbian relationship Paul is talking about. Perhaps the degrading passion is the feminist hatred of men, of which lesbian relationships are merely a symptom and girl-girl sex is merely a side note."*

Paul does not talk about lesbians, so this is artisanaltoa's treating "degrading passions" and "unnatural function" (from the letter of the law) as interchangeable with "lesbian relationships". (toa's take on intent of law)

In making these points, artisanaltoa is making room for but not claiming that "girl-girl sex" between wives is not unnatural. Toad is silent on whether there is an area of !natural && !unnatural functions for women. In the absence of such definitions; then !natural == unnatural. In carefully defining unnatural to exclude wifely "girl-girl sex", this is an indirect method to claim that wifely "girl-girl sex" is part of the natural function of women without ever explicitly saying so.

If he wasn't a bore, it would be interesting to see how he responds to that when pressed.

915. Artisanal Toad

August 22, 2015 10:49 PM



Honestly, you just can't make this stuff up. They're running blind in full SJW / White Knight mode and no longer even paying attention.

#### 916. Artisanal Toad

August 23, 2015 3:27 AM

Another example of how SJW's argue: The Hamster said

*From Leviticus, he claims that the lack of explicit condemnation of "girl on girl sexual acts" (letter of law) is non-condemnation. (toad's take on intent of law)*

*Referring to Roman 1's use of "natural function" for woman, artisanaltoad defines that "The natural function of a woman is to be married to a man and make his babies, to be her husband's helpmeet."*

Notice the Hamster doesn't deny those points and notice that he doesn't present a counter-argument. Just typical SJW snark without saying anything. But it gets even better!

*"If he wasn't a bore, it would be interesting to see how he responds to that when pressed."*

Did he ask any questions? **No.**

Did he "press" me with anything? **No.**

Did he take the Simple Tim challenge? **No.**

Just as a reminder, this is the Simple Tim challenge:

**"This isn't about sex, Simple Tim. This is about authority. Either show me where God said sexual contact between wives married to the same man is sin, or show me your delegation of authority that allows you to arbitrarily step into another mans' family and declare something to be a sin when God didn't."**

The Simple Tim challenge was first presented on July 16th, at comment [@706](#). It's now August 23rd, and there has been no response other than a refusal to answer. 38 days with an open-book test and still no answer.

What's even more interesting in light of his refusal to

answer is on June 24th, Simple Tim claimed "it is just as wrong for a woman to lie with a woman as it is for a man to lie with a man." [@504](#)

On August 8th, Tim said: "As husband, if you are like Caesar and commanding your wife to do that which is against the will of God, then somebody has to intervene if the wife cannot help herself."

It should come as no surprise to the reader that while Simple Tim has claimed that sex between women is wrong and he has the authority to intervene in another man's marriage to the point of regulating his marital bed, he refuses to justify his positions or answer any questions about these assertions.

The SJW team in action: Tim, the ignorant SJW schoolboy and Sir Hamster, the SJW white knight VFM. Remember: SJW's never fight alone, they (like vibrants) prefer to operate in a pack.

917. Anonymous

August 23, 2015 7:27 AM

SirHamster,

It just occurred to me that the next fundamental definition is "COVENANT".

Until that is clearly defined, then the concepts of "AUTHORITY" and "HEADSHIP" cannot begin to be addressed.

In the same way that defining "The Law" has clarified the nature of the debate, I believe defining COVENANT will have a similar effect of allowing us to recognize any differences in definition and avoid the problems of ambiguity.

Toad asserts the authority, as **covenant head**, to defile the **covenant** of marriage with sin. He argues that wife-wife sex within the **covenant** of marriage is not sin. Then toad asks by what authority I can condemn toad for what God has not prohibited.

Clearly toad is playing fast-and-loose with covenant headship. Since 'headship' is dependent on 'covenant' the definition of covenant must be stated to avoid

ambiguity when addressing the derivative concepts.

Regarding 'STORY Vs VERSE" the link [@436](#) is clearly wrong. I apologize.

I started some initial work on COVENANT this morning-- jotting down my preconceptions--there is scriptural work to be done that will take some time and effort.

One final thing. Toad is utterly and completely wrong on THE NATURAL FUNCTION. When the definitional work is done I will post the results of my analysis; it will be good fun.. I want to maintain mission discipline, so I am not going to jump ahead of primary tasks.

thx.

t

Regarding

*Not sure how [@436](#) from Mark Call on Greek vs. Hebrew language is linked to the concepts listed in [@773](#) relating to marriage. Is that reference wrong, or were you meaning to give Mark's post its own item?*

The link is wrong. My error.

I have noticed some comment number drift. Either I made the mistake or the comments where deleted (I know one of Mark Call's has been)

Regarding Natural Function. toad has it completely and utterly wrong.

I will discuss with you after the definitions are done (neglecting the fundamental work is a huge strategic error that I refuse to make) .

**918. Anonymous**

**August 23, 2015 7:28 AM**

Regarding definition of The Law,

I will parse Mark Call's comments and make the changes he asked for then re-publish the results. I expect to have time to do that by Wednesday.

## 919. Artisanal Toad

August 24, 2015 12:20 PM

Simple Tim claims:

*Toad asserts the authority, as covenant head, to defile the covenant of marriage with sin. He argues that wife-wife sex within the covenant of marriage is not sin. Then toad asks by what authority I can condemn toad for what God has not prohibited.*

Obviously, Tim argues that wife-wife sex is a sin and Toad is to be condemned, which is why he lied, claiming “Toad asserts the authority, as covenant head, to defile the covenant of marriage with sin.” This is known as a “contested issue of fact” so let’s test it. Romans 4:15 and Romans 5:13 are quite specific, referring to the letter of the Law. In Romans 4:15 the word translated as “law” is the Greek νόμος with [34 occurrences](#). Note that in this verse it is used twice.

Romans 4:15a

GRK: ὁ γὰρ νόμος ὀργὴν κατεργάζεται

NASB: for the Law brings about wrath,

Romans 4:15b

GRK: οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος οὐδὲ παράβασις

NASB: there is no law, there also is no violation

The first occurrence contains the definitive article ὁ thus referring specifically to the Law of Moses. The second occurrence does not have the definitive article, and thus *could be* a reference to \*any\* law or regulation, but contextually it can only refer to the Law of Moses given the previous usage in the same verse.

We see the same thing with Romans 5:13, with a slight variation of the same word ” νόμου” which is used [67 times](#). You might want to take a look at how it’s used in other passages.

Romans 5:13a

GRK: ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν

NASB: for until the Law sin

Romans 5:13b

GRK: μὴ ὄντος νόμου

NASB: is not imputed when there is no law.

Tim, I know you want the Romans 1:26 reference to the "unnatural function" to be about sex, but regardless of what the girls might do in bed, **there is no violation because there is no law.** The "likewise" conjunction found in Romans 1:25-27 can only refer to the men and women BOTH giving up the natural function of the woman and developing unnatural relationships because we are forbidden to add to the law. **Paul knew that** and the only thing he stated about the women was they "gave up the natural function for the unnatural."

Beau (and you as well, I take it) argue the "likewise" conjunction compares the mentioned, prohibited and condemned sexual behavior of the men with unmentioned behavior of women, thus condemning (calling sinful) the women's unmentioned behavior. You (Tim) and Hamster have both also argued a "spirit of the law" condemnation applies.

Deuteronomy 4:2 says *"You shall not add to the word which I am commanding you, nor take away from it, that you may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you."* Paul reinforced this, stating: *"where there is no law there is no violation"* and *"sin is not imputed when there is no law."* As has already been mentioned repeatedly, Leviticus 18:22-23 prohibits men with men, men with animals and women with animals, but makes no mention of women with women. There is no mention anywhere in Scripture of women's sexual contact with women.

With no law, there can be no sin imputed, so Romans 1:25-27 cannot be taken to prohibit or condemn [completely unmentioned] sexual acts between women. Therefore, the "likewise" argument that attempts to conflate prohibited male behavior with unmentioned female behavior fails. To claim otherwise is to claim Paul violated the command not to add to the Law by condemning behavior God chose not to condemn. A careful study of the text reveals the only thing Paul said about the women was they "gave up the natural function for the unnatural." I dealt with this in [@793](#).

**Continued**

## 920. Artisanal Toad

August 24, 2015 12:22 PM

Now that we've examined Romans 4:15, 5:13 and looked at Romans 1:25-27 in light of those passages, we can examine Tim's claim:

*Toad asserts the authority, as covenant head, to defile the covenant of marriage with sin. He argues that wife-wife sex within the covenant of marriage is not sin. Then toad asks by what authority I can condemn toad for what God has not prohibited.*

**The first sentence is a lie.** I have never asserted the authority of the husband to defile the marriage with sin.

**The second sentence is incorrect.** I argue that according to Romans 4:15 and 5:13, in the absence of specific prohibition, wife-wife sex within the marriage is not sin. Further, Romans 1:26 cannot be taken to prohibit or condemn such acts because that would be a violation of Deuteronomy 4:2 and 12:32.

**The third sentence is likewise incorrect.** I have repeatedly asked Tim to show me where God prohibited such sexual contact, or to show me his delegation of authority to intervene in another's marriage and call sin that which God did not call sin.

Tim stated "*for the Christian, there are restrictions placed on him that are not in any law, but are wrong by their very nature.*" This claim conflates that which is sin for everyone (violations of the Law) with that which is sin to the individual ("That which is not of faith is sin") and this is where the "letter of the Law" and the "spirit of the law" come into play.

I'll illustrate with one of those things that's not in any law, but is wrong by its very nature and truly an abomination before the Lord: *boiled okra*. You can tell just by looking at it that it's not right, because each piece looks like a green dog penis floating in snot. When you stab one with a fork to pick it up off your plate, it oozes and drips slime.

The taste of boiled okra is indescribably gross and combined with the mushy texture and the slime oozing out of it that's just like warm snot, I'm about to gag just typing this. But it wasn't just being forced to eat it, it was being required to tend the garden every

summer, watching that stuff grow and knowing what was coming. It was watching Mom pick the really tender stuff and freeze it for filé Gumbo, while we got the hard stuff (maximum slime) boiled up and served to us at supper.

I am convinced boiled okra is a crime against nature. Now, I grew up in a large family and one of my brothers developed a taste for boiled okra in order to torment the rest of us. The rule was nobody left the table until Dad got up or everyone was done eating and we'd all be excused together. This brother would make us all wait and we'd have to watch as he slowly pick up the okra and played with the snot dripping off of it before slowly eating it. So, maybe my problem with boiled okra is as much due to childhood trauma as the simple fact that it's just as much an abomination as store-bought bottled barbeque sauce.

This brother of mine still likes boiled okra and he regularly serves it to his kids. I know he does it, but it's none of my business what happens in his house after he closes the door to his dining room. See, there's no law forbidding him from boiling okra until the snot gets thick and putting it on the dinner table. I know that for me, to make my kids experience that stuff would be one of the most horrible and unloving thing I could do to them, but my brothers' kids actually enjoy boiled okra. It's a treat for them and they ask for it. (True family story.)

Paul discussed this situation in Romans 14 and it can be a difficult concept to handle. That which is not of (your) faith is sin to you, but that doesn't make it sin for your brother. So, you can be convinced that a woman lying with a woman is wrong, but that doesn't extend beyond your family because God chose not to apply it to everyone. That's the lesson Romans 4:15 and 5:13 teaches us when contrasted with Romans 14. Neither you or the church has the authority to come into my house and either require or forbid boiled okra.

921. Artisanal Toad

August 24, 2015 2:45 PM

#### Statistics

Simple Tim's total number of comments to date,

starting at [@228](#): 250

Demands for formal arguments and ad hominem attacks: 6 comments

Updates saying “this is what I’m working on.” 27 comments.

Comments refusing to answer questions: 11 comments.

Summaries, headings, and spams of previous comments: 59 comments.

Random comments that had nothing to do with the argument: 20 comments.

In total, 50% of Simple Tim’s comments have been something other than arguing the point. Of the 127 comments that could be construed as contributing to the discussion (and I’m being generous here) in 31 of those comments he asked questions. Interestingly, in another 31 comments he made an assertion of something. I didn’t consider the comments he included in his spams, such as from [@750](#) to [@775](#), so your mileage may vary.

Simple Tim has done an incredible job of proving Vox’s three axioms of a SJW:

1. **Tim is always lying.**
2. **Tim is always doubling down.**
3. **Tim is always projecting.**

In addition, Tim displays the gamma behavior one would expect from a SJW. He claims he’s committed to this fight because he wants to impress people he respects and because God told him to “go for it.” He obviously idolizes Vox, but Tim is \*special\* and couldn’t get Vox’s advice correct (the part about read and study BEFORE making a critique) and can’t be bothered to obey Vox’s rules.

In keeping with the gamma profile, Tim has turned this thread into a major drama production, as if the entire discussion was a dealing with a fantastic new discovery. The endless spams of previous comments (“by golly, look at that kid go!”), the quibbling over categories and definitions (“wow- this must be a really important issue!”), all the while refusing to answer the one critical question that could end the argument decisively, which I’ve called the “Simple Tim Challenge”:



“This isn’t about sex, Simple Tim. This is about authority. Either show me where God said sexual contact between wives married to the same man is sin, or show me your delegation of authority that allows you to arbitrarily step into another mans’ family and declare something to be a sin when God didn’t.”

Tim has had the Simple Tim Challenge laid squarely before him since July 16th and it’s been repeated 14 times now. Tim, of course, has refused to answer, and like a proper SJW he’s lied, doubled down and projected all through this thread.

Typical of gamma attitude (“I’m special!”) Tim refuses to back up his assertions or answer questions about some of his amazing claims. He states he will decide at what pace and in what way he will allow the discourse to move forward. His most amazing claim is he has the authority to step into another man’s home, decide what God’s will for the wife is and regulate their marital bed. In keeping with this attitude of superiority is his delusion that he’s involved in something really fantastic and he’s \*winning\* at this! Observe his comments at [@879](#):

*We do not need toad.*

*His claims and argument are there to be analyzed.*

*Tactically speaking we have air superiority.*

*He is inside our OODA loop.*

*We Observe, We Orient ourselves, We Decide, We Act.*

*He is still fighting his battle his way, but his tactics are useless given the strategic view that we have of the argument.*

*He can OODA all he wants, but we are looking DOWN on him from altitude his aircraft cannot reach.*

*Strategically, he is fucked.*

*If his argument is shit (and it is, the claims are starting to fall, I will post them once the definitions are complete and each claim is meticulously examined) then he is powerless to divert the counter-claims and he will have to dodge the bombs that we will be dropping on him when WE are ready.*

*Its fun.*

Pure gamma SJW self-delusion.

922. Anonymous

August 24, 2015 3:36 PM

toad.

Are you repeating yourself again?

What part of "I will address your claims after I ...."  
don't you understand?

923. Anonymous

August 24, 2015 3:51 PM

*Obviously, Tim argues that wife-wife sex is a sin and  
Toad is to be condemned, which is why he lied,  
claiming*

It is my opinion that it is sin. The arguments for my  
view are very solid. Much more solid than yours. I am  
building a careful case to take your ass out.

You are not the mission toad. The innocents you target  
with your evil need a clear understanding of the roots  
of your argument and a faithful rebuttal of it.

It is that which I am working on. You are irrelevant.  
Your argument is the target. My work continues.

924. Anonymous

August 24, 2015 4:07 PM

I have now read your comments. You have said nothing  
new.

You *depend* on the command/response dynamic to "win"  
your case.

You obviously fear logical examination of your case as  
every step of progress is met by a wall of nonsense  
from you.

It. Ain't. Happening.  
You will not stop me.

Collection of claims is done.  
Categorization of claims--first draft pass complete.  
Expect several iterations (that "spam" you referred to)  
"The Law/instruction" defined for several points of  
view. (ambiguity removed, especially when discussing  
with Mark Call)  
"Covenant" next up to define.

Sorting claims in each category into sub-categories--in  
progress.  
Looking for other fundamental concepts to define so as  
to bypass ambiguity--in progress

Rebuttal of THE NATURAL FUNCTION --done.

Then each claim in each category will be examined  
with a cold pitiless eye.  
The more I look the stupider your argument is. You are  
going down, drama-boy.

Mission discipline will be maintained; Definitions will  
be made; claims will be examined one by one. Your  
arguments will be stated.  
Counter-arguments will be made.

When the work is done, the innocents who are troubled  
by your "doctrine" will have the tools needed to reject  
your insanity. You will be out of the loop. The truth will  
out.

#### 925. Artisanal Toad

August 24, 2015 5:04 PM

Simple Tim claims, OMG!

*It is my opinion that it is sin. The arguments for my  
view are very solid. Much more solid than yours. I am  
building a careful case to take your ass out.*

HIS OPINION!

Yet, Simple Tim does not back that up with anything.  
Does he show where God says it's wrong? NO!!! He  
claims he is building a careful case... Do we hear the  
Jame Bond background music playing? Simple Tim  
thinks so. After all, he's a Social Justice Warrior, badge  
#007. Licensed to choke.

What evidence has Simple Tim brought forward? Not one shred. Nothing. Nada. No cites, No exegesis, no nothing.

The noise of a clanging gong.

**926. Artisanal Toad**

August 24, 2015 5:06 PM

Has Simple Tim answered the "Simple Tim Challenge?" No. For 39 days he's avoided it. It's a simple question, Simple Tim. Why can't you answer it?

**927. Artisanal Toad**

August 24, 2015 5:14 PM

Timmy...

39 days? And you couldn't come up with anything? Nothing? Even John Scalzi is doing better than you. I think you're going for the SJW congressional medal of honor. The only thing you can do at this point is dive on a grenade.

**928. Matthew**

August 24, 2015 5:17 PM

New rule for this particular thread:

All participants will refer to each other by full names.  
No derogatory alterations, no abbreviations.

**929. Matthew**

August 24, 2015 5:53 PM

Next.

I'm putting this post under moderation, meaning comments must be approved by me before they will appear. I do not wish to shut down this debate, but it will henceforth be conducted in a more productive manner.

So I'll grant you a reset. All previous "answer the question" demands are now voided, because I'm not

going to review anything. Start thinking about how you will summarize your position and arguments. At some point tomorrow, I'll ask for opening statements.

**930. Artisanal Toad**

August 24, 2015 6:33 PM

VFM

Copy your com at [@928](#) and [@929](#); but note per [@928](#) I'm perfectly happy to be referred to as "toad," toady." "AT" or "arti" as many of the commentators have done. I actually prefer flexibility in how anyone refers to me because it becomes part of the tone of their message. This applies to both friends and enemies. And, really, how does one slide further down from "toad?" That's why I chose the name, it means nothing to me.

Housekeeping: I assume my comments will go into mod and you'll get them? If not, communicate the procedure for this please.

Question: When you say this is a "reset" does that mean start from zero (completely restate arguments), or can we build on what was said (links, quotes)? This has been dragging on for a hell of a long time and some of the stuff is buried back 700 comments or more. Again, are you requiring a restatement de novo? I see a difference between links that might not be completely on point vs. modified cut and paste that are, but I don't know what you're looking for. Make the call.

I was hoping for something else, but nice you could stop by. Glad to see the chain of command is working.

Toad, out.

**931. Artisanal Toad**

August 24, 2015 6:34 PM

OH- and if you want to delete my comment and just answer the questions, go for it. Got no skin in that fight.

**932. Matthew**

August 24, 2015 8:18 PM

To clarify: all comments on this post are now held in moderation, and I get an email asking what to do.

Someone asked: **When you say this is a "reset" does that mean start from zero (completely restate arguments), or can we build on what was said (links, quotes)?**

The first stage will be to gain agreement on the situation. I will ask each of you in turn to summarize your understanding of the state of the debate as it stands, including your position and what you believe the other interlocutors' positions to be. Avoid anything that even smells of a strawman.

No links or quotes. That can only lead to the recrimination tarpit.

The second stage commences when no one has any objections to their interlocutors' descriptions of anyone's positions.

N.B. I'm tolerating and facilitating this instead of shuttering the post because I am familiar with and appreciate all of the combatants, and I find the topic interesting. Don't make me regret this.

933. Anonymous

August 25, 2015 8:25 AM

[@930](#) Vile Faceless Moderator

I look forward to it. Thank you. I am gone for today and will be home all day tomorrow.

I will compose a reply to

*The first stage will be to gain agreement on the situation. I will ask each of you in turn to summarize your understanding of the state of the debate as it stands, including your position and what you believe the other interlocutors' positions to be. Avoid anything that even smells of a strawman.*

tomorrow.

Thanks for this, I am having fun and it is important work.

**934. Matthew**

August 26, 2015 6:27 PM

I've been distracted last couple of days. Still thinking about how to make this work well and give everybody skin in the game.

Stay tuned.

**935. Artisanal Toad**

August 26, 2015 11:05 PM

I don't think anyone would disagree that I'm the one that started this and their arguments have all been in response to mine. Would it help you if I explained the background behind it, what I was trying to do and where I was trying to go?

Additionally, if I may be so bold, I suggest you request a private statement from the various parties (Me, SimplyTimothy, SirHamster and Mark Call) as to the following:

The subject of discussion. (Short statement)

The major issues of the discussion. (Bullet points)

How they see the current state of the discussion. (Short statement)

What their argument is. (Bullet points without discussion)

What their motivation is for being in the argument. (Why are you here?)

What is their opponent's motivation? (Why are they here?)

What their goal for the argument is (Where do you want to go with this?).

What is their opponent's goal for this? (What are they trying to do?)

(That's what I did to resolve things and restore peace when my children got into drawn-out fights.)

As to whether those become public after everyone has submitted one is your call. I can see pros and cons.

I think that approach would give you more information to make a decision on how to continue; and knowing the stated motivation and goals of the parties would be beneficial if you intend to continue in an active role

after getting things "reset." If you want to take a more hands-off approach, that information allows you to craft a set rules/guidelines/restrictions specifically for this thread.

/Toad

**936. Matthew**

August 27, 2015 12:05 AM

There's enough material here for an ebook. I think that will be the game.

**937. Anonymous**

August 29, 2015 4:52 PM

I agree with artisanalloadshalls comment 935. I wrote a response to your comment 932 and have been waiting for you to

*... ask each of you in turn to summarize your understanding of the state of the debate as it stands, including your position and what you believe the other interlocutors' positions to be.*

My summary has been ready for a few days awaiting your request for it.

**938. Matthew**

August 29, 2015 5:58 PM

Go ahead, everybody, and post your comments. As many as you like. I'll release them in contiguous blocks, so that there's no interleaving.

**939. Anonymous**

August 29, 2015 6:58 PM

*The first stage will be to gain agreement on the situation.*

*I will ask each of you in turn to summarize your understanding of the state of the debate as it stands, including your position and what you believe the other interlocutors' positions to be.*

*Avoid anything that even smells of a strawman.*



**artisanaltoaadshall's position**

Since links are prohibited in the reply, I do not link to his stated argument.

Paraphrasing,

Within a polygynous marriage sex between wives is not prohibited by God.

artisanaltoaadshall correctly asserts that there is no specific scripture that says that woman-woman sex is prohibited.

He correctly states that all sex outside of sex is prohibited.

He asserts that the specific prohibitions against woman-woman sex are telling given that specific prohibitions exist: men with men, men with animals, women with animals. (note, no women with women prohibition)

He asserts that as a husband there is no prohibition against wife-wife sex within his marriage and that given the absence of scriptural explicit scriptural condemnation against women-women sex no justification for any outside authority to challenge his covenantal authority as head of the wives.

(Aside, the issue of polygamy/polygyny is not addressed in this debate. I have not conceded that, I am simply not arguing it)

**my position**

(continued...)

**940. Anonymous****August 29, 2015 6:59 PM**

(...continued...)

**my position**

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

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

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

That is the case I am in the process of building; it is eminently doable. It will take time, probably months (see item list in STATE OF DEBATE for why);

There are several lines of attack.

1. St. Paul in Romans "The Natural Function" argument; artisanaltoa shall gets it wrong on several levels.

I will present why after the discipline of defining terms and close research on the matter is done.

2. The "argument by silence" employed by artisanaltoa shall cuts both ways. I will be employing a reduction-ad-absurdum to this later.

3. Covenant marriage. If sex between unmarried persons is prohibited, then the question of who is married to whom is important.

My take: the wives are not married to each other.

They are only married to the man. Therefore

...paramount to this is the definition of COVENANT.

This is one of my present tasks. Defining the term

4. A possible/probable logical self-refutation in artisanaltoa shall's assertion that "Its all about the relationships" and it is "not about sex"

I thought it through and have forgotten my train of thought. I will recall it when the discipline of the mission is done.

5. The use of the masculine pronoun. For example in Exodus 21:16:

"He who kidnaps a man, whether he sells him or he is found in his possession, shall surely be put to death.

Coupled with artisanaltoa shall's foundational claim that it is arrogance and blasphemy to claim the authority to condemn where God chose not to.

Implies that God approves and sanctions a She who kidnaps a man for possession or selling (I am unsure on funding such she-ventures with bonds, stocks etc...)

Work needs to be done on highlighting all the wonderful things that God wants women to do that men are forbidden from doing.

6. Others that will come to light as the process of refactoring artisanaltoa shall's claims within the categories continues.

**STATE OF THE DEBATE.**

(continued....)

941. Anonymous

August 29, 2015 7:00 PM

(continued....)

#### STATE OF THE DEBATE.

There are two debates; there was the pre-comment 666 'debate'; The post-comment 666 debate has not started.

The pre-comment 666 debate was marred by a rapid-fire command/response dynamic coupled with a long comment thread chain.

The usual problems of retaining context and remembering a train of thought entered the thread.

Since I think the question is an important one (which I will explain below) I decided to collect artisanalloadshalls claims and look at his argument logically.

i.e. I separated artisanalloadshall's argument from artisanalloadshall's rhetoric and 'debate' style.

Restating the prior thought, I began the process of understanding my opponent's argument better than my opponent does.

To do that, I am implementing the following approach.

1. collect artisanalloadshall's claims. (done)
2. retain context by providing links to the comment where the original comment was made. (done)
3. categorize them; re-categorize; sub-categorize them in an iterative refactoring loop as his meta-argument/framework becomes clear. (in process)
4. define terms. (in progress. One definition "The Law" brings into stark focus the power of ambiguity in generating futility. We have a link to a beta version of that definition on request)
5. restate artisanalloadshall's argument from first principles (he has done this in a comment, still the exercise is important) (not done)
6. argue each category (semi-in progress. it is important to complete the process before re-engaging in the debate.
7. demolish artisanalloadshalls argument on Biblical grounds, using standard Christian definitions.
8. make the argument publically available as I believe artisanalloadshall's argument is ripe for popular distribution.

During this (time consuming) process, artisanalloadshall appears to believe that I am participating in the pre-comment 666 debate.

I am not. Hence my refusal to re-enter the dynamic (search the latest comments for OODA to get my take on the strategic situation) that characterized that 'debate'.

My opinion is that artisanalloadshall is irrelevant until the step 7. above is entered.

Getting to that step 7 is what I call 'maintaining mission discipline'

### Summary

Please ask if I am unclear on any point or intention and I will attempt to clarify.

942. Mark Call

August 31, 2015 2:50 PM

I have virtually nothing to add at this point. But a brief summary is as follows, and can be readily confirmed from any reading of Scripture, as Written, line-by-line, precept-by-precept, from the Beginning.

YHVH, and ALL of those who come in His Name, including His Anointed Meshiach, the Torah Made Flesh, must speak His Truth consistently, or they are NOT of Him. (Deuteronomy chapter 13, and many others.)

Yahushua can thus be distinguished from "another jesus,, whom we did NOT preach" (II Cor. 11:4) by that undeniable and unchanging criterion. He IS, in fact, "the same, yesterday, today, and forever." (Hebrews 13:8, repeating Malachi 3:6. And check out the end of that Book, too!)

In His very first public address, Yahushua made that point the foundation of what He said that day, and thereafter. (Matthew chapters 5 through 7, etc.) He did not come to change the "least part" of His own "teaching and instruction (Matt. 5:17-19) - and those who said otherwise had a problem.

NOT ONE of the statutes, judgments, and commandments that He gave to us in His Word has

been “done away with”, from His Sabbaths (plural), to what He told us is “food”, to His instruction about His Covenant with us, and thus our responsibilities to one another. His “grace” has been proven at least since Noah (and a rainbow which still exists, too) and arguably from Genesis chapter 3. Otherwise, what would be the point of the rest of the Book?

All of those we changed by men, by "adding to," and "subtracting from", in violation of His Word. (Deuteronomy 4:2, 12:32, and the "last command in Scripture", at the end of Revelation.) As several other commentators have said in more than one way, "are we to obey God, or men?"

We have a choice, however, (Deuteronomy 30) between life and death, blessing and cursing, and obedience to Him or rebellion. Consequences follow.

And He made it clear again then, as always, that this applied to marriage. His (of which there were more than one, see Jeremiah chapter 3, Ezekiel 23, etc) and ours, too. There is no limitation to a specific number of such Covenants ever given in Scripture. And Scripture leaves no doubt that many of more than a single wife were both blessed by Him, endorsed by Him, given by Him, and regulated by Him. As for the alleged “ideal” of Adam and Eve, note that it was without question the marriage by which “sin entered into the world,” not to mention progenitor of the first murderer.

There are, as His taught ones observed, many “hard teachings” in Scripture. This is not one of them.

**943. Anonymous**

August 31, 2015 6:20 PM

I will correct the typos in my latest comments by Wednesday.

*He correctly states that all sex outside of sex is prohibited.*

Should be  
*He correctly states that all sex outside of **marriage** is prohibited.*

*He asserts that the specific prohibitions against*

woman-woman sex are telling given that specific prohibitions exist: men with men, men with animals, women with animals. (note, no women with women prohibition)

should be

He asserts that the **absence** of specific prohibitions against woman-woman sex are telling given that specific prohibitions exist: men with men, men with animals, women with animals. (note, no women with women prohibition)

e asserts that as a husband there is no prohibition against wife-wife sex within his marriage and that given the absence of scriptural explicit scriptural condemnation against women-women sex no justification for any outside authority to challenge his covenantal authority as head of the wives.

Should be

he asserts that as a husband there is no prohibition against wife-wife sex within his marriage and that given the absence of **any** explicit scriptural condemnation against women-women sex no justification for any outside authority to challenge his covenantal authority as head of the wives **exists**.

My apologies for the sloppy writing. I will proofread again tomorrow or Wednesday.

944. Artisanal Toad

September 01, 2015 5:44 PM

What I've observed in the manosphere is it offers very little in the way of solutions, and those solutions that do appear are rigorously attacked (MGTOW, for example). My experience and education makes me pretty unique, and in looking at the destruction that no-fault divorce has wrought (especially in the church) I started thinking about solutions. The solution had to encompass the problems we're faced with, but keep in mind the primary context for what I'm looking at is the church (Christians).

Monogamy is dead, destroyed by feminism, no-fault divorce and a legal system heavily tilted in favor of the

woman that penalizes men who commit to marriage. The death of monogamy is due in part to the prevalence of cock-carousel riding sluts who, while rendering themselves completely unfit for monogamous marriage, eventually change lanes and want to get married.

Within the church the situation is such that non-married women tend to outnumber the non-married men by a ratio anywhere from 3:1 to 8:1. They still have a libido but instead of marriage they go from one “dating relationship” to another. The large disparity in numbers of men and women tends to give women (as a group) a lot of power. Church leaders understand this very, very well.

The women (especially the divorced ones) are typically completely nested (they have their home, car, job, social network, etc.) and are not willing to marry unless doing so increases their financial security, standard of living and quality of life. In terms of marriage, they’re holding out for their Personal Alpha™, but while they’re waiting... well, a girl has needs.

The men (especially the divorced ones) are typically not willing to marry without some assurance they won’t be turned into an incel at the whim of their wife, and without more assurance they won’t be arbitrarily divorce-raped with half their assets and their children stolen with the added insult of being forced to pay for years to come. It has become common knowledge that women have all the power in marriage and many men are acutely aware of this.

Women within the church are typically not attracted to the men they find in church for multiple reasons. One major reason is the “servant leadership” and “mutual submission” doctrines being taught that turn men into supplicating, contemptible betas. Another is any man within the church that displays masculine dominance is attacked and beaten down for doing so. Another is the feminist doctrines taught in churches today empower the women but in doing so deprive them of what they want: strong, independent, masculine men.

In arguing the case for polygyny as a solution within the church to the general destruction of marriage (especially to fix broken families and get a father in

the home for the children of divorce) I have seen polygyny attacked at a moral level repeatedly and sooner or later the attack devolves to the husband's desire to bed them all at once and the resulting possibility of sexual contact between the wives. This is compounded by the "headship doctrine" of Ephesians 5:22-24, which states "Wives, submit to your own husbands as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife just as Christ also is the head of the church."

The idea that a wife is to submit to her husband in everything (and 1st Peter 3:1 says "even if he is disobedient to the word") brings on whole new meaning when there's more than one wife. Feminism has worked for many decades to chip away at the headship doctrine and it usually starts with "That passage doesn't mean "everything" because Christ would never command His church to sin." The effort is to convert "Wives, submit to your husbands in everything" into something along the lines of "Wives, submit to your husbands in everything except [that]. Once a [that] is established all that's left is to expand the definition of [that] until the whole thing is meaningless.

945. Artisanal Toad

September 01, 2015 5:45 PM

When I argue that female-female sexual acts are not sin and thus can be legitimately expressed and experienced within a polygynous marriage... everybody goes batshit crazy. This is where the emotional hind-brain kicks in and the ad hominem attacks begin. I no longer take this personally because I've come to realize that the effect of cultural conditioning and long taught wrong doctrine has conditioned this kind of knee-jerk reaction.

This is the point where the fight is right now. SimplyTimothy pointed out early that this is the first time he's ever heard an argument made like this- as a Scripturally based argument. I'm making this argument as a matter of doctrine, so I'm getting right down into the nitty-gritty of things. This is a very simple argument and Scripture is very clear: *Where there is no law there is no violation and sin is not imputed when there is no law. Romans 4:15 and 5:13.*



Multiple times the Romans 1:26 verse has been brought up as a proof-text that sexual contact between women is sinful. Yet, the fact is the law is silent on the subject and Paul not only knew that, but only a few chapters later (4:15 and 5:13) he made it clear that he could not condemn any sexual contact between women as sinful. Those who claim what God chose not to call sinful is wrong are in violation of Deuteronomy 4:2 and 12:32. I made the point early on that adding to the Law is essentially saying that God got it wrong.

The problem is not with God's Word, rather, our culture and traditions that were shaped by the church for over a millennia, which established doctrines that have nothing to do with what the Bible says. Most people have no idea of history and assume that something taught by the church for so long must be correct. In this case, nothing could be further from the truth.

"Regarding the emergence of the Christian Church as a powerful, highly collectivist institution that was able to impose monogamy on the secular elite, **there is agreement among historians that socially imposed monogamy in Western Europe originated as a result of conflict in which ecclesiastical authorities attempted to combat the power of the aristocracy.** The Church was "the most influential and important governmental institution [of Europe] during the medieval period" (Ullman, 1970:1), and a major aspect of its power over the secular aristocracy involved the regulation of reproductive behavior. Thus, Herlihi (1985) finds that **the major influence against polygyny in the Middle Ages was Christian sexual ideology combined with a vigorous campaign against the nobility to control marriage.**"

<http://web.csulb.edu/~kmacd/Monogamy1995.pdf>  
pg8, **emphasis mine.**

The subject of polygyny is an alien concept for the vast majority of Christians and they have no observational data to refer to, so they draw on tradition (which says it's wrong) and use their imaginations to fill in the blank spots. I had two poly-type long term relationships when I was young, and as part of the research for the books I've written I've been privileged to meet quite a few polygynous Christian families. I was able to get to know some of these families and develop enough of a

relationship with them that they were willing to have open discussions about the subject.

I can think of nine families I know in which there are 3-4 wives (the rest only have 2 wives). Were there any way to get them all together as a group, they would blow the minds of most Christians, especially the opponents of polygyny. These families all have a few things in common:

**946. Artisanal Toad**

**September 01, 2015 5:52 PM**

I've also seen the way those women treated the men who had more than one wife. One time I was speaking to a mixed group of polygynous and monogamous husbands. One of the singleton wives interrupted to join in the discussion and one of the poly husbands said "Woman, be silent. Men are speaking." She blushed, went into shock for a moment, apologized and left. Her husband looked at him and said "If I'd said that she'd have started screaming and probably hit me. How did you do that?" That got a few chuckles and one of the other husbands said "She knows she can get away with treating you disrespectfully, but she also knows we won't tolerate it from our wives and we won't tolerate it from her." The husband got angry with that and left.

Feminism has spawned the complementarianism - egalitarianism debate with respect to the headship doctrine. During the course of this argument I have repeatedly stated that it isn't about sex, it's about authority. I notice that no-one has attempted to answer the simple question that ends the entire debate, but there has been an intense effort to obfuscate, confuse and overly complicate a very simple issue. My experience is this is the result of fear, envy and jealousy, because the fact is not many men can manage multiple wives.

We are now at the point in our culture at which polygyny is the only rational approach to marriage. While I'm sure there are some unicorns out there, but the fact is the church is overflowing with sluts and fatherless children. The culture and society as a whole have removed the restraints on women's bad behavior and subjected them to temptations they should not have to bear. Polygyny is a marital structure that puts

the husband in the dominant position and returns the wives to a submissive role, arranges the incentives to reward staying in the marriage and penalizes those who wish to leave.

The response amongst Christians is there is somehow, some way, something inherently immoral about a man having more than one wife in his bed, given the possibilities of what might happen. With that in mind, I moved the moral objection front and center and baldly stated that sexual contact between women is not sinful and challenged everyone to show me where God said it's wrong. I summarized my argument concisely at several points and even issued a challenge:

**Either show me where God said sexual contact between wives married to the same man is sin, or show me your delegation of authority that allows you to arbitrarily step into another mans' family and declare something to be a sin when God didn't.**

That challenge has been repeated over a dozen times, to no response. It's very easy: cite chapter and verse. Again, the response has been to obfuscate, confuse and complicate, with widespread spam designed to render this thread unreadable. It has been suggested that some things are wrong, simply because they're wrong. That flies in the face of the clear text of Romans 4:15 and 5:13.

947. Artisanal Toad

September 01, 2015 5:54 PM

I've also seen the way those women treated the men who had more than one wife. One time I was speaking to a mixed group of polygynous and monogamous husbands. One of the singleton wives interrupted to join in the discussion and one of the poly husbands said "Woman, be silent. Men are speaking." She blushed, went into shock for a moment, apologized and left. Her husband looked at him and said "If I'd said that she'd have started screaming and probably hit me. How did you do that?" That got a few chuckles and one of the other husbands said "She knows she can get away with treating you disrespectfully, but she also knows we won't tolerate it from our wives and we won't tolerate it from her." The husband got angry with that and left.

Feminism has spawned the complementarianism - egalitarianism debate with respect to the headship doctrine. During the course of this argument I have repeatedly stated that it isn't about sex, it's about authority. I notice that no-one has attempted to answer the simple question that ends the entire debate, but there has been an intense effort to obfuscate, confuse and overly complicate a very simple issue. My experience is this is the result of fear, envy and jealousy, because the fact is not many men can manage multiple wives.

We are now at the point in our culture at which polygyny is the only rational approach to marriage. While I'm sure there are some unicorns out there, but the fact is the church is overflowing with sluts and fatherless children. The culture and society as a whole have removed the restraints on women's bad behavior and subjected them to temptations they should not have to bear. Polygyny is a marital structure that puts the husband in the dominant position and returns the wives to a submissive role, arranges the incentives to reward staying in the marriage and penalizes those who wish to leave.

The response amongst Christians is there is somehow, some way, something inherently immoral about a man having more than one wife in his bed, given the possibilities of what might happen. With that in mind, I moved the moral objection front and center and baldly stated that sexual contact between women is not sinful and challenged everyone to show me where God said it's wrong. I summarized my argument concisely at several points and even issued a challenge:

**Either show me where God said sexual contact between wives married to the same man is sin, or show me your delegation of authority that allows you to arbitrarily step into another mans' family and declare something to be a sin when God didn't.**

That challenge has been repeated over a dozen times, to no response. It's very easy: cite chapter and verse. Again, the response has been to obfuscate, confuse and complicate, with widespread spam designed to render this thread unreadable. It has been suggested that some things are wrong, simply because they're wrong.

That flies in the face of the clear text of Romans 4:15 and 5:13.

948. Anonymous

September 02, 2015 7:29 PM

My apologies if I am commenting out of turn or breaking a rule by writing this comment. Please do not publish if I am doing so.

When artisanaltoadshall writes:

*That challenge has been repeated over a dozen times, to no response. It's very easy: cite chapter and verse. Again, the response has been to obfuscate, confuse and complicate, with widespread spam designed to render this thread unreadable. .*

I point the moderator to the "two debates" claim I made. Since about comment 666 I decided it was imperative to get this right. That meant collecting and categorizing my opponents claims (with cross references) so that statements could be viewed in context.

The methods of proper debate then flow as follows:

Identify the claims (done)

categorize claims (in progress)

Define terms. (in progress)

Restate the argument.

Examine the validity of the same.

As you can see this is important work.

artisanaltoadshall's views will be made known and popularized and given the failure of 501(c) Churchianity and the rise of the mano-o-sphere it is important for "standard Christianity" to have its arguments in a row to meet this.

My opponent calls this "spamming the thread". My methods and motivations are sincere. This effort will take time; but it should be done.

thank you for your time.

t

949. Artisanal Toad

September 04, 2015 9:58 PM

There is a consensus among researchers that women's erotic response is far more plastic than men's and responds to a variety of pressures. This presents difficulties for conservative Christians because from that standpoint one has to accept that women are the way God made them, as too are men. There is a wide divergence of opinion and thought within the manosphere as to the why, but a broad and strong consensus on the observable hypergamy, solipsism and dualistic mating strategy of women. Let's look at some observations:

<https://jaymans.wordpress.com/2012/10/28/the-evolution-of-female-bisexuality/>

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/sax-sex/201004/why-are-so-many-girls-lesbian-or-bisexual>

The psychology today article poses an interesting question:

*Why is it OK for girls to be bisexual or homosexual, but not boys?*

Then the article makes an interesting point guaranteed to drive certain Christian MEN nuts:

*Female sexuality is different from male sexuality. If a straight boy kissed another boy, perhaps to amuse some girls who might be watching, he would be unlikely to undergo a change in sexual orientation as a result. But, as Professor Roy Baumeister at Florida State University and others have shown, sexual attraction in many women seems to be more malleable (see note 3 below). If a teenage girl kisses another teenage girl, for whatever reason, and she finds that she likes it - then things can happen, and things can change. If a young woman finds her soulmate, and her soulmate happens to be female, then she may begin to experience feelings she's never felt before.*

And if women who have married the same man in a relationship in which they are sharing him become comfortable enough to share his bed and things of a sexual nature happen between them, that can reshape their erotic profile due to women's erotic plasticity.

This **can be** an underlying dynamic in poly families, which brings us back to the subject of white knighthood and polygyny. I can't call it hysterical, its more a coldly furious intersection of one-itis, pedestalism, false moral indignation and the inability to understand solipsism and hypergamy. When I make the point that men and especially women are better off in a polygynous marriage it's taken as an attack on marriage due to the widespread belief that marriage is properly defined as strictly monogamous.

It is an observable fact that men desire sexual variety, to include multiple partners at the same time, just as hypergamy, solipsism and the desire for attention are observable behaviors in women. When the erotic plasticity of women is added to a polygynous relationship an entirely new set of observations may be made which those who cling to tradition find truly disturbing. Yet, with the traditional cultural and social mores that once restrained such female behaviors no longer functioning in any meaningful way, polygyny becomes the solution that rebuilds and restrains from the ground up in ways that monogamous marriage cannot possibly do.

The truth is that socially imposed monogamy was and still is an attack on the headship authority of the husband, which is the foundation of marriage. The real question is why so many men hate the headship authority within marriage and argue it must be limited, even to the point of claiming the right to invade the home, usurp the husband's authority and regulate his marriage.

**950. Artisanal Toad**

September 04, 2015 9:58 PM

Before we get too far along, I'd like to make a couple of suggestions to clarify the issue. SimplyTimothy has stated a moral objection to homosex, yet I find this word inadequate for the purposes of our discussion. The reason is the term "homosex" conflates prohibited sexual activity between men with not-prohibited sexual activity between women. It makes an argument *by definition* that is a lie.

Consider the terms adultery, incest, fornication, rape and marital relations; all of which can be applied to

the act of a man's penis being inserted into a woman's vagina (PIV). Note that all of these terms have a moral component, identifying the relative morality of the same act based on the relationship involved. I cannot rape, commit adultery, fornicate or commit incest with my wife so it would be ridiculous to refer to my marital relations in such terms. It would also be to accuse me of a violation of God's Law. Referring to physical intimacy between wives married to the same man as "homosex" or "lesbian sex" is to falsely imply an accusation of a crime that does not exist.

**It is very difficult to have a conversation about a morally neutral subject when the terminology related to such subject is uniformly negative and falsely defines an act of immorality.**

Observe the subject of masturbation. The definition and denotation of masturbation, in the general sense, can encompass both men and women and include masturbatory aids (vibrators, dildos, lubricants, fleshlights, etc.). Yet, in terms of connotation, there is a distinct difference between male and female masturbation; with female use of a vibrator being seen as neutral while self-satisfaction by any means by a man is considered shaming.

Women are not shamed for using a vibrator and indeed, within marriage, the wife's use of toys to obtain climax is normally considered shaming to her husband ("Can't take care of business?"). Men, OTOH, have traditionally been shamed for the act of masturbation as the church once taught that masturbation was a sin. Interestingly, in keeping with the ancient church's fascination with celibacy and the romantic pedestalization of women, masturbation was considered something confined almost exclusively to men. The cultural inertia still considers the act to be, if not sinful, certainly shameful.

Consider the difference in emotional inflammatory impact between "homosex" and female-female erotic acts (FFEA). Intermarital grooming between wives (IGBW) doesn't seem to be so bad because it's so ambiguous. However, I think I like "assisted intercourse in marriage" (AIMM) best, but I'm open to any suggestions.



Now that SimplyTimothy has admitted there is no way for him to craft a general moral objection to AIIIM without violating Scripture, perhaps we can discuss why the idea of two or three naked women *enjoying* AIIIM with their husband is so frightening. Because let's face it- polygyny isn't illegal and in today's legal environment it's the only rational choice for a man who wants a family.

Polygyny presupposes a high-quality man that's at the top of his game and can attract multiple women and get them to take the plunge on a poly marriage. As the economy gets worse and the "safety net" gets enough holes in it, expect to see more women jump on the opportunity. That means men would no longer be evaluated on mono-terms, but poly-terms. And, yes, I advocate women (especially former sluts and single mothers) be encouraged to move in together with friends (gasp!), put their house in order and offer themselves as a package deal. But the question remains. Why is it that far more men are opposed to polygyny and the idea of AIIIM than women?

951. Artisanal Toad

September 05, 2015 4:23 AM

**YES! We seem to have a breakthrough.** SimplyTimothy said:

*I believe what I have been taught, that all homosex is sin. Attacking artisanaltoadshall's position cannot be made by showing a prohibition against woman-woman sex as no verse does so.*

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

**NO.** The question is why SimplyTimothy is trying to condemn something God chose not to condemn.

SimplyTimothy is to be commended for his intellectual honesty because he's finally answered the question and identified the fatal flaw his argument. Romans 4:15 and 5:13 clearly state that *where there is no law there is no violation* and *there is no sin imputed when there is no law*. These passages define what sin is in the general sense, that is, applicable to all people for all time. In

order to make a Biblical case that “it is a sin” where God was silent, one has to add to the Law, which is specifically forbidden at Deut. 4:2 and 12:32.

In other words, a **Biblically correct case for sin on this issue cannot be made** without either violating Scripture (adding to the law) or engaging in intellectual dishonesty (lying about what Scripture says). Yet, SimplyTimothy has expressed a desire to find *some way* to condemn something God chose not to. That is the problem. More or less it’s an attitude of saying “I don’t care what God said, I don’t want His morality, I want mine...”

SimplyTimothy claims to hold a belief that female-female sexual contact is sinful in the same way as male-male sexual contact is, and he bases this on the tradition he has been taught. Yet, according to relevant historians the traditional doctrine did not originate from the exegesis of Scripture, but rather was created as a political tool used by the church to subjugate the nobility through the control of marriage in its efforts to gain power and control of temporal government.

The traditional “support” for this doctrine is in two parts. First is Romans 1:26-27 which conflates the prohibited sexual contact between men (in which they are condemned and punished) with the unmentioned activity of the women. This fails when examined in light of Romans 4:15 and 5:13 because **were Paul condemning some unmentioned acts of the women in that passage, Paul would be in direct violation of Deut. 4:2 and 12:32.** The second was the claim that “men with men” ALSO meant “women with women” but this conflation argument fails in light of the subject, text and context.

SimplyTimothy’s argument is not with my “claims” but rather with Scripture itself because Scripture doesn’t say what he wants it to say. I made an argument from silence, context and the integrity of Scripture, which can be stated in 107 words:

**If God had wanted to declare female-female sexual contact to be a sin, He would have done so. God chose not to do so.** He didn’t forget and He didn’t accidentally leave it out because God is perfect and His inclusion of women with animals as universally

prohibited indicates He chose not to prohibit or condemn women with women. Where there is no law there is no violation and adding too or taking away from the Law is prohibited, so Romans 1:25-27 cannot be construed as a prohibition or condemnation of whatever the women might do sexually without placing Paul in violation of Deut. 4:2 and 12:32.

See? No collection, categorization or defining needed.

**952. Artisanal Toad**

**September 05, 2015 4:36 AM**

With SimplyTimothy now admitting there is no law concerning female-female sexual contact, applying Romans 4:15 and 5:13 to that lack of law means female-female sexual acts are not sinful, so why does he focus on calling something a sin that God chose not to? Why is it his desire that wrong doctrine be taught in the churches? He stated:

*it is important for "standard Christianity" to have its arguments in a row to meet this.*

Polygyny is the solution for "standard Christianity" which has been almost completely destroyed by feminism, leaders who suffer from testicular atrophy and gamma white knights who viciously attack anything resembling masculinity. The church is dying because the family is in the final act of being legally destroyed by non-stop feminist attacks on the headship doctrine, no fault divorce, the VAWA, a misandrist legal system and the celebration of female promiscuity.

If one studies the history of the church's invasion of the family, regulation of the marital bed and the imposition of monogamy on the culture they'll learn that what they thought was sound Biblical doctrine is nothing more than the traditions of men. The state, culture and church are being destroyed by the destruction of the family, but SimplyTimothy is attacking the only stable marital structure left that arranges the incentives to stay in the marriage: polygyny. Why? The possibilities available in bed with multiple wives!

Women I've discussed this with take a black and white view of polygyny, but which side of the black and white line they admit to has a lot to do with a number of

factors, such as how much they've had to drink, whether their friends are around to overhear the opinion and whether they think they'll be judged. On a non-judgmental private patio after having a few drinks, the attitude undergoes a remarkable shift. Seems there are a lot of girlfriends that share or have shared a boyfriend to one extent or another and in a non-judgmental atmosphere a lot of women who claim "I would never do that" can't seem to get worked up about other women who would... and in the back of their minds they know they would too, under the right circumstances.

I have had these conversations hundreds of times over the past few years and make no mistake, the women know instinctively where such a relationship will lead. The reaction of the women to that understanding falls into several broad categories: terror, curiosity and desire. I have found that within the category of terror, the reaction is one of fear of shaming and to a greater extent the fear that they'd develop a desire for group sex because it specifically included other women. And what does the culture (especially the conservative Christian culture) say about that?

The idea has been put forward that if the husband is acting like Caesar (an Alpha) and commanding his wives to do something that is not God's will for their lives and the wife cannot help herself... that the church or individual must intervene. This is white knight projection at its finest. Let's look at the assumptions:

**First** is the assumption that someone other than the husband determines God's will for his wife, who is commanded to obey her husband in everything. This is either rebellion on the wife's part or a usurpation of the husband's authority.

**Second** is the assumption that some outside individual or entity has the authority to invade the home, usurp the husband's authority and impose regulations in an area that God left solely to the discretion of the husband.

**Third** is the projection that what the outside entity or individual believes to be wrong is automatically wrong for everyone (a violation of Romans 14:4) and **the wife/wives won't like it.**

**Fourth** is the inherent shaming of a family and women who are doing nothing wrong. It rejects God's Word and

objective science in refusing to acknowledge that men and women are not only different but also held to different standards of behavior.

953. Anonymous

September 05, 2015 9:16 AM

We see now why the need for definitions and itemization of claims is an imperative before starting the debate. I do not think artisanalloadshall's scriptural argument is made at Texas Baptist nor taught as part of the RCC Catechism; I stand by my assertion that it is a unique argument.

Since it is a rival claim to the Christian definition of marriage\* it must be understood on its terms and then each part examined against scripture.

Artisanalloadshall's claims will fall and his attempt to redefine sin as Christian marriage will fail.

I ask the Body of Christ to join me in this debate as artisanalloadshall's argument is, as I have stated previously, attractive and coherent withing the manosphere. It does nothing less than invite lost souls into a false doctrine under the label of Christianity. Like all sin, it will be tempting and attractive.

The best strategy is to preempt it rather than react to it.

One final point. I will carry on this battle. However, I am not beau nor am I trained in Scripture. I am a laity, doing my job. If there is anybody of the faith, who has the training and intellect to lead this battle I appeal to them to step forward. Failing that, I will do my duty.

God bless.

t

Postscript. I await the moderators advice on how to proceed. I will not engage artisanalloadshall using the "command/response" dynamic that is his OODA loop comfort zone. ie. I will not allow him to drive the terms or method of my response as was the dynamic pre-comment 666. It was precisely at the time I asserted that would not be the case that artisanalloadshall appealed to the moderator. I am

quite willing to proceed as I was before this "timeout" was called.

\*I am aware that artisanaltoa shall claims it is christian marriage and that I respond to his immediate claim as proof.

I reject both the redefinition of the term and that the rebuttal be along lines he demands. He says, "attack me from the West!"

I will attack at a time and direction I think is appropriate to disprove his argument

954. SirHamster

September 07, 2015 12:58 PM

I have no interest in debating artisanaltoa, but I will submit my summary and understanding of the debate before adding any comments.

**State of the debate as of [@932](#):**

artisanaltoa is issuing challenges that no one is answering. simplytimothy is making a series of posts documenting and distilling artisanaltoa's comments from the first 600 or so posts in the thread. I have lost interest in responding to artisanaltoa on the discussion topic, but still make side comments about how the discussion is taking place.

artisanaltoa thinks that the choice of non-response to his direct challenges violates the Rules of the Blog and has successfully summoned moderation.

The debate itself is on the topic of the Biblical stance on polygamy and what is acceptable within such a marriage.

**artisanaltoa's position:**

- Men must not add to the Bible where it is silent.
- The Bible does not forbid polygyny, the taking of multiple wives. Christians forbidding polygyny are going beyond what is allowed by God.
- The Bible grants husbands complete authority over the activities within their marriages. It is not for any other man or woman to judge what goes on within a marriage.
- The Bible is silent on restrictions on the marital bed, which grants a polygynous husband the right to command his wives to commit sexual acts on each

other for his pleasure.

**simplytimothy's position:**

- polygamy is not a good thing based on general Church tradition
- artisanaltoa has twisted the meaning of Scripture and is outside Christian orthodoxy
- in the process of verifying the Scriptural basis of that Christian orthodoxy/tradition as a layman.

**Mark Call's position**

- Scripture needs to be interpreted according to its Hebrew meaning
- The Hebrew language meaning is distinct from the common English meanings others have used in this discussion

**SirHamster's position**

- polygamy is not generally prohibited by the Bible, but is specifically restricted for certain people in leadership positions
- sexual acts between wives within a polygamous marriage are homosexual (lesbian) acts - and are unnatural and thus sinful
- Scriptural silence is a different category than explicit allowance. It can be wrong for Christians to do what they are not explicitly forbidden to do. It can also be wrong for Christians to do what they are explicitly commanded to do - prioritization is needed. (This position was not explicitly laid out in detail)
- artisanaltoa's behavior in this thread demonstrates an un-Christian priority and attitude

I will be surprised if artisanaltoa takes exception to my summary of his position, but he is invited to do so.

Having complied with the VFModerator's [@932](#) requirement, I now point out that artisanaltoa has not offered a summary of my or simplytimothy's position, in his initial posts from 944-946. 950-951 do contain references to simplytimothy's positions, but with the objective of refuting them rather than restating them. It was my impression that we are still in Stage One, where everyone is to reach an agreement on the state of the debate and each other's positions before continuing debate. I ask the VFModerator to clarify.

artisanaltoad, it is clear you are very passionate about this topic, but that does not excuse your failure to follow basic instructions. If you can spare the time to write 3 posts (944-946) on your own position, you can offer a post to restate simplytimothy's position.

I do not expect you to do mine since I am not interested in debating you; but it is also because I think you are incapable of restating my position in a way that I agree with. You are welcome to prove me wrong.

**955. Mark Call**

September 08, 2015 3:29 PM

Brief correction:

**Mark Call's position**

- Scripture needs to be interpreted according to its Hebrew meaning
- The Hebrew language meaning is distinct from the common English meanings others have used in this discussion

No, in most cases the English will suffice. But, when in doubt, or when twisted beyond limit by the "traditions of men" and the cultural bias of translators -- THEN it is vital to go to the original text.

And those who assume that words mean what they want them to will be disappointed, not only in exegesis, but especially in US courts of what is sadly now called "law".

Also, what was left out may be obvious, but in the interest of completeness:

MC has made it clear (as does Scripture) that polygyny is without question permitted, is regulated as 'marriage', and may even be prescribed. God does not provide guidelines for doing what He prohibits!

**956. SirHamster**

September 08, 2015 8:43 PM

I accept Mark's corrections.

Modifications:



- Hebrew language meaning can be distinct from common English meaning. **Original text should be consulted when translation or meaning is in doubt.**
- Polygyny permitted by Scripture. God does not provide guidelines for activities he prohibits.

957. Artisanal Toad

September 08, 2015 11:11 PM

This is a summary and the current state of the debate:

We have a Lawbook, and two acts that may or may not be sinful. There are those who claim the acts are sinful and wave in the general direction of the Lawbook claiming the acts are sinful because the Lawbook says they are. The Lawbook clearly states that if something isn't prohibited then it isn't a sin. Toad comes along and looks very carefully at the Lawbook and finally concludes there is no prohibition. This is what follows:

**(Claim from silence)** Toad: "It isn't there!"

**(Counter-claim by Tim)** Tim: "Yes it is there and you're a degenerate to say it isn't."

**(Demand for proof)** Toad: "Really? Show me where it is!"

**(Evasion, no answer)** Tim: "I refuse to be driven by your terms!"

**(Delaying and avoidance)** Tim: "I must re-create Toad's search, examine and define it."

**(Appeal to the Rules)** Toad: "No, show me where it is if you know, or admit you don't."

**(Rejection of the Rules)** Tim: "No. My time, my terms, my pace, so shut up."

**(Request for Moderation)** Toad: "VOX, can you delegate a moderator over here?"

**(Moderator intervenes)** Matt: "Everyone play nice, we'll start over"

**(Dispositive Admission)** Tim: "OK, *it isn't there, but how can I claim it is anyway?*"

**(The Crusaders Call)** Tim: "Can someone please come help me defeat the Dark One?"

**(Wanting to move forward)** Toad: Great! You admit it isn't there, let's move forward.

**(The Big Retraction)** Tim: "NO! I admit NOTHING! I must define everything!"

**(Builds A Strawman)** Tim: "I refuse to accept your Christian Marriage definition!"

**(Reasserts rejection of rules)** Tim: "I will attack when

and where I think is appropriate”

**It should be obvious that the central point to the debate is whether the Lawbook has a prohibition on polygyny or female-female sexual contact. If it does, it's sin. If it does not, it is not sin.**

The central question is two-fold. Is polygyny a sin and is sexual contact between two women a sin? God helpfully gave us a definition of what sin is at Romans 4:15 and 5:13, so this should be easy. If something is identified as sin in the Law, it is sin for all people for all times and will be imputed as sin when there is a violation.

I made an argument from silence, stating there is no prohibition. SimplyTimothy and SirHamster both claim such a prohibition exists. It is thus incumbent upon both SirHamster and SimplyTimothy to bring forth evidence (chapter and verse) in which God prohibited either polygyny or female-female sexual contact. Neither has been able to do so. Both, at one point or another, have conceded polygyny is a legitimate form of marriage. Both have been adamant that female-female sexual contact is wrong and sinful.

SimplyTimothy has engaged in a months-long campaign of delays and obfuscation, refusing to deal with the central issue. He refused time and time again to answer his claims, that female-female sexual contact is sinful. He finally admitted there is no passage of Scripture that prohibits it, yet he continues to call it sin in spite of what Romans 4:15 and 5:13 say about that.

SirHamster has taken a different position, claiming female-female sexual contact is sin because it's "homosex." SirHamster defines homosex as both male-male and female-female. Because male-male was declared to be sin and an abomination (Leviticus 18:22) SirHamster uses that as his excuse to claim female-female sexual contact is a sin despite the complete lack of God's prohibition on female-female sex. Thus, SirHamster lies and engages in an intellectually fraudulent argument by knowingly and wrongly conflating the forbidden with the not-forbidden.

958. Artisanal Toad

September 08, 2015 11:11 PM

**SirHamster's position:**

SirHamster is the chief anklebiter and ally of SimplyTimothy. He has for the most part stayed on the sideline allowing SimplyTimothy to carry forward the debate. This is proven by his statement that he has no desire to debate me, but he cannot resist any opportunity to attack me. In true SJW fashion, the rules are there to be applied to others but not to him or his. Thus, his demand that I answer SimplyTimothy's questions, but when the question was put squarely before Simplytimothy, he ignored the fact that Tim refused to answer 10 times over the course of a month.

SirHamster has stated repeatedly he has no problem with polygyny, but he has had a problem with how I "sell" the idea and the mere mention of lesbian porn sent him over the edge. He has been extremely loyal in defending SimplyTimothy's positions:

**SirHamster's assessment of simplytimothy's position:**

*- polygamy is not a good thing based on general Church tradition*

**ABSOLUTE LIE #1.** SimplyTimothy has repeatedly called polygyny a sin, yet has admitted in [@941](#) the following:

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

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

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

The simple answer is he can't. I repeat for you, SirHamster, Romans 4:15 and 5:13: "Where there is no law there is no violation" and "sin is not imputed when there is no law." Ergo, SimplyTimothy has clearly stated that no verse in Scripture forbids female-female sexual contact and this is correct. Thus, the controlling passages are Romans 4:15 and 5:13, and by those

definitions sexual contact between women is not a sin.

Therefore, SirHamster's assessment is a LIE. After a thorough study of Scripture lasting for months, SimplyTimothy admitted there is no prohibition against female-female sexual acts, he knows it is a sin to add to the law, yet in identifying this as sin he does so in violation of Scripture and you describe his statements as "**not a good thing.**"

*- artisanaltoad has twisted the meaning of Scripture and is outside Christian orthodoxy*

Cites, please.

*-[SimplyTimothy is] in the process of verifying the Scriptural basis of [Toad's claims in the] Christian orthodoxy/tradition as a layman.*

I'm going to assume my additions were along the lines of what you meant to say, but feel free to correct. However, **all anyone has to do is demonstrate a prohibition on polygyny or sexual contact between women somewhere in the Bible.** That's it. Arguing over anything else is meaningless unless it leads to a prohibition. **Did God say it's wrong?** If He did, show me where and I shut up and retract. If not, it's your turn to retract your statements that it is a sin.

959. Artisanal Toad

September 08, 2015 11:13 PM

**Sirhamster attempts to state Toad's position:**

*- Men must not add to the Bible where it is silent.*

This is correct with respect to what SirHamster and SimplyTimothy have been trying to do (adding to the law), as cited in the Bible at Deuteronomy 4:2 and 12:32.

*- The Bible does not forbid polygyny, the taking of multiple wives. Christians forbidding polygyny are going beyond what is allowed by God.*

Partially correct, partially incorrect. It is true the Bible does not forbid polygyny. However Christians forbidding polygyny as being not allowed by God are not "going

beyond what is allowed” but rather in direct violation of Deuteronomy 4:2 and 12:32 by “adding to the law” and are in sin for doing so.

*- The Bible grants husbands complete authority over the activities within their marriages. It is not for any other man or woman to judge what goes on within a marriage.*

Ephesians 5:22-24 grants the husband the same authority over his wife as Christ has over the church. So, for anything within the husband's sphere of authority it is within his authority to command his wife in that area. When the husband commits a public crime, however, he forfeits his claim to authority and invites outside intervention. An example of this would be the kind of crimes SimplyTimothy claims are “sex acts,” such as breaking bones or throwing acid in the face (both of which cause injury). Otherwise Romans 14:4 applies.

*- The Bible is silent on restrictions on the marital bed, which grants a polygynous husband the right to command his wives to commit sexual acts on each other for his pleasure.*

Mostly incorrect. There are two restrictions on the marital bed which I have mentioned repeatedly. Otherwise, if he is not commanding the wives to sin he is within his rights to command them, for any reason he sees fit. However, one must also consider the implied reciprocity of 1st Corinthians 7:4. The wife's body belongs to her husband and he has the right to make demands of it. Likewise, the husband's body belongs to his wife. Does she not have the right to make demands as well?

**With respect to SirHamster's "State of the Debate comments:"**

*artisanaltoad is issuing challenges that no one is answering.*

**A deliberate misstatement.** "Toad is demanding responses and asking questions in accordance with the rules of the blog and others are refusing to obey the rules of the blog by refusing to answer."

## Consider that perhaps that's why we are in moderation

In fact, consider what SimpleTimothy has said:

*" I will not engage artisanaltoadshall using the "command/response" dynamic that is his OODA loop comfort zone. ie. I will not allow him to drive the terms or method of my response as was the dynamic pre-comment 666. It was precisely at the time I asserted that would not be the case that artisanaltoadshall appealed to the moderator."*

Couple of points here for the both of you. The terms are not mine, they are the rules of this blog. We ALL chose to abide by these rules when we got involved here. We can all see that SirHamster is defending SimplyTimothy like a good lad, but the fact is, none of us get to set the rules here because VOX already did that. There is even a special segment of the blog rules that apply to this situation and SimplyTimothy's refusal to answer:

*If you are asked a direct question relevant to the topic, then you will be expected to answer it in a straightforward and non-evasive manner; providing links in lieu of answers is not acceptable. (Links providing additional information in support of your answer are great, of course.) The dishonest and evasive tactics that are so common in Internet argumentation are not permitted here. If you refuse to either answer a question or admit that you cannot answer it, then you will not be permitted to comment here and all of your subsequent comments will be deleted.*

960. Artisanal Toad

September 08, 2015 11:13 PM

### SimplyTimothy's position

SimplyTimothy's position from the beginning has been that polygyny is a sin and female-female contact is likewise a sin. He wavered from time to time, at one point stating he had no objection to polygyny, later stating he had his reservations and would no longer argue the issue. At this point he is again identifying polygyny as a sin.

Throughout the course of this debate SimplyTimothy has displayed all the classic signs of an SJW. He's lied, doubled down and projected everywhere. Yet, he's also had surprising bouts of openness and honesty. He started off swinging wildly but not knowing what he'd gotten himself into. He's admitted repeatedly he isn't a Bible scholar and demonstrated it with some of his blunders. He admitted this was the first time he'd ever encountered an argument for polygyny from a Biblical perspective.

I've known for some time that SimplyTimothy is incapable of going forward with this argument because he has refused over and over again to address the real issue. His preoccupation with getting things right and making a close and detailed examination of my claims is nothing but a smokescreen. However, in comment [@940](#) under "My Position" SimplyTimothy said:

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

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

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

SimplyTimothy now admits there is no prohibition in the Law on women with women sex. As Romans 4:15 says: "*Where there is no law there is no violation*" and Romans 5:13 says "*sin is not imputed when there is no law.*" That's not a claim by Toad, that's God's Word.

Yet, Simplytimothy said "*The question then becomes, how do I make a Biblical case that it is sin absent such a verse?*" I refer SimplyTimothy to Romans 4:15 and Romans 5;13 and point out that he can't. Those passages are not suggestions, they are statements of fact and doctrine. Based on God's Word, no matter what kind of case he creates, it cannot rise to the level of sin.

SimplyTimothy followed up his admission of no prohibition with a 6-point list of arguments for why, despite what Romans 4:15 and 5:13 say, he thinks he could still label female-female sex a sin. It seems to

me this indicates one of three possibilities.

1. SimplyTimothy still doesn't understand what he's arguing. It isn't my claims, it's the fact he doesn't like what Scripture actually says. It's like watching someone eat the red pill. SimplyTimothy has grown tremendously over the course of this debate (it would be fun to go back over some of the blunders he's made previously) but as he's grown in knowledge and understanding, he's discovered that God's Word doesn't say what he thought it did. He wants to cling to his illusions.

2. SimplyTimothy understands the argument, knows he doesn't have a leg to stand on but will do anything to "win" the argument because what I'm advocating is more frightening than anything he's ever encountered before. SimplyTimothy is a gamma white knight, so completely wrapped up in his worldview that the very concept of polygyny and girl-girl sex is more frightening than anything he's ever encountered before. He is shocked and frightened by the extent of authority the headship doctrine confers within marriage.

3. SimplyTimothy is a SJW projecting his fears and insecurities into the argument to the point he must find a way to win. His comment about intervening in a marriage if the husband acting like Caesar, commanding the wife to do that which is contrary to the will of God for her life is a huge indicator of where his heart is. His lust is for power and control, the gamma holy grail, especially if it involves women.

I'm guessing it's a bit of all of them, 20%, 30%, 50% in order, 1, 2, 3.

961. Matthew

September 08, 2015 11:17 PM

**SirHamster is the chief anklebiter and ally of  
SimplyTimothy**

Foul and a miss. Keep it civil, or you will be punished.

962. SirHamster

September 09, 2015 11:32 AM



I will attempt correction of my statement of artisanaltoa's points. I will not correct artisanaltoa's statement of my points, as it has been ruled a miss by the moderator and I do not think it salvageable.

Start over if you're going to try at all, artisanaltoa. I will accept a retraction and complete silence there as well. Ex: "I will not restate SirHamster's position" I don't mind if you treat me as not worth the effort to speak to/debate (this is the correct response to "anklebiters"); but if you mention me I will make corrections as I see fit.

My restatement of simplytimothy's points are only for simplytimothy to correct, and I will make no response to attempted corrections there by artisanaltoa.

As for the state of the debate, I sought a neutral restatement without assigning blame. I do not agree with artisanaltoa's version of events, and see no point in seeking agreement there while artisanaltoa fails to fulfill the basic requirements laid out in [@932](#). I find this to be a pattern that makes it futile to engage him, but I will participate in this Stage One activity to help the moderator assess the situation. I will participate further on request by persons who are not artisanaltoa.

Corrections to my take on artisanaltoa's positions, additions in bold.

- Men must not add to the Bible where it is silent.
- The Bible does not forbid polygyny, the taking of multiple wives. Christians forbidding polygyny are going beyond what is allowed by God. **Christians who claim the Bible prohibits polygyny are blaspheming.**
- The Bible grants husbands complete authority over the activities within their marriages **unless he commits a crime inviting outside intervention. Otherwise,** it is not for any other man or woman to judge what goes on within a marriage.
- The Bible **has only two restrictions** on the marital bed, which allows a polygynous husband the right to command his wives to commit sexual acts on each other for his pleasure. **The only two restrictions are 1.) no sexual acts while she is menstruating; 2.) no sexual acts after childbirth for 40 (boy)/80(girl) days.**

I will note that the correction to the second point

opens a new line of discussion on defining what qualifies as a "crime", and how such a thing is to be detected and corrected. I assumed that the choice to use the words "public crime" does not mean "private crime" is acceptable.

963. Artisanal Toad

September 09, 2015 7:41 PM

@SimplyTimothy

**Scripture very helpfully defines for us what sin is and what it is not.**

**1st John 3:4** says *"Everyone who practices sin also practices lawlessness; and sin is lawlessness."*

**Romans 4:15** says *"Where there is no law there is no violation."*

**Romans 5:13** says *"sin is not imputed when there is no law."*

Therefore, we know that sin is violating God's Law, but if there is no law there is no violation and sin is not imputed. To impute is to judge. We know this because as Christians, we are imputed with the righteousness of Christ.

I do not speak of imputed sin (Adam's sin imputed to us, the reason we are born dead in trespasses and sin), of sins that result from lack of faith (c.f. Romans 14), or of sins of omission (James 4:17) but rather **sins of commission which are sins for all people for all time**, which are judged by the Law.

**Romans 14:4** states: *"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."*

**Romans 14:12-14** states: *"Each of us shall give account of himself to God. Therefore let us not judge one another anymore, but rather determine this-- not to put an obstacle or a stumbling block in a brother's way. I know and am convinced in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself; but to him who thinks anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean."*

SimplyTimothy

From your very first comment on this thread, you have repeatedly and are currently claiming that polygyny is sinful and female-female sexual contact is sin. This is not a position I have taken, nor is it a claim I have made. **This is an assertion you have made.** It is an accusation, a charge of lawlessness and a judgment of sin on your part. Please confirm this by answering the following questions:

Is the marriage structure of polygyny (one man with more than one wife) a sin? (Yes, No or That's what I've been taught but I don't know)

Is sexual contact between women a sin? (Yes, No or That's what I've been taught but I don't know)

If you answer either of these questions with a "Yes" then in keeping with 1st John 3:4, Romans 4:15 and Romans 5:13, cite chapter and verse where God prohibited these things, OR explain your delegation of authority which authorizes you to designate something as sin when God chose not to do so. **Keep in mind, these are your assertions, not mine; and I'm demanding you back up your assertions or retract.**

In citing the source for a prohibition to polygyny or female-female sexual contact, please observe the way in which God prohibited male-male, male-animal and female-animal sexual contact in Leviticus 18:22-23. Notice that God was clear, unambiguous and dispositive in His prohibitions. Further, observe the 15 prohibitions on sexual activity God listed in Leviticus 18 and the 12 sexual prohibitions in Leviticus 20. If God prohibited female-female sexual contact anywhere in Scripture, I expect to see such a prohibition stated in the same way.

#### **One last question:**

Deuteronomy 4:2 states *"You shall not add to the word which I am commanding you, nor take away from it, that you may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you."* and Deuteronomy 12:32 states *"Whatever I command you, you shall be careful to do; you shall not add to nor take away from it."*

**Did the Apostle Paul violate Deut. 4:2 or 12:32 and**

add to or subtract from the commandments of the Lord? (Yes, No or I don't know)

964. Artisanal Toad

September 09, 2015 7:42 PM

@SirHamster

Toad pointed out that with respect to sexual relations, God prohibited males with males, males with animals, females with animals, but did not choose to prohibit females with females.

SirHamster has previously stated that homosexual sex is BOTH males with males AND females with females. He specifically states sexual acts between wives within a polygamous marriage are homosexual (lesbian) acts and are un-natural and thus sinful

He further states *"scriptural silence is a different category than explicit allowance. It can be wrong for Christians to do what they are not explicitly forbidden to do. It can also be wrong for Christians to do what they are explicitly commanded to do - prioritization is needed. (This position was not explicitly laid out in detail)"*

SirHamster states: ***" It can also be wrong for Christians to do what they are explicitly commanded to do"***

Disobedience to God is sin. If the Law commands a person to do something or to not do something, disobedience is a sin. Here we have SirHamster claiming "It can also be wrong for Christians to [obey God when He explicitly commands them to do something]. This is the guy that's telling me I'm in the wrong for pointing out that God DID NOT prohibit girls from diddling with girls and therefore it's not a sin? Yet, he's claiming that Christians can thumb their noses at God and His commands and it's a good thing? Sir, you claimed the correct name: HAMSTER.

You have now proved my point that SJW churchians will go to any lengths to fight this argument, including attacking the validity of your one sure source of authority, God's Word.

Now lacking all credibility as a Christian, SirHamster stated that female-female sexual contact is homosexual sex, which is unnatural and therefore a sin. In doing so he is claiming all sex between men and all sex between women is a sin, even though the Bible only prohibits males with males. He apparently made the point as a dismissal to my argument that female-female sexual contact is not prohibited anywhere in Scripture.

Let's see how that logic works when applied to penis in vagina (PIV) sex.

Rape is PIV plus lack of consent.

Incest is PIV plus blood relationship

Fornication is PIV without marital relationship

Adultery is PIV with another man's wife.

Marital relationship is husband's penis in wife's vagina.

Bestiality is animal PIV

Bestiality is PIV in animal vagina.

According to SirHamster it is irrelevant that nowhere did God forbid or prohibit husbands placing their penis into the vagina of their wife, because "*Scriptural silence is a different category than explicit allowance. It can be wrong for Christians to do what they are not explicitly forbidden to do.*" Under this rubric we must conclude husbands are obviously fornicating, adulterous, incestuous, rapists committing beastly sex acts with their wife any time their penis pokes her vagina.

SirHamster stated artisanaltoa's behavior in this thread demonstrates an un-Christian priority and attitude and has previously complained my attitude is bad and I'm acting inappropriately as a Christian because (in his opinion) my focus is not on heaven and a spiritual life but rather on what I can do with my penis. In Matthew 19:12, Jesus said "*there are also eunuchs who made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. He who is able to accept this, let him accept it.*" Accordingly, given SirHamster's view that all sex is sinful and the suggestion (if not command) by Jesus for men to make themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom, I only have two questions for him:

**SirHamster, have you scheduled yourself for castration yet? SirHAMSTER, given your claim that it**

can be wrong for a Christian to be obedient to God, have you considered the words of Jesus: "Depart from me, you who practice lawlessness"?

965. Anonymous

September 09, 2015 7:51 PM

My apologies if I am commenting out of turn. Please delete this if it is inappropriate.

FWIW, I started reading artisanalloadshall's comment up til his first mistake where he wrote:

*Simply Timothy has engaged in a months-long campaign of delays and obfuscation, refusing to deal with the central issue. He refused time and time again to answer his claims, that female-female sexual contact is sinful. He finally admitted there is no passage of Scripture that prohibits it, yet he continues to call it sin in spite of what Romans 4:15 and 5:13 say about that.*

I read no farther than that as the man is tedious....

As I wrote above, I am not in artisanalloadshall's OODA loop where he commands and I respond.

Rathere, addressing his extraordinary claims deserves careful attention--independent of the demand/response dynamic that is artisanalloadshall comfort zone. ( @879 gives my take on the change in the nature of this debate as I related it to SirHamster.. )

As I wrote above I am...

*The methods of proper debate then flow as follows:*

*Identify the claims (done)*

*categorize claims (in progress)*

*Define terms. (in progress)*

*Restate the argument.*

*Examine the validity of the same.*

artisanalloadshall complains that this is taking a long time. This is true. I work full time and have 2 acres and garden to maintain--i.e. I am a busy man. That said, at the end of my day after work, I do this work at my pace

and time.

There is no harm in this. artisanalloadhall doesn't like it but tough.

This is an open process with much value. The definition alone of the first half of "THE LAW IS PERFECT" has brought to light an important definition you can view in [@903](#) shows the cause of much confusion in the debate with Mark Call. I expect similar clarifying details as we proceed.

In summary, as I wrote in [@940](#), I expect artisanalloadhall's argument to explode like the pig-lizard in Galaxy Quest. I want the process to be thorough and correct and transmittable to any Christian who encounters artisanalloadhall's teaching and wants a counter-argument to consider.

Doing so will take time and pace that artisanalloadhall finds unacceptable. I don't care about artisanalloadhall's feelings, his argument has been made the claims collected and cross referenced and initial categorization. We will then examine carefully and coldly the facts without the boredom of his personality cluttering up the ideospace.

**966. SirHamster**

September 09, 2015 9:43 PM

[@963](#) artisanalload,

That is not a statement of my position. Would you like to try again or give up?

*"I don't expect you to disagree. I don't even expect you to understand."*

**967. Matthew**

September 09, 2015 10:01 PM

Haw haw haw.

Some of y'all aren't operating from the same framework.

"Is it any wonder I reject you first?"

**968. Anonymous**

September 10, 2015 6:02 AM

*Some of y'all aren't operating from the same framework.*

There are at least two--Mark Call's and mine. Artisanaltoaadshall's framework is ill-defined, see the definition of "The Law" as an example.

artisanaltoaadshall's argument will fall under his own framework. That is the reason for my care and attention to detail. It is not enough that it fall under WCF or RCC theology, rather I want to bury artisanaltoaadshall's argument in the rubble of his own framework.

This is the motivation for...

*The methods of proper debate then flow as follows:*

*Identify the claims (done)*

*categorize claims (in progress)*

*Define terms. (in progress)*

*Restate the argument.*

*Examine the validity of the same.*

I believe I have three (I am sure of two) arguments that refute artisanaltoaadshall's argument under the terms of his framework. I suspect there are more, but do not know it yet. I will post these after I have compiled them, not before. I refuse to reenter the command/response "debate" that is artisanaltoaadshall's preferred battlefield; I will attack on my terms at my choosing..

The collection and categorization of artisanaltoaadshall's claims is a useful thing for any observer. I submit the process continue as it has. I remind the moderator that it was artisanaltoaadshall who cried out for moderation, not me. Things are progressing nicely, (albeit slowly due to my reasons given) and I look forward to completing the work.

**969. Mark Call**

September 10, 2015 2:48 PM



With all due respect, ST (and no small amount of Loving Tonue-in-Cheek-itude ;) I offer the following correction to your last:

The 'framework' is hardly mine...it is the Creator Himself's, and that of the Messiah Who came in His Name.

Because He said so, and Shaul (Paul) warned explicitly about that "alternative framework" that some "may well fall for" (II Cor 11:4) of *"another Jesus, whom we have not preached."*

Where I differ with Artisanal Toad is not only in style, but in his failure to emphasize that overwhelmingly key point. So key, in fact, that He came personally to tell us so.

**970. Anonymous**

**September 10, 2015 5:43 PM**

Hi Mark Call,

Since I have been focusing on the task of artisanaltoaadshall's argument, I have not been reading closely your points regarding polygyny.

Since the rebuttal of artisanaltoaadshall's argument does not depend on any argument for or against polygyny, I, while not ceding the argument, am not engaged in it. Frankly, I find the WCF/RCC exegis a better reading of God's work than I do yours; I know you strongly disagree. If I have time and inclination, I will re-examine your claims and possibly engage on that topic. However, my focus now is only on artisanaltoaadshall's introduction of sin into marriage under the color of God's will.

cheers.

t

**971. Matthew**

**September 10, 2015 7:16 PM**

"However, my focus now is only on artisanaltoaadshall's introduction of sin into marriage under the color of

God's will."

You really can't help yourself, can you?

I'm closing comments on this thread. If you want to continue to abuse a platform, take it to my test blog, so at least someone benefits.

<http://vilefacelessmoderator.blogspot.com/2015/09/girls-gone-wild.html>