

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST

Volume Seven



Mystery of Christ & The Church

Biblical Perspectives on Church, Marriage
and Family

By

Daniel Briggs, Ph.D.



Olive Press Books © 2007 1st Edition
Aletheia Logos University

Publishing Headquarters
World Christian Ministries Association, Inc.
10671 U.S. Hwy Route 301
Oxford, FL 34484

www.wcma-usa.org

TABLES OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

Hidden Secrets Part One

CHAPTER TWO

Hidden Secrets Part Two

CHAPTER THREE

Biblical Rhetoric and the Marriage Process

CHAPTER FOUR

Marriage, the Metaphor of HaMashiyach and the Church

CHAPTER FIVE

Divorce, Adultery and Other Sexual Sins

CHAPTER SIX

Celibacy, Monogamy and Polygamy

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Family System

A PARADOX

In an era when people are well beyond being tired of lies and hypocrisy from world and governmental leaders, they are then faced with the added pain and frustration that their church leaders are failing to tell them the truth as well. Most clergy still refuse to tell the whole truth when they could (because they know it) and should (even if they do not know, but should know it). Not only is this failure a disservice to the Body of HaMashiyach but truly an abomination in the sight of YHWH.

Most clerics publicly claim they believe the Bible to be YHWH's Word, which holds the truths of salvation, the definition of sin and a reasonable list of what acts are considered sinful, among many other life-giving words. Sadly, in the next moment most clerics reduce YHWH's word into two categories, 1) Orthodoxy (traditional—salvific) doctrines and 2) Heterodoxy (nontraditional—non-salvific) doctrines. The question that must be asked, then, is this. Since when are mortal men given the authority to take any of YHWH's words and reduce them to less than salvific? Whenever YHWH took the time to speak and interact with humankind, it was definitely salvific in nature. All (every word) of YHWH's word is LIFE (Deuteronomy 8:3; Matthew 4:4; Luke 4:4) and without it, death is at the door.

This poses the next question. If clerics do or should know the truth, then why do they not share it with the Body of HaMashiyach? The answers come down to the same age-old problems that all humans face at varying degrees.

1. Said cleric is truly ignorant (although unlikely), yet pretends to know.
2. Said cleric knows the truth but either ignores it or deceives himself/herself into believing it is not important.
3. Said cleric knows the truth and knows its importance but refuses to disclose since he/she believes it may threaten his/her popularity and diminish his/her “cash flow” (security, etc.). Yes that is correct, the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh and the pride of life at work even among the clergy.

This book will make every effort to speak the whole truth regarding this subject matter, whether popular or not. The truth is the truth and it is not open to private interpretation (2 Peter 1:20-21), whereas, more often than not, most clerics present their own (or that of others) private interpretations on nearly all subjects they present to the Body of HaMashiyach.

DISCLOSURE

Theology is popularly known as the science or the study of God (Theos - transliteration) and of the relations between God, man and the universe. However, the word Theos and Theology come from Greek influences (Hellenism) since the word Theos is a Greek prefix used for each Greek deity which is not a term that Messiah (HaMashiyach) or the Apostles would have used. The HaMashiyachim [a name used by Jews to collectively refer to the people who believe that Yahushua (Jesus) is Messiah (HaMashiyach)] would have used the Tetragrammaton YHWH (transliteration) instead of LORD and possibly Yahweh. Technically, the HaMashiyach's name (not title) was Yahushua (Hebrew/Aramaic translation/transliteration), not *Jesus (an English creation)*. The English usage of *Jesus* follows the Latin *Vulgate* path of translation/transliteration. In other words the English spelling *Jesus* is an English translation that comes via the Greek to Latin (*Vulgate*) to the *Textus Receptus* path. The earliest publications of the *Textus Receptus*, before it was called the *Textus Receptus*, which Desiderius Erasmus, a Dutch Catholic humanist, began in 1512, that was published in 1516 AD, was known as the *Novum Instrumentum omne*. Desiderius Erasmus developed this version for economic gain and it was endorsed by the Roman Catholic Church. The full Polyglot Bible (the first printed, but not published, being the *Complutensian Polyglot*) would have been published before the *Novum Instrumentum omne*, had it not been for the exclusive printing rights granted to Erasmus by the Catholic Pope (Pope Leo X). His first few editions were so flawed that he, Desiderius Erasmus, ended up using the Vulgate (he had collected as many *Vulgate* manuscripts as he could find) to fix his translations. Later editions of the *Novum Instrumentum omne* came to be known as the *Textus Receptus*. The *KJV* did not precede the early editions of the *Textus Receptus*, which were used extensively by the *KJV* translators, despite this version's acclaim to the Byzantine line (versus the Alexandrian line). And most English Bible versions also relied heavily on the *Textus Receptus*, i.e., both its earlier versions, before it was known as the *Textus Receptus*, as well as the *Textus Receptus* itself.

Even the translators/editors of the *New International Version* acknowledge the accuracy of the YHWH Tetragrammaton (International Bible Society) but opted to use the traditional Catholic translation via the Vulgate path keeping the use of LORD, God, Jesus, etc. in vogue. As indicated above, this is the same path used by the *KJV* and most all other English translations. I suggest that **Yahushua** is the further revealed (a continuum of revelation/divine expression) name of YHWH because why would YHWH give Yahushua a name above HIS own name (Isaiah 42:8; Psalms 29:2; 148:13; Jeremiah 16:21; Nehemiah 9:5; Philippians 2:9; Ephesians 1:21)? HE would not, thus the reason why an understanding is needed to cancel misguided accusations of Biblical contradictions.

It is also believed that the name Jehovah was given prominence by the Vatican. It emerged by inserting the vowel points of Adonai into the sacred Tetragrammaton YHWH and symbolized the ecumenicalism of that period. (Wiseman, 1990). Therefore, YHWH-ology would more accurately describe the specialty study of the God of the Jews and the

early church since they were Jews who believed that Yahushua was the HaMashiyach (HaMashiyach/Messiah). The term "theology" would more accurately apply to the study of the Greek gods (and perhaps the gods of other non-Jewish and non-"Christian" religions) but not the YHWH of the Jews and of the Neo-Jews.

"Thou shalt call his Name Yeshua BECAUSE He shall save his people from their sins."

Matthew 1:21 (From the Peshitta Bible—Aramaic N.T.)

The Peshitta Bible (Aramaic Bible) still uses the Aramaic variant of the Hebrew name Yahushua. Therefore, the Disciples of Christ volumes use YHWH and Yahushua throughout for technical reasons when referring to the English translated words "LORD", ("God") and "Jesus" respectively. However, keep in mind that even though there are many translation or transliteration issues with most Bible versions, this does not detract from the veracity and eternal nature of YHWH's WORD that is forever settled in heaven. The mishandling of and the imperfections of humanity regarding translations and transliterations in no way diminishes nor alters the original divinely inspired WORD of YHWH that came from YHWH himself.

You can read a full treatment of this topic in *Disciples of Christ Volume 12*.

Chapter

- 1 -

THE HIDDEN SECRETS

Part One

INTRODUCTION

Each person reading this book has belief systems and lifestyles that were developed over time and built upon the embraced paradigms of their predecessors. This is not always consciously done, since many paradigms are established early on in one's life, whether misconstrued or not and some are housed in the "instinctual" part of the brain deposited from past generations. And the beliefs held by predecessors were established the same way going backward throughout the centuries and millennia's. These said beliefs can most often be called traditions and if said beliefs are embraced by a large body of individuals, it can even be called culture or subculture. What this chapter sets out to accomplish is to visit history to reveal not only its secrets relative to currently held traditions and culture, but origins of the many held traditions, whether they be of "carnal" descent or "divine" descent.

Finally, some of the discussions in this chapter and subsequent chapters are not written as prescriptions, but rather as descriptions, findings; they are not intended to be lifestyle suggestions. There is a big difference and it is important for the reader to differentiate between the two. What one decides to do with these said descriptions/findings is, and should be, entirely individualistic.

THE MYSTERY OF HAMASHIYACH

The Mystery of HaMashiyach (Christ) and the church has dual meanings, spiritual and natural. The spiritual elements relate to present and future relations between HaMashiyach, the members of the entire Body of HaMashiyach and YHWH (God) as well as the relations among and between the members of the Body of HaMashiyach. The natural elements of the Mystery of HaMashiyach relate to human relationships within the scope of marriage, family, childrearing and human sexuality. The scriptures have drawn strong parallels between HaMashiyach and the church and the husband and wife relationship within our human reality.

Spiritual Meanings

HaMashiyach as the Head of the Church: This does not mean that the Church is headless or that somehow HaMashiyach is attached (or sewn) to a body as its anatomical head. The term is a metaphor implying the following meanings:

1. Leader/Guide/Law Giver
2. Protector
3. Provider
4. Adorner
5. Companion/Friend

The Body of HaMashiyach as the Wife of the HaMashiyach: This does not mean that the church is the anatomical body of HaMashiyach. Again, the term is a metaphor implying the following meanings:

1. The Wife (individual and corporate-the church) of HaMashiyach
2. The Follower (individual and corporate-the church) of HaMashiyach
3. The Co-heir (individual and corporate-the church) of HaMashiyach
4. The Co-laborer (individual and corporate-the church) of HaMashiyach

5. The Child Bearer (individual and corporate-the church) of HaMashiyach
6. The Nurturer of Offspring (Kingdom Expansion)
7. The Faithful Companion/Friend (individual and corporate-the church) of HaMashiyach

What is the beauty/attraction of the Wife: This does not mean an anatomical physical beauty, but parallels it in the following ways:

1. Her symmetry relative to her eyes, nose, mouth, hearing and hair
2. Her spirit/personality
3. Her femininity (follower, submissiveness, worshipper, child bearer ability, etc.)
4. Her chastity (faithful companion, avoids idolatry/adultery, purity, holiness)
5. Her adornment

The church and its leadership have failed themselves and the entire body of HaMashiyach regarding this vital subject by parroting traditions of men rather than pursuing the laborious task of seeking out truth and, upon finding it, standing firm among the shifting sands of culture. For this reason, true Biblical morality has all but disappeared. The proof of this is most clearly seen by the breakdown of the institution of marriage, family, childrearing and the chaos that shrouds the realm of human sexuality.

The marriage and family systems are deteriorating and sexual immorality and sexual crimes are on the rise, in America and around the world. The world is alluring and seducing many into committing horrid sexual sins and in particular, adultery. It is therefore timely to openly discuss (and uncensored) Biblical concepts that have successfully proven helpful to hold marriages and family systems together. Those who follow the precepts found in YHWH's word (and as is contemplated herein) can expect to reap its blessings. Many do not realize just how skewed current politically correct views are and how these views have precipitated world-wide moral decay.

This book will undoubtedly be the most candid and frank "Christian" book you

have ever read on the subject of marriage, family and human sexuality. This book will present information critical to marriage, family systems, morality and human sexuality and will "pull no punches" while doing so. It will tell the truth, the kind of truth that most pastors, priests, rabbis, or theologians generally will not discuss. This is, undoubtedly, because the material found herein is not politically correct and/or they are either too embarrassed to discuss the subject thoroughly or afraid of losing popularity if they were to do so. However, the truth is truth and every person alive should hear it, then what they do about it is between them and YHWH.

It is a profound phenomenon that current "Christianity" has for so long avoided a long overdue visit to the many Biblical teachings surrounding family, marriage, childrearing and human sexuality. In particular, re-examining the relevancy of beliefs introduced by Augustine that greatly infected, altered, if not even completely reversed, modern thought and away from sound Biblical teachings. This is especially profound in that the influence Augustine exerted on the "Christian" view of Human Sexuality was directly related to his own personal struggles with human sexuality and immorality. In particular, his uncontrollable urges to be sexually active with harlots (street girls, prostitutes). In his effort to overcome his problem (i.e., his inability to exert self-control over his YHWH given sexual drives and to keep them within the context and framework of scriptural boundaries), he supposedly forsook his sexual immorality and became celibate, and then became celebrated by the Roman Catholic Church. He commenced to "shame and blame" women, condemn sexual relations and the YHWH-given sexual drive and teach that sexual relations within any context is essentially EVIL and SINFUL. Thus, he transferred his own guilt, shame and personal struggles onto the "Christian"

culture through ideas that promote sex as perverted, carnal, sinful, etc., etc. This plunged the Church still further into the dark ages.

KNOW THIS, "Nothing is too absurd such that if you repeat it long enough and loud enough, people will believe it." Augustine is a case in point.

However, one only need to take an honest look at the sacred scriptures to realize that the subject of marriage, family and human sexuality was certainly not skirted nor was it discussed with any form of embarrassment, nor was it shrouded with any cloak of evil, unless sex occurred outside YHWH's ordained framework. The scriptures admonished proper sexual conduct and that any sexual activity outside established moral boundaries had both short-term consequences as well as eternal ramifications. On the other hand, sex within a moral context is celebrated, praised and lauded.

This book and this chapter will attempt to follow the "positive" perspective found in scripture regarding marriage, family and human sexuality and will discuss it candidly and with the spirit of celebration. This discussion will also clearly and succinctly paint the Biblical moral framework and boundaries for human sexuality. This book will candidly and graphically discuss and put to rest moral questions surrounding marriage, divorce, and human sexuality. Some may find some scriptural models a bit shocking if they have a Puritanical philosophy (Greek influenced) and this may be particularly true if they have inadequate scriptural and historical knowledge. However, one will soon discover the cultural context within which Biblical writers wrote, which will in turn bring insight to the religious and moral views of YHWH's divine precepts for humanity as written by the Patriarchs, the Prophets, and Holy Apostles. Additionally, and more

importantly how these marriage principles prophetically pointed to YHWH's secret spiritual plan--HaMashiyach and the church.

As this text is read, it will be helpful to keep in mind that Biblical teachings are NOT rooted in Westernized (Hellenized) culture. One MUST set aside Westernized views in order to fully comprehend the purest and truest spiritual meanings found within scripture on this very critical subject.

Parallels will be drawn between the core scriptural theme of "the mystery of HaMashiyach and the Church" and that of the marriage relationship. This is especially important and timely in light of the rampant sexual problems faced in Europe, America and around the world where a westernized Judeo-Christian heritage exists via the deceitful work of Satan. As proof, just look at the high levels of divorce, adultery, prostitution, pornography, fornication, and the like!

It is important to take the time and discipline to get through this chapter, all of it, even if it is taken in small doses. Tucked away in both Biblical and historical writings are discussions critical to this book's main premise. History reveals when, where and how the breakdown of the marriage institution, family and sexuality morality began for the modern "Christian" era. This chapter develops an essential overview of the critical elements in history that led to the current state of affairs. This chapter will also reveal the HOW and WHY people think and believe the way they do in modern times.

OVERVIEW OF HISTORY FROM ANCIENT TIMES TO GRECO-ROMAN TIMES

Biblical historical culture is where one will unearth most of the foundational

truths that will become the basis for understanding the paradigms of marriage, family and human sexuality that are ordained by YHWH. Why Biblical culture? Biblical culture is pure in that it is comprised of the beliefs put into practice by those who were inspired (by YHWH) to write the Holy Scriptures. It captures historical human behavior, both the blessed and the denounced via YHWH's holy prophets and priests. It reveals the understanding and practices of holy men and women relative to YHWH's word and those found in the text of YHWH's word itself.

To enjoy a broader comprehension of the Biblical writings, it is often helpful to understand the cultural context of the writers as well as the preceding cultures that led to the developments of the cultural context being examined. If a piece of literature is considered solely from the point of view of the reader, for example, a 21st century reader reading the Bible that was written by writers from a different era, culture and background, then a full understanding is often lost or even skewed. Therefore, an examination of the historical contexts that influenced modern "Christian" thought and practices relative to marriage, family and human sexuality that runs contrary to Biblical teachings is important.

Most renown theological and historical scholars agree that Hellenism and Babylonianism greatly influenced the context within which the Neo-Judaism faith was born (Tillich, 1968; Pelikan, 1971, and Wells, 1929) and how this impacted future thought and practices. Keep in mind that "Christianity" was never intended to be a separate religion from Judaism, *per se*, and initially was not, but was to be an advanced stage of YHWH's ordained continuum of the Jewish faith. History, on the other hand,

reveals how particular Biblical truths regarding the family system and morals WERE changed (even though the scriptures do not validate said changes) from being Biblically based to being non-Biblical and how pagan ideas came to be accepted as being “Christian” truths. Citations are scattered throughout this book, but it is recommended that the reader also take time to investigate said sources and even others. Enlightenment is sure to follow!

Since Babylonianism, Hellenism and Romanism (B-H-R) has affected virtually every society, including current views on marriage, family and human sexuality, this part of the discussion will take advantage of recorded history to discover the influences and the global developments that led Neo-Judaism into non-Biblical beliefs and practices. To begin, the serious researcher will find that Babylon had its beginnings in Babel, which is historically known as Bab-Ilu--gate of the gods. However, the Hebrews called it Babel and the Greeks called it Babylon. Babylon existed not long after the Flood in the Mesopotamia plains (known as Shinar in the Bible) around the 4th millennium B.C., as did all major ancient civilizations.

During its first thousand years of history, Babylon was a mere village, just one of the many tribal-cities that comprised the region known as Babylonia. Political power, however, was centered in the southern tribal-cities that were inhabited by Sumerians. To date, no clay tablets of the Sumerians have been found that reveal their ancestral origin. The Bible record, however, indicates that they were Shemites. Modern scholars, however, do not consider the Bible record as an authority because Moses, the individual heralded by many unschooled preachers as being the first and major writer of the Bible,

did not appear on the scene until around the 14th century B.C. His writings (i.e., the Law tablets, the core of Deuteronomy, perhaps nothing more) would not have begun until around the 13th century B.C., about seventeen hundred (1,700) years after the first written Sumerian records.

The writers in Josiah's time--the actual first canonizers of the Pentateuch, either in rough draft or a finished form (read about the "J" Document and the "P" Document)--either received and compiled oral history from Israeli elders which undoubtedly included fragmented writings. They may have kept some historical clay tablets passed on from generation to generation, perhaps from the time of Abraham when he left Ur (a suburb of Babylonia). Or, the compilations were completely illumined by divine inspiration. In either case, there is little surviving written history available to prove or disprove the history before Abraham's day. It is a history that, if believed, must be embraced by faith.

The Sumerians, nonetheless, are credited for developing the world's first known (documented) civilization (see Ancient Civilization). This is known because the Sumerians developed the world's first known writings, hence the earliest known written records. Outside of these written records, archeologists can only speculate early history. The written language of the Sumerians is now known as cuneiform (from the Latin *cuneus*, meaning "wedge"). These writings were basically picture writing that in time lost its picture form and became stylized symbols, i.e., modern cuneiform. Eventually, each symbol began to represent a sound (i.e., a syllable), rather than the idea. Even though cuneiform never developed an alphabet, it was still used long after the alphabet did appear.

Babylonia's tribal-cities were ruled by the strongest leader that would rise and conquer the other cities. Each enjoyed its day of glory--Lagash, Uruk (Erech, in the Bible), Akkad, Calneh, and Ur kings (called lugals) that replaced the city rulers (ensis). According to Bible genealogies, Ham (Noah's cursed youngest son) was the progenitor of Cush. Cush was the progenitor of Nimrod and it was Nimrod that had his first kingdom center in Babylon. Therefore, the town Babylon proper, was established by Hamites, via Nimrod. Later, Nimrod migrated to a new land to start a new "kingdom", where he built Ninevah, which became the capital of what is now known as Assyria. Thus, Assyria was also established by a Hamite and again via Nimrod.

Sumerian (Babylonian) influences can be found everywhere, even in the late twentieth century. The more obvious and written influences are mathematics. For example, a circle is divided into three hundred sixty (360) degrees. This process is a number system of ten (10), like America's, and then multiplied by six (6) to get the next unit, i.e., ten (10) times six (6) equals sixty (60); sixty (60) times ten (10) equals six hundred (600) and so on. A "dozen" is a fifth of sixty (60) and the modern division of the clock to measures of hours, minutes, and seconds is in units of sixty (60). Even the modern day calendars use the names of Sumerian gods. All this including standard measures, money system, and the documenting of purchases--called receipts today, even down to the clothes or shoes purchased--was also performed by Sumerian city scribes using a stylist on wet clay in cuneiform writing. Cuneiform was adopted by the Babylonians and Assyrians for their own Semitic languages and spread its use westward into Syria, Anatolia, Armenia, and Iran.

Sargon of Akkad, a Semitic king, conquered the Sumerians about 2340 B.C. His empire was short-lived but was vast and one that fostered art and literature. Around 2150-2050 B.C., Ur, the next Sumerian leader, spread their rule far westward. It was during Ur's supremacy (about 2150-2050 B.C.) that the Sumerian culture reached its zenith. Shortly thereafter the Sumerian cities lost their independence forever, and gradually they virtually disappeared as a people, with the exception of one major descendant, i.e., the Semite Abraham. It was during Ur's zenith that Abraham left Ur of the Chaldeans due to a divine "call", transforming himself and his family into a nomadic people. Only one other Semite was a flickering light shining brightly in history but was soon extinguished. It was during a 70-year Chaldean kingly rule in the new Babylon. Its most famous king was a Semite—Nebuchadnezzar II.

Political power then moved northward to Babylon and it became the capital of Babylonia around 1894 B.C. and reached its peak of glory under Hammurabi—the first known Law Giver—around 1800 B.C. (about 400 years before Moses). By that time, however, Abraham had long left the Sumerian city of Ur some two hundred (200) years earlier and had moved with his father's (Terah) family toward Canaan. However, they all stayed in Haran (named after Terah's dead son) until Terah died. Haran was about 450 miles north of Babylon and Ur was about 160 miles south of Babylon putting about 610 northerly miles between Ur and Abraham. In ancient times, that was a tremendous distance.

It was during the early era of Babylonian history that polytheistic religions began to mix religion and politics by writing moral and social laws on public monuments.

Babylonian religious rituals included female temple prostitutes (mediums for access to the Female goddess—a matriarchal system) which were incorporated into religious rituals and worship. The scriptures also reveal that such practices existed even in Israel's history, even though it was contrary to the holiness standards of YHWH. This practice is emerging again, only this time on American soil and around the world—the worship of Isis and/or Ishtar, the female goddess and of self as a goddess. Modern advertisers are subliminally selling this concept through advertisements alluring the innate appeal of women to become goddesses—same old trick as was used on Eve.

Undoubtedly, some matriarchal cultures came out of the Babylonian era and influenced the native Indians of America and different cultures in Asia that became landlocked when the shifting of the plates occurred, post Flood, (Genesis 10:25) and they remained unchanged for millennia's due to separation from the rest of the world. This was common among a number of native Indian tribes until "Christianity" introduced a more Biblical patriarchal system, post Columbus. However, even the patriarchal system introduced to the American-Indians was already skewed by the influences of B-H-R.

Under Hammurabi's rule, Babylon became the religious cultural center of Western Asia. In its temples scholarly priests copied and preserved the writings of the Sumerians, from whom the Babylonians derived their first form of civilization. Thus, much of the Sumerian culture, language, writing, business organization, scientific knowledge, mythology, and law lived on through cuneiform writing and spread to the "Semitic" peoples who later lived side by side with Babylon, Kassites, the Chaldeans, the Aramaeans, and the Assyrians. However, Hammurabi made his own Semite language

official throughout his kingdom and raised the god of Babylon, Marduk, to first place among their deities. Ishtar was Babylonians' chief female deity, the ancient mother goddess Innini of Uruk (renamed Ishtar). Ishtar was the mother of the god Tammuz, whom Ezekiel the prophet was horrified to see women in Jerusalem "weeping for Tammuz" as late as 600 B.C. (Ezekiel 8:14). The worship of Ishtar and Tammuz spread over Asia and reached Egypt and took on the form of Isis and Osiris. Even later the deities appeared in Greece as Demeter and Persephone.

After Hummarabi's death, Indo-European tribes swept over Babylonia wave after wave. This plunged the civilized world into darkness known as the Middle ages of Antiquity. It was not until about 1400 B.C. that the Assyrians freed themselves from the invaders' rule and was able to extend their kingdom northward. Assyria had long been under the control of Babylon and had already absorbed their culture. Even their language was almost identical to the Babylonians. It was not until about 700 years later, however, that Assyria experienced its greatest period under Tiglath-Pileser III (745-727 B.C.) and Sargon II (722-705 B.C.), the most famous of Assyrian kings who made Israel an Assyrian province and carried into the interior of his empire 30,000 Israelites (the so-called Ten Lost Tribes of Israel). However, strong Babylonian religious influences could still be found in Assyria.

It was Josiah, King of Judah, who opposed Pharaoh, Necho II, and was defeated and slain at Megiddo (608 B.C.). Judah then became a tributary to Egypt, and when Nebuchadnezzar the Great, the new Chaldean king in Babylon, rolled back Necho into Egypt, he attempted to manage Judah by setting up puppet kings in Jerusalem. The

experiment failed, the people massacred his Babylonian officials, and he then determined to break up this little state altogether, which had long been playing off Egypt against the northern empire. Jerusalem was sacked and burned, and the remnant of the people was carried off captive to Babylon. There they remained until Cyrus took Babylon in 538 B.C.

Before that time the Jews did not seem to be a very civilized or united people. Probably only a very few of them could read or write. Even in their own history one never hears of the early books of the Bible being read. In fact, the first mention of a Jewish book is in the time of Josiah. It was the Babylonian captivity that inspired them to become civilized and consolidated as a people. They returned to Jerusalem aware of their own literature becoming an acutely self-conscious and political people. Their "Bible" at that time seems to have consisted of the Pentateuch, that is to say possibly the first five books of what is now known as the Old Testament. Israel's own history implies that it could have been less than that, perhaps just the Mosaic Law—the tablets of stone, perhaps nothing more than Leviticus, Deuteronomy and a genealogical record. Other writings may have existed separately (e.g., Psalms, Proverbs, etc.) and were not added until much later into what has now been canonized as the Hebrew Old Testament. Interestingly, the Biblical accounts of Creation, the Flood, etc. closely parallel the Babylonian legends. Said accounts seem to have been a common belief among the Semitic peoples.

Back a few years, in 612 B.C., Babylon and the Medes became allies, joined forces and completely destroyed Nineveh. Six years later the Assyrian empire had totally

collapsed. After the fall of Assyria, Babylon once again enjoyed independence, for seventy (70) years and was ruled by the Chaldeans. During this time period, Babylon strongly influenced the Greeks. However, the Greeks did not overthrow Babylon. It was to be Persia.

The Turkestani people of Central Asia moved into the region of the Persian Gulf and were mistakenly named "Persians", after the province Parsa, where their first kings had their capital, by the Greek geographers. They actually called themselves Irani (Aryans) who settled in the land that is now known as Iran. These "Persians" were similar in appearance to their close relatives, the Medes, but their language was different. It was the Medes, however, that ruled over the Persians to the east and the Assyrians to the west as early as the 6th century B.C. However, around 550 B.C. Cyrus the Great of Persia conquered the Medes. By conquering the Medes, Cyrus also acquired Assyria, which the Median King Cyrarxes had taken in about 612 B.C. Cyrus' warriors, comprised of both Medes and Persians, were notorious fine horsemen and skilled bowman. By 539 to 538 B.C. proud Babylon was seized, without resistance, by Cyrus, king of what is known as Persia. Palestine was acquired by this victory and Cyrus allowed the Jews to go home from Babylonian exile and rebuild their temple in Jerusalem. However, strong Babylonian religious, cultural, and philosophical influences were still found in most cultures.

The Persian Empire lasted for about two centuries, until Alexander the Great captured the western half of the Persian Empire in 333 B.C. (at the battle of Issus). Shortly after that, around 331 B.C., Darius was murdered by one of his own followers.

Alexander the Great was born at Pella, the capital of Macedon, a kingdom north of Greece, which was the first known real nation in European history, and was personally tutored by Aristotle by age thirteen. His father, Phillip, was bent on conquering Persia but was faced with the fact that he had to subdue Greece first. In 338 B.C., at the battle of Chaeronea, Phillip succeeded in bringing all the Greek city-states except Sparta under his leadership. After Phillip's murder in 336 B.C. (perhaps plotted by his wife), Alexander the Great came to the throne.

Late in 332 B.C. Alexander the Great reached Egypt, who welcomed him as a deliverer from Persian misrule and coroneted him as their pharaoh. Here he sacrificed to the Egyptian gods and founded a new city, to be named Alexandria after him. At Ammon, in the Libyan Desert, he visited the oracle of the Greek god Zeus, and the priests saluted him as the son of that great god.

Greece (or Hellenes) is the place where democracy was born (however, not exactly as it is “practiced” today) as well as the Age of Hellenism--the spread of Greek language, literature, and culture (with some strong Babylonian cultural influences) throughout the Mediterranean world. Athens, Greece soon lost its preeminent status as the leader of Greek culture and was replaced temporarily by Alexandria of northern Egypt. From the 3rd century B.C. Alexandria was the outstanding center of Greek culture that soon attracted large Jewish populations, making it the largest center for Jewish scholarship in the ancient world. To the detriment of modern Christianity (deformed Neo-Judaism), it also became the focal point for the development of post-Apostolic Neo-Judaism (Christian) thought.

The museum in Alexandria, or Shrine to the Muses, which included the library and school, was founded by Ptolemy I. The institution was from the beginning intended as a great international school and library. The library, eventually containing more than a half million volumes, was mostly in Greek. It served as a repository for every Greek work of the classical period that could be found. By the time it was destroyed by a Roman emperor around 300 A.D., it had already done its influential damage to Judaism, Christianity, and other cultures around the world. Secular scholars believe that the Septuagint (“LXX”), the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek, was to be one of the most valuable contributions of the Hellenistic period. The work was done at Alexandria and completed before 245 B.C. Some Jewish scholars also believe that most of the New Testament was originally written in Hebrew, translated into Greek at Alexandria. Apostle Paul was the largest contributor to the New Testament and he was a Hebrew of Hebrews and a Pharisee of Pharisees. It would be defamatory for a Pharisee of Pharisees to write sacred texts in any language other than Hebrew, even though Greek was the prevailing language of the common folk of the day. Unfortunately, Alexandria was destroyed and all such proofs are destroyed. Sadly, not one original text of any proportion of the Old or New Testament has yet surfaced. But I spoke with a man in a Library in Florida that claimed he visited the Vatican library and said he actually saw and held in his hand an ancient Hebrew New Testament.

REFLECTIONS

Before continuing, it is at this juncture that the reader must understand that the Roman culture preceding and surrounding the birth of HaMashiyach was greatly

influenced by the Greek culture. In fact, it is often called the Greco-Roman culture. And, the Greek culture carried many Babylonian carry-overs. Hellenism (Greek culture and philosophy) greatly influenced Jewish thought and practice preceding Neo-Judaism (later erroneously dubbed “Christianity”) and after its birth. This influence was then spread around the world through Roman and Greek Catholicism. Said influence is now often referred to Westernization (Kelly, 1992).

Unfortunately, most Bible readers can only comprehend and explain the Bible from a westernized view expressed with westernized thought and language. Even the language itself that is used to explain thoughts carries many ideas inherent within the language (word meanings and idioms). To reverse this problem, one must first enlighten their mind with cultural context, both preceding culture and the cultural context within which the Bible was written. This will bring tremendous enlightenment to the meanings of a particular text or subject.

One particular Hellenistic influence, paramount to this book, is the introduction of MONOGAMY as a state law. This was not a Judaic or a Neo-Judaic idea. It was a Hellenistic and pagan idea. Greek monogamy was imposed with sinister intentions and gross debauchery by polytheistic, often homosexual and adulterous politicians who sought to protect their wealth and status. Conversely, and this may be shocking, a mixed culture of both single and plural marriages, like the Jewish culture, provided for a more stable society, so long as the marriage institution remained in the hands of the “family” to monitor and control it and not in the hands of the government. Such a model is far more scriptural, historically accurate and beneficial to the adhesiveness of society than any

newly government enforced monogamous law. Granted, such statements are not politically correct in most western (Hellenized) countries but this book is not trying to be politically correct; neither is this book hereby suggesting any form of anarchy or changes from monogamy to polygamy. Nonetheless, politically correct or not, the practice of multi-wife lifestyles is a historical and scriptural fact, practiced by some of the most revered patriarchs, priests, kings and the like, as recorded in the Bible and in historical literature.

It is appropriate, however, to take a look at the origins and true meanings of “legalized” monogamy and how its enforcement and practice contradicted YHWH’s law of righteousness. Prior to the legalization of monogamy in Greece most cultures knew and understood the moral obligations of marriage and family whether multi-wife families or single-wife families. However, this moral obligation presented a series of problems to wealthy powerful men who chose multiple wives. They would have to share their wealth and inheritance equally with their wives and offspring potentially reducing their wealth, power and influence within the Greek aristocracy and government. To remedy this problem—to keep the power and wealth to just a few—the power elite in Greece decided to make a monogamy law allowing its citizens only one legal wife and thus the moral and inheritance obligations were limited to just a very few. Monogamy also allowed the Greeks to keep their Greek "citizenship" count reduced to hundreds or thousands, which in turn kept the thousands of slaves, freedmen, and so forth out of public affairs (Wells, 1929). So, this does not sound so bad, right? Wrong, if you read the rest of the story.

The Greeks were still allowed the legal purchase of as many female slaves as their

wealth allowed, without any sexual restrictions or familial obligations. Therefore, female slaves could be bought and sold with no moral or ethical restrictions, obligations or responsibilities no matter how often they were used for sexual gratification; and if children were sired, there was no moral obligation to them either. In the eyes of YHWH this was a severe travesty and a serious breach of morality and human dignity. In fact, it sounds a lot like what is still going on in modern times in Hellenized cultures. A very high percentage of “married” men still seek plural sexual partners but exhibit no moral obligation to these partners or their offspring since most westernized law prohibits said moral obligation. Most westernized cultures have adopted the Greek monogamous law which not only promotes immorality but actually prohibits morality.

In America, when the government got tired of funding the results of “unlawful” “polygamy”, for example, supporting unwed mothers and their children, they began to enforce a law that partially obligated the fathers to care for these children (known as “child support”) but failed to take the next step that would force the fathers to care for the mothers as well, because one more advanced step would contradict the monogamy laws they instituted (put on the law books) that caused these problems in the first place. As can be seen, it is all quite hypocritical. If these matters were left in the hands of families, like it always was prior to Hellenism, then the town fathers (or courts) would only need to be involved if/when family enforcement of moral obligations failed.

Legally enforced monogamy also prevented non-elitists males from developing a potentially hostile (non-sanctioned) “kingdom”, which could potentially rise against the power elite. A prime example is Jacob’s (Israel’s) family that began expanding rapidly.

Egypt feared this growing “clique” and fiercely subjugated them to prevent a potential overthrow. This is no different than the concerns of the Greeks, yet they visualized the threat from a different perspective, albeit closely related.

From a Biblical (Judaic) perspective, however, what the Greeks were doing was gross sexual sins of the worst kind—adultery and fornication. From a Judaic perspective, a slave owner that had sex with his female slave had to consider her as a concubine—a slave wife. The Old Testament clearly teaches that concubines, although a lower status wife than a regular wife, were to be cared for, respected and treated as a wife. In fact, Biblical laws were written that protected both the concubine and her children (Exodus 21:10-11; Deut. 21:15-17).

From a Judaic perspective, a female slave could only qualify as a concubine if she was never previously sold and was a virgin at purchase or a widow. Concubines were to be treated with proper respect and with all due moral obligation. To follow the Greek model, men were forcing slave women to become adulteresses, if they were virgins on purchase and then sold off to others and subsequent owners took them to “wife”. This would cause a triple sin—forced sin upon another (committed by the slave wife’s owner) and unwilling (forced) adultery committed by the slave wife and adultery/rape committed by the new slave owner.

Prior to Greek culture, governmental enforcement of monogamy was foreign to all cultures of the day, including Judaism. All cultures understood the moral obligations of a man to provide, in every way, for the needs of his wife (wives) and offspring. If a man had sex with a woman (with or without family ceremony), she became his wife or

concubine. He then was obligated to be responsible to her for the rest of his life, so long as she was a virgin, widow, or “lawfully” divorced woman prior to having sex with her. However, the sinful Greek philosophical influences regarding monogamy soon infiltrated Judaism and Neo-Judaism and was soon adopted as a post-Apostolic canonized dogma. Wherever Rome ruled, so did their ideas of hypocritical celibacy (priests frequently had sex with nuns—temple prostitutes—in secret) and tolerated monogamy which had an anti-human sexuality undertone—the result of Augustine's (et al.) efforts.

Of course, not all cultures were as quickly influenced by Hellenism with regard to marriage, family and human sexuality. One prime example is found in the Middle East with the Muslim founder, Mohammed (610 A.D.). However, even he began to sway under this modern influence and pressure that surrounded him and his followers on every side. He began to suggest only four wives but certainly did not practice or mandate this limit. Having multiple wives was also restricted to men who could afford it, who often had to provide separate housing units for each wife if they could not get along with the others. This was not a good idea for the family system. In addition, by parallel contrast, YHWH did not want his corporate "wife" divided with isms and cisms.

Thus, poor and middle class men generally had to “suffer” the monogamy restrictions. This too was a perversion because it did not address the social and physical needs/wishes of the poor and middle class. Although modern Islam is grossly wrong religiously speaking, in fact blatant “anti-HaMashiyach”, Islamic countries, however, are among the few cultures that survived some of the Hellenistic influences, aside from some Asian, Chinese, and African cultures.

Mohammed, like Apostle Paul, knew that monogamy produced other kinds of sexual immorality, since, by nature, males generally possess the stronger continuous sex drive as compared to the average female. (Shakir, 1993). The only marital problems found in polygamous cultures stem from the lack of healthy social training among females who are not taught how to communicate and cohabit peaceably and the immoral practice of divorce without a “cause”. This is not the case with every marriage, but it does exist far too often. This comes from their early social learning—poor father-husband models, etc.—and failure to practice righteousness that was/should have been learned.

Orthodox Jews acknowledge either option as scripturally acceptable so long as a man’s wife (or wives) agrees that her husband may have more than (or an additional) one wife. Of course as with most religious leaders who acknowledge this Biblical lifestyle they do not publicly promote or admit they agree with this view since most of the governments within which they live oppose a multi-wife family modality.

While this book does reveal many facts relative to marriage, family and human sexuality, the intent is not to promote Islam, Mormonism, Judaism or “unlawful” polygamy, etc. by any means. Findings and citations are given merely to show some historical conventional wisdom of the cultures of early Judaism, Neo-Judaism (now erroneously called “Christianity”), and Islam. So, let me reiterate that these comments herein are not prescriptions but observations. Unfortunately, ministers like Joseph Smith (and others) saw the scriptural validity of multiple wives, but Joseph Smith (and others) advanced his ideas beyond Biblical teachings by forcing the lifestyle of polygamy upon

others who may have otherwise not chosen to do so. Furthermore, both Islam and Mormonism are believed (by this author) to be fundamentally unscriptural and outside of pure Neo-Judaism, even if they do embrace some portions of mutually held conventional wisdom found within the scriptures relative to the issue of marriage, family systems and human sexuality.

It is also interesting to note that some of Apostle Paul's writings have been misinterpreted due to Hellenism. For example, where Paul discussed the marital qualifications of a Bishop or Deacon (1 Timothy 3:2, 12), he is often misinterpreted by modern Puritanical (Hellenistically influenced) minds that claim this passage to be a monogamous policy to be held by both church leaders and all Body of HaMashiyach members. However, not only is this view not true, the contextual issue of marriage itself is even skewed. Apostle Paul was merely stating that administrative leaders of the Church (Bishops and Deacons) were to be the husband of a like-faith virgin (first-time a wife) and that this policy does not apply to the general church constituency. Furthermore, many scholars admit that the Greek words used here for "one wife" is odd and probably refers to the female's sexual credentials, that she is to be a virgin (first time a wife), that her husband is the first and only man she has had sex with, only once (first time) a wife—one wife. When in doubt, it is always helpful to turn to the Old Testament, since that is where all New Testament principles and truths have roots. A careful analysis reveals that 1 Timothy 3:2 and 12 are closely aligned with Judaic teachings regarding the lifestyle of a priest (Ezekiel 44:22).

The Levite priests could only marry Israeli virgins or widows formerly married to

another Levite. A high priest was more narrowly restricted. He was not allowed to marry widows (etc.), only Israeli virgins (Leviticus 21:13-14; Ezekiel 44:22). As clearly seen here in scripture, a high moral standard was required of priestly (church) leadership; as a result of this high moral standard, many bishops and deacons who disregard this moral principle are unqualified yet remain in office anyway. The act of taking one or more wives, in and of itself, is not immoral but, how a husband treats and behaves towards his wife (or wives) or who he selects as his wife (or wives) is what determines whether or not his action(s) are moral or amoral. This fact is grossly overlooked within modern “Christianity”.

Chapter

- 2 -

THE HIDDEN SECRETS

Part Two

INTRODCUTION

This chapter will continue where Chapter One left off and will also offer additional reflections at the end of the historical review. Of course there are more histories that could be written here but said histories are not really relevant to this book.

OVERVIEW OF HISTORY PART TWO

FROM GRECO-ROMAN TIMES TO MODERN TIMES

It is interesting to note that after the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C., the Parthians of Persia kept Rome at bay for 300 years. However, Alexandria, Egypt ended with the Arab conquest of 642 A.D. because Rome did not completely destroy Alexandria when Egypt became a province of the Roman Empire in 30 B.C., after Cleopatra committed suicide. In fact, it enjoyed prominence in the Roman world as a center of "Neo-Judaism" until the Arab conquest. However, please note that prior to this Arab conquest the Great Library of Alexandria was already destroyed around 391 A.D. by decree from Emperor Theodosius I, who made "Christianity" the state religion of Rome (known as the Roman Catholic Church), and this decree was carried out by Patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria. Therefore, as far as Islam was concerned, Alexandria was "Christian" (Roman Catholic) and had to be destroyed. In modern times, Islam is the chief religion of Alexandria, not Roman Catholicism, even though scattered

“Christianity” still embraces many Hellenistic/Babylonian ideas to this day.

While the Greeks were reaching the zenith of their glory, the power of Rome, to the west, was slowly building momentum. Rome is often known by historians as the "City of the Seven Hills" situated on the left bank of the Tiber. For mercantile reasons towns were built on the seven hills on the banks of the Tiber. However, these towns eventually joined hands to make one city—Rome—that came to occupy the plateau area between the hills and even the present-day Vatican City rests on a plateau as well (not on the seven hills).

The genius of the Greeks lay in art, literature, science, and philosophy. The Romans were best at warfare, engineering, and government. Although Rome had no set plans for world conquest, they did fight many wars and enslave many people. By the time of Augustus, shortly before HaMashiach, most of the known world was unified and at peace under Roman rule. Up to the times of Augustus, however, Rome was a wobbling power. The only thing that saved her was the emergence of two brilliant statesmen, Gaius Julius Caesar and his great-nephew Augustus (Octavian). Together they scrapped the old republican framework, except in outward form, and molded Rome into an Empire. All power was gradually concentrated in the hands of a single ruler, who was backed by the might of the Roman legions. This establishment brought profound peace for two centuries, broken only by frontier warfare. Paved roads stretched from one end of Italy to what is now known as France and Germany. In 70 A.D. Rome destroyed Jerusalem scattering both Jews and Neo-Jews.

Under the rule of Augustus Neo-Judaism continued to grow slowly despite

repeated waves of persecution from the Romans, often initiated by the Jews and sometimes even administered by them. However, with Theodosius in power, he removed the schisms (Arianism vs. Trinitarianism, etc.) from Rome and enforced a Roman State Religion, a religion already set in motion by Constantine—a “Trinitarian Christianity”—which was certainly quite different from the original pure "Neo-Judaism" embraced by the apostles. The new religious Rome resembled Babylonianism, Hellenism and Romanism, certainly far afield from pure Neo-Judaism. Shortly thereafter, pure Neo-Judaism was illegal to be practiced.

This admixture of beliefs and liturgical practices were established and sanctioned by the Roman State Church, ranging from statues, incense burning, candle burning, celibacy, monogamy, church prostitutes, phallic monuments (obelisks), polytheism, etc. Any beliefs or practices outside those delineated by the State Church were considered heresy and illegal. Anyone caught practicing or teaching any non-canonical dogmas were enemies of the church and were dissidents/criminals and thus enemies of the state. Therefore, they were criminals and were often punished as such. The “church” soon gained the “political” power to rule with similar authority by an interesting historical development. After Constantinople was overrun by barbarians, a political power vacuum existed by the lack of an imperial presence in Rome. The "popes" in Rome, who were already claiming for themselves primacy over other matters of doctrine, saw this as their opportunity to gain complete legal jurisdiction over all other purer Neo-Judaism followers/churches throughout the known world. So, the Roman church stepped into the political power vacuum and acquired the power to physically punish "heretics", even by death in many cases. This meant that the Roman Church now governed land and peoples

as well as ruling the church.

Not long after the Roman Catholic Church (RCC) came to power a new empire began to emerge with the birth of a (possibly) distant relative of Abraham, the progenitor of Islam, Muhammad. He hailed from Arabia, a possible descendant of Ishmael (or possibly related through marriage), the son of an Egyptian mother, a concubine of Abraham. Her name was Hagar. After Hagar departed away from her husband Abraham, she found an Egyptian (polytheist) wife for her son, Ishmael. The constituency of Arab nations has dispersed admixtures of Ishmael's posterity among those that already lived there before Ishmael's arrival. Much later in history, in 570 A.D., Muhammad was born in the Mekkah (Mecca) region of Saudi Arabia but no specific genology has been developed to demonstrate any clear link between Muhammad and Ishmael. But these facts alone lead any researcher in the direction of polytheism relative to Islam.

Contrary to what Dr. A. Zahoor, Dr. Z. Haq, M S M Saifullah, Mohd Elfie Nieshaem Juferi, Abdullah David, et al. try to deny or cover up, the pagan historic roots of Islam is quite difficult to hide. The culture and religion surrounding Muhammad clearly shows that he was born in the Mekkah (Mecca) region that was steeped in polytheism. Zahoor and Z. Haq (1998) clearly state that 'Ka'bah' was the "first house of worship built on earth for the worship of Allah". And with another stroke of the pen admits that 'Ka'bah' was "filled with three hundred sixty idols". The 'Ka'bah' was the holy sanctuary that Muhammad's grandfather, 'Abd al Muttalib, cared for long before Muhammad ever received any supposed revelations in 610 A.D.

If Zahoor, et al. within Islam, were to deny that Islam has its roots in polytheism it

would not only contradict their own writers (which they are bold enough to do) and history, but it would be a blatant attempt to deceive others. It is true that monotheism is the belief in “one god”, but claiming to be a monotheist is not the same thing as being one in practice or in deed. Furthermore, monotheism is not confined to Judaism. In other words, a monotheistic belief does not necessarily mean that the monotheistic god of that belief system is the same monotheistic god as YHWH, the God of the Jews.

After the death of Muhammad, his followers, who took both the leadership of Islam and expanded their political and religious boundaries through military might, were called caliphs. This led to dynasties which led to an empire known as the Caliphate but most notably known as the Ottoman Empire, the dynasty that brought the caliphate to its zenith. This is important because the emergence of Islam plays a significant role in the revival of Medo-Persia. In fact, the revived Medo-Persian Empire is already in existence today even though the Ottoman Empire and the Ottoman/Caliphate was abolished in 1922 A.D. (Briggs, 2007). Before his demise, the Ottoman/Caliphate spread the Arabic language and the Islamic faith during his reign and dynasty.

To date, Persia/Islam has not elected a new Caliph because the Caliphate was dissolved during the same time the Ottoman Empire was dissolved. This is partially what Osama Bin Laden tried to accomplish (Al Qaeda)—to become an accepted caliph or stir up Sunni Islam to reinstate the Caliph system. But, little did he know, or all of Islam for that matter, that the time for such had not come. Most likely a Caliph or Ayatollah will arise in connection with the OIC. In fact, the wise person will know the identity of this man since they will be able to calculate his name (Revelation 13:18). Others, like Osama

Bin Laden, tried to become the next caliph too, but failed. Even President Bush briefly touched on this subject in one of his presidential speeches (as do other politicians).

By definition, the Caliphate is a comprisal of rightly guided caliphs (successors of Muhammad), i.e., the form of government representing the political unity and leadership of the Sunni branch of the Muslim world. The caliph was often known as the “Commander of the Faithful”. Ottoman (the Ottoman Empire) was only one of the Caliphs so Ottoman unknowingly played a dual role. Although expanding the Ottoman Dynasty was the intended goal of the Ottomans, which came to be known as the Ottoman Empire, in their wake they also expanded Islam and the Arabic language. The Ottoman Empire was the Empire that ended what was left of the Roman Empire in former Asia Minor. By the time of the Ottomans, Rome had been reduced to mostly Asia Minor (modern Turkey). And it was the Ottoman that changed the name of Rome’s new capital from Constantinople to Istanbul, whereupon, the Ottomans made Istanbul their capital—the “royal tents” spoken of in Daniel’s vision (Daniel 11:45) were pitched between the two Seas (Mediterranean and the Black Seas)—until 1922. The Ottoman Empire was the seventh and last Empire and was the tenth caliph.

The Caliph (Sunni) and the Ayatollah (Shia) are now more accurately represented in and by what is known as the OIC, founded in 1969, an organization now comprised of fifty-seven (57) Islamic member States, both Sunni and Shia branches. This means that both Iran and Turkey are represented in/by the OIC. What is yet to be seen is what role will Iran (or Turkey) play in the OIC as the OIC interfaces with the world? Recently, the General Secretary met with the Iranian President for a consult. It would be interesting to

know what was discussed.

From said OIC members there are 141 capitols and cities that are members of the OICC, founded in 1980, a branch of the OIC. This means that Istanbul and Tehran are also represented in/by the OICC. Finally, the OIC is currently headquartered in the Holy City of Makkah and presently the OIC/Islam has a following equal to (or exceeds) that of “Christendom” and growing rapidly.

Outside of the Middle East and by the 10th century A.D. the religious and cultural community, what is called Western Christendom, emerged. Simultaneously, new political arrangements were being formed in Europe, i.e., kings and nobles were dividing territory and exerting authority. This soon led to inevitable conflicts between the popes and the civil rulers, what would later be known as the divine right of kings, clashing with the divine rights of the papacy.

The papacy eventually lost political power in the Middle Ages but still held tremendous religious authority. By 1870 all Papal states had been lost, leaving only the Vatican City as the pope's civil domain. Papal infallibility, however, remained essentially unchanged until the papacy of John XXII, 1958-1963 A.D. Now the Roman Catholic Church (RCC) is taking a different tactic to gather all religions of the world under its wings. It is trying to find commonalities and encourage tolerance of religious views, to compromise in order to establish a One-World religion, completely.

England, a strong "Christian" nation that influenced major sectors of the world, wielded their political and religio-socio-cultural clout, especially during their empire

building days. This included their Hellenistic ideas of monogamy, divorce, etc. carried over from their Greco-Roman "mother" church, the RCC. This influence reached the Americas too, by way of the early explorers going to America from Europe. This does not mean to say that all the ideas and beliefs held by Western Christendom are off the mark. But Satan does not mind some truth so long as it is mixed with lies and deception.

However, political powers are basically controlled by the economic powers and are also haunted by another major "problem"—organized religions. In particular, "Christendom", Islam, Judaism, Buddhism, and Hinduism, can still be thorns in the sides of political powers that be. To rid themselves of this "problem", efforts are being made to develop a One-World Religion capable of seducing all faiths into collaboration, to be undoubtedly led by one economic and political power figure. This may well happen in order to facilitate what the prophets of old foretold.

History reveals that religion is a major component of every culture and nation, heathen, Jewish, Neo-Jewish or "Christian". Unless religious faiths are either altered or toppled (by casting doubts, etc.), world dominance is more challenging. History also reveals man's hunger for money which is also at the root of most civilized cultures since it represents power. The money (banking) system was introduced by Babylon. However, the Jews perfected the banking craft of usury and has capitalized on it for centuries around the world.

Truly the **love** of money is the root of all evil. HaMashiyach taught his followers to seek authority and power that comes through the exercise of servitude, not by

exercising power and authority over people through politics and money.

Recent efforts are being made by such movements as the Unification Church, the Ecumenical Movement, and the Catholic Church to bring all religions together under their banner by deceptively employing politically correct rhetoric and traditionally correct religious rhetoric. The unlearned and unenlightened will be easily seduced.

So why so much talk about history? To vividly illustrate how morality, culture, philosophy, etc. was in a constant flux and how keeping a religion pure is extremely difficult, even next to impossible. However, the Jews were masters at recording and standardizing their faith. You see, the Jews and Judaism were a new thing in the rise and fall of civilization, a people without a king and without a temple (early in their history and later too after 70 A.D.), but held together and consolidated out of diverse elements, by nothing but the power of the written WORD.

And this literary and mental merging of the Jews was neither humanly planned nor foreseen nor solely done by either priests or statesmen. Not only was this a new kind of community but a new kind of man comes into historical view with the development of the Jews. In the days of Solomon the Hebrews looked like becoming a little people just like any other little people of that time clustering around court and temple, ruled by the wisdom of the priest and led by the ambition of its king. But already, the reader may learn from the Bible, a new sort of man, the Prophet, the HaMashiyach, was to arise on the scene of history. As troubles thickened round the divided Hebrews the importance of these Prophets increased.

Prophetic fulminations were written down and preserved and studied. They went wherever the Jews went, and wherever they went they spread a new religious spirit. They carried the common man past priest and temple, past court and king and brought him face to face with the rule of RIGHTEOUSNESS. That is the supreme importance in the history of mankind. In the great utterances of Isaiah the prophetic voice rises to a pitch of splendid anticipation and foreshadows the whole earth united and at peace under one YAH. Therein the Jewish prophecies culminate. The Hebrew prophets of the period round and about the Babylonian captivity who mark the appearance of a new power in the world, the power of individual moral appeal, stood as an appeal to the free conscience of mankind against the fetish sacrifices and slavish loyalties that had hitherto bridled and harnessed the human race. In fact, the Jews were the first in history to write history with reflection upon man's current state of righteousness together with a look to the future righteousness of the human race. This is called prophecy. Prophets came unheralded, unpaid, and frequently, unwelcomed. They held sole allegiance to YAH and feared neither beast nor man. They held a distinctive vocation, for which a school (sons) of prophets (a Hebrew fraternity) was soon developed not long after the time of Josiah. Undoubtedly, Daniel, Isaiah and others attended this Jewish religious training school.

These now civilized Semites, who were beaten and overrun in their first five eventful centuries, were held together as one people and clung to their ancient traditions by the inspiration of Prophets to face many more centuries of suffering ahead of them after 70 A.D. And they were able to do this, because they had collected and canonized this literature of theirs, while in Babylon. It is not so much the Jews who made the Bible as the Bible made the Jews. Running throughout the Bible are certain ideas, different

from the ideas of the people about them, very stimulating and sustaining ideas, to which they were destined to cling throughout many centuries of hardship, adventure and oppression.

Foremost of these Jewish ideas was this, that their YHWH was invisible and remote, an invisible YHWH in a temple not made with hands, a Lord of Righteousness throughout the earth, married to Israel and Judah, two sister wives, comprised of two separate multitudes, who were to become one again as a united bride with a third unexpected bride, but who were not jealous, envious, or bickering. (Jeremiah 3:7-10; 2 Corinthians 5:19; Ephesians 1:10; 2:12; 3:6; Revelation 21:2, 9; 19:7-9; Matthew 25:1-13; Ephesians 5:32). They were to work in harmony as assistants to their eternal husband. They were to rule the world together as a unified harmonious force when HaMashiach would come.

All other peoples had national gods embodied in images that lived in temples. If the image was smashed and the temple razed, presently that god died out. But this was a new idea. This YHWH of the Jews was in the Heavens, high above priests and sacrifices of whom no graven image was allowed to be made. And this YHWH of Abraham, the Jews believed, had chosen them to be HIS peculiar people—HIS wife, to restore Jerusalem and make it the capital of Righteousness in the World. They were a people exalted by their sense of a common destiny. This belief saturated them all when they returned to Jerusalem after the captivity in Babylon and has continued to this day. Neo-Judaism was to carry forth this embodied idea and has to some degree, but the beautiful essence of this idea has been lost by the westernization of a deformed “Christianity” and

the deterioration of the patriarchal family system.

REFLECTIONS

The Biblical truth that the Church will one day be united with YHWH's first two abandoned Old Testament wives is what Apostle Paul taught to be the continuum of Judaism into the eternal future (Isaiah 54:5-7; Isaiah 62:5; Jeremiah 2:2-3; 3:7-10, 14; Ezekiel 23:1-10; Revelation 19:7; 21:9; Romans 11:11, 25-26; Mark 2:19-20; John 10:16; 1 Corinthians 12:13; 2 Corinthians 2:11; Ephesians 2:12; 5:23, Colossians 1:18-24; etc.). This is not a common subject because many ministers find this too difficult a subject to even consider (politically incorrect), let alone teach on in its full breadth.

YHWH had at least five corporate wives that can be identified in scriptures and they are as follows:

- 1) Israel
- 2) Judah
- 3) Samaria
- 4) Jerusalem
- 5) Gentiles

Many "Christian" beliefs were not canonized (made into dogma) until after several hundred years after HaMashiach (Tilluch, 1968). What this means is that many Hellenistic and pagan beliefs were incorporated and canonized as part of a Neo-Judaism dogma, which actually replaced, in many cases, the pure Judaic belief systems. Is this bad? It is nothing less than sacrilegious. Neo-Judaism was to be a Judaic outgrowth, a stalk of corn sprung from its corn seed, recognizably Semitic, a Judaic belief system birthed out of the Judaic seed. It was not to be an eclectic conglomerate that would

totally forsake Judaic morality, culture, etc. Neo-Judaism was to provide global access (to all men/women everywhere) to the Abrahamic (Semitic) covenants of promise via a Spirit-walk of faith in Yahushua and HIS teachings (corrections and enlightenment). This belief was promulgated early on starting with Abraham, on to Moses, and on to Neo-Judaism (Exodus 9:16 with Romans 9:17; Numbers 14:21; 28:1,10; Joshua 4:24; Exodus 40:15 & 19:6 with 1 Peter 2:5,9; Numbers 25:13; Acts 15:21; etc., etc.).

Even the Romans did not make a distinction between the early church and the Jews and why should they? Neo-Judaism was after all of Jewish origin with its first congregations predominately Jewish. It was not until much later through the efforts of Apostle Paul and his missionary journeys did Rome begin to acknowledge some differences between Judaism and Neo-Judaism.

New Testament righteousness was to come by faith rather than by regulation of Mosaic Law. The Mosaic Law was divinely parenthetic, purposive, and strategically placed. It was introduced to teach the world two very important things, 1) That no man/woman can be justified by the works of the flesh, because they would fail due to their fallen nature, and 2) Provide a definition of sin and righteousness, right from wrong. Both would lead, guide and instruct us in the direction of HaMashiyach. In other words, to "trash can" fundamental Judaic concepts of righteousness or morality was not HaMashiyach's intent or purpose for coming. What HE came to do was to abolish the penalties and curses of the Mosaic Law so when people fail to behave less than righteous (which is a never ending growth process) they would not be immediately judged or face the curses and penalties of the Law but have a covering and a cleaning, a time of grace, a

time and opportunity to get it right. Praise YHWH!!!

"Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them. I tell you the truth, until heaven and earth disappear, not the smallest letter, not the least stroke of a pen, will by any means disappear from the Law until everything is accomplished. Anyone who breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whoever practices and teaches these commandments will be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I tell you the truth unless your righteousness surpasses that of the Pharisees and teachers of the law, you will certainly not enter the kingdom of heaven."

Matthew 5:17-20 (NIV)

"Do we, then, nullify the law by this faith? Not at all! Rather, we uphold the law."

Romans 3:31 (NIV)

Within this window of grace and this discussion, sexual sins are included. And the moral standards regarding human sexuality (and the related issues of marriage, family, etc.) is taken from the moral and judicial sections of the Mosaic Law, for they reveal the very words of YHWH and its inherent righteousness. It reveals HIS heart beat and HIS passion for as well as a description of righteousness (Romans 3:2). Of course, trying to become righteous by works negates righteousness by faith, but, the continual lack of doing right (lack of bearing fruit) can damn a person by wasting and expiring the credit of righteousness. If a person fails to be less than righteous, does this mean that they face the penalties and curses of the law? No! unless it is willful. And YHWH be thanked for HIS mercy! So long as people trust in HaMashiyach as their savior and honestly try to get it right the next time, with YHWH's help, of course, HIS mercy endures forever.

As discussed in Chapter One, the breakdown of marriage and the family system in the modern era began with Hellenism and has expanded from thence. The “church” has failed to tell the truth on this subject and has plunged its constituents and the world into world-wide sexual immorality. To truly understand this subject scriptural information must be carefully scrutinized without wearing the glasses of Hellenism. Subsequent chapters will attempt to do just that.

SUMMARY

Babylon, Hellenism and Romanism have greatly influenced religion and culture throughout history in the following ways:

- * The introduction of law enforced Monogamy and the sins that it carries.
- * The introduction of polytheism (that even infected monotheism).
- * The introduction of the "marriage license" as the only way to recognize marriage rather than the Biblical model—the payment of a dowry and the sex act (marriage bed) to consummate, all managed by the family system and not the government.
- * The introduction of priest (clergy) involvement (control) in marriage ceremonies as the consummating factor rather than a dowry paid to the father and the sex act to consummate.
- * The introduction of the concept that "pre-marital" sex is marriage.
- * The introduction of a cloud of "evil" over human sexuality.
- * The introduction of the idea of marriage annulment and easy divorces, etc.
- * The introduction of church/polity as the authority over marriage rather than it being instituted by YHWH and between the father of the bride-to-be and the husband-to-be.
- * Etc., Etc.

Unless a grass roots change occurs, most westernized “Christian” nations will remain in the same bed of fornication with the mother of harlots—Mystery Babylon. The prophet foretold that YHWH would call his people out of mystery Babylon. And adultery/fornication is one such transgression that modern “Christians” are unknowingly

and continuously engaged in. This must stop if one hopes to avoid the flames of hell fire.

"... I will show unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters: With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication...MYSTERY BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH."

Revelation 17:1-5

"...Babylon the great is fallen...And I heard another voice from heaven saying, 'Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not her plagues.'"

Revelation 18:2, 5

“Polygamy” is not the culprit here. It is adultery and other sexual sins that are being overlooked and remain unexamined. While some have misconstrued polygamy as adultery or some other independent sin, this is not the case according to Biblical record. But neither does this admission purport nor support that one must or should practice it either, like how Joseph Smith or Brigham Young forced it upon their constituents. There always has been and always will be those men who have more than one wife, whether openly or secretly. But sadly, modern laws have contributed to a windfall of sin now committed by many men and women because of said governmental laws. Judgment will truly fall upon both the lawmaker(s) (man’s laws) and the law (YHWH’s laws) breaker(s).

It has been Satan's trick to deceive (for he is the father of lies) the “Christian” world into blind fornications and adulteries (harlotry) by skewing, even changing, the Word of YHWH regarding this vital institution of marriage. In this way, people are

living in sin every day even though they think they are pure. Millions of people engage in adultery/fornication on a daily basis and do not even know it. But the scriptures clearly teach that no adulterer, fornicator, or whoremonger will enter the Kingdom of Heaven. HaMashiyach is making the call for people to "**come out of Babylon**".

NOTE: Read more helpful information about covenants and laws in Disciples of Christ Volumes 1-12.

Chapter

- 3 -

THE BIBLICAL MARRIAGE MODEL

INTRODUCTION

In order to fully comprehend the Biblical principles and teaching regarding marriage, family and sexual morality, it is first important to understand Biblical rhetoric and the inherent meanings, from a Middle Eastern view, not a western view. After all, the cultural context of the Biblical writers who were inspired by YHWH utilized language(s) with inherent meanings, whether Hebrew or otherwise. Secondly, it is important to understand the Biblical marriage model. This chapter will focus on bringing to light the inherent meanings of rhetoric used relative to marriage, family and human sexuality and the actual Biblical marriage model.

RHETORIC

A study of and a careful examination of the inherent meaning of Hebrew words is difficult at best since the original writers are not available to expound on the choice of words and what was truly mean by their writings. However, words themselves tell a story. To the casual Westernized observer this chapter may seem a bit male oriented, bigoted, and chauvinistic. And to some degree, that is correct since the Biblical context was certainly not a 21st century “politically correct” environment. However, each reader is asked to set aside cultural biases and take a fresh look at YHWH's word to glean its true messages. Remember, the Bible was not written for private interpretation, nor was it

to be used by only one specific culture, or one specific generation. Neither was it written so people could change it whenever a passage is disliked. Nor was it written to be altered to fit an already established personal social system or personal belief system. It was written, rather, so that ALL CULTURES everywhere can look to it as a model, for guidance, for understanding, and for eternal salvation.

First, in order to understand the meaning of marriage, family and human sexuality and all its related discussions, e.g., lust, adultery, and other sexual sins, it is first important to understand how the Bible depicts and defines females and males according to their sexual status and their relationship to each other. It will also help to understand the Biblical process by which men and women became married.

Biblical rhetoric and nomenclature, regarding the female, is guided by sexual status as well as, at times, economic or social class. Each and every female fits into one of these classes or statuses, without exception. Any new (first time) sexual activity would alter the current status even if it was an immoral sexual act. The first status was automatic at birth. When a female was born she was born a virgin. From birth to adolescence she was considered a *naarah* (transliteration), a Hebrew word meaning virgin, maid, maiden, or damsel. In the Greek, the word *pais* (transliteration) was used, having the same implication as the aforementioned Hebrew word.

When a female child was old enough (sometimes before adolescence), she may become an *amah*² (transliteration), Hebrew word for slave, maid, maid servant, or handmaid. A female slave may remain so into adulthood and then be referred to as a *shiphchah* (transliteration), Hebrew word for maid, maiden, maid servant, or handmaid.

Usually, a female slave, even if she was the wife (concubine) of her master, was under the direct supervision of one of the master's free wives. Some masters would buy slaves for their sons. Kings, priests and others in authority would also take females as slaves for either sexual or non-sexual purposes. If the purchase was made for sexual purposes and labor, said female slave became the concubine of the owner. Thereafter, the husband/owner was responsible for her for the rest of her life, unless "lawfully" divorced.

If a free female kept her virginity until adulthood she was referred to as *bethuwlah* (transliteration), Hebrew word for virgin female woman, who was eligible for marriage. Once married, the female was considered an *ishshah* (transliteration), Hebrew for wife or a *gune* (transliteration), Greek for married woman. In this state she was unavailable to anyone so long as her husband was alive, period. Should her husband die she was then considered an *almanah* (transliteration, Hebrew for widow or a *chera* (transliteration), Greek for widow implying "lacking a husband". After mourning her dead husband she was free to be remarried, in fact socially obligated to remarry until past the age of sixty. If childless, it was her brother-in-law's responsibility to marry her and ensure that she bare a child for her dead husband's name, since she was honorable until her husband died.

Any sexual activity outside of marriage placed the female into one of several statuses which depended on the status of the female, not the male. For example, if the man had sex with another eligible free woman other than his first wife, the female would become his second wife at the same level of rights (unless she was at a concubine status). But of course a fixed dowry had to be paid first. If the female was his wife's slave, she would be a *piylegesh* (transliteration), Hebrew for secondary wife or concubine with less

rights than a primary wife (See Judges 19:1-3, which illustrates that a concubine was considered a "wife", but certainly not the same status as a free wife with full dowry paid). Another classic example of this can be found in Genesis 29:14-24.

If a married woman had sex with another man other than her husband, she was a *Ishshah* or *qadesha* (transliteration), Hebrew for an adulteress or whore (respectively), and was to be divorced. This is only one of two causes that can be used to execute a divorce. If a woman habitually made herself available for sexual relations for a fee she was considered a harlot. If a man habitually made himself available for sexual relations for a fee, he was considered a *qadesh* (transliteration), Hebrew for sodomite or male prostitute (1 Kings 14:24, etc.) or a *pornos* (transliteration), Greek for fornicator. The second reason for divorce was for gross sexual perversion, i.e., prostitution, incest, bestiality, lesbianism or idolatrous sexual practices (i.e., orgies, etc.).

BIBLICAL RHETORIC GLOSSARY

Below is a list of Biblical words used with inherent meanings that assist the reader to better understand the meaning of Biblical passages.

Hebrew Rhetoric

Chalal (Prostitute): To bore, to wound, to dissolve, to profane, to break one's word, to begin.

Ishshah (Adulteress): - to be extant - a woman (as an individual or a female): a female mortal (singularly or collectively) adulter(ess), each, every, female, (times) many, (plus) none, one (plus) together, wife, woman.

Naap (Adulterous): To commit adultery; (fig.) to apostatize: adulterer(ess) commit(ing) adultery, a woman that breaketh wedlock.

Naaphuwpf (Adulteries): Adultery Niuph (adulteries): Adultery

Pilegesh (Concubine): A concubine; (also, if a male, a paramour):--concubine, paramour.

Qadesh ((Sodomite (s)): A quasi sacred person, i.e., (technically) a (male) devotee (by prostitution) to licentious idolatry:-sodomite, unclean.

Qedesah (Harlot): a female devotee (i.e., prostitute):--harlot, whore.

Taznuwth (Fornication): --harlotry, i.e., (fig.) idolatry:--fornication, whoredom.

Zanah ((Harlot('s,s,s')), Whore(dom, doms, 's, s)): [Highly fed and therefore wanton]; to commit adultery (usually of the female, and less often of simple fornication, rarely of involuntary ravishment); (fig.) to commit idolatry (the Jewish people being regarded as the spouse of Jehovah):--(cause to) commit fornication, (times) continually, (times) great, (be an, play the) harlot, (cause to be, play the) whore, (commit, fall to) whoredom, (cause to) go a-whoring, whorish.

Greek Rhetoric

Aselgeia (Lasciviousness, Wanton): Incontinent; licentiousness (sometimes including other vices):--filthy, lasciviousness, wantonness.

Blepo (Looketh): To look at (lit. or fig.): behold, beware, lie, look (on, to), perceive, regard, see, sight, take heed. Comparative (which means to gaze (wide-eyed, i.e., stare).

Einai (Lust): --a craver--(plus) lust after.

Epipothio (Lusteth): to dote upon, i.e., intensely crave possession (lawfully or unlawfully): (earnestly) desire (greatly), (greatly) long (after), lust.

Epithumia ((Concupiscence, Lust(s)): From: Epithumeo ((Lust(ed, eth)): To set the heart upon, i.e., long for (rightfully or wrongfully): covet, desire, would fain, lust after (from Greek words which means upon passion as if breathing hard); longing (especially for what is forbidden), concupiscence, desire, lust (after).

Gune (Woman, wife, wives): A woman; specifically a wife:--wife, woman.

Haptomai (Touch): to light on fire by fastening to):-- To attach oneself.

Hedone (Lusts): (To please): Sensual delight; by implication, desire;--lust, pleasure.

Katastreniao (Wanton): To become voluptuous against.

Machalis (Adulterous): Form of the feminine: an adulteress (lit. or fig.): adulteress (ous, y): a female paramour.

Moichao (Adultery): to commit adultery: a paramour.

Moicheia (Adulteries): From other Greek words meaning: adultery, to commit adultery, a paramour; (fig.) apostate.

Moicheuo (Adultery): to commit adultery: a paramour.

Moichos (Adulterer): Perhaps a primary word; a (male) paramour: (fig) apostate: adulterer.

Neoterikos (Youthful): Juvenile, youthful Oregomai: : To stretch oneself, i.e., reach out after: (long for): covet after, desire.

Orexis (Lust): --excitement of the mind, i.e., longing after.

Parthenos ((Virgin(s, ity, 's)): A maiden; by implication an unmarried daughter:--virgin.

Pathos (Inordinate): Properly suffering ("pathos"), i.e., (subjective) a passion (especially concupiscence):--(inordinate) affection, lust.

Piprasko (??): To traffic, to dispose of as merchandise or into slavery;

Porne ((Harlot(s), Whore): Feminine: a strumpet; (fig.) an idolater:--harlot, whore.

Porneia (Fornication): --harlotry (includes adultery and incest): (fig.) idolatry,

fornication.

Porneuo (Fornication): --to act the harlot, i.e., (lit.) indulge unlawful lust (of either sex), or (fig.) practice idolatry: commit (fornication).

Pornos ((Fornicator(s)): To sell, similar to:--a (male) prostitute as venal, i.e., sold as bribery or filthy, dirty, mercenary bargaining, a debauchee (libertine), i.e., one habitually profligate, drunken, or lewd:--a fornicator, whoremonger.

Skolios (Giving): :--warped, i.e., winding; (fig.) perverse: crooked, froward, untoward.

Spatialao (Wanton): To be voluptuous.

Thelus (Woman): --female:--female woman.

English Rhetoric

Beastiality: Sodomy, i.e., particularly unnatural sexual relations between human beings as animals.

Concupiscence: Any immoderate desire, i.e., sexual desire, lust--with a breathing hard passion for, particularly for what is forbidden.

Crooked: Tricky or dishonest.

Debauchery: Gross indulgence of one's sensual appetites.

Fornication: Incest, homosexuality, lesbianism, beastiality, whoredom, prostitution, adultery, idolatrous perversions, and orgies.

Froward: Disobedient, unruly, unmanageable, etc.

Immoderate: Exceeding reasonable or proper (lawful: conforming to prevalent standards) bounds.

Impose: To establish by authority as an obligation, penalty, etc.; to take advantage of; make unwarranted or unfair use of; to deceive, cheat.

Incontinent: Exercising little control or restraint, especially sexual desires.

Inordinate: Exceeding proper (lawful: conforming to prevalent standards) limits, unrestrained.

Lascivious: Having, manifesting, or arousing sensual desires, lustfully.

Lewd: Characterized by or inciting to lust or debauchery; Obscene; ribald; bawdy.

Libertine: One who lacks any moral restraint.

Licentiousness: Lacking in moral restraint--lewd.

Lust: Excessive sexual appetite, especially that seeking immediate or ruthless satisfaction--to have passionate or inordinate desire.

Paramour: One who unlawfully takes the place of a husband or wife.

Profligate: One who has lost or is insensible to principle, virtue, or decency; recklessly extravagant in good profusion. n. a depraved or dissolute person, a reckless spendthrift.

Sensual: Unduly indulging the appetites (i.e., physical senses) or sexual pleasure, lewd.

Sodomy: Male prostitution using quasi sacred (male) persons, homosexuality; unnatural sexual relations, especially between male persons or between human beings (males or females) and animals.

Superimposition: Causing to lay or impose upon something (someone) else; to add to something (someone else).

Untoward: Causing hindrance, vexatious, refractory, perverse.

Venal: Ready to sell honor or principle, or to accept a bribe; mercenary; purchasable.

Subject to sordid bargaining or to corrupt influences; salable. Characterized by corruption.

Vexatious: Causing anger or displeasure by small irritations over a subject of dispute; annoy.

Wantonness: Licentious, lustful, unjust, malicious; wanton savagery; also unprovoked--also a licentious person, especially a woman. Unrestrained (toward many things) and extravagant, sure, money system, and the documenting of purchases--called receipts today.

NOTE: Webster's Dictionary is Puritanical in origin, by Webster. Prior to Webster's dictionary there was no standard in spelling or definition in the U.S.A. and most views were extremely Puritanical. It is also interesting to note that there are few to no English words to describe the wonderfully grand pleasures of sex within the marriage bed. Most all descriptions carry a negative connotation, as though sex were sinful even in the marriage bed, how sad!

THE MARRIAGE PROCESS

The Biblical method for marriage involves the dowry system, which was a negotiated payment that was derived between the husband-to-be and the father of the bride-to-be and had to be paid in full to the father of the bride-to-be before any marriage consummation could take place. If a down payment was paid by the husband-to-be to the father of the bride-to-be, a contract was established between the bride-to-be's father and future husband-to-be. This legal contract espoused (bound) the bride-to-be and she then belonged to future husband-to-be, although he could not take her to wife (consummate) until the dowry was paid in full. As soon as the agreed dowry was paid in full, the bride-to-be then left her father's house and became the wife of her husband.

Upon contractual down payment, the said bride-to-be was officially betrothed

(engaged) and belonged to her future husband-to-be and could not, therefore, belong to any other. Any sexual activity of the bride-to-be, other than with her husband-to-be, constituted adultery and she could be put away. Both offenders could be stoned or she could be divorced privately making her ineligible for marriage for the rest of her life, unless her espoused husband died (e.g., Mary & Joseph). The only way this marriage contract could be broken was by “lawful” divorce. In some cultures parents still decided to whom and when their daughters could get married, no matter their age, while others allowed daughter-participation in husband selection.

Both the down payment and the balance of the dowry was paid to the father of the betrothed daughter as a guarantee that his daughter would have financial support should her future husband divorce her. It was like a prepaid alimony. In light of the many serious divorce problems in western countries, the Biblical model is certainly superior, and is one that promotes social and moral responsibility.

Once the balance of the dowry was paid to the father of the bride-to-be, the groom could then take her away to consummate the marriage, a marriage that had technically been established with the exception of the consummation act—coitus. Depending on the financial success of the husband-to-be or by choice of the husband-to-be, the bridegroom could take as long as necessary within the boundaries of the agreement to finish paying the dowry. This happened from time to time simply because the husband-to-be could not afford to pay the dowry in full and needed time to gather pay the full dowry price. This was also done to prevent another suitor from stepping in.

A famous Biblical example was when David at first refused to take King Saul's

daughter as his wife because he came from a poor family and knew he could not afford to pay a reasonable dowry for a King's daughter (1 Samuel 18:25). It would take him forever to pay. As can be clearly seen, marriage technically involved the purchase contract of ownership made between a father and his future son-in-law, consummated by the sex act, but only allowed after the dowry was paid full, no matter what price was established.

The Bible clearly shows that marriage is to be a family institution established by YHWH and not a governmental or ecclesiastical institution. It is also interesting to note that the modern marriage ceremony, with ecclesiastical involvement, is a RCC invention, rather than a Biblical doctrine. Marriage is a family matter not a church matter. The dowry negotiation, dowry payment and the sex act constituted marriage and had nothing to do with a priest or minister. It required familial consent, a dowry payment, a consummation act, and proof of chastity. All four elements clinched the life-long binding marriage contract. Church involvement was merely a ploy by the RCC to exert greater control over its constituents.

In modern times, since the moral and social decline of the family system, and the failures of the ecclesiastical world, governments have also stepped in to take its share of control by issuing marriage licenses, enforcing monogamy, and allowing easy divorce in some countries while making it extremely difficult in others. But what good has it done? It has only produced serious social problems, revenues for the government, lawyers, judges, and various allied professions and placed power/control in the hands of those who should not have it. It certainly has not protected women, men and children from pain,

suffering and immorality. Instead, divorce runs rampant and nothing is gained by governmental and church involvement. Money would be far better spent on a dowry system that would focus on stronger family systems and moral strengths.

The issues surrounding the moral law of marriage and familial ties, regarding marriage and divorce, pre-dates both the government and the church. Why should either exert control? And why should families submit themselves to governmental methods of control? There certainly is no scripture mandating such submission if an alternative would be allowed. Marriage is instituted by YHWH, i.e., “what YHWH hath joined together, let no man put asunder” (Matthew 19:6).

While many would/do disagree with this marriage view (solely due to culture/traditions), careful scriptural analysis brings solid veracity to it. This model is clearly documented in scripture and it can also be found in history, including the Book of Macabees. True, this marriage model may not be politically correct, but unquestionably Biblically correct. And if Biblically correct, then there are reasons why it is so and therefore must not be overlooked. Read Chapter 7 for additional discussions on this vital Biblical principle.

Once an individual realizes the Biblical model is quite different than what they practice or believe, the immediate response is to justify themselves and their beliefs by reducing the Biblical model as merely historical, cultural and not relevant for today. To do so is to toss yet another Biblical truth onto the heterodoxy pile further depleting one’s oil (faith, life, salvation) in their lamp and from one’s “jar”. Once this is done with one teaching it becomes easier to do it to another and another, whenever a teaching is not

suitable or politically correct. This is a very dangerous path to take.

One cannot be partially saved, either you will have enough oil (Leviticus 24:2-4; Matthew 25:3) at HaMashiyach's return or you will not. Only the wise "virgins" who have enough oil (jars full) for their lamps will make it into the "wedding". The foolish "virgins" will not have enough oil and they will be excluded from the "wedding". The foolish will want to borrow from the wise on that day, but once the call goes forth, it is too late to beg and bargain. All preparations must be made prior to the call. The lesson here is this. The next time an urge is felt to dismiss and discard another portion of YHWH's word, remember, said act will only destroy the hope for salvation—life eternal.

David made it clear that the word of YHWH was his light and lamp, which was illuminated by burning fine clear olive oil, symbolic of YHWH's spirit. Paul made it clear that the source of faith was hearing YHWH's word and HaMashiyach made it clear that all of YHWH's words are the source of life (see below). The wise betrothed virgins (believers—the true church) had their lamps, tended them, brought plenty (jars full) of oil and in the end, trimmed their lamps so they would burn brightly just prior to HaMashiyach's return.

* Thy Word – Is Light and a Lamp (Psalms 119:105; Leviticus 24:2-4)

* Word of YHWH – Is the Source of Faith (Romans 10:17; Hebrews 11:6)

* All the Words of YHWH – Is the Source of Life/Salvation (Deuteronomy 8:3; Matthew 4:4)

So, if the Biblical marriage model is given for all to see, what are the reasons? As indicated above, there are four major components to the marriage process. They are as follows:

Earthly Marriage Process	Spiritual Marriage Process
The father sets the dowry price – the father’s part.	YHWH as father of creation set the dowry price.
The dowry is paid by the husband to be – the husband-to-be’s part.	HaMashiyach paid the dowry price, with his shed blood.
The consummation act – the couple’s mutual part.	Believers enjoin with HaMashiyach via obeying the gospel by repenting, being water baptized and HaMashiyach infilling the believer.
The proof of chastity – the wife’s part.	The church makes her self ready, by remaining faithfully chaste to her espoused, keeping her lamp burning.

Each component above has a spiritual parallel, relative to the Body of HaMashiyach and therefore has great implications. The reason why most miss many of the truths in YHWH’s word relative to the “Mystery of HaMashiyach and the Church” is because the Biblical marriage model has all but disappeared including its inherent truths. Below is a little more in depth detail to the marriage process.

Familial/Bride Consent and Dowry Negotiations

When a man desired a woman as his wife, he first had to go to her father to see if his wish was possible. If so, they would begin a dowry price negotiation that would be paid to the father of the bride-to-be. If the husband-to-be truly wanted her he would be willing to pay nearly any price. Jacob labored for fourteen years to acquire Rachael (Genesis 29).

The Dowry Payment

Once a dowry payment amount was determined, the husband-to-be must perform it or lose his chance to marry the woman he desired. Furthermore, a man was not

allowed to have sex with a “free women” without first paying a dowry to her father, since the sex act constituted/consummated marriage. It was, by all intensive purposes, a purchase as well as prepaid alimony (Deuteronomy 22; Leviticus 22:13). Some scholars actually believe that it was merely a wife purchase rather than an included prepaid alimony.

Granted, it appears that a woman was property, and to some respect that was true. Even the word *baal* (transliteration) is the Hebrew word for **man's** in Genesis 20:3 (“...is a **man's** wife...” which means “having a master”. Even Sarah called her husband “lord”. But, once married, the husband was also legally bound to her, to care for her the rest of his life. He could not neglect her daily needs no matter how many wives he had.

As stated earlier a betrothed maid belonged to one man and could not be loosed from that betrothal other than by divorce or death. If she had sex (by consent) with anyone other than her husband-to-be, she was committing adultery and was considered a whore. If a man had sex with a betrothed woman without her consent it was rape and if she screamed out for help, she was exonerated and the man was to be stoned to death. If she did not scream out during this sex act, it was considered consent on her part. Then both the man and the woman was considered adulterers, and both were stoned to death (Deuteronomy 22:22).

If a virgin was betrothed and a man forced her sexually, and if she did not scream out, both were stoned, because she was betrothed, she was untouchable (Deuteronomy 22:23-24). However, if this virgin was not betrothed, the man must pay a set dowry (fifty shekals of silver) and he was forced to take her as his wife and he could never divorce her

his entire life (Deuteronomy 22:28-29), no matter what. If a damsel who is given in marriage as a virgin and was found to be a non-virgin, then she was stoned to death because she was considered a harlot and had fraudulently tried to pass herself off as a virgin (Deuteronomy 22:20-21).

The father of the virgin was to keep a portion or all of the money by virtue of investment, etc., since it would be the father that would have to take care of his daughter should she become divorced and be returned to his house, because if ever divorced, a woman was ineligible to remarry (until her husband's death), she was disgraced. The balance of the money was given to the wife and was worn as ornaments around the head or as a necklace, etc. This became her personal bank account. Men were never aloud to take possession of what a woman had on her person. It was her security. HaMashiyach's parable of the "lost coin" addresses the issue and importance of the coin (portion of the woman's dowry) if ever lost. This was the Judaic-HaMashiyachian culture.

What should seem curious to religious leaders, scholars and theologians is that most accept the notion of HaMashiyach paying the "bride" price for his "bride" (the church), but most disdain the principle relative to human marriage, or are ignorant of very relevant Biblical principle. If it is good enough for the patriarchs and good enough for HaMashiyach, should it not be good enough in modern times? Many cultures that still practice the dowry system have marriages that last longer than marriages in western cultures. There is something to be said about the psychological factors that imbue the dowry system.

The Consummation Act

Consummation was a critical and the concluding portion of the marriage process. Once the dowry was paid, then the couple could then celebrate their union by physical copulation as well as by wedding celebrations. Many families would conduct a wedding party that could last for days. But the wedding party (supper) was not the "consummation", it was a celebration of the union between a man and wife, the completion of the wedding process and the birth of a new life together.

The sexual act done between a non-adulterous man and a non-betrothed woman constitutes marriage not "fornication" (as believed by many "ministers" and "church" members), even though it was a social taboo. The sex act alone was a statement of contract between two parties (man and woman). However, to sidestep the important marriage contract betrothal process (i.e., the dowry system) was a serious breach of morality. The Mosaic Law required that if a man tried to bypass the marriage contract process, such a man would be forced to pay a fixed dowry fee to the father of the woman perpetrated, and the man was then never allowed to divorce his wife (Deuteronomy 22:19) in spite of said dowry payment or potential marital problems that may arise. The dowry payment in this case was more like a fine and/or penalty because of the neglect and avoidance of familial ethics and morays.

If the focal point of consummating the marriage is the marriage bed, then this must be discussed. Why? Keep in mind, not everyone could afford a "marriage supper". Only the well-to-do could afford to have such a celebration. Thus, even the poor were not prevented from marriage if they could not support a "marriage supper" because the

focus was the consummation, the union between the couple, not the "supper". This does not mean that most brides would not want a celebration, it just may not be possible for everyone. However, church's Bridegroom, HaMashiyach, owns the cattle on a thousand hills and will throw a GRAND MARRIAGE SUPPER OF THE LAMB.

Apostle Paul said that the marriage bed is undefiled (Hebrews 13:4). It is YHWH's divine gift of pleasure given to a husband and wife alone. Within the right context (marriage) it is intended for sheer ultimate pleasure and the medium of procreation. This verse can also imply that the marriage bed is to be kept undefiled, complete free from adultery, beastiality, fornication, and homosexuality.

SEX CONSTITUTES MARRIAGE, if done between two eligible individuals, not a marriage license. Every Biblical and historical reference in scripture reveals this truth. Marriage need not be confirmed by the presiding governmental law to make a sexual union between a man and woman a marriage. It has been one of Satan's tricks to skew YHWH's divine institution of marriage, to deceive the world into broad sweeping adultery. Even the U.S. government does not recognize co-habitation as marriage unless an act of consummation occurs. This is especially accentuated for those couples with one partner seeking a "green card".

YHWH INSTITUTED marriage, not the CHURCH, and not the GOVERNMENT. YHWH entrusted this marriage power to the family system to allow or disallow marriage via the marriage bed (the sex act) and was not granted to any other power or institution. And, marriages last, not because of a marriage license, but because of a commitment between a husband and wife and their moral views supported by

surrounding family system.

Recently in an NBC Nightly News broadcast (March 11, 2008) it was stated that at least 33% of all U.S. teenage girls already have sexually transmitted diseases (STD), indicating their sexual activity. This does not include those sexually active teen girls who have not yet contracted a STD and both of whom do not know they have already gotten married, since having sex IS marriage and NOT pre-marital sex. Pre-marital sex is a myth. There is no Biblical reference to support the idea of pre-marital sex, only marriage, if a virgin or adultery if she is not a virgin.

This means that many girls, who are getting “legally” married in modern times, if they are not a virgin upon said “legal marriage”, are not morally eligible for said unions. They already belong to another, the one who took their virginity. Sadly, this lack of knowledge has plunged the world (including the “Christian” community) into gross sin, namely adultery.

The Proof of Chastity

After the dowry is paid and the husband takes his bride to consummate their marriage, proof of chastity was quite important and was kept by the bride’s parents should their son-in-law ever attempt to disgrace their daughter (Deuteronomy 22:16-17). This proof of chastity was merely a bed cloth (or bed sheet) that was on the wedding bed the day/night of the couple’s consummation. When virginity is removed, it is common knowledge that a female bleeds, which ends up on the bed cloth. This bed cloth is then collected by the bride’s parents as proof of their daughter’s chastity. Even the Maccabese

Books provide records of the proof of chastity issue and how the parents of the bride provided/prepared the consummation (marriage) bed for the bride and groom.

LIFE AFTER MARRIAGE

The Bible is very clear on how a husband is to treat his wife once he has made her his wife. He is to love, protect, nurture and lay down his life for her as if it were his own body. HaMashiyyach is the perfect model. Study how he loved and behaved towards the church and that will guide the husband on how to behave towards his wife.

“From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.”

Ephesians 4:16

This principle of nurture, protection, comfort, etc. had its beginning in the Old Testament as recorded in Deuteronomy.

“When a man hath taken a new wife, he shall not go out to war, neither shall he be charged with any business: *but* he shall be free at home one year, and shall cheer up his wife which he hath taken.”

Deuteronomy 24:5

CONCLUSIONS

What is interesting to note is that there is little distinction between the two words Biblical words, Idolatry and Adultery. They are very close relatives. Any act of infidelity of a wife constitutes adultery, just as any idolatrous act, including a love for the world and the lusts thereof (the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life)

by a believer constitutes infidelity towards HaMashiyach, which is spiritual adultery. The church is the espoused husband of HaMashiyach (2 Corinthians 11:2; Revelation 19:7; 21:9) and must keep herself pure, chaste and lamps burning. Therefore, the only real distinction between the two is adultery is physical act of unfaithfulness by a human being against their spouse and idolatry is a spiritual act of unfaithfulness against YHWH.

This speaks to the jealousy of YHWH. This speaks to the necessity of avoidance of maltreatment to YHWH's wife; this speaks to the protection of YHWH's children; this speaks to the judgment promised upon those who touch YHWH's anointed, prophets, etc. More on this later.

Chapter

- 4 -

MARRIAGE, THE METAPHOR OF HAMASHIYACH AND THE CHURCH

INTRODUCTION

It is important to examine the scriptures to clarify what a marriage is. This is critical because the concepts of marriage, as well as wedding ceremonies, vary from country to country. Even though there are similarities among "Christian" (westernized) cultures and some consistencies, they are still done contrary to scripture. However, as will be shown, some cultures are more scripturally aligned than others.

BIBLICAL MARRIAGE

First of all, a marriage ceremony, which often involves clerics (ministers, priests, rabbis) is a modern tradition, introduced by the Catholic Church centuries ago. Early writings, both canonized and non-canonized, reveal that a marriage was complete only after the man and woman had copulated. It was NOT when a man and woman says "I do" to each other in front of a priest, rabbi, minister, or justice of the peace and/or when they then sign a "marriage license". The espousal contract, dowry payment, the marriage bed and the proof of chastity were the four focal points of a marriage.

Genesis accounts of marriage and even the canonized (canonized by some mainline churches, not by others--See the Oxford Annotated Bible) Tobit Chapters 7 & 8 clearly demonstrate the Divine concept of a man and woman being wed. It was the

marriage bed that was the key aspect. Even the parents of the bride assisted in the preparation of the marriage bed to assure that the sex act took place, which was the completion of an earlier contract between husband-to-be and the father of the bride-to-be. Certainly, when YHWH brought Eve to Adam, there was no priestly wedding ceremony, there was no government, no marriage license and so on. But, there was, none the less, a marriage. It was when Adam “knew” his wife (Genesis 4:1). This is how YHWH joins a husband and wife together, through the process of ownership and copulation (Matthew 19:6) and “let no man put them asunder”. This means by way of adultery or by way of “bills of divorce”. It is not the business or right of any other man to take another man’s wife by any method, i.e., a wife belongs to her husband (see Chapter 7), until death do them part.

A marriage license from the state gives unscriptural power and control to the government or to a carnal church polity. HaMashiyach never intended the clergy be a "lord over YHWH's" heritage". Therefore, marriage licenses and clerical marriages should be avoided and discontinued so the power of marriage will be returned to families. Does this sound radical, or politically incorrect? Absolutely. So why avoid it then? After all, this power truly belongs to the family and not to any other entity. And, Hellenistic laws in many countries will not allow more than one civil marriage anyway. And, rampant divorce clearly illustrates how the staying power is not in the obtaining of a government marriage license but in the social moral fabric of the family system.

The only advantage a marriage license affords a husband and wife is possible governmental tax advantages, and even that is waning. In many cases, a marriage license

gives Westernized “Christians” a false sense of “holiness” or “purity”. True, a couple may have secured a “civil marriage”, but a government has no divine power to make a marriage holy if it is already unholy. Did Adam and Eve (and all the other patriarchs) receive a marriage license to get married? Of course they did not. Did a Rabbi, Priest or Minister conduct a “wedding ceremony” for them? Of course that did not happen. Does this mean they were committing fornication, adultery or pre-marital sex when they copulated? Of course they did not to all three. Were they still married? Of course they were. Was it a holy marriage? Of course it was. But notice the false power and assumptions of magistrates, churches and governments that create unfounded authority as well as guilt if the marriage is not sanctioned by them, an institution they did not create and an institution they have no genuine authority over.

The advantages of a marriage license are all in favor of external entities, government, insurance companies, etc. and all said advantages pertain to money and unscriptural control. If “Christians” followed a more Biblical model and its principles, none of these issues would be of any concern. To avoid marriage licenses and revert back to Biblical methods disarms unscriptural governmental power and is, therefore, recommended. A public revolt is not necessary, nor is it recommended. Simply follow the Biblical model. However, this cannot and will not work without the proper breadth of understanding.

The wedding supper (as discussed in the Bible) was one of celebration, celebrating an earlier marriage (consummation). The ceremony followed the dowry agreement, its immediate or eventual payment and the marriage bed (copulation). Thus,

the wedding ceremony was truly and rightfully a celebration!

Consequently, the Biblical patriarchal model (especially polygamy) more accurately reflects the "Mystery of HaMashiyach and the Church" than does the Westernized view. HaMashiyach bought his bride (comprised of multiple unified members) with the most expensive dowry ever paid, HIS own shed blood (Acts 20:28; 1 Corinthians 6:20; Ruth 4:10). The Church, a collective group of individuals referred to as a singular wife, is now his purchased (espoused) Bride. The wedding supper of the Lamb is a celebration of the church's spiritual espousal, dowry payment via Calvary and the spiritual union, consummated by a spirit infilling.

A revisit to one of HaMashiyach's parables, found in Matthew 25, concerning ten virgins waiting for their bridegroom to return, five were foolish and five were wise. The word *nymphious* (transliteration) is a Greek word translated into English as bridegroom, which means a new husband. The fact that there were ten virgins is indicative of the plurality of the church, many unified members, which certainly parallels between a polygamous marriage and the Kingdom of Heaven. They were all "virgins", symbolic of the initial chastity of all of them. Ten individual female virgins (symbolic of believers—the Church) were anticipating the return of their new husband (HaMashiyach), who would make good on his marriage vows, who was away preparing a place for his bride (John 14:2-3).

It is doubtful that the husband had ten different marriages, per se. However, this is unknown since the scriptures are silent on this matter and is quite irrelevant. What is known, however, is that the five wise virgins went in together with their bridegroom

(husband) into ONE grand wedding banquet (NIV). The reason why banquet is known to be a proper translations of the Greek word *gamos* (transliteration), which the KJV translates it to mean “wedding” and the NIV translates it to banquet, is because, the Book of Revelation calls this event the “marriage supper” (supper or feast) and this is in keeping with the Biblical model and the culture of the day.

Yes, that is right, TEN different virgins to ONE husband, but 50% of the church (five virgins) did not remain faithful. It is unclear if 50% is indicative of an exact percentage, but it certainly indicates a significant departure from chastity. This is not a percentage of the entire world of “Christendom” since most of them were never properly enjoined with HaMashiyach in the first place. HaMashiyach concluded his Matthew 25 parable of the ten virgins with a warning, saying, “Keep watch, because you do not know the day or the hour.”

The espoused virgins in this parable, taught by HaMashiyach, illustrates that those who were faithful reaped the anticipated blessings. Those virgins that remained chaste and dedicated to wait for their husband’s return, for as long as it would take, and stayed prepared for that said eternal joining with their husband, found joy. But for those who were less inclined to be "faithful", and let their lamps burn out, were left out. The patience and sincere devotion of the wise virgins metaphorically illustrates the depth of their sincerity, the quality of their faith, the commitment to their espoused husband, embracing the very words of YHWH as life itself. Those with less oil proved to be undeserving and uncommitted for marriage and were thus "put away".

The true patriarchal marriage system is to be one of joy where one or many

women can be married to one man who honors their "head", just as multitudes of believers can honor, adore, and love their husband, their head, who is HaMashiyach and without jealousies, factions or disunity. In fact, the adoration is so great believers wish others to be united to him as well so they may share the bountiful love endowed upon his beloved. It is to be a joyous and intimate eternal relationship, where no spiritual adultery, fornication, etc. will ever occur, with one husband who is extremely "jealous" and protective of His "bride", whom He purchased with a great price.

Apostle Paul strongly promoted the same analogy of the "Mystery of HaMashiyach and the Church" by comparing it to the patriarchal marriage of husband and wife. He, too, refers to "wife" as singular, even though the church is comprised of a multitude of people. The Church is espoused to one husband, who is HaMASHIYACH, whom the "wife" loves, honors, and adores. And she is to be eternally joined with her husband.

Apostle Paul wrote:.

"...that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead..."

Romans 7:4

"...for I have espoused you to one husband; that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ."

2 Corinthians 11:2

"This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church."

Ephesians 5:32

Mark recorded the words of HaMashiyach regarding himself,

"But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away..."

Mark 2:20

John wrote,

"...as a bride adorned for her husband."

Revelation 21:2

"And the spirit and the bride say, come..."

Revelation 22:17

Peter wrote,

"For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls. Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands..."

1 Peter 3:1

In another place John wrote,

"... Come hither, I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife."

Revelation 21:9

The above scriptures can be summed up in the following laymen terms. Just as the collective bride (the church) is purchased (redeemed) with a great dowry (HaMashiyach's shed blood) from the shame of being husbandless (no hope of eternal salvation with HaMashiyach), so in like manner let every natural wife learn from this great spiritual model planned from the very beginning of the world and submit to the

directions and wishes of their bridegroom, who will in turn love, protect and provide for his bride.

Just as every true Neo-Jew (believer) wants to know the desires and wishes of the Lord so that they may please him in everything by being obedient, so should every "wife" follow this ultimate spiritual model of HaMashiyach and the Church. Unfortunately, Satan has made a brash attempt to destroy the patriarchal family system in the minds of every female in the world, by polluting them with feminism, and monogamy-only ideations. Why? To destroy the DIVINE concept of HaMashiyach and the Church, YHWH's "dream come true", spending eternity with his corporate "wife". But, this female deception is not new. It started in the Garden of Eden and has its origin in witchcraft (the roots of the Hebrew words translated into "subtle" and "beguiled"). YHWH is not pleased because it runs totally contrary to the Biblical model.

The continued usage of the husband-wife union metaphor (and model), of HaMashiyach and the Church, used by HaMashiyach himself while he taught on earth was not a new concept. The prophets of Old made the same metaphorical comparison.

"For thy maker is thine husband: ... For the Lord hath called thee as a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit, and a wife of youth..."

Isaiah 54:5-6

"...as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall thy YHWH rejoice over thee."

Isaiah 62:5

"... I remember thee, the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals, when thou wentest after me in the wilderness, in a land that was not sown...Israel..."

Jeremiah 2:2-3

"...backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce, yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also. ... And yet for all this her treacherous sister Judah hath not turned unto me with her whole heart..."

Jeremiah 3:8-10

"...for I am married unto you..."

Jeremiah 3:14

"And the names of them were Aholah the elder, and Aholibah her sister: and they were mine, ... Thus were their names; Samaria is Aholah, and Jerusalem Aholibah."

Ezekiel 23:4

(NOTE: Read the entire chapter of Ezekiel 23, it is very enlightening)

It is interesting to note that in the New Testament HaMashiyach dealt with the Ezekiel 23 issue when he addressed the woman at the well in Samaria. What did he actually mean by:

"...Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him."

John 4:21-23

HaMashiyach was addressing the history of Israel and Samaria, how they both

wanted to love their spiritual husband (YHWH) but did so separately. Samaria loved YHWH more ignorantly than did Jerusalem. However, YHWH wanted love from them both in a "spirit" of "oneness", in a united way. He prophetically told of how the two would come together as one household once again to "worship" YHWH different than before, with full spirit and knowledge. In this he fore spoke of a reunited Israel (Judah and the other Ten Tribes); a reuniting of Israel and Samaria under one roof; of a uniting of the "whole" Israel and the Church under one roof; of a reunited Church come together in the unity of the faith under one roof together as a "whole" commonwealth of Israel, worshipping YHWH in spirit and in truth as a "wife" joined with her husband.

This thread of truth regarding Israel and the Church, unified as "ONE", loving and worshipping YHWH in HaMashiyach as a spiritual husband and how the church should approach her husband, can be traced throughout the entire Bible. The CHURCH is truly YHWH's eternal dream come true. The doctrine of the mystery of HaMashiyach and the church is to be analogous with a natural husband-wife relationship. Remember, the mystery of HaMashiyach and the church preceded any human marriage event on earth, so by understanding the spiritual truth of HaMashiyach and the church, one can better understand how a marriage in human reality should compare, not the other way round; it will teach a husband how to be a godly husband; it will teach a wife how to be a godly wife.

Another analogy (among several) Apostle Paul used to explain the Church was a human BODY... the Body of HaMashiyach, comprised of many members, working together in harmony following the directions given by the "head". A unified body

working in harmony for common causes and purposes, the way the wife (should she be one or many) is to conduct herself toward her husband and the way the husband is to conduct himself towards his wife.

What did the Physician Luke recorded on this subject,

"...Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?

Acts 9:4

Notice HaMashiyach said "thou me", not "the saints" or "the Neo-Jews". Why? Because when "two" are joined they become one. The Body of HaMashiyach is HaMashiyach's corporate wife, his own body. The "body" is no longer self-owned but becomes one with the husband. In the natural sense, when a husband copulates with his wife, the two become one. This is why if a man copulates with a harlot or an adulteress, the man and the harlot/adulteress become one and he enjoins her sin and he becomes what she is.

"Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of HaMashiyach, and make them members of a harlot? YHWH forbid. What! Know ye not that he which is joined to a harlot is one body? for two, saith he, shall be one flesh. But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit."

1 Corinthians 6:15-17

This is the same reason why the church must be without spot or wrinkle, why it must be chaste, HaMashiyach will not join himself a harlot, a sinner. Notice three important aspects found in the above analogy relative to the ultimate spiritual example of HaMashiyach and the Church:

1. The term "members" is plural signifying many, multiple.
2. It takes many members (body parts) to make a healthy "body".

3. The joining of any "two" (female with a man) constitutes oneness, whether is be moral or immoral.

Apostle Paul used this ultimate truth, HaMashiyach and the Church, to explain why men should not have sex with harlots (who are women that are not lawfully available for sex). Having sex with harlots causes them to become as one just as the oneness that already exists between the husband and his "lawful" wife or wives. This pollutes the husband and transforms him into a "harlot" as well. So in order to keep pure, husbands are to only have sexual relations with those women who are lawfully available, and who will then become a member in particular of his "body", his singular or collective "wife".

"Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular."

1 Corinthians 12:27

In 1 Corinthians 12, it can be seen where many members are considered as "one" working together in unity and with sameness of purpose. There are some that say that the word "two" signifies that a man can only have one woman, because, otherwise two is no more two but three, four, etc. However, from obvious scriptural analogies and other blatant Biblical accounts, this is not the case. It merely means that when one man copulates with a woman, the "two" are forever joined as one. If she is wife two (or more), she becomes part of the corporate wife. The "wife" (whether she be one or many) no longer belongs to herself, but to her husband in the same manner as Neo-Jews are "not their own" but are purchased and enjoined unto HaMashiyach via Spirit infilling who, by so doing, have joined the ranks of HaMashiyach's corporate wife.

"What know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's."

1 Corinthians 6:19-20

Notice that this scripture is in the same context regarding copulating with a woman (harlot). Certainly, no marriage ceremony with priests and bridesmaids come to the copulation ceremony of a harlot and a man. It is usually clandestinely done. However, whether done in secret or in the open, the sex act still constitutes marriage in YHWH's eyes and therefore creates "oneness", and if it is with a harlot, then the sin of the harlot is enjoined. Such a man becomes a sinner and must repent and separate from the harlot forever, for she belongs to some another man.

The word "two" represents two parties (entities), i.e., one husband (singular) and one "wife", whether comprised of one or many members. The same is true with the word usage of "church" (YHWH's corporate wife). It is used in a singular sense although all of Christendom knows that the church is comprised of many members in particular.

YHWH, who made man in his image, instilled in man the same natural desires regarding his "wife", whether she is comprised of one female or many. To find a "wife" in the true sense is the hope of every man. It would be his "dream come true". He desires and hopes for the same dynamic with her as HaMashiyach does with the Church.

A GOOD HUSBAND

From the scriptural model of HaMashiyach and the church, one can draw conclusions of how a husband should conduct himself towards his wife. A husband who

practices the scriptural model will behave towards his wife in the following ways, but certainly not limited to:

1. He will give his life for his wife (John 10:15; Galatians 2:20).
2. He will protect, provide, bless and guide his wife (Psalms 61:3; 78:24-27).
3. He will be jealous over his wife with a Godly jealousy (Deuteronomy 4:24).
4. He will provide for her adornment/perfection her. (Ephesians 4:11-12; Revelation 19:7)

Read the Book of Solomon. It provides helpful analogies of HaMashiyach and the Church as well as how a husband should behave towards his wife. Granted, the Biblical record is not an exhaustive history book and therefore only gives limited information, but it certainly provides enough to clearly identify righteous social behavior. The husband is to be the leader, protector and provider. After all, the stronger sex drive is within the male's nature and he is physically stronger to protect "the weaker vessel" (1 Peter 3:7).

As indicated earlier, the Bible is very clear on how a husband is to treat his wife once he has made her his wife. He is love, protect, nurture and lay down his life for her as if it were his own body. HaMashiyach is the perfect model. Study how he loved and behaved towards the church and that will guide the husband on how to behave towards his wife.

"From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

Ephesians 4:16

This principle of nurture, protection, comfort, etc. had its beginning in the Old

Testament as recorded in Deuteronomy.

“When a man hath taken a new wife, he shall not go out to war, neither shall he be charged with any business: *but* he shall be free at home one year, and shall cheer up his wife which he hath taken.”

Deuteronomy 24:5

Spiritual Meanings

As already indicated in Chapter One, there is a direct parallel between the spiritual model and the physical natural marriage.

HaMashiyach as the Head of the Church: This does not mean that the Church is headless or that somehow HaMashiyach is attached (or sewn) to a body as its anatomical head. The term is a metaphor implying the following meanings:

1. Leader/Guide/Law Giver
2. Protector
3. Provider
4. Adorner
5. Companion/Friend

What is the beauty/attraction of the Husband: This does not mean an anatomical physical beauty, but parallels it in the following ways: His ability to exhibit the above five attributes.

A GOOD WIFE

From the scriptural model of HaMashiyach and the church, one can also draw conclusions of how a wife should conduct herself towards her husband. There are three ways a wife should behave toward her husband according to the Biblical model (and is

the way every husband hopes she will):

1. She is to be proactive:

She is to “enter into his gates”... (Psalms 100:4); to “seek ye first”... (Matthew 6:33); to “Draw nigh to God and he WILL draw nigh to you” (James 4:8); to “...love the Lord thy God” (Deuteronomy 6:5); to “...have no graven image...” (Leviticus 26:1); to ... “come unto me...”(Matthew 11:28); to “...adorn...” herself and make herself ready (Revelation 19:7; 2 Corinthians 7:1); and so on.

2. She is to be interactive:

She is to chose “...the best part” (Luke 10:42); to “... learn of me...” (Matthew 11:29); to not have “...power over her own body, but the husband... (1 Corinthians 7:4);

3. She is to be reactive:

As his spirit blesses, we laugh, cry, enjoy, bathe in his presence, etc.; in his presence there is fullness of joy (Psalms 16:11).

The way for a wife to be all she can be is to do so in "spirit" and in "truth". She can have the right attitude (spirit) and knowledge (truth) by studying the scriptural model. The wife's spirit and approach to her husband should be in the same order as shown above as well as with the same content. Every example of Israel or the Church (HIS wife) reflects this model. The prophets frequently presented YHWH's (the husband's) desires of how he wanted his WIFE to behave toward HIM.

Spiritual Meanings

As already indicated in Chapter One, there is a direct parallel between the spiritual model and the physical natural marriage.

The Body of HaMashiyach as the Wife of the HaMashiyach: This does not mean that church is the anatomical body of HaMashiyach. Again, the term is a metaphor implying the following meanings:

1. The Wife (individual and corporate-the church) of HaMashiyach
2. The Follower (individual and corporate-the church) of HaMashiyach
3. The Co-heir (individual and corporate-the church) of HaMashiyach
4. The Co-laborer (individual and corporate-the church) of HaMashiyach
5. The Child Bearer (individual and corporate-the church) of HaMashiyach
6. The Nurturer of Offspring (Kingdom Expansion)
7. The Faithful Companion/Friend (individual and corporate-the church) of HaMashiyach

What is the beauty/attraction of the Wife: This does not mean an anatomical physical beauty, but parallels it in here ability to exhibit the above seven attributes as follow:

1. Her symmetry relative to her eyes, nose, mouth, hearing and hair
2. Her spirit/personality
3. Her femininity (follower, submissiveness, worshipper, child bearer ability, etc.)
4. Her chastity (faithful companion, avoid idolatry/adultery)
5. Her adornment

The anti-HaMashiyach attempts to subvert, circumvent and imposter against individuals and/or the corporate wife to allure her away from her husband, to strengthen his own evil kingdom and destroy/dissolve the Kingdom of righteousness. Satan's methods employ the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, all of which are false hopes and false security and the pleasures offered are only for a season. Satan attempts to lure her into idolatry (adultery) by dangling the twinkle and pleasures of sin. But this temptation is for but a season. In exchange for her temporal pleasure, she must surrender her eternal hope.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the scriptures provide more than ample information on what a marriage is and how a husband and wife should behave toward each other. If ministers and church members alike would follow these Biblical teachings, many of the marriage, family and social problems would disappear. It is not that “Christians” are unaware that the Bible has something to say on this subject, but they lack the understanding of its importance (salvific in nature), validity and meanings. Although the responsibility lies with each believer to diligently search the scriptures to know the truth, it is as equally important for the ministry to tell the truth and accurately guide the body of HaMashiyach.

Chapter

- 5 -

DIVORCE AND ADULTERY

INTRODUCTION

Divorce and adultery is rampant everywhere around the world, higher than ever before. With this serious social and sinful problem becoming worse, it is high time to seriously analyze the scriptures and see what it really says. The U.S. government is beginning to take a look at it, but this is mostly economically driven. In other words, they are mostly concerned because of the negative impact divorce (and all of its ripples) has on the American economy.

DIVORCE

The scriptures teach that there is only one reason for which divorce is allowed and that is adultery/fornication, i.e., marital unfaithfulness, to act the harlot, indulge in unlawful lust. As indicated earlier, fornication is not premarital sex. There is really no such thing as premarital sex. That is a modern idea and an unbiblical one. Fornication is perverted sexual behavior, which includes sex with whores, repetitive adultery, sex with prostitutes, sex with animals, (Jeremiah 3:8) orgies, homosexuality, lesbianism, etc.

HaMashiach said:

"It hath been said that whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and

whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery."

Matthew 5:31-32

In other places HaMashiyach said,

"They say unto him, 'Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorce, and put her away?' He saith unto them, 'Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.'"

Matthew 19:7-9

Right after HaMashiyach made the above statement, the disciples thought this was too difficult to comply with and perhaps a man was better off not getting married. To answer their comment, HaMashiyach recommended emasculation for those with the desire to be celibate for the Kingdom of YHWH's sake.

Mark recorded HaMashiyach's words on this subject as follows,

"And he saith unto them, 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.'"

Mark 10:11-12

Physician Luke recorded these words,

"Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from *her* husband committeth adultery."

Luke 16:18

Apostle Paul disclosed his familiarity of the Law as follows,

"For the woman which hath a husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man."

Romans 7:2-3

In other places HaMashiyach said,

"Ye have heard it said by them of old time, 'Thou shalt not commit adultery.' But I say unto you, 'That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.'"

Matthew 5:27-28

"And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail. Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery."

Luke 16:17-18

It is quite obvious that what Moses allowed and what HaMashiyach allowed were quite different. The era of Moses was merely parenthetic, regarding divorce.

HaMashiyach called for a revival of YHWH's true morality on the issue of marriage and divorce, which was actually more stringent than under the Law of Moses.

In quite blunt and simple terms, if a wife has not fornicated, she cannot be divorced (Old or New Testament), period. Furthermore, divorce was not a choice given to the wife. She did not have the authority to divorce her husband, in general. However, if the husband did fornicate, he was not divorced but stoned for his sin making his wife a widow and free to remarry. Of course in modern times, there is no death penalty for adultery, so the only recourse for such a woman, whose husband committed fornication,

and if she wanted to be free, would be divorce (a spiritual death) making here a widow, in YHWH's eyes.

What about if a man physically abuses his wife or children (unprovoked)? First of all, no true believer would do such a thing, for there is no Biblical teaching that promotes or tolerates a husband to beat his wife. However, if it does occur, even once, it is best for the wife to get help and separate from her husband until her husband repents and gets personal help from YHWH and perhaps a good Neo-Jewish therapist. If he chooses to live the life of a sinner, the wife should remain separate until he decides he does not want his wife anymore and commits adultery or fornication. Thereupon, she is free to remarry, but only in the Lord. Apostle Paul also wrote this on the subject,

“And unto the married I command, *yet not I, but the Lord*, Let not the wife depart from *her* husband: ¹¹ But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to *her* husband: and let not the husband put away *his* wife. ¹² But to the rest speak I, not the Lord: If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away.”

1 Corinthians 7:10-12

If a person is rightfully divorced, the divorced party is scripturally bound to live a life of celibacy. This sounds dreadful but it is actually merciful, since celibacy is by far a better choice than being stoned or burned to death and/or not making it into heaven. Every time a man or woman has unlawful sex, they are committing fornication (adultery, etc.) or causing someone else to do so. And HaMashiyach said that if one causes someone else to sin (offend) is worse than never being born. It is a serious offense.

The innocent (righteous) party is free to remarry (since technically the

unrighteous divorced party would be dead according to the “law”) because the requirement of "death do us part" has been lifted. Therefore, remarriage in this case is permissible and does not make the innocent party an adulterer nor does he/she cause another to commit adultery.

If a polygamist puts away any one of his wives without just cause and marries another, he too is an adulterer. He can never further marry, the same as if he had only one wife. If he did marry another after that, all his wives would be free to divorce their adulterous husband and be free to remarry, since they would be free from the law of their husband (he would be technically dead, under the “law”).

In conclusion, one must ask, “Why did Apostle Paul allow divorce and remarriage under a circumstance that was not due to fornication or adultery?” Paul wrote this,

"But to the rest speak I, not the Lord: If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which hath a husband that believeth not, and if she be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him...but if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases: but YHWH hath called us to peace. For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? or how knowest thou O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?"

1 Corinthians 7:12-16

First of all, it was not a command from the Lord, it was Apostle Paul's opinion being expressed, which is so indicated in the scriptures. Nonetheless, if Paul did teach something that seems to contradict what Yahushua HaMashiyach taught, then there must be an explanation. Apostle Paul was extrapolating on the grounds of being "unequally yoked", i.e., being married to an unbeliever. In the Jewish mind, this would be no

different than a Jewish man marrying a "strange wife" or a Jewish woman, marrying a "strange husband" or a Jewish man or woman marrying an idolater. That was a real taboo. It was simply unlawful.

In Paul's teachings, he was simply trying to anticipate the salvation of an unsaved spouse. He was trying to encourage the wife or husband to wait and see if the unsaved spouse would get saved. If, however, it was very clear that this was not going to happen, and especially if the unsaved spouse desires to be divorced from their saved partner (regardless of the absence of sexual sin) then Apostle Paul said, don't resist the divorce and go ahead and let the unsaved partner divorce you and then remarry an eligible Neo-Jewish partner. His/her partner then becomes "dead" making the believer spouse a widower or widow.

In essence, the marriage between an unbeliever and a believer is a sexual sin, much like being married to a fornicator. Why? Fornication, adultery, idolatry, etc. are very close relatives, and unsaved people are considered idolaters (2 Corinthians 6:14-16). Granted, Apostle Paul was talking about more than just marriage here, but it was a broad sweeping principle which would include marriage. Nonetheless, to be married to an idolater is similar to having sex with an idolatrous prostitute or whore and this union causes the believer to be joined with the sin of the prostitute or whore. So, in this case, and since sex is MARRIAGE, to remain married to an unbeliever would create an unholy marriage, assuming of course that the unsaved spouse remained unsaved up to the point the unsaved spouse divorced his/her saved spouse. This is Apostle Paul's opinion, since he could find no real scripture or specific guidance from HaMashiach regarding this

scenario. It is merely an extrapolation of the moral law, and one could certainly argue that Paul was right on track.

The New Testament teachings on marriage and divorce predominately came from the Old Testament, with the exception of HaMashiyach's correction on divorce relative to the parenthetical Mosaic Law. If one follows the single Messianic Covenant ordinance, then one would easily see and willingly conform to the morality surrounding the teachings on marriage and divorce. Fortunately, if one gets it wrong, they are given the grace and opportunity to get it right, without the same immediate penalties of the law.

ADULTERY

As learned earlier, adultery is when a man has sex with a "married" (or espoused) woman or if a "married" (or espoused) woman has sex with a man other than her own husband. There is no other definition, period. If an innocent partner married to a fornicator wants to divorce their spouse on the above grounds, then according to Yahushua HaMashiyach, it is allowed.

Furthermore, when a partner has been sexually sinful, it is virtually impossible to repair the marriage trust, which is so critical to make a marriage successful. For those who sincerely doubt their ability to completely forgive their guilty partner, then the aggrieved partner should divorce the guilty party and be done with it, the quicker the divorce, the better. This will help one to avoid some unnecessary pain and hardship. However, divorce is never easy or pretty but it is scripturally allowed since YHWH understands this sin very well. He was able to forgive Israel just as HE forgives believers

when they commit spiritual adultery (as long as it is not premeditated and willful). But it was clearly not easy. Read the prophets.

It appears from scripture that virginity (and chastity) was the female's side of the obligation and authority and responsibility was on the male's side of the obligation. For example, Jesus said,

"And Jesus answered and said unto them, ... 'Whosoever shall put away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.'"

Mark 10:5-12

Take notice that a man had a greater condemnation if he puts away his wife than if a woman puts away her husband. And this text, of course, implies that both did so without a cause. Both, then, are guilty of sin but if a man puts away his wife he is superimposing adultery upon her, which is a greater sin, whereas the wife is merely committing adultery against herself. If a man causes another to sin he would better off not to have been born, he should have a millstone tied about his neck and be cast into the sea (Matthew 18:6; Mark 9:42; Luke 17:2).

HaMashiach came to a wicked, perverse, and adulterous generation (Mark 8:38), particularly among his own people. Men (and perhaps women) were putting away their spouses "without a cause" plunging innocent women into adultery as well as themselves. He came to set the record straight. He laid it down very strict. HE confirmed that there is only one reason a person can put away his/her spouse, and that is for marital unfaithfulness only. Polygamy was not one of those justified reasons because polygamy

was not a sexual sin so long as his wives were either a virgin or a widow (except in the case of a bishop or elder where stricter rules apply).

If your spouse is not rightfully yours, then you must get right before YHWH, and still remain responsible to your social obligations if there be any. If your wife was not a virgin (or a “widow”) when you consummated, then you are probably committing adultery. If your husband is an “adulterer” then you are committing adultery by being with him. If your husband refuses to take care of you as his wife and continually commits adultery, then you are free to be remarried to a new husband because you would be considered a “widow” (not literally, but in essence since adulterers are to be lawfully “put to death”), so long as he is rightly available for marriage and a believer.

“They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. ⁵ Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou? ⁶ they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him. But Jesus stooped down, and with *his* finger wrote on the ground, *as though he heard them not.* ⁷ So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her. ⁸ And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground. ⁹ And they which heard *it*, being convicted by *their own* conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, *even unto the last:* and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst. ¹⁰ When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? ¹¹ , No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more.”

John 8:4-11

John records an incident where HaMashiyach was challenged by the Pharisees with an actual adulterous scenario to see what his response would be. Instead HaMashiyach ignored them and wrote on the ground. Eventually, he responded to their continual asking, which caused them all to leave one by one. After all her accusers had

gone, HaMashiyach said to the woman caught in the very act of adultery, “Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more.” HaMashiyach forgave, but did not condone her behavior, but instead, gave her another chance at life, a chance to get it right. He said, “Go and sin no more”, meaning stop committing adultery. It is wrong and always has been wrong but HaMashiyach gave life, another chance to stop committing adultery and correct a lifestyle gone awry. Do not wait, there is no promise of tomorrow.

There are many verses in Proverbs that warns about being seduced into adultery and the consequences of it.

“So he that goeth in to his neighbour's wife; whosoever toucheth her shall not be innocent . . . ³² *But* whoso committeth adultery with a woman lacketh understanding: he *that* doeth it destroyeth his own soul.”

Proverbs 6:29-32

There are many more such verses scattered throughout Proverbs. It is highly recommended to review Proverbs in light of this discussion.

In review, keep in mind that what the civil law says about marriage and divorce does not trump what YHWH's moral law teaches, which predates the Mosaic Law. The discussion here is from the Biblical perspective, not the civil perspective. Paul's writings on the matter, clearly teach that a woman can only be remarried if she is a “widow” (literally or abstractly). This means that should an unsaved spouse decide to leave (divorce) a saved spouse (so long as the divorce is not for other sexual sins), since this falls under the issue of Israelites (or Christians) not being allowed to wed non-Israelites (the parallel for believers is 1 Corinthians 6:15-20; 2 Corinthians 6:15—this verse also

applies to more than just marriage), unless one becomes a proselyte, then remarriage is not allowed. The believing spouse becomes a “widow or widower.

Un-proselytized people (unbelievers) are considered idolaters/spiritual adulterers. Why is this important? To be wed to an idolater causes one to enjoin the sins of the idolater (but this becomes complex to extrapolate, perhaps later), which can be many. And idolatry itself is a form of spiritual adultery, not to mention the many other types of sins that may apply here.

Paul does not suggest a forced divorce in the case of saved people married to unsaved individuals, since he taught that the saved spouse can "win" (1 Corinthians 7:12-14) the unsaved spouse to the faith. In fact, if a saved spouse does decide to divorce an unsaved spouse, the saved divorcing spouse must remain unmarried or be reconciled to the spouse (1 Corinthians 7:10-11) because the “death” principle applies (1 Corinthians 7:39-40). But, in the event that an unsaved spouse divorces his/her saved spouse, the saved divorced spouse is free (1 Corinthians 7:15) to remarry (to only a saved person who is lawfully eligible for marriage), even though the unsaved spouse is still physically alive. In other words, the saved spouse cannot force a conversion on the unsaved spouse who decides to live in sin and decides to divorce his/her righteous spouse. Thus, the unbeliever (non-Jew, parallel) rule applies. The forced divorce by the unsaved spouse upon the saved spouse frees him/her by an abstract “death”, which makes the saved spouse an abstract widow/widower.

Recall that Joseph did not seek to have Mary put to death, but was planning to put her away privately, i.e., divorce her (perhaps a more humane approach, more fitting for

the Messianic era). Remember, Joseph believed that Mary was unfaithful, even though they were only espoused, but espousal was the same thing as being married, relative to any sexual activity by the espoused wife. Therefore, Joseph could rightfully put her away (divorce her, or have her stoned), that is, if she was in fact guilty of adultery.

The same is the case with the woman caught in the very act of adultery. Yahushua avoided the death penalty to give her a chance at life, a chance to get it right. She was forgiven, but was instructed to go and sin no more. Yahushua also indicated that her present husband was not her true husband, undoubtedly because her true husband was still alive. It is likely that her true husband was a good Jewish man and Yahushua was indirectly telling her to return to him.

Within the same thread of principles, this explains why David collected one of his wives (2 Samuel 3:13-15), who had long lived with another man by the hand of her father (his father-in-law), King Saul (1 Samuel 25:44). When he had the authority to do so, he had Ish-Bosheth give orders to collect her since David had already paid the dowry for her according to preset dowry payment arrangements (1 Samuel 18:20-27) made between David and her father, King Saul. Remember, marriage is a family institution, not a government institution and it is not a church institution.

Although death is no longer adjudicated for the sin of adultery and/or fornication, since the times of the Mosaic Law, as previously observed (relative to all the lengthy rituals, ceremonies, killings, etc.), YHWH's laws (moral law) still apply, except that they are applied to the heart and mind that are supposed to dictate behaviors. Granted, death is a good deterrent to adultery, but a greater deterrent is when YHWH's laws are written in

the hearts and minds of people's very beings/souls. And if so, then people will behave accordingly because of their love (relationship) for the divine (and his righteousness), the love they have for their fellows and the love they have for themselves (See Disciples of Christ Volume 1).

Yahushua said that the only allowable act that permits divorce (Matthew 5:28, 32; 19:9) is adultery ((or fornication, in another place (Matthew 19:19), which includes incest, etc.)). And, lawful divorce is the alternative to death. And death makes the righteous spouse a "widow", and, therefore, makes him/her eligible for remarriage. Although death for adultery was allowable (still is in some non-westernized countries), it is not recommended. By HaMashiyach's example, the alternative method should be utilized, i.e., divorce--a second chance at life, a chance to get it right. And since divorce is essentially the gracious humane way to execute the abstract "death penalty", the freed innocent spouse is an abstract "widow". Granted, Paul did not use the exact terms but the same principle applies. His audience was quite keen and knowledgeable on the Law relative to marriage, divorce, sexual sins, etc. because Paul was a Hebrew of Hebrews and taught the Tanakh subjects well (N.T. was not yet canonized).

Even under the Law, YHWH wanted men and women to live in love, mercy, (Mathew 23:23) etc., the weightier matters of the Law, but without the Holy Ghost, their focus became legalistic. Unfortunately, even many that are filled with the Holy Ghost, resist the leading Spirit of YHWH and break YHWH's moral law and/or often live harshly (legalistically) or abandon the moral law on this matter altogether.

So how is divorce an abstract death penalty? If one examines the principles of

divorce, the unsaved spouse, the one doing the unlawful divorcing of their spouse, and (here is the key) marries another, intensifies their own sin (digs the hole deeper) and the crime against the innocent spouse (Mark 10:11; Matthew 5:32; 19:9). Furthermore, the divorcer (saved or unsaved) who unlawfully divorces his/her spouse is banned (forbidden) from marrying anyone else, ever again. Of course, usually they do and thus are entrapped in a never ending cycle of sexual sins, an eternal death penalty.

Sometimes, when reading these verses it can seem a little confusing, but let's take a little more systematic approach.

1. If a spouse (husband or wife) divorces their spouse without just (lawful) cause, and marries another (this is the operative phrase), the divorcer commits adultery against his divorced spouse (by Biblical definition, not civil definition).
2. If someone marries a divorced woman/man (whether for a just cause or otherwise and the divorced man/woman's spouse is still alive) the incoming spouse commits adultery since he/she is not allowed to marry the divorced person (by Biblical definition, not civil definition).
3. If someone marries a person who was divorced because of their faith, whose former spouse is an idolatry, sinner, etc., etc., it is allowed (the divorced person is an abstract widow/widower) (by Biblical definition, not civil definition).
4. If a man marries a widow (whether by actual death or abstract death), it is allowed (by Biblical definition, not civil definition).
5. If a woman marries a widower (whether by actual death or abstract death), it is allowed (by Biblical definition, not civil definition).
6. If a woman marries a man (even if he has more than one wife lawfully) and he is not an adulterer, it is allowed (by Biblical definition, not civil definition).
7. Divorce is not allowed among saved spouses, unless adultery/fornication applies (by Biblical definition, not civil definition).
8. A father, who rapes his daughter, is certainly not a saved person. It is a sin equal to murder, carrying the same punishment (by Biblical definition, not civil definition).
9. If a man (not an incest issue) rapes a woman without her consent (the Biblical definition), they are not a saved person. It is a grave sin equal to murder, carrying the same punishment (by Biblical definition, not civil definition).
10. Thus in the two cases above (8 & 9) the woman is free to remarry. YHWH does not actually demand that an execution (physical death) takes place for the technicality to apply. In other words, if someone breaks the law, whether they are caught or not or whether they are punished or not, it does not change the fact that

the crime was committed and all the lawful punishments apply, even if not executed. What is done is done.

11. In other words, punishment in the here and now is not the focus, having life and getting it right is the focus. However, neglecting the chance to get it right will generate a severe price on judgment day.

The Jews, prior to and up to HaMashiyach, practiced an expanded divorce method, because of the “hardness of their hearts”, but Yahushua came to downsize the practice, to its original intended use and application. As can be seen, the church has failed miserably to teach this subject properly, which has brought about a very misguided and undoubtedly perverse generation. It is a problem not easily fixed, now that such a misguided web has been woven. Furthermore, true Biblical teachings on this subject is certainly not “politically correct” and has the appearance of being like a “cult”. But, after all, believers are not supposed to be like the world. Just because “Christianity” has decided to adopt pagan beliefs and practices, which have become common place, does not make them right.

SEXUAL MORALITY

Sex During Menstruation.

The Mosaic Law had a number of regulations surrounding sexual uncleanness. These regulations covered night emissions (unknown ejaculations while sleeping), ejaculations as a result of sexual activity, and sex during menstruation. Observation prevented/reduced the Israelites from contracting potential diseases. The climate and geographical conditions could cause potential health problems since they lacked modern conveniences for cleansing, i.e., they had no running water, bath tubs, showers, clean sanitized houses, etc. It was for their own good, health protection, as were most

cleansing regulations found in the Mosaic Law.

Sexual Crimes

You will find that Old Testament teaching on human sexuality did not relax. Instead it was clearly and succinctly clarified in the Pentateuch, in particular Leviticus and Deuteronomy. There are other citations outside of the Pentateuch as well, but to list everything here is too cumbersome and inappropriate for the purpose of this book. The reader is encouraged to conduct additional independent research to expand on this neglected Biblical subject.

Incest

Incest is sex occurring between two individual too close to kin, particularly sex with family members that are declared by law as being to close. In particular, 1) males having sex with full sisters, mothers, and aunts and 2) females having sex with full brothers, fathers, and uncles.

Rape

Rape is forced sex on another individual, i.e., sex without consent. According to the Mosaic Law, if a man raped a virgin girl that was not betrothed, he would be forced to marry her, pay a “standard” dowry to her father and could never divorce her. If the girl chose not to marry, he would still have to pay the dowry fine for shaming her and she could remain celibate. If she was betrothed (or married), and she cried out for help, the rapist was to be put death, for that would be forced adultery.

Prostitution

Prostitution is when a man or women continually sells sex to the general public for money or for commodities. It is prohibited in both the Old and New Testament.

Fornication

Fornication is a broad term and does not mean, as thought by most Americans, "pre-marital sex". THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS PRE-MARITAL SEX. Having sex is either "lawful" marriage or fornication, period. The church has failed miserably to teach the truth about this simple subject. Again, fornication covers a broad spectrum of sexual sins, e.g., repetitive adultery (whoredom), incest, prostitution (male or female harlots), orgies, idolatrous sex, homosexuality, lesbianism (sodomy), and beastiality (sex with animals), etc.

"Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body."

1 Corinthians 6:18

"...and shall commit fornication with all the kingdoms of the world upon the face of the earth."

Isaiah 23:17 (this is a metaphysical or allegorical fornication)

Things become complicated when a no-virgin wants to marry and her first true husband (the one who took her virginity) is now married to another woman, especially when so many families and women think multiple wives is taboo in her country. She could return to her first husband if he would have her (see below). Otherwise, many young women are committing adultery and causing many men to commit adultery by

“marrying” some one other man other than her true husband. Thank YHWH for his mercies to forgive sins, but it is not a license to continue to have sex with a man who is not a woman's husband. Until her true husband is dead, she is bound to him for life. If, however, her true husband commits sexual sin, as defined Biblically, then she is free to remarry or if her true husband puts her away without a cause and marries another, then he is an adulterer and she is free to remarry.

In America, where most of the population has been deceived into thinking that "sex before legal marriage" is not marriage, a massive nation-wide tangled web of adultery as emerged. Husbands everywhere and wives everywhere are not remaining faithful and marrying unlawfully, in YHWH's eyes. Of course the American government does not see it this way and have therefore not only allow this sin to expand, but even encourage and facilitate its expansion. This evil is in the land and must be set aright. It is high time to get rid of the leaven of ignorance relative to the sin of adultery, for it is destroying marriages, families and children and placing people on a fast track to hell.

There are many New Testament scriptures that teach that no adulterer or fornicator will be in YHWH's kingdom. Therefore, if a young lady is not a virgin, they must not try to pass themselves off as one. She should either unite with her true husband, the man to whom she lost her virginity, or be sure he has either committed adultery (even by marrying another non-virgin) or fornication so she can be free to marry another. Or remain celibate until her true husband dies. Or if he is a non-believer and will not have her, because it is required of him to care of her, unless she has committed adultery, or fornication, then she is free to remarry, but only in the Lord. If he “divorced” her due to

her unfaithfulness, then she can never remarry until her true husband dies.

For this reason young women are encouraged to be absolutely sure that the man they are about to have sex with is going to take care for them for the rest of their life. Get family involved. It is the only chance they have (unless he dies or becomes an adulterer or fornicator). Once they have lost their virginity, they would be playing the harlot or an adulteress anytime they have sex with another man, other than the one they lost their virginity to. Be very sure for this is a very serious matter. Yes, HaMashiyach will forgive, but once forgive he does not condone continual sinning.

SPECIAL LAWS

Slavery

Although slavery is abolished in most modern and “civilized” countries, slavery is not a sin per se, nor to be a slave or to have one. It is, however, discouraged Biblically and should not be practiced. Most modern cultures agree and this is especially true due to the current definition and maltreatment of slaves. The Old Testament taught righteous guidelines and boundaries for slavery. Biblical slavery was more in line with the modern concept and term called indentured servants. If “slavery” was a way a believer could help someone in a more humane way, and history has shown that in some rare cases it is more humane, then so be it. For example, during war times, if it meant saving a life by being enslaved, then in this case slavery is the better choice. After all, a Neo-Jewish master or slave is instructed in scriptures on ways to treat or be treated, respectively. In time, however, the believing slave owner should grant the slave freedom. History reveals many such cases. Slavery has always existed with humanity and probably always will

exist until the return of HaMashiyach. So, in this area let Neo-Jews be the leading example of human kindness and proper humane treatment.

Plunder

A woman taken as a wife under the guise of "plunder" was not considered a strange wife. Why? It is because all of her family had been destroyed during warfare, i.e., all the males were killed thus making all the non-virgin females widows. In other words, the society was destroyed and the young virgins and widows easily simulated into the Jewish culture. They would become a Jewish proselyte.

If, however, a woman was taken to wife outside of the Jewish faith and was not plunder, she would be considered a "strange wife". Per Mosaic Law, this was not allowed (Nehemiah 13:26-27). Why? She could find strength and solace in her non-Jewish family and could possibly retain her former beliefs and practices.

Surrogacy

Surrogate fatherhood was a requirement of the Mosaic Law. If a man's brother died and left no children via his surviving wife, the eldest brother had to marry her and give her children. The first male child would not be considered the son of the surviving brother, but the son of the deceased brother to ensure that every man had a progenitor. The entire wonderful story of RUTH is all about surrogacy. Ruth's invitation for Boaz to have sex with her was not sin (Ruth 3:9), since her uncle was Ruth's closest relative to Ruth's dead husband and since he had a right to buy her and her estate, to raise up children for his dead nephew (Ruth 4:5,10-17). Interestingly, the adoptive father of the HaMashiyach came through Ruth (Matthew 1:5).

The most astonishing story of surrogacy is not the story of Ruth but is cited in the Book of Ruth (Ruth 4:12). It is the story told in detail in Genesis Chapter 38. This is a very fascinating story of surrogacy of how Tamar was more righteous in her act of “playing the harlot” to ensure a progenitor for her dead husband than was Judah. In fact, the adoptive father of the HaMashiyach came through one of her sons (Matthew 1:3). Perez (Pharez) was conceived by Tamar by “marrying” (having sex) her Father-in-law, Judah. She pretended to “play the harlot” because Judah failed to observe the surrogacy law of YHWH. Judah had refused to give Tamar to his son (her husband’s brother) to raise up a son for Tamar’s dead husband.

HaMashiyach was presented with this same scenario to test him. HaMashiyach did not condemn the practice, but rather, he corrected the flawed view of the Sadducees regarding life after death (Mark 12:24-27), which they did not believe.

“Master, Moses wrote unto us, If a man’s brother die, and leave *his* wife *behind him*, and leave no children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. ²⁰ Now there were seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and dying left no seed. ²¹ And the second took her, and died, neither left he any seed: and the third likewise. ²² And the seven had her, and left no seed: last of all the woman died also. ²³ In the resurrection therefore, when they shall rise, whose wife shall she be of them? for the seven had her to wife.”

Mark 12:19-23

Inter-racial Marriages

There is absolutely no Biblical teaching against inter-racial marriage. In fact, careful research will reveal many Biblical examples of inter-racial marriages. Most cultures have no problem with it, except Westernized “Christians”. Westernization is

improving but has a long way to go. The scriptures teach, however, to not be "unequally yoked." This however, is not referring to ethnicity but to spirituality and morality. The scriptures heavily advise believers to marry believers.

Why Not Matriarchal System?

There are a number of reason why this is not Biblical. For example,

- * It does not follow the scriptural example which is patriarchal.
- * It goes contrary to the heavenly model of YHWH's kingdom-the church being YHWH's corporate bride.
- * Children would be bastards.
- * It goes contrary to nature, YHWH's divine law.

Chapter

- 6 -

CELIBACY, MONOGAMY, POLYGAMY

INTRODUCTION

What does the Bible have to say about celibacy, monogamy and polygamy?

There has been much debate over these subjects, especially since Hellenism and Romanism exerted their influences on the world. However, Hellenistic and Romanistic philosophy and religion was not YHWH's revelation to the masses. The path of truth goes back beyond Hellenism and Romanism.

CELIBACY

Celibacy is a lifestyle where marriage is not allowed. The Roman Catholic Church (RCC) imposes this upon its entire priesthood. Whereas the GOC, a RCC splinter group, allows its priests to be married. The hypocrisy of it all is that the most of the RCC priesthood has not been celibate. Mandated celibacy is an unscriptural teaching, although if Apostle Paul had his way, everyone would be celibate, but even he knew it would be an unscriptural mandate if so enforced. HaMashiach recommended celibacy only for those who have the ability or will power to self-execute castration for the kingdom's sake. However, this is far from a salvific doctrine or requirement of either the believer or the minister.

"But he said unto them, All *men* cannot receive this saying, save *they* to whom it is given.¹² For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from *their* mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's

sake. He that is able to receive *it*, let him receive *it*.

Matthew 19:11-12

In modern times, celibacy was instituted by the RCC. Unfortunately, it is a known fact that many RCC priests have certainly not remained celibate. Furthermore, many are homosexuals. Why all this horrific behavior? It is because YHWH never intended men or women to neglect their sexual desires, but rather to satisfy them within the right context. Charlotte's story is a real shocker, written by an ex-nun. She revealed how some nunneries were nothing more than a place for temple prostitution, verified by FBI investigations. One such nunnery in Mexico was closed down after many baby skeletons were found in the lime pits in underground tunnels (Briggs, 1988).

HaMashiyach taught that celibacy for men was an alternative of choice for those wanting to specially dedicate themselves to the kingdom of heaven. But to do so, one had to become a eunuch by self castration or because their gonads were entrapped in their body at birth, which is rare but does happen periodically by nature. Usually, however, self-castration is required.

John said,

"And they sung as it were a new song before the throne, and before the four beasts, and the elders: and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand, which were redeemed from the earth. These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins..."

Revelation 14:3-4

In the Greek, the implication for "virgin" here is someone that has never had sex before and possibly a eunuch. If a man is not a eunuch it is almost 100% guaranteed that

he is not a virgin or a fornicator, unless he is a child. The sex drive is too strong. And, this scripture does not apply to women.

MONOGAMY

The following discussion is not a recommendation of any particular lifestyle choices, just observations of scripture. Any lifestyle choice has its problems and complications depending on the individuals involved. It is important to understand the difference between prescription and description. The following is an observation and description of said observation.

Monogamy is not a Biblical term nor is it a Hebrew concept. It was birthed by the Greeks much later in human history, long after Biblical Patriarchs lived and practiced marriage quite different than what the Greeks proposed. Monogamy is a legally enforced law requiring a man to register only one woman as his “legal” wife, with the exclusions of concubines, handmaids and/or female slaves. Monogamy is not supported by nor suggested by the Bible neither is it mandated nor discussed in scripture. The main reason why some men had only one wife prior to the Greek introduction was because they could not afford the dowry of another wife and could not afford to support her and the eventual children that would arrive.

An examination of the Greco-Roman idea of monogamy is an abominable perversion and has literally destroyed the true moral fabric of the modern world. The ugly pervasive undercurrent of sexual perversion and immorality is now rearing its ugly head and will undoubtedly not end except for minor grass-root restorations. This perversion is just one element of Mystery Babylon, from which the prophet John spoke,

that YHWH is calling his people out of Mystery Babylon. This is one sin that true believers must leave behind because it is causing many to sin and become sinners everyday of their life.

"...I will show unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters: With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication...MYSTERY BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH."

Revelation 17:1-5

"...Babylon the great is fallen...And I heard another voice from heaven saying, 'Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not her plagues.'"

Revelation 18:2,5

There are some ministers who claim that 1Timothy 3:12 is a call to monogamy, at least for ministers. However, careful analysis reveals an entirely different view when several important facts and concepts are reviewed that contradicts a monogamy law and lifestyle.

Here is a common example where enforced monogamy can cause long-term heart ache, sorrow and loneliness. Let's say woman "A" is a virgin and she has early sex with her boyfriend (who is now her husband in the eyes of YHWH) and is then "dumped" by her boyfriend ("husband"). Woman "A" must remain chaste to her original husband and wait to see if he marries a non-virgin, e.g., woman "B", and becomes an adulterer. Woman "A" is then free to remarry. But if not, the wait becomes very burdensome and possibly messy. Conversely, if the church had not failed to teach Biblical truths

regarding human sexuality, in the first place, these types of scenarios would be dramatically reduced. And if they did occur intermittently and multi-wives was an option, it would even further reduce these kinds of scenarios.

The sin of adultery is still sin and said sin will still cause one to be separated from YHWH eternally. The TRUTH has been misrepresented for far too long. Very few people realize just how crazy and sinful things have become around the world.

Biblical History

First of all, there are no scriptural citations in the Old Testament or the New Testament that teach monogamy as a mandate for believers. In fact the word is not even used or implied. However, this does not mean that there were no men that had only one wife, for that was quite plausible, especially for those who could not afford to pay the dowry for more than one and the cost of caring for a larger family. In this case, this was not a legal enforcement or a social prohibition but a matter of fiscal ability. HaMashiyach only denounced divorce practices, fornication and adultery relative to marriage. He did brush on the subject of celibacy via castration, but that has nothing to do with “monogamy”. It was purely a Greek invention and adopted by the RCC who then spread it around the world. Some countries embraced it others did not.

Priesthood Restrictions

As shown earlier, a priest (Levite) was restricted as to the purity of the woman he chose for a wife, not the number. Likewise with the High Priest, with the exception that he was further restricted regarding the purity of the wife (wives) he chose, she had to be a virgin and an Israelite. Non-virgins, widows, divorced women and foreigners were not

allowed.

It is known that Levites had more than one wife at a time, because the father of Samuel, Elkanah, had two wives, Peninnah and Hannah. Hannah was the mother of Samuel. Levites commonly lived in Ephrathite, as did Elkanah. Furthermore, if Elkanah was not a Levite, how else could Samuel be allowed to assist the High Priest? In fact, Elkanah is listed in the Levitical genealogies.

²⁵ And the sons of Elkanah; Amasai, and Ahimoth. ²⁶ As for Elkanah: the sons of Elkanah; Zophai his son, and Nahath his son, ²⁷ Eliab his son, **Jeroham** his son, **Elkanah** his son. ²⁸ And the sons of **Samuel**; the firstborn Vashni, and **Abiah**. ²⁹ The sons of Merari; Mahli, Libni his son, Shimei his son, Uzza his son, ³⁰ Shimea his son, Haggiah his son, Asaiah his son.”

1 Chronicles 6:1-30

So, Samuel became Eli's assistant and later took his place as High Priest since Eli's sons became wicked before the Lord.

“Now there was a certain man of Ramathaimzophim, of mount Ephraim, and his name was Elkanah, the son of Jeroham, the son of Elihu, the son of Tohu, the son of Zuph, an Ephrathite: ² And he had two wives; the name of the one was Hannah, and the name of the other Peninnah: and Peninnah had children, but Hannah had no children... ¹¹ And she vowed a vow, and said, O LORD of hosts, if thou wilt indeed look on the affliction of thine handmaid, and remember me, and not forget thine handmaid, but wilt give unto thine handmaid a man child, then I will give him unto the LORD all the days of his life, and there shall no razor come upon his head... ¹⁹ And they rose up in the morning early, and worshipped before the LORD, and returned, and came to their house to Ramah: and Elkanah knew Hannah his wife; and the LORD remembered her. ²⁰ Wherefore it came to pass, when the time was come about after Hannah had conceived, that she bare a son, and called his name Samuel, *saying*, Because I have asked him of the LORD... ²⁴ And when she had weaned him, she took him up with her, with three bullocks, and one ephah of flour, and a bottle of wine, and brought him unto the house of the LORD in Shiloh: and the child was young. ²⁵ And they slew a bullock, and brought the child to Eli. ²⁶ And she said, Oh my lord, *as thy soul liveth*, my lord, I am the woman that stood by thee here, praying unto the LORD. ²⁷ For this child I

prayed; and the LORD hath given me my petition which I asked of him:
²⁸ Therefore also I have lent him to the LORD; as long as he liveth he shall be lent to the LORD. And he worshipped the LORD there."

1 Samuel 1:1-28

Samuel also became a great prophet in Israel in addition to other duties.

"And Samuel grew, and the LORD was with him, and did let none of his words fall to the ground. ²⁰ And all Israel from Dan even to Beersheba knew that Samuel *was* established *to be* a prophet of the LORD.

1 Samuel 3:19-20

As shown below, in addition to the above genealogy, Samuel did become the leader in Israel, the High Priest as well as a Judge and Prophet.

"And Samuel took a sucking lamb, and offered *it for* a burnt offering wholly unto the LORD: and Samuel cried unto the LORD for Israel; and the LORD heard him. ¹⁰ And as Samuel was offering up the burnt offering, the Philistines drew near to battle against Israel: but the LORD thundered with a great thunder on that day upon the Philistines, and discomfited them; and they were smitten before Israel... ¹⁵ And Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life... ¹⁷ And his return *was* to Ramah; for there *was* his house; and there he judged Israel; and there he built an altar unto the LORD.

1 Samuel 7:9-17

So as can be clearly seen from scripture, Priests (Levites) did have more than one wife and they served before the Lord. Having more than one wife was not a sin or evil. It was never condemned in Israel, so long as men did so within the guidelines of morality.

Special (strict) marital regulations applied to the High Priests (Aaronic priests) that did not apply to Levite priests. This parallels the Bishop/Deacon requirement as compared to the saints, respectively given that all believers are part of the general royal

priesthood. (See 1 Peter 2:9)

"They shall not take a wife that is a whore, or profane; neither shall they take a woman put away from her husband: for he is holy unto his YHWH ... and he shall take a wife in her virginity. A widow, or a divorced woman, or profane, or a harlot, these shall he not take: but he shall take a virgin of his own people to wife. Neither shall he profane his seed among his people: for I the LORD do sanctify him"

Leviticus 21:7-15

As can be clearly seen the High Priest (Aaronic priesthood), the administrative arm of the priesthood, could only take a woman that was a virgin from the house of Israel, no exceptions. She could not be divorced or even be a widow. So the parallel between the Old and New Testament is consistent. Notice further that the scriptures did not say that the priesthood had to be celibate or monogamous. It merely stipulated the status of the females that a priest was allowed to marry. It was very strict and very narrow.

The word "one" in 1 Timothy 3:2, 12 and Titus 1:6 implies something more significant than just the count of one. The word "One" can become confused because the Greek word (mia) comes from the Greek words (*heis*) and (*heis kath' heis*)² which can imply "one of many", "first and only", etc. and everything in between (see note below). Therefore, to find the answer to this dilemma one must search the Old Testament for clarity, as is always the case when one hopes to discover a New Testament truth. Why? Because all New Testament truths have their roots in the Old Testament (Luke 16: 17-18) because the New Testament was to be a continuation of the Old Covenants of Promise but with greater clarity that is now made available to all, through Yahushua

HaMashiyach.

NOTE: In the list of scriptures below, one can find various ways the Greek word mia is used:

<i>Matthew 19:6 – "one" a unified flesh comprised of two</i>	<i>Matthew 16:2 – "first"</i>
<i>Matthew 28:1 – "first"</i>	<i>Luke 5:12, 17 – "certain"</i>
<i>Matthew 21:19 – "a"</i>	<i>Luke 8:22 – "certain"</i>
<i>Luke 13:10 – "one" (of multiple synagogues)</i>	<i>John 20:1, 7 – "first"</i>
<i>Luke 14:18 – "one" consent, multiple as one</i>	<i>1 Corinthians 16:2 – "first"</i>
<i>Titus 3:10 – "first"</i>	<i>Revelation 17:13 – "one" of multiple</i>
<i>Philippians 1:27 – "one" mind of multiple</i>	<i>Luke 15:8 – "one" of ten pieces</i>
	<i>Luke 24:1 – "first"</i>
	<i>Revelation 9:13 – "a"</i>
	<i>Revelation 17:17 – "agree" unity of multiple</i>

Therefore, as shown above in Leviticus 21, a High Priest must not defile himself in anyway. His wife must be an untouched woman in every way, truly a pure virgin. She cannot be a widow, divorcee, harlot, whore, prostitute, or profane. In other words, when she has sex (marriage) with the priest it must be the **first** time she has ever had sex with anyone or anything. As is customary, the "one" is an adjective describing the woman's moral status not the man's, as many theologians improperly reverse.

The Old Testament, therefore, reveals that the odd use of the Greek word "mia" in the New Testament implies that the wife of an Elder (Bishop) or Deacon must be a pure virgin, i.e., the **first** and only time she has ever been a wife to any man, furthermore, the **first** time she has ever had sex with anything, i.e., human male, female or even an animal.

Additionally, if a daughter of a priest was given in marriage and discovered that she was trying to fraudulently pass herself off as a virgin she was to be killed by being burned with fire. A woman could belong to only one man so long as that man lived, unless he became a fornicator (or adulterer), in which case she could then be free by divorce and then remarry if she chose, since the law would have put the

adulterer/fornicator to death, making her a widow. It was even worse for this sin to exist within a priest's family and had to be dealt with treacherously. Why? It was because the priesthood set the precedence for holiness among a nation. In the same sense, the New Testament requires that Bishops and deacons to maintain a high moral standard and have their house in order (1 Timothy 3:4) and ruled well.

To deny this crucial Biblical and secular history is to deny the word of YHWH and it robs an individual of the deeper meanings of the mystery of HaMashiyach and the Church. In fact, alternative models run contrary to the divine model, even the will of YHWH. This mystery of HaMashiyach and the Church produces a broader panoramic view and the deeper intrinsic purposive/meaning and nature/will of YHWH, the end game, the culmination of all things.

Hebrew Rhetoric Compared with Greek Rhetoric

To expand further, the above concept for priests was not something familiar to the Greeks nor was it found within their language since within their law and inherent in their language they knew only monogamy. Looking carefully at the selected choice of Greek words to translate Paul's writings to Timothy is not as clear cut as is often supposed, especially with the Old Testament principles available to enlighten. See the chart below for detailed analysis relative to English translation variations of the same Greek words.

Comparative Scriptural Analysis Chart

1 Timothy 3:2	1 Timothy 3:12	Titus 1:6	1 Timothy 5:9
“the husband of one wife”	“be the husbands of one wife”	“the husband of one wife”	“having been the wife of one man”
“ <i>einai</i> (to exist) <i>mia</i> (first/one) <i>gune</i> (wife) <i>aner</i> (husband)”	“ <i>mia</i> (first/one) <i>gune</i> (wife) <i>aner</i> (husband)”	“ <i>mia</i> (first/one) <i>gune</i> (wife) <i>aner</i> (husband)”	“ <i>ginomai</i> (caused to be/married) <i>heis</i> (only/one) <i>aner</i> (husband) <i>gune</i> (wife)”

The Greek word <i>mia</i> is used here instead of <i>heis</i> for the word one since the implication is different.	The Greek word <i>mia</i> is used here instead of <i>heis</i> for the word one since the implication is different.	The Greek word <i>mia</i> is used here instead of <i>heis</i> for the word one since the implication is different.	The Greek word <i>heis</i> is used here instead of <i>mia</i> for the word one since the implication is different.
Mia is also closely related to <i>heis</i> which can mean “one by one” in the right context. This means he could have a history of more than one wife if he became a widower and got re-married.	Mia is also closely related to <i>heis</i> which can mean “one by one” in the right context. This means he could have a history of more than one wife if he became a widower and got re-married.	Mia is also closely related to <i>heis</i> which can mean “one by one” in the right context. This means he could have a history of more than one wife if he became a widower and got re-married.	This context clearly denotes only one (numeral) husband ever. This implies that being divorced and remarried or becoming a widow once before and being remarried and then becoming a widow again is not included in the meaning.
In light of Old Testament truths, the original New Testament text was more likely to have meant that Bishops had to be the husband of a virgin, “first time a wife” rather than a focus on how many. The Bible is focused more on morality and chastity. Only Hellenized translators would have thought about how many wives rather than on chastity.	In light of Old Testament truths, the original New Testament text was more likely to have meant that Bishops had to be the husband of a virgin, “first time a wife” rather than a focus on how many. The Bible is focused more on morality and chastity. Only Hellenized translators would have thought about how many wives rather than on chastity.	In light of Old Testament truths, the original New Testament text was more likely to have meant that Bishops had to be the husband of a virgin, “first time a wife” rather than a focus on how many. The Bible is focused more on morality and chastity. Only Hellenized translators would have thought about how many rather than on chastity.	In light of Old and New Testament truths, the original New Testament text was more likely focused on a widow’s morality and chastity first and then her status as a widow. Age denotes her ability to get remarried or ability to still work and provide for herself rather than drain the charity resources. Not being divorced or widowed twice or more speaks to her chastity.

Even if Paul was implying a specific number of wives, this was only restricted to Bishops and Deacons. And if it was, perhaps this was because he knew of the challenges and perplexities of families with multiple wives and children. The time and attention required of such a man would undoubtedly distract most men more than a man with only one wife. Of course, one wife can be just as challenging, depending on the personalities and dispositions of the married couple. However, with Paul being a Hebrew of Hebrews, it is more likely than not that he was referring to the chastity status of a Bishop’s or Deacon’s wife rather than the number of wives, which would be more aligned with

scriptural morality.

Polygamy was commonly accepted in the New Testament days, and if so, there should be plenty of passages making it clear that polygamy was wrong if that was the real issue Paul cared about. Conversely, a *lack* of passages stating that polygamy is *right* in the Bible or books written to cultures that were already openly polygamous proves nothing. They didn't *need* to be told it was right. They were already practicing it and had been practicing it throughout biblical history, as openly recorded in the Bible.

As for whether or not the New Testament shows any examples of polygamous marriages, you might just as well argue that monogamy is wrong on the basis that it does not show any monogamy among the disciples either. It is known that Peter had a mother-in-law who was sick; but no one has any idea of how many mothers-in-law he might have had who were not sick or how many wives he had or *if he had any*. Maybe he was celibate by the time he became a disciple. The daughter of that mother-in-law may have died.

Neither is it known if Paul had any wives. Maybe none of the disciples had wives by the time they became disciples. So, does that prove monogamy is wrong if none of them were married? How, then, can a lack of any statements at all about wives prove polygamy is wrong? Moreover, since nothing is known about how many wives any of them had, it is ALSO not known if some of them were openly polygamous. In short, a *lack* of passages stating something proves nothing. One could simply make any case out of it.

Clearly the church had men who had more than one wife or Paul would not have laid out the requirement that elders of the church be men with only “one” wife. Since *all* elders of the church are appointed from *within* the church it would be impossible for them to be *anything but* men with only one wife (or no wives) if that was the only kind of marriage allowed in the church. For example, if you have a box of apples that is only apples, you don't have to tell people selecting oranges from the box, “Don't select any apples out of that box.” It would be kind of dumb to even say it if there were no apples in the box. So, polygamy clearly was not a basis for being excluded from the church.

Paul, however, describes his ideal as being celibacy. But, lacking celibacy, certainly no more than “one” wife would be his second-best to the *ideal* for the ministry. But, an ideal doesn't make something mandatory. If it did, ALL “Christians” would be celibate and “Christianity” would implode into non-existence over time.

Finally, due to the lack of reliable and stable early texts of the New Testament, it is quite difficult to know with 100% certainty that the translators got it right. This does not mean that YHWH's word is not stable or true, but that due to human error and flaws it is possible that the translators missed some overlooked and/or skewed initial and intended meanings. One of the best checks and balances available is the stable Hebrew texts. After all, the HaMashiyach and the Apostles only had the Hebrew texts to teach and preach from in the first place. Therefore, it is more likely than not that Apostle Paul would have leaned heavily towards the Hebrew model rather than the Hellenistic model, as he did in so many other places in his writings.

POLYGAMY

As a preface statement to this section, this book neither promotes nor denounces multi-wives (or polygamy, as it is often called). It merely attempts to present the facts as they are found in scriptures and in history. Description is not prescription. They are significantly different. The choice of what to do with this information should be entirely individualistic.

Polygamy is another term not found in the Bible, but its meaning to Hellenists, Greco-Romanism or Westernizers is not a welcomed one. However, given the nature of men, there always have been and always be many men who will have multiple wives (legal or not), so long and the earth exists as it is known. As far as western governments are concerned, polygamy is the practice of registering more than one wife at a time. Unfortunately, due to political correctness and the laws on the books of many western countries, many countries have developed into cultures and lifestyles contrary to Biblical morals causing the family structure to decay and fall into chaos.

Notwithstanding, this book is not presenting polygamy as a law that must be enforced and practiced by all nor as a law that must be obeyed in order to become holy. It merely illustrates and reveals an alternative righteous model that may fit for some believers around the world, while for others it may not. In fact, many still practice this model and have very solid family systems with little social problems. It is also hoped that these discussions will abrogate the misjudgments of many Westernized "Christians" who heretofore see those who practice having multiple wives as "sinners". Many peoples in many nations outside of Westernized Christendom see multiple wives as a

normal way of life.

To say, then, that "polygamy is unrighteous and unscriptural" would be to deny Old Testament righteousness, to declare all patriarchs, Levites, and prophets are sinners, and to "trash-can" the New Testament concept of the "Kingdom of Heaven" illustrated by HaMashiyach and the "Mystery of HaMashiyach and the Church" as illustrated by Apostle Paul and the "Bride, the Lamb's wife" as illustrated by Apostle John. The marriage model that existed prior to and during the Mosaic Law parenthetic era was not condemned by HaMashiyach, other than he abrogated the "giving a bill of divorce". To the contrary, HaMashiyach upheld said model as being the only righteous document to follow.

Conversely, if one does not practice having more than one wife, they are not sinning. For that matter, to practice celibacy or to become a self-made eunuch is not sinful either. The point is this. Just because you do not live a certain way it does not make it wrong or sinful for others to live differently so long as they comply with righteous guidelines. However, it would be unkind and ungodly to condemn fellow brothers and sisters in HaMashiyach who do practice having more than one wife as a righteous alternative to monogamy (or celibacy), especially in an effort to avoid adultery and fornication. Apostle Paul said that it is "Better to marry than burn". It is better to forsake a life of sin and pursue righteousness and godliness, than be cast into HELL FIRE.

As stated earlier, one particular Hellenistic influence is the introduction of MONOGAMY as a state law versus the multi-wife lifestyle. This was not a Judaic or a

Neo-Judaic idea. It was Hellenistic and pagan idea. Greek monogamy was imposed with sinister intent and gross debauchery by polytheistic, often homosexual and adulterous politicians who sought to protect their wealth and status. Conversely, and this may be shocking, a mixed culture of both single and plural marriages, like the Jewish culture, provided for a more stable society, so long as the marriage institution remained in the hands of the “family” to control and not in the hands of the government. Such a model is far more scripturally and historically accurate and beneficial to the adhesiveness of society than any newly government enforced monogamous law. Granted, such statements are not politically correct in most western (Hellenized) countries and this book is not hereby suggesting any form of anarchy. Nonetheless, politically correct or not, the practice of multi-wife lifestyles is a historical and scriptural fact, practiced by some of the most revered patriarchs, priests, kings and the like, as recorded in the Bible and in historical literature.

It is appropriate, however, to take a look at the origins and true meanings of “legalized” monogamy and how its enforcement and practice contradicted YHWH’s law of righteousness. Prior to the legalization of monogamy in Greece most cultures knew and understood the moral obligations of marriage and family whether multi-wife families or single-wife families. However, this moral obligation presented a series of problems to wealthy powerful men who chose multiple wives. They would have to share their wealth and inheritance equally with their wives and offspring potentially reducing their wealth, power and influence within the Greek aristocracy and government. To remedy this problem, to keep the power and wealth to just a few, Greece decided to make a monogamy law allowing its citizens only one legal wife and thus the moral and

inheritance obligations were limited to a very few. Monogamy also allowed the Greeks to keep their Greek "citizenship" count reduced to hundreds or thousands, which in turn kept the thousands of slaves, freedmen, and so forth out of public affairs. (Wells, 1929).

So, this does not sound so bad, right? Wrong, if you read the rest of the story.

The Greeks were still allowed the legal purchase of as many female slaves as their wealth allowed, without any sexual restrictions or familial obligations. Therefore, female slaves could be bought and sold with no moral or ethical restrictions or responsibilities no matter how often they were used for sexual gratification and if children were sired, there was no moral obligation to them either. In the eyes of YHWH this was a severe travesty and a serious breach of morality and human dignity. In fact, it sounds a lot like what goes on in modern times. A very high percentage of "married" men still seek plural sexual partners but exhibit no moral obligation to these partners or their offspring since most westernized law prohibits said moral obligation. Most westernized cultures have adopted the Greek monogamous law that not only promotes immorality but actually prohibits morality.

In America, when the government got tired of funding the results of "unlawful" "polygamy", for example, supporting unwed mothers and their children, they began to enforce a law that partially obligated the fathers to care for these children (known as "child support") but failed to take the next step that would force the fathers to care for the mothers as well, for this step would contradict the monogamy laws they instituted (put on the law books) that caused these problems in the first place. As can be seen, it is quite hypocritical. If these matters were left in the hands of families, like it always was prior to

Hellenism, then the town fathers (or courts) would only need to be involved if/when family enforcement of moral obligations failed.

From a Biblical (Judaic) perspective, however, what the Greeks were doing was gross sexual sins of the worst kind—adultery and fornication. From a Judaic perspective, a slave owner that had sex with his female slave had to consider her as a concubine—a slave wife. The Old Testament clearly teaches that concubines, although a lower status wife than a regular wife, were to be cared for, respected and treated as a wife. In fact, Biblical laws are written that protected both the concubine and her children (Exodus 21:10-11; Deut. 21:15-17).

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT MULTI-WIVES

Having more than one wife is not about dominance or subjugation over a female(s). It is more about procreation, companionship, partnership and kingdom building. Even science is now admitting this to be true within both the human species and the animal kingdom. And it is also more about a female's willingness to participate than the male's ability to dominate/control, per se. Unfortunately, there are evil men who do subjugate and dominate over women, but in today's world, they are not the norm, they are the exception.

It is found that females want males who are good providers, protectors and leaders for the sake of themselves, but more importantly for their offspring. This is not always consciously known or discussed openly, but rather more instinctively. Unfortunately, current Western culture discourages females from this natural process and simultaneously

prevents non-elite males from getting any kind of a “kingdom” foot hold and wards off their own jealousies and inabilities to attract females on a larger scale, a pride defender, with the word “pride” having a broader meaning than is conventionally used.

For the male it is more about procreation diversity within specific genetic limitations. The greater the number of wives a male has, the greater the controlled diversity of a male’s offspring and the greater/larger his kingdom with reasonable unity. This also equals a larger stronger prevailing kingdom.

Below are a few more common examples of great patriarchs and righteous men who had multiple wives. Of course there are many more that could be provided, but there is not time or space to be exhaustive here.

ABRAHAM

Abraham, the "father of the faithful", had multiple wives and concubines. His life-line is unclear in scriptures, but most scholars agree that his other wives and concubines were concurrent with Sarah. Hagar was prominently discussed because she was Sarah's handmaid, Sarah being the one to bare the Promised Son. The big issue was not that Abraham took Hagar to wife, but the issue was over a Promised Seed (son) versus a Natural Seed (son), i.e., faith versus the natural law, Grace versus the Mosaic Law. True, Abraham had a number of children, but none of these were children of promise.

In spite of it all, an interesting blessing came from YHWH for Ishmael and for an interesting reason. Hagar was Sarah's handmaid, thus directly under her control and the

blessing or maltreatment of Sarah. Thus, when Hagar had Ishmael, YHWH did promise to bless him but he would have to be sent out, away from Isaac, at Sarah's discretion, to ensure that he would never be confused with the Son of Promise, Isaac. When Sarah offered Hagar to Abraham it was not revolutionary, it was customary. What YHWH had to correct was the minds of both Sarah and Abraham regarding Ishmael. HE WAS NOT the promised son. YHWH did not say divorce Hagar. That would have been unlawful. If multiple wives were an issue, then the scriptures would have so indicated. In fact, ample evidence is given that having multiple wives was not the issue. The issue was Promise (and faith) versus natural laws (works).

In many countries if a Hellenized missionary convinces a husband to put away his many wives, their children become bastards, wards of the state and the women are humiliated, never allowed to marry again. So, it is the narrow minded westernized "Christian" that misunderstands and knows little about this subject.

Sarah became quite hurt when Hagar became haughty, even cruel because she knew that the great man Abraham was childless, and she mistakenly assumed that her status was elevated from concubine to "free wife" since she brought forth what both Sarah and Abraham temporarily thought was the Promised Son. Hagar hoped to replace Sarah as "queen". What a mistake on Hagar's and Ishmael's part. This certainly was a good lesson for all wives and concubines to learn. Marriage and family is not about the big "I's" and little "you's", it is about the collective purpose, to live in unity and honor the husband. History would have undoubtedly been different had the perspectives and attitudes of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar been different regarding the birth of Ishmael and

Isaac.

Abraham's other wife, Keturah, was not a handmaid, so there was no issue. The children between her and Abraham were never an issue. She was undoubtedly a subsequent wife to Sarah. Additionally, Abraham had other concubines aside from Hagar. In fact scripture doesn't say how many, it just pluralizes the word so it could have been many, which would be logical considering the custom of the day. Wealthy men, who could afford to take care of a harem, did so.

"But unto the sons of the concubines, which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts, and sent them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived..."

Genesis 25:6

The writing style of Genesis was to tell the most important information first when recording the life of a patriarch. Less important information was "thrown in" as a side item. In fact, it is well understood that much is left out. The Bible is not an exhaustive history book. Its main purpose is to focus on the events that led to the coming of HaMashiyach and the development of YHWH's corporate united wife—the church—where Jews, Samaritans and Gentiles are one.

It is also interesting to note that Sarah's faith in her husband's devotion for her was challenged when circumstances (Hagar and Ishmael) tested it. In the same manner, a believer's faith is often tested by circumstances as to whether or not the love and devotion for HaMashiyach is solid since, a believer in HaMashiyach is just one individual among the many within HaMashiyach's corporate wife (the church). Neo-Judaism is truly a walk by faith. Abraham proved to be a man of integrity, a strongly devoted husband and

a responsible husband to all his wives and concubines and father to all his children. He did not neglect the wife of his youth no matter how many wives that followed Sarah. He was a great example to all husbands.

Sarah, after recovering from her troubles caused by Hagar and her bout of doubt, continued to be an honorable wife, one who revered her husband, called him "lord", was dedicated to her husband's pleasure and was a wonderful mother to her only son. She too was a great example.

JACOB (ISRAEL)

Jacob (Israel) who was very blessed by YHWH AFTER he already had more than one wife and several concubines. He was to be a prince among men and have power with YHWH. The rest is history. YHWH never condemned his multi-wives practices. To the contrary, he was very blessed. It is also interesting to note that it was his wives' idea to give him even more wives, to honor him even more, i.e., to give him more children, one of the most valued prized possession in those days. Unfortunately, a rivalry existed between the two of his wives who were sisters and YHWH purposely blessed Leah with children more than Rachael to level the playing field. This is one of the reasons why the Mosaic Law included a clause that prohibited a man from marrying rival sisters. It can cause a less than harmonious home, to say the least. The book of Ruth praises Jacob's two wives and thus his concubines, via the handmaids of Jacob's two wives. (See Ruth 4:11).

ESTHER

Esther, who was very beautiful, seized upon the opportunity to become part of the

King's harem (the king's collective wife). Not only was she beautiful, she knew how to give sexual pleasure too. That was what the contest included, sexual pleasure and beauty. She won grandly on both fronts. She not only gained access to the King's harem but was inaugurate Queen to replace Vashti (former Queen). YHWH in turn used this position of power to preserve Israel. YHWH did not condemn her for marrying a man who already had many wives and concubines, but blessed her abundantly instead. Neither was Morticai (Esther's guardian) hesitant about giving her to a king with many wives and concubines. (Read the book of Esther)

DAVID

David is a beautiful type of HaMashiyach, a man after YHWH's own heart. In fact, from his loins the redeemer did come. He had many wives, too. His great sin was not having multiple wives, but the gross sin of taking another man's wife and having sex with her. Bathsheba was a woman that was not rightly available for sex. She did not belong to David, nor was she to be available so long as her husband was alive.

The prophet Nathan was sent to King David because he committed adultery (not polygamy) and then murder. He had sex with another man's wife, she got pregnant and then David tried to cover it up by bringing her husband, Uriah, home from war so he would think Bathsheba's child belonged to him. When that failed he knew he or she would be found out so he had Bathsheba's husband killed. Furthermore, how else could David lawfully marry her while her husband lived? When David finally married Bathsheba, she was one among many wives. The prophet did not condemn David for his already multiple wives, in fact, Nathan confirmed that he had many and could select more

from the finest choice of available Jewish virgins (2 Samuel 12:8).

King Saul's daughter, Merab, was paid for (by David) by the death-threatening dowry of Philistine foreskins. Although he paid in full the required dowry, King Saul broke the covenant and gave his daughter to another. Later, after David sat on the throne of Israel, he went to collect his rightful wife, even though she had been given to another. Why didn't YHWH send the Prophet to correct his behavior like Bathsheba? It is obvious. Merab was rightfully David's wife. He bought her and even though he was unable to consummate their marriage, she belonged to him. She was unlawfully given to Adriel (1 Samuel 18). The same thing happened with Saul's daughter Michal (1 Samuel 25:40-44). David also recovered her in time.

Contrary to public opinion, women of the day were not opposed to being married to a man with more than one wife. Take notice of the attitude of Abigail.

“That this shall be no grief unto thee, nor offence of heart unto my lord, either that thou hast shed blood causeless, or that my lord hath avenged himself: but when the LORD shall have dealt well with my lord, then remember thine handmaid...³⁹ And when David heard that Nabal was dead, he said, Blessed *be* the LORD, that hath pleaded the cause of my reproach from the hand of Nabal, and hath kept his servant from evil: for the LORD hath returned the wickedness of Nabal upon his own head. And David sent and communed with Abigail, to take her to him to wife.⁴⁰ And when the servants of David were come to Abigail to Carmel, they spake unto her, saying, David sent us unto thee, to take thee to him to wife.⁴¹ And she arose, and bowed herself on *her* face to the earth, and said, Behold, *let* thine handmaid *be* a servant to wash the feet of the servants of my lord.⁴² And Abigail hasted, and arose, and rode upon an ass, with five damsels of hers that went after her; and she went after the messengers of David, and became his wife.⁴³ David also took Ahinoam of Jezreel; and they were also both of them his wives.⁴⁴ But Saul had given Michal his daughter, David's wife, to Phalti the son of Laish, which *was* of Gallim.”

1 Samuel 25:31-44

Notice that Abigail, a beautiful and intelligent woman (1 Samuel 25:3), wanted to be remembered by David when her husband died. David kept his promise to her and invited her to become his wife. She wasted no time and quickly went to David with her damsels to join him as another one of his wives. They highly revered David's needs and considered themselves happy and willing servants of their husband. Their main focus was to honor their husband (in every way), their 'head'. They were truly an example of HaMashiyach (David) and the Church (David's wives and concubines, especially as shown in Abigail). Each and every member of the church should be solely devoted to their HUSBAND and seek to honor HIM in every way, and to become joint-heirs in the endeavor of expanding HIS kingdom.

SOLOMON

Solomon had seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines. He was a husband to each and every one. He was their head, whom they were to honor. Solomon's only dreadful mistake was he committed spiritual adultery, a great sin before YHWH and he married "strange women" (Nehemiah 13:26-27). Strange women are women who do not embrace Judaic beliefs who came from non-Israelite families and who eventually turned his heart away from upholding YHWH righteousness. He began to allow his foreign wives to worship heathen gods.

Solomon could afford to have as many Jewish wives as he wanted and YHWH never once condemned Solomon for having multiple wives and concubines, per se, nor did a prophet ever condemn him. Why? Because having multiple wives is not sin! In fact, Solomon provided good protection for women and for any children that would

hopefully be born to expand the Kingdom of Israel. Multiple wives has never been considered as lustful, sinful, or wicked in the eyes of YHWH, the prophets, the Apostles, or HaMashiyach. Solomon's sin was toleration of idolatry in the land of Israel, not adultery or the supposed sin of polygamy.

If Solomon was over sexed, no problem, there were plenty of wives to divert any such problem. For him, adultery was totally unnecessary, he was well guarded this way. He was truly wise! Yet, he was unwise in one area, as already said, he married strange women. In this way he became a spiritual fool in his later years by allowing 1) his "strange wives" to pursue their idolatry instead of requiring conversion, 2) by not putting to death all of her relatives, and 3) idolatry in the land of Israel.

SONGS OF SOLOMON

Theologians will tell you that this book is a type of the church! Exactly correct. The story (via poetic verse) reflects the individual love of a concubine (saint) for her "lover", Solomon in spite of all the other Queens or concubines in the harem (church) (Song of Solomon 6:9). The concept of the Church is truly patriarchal as was the true Jewish culture regarding marriage. As the church is comprised of many, yet are collectively referred to as "wife" espoused (newly contractually married) to one husband HaMashiyach (The Head of the Church--the wife, as confirmed in 2 Corinthians 11:2, Ephesians 5:32, and Revelation 21:2, etc., etc.), so was the case of a Husband with more than one wife. He was their head, whom they (collectively) were to honor.

GIDEON

Gideon was a mighty man of valor and was a great righteous Judge of Israel. He

had many wives and concubines. He was heralded as a righteous man in the scriptures.

Read Judges 8:30.

ABIJAH

"But Abijah waxed mighty, and married fourteen wives...the rest of the acts of Abijah, and his ways, and his sayings, are written in the story of the prophet Iddo"

2 Chronicles 13:21-21

Abijah is another great scriptural example of a very godly and righteous man who

liberally practiced polygamy.

RUTH

If you have never read the Book of Ruth in the Bible, you must do so. It is one of the most remarkable stories of love for family you have ever read. Boaz became a surrogate husband for Ruth's dead husband. Ruth chose Boaz (even though he was much older than she) due to her deep devotion to Naomi to have for her family name a son from Naomi's family to perpetuate the family name (Naomi's). Ruth was very unselfish and chose not younger and/or rich men, but did what was pleasing to YHWH. Granted Boaz had many maidens (and probably wives although specifics are mentioned--not the point of the story) but Ruth was to be special because of her virtue and love.

YHWH

If you count them, YHWH has more than three collective "wives"--Samaria, Judah, Israel, Jerusalem, and the Church. Apostle Paul declared that YHWH never put away his wives (Romans 11:1-2). However, HaMashiyach came to breakdown the walls that kept these separate corporate wives apart. He wanted them all under one roof as one

in unity, purpose and faith, dissimilar regarding personality, yet similar in unity, purpose, and faith.

Not only are Neo-Jewish husbands instructed to treat their wives as joint heirs of YHWH's kingdom, just as HaMashiyach gave himself for the Church and paid a great dowry price to redeem her, wives are taught to be subject to their own husbands in everything and reverence her husband as one who is redeemed; to do all they can to revere their husband by honoring him in every way as their "head". To see that he is ultimately happy, respected and honored. Review how godly women in the Bible did this for their husbands.

"For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: he is the savior of the body."

Ephesians 5:23

The YHWH-ORDAINED Neo-Jewish responsibility of females is to get married and be subject to their husband, not to run around "free as a bird" and be unproductive as a wife and as a believer. A husband is the savior of the wife, just as HaMashiyach is the savior of the body (his wife). Apostle Paul would not tolerate a widow to avoid getting remarried unless she lived a chaste and celibate life as a servant of the church. She was not even allowed to change her mind after several years of church servitude.

"Having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith"

1 Timothy 5:12

"Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything."

Ephesians 5:24

"Subject" in the Greek means to subordinate, to submit ones self unto.
"...and the wife see that she reverence her husband."

Ephesians 5:33

"Reverence" in the Greek mean to be in awe of, be afraid of, revere.

"Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord."

Colossians 3:18

It is through this divinely ordained subordination structure that women are greatly blessed by YHWH and their prayers unhindered. In this way, husbands will honor their wives and speak of them in the gates (Proverbs 31:23, 30-31) and their names praised among women. The spirit of anti-HaMashiyach is one who cannot confess that Jesus is the HaMashiyach, the husband of the bride. In the same sense, feminism, etc. is of the spirit of anti-HaMashiyach. Women who do not honor, subject, and revere their husbands are rebellious, i.e., they are ANTI-husband.

CONCLUSION ON MULTI-WIVES (POLYGAMY)

Keep in mind that description is NOT prescription. This book merely submits both Biblical and historical facts, which does not mean that this book prescribes its findings, *per se*, nor does it suggest a mandate. But the question must be asked, given so much Biblical evidence, why do people in modern times try and say that polygamy (this is not a word used in the Bible) is sinful or ignore its existence? There is no scripture

anywhere that teaches against it or declares it as sinful. Nor did HaMashiyach condemn the practice. The only logical answer is that Satan tried to destroy the paradigm of the "Mystery of HaMashiyach and the Church" in the minds of saints, to break down the family system, by preying on the weakness of men and women, which has altered the eternal destiny of so many. As stated earlier, the concept of enforced "monogamy" is a very perverse concept and totally contrary to YHWH's word and the true ways of righteousness. Conversely, forced "multi-wives", as did/do the Mormons and especially when done immorally, or as the Muslims practice it, is also perverse.

Monogamy was forced onto society by the Greeks and later adopted by the RCC, then passed onto the Protestants and then to governments. As Protestant Organizations formed, emerging from the RCC, they still held onto many of Augustine's unscriptural and evil ideas regarding human sexuality. If Augustine had had his way everybody would be sexless (emasculated). If that were the case, humanity would cease to exist because there would be no babies born due to a lack of all sexual activity, again contrary to YHWH's word. YHWH instituted marriage and human sexuality for procreation among other reasons.

Studies show that multi-wife patriarchal families stay intact just as long (if not longer) single-wife families, with little to no promiscuous sexual occurrences. Children are just as stable and just as well behaved. Said multi-wife families tend to be more prosperous, in more ways than one, and so on.

Nonetheless, it is still a lifestyle of personal choice, and is certainly not for everyone. Unfortunately, the monogamy enforcement laws have prevented many women

in the “Christian” community from experiencing a happy marriage and family life. In fact, it has driven many women to choose from among far less than desirable (ungodly) males due to the lack of a sufficient number of godly men within the church.

Many holy multi-wife families are more in line with the Biblical model which provides for a more stable family environment. Unfortunately, society may never shed its Hellenistic views in the area of marriage, and may never return to the Divine patriarchal family system, the true type of HaMashiach and the Church. As a result, sexual perversion and broken families are on the rise. Adultery, divorce, and fornication are rampant, even among “Christians” in “Christian” nations of Europe and the Americas, where polygamy is tabooed. It is high time for a grass roots revival of these Biblical principles.

It is terribly unfortunate that the Church has failed to teach the truth on this vital subject that could benefit men, women and family life. Proper Neo-Jewish obedience will help men and women become free from the snare of the devil. There are far too many women who are not virgins, yet seek a husband (not their first) and expect said husband to accept her non-chastity. Thank YHWH for grace, because under Old Covenant laws, such frauds would be killed immediately. Grace keeps many who are guilty alive and forgiven with a chance to get it right, when and if the chance comes along. Women can unite with their rightful husband, unless he will not have her. Then she is free to remarry, but only in the Lord.

What happens far too often is many young ladies in the church seek relationships with young men outside the church, men who are often sinners/un godly, men who are

seeking only sexual pleasure, men who have little to no maturity, men who have little to no intention of providing for her the rest of her life. But because the young lady wants "love", children and family and has no alternative within the church due to monogamy constraints and the lack of eligible single males, she seeks unbelieving males as a potential husband. This is a tragedy. At least the Muslims and Mormons (as did the Jews) ensure marriage "within the faith" by allowing, even encouraging if necessary, polygamy as an answer in such cases.

Even girls outside the church with no moral restraints often yield to the "if you love me you will have sex with me" gimmick (or something similar). She then loses one of her greatest and sacred gifts she can offer to her husband to be, her virginity. Young immature men cannot and do not appreciate virginity, today in a moral sense. This is also a tragedy. Thus, girls are unlawfully seeking men and men are unlawfully seeking women producing a pandemic of adultery, it is everywhere.

Although multi-wives may not be for everybody, and should not be enforced like the Mormons did, one could keep it in mind as a potential alternative, but only for the right scenarios and with total openness and honesty (unless non-enforcement causes a woman to be separated from her husband without a cause and to be exposed to adultery as the only option for a male relationship). Also, do not condemn the many believers (or even non-believers) that do practice it, for there are many. If one seeks a concubine for her husband and they live in a culture where "Westernized Christianity" prevails, it is suggested that they seek a concubine or handmaid from another culture where they are more inclined to the Biblical model. For example some Asian, African and Middle

Eastern countries have been less influenced by Hellenism in this regard.

Remember, although Polygamy was commonly accepted in the New Testament days, it did not mandate the lifestyle either. Conversely, neither did they condemn it. If so, there should be plenty of passages making it clear that polygamy was wrong if that was in fact a real issue HaMashiyyach and the Apostles (including Paul) really cared about. Additionally, as stated earlier, a *lack* of passages stating that polygamy is *right* in the Bible or books written to cultures that were already openly polygamous proves nothing. They didn't *need* to be told it was right. They were already practicing it and had been practicing it throughout biblical history, as openly recorded in the Bible.

As for whether or not the New Testament shows any examples of polygamous marriages as being wrong, you might just as well argue that monogamy is wrong too on the same basis that it does not show any specific monogamy examples among the disciples either. It is known that Peter had a mother-in-law who was sick; but we have no idea how many mothers-in-law he might have had who were not sick or how many wives he had or *if he had any*. Maybe he was celibate by the time he became a disciple. The daughter of that mother-in-law may have died.

Neither is it known if Paul had any wives. Maybe none of the disciples had wives by the time they became disciples. So, does that prove polygamy or monogamy is wrong if none of them were married? How, then, can a lack of any statements about wives prove polygamy or monogamy whether it is right or wrong? Moreover, since nothing is known about how many wives any of them had, it is ALSO not known if some of them were openly polygamous or not. In short, a *lack* of passages stating something proves nothing.

One could simply make any case out of it.

Clearly the church, at the least, had men who had more than one wife or Paul would not have laid out the requirement that elders of the church be men with only “one” wife, if the word “one” is interpreted to mean “one in number”. Since *all* elders of the church are appointed from *within* the church it would be impossible for them to be *anything but* men with only one wife (or no wives, which is ludicrous) if that was the only kind of marriage allowed in the church. For example, if you have a box of apples that has only apples in it, you don't have to tell people selecting apples from the box, “Select only apples out of that box.” It would be kind of ignorant to even say it if there were only apples in the box. So, at the minimum, polygamy existed and was clearly not a basis for being excluded from the church.

Paul, however, describes his personal ideal as being celibate. But, lacking celibacy, certainly no more than “one” wife would be his second-best to the *ideal* for the ministry. But, an ideal doesn't make something mandatory. If it did, ALL “Christians” would be celibate and “Christianity” would implode into non-existence over time.

Chapter

- 7 -

THE FAMILY SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION

Due to the severe breakdown of the family system around the world this chapter will delineate basic Biblical principles that will help strengthen the family and bring it into alignment with YHWH's principles. HaMashiyach was just as interested in children as in adults and mandated that children not be forbid. He further indicated that adults must receive the kingdom of YHWH as a little child, or entrance would not be granted.

“And they brought young children to him, that he should touch them: and *his* disciples rebuked those that brought *them*. ¹⁴ But when Jesus saw *it*, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. ¹⁵ Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. ¹⁶ And he took them up in his arms, put *his* hands upon them, and blessed them.”

Mark 10:13-16

“And he took a child, and set him in the midst of them: and when he had taken him in his arms, he said unto them, ³⁷ Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.”

Mark 9:36-37

In other words, the scriptures deal with the entire family system, husband, wife, and children. YHWH is interested in everyone from the youngest to the oldest. However, without key Biblical principles applied to the family system, serious problems

can result causing a breakdown of the family and/or the marriage and the even the loss of faith in all parties concerned.

HUSBAND AND WIFE RELATIONSHIP

Of course the husband and wife relationship comes before any children are added to the system. Therefore, this dyad will be examined first and then the expanded family system with children involved. There are three major components to a strong husband and wife dyad and they are listed below.

Authority Structure

Adam was formed first, by YHWH and was considered a Son of YHWH (Luke 3:38) and then Eve was created second, by YHWH. However, Eve was created by YHWH, not from the dust of the ground (Genesis 2:7) like Adam, but from one of Adam's ribs (Genesis 2:22) denoting not only that Eve was a Daughter of YHWH, but that Eve belonged to Adam. Eve was Adam's rib (expanded) and thus belonged to Adam (it was Adam's rib, literally, that was borrowed to make her) and she was to be by his side as a help meet. Woman was created for the man, not man for the woman (1 Corinthians 11:8-9), a fact that modern women are trying to sweep under the carpet and a fact that has nothing to do with the first part of the curse placed on the woman (Genesis 3:16), but maybe somewhat related to the second part of the curse.

The New Testament scriptures further validates this Old Testament principle of the divinely established ownership/authority structure of the wife and family. Apostle Paul compared the husband and wife union to the union of HaMashiyach and the Church in this way. HaMashiyach is the “head” of the church (Ephesians 1:22; Colossians 1:18)

even as the husband is the “head” of the wife (and family) (Ephesians 5:23). This word “head” refers to “seizing”, “taken hold of” (*kaphale*, Greek transliteration), as in owner and ownership. Ownership, then, speaks to authority of/over. Of course, there is no true believer that denies that HaMashiyyach is the “head” of the church or is the one that is in authority over his church (wife), after all HaMashiyyach purchased (seized her) her (paid the dowry for her) with his own shed blood (Acts 20:28; Hebrews 9:12; Ephesians 1:27; Colossians 1:14). In like manner, the husband is the “owner” of the wife, the one in authority, i.e., the head of the wife. Even governments recognize the concept of the “head of household”. So how is it that anyone could deny the Biblical principle of dowry, ownership, authority over? To do so is to deny the word of YHWH and the truths found therein.

However, keep in mind that it is the woman (wife) that is the glory of the man (1 Corinthians 11:7). This “glory” principle is found in many places throughout the scriptures and should be paid close attention to by both the husband and the wife. As the church is the glory of Yahushua (Revelation 21:9-11) so is the natural wife the glory of her husband. She is his most prized possession, the one who he is willing to give his life for, the one he is willing to give all to and for. This concept, when understood, is what woman want, to be “married for love” and what greater love (John 15:13) is there than a man willing to lay down his life for his friend (in this case, his wife).

Strong Bond of Charity

The first major component to examine is a strong bond of love (charity). This bond is not referring to sexual passion and human sexuality. This refers to the Universal

Tri-Directional axiom (Briggs, 2007). Feelings come and go, passions come and go and they are driven by hormones and pheromones, which are unstable. However, if a couple maintains a bond of love (charity), there should be far less (to none) problems with passion and human sexuality between them as well as many other potential conflicts.

It is natural for couples to face and experience conflicts and disagreements. But that is all part of the bonding process and the meshing of the two psyches, a critical process in the marriage relationship. Just as a couple becomes one sexually (physically), they also, and more importantly, become one intellectually (psychically), spiritually. These three strands braid together to create a bond like a three-fold chord that is not easily broken.

“Two *are* better than one; because they have a good reward for their labour.¹⁰ For if they fall, the one will lift up his fellow: but woe to him *that is* alone when he falleth; for *he hath* not another to help him up.¹¹ Again, if two lie together, then they have heat: but how can one be warm *alone*?¹² And if one prevail against him, two shall withstand him; and a threefold cord is not quickly broken.”

Ecclesiastes 4:9-12

Strong Leadership

The second component that is important to examine is the family leadership issue. YHWH has established that the man be the “head” of the wife (Ephesians 5:23) and the wife in charge of the family under the guidance of her husband. It is important that both the husband and wife understand this and acknowledges this establishment. Without it, there will be undo conflicts and constant power struggles, which, if/when children are born to the family, is something that must be resolved long before they reach one year old. If the wife feels her husband is incompetent, find a way to helpfully change that,

whether through mutual efforts or through external assistance.

Strong established leadership within the family system prevents financial issues, which are among the top five issues that couples struggle with in married life. This is regardless of whether or not there are one or two income producers. This also links heavily to gender guiding lines brought to the marriage by both the husband and the wife. Therefore, strongly established Leadership with readjusted (if necessary) gender guiding lines helps establish a united front in reference to child rearing and any external issues that may face the family system.

Leadership also requires that the “head” of the family lead and guide the family spiritually. This includes family prayer, Bible reading and teaching, and family worship, whether by house church or joining another house church. This not only bonds the family spiritually, but will act as an aid to help the family through difficult times if/when they come.

Contrary to the belief of many men, this is not a license for cruelty, dictatorship or “lordship” attitudes or behaviors. The leadership position is a serious responsibility, one that is not to be taken lightly, but administered with all humility, honesty, integrity and kindness, i.e., with all the elements of charity. After all, YHWH will hold every “head” of household responsible for their leadership actions.

Distribution of Labor

The final component to examine here is the distribution of labor. This is critical component that brings harmony to and keeps balance in the home. In modern times,

particularly in western cultures, many wives work outside the home. Although, in some circumstance this may be absolutely necessary, it is best for the wife to be a keeper of the home and children, while the husband works in the community or in and around the home relative to self-employment. This does not necessarily make him the sole “bread winner”, for the wife usually contributes in some way by creatively reducing the “cost of living” for the household through her labor at home and other possible contributions.

This component also plays closely to the subconscious gender guiding lines each party brings to the marriage. If there is serious conflict here, adjustments must be made or a never ending battle will erupt again and again. It is important that the couple “talk this out” and work this out. Just because the “head” of the household may be the chief “bread winner”, this does not exclude him from participating in household labor. In fact, it can be of great help to his wife during high activity times adding stress whether brought on by increased number of children during meal time or when guests may be visiting and being entertained.

It is also important for a husband to respect his wife’s role in the household and give her the “space” she requires to accomplish her tasks and if assisting her, be sure to inquire how she would like things done. This will prevent unnecessary conflict. Should she want suggestions, she will certainly seek advice. Tasks/labor relative to the home can include, cooking, cleaning, laundry, feeding the children and rearing the children. There are many ways the husband can and should assist in these tasks, within a balanced proportion. Husbands can go beyond the “call of duty” when doing so helps maintain peace and harmony in the home, especially at stressful times.

CHILDREN'S RELATIONSHIP TO PARENTS

An interesting scripture can be found in the first epistle of Timothy relative to childbearing. It is clear that Apostle Paul believed that women were to be submissive, particularly since the order of creation placed men before women and that Adam was not the first one to be deceived and transgress. Apostle Paul linked death during childbirth with the lack of faithfulness, charity and holiness with sobriety for women. Paul obviously believed that the significant role of women was childbearing. An alternative view is that childbearing is an element of salvation for a woman, but this idea is unfair for women that are barren and must be dismissed.

“Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.¹² But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.¹³ For Adam was first formed, then Eve.¹⁴ And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.¹⁵ Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.”

1 Timothy 2:11-15

The Bible is also quite clear on how children should behave towards their parents. But, sadly, it appears that in end times, the family system will have faltered to the point of alarm.

“Now the brother shall betray the brother to death, and the father the son; and children shall rise up against *their* parents, and shall cause them to be put to death.”

Mark 13:12

Biblical principles regarding this subject were set forth very early in scripture,

early in the Old Testament.

“Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee.”

Exodus 20:12

“Honour thy father and thy mother, as the LORD thy God hath commanded thee; that thy days may be prolonged, and that it may go well with thee, in the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee.”

Deuteronomy 5:16

This principle was reestablished by HaMashiyach, since the Pharisees and the teachers of the law had apparently skewed the Mosaic Law to the point it was useless.

“But he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? ⁴ For God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and mother: and, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death. ⁵ But ye say, Whosoever shall say to *his* father or *his* mother, *It is* a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; ⁶ And honour not his father or his mother, *he shall be free*. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition.”

Matthew 15:3-6

“Honour thy father and *thy* mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.”

Matthew 19:19

“And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition. ¹⁰ For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death: ¹¹ But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, *It is* Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; *he shall be free*. ¹² And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother; ¹³ Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like

things do ye.”

Mark 7:9-13

The Apostles also took up the torch to further advance this valuable principle with its roots in the Old Testament.

“Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. ² Honour thy father and mother; (which is the first commandment with promise;) ³ That it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth.”

Ephesians 6:1-3

What is interesting about this commandment is it the first commandment with promise. It is important that children are taught this principle as early as possible and reminded of it throughout their childhood and teenage years, not in a nagging sort of way, but one of opportunity. This teaching is not just about obedience, but also about showing and bringing honor to the parents.

CHILD REARING AND DISCIPLINE

This section of the chapter examines the Biblical principles relative to child bearing, childcare, child rearing and disciplining a child. These principles will aid in stabilizing the family system and help bring and maintain peace and harmony in the home.

Highest Priority

The first principle relates to the priority of nurturing and caring for children within the home. HaMashiyach brushed on this principle as recorded by Mark

“But Jesus said unto her, Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast *it* unto the dogs.”

Mark 7:27

Children are the first priority of mothers and father, to make sure they are fed and well cared for, before others. Sadly, some parents neglect this principle. In the following verse, it can be seen the level of priority a mother has placed on the well being and future of her children, commendable.

“Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children with her sons, worshipping *him*, and desiring a certain thing of him.²¹ And he said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom.”

Matthew 20:20-21

In the following verse, recorded by Matthew, the same principle is shown again, that even “evil” parents know how to give good gifts to their children, a principle that come from YHWH himself.

“If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?”

Matthew 7:11

Nurture

Included within the priority of child is the nurturing of a child, an extremely important aspect of healthy child development. Nurture includes feeding food, keeping the child warm and clean and tending to the child's needs. Nurture also includes emotional, intellectual and spiritual nurture as well. The nurturing element can be seen

within the following verse as recorded by Matthew.

“O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *thou* that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under *her* wings, and ye would not!”

Matthew 23:37

Discipline

Another important element relative to child rearing is discipline. When children are given a consistent framework of boundaries and limits, a child can flourish within said boundaries and limits. It is the parents' job to establish them and the child think it is their job to test them and test them they will. However, so long as the parents' remain consistent, the child is better psychologically developed and better equipped mentally and emotionally to deal with real life. However, discipline relative to the breach of established boundaries and limits should not be disproportionate, but just. To do so, can break down the proper bond and provoke a child to wrath.

“And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.”

Ephesians 6:4

Nonetheless, discipline is important. In modern times, many are questioning the age-old method of corporal punishment and its validity and value. First, a review of what the scriptures have to say about it.

“Withhold not correction from the child: for *if* thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die.¹⁴ Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell.¹⁵ My son, if thine heart be wise, my heart shall rejoice, even mine.¹⁶ Yea,

my reins shall rejoice, when thy lips speak right things.

Proverbs 23:13-16

“The rod and reproof give wisdom: but a child left *to himself* bringeth his mother to shame.”

Proverbs 29:15

“And he said unto them, What counsel give ye that we may answer this people, who have spoken to me, saying, Make the yoke which thy father did put upon us lighter? ¹⁰ And the young men that were grown up with him spake unto him, saying, Thus shalt thou speak unto this people that spake unto thee, saying, Thy father made our yoke heavy, but make thou *it* lighter unto us; thus shalt thou say unto them, My little *finger* shall be thicker than my father's loins. ¹¹ And now whereas my father did lade you with a heavy yoke, I will add to your yoke: my father hath chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions. ¹² So Jeroboam and all the people came to Rehoboam the third day, as the king had appointed, saying, Come to me again the third day. ¹³ And the king answered the people roughly, and forsook the old men's counsel that they gave him; ¹⁴ And spake to them after the counsel of the young men, saying, My father made your yoke heavy, and I will add to your yoke: my father *also* chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions.

1 Kings 12:9-14

Obviously, corporal punishment is Biblical. But what it does not say is when it is appropriate and how often it should be administered. This, once again, comes back to justice, moderation, etc. Punishment must meet the offense. This establishes justice in the mind of children and prevents a provocation to wrath. What is important here is a proper balanced and well developed child that is ready to handle adulthood in the real world. Just because family tradition may have dealt out punishment a certain way does not necessarily mean that it was the best way. Each family should carefully consider the Biblical principles and what discipline is all about, its purpose and intended outcome.

Being “right” on a particular matter is not necessarily always the best for all involved. Stubbornness has its merits, but not if more damage is caused than good as a result of it, especially when it comes to family systems. Wisdom and caution is required here. Do not hastily dish out discipline beyond the simplest of matters

Bishops and Deacons Set the Example

This section of this chapter will examine the example that Bishops and Deacons must be for the general assembly of the Body of HaMashiyach. People are watching them whether intended consciously or not, some just by transference. Below is what Apostle Paul wrote to Timothy on this subject.

“A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach; ³ Not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; ⁴ One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; ⁵ (For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?) ⁶ Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil. ⁷ Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.”

1 Timothy 3:2-7

“Likewise *must* the deacons *be* grave, not doubletongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; ⁹ Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. ¹⁰ And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being *found* blameless. ¹¹ Even so *must* *their* wives *be* grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. ¹² Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. ¹³ For they that have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus.”

1 Timothy 3: 8-13

Apostle Paul also wrote on this subject when he wrote to Titus.

“If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children not accused of riot or unruly. ⁷ For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God; not selfwilled, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; ⁸ But a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate; ⁹ Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.”

Titus 1:6-9

It is quite clear that if a Bishop or Deacon is unable to rule his own household well and train his children he lacks the ability to lead the house of YHWH and should certainly focus on getting his own house in order first. Unfortunately, many ministers seem to be unable to recuse themselves from church leadership if/when necessary.

In conclusion, this chapter is not intended to provide extensive child rearing, child psychology or marriage counseling, but to present Biblical principles that can set the basic standards, which can be extrapolated out into real life scenarios. It will also act as a guide to know when an individual or literature is misguiding people with regards to marriage, family and human sexuality.

Chapter One Quiz Questions

1. How is the phrase “head of the church” used, from a language perspective? _____

2. What five meanings can be attributed to the term “head of the church”? _____

3. Who fulfills the role of “head of the church”? _____

4. What synonym can be used for the phrase “body of HaMashiach”? _____

5. Who fulfills the role of the “body of HaMashiach”? _____

6. Identify five things that define the “beauty/atraction” of the wife. _____

7. What cultural context is scripture rooted in? _____

8. What patriarch emerged from among the Sumerians that is considered the progenitor of the most ancient surviving religion on earth? _____

9. What cultural influences were present when HaMashiach arrived upon the scene?

10. What culture first introduced “monogamy” as a state law and for what purpose?

11. What was the norm prior to “monogamy”? _____

12. Why was the introduction of “monogamy” by its founders evil relative to Biblical morals? _____

HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT

On the space provided below write a one-page response to this Chapter. Express your thoughts and feelings about this Chapter and how you have received it!

Chapter Two Quiz Questions

1. What Roman emperor declared/made “Christianity” the state religion of Rome?

2. What Roman emperor enforced “Christianity” as Rome’s state religion? _____

www.english-test.net

3. Based on historical facts, what can one conclude about Islam regarding monotheism or polytheism? _____

Page 10 of 10

4. In what new way (never before done) did the Jews utilize history? _____

5. How many corporate wives did YHWH have? _____

What will YHWH one day do with these corporate wives?

7. Who's righteousness must NT believers surpass to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven? _____

3. Identify four ways Byzantinism, Hellenism, and Romanism influenced “Christendom” post Apostolic era (after 100 AD)? _____

9. Identify four additional ways Babylonianism, Hellenism, and Romanism

influenced “Christendom” post-Apostolic era (after 100 AD) beyond what you

Write in Question # 8 above: _____

HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT

On the space provided below write a one-page response to this Chapter. Express your thoughts and feelings about this Chapter and how you have received it!

Chapter Three

Quiz Questions

1. Identify four Hebrew words that identify the sexual status of a female. _____

2. Identify four additional Hebrew words that further identify the sexual status of a female. _____

3. Identify four additional Hebrew/Greek words that further identify the sexual status of a female. _____

4. Identify two Hebrew words that identify the immoral sexual status of a male. _____

5. Identify three Hebrew words (and their meanings) that bring contextual perspective relative to the subject of scriptural sexual morality/immorality. _____

6. Identify three Greek words (and their meanings) that bring contextual perspective relative to the subject of scriptural sexual morality/immorality. _____

7. Identify three additional Greek words (and their meanings) that bring contextual perspective relative to the subject of scriptural morality/immorality. _____

8. Identify three English words (and their meanings) that bring contextual perspective relative to the subject of scriptural morality/immorality. _____

9. In YHWH's eyes, what constitutes marriage and within who's hands (oversight) has this sacred institution been left to on earth? _____

10. What was the Biblical penalty for a man (or woman) that circumvented the dowry system? _____

11. What is the Biblical marriage process supposed to be? _____

12. What is the Biblical proof of chastity and what is the punishment for the lack thereof? _____

HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT

On the space provided below write a one-page response to this Chapter. Express your thoughts and feelings about this Chapter and how you have received it!

Chapter Four

Quiz Questions

1. How does YHWH join a man and woman as husband and wife? _____

2. What part does the family of the bride-to-be and husband-to-be play in joining a man and woman as husband and wife? _____

3. According to the OT, how long is a marriage supposed to last? _____

4. According to the NT, how long is a marriage supposed to last? _____

5. What NT parable did HaMashiyach use to illustrate the spiritual “wedding/marriage” nature of the Kingdom of Heaven (the future of the “church”)? _____

6. What Apostles used the “marriage” (and wife) concept in their writings to indicate the corporate wife (“church”) of YVHV in HaMashiyach to be married or espoused like a “wife”? _____

7. What prophets used the marriage (and wife) concept in their writings to indicate the corporate wife of YHWH? _____

8. What lesson should be derived from the “body” of HaMashiyach doctrine relative to the “wife” of YHWH in HaMashiyach? _____

9. In what four ways does HaMashiyach model how a natural husband should behave towards his natural wife? _____

10. What seven ways should a wife be/behave towards her husband as modeled by the church (“body of HaMashiyach”)?

HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT

On the space provided below write a one-page response to this Chapter. Express your thoughts and feelings about this Chapter and how you have received it!

Chapter Five Quiz Questions

1. What act(s) allows a spouse to divorce his/her spouse, according to scriptures?

2. Define Adultery. _____

3. Define fornication. _____

4. Explain why it seems that Apostle Paul controverts the teachings of HaMashiyach on divorce.

5. In the event of an unjustified divorce, who has the greater condemnation, the wife or husband, and why? _____

6. What is the scriptural logic/principle for HaMashiyach forgiving the woman caught in the very act of adultery and with what instruction did he send her away with?

7. Explain what is meant by an “abstract death penalty”. _____

8. According to the Mosaic Law, what punishment should be administered to an individual that commits incest (according to the Biblical definition)? _____

9. Identify four sexual crimes. _____

10. Identify four “Special Laws” found in Chapter Five and explain what they are.

HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT

On the space provided below write a one-page response to this Chapter. Express your thoughts and feelings about this Chapter and how you have received it!

Chapter Six

Quiz Questions

1. What splinter group of the RCC allows its priests to marry? _____

2. In what way did HaMashiach endorse/encourage celibacy? _____

3. Who introduced monogamy to the world a politically/governmentally enforced lifestyle and in what way(s) does this contradict Biblical principles? _____

4. How has 1 Timothy 3:12 often been misconstrued? _____

5. What were the Levitical/Aaronic priesthood restrictions regarding marriage and multi-wives and how was this different from the general populous? _____

6. What famous priest had multi-wives? _____
7. What famous judge/prophet/priest was the son of a mother that lived in a multi-wife family system? _____
8. What was the difference between the laws on marriage for Levites as compared to the Aaronic Priesthood (High Priests)? _____

9. What can be shown scripturally relative to the problem with the traditional view 1 Timothy 3:12? _____

10. Cite at least four OT examples of righteous men that developed a multi-wife family system. _____

11. Why did Nathan not condemn King David for having multi-wives; conversely, what did Nathan condemn David for? _____

HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT

On the space provided below write a one-page response to this Chapter. Express your thoughts and feelings about this Chapter and how you have received it!

Chapter Seven Quiz Questions

1. What was HaMashiyach's perspective on children? _____

2. What is the Biblical family authority structure? _____

3. Concerning the "head" of the family system, what does this word mean in the Greek? _____
4. What does "glory" mean relative to the wife to her husband? _____

5. Identify at least three major components that yield a strong healthy Biblical family system. _____

6. What is the Biblical teaching regarding the relationship between children and their parents? _____

7. What is the commandment with promise relative to the family system? _____

8. What are the three major Biblical principles should be utilized relative to child rearing and discipline? _____

9. Who in the church should set the example for the flock relative to the family system? _____

HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT

On the space provided below write a one-page response to this Chapter. Express your thoughts and feelings about this Chapter and how you have received it!

APPENDICES

Appendix One

EXTRA COMMENTS

YHWH instituted marriage (as defined herein) and never entrusted it with any institution--not even the church or the government. Thus the marriage license, the clergy involvement and/ or justice of the peace involvement, was a Babylonian (Mother of Harlots') creation and undermines YHWH's divine and glorious institution and how it was to be entered into. The scriptural teaching regarding the concept of HaMashiyach and the Church starts by utilizing Old and New Testament examples. Right from the very first human union, the metaphor of Adam and Eve, as a type of HaMashiyach and the Church can be seen.

"For Adam was first formed, then Eve."

1 Timothy 2:13

"Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him to come ... Jesus HaMashiyach ... "

Romans 5:14-15

"For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to HaMashiyach. But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in HaMashiyach. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus..."

2 Corinthians 11:2-4

So what was Adam and Eve's transgression? Not everyone commits the same kind of sin Adam did, so what was it? What did the serpent beguile Eve to do? What did she then convince her husband, Adam, to do? If the sin was merely eating a piece of citrus fruit, why then did they want to cover their genitalia when previously they were unashamed to leave it uncovered? Leviticus 18 gives some insight.

"... The nakedness of thy father's wife shalt thou not uncover: it is thy father's

nakedness..."

Leviticus 18:6-30

The Hebrew word for "nakedness" refers to *pudenda*. How is a woman's *pudenda* her husband's *pudenda*? Simply put, a woman's *pudenda* is sacred and belongs to her husband and is unavailable to anyone else. If she is a virgin, then it is only available to the man to whom she is to wed and no other.

"The wife hath not power over her own body, but the husband: ..."'

1 Corinthians 7:2

Please note that the husband must also make himself sexually available to his "wife" any time she desires.

Therefore the entire chapter 18 of Leviticus is dedicated to the sacredness of the *pudenda* and to whom it is or is not available. Once the *pudenda* is spoken for and paid for (even if a deposit is made) it immediately becomes unavailable indefinitely, until the husband (the only rightful owner) dies and that is if he dies before his "wife".

Apparently the sin of Eve was a disobedient sex act and metaphorically depicted by "fruit", even as Songs of Solomon uses fruit for sexual metaphors. The same goes with Adam and Eve. The question however, is what sex act? One may conclude (but not blatantly stated in scripture), first of all, that Eve's sexual experience was not with Adam but with someone or something else. If there were no other men on earth (as many evangelicals believe, but unlike many Jews or other faiths), then the sex act had to be with an animal (which is also covered in Leviticus 18 too, which apparently became a common practice, or at least known to be practiced in early history and is still practiced today). However, Adam was then persuaded to do it as well.

Some cults teach that Eve had sex with Satan (a fallen angel) and had children by him, i.e., Cain. However, HaMashiyach taught that angels could not have sex and/or procreate. So, it is unlikely that Eve had sex with an angel. It is probable that Eve was beguiled (by trickery, sorcery) into having sex outside the marriage bed with the "serpent". The serpent was the most subtle beast of the field and with Satan's supernatural powers the beast verbally seduced Eve into an unrighteous sex act. (Read 2 Corinthians 11:14; Galatians 1:8). Later, the beast copulated with Adam.

Why do most theologians think the forbidden "fruit" was a sex act? The New Testament analogy gives light on this. For example, as shown above, 2 Corinthians 11:2-4 indicates by analogy that Eve was seduced away from Adam in the same way the Judaizers were attempting to seduce the Church away from HaMashiyach. The major transgression a woman commits when seduced away from her husband is unlawful sex.

And, unlawful sex for a male is comprised of having sex with another man's wife (pudenda), which is adultery or fornication (which includes incest, prostitution, whoredom, orgies, homosexuality and having sex with an animal). Since therefore there were no other men and no other women that belonged to other men, the sin was not adultery, incest, prostitution, whoredom, orgies, or homosexuality. The conclusion can only be beastiality.

One main reason why most main-stream theologians believe that the forbidden "fruit" that Eve ate was a metaphor of Eve being seduced into inappropriate sex was because the disobedient act did produce guilt that focused on both of Adam and Eve's "nakedness". All Old Testament citations reflect "nakedness" as the same Hebrew root as "naked" found in Genesis 3:7; 10-11. Nakedness specifically refers to having sex with the female pudenda, i.e., the female genitalia composition--clitoris, labia, vagina, etc. In the case of a male application, it is generally referring to the *pudenda* of his wife; in extremely rare cases it would mean the male genitalia.

Nevertheless, right from the beginning, the lesson of the "wife" being espoused to only one man can be clearly seen. Because of Eve's disobedience (to keep herself chaste), she was cursed with multiplication of sorrow, i.e., women would bring forth children with pain and their desire shall be to their husband, who would rule over them. (Read Genesis 3:16) And, this principle and divinely placed law is carried forth into the New Testament as well.

"Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence...And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in transgression."

1 Timothy 2:12-14

Apostle Paul indicates that it was the woman who was deceived (first) not Adam and then she, not Satan, talked her husband into sinning. Thus, he taught that men should do the "talking" when it comes to giving guidance in the words of truth.

Miscellaneous Facts

Kenneth E. Lamb, (writer for the Miami Herald, New York Times, and the Jewish Information Network) (Lamb, 1997), writes,

"...child prostitution is next, since the sex business needs "clean" partners young enough unlikely to be infected with AIDS yet. Internationally, it's already happened. In Japan, child sex is so excepted that vending machines offers pictures and phone numbers of high school and middle school girls selling themselves to get money for designer clothes; in India, families dedicate their pre-teen daughters to urban brothels; and in Thailand, escorted tours to pre-teen prostitutes are marketed openly outside the country. In the U.S. alone, officials estimate more than 600,000 early teen and pre-teen girls work the streets."

Covenant Truths

The following discussion on Covenant Truths will cast additional light on the subject. It will also reveal that some covenants did not actually end and how many Divine institutions transcend parenthetical covenants.

Most theologians understand the significance of covenants regarding various truths. However, the issues of marriage, human sexuality and the family system precedes and transcends all dispensations until eternity begins. In other words, marriage and human sexual guidelines were ordained and instituted by YHWH and is not altered in any given dispensation, although a few things are tolerated by YHWH rather than encouraged. This is critically important when considering this important subject.

Theologians are in close agreement on the subject of covenants, sometimes referred to as dispensations, although dates and dispensation titles may slightly vary. However, the general consensus promotes eight covenants and/or dispensations as follows:

Innocence - From the Creation of Adam to the Fall of humanity by partaking of the "Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil" when YHWH expelled Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden.

Conscience - From the Expulsion to when YHWH destroyed the world by water in the times of Noah and the Ark.

Human Government - From the Flood to the times when YHWH dispersed humanity across the face of the earth by divinely introducing multi- languages as a judgment.

Promise - From times of the disbursement, the calling of Abram, to the times when Israelites was forced into Egyptian slavery.

Law - From the times of the Egyptian bondage to the times when the HaMashiyach (HaMashiyach the Lord) was slain as the "lamb slain from the foundations of the world", HaMashiyach's death on Calvary.

Grace - From the times of the crucifixion to the times when HaMashiyach will return a second time to take his "bride" to their new home, catching away of the saints and YHWH's "wrath" poured out upon the earth. This dispensation is still in effect. This actually gives all believers in HaMashiyach access to the "covenants of promise" via YHWH in HaMashiyach and the work of Calvary. Its mercy and grace because without HaMashiyach Gentiles would otherwise have no access to the commonwealth of Israel.

Millennium - From the Wrath of YHWH to the destruction of "Gog and Magog", the times of the "White Throne Judgment" when time will cease and eternity will begin.

As can be seen above, a dispensation is nothing more than a span time from one point in history to another point in history under a particular YHWH ordained form of covenant between YHWH and man that governed divine-human relationships. This section of the chapter will focus upon two particular dispensations that closely effect the twenty and twenty-first centuries A.D., i.e., Law and Grace. Keep in mind that throughout the teachings of both dispensations, righteousness is upheld, of particular importance are the teachings central to this book--human sexuality. The Divine ordained social moral framework of human sexuality has existed prior to and will transcend each and every dispensation until eternity is ushered in. In fact, it had its roots even in the first dispensation. Said framework will be discussed in greater detail later on in this book.

This chapter is not written to promulgate legalism by any means nor does it promote a revival of the Law dispensation. However is written to clarify and often misrepresented teaching. The righteousness of the law is often discarded as inapplicable, invalid, and null and void for all "Grace Dispensation" believers. This belief is usually, albeit inappropriately, backed up with the following scriptures (i.e., these scriptures are often taken out of context):

"For it is by grace you have been saved, through faith--and this not from yourselves, it is the gift of YHWH--not by works, so that no one can boast."

Ephesians 2:8-9

"Therefore no one will be declared righteous in his sight by observing the law; rather, through the law we become conscious of sin."

Romans 3:20

"All who sin apart from the law will also perish apart from the law, and all who sin under the law will be judged by the law."

Romans 2:12

"...Now then, why do you try to test YHWH by putting on the necks of the disciples a yoke that neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear? No! We believe it is through the grace of our Lord Jesus that we are saved, just as they are..."

Acts 15:1-29

"All who rely on observing the law are under a curse, for it is written: 'Cursed is everyone who does not continue to do everything written in the Book of the Law.' Clearly no one is justified before YHWH by the law, because, 'The righteous will live by faith.' The law is not based on faith; on the contrary..."

Galatians 3:10-14

The grace aspect of each scripture above is undeniable, powerful, and true. However, there are many scriptures that must be reconciled and synthesized with popular "GRACE" teachings to expose a more complete and synergetic truth.

Additionally, when the subject of Judaic law is discussed it is important to understand that the Mosaic Law was divided into three major areas, 1) judicial, 2) ceremonial, and 3) moral. When the righteousness of the law is mentioned it includes all three areas. The righteousness of the law is no longer required to be pursued or repeated by believers for initial salvific reasons given that morality, ceremonies, and judgment were sufficiently satisfied by the actions and offerings of one, Jesus HaMashiyach. In other words, morality, ceremonies, and judgment are only necessary to repeat if the previous morals, ceremonies, and judgments were insufficient in breadth of application and perfect ness.

Some of the morality, ceremonies, and judgments included in the law are:

- * Washing of pots
- * Washing of clothes
- * Washing of bodies
- * Quarantines
- * Offering of Incense
- * Offering of Blood/Meat Sacrifices
- * Offering of Grain Offerings
- * Observing of Days, Moons, etc.

- * Stoning to Death
- * Ten Commandments
- * Etc., Etc.

However, if one preaches just grace and no concepts of righteousness, they are faced with the same accusation Paul was faced with, although he defended himself by the following rebuttal:

"Why not say--as we are being slanderously reported as saying and as some claim that we say--`Let us do evil that good may result'? Their condemnation is deserved."

Romans 3:8 (Also read Romans 6:1-2)

Quickly, then a "grace" preacher may add, "Oh I preach against sin!" Good! However, he/she must then answer the following counter questions:

- 1) By what standard?
- 2) Where did this standard originate?
- 3) Why preach against sin if only grace applies?
- 4) Why preach against sin, if you know it creates condemnation if you may think that there is therefore no condemnation for believers per Romans 8:1 ?
- 5) If there is condemnation, then when and how does this condemnation come if there is only grace?

Unless there is a proper dividing of the Word of YHWH, confusion erupts. Confusion is the result of insufficient knowledge to reconcile both sides of a research question. However, with enough "seeking", "knocking", and "asking" confusion dissipates and understanding and peace returns.

The fundamental and reconciling points of these two dispensations can be summed up this way.

* HaMashiyach came as a sufficient lamb sacrifice possessing incorruptible blood simultaneously 1) forever pinned the judgments and curses of the law to the tree (cross), i.e., he made every payment due on the contract so that the parenthetic dispensation of law could become null and void as a binding and enforceable legal document and 2) provided access to the covenants of promise--to be heirs of and share in the promises made to the commonwealth of Israel.

*The absence of penalties and curses gives humanity a second chance to live instead of die when they sin. This second chance at life allows humanity the grace to try and get it right. If people were killed every time

they sinned they would never have a chance to get it right. HaMashiyach also granted believers in Him access to all covenants of promise (still in force) and without regulation--to allow believers a chance to walk as children of Faith, as children of the "father of the faithful" (see Disciples of HaMashiyach, Volume Two: Covenant Epistemology).

In short, HaMashiyach eradicated the Law of Moses as a binding covenant, including all of its judgments and curses and ushered into existence a "New Commandment", i.e., a new dispensation. Thus, as for believers, the Mosaic Law does not exist as a binding legal document anymore but is merely a teaching/history piece that believers utilize to learn and teach spiritual lessons under the "New Covenant"—Love (see Disciples of HaMashiyach Volume One: The Universal Tri-Directional Axiom). The New Covenant facilitates relationship and behavior based on relationship.

* Sin existed before the law and exists after the law. Divine Law requires a blood sacrifice to remit sins. Since an incorruptible blood sacrifice was offered pre-20th and pre-21st century, then the atoning and remitting power of that sacrifice is still valid for any individual looking to it for the atoning and remission of their sins.

* Doing good deeds, works, etc. will not save you, only merciful selection of Jesus HaMashiyach your savior brings you to the Father. HaMashiyach's favor will reveal itself in the hour he calls his "bride" home.

* However, the continual lack of good deeds, works, etc. can damn you. Even though these two aspects are parallel, they do not meet, ever. But by virtue of osmotic effect they do influence each other.

Colossians Chapter Two verses fourteen and fifteen verifies the above. Hebrews Chapter 10 also discusses the incorruptibility of HaMashiyach's shed blood. Secondly the way HaMashiyach handled the incident of the woman caught in the very act of adultery also verifies the above. True, the act of adultery was to be punished by stoning to death according to the law (which both Jesus and the adulterous woman knew), but Jesus turned to the weightier side of the law to pronounce his decision, i.e., he turned to

"...justice, mercy, and faithfulness..."

Matthew 23:23-24

James, the half-brother of Jesus, said,

"...Mercy triumphs over judgment!"

James 2:8-13

Secondly, Ephesians Chapter Two verses eight and thirteen, Galatians Chapter Three verses ten through twelve, and Hebrews Chapter Ten also verify the above. To further affirm the above points, consider, "Does HaMashiyach condone adultery?" No! Certainly not. He graciously gave back life and a second chance to the already but dead adulterous woman. He ended their meeting with these words,

"...neither do I condemn you...Go now and leave your life of sin."

John 8:1-11 (NIV)

What sin? By what definition? In other words, "What was the real purpose of the Law?" Paul said,

"...through the law we become conscious of sin."

Romans 3:20 (NIV)

"The law was added so that the trespass might increase..."

Romans 5:20-21

"So the law was put in charge to lead us to HaMashiyach that we might be justified by faith. Now that faith has come, we are no longer under the supervision of the law."

Galatians 3:24-25 (NIV)

"But the ministry Jesus has received is as superior to theirs as the covenant of which he is mediator is superior to the old one, and is founded on better promises. For if the there had been nothing wrong with the first covenant, no place would have been sought for another. But YHWH found fault with the people and said: 'The time is coming, declares the Lord when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel...I will put my laws in their minds and write them on their hearts. I will be their YHWH, and they will be my people...' By calling this covenant

‘new’ he has made the first one obsolete; and what is obsolete and aging will soon disappear.”

Hebrews 8:6-13 (NIV)

The problem with the law had nothing to do with the precepts and principles of the Law itself. It had to do with a human problem as shown above and below. Paul said,

“For what the law was powerless to do in that it was weakened by the sinful nature, YHWH did by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful man to be a sin offering. And so condemned sin in sinful man, in order that the righteous requirements of the law might be fully met in us, who do not live according to the sinful nature but according to the Spirit.”

Romans 8:3-4 (NIV)

Continued mercy and eternal life are for those who pursue a righteous lifestyle. It is not a salvation derived from actions nor void of faith. Paul said,

“YHWH ‘will give to each person according to what he has done.’ To those who by persistence in doing good seek glory, honor and immortality, he will give eternal life. But to those who are self-seeking and who reject the truth and follow evil, there will be wrath and anger...”

Romans 2:6-11 (NIV)

The seemingly polarized righteousness acquired by actions and righteousness acquired by faith were preordained to actually work in concert with each other (i.e., to complement each other), not against each other.. Salvific righteousness comes by faith and is verified by obedience to HaMashiyach's voice speaking to us from the words written on our hearts, not on “tablets of stone” (Mosaic Law) because of RELATIONSHIP not by fear of breaking a regulation. The believer's walk is to be like an Abrahamic walk. YHWH speaks, the believer hears, believes, and obeys because of RELATIONSHIP--Abraham was a FRIEND OF YHWH.

You will notice that faith always precedes obedience. Under the law, people were forced to obey without relationship. Nor was righteous behavior necessarily present because it was in their hearts. It was social law. Now, however, with the immediate penalty of the Law removed, people will reveal their true character by choosing to live righteously or to live in sin. Believers no longer need worry whether judgment will immediately fall upon them. This is the POWER of GRACE. However, for the reprobate, the absence of law means an opportunity for lawlessness (abuse of Divine

precepts of morality). But HaMashiyach's GRACE is a humbling and gracious metaphysical molding force.

The Law was broken down into three areas, 1) ceremonial, 2) judicial, and 3) moral. All ceremonial laws were complete in HaMashiyach Jesus, every one. Paul said this about ceremonial issues of the Law,

"The law is only a shadow of the good things that are coming--not the realities themselves..."

Hebrews 10:1 (NIV)

"Therefore do not let anyone judge you by what you eat or drink, or with regard to religious festival, a New Moon celebration or a Sabbath day. These are a shadow of the things that were to come; the reality, however, is found in HaMashiyach."

Colossians 2:16-17 (NIV)

The ceremonial laws also included a very heated issue with the early Church, circumcision. Paul said this about circumcision,

"Circumcision has value if you observe the law, but if you break the law, you have become as though you had not been circumcised. If those who are not circumcised keep the law's requirements, will they not be regarded as though they were circumcised? The one who is not circumcised physically and yet obeys the law will condemn you who, even though you have the written code and circumcision, are a lawbreaker. A man is not a Jew if he is only one outwardly, nor is circumcision merely outward and physical. No, a man is a Jew if he is one inwardly; and circumcision is circumcision of the heart, by the Spirit, not by the written code. Such a man's praise is not from men, but from YHWH."

Romans 2:25-29 (NIV)

In another place Apostle Paul said,

"...not with circumcision done by the hands of men but with the circumcision done by HaMashiyach, having been buried with him in baptism and raised with him through your faith in the power of YHWH, who raised him from the dead."

Colossians 2:11-12 (NIV)

Although the ceremonial laws were complete in HaMashiyach, the New

Testament reveals the necessity of learning the judicial and moral laws, to have a righteousness that exceeds the Scribes and Pharisees. Not that someone stands over us to kill us when we sin but that we would submit ourselves to the Spirit's leading. HaMashiach said,

"For I tell you that unless your righteousness surpasses that of the Pharisees and the teachers of the law, you will certainly not enter the kingdom of heaven."

Matthew 5:20 (NIV)

Paul said this,

"For if you live according to the sinful nature, you will die; but if by the Spirit you put to death the misdeeds of the body, you will live, because those who are led by the Spirit of YHWH are sons of YHWH. For you did not receive a spirit that makes you a slave again to fear, but you received the Spirit of son ship. And by him we cry `Abba, Father.'"

Romans 8:13-15 (NIV)

The only way one can exceed in righteousness is firstly, walk by faith and secondly be obedient to the voice of YHWH as the Spirit writes his moral and judicial codes on people's hearts.

Not only did HaMashiach come to fulfill (satisfy every regulation and become every curse) all the ceremonial laws by his life on earth and by being the perfect lamb, etc., but to make the Law replete (Greek: *pleroo*: replete), especially in the sense of how a Testator would want to explain his/her will if they could come back to life and explain it. They would want to fully interpret all its blatant and hidden meanings, the explicit and implicit. Jesus said,

"Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them. I tell you the truth, until heaven and earth disappear, not the smallest letter, not the least stroke of a pen, will by any means disappear from the Law until everything is accomplished. Anyone who breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whoever practices and teaches these commandments will be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I tell you the truth unless your righteousness surpasses that of the Pharisees and teachers of the law, you will certainly not enter the kingdom of heaven."

Matthew 5:17-20 (NIV)

True, YHWH provided a righteousness apart from the law which comes through faith in Jesus HaMashiyach to all who believe (Romans 3:21-22), but this righteousness does not nullify the righteousness of the law. It was to work in concert with the righteousness of the law that was to be written on the hearts of Spirit filled believers, rather than on tablets of stone. It was added to increase trespasses (Romans 5:20), i.e., knowledge of sin, among other significant aspects (Romans 7:7-8). Even though the Law produces knowledge of sin and conviction (not condemnation) keep in mind that the Mosaic Law can no longer produce death (unless you choose to live by the law rather than by faith). It is deception, doubt, and continual willful unrighteous behavior that produces death (Romans 7:11 & 13). The law is holy, and the commandments are holy, righteous and good and spiritual (Romans 7:12 & 14). It is carnal man, however, that is unspiritual (Romans 7:14)--outside of HaMashiyach. Why? Because man was depraved of his spirituality via Adam's disobedience (Romans 5:12-14).

Notwithstanding, YHWH made provisions to make carnal man spiritual again with a righteousness apart from the Law, to reconcile him back to YHWH through Jesus HaMashiyach and our faith in him (Romans 5:15-19; 3:21-22; 2 Corinthians 5:18).

So, does this righteousness that comes by faith in HaMashiyach do away with the need for the law? Apostle Paul said,

"Do we, then, nullify the law by this faith? Not at all! Rather, we uphold the law."

Romans 3:31 (NIV)

Also, an examination of the New Testament will reveal that HaMashiyach brought a more glorious understanding of not only the ceremonial but also the moral and judicial laws. You see, regarding the testator, who is HaMashiyach, when a testator dies, only then can the testament (will) of the testator (writer of the will) be read to the public and examined carefully for full understanding. So, after HaMashiyach died, was buried, and rose again, not only was he able to expound upon the Law and bring full clarity to it, it actually came into effect.. In this post-resurrection era (time lapse between two dispensations—Law and Grace) HaMashiyach expounded and exhorted on the Law and the Prophets, regarding himself and the kingdom. (Luke 24:27; Acts 1:3; etc.).

Before his death, however, it was critical that HaMashiyach keep his death and its significance a secret (mystery), lest the princes of this world discover his true identity and prevent his death. Certainly if Satan had known the significance of HaMashiyach's death and how it fitted into YHWH's true paradigm, he would have made every effort to prevent it. For this reason, in the Old Testament no man could see YHWH and live to tell about it (Briggs, 1996).

REFERENCES

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. (1983). A history of prophecy in Israel: From the settlement in the land to the Hellenistic period. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Briggs, D.A. (1996). Disciples of Christ Vol. 2: Covenant Epistemology. Jacksonville: Olive Press.

Briggs, D.A. (1988). Conversations with Rev. Arthur Briggs about Rev. George Briggs being protected by Maine State Police due to the many serious death threats and murder attempts made on his life and “Charlotte’s” life back in the late 1940’s to the early 1950’s due to exposing RCC secrets. Oxford, Florida.

Fiorenza, Francis S. and Galvin, John P., editors. (1991). Systematic theology: Roman Catholic perspectives., Vol 2. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Grant, Michael. (1978). A history of Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Joseph, Elizabeth. (1997). Comments made at a meeting of the National Organization for Women, reprinted in Time. New York: Time, Inc., May 19, 1997, pp. 21.

Kelly, J.N.D. (1992). Early Christian doctrines. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco.

Lamb, Kenneth E. (1997). "World News" for Pentecostal herald. Hazelwood, MO: Word Aflame Press, May 1997 Issue, pp. 9.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. (1987). A history of Christianity. Vol. 1: to A.D. 1500. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Merton, Thomas. (1992). Thomas Merton: Spiritual master. The essential writings. New York: Paulist Press., edited by Cunningham, Lawrence.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. (1971). The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600): The HaMashiyachian tradition: A history of the development of doctrine. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. (1984). Reformation of Church and dogma (1300-1700): The Christian tradition: A history of the development of doctrine. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Peshitta Bible – Aramaic/Hebrew Bible.

Shakir, M.H., translator (1993). The Qur'an. New York: Tahrike Tarsile Qur'an, Inc.

Tillich, Paul. (1963). Systematic theology Vol. 3: Life and the spirit history and the

kingdom of God. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tillich, Paul. (1968). A history of Christian thought: From its Judaic and Hellenistic origins to existentialism. New York: Simon and Schuster. Edited by Carl E. Braaten.

Wells, H.G. (1929). A short history of the world. London: Watts and Company.

RECOMMENDED READING

Briggs, D. (2007). Disciples of Christ, Volume 1: Universal Tri-directional Axiom. Oxford, FL: Olive Press Books.

_____. (2007). Disciples of Christ, Volume 2: Covenant Epistemology. Oxford, FL: Olive Press Books.

_____. (2007). Disciples of Christ, Volume 3: The Gospel Demystified. Oxford, FL: Olive Press Books.

_____. (2007). Disciples of Christ, Volume 4: The Sincere Milk of the Word. Oxford, FL: Olive Press Books.

_____. (2007). Disciples of Christ, Volume 5: The Order of Melchisedec. Oxford, FL: Olive Press Books.

_____. (2007). Disciples of Christ, Volume 6: The Mystery of Christ and the Church. Oxford, FL: Olive Press Books.

_____. (2007). Disciples of Christ, Volume 8: Eschatological Epistemology. Oxford, FL: Olive Press Books.

Lewey, Ernest. (1979). "Charismatic Leaders and Mythical Heroes." Journal of Psychohistory. Vol., 1,

Thomas, Ernest. (1960). Personal power through the spiritual disciplines. New York: Abingdon Press.

Weisser, Thomas. (?). After the way called heresy. ?: Thomas Weisser.



Daniel Briggs, Ph.D.

Brother Daniel Briggs earned his Ph.D. from [Walden University](#), his C.A.C. from AAINE (n/f [Alfred Adler Institute of New England](#)), his B.A. in Fine Arts in Writing & Literature from [Union Institute & University](#), and did most of his undergraduate work in Sociology at [Norwich University](#). He also received a Th.B. at [Indiana Bible College](#)). He has held various professional positions ranging from Home Missionary (Founder/Pastor of FACB), CEO, Psychoanalyst, LCPC Therapist, Non-Destructive Radiographer II (within an aerospace manufacturing company, FMI), Financial Consultant (within a Wall Street company, First Investors), owned/operated a successful mechanical engineering company, etc. He now teaches Sociology and Philosophy at IADT, which is accredited by ACICS, writes books, and is also the Chairman of WCMA. He also writes articles for the Examiner.com.

Dr. Briggs founded [Bangor Counseling Center](#), Cornerstone, Inc. (n/f), Cornerstone Theological University, First Apostolic Church of Biddeford, Apostolic Church of Faith, Maine Christian Ministries, and others. He also founded [Aletheia Logos University](#), which is now approved to operate in the State of Florida, and [Transmutation Psychology Institute](#). He also helped establish, design and build the Pentecostal Church of Moncton. He has authored several books, most notably his [Disciples of Christ Volumes, \(seven books\)](#), [The Origins of Morality](#) and [A Comparative Historical Analysis of Freudian, Adlerian and Theocentric Psychologies](#).

Dr. Briggs, is a third generation clergyman who began his life calling when he was just 15 years old, when he first started preaching under the guidance of his father, Rev. Arthur Briggs, in Winterport, Maine. When Dr. Daniel Briggs was 17 years old he began attending seminary in the USA and by 18 years of age he transferred to a Canadian seminary and simultaneously began to minister in many churches throughout Eastern Canada. By age 21 Dr. Daniel Briggs left Canada and went to Biddeford, Maine (a predominately catholic French speaking city) to start a new congregation he named [First Apostolic Church of Biddeford](#) (FACB), where he also founded and headquartered WCMA-Maine in 1993. WCMA-Maine divested in 2008 to WCMA-Florida (2006). It has since flourished to over 38,000 clerics representing over 5.2 million constituents.