

# Polygamy

## A man having more than one wife, what does the Father in Heaven say about it?

This is truly a hard topic for most people to accept as something that is true in the Scriptures. That the Father would possibly see it as **not** sinful. The topic about a man having more than one wife almost always brings with it a great deal of anger and passion in conversation. However, keeping in mind that the Father never changes, He says He is the same yesterday, today, and tomorrow. It is extremely important you do not make His Scriptures fit your point of view.

We always need to accept what is in His Scriptures as the final authority even if our traditions and points of view differ from what is in His Scriptures. One must always remember, and I need to make sure you hear this. I emphatically what you to completely comprehend this: He, “The Father” “Our Creator” **never states anywhere** in the Scriptures that we are commanded to live this way. What He gives us in His Scriptures are instructions on how to live and how to treat our **wives if we choose** to live this way.

The reason I am addressing this subject is because of events in our culture that has taken place recently and I have been asked, “What does the Scriptures have to say on this subject.” Again, I am emphatically stating **that in no way** we are commanded to live this way and neither does the Father. I would also like to add, I am not pushing, indorsing any agenda of any sort. I just want to uncover the truth from the Scriptures along with historical facts.

If we are going to accept the **whole truth** from the Fathers Scriptures, we need to be very careful not to pick and choose which ones we like or dislike to govern our lives or to judge how other people live if they choose as long as it’s within the terms of the Scriptures.

**Psams 102:27** "But You are the **same**, And Your years have no end.

**Malachi 3:6** "For I am יהוה, (*GOD, THE LORD*) I shall not change and you, O sons of Ya’aqob, shall not come to an end. **Footnote: 1Jas. 1:17.**

**James 1:17** Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights, with whom **there is no change**, nor shadow of turning.

**Heb 13:8** יהושע (*Jesus*) Messiah **is the same** yesterday, and today, and forever.

**Col 1:15** who is the likeness of the invisible Elohim, the first-born of all creation. **:16** Because in Him were created all that are in the heavens and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or rulerships or principalities or authorities – all have been created through Him and for Him. **:17** And He is before all, and in Him all hold together.

**Col 2:8** See to it that no one makes a prey of you through philosophy and empty deceit, **according to the tradition of men**, according to the elementary matters of the world, and **not according to Messiah**. **:9** Because in Him dwells all the completeness of the Mightiness bodily, **:10** and you have been made complete in Him, who is the Head of all principality and authority.

Therefore, if He **never** changes, then His Laws, Precepts, His view on what is right and wrong are enduring and are forever. Therefore, if we view something as a sin, or in our view as wrong, we must realize, if it is contradicting to what the Scripture says, we have changed, not the Father. If the Father does not see something as a sin, then it is not wrong.

The Father is so detailed in what He views as right and wrong. With Him knowing our hearts, knowing we are sinful, He has gone out of His way in His Scriptures to let us know **ALL** of what He views as right and wrong. Look at when He gave us the instructions on how to live, what to eat, what not to eat, how to be when we become unclean with so much detail. **Example: Leviticus 11.** There are so many arguments one could bring to the table as to whether or not it is good for a man to have more than one wife, and while some may be valid arguments for some people, it does not change the fact that the Father **never** said it was wrong. In fact, He gave instruction on how a man was to behave and how to treat his other “Wives”.

- **Deut 4:2** “Do not add to the Word which I command you, **and do not take away from it**<sup>1</sup>, so as to guard the commands of יהוה your Elohim which I am commanding you. **Footnote:** <sup>1</sup>See also 12:32, Prov. 30:6, Rev. 22:18-19.
- Deut 12:32 “All the words I am commanding you, guard to do it – do not add to it nor take away from it.<sup>1</sup> **Footnote:** <sup>1</sup>See also 4:2, Prov. 30:6, Rev. 22:18-19.
- Prov 30:6 Do not add to His Words<sup>1</sup>, Lest He reprove you, **Footnote:** <sup>1</sup>Dt. 4:2 & 12:32, Rev. 22:18-19. and you be found a liar.

According to the [Torah](#) and the [Talmud](#), a man was permitted to marry more than one wife, but a woman could not marry more than one man, probably because at that time, it would be next to impossible to determine who was the father, and this would have caused great problems with inheritances. Although polygyny was permitted, many other cultures may have frowned on it. The Talmud never mentions any [rabbi](#) with more than one wife. Around 1000 [C.E.](#), [Ashkenazic Jewry](#) banned polygyny because of pressure from the **predominant Christian culture**. It continued and still is permitted for [Sephardic Jews](#) in Islamic lands. To the present day, [Yemenite](#) and [Ethiopian Jews](#) continue to practice polygyny; however, the modern state of [Israel](#) allows only one wife. Those who move to Israel with more than one wife are permitted to remain married to all of the existing wives, but cannot marry additional ones.

I have to ask this one very simple question. If the Father viewed having more than one wife as wrong, **“Why didn’t He just plainly say so?”** Remember, he knows the wickedness of our hearts... He knows we would try to find every loophole in His Law and instructions so we could live in our sin. Rather, on this subject, the Scriptures are bafflingly silent on this subject with exceptions of how to treat our **other wives**. Hmmm Why I wonder, unless it was accepted by Him and it was in practice at the time of His instruction to us. Do you really think He would just be so silent on this matter knowing that at some time in the future, people would find this a sinful practice unless He knew the evil one would come to deceive us in **“ALL”** matters of right and wrong? Remember, He knows the future and He knows our hearts to be sinful. Either the Scriptures are wrong, the Father contradicted Himself, or maybe He just forgot to mention it... What do you think?

I cannot believe that someone so capable of Creating **everything** would forget something this important, and I cannot find anywhere in the Scriptures where He contradicted Himself. Therefore, if He is giving instructions on how to treat the **“other”** wives, the only conclusion one can come to **without** adding to or taking away from His Scriptures is that He viewed it as something as Non-Sinful, and if it is not a sin, it is not wrong.

You may have personal beliefs or thoughts as to whether or not you feel it is a good idea, but these are **JUST** your beliefs, **not** the Fathers. You may want to argue it is not edifying or a viable way to live life in our lives here today, with our customs and traditions being so different from what were practiced in Biblical times. Again, remember, we are the ones who have changed, not the Father, and aside from that, it is still only your feelings or beliefs on this matter that make it wrong and **are not** based on what the Father has said in His Scriptures.

Again, you may have personal feelings on this matter, but the Father does not change and He cannot lie. Read for yourself what He said on this matter. Please try **not** to introduce your personal experiences and prejudices into what is here, only take it for what is here in the Scriptures. I would also like to say that **the Father never**

said we have to live in this life style, nor am I. It is just that we need to be aware of what the Scriptures really say before we condemn someone for wanting a life of this type.

I would like to add, if you are going to respond with an opposing view, do so only with the Scriptures. I do not care to even have a conversation on this matter **if it is only with your opinion** or with some commentaries opinion. I will only respond to actual Scriptures and **not** your opinion.

Take care to make sure they “The Scriptures”, are in context and not twisted to make your point. If you take a Scripture that has subject in matters of men and women, remember not to ADD to or TAKE away from what they are saying. If your Scriptures do not directly pertain to the subject of a man and a woman having more than one wife, do not try to make them fit your point of view, this is taking the Scriptures out of context and you are trying to make them fit your beliefs, and this is what we were commanded **NOT** to do. The Father is more than capable of making His own point and does not need us to manipulate His Scriptures to help Him out.

Here are the Scriptures so you can read them for yourself on this matter.

### Exo 21:1

(MKJV) And these *are* the judgments which you shall set before them.

(KJV+) Now these<sup>H428</sup> *are* the judgments<sup>H4941</sup> which<sup>H834</sup> thou shalt set<sup>H7760</sup> before<sup>H6440</sup> them.

**Notice here that these are His, “The Fathers”, Ordinances, Judgments, Commandments, Right-Rulings that Moses should set before them...**

Here is the information about **Judgments** from above...

**H4941** judgments / ordinances

משפּט mishpâṭ *mish-pawt'*

From H8199; properly a *verdict* (favorable or unfavorable) pronounced judicially, especially a *sentence* or formal decree (human or (particularly) divine *law*, individual or collectively), including the act, the place, the suit, the crime, and the penalty; abstractly *justice*, including a particular *right*, or *privilege* (statutory or customary), or even a *style*: - + adversary, ceremony, charge, X crime, custom, desert, determination, discretion, disposing, due, fashion, form, to be judged, judgment, just (-ice, -ly), (manner of) law (-ful), manner, measure, (due) order, ordinance, right, sentence, usest, X worthy, + wrong.

**Exo 21:10 (The Scriptures 1998+)** “If he takes another *wife*, her food, her covering, and her marriage rights are not to be diminished.

### Other Bible Versions of Exo 21:10

(KJV+) If<sup>H518</sup> he take<sup>H3947</sup> him another<sup>H312</sup> *wife*; her food,<sup>H7607</sup> her raiment,<sup>H3682</sup> and her duty of marriage,<sup>H5772</sup> shall he not<sup>H3808</sup> diminish.<sup>H1639</sup>

(MKJV) If he takes himself another *wife*, her food, her clothing, and her duty of marriage shall not be lessened.

**Deut. 21:15** "If a man has two **WIVES**, one loved and the other unloved, and they have borne him children, both the loved and the unloved, and if the firstborn son is of her who is unloved,

## How about Servants?

**Note:** I am only using the verses that pertain to this topic. I am not taking it out of context. Look it up for yourself...

**Exo 21:4 (MKJV)** If his master has given him a wife, and she has borne him sons or daughters, the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself.

I would bet any amount of money that most of the masters referred to here already had a wife because in this culture, most wealthy men had large families with many children. So is the Father is saying that the master would take the **wife** and the **children** as **his own**? Now how does that work if the Father declares to us in His Commandments not to commit adultery when He is telling us to take more than one wife? There is **not** a **double standard** in His Commandments for some and not others!

**Exo 21:8 (MKJV)** If she does not please her master, who has betrothed her to himself, then he shall let her be redeemed. He shall have no power to sell her to a strange nation, since he has dealt deceitfully with her.

The Father here is talking about if a man, a master, a lord, and it does not say “**IF**” he is single, takes a slave or servant, “sexually” and decides he does not want her, he is to pay a ransom for her giving up her virginity.

## What about your brother's wife if you were to die?

**Deu 25:5 (MKJV)** If brothers live together, and one of them dies and has no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry outside to a stranger. Her husband's brother shall go in to her and take her as a wife for himself, and perform the duty of a husband's brother to her.

Some could argue that the brother that was still alive was not married. That would be an assumption! It does not say he was married or single. The Father just says for the brother that is still alive to take his brother's wife as his own, “For the sake of the dead brothers **name sake**”. These next verses are quite interesting. If the brother did not wish to take his dead brothers' wife as his own, she was to go to the elders, and after all is said and done, and if the brother still would not take her as his wife, she was to spit in his face and say a curse over him. Interesting, Read it for yourself in the following verses... I would also like to point out I understand the fact that the whole purpose of this is for the dead brothers name to carry on, but the fact doesn't change that the Father is telling a man to have more than one wife. The focus here is the matter of a man having more than one wife, if this was wrong in His eyes, He cannot contradict Himself, and He would not command us to sin.

**Deu 25:7** “But if the man does not desire to take his brother's wife, then let his brother's wife go up to the gate to the elders, and say, ‘My husband's brother refuses to raise up a name to his brother in Yisra'el, he does not agree to perform the duty of my husband's brother.’ **:8** “The elders of his city shall then call him and speak to him, and he shall stand and say, ‘I have no desire to take her,’ **:9** then his brother's wife shall come to him in the presence of the elders, and remove his sandal from his foot, and shall spit in his face, and answer and say, ‘Thus it is done to the man who does not build up his brother's house.’ **:10** “And in Yisra'el his name shall be called, ‘The house of him who had his sandal removed.’ **:11** “When men fight with one another, and the wife of one shall draw near to rescue her husband from the hand of the one attacking him, and shall put out her hand and seize him by the genitals, **:12** then you shall cut off her hand – your eye does not pardon. **:13** “You shall not have in your bag differing weights, a heavy and a light. **:14** “You shall not have in your house differing

measures, a large and a small. **:15** “You shall have a perfect and right weight, a perfect and right measure, so that they prolong your days on the soil which יהוה your Elohim is giving you. **:16** “For all who do these, and all who do unrighteously, are an abomination to יהוה your Elohim. **:17** “Remember what Amalēq did to you on the way as you were coming out of Mitsrayim, **:18** how he met you on the way and attacked your back, all the feeble ones in your rear, when you were tired and weary. And he did not fear Elohim. **:19** “Therefore it shall be, when יהוה your Elohim has given you rest from your enemies all around, in the land which יהוה your Elohim is giving you to possess as an inheritance, that you blot out the remembrance of Amalēq from under the heavens. Do not forget!

Ok, here in the following are the Scriptures so many Christians like to use to support their point of view in this matter. Remember Not to ADD to or TAKE away from what He is saying; He does **not** need help to make His point. It would be a sin and very irresponsible of us to read into more than what He was actually saying here. What was the subject matter He was talking about here? Furthermore, what was he being asked about? Was it about divorce, or was it about a man having more than one wife? The only right answer was about divorce!

## Mark 10:2-12 and Mt. 5:31

**Mar 10:2** And there came unto him Pharisees, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away *his* wife? trying him. **:3** And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? **:4** And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away. **:5** But Jesus said unto them, For your hardness of heart he wrote you this commandment. **:6** But from the beginning of the creation, Male and female made he them. **:7** For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; **:8** and the two shall become one flesh: so that they are no more two, but one flesh. **:9** What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. **:10** And in the house the disciples asked him again of this matter. (*Divorce not plural wives*) **:11** And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, (**Note: The context of “wife” being used here is the same as a singular address. Example: If you have five brothers, and you were only talking to one of them, you would not address him as “brothers”, but rather “brother” in the singular, not plural. This would in no way take away from the fact that you had other brothers.)**

...and marry another, committeth adultery against her:

**(Again, the subject matter here is dealing with divorce and causing adultery, nothing more!)**

- **Mar 10:12** and if she herself shall put away her husband, and marry another, she committeth adultery
- **Mat 5:31** It was said also, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: **:32** but I say unto you, that every one that putteth away his wife, **(Again, a husband could have more than one wife, and divorce one of them. It would not be likely he would divorce all of them at the same time.)** ...saving for the cause of fornication, maketh her an adulteress: and whosoever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery.

These Scripture verses are the principal verses Christians try to make fit their way of thinking concerning only having one wife, but they have taken them totally out of context. The primary topic in these verses deal with divorce. It is utterly irresponsible to take one or verses that are dealing with one topic and claim they are referring to another topic.

**Notice in Mar 10:6** *But from the beginning of the creation, Male and female made he them.* The Male and Female is in reference to **gender not** referring to numbers as in wives. If He had been referring to numbers of wives, don't you think our Creator would have been smart enough to say so plainly?

Furthermore, it is a lot easier to make a case for the fact that He was talking about homosexuality because of His statement concerning a "Male and Female" rather than He said for us not to have more than one wife when He was plainly speaking about divorce in the first place. Let us be responsible.

He was speaking about this because of homosexuality, **NOT** with a man having more than one wife. In fact, when you read the complete text in this verse without adding to or taking away from it, you will notice the primary topic here is **dealing with divorce**, **not** as some would try to make it read pertaining to two or more wives. When you read what He said about a man laying together with a man as he would as a woman, or a woman laying together with a woman as she would a man, this **IS** considered an abomination to Him.

**Lev 18:22** 'And do not lie with a male as with a woman, it is an **abomination**.

*Not my words, but right from the Father... So, do not call me a hater...*

Main article: [Homosexuality in ancient Rome](#)

From <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pederasty#Romans>



Jupiter abducting Ganymede; 1st c. CE Roman statue.

From the early Republican times of [Ancient Rome](#), it was perfectly normal for a man to desire and pursue boys.<sup>[38]</sup> However, penetration was illegal for free born youths; the only boys who were legally allowed to perform as a passive sexual partner were slaves or former slaves known as "freedmen", and then only with regard to their former masters. For slaves there was no protection under the law even against rape.<sup>[39]</sup>

The result was that in [Roman](#) times, pederasty largely lost its function as a ritual part of education and was instead seen as an activity primarily driven by one's sexual desires and competing with desire for women. The social acceptance of pederastic relations waxed and waned during the centuries. Conservative thinkers condemned it — along with other forms of

indulgence. [Tacitus](#) attacks the Greek customs of "gymnasia et otia et turpes amores" ([palaestrae](#), idleness, and shameful loves).<sup>[40]</sup>

Other writers spent no effort censuring pederasty *per se*, but praised or blamed its various aspects. [Martial](#) appears to have favored it, going as far as to essentialize not the sexual use of the [catamite](#) but his nature as a boy: upon being discovered by his wife "inside a boy" and offered the "same thing" by her, he retorts with a list of mythological personages who, despite being married, took young male lovers, and concludes by rejecting her offer since "a woman merely has two vaginas."<sup>[41]</sup>

From <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pederasty#Romans>

One of the reasons He addresses this is because of the perverted Greek/Roman culture in which He lived. It was common for men to sleep with men, as well as having sex with little boys at that time. You can verify this with any trustworthy history book or encyclopedia. Again notice, not once anywhere in this passage of Scripture is it even remotely mentioned of a man having more than one wife, so to try to make it say so is adding to His Scripture which is exactly what He commanded us NOT to do.

To a Roman sex did not create any kind of bond between two people. It created no obligation between one side and the other. And, for the man at least, there appeared no reason why he should not share many sexual partners, - as long as it didn't get him into any form of trouble.

What is peculiar though is that, whereas even the sharing of a meal created a form of social relationship with a person, having sex with them did not.

Marriage was a contract between a woman and a man, but it did in way require them to love each other.

If Romans saw marriage as an institution brought about by civilization, then sex to them had nothing to do with civility. In fact it was the direct opposite. It was where the animal still resident in man revealed itself. There was no shame in sexual acts at all. And yet it was seen as indecent to treat it as anything else but a private matter. Therefore, it was definitely not something one talked about.

As far as the law was concerned then sex with slaves was not adulterous. Or at least not for men. And sex with a free-born man or woman was only adultery if they were not doing it for money. Thus, sex with a prostitute did not constitute adultery.

However, adultery with a free-born was a crime, stuprum. And for this there was only one punishment; death. So as long as one steered clear of committing stuprum, **anything was allowed**. There **was no limits on age and also none on gender**.

From <http://www.roman-empire.net/society/soc-household.html>

It has been noted that out of the first 16 Roman Emperors 15 were bisexual, but only the Emperor Hadrian may have actually committed a homosexual act. It has also been noted that the Spartans of Greece viewed homosexuality like a part of military training. According to the Greeks, every soldier knew it was ideal to have an older lover to train him in the art of war. Philosophers have argued that the acceptable desire was defended less by the gender of a man's partner than by the relative status and role played in the sexual act. The Emperor Nero was said to have seduced free born boys to satisfy his sexual appetite. The Emperor is alleged to have castrated a young boy to turn him into a girl, he later married the boy. Some emperors mixed homosexual acts with heterosexual with both men and women.

From <http://www.oppapers.com/essays/Same-Sex-Relationships-Greeks-Romans/100817>

What century did the roman emperor Nero live? The Roman Emperor Nero was ruler in the 1st Century (ad 54-68) and the largest landholder in his time.

From <http://www.chacha.com/question/what-century-did-the-roman-emperor-nero-live>

The Practice of homosexuality and sex with boys had been part of the Greek and then later the Roman cultures many years prior to the statements made by Yeshua in verse **Mar 10:6 and Mt. 5:31** and well after. If you read the entire chapter of **Leviticus 18**, it deals with the Laws of Sexual Morality. If the Father was to ever say that a man was not to have more than one wife, don't you think He would have included it here? In fact, He does not even hint at it anywhere here or anywhere else in His Scriptures.

Let us look at the symbolism He was using in Mark 10:8 concerning the two becoming one flesh. This is a quote He was using from,

**Gen 2:24** For this cause a man shall leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife, and they shall become **one flesh**.

This is the exact kind of symbolism He uses when He talks about His bride, "The Church". The Bride, His Bride, is not just one person; it is all of the believers. He uses this symbolism to convey His purpose of unity. The "MASS", becoming one with Him. As for a man and a women becoming one flesh, this would also be true

if he had more than one wife. Here let me explain; The Father was also the Creator of mathematics, and sense He uses symbolism describing matters so we can understand His will, I will also use symbolism to make my point. This is simple. He said to go forth and multiply. Right? Ok, here.  $1 + 1 = 2$  and  $1 + 1 + 1 = 3$  and 3 does not equal 1, but if you take  $1 \times 1$  it equals 1 and also  $1 \times 1 \times 1$  still only equals 1. The three 1's only equal 1. Again, His Bride being perhaps millions or even billions will be **one** with him.

How about King David? How many wives did he have? What did the Father say about King David? He said King David was a man after his own heart, and King David had **8** "WIVES". The Father even said if he wanted more wives, He would have blessed him with more. Why the double standard for King David when He said there would be but one Law that governs all people?

**2Sa 12:8** 'And I gave you your master's house and your master's **wives** into your bosom, and gave you the house of Yisra'el and Yehudah. And if that were not enough, **I also would have given you much more!**

**Notice** here He, The Father, gave him, King David, his "WIVES". If He, the Father, viewed having more than one wife as a sin, i.e. something that is wrong, then how could He, the Father be a hypocrite and give King David more than one wife? Remember, He is not a man that can lie, and He does not have double standards when it pertains to His Law and Commandments because He says He has given but one Law or Commandment to govern ALL men in all of the earth.

**Exo 12:49 MKJV** There shall be **one law** to the native, and to the visitor that stays among you.

**Lev 7:7 MKJV** As the sin offering, so *is* the trespass offering. **There is one law for them.** The priest that makes atonement with it, it is his.

**Num 9:14 The Scriptures 1998+ (14)** 'And when a stranger sojourns among you, then he shall perform the Passover of יהוה. He shall do so according to the law of the Passover and according to its right-ruling. **You have one law, both for the stranger and the native of the land.'** "

**Num 15:15-16 The Scriptures 1998+ (15)** '**One law** is for you of the assembly and for the stranger who sojourns with you – a law forever throughout your generations. As you are, so is the stranger before יהוה. 16) יהוה. 'One Torah and one right-ruling is for you and for the stranger who sojourns with you.'

**Act 10:34 KJV** Then Peter opened *his* mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that **God is no respecter of persons:**

**Act 10:34 The Scriptures 1998+ (34)** And opening his mouth, Kēpha said, "Truly I see that **Elohim shows no partiality,**

Here are the facts of the Scriptures, **not** based on my opinion, but based on the Scriptures. I am tired of people taking my Fathers Scriptures out of context to fit their desires of how they feel the Scriptures should be in order make everyone fit in with their idea of how we should live. I am only interested in what the Father says in His Scriptures and what He says is good enough for me.

As far as **1Ti 3:2** An **overseer** <sup>G1985</sup>, then, should be blameless, the husband of **one wife**, sober, sensible, orderly, kind to strangers, able to teach,

**G1985** ἐπίσκοπος episkopos

**Thayer Definition:**

1) an overseer

1a) a man charged with the duty of seeing that things to be done by others are done rightly, any curator, guardian or superintendent

1b) the superintendent, elder, or overseer of a Christian church

**Part of Speech:** noun masculine

**A Related Word by Thayer's/Strong's Number:** from <sup>G1909</sup> and <sup>G4649</sup> (in the sense of <sup>G1983</sup>)

**Citing in TDNT:** 2:608, 244

This is a principle they felt was necessary for the overseers of that time to do in order to show possibly a higher standard to the body. Remember, they lived among the **pagan gentiles** at that time that practiced all sorts of perverted behavior. You should notice this verse is referring to the **leaders** of the church, **not** the common people, and again I would suggest it had to do with keeping up the appearance of not being like the **pagan gentiles** that lived there in the same community. I do not have a complete answer on this except to say the Father **does not** have double standards in His Scriptures. He is the same yesterday, today and tomorrow. He gave King David more than one wife, and he was the leader of the people, and we need to remember that there are **NOT any Idle words** in His Scriptures. Only man must give an account for his idle words, not our Creator.

**Mat 12:36 The Scriptures 1998+ (36)** “And I say to you that **for every idle word men speak**, they shall give an account of it in the day of judgment.

Do not add to or take away from what is in the Scriptures...

I again want to make this point exceedingly clear. The Father **never** said **we have to live in this life style and neither am I**, just that it is wrong to say it is not right to live this way when the facts of the Fathers Scriptures instructs us how to live in this way **if we choose**. It is ok for you to have an **opinion** as to whether we should live this way and to express how you feel this may not be a productive way to live, but we need to completely embrace His Scriptures as the **final fact** as to whether or not this is a sin. The Fathers Scriptures **does not** say it is a sin!!!

**Notes:**