



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Luke 17:34 - 36

Luke 17:34 - 36, on: 2006/2/3 5:52

Luke 17

34 I tell you, in that night there shall be two in one bed; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left.

35 Two shall be grinding together; the one shall be taken, and the other left.

36 Two shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left.

Having posted this yesterday, I realised from the italics in my KJV that I hadn't noticed the brackets round 'men' and 'wo men' in the above verses.

In the light of the current flurry of threads on homosexuality, how did the choice of 'two men in a bed' ever get into scripture.....?

Re: Luke 17:34 - 36 - posted by Greenquality, on: 2006/2/3 21:29

Hello, in lev.18:22 1kin 14:24 also in this time compared to, or likend to the day's of noah and lot.

Re: - posted by Greenquality, on: 2006/2/3 22:38

Now the word two in the greek is =(dou) does this text refer to homosexuality ?? it would take further studying in to the greek& hebrew! (men) used in this text could be man and man or father and son, it was all so custom to sleep in one bed or share. so I can't say yet! also two women grinding together, IT was costum to send women to the mill house, an act of milling by hand. BUT I think the real ??? is who is taken and who is left. and did the eagles do the taking? or gather the one who is left?

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/2/4 0:14

Luke 17:34 I tell you, in that night there shall be two men in one bed; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left.

This word can also mean table or couch or bed.

Search for G2825 in KJVSL

klinh kline klee'-nay

from 2827; a couch (for sleep, sickness, sitting or eating):--bed, table.

The word for in is not the word en but the word epi which has a better rendering in this setting of being in the meaning "at".

1909. epi

Search for G1909 in KJVSL

epi epi ep-ee'

a primary preposition; properly, meaning superimposition (of time, place, order, etc.), as a relation of distribution (with the genitive case), i.e. over, upon, etc.; of rest (with the dative case) at, on, etc.; of direction (with the accusative case) towards, upon, etc.:--about (the times), above, after, against, among, as long as (touching), at, beside, X have charge of, (be-, (where-))fore, in (a place, as much as, the time of, -to), (because) of, (up-)on (behalf of), over, (by, for) the space of, through(-out), (un-)to(-ward), with. In compounds it retains essentially the same import, at, upon, etc. (literally or figuratively).

I don't believe it has anything to do with Gay rights. But it does have to do with Christs' rights to His Body and in two men being at table, one will be taken and the other left.

Lu 17:34

In that night there shall be two men on one bed; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left. Day and night exist simultaneously upon the earth, and the Lord's coming will be at noon to some and at midnight to others. His saints will be found mingled with the rest of the people and engaged in duties befitting the hour. But the Lord will receive them to himself as his own (Joh 14:3; 1Th 4:17), and they will be ready to be detached from their worldly ties that they may go to meet and welcome the bridegroom at his coming (Mt 25:6-7).

Quote: ""In the light of the current flurry of threads on homosexuality, how did the choice of 'two men in a bed' ever get into scripture.....? "" OOPS, :-?

In Christ: Phillip

Re: Luke 17:34 - 36, on: 2010/6/30 3:55

In response to your question, "how did the choice of 'two men in a bed' ever get into scripture?"

It was deliberate. Luke drew our attention to the issue of homosexuality with his whole discussion of Sodom, Lot, fire and brimstone, and Lot's wife in 17:28-32.

The O.T. background for Luke 17:34 are the prohibitions of the Law against homosexual sex in Leviticus 18 and 20. The context of this verse is the story of the destruction of Sodom, where the homosexual theme is so strong.

Jesus used three same-sex couples to illustrate a lesson about God's judgment. In this passage, Jesus taught that half the gays and lesbians were taken, and half of them were left.

If people's sexual orientation were an issue to God, all six homosexuals would have been left to face God's wrath.

Luke 17:34-36 must be studied in the context of verses 28 through 37, not in isolation and out of context.

Re: Luke 17:34 - 36 - posted by castling, on: 2010/6/30 6:12

I think it's sad that we can no longer speak of two people of the same gender sharing the same bed, without eliciting perverse interpretations. I've done it before - what's the problem?

Don't let homosexual propaganda hijack your mind.

btw I realized today that the "gay pride" flag has six instead of seven colours. It's not God's rainbow after all :)

Re: Luke 17:34 - 36 - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/6/30 8:07

The way that cases work in Greek is different to English. In English if a man and a woman were in one bed we would say 'they' which is 'neutral' (not neuter). In Greek if two men were in a bed it would be 'they' in the masculine. If two women were in a bed it would be 'they' in the feminine. HOWEVER, if a man and a woman were in a bed it would be 'they' in the masculine. The masculine would take precedence over the feminine in the Greek idiom.

See this in

Acts 18:2 And found a certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla; (because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome:) and came unto them.

The last word in the sentence, 'them' is in the masculine plural form even though one person was male and the other female.

Luke 17:34-36 is an interesting mix in the Byzantine and TR textforms.

It would read something like this.

"There shall be two (masc gender - grammatically not sexually) upon a bed; the one (feminine gender) will be taken and the other (masculine) shall be left."

It looks to me as if the most natural interpretation here is that we have a married couple on a bed. In this case the 'two' w

ould be in the masculine even though one person was a woman. The scenario continues that 'one' masculine (the man) would be taken and the other (feminine) the woman would be left behind.

What we have here is a statement that in the last day even those in the closest bonds may find that the 'day' will separate them.

On the other level. In more primitive and poorer cultures more than one male would frequently share a bed. In my father's family there were two beds, one had three daughters in it and the other had 6 sons! There is no homosexual connotation in this passage.

Re: , on: 2010/7/3 1:12

In context we are intended to be reminded of forbidden sexual relations between two men. Luke 17:22-32 is a recounting of the salient points of the Sodom story (Sodom, Lot, fire and brimstone, and Lot's wife). Then comes the reference to "two men in one bed," which refers back to Levitical prohibitions against homosexual relations. "Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination" (Lev. 18:22).

The story of Sodom is the immediate context of "two men in one bed." In context, we were intended to think of two men in one bed--at night.

When we study the Bible, we're supposed to compare scripture with scripture. In this case, the only O.T. background for two men sleeping in one bed is Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13. And this is precisely what we were intended to think of, with this reference following so closely the Sodom material.

The scribes who worked on one particular manuscript, the Vaticanus Sinaiticus, understood it to be two men, which can be seen in the variant reading they produced: "Two men shall be in one boat."

Men and women did not work together on fishing boats. Fishing was a man's job.

I believe some unknown scribes felt uncomfortable with the implications of "two men in one bed" and changed "bed" to "boat." But this is speculation.

Most scholars I've read agree that verse 34 can be understood either way, as "two people" or "two men." Since verse 35 has "two women," the parallelism that is so typical in Scripture also strongly suggests that we're looking at "two men in one bed."

Also, another unknown scribe introduced verse 36 from Matthew 24, "two men in the field." Why did the scribe borrow this verse and place it here? In order to place all the same-sex couples together in one place.

Please note: everything in these three verses takes place at night. And "in that night" is a very unusual phrase in the scripture.

Luke 17:22-37 forms what I call "Luke's Gay Apocalypse." Luke 17:34-36 forms what I call "The Same-Sex Triptych of Jesus."

Please, let's not get involved in name-calling. Let's study together what this passage actually says, in context, and in the context of its time.

Re: , on: 2010/7/3 2:17

Quote:
-----Jesus used three same-sex couples to illustrate a lesson about God's judgment. In this passage, Jesus taught that half the gays and lesbians were taken, and half of them were left. If people's sexual orientation were an issue to God, all six homosexuals would have been left to face God's wrath. Luke 17:34-36 must be studied in the context of verses 28 through 37, not in isolation and out of context.

Yes.... I'm sure that must be it.... God doesn't mind homosexuality so much as we might believe.... Just let me begin by cutting Romans out of my Bible, and we're already seeing Him care less and less... There we go....

A quick question, if you haven't decided to just do a hit and run posting. How long did you have to back browse the forums before you could find a suitable one to dig up and spew this sort of anti-Biblical propaganda, as this one appears to be what, four years old or so? Or perhaps you're just trolling...

Re: EverstoSama, on: 2010/7/3 2:59

My friend, let me repeat what I said at the end of my last post:

"Please, let's not get involved in name-calling. Let's study together what this passage actually says, in context, and in the context of its time."

Sarcasm and name-calling, my friend, are not in the spirit of these forums. If you'd like to discuss the Scripture, then I'll be glad to interact with you in a spirit of constructive dialogue. All I have done so far is discuss Scripture.

Re: , on: 2010/7/3 3:03

Unless you suffer from persecution mania, I don't remember calling you any names. And all you've done so far is actually distort scripture, not discuss. Let's not skirt around this.

And if we're going to discuss this scripture in context, we should look to Philologos's post. The majority of modern translations seem to agree with his post as well. It takes a rather subjective predisposed spin to take this where you're trying to take it. Which is why I had to question why you would go through such great effort of back browsing to dig this thread up. My question still stands, by the way.

Re: EverestoSama, on: 2010/7/3 3:12

You're right. You didn't call me any names. You simply characterized my posts as "anti-Biblical propaganda" and suggested that my posting is "trolling."

You have now said that I may be suffering from persecution mania, and that all I have done is distort the Scripture. In a discussion, it will be necessary to demonstrate where I have distorted the passage in Luke 17, not simply accuse me of distorting it.

Would you like to discuss the passage, my friend?

I didn't dig the thread up, as you suggest. I found it while googling for some research I'm doing.

So how about those three gay and lesbian couples in Luke 17? Jesus didn't have blanket condemnation for the six homosexuals. He accepted them on the same basis as heterosexuals, on a case by case basis.

Re: , on: 2010/7/3 3:16

Read Philologos's post. Then we'll discuss this further. The context was NOT in reference to six homosexual couples. Paul was pretty clear that homosexuals would not inherit the Kingdom of God, I'm not so sure why you're saying something to the contrary.

Re: , on: 2010/7/3 3:27

I am writing in response to the following question:

"In the light of the current flurry of threads on homosexuality, how did the choice of 'two men in a bed' ever get into scripture.....?"

I'm just staying on topic, my friend. Answering the question. My answer to the question is essentially this:

The phrase "two men in one bed" is in the Scripture because Jesus used three same-sex couples to illustrate a lesson on judgment, the main point of which was to show that sexual-orientation is a non-issue for God.

Those three couples appear in Luke 17:34-36 (KJV):

I tell you, in that night
there shall be two men in one bed;
the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left.

Two women shall be grinding together;
the one shall be taken, and the other left.

Two men shall be in the field;
the one shall be taken, and the other left.
(Luke 17:34-36, KJV)

Three same-sex couples, four gays and two lesbians. Three gays and lesbians are delivered out of judgment, and three are left.

And the context of Luke 17:22-32 requires us to understand that these were homosexuals.

Jesus contravened the O.T. law on other occasions, and he contravened Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 in this passage.

"Therefore everyone who hears these words of mine and puts them into practice is like a wise man who built his house on the rock" (Matthew 7:24).

Re: , on: 2010/7/3 3:44

Notice that all the action takes place at night.

Two men in one bed--at night.

Two women grinding together--at night.

Two men in the field--at night.

Re: , on: 2010/7/3 3:49

Because every time night is mentioned, it's clear that it's referring to something sexual. I'm glad we've all been shown the light here.

Re: , on: 2010/7/3 3:54

Not so, EverestoSama. The immediately preceding context of Luke 17:22-32 tells us it was sexual. Those verses are about Sodom, Lot, fire and brimstone, and Lot's wife. The sin of Sodom was widely believed to be primarily homosexual.

So all the details of Sodom are brought up, immediately followed by a reference to "two men in one bed" and "two women grinding together." Jesus intended us to think "sex." I'm not reading something into the text. That is what it refers to in context.

This is what they mean when they say "you have to read it in context."

In all seriousness, to say that "two men in one bed" does not refer to a homosexual encounter is to take it out of context, to say that context doesn't matter.

The fact that it occurs at night simply confirms it, and draws our attention to the same-sex element.

Re: , on: 2010/7/3 3:57

HAHA. OK dude. Feel free to continue.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/3 5:07

Quote:

-----Then comes the reference to "two men in one bed,"

Except that it doesn't say 'two men' in one bed. It just says two 'people'. See my earlier post.

Re: , on: 2010/7/3 6:16

Bible translators agree that it can be translated either way. It can be "two people" or it can be "two men."

The scribes that produced the Vaticanus Sinaiticus manuscript of the N.T. translated the verse "two men will be in one boat." Men and women didn't work together fishing--it was all men on the fishing boats.

So it is clear that early Christian scribes understood it to be "men."

I believe that these scribes were uncomfortable with the implications of "two men in one bed," and amended the text to read "two men in one boat," but that is only a speculation as to why they made the change.

The fact remains that early Christians read it as "men."

And this is the direction our minds would naturally go after Jesus just finished talking about the Sodom story, where men having sex with men would have been the dominant image in the minds of Jesus' hearers.

Context, context, context.

The order of the elements runs like this:

Lot
Sodom
Fire and brimstone
Lot's wife
In that night.
Two men in one bed.
Two women grinding together.
Two men in the field.

This is the order, this is the context. The verse must not be isolated from its context when we interpret it.

We shouldn't take verse 34 out of context and insist it refers to a woman and her husband.

There is nothing in the context of Luke 17 that suggests we not render it two men. In fact, all the contextual flags point to "two men."

Once again, Jesus abrogated various O.T. laws, and he abrogated Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 here in Luke 17:22-36.

My friends, believe me, this was a startling discovery for me, one that took a while to sink in.

Re: - posted by mguldner (), on: 2010/7/3 9:01

"And this is the direction our minds would naturally go after Jesus just finished talking about the Sodom story, where men having sex with men would have been the dominant image in the minds of Jesus' hearers."

Maybe for our 21st Century readers but I for one didn't go there mentally ever when I read that in the past.

"Two women grinding together.
Two men in the field."

I am also almost certain this isn't a sexual refer to sex, Two women grinding together is grinding wheat and other grains for bread at a grinding mill, do some research on bread making and you will see that.

Two men in a field also wouldn't refer to sex because there was often more than two individuals in a field they farmed as much as they could because it was important to farm for food.

"My friends, believe me, this was a startling discovery for me, one that took a while to sink in."

Unfortunately none of the New Testament agrees with your line of thinking and any good interpreter doesn't take one verse and pull from that one verse but takes more than one verse and scripture from different part of the bible to interpret what is actually being said.

1Corinthians 6:9-10

"9Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: Neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders.10nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.

Romans1:26-27

"26Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. 27In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion."

I would abandon this line of thinking my friend because you won't offend us here but will be judged by a Holy and Just God who will rightly pour out His wrath on not only the offender but those that agree and applaud such acts.

Romans1:32 "Although they know God's righteous decree that those who do such things deserve death, they not only continue to do these very things but also approve of those who practice them."

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/3 10:12

Quote:
-----The scribes that produced the Vaticanus Sinaiticus manuscript of the N.T. translated the verse "two men will be in one boat." Men and women didn't work together fishing--it was all men on the fishing boats.

So it is clear that early Christian scribes understood it to be "men."

Ron

I don't understand this statement. The Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are two copies of the Greek text of the New Testament. They are not 'translations' at all so I don't see how they could 'translate' the verse as 'two men' will be in one boat.

This is simply a function of the way that biblical Greek works. It has no connotation of immorality in these verses. The plural use of the masculine 'one' does not necessarily mean 'men'; it can mean men or it could mean a man and a woman so we have to look into the context. As I pointed out, where the verse says 'one will be taken' the word for 'one' is feminine while the word for 'the other' is masculine. This shows plainly that of the 'two' mentioned one is feminine and the other masculine. It cannot honestly be translated in any other way.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2010/7/3 10:23

1 Corinthians 6:9-10 (NKJV)

Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived. Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor sodomites, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners will inherit the kingdom of God.

Why even debate this issue? The Bible is clear on what happens to Homosexuals. The only person who is not clear is RonaldGoetz. This scripture implies that RonaldGoetz is deceived.

Pointless topic Ronald, unless you are trying to bring others to Hell. So in light of this, I will stick with what scripture says, not how RonaldGoetz tried to spin it.

Re: , on: 2010/7/3 11:13

The Sinaiticus Codex contains a variant reading.

Instead of "bed" it reads "boat."

Since men and women did not work in boats together, the scribal copyists understood that it was specifically two men, not two people.

Re Christian: I am discussing the words of Christ and what they mean.

"Long ago God spoke many times and in many ways to our ancestors through the prophets. And now in these final days, he has spoken to us through his Son" (Heb 1:1-2a).

"Therefore everyone who hears these words of mine and puts them into practice is like a wise man who built his house on the rock" (Matthew 7:24).

Re: Ronald - posted by Lysa (), on: 2010/7/3 11:28

Ronald,

I do my best to not condemn anyone, I have too much stuff in my life that God shows me I need to overcome to be busy condemning someone else. But I do like to share the truth of the Bible. And like I previously told you, I thought what you wrote was an interesting take on Scripture... but then I went to your facebook page.

Jesus came to set us FREE from sin so we could live a life that GIVES HIM GLORY. It is not about us staying comfortable in a lifestyle that does not give Him glory; it is about living to give Jesus Christ glory, we are not our own anymore!

I'm going to share this truth with mercy with you that if you (or anyone else) have been born again, you have been bought with a price (1 Cor 6:19-20), you are NOT your own anymore - to not live according to the lusts of the flesh!!

And when I talk about having mercy, it is not to help people stay in their sins. Ronald, this book you have written on Luke 17:34-36; I must ask, do you not know that it will KEEP people (you included) bound up in their sins, instead of showing them that freedom awaits? - Freedom FROM their sins.

Brother, I fear God and just like the rest of us - you have to give an account for every word you've spoken and typed that has helped or hindered people. (Matt 12:36)

(edit: And having to give an account also is why I felt I must say something to you here about the book you've written). God loves you Ronald and you may have been told other wise, yes he loves homosexuals too! But He did not voluntarily lay down His life for each one of us to stay in our sins. If that was the case, I could've stayed a God curser, an adulter

er and a party'er! I hope you can see that He doesn't allow one group of people to stay the same while making everyone else change. (/edit)

In Christ,

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2010/7/3 11:46

RonaldGoetz wrote:

"Re Christian: I am discussing the words of Christ and what they mean."

As am I. I quoted straight scripture, and your reply is that you are discussing the words of Christ.?? How about the words of the Lord throughout the entire Bible? All scripture is to be used, not just what fits your agenda.

Proof texting scripture to twist it to fit what you want it to mean is NOT scriptural. Also, I read that you wrote a book on this subject? If that is so, and you support the stance that you are taking, then it seems that your only reason at being here is the following:

- ~Promote your book.
- ~Convert others to your beliefs
- ~or to use what others share here in your next book

Please explain how 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 (NKJV) fits into God's plan?

Re: , on: 2010/7/3 11:57

As his agenda is becoming quite clear, (the first tip off should have been the revival of a barely responded to, four year old thread) it would appear Ronald is not a hungry soul looking for truth from Christ's words, but someone trying to sneak in with divisive doctrines contrary to what has been handed down to us. I honestly think the best option for us is to pray for him, but to also mark and avoid. I see absolutely no fruit coming from the continuation of this thread.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/3 12:11

Quote:

-----The Sinaiticus Codex contains a variant reading.

Instead of "bed" it reads "boat."

Since men and women did not work in boats together, the scribal copyists understood that it was specifically two men, not two people.

Re Christian: I am discussing the words of Christ and what they mean.

Ronald

Indeed it does but hardly any editors, only Lachmann ever thought is even worth considering and Westcott and Hort put it into the margin. As far as I can ascertain no translation has ever included this Sinaiticus oddity.

But the real refutation to your theory does not rest there but as the verse proceeds.

Luke 17:34 LegO hymin, tauteE tE nukti esontai duo epi klinEs mias; heis paralEphthEsetai, kai ho heteros aphethEsetai.

the word 'duo' here is in the grammatical masculine plural. This has nothing at all to do with sexual gender but is simply a plural form of the word two. As I have tried to explain this would be the way this would be written if there were one man and one woman, and if there were two men. So far, it could be either BUT the word mias, is the feminine gender form of the word 'one' and on its own would certainly suggest a woman. then the word heteros, is the masculine gender form of another. So if you were trying to get all this into an English paraphrase it would read something like...

In that night there shall be two in a bed and the female one shall be taken and the masculine other one shall be left.

There is absolutely no basis in this verse for bringing the question of homosexuality into the interpretation.

Re: Lysa, on: 2010/7/3 17:40

Lysa, I appreciate your genuine concern for me, and for what you said about people in their sin.

If Jesus accepted gays and lesbians as equivalent to heterosexuals, and did not consider their sexual orientation sinful, then I am following my Lord's words.

I believe, with all my heart, that this passage proves beyond any doubt Jesus considered sexual orientation a non-issue. I cannot, must not, call unclean what Christ has declared clean.

My conscience is clear. I am blameless in this matter. I am proceeding according to Scripture.

According to Jesus, homosexuality is not a sin people need to be delivered from.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2010/7/3 17:53

Matthew 7:15-23

15 "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravenous wolves. 16 You will know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes from thornbushes or figs from thistles? 17 Even so, every good tree bears good fruit, but a bad tree bears bad fruit. 18 A good tree cannot bear bad fruit, nor can a bad tree bear good fruit. 19 Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. 20 Therefore by their fruits you will know them.

21 "Not everyone who says to Me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of My Father in heaven. 22 Many will say to Me in that day, 'Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Your name, cast out demons in Your name, and done many wonders in Your name?' 23 And then I will declare to them, 'I never knew you; depart from Me, you who practice lawlessness!'

Re: EverestoSama, on: 2010/7/3 18:01

"His agenda is becoming quite clear, (the first tip off should have been the revival of a barely responded to, four year old thread)."

Everesto, I already told you I stumbled across this site and this thread as a result of a google search.

What you characterize as my "agenda" I call my Biblical convictions. I am here because you and the rest are my Christian brothers and sisters, and I have found a jewel in the Gospel of Luke that I want to share with you.

By the way, your comments remind me of an interesting Scripture.

"For you know that it was not with perishable things such as silver or gold that you were redeemed from the empty way of life handed down to you from your forefathers" (1 Peter 1:18).

Everesto, if I am right, and you are ignoring something that Christ taught regarding a despised minority, then this counts as something from which you need to repent.

If I am right, and Christ abrogated the Law regarding homosexuals (Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13), then insofar as you continue to ignore Jesus' word, that part of the way of life that has been handed down to you is empty, as Peter said, and must be abandoned.

You have been redeemed from the need to look down on ostracized groups like lepers, Samaritans, and homosexuals (all of which appear in Luke 17).

When confronted with the words of Christ, all of us must be humble, and ask ourselves, "Lord, is it I?"

All of us must be prepared to change in response to the teachings of Christ. To harden our hearts against Jesus' words is foolhardy and arrogant. I'm not calling you foolhardy and arrogant. I don't know you well enough to characterize you that way.

And Everesto, I've been completely frank and open with you. I haven't tried "to sneak in" at all.

Re: Beds vs Boats, on: 2010/7/3 18:18

Ron, I think you're missing my point about the Codex Sinaiticus variant "boat."

I'm not saying that it is a preferred reading. My point is that the "boat" variant demonstrates that the scribe(s) who generated that variant did not understand verse 34 as referring to a woman and a man, but two men.

Men and women are not out in boats together at night.

It is proof that early greek speakers realized that it could go either way, "men" or "people." I really must give their understanding of koine greek precedence over yours.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/4 3:17

Ronald

Quote:
-----It is proof that early greek speakers realized that it could go either way, "men" or "people." I really must give their understanding of koine greek precedence over yours.

The Greek in the Vaticanus still says, there were two... and then the female and then the male. The Vaticanus grammar is just the same as the Byzantine textform. The language itself says there were two... then the female was taken and the other male was left. The Vaticanus is saying exactly what I am saying!

Re: Two Men in One Bed, on: 2010/7/4 6:22

Philologos, at least sixteen English versions specify "two men" in this verse:

American Standard Version
Amplified Bible
Young's Literal Translation
Darby
King James Version
Douay Rheims
Peterson
New Life Bible
Moffatt
Phillips
English Revised Version
Webster's Bible Translation
Emphasized Bible
Weymouth
Bible in Basic English
Wesley's New Testament

I don't think there are grounds for your certainty that "two men" cannot be a legitimate rendering of verse 34.

You can be certain for yourself, but I can't be expected to share that certainty.

Re: Re: Ronald - posted by Lysa (), on: 2010/7/4 11:10

Ronald wrote:

Quote:

-----My conscience is clear. I am blameless in this matter. I am proceeding according to Scripture.

According to Jesus, homosexuality is not a sin people need to be delivered from.

Bro, I fear you are proceeding according the gospel of Ronald and you will be blamed if you do not tell people they need to be delivered from ALL forms of fornication (sexual immorality).

1 Cor 6.18 Flee fornication

1 Cor 7.2 ... to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.

If what you say is true, homosexuality should be supported here but it is not and also it would be supported even by Paul and the disciples throughout the Scriptures but it is not. From the Old Testament to the New, fornication is a sin and this fact ALONE does not support your thesis of Luke 17.34-36.

Can you explain why fornication is a sin for all people? Including you?

God is no respecter of persons. Logic dictates that if Jesus was saying homosexuality is ok and that He is cool with you having multiple partners; then logically He should be cool with the rest of the church having multiple partners but again Scripture does not support this.

Ronald, the homosexual community is a self-supporting world unto itself. You know this to be true. And you also know that to acknowledge the whole truth of the Scriptures and live a celibate life, you must leave it. Many think that cost is too high and possibly you do to; because you've created this facade of truth about two or three verses in Luke 17 that cannot be supported anywhere else in the Bible.

And I don't believe you came to sermonindex by chance.

Re: Assumptions, on: 2010/7/4 17:02

Hi Lysa,

You touched on so many topics, I'm not sure where to begin.

It sounds like you think I'm gay. I'm not. I'm happily married, have three children and three grandchildren. So I thought I'd clarify that upfront.

I think you may be right. I didn't come to sermonindex by chance. God lead me here. But I did not come here on purpose, I got here by googling "Luke 17:34" and "two men". (I really don't understand why you and Everesto think I somehow came here on purpose. If you want to explain, it would be interesting to hear why.)

I know fornication is a serious problem. I was fortunate as a young man to have been rather shy, and my wife and I were both virgins when we got married. While I have been tempted to adultery as an adult, I think it has been much less severe for me since I never "practiced" as an adolescent.

I think this may be one of the reasons why I don't judge and condemn people who stumble into sexual sin more seriously than I have done. God doesn't judge and condemn them. Jesus didn't judge and condemn them, and I try to follow his example.

I know from my own life that change doesn't come from people scolding, haranguing, and warning. All scolding, haranguing, and warning do is harden people, make them resentful, and sometimes make them feel defeated. People become too busy fighting my voice, or your voice, instead of listening to the much more effective voice of the Spirit of God.

Romans 2:1-3 shows two ways of bringing people to repentance. One is by judging, evaluating, and condemning--which doesn't work. The other way is God's way: kindness, tolerance, and patience.

It is God's kindness, tolerance, and patience that leads us to repentance. If we are going to be godly in our ministry, like God in how we minister, then it will be our kindness, tolerance, and patience that leads people to repentance.

"You, therefore, have no excuse, you who pass judgment on someone else, for at whatever point you judge the other, you are condemning yourself, because you who pass judgment do the same things. Now we know that God's judgment against those who do such things is based on truth. So when you, a mere man, pass judgment on them and yet do the same things, do you think you will escape God's judgment? Or do you show contempt for the riches of his kindness, tolerance and patience, not realizing that God's kindness leads you toward repentance?" (Romans 2:1-3)

Kindness, tolerance, and patience lead people to repentance. Carping and scolding, as a rule, do not.

And what is it that God tolerates? Well, I know what God tolerates in my life.

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/7/4 18:36

RonaldGoetz wrote: "If I am right, and Christ abrogated the Law regarding homosexuals (Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13), then insofar as you continue to ignore Jesus' word, that part of the way of life that has been handed down to you is empty, as Peter said, and must be abandoned."

I think Philologos has given very clear insight into the correct interpretation of this verse (Lk. 17:34) but even if the correct interpretation is "two men" you cannot read homosexuality into this, Ronald. I've read it for years and it never entered my mind that this is what Jesus was saying.

Furthermore you cannot interpret this verse as demonstrating that Jesus is abrogating Lev. 18:22 and Lev. 20:13. For in the New Testament also homosexuality is spoken against (as other posters have already pointed out. See 1 Cor. 6:9-11, for example).

And so you will also have to try to say Jesus "abrogated" what the apostle Paul taught as well. But to do that you will have to say that it was not the same Jesus who spoke in Paul, the same Jesus who walked the earth who was now ascended to the throne of God, and was speaking through the new testament apostles.

...Homosexuality is a very strong current in our day. Very strong, and thousands have been swept into it. But the God of love has a Way of salvation for all sinners, including those who are tempted with homosexuality. No doubt that Way will bring a Cross into their lives. Oh, that despised Cross...

Re: "Reading homosexuality into this", on: 2010/7/4 19:40

Disciple, I am not reading homosexuality into this verse. The context demands that I see what is there.

Let's look at the verses immediately preceding verse 34-36.

The story of Sodom is given in four key references: Lot (v. 28), Sodom (v. 29) fire and brimstone (v. 29), and Lot's wife (v. 32). This story has homosexuality written all over it.

Then comes a reference to "two men in one bed," which, comparing scripture with scripture, refers directly to "a man lying with a man as he would with a woman."

Disciple, in context, the three same-sex couples in verses 34-36 are homosexuals.

Jesus used six homosexuals in a lesson on judgment, in the immediate context of the Sodom story, to demonstrate that, when it comes to judgment, sexual orientation is a non-issue for God.

If sexual orientation were an issue for Jesus, then he would have issued a warning, like "go and sin no more," to the six gays and lesbians. But he doesn't.

Disciple, I am not reading homosexual meanings into verses 34-36. The context requires me to see and understand the presence of two gay couples and one lesbian couple. Context.

If you don't believe they are gay and lesbian couples, then it is you who must explain why context doesn't matter here.

(v 28) Lot
(v 29) Sodom
(v 29) fire and brimstone
(v 32) Lot's wife
(v 34) in that night
(v 34) two men in one bed
(v 35) two women grinding together
(v 36) two men in the field
(vv 34-36) one shall be taken and the other left. (three times!)

Jesus was teaching that practicing gays and lesbians are acceptable to God the same as heterosexuals--on a case by case basis. Jesus issues no blanket condemnation of homosexuals.

Jesus discusses 3 despised minorities in Luke 17: lepers, Samaritans, and homosexuals. His point? for us to stop ostracizing people, no matter how much Biblical support there is for ostracizing them.

There has always been plenty of Biblical support for popular prejudice against these three groups: lepers, Samaritans, and homosexuals. Jesus said, "Enough already!"

"Therefore go and make disciples of all nations...teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you." (Matthew 28:19-20a)

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/7/4 19:49

"Disciple, in context, the three same-sex couples in verses 34-36 are homosexuals."

No they're not.

You are wresting Scripture to your own destruction.

"Jesus was teaching that practicing gays and lesbians are acceptable to God the same as heterosexuals--on a case by case basis. Jesus issues no blanket condemnation of homosexuals."

No He was not. You totally ignored the the passage I mentioned-- 1 Cor. 6.9-11-- which are the words of this same Jesus from the mouth of the apostle Paul.

And I know why you ignored them. They totally shred your argument.

Re: , on: 2010/7/4 19:52

Quote:
-----There has always been plenty of Biblical support for popular prejudice against these three groups: lepers, Samaritans, and homosexuals. Jesus said, "Enough already!"

I never remember anywhere in the Bible where it said the leper and the Samaritan will not inherit the kingdom of heaven. As far as the homosexual though... I'm just curious why you refuse to address the other Scriptures that are being presented here (as shown by Paul in Romans and Corinthians) as they most definitely knock out the one faulty wooden leg you're attempting to stand on.

And just so you're aware, the users on this site are HEAVY into the Bible. You can't try and spout this modern liberal humanist gospel and expect to get ANY support here. Just giving you a heads up that you're completely wasting your time. No one here is on your side on this issue, nor will anyone be swayed to agree with something the Bible disagrees with.

Re: Explain to me, on: 2010/7/4 20:03

Disciple, please explain to me why, in a lesson on God's judgment that comes right after the story Sodom's destruction (where man-on-man sex figures so highly), that Jesus should talk about 1) two men in the same bed (at night), 2) two women grinding together (at night), and 3) two men in the field.

I know I'm not the only person around here who care about the importance of context in Bible interpretation.

Disciple, explain to me why context doesn't matter here.

Please stay on topic. The topic is the meaning of Luke 17:34 in context.

If Jesus really did say that some gays and lesbians will be "raptured" out, and some won't, then this has serious ramifications for all of us.

This isn't the time to say "But what about this verse?" and "What about that verse?"

"Long ago God spoke many times and in many ways to our ancestors through the prophets. And now in these final days, he has spoken to us through his Son." (Hebrews 1:1-2a)

Re: Everesto, on: 2010/7/4 20:12

Everesto, the topic of this thread is the meaning of Luke 17:34 in context.

I won't be discussing the other passages in this thread. That's going off topic. This topic has a lot to it.

I have, however, thought through the passages to which you refer, thought them through in the light of Scripture.

You're very good at phrase making. You have lots of clever ways of characterizing my interpretation of Scripture, but you never actually engage the Scriptures we're discussing here.

Re: , on: 2010/7/4 20:12

Quote:

-----This isn't the time to say "But what about this verse?" and "What about that verse?"

That's a fantastic argument actually. It's a personal favorite of the Jehovah's Witness and Mormons when they watch their false doctrine get shredded up by God's Word and they're forced into a corner. Let's just continue to pretend that the Bible doesn't stand as a whole, shall we? In fact, let's not use the other verses in the same chapter at all. Let's just contextualize things verse by verse. Each verse will be in its own context.

And to what you said, no. I don't need to go into the interpretation of the verses, as they would only be a reiteration of what Philologos and some of the other members on this site have already expounded on. But since you're so set on bringing up the context (which you've eisegetically distorted) the context of Sodom and Lot was in reference to judgement AGAINST wicked people who were practicing evil and sexual immorality, and widely believed to be predominately homosexual (as you yourself stated). So it will be in the end times. The distortion you've used about the passage of night should actually be noted that many of the end time parables Jesus uses are set in night time and darkness. It's metaphorical of the unknown, the unseen, and many times also times of lawlessness and judgement. We can't just separate the word night in this context when talking about the end times to all of a sudden mean that because it mentions two people of the same sex somewhere together that there is a sexual undertone now existing.

Re: Lepers and Samaritans, on: 2010/7/4 20:27

Everesto, there are two entire chapters devoted to leprosy in Leviticus, with commands to ostracize lepers from the community.

And there are two entire chapters devoted to sanctions against intermarriage with gentiles, which is the background of the Samaritans in the popular mind.

Those chapters would be Leviticus 13 & 14 and Ezra 9 & 10.

And of course the prohibitions against male homosexual sex are two verses in Leviticus 18 and 20.

Everesto, my point is this. The Jews had plenty of reason for their popular prejudice against lepers, Samaritans, and homosexuals. Jesus repudiated that prejudice, despite the Biblical support there was for it.

Jesus, the Incarnate God, spoke and taught against popular prejudice against homosexuals around AD 30.

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/7/4 20:31

RonaldGoetz said, "This isn't the time to say "But what about this verse?" and "What about that verse?"

...You can't say something like that and expect to be considered a serious seeker of truth, Mr. Goetz. If you want to defend your point against all reason-- and so deceive yourself-- you will find yourself ultimately being given your own way.

Re: , on: 2010/7/4 20:39

Quote:
-----Everesto, the topic of this thread is the meaning of Luke 17:34 in context. I won't be discussing the other passages in this thread. That's going off topic. This topic has a lot to it.

Quote:
-----Those chapters would be Leviticus 13 & 14 and Ezra 9 & 10. And of course the prohibitions against male homosexual sex are two verses in Leviticus 18 and 20.

There we go. Just wanted to see what those two statements looked like side by side. This is the type of double-mindedness that's absolutely required in order to twist the Bible to suit our own lusts and worldly wisdom.

If you've now permitted the double standard, I'll just resubmit 1 Corinthians 6:9 Romans 1:25-32 and 1 Timothy 1:8-11 for starters. But maybe we shouldn't use other Scriptures, as it's always a bummer when we can't get them to say what we want them to say, and they won't line up with our twisting of texts.

ADisciple stated that "...You can't say something like that and expect to be considered a serious seeker of truth, Mr. Goetz. If you want to defend your point against all reason-- and so deceive yourself-- you will find yourself ultimately being given your own way."

The Bible prophesied about this long before in 2 Thessalonians 2:10-12; and with all the deception of wickedness for those who perish, because they did not receive the love of the truth so as to be saved. For this reason God will send upon them a deluding influence so that they will believe what is false, in order that they all may be judged who did not believe the truth, but took pleasure in wickedness. (NASB)

Re: A Time for Every Purpose, on: 2010/7/4 21:46

"To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven." (Ecclesiastes 3:1)

Disciple, there is a time for every purpose under heaven. There is a time to superficially quote our favorite prooftexts at one another, and there is a time to thoughtfully discuss a 15 verse passage of a teaching of Jesus.

I think we should take a breather from unproductively "shooting verses at one another" and discuss why Jesus talked about three same-sex couples in the context of the judgment of Sodom, without rendering all six homosexuals the judgment that, according to some of you, they so richly deserve.

I'll be happy to discuss the verses others are bringing up later on. Right now, the time is to discuss a what Jesus taught, in context, calmly and respectfully.

The topic of this thread (which I did not start) is the meaning of Luke 17:34. Early on someone asked why God put "two men in one bed" here at all. I answered that it was deliberate, that Jesus was using three same-sex couples to illustrate a lesson on judgment, the point of which was to teach us that sexual-orientation is a non-issue for God when it comes to our acceptability.

Re: Lepers, Samaritans, and Homosexuals, on: 2010/7/4 21:56

Everesto, when we examine a portion of Scripture in context to determine its meaning, we look at it in context. The context of Luke 17 includes an important story about some lepers and a Samaritan. Jesus, as he often did, made a hated, despised person the hero of his story. Jesus always sided with the outcasts, never with the respectable religious people.

The presence of lepers and a Samaritan in this passage required a look at the O.T. background of lepers and Samaritans. Luke put three despised groups together in the context of Luke 17--lepers, Samaritans, and homosexuals.

All three of these groups were despised, popular prejudice against them was high in Jesus' day. And people could quote the Bible to confirm their prejudice and meanness.

Jesus ignored popular prejudice and meanness, no matter how much Biblical support there was for it, and affirmed the acceptability of lepers, Samaritans, and homosexuals.

"Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock." (Matthew 7:24)

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2010/7/4 23:06

Ronald,

I did a tiny bit of research into the word 'men' as it appears in Luke 17:34. I went to e-Sword and find the word in italics; the word woman as it appears in v. 35 is also in italics and the word men in v.36 is as well.

E-Sword has no definition for any of these words. Then I went to an online site where there were many different Bible translations and did a comparison check there of these verses. Most of the newer translations do not have the word men or woman in any of these verses. The KJV does as does the NKJV. There are also couple others which I am totally unfamiliar with.

My conclusion is that the words men and women do not appear in the original. Words in the KJV that appear in italics do not appear in the Greek. They were added by the translators.

I choose to stick by the WORD. And you would do well to do so as well. Your soul is at stake, sir!

Re: Hi Ginny Rose, on: 2010/7/4 23:58

Ginny Rose, I appreciate the research you did to verify whether my understanding of Jesus' teaching here is correct or not.

Perhaps I should be clearer about this. I understand that the words "men" and "women" do not appear in Luke 17:34-36. The grammatical construction of verse 35 is feminine, however, and the "women" is there grammatically, if not the word.

What is also true is that, in a sense, it's a 50/50 situation. Verses 34 and 36 can be read as "two " or "two ."

What makes it a less than 50/50 situation is the context. With verses 22-32 dealing specifically with Sodom, where homo sexuality figures so highly, there is a much greater likelihood that we were intended to think "two men" in verse 34. This likelihood increases with the Leviticus 18 & 20 background against "a man lying with a man as with a woman," and even more with the following same-sex couple in verse 35, two lesbians.

The word phrase "two men" is specified in over sixteen English versions. Here are the most well-known ones:

American Standard Version
Amplified Bible
Young's Literal Translation
Darby
King James Version
Douay Rheims
Peterson
New Life Bible
Moffatt
Phillips
English Revised Version
Webster's Bible Translation
Emphasized Bible
Weymouth
Bible in Basic English
Wesley's New Testament

My point in listing these is that many, many Greek translators have specified "two men" in verse 34. The "two men" rendering cannot be ruled out, at all.

The reason "two men" is important is because of the homosexual theme in verses 22-32, the presence of three same-sex couples in verses 34-36, and the fact that Jesus said that some practicing gays and lesbians would be delivered from wrath, and some would not.

Jesus did not utter a blanket condemnation of gays and lesbians, but used six gays and lesbians to illustrate this lesson on judgment.

Ginny Rose, I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day. I prayed to receive Christ as my savior around age 4, and again around age 12, and came to grips with his Lordship around age 14. I am working out my salvation with fear and trembling. My thanks to you, and to everyone else, for your expressions of concern for my salvation and my eternal destiny.

BTW, I have concrete evidence that the two women in verse 35 were lesbians.

Re: , on: 2010/7/5 0:27

Quote:

-----BTW, I have concrete evidence that the two women in verse 35 were lesbians.

We're all on the edge of our seats.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2010/7/5 0:34

RonaldGoetz wrote:

Quote:

-----I think we should take a breather from unproductively "shooting verses at one another" and discuss why Jesus talked about three same-sex couples in the context of the judgment of Sodom, without rendering all six homosexuals the judgment that, according to some of you, they so richly deserve.

Ronald. There are no homosexual couples in the verses that you pointed out. None. Not one. Nothing of the sort. Your argument is based on fiction. The fiction being that Jesus said that these 6 PEOPLE, not same-sex couples (which in itself is not a biblical phrase...), were in fact actually homosexual.

How do you expect an honest conversation about the verses that you posted, when the foundation you laid is fiction? Since you are already blinded by thinking that these verses are talking about homosexuals, there is no way to reason with you. You will not even take SCRIPTURE that is given you as proof. You set the parameters of your questions based on your wrong interpretation of scriptures, and you're not willing to listen to those that are pointing that out to you.

RonaldGoetz. YOU.. are a false teacher. You are what the Bible warns Christians about. You should be marked as such and shunned.

1 Timothy 6:20-21 (NKJV)

O Timothy! Guard what was committed to your trust, avoiding the profane and idle babblings and contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge—by professing it some have strayed concerning the faith.

2 Peter 2:18-19 (NKJV)

For when they speak great swelling words of emptiness, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through lewdness, the ones who have actually escaped from those who live in error. While they promise them liberty, they themselves are slaves of corruption; for by whom a person is overcome, by him also he is brought into bondage. Grace be with you. Amen.

Re: M Guldner, on: 2010/7/5 0:56

"Two women grinding together.
Two men in the field."

"I am also almost certain this isn't a sexual refer to sex, Two women grinding together is grinding wheat and other grains for bread at a grinding mill, do some research on bread making and you will see that."

"Two men in a field also wouldn't refer to sex because there was often more than two individuals in a field they farmed as much as they could because it was important to farm for food."

* * * * *

Thanks for bringing all this up, M. Guldner.

One thing to remember is that all this takes place at night: "in that night." `

"Two women will be grinding together,
one will be taken, the other left."

Words like "mill" or "flour" do not appear in Luke's version in the Greek. Matthew does have "mill," but Luke does not. He seems to have deliberately left it out.

Two women grinding together, at night.

The word grind is used as a euphemism for sex three times in the Hebrew scriptures: Job 31:10, Judges 16:21, and Lamentations 5:13.

Let me repeat that. "Grind" is a euphemism for sex in the Old Testament in three places. This is confirmed by the Talmud, the Douay Rhiems, and Hebrew scholars.

Jesus was using a polite euphemism for making love when he referred to "two women grinding together." This phrase had a double meaning.

1) "Then let my wife grind unto another, and let others bow down upon her." (Job 31:10, KJV)

2) "But the Philistines took him, and put out his eyes, and brought him down to Gaza, and bound him with fetters of brass; and he did grind in the prison house." (Judges 16:21, KJV)

3) "They took the young men to grind, and the children fell under the wood." (Lamentations 5:13)

The Talmud says that in Job and Judges, the word "grind" refers to sex. In the Job passage, the phrase "let others bow down upon her" is known by Bible scholars as referring to sex.

In the Judges story, the Talmud says the Philistine princes wanted their wives to bear them children with the same great strength as the famous Samson, and put Samson to work on their behalf.

No words like "meal" or "wheat" appear in the Judges story.

Regarding the Lamentations reference ("They took the young men to grind"), the Douay Rhiems version renders this, "They abused the young men indecently," referring to male rape. This occurred during the siege of Jerusalem.

So the word "grind" was a polite euphemism for sex in the Old Testament, known, obviously, to Jesus and other Jews.

The two women in verse 35 were making love.

One of them was taken, and the other left.

Jesus uttered no blanket condemnation of lesbians here.

Re: - posted by mguldner (), on: 2010/7/5 1:17

None of those grind verses refer to sex, You can't point to certain scriptures and say that is what they mean, when they obviously don't mean those things. Your arguments are scripturally deceitful at best. If you are serious about this argument I would probably take it somewhere else, you obvious have choosen to ignore All of the Scripture against you and aren't listening to any voice of reason so arguing with you or even debating this really is irrelevant.

Anyone can take a scripture and justify an act they chose but that is called Isogesis interpretation it is where one takes a n argument and pulls all of the scripture that vaguely supports their argument while ignoring all other scriptures that stro ngly stands against it.

Now if you wanted to take an Exogesis stand point on this then that would be a more desirable form of interpretation, It i s looking at what ALL Scripture says and forming your thought process based off of ALL Scripture not just the scripture t hat supports your argument.

Your precious "gem" of revelation is a fraud and deceit that will lead you and all who read your books to hell if that confid e in them,(if your books are written with this line of thinking).

I would strongly advise you to abandon this line of thinking because you are very much in danger of hell if it continues, You will not be held blameless for this and you will be responsible for all that follow you in this thought process.

God is Holy and Just and He will judge ALL. I will be praying for your salvation and repentance, but as for continuing thi s debate I would advise all involved to stop involvement because we are kicking a brick wall in terms of benefitting anyo ne, Ronald has made an obvious choice in this matter.

God Bless,
Matthew

Re: , on: 2010/7/5 1:18

THAT'S your concrete evidence? I'm stuck somewhere between laughter and utter amazement. Sorry man, this is the la st you'll be hearing from me. You've been warned in love by several on this site that you need to repent of this heretical nonsense, but you hold on to trying to teach and to promote the very thing that Christ died to save men and women FRO M. His blood is worth more to me than that. Marked and avoided.

Re: Miccah, on: 2010/7/5 1:34

Miccah, this site, and this section of the site, is devoted to conversations about the Bible and Theology.

You ask this question:

"How do you expect an honest conversation about the verses that you posted, when the foundation you laid is fiction?"

You allege that the foundation is fiction, but you haven't demonstrated it. You've simply made an assertion.

Of course I realize this understanding of Luke 17:34-36 is unusual. That's why I am doing precisely what you critique: I am laying the foundation.

So far I have demonstrated 1) that all the action takes place at night, 2) that verse 34 can be read as either "two " or "tw o ", 3) that the details of the Sodom story, with its strong homosexual theme, is the immediate context of the couples mat erial in verses 34-36, which 4) vastly increases the likelihood that the "two" in verse 34 was intended to mean "two men," and 5) that Leviticus 18 and 20 are the specific scriptural background of "two men in one bed."

Furthermore, I have just demonstrated that in the Old Testament the word "grind" was a polite euphemism for sex. Com paring scripture with scripture, this means that my belief that Jesus' reference to two women "grinding together" at "night " was a reference to two lesbians. This belief has a thorough foundation in the Old Testament.

I must repeat: the homosexual theme of Luke 17:22-32 requires us to understand these three same-sex couples were g ays and lesbians. The burden of the argument rests with those who deny the relevance of context.

Miccah, let me speak personally. I have had to make radical changes in my life on numerous occasions--based on things I learned in the Scriptures. The changes required me to re-evaluate many things, including other elements of my beliefs and my vocation.

Christians must allow their beliefs, practices, and their lives to come under God's scrutiny. Remember Balaam's Ass.

Being Christ-like, on: 2010/7/5 2:07

We need to look at the implications of Christ's teachings for all aspects of our lives. It is absurd to imagine that Jesus would join the current crusade against gays and lesbians. Absurd.

The only people Jesus crusaded against were scribes and Pharisees. He criticized them at every turn. Scribes were the experts in the Scripture. The Pharisees were the ones who emphasized legal personal holiness. That's just a fact.

We need to look at Jesus and Marriage Equality. For us, this is primarily a spiritual and ethical issue, a Biblical issue.

I want to be Christ-like. That means loving the people Jesus loved, the way he loved them. That means loving and rebuking the people Jesus loved and rebuked.

Jesus rebuked good, respectable religious leaders.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2010/7/5 2:08

RonaldGoetz wrote:

Quote:

-----You allege that the foundation is fiction, but you haven't demonstrated it.

I will let the words of Jesus reply for me.

Matthew 7:6 (NKJV)

“Do not give what is holy to the dogs; nor cast your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn and tear you in pieces.

Re: Tearing to Pieces, on: 2010/7/5 2:14

Miccah, I really don't see how that applies to me.

I haven't turned and torn anyone to pieces.

I've been accused and castigated, maligned, noted and shunned, had blocks of Scripture thrown up against me, etc.

I have been nothing but civil and courteous.

How exactly have I turned on anyone and torn them to pieces?

Isn't it more appropriate for me to be quoting Jesus on that one?

But I don't consider anyone here swine. I consider you my Christian brother, in spite of our disagreement.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/5 5:36

Quote:
-----My conclusion is that the words men and women do not appear in the original. Words in the KJV that appear in italics do not appear in the Greek. They were added by the translators.

ginnyrose

You are right to point out the KJV has the word 'men' in italics signifying that it is not in the original Greek. In a way Biblical Greek doesn't quite work like our English. If I try to show the both verses it may make it more simple.

"I say to you, In that night, there shall be two on one couch, the one (mias - feminine form of 'one') shall be taken, and the other (heteros - masc form of 'other') shall be left; Luke 17:35 two shall be grinding at the same place together, the one (mia -feminine form of 'one') shall be taken, and the other (hetera- feminine form of other) shall be left; Luke 17:34-35

The word two could be either feminine or masculine, but the interesting thing is to notice the switching of the genders of the word 'other'. In verse 34 the 'other' is masculine BUT in verse 35 the 'other' is feminine.

So we have something like..

There were two on a bed and the woman was taken and the man was left.
There were two grinding and the one woman was taken and the other woman was left.

The grammar of these verses shows very plainly that the 'two' in verse 34 were a man and a woman AND the 'two' in verse 35 were both women.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2010/7/5 11:33

Quote:
-----The grammar of these verses shows very plainly that the 'two' in verse 34 were a man and a woman AND the 'two' in verse 35 were both women.

Ron, since this is the case, why did the translators of the KJV translate it otherwise? Did they have an axe to grind?

I have done a lot of checking on the web in other translations and all of the well known ones, except for the KJV and NKJV omit the words men and women....

Re: , on: 2010/7/5 14:12

The Talmud is the ancient Jewish commentary on the Hebrew Scriptures. The Talmud says that the word "grind" in Job 32:10 and Judges 16:21 referred to sex.

"Then let my wife grind unto another, and let others bow down upon her." (Job 31:10, KJV)

"But the Philistines took him, and put out his eyes, and brought him down to Gaza, and bound him with fetters of brass; and he did grind in the prison house." (Judges 16:21, KJV)

The word "grind" was a polite euphemism for sex in the Old Testament and in Jesus' day.

"In that night...two women shall be grinding together
One shall be taken, the other left."

My last go around - posted by Lysa (), on: 2010/7/5 14:45

Ronald,

It's hard to tell someone's tone is when we cannot hear what they are typing and I hope you believe me when I say there was not one bit of sarcasm or smart-alecness in my words to you earlier. I was not condemning, judging, scolding, anyone, my concern was for your soul. Anybody that's been on SI for awhile should be able to tell you that when the topic of homosexuality comes up, I am on the opposite side of any condemnation even to the point of total aggravation. This is actually the first time I have "taken on" (per se) someone about homosexuality online or offline!! And I did my best to be ever so careful with my words only to be scolded back by you!! (huge grin) For someone who is not gay, you didn't take the fornication topic very well.

Which leads me to my response earlier, there was on one topic I continually spoke on and that was fornication and the best you responded with was, "I know fornication is a serious problem;" and the rest of the space was used to scold me! (grin) And you never once offered a meaty response on fornication.

Brother, let me add that you can be nice and supportive of people all day long that are of differing opinions and lifestyles but there comes a time when you must stand for the truth. I know because I'm right there with you because I have lesbian friends, we are not around each other that often but when conversation has turned toward "well, there are many ways to heaven," or "I don't know why Christians consider this a sin," then I weigh my words heavily in light of eternity and not my friendship with them and I speak the truth as lovingly as I can AND I might add, they accepted it a lot better than you did!!!

You can argue over semantics with the others, I'm not doing that; I've seen your book and I find it incomprehensible that you declare that you are not gay but are yet leading multitudes of gays and lesbians down to the road to destruction (with false hope in) your book, "Jesus and Marriage Equality."

Your continual refusal to receive the love of the truth will lead God to send you a strong delusion (if He hasn't already) that you would believe a lie (2Thess 2.10-12). This is why I do not think you have come to SI by chance; yes, God DID send you here but to hear the truth.

This is my last response to you. In Christ,
Lysa

"You were running the race nobly! Who has interfered and caused you to swerve from the truth?" (Gal 5.7 WEY)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/5 14:53

Quote:

-----Ron, since this is the case, why did the translators of the KJV translate it otherwise? Did they have an axe to grind?

I really don't know why the KJV translated it as they did. They often followed Tyndale but in this case they didn't and Tyndale has none of the problems with the verse...

34 I tell you: In that nyght ther shalbe two in one beed the one shal be receaved and the other shal be forsaken.
35 Two shal be also a grindynge to gedder: the one shal be receaved and the other forsaken.

I think the NKJV sometimes follows the KJV a little too slavishly.

Re: My last go around, on: 2010/7/5 15:11

Lysa, you're right. *smile* It's not possible to read people's tone very well. I didn't interpret your comments as scolding or carping at all--honest. And I wasn't "aiming" my remarks at you, either. I'm afraid my tone came across all wrong.

I was giving you what I felt was the most relevant comment I could make on the topic of fornication. And when it comes to sexual temptation, the personal element is far more significant to us than the intellectual element.

I'm sorry that the limitations of typed communication and "tone mis-cues" interfered here.

I didn't feel defensive in my remarks to you at all, which I think is how they may have sounded.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/6 5:52

You know I don't know why I didn't think of this before. It is so obvious and shows beyond all doubt that Ron G's view of this verse is totally wrong.

The Greek language can be very precise. They have two different words for 'another'.

there is 'allos' which means 'another of the same kind'. This is the word that Christ used when he spoke of 'another comforter'; another one of exactly the same kind. If you believe Christ is God you must believe that the Spirit is divine too. You can see the word in 'parallel' para and allos which another of exactly the same kind by the side of; para = by the side of, allos = another of the same kind.

there is also 'heteros' which means another of a different kind. The two words allos and heteros have quite different meanings. The classic example is in

"I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." Gal 1:6-7 KJV
which sounds a bit bewildering in the KJV. The NKJV has sharpened it up...

"I marvel that you are turning away so soon from Him who called you in the grace of Christ, to a different gospel, Gal. 1:7 which is not another; but there are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ." Gal 1:6-7 NKJV.

the first 'another' of the KJV is heteros but the second 'another' of the KJV is allos. Paul is saying this is a different kind of gospel and not another variant of the gospel.

heteros, incidentally, is the word we have in heterosexual, meaning another sex of a different kind. Homo means the same; hence homosexual = same sex, while heterosexual = different sex.

In Luke it is the word 'heteros' that is being translated other. If this were another man it would have to be 'allos', the fact that it is 'heteros' and in the feminine form shows that the second one, who was left, was of a different kind to the one who was taken. This is without any shadow of doubt a hetero-sexual couple sharing a bed. This is not a matter of opinion; it cannot mean anything else.

Re: Your Unwise Certainty, on: 2010/7/6 6:08

Okay Ron B, let me re-post something. These are sixteen versions which specify "two men."

American Standard Version
Amplified Bible
Young's Literal Translation
Darby
King James Version
Douay Rheims
Peterson
New Life Bible
Moffatt

Phillips
English Revised Version
Webster's Bible Translation
Emphasized Bible
Weymouth
Bible in Basic English
Wesley's New Testament

If it is such a certainty, I don't understand how all these translators and translation teams got it so totally wrong.

I have never insisted that it MUST be translated "two men." I have said, correctly, that it can be translated either "two people" or "two men," and that in the immediate context of the Sodom story, "two men in one bed" is highly likely.

As I said before, with over sixteen versions specifying "two men," your certainty seems misplaced.

Ron, I have never said it HAS to be translated "two men."

I have argued that, on the basis of context, it SHOULD be translated "two men."

Ron, why doesn't context matter here?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/6 9:01

I think this will be my last comment on this topic. You obviously have another agenda and refuse to hear what is being said here plainly. There are not so deaf as those who are not willing to hear.

Context does matter but you are not reading the context you are creating a context. You are desperately clinging to a view which has no basis and is clearly wrong. I have avoided addressing the homosexuality issue but now I will do so.

The prospect of a homosexual relationship in the Jewish society in which Jesus lived and worked is beyond possibility. Jesus and so did all his hearers that such relationships were declared abhorrent to God.

As regards your flight to the versions... ask anyone who has a smattering of Biblical Greek... there is no support for 'men'. The noun is not there only the 'adjective' which is none specific as a result of the way that a plural masculine would be used for two males or for a male and a female. But the 'one female' would be taken and the 'other a male' cannot possibly be translated in any other way.

The original KJV is almost certainly using 'men' (even though it is not there) as a generic term for 'people'. Your sixteen versions are probably doing the same. There were two (people)... the female (fem form of 'one') was taken and the other one the male (masculine form of heteros meaning another of a different kind) was left.

Enough said... end of conversation.

Re: Att. Ronald - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2010/7/6 10:19

Ronald,

I have been thinking a lot about this thread. I discussed it with my husband and I still think.

I have a few questions I would like to ask you. I do not have the time to ask you one by one and thus have an ongoing conversation. After I post this, I will leave the house and go to our greenhouses, be there all day. When I come home I will likely be dog-tired. So, I have to make the choice of dumping them all at once or prolong this conversation where it may lose some of its urgency so I am choosing to ask all my questions now.

Here goes:

God made male and female, placed them in the garden and told them to go forth and multiply. He equipped each body to accomplish this command. This command has never been rescinded. Now, how can two males or two females obey this command? They do not naturally multiply, not without borrowing other peoples' bodies/fluids.

One of the ten commandments is "thou shalt not commit adultery". This commandment is still in force. This command refers to all sexual acts outside of the context of marriage. In face of this command, how can you justify homo relations?

Homo relations have their origins in defilement. A person violates God's law for moral purity and from there it will progress to recreational sex, be it heterosexual relationships or same sex. When this happens, sexual addiction occurs. One becomes so driven with needing it to satisfy themselves that their need becomes obsessive/intense, takes on the form of addiction. (I had a female client who suffered from sexual addiction.) Do you not wish to be free from this intense drive?

When sex is entered into the context in which God has ordained it to function, it is highly satisfying. It frees its participants to accomplish much in life. We are not obsessed, it frees us from the addiction mode.

Ronald, do you not ever in the quietness of the night wish you were free from this intense drive, desire? Do you not ever wish you could be like the man God wants you to be with normal drives, desires, have a wife and children that will call you 'daddy'? Do you not ever wish you would have a family that came out of your own loins that will share some of your characteristics? Do you not ever wish to teach your son how to play ball? how to excel in whatever skills you deem important?

And who will care for you when you get old? ...on the other hand, a homosexual lifestyle kills, so you will likely not get old. Do you not know that the human body is not made to accommodate the bodily fluids of multiple partners? To do so makes you vulnerable to diseases?

I must go...but wish you would consider this...

(In case you wonder who I am, I did work in a pro-life ministry and we did chastity counseling.)

Re: Ginny Rose, on: 2010/7/6 16:26

Hi "Ginny Rose,"

Your last line, "In case you wonder who I am", tells me a lot. You're a woman who acts on her convictions. I was arrested for blocking an abortion clinic back in 1990 and was sentenced to 25 days in jail. It was certainly an interesting experience. My wife made me promise to never get arrested again, though! *chuckle* She hated it that I was in jail, although she did bring the kids to talk with me through the plexiglass window--just like on TV!

So I have had numerous opportunities to share my values with my children. All three still attend church, and they often sing duets and trios for special music. We raised our children singing together: in the car, at church, during advent, etc. And I take care of two of my grandkids three or four afternoons a week.

Don't worry, at first lots of people think I must be gay, writing the way I do. It's a totally reasonable misunderstanding.

There are a lot of Scriptures which guide me in what I do, but I have two favorite verses:

"Sometimes you were exposed to public ridicule and were beaten, and sometimes you stood side by side with those treated that way, sharing in their suffering" (Hebrews 10:33)

Gay and lesbian Christians, as well as non-believers, are subject to ridicule and beatings. Some people have been beaten to death, as I'm sure you know.

I don't stand side by side just with Christians who are persecuted. I want to stand side by side with anyone who is treated unjustly. Christian or Jew, homosexual or heterosexual.

I am called to "share in their sufferings," that is, to koinonia in their suffering. To feel it, partake of it, share it.

The other verse is in Proverbs 31, just before the "Good Wife" passage.

"Speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves;
ensure justice for those being crushed.

Yes, speak up for the poor and helpless,
and see that they get justice." (Proverbs 31:8-9)

Younger gay and lesbian believers cannot speak up for themselves, and they are crushed by the intemperate rhetoric that pours out from many pulpits.

I have devoted the remaining years of my life to "speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves."

Yes, I do have "an agenda," it is this Biblical Justice agenda. An agenda to follow the command of Scripture.

About 1/3 of adolescent gays and lesbians are kicked out of their homes when they come out to their parents. Someone has to stand by them, speak for them, protect them.

I know a young gay adolescent who was kicked out of his home. He was homeless, but started pulling his life together. Three weeks ago he took his life.

I regret not being there for him. I knew him. I have resolved to somehow bring greater focus to my efforts and activities, to become more effective. It was sobering and upsetting to lose someone I know, knew, to suicide.

In the church there is a diversity of gifts and callings, Ginny Rose. We are not called to identical ministries, with identical messages.

I saw that you like Ecclesiastes. Me, too. I call myself an "Ecclesiastes Christian." If a book like Ecclesiastes can be in the Bible, then a Christian like me can be in the church.

There's more, about the purposes for sexual intercourse, but I have to get ready for some foreign exchange students arriving next Monday.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2010/7/6 18:47

Ok, I get it. You are a married man with children. And a child that is gay?

When or how did your 'drive for justice for the gays' evolve?

ginnyrose

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2010/7/6 22:22

Ronald, I went to YouTube and googled your name...I think I found out all I need to now in order to know where you are coming from.

You have a son who is gay, tried to commit suicide several times. I do not doubt for one minute this would be a traumatic time for parents and the entire family. As a dad you want to protect your child at all costs. But at what cost?

Let me tell you a story...and it is true and I am not beating around the bush trying to make you think it is about someone else. It is about ME and few others as you shall see.

When I was 40 YO back in 1987 all of our children were in school and now I had time to pursue something I had wanted to do since Roe v Wade. My husband and I decided that once all of our children are in school I will get involved in the pro-life ministry.

I took classes that taught us how to counsel those in crisis pregnancies. One day in class the LORD had me face an issue and I needed to make a decision. I sat and thought and thought: what would I do IF my child got caught in immorality? Would I still say it is sin or would I make excuses, hedge, blame others or still call it sin? I thought long and hard: what would I do? My grandparents' example came to my mind: Grandpa was a preacher, ever since 1935. They had five children but the oldest one divorced and remarried. This grieved them to no end. Uncle had five children with woman #2...To their dying day, they maintained the conviction that what uncle did was sin. Grandpa preached it from the pulpit and whenever the subject came up, he preached it, never mind what his son did. This was the example my grandparents left me. I witnessed it: seeing it, hearing it. As I wrestled with this question I decided my grandparents did the right thing and by G

od's mercy and grace I want to be faithful: I will be obedient to the WORD regardless what my children do.

Fast forward several years - son #2 - left the faith by degrees. Today he is shacking up with a divorcee who has a husband still living and who also has two sons, now adults. I like Renee. She is smart, working on a Ph.D. in sociology. She is pretty, has an excellent work ethic, is an excellent cook. But this relationship is all wrong. The son knows it. What are we to do? Surrender our convictions to make him feel good? To build his self-esteem?

Ronald, Luke 14:26 tells us "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." We cannot allow our children's behaviour impact our convictions. God's word is eternal and we cannot change it. You do your son no favor by accommodating his sinful urges.

Ronald, your son suffers from guilt. Why on earth do you not work to help him overcome his sin instead of working to gain Christians acceptance of it? His guilt still remains! How helpful is that? He may feel good at the moment, but he knows in the deepest recesses of his heart it is not right.

Ronald, are you not aware of Romans 1:26-32 NASB ?

"26 For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural,

27 and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error.

28 And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper,

29 being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malice; they are gossips,

30 slanderers, haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents,

31 without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful;

32 and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them."

Do you not see what lies in store for you (v. 32) if you persist on the path you have chosen?

Ronald, if you would love your son as Jesus loved you would work to help your son and others find victory over this addiction, and not castigate Christians who are brave enough to stand up and speak against sin.

ginnyrose

Re: Ginny Rose, on: 2010/7/7 0:33

Thanks for taking the time to find "Holding Families Together" on YouTube. Raymond Portillos Leon is the young man I mentioned who committed suicide a few weeks ago.

I spoke with his mother at the viewing. She told me that Raymond wasn't "religious." She said, "Ray said, 'The church says I'm going to hell.'"

You said I shouldn't "castigate Christians who are brave enough to stand up and speak against sin."

I haven't castigated anyone in these forums. I've been castigated repeatedly. Excuse me, I did characterize how some people deal with gays and lesbians as "carping," but I have been quite civil throughout. I, on the other hand, have been, well, castigated quite thoroughly.

You quoted Romans 1, a very familiar verse to me, and to many people. Let's discuss the Romans passage in another thread.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2010/7/7 7:35

Quote:

-----I spoke with his mother at the viewing. She told me that Raymond wasn't "religious."

Please share my condolences with this mother. I am sure she is grieving. She will have many dark nights and moments. The enemy will come along and make things difficult for her. All this mother can do is to cast herself upon the LORD Jesus.

Quote:

-----"Ray said, 'The church says I'm going to hell.'"

Ronald, if the church echoes this sentiment, God bless that church. This is what the WORD says: if you do not repent of your sins, you have only hell to look forward to when you die. And God is not partial, even with our children. Ronald, compassion demands one be honest and speak honestly, even if it means your child. God will not cut your child any slack simply because he is your child.

When you follow the LORD Jesus, you will live a repentant lifestyle. This is the evidence of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

Ronald, if you are alert enough, you will notice that gays have more problems than just sexual-orientation. A person is not just guilty of one sin. When a body is practicing a 'sin' the whole family of sins abides within that person. It may be lying, strife, anger, bitterness, lust, covetousness, et al. This is true of all sin. It will usually take one sin to alert others what is going on in a person's life. Upon closer examination you will find a host of other sins, some in its infancy abiding there, growing, and being nourished by the 'big sin' that is so evident. Brother James informs us of such in James 2:10.

Ronald, as a parent, I am sure you may have experienced a lot of sorrow over your son's decisions and wondered where you as a parent has gone wrong, especially as head of the household. We do not know the dynamics of your household, but know this, too, that God's first human children choose to violate his commands as well - and they had an absolutely perfect parent, home and upbringing. Knowing all this, the only thing you can do for your son is to pray and work to get the son experience victory - but he may not want it, either.

Quote:

-----but I have been quite civil throughout.

Agreed.

Changing the subject here....

When I was at CPC we had clients in a crisis pregnancy. They were in a real crisis, I promise. Abortion seemed to be the best option in dealing with this crisis. Occasionally I was tempted to agree to this route. BUT. There is always this BUT. And this means God had something else to say about this matter. To violate this will incur untold grief - somewhere down the road, maybe 20 years hence - upon the victim and by extension me as well. We were required to speak the truth, Ronald. Doing otherwise would have resulted in our expulsion from the ministry - and for good reason. Truth liberates, always. ("Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." John 8:32) Painful? Indeed. But lying blinds, destroys, always. So which in the end is the worst? Lying may seem to be the best option at the moment but when you factor in eternity it is utter foolishness.

This is my concern, Ronald. Not only mine but others who posted on this thread as well.

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2010/7/7 19:24

Ginny,

Thanks for your last two posts, I think they redeemed the thread.

In Christ,

Ron

Book Available Free as PDF, on: 2010/8/21 8:14

The book "Jesus and the Six Homosexuals" is available free as a PDF. To get a free copy, send an email to radical_discipleship@hotmail.com.

Re: Book Available Free as PDF - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/8/21 15:28

I think it is disgraceful that you are using the SI forum to propagate this toxic nonsense. I have only read the first part of the introduction and find it is based on the false premise that we exposed in this thread much earlier. Your notion of the six homosexuals is just bad exegesis and has no basis in the text as we have already shown.

The fact that you continue to propagate this vile notion when we have exposed its falseness shows that you are determined to stick to your agenda irrespective of data to the contrary.

I think you should apologise for abusing Sermon Index forums.

Re: , on: 2010/8/24 16:09

My brother Philologos,

What you call "toxic nonsense" I believe is the teaching of Christ in Luke 17:34-36. I'm sure people called the anti-slavery message of the American abolitionists "toxic nonsense" as well, but that didn't stop them.

I am obligated by the Great Commission to share what Christ taught.

I cannot dodge the commandment of the Lord simply because you disagree with my understanding of Scripture.

"Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you."

Finally, I can no more apologize for teaching the Scripture than you, my friend.

Dear Ronald and all my dear brothers and sisters, on: 2010/8/24 20:50

i'm coming a little late to this party, but ...wow.

forgive that intellectually impoverished statement, "wow", but that's all i can come up with, after reading thru this ENTIRE thread.

i thought i've seen every kind of thread on this forum, but this one is in a category all by itself.

Ronald, you have maintained a civil, courteous demeanor throughout, which speaks volumes about your heartspace in Messiah Jesus, but dear brother to give Christologic covering and blessing to same sex marriage?....or for that matter to give spiritual covering to same gender sexual relations?

search your heart, could you be wrong?

S'chma, hear me, i know full and well, one of the hot button issues of the North American evangelical church is the issue of same sex marriage. it's an easy issue to galvanize around, there's a lot of cultural froth and bile and rank hatred going

g back and forth, etc.

My feeling, lensing the issue from a Constitutional standpoint, is that if gay folks WANT to get married, they should be free to do so, but for them to assume that they would have the blessing of Christ attached to such a union, is foolhardy at best, and eternally perilous at worst.

i dont get too lathered up in righteous indignation about homosexuality, homosexuals, or their desire to get married, but it is sinful behavior. to me, its just one sin among MANY sins.

and i;ve committed many many sins in my life, but i'm grateful to God that i've never had an appetite for homosexual sex , and from what i've noticed and discussed with my soon to be 15 year old son, he's not given to homosexual appetites, thank God, and i mean that.

Because it just breaks my heart to see parents booting their children out the house for being homosexual. If my boy was, God forbid, i could never kick him out of the house, into the dark cruel world. i dont know WHAT i would do, but i wouldnt kick him out, or drive him out. (i'd wear out knees in prayer, thats for sure)

Ronald, its a tough topic you've taken on, but i cant go along with you on this, your thesis, the spiritual covering you're giving to a gay lifestyle, its just not there my brother. Jesus DID tell that poor shamed woman caught in adultery to go and sin no more....do you know what i'm saying?

that said, how do we possibly evangelize gays? i dont know.

Y'know, i'm a Jew who follows Jesus, and most regular posters here now that, and i bring it up, because Jews are so tough to preach the Gospel to. i was blessed, it was the Holy Spirit that helped me to apprehend Messiah...no man spoke to me. Point being, Jews and homosexuals are probably the toughest to evangelize. (what that statement says, i dont know) But Jews have a lot of fear about Christians, given all the historical baggage, and gays, homosexuals probably feel hated by Christians, hated by the Church, so.....they hate back. its grievous.

but please Ronald, I know you've written a book, you have a FB page, you are now known for the stance you've taken, and you believe that God has spoken to you on this hard topic.....but please do this for Christ's sake, just search your heart, ask the Holy Spirit, talk to Jesus, and ask, "am i wrong?"

what if Jesus says your wrong? Are you ready to do what would in the world's view be, a humiliating 180 degree turn?

i'm just a lonely struggling saint, but i gotta tell you, in Jesus Love, you're wrong dear Ronald, you're thesis is wrong, i say that in love, and i say this in love, you could be possibly leading many many dear souls to eternal peril, could you live with that possibility?

just consider what i've written...please?

neil

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2010/8/25 6:05

Quote:
-----What you call "toxic nonsense" I believe is the teaching of Christ in Luke 17:34-36. I'm sure people called the anti-slavery message of the American abolitionists "toxic nonsense" as well, but that didn't stop them.

I am obligated by the Great Commission to share what Christ taught.

I cannot dodge the commandment of the Lord simply because you disagree with my understanding of Scripture.

"Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you."

Finally, I can no more apologize for teaching the Scripture than you, my friend.

Alas you are indeed bent towards preaching this gospel of homosexuality. It is not just toxic nonsense it is blasphemy against Christ without mixture. Surely it is the fruit of strong delusion and the giving over to a reprobate mind as we see described in Romans 1:26,27. Having had more than a first and a second admonition you have continued, yea verily, have indicated your intention to continue to foment these lies as if compelled to do so by God?

Is it love to suggest to a person that their damnable heresy is not damnable. Would you have us to be liars as well? Or would you have us acquiesce to such vileness as if somehow homosexuality deserves special treatment- until the sinner grows comfortable in their sin and dies clinging to it? Shall we hold our peace and let you preach this gospel? What devilish love would allow such wretchedness to plunge a person into hell unthwarted? You would obviously seek to spread this deception until the whole of Christendom was leavened. You would have us stand by and watch dumbfounded as you unlock the wheels of iniquity until the whole of Christendom is carried before this ministry of unchastity. Nay verily! I for one will not stand by as you preach and impressionable minds and hearts (perhaps in the throws of temptation) believe the lies and be damned.

Quote:

-----You quoted Romans 1, a very familiar verse to me, and to many people. Let's discuss the Romans passage in another thread.

Romans 1:27 is relevant to 'this' thread. I will not give the answer for your sake- as you have already judged yourself unworthy of another answer through your rejection of that light that has already been beamed upon you; but I will answer for those impressionable minds that watch in these forums. Turn not again so as to rend me- for this is for them.

...and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, ymen committing shameless acts with men and receiving in themselves the due penalty for their error.

'Consumed with passion' here is a terrible word meaning literally 'burned out' (θξεκαύθησαν).

v.28 And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient;

This is a mind that has failed the test. These people were committing acts that were even a shame to speak of (Ephesians 5:12). See II Cor. 13:5 and see that it is possible to believe one is in fellowship with Christ and yet still be a reprobate.

Or do you not know that the unrighteous* will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: neither the sexually immoral, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor men who practice homosexuality, (I Corinthians 6:9)

You will notice:

1. Do not be deceived
2. Among those that will not inherit the kingdom of God: μαλακοί, οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται, (malakos and arsenokoatai) that is effeminate men and homosexual.

The word arsenokoatai* is also found in I Timothy 1:10, a passage outlining to whom the Law was given for:

For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind (arsenokoatai), for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine.

note*

The Bauer, Walter And Frederick William Danker Lexicon (hereafter BDAG) is perhaps the most respected Greek Lexicon available today. On this term BDAG 135 s.v. ἀρσενοκοίτ

ης states, "a male who engages in sexual activity w. a pers. of his own sex, pederast 1 Cor 6:9...of one who assumes the dominant role in same-sex activity, opp. μαλακός...1 Ti 1:10; Pol 5:3. Cp. Ro 1:27." L&N 88.280 states, "a male partner in homosexual intercourse — 'homosexual.'...It is possible that ἀρσενοκοίτης in certain contexts refers to the active male partner in homosexual intercourse in contrast with μαλακός,, the passive male partner." Since there is a distinction in contemporary usage between sexual orientation and actual behavior, the qualification "practicing" was supplied in the translation, following the emphasis in BDAG. (NET translators note)

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2010/8/25 6:39

This is definitely an attempt on Ronald Goetz's part to promote a pro homosexual agenda. He just released a book on the subject this year. He intentionally resurrected this thread that had been dormant for years. He is an apologist for homosexuality.

Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple. (Romans 16:17, 18)

He is here to draw fire and talk nice. He figures if he can come off as academic and reserved he can expose believers as homophobic hate mongers. Stop giving the man accolades. He is here to deceive the hearts of the simple.

Re: Luke 17:34 - 36, on: 2010/8/25 8:18

Robert, appreciated your exposition in the post before last. I have not been following this thread in detail.

For me, the first (and last) word on homosexual behaviour is IDOLATRY, as God through Moses lists it in Leviticus 18 in the context of worship of the gods of land into which He intended to bring the Hebrews, which practices He denounces as abominable to Him, in which worship they are NOT to participate.

As such, it gives greater definition to Exodus 20:3 Thou shalt have no other gods before me. 4 Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness that in heaven above, or that in the earth beneath, or that in the water under the earth: 5 Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth of them that hate me; 6 And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

Verse 4 above is given the light of observation by Paul in Rom 1:18 - 25.

I wonder whether there are Christians who think that to 'bow down' and 'serve' such other gods, is about singing praises to them a different kind of service in a different kind of church? (Well it is, but it is the service of all which opposes God Himself.)

Whereas what these verses mean is that the acts of worship themselves, involve the sexual activities listed in Leviticus 18. (Other activities might involve eating and drinking things which ought not to be eaten and drunk by a body made in the image of the living God who wishes to dwell in it by the Holy Spirit, or, the taking of oaths to those gods, or chanting ungodly 'praise' to them.)

As I have posted many times before, a reason the Church of Jesus Christ is weak (in places), is because ALL the contexts of fornication (as listed in Leviticus 18) are not taken nearly seriously enough by individual 'believers'. Whereas, we are

e ALL to rid our lives of ALL these practices and of the mind which accommodates and nurtures the possibility of engaging in them.

This is the second of 'the ten commandments'. This is only one part of 'the law' which Christ fulfilled in Himself by Himself; to whose example of purity we aspire, through the Holy Spirit with whose help we may mortify the flesh and ALL its wrong-doings. (Rom 8:13)

This is not an optional part of living by faith. It was for this that Christ came, that we might IN DEED have victory over SIN - that is, over every thing that opposes the Lordship of God in our lives.

That is, first of all, everything which HE declares opposes His Lordship in our lives. How else can we claim to be HIS disciples, following the disciplines which He delivered to us by His (Word-made-Flesh) life?

That's how I've come to understand these issues.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/8/25 10:19

There is a form of quiet communication which has the appearance of gentleness and sweet reason...

The words of his mouth were smoother than butter, But war was in his heart; His words were softer than oil, Yet they were drawn swords. Psa 55:21 NKJV

It is the content that we need to examine in these matters.

To preach that Christ permitted homosexual practise is diabolical, and I am choosing my words carefully. It doesn't matter how gentle the language may sound, there is a hidden weapon of destruction here.

Re: Neil's exhortation: "Search your heart, could you be wrong?", on: 2010/8/25 13:32

Dear Neil,

Thank you for your heartfelt concern, and for your spirit of gentle correction. You undoubtedly take seriously Paul's exhortation: "Brothers, if someone is caught in a sin, you who are spiritual should restore him gently. But watch yourself, or you also may be tempted," (Galatians 6:1).

"Search your heart, could you be wrong?"

"Search your heart, ask the Holy Spirit, talk to Jesus, and ask, 'Am I wrong?'"

Neil, I have asked myself that question, repeatedly.

When I discovered the three places in the Hebrew Scriptures where "grind" is used as a metaphor for sex, I said to myself, "Ron, Jesus didn't really mean that. You're just being too clever."

When I discovered the usages of "grind" as a metaphor for sex from authors in Latin (Horace) and Greek (Plutarch) in the time of Christ, I said to myself, "Ron, Jesus didn't really mean that. You're just being too clever."

When I discovered that the material just before the Same-Sex Triptych of Jesus, verses 20-29, actually did not undermine my thesis (as I feared they might) but actually supported the fact that it is indeed two *men* in Luke 17:34, still I said to myself, "Ron, Jesus didn't really mean that. You're just being too clever."

As much as I wanted to believe that the simple, face-value understanding of Luke 17:34-36 (KJV) pointed to three same-sex couples, I still was not absolutely convinced that I was correct.

I did not become absolutely convinced of my thesis until late in my research, when I compared the parallel passages in Luke 17 and Matthew 24. It was at that point that I discovered that Luke had taken Matthew 24:40 and given it a totally new context, what I call "Luke's Gay Apocalypse." Matthew had one apocalypse, whereas Luke has *two*--the apocalypse

in Luke 21:5-36 and the shorter apocalypse (Luke 17:20-37), the additional "Gay Apocalypse" in which the theme of homosexuality predominates.

Luke introduces all the elements of homosexuality, which are completely missing from Matthew. Yet Jesus does not condemn homosexuals (which might be expected following a discussion of Sodom, Lot, fire and brimstone, and Lot's wife), but instead tells us that half the practicing homosexuals in the story are acceptable to God. Labeling Luke 17:20-37 "Luke's Gay Apocalypse" is quite accurate.

When I saw that Luke had taken Matthew 24:40 and constructed a second, shorter apocalypse in his gospel, and had made that verse the passage's climax instead of a relatively small detail, then and only then did I have evidence of Luke's conscious design of his "Gay Apocalypse." Only then could I assert with a completely clear conscience that the author intended for us to understand the three couples in Luke 17:34-36 as gays and lesbians.

Neil, for most of the time that I was researching and writing the chapter titled, "The Same-Sex Triptych of Jesus" I was not only questioning my thesis, I wasn't completely convinced myself, UNTIL I discovered the evidence of conscious, deliberate design and intent.

Neil, the book is free. I spent six months researching and writing, and I give that time and energy to you as a gift. I do not make merchandise of the gospel. Please read, especially, the first two chapters. The second chapter, "Bible Bigotry and Biological Heretics" describes how Jesus rejected three kinds of biological bigotry--against lepers, Samaritans, and homosexuals--all of which were commanded in the Hebrew Bible.

For months I lived, not with the possibility that I was wrong, but with the awareness that I really could be wrong. From Scripture God convinced me otherwise.

You wrote, "You believe that God has spoken to you on this hard topic."

Yes. God spoke to me using the words of Christ as recorded in the Scriptures.

There is a way you can verify this for yourself.

Ronald, on: 2010/8/25 18:34

in love i say this; God speaks to me too, for which i'm grateful, humbled and awed, and as He leads me, i have to tell you, you're wrong in this stance that you have taken.

and i say that as someone who if he had lived in the 1830's to 1863 would have been a on fire Spirit filled "conductor" on the Underground Railroad. Believe me, i have read Rev John Rankins "Letters on American Slavery" more than once, and i know this, most modern day African-American preachers are resentful, that the cause of African-American civil rights in America, has been tied to cart of same sex marriage. They don't equate their struggle with same sex gender issues, and i don't either.

i am not stilted intellectually nor theologically, i am always ready to reason, ready to read, and i thank you for your offer of your book, however, on my shelf right now, i have over 20 books, crying out to me, "read me!!", so i must beg off of your offer.

and i say once again, in the Spirit and Love of Jesus Messiah, you are wrong in your thesis, and i beg you, turn. Fear God only, and not the opinion of man, NOR give covering to the lust and appetites of man. remember the heart of man is dark and deceitful, beyond cure, only Jesus can understand it, so i beg you, turn. Ronald, i have no other words. Understand this.

neil

Re: Ronald , on: 2010/8/26 4:25

Blessed is the man who trusts in the Lord,
And whose hope is the Lord.
For he shall be like a tree planted by the waters,
Which spreads out its roots by the river,
And will not fear when heat comes;
But its leaf will be green,
And will not be anxious in the year of drought,
Nor will cease from yielding fruit.
The heart is deceitful above all things,
And desperately wicked;
Who can know it?
I, the Lord, search the heart,
I test the mind,
Even to give every man according to his ways,
According to the fruit of his doings.
Jer. 17.7-10

Ronald,

Research of words and letters is one thing. (The leading of the spirit of Jesus Christ is another.) We can know only a very limited amount of things from research, and through reason we can rationalize away virtually anything.

Anyone can pick and choose certain scriptures, ignore whatever does not fit their chosen belief, and come up with a doctrine that makes them feel right.

Feelings change and are as fickle as the whirlwind. Feelings, if relied on, will lead you down a grand path destined towards a place of emptiness here, smoke and the lickings of flaming fire hereafter.

Looking to our hearts is at the root of following something other than God. It will deceive us every time into things that are twisted against and opposing Him, blessed Be His Name, Jesus Christ forever.

Does what you are claiming coincide congruently with ALL scripture?

If certain verses seem to contradict others, we are the ones who are not understanding things correctly.

I was awakened to address this thread and to bring it under the scrutiny of the whole counsel of God.

Can you deal with that?
or
Are you going to chicken out?

Reading this thread, looking to what just you have written, does not glorify our creator, Jesus Christ, blessed be His name forever.

Jesus rejected all bigotry: period! FYI, there is no bigotry commanded in the Bible...and of what you call bio-bigotry, you forgot to mention that He touched the dead, the sick, and the diseased --(of which you mentioned lepers).

Here on earth, He never judged any person. He never condemned anybody. He came to seek out and save those who would come to Him, dropping all defences, and reject their lives for Him and His ways. Are you doing this?

He rebuked in warning, listening to the will of His Father, then meekly carried out Father God's will even to His own death on a cross for you and me. He willingly allowed His flesh to be beaten and torn open, and with gaping wounds His blood was splattered to save us from ourselves. Can you receive this?

The gospel is not that God approves anything against the way Jesus created everything in Genesis, but that He came to recreate everything that exists into something better than what it was initially made to be.

Homosexuality is borne of lust --(of the eyes and/or of the flesh)-- which is covetousness.

Covetousness --(of this nature)-- is idolatry and an abomination to God.

Therefore, homosexuality is an abomination to God.

Speak up and we can cover this (bit by bit if need be).

In ending, consider two clips from one of Paul's letters:

I marvel that you are turning away so soon from Him who called you in the grace of Christ, to a different gospel; which is not another; but there are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ. But even if we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than what we have preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so now I say again, if anyone preaches any other gospel to you than what you have received, let him be accursed. For do I now persuade men, or God? Or do I seek to please men? For if I still pleased men, I would not be a bondservant of Christ . . . But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is Christ therefore a minister of sin? Certainly not! For if I build again those things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor. For I through the law died to the law that I might live to God. I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me. I do not set aside the grace of God; for if righteousness comes through the law, then Christ died in vain.

Gal. 1.6-10, 2.17-21

Do you understand what a seared conscience is?

Prayers
are moving
towards you
from here:
Sincerely,

g

p.s. You should check and double check to be sure that it is actually God telling you what you are claiming, as we who declare things from the scriptures are the ones who will be judged extremely and severely in that great and dreadful day when everyone will be salted with fire.

p.s.s. ...back to sleep, so goodnight FN

Re: , on: 2010/8/26 4:37

i would be remiss in not clarifying something.

Sodom and Gomorrah were not destroyed because of homosex.

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2010/8/26 4:41

to Ronald

Many of us may differ how we interpret the scriptures, some say it is sin, you say its not. So who is right and who is wrong?

Well one way is to see what main stream of christianity has believed throughout history of christianity. And to my knowledge all "classical" christianity from the church fathers and through out history of those that i would say is included in the "sound faith" of the Gospel of Christ, no one has ever said its not a sin and abomination to engage in a homosexual relationship or act. I am most certain they all come to the conclusion it is wrong and should not be good for a christian to act or live in as any other sin.

So when looking at that, and then looking at me or you or any others of us, it could theoretically be possible you are right and 2000 years of christian men and women be wrong...

you must judge for yourself what you find most likely.

Many have tried reason with you, and the verses and interpretation you do of your handful of verses are very far fetched and not what the common reader would come to conclude i suspect. But on the other hand you have the OT that speak very clearly what God feels about this act of homosexuality, although we had a clearer revelation of God in the man Christ and his words God does not change, he still is the OT God and he still have the same Holy Standard and laws.

It does not matter how we feel about them, god is always right...

So i think and echo what brother Neil said, please do re examine your interpretation of these passages in context of the whole of scripture.

And i think you are "kicking against the bricks" here trying to convince others of your convictions.

please do take to heart brother.

Christian

The Doctrinal Delusions of Ronald W Goetz - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/8/27 5:07

I have set up a thread entitled "the doctrinal delusions of Ronald Goetz". In this thread I will try to engage RG's thinking and show not only that he is wrong but why he is wrong. If you would like to follow it you can do so here...

https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmode=flat&order=0&topic_id=34862&forum=36&post_id=&refresh=Go

Re: "in context of the whole of scripture", on: 2010/8/27 6:23

Hi Christian,

Thanks for your gentle exhortation.

You and Phanetheus, and probably others, have suggested that I compare what Jesus said in Luke 17:34-36 with other passages about homosexuals.

I have dealt with the so-called "Slam Passages" (Leviticus 18:22 & 20:13, Romans 1:18-32, etc.) to my own satisfaction, and I am more than willing to discuss them here. I don't know how determinedly I will "defend" my interpretation since I doubt that I will, as you said, convince others of my convictions.

I think it is fair to reply to the many invocations of the Slam Passages.

I must confess that I will continue to refrain from replying to people's warnings from Romans 16:17 to "mark and avoid" me! (Of course, those comments weren't directed toward me anyway!)

Ron