



Scriptures and Doctrine :: A couple hard passages that I am looking for answers on like David with a harem?

**A couple hard passages that I am looking for answers on like David with a harem?... - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/21 11:01**

There are a couple passages in the scriptures that I have wrestled with before and am seeking further clarification on. The topic is mainly on the men in the OT in context to women.

The first is polygamy. I would say that I am quite confident from scripture that one man and one woman is God's ideal and even His law. However, there are a couple things which cause me to look further on the issue. For instance Jacob married both Rachel & Leah. Jacob was called to marry Rachel. Yet he was duped into marrying Leah. So it would seem that it was not God's will nor Jacob's. However, it was through Leah that part of the tribe of Israel came. So maybe this is just another example of Rahab the Harlot and Bathsheba being in the lineage as sinners and not God saying it is not my ideal but it is not all that bad?

Polygamy again though in that David married many wives. I think there is a passage that tells for the kings to not marry many women like the Gentiles? So once again I think that would point out that God did not want this. However, David and Solomon did this. So maybe one can say that it was not God's will but that He did not come down that hard on it since it would seem He did not judge them. So maybe polygamy is not that great of a damning sin?

Again with David and Solomon. Didn't they have other women I can't remember the title right now that were in their harem, but were not actually their wives? If so how can this then be justified? How come they were not judged or even rebuked if so? Would this not be fornication which is condemned in the NT letters? Or were the rules not as hard back then as also Moses because of the hardness of their hearts allowed divorce? Or because they were not born again as Temples of God?

I have also read of some passages of men like Samson going into a harlot and they seemed to not be judged. Was it not as bad to go into a harlot as it was to a virgin?

**Re: A couple hard passages that I am looking for answers on like David with a harem?., on: 2009/7/21 11:01**

Hello Anonymity:

In the Bible, the Jews looked upon adultery as only applying to women (because they did have multiple wives from the beginning of time). However, when Christ came on the scene, he answered your question. Marriage is between one man and one woman only:

Mark 10: 2. And the Pharisees came to him, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? tempting him. 3. And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? 4. And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away. **5. And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept. 6. But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. 7. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; 8. And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh. 9. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.**

Matthew 19: 7. They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? 8. He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.

9. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery. 10. His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry.

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: A couple hard passages that I am looking for answers on like David with a harem?...**

Matthew 5: 31. It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: 32. But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

-----  
anonymity wrote:

There are a couple passages in the scriptures that I have wrestled with before and am seeking further clarification on. The topic is mainly on the men in the OT in context to women.

The first is polygamy. I would say that I am quite confident from scripture that one man and one woman is God's ideal and even His law. However, there are a couple things which cause me to look further on the issue. For instance Jacob married both Rachel & Leah. Jacob was called to marry Rachel. Yet he was duped into marrying Leah. So it would seem that it was not God's will nor Jacob's. However, it was through Leah that part of the tribe of Israel came. So maybe this is just another example of Rahab the Harlot and Bathsheba being in the lineage as sinners and not God saying it is not my ideal but it is not all that bad?

Polygamy again though in that David married many wives. I think there is a passage that tells for the kings to not marry many women like the Gentiles? So once again I think that would point out that God did not want this. However, David and Solomon did this. So maybe one can say that it was not God's will but that He did not come down that hard on it since it would seem He did not judge them. So maybe polygamy is not that great of a damning sin?

Again with David and Solomon. Didn't they have other women I can't remember the title right now that were in their harem, but were not actually their wives? If so how can this then be justified? How come they were not judged or even rebuked if so? Would this not be fornication which is condemned in the NT letters? Or were the rules not as hard back then as also Moses because of the hardness of their hearts allowed divorce? Or because they were not born again as Temples of God?

I have also read of some passages of men like Samson going into a harlot and they seemed to not be judged. Was it not as bad to go into a harlot as it was to a virgin?  
-----

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/21 11:15**

Hi Walter,

Quote:

-----the Jews looked upon adultery as only applying to women (because they did have multiple wives from the beginning of time)  
-----

So you are not saying the Scriptures said it nor that Moses accepted it, but that the Jews held to that right (adultery only for females)? Are you sure that the Jews held to that? Or did they only hold to that in part or at times? Is there proof of this?

Are you sure they had multiple wives from the beginning?

**Re: - posted by enid, on: 2009/7/21 11:32**

In Genesis 4v19, we have the first mention in the Bible of someone having 2 wives.

His name was Lamech, a descendant of Cain.

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2009/7/21 12:19**

Deuteronomy 22:22: If a man is found lying with a married woman, then both of them shall die, the man who lay with the woman, and the woman; thus you shall purge the evil from Israel. NASB

Leviticus 20:10-21 deals with all manner of sexual sins, most of which earned death for the participants.

Nowhere do I find in the OT that it was permissible for a male to commit sexual sins without a curse or punishment. The law "Thou shalt not commit adultery" is not gender specific.

Still your question is why did the OT folks practice polygamy and why did God allow it? Acts 17:30 may provide for you a springboard which could point you in the right direction.

I suspect you have an unasked question behind the one you posted...?

ginnyrose

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/21 12:29**

Enid,

thanks for the info.

I would note that this was a descendant of Cain as you mentioned.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/21 12:39**

Ginny,

Yeah it says that if a man lays with a married woman he shall die. But if with a virgin then he will have to pay money and marry her. It doesn't mention non virgins such as harlots.

So I guess David was judged for his sin with Bathsheba who was married, but it is interesting that he was not killed but I guess his son was yet it still wasn't him so I guess the Lord bestowed some mercy I'd guess. Yet for the fornication and what not maybe it is not counted as a very grave sin at least to a top notch level. Because I think he was with women he was not married to and also the polygamy thing he seemed to get away with.

The times of ignorance. That is an interesting verse I have thought over before. I think possibly contextually it mainly speaks of the Gospel, but I will have to look it over again.

So, I think maybe I am thinking that fornication and polygamy and such were sins but not as grave as adultery at that point yet I also know as it says in the NT letters that those who practice such things will not inherit the kingdom so either David wasn't doing that or he because under more of the OT was allowed to some degree grace of some kind.

I'm not clear what you mean about an unasked question. I think that I have been transparent and have written clearly and openly.

I was also thinking on the issue of what if you are a missionary and a guy gets saved who has multiple wives what does he do divorce everyone but the first I think that according to scripture he should probably keep them all.

**Re: A couple hard passages that I am looking for answers on like David with a harem?. - posted by narrowpath, on: 2009/7/21 12:40**

You will also notice that whenever there was polygamy involved there was never harmony but always strife in the family

In 1.Tim 3 an elder or deacon would have to be the husband of one wife. The way I understand it is that some people were in polygamy before they got saved. Polygamy was clearly marked as sinful, however expelling the other wives to stay only with one wife would be uncaring. Therefore anyone living in polygamy would have to be excluded from eldership or deaconship but would not be further disciplined for continuing in polygamy.

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: A couple hard passages that I am looking for answers on like David with a harem?...**

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/21 12:45**

Narrow,

interesting you just posted on the topic I just in the last paragraph wrote of. I had before thought that that polygamist should divorce all but the first but I see now in scripture it says that you have to care for your wives if you take them to yourself like for instance if you laid with a virgin you would have to marry her.

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2009/7/21 13:41**

anonymity,

Quote:  
-----I was also thinking on the issue of what if you are a missionary and a guy gets saved who has multiple wives what does he do divorce everyone but the first I think that according to scripture he should probably keep them all.  
-----

This question becomes a reality for some missionaries. I have heard some will tell a man to put away all but his first wife. Then others will say, "no, keep them but no more marrying more women."

In my understanding, I would say the man in this case should keep them all because divorcing implies 'putting away.' In fact in some places these terms are used interchangeably in the NT.

Quote:  
-----Yeah it says that if a man lays with a married woman he shall die. But if with a virgin then he will have to pay money and marry her. It doesn't mention non virgins such as harlots.  
-----

This is true. If a man rapes a virgin, he was required to marry her but was prohibited from divorcing her in the future.

Why should the law treat a sin professional differently than another person? I do not see that it does. But what we do see is that the people were not obedient to it and got into trouble for it.

The fact that David was spared death is because he admitted it when confronted with his sin. This is admirable. How many folks today will admit guilt when confronted about a sin they committed? How many will work to justify it? even manipulating scripture to justify it?!

The NT uses the term the 'sure mercies of David' Acts 13:34 to describe forgiveness of sins committed. David, according to the law, was doomed to die. Since he acknowledged his sin, repented of it, God granted him mercy and allowed him to live. (But if you follow this story through, you will see how his sin effected his family. It seems as though from that point on his family was in a turmoil like you would not believe. Sin destroyed his family.) Today, if we acknowledge our sin, confess it and repent, we also can experience "the sure mercies of David."

I often had to wonder about Bathsheba - why did God allow her to birth the future king of Israel? And her to be the queen mother? The only conclusion I have is this: Bathsheba was seriously violated. The king raped her: there was no love affair ongoing with her prior to his command to bring her to him. One does not cross a king's wishes: he gets what he wants and you have to obey! Did God granted her comfort by giving her several children of whom Solomon was made king? Did God orchestrate this to bring the woman a measure of comfort because she was so seriously violated? (Consider for a moment: she loved her husband dearly. Now, here is an old man, a king, and he rapes her!! Most young females do not think having sex with a man old enough to be your dad to be romantic!) I seem to think so.

I know that when one reads, studies the OT questions will arise as to why God tolerated some hideous things and the answers are not always forthcoming. Since they may not be, God apparently did not think it was important for us to know so some thing will always remain shrouded in mystery.

Now we live in the NT era, under a new set of 'rules', if you please. The OT is there to teach us a lot about God, human nature and how he deals with it. Some things will stump a body, like the life of Samson. Yet, if one looks long enough th

Answers may come but if they don't, that is OK, as well. It won't hinder our faith, will it?

My understanding,  
ginnyrose

**Re: Why was only the Adulteress brought before Jesus?, on: 2009/7/21 20:21**

To Anonymity:

In (John 8:3-11) we find that **the scribes and Pharisees brought ONLY THE woman caught in the act of adultery to Jesus Christ:**

3. And the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst,  
4. They say unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. 5. Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou? 6. This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him. But Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, as though he heard them not. 7. So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.

8. And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground. 9. And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst. 10. When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee?

11. She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more.

**Haven't you ever wondered why only the woman caught in the act of adultery was brought before Jesus? So, since she was charged with the crime of adultery, we know for sure she was a married woman. However, the man that she committed it with, if he was married, had also committed adultery. Based upon the law, he should have been stoned to death as well. If he was not married, the man was committing fornication, and should have been stoned for that. Yet the scribes and Pharisees only brought the woman to be stoned.**

**It is interesting that adultery was considered a sin for women. But concubinage (women as breeders) and polygamy (men could have many wives, but a woman only one husband) were acceptable. The capturing of women in battle and forcing them to be wives, as well as "levirate" marriage (The term is a derivative of the Latin word levir, meaning "husband's brother"...if a man's brother died without heirs, the man had to marry his dead brother's wife and have children by her to perpetuate the deceased brother's name) were also seemingly acceptable biblical practices. Women were considered to be property. Initially, they were the property of their father. When they were married, they were considered the property of the husband. Women were not allowed to bring offerings to the Temple to atone for their sin. When they were living at home, their father, the Family Priest is the one who took the offering to the Temple for the sins of the entire family. When she became married, her husband, the Family Priest, was the one bringing the offering to the temple.**

**King Solomon had 700 Wives + 300 Concubines In O.T. times concubinage was an official status. God rebuked Solomon not for polygamy and the concubines, but for the fact that many of his wives were non-Hebrew. These foreign wives were non-believers in Jehovah and brought idols in for worship from their pagan cultures, which was contrary to God's teaching.**

**Also, at the time that Jesus walked the earth, a man could sign a decree of divorcement against his wife for any reason.**

**Jesus made it clear throughout the New Testament that men were just as guilty as women if they committed the act of ADULTERY.**

**At least, that's what I see in God's Word**

**(Mark 10:11-12)**

11. And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her.

12. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.

**In Matthew, Christ tells us that even looking at another woman in lust is adultery in God's eyes:**

(Matthew 5:27-28)

27. Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery:

28. But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

(Matthew 5:31-32)

31. It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: 32. But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

(Matthew 19:1-9)

1. And it came to pass, that when Jesus had finished these sayings, he departed from Galilee, and came into the coasts of Judaea beyond Jordan; 2. And great multitudes followed him; and he healed them there. 3. The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? 4. And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, 5. And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?

6. Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. 7. They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? 8. He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.

9. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.

(Mark 10:2-9)

2. And the Pharisees came to him, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? tempting him. 3. And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? 4. And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away. 5. And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you that his precept. 6. But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. 7. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; 8. And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh.

9. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

(Mark 10:18-19)

18. And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God. 19. Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Defraud not, Honour thy father and mother.

(Luke 16:18)

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

(Luke 18:20-21)

20. Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother. 21. And he said, All these have I kept from my youth up.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

-----  
anonymity wrote:  
Hi Waltern,

Quote:  
-----the Jews looked upon adultery as only applying to women (because they did have multiple wives from the beginning of time)  
-----

So you are not saying the Scriptures said it nor that Moses accepted it, but that the Jews held to that right (adultery only for females)? Are you sure that the Jews held to that? Or did they only hold to that in part or at times? Is there proof of this?

Are you sure they had multiple wives from the beginning?

-----

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2009/7/21 23:29**

anonymity, when you stop and think about this thing of polygamy vs divorce, divorce is much more cruel than polygamy. In divorce you are abandoning a spouse. Leaving him or her set with no support whatsoever. You had vowed to love and cherish that person and now you are violating that vow! Not so with polygamy, you are just adding more to your harem to care for. Having said this I will be the first one to say I would be as mad as a wet hen if my husband were to take another wife with me still living!!! You better believe there would be much strife!!!

There is another angle to consider about polygamy in the OT era: the Israelites fought a lot of wars with many males killed. How is a country to grow with few males to sire children if all they had were one woman per man? This is a problem whenever you have extended wars, even in today's world.

I am so glad that in our era of time, that Jesus said couples should not divorce and there should be only one man, one woman to a marriage. So much more peaceful....I love this new dispensation, do you not?

ginnyrose

**Re: , on: 2009/7/22 5:01**

Below we see the account of Abraham's latter years in Genesis. Consider the father of faith, and certainly one of the most, if not THE most honored man in the Bible. Sarah had passed, and Abraham remarried, and also had a harem....concubines.

5" And Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac.

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

7 and these are the days of the years of Abraham's life which he lived, an hundred threescore and fifteen years.

The Lord sees things differently, and though I am not a dispensationalist, I believe that obviously things were different then. It's one of those things that I have to accept, and trust God, that He knew what He was doing. Neither Abraham, nor David were in rebellion in this case. It even seems that the Lord ordained it, doesn't it?

One of those things that we just have to give God permission to do, you know. ;-)

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/22 9:36**

Ginny,

"the sure mercies of David" I like that a lot.

Yeah I will say that I have often come into intellectual contradiction in my mind when reading the Scriptures. I have found time after time that there is an answer sometimes through study and sometimes through prayer and sometimes through both together. There is always an answer, but we are not always given one and are sometimes called to just trust God though most of the time I would say we do get an answer. IN John6 Jesus once purposely offended by saying to eat His flesh and blood and many left, but His disciples didn't not because they understood but because they knew to where shall we go you alone have eternal life and trusted.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/22 9:49**

Waltern,

yes you are correct the Jews at that time did think it okay to divorce for any reason and probably only tried to judge the women for adultery though I am not completely sure if that second thing is so as the omission of mentioning the man does not surely mean they left him alone.

As for the polygamy I know Solomon was rebuked for marrying foreign wives, but I think that he was also to not add to him many wives:

Deu 17:14 "When you come to the land that the LORD your God is giving you, and you possess it and dwell in it and then say, 'I will set a king over me, like all the nations that are around me,'  
Deu 17:15 you may indeed set a king over you whom the LORD your God will choose. One from among your brothers you shall set as king over you. You may not put a foreigner over you, who is not your brother.  
Deu 17:16 Only he must not acquire many horses for himself or cause the people to return to Egypt in order to acquire many horses, since the LORD has said to you, 'You shall never return that way again.'  
Deu 17:17 And he shall not acquire many wives for himself, lest his heart turn away, nor shall he acquire for himself excessive silver and gold.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/22 9:57**

Brotom,

I'm not sure if God ordained polygamy.

I have heard it said that women had it much harder in that context and therefore it was good if a man could care for multiple women.

I believe I read somewhere that it said and in that day the women will plead with the man to take them as Ginny was mentioning.

Isa 3:25 Your men shall fall by the sword and your mighty men in battle.  
Isa 3:26 And her gates shall lament and mourn; empty, she shall sit on the ground.  
Isa 4:1 And seven women shall take hold of one man in that day, saying, "We will eat our own bread and wear our own clothes, only let us be called by your name; take away our reproach."

I am sure that many women have it like that today. I believe that many of the reasons that the western women have it so easy is not totally because we have had a womens lib movement but because we have it so easy over here in which all the wealth has shifted that the situation is not hard and jobs and such are easier. Not that women cannot do hard jobs for look at proverbs 31 but many jobs were more laborious ect.

I still do not know if I can say that God ordained polygamy I would have to look into it further.



**Re: Multiply? - posted by dohzman (), on: 2009/7/22 10:30**

I didn't have the time to read through the others postings so I may be re-peating what someone else has said. Deu 17:15 Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the LORD thy God shall choose: one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother.

Deu 17:16 But he shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses: forasmuch as the LORD hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way.

Deu 17:17 Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away: neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold.

This is part of the ordinance for the kings of Israel. When they became king they were to write out by their own hand the first 5 books of the law, Gen through Dt.

Your questions are difficult at best, while on the streets preaching every now and again I would have some learned individual who would raise such a question but that was to justify some sort of sinful behavior. I doubt that you fall in the ilk. I have had to look at the multiple wives as covenants, multiple covenants would be multiple sin habits we Christians have learned to live with, it could be as innocent as golfing every week when we know we should be doing something the Lord has asked us to do instead.

I hope you won't go down the road I have gone down many times and it's still a hard pill for me to swallow, but it seems that God acts towards some a certain way and that's it, end of story, no matter what they do in this life, good or bad, I am talking about Christians here. I have to assume it was the same way in the OT.

Your passage about Sampson and laying with a harlot who was a Philistine is one also that I see as a type, a type of a Christian who beds down with their sin that they intend on multiplying. But as to the literal import of the thing, I'm not sure you can take an individual account or action (sin or other wise) as not going unpunished, in Sampson's case the progression to his being blinded and bound seems to be his "reaping" what he sowed. I know many Christians who are today bound by .....what ever, and they have become blinded or lost all discernment period.

So I would encourage you to look with more of an over all life time view at these individuals in the Bible who it may not immediately appear that they are being judged or reaping what they sowed, but they are.

**Re: , on: 2009/7/22 10:32**

To Anonymity:

Have you ever thought that perhaps the scribes and Pharisees set this adulteress up, then caught her in the act and brought her to Jesus as a "set up", to trap Him?

I think it is very likely. But still, at this time in history, women were perceived as property, they had no rights to speak of-compared to men.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

-----  
anonymity wrote:  
Walter,

yes you are correct the Jews at that time did think it okay to divorce for any reason and probably only tried to judge the women for adultery though I am not completely sure if that second thing is so as the omission of mentioning the man does not surely mean they left him alone.

As for the polygamy I know Solomon was rebuked for marrying foreign wives, but I think that he was also to not add to him many wives:

Deu 17:14 "When you come to the land that the LORD your God is giving you, and you possess it and dwell in it and then say, 'I will set a king over me, like all the nations that are around me,'

Deu 17:15 you may indeed set a king over you whom the LORD your God will choose. One from among your brothers you shall set as king over you. You may not put a foreigner over you, who is not your brother.

Deu 17:16 Only he must not acquire many horses for himself or cause the people to return to Egypt in order to acquire many horses, since the LORD has said to you, 'You shall never return that way again.'

Deu 17:17 And he shall not acquire many wives for himself, lest his heart turn away, nor shall he acquire for himself excessive silver and gold.

-----  
**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/22 12:40**

Dohzman,

thanks for the response.

Yeah, I've read that verse thanks.

The same is with me. I have thought about this subject before, but just never really discussed it or received a lot of clarity on the matter. I was talking to someone who was bringing up a couple of these issues who is somewhat learned and does not think premarital sex to be wrong or immoral.

Yeah I think I agree with you about the Samson thing.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/22 12:50**

Ginny,

oh I remembered one of the things you wrote and forgot to respond. About Bathsheba being in Christ's lineage. It would seem that sinful people were in the lineage of Christ. There are some interesting things going on in the lineage of Christ as mentioned in Matthew 1.

For instance the Lord allowed Leah to have children because she was hated in contrast to Rachel who was loved and Judah was born and through him was Messiah born. Or the Ruth and Boaz story who was a Gentile. Or Rahab the former harlot who was also a Gentile actually was the mother of Boaz. Or Bathsheba who had her first son killed then birthed Solomon who became the wisest man and through him came the Christ.

I am sure there are other things. So I think this tells us of God's upside down or actually right side up wisdom and His mercy and second chancing restoring love. How he takes a sinner who is unworthy and gives them grace to His glory in which no man may boast and through whom the power of God came and birthed Christ. Christ was born through sinners and gentiles who by faith forsook the world and came to the God of Israel. Cool stuff.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/22 12:56**

Walter,

I wouldn't doubt if they had.

I want to try and address something just in case it needs to be cleared up. I think that our modern day views of feminism are in some ways false. There are some truths and good things that have happened but also some bad things. There are also things with men that have been skewed as to what is the role of man etc.

It is true that men in those past times treated women falsely. I will say though that I think some of the things to be biblical. One might hear that women were treated as property and be turned off. Rightly so in some sense but in others not. What I mean is men are also property to their wives once married they belong to that one. So it is not always a bad thing to be property.

I see the western culture and we always hear of how much better it is than in other countries that are more conservative. However, I see good things in other cultures that are more conservative as well. For instance in other countries men will

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: A couple hard passages that I am looking for answers on like David with a harem?...**

often hold hands in friendship and not have an ill feeling of homosexuality because it is not something that is really poisoned into their culture. Or I think maybe of the parents being the ones to choose their mates and I wonder if done rightly if this is right or wrong. It would seem that Paul spoke of a man not wanting to give away his daughter then it would be okay. Or other things culturally in this context.

**Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2009/7/24 20:25**

I thought about what Ginny said concerning the missionaries ministering to those with more than one wife and what to do after they were saved.

What about all the people today cohabiting together and having children together out of wedlock. They need to hear the gospel and they also need to be saved. I have seen God save people who have been living together and even having children together without being married and then try to work this situation out without deserting their children. Are they not saved by the spirit even though they have not gotten a certificate of marriage as of yet.

Trying to understand

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/24 20:59**

Rbanks,

Well, this is a hard topic that I have wrestled with. This has also recently come up in another discussion around the same topic somewhere else.

I think the first thing is those people if they have had children and such probably shouldn't separate and actually get married and that would be better than trying to work something else out like a dual guardianship.

I think these things need to be looked at in detail and are hard to judge as a whole and easier and probably better on a case to case basis so therefore I cannot really answer universally.

Here is my take on the marriage question you gave though I am still seeking more clarity on the matter.

I believe that marriage is before man like family friends and society, government, each other, and God. I think the main thing about marriage is commitment and exclusiveness. Adam and Eve only answered to each other and God. So therefore I would think it possible that some could be married if they were committed and exclusive in a strong formal serious way if it were before God and each other even if not before man and government. So therefore if one does not have a marriage license I think it possible for them to be actually married. I still think it best to get married in the law of man and what not as well and it should be done that way. I don't know why someone would make a commitment before God and each other and not before the government and man it would be a contradiction, but I could see a couple instances in which it would happen. Some get married in other countries and then when they come back to their homes it is not valid. In summation I think that some can be married if they are committed to each other before God, but that it is best and commanded to be married before man and government. Maybe I am wrong maybe you do have to be married before man for the marriage bed to be undefiled I am not sure... I would also like to hear some thoughts on this.

**Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2009/7/24 21:15**

Quote:

-----  
anonymity wrote:  
Rbanks,

Well, this is a hard topic that I have wrestled with. This has also recently come up in another discussion around the same topic somewhere else.

I think the first thing is those people if they have had children and such probably shouldn't separate and actually get married and that would be better than trying to work something else out like a dual guardianship.

I think these things need to be looked at in detail and are hard to judge as a whole and easier and probably better on a case to case basis so therefore I cannot really answer universally.

Here is my take on the marriage question you gave though I am still seeking more clarity on the matter.

I believe that marriage is before man like family friends and society, government, each other, and God. I think the main thing about marriage is commitment and exclusiveness. Adam and Even only answered to each other and God. So therefore I would think it possible that some could be married if they were committed and exclusive in a strong formal serious way if it were before God and each other even if not before man and government. So therefore if one does not have a marriage license I think it possible for them to be actually married. I still think it best to get married in the law of man and what is not as well and it should be done that way. I don't know why someone would make a commitment before God and each other and not before the government and man it would be a contradiction, but I could see a couple instances in which it would happen. Some get married in other countries and then when they come back to their homes it is not valid. In summation I think that some can be married if they are committed to each other before God, but that it is best and commanded to be married before man and government. Maybe I am wrong maybe you do have to be married before man for the marriage bed to be undefiled I am not sure... I would also like to hear some thoughts on this.

-----

Thank you! I just love a brother with an honest reply.

I have also wrestle with these same things over the years. I remember years ago a lady came to the church and accepted Christ and you could see the joy. I notice the very next week she didn't come to church and I went to her home and met her children and found out that she had been living with the Father of her children for over 8 years and she said that she couldn't go to church.

I told her that the Lord knew her situation before he saved her and asked her not to quit coming to church for the Lord would help her work this thing out pleasing to Him.

Blessings to you!

**Re: - posted by poet (), on: 2009/7/25 0:13**

I have a pastor friend from Kenya, and Polygamy is a problem there especially when he has men come to him and the whole family get saved but he has two wives..

My pastor friend tells the man he must divorce the second wife, but he must supply all her needs.

I didn't ask about whether she was free to remarry or not, I suppose she would be since the marriage was not really legal to begin with.

As for kings having multiple wives in Deuteronomy

17:17 it states.

Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away: neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold.

Why David or Solomon deviated from this Law of God I don't know, but it appears that God did judge both of them for this, not as speedily as we would presume but when calamity befalls us it at the time seems quite sudden.

I don't know what their judgment was eternally but in the flesh it was apparent. God could have forgiven them, I do know he does remember mercy in his wrath.

**Re: - posted by ceedub, on: 2009/7/25 1:54**

Interesting thread. I tried to skim most of the posts.

A number of years ago I was watching a documentary about the mormons in Bountiful, B.C, Canada as they were practicing polygamists. My wife came downstairs and commented on the disgusting nature of the polygamy and how evil it was.

My knee-jerk reply was, 'Do you think David was evil?'

I assured my wife I wasn't defending polygamy, but, when you look at David's life it's hard to square God's judgements...

David allowed a census, and he was given the 3 options: man, pestilence or God's wrath. (and I believe God destroyed some 70 thousand men over that sin), yet God didn't say a word about the multiple wives he had at the time!

It's hard to judge right by God's standards, especially when you look at God's judgements and are totally perplexed at times.

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: A couple hard passages that I am looking for answers on like David with a harem?...**

Not only that, but when Nathan indicted David of Uriah's murder, didn't God say that if he wanted more wives, all he had to do was ask?

I guess when you look at polygamy, it is neither adultery, nor fornication.

Glad I'm not the Judge.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/25 16:29**

Rbanks,

good word.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/25 16:30**

Poet,

So divorcing yet still caring for her hmm interesting thought.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/25 16:35**

Ceedub,

Quote:

-----David allowed a census, and he was given the 3 options: man, pestilence or God's wrath. (and I believe God destroyed some 70 thousand men over that sin), **yet God didn't say a word about the multiple wives he had at the time!**

It's hard to judge right by God's standards, especially when you look at God's judgements and are totally **perplexed** at times.

Not only that, but when Nathan indicted David of Uriah's murder, **didn't God say that if he wanted more wives, all he had to do was ask?**

I guess when you look at polygamy, **it is neither adultery, nor fornication.**

Glad I'm not the Judge.

Hmm interesting insights. I had not thought of a couple of those things before.

The thing that stood out most was in saying didn't God say all you had to do was ask for more women. I will have to look over that text.

Also, that it's neither adultery or fornication.

**Re: - posted by ceedub, on: 2009/7/26 0:18**

2 Sam 12:7 And Nathan said to David, Thou art the man. Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, I anointed thee king over Israel, and I delivered thee out of the hand of Saul;

8 And I gave thee thy master's house, and thy master's wives into thy bosom, and gave thee the house of Israel and of Judah; and if that had been too little, I would moreover have given unto thee such and such things.

This is the verse I was speaking of concerning God's response through Nathan.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/26 15:59**

Ceedub,

Yeah I knew which passage you were talking about. I just wanted to look it over as a topic like this is hard to digest. It is definitely clear I would say. At the same time I would still guess it God's ideal to have 1 with 1 as for instance Elders and such are to be of 1. Adam was of one. Peter was of one. Jesus will be of one though many still one. I still don't understand it all.

**Re: - posted by ceedub, on: 2009/7/27 13:22**

make sure you post what you come to. Very curious what you make of this. Thanks.

**Re: A couple hard passages that I am looking for answers on like David with a harem?. - posted by patricks916, on: 2009/7/27 13:22**

I would believe in Genesis 2:24, God stated what marriage is. Between one man and one woman becoming one flesh. Due to the wresting of the law, Jesus came and defined what adultery really is: Matthew 5:28. Which is lusting in the heart.

I would even say that Samson did get judged, maybe not in the way that we would have expected, but because of his looseness and lifestyle it, slowly caused him to become weaker. Maybe not physically but spiritually.

Another thing to note that many of the things in the OT, were types and shadows. Adam sinned, and God said he would die, but yet he still lived. So what part of him truly died? Is this not the same thing that had come upon David? (Psalms 51:11) Did not the same thing happen to Samson? (Jdg 16:20) Is not our God merciful at the same time? (Rom 2:4)

We must also see that no one in the OT was saved by the law, but by faith. The law was to show us the sinfulness, which they did all confess of their need for Christ. Their hearts at that time could only be broken before God, but never purified like in the NT. So for that reason I believe God was merciful to them, just like he is to us, wanting us to come to repentance, but now our hearts can be purified. I know this does not answer all. But just some thoughts