

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2003 Issue

Does <b>hwhy</b> Ever Not Answer?.....	2
Wanted: Writers.....	5
Correction To 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2002 Issue.....	5
Marital Fidelity (part 1).....	6
Marital Fidelity (part 2).....	9
The Lost Art Of Family Roles.....	31
The Need For Scriptural Headship.....	31
Scriptural Courtship And Betrothal.....	32
Marriage And Divorce.....	33
"Blue Law" Time Line.....	34
Putting Away For Adultery.....	28
The Pain Of Adultery.....	38
Philippians 3:4-8 Rewritten.....	43

**hwhy** = YAHWEH

**uwhy** = YAHSHUA

(more regarding the names of the Creator & His Son on back cover)

worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them."

I can just envision the shame and grief of a woman who has committed adultery. She stands in front of her accusers. Those in charge, unveil her for all to see her shame. Soon the rocks are thrown. The suffering ensues and the woman enters into an eternal death.... I want to shout with tears to all who will listen, including myself, to avoid such wickedness! Avoid fornication, for it is in your power to do so. Do not grieve the heart of [hwhy] any longer. The wrath of [hwhy] may not abide on us now, but we have to fear his terror! Let us no longer look around us at the "Normal" living in this world without fear and trepidation. Guard yourselves and seek a Holy life while constantly remembering this Proverb (14:13) "Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed: but he that feareth the commandment shall be rewarded."

"It is clear that the legally mandated penalty for adultery in the Massachusetts Bay Colony was death. Still, the Puritan court exercised great discretion in cases of adultery, and though it was committed frequently, perhaps only on one occasion were a pair of adulterers put to death. More often than not, the court would declare

that there were not enough witnesses to the crime, as required by law. . . Gov. John Winthrop, it seems, was particularly uneasy about carrying out the death penalty. Nevertheless, adulterers were, at the very least, beaten, branded, imprisoned, fined, and banished from Massachusetts Bay."\*

Some examples from the Records of the Massachusetts courts:

1. John Bickerstaff was censured to be severely whipped for committing fornication with Alice Burwood . . . Alice Burwood was censured to be whipped for yielding to Bickerstaff without crying out and concealing it. (Boston 1638)

2. Dorothy Temple, for uncleanness and bringing forth a male bastard, is censured to be whipped twice; but she fainting in the execution of the first, the other was not executed. (Plymouth 1639)

\* Taken from Understanding the Scarlet Letter by Claudia Durst Johnson.

*Hebrews 12:8 "But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons."*

[The names of Yahweh and Yahshua were restored throughout this article with permission from the author.]

tookest vengeance of their inventions.”  
hwhy answers his people in love when they call upon him in repentance.

Likewise, hwhy answers those who serve him not. Egypt was a pagan nation which did not worship hwhy, and yet, in reply to Pharaoh’s dream, Joseph said, “hwhy shall give Pharaoh an answer of peace” (Genesis 41:16) However, many times hwhy’s answer is according to their own works. “And the word of hwhy came unto me saying, Son of man, these men have set up their idols in their heart, and put the stumblingblock of their iniquity before their face: should I be enquired of at all by them? Therefore speak unto them, and say unto them, Thus saith hwhy Elohim,... I will answer him that cometh according to the multitude of his idols... I, hwhy, will answer him by myself.” (Ezekiel 14:3,4,7)

If it were possible for mankind to ask of hwhy at one time and receive an answer, yet ask at another time and receive no response, our Elohim would not be dependable, thus making him unworthy of our respect. Scripture proves such a line of thought to be in error, for hwhy himself says, “I am hwhy, I change not” (Malachi 3:6) If this is the case, why does it seem at times as though hwhy does not answer?

The problem in the communication line between mankind and his Creator lies not in a lack of response from hwhy, but a lack of listening for an answer (and at times accepting the answer that is provided) on the part of mankind himself. Many times believers do not

hear hwhy’s answer because they have allowed the spirit of unbelief to enter into their hearts. Such was the spirit of Job when in great affliction, he cried out, “If I had called, and [hwhy] had answered me; yet would I not believe that he hearkened unto my voice. (Job 9:16)

In spite of scriptural support for an Elohim who answers our prayers, there are several verses which may at first seem to indicate otherwise. Speaking through the prophet Micah, hwhy said, “Concerning the prophets that make my people err... The seers [shall] be ashamed, and the diviners confounded: yea, they shall all cover their lips; for there is no answer of hwhy. (Micah 3:5,7) Is there a contradiction in hwhy’s scriptures? Not really. We merely have to understand the surroundings of this verse in order to read it in proper context. We are dealing with a situation much like ucmhy dealt with when he was placed on trial before the multitude of the Jews. “[Pilate] sayeth unto ucmhy, Whence art thou?, but ucmhy gave him no answer.” (John 19:9, Mark 15:4,5) Why did ucmhy ignore the question? Precisely because he had already answered it when he told Pilate, “My kingdom is not of this world... Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.” (John 18:36,37) Pilate was “attempting” to tempt the Messiah as he stood on trial. Both he and the multitude before him already realized the true identity of ucmhy. What they did not realize was that “hwhy [this includes ucmhy] cannot be tempted of

John MacArthur goes on to say that “Only those who were not guilty of the same sin could participate.” Therefore, to be in line with the law, the men must be guiltless themselves of adultery in order to partake of the execution. Some are confused with this point and think that we are all sinners and should be forgiven (or get away with whatever we do!) It is not really forgiveness they seek, but immunity from punishment. This gives us a mistaken understanding of the wickedness of our sins. The reason the men walked away and no longer accused her was because “they... being convicted by their own conscience went out one by one.” They realized they were also guilty of the sin in their own lives and could not proceed with the punishment. In no way does this mean that adultery is okay and we should never think that [hwhy] will forgive us without punishment for our sins, particularly the sins which we commit knowing full well they are wrong. Yes, [ucmhy] died on the cross for our sins and took our punishment. But the punishment he saved us from was eternal death and doom in hell. We are still held accountable for our actions and chastened for wrongdoing!

What exactly happens when a woman commits adultery? She betrays the loyalty and trust from her husband. She sears his heart with torment. The children are affected and most often, the family is broken up and destroyed. The pain and torments never leave the hearts of those involved. Regret is often played out in her mind over and over again. If she simply guarded her heart and treated her purity and marriage as a Holy institution with respect unto [hwhy], the suffering would never have occurred because the sin would not

have happened.

Over the past 15 years in the tiny villages of Iran, it is estimated that 1,000 women have been stoned to death for their sin of adultery. Others, who lived in the cities, were sentenced to death by hanging for their crime. This is going on right now!

In earlier centuries, here in America, it was considered a crime to commit adultery. Either time in jail or death was the punishment. Sadly, in this present moment, it is no longer considered a sin, but normal. How far away have we gotten from [hwhy’s] laws that we have no sorrow, no compassion no loyalty for the ways of Elohim?

In practical terms, there must be complete care taken to protect ourselves from adultery. One thing that greatly disgusts me is that a woman will attempt to go to Church without her husband. Perhaps he is ill or maybe he is not a believer in Messiah. She is often encouraged to attend Church without him and praised for her faithfulness. Do we even realize that she has betrayed her husband and begun on the road to destroying her marriage? The woman was made to be a helper of the man. She is to remain his, and by his side through all of life. If the family does not go to Church, it is then her duty to privately study [hwhy’s] word to reap the benefits of religion while at the same time obeying and remaining loyal to her husband. Many who have gone off on their own to Church, have ended up getting a divorce, either because she was led astray into someone “who was a better man” or because her husband felt her betrayal and sensed that she didn’t want to be with him. He then pursued his own life, which eventually did not include her!

# AWRITERS WANTED

We are currently looking for a variety of regular and freelance writers for this quarterly magazine and for our weekly message section over the internet. We are interested in material which encourages a wholesome lifestyle and which will challenge our readers to return to the true vine of righteousness that we may bear much fruit for hwh.

Material dealing with doctrinal issues is welcomed, so long as the doctrine is scripturally based. However, we are not looking for material which is designed to tear down others beliefs, for tearing down does not open eyes, nor bring spiritual revival. We are interested in material which reveals hwh's true

character, commands, and will for our lives in a loving way. In this way, we may each build up our fellow man and make him a better citizen for hwh's soon coming kingdom of shalom (peace).

We are not looking for writers who desire to be payed for their work, nor will we own the material which we publish. Our time, work, and expense which we invest for hwh is an offering for him, and we pray that you can say the same.

Please let us know if you can help in spreading the truth in these troubled times.

**JOY IN THE WORLD MINISTRIES**  
Post Office Box Seven (7)  
Shippensburg, Pennsylvania 17257  
United States Of America

Website: <http://user.pa.net/~jitwministries>

**CORRECTION:** "Infamous Luther Quotes" in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2002 issue should have had more explanation. We're NOT in agreement with Martin Luther's attitude towards the Jews... His quotes were only printed to expose the "real Luther" whom most have never met. Thanks, Mr. S. for pointing out the need of a better explanation.  
-The Editor

devil and sin, he has one repentance. But if he will often sin and repent, it will not profit him, for he will hardly ever live to hwh."

And I said, "Sir, I am restored again to life since I have thus diligently hearkened to these commands. For I understand that if I shall not add any more to my sins from now on, I shall be saved."

And he said, "You will be saved, and so will all others, as many as will observe these commandments."

And again I said to him, "Sir, seeing you hear me patiently, show me yet one thing more."

He said, "Tell me what it is."

And I said, "If a husband or a wife dies, and the surviving party marries again, does he sin in so doing?"

"He that marries", he said, "does not sin. However if he remains single, he will by that means gain to himself great honor before hwh. (See Romans 7:3; 1 Cor. 7:40)

## The Importance Of Purity

Keep therefore your chastity and modesty, and you will live to hwh. Observe from now on those things which I speak with you and command you to observe, from the time that I have been delivered to you to dwell in your house. So will your former sins be forgiven, if you will keep these my commandments. And in like manner will all others be forgiven, who will observe these my commandments.

## The Pain of Adultery

by Mrs. Sharon White

*(Note: Many of the articles I write evolve out of my own struggles and also the sins I see in those around me. We have been misled by society into accepting Adultery as a part of human nature and a normal aspect of life. However, what I hope to accomplish with this article is to bring a powerful illumination of Elohim's truth into all souls and allow us, my trembling self included, to see how despicable and grave is the act of adultery. It is the denial of love, the betrayal of loyalty and the cause of unceasing harm in all parties involved. It is a wretched sin,*

*which in Biblical times was punishable by death. Those of us who have been corrupted and scarred by the world, tend to have a lot of compassion and wish only to warn others of impending doom. Be on guard, my readers, and learn how to protect your innocence under the all seeing eyes of [ hwh].)*

"Adultery is an exceeding sinful sin, for it is the rebellion of a vile lust, not only against the command, but against the covenant, of our God. It is the violation of a divine institution in innocency, by the indulgence of one of

residents of your town, and when you find them dead in the morning, it would be perfectly OK to cut their body into 50 pieces (states in comparison to tribes) and send a piece to each state throughout America!!! (See Judges 19:22-29 for such an account!). If you read on into chapter 20, you will find that there is never a word spoken (in this account) against the man who handed the woman over, but only against the men of the town who actually abused the woman. Does this mean that it is OK for us to do the same? It is clearly evident that this deed was both scripturally and morally wrong. The same goes for polygamy, for nowhere in hwh's scriptures is it deemed as acceptable. It is scripturally and morally wrong as well.

Throughout the ages, mankind has greatly corrupted hwh's roles for men and women, and the scriptural institution of marriage. However, uchw instructed us that "...From the beginning it was not so." (M't 19:8) uchw taught that a man committed adultery if he even looked at a woman and lusted after her. (see M't 5:28). In Luke 16:18 uchw warned us saying "Whosoever puts away his wife, (notice it is singular) and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery." The sin of adultery goes for both sides. If it is adultery to marry again after ones' wife or husband is put away, it is most certainly adultery to do so while they remain your spouse. The apostle Paul reminds us that "In uchw there are neither male nor female" (Galations 3:28). What is sin for one is also sin for the other.

At the creation of the world, hwh created one man. When he saw that the man was lonely, he took of his rib and made one woman. uchw said, "hwh made them male and female (notice it does not read "male and females") Therefore shall a man (singular) leave his father and mother and be united with his wife (singular once again)". (M't 19:4-6) It is singular for both man and woman. Any man who is a physical leader of a Yahshua's flock must be a husband of only one wife. (see 1 Timothy 3:2). This rules out polygamy, along with remarriage after divorce. Polygamy is forbidden in the TORAH as well. "Neither shall he (the king) multiply wives unto himself, that his heart turn not away..." (Deut. 17:17) The king of Israel was not to have multiple wives. What goes for the shepherd, goes for the flock as well (See Matthew 5:48 & Luke 6:40).

In regards to sex before marriage, this too is greatly forbidden of hwh, and there are a host of scriptures which confirm this to be a sin. You can easily prove this for yourself by looking it up in a concordance or merely reading throughout the TORAH, the prophets, and the newer writings. Throughout the scriptures, we find the terms "fornication" and "adultery". They are not one in the same. "Fornication" is sexual relations before marriage. "Adultery" is sexual relations outside of an existing marriage covenant. Both are forbidden. If a man seduced a virgin, he was required to pay the bride price and marry the virgin, never being allowed to put her away for all of his days. If the father would not give his daughter to the man, he was still required to pay the bride price, and remain single. (See

(Matthew 5:32)

And he said to me, "As long as he is ignorant of her sin, he commits no fault in living with her; but if a man will know his wife to have offended, and she will not repent of her sin, but go on still in her fornication, and a man will continue nevertheless to live with her, he will become guilty of her sin and partake with her in her adultery."

And I said to him, "What therefore is to be done if the woman continues on in her sin?"

He answered, "Let her husband put her away and let him continue by himself. But if he will put away his wife, and marry another man's wife, he also commits adultery."

## Reunion Upon Repentance

And I said, "What if the woman who is so put away will repent and be willing to return to her husband, will she not be received by him?"

He said to me, "Yes, and if her husband will not receive her, he will sin and commit a great offence against himself; but he ought to receive the offender, if she repents, only not often.

For to the servants of hwh there is but one repentance. And for this reason a man who puts away his wife ought not to take another, because she may repent. This act is alike both in the man and in the woman.

Compare with: "And unto the married I command, [yet] not I, but hwh, Let

*not the wife depart from [her] husband: But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to [her] husband: and let not the husband put away [his] wife. But to the rest speak I, not the hwh: If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy... For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save [thy] husband? or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save [thy] wife?" (1 Corinthians 7:10-16)*

*If a couple cannot stay together, the two alternatives are to remain unmarried, that is, separated, or be reconciled. Paul also forbids remarriage while the first spouse is still living, and if the first spouse should die, then only to another believer: "The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in hwh." (1 Cor. 7:39)*

## A Heart Adultery@

Now they commit adultery, not only who pollute their flesh, but who also make an image. If therefore a woman perseveres in anything of this kind, and repents not, depart from her, and live not with her, otherwise you also will be partaker of her sin.

# MARITAL FIDELITY

## Part Two

When one attempts a scriptural study *merely* to support previous conclusions, the results are often disastrous. Because mankind is fallible, his conclusions are many times in error. Logics and accuracy are frequently overlooked when a study is undertaken to safeguard oneself, rather than reveal truth. The reason we are in opposition to “Mr. A.’s” ignominious views regarding moral rectitude, is because they prove to be illogical and scripturally inaccurate when aligned with hwhy’s character and commands.

Mr. A. says, “Your reasoning is good and you’re a very eloquent writer.”

**Logics and accuracy are frequently overlooked when a study is undertaken to safeguard oneself, rather than reveal truth.**

“With her much fair speech she caused him to yield, with the flattering of her lips she forced him. He goeth after her straightway, as an ox goeth to the slaughter, or as a fool to the correction of the stocks; til a dart strike through his liver; as a bird hasteth to the snare, and knoweth not that it is for his life.” (Prov 7:21) Mere eloquence of speech is not my desire, neither is it hwhy’s will for my life. Likewise, mere words will not draw me from the threshold of

truth. Upright words are filled with truth while falsehood remains a lie, no matter how it is said. “Moses said unto hwhy, I am not eloquent, but I am slow of speech and of a slow tongue. hwhy said unto him, I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say.” (Ex. 4:10-12) “[Paul] came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you

the testimony of hwhy.” (1Cor.2.1) “Behold, hwhy doth take away from Jerusalem... the eloquent orator.” (Isa.3:1,2) I desire not “the speech of them that are puffed up” (1 Cor.4.19), but “great plainness of speech”, (2 Cor.3.12) “boldness in speech” (7:4) and “sound speech which cannot be condemned” (Titus 2:8)

hwhy’s will for mankind may be summed up in Paul’s words found in 2 Corinthians 11:6: “Though I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge...” I am not condemning the gift of speech, but merely wish to say that it is the message that counts. If hwhy uses my words to spread his truth, then may the glory and the honor be unto him, for he has placed those words in my mouth. If my words

## “Blue Law” Time Line

In hwhy’s TORAH we find a very important command. It reads as follows:

“Remember Shabbot, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Shabbot of hwhy, thy Elohim: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: For in six days hwhy made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day: wherefore hwhy blessed Shabbot and hallowed it.” (Exodus 20:8-11)

We have also been given another command; this time to remember hwhy’s laws.

“Speak unto the children of Israel and bid them that they make them fringes in the borders of their garments, and that they put upon the fringe of the borders a ribband of BLUE. And it shall be unto you a fringe, that ye may look upon it and remember all the commandments of hwhy, and do them...” Numbers 15:38,39

Strangely enough, American “Blue Laws” have become a bit corrupted.

- T In 1237 Henry III forbids the frequenting of markets on the first day of the week.
- T In 1409 the playing of unlawful games is banned by Henry IV
- T In the mid-1500s Edward VI disallows first day of the week

labor.

- T In 1682 Pennsylvania enacts laws calling on citizens to “abstain from their usual and common toil and labor” on the first day of the week.
- T In 1939 the modern “Sunday” (day of the SUN ???) trading act is passed, prohibiting nearly all retail trade and setting penalties of a \$4.00 fine or 6 days in jail.
- T In 1959-1961 the 1929 act is modified to allow “wholesome recreation” such as golf, bowling and target shooting. It also allowed some sales.
- T In 1974 the Kroger Co. challenges the closing law in Allegheny County. It lost, but was allowed to stay open on the first day of the week during appeal.
- T In 1978 the Pennsylvania Supreme Court overturns the “Sunday” Trading act. First day of the week shopping becomes the rule in Pennsylvania.
- T In 2002, Gov. Mark Schweiker signs legislation to allow select state-owned liquor stores to open on the first day of the week starting in 2/2003.

Is America on an uphill climb? From all appearances, the answer is ‘No’. Perhaps a better question would be, “How high up were they when they started going downhill?” Probably no higher than the blue of the rainbow which we see when hwhy cries for an entire world gone astray.

(American Blue Law Time Line reprinted from the 12/15/2002 issue of the “Sunday” Patriot News, volume 154, number 15)

specificity. An English word may mean either literal or figurative, while the original Hebrew word meant only one or the other. Mr. A. should remember that he cannot get blood out of a turnip. If he attempts to extract a figurative definition from a Hebrew word that means *only* literal, his efforts will be useless. He may become “firmly persuaded in his own mind”, but that is absolutely meaningless unless he is firmly persuaded in truth.

**Mr. A. says that I misquoted him by suggesting that he said “the commands which forbid [immorality] are *only* referring to the spiritual aspect of the sin.”**

“Technically” he is correct. However, reading between the actual lines of written text can reveal a million words. I gather that he is ‘currently’ telling me that there actually is such a thing as physical adultery, fornication, and harlotry? I did not catch this from his previous communication... in fact, it portrays the exact opposite. Nonetheless, if he does indeed believe that a physical aspect of these sins exists, it would be interesting to know where he might find a definition by which to describe them. By showing support for polygamy, premarital sex, remarriage after divorce, etc., he has quite exhausted the supply of definitions which are applicable in describing physical immorality and infidelity.

**Mr. A. supplied a number of Hebrew and Greek Word definitions regarding the subject.**

Several of the definitions which he provided did not coincide with what I

was able to find. I am using “The Strongest Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible”, copyright 2001 by Zondervan. The definitions which I found are as follows.

*Hebrew/Aramaic #5003: to commit adultery; adulterer, adulteress; by extension: to be unfaithful to hwhy (by having illicit relations with other gods):-- translated as the following in KJV: commit adultery [6], committed adultery [6], adulterers [5], committeth adultery [4], adulterer [3], adulteresses [2], adulterous [1], breaketh wedlock [1], committing adultery [1].*

Mr. A.’s definition read “woman that breaketh wedlock”. This is in error, as the “breaking wedlock” refers to either sex.

*Greek #3431 (act.) to commit adultery; (pass.) to become an adulterer:-- commit adultery [10], committeth adultery [2], adultery [1], committed adultery [1]*

*Greek #3432 adulterer:- adulterers [4].*

Mr. A.’s definition for #3432 included a figurative meaning. I found no *figurative* meaning listed. Perhaps our reader’s 1994 concordance contains some errors which have since been corrected; or perhaps the ‘error’ was on his part. Who knows?

When only the spiritual meaning of every word is considered, greater confusion is readily created. Why? Because hwhy is an Elohim of order (creation alone is proof of that statement). That which is the opposite of

symbolic of spiritual headship, it must be remembered that wives are to be in submission to their husbands at all times. Under such circumstances, the witness would be much greater if the

head covering was worn at all times, and real headship was practiced at all times as well.

## % Courtship And Betrothal

**S**ADLY enough, the world has set it's own guidelines for human conduct, and among these is the recent trend of “dating”. Contrary to popular opinion, dating prepares young people FOR DIVORCE, not marriage. It is truly the breeding ground for adultery. All it takes is a look around at the world and the “church”. This abominable sin has crept in with such stealth that it can now be found most anywhere, and nobody even seems to be alarmed!

It is not necessary for young people to have multiple partners of the opposite sex in order to have a successful marriage. For an ideal marriage, the multiple partners must go out the door. Dating creates the “broken heart syndrome”. Two people give each other their hearts and “The two become one” However the next thing you know, they have separated and each is left with only half a heart because they have left the other half with the other person. Because of this destructive process, our young peoples' hearts become smaller and smaller. When they finally marry, they have no heart left to give their spouse, and this is why divorce is so often the sad result.

Anyone who teaches that impurity is acceptable in youth is directly ignoring

hwhy and looking for big time problems with their children. One who does not strive for purity in youth will not strive for purity in old age or anywhere in between. Many seem to think that if they are not married, they are not held to as strict of a standard, but this is by no means true!

Scriptural courtship and betrothal consists of a “hands off” relationship between two individuals of the opposite sex, who are anticipating marriage. If the relationship is not in preparation for marriage, then it should not even exist. The scriptures read, Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh. (Gen.2:24, Mt.19:5, Mk.10:6-8). The scriptures clearly do not give allowance for “temporary relationships” between men and women.

When getting to know each other, many young people want to get off on their own, and quite often, this is what leads to temptation. It is not necessary for our young people’s actions to be behind closed doors, for with purity as the ultimate goal, there is nothing to hide.

With hwhy as the leader and lawgiver, One man + One woman = 1 Marriage which is blest with the fruits of

throughout TORAH, and *uc̄h̄y*'s perfecting of TORAH. The focus point of purity throughout the books of the law is physical. Throughout the prophets, physical is often *compared* to spiritual with such expressions as "committing whoredom against *h̄h̄y* ." Because TORAH places the *most* emphasis on physical sin, people were defiled through such actions as lust (just as they are today). For this reason, *uc̄h̄y* perfected TORAH by saying, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, THOU SHALT NOT COMMIT ADULTERY: But I say unto you that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." (Matthew 5:27,28) Mr. A. mentioned that the word "woman" would better be rendered "married woman". My concordance gives the same definition. It is necessary for one of those involved in the act to be married before for the act is considered *adultery*. However, we must remember that a coin remains the same size, no matter which side we look at. If the man was married and the woman was unmarried, the act would be adultery

There Is *One* Command To Abstain From Idolatry And *Another* To Abstain From Adultery. They Are *Not* One In The Same.

just the same. On the other hand, if those performing the act are unmarried, it is considered fornication. I'll get on to why this is based on another definition from the concordance further down.

*h̄h̄y* did not repeat the same command twice in the ten 'words' (commandments) which He spoke from the cloud at Mt. Sinai. There is *one* command to abstain from idolatry (Deut 5:7-10), while there is *another* to abstain from adultery. (Deut 5:18) Notice that the spiritual (idolatry) was mentioned first, and the physical (adultery) second, being placed amongst other sins which involve our fellow man. The reason for this order is because the things of earth are patterned after the things in the heavens. (See Gen 5:1, Deut 5:8, Heb 8:5, 9:23, 1 Cor.15:49) The

physical is likened unto looking darkly through a mirror at the spiritual (1 Cor.13:12, 2 Cor.3:18, James 1:23). If we are not to commit spiritual adultery, a physical form of the sin *must* also exist.

Following those first 10 sayings, *h̄h̄y* mentions fornication, whoredom, uncleanness, etc. If all such words mean spiritual *idolatry*, scripture is merely a repeat of itself. If scripture is only one 'big' repeat of one 'little' command, we

marriage, in ones youth. In modern society, this aspect, along with the rest of the concept, has been tossed on the wind and applause has been heard as it is slowly carried away to those which yet have "ears to hear" and a heart to obey. "Thou shall surely rebuke your neighbor, and not bear sin because of him." (Lev. 19:17) My only desire is to make known the important truths in *h̄h̄y*'s word which have been removed from the religion which many practice. If I were to remain silent regarding the matter, *h̄h̄y* would hold me accountable for the soul of my fellow man, by not causing the undefiled message of truth to be heard. If I do my part in spreading *h̄h̄y*'s truth, I have freed myself from this burden and can continue pressing towards the prize which *h̄h̄y* Elohim has set before us.

Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear *h̄h̄y* and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. For *h̄h̄y* shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil. (Ecclesiastes 12:13,14)

"If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Rabbi, *uc̄h̄y* Moshiach, and to the doctrine which is according to righteousness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but dotting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of

the truth, supposing that gain is righteousness: from such withdraw thyself." (1 Timothy 6:3-5)

Perhaps Mr. A. now feels that my words are too plain, too bold, too strong, or too sound. All I can say in response is the words which *uc̄h̄y* spoke so many years before. "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when you depart thence, shake the dust off you feet for a testimony against them. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the Sodom and Gomorra in the day of judgement, than for that city." (Mark 6:11)

**Mr. A. says, "You might be right? I may be wrong? What I appreciate is that you provoke me to think."**

A seed has been planted; the remainder is between Mr. A. and *h̄h̄y*. Whether the roots will take hold, that I do not know. However, if the seed is spread abroad, some searching heart will eventually become established and develop into a living example of *h̄h̄y*'s power and life changing love. It is for this reason that the foregoing correspondence has been included in this issue. May *h̄h̄y* grant the increase, and may we be prepared for the approaching harvest.

Baruch Haba BaShem *h̄h̄y* .

A servant in Moshiach *uc̄h̄y* ,

**Matthew Coover**

**Mr. A. says, “hwhy said about Abraham in Gen 26:5, ‘because Abraham obeyed my voice and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.’”**

hwhy also described Job as “a perfect and upright man, one that feareth hwhy, and escheweth evil.” (Job 1:8, 2:3). David likewise was described as “a man after hwhy’s own heart”. Upon reading the accounts of these men’s lives, it becomes evident that they were not without sin. We are commanded to “Be perfect as our father in heaven is perfect” (M’t 5:48), and yet, on the other hand ucwhy taught that “There is none perfect but one.” It is obviously a different meaning of perfect... and has been since the forbidden fruit was consumed.

**Mr. A. says, “David coveted Uriah’s wife and his coveting lead to murder; not the act of [polygamy]. It’s important to keep things in context.”**

If David had purposed to obey the command forbidding polygamy in Deuteronomy, he would never have coveted Bathsheba; thus, he never would have murdered Uriah the Hittite. It may easily be concluded that polygamy was the root of the problem.

Yes, it certainly is important to keep scripture in context. This requires that we not invent new scenes, or ignore the obvious causes of the many scenes enacted throughout history.

**Mr. A. says, “We would not have the 12 tribes of Israel Today if Rachel and Leah’s maidservant did not sleep with Jacob. That sounds like ‘lust and fornication to me’ what’s the difference? Are you saying hwhy is a respecter of person’s or they did nothing wrong.”**

I wish to remind Mr. A. that it would not be *fornication*, for Jacob was married. In regards to ‘lust and adultery’, that is precisely what I would classify it as, and scripture will back up that classification. He has also ask me, “Are you saying hwhy is a respecter of persons or they did nothing wrong?” I am saying neither, for both of the answers which he presented are unscriptural.

I wish to remind Mr. A. of something else, using a verse that *he* brings to my attention further down. Jacob took both Leah and Rachel as his wives. This was in direct violation to Leviticus 18:18, for they were both sisters. Because Mr. A. did not attempt to explain this verse away throughout his communication, he has shown support for such an action being deemed as sin. With this in mind, we can more carefully consider the twelve sons of Jacob, through which we get the 12 tribes of Israel.

It is obvious that hwhy’s plan was not to create a world which would become

and cunning craftiness wherein they lie in wait to deceive.” (Eph. 4:14) Without opinion, we are no more than defenseless prey of the lion which roams about, seeking whom he may devour. (1 Peter 5:8) In regards to a lack of scriptural backup, perhaps this because the article was written from the viewpoint of one already convicted regarding morality, who merely desired to help others fit the sometimes “confusing” puzzle pieces of TORAH together. This I could not say for sure, as it was not I who wrote the article in the first place. Then again, perhaps the seeming lack of scripture from Mr. A.’s viewpoint is merely due to the glasses through which he has chosen to examine the subject.

Folks often use the term ‘cult’ for anything that is off the mainstream watered down American religion... Many seem to think that this is what we are, and the same term is probably used on Mr. A. as well. “Cult” really means “a follower of a man”. ucwhy was more than just a man. He was the son of hwhy in the flesh, and he was without sin, for he came in his Father’s name, and he did his Father’s will. As long as we are following ucwhy, we are not a cult. Sadly enough, there are a number of Sacred Name groups out there which advocate and accept polygamy, especially for the “head man”. But just because they use the Sacred Names does not mean they are seeking after hwhy’s heart. “This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection,

truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of hwhy, having a form of righteousness, but denying the power thereof: from such TURN AWAY”. (2 Tim. 3:1-5) If our beliefs are based firmly upon the teachings contained in scripture, our opinions may likewise be firmly adherent to the truth.

**Mr. A. says, “I’ve been to too many Sacred Name groups, and heard many of their different doctrines. Whenever one starts to think they know it all concerning all things and they know the way one should live according to the scriptures, I start to wonder.”**

We also have been to many religious groups throughout the years. For us, this has proved to be an invaluable tool in regards to hwhy’s leading in our lives. We cannot say that we have been to “too many” groups, or heard “too many” opposing doctrines, for if we hadn’t been where we have been, we most likely would not be where we are now. The many doctrines in constant circulation serve as a refining fire, to test the purity and durability of hwhy’s true followers. By no means do we consider ourselves as having obtained all truth, for we are ever learning and growing as well, and will be until the end of our earthly lives.

**Mr. A. says, “I try to listen and be**

**It is obvious that Yahweh’s plan in creating the world was not to have it polluted by sin. Sin came into the picture as a direct result of man’s indiscriminate choices.**

redeemed,... seeing he hath dealt *deceitfully* with her.” This verse sets forth a way of dealing with sin, a way of enforcing fairness and making sin much less desirable. Once a man realizes that he cannot get out of providing for the woman whom he no longer desires, (even if he sins *again* by marrying another woman) he will be much less likely to do that which he knows to be wrong. To do so will only be an inconvenience and financial hardship for him. In this simple command, scriptural “alimony” requirements are set forth, and they worked much better than today’s corrupted laws, for they greatly discouraged sin in the first place. American courts do not care how many times such situations happen. Their occurrence only serves to support the legal system, and further enlarge the lawyers’ ever growing bank accounts.

Why couldn’t the woman which had been dealt deceitfully with depart and become another man’s wife? If she did so, she could still be provided for, and she could have a loving husband to top it all off, couldn’t she? The reason this was out of the question is because she had already been betrothed to another man. A betrothal is as binding as a marriage; a legal divorce being required to break the covenant. Once the woman has been betrothed, she becomes an adulteress by marrying another man. For this reason, if a man raped a betrothed woman, he was definitely put to death. If the crime was committed where none could hear the woman’s cry for help (i.e. somewhere in the country), the woman was allowed to live. If the rape of the betrothed woman occurred in the city, the woman was put to death

as well, for she could have screamed for help, but did not do so. (Deut. 22:23-27). These few verses alone rule out the idea that *only* a woman can commit adultery. Several verses just previous rule out pre-marital sex as well, but I’ll cover that when we get there.

**Mr. A. says that Yahshua gave allowance for divorce in M’t 5:31,32. Therefore, he says that our understanding of 1 Timothy 3:2 (that polygamy and divorce / remarriage is forbidden) is conflicting to uahy’s teachings.**

Many folks have the same interpretation of Matthew 5:31,32 as that which Mr. A. has presented. For the life of me, I have never been able to understand how they reason out that uahy was *giving* allowance for divorce. Granted, if a woman commits adultery, TORAH commands that she be “put away”. In this verse, uahy is not contradicting TORAH, but neither is he advocating putting away. “For hahy, Elohim of Israel, saith that he *hateth* putting away...” (Mal.2:16) uahy certainly can not be filled with hahy’s spirit, and yet be advocating that which hahy hates! What did uahy really say in this verse? He taught that *IF* a man discovers his wife is being unfaithful, he is to “put her away”, so that he will not partake of her sins. (To knowingly continue to live with an adulteress is committing adultery) In uahy’s day, if a man put away a wife for a reason other than adultery, he placed her in between a literal “rock and a hard place”. In the time frame which we are looking at, a woman was supported by a man. This was prior to the corrupt feminist

Hebrew term for fornication and gather that since the newer writing were originally written in Hebrew as well, the intended meaning is most often the same.

Following are a couple other words and definitions which give indication that fornication is a sin for both sexes.

*Harlot(s) Greek #4204, porne, meaning prostitute, a woman who practices sexual immorality for payment; this can refer to religious unfaithfulness:-- also translated as whore on 4 separate occasions*

*Fornicator(s): Greek #4205, pornos, meaning one who is sexually immoral (male or female), in some contexts distinguished from an adulterer (1Cor.6:9):-- also translated as whoremongers on 4 separate occasions, and as whoremonger once.*

*Whoredom(s): Hebrew #2183: wanton lust, prostitution, adultery; by extension: idolatry, as unfaithfulness to hahy. Hebrew #2184: prostitution, sexual immorality, unfaithfulness, by extension: idolatry, as unfaithfulness to hahy*

Take notice to the root of all the Greek words referring to fornication. I suppose that Mr. A. considers ‘adult’ establishments and XXX rated movies acceptable as well? I am certainly reminded of uahy’s words in Matthew 7:22,23. “Many will say unto me in that day, Rabbi, Rabbi, have we not prophesied in **THY NAME?** and in **THY NAME** cast out devils? and in **THY NAME** done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from

me ye that work iniquity.”

The point can be pressed further by asking another simple question: Is prostitution a sin? Mr. A has told me that as long as a prostitute is unmarried, as long as none of the men she has had relations with have been married, and as long as I am not married, it is OK for me to have relations with such a person. In the future, any of those involved, including myself, may go and marry someone else who can say “Been there, done that” as well. In his opinion, the fact that such a business is technically a crime in this country does not matter, because HE believes that “hahy allows it”, and scripture teaches that we are to obey hahy rather than men. (Is this why Rahab was spared? and was it for this reason that the spies stayed in her house? Come on, be REAL!!!) I know much better than that. “Do not prostitute thy daughter, to cause her to be a whore; lest the land fall to whoredom, and the land become full of wickedness” (Lev. 19:29) However, if Mr. A.’s statement were to lead me astray, who would hahy hold accountable for my defilement? I would be accountable, for one, but the apostle Paul reminded us that those who teach false doctrine and cause others to stray from truth will receive a greater condemnation. uahy came on even stronger. In Mark 9:42 He taught that whosoever caused a **CHILD** to sin would have been better off to have a millstone hung around his neck and be drowned in the depths of the sea. (I’m 17, just in case anyone wondered.) I am once again reminded of uahy’s words on a separate occasion when he came on even stronger than before. “Depart from me, ye cursed, unto everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.” (M’t 25:41)

uncovering the nakedness of anyone that is closely related. I think sisters definitely qualify for closely related... don't you? A second marriage to any other woman is forbidden in Deuteronomy 17:17. *That* is a perfect spot as well.

IF it could be said that anything was not forbidden in scripture, it seems as though wives with multiple husbands would have a far better chance. Perhaps it is merely circumstance in favor of such an argument, due to the fact that scripture was written before the "revolution of the sexes" where women have now taken it upon themselves to do the proposing. But anyway, I can't help but ask Mr. A. why he didn't choose an "easier" stand to back up? Or since he is a man, does he leave that side of it up to his wife?

**Mr. A. says, "The bottom line is this: Polygamy was a part of ancient Hebrew lifestyle."**

I rather strongly disagree with Mr. A.'s sense of order, through which he has determined "the bottom line". It has been wisely said that "Right is right, even if nobody does it, while wrong is wrong, even if everybody does it." Just because something is common in society does not mean that it is lawful in the sight of *hwh*. Sin is a part of "modern American lifestyle", but does this mean that *hwh* does not forbid sin? If it did, sin would no longer be sin... sin would really be righteousness, for sin is a way of life to many, and always has been. This is another crazy argument, and yet, Mr. A. has formed his opinions upon such arguments, instead of the infallible,

unchanging word of *hwh*.

The best example to pattern our actions after is the nature of *hwh*. *hwh* commanded us, "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in Heaven is perfect" (M't 5:48) The Creator (*hwh* & *hwh*), see Genesis 1:26, taking notice to the "US", also John 1:1-5) is the husbandman, and we, being the assembly, are his bride (Hosea 2:19,20). It is not acceptable for the assembly to depart from *hwh*, neither does *hwh* depart from a faithful bride. If it were permissible for *hwh* (being a spiritual husband) to commit adultery, he would not be reliable, nor deserve respect. I'm sure Mr. A. understands that as clear as night and day. He must consider the scenario from the woman's side also. Just as we would not be joined to an Elohim who would be unfaithful to us, no *virtuous* woman will willingly be joined to a man who will be unfaithful to her. The command to abstain from adultery is clearly to be observed by all "4" sides (*hwh*/Humanity; Man/Woman).

**Mr. A. says, "Polygamy was a matter of choice. If someone chose to live that way, I don't see where it was sin, we can quote scriptures all day."**

Such a statement reveals an inward attitude against change, and against scriptural truth. "Behold, ye have sinned against *hwh*, your Elohim... ye have turned aside quickly out of the way which *hwh* had commanded you." (D't 9:16) "[Such a man] feedeth on ashes, a deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his soul, nor say, Is there a lie in my right hand?" (Isa 44:20) The paths of [his] way are turned aside;

*term of abuse. Bastardize: 1. to declare or prove to be a bastard 2. To reduce from a higher to a lower state or condition : debase*

"A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of *hwh*; even to his tenth generation shall he not enter into the congregation of *hwh*." (Deut. 23:2) Commonsense tells us that children live what they learn and it gets passed on from generation to generation.

"And a bastard shall dwell in Ash'-dod, and I will cut off the pride of the Phi-lis'-tines." (Zechariah 9:6)

"If ye endure chastening, *hwh* dealeth with you as sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons." (Hebrews 12:7,8)

In Mr. A.'s first correspondence, I quote him as saying, "There is no commandment saying premarital sex was a sin. If so please correct me." In present day court systems, a trial and/or jail sentence is only carried out when one violates an existing law which has been set in place by the government. Likewise, a scriptural judgement only comes into effect in order to counteract a sin which has already been committed. *hwh* has instituted the following judgements in regards to dealing with premarital

relations between men and women.

If a man has sexual relations with a virgin who is *not betrothed*, *hwh* requires that he pays the dowry according to virgins and marry the woman. As long as the father allows the marriage, *hwh* husband may never divorce her all of his days. If the father *w i l l* absolutely not consent

**A SCRIPTURAL JUDGEMENT ONLY COMES INTO EFFECT IN ORDER TO COUNTERACT A SIN WHICH HAS ALREADY BEEN COMMITTED.**

to the marriage taking place, the man must still pay the dowry, and remain single. (Exodus 22:16,17, Deut. 22:28,29) This way of handling the matter greatly discourages premarital sex, as the couple will, in all probability, be "stuck" for life. If premarital sex is used as a pressure technique to get the woman's father to allow the marriage, he may still say "No". Under such circumstances, the man is still required to pay the dowry, and both the man and woman have resigned themselves to singleness.

**Mr. A. says, "Every form of unchastity is included in the term, 'fornication'."**

While this may be true, what are the most common meanings? The Strong's definitions are as follows:

*Hebrew #2181: be, become a*

Mr. A. says, "There is no commandment saying premarital sex was a sin."

By saying this he has presented an extremely confusing message. *IF* it was lawful for unmarried people to engage in the same actions which a married couple are entitled to, there would be absolutely *no* purpose in marriage, for it would merely be self inflicted 'bondage'. Based on such a presumption, it would be unnecessary for *hwh* to marry his people; likewise it would no longer be imperative that we remain true to Him. We could conduct

ourselves in like manner to the world, having intimate relationships with Nimrod (sun worship) Baal, Molech, Buddha, Mohammed, Satan, self, or whosoever we desired.

Is this yet another *crazy* argument??? And yet, this is exactly what the world has done. Furthermore, this is what many claiming believers have done through their disobedience to TORAH, their participation in the customs of sun-worshiping pagans, and the sacrificing of their children to the Satanically based governmental education system. Due to crazy, unscriptural arguments and mans' perverted opinion, physical defilement has become accepted, and so has the

spiritual.

Sadly enough, Mr. A. has already shown support for such nefarious practices by declaring that purity is only required once we have made a lifetime commitment, if even then. What Mr. A. fails to realize is that once a single man or woman ceases to maintain their virginity, they become defiled. This is

**YAHWEH'S  
FIRSTFRUITS MUST  
BE UNDEFILED,  
BOTH IN BODY AND  
IN SPIRIT.**

not something that marriage can undo... rather, such actions tend to quickly "undo" a marriage. Although Mr. A. claims to be a follower of *uchwh*, the opinions which he

has presented testify otherwise.

"[Those] which have not defiled their garments,... they shall walk worthy of me in white: for they are worthy." (Rev 3:4) "...They which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the lamb whithersoever he goeth..." (Rev. 14:4) Have we not heard the warning from *hwh*? Spiritual and physical purity travel hand in hand. But, (Quoting a prisoner who often writes from one of the worst prisons in the country), "Who listens to *hwh*, anyway?"

Mr. A asks: "Does this verse (Rev. 14:14) mean *hwh*'s called out ones are

virgins? or they did not partake in false doctrine?

Upon looking up the Greek definitions for "defiled" and "virgins" in Revelation 14:4, it appears as though the intended meaning is indeed physical. Greek #3933 is the root of "virgins" in this passage, and means "a male or female who has never engaged in sexual relations." There is *no* figurative meaning listed. The Greek for defiled is "molyno", #3435, meaning to defile, soil, stain, make impure:-- defiled [3]. Such a definition may be applied to either defilement of the body (physical) or of the mind (spiritual)... in this case, both sides would be literal.

From scripture we find that marriage, when practiced according to *hwh*'s guidelines, does not make one physically impure. "Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled..." The Greek root of "undefiled" in this passage is #283, meaning pure. However, we must realize what a pure marriage bed actually consists of. We must also beware that the cares of this life do not cause us to leave our first love, being *uchwh*. (see Rev. 2:4)

With this in mind, Revelation 14:4 coincides with 1 Cor 7:8,9 where Paul says, "I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn." (More proof that premarital sex is sin... otherwise, why should there be fear of burning?) Also skip up to verses 32-34 where we read, "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to *hwh*, how he

may please *hwh*: But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife. There is difference also between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of *hwh*, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit, but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband." Taking all this into perspective, it becomes evident that the *firstfruits* of *hwh* are *first* undefiled in mind, meaning that they have not been distracted by the many carnal cares which naturally accompany marriage. They have devoted 100% of their service to *hwh*, therefore they are the *first* (but not the only) fruits of *hwh*'s kingdom.. Whether their virginity is physical or figurative may be debated, although I would go with the first, based on the Greek definition. Clearly, the main emphasis is summed up in James 1:27 where we read, "Pure religion and undefiled before *uchwh* and *hwh* is this:.. to keep ones self unspotted from the world" (See also Eph 5:27, 1 Tim 6:14, 2 Peter 3:14) The formula for purity is currently being broadcasted worldwide in the form of the Scriptures. All one must do is make sure they're tuned in to the right channel, being *hwh*'s spirit.

Since Mr. A. currently accepts fornication (often referred to as "sowing your wild oats"), I realize that he might reply that 'virginity' only means unmarried, but does not mean that the individual has not had pre-marital sexual