Subject: Re: Questions I would like to pose to athiests
Posted by Spoony on Wed, 20 Apr 2011 01:54:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

shippo wrote on Tue, 19 April 2011 15:44we as christians believe that he has always existed, and that he is outside the time line of us here one earth, so He has existed past, present and future.. (I can explain and go more indeepth with this if you like)
i think you'd better, because you're making an enormous claim here. what do you have to back up such a huge assertion, much much much bigger than anything any scientist says about the origin of life?

Quote:Quote:
truth first. who was Joseph's father? two of the gospels give entirely different answers to this question. (joseph referring to jesus's father, not the technicolor dreamcoat guy in Genesis)

Well I'm no Biblical schollar, but I will try to answere both questions as best I can.

from what I have learned and read most biblical scholors belive that one line was purly the male or Joseph's line the other was Marry's and the part where it says son of, probably ment son-in-law of, which would make sence, because even now it is not uncommon to be refered to as son or father for in-laws.
yeah, "biblical scholar" is a phrase you'll hear whenever someone tries to get around the fact that something the bible says is either obviously wrong or morally appalling. another is "theology".

what a biblical scholar or a theologian will never tell you is "yeah, that's wrong, i dunno why he wrote that"

Quote:Well I'm no Sociologest, but you have to keep in mind that they have a much different culture than ours. Alos keep in mind that the attacker would be put to death if she was married. But as far as the question you put forth I don't know enough about the Middle eastern culture and values to make an honest opinion on it.
Firstly, what makes you think this only instructs those people at that time and place? The commandment is not repudiated later in the book. God gave you this rule and He has not repealed it.

Secondly, the point about whether the attacker was married shows you what's going on here; it's a culture where women are seen as property, and this is hardly the only thing in the bible which shows that. If she's married then raping her is a terrible offence - not because of any consideration of the woman as a human being, but because you're using another man's property. If she's not married then you can just rape her, pay off her dad and you've bought yourself a wife, if "wife" is the right word... "sex slave" is probably nearer the mark.

I'm going to repeat the original assertion just to see if I can get the reaction such a monstrous thing deserves. If a man rapes a woman, they have to get married. The victim of a violent sexual assault is then forced to spend the rest of her life married to the scum who violated her. Anyone of normal moral sensibilities ought to "have an opinion" on it without needing to research the culture; this alone tells you all you need to know about the culture. And remember, this law is coming to

you from this god of yours. Go ask your mother or your sister's opinion on it, if you dare. Stand up in church next time you're there and say there's a law in the Bible we as a society are not following. Write to your congressman about it, maybe.