

Parable of the importunate widow and the unjust judge Luke 18:1-8

Intellectual Property of [John Marsing](http://www.MyHebrewBible.Com) - www.MyHebrewBible.Com

Luke 18:1-8 KJV And he spake a parable unto them *to this end*, that men ought always to pray, and not to faint; ² Saying, There was in a city a judge, which feared not God, neither regarded man: ³ And there was a widow in that city; and she came unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary. ⁴ And he would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself, Though I fear not God, nor regard man; ⁵ Yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me. ⁶ And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith. ⁷ And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them? ⁸ I tell you that he will avenge them speedily. Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?

Prerequisite

This article is a series of articles I have been writing on regarding Y'shua's ¹ parables that relate to legal matters (see [related articles](#)). It's assumed that the reader has at least a general knowledge of the [Biblical Commercial Redemption](#) concepts and have access to a reasonable and insightful teacher on the subject. For me this teacher would clearly be Jack Smith and it is his teachings that I rely a lot on to make my points.

At the risk of sounding arrogant, I assume that the reader is disciplined in the knowledge of how to think (what I call critical thinking). Critical thinking is a topic that is beyond the scope of this article but it goes back to identifying what your core beliefs are so that you can go forward with great clarity and to do so efficiently. The topics discussed in these articles stretch the mind in a direction that many would perceive as quite scary. Nevertheless I contend that if you're a zealot for the truth and can handle not being afraid of reevaluating some of your core truths then it should not be a problem but rather a fascinating journey.

Let me leave you with this thought as an example of what I'm talking about.

A disciple of critical thinking is someone who is disciplined in discernment and someone who can take in information, evaluates it's authority and react accordingly in harmony with that which is required of him from both God and Man.

Overview

The parable of the importunate² widow and the unjust judge found in Luke 18:1-6 is fascinating to me because it's a scriptural reference to a legal issue and therefore is a subject that is my passion³. When I first heard this verse I was a bit troubled because it had appeared to be in conflict with another important topic that I had accepted as truth namely biblical commercial redemption. The relevant issue of biblical commercial redemption that is in conflict with this parable is the mantra that "the government is always right" and if my general thesis which is that scripture is always in harmony with matters of the law then I felt compelled to investigate.

¹ Y'shua is the Hebrew name for Jesus. Also Elohim is the Hebrew word for God, and YHVH is the transliterated Hebrew letters Yood Hey Vav Hey that is the name of Elohim, translated in the King James as The LORD.

² Importunate means demanding, persistent. This could be thought of as the Derash in PaRDeS

³ My passion specifically is Torah law form and Torah "equity". To put it another way, I contend that the connection of law and religion are tightly and profoundly connected and very much relative in this day and age.

This investigation is the motivation for this article.

To help me understand Luke 18:1-8 and make it fit into my prior knowledge of biblical commercial redemption, I touch on the subject of parables themselves (see below [About Parables](#)). In my commentary on verses 2, 4 and 5 I inject the idea of perceptions and how it relates to fear which is used in verse 2 & 4. I bring this up to warn the reader that I am making conclusions that can't be found literally in the text but because it is a parable it seems reasonable to project a little or read into what the literal text says.

More on this later.

Details

Here is Luke 18:1-6 verse by verse followed up by my comments.

<p>¹ And he spake a parable unto them <i>to this end</i>, that men ought always to pray, and not to faint;</p> <p>parable overview. Y'shua is telling us up front that the lesson from this parable is to <u>pray always</u> and <u>not to faint</u>.</p> <p>pray always: The body of this parable is put in a legal context and I think it's noteworthy that prayer has a legal definition. To <u>always pray</u> sounds like the legal doctrine of "exhaustion of remedies"⁴.</p> <p>not to faint: the two sides to this coin "not to faint" are that we should be persistent (importunate) and to fear Elohim (God). The fear of Elohim is to be motivated by what he would have us do and not what others (e.g. the Judge) would have us do. More on the fear of Elohim later.</p>
<p>² Saying, There was in a city a judge, which feared not God, neither regarded man:</p> <p>the city. The background is in a city. The scriptures does not speak well of cities and those that build them, therefore you are much less likely to run into an unjust city judge if you're not from there. If you live in a righteous "city"⁵ then you are to adjudicate matters between the brethren in private and to only seek from a city judge (the public) a ministerial recognition of the record that has already been settled see <u>Res Judicata and Stare Decisis</u>.</p> <p>feared not God, neither regarded man. At first glance I thought this was contradictory, but after thinking about it I concluded it was complimentary. I would argue that a man can only respect (i.e. regard) another man if he first has respect for and fear of Elohim. I would also argue that this can only occur to those who have a covenant with Him. The ten commandments can be broken down into two parts; the first half dealing with Elohim and necessarily so the second half dealing with your fellow man hence the two parts complement each other⁶.</p> <p>With all that said, this to me initially was the most troubling part of the parable and was the main motivation for why I wrote this article.</p> <p>Imagine what this parable would be if you replaced the unjust judge with a just judge ... it wouldn't be much of a parable. It would be like imagining a Shakespeare play with no tragedy.</p> <p>So what is it then that Y'shua is saying in the parable. My speculation is that the widow <u>perceives</u> that the judge is unjust or maybe it's just those in the city who perceive him as unjust. More on this in verse 4.</p>

⁴ **Exhaust your administrative remedies:** Most would think of this in regards to dealing with government agencies but you should also include in your understanding the **three part administrative process** (ToDo need reference). As agents of YHVH/Y'shua, we are administrators and we have our own little "agency". What Y'shua is saying is go to your brother first and try to resolve it in private. To put it another way don't go postal/medieval/biblical on your brother and call on the wrath of YHVH. Nor should you take matters in your own hand and execute judgment yourself because the job of vengeance is YHVH's and your job is giving your brother/neighbor/enemy/advisory due process.

⁵ This is what I euphemistically call a Torah Gated Community (ToDo write an article on this).

⁶ For more details on this, see my article [The Great Commission is to Teach Torah](#)

³ And there was a widow in that city; and she came unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary.

She's doing the rational civil thing to do which is to seek justice, but I have many questions that relate to biblical commercial redemption. 1) Doesn't she have a covering? I would contend that this what "visiting" means in James 1:27; see [pure religion](#). 2) What is she bringing to the judge, a private remedy that has already been adjudicated⁷? 3) has she given her adversary due process and is he in dishonor? Isn't this parable contrary to Mat 5:25-26⁸. 4) Is the widow symbolic of Israel or maybe just the House of Israel (Ephraim)? ToDo: need a two house reference

⁴ And he would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself, Though I fear not God, nor regard man;

"..he would not for a while.." This verbiage implies that it took time. At the risk of reading too much into the parable, I would ask the reader to consider my comments from the previous verse where I suggest that maybe the widow had pursued a process that's in alignment with biblical commercial redemption. Part of the time delay could certainly be as a result adjudicating matters which deals with substantive rights of people and when you're in this jurisdiction (the private) you need to have patience because it takes time⁹. Another most important thing to be gleaned when trying to make the biblical commercial redemption a part of your mindset ("come from") is that you most assuredly will be tested on your faith that your remedy will prevail. As I also questioned in verse 3 whether or not the widow was, metaphorically speaking, Israel. What is a widow in need of and also what is pure religion?

A widow is in want of a man and the covering he provides. Pure religion as defined by James 1:27 is "To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction ..."

Affliction: G2347 *thlipsis*: pressure, afflicted, anguish, burdened, persecution, tribulation trouble.

Based of the definition of affliction it's quite reasonable to conclude that this is why in verse 3 she was seeking to be avenged from her adversary i.e. pure religion which definitely deals with legal matters of people who are in need of such help (widows and orphans). If you're a full grown man but are ignorant of the law and how to resolve things righteously you're like a "full grown orphan" before the judge. As a "full grown orphan" you are viewed as incompetent.

So back to the parable, what's a widow to do, isn't it to become widow-less i.e. find someone who can resolve her financial debts (sin) and the related legal ramifications? Isn't this the role of Y'shua? The next question I have is how did the widow become a widow in the first place? The widow at one time was a woman who was married. If the widow represents Israel then she was married at Mt. Sinai and her marriage contract (Heb. Ketuba) was create by YHVH trough Moshe on the top of the mountain.

Here's what I'm getting at, If you seek access to the funds that are a result of your spiritual birth right and have a history of not respecting your birth right (like because of your father, and your father's father etc.) then it's reasonable that the judge has a right to test your veracity. Therefore I'm interpreting "he would not for a while" (admittedly in a long winded way to mean that it will take time. According to Torah this test need not happen more than two or three times because then it will be established that you are responsible and can be trusted with your birthright trust.

This realization intellectually speaking is all fine and dandy, but the question you ought to be asking is how do I prepare for the test. This is what encompasses and is the point of biblical commercial redemption. For example if you have a remedy that was created by contract on the private side, and you go to the judge to get a public ratification of that fact (see Res Judicata / Stare Decisis) then a test will be if the judge can get you to re-contract (which by definition means the old contract is done away with) and cause you to lose your remedy.

⁷ See my article [Res Judicata and Stare Decisis](#).

⁸ **Mat 5:25** Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison." See also **Luk 12:58**

⁹ Another sidebar point is that the parable does not indicate that widow "bad mouthed" the judge and therefore didn't fall into dishonor. Avoiding dishonor is an important practice when dealing with commercial redemption but it's speculative because there are an infinite number of things that the parable doesn't say (proving a negative), regardless I decided to go ahead and make this note.

“...I fear not God, nor regard man...”. Again I ask the question is it in fact true that this is an accurate description of the judge, or is it our perception of him. If we are not thinking righteously then we are not thinking rationally¹⁰ and we can allow perceptions to overwhelm us and trigger a self-inflicted wound (like unwittingly giving up our remedy). It appears to not have bothered the widow because she’s ignorant of the perception that others have of this judge or she has clarity about what her righteous actions should be and simply proceeds accordingly.

fear not God: Some people think that fearing god is somehow distasteful or nonintellectual and so they substitute the word reverence for fear. The key for me on this topic is to think of fear as being all about motivation and to recognize that you can still be rational and have fears. If we think of “The fear of God (Elohim)” to mean that we want to be motivated first and foremost by God then this biblical phrase makes sense. The fear is that we don’t want to be in breach of covenant/contract with him. What this judge is saying to himself appears to be delusional because as we see in the next verse the widow forces the judge to relent to what she wants. If we accept that the widow is acting righteously then she is an agent of Elohim and even though the words of the judge say he is not a fearer of Elohim, his actions in the end are the opposite (actions speak louder than words).

5 Yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me.

Is the Holy Spirit¹¹ gnawing at him? On the other hand is the judge working in perfect harmony with YHVH and acting as the trustee of YHVH’s people, and again I argue that maybe it’s a perception that he’s unjust. To support my perception argument, how can another man really know if another is a YHVH fearer or not? Actions speak louder than words (even silent private words to yourself) so in the end he was motivated to do what a YHVH fearer would do. I’m aware that the obvious understanding to verse 5 is that righteous persistence pays off, but additionally we don’t have the right to prejudge others or to presume to know that their true motivations are evil.

6 And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith.

If you accept the mantra that “the government is always right” and if you have ears to hear, i.e. you study biblical commercial redemption and you know what to expect from these judges, then hidden in the judges message is your answer. For example it may not be what he said but what he didn’t say, or maybe what was said was articulated colorfully, but is still beneficial to you if you carefully dissect this words (which is hard to do if you have gotten into the habit of prejudging others e.g. the trustees of YHVH’s people). At first glance this statement by Y’shua seems out of place as he only said ‘the words’ to himself. The words in verse 5 cannot be uttered in public else ‘the jig would be up’¹², therefore what the judge has to do is craft his words that are meant for public consumption carefully while at the same time respecting the remedy that has occurred on the private side.

An essential part of critical thinking is to never accept a conspiracy theory mindset as a dependency on my thought process. I say this because one could argue that my analysis is accepting this kind of mindset because I am suggesting that the judge is being less than honest and therefore could be conspiring against the widow’s private remedy. My response to this is that the judge is merely testing whether or not the widow can stand by her private remedy and determine if she can be talked out of it be it by her actions or words. This test will show if the widow can keep/guard her remedy or will she give it up act like Adam did in the Garden of Eden.

This is a pattern for today. If you wish to use a private remedy and access your private asset account to offset charges against the strawman then you have to come to terms with the essence of this energy if you will is coming from. The birth certificate is essentially a monetization of the energy that is a result of rights that come from the Creator (CGUR) which in turn is a result of the Mt. Sinai covenant. The energy you get from that covenant is that you will be blessed and not just blessed from a fuzzy spiritual concept but by actual things.

The problem that the widow has is that she needs to overcome the presumption of not being worth to utilize this type

¹⁰ The Elohim of Yisrael is a reasonable Elohim (Isa 1:18)

¹¹ Heb. Ruach HaKodesh

¹² **The jig** is a dance that was performed for an audience at the end of all plays in Elizabethan times until Shakespeare did away with it in the early 1600’s. The jig would occur when all the complexities of the plot had been revealed; therefore, **“the jig is up” means that everything that was hidden is now known.** What is it that’s hidden...the Torah, and it is hidden in plain sight, see **Isa 40:4-5, Pro 25:2.**

of remedy because of the very fact that she is a widow. The first question I asked in my commentary for verse 3 is “where is her covering?”

Regardless of what the intentions of the judge are, nefarious or otherwise, the widow proc because if this was known then they would lose their ability to test our resolve.

If my analysis is true then Y’shua’s statement in verse 6 now makes sense.

7 And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them?

What is faith? To me it’s very simple... do you actually believe the YHVH as your Elohim will do what he said he will do i.e. to bless you and protect you. I contend that you can only have this level of faith if you do what is expected of you pursuant to the terms and condition of your covenant with him. What were suppose to do (at least in the context of this parable) is give our brother due process (in contrast to pre-judge) and if we do all that and still have no remedy, then YHVH will avenge us¹³.

cry day and night: I wonder if day and night has to do with the appointed times (Heb. moedim), and that then and only then will YHVH hear our cry¹⁴. Appointed times are part of the terms and condition of the covenant.

8 I tell you that he will avenge them speedily. Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?

At first glance this seems to be off point to the parable. Is Y’shua saying when he returns will the judges of this world figure out how to be just, or is he referring to the people represented by the widow. Regardless of whether you are the judge or the widow (I can see where we could be both) we need to deal with our obligations to our covenant with YHVH and not worry about what relationship YHVH has with others (like the “unjust” judge). If we are the widow, then we need to be persistent which means we will be pursuing justice justly. We will be giving our brother/neighbor/adversary due process.

speedily and bear long: The “bear long” in verse 7 seems to be contrary to speedily. Is it reasonable to understand that the due process is just that a process and takes time to complete therefore we need to “bear” with YHVH and his established process¹⁵.

Related Articles

- [1Corinthian-ch-11-31-and-32–Private-vs-Public](#)
- [Matthew_5-22-26_Agree-with-thine-adversary-quickly](#)
- [Biblical Commercial Redemption](#)
- [The Great Commission is to Teach Torah](#)
- [Res Judicata and Stare Decisis](#)

See these and other related articles at www.MyHebrewBible.com/Article

About Parables

What is the purpose of parables? Isn’t it a story that’s encrypted? The keys to the encryption of biblical parables is to know the scriptures intimately¹⁶. In summary the more you know these things the more you will

¹³ Were not in the avenging business that’s Elohim’s job (thank God) rather we are in the “due process” business. *ToDo* add a reference about Moshe dealing with Pharaoh and what the meaning of the nine plagues plus the final plague.

¹⁴ Cry like a baby? I can’t imagine this. YHVH wants us to be problem solvers and creditors not whiners.

¹⁵ See the footnote related to verse 7 about YHVH avenging us

have ears to hear. If this is an accurate understanding of this term, then Y'shua does not have to tell the whole story, that's what, in part, makes it encrypted¹⁷. He expects the user to read the parables slowly and contemplate what's being said. For example, comparing it with other verses in scripture and to ask questions with a critical mind. My intent is not to try and catch Y'shua saying something contradictory or contrary to Torah / TaNaCh¹⁸, but to pull you into the deeper meanings of scripture and how you relate to it¹⁹.

¹⁶ You should for example now PaRDeS, the metaphors, the point purpose patterns context and goals of the bible etc. There is more to understanding than the surface or to simply to have casually read the bible once in your life. You need repetition (Heb. Parasha). It's about studying with a group of like minded people who are passionate about the word. You should seek out how to study (see hermeneutics).

¹⁷ This kind of reminds me of encryption used in programming (see the Wikipedia article [Public-key cryptography](#)) which describes a system requiring two separate keys. The first key is the scripture and a willingness to seriously study it, and the second is Y'shua to give it more understanding.

¹⁸ TaNaCh is the Hebrew bible (Old Testament).

¹⁹ I talked briefly on this in the prerequisite section of this article.

Why a widow and why an unjust Judge

The two principle players in this parable are the widow and the judge. Is it worth investigating more into the meaning of this parable by digging deeper into why these two roles were chosen? Depending on which (PaRDeS) level you're talking about, either party could be the protagonist or the antagonist. At the surface level, we are sympathetic to the widow so she's our hero (protagonist) and the mean ole judge is the bad guy (antagonist).

The Judge

With regard to the views of the judge I first want to key in on the characteristic of him "not being a respecter of man". When two parties go to court a decision has to be made so one party or the other is going to win i.e. people don't go to court if they don't think that they have a chance. Ultimately a judge will make a decision and, in theory, he will have to respect the arguments made by one party over the other, but isn't this in conflict with the aforementioned character of the judge. If there is a winning party then couldn't it be concluded that the judge respected that party.

The answer to my question goes back to perceptions. The question isn't about what we perceive the judge will do but rather it's about our heart. If the widow is operating under righteousness she goes to the judge with no fear because her Elohim has her back. Other's may fear this judge and conclude that seeking avengement is pointless so why bother. For those people, maybe their case is not founded in righteousness. They go to the judge without clean hands and they have ulterior motives. Therefore maybe sub-consciously their heart is not in it and they have no energy to be persistent... maxim guilty mind guilty act ²⁰. Might I also suggest that it is these same people who are perpetuating the very idea that the judge is "not a fearer of God, nor regards man" because they don't want to deal with their own unrighteousness.

ToDo: How does the next paragraph/sentence fit?

In my comments for verse 3 where it first mentions that the widow goes to the judge to avenge her, I asked a series of questions that someone with knowledge of biblical commercial redemption might ask.

²⁰ Maxim in Latin "actus non facit reum nisi mens sit rea", which means "the act does not make a person guilty unless the mind is also guilty".

More on Biblical Commercial Redemption

For more details see my [Biblical Commercial Redemption](#) article.

If you haven't already figured it out, I have a passion for law and religion (to me they are in essence the same thing). The topic of commerce is about law (admiralty / maritime) and redemption has or can have a spiritual aspect about it. With the term **biblical commercial redemption**, a term I made up, I am explicitly putting commercial redemption in the context of scripture and I do so for the sake of clarity and distinction.

The teacher in this area that I most respect is Jack Smith because he is the best that I have listen to that make some of these biblical connections.

One of these understanding from Jack that I have already talked about (see [overview](#)) is "the government is always right" which comes with an attitude when dealing with your brother/neighbor/adversary is to always try to "go to peace" with him instead of going to war. For the record, it's my observation that this concept is, unfortunately, not prevalent in the commercial redemption world as most people want to argue and subconsciously identify with being a victim. This all goes back again to being a heart issue and where you "come from" is coming from.

As I said in the overview, it is my goal therefore to expand on some of these biblical related concepts of commercial redemption for which this article (and many others I have written) is attempting to do.

I say all of that to make these points...

- To try to tie together the idea that the judge is perceived to be something he is not and further this perception problem is ultimately not his but ours (metaphorically the widow).
- To say that "the government is always right" is to say that the "judge is always right". To be right means to be acting righteously i.e. in alignment with YHVH's plans and wishes. As a consequence of this we might say the following that it is within the realm of possibilities that YHVH purposed the role of the earthly judge to be his agent to test our faithfulness. How do we know that these judges and trustees of our birthright do not operate under the full knowledge and authority of YHVH? My attitude is that they do, and if this is so then their business with YHVH is not my business, isn't this the main teaching of the Parable of the Hired Laborers (Mat 20:1-16) which is to focus on the contract you have with Elohim and not be concerned with how Elohim has contracted with others. By me focusing on and having trust and faith in my covenant with my Elohim then I don't have to worry about what others are doing but we do have to respect them.
- Some might argue that YHVH would not test us, I disagree. If you are Torah observant as I am, than one of the terms and condition of the covenant with is that the Law of the Jealous Husband. Earlier in my analysis of this parable I suggested that not only is there a perception problem with the judge, but there is a perception problem with the widow. If the judge perceives that we are a widow then there is a question about what covering she is under. Therefore the judge, acting as the agent for YHVH, can, in the nature of the Law of the Jealous Husband, test our righteous claims. This helps me to understand why the judge is appearing to act strange to those who seek a remedy through a commercial process. We shouldn't assume that he doesn't like us or that he has a vendetta against us but rather he may very

well be testing us under the power and authority of our Elohim. For most people in the commercial redemption movement, this is a very hard thing to overcome.

- Some might also argue that if YHVH were here today seeing the legal struggles we have to go through, he would be surprised and would be sympathetic to us e.g. going to war with these judges. Again, I would have to disagree. First of I would ask, do you really believe that YHVH is surprised? Was he surprised when the Assyrians took away the House of Israel? Was he surprised when the Babylonians took away the House of Judah? How many times throughout history has Israel walked away from her commandments?

Pure Religion – James 1:27

ToDo: Review

But consider verse two which says he is not a fearer of Elohim so therefore had no regard for His word like for example **James 1:27** which defines pure religion as “To visit ([G1980 aka H6485 PaQaD](#)) the fatherless and widows in their affliction ...”

Strongly held religious beliefs and convictions

ToDo there is a lot of verbiage here on SHRB&C, should I pull this out and make it it's own article then summarize the relative points reference the SHRB&C document?

- In the article Strongly held religious beliefs and convictions, I make a couple of points that are relevant to this article.
- It's a faith issue. Do you really believe i.e. are convicted that you have a covenant with YHVH and that he will do what he said he will do.
- When it comes to understanding fearing Elohim (God), do you put the fears of others (e.g. the judge) above our below the fear of Elohim?

ToDo articulate how BCR in the age in which we Americans find ourselves (Constitution Bankruptcy) dictates the attitude we are to have towards judges.

ToDo articulate "separated law from religion"

My point is that most people don't go to court with similar views that I had expressed to my friend. This is because they have separated law from religion. If you accept my contention that the widow is acting in righteousness and is boldly and persistently proceeding forward to be avenged for a right then you might ask which rights is you basing them on. Could it not be those rights that are a result of the covenant/contract that she has with her Elohim. Her character is that of having persistence (importunate) which you must have if you are in fact convicted to those religious beliefs that are strongly held. Who would be persistent to do anything if their heart wasn't in it?

The judge's words that he said to himself, "...I fear not God, nor regard man..." are full of bravado because his actions are not consistent with them. This shows that because his words and actions don't line up, his belief of not being a Elohim fearer nor showing any regard towards man are not strongly held.

Who wins in this showdown between the widow (who has no earthly man for her cover but comes to court packing her CGUR and SHRB&C) and the Judge (who, like the Wizard of Oz is full of a lot of hot air)?

FN Remember in the end that the Wizard of Oz gave Dorothy and her entourage what they needed and all he did was point out to them that they had their remedy all along. As I recall from the movie this occurred in private. Before that though the Wizard put on a really good show with smoke and loud noises which I contend was entertainment meant for public consumption.

PaRDeS – Two House

I would like to try to fit this parable into a PaRDeS format by suggesting that the widow is a metaphor for the House of Israel/Ephraim and the judge is a metaphor for the House of Judah. It's subjective where in the four categories of PaRDeS that my analysis that is to follow would fit, but I would suggest it's at the Sod level (sod is the Hebrew word meaning hidden/mystery).

ToDo: formally try to fit this parable in the three remaining levels of PaRDeS.

I am going to rely on the book of Hosea in part to make argument, but there are many biblical references to support the two house teaching which is a big topic in itself.

ToDo: add a reference to PaRDeS and to the Two House teaching.

The House of Israel/Ephraim

Like the widow who once had no covering because she was given a Get (Hebrew word meaning bill of divorce) by YHVH (see Hosea chapter 1). But now, because she has accepted the redemptive work of Messiah as the Lamb of Elohim, is back under the cover of YHVH and so she can call on the rights that are a result of honoring the covenant that was initially given at Mt. Sinai.

The House of Judah

In my analysis, this leaves the judge to represent the House of Judah. Scripture states that the House of Judah is still in covenant with YHVH although "She", as described in Jeremiah 3:10-11, is treacherous. Jeremiah states this even to the point that backsliding Israel (House, of) has more justification than her. This leaves us with an ironic situation where the judge (metaphorically Judah) on the one hand does not respect Elohim but on the other hand has been given the authority to be a judge via the unbroken covenant with YHVH.

Back to Perceptions

As I have already suggested in my verse by verse analysis I contended that it was a perception that the judge was "not a fearer of Elohim nor a respecter of man". I would also like to suggest that the woman playing the role of the widow is also a perception. The one who perceives this is the judge whom initially dismissed her righteous claims and believes that she is disingenuous. The parable goes on to show that the "widow" was persistent (importunate) with her claims and the judge caves in to her demands.

The judge comes to his senses when confronted with a righteous claim just like Judah (the fourth born son of Jacob) did when in Genesis 38:26 he says "...She (Tamar) hath been more righteous than I...". Genesis chapter 38 is to me another two house metaphor with Judah obviously represents the house of Judah and Tamar the perceived harlot (not so obviously) representing the House of Israel.

ToDo: add a reference to my commentary on Genesis chapter 32.

The widow won her claim because she was in fact under the covering of YHVH and therefore operating in righteousness and this left the judge with nowhere else to go with his decision. In defense of the judge, could it also be that he has acquired a cynical attitude towards claims wrapped in righteousness because he constantly has to listen to those whose claims are ultimately not founded in righteousness?

Reference to Luke Chapter 11

A similar verse in Luke chapter 11 that uses the word **importunity**

Luk 11:1-13 KJV And it came to pass, that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples. ² And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth. ³ Give us day by day our daily bread. ⁴ And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil. ⁵ And he said unto them, Which of you shall have a friend, and shall go unto him at midnight, and say unto him, Friend, lend me three loaves; ⁶ For a friend of mine in his journey is come to me, and I have nothing to set before him? ⁷ And he from within shall answer and say, Trouble me not: the door is now shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot rise and give thee. ⁸ I say unto you, Though he will not rise and give him, because he is his friend, yet because of his **importunity** ^{G335 anaideia} he will rise and give him as many as he needeth. ⁹ And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. ¹⁰ For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. ¹¹ If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if *he ask* a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? ¹² Or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion? ¹³ If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall *your* heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?

The moral of this parable is to exercise your faith boldly as Y'shua says in the last have of this parable, verses 8-13. I think of the Hebrew word Darash which is the 3rd letter in the PaRDeS acronym. I also think of this in a judicial sense, like to seek justice, demand/require rights (e.g. CGUR) from my Elohim because of the Mt. Sinai covenant etc. In verse 8, Luke uses the Greek word anaideia (G335) which is translated into importunity (the same word used for the title of the article describing the widow). Y'shua is connecting this word (anaideia) with the message of a boldly exercising ones faith. WordStudy uses words like recklessness, audacity, shamelessness. Normally these descriptive words are associate in a negative way, as in the opposite of what we think the word humbleness means, however the use here is to show that we are to walk out our faith with an attitude of reckless abandon.

Terms and Definitions

conspiracy theory mindset

This is all about where your coming from i.e. where you set your mind. It is of no interest to me and therefore not worthy of any of my time to investigate if conspiracy ABC is valid or invalid. My SHRB&C preclude me from entertaining this kind of mindset as it would bring into question the sincerity of my faith. This mind set is contrary to [critical thinking](#) which plays a major role in my teaching. A maxim of mine would be “you can’t be a critical thinking while at the same time have a conspiracy theory mindset”. A lot more could be said about this and I would like to do a more detailed explanation of my thoughts in this regard, but I would hope that the reader gets the gist of what I’m talking about from this article.

critical thinking

A higher order thinking that is contextualized by the scripture and specifically the covenant that exists between God and man and between man and man. It is from this foundation that man can efficiently achieve the goals set out by Elohim in a harmonious way. see hermeneutics, biblical patterns etc. see [conspiracy theory mindset](#) as an anti-pattern.

Webster’s on importunity

Pressing solicitation; urgent request; **application for a claim or favor**, which is urged with troublesome frequency or pertinacity. Men are sometimes overcome by the importunity of their wives or children.

WordStudy G335 ἀναιδεία

anaídeia; gen. *anaideías*, fem. noun from *anaidḗs* (n.f.), impudent, which is from the priv. *a* (G1), **without**, and *aidḗs* (G127), shame. **Recklessness**, **audacity**, **shamelessness**, insolence. Recklessness or disregard of consideration by the one making the request ([Luk 11:8](#)).

Syn.: *atimía* (G819), shame, disgrace, dishonor; *aschēmosúnē* (G808), unseemliness, shame.

Ant.: *aischúnē* (G152), a sense of shame due to the exposure of one's weaknesses or sins; *entropḗ* (G1791), a withdrawal into oneself in aversion to evil; *aidḗs* (G127), modesty.

KJC: importunity, [Luk 11:8](#)

Isaiah 1:22-26 KJV ²² Thy silver is become dross, thy wine mixed with water: ²³ Thy princes *are* rebellious, and companions of thieves: every one loveth gifts, and followeth after rewards: **they judge not the fatherless, neither doth the cause of the widow come unto them.** ²⁴ Therefore saith the Lord, the LORD of hosts, the mighty One of Israel, Ah, I will ease me of mine adversaries, and avenge me of mine enemies: ²⁵ And I will turn my hand upon thee, and purely purge away thy dross, and take away all thy tin: ²⁶ And **I will restore thy judges** as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called, The city of righteousness, the faithful city.

ToDo: Show via the PaRDeS perspective according to the last few verses that the judge is YHVH/Y'shua in the final judgment.

zzz