



Articles and Sermons :: Hath God said, "Men Rule?"

Hath God said, "Men Rule?" - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/1 8:42

Hath God said, "Men Rule?"

<http://www.sermonaudio.com/playpopup.asp?SID=826131724225>

Re: Hath God said, "Men Rule?" , on: 2016/7/1 9:39

Oh, get over your misogynism!

Men ruling over women was part of the curse.

Jesus lifted the curse for those in Christ.

Men are to submit to their wives as wives submit to their husbands.

Re: Hath God said, "Men Rule?" - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2016/7/1 10:02

What's up with this kind of thread? are we Christians, or Barbarians? Threads like these make the devil happy with all the strife they bring. :-(

The Holy Spirit Rules, Not man, not woman., on: 2016/7/1 10:35

Men ruling over women or women ruling over men. Both are out of order. The Holy Spirit is supposed to rule in the life of the Husband and the wife. They mutually submit to the Spirit of Christ in each other. Be careful that you are not doing Satan's work. Eve was innocently through her ignorance deceived, but Adam was willful disobedience.

"Henceforth it is also war by Satan upon the womanhood of the world, in malignant revenge for the verdict of the garden. Yes, war by the trampling down of women in all lands where the deceiver reigns. And war upon women in Christian land too, by the continuance of his Eden method of misinterpreting the WORD OF GOD: insinuating into men's minds throughout all succeeding ages that God pronounced a "curse" upon the woman, when in truth she was pardoned and blessed; and instigating fallen men to personally carry out this supposed curse, though in truth it was a CURSE UPON THE DECEIVER and not upon the deceived one (Gen. 3:14).

"I will put enmity between thee and the woman," said God, as well as between "thy seed and her seed," and this vindictive enmity of the hierarchy of evil toward women, and especially believers, has not lessened in its intensity from that day."

War on the Saints - Jessie Penn-Lewis

"The order of God's dealing with Adam and Eve and the serpent is worthy of notice. First, He spoke to Adam: "The LORD God called to the man, and said unto him, Where art thou?" Second, He called to the woman: "The LORD God said unto the woman, What is this thou hast done?" Third, He turned to the serpent as the first cause of sin, and declared, "Cursed art thou." This interrogating order was reversed when God pronounced judgment upon them. First the judgment was upon the serpent, who was cursed as the first cause, and the first in order; then God turned to the woman, and although she had been deceived, she was told she could not escape the consequent suffering; and lastly the man was told, "With the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread." The order in which God addresses the three—first the man, then the woman, then the serpent—and the reversal of it in the pronouncement of judgment—first the serpent, then the woman, then the man—is very remarkable and suggestive.

It is equally remarkable to notice that because the woman was deceived by Satan, and was not a willful transgressor, she

He was chosen as the means of his defeat. Paul points out in his first letter to Timothy that Adam's transgression was willful, that is, fully knowing he was doing wrong, and that there would be resulting consequences; he was not therefore chosen for the undoing of the serpent's work, but was given the part of toiling at the cursed ground for material sustenance. The woman, who had been deceived innocently, was chosen to produce the promised Seed which would bring about the absolute defeat of Satan.

In this we may learn the lesson that God will turn the very devices the enemy uses against His children into weapons for his defeat. Willful transgression brings the judgment of God upon it, even though the transgressor is forgiven; but every single thing in which Satan may have deceived you, as an innocent victim of his wiles, can become the very cause of his defeat. May God give you that comfort through this glimpse into the fall in Eden—especially those of God's children who have been deceived by "supernatural manifestations" which they afterwards found were not of God, and who have fallen into depression, darkness and despair.

Eve was innocently deceived by the serpent, and then in His grace God promised that through her would come the very defeat of the one who had deceived her. Yes, God can turn the very devices of the enemy into a weapon of victory over him."

Conquest of Canaan, Jessie Penn-Lewis

Re: - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/1 10:37

The headship of the husband over the wife is not misogyny. Men having godly headship over their wives and a leadership role in the church is the word and will of the Lord. This is a serious matter with spiritual and eternal implications as the below passage indicates:

"Wives, be subject to your own husbands, as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the church, He Himself being the Savior of the body. But as the church is subject to Christ, so also the wives ought to be to their husbands in everything."

~ Ephesians 5:22-24

Re: Hath God said, "Men Rule?" - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2016/7/1 15:02

It is not often I will quit listening to a sermon before the speaker finishes, but I did this one.

The speaker declares that you will not find one female priest, one prophet, one female disciple, one female bishop, etc in the WORD. He also declares that Deborah's reign was as a result of a nation gone apostate.

It is true there is not one priest in the OT; nor one prophet and that is because a female prophet is not called a prophet but a prophetess! And they existed in the OT and NT.

It is also true that most of the judges that 'ruled' Israel rose in response to a nation gone apostate. It should also be noted Deborah did not seek authority but it was given to her.

Nowhere does one find any criticism of Deborah in the WORD. Not one. No one came and told her she was "out of line". Nor does the text suggest it.

In Jesus' inner circle there were no females, but he certainly had female disciples...true, none led congregations but they functioned as helpers and took responsibility. To give them authority they were to wear the sign on their head that they are under authority just as the men were by having an uncovered head. All people are under authority and must submit to it. Jesus warned his disciples against ruling as lords over the flock. Ruling as lords contrasts sharply with servant leadership.

When I read of someone who will be critical of a Bible character - something he/she did, the way it was done or not done and the WORD is silent about it, I will no longer listen to him because if God did not rebuke this person via of a prophet or Himself, who are we to judge? Sounds arrogant to me.

Yes, I know there are people who are very aggressive in faulting Bible characters when the LORD does not even do this - wearies me. This is why I refused to listen to the end of this audio - have heard this being done before.

(Many years ago I read a famous author's writings' who was critical of Moses for delegating authority based on advice given by his father-in-law. God NEVER rebuked Moses for doing so. The audacity of moderns to fault Moses...maybe they need to teach God a few things..???)

This is my thoughts on what I heard on this audio.

Sandra

Re: , on: 2016/7/1 16:52

Quote:

by forrests on 2016/7/1 10:37:21

The headship of the husband over the wife is not misogyny. Men having godly headship over their wives and a leadership role in the church is the word and will of the Lord. This is a serious matter with spiritual and eternal implications as the below passage indicates:

"Wives, be subject to your own husbands, as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the church, He Himself being the Savior of the body. But as the church is subject to Christ, so also the wives ought to be to their husbands in everything."
~ Ephesians 5:22-24

Forrest,

Brenda did not say the headship of the husband was misogyny. She expressed that men have perverted the scriptures and used them for an excuse for misogyny. I know many personally who do this.

These same men conveniently forget these verses:

Ephesians 5:25

Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;

1 Peter 3:7

Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered.

Jesus doesn't like bullies. Praise God you're not a misogynist.

Re: misogyny - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/1 22:51

The definition of misogyny is;

a hatred of or hostility toward women.

Brenda, why is it that you immediately resort to name-calling?

A hatred of men may be the cause of your reaction, as well as your condition!

Have you listened to the message?

Re: , on: 2016/7/1 23:28

Savannah,

I would not even imply that about a sister, especially one you don't know in 3-D. C'mon, you know how it feels to be wrongly characterized. There are guys on here that have done much more than imply things about you and u so you know how it feels. Please don't go down this road with Brenda or any sister for that matter.

Re: Superman - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/2 0:08

Julius21,

You are not Clarke Kent, and Brenda is not Lois Lane!

Stop trying to play superhero, and stop fighting with carnal weapons.

Pray, meditate, wait and then proceed to post!

Re: , on: 2016/7/2 0:25

Seriously???

I doubt anyone is going to respond to your acerbic post. I don't blame them.

Re: , on: 2016/7/2 9:35

Any man who stands up for his principles is a superman in my eyes and especially when he will incur the wrath of the persecuting side. Misogynism in the church has done more damage than anything.

Re: , on: 2016/7/2 9:53

Just to add that I believe that the man is to be the head and leader of the family. His role is also as protector of the woman because God knows that women have a hard time in this man's world. They have different roles but are created equal in God's sight which is sadly not obeyed in the church where they are often only good for children's work.

When God said that man will rule over the woman He knew what would happen and it has been true. Not only did the man Adam disobey God he tried to blame the woman who had been deceived so he had not protected her either.

Re: , on: 2016/7/2 10:16

Quote:

-----by brenda7 on 2016/7/2 9:35:50

Any man who stands up for his principles is a superman in my eyes and especially when he will incur the wrath of the persecuting side. Misogynism in the church has done more damage than anything.

It's a major scandal in the church that even respected men of God shrink back from addressing because of what they would lose. It taints Christianity and pollutes the Church's witness. It gives the enemies of Christianity a foothold to talk about why we are no different than they.

Re: , on: 2016/7/2 10:20

Well said Julius. We do with a lot more godly men like you.

Re: Hath God said, "Men Rule?" - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/5 12:51

"Men are to submit to their wives as wives submit to their husbands."

This is not true. There is not one shred of biblical support for such a statement. Ephesians 5:21 does not make Ephesians 5:22-33 void, and Galatians 3:28 does not contradict it nor make it void either (actually, it has absolutely nothing to do with the subject, though self-proclaimed "Christian Feminists" do try to use it to void whole passages of scripture in order to preserve their erroneous doctrine).

There is no clear command for men to "submit to their wives" in scripture. But there is at least one where wives are instructed to "be subject" to their husbands "in everything" - "as unto the Lord".

That is not misogyny - it's the word of the LORD.

I do not "lord over" my wife's faith or rule over her in a spiritual sense, but in things natural I do have the authority. This does not necessarily contradict love and meekness and humility - even though in the minds of some it apparently does.

Also, I am tasked with teaching my wife the truth of God and we are really counted as one person in God's eyes - in accordance with Jesus' teaching that "what God has joined together, let not man put asunder." Just as the body is subject to the head, though not necessarily inferior to it - but necessary and glorious, and the two are interdependent: so are the husband and wife.

Authority - though often perverted and usurped and abused - is not, in itself, evil. Nor is submission to authority evil in itself; so long as it is "under God" - meaning that it is God-given authority and it is held and exercised in the fear of the LORD and according to the revealed will of God.

But denying the revealed will and word of the Lord in favor of one's own idea and concept of equity and justice is "evil" and very dangerous. It is a form of usury and rebellion.

I wonder how many people secretly believe Paul was a misogynist for (in the Spirit) forbidding women to teach or exercise authority over men in the church?

This is not "persecution" as one has stated in this thread - it is truth.

Re: , on: 2016/7/5 13:57

It is quite possible that Brenda meant that we should submit to the Spirit of Christ in one another but even if not, I would find it very difficult for any husband here to tell me they have not submitted to their wife in any request their wife may have made to them regarding their home, children, schooling, appointments, etc, etc, etc. Surely, your wife has spoken some wisdom to you (from the Lord) and you realized she was right and you submitted to that wisdom. My wife has also lovingly shared scriptures in a very timely way to me and of course not to submit to her, but to ponder what the Lord might be saying. Am I to tell her that only I can share the Word?

And, what about conjugal relationships? I submit to you (excuse the pun) that the way that the world uses submit is in a very "hard", militaristic way, maybe. Soften the edges a bit on the word and you will see that Christian husbands and wives submit (acquiesce) to one another all of the time. It is all wrapped up in loving and respecting one another.

Paul was not a misogynist.

We can't read Paul through the societal lens of a 21st century perspective, rather than the 1st century world in which Paul lived.

In Paul's time, women were considered their husband's property, not their partner, and they had very few rights or protections. They certainly would not have agreed with this scripture:

1Pet 3:7 Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weak

er vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered.

"Heirs together of the grace of life". This is what Paul refers to when he says in Christ, there is no distinction between man and women. They both equally can receive the Holy Spirit's power to be a witness for Christ and to overcome Satan, the world and the flesh. And we have also seen God use women in very powerful ways. (Jackie Pullinger, Elizabeth Elliot, Jessie Penn-Lewis to name a few).

Probably, the most revolutionary thing about Paul's teachings about marriage in Ephesians is that husbands were to love their wives sacrificially "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it" and husbands were to nourish and cherish their wives as Christ "nourishes and cherishes" His church (Eph. 5:25, 29).

Paul's speaks about the essential equality of husband and wife (in 1 Corinthians) on the most intimate, conjugal level. He instructs the Corinthians that in marriage the husband and the wife have equal right to conjugal relations:

Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence: and likewise also the wife unto the husband. The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife. Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency.
... (I Cor. 7:3-5a, NASB).

This was written during a time where wives were considered the property of their husbands.

No, Paul was no misogynist.

Eph 5:33 Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2016/7/5 14:05

Quote:

-----Julius21,

You are not Clarke Kent, and Brenda is not Lois Lane!

Stop trying to play superhero, and stop fighting with carnal weapons.

Pray,meditate,wait and then proceed to post!

We will not stand for such name-calling on SermonIndex forums. This is a clear warning to all believers, may we check our hearts and realize that speaking against others in the forums will not bear any fruit and it is not the right thing to do. If you cannot resist.

Colossians 3:8 New International Version (NIV)

8 But now you must also rid yourselves of all such things as these: anger, rage, malice, slander, and filthy language from your lips.

James 3:2 New International Version (NIV)

2 We all stumble in many ways. Anyone who is never at fault in what they say is perfect, able to keep their whole body in check.

Titus 3:1-2 New International Version (NIV)

Saved in Order to Do Good

3 Remind the people to be subject to rulers and authorities, to be obedient, to be ready to do whatever is good, 2 to slander no one, to be peaceable and considerate, and always to be gentle toward everyone.

Re: Name Calling - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/5 16:04

Brother Greg,

I don't believe the person you quoted was calling names, but instead referring to one sister calling a brother "Superman" or referring to him as "a superman."

Though a couple times the term "Misogynist" was used (presumably in reference to those who hold a Complementarian view instead of an Egalitarian one)...

That, in my opinion, is far more derogatory of an instance of "name calling" (and far more damaging) than that which you called out...

Don't you agree?

At one point, a mention was made of alleged "persecution" that those men who ascribe to a more Egalitarian doctrine endure from the "mysogynists" in the church (again, presumably the Complementarians). This type of martyr complex and demonizing of those who disagree with you is not loving nor productive either.

Just my thoughts...for what it's worth.

Blessings, brother Greg, and thank you for giving me the opportunity to add my two cents on this website.

Re: Demonization of those who disagree - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/5 16:34

Quote:

-----"Any man who stands up for his principles is a superman in my eyes and especially when he will incur the wrath of the persecuting side."

brenda7,

Given the context of the discussion, the "principles" that you are applauding are of an Egalitarian nature...is this a fair inference on my part? If so, it stands to reason that the "persecuting side" are those who disagree with his Egalitarian views - thus Complementarians. Is this also a fair inference?

If so:

Incur wrath? Such as what? Having his house or church burned down? Torture? Murder? Stoning? Beheading? I have never heard of a Complementarian ("misogynist" or otherwise) doing any of the above to an Egalitarian in my lifetime.

Such sensationalism is careless, irresponsible and unprofitable at best - and nefarious, slanderous and deceptive at worst.

"Persecuting side"? Please do explain who you are referring to here, if you would. Who in the Christian world is currently truly "persecuting" (in the true definition of the word) other Christians?

If by persecution you mean verbal/written "hostility" and "ill-treatment" - I would have to say you are the one most guilty here in this discussion based on your apparently flippant and repeated tossing around of a very serious accusation of hatred (misogynist) in the general direction of those who disagree with you.

This is closer to persecution than anything that I have seen from the (so-called) "persecution side"...

Brenda7, if I may, have you been hurt by men/a man? Or have you experienced hurtful and un-godly behavior from one claiming to have the authority of God to do so to you? I understand past wounds and the scarring they can leave on one's heart (my wife and I both have these and desperately yet need the oil of the Lord to soften our hearts in many ways where they have been hardened through the wounds of a sin-stricken world); but I do urge you to not allow your past (if this is the case with you) and the wrongs of men to cause you to harden your heart to whole groups of people and possibly even the word of God and Lord Jesus Himself...

Grace and Peace to you in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ - our Living Head.

Re: , on: 2016/7/6 3:06

32 And be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you . Eph. 4.

21 Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God. Eph. 5.

forrests,

As you can see, we are instructed to submit to one another in love. Much of the misogynistic writings omit this verse and say that the woman is to submit to the man and it is often meant in a bullying way. The replies on this thread are in response to one such article.

Your theory that it is women who have been hurt by men, who call out the misogyny in the church does not stand for the men who also agree and bemoan it and are ashamed of it.

And those who do have an even harder time of it when the misogynists prepare for battle.

Naming it and shaming it, is something that is grossly neglected.

It is not fruitful to discuss the matter on this forum so that is my last reply on the subject. Peace to you.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2016/7/6 5:11

21 Submit to one another out of reverence for Christ.

22 Wives, submit to your husbands as to the Lord. 23 For the husband is head of the wife, just as Christ is the head of the church, His body, of which He is the Savior. 24 Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit to their husbands in everything.

25 Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ loved the church and gave Himself up for her 26 to sanctify her, cleansing her by the washing with water through the word, 27 and to present her to Himself as a glorious church, without stain or wrinkle or any such blemish, but holy and blameless.

To be fair,,, many will see the context of submission, that Paul speaks about is actually referring to the wives towards their husbands, that is why he clarifies that in the very next verse ,, but husbands ,are to be ready and willing to die for their wife as Christ died for , us ,,,, Christ was not in submission to the church , and neither should a husband be to his wife , but Christ was to God as we are to Christ ...

That's the clear order that Paul presents in his letters as well as Peter

We can take a verse out of context brothers and sister to suit our feelings can we , should we do that .?. No

Re: light revealing the hidden things - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/6 7:01

Thank you Forrest and Gary for shining light on that which was trying to hide in the dark.

May God's blessing and peace be upon you.

Re: , on: 2016/7/6 7:46

I don't agree with your interpretation..

Both are to submit to each other, but wives as to the Lord and husbands as to the weaker vessel. There is a difference.

Re: , on: 2016/7/6 8:05

I have to agree, I have seen it in practice in very godly homes with strong spiritual husbands (and in mine). The more spiritual the husband the greater is the care and love for the wife.

Gary, Savannah are you guys married? Have you never given deference/submitted to your wife as the weaker vessel in anything?

Re: , on: 2016/7/6 8:18

I must add that I think it is much harder to submit to a weaker vessel than to the Lord. It surely serves greatly in the sanctification of the male spirit in it's desire for control and dominance which the Lord informed us of after the fall.

Re: - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/6 8:32

Quote:

-----"Have you never given deference/submitted to your wife as the weaker vessel in anything?"

We are not discussing whether a man must lord it over his wife and make every single decision, but whether men are to submit to their wives and if there is a positional authority that God has given the man in the marriage.

My wife makes all kinds of decisions in the home. She is likely going to unilaterally name our next child. I'm okay with that (even though I'm not thrilled about the name she has loved since she was a young woman). She is the bookkeeper and pays all of the bills. But when I disagree with her decision enough to step in and overrule it - I can.

I said before - having authority is not necessarily being a hard dictator. It doesn't have to be (because of Christ, in my case anyway).

But we are discussing God's word and order in the marriage/home. The word of God is clear: the man is the head of the wife, and she is to be subject to him in everything as unto the Lord. The husband is commanded to love her - no doubt - but never commanded to submit to her.

My wife making decisions when I would rather she do it is her submitting to me.

Again, the word "misogynist" is used again to describe one's theological opponents - because if you use it enough it will stick in the minds of others and do its work: discredit them and win the unconvinced over to your side through sensationalism and demonization of the other side.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2016/7/6 8:32

What do you mean submit to her as the weaker vessel.

Why would i do that ,the bible doesnt say that ..

Iv only been married about ten years ,to a verry head strong red headed woman , and i dont bow down to her ,in the way i bow down to the Comandments of god , I submit to that ..

If my wife want to do somthing that goes against scripture ,i let her know what the bible says ,and i dont give my blessing ,or shrink back , or go along with it

Or whatever it is that i feel is not going to be good for me or her ,i let her no that i strongly disagree , and give all the reasons why ,and dont give my blessings ,if she goes and does it , she knows i dont condone it or go along with it so when it fails i dont give her sympathy .

She respects that about me , that im not a crawler , or timid ,and stand my ground with her , she is like that as well with everyone , shes a red head so to speak , so she can relate ,,

Im sorry for you julius ,if you feel you have to bow down and submit to your wife ,,you do her know favours acting like a jelly fish , you know ...

She calls me her rock ,i say to her dont call me that jesus is our rock , shes only a baby christian at bestbut god brought us together ,our marriage is before god ,she know how i fell about jesus and the word of god ,and she allways has ... , i m forty shes seven years older then me , shes a tough woman , and we bring it out the best in each other Well most of the time ...

Re: , on: 2016/7/6 8:47

I don't know how the scriptures can make it clearer:

Quote:

-----21 Submitting yourselves ONE TO ANOTHER in the fear of God. Eph. 5.

I am constantly amazed at how texts can be ignored like this.

"What do you mean submit to her as the weaker vessel."

<http://www.charismanews.com/opinion/49258-why-the-woman-as-the-weaker-vessel-teaching-is-wrong>

Re: , on: 2016/7/6 9:02

I think that the meaning includes the command to recognise that women are affected and damaged by the male desire for power and rule, and therefore they come to the marriage damaged in a way that men are not. They have been made aware right from being small that they do not count as much as males and many of them will have had plenty of unwanted sexual attention especially if they have the misfortune to be attractive. Women need a time of healing which a mans love will give them.

Re: - posted by StirltUp (), on: 2016/7/6 9:12

Sister Brenda,

Although I appreciate a lot of what you post and the sincerity with which you share it, I must respectfully disagree. The scripture you refer to from Ephesians about "submitting to one another" is meant in a body-life context, the coming together of the church, the fellowship.

If husband and wife are to be seen as completely equal in all ways, then why would Paul be inspired to write different words to each?

I agree that because of sin and abuse many women come into relationships broken, but so do men. Although the love of a man may help in the healing process, true healing and wholeness is found in both man and women submitting to Christ and His Word, especially these amazing and mysterious words in Ephesians regarding husband and wife.

Make no mistake, there is great power in a marriage relationship where these principles are submitted to and faithfully carried out. The greatest power and influence a wife can have is through respectful submission to her husband (I will not claim that I know how it works but it does)

Let the husband learn how to love his wife...and let the wife see to it that she reverences her husband as her head. God bless you.

Re: , on: 2016/7/6 9:21

Thank you but I don't think so - it is meant to be universal and then Paul goes into detail. You cannot have one command for one place only, which does not count in the home. We are the body wherever we are.

I agree that men can have damage that needs repairing and sometimes from their mothers. A loving wife will help him overcome but there is a very basic damage to women to their very identities as women that is very deep as it comes from many places therefore multiple abuse and I am sure that married men here will agree.

Men and women are not the same. They have different roles, the male one being leadership and protector.

Re: - posted by StirltUp (), on: 2016/7/6 9:32

Sister Brenda,

I agree that submitting to one another (fitting in with one another says JB Phillips) is for all believers, even as in Colossians chapter 3 he speaks of "living in harmony", once again in body context, including men and women not necessarily in a marriage relationship.

In both letters he then goes into detail about different types of relationships: Husband and wife, Master and slave, Father and children.

So the specific words to husbands and wives must be understood separately from the general advice to the church.

Re: , on: 2016/7/6 9:59

If husband and wife are "heirs together of the grace of life", then they are both in the body. They are not excepted from the verse, "Submitting yourselves one to another".

Gary, I am glad you exposed your thinking on the word "submit", because I was thinking that brothers have a various thoughts and definitions for what "submit" means from a NT perspective and you confirmed it for me. We are not talking about "bowing down to each other". I wonder Gary, if you would submit to your wife's wisdom if she meekly and lovingly reminded you that a decision you were about to make would possibly not be good for your family or your relationship? She does have the Spirit of God and has the responsibility to tell you what the Lord tells her. We must communicate to each other in love and who loves you more than your wife?

You recently spoke of a besetting sin on the forum (and you named it) that you have not given up. I won't say what it is here, but is it not unfair to talk about her as being strong headed when you will not give up your own sin? Don't you think this concerns her and it also costs money taking away from the family budget. Is this not putting stress on her and your marriage? And why do you mention "red hair"? Are you not saying that she is strong headed because she has red hair and therefore generalizing that all red haired women are strong willed. This is the kind of thinking that we do not need in Christian relationships.

Surely, you have given deference and submitted to your wife's wishes in conjugal relationships as the Apostle Paul instructs or raising the kids, decorating the house, budgeting, etc, etc. I would hope that you have not withheld yourself from

your wife as punishment to her for being "strong headed". Do you let her do the same with you, or do you "make her submit"?

I think Forrest in his latest post is getting it right. There is an order for marriage that God has given, but as members of the body of Christ, both husband and wife, are to "submit one to another in the fear of God". Stiritup and Forrest touched on what this kind of submission looks like but it certainly is not the kind that usurps God's order in a marriage or makes one bow down to one another.

So many have a perverted idea of what submit means from a Christian perspective.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2016/7/7 1:24

Playing the devils advocate are we now julius, accusing me of sin ,yet you know nothing about repentence in my life ..

You will need to enlighten me about this sin that is effecting my budget , scince you seem to know so much about,,

Rember satan is the accuser of the brethren ...

Iv allready said that according to the truth of the scripture i dont submit to my wifes demands or comands , she has no authority over me or any other wifes husbane , neither to teach ,as paul says , and she respect that and acutauly is disgusted at the lak of head ship among christians , to be honest it stumbels her, by the way im not asking for your opinion about my wife , just trying ti answer ...
But in reality it is none of your bisness is it

Nor is it your job to put me below you jugmemt seat .

This is legitimate thread , decusing scripture ,, not a place to weald acusation and usmptions about one another , beca use we disagree,

Cheack your heart....

I leave a scripture that seems to be glossed over my many , for the concideration , and , ask why is Peter using Abrahams and his wife as an example for us to follow ,,,

Notice the strong words that are used ,like obey and lord , as sarahs way of adressing her husbane in obedience

3Your beauty should not come from outward adornment such as braided hair or gold jewelry or fine clothes, 4but from the inner disposition of your heart, the unfading beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is precious in God's sight. 5For this is how the holy women of the past adorned themselves. They put their hope in God and were subject to their husbands, 6just as Sarah obeyed Abraham and called him lord. You are her children if you do what is right and refuse to quiver in fear.

Re: , on: 2016/7/7 8:09

I am just paraphrasing what you stated, Gary. I don't think I would speak of my wife as you spoke of yours in a public thread. It is absolutely none of our business but you decided to make certain comments public, not me. Your attitude about your wife is astonishing so I submit that maybe your comments in this thread are very biased.

What I find equally astonishing is that a sister is interrogated twice about whether she hates men or not. Does anyone else not find that subtle labeling, disturbing?

The legitimacy of this thread ended there when the sister was labeled.

Has any man in this thread been subtly accused of being heavy handed, authoritarian and lacking in love and

compassion for their wife? Apart from your comments about me, I don't think so.

Quote:

----- from Gary

Im sorry for you julius ,if you feel you have to bow down and submit to your wife ,,you do her know favours acting like a jelly fish , you know ...

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2016/7/7 8:50

Julius you ask if i even had a wife ,obviously with some preconceived notion behind the question , so i thought i would tell you about her .if you didnt want to know ,maybe you could have not ask me And i would not have told you about her

My coments might astonish you , so what if they do ,thats no big deal , and ,or maybe my coments aren't biast ,their honest.

You say that what i said was none of your bisness so,why then did you make my budget your bisness..

Acusing me of being unrepentant of a besetting sin , is a heavy handed on your part julius ,especially, when you dont know anything about by life

A jelly fish was a figure of speach ,and jesus also used them in much harsher ways ,,,, a jelly fish moves under verry little pressure can be pressed into different shapes,and flows with the tide ,,

I thought it was quite a thoughtful figure of speach ,that can be used to describe a man who submites to his wifes authority ,that she doesnt have over him

Regarding the last thing you said , yes it seems you are clearly saying im biased toward by wife wasting money and she is suffering because of me ,,

You described your self there ,, because it all there in your post about me brother..... Tho it wasnt really subtle as you said

I dont want to get involved what others said about brenda and what she said to them , but obviously both parties said the same thing to one another ,with brenda using the ,how do you say it misogyny.....,and then some said ,,you said they said she was a man hater ,which means the same things ,,

I dont like taking sides ,in name calling , your better off not participating in that type of argument ,,,, its better we just talk biblical and dont get to personal Hey!

Re: , on: 2016/7/7 9:05

Yes, my thought behind the question is that every husband dwelling with his wife according to the scriptures knows the reality of "submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God". To single people, by and large this is theory.

Yes, let's keep things biblical. My apologies if I offended you in anyway.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2016/7/7 15:05

Every things cool

Re: Accusations - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/7 15:56

Quote:
-----Julius21: "Has any man in this thread been subtly accused of being heavy handed, authoritarian and lacking in love and compassion for their wife?"

Julius21,

Yes, we have - and not so subtly at that.

"brenda7" does just this in nearly every comment she posts. She says the following of those who hold a Complementarian theology (myself included):

Quote:
-----"Any man who stands up for his principles is a superman in my eyes and especially when he will incur the wrath of the persecuting side. Misogynism in the church has done more damage than anything."

Quote:
-----"Much of the misogynistic writings omit this verse and say that the woman is to submit to the man..."

Quote:
-----"Your theory that it is women who have been hurt by men, who call out the misogyny in the church...And those who do have an even harder time of it when the misogynists prepare for battle."

So, Julius21, do you now acknowledge that the accusations of the sort you implied have not been leveled at Complementarians in this thread (namely a hatred/contempt for women, or "Misogyny") have in fact been repeatedly used by at least one outspoken person on the Egalitarian side of the debate - and that from the very beginning of the discussion?

Let's walk in the light and deal with one another in truth and equity. For Jesus' sake.

Grace and Peace to you in His Holy and Cleansing Name.

Re: , on: 2016/7/7 19:09

Brenda is speaking in general terms and brings up a valid concern and very real problem today in the church.

I don't know why you were applying it to yourself.

Re: Accusations of hatred directed at theological "opponents". - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/7 20:05

Julius21,
Do you admit that accusations were prevalent among the comments of brenda7 (contrary to your earlier statement implying that none were)? Do you honestly deny that she was broad brush labeling people with a different view than her as misogynists? And are you sincere that you "don't know why" I was applying the accusations and slanderous propaganda to myself?

I want to give you the opportunity to speak for yourself and leave no doubt concerning your position.

I find it to be very plainly evident that the sister was labeling anyone who rejected her form of Egalitarianism a "misogynist".

brenda7, would you please clarify your position? Do you believe all Complimentarians are "misogynists"?

Re: satan's hatred - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/7 22:13

Julius21 asks,

"Has any man in this thread been subtly accused of being heavy handed, authoritarian and lacking in love and compassion for their wife? Apart from your comments about me, I don't think so."

I answer. NO.

I answer NO...because not "subtly accused" but strongly declared guilty of a hate crime. And even without evidence nor a fair trial. How about that! And I thought we live in America, and have a Constitution!

(I'll stop being facetious now. I speak so, to make it plain that I am not in the least offended by my accuser, keep that in mind as you finish reading) .

You might say, "there's no mention of the word wife in the quote of note. "

I'd reply that this accusation is even worse, in that it is an attack upon my very character, placing my hatred of women on the level of universality. A person who is such a person cannot even be a Christian.

I was somewhat surprised that such was overlooked by all, and no remark was made by Greg or any others. Until it was picked up on by Forrest.

Also, both Gary and Forrest answered your request Julius in regard to having a wife. They were transparent, honestly giving information voluntarily. And you saw opportunity to use what was said, against one of them.

The request made of Brenda was totally ignored. She never replied to that!

This forum, and our relations with others, as we interact by conversing, is quite a revealer of what is truly in our hearts. Some of the hidden things surely do come into visibility to the discerning.

All of us are subjective to a degree, more or less. But when we read words like, "...but when I heard the first part it reminded me of what I used to hear a lot when I was a young woman..." or "Just telling you what we have seen and experienced and my reaction", our biased subjectivity is more obvious.

Now, here is the quote of note, posted by Brenda;

"Oh, get over your misogynism!"

That was from the first post on this thread. What doth possess a person to immediately jump on board a thread and begin unloading their barrel. Not only emptying one, but reaching for more ammo in the aftermath, as she wipes her mouth and says, "I've done nothing wrong."

And all this coming from one who believes in that false teaching of "entire sanctification", a.k.a. "sinless perfectionism. "

Now, let's keep things biblical and keep it with the subject of the thread.

Where might Peter and Paul have missed it (being fallible men as all of us are) when they wrote the following;

1 Peter 3:5,6 For thus also the holy women who have hoped in God heretofore adorned themselves, being subject to the Lord as to the Lord; as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord; whose children ye have become, doing good, and not fearing with any kind of consternation.

To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed. Titus 2:5

Might they have used different words to avoid being misunderstood!

Nowhere else do we find that the Word of God is blasphemed but here in Titus, and in this context of submission.

And nowhere else in the Word do we find someone calling another "lord", used in a positive way.

May we not be deceived by the subtlety of Satan, as he twists the Scripture in an attempt to make others into usurpers of authority, after his own likeness.

Surely, he hates both men and women!

Re: Not rule., on: 2016/7/8 2:15

Brethren

I admit that I originally only listened to a part of the sermon in the OP because I was turned off by the misinterpretation of Genesis 3 by the preacher Reg Kelly. I have now listened to it in full.

16 Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

17 And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life;

18 Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field;

19 In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return. Gen. 3.

God hereby declares the curses which would fall upon Adam and Eve for their disobedience. He had made Eve to be the helpmeet of Adam, to compliment him as his equal because he was not complete without her. A man needs the perspective of the woman.

Kelly however, looks upon that curse as a blessing and blames the woes of American society on men ignoring the 'blessing' of men ruling over women.

No, it was God saying that the spirit in man, that made him fail to protect her against the enemy who was able to have free access to the garden because the 'borders' were not being protected and then blame her for being deceived, despite the fact that he was standing by and failed to intervene, and even worse, to put the blame on God for 'giving him the woman', this rebellious spirit which was the first sin in Eden, would continue with his blaming and wishing to subjugate her to his own desires and wishes.

All human unsaved societies with the exception of possibly one Amazonian one (which was incidentally a peaceful prosperous one) were to continue in this subjection of women, and especially amongst the Jews at the time of Jesus who treated women like possessions. Women have frequently been denied basic human rights.

Even in the early church, we see no attempts by men to put right this persecution of women and we read the following writings:

Clement of Alexandria

Theologian and Greek Father, 2nd century

“Every woman should be filled with shame by the thought that she is a woman. . . . the consciousness of their own nature must evoke feelings of shame”
Origen

Theologian and Greek Father, 2nd-3rd centuries

“Men should not sit and listen to a woman . . . even if she says admirable things, or even saintly things, that is of little consequence, since it came from the mouth of a woman.”
Fragments on 1 Corinthians
Tertullian

The Father of Latin Christianity, 155-245

“And do you not know that you are (each) an Eve? The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age: the guilt must of necessity live too. You are the devil’s gateway: you are the unsealer of that (forbidden) tree: you are the first deserter of the divine law: you are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack. You destroyed so easily God’s image, man. On account of your desert—that is, death—even the Son of God had to die. And do you think about adorning yourself over and above your tunics of skins?”
On the Apparel of Women, Chapter 1 (Read it here.)
Chrysostom

Archbishop of Constantinople and Doctor of the Church, 4th century

“God maintained the order of each sex by dividing the business of life into two parts, and assigned the more necessary and beneficial aspects to the man and the less important, inferior matter to the woman.”
Jerome

Priest, Theologian, Doctor of the Church and Latin Father, 4th-5th centuries

“Woman is the root of all evil.”
Augustine

Bishop of Hippo, Doctor of the Church and Latin Father, 354-430

“I don’t see what sort of help woman was created to provide man with, if one excludes procreation. If woman is not given to man for help in bearing children, for what help could she be? To till the earth together? If help were needed for that, man would have been a better help for man. The same goes for comfort in solitude. How much more pleasure is it for life and conversation when two friends live together than when a man and a woman cohabit?”

“ . . . the woman together with her own husband is the image of God, so that that whole substance may be one image; but when she is referred separately to her quality of help-meet, which regards the woman herself alone, then she is not the image of God; but as regards the man alone, he is the image of God as fully and completely as when the woman too is joined with him in one.”
On the Trinity Book 12 7.10
Thomas Aquinas

Doctor of the church, 13th century

“As regards the individual nature, woman is defective and misbegotten, for the active force in the male seed tends to the production of a perfect likeness in the masculine sex; while the production of woman comes from a defect in the active force or from some material indisposition, or even from some external influence.”
Summa Theologica, Vol. I, Q. 92, Art. 2: 489.
Martin Luther

German priest, theologian and Protestant Reformer, 16th century

“The woman certainly differs from the man, for she is weaker in body and intellect. Nevertheless Eve was an excellent creature and equal to Adam in so far as the divine image: that is, righteousness, wisdom and eternal salvation, is concerned. Still, she was only a woman. As the sun is much more glorious than the moon (though also the moon is glorious), so the woman was inferior to the man both in honour and dignity, though she, too, was a very excellent work of God.”

From Luther’s Commentary on Genesis.

John Calvin

French theologian, pastor and Protestant Reformer, 1509-1564

On the first post-resurrection appearance of Jesus to women rather than to men: “I consider this was done by way of reproach, because they had been so tardy and sluggish to believe. And indeed, they deserve not only to have women for their teachers, but even oxen and asses. . . . Yet it pleased the Lord, by means of those weak and contemptible vessels, to give display of his power.”

From Calvin’s Commentary on the Gospel of John.

“On this account, all women are born that they may acknowledge themselves as inferior in consequence to the superiority of the male sex.”

From Calvin’s Commentary on 1 Corinthians (Chapter 11)

John Knox

Scottish clergyman and Protestant Reformer, 16th century

“weake, fraile, impatient, feeble and foolish.”

“unconstant, variable, cruel and lacking the spirit of counsel and regiment” and “woman in her greatest perfection was made to serve and obey man.”

From his The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women.

<http://newlife.id.au/misogynist-quotes-from-church-fathers/>

In fact, this misogyny in the church has negatively influenced the societies in which it has been found.

The church should be a safe haven for women who have been abused and devalued by the communities they grew up in, and find Christians brothers who stand against those who perpetuate these myths but she finds the opposite.

Mark my words, this is going to be a huge issue in years to come and those who use the word 'rule' will be rightly accused of a hate crime.

Men in the church are to be the head and to lead which includes protecting women from the curse that they have to endure in this world and to even speak out against it otherwise they are spineless jelly fish Gary.

Kelly gives his own attitude very clearly when he speaks about Sarah's sin in choosing Hagar to bear a child in the fruitless marriage, when he said that he would have yelled (mark you) at Sarah 'I can't believe what just came out of your mouth but it must never come out of your mouth again. Don't you EVER say anything like that again, how stupid are you, shut your mouth and go back to your canning pickles'. This was followed by chuckles by the men.

He even thinks that women wearing pants is evil! Do I need to comment ladies? So in answer to the question asked - yes I think that any man who does not denounce this preachers misinterpretation of Genesis 3 and admit and denounces misogyny outside the church then he is by definition a woman hater.

Man is to be a godly leader and has failed miserably through the history of mankind. He has not called out the misogyny outside of the church, and not cleared it out of the inside the church. Man will answer to God for this one day because he was given the role of leadership and is therefore going to be held responsible.

I have met few brothers in Christ in the flesh who have treated me as a sister. Their reactions to me have always been along the lines of whether they find me sexually attractive or not. I have not been healed through brotherly love, from the attitudes of men and the abuse I have suffered, outside of the church. The Lord has had to do it Himself. It is time for change.

ange.

Re: the first sin in Eden - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/8 3:19

"And thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."

John Bunyan (author of Pilgrims Progress) comments;

Doubtless the woman was, in her first creation, made in subordination to her husband, and ought to have been under obedience to him: Wherefore, still that had remained a duty, had they never transgressed the commandment of God; but observe, the duty is here again not only enjoined, and imposed, but that as the fruit of the woman's sin; wherefore, that duty that before she might do as her natural right by creation, she must now do as the fruits of her disobedience to God. Women therefore, whenever they would perk it and lord it over their husbands, ought to remember, that both by creation and transgression they are made to be in subjection to their own husbands. This conclusion makes Paul himself: "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence; for Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression" (1 Tim 2:11-14).

Brenda says,

"No, it was God saying that the spirit in man, that made him fail to protect her against the enemy who was able to have free access to the garden because the 'borders' were not being protected and then blame her for being deceived, despite the fact that he was standing by and failed to intervene, and even worse, to put the blame on God for 'giving him the woman', this rebellious spirit which was the first sin in Eden, would continue with his blaming and wishing to subjugate her to his own desires and wishes."

I bring out the following in Brenda's words above to show how she twists the WORD OF GOD to support her own private interpretation;

"...this rebellious spirit which was the first sin in Eden, would continue with his blaming and wishing to subjugate her to his own desires and wishes."

Now read the inspired WORD OF GOD from Paul an Apostle;

"Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence; for Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression" (1 Tim 2:11-14).

The man Paul tells us who committed the first sin in Eden and what it was.

Now I ask, who is misrepresenting things here and blameshifting.

Let's accurately handle The Word of Truth!

May The Word and Spirit enlighten, where some are attempting to darken counsel!

Re: , on: 2016/7/8 4:16

More twisting of the scripture. I would urge the brethren to read the link given which very aptly, by a Bible teacher explains where the scriptures have been twisted and misrepresented and especially regarding the apostle Paul's writings. Here is one example:

"189. The Apostle Paul speaks twice, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, concerning the public ministry of women, in 1 Corinthians 11:3 -16, and 14:29-40. We shall treat of the second utterance, as the simpler, first. Please read these two passages in turn, and note that they occur in the same letter, and if the writer was not interrupted, he wrote the second in the next breath after the first, that is, one could not have been written more than fifteen minutes or a half hour after the other. This point is important. Next note that if St. Paul veiled women he did not silence women, for, according to this interpretation he ordered them to veil only when prophesying or praying, not at other times; so that, if they were silenced they were left unveiled, so far as Scripture teaches. Yet the general idea and teaching is that Paul both veiled and silenced women.

190. Now turn to the second passage: Fix your attention, for a moment, on verses 31-36. Does it not seem strange that unless Paul means "all," he should have repeated "all" three times over? It is probable that the women far outnumbered the men in these early churches, held in the homes of the people, for they have usually outnumbered the men throughout Church history even since meetings have been held in public churches.

Now if only a small fraction of the attendants (the mature men released from business so that they could be at home meetings), were allowed to prophesy (Paul says nothing about mere Sunday meetings), then why did the Apostle say, "Ye may all prophesy, one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted?"

191. Again, at verse 34 he says, "It is not permitted . . . as also saith the law." Who did not permit it?

Where was it not permitted? The O. T. says absolutely nothing from Genesis to Malachi to forbid women to speak. No "law" can be found anywhere in the Bible forbidding women to speak in public, unless it be this one only utterance here by St. Paul. And besides, we know perfectly that the O. T. permitted women to speak in public (Numbers 27:1-7), and Jesus Christ did also, without rebuke, Luke 8:47, 11:27, 13:13.

192. What is actually known about the situation which occasioned the writing of this Epistle to the Corinthians? We gather from the Epistle itself that the Corinthian Christians had written Paul a letter (7:1) and he is answering it. There were divisions among them (1:11). He had enemies at Corinth, who disputed his right to be called an Apostle (9:1), and criticized him and his companions for leading about a woman with them (9:5) and he declares that "we" have as much right to do it as "the other apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas."

Who was this woman? Doubtless Priscilla, who with Aquila her husband had left Corinth, in company with the Apostle, shortly before (Acts 18:18), the woman whom Paul mentions before her husband. He actually dares to put this woman's "head" on behind! How that would scandalize the proprieties of modern theology! She was, all are bound to agree, a very able person, and well known to: "all the churches of the Gentiles" (Romans 16:4), and how could that be if she was altogether silenced and veiled? Paul was probably writing this very Epistle in her home at Ephesus (1 Corinthians 16:19). Here we have the proper setting for these words addressed to the Corinthians."

https://godswordtowomen.files.wordpress.com/2010/10/gods_word_to_women1.pdf

"Katharine C. Bushnell

(1856-1946) was a courageous and gifted servant of God who modeled her life's motto "I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me." (Phil 4:13). She was a physician, missionary, crusader, reformer, author and speaker as well as a brilliant and original scholar who spoke seven languages and was grounded in Greek and Hebrew. Bushnell left medicine to do what she considered the more important work of reforming conditions of human degradation through leadership in the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) of the 19th century women's movement. The scriptural status of women was of intense concern to Bushnell who came to believe that mistranslations were responsible for the

social and spiritual subjugation of women. She left the WCTU in 1896 to spend her remaining years writing and sharing the biblical truth of God's original and unchanging intent of full equality for women."

Re: , on: 2016/7/8 4:30

Oh and by the way, the opening preacher was wrong - the first evangelist was Mary Magdalene. I think that Christ was making a statement there.

Brenda - posted by jochbaptist (), on: 2016/7/8 10:19

Hi Brenda

I just listened to the sermon. The Brother preached a very anointed message with the purpose of stirring up men to take up the mandate to rule, instead of abdicating it. Themselves, their households and the Church. This is the gist of the sermon. Some points I don't agree with, and others might be challenging to some, but true.

You are maybe confusing women as fellow ministers (evangelizing, prophesying, praying, encouraging, serving etc.), with women trying to rule in the family or church. The latter is totally unscriptural.

The Brother's message really triggered you, it seems. ;)

Blessings,

Johannes

Re: Katherine C Bushnell - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/8 22:44

Re: Katherine C Bushnell

The woman that Brenda calls, "a very apt Bible teacher" one who, "explains where the scriptures have been twisted and misrepresented and especially regarding the apostle Paul's writings", believed that the Scriptures needed to be reinterpreted, and went about the work of doing just that;

Brenda considers this woman to be a sound exegete of the Word of God.

From a website of one of her followers we read some of her explaining of the "new meanings" of Scripture,

"In her hands, the Scriptures told a very different story. Woman had been created equal (if not superior) to man. It was not Eve's sin that had led to the Fall of humanity, but Adam's (Eve rightly blamed the Serpent, but Adam blamed God). Eve had, however, sinned in turning away from God to follow Adam out of Eden. Thus, women sinned when they submitted to men, rather than to God, and men sinned in usurping God's authority, and in dominating women.

Bushnell identified a number of gendered patterns of mistranslation, particularly when it came to concepts like courage, chastity, and modesty. She discovered new meanings for obscure Old Testament passages, as well as for familiar New Testament passages on wifely submission and female authority. Indeed, she presented the Apostle Paul as quite enlightened on the woman question.

Bushnell believed that redemption would bring about women's social and spiritual emancipation, a redemption foretold in Jeremiah 31:22: "It seems God's design that the new woman in Christ Jesus shall no more turn away, as did Eve, to her husband," she explained, "but remaining loyal to God alone, and true to her destiny as the mother of that Seed shall lead man about, out of the wilderness of the inefficiency of egotism into the glorious liberty of the children of God."

Has anyone noticed that none of the Scripture which has been posted in several posts have been addressed! I leave yet another now,

For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man.Â For the man is not from the woman, but the woman from the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man. 1 COR. 11:7-9

Re: Hath God said, "Men Rule?" - posted by joliboy11, on: 2016/7/9 0:41

from Elisabeth Elliot:

â€œIt is a naive sort of feminism that insists that women prove their ability to do all the things that men do. This is a distortion and a travesty. Men have never sought to prove that they can do all the things women do. Why subject women to purely masculine criteria? Women can and ought to be judged by the criteria of femininity, for it is in their femininity that they participate in the human race. And femininity has its limitations. So has masculinity. That is what weâ€™ve been talking about."

Re: , on: 2016/7/9 1:37

Quote:

-----by brenda7 on 2016/7/8 2:15:10

Brethren

I admit that I originally only listened to a part of the sermon in the OP because I was turned off by the misinterpretation of Genesis 3 by the preacher Reg Kelly. I have now listened to it in full.

16 Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

17 And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life;

18 Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field;

19 In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return. Gen. 3.

God hereby declares the curses which would fall upon Adam and Eve for their disobedience. He had made Eve to be the helpmeet of Adam, to complement him as his equal because he was not complete without her. A man needs the perspective of the woman.

Kelly however, looks upon that curse as a blessing and blames the woes of American society on men ignoring the 'blessing' of men ruling over women.

No, it was God saying that the spirit in man, that made him fail to protect her against the enemy who was able to have free access to the garden because the 'borders' were not being protected and then blame her for being deceived, despite the fact that he was standing by and failed to intervene, and even worse, to put the blame on God for 'giving him the woman', this rebellious spirit which was the first sin in Eden, would continue with his blaming and wishing to subjugate her to his own desires and wishes.

All human unsaved societies with the exception of possibly one Amazonian one (which was incidentally a peaceful prosperous one) were to continue in their subjection of women, and especially amongst the Jews at the time of Jesus who treated women like possessions. Women have frequently been denied basic human rights.

Even in the early church, we see no attempts by men to put right this persecution of women and we read the following writings:

Clement of Alexandria

Theologian and Greek Father, 2nd century

â€œEvery woman should be filled with shame by the thought that she is a woman. . . . the consciousness of their own nature must evoke feelings of shameâ€

Origen

Theologian and Greek Father, 2nd-3rd centuries

â€œMen should not sit and listen to a woman . . . even if she says admirable things, or even saintly things, that is of little consequence, since it came from the mouth of a woman.â€

Fragments on 1 Corinthians

Tertullian

The Father of Latin Christianity, 155-245

“And do you not know that you are (each) an Eve? The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age: the guilt must of necessity live too. You are the devil’s gateway: you are the unsealer of that (forbidden) tree: you are the first deserter of the divine law: you are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack. You destroyed so easily God’s image, man. On account of your desert—that is, death—even the Son of God had to die. And do you think about adorning yourself over and above your tunics of skins?”

On the Apparel of Women, Chapter 1 (Read it here.)

Chrysostom

Archbishop of Constantinople and Doctor of the Church, 4th century

“God maintained the order of each sex by dividing the business of life into two parts, and assigned the more necessary and beneficial aspects to the man and the less important, inferior matter to the woman.”

Jerome

Priest, Theologian, Doctor of the Church and Latin Father, 4th-5th centuries

“Woman is the root of all evil.”

Augustine

Bishop of Hippo, Doctor of the Church and Latin Father, 354-430

“I don’t see what sort of help woman was created to provide man with, if one excludes procreation. If woman is not given to man for help in bearing children, for what help could she be? To till the earth together? If help were needed for that, man would have been a better help for man. The same goes for comfort in solitude. How much more pleasure is it for life and conversation when two friends live together than when a man and a woman cohabitate?”

“... the woman together with her own husband is the image of God, so that that whole substance may be one image; but when she is referred separately to her quality of help-meet, which regards the woman herself alone, then she is not the image of God; but as regards the man alone, he is the image of God as fully and completely as when the woman too is joined with him in one.”

On the Trinity Book 12 7.10

Thomas Aquinas

Doctor of the church, 13th century

“As regards the individual nature, woman is defective and misbegotten, for the active force in the male seed tends to the production of a perfect likeness in the masculine sex; while the production of woman comes from a defect in the active force or from some material indisposition, or even from some external influence.”

Summa Theologica, Vol. I, Q. 92, Art. 2: 489.

Martin Luther

German priest, theologian and Protestant Reformer, 16th century

“The woman certainly differs from the man, for she is weaker in body and intellect. Nevertheless Eve was an excellent creature and equal to Adam in so far as the divine image: that is, righteousness, wisdom and eternal salvation, is concerned. Still, she was only a woman. As the sun is much more glorious than the moon (though also the moon is glorious), so the woman was inferior to the man both in honour and dignity, though she, too, was a very excellent work of God.”

From Luther’s Commentary on Genesis.

John Calvin

French theologian, pastor and Protestant Reformer, 1509-1564

On the first post-resurrection appearance of Jesus to women rather than to men: “I consider this was done by way of reproach, because they had been so tardy and sluggish to believe. And indeed, they deserve not only to have women for their teachers, but even oxen and asses. . . . Yet it pleased the Lord, by means of those weak and contemptible vessels, to give display of his power.”

From Calvin’s Commentary on the Gospel of John.

“On this account, all women are born that they may acknowledge themselves as inferior in consequence to the superiority of the male sex.”

From Calvin’s Commentary on 1 Corinthians (Chapter 11)

John Knox

Scottish clergyman and Protestant Reformer, 16th century

“weake, fraile, impatient, feeble and foolish.”

“unconstant, variable, cruel and lacking the spirit of counsel and regiment” and “woman in her greatest perfection was made to serve and obey man.”

From his The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women.

<http://newlife.id.au/misogynist-quotes-from-church-fathers/>

Absolutely, astounding quotes and all from the pit of hell. None of this comes from the Father's heart. Many of these men are revered by many and they have created popular Christian belief systems with thousands and thousands of devotees. Now, some puzzle pieces come together for me regarding the errant patriarchy and self-serving perversion of scripture I have encountered in the church in the last 39 years.

Such hateful and mean spirited words towards sisters and wives, "heirs together of the grace of life", with us men.

The prayers of many have been hindered for the grave disservice that has been perpetuated upon our fellow believers in Christ.

1Pe 3:7 Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered.

Re: - posted by StirltUp (), on: 2016/7/9 4:06

Dear brothers and sisters,

Let us all agree on the following, if we can :)

Women, in general, in many societies and cultures, have been oppressed and unappreciated. A lot of this has changed and improved, and can still improve.

We, as individual men, need to practice gentleness, understanding and respect toward our sisters, as the bible commands.

At the same time, let us all be careful in our interpretation of scripture, not to read into it what we would like to see, but to submit ourselves to it and be teachable.

Let us remain, men and women alike, in the place God has given us: in the church and in the family and fulfil our role as best we can, by the grace of God.

Let our acceptance and identity flow from Christ first, not from man, and let His Spirit form and mould us into the beautiful men and women He has planned for us to be.

In His Love,

Re: For this very Purpose raised...the glory of God - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/9 6:01

In another thread markuskiwi said re the topic at hand,

"Not sure what the purpose is."

The only purpose is the glory of God, Who has created us for His own glory.

"He is most glorified in us when we are most satisfied in Him." John Piper

My prayer is that His Kingdom come, and that His will be done, on earth as it is in heaven.

If His Word be obeyed by all, in its simplicity, neither added to nor taken away from, we'd have order, God's order, rather than the chaotic disorder we have.

Sin has surely permeated the Divine order that God created in the beginning. Even His Holy Word is received with a suspicious eye, and a readiness to hear the voice of doubt as Eve in the garden, "Hath God said..."

The many take offense at God's rule. He rules by His Word and Spirit. And all authority is in and by THE WORD.

When His Word strikes a chord in us, it's merely a revealing of our rebellious hearts. No matter how we go about excusing it. It's just as Jesus' parable shows, "But his subjects hated him and sent a delegation after him to say, 'We do not want him to rule over us.'"

ant this man to rule over us.â€™™" Luke 19

Here's yet another command from Him having to do with rule and authority.

And Moses spoke to the heads of the tribes concerning the children of Israel, saying, This is the thing which the LORD HATH COMMANDED. If a man shall vow a vow to the LORD, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond; he shall not break his word; he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth.

If a woman also shall vow a vow to the LORD, and bind herself by a bond, being in her father's house in her youth; And her father shall hear her vow, and her bond with which she hath bound her soul, and her father shall hold his peace at her: then all her vows shall stand, and every bond with which she hath bound her soul shall stand. But if her father shall disallow her in the day that he heareth; not any of her vows or of her bonds with which she hath bound her soul shall stand: and the LORD shall forgive her, because her father disallowed her.

And if she had a husband when she vowed, or uttered ought from her lips, with which she bound her soul; And her husband heard it, and held his peace at her in the day that he heard it: then her vows shall stand, and her bonds with which she bound her soul shall stand. But if her husband disallowed her on the day that he heard it; then he shall make of no effect her vow which she vowed, and that which she uttered with her lips, with which she bound her soul: and the LORD shall forgive her.

But every vow of a widow, and of her that is divorced, with which they have bound their souls, shall stand against her. And if she vowed in her husband's house, or bound her soul by a bond with an oath; And her husband heard it, and held his peace at her, and disallowed her not: then all her vows shall stand, and every bond with which she bound her soul shall stand. But if her husband hath utterly made them void on the day he heard them; then whatever proceeded out of her lips concerning her vows, or concerning the bond of her soul, shall not stand: her husband hath made them void; and the LORD shall forgive her.

Every vow, and every binding oath to afflict the soul, her husband may establish it, or her husband may make it void. But if her husband altogether holds his peace at her from day to day; then he establisheth all her vows, or all her bonds, which are upon her: he confirmeth them, because he held his peace at her in the day that he heard them. But if he shall in any way make them void after that he hath heard them; then he shall bear her iniquity.

These are the statutes which the LORD commanded Moses, between a man and his wife, between the father and his daughter, being yet in her youth in her father's house. Numbers 30

Re: , on: 2016/7/9 6:25

I want a new translation, from male AND female Hebrew and Greek scholars, doing what God intended, that is, working together so that there is no bias from either side. There is nothing wrong with the original texts, it's the bias in translation that is the problem.

For example, there is a heavy emphasis on sexual sin in scripture, but for women, they generally do not have the temptations and lusts that are common in the male. Married women will frequently say they would rather have a bar of chocolate than you. Women are no less sinners, but their sins lie in other areas.

Time for change and no, it is not enough William to try to find common ground. This failure needs a complete ground shaking overhaul and I believe that we will need to be forced into it but there are encouraging signs that men are slowly becoming enlightened. Julius yes it impedes the prayers of men.

Re: , on: 2016/7/9 7:15

savannah quoted: 7-9 For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not from the woman, but the woman from the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man. 1 COR. 11

"THE SOPHISTRY OF THE VEIL

216. We can prove that the usual interpretation of St. Paul's words about veiling is wrong, because it is a misfit a

It around. Please read over carefully 1 Corinthians 11:1-16, and keep your Bibles open to the passage while we study it. The usual sense (not ours) put upon these words by expositors, beginning with verse 3, we give in the language of Dr. Weymouth's Modern English translation: (3) "I would have you know that of every man, Christ is the Head, that of a woman her husband is the Head, and that God is Christ's Head. (4) A man who wears a veil praying or prophesying dishonors his Head; (5) but a woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her Head, for it is exactly the same as if she had her hair cut short. (6) If a woman will not wear a veil, let her also cut off her hair, but since it is a dishonor to a woman to have her hair cut off or her head shaved, let her wear a veil. (7)

For a man ought not to have a veil on his head, since he is the image and glory of God: while woman is the glory of man. (8) Man does not take his origin from woman, but woman takes hers from man. (9) For man was not created for woman's sake, but woman for man's. (10) That is why a woman ought to have on her head a symbol of subjection, because of the angels. (11) Yet, in the Lord, woman is not independent of man nor man independent of woman, (12) For just as woman originates from man, so also man comes into existence through woman, but everything springs originally from God. (13) Judge of this for your own selves: is it seemly for a woman to pray to God when she is unveiled? (14) Does not nature itself teach you that if a man has long hair it is a dishonor to him, (15) but if a woman has long hair it is her glory, because her hair was given to her for a covering? (16) But if anyone is inclined to be contentious on this point, we have no such custom, nor have the Churches of God."

217. MISFIT 1. Now please note, first of all, that at verse 10, first clause, Dr. Weymouth substitutes something totally different from what the text says. The text reads, "ought to have power," while Dr. Weymouth, following the usual interpretation, says, "ought to have... a symbol of subjection." The original word for "power," here, is *exousia*, meaning authority, right; the same word for "power," and preposition for on, *epi*, (often translated "over"), with the same construction, will be found in many places, for instance, Revelation 11:6, "They have power over waters to turn them to blood." And 90 likewise in Matthew, Mark and Luke, in the sentence, "The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins." Furthermore, the original text here has never been called into question; the reading is as simple as it could possibly be, "The woman ought to have power over (rendered "on" in the English Versions) her head." No scholar questions this.

218. At this place, the Authorized Version introduces the longest Marginal Note to be found in the whole Bible. Where Paul says, "ought to have power," the Note reads, "That is, a covering in sign that she is under the power of her husband." This is certainly a most extraordinary substitute for the words of Scripture. Had it read merely, that she was to be "under power," even that would have been a contradiction of the explicit statement of St. Paul; but they add to this contradicting thought: The woman is not only expected to yield to authority, instead of wielding authority, but also to "wear a sign" that she renounces the authority Paul gives her. And not only is she to renounce that authority, but to renounce it in favor of a particular person, her husband. The Bible St. Paul says nothing of this sort, but the Marginal Note, and the Bible Commentators teach it. For our part, we think it suspicious because that husbands, not wives, have discovered this extraordinary meaning for St. Paul's words. If indeed a woman should wear "a sign of subjection" (and scholars can produce no Scriptural proof that a veil is a sign of subjection), then why should it not rather be a sign of subjection to God, whom she serves in prophesying, or whom she addresses in prayer? Why is the husband thrust in by husbands, at this point? Dr. J. W. Thirtle makes the sensible remark here, "The context puts in no plea for anyone outside the woman: it is THE WOMAN'S OWN AUTHORITY that is in question, and the Apostle defends it with his decisive OUGHT." (The capitals are Dr. Thirtle's.)

219. This phrase in verse 10 is manifestly a conclusion the ergo of all the foregoing arguments of the passage. Now we ask, If you were arguing a point, would you, or would you not, know the point you were arguing? Certainly you would know it. And would you know how to state your point? Certainly, even if you could not argue it, for you have your right mind. St. Paul was a highly intelligent person, and to pretend that he knew how to argue a point, but could not express the point in plain words, is puerile. Whether Paul knew how to argue clearly or not, he knew how to state what he was

arguing about, or St. Paul's intelligence was far below the average man's. And when we believe that St. Paul was inspired by the Holy Spirit in what he wrote, then we must yield at once that verse 10 means what it says, and we dare not reject its teaching for the "vain traditions of men."

https://godswordtowomen.files.wordpress.com/2010/10/gods_word_to_women1.pdf

Re: , on: 2016/7/9 7:32

Paul said that men would twist his words.

So which camp is twisting his words? The camp that wishes to continue in the gross wrong doings that have been committed by the church in suppressing women, based on the shocking views of those who have been instrumental in Bible interpretation? Those who want to deny the accusations of the wronged because man resists change and does not like to lose power and control?

Or the victims of the suppression which is found extensively in the non Christian world and are claiming that it has invaded the church as well?

Savannah asked me to answer the verses he is quoting and I ask him to comment on the quotations of the church fathers that I have quoted. Sauce for the goose.

Re: , on: 2016/7/9 7:45

savannah

Using OT regulations and laws is clutching at straws.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2016/7/9 10:58

I don't know why, we just can't let it go! Unless you're going to be standing at the judgement seat of these women, why do we have to cause a riot over all this?

Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2016/7/9 14:07

Isn't it more important that God has designed us and created us, doesn't he know best

Re: clutching at straws - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/15 8:00

Brenda says,

"savannah Using OT regulations and laws is clutching at straws."

According to Brenda, Jesus was clutching at straws.

NEW TESTAMENT record shows that Jesus referenced the OT 84 times. And that is just what we have from NT record!

Re: , on: 2016/7/15 11:05

Quote:

-----Brenda says,

"savannah Using OT regulations and laws is clutching at straws."

According to Brenda, Jesus was clutching at straws.

NEW TESTAMENT record shows that Jesus referenced the OT 84 times. And that is just what we have from NT record!

Oh wow! I think you are using a logical fallacy against Brenda, in order to attack her, Savannah.

But which one, I am trying to figure out.

1. You could be setting up a Strawman.

You misrepresented someone's argument to make it easier to attack.

2. You are getting real close to an ad hominem,

You attacked your opponent's character or personal traits in an attempt to undermine their argument. Granted, you did not really do it, but in veiled language you are casting aspersions on Brenda by stating how she thinks of Jesus.

3. But maybe you are just "moving the goalposts", by reframing Brenda's reply and concluding that she thinks Jesus was clutching at straws when she has never given any indication of that.

I don't know which one, I just know that something does not feel pure about your answer.

Bottom line, your answer shows that you have no intention of conversing with her on an equal basis, believer with believer, hence the veiled implications meant to make her look flighty.

Re: - posted by tonysmith (), on: 2016/7/15 11:23

I read in scriptures that a man can experience the pains of childbirth !!
shall we discuss or leave that one alone!...

Also

Galatians 3:28 New International Version (NIV)

28 There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

We are all Abrahams seed and all heirs together with Christ. Male or Female.
However, I wouldn't attend a church where all the leaders were female,.

Re: Arguments - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/15 14:51

Savannah,

It's apparent that there are some here who do not want to hear the simple and pure word of the Lord on this matter. I find your position to be in conformity to the plainly revealed will of God and the mind of Christ, but there comes a point where continuing to argue the point is futile.

Trust me, I don't say this as one who is overly mature or pious - I am still learning this lesson myself (most often the "hard" way).

I categorically disagree with others remarks about ad hominem and the like...and I feel the handling of arguments and people (i.e, who is seen as "attacking" and who receives rebuke and who doesn't) is biased by the position particular people hold in the debate (and I feel this is becoming glaringly obvious).

To criticize and accuse one of "ad hominem" for drawing a conclusion based on the persons own words and position, and yet never to address the clear and repeated slanderous accusations of "mysogyny" - shouts "bias" and "partiality in judgement" in my eyes...

Scripture is clear, and those who reject the headship of the man in the marriage and the clear leadership role in the church are...well scripture is clear about them as well. I'll just leave it at that.

That day will reveal all. No?

...And the Galatians 3:28 proof text comes out again...

Foolish. It really is.

I have seen a whole lot of hermeneutical gymnastics and contortion on this topic, in my eyes anyhow.

Savannah, the Lord bless you and for your humble faithfulness to His word - and may He grant some repentance before they harden their hearts too far...

Re: OT + NT = YHWH - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/15 14:53

No logical fallacies nor attacks Julie!

Jesus had no issue with the OT, nor with the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures as Brenda appears to have.

We've moved from equity feminism to gender feminism. Satan is subtle but his venom is deadly. Authority has been what he hated most from the beginning. This sin he brought into the garden and continues to promote such rebellion to authority even to this day.

Re: Question for "brenda7" - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/15 15:25

Julius21,

You say:

Quote:
-----"Bottom line, your answer shows that you have no intention of conversing with her on an equal basis, believer with believer..."

Yet Brenda has ignored my questions presented to her as an opportunity to clear the air and avoid people from drawing wrong conclusions about her by misunderstanding her words:

Quote:
-----brenda7,

Given the context of the discussion, the "principles" that you are applauding are of an Egalitarian nature...is this a fair inference on my part? If so, it stands to reason that the "persecuting side" are those who disagree with his Egalitarian views - thus Complementarians. Is this also a fair inference?

If so:

Incur wrath? Such as what? Having his house or church burned down? Torture? Murder? Stoning? Beheading? I have never heard of a Complementarian ("misogynist" or otherwise) doing any of the above to an Egalitarian in my lifetime.

Such sensationalism is careless, irresponsible and unprofitable at best - and nefarious, slanderous and deceptive at worst.

"Persecuting side"? Please do explain who you are referring to here, if you would. Who in the Christian world is currently truly "persecuting" (in the true definition of the word) other Christians?

Or more simply:

Quote:
-----"brenda7, would you please clarify your position? Do you believe all Complementarians are "misogynists"?"

And you yourself seem to do the same thing; namely, avoid direct questions pertaining to your position and previous claims:

Quote:
-----"Julius21,
Do you admit that accusations were prevalent among the comments of brenda7 (contrary to your earlier statement implying that none were)? Do you honestly deny that she was broad brush labeling people with a different view than her as misogynists? And are you sincere that you "don't know why" I was applying the accusations and slanderous propaganda to myself?

I want to give you the opportunity to speak for yourself and leave no doubt concerning your position.

I find it to be very plainly evident that the sister was labeling anyone who rejected her form of Egalitarianism a "misogynist".

So my questions to you are:

1) Who is it that really "no intention of conversing...on an equal basis, believer with believer"?

And

2) Who is it that is truly acting "flighty"?

If you would, for equity and truth's sake, can you and Brenda both clear the air by honestly answering the two questions numbered above?

And then, if you would, please address the ones I quoted from earlier comments that weren't ever even acknowledged, much less answered.

Thank you kindly.

Re: - posted by followthelamb (), on: 2016/7/15 17:44

Dear Brenda,

Those scriptures about the original sin of woman and also the required submission of women in specific areas...if The Lord Himself were to appear to you tonight and tell you that those verses were not twisted by misogynistic men, but that He indeed is asking us to lay down our rights rather than fight for them during our brief time in the flesh...would that change how you feel about Him or His Word, His justice?

I do realize that you believe the scriptures have been twisted, and you are wanting to help those who are oppressed or mistreated, but IF He suddenly revealed clearly and unmistakably that they were not twisted but that He expects an absolute denial of self and rights, how would that change your view of things?

There is no doubt about God's heart for the oppressed, the orphans, widows, the poor, the mistreated...but is it in this life we look for justice and fairness or do we wait for the age to come when He restores all things?

Re: , on: 2016/7/16 3:56

Dear FTL

I would not say purposely twisted in every case, but it is a known fact that all persons have a bias, male and female, and this applies to women translating scripture on their own too. God gave the man and the woman equal responsibility in the beginning to tend His creation, each being one half of the whole and this should apply to translating His word and even more so.

Again, the curse declared upon women, to be ruled, should be acknowledged as lifted for those in His kingdom where all are equal, though we will not be able to demand justice and fairness outside of the church. They live by their own standards. We can only pray for the salvation of the oppressors and the oppressed and support legislation whenever we can.

During revivals this is always a result. The great Quaker revival resulted in better conditions for prisoners. The later revivals ended slavery.

Of course I believe in denial of ones self and rights as a condition of being in the kingdom, but this should go both ways. It means that men have no rights to rule women and should treat them as equals instead, in the correct scripural role of leadership that is to serve them as the weaker beings as protectors and champions when they are mistreated and not like Adam who blamed his wife first then blamed God because of the sin of wanting pre-eminance. I don't believe in fighting for rights, but I do believe in naming perversions and misinterpretation of scripture.

I am greatly concerned that God says that mens prayers will not be prevented from answers if they persist in sin.

Re: , on: 2016/7/16 4:37

Hello Forrest

I apologise for the unanswered questions. I have to confess that not kept up well, and thought that I had answered them, in that I declared my position as not being a feminist and that although men and women are equal in God's sight, they have different roles, neither being of more importance than the other and that man is to be the head and leader of his family.

I don't recall this as being acknowledged however, with the implications being made that I do not accept the differing roles of men and women and that I support the feminist cause. I already said that I believe that the radical side has caused much damage.

I took exception to the title of this thread by savannah - that men are to rule over women, which is a perversion of what did happen, that is to say that God pronounced a curse on mankind that was out of fellowship with Him and banished from the kingdom, and that the curse is lifted when men come back into the kingdom and the original role for men and women once again applies, in woman and man are to work together in their roles of serving God.

The belief that men are to continue to rule, and that is interpreted by many as women being required to subject themselves to men, has even affected how men treat women outside of the church and is long overdue for a remake like what has happened regarding slavery, and other forms of abuse that the church has allowed in its midst.

It would have even helped the discussion, if you and savannah had admitted that the church fathers have said some pretty outrageous things about women being inferior and that their influence would continue in the church.

I did challenge savannah to comment on these quotes but he has ignored my request or overlooked it so I am not the only one who is failing to engage with what has been said.

If you would like to prove that misogyny has not existed in the church and has not caused countless problems, not least of all the problem that God points to in the prayers of men not being answered who persist in this then I would like to hear.

If you would like to say that you admit of the problem and agree that it is some thing that needs to be tackled, in a manner suitable to those in the kingdom, which involves not resorting to the tactics outlined in that excellent thread by Tozsu on "Thou shalt not commit logical fallacies", thank you Tozsu.

As Julius has said, thank you Julius for that, savannah has committed some of the LF's in answer to my statement here:

"Brenda wrote, savannah Using OT regulations and laws is clutching at straws. "

"savannah wrote, According to Brenda, Jesus was clutching at straws.

NEW TESTAMENT record shows that Jesus referenced the OT 84 times. And that is just what we have from NT record!

"

This was his reply:

"Oh wow! I think you are using a logical fallacy against Brenda, in order to attack her, Savannah.

But which one, I am trying to figure out.

1. You could be setting up a Strawman.

You misrepresented someone's argument to make it easier to attack.

2. You are getting real close to an ad hominem,

You attacked your opponent's character or personal traits in an attempt to undermine their argument. Granted, you did not really do it, but in veiled language you are casting aspersions on Brenda by stating how she thinks of Jesus.

3. But maybe you are just "moving the goalposts", by reframing Brenda's reply and concluding that she thinks Jesus was clutching at straws when she has never given any indication of that." END OF QUOTE

If you and Savannah are conversely claiming that yes there has been a problem in the church, and still is, but we ourselves are not guilty, then the previous quote by Savannah has not gone one inch towards showing that and neither have previous discussions on SI about this matter.

As Jesus said, "those who are not for us are against us."

Please make your positions clear: do you condemn the mistreatment of women that has taken place in the church from the early days and would you like to see the end of it?

Re: , on: 2016/7/16 5:00

Question: if Adam and Eve were acting in the perfection of God's ruling for male and female interactions and roles, why did he not 'rule' over her when she took the fruit to eat? He was right beside her as scripture tells us yet the church has claimed right down through the ages that Eve committed the first sin and is to blame for the fall of creation.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2016/7/16 10:06

Haven't read this thread, but I can tell by the name and almost 70 posts, I bet it's been real edifying to the body of Christ. Carry on soldiers.

Re: - posted by followthelamb (), on: 2016/7/16 13:09

Hi Brenda,

Thank you for your thoughtful response. You asked: "...He was right beside her as scripture tells us yet the church has claimed right down through the ages that Eve committed the first sin and is to blame for the fall of creation."

Respectfully and with love in Christ Jesus, I would only say that in this case the church taught this through the ages because the Word of God clearly and absolutely teaches that sin first entered the world through Eve, the woman.

To go beyond and speculate how Adam failed to protect her and that the first sin is therefore his...goes beyond and even contrary to what God the Holy Spirit clearly says in the Holy Scriptures. With this kind of reasoning one could ask then is the sin God's for not protecting both Adam and Eve since God rules over all? God forbid! For there is no sin in Him not even will be as we know. I just want, as a sister, to address the reasoning you present in this case with all respect for the sake of any new Christians who may be reading.

The Bible emphatically traces and states that the woman was the first to transgress.

When something is addressed in the Word of God in both old and new testaments please let us stand upon His Word even if it is absolutely against the wisdom of our best human intentions.

Re: , on: 2016/7/16 13:17

Hello FTL

Thank you for your graceful reply.

However, it is a myth that Eve sinned first as scripture says that it was through the sin of Adam that death entered the world, not Eve who was deceived though later sinned.

"For since by man came death, by Man also came the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive.

And so it is written, "The first man Adam became a living being." The last Adam became a life-giving spirit. (1 Corinthians 15:21-22, 45)

Therefore, just as through one man sin entered the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men, because all sinned.

But the free gift is not like the offense. For if by the one man's offense many died, much more the grace of God and the gift by the grace of the one Man, Jesus Christ, abounded to many.

For if by the one man's offense death reigned through the one, much more those who receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness will reign in life through the One, Jesus Christ. Therefore, as through one man's offense judgment came to all men, resulting in condemnation, even so through one Man's righteous act the free gift came to all men, resulting in justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so also by one Man's obedience many will be made righteous. (Romans 5:12, 15, 17-19)"

Re: - posted by followthelamb (), on: 2016/7/16 13:36

Thank you Brenda I do see the point you're trying to convey but in love I feel compelled to address this problem for the sake of young Christians who will read this. Note: I am well aware of our common Enemy and in am not contending against you personally but against the age old question, "hath God said?"

You say, "it is a myth that Eve sinned first"

But the Bible says:

"For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. " (1 Timothy 2:13,14)

Adam was not deceived by satan...and did not sin until Eve first allowed sin to enter through herself.

"But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." 2 Corinthians 11:3

The issue is : did God really say that Eve became the first transgressor before her husband or not?

This is no myth and no trivial issue but is at the heart of why Jesus our Lord came in the flesh to be slain for us.

Re: , on: 2016/7/16 13:51

Dear Sister

Eve transgressed or broke the law first but did not do so out of rebellion. She became a transgressor because she was deceived, in contrast to Adam who knew what he was doing and showed his rebellion when God called them both to answer. Eve spoke the truth and confessed her transgression and said that she had been deceived but Adam blamed both God and Adam for his action. She had confessed her unintended breaking of the law. Sin is defined in scripture as breaking the known law of God not sins of ignorance. your version is saying that God did not forgive her after confession.

In her reply to the devil she was most likely speaking from a secondary source of the law of God that is to say that it sounded like she was told what God had said and was not told directly and like many cases of hearsay, it was not correct. It does not say in scripture that both she and Adam had been told what they could eat. The instruction as to what they could eat was given before Eve was created so it is conjecture that she knew directly from God.

16 And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat:

17 But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

18 And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him.

Re: , on: 2016/7/16 15:04

That's giving Eve TOO MUCH of an "responsibility escape", While Adam was the most ultimately responsible (he should have been leading, watching over and instructing his wife rightly and not allowing it to happen) & so God came to Him first to Him. But Eve wasn't innocent. That's a fallacy. She was deceived, but as Art Katz said famously, "everyone who is deceived plays an active part in their own deception." Eve knew what God said. Her listening to the devil & choosing to believe & obey Him rather than God (& because the fruit looked good & the promise of superior knowledge appealed to the flesh) was SIN. Adam's sin may have been even greater in knowing more clearly what he was doing willfully, but Eve knew what God said. Sure Adam blamed Eve, but fact is that Eve blamed the devil. To give her an "innocent" pass is not Biblical. If she was innocent, why would God have cursed her with pain in childbirth & the rest of the curse that pertains to her? That makes no sense if she was totally just innocent? The man bears the greatest weight of responsibility as he bears the weight of the authority/headship/leadership. But the woman/wife is still personally responsible for her own individual responses to the Lord. This is true in the Garden, throughout the OT, in the epistles' doctrine, etc.

Re: , on: 2016/7/16 15:08

Followthelamb I believe has made the scriptural point/case well & accurately

Re: - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/16 17:52

Brenda,

You still never answered my questions and asserted once again that women being subject to men (specifically in the case of marriage, which has been the context of my position all along) is not the will of God and is also the cause of the sins of the world. .

That is contrary to the clear and revealed will of God in the word of God. (Ephesians 5:22-24; Colossians 3:18; 1 Peter 3:1-6; 1 Timothy 2:9-15; Titus 2:3-5; 1 Corinthians 11:3; 1 Corinthians 14:34-38)

You claim that the headship of the man over the wife is part of the curse and is done away with in the Lord - which position all of the scriptures above clearly contradict. Is it the case that the part of the curse that fell on man is now removed, here in this age, in Christ? No more getting bread by the sweat of his brow?

Sure, an ungodly wielding of and abuse of authority is sin and symptomatic of the fall and the curse - but not the authority of the man over his wife and his headship over her. The NT scriptures bear this out.

And lastly, I don't have to prove that the things you say happened in the church in the past never have - because that was not the discussion I entered nor was it ever my position.

So, are those who hold to the scriptural view of marriage and leadership in the church as revealed in the above passage

s (Complimentarians such as myself) "mysogynists" in your eyes? Those of us who affirm that God's will is for the wife to "be subject" to her own husband "in everything"...?

Would you please answer that at least?

Re: seed - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/17 0:29

What we read in Romans 5 and 1Cor 15 says nothing of who sinned first. They address the simple principle of the fact of sin passing on to the human race through the male as he carries the seed.

Just as we are of the spiritual seed of Christ, Who is a life giving Spirit, Who has been birthed in us.

The confusion brings you further and further away from the truth, just as taking one wrong turn on a country road takes you hundreds of miles out of the way.

NOTE: Here is a sample of the confusion I speak of which is abounding more and more;

Brenda writes, "However, it is a myth that Eve sinned first as scripture says that it was through the sin of Adam that death entered the world, not Eve who was deceived though later sinned."

Her next post begins thus, "Eve transgressed or broke the law first but did not do so out of rebellion."

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2016/7/17 1:29

Why has satan put it into your heart to lie to the holy spirit...

Was what peter said to anias, and sifira,,, then through the judgment of god they fell down dead and were carried out ,

Being deceived by satan seems to be serious !

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2016/7/17 4:03

I think a major problem with interpretation, is when people take a verse out of the context that it was designed for and make a doctrine out of it when it was clearly not a doctrinal statement ,, the prislia and aquiler, verses were not doctrinal verses but a historical statement about what some said they knew , where as paul and peters letters about the roll of a woman in the church , were doctrinal commands clear cut , we interpret the scripture with clear cut doctrine , and deart cut commands , not the other way around , i herd zack poonan say that once in a sermon , that historically information should never be used to develop a new doctrine that contradicts , or that is not already a doctrine

Biblical doctrine

What does the apostles teach about this subject ???

Any takers ?

Not what did luke record in a situation that occurred

Many things can be said about luke recording that one thing can be said if prislia did teach with authority another man as people are saying , she would have been wrong to do that and even in sin that's if paul or peter taught contrary to that ...

Or ,, luke may have been speaking in general because prislia was with her husband , so he said they but literally aquiler was the one who taught the ways of god to him that would line with the clear cut doctrines of paul and peter

Re: , on: 2016/7/17 10:27

Gary, what do you think about Jackie Pullinger going to Hong Kong on her own and working amongst the drug addicts, leading them to Christ, baptising them in the Holy Spirit (of course God does that), with many, many miracles following. And she taught them the Word of God.

Or what do you think about Corrie Ten Boom, travelling to over 60 countries teaching and preaching about the Lord Jesus?

They did not have any husbands with them. Do we sometimes make our God, too small? These women did not. And there are so many, many other testimonies of God blessing women with signs following. I just don't know how we ignore these witnesses of women who have borne testimonies of integrity and handling the Word of God, properly. Is it the Devil who is blessing them?

Re: , on: 2016/7/17 10:45

I addressed this in the other thread. Jackie, like Amy Carmichael, was a pioneer in a foreign land where there was no real church established. Praise God for her witness! Amy Carmichael did this also, and then at the right time that real men were established, humbly passed the leadership torch to them (wow).

Corrie Ten Boom (one of my favorites in church history) was going around the world sharing what she learned, lived through, the Lord taught her (& the respect of living through a Nazi death Camp with forgiveness and miracles speaks volumes). She didn't start a local church to lead it & teach basic foundational doctrines each Sunday. And frankly, I think the words of Corrie Ten Boom & Jackie Pullinger carry significant weight looking at their lives and testimonies & hearts. As for every woman who starts an Internet blog to jump on what's wrong with men or the church or ESPECIALLY to teach church doctrine - well, that's another story altogether. Everyone these days "presumes to be a teacher" which the Word of God says shouldn't be common or widespread as stricter judgement awaits those who teach. The Internet has turned everyone into "self proclaimed presumptive 'teachers'". As another said, the CLEAR NT doctrinal instruction for the normative role for women in the Body is where you should be starting. But the internet blogging opinionated crowd has no real explanation or teaching on those now do they? No they do not (except attempting to be explaining them away with something basically akin to "Did God really say...?" - and for them Paul specifically stated after discussing women's role and teaching - "If anyone claims to be a prophet or spiritual, let them acknowledge the words I speak to you are from God and not from man").

In Jesus,
Jeff

Re: , on: 2016/7/17 11:10

Quote:
-----by jeffmar1130 on 2016/7/17 10:45:05

I addressed this in the other thread. Jackie, like Amy Carmichael, was a pioneer in a foreign land where there was no real church established.

There were many churches in Hong Kong at the time Jackie was there. We are talking this century, Jackie is in her 60's. Hong Kong is where Stephen Kaung is from. Watchman Nee spent time there. There are plenty of Christian churches there.

Why don't you post some quotes from the sister's blog instead of taking very general swipes at her?

Can you acknowledge the good things she is saying and bringing to light? Have you even read it?

Can you quote where she is "jumping on men"? Presumably you mean, criticizing them. I am a man and don't feel criticized by her as she is speaking about perverted uses of scripture. Do you feel criticized?

Re: , on: 2016/7/17 11:41

No,

This is not about "do you feel criticized?" Lol. ðŸ˜Š Nor is it about me. It Is about the plain spoken clear doctrine of the Word of God. Period.

As far as Jackie/China, I meant there were obviously no men going into that exact sphere & doing what she did. That's what made her a "pioneer" if you will. Not in that way. The heroin junkies where she was going were not being reached by the theology of Watchman Nee shared in churches. For that, I applaud her boldness, obedience & acting on the Love of God!

But that doesn't nullify clear NT Doctrine bro. It just doesn't. Nor does every woman with an opinion in the "blogosphere". Sorry.

God Bless,
Jeff

Re: , on: 2016/7/17 11:59

I have no problem with clear NT doctrine. Never said I did.

Which one of her opinions do you disagree with?

Re: - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/17 15:03

"Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord. For the husband is head of the wife, as also Christ is head of the church; and He is the Savior of the body. Therefore, just as the church is subject to Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything."

- Ephesians 5:22-24 NKJV

"Wives, submit to your own husbands, as is fitting in the Lord."

- Colossians 3:18 NKJV

"Wives, likewise, be submissive to your own husbands, that even if some do not obey the word, they, without a word, may be won by the conduct of their wives, when they observe your chaste conduct accompanied by fear. Do not let your adornment be merely outward--arranging the hair, wearing gold, or putting on fine apparel-- rather let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the incorruptible beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is very precious in the sight of God. For in this manner, in former times, the holy women who trusted in God also adorned themselves, being submissive to their own husbands, as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters you are if you do good and are not afraid with any terror."

- 1 Peter 3:1-6 NKJV

"...in like manner also, that the women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with propriety and moderation, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or costly clothing, but, which is proper for women professing godliness, with good works. Let a woman learn in silence with all submission. And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence. For Adam was formed first, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression. Nevertheless she will be saved in childbearing if they continue in faith, love, and holiness, with self-control."

- 1 Timothy 2:9-15 NKJV

"...the older women likewise, that they be reverent in behavior, not slanderers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things-- that they admonish the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, home makers, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be blasphemed."

- Titus 2:3-5 NKJV

"But I want you to know that the head of every man is Christ, the head of woman is man, and the head of Christ is God."

- 1 Corinthians 11:3 NKJV

"Let your women keep silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak; but they are to be submissive, as the law also says. And if they want to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for women to speak in church. Or did the word of God come originally from you? Or was it you only that it reached? If anyone thinks

himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things which I write to you are the commandments of the Lord. But if anyone is ignorant, let him be ignorant."
- 1 Corinthians 14:34-38 NKJV

Re: , on: 2016/7/19 9:42

Forrest

This will be the last time I respond to you on this issue as you continue to misrepresent my views.

A man is to be the head and leader of his family. I do not name brothers as misogynists but I will speak against that spirit which is common in the church. That spirit will say that men are to rule over women, in the way it is meant, which is a step further than headship.

In the world today, there is a revival of misogyny and a survey has shown that young girls are increasingly saying that they suffer abuse from their boyfriends especially those who are influenced by gangster rap and are forced into sexual deviations as normal practice.

As we have heard from David Pawson, what the church says does have an effect on the world for example John 3:16, and if the world hears that men are to rule over women, then that will give the misogynists more fuel.

Instead Christian men should be speaking out against the abuse of women outside of the church and indeed inside it. The rates for domestic violence amongst pastors wives has risen exponentially these last 10 years.

God said that the curse of rule by men was ended in the NC when He said that there is now no male or female, Jew or gentile but He did not say that the soil would be now easier to tend.

Re: , on: 2016/7/19 9:46

savannah

Quote:

-----NOTE: Here is a sample of the confusion I speak of which is abounding more and more;

Brenda writes, "However, it is a myth that Eve sinned first as scripture says that it was through the sin of Adam that death entered the world, not Eve who was deceived though later sinned."

Her next post begins thus, "Eve transgressed or broke the law first but did not do so out of rebellion."

Sins are those actions which are known to be against the law of God. Eve was deceived into thinking that God did not say not to touch the fruit. It is an assumption to think that God had told her, moreover. She sinned out of ignorance and therefore a transgressor but not a sinner.

Re: Everyone who commits sin also breaks the law; sin is the breaking of law. - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/20 8:45

Brenda, you continue to make up your own theological system. You say,

"Sins are those actions which are known to be against the law of God."

And also that Eve was,

"... a transgressor but not a sinner."

In a prior post you said,

"Eve transgressed or broke the law first..."

What confusion is this!

What contradiction!

If you'd hear what God hath said, you'd repent of this and much more of your false teaching your attempting to promote to others. Stop following in the footsteps of Eve, trying to get others to eat the fruit of your bad doctrine.

Hear the Word of the LORD,

Everyone who commits sin also breaks the law; sin is the breaking of law. 1 John 3:4

Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.

Re: , on: 2016/7/20 12:11

Quote:

-----2016/7/19 9:42:52

Forrest

This will be the last time I respond to you on this issue as you continue to misrepresent my views.

A man is to be the head and leader of his family. I do not name brothers as misogynists but I will speak against that spirit which is common in the church. That spirit will say that men are to rule over women, in the way it is meant, which is a step further than headship.

Very clear and excellent distinction that you draw, Brenda.

Headship is so much different than "ruling" over other people.

Many men don't understand biblical headship and yet we have Christ as Head of the Church as our example.

Re: Headship - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/20 14:22

Quote:

-----by Julius21 on 2016/7/20 9:11:30

Headship is so much different than "ruling" over other people.

May I ask plainly: Is Christ the head of man and the church? And if so, as such: does He rule him and it?

"But I want you to know that the head of every man is Christ, the head of woman is man, and the head of Christ is God."
~ 1 Corinthians 11:3

"Wives, submit to your own husbands, _as to the Lord._ For the husband is head of the wife, *as also Christ is head of the church,* and He is the Savior of the body. Therefore, *just as the church is subject to Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything.*"
~ Ephesians 5:22-24

Re: Misrepresenting Views - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/20 14:27

Quote:

-----by brenda7 on 2016/7/19 6:42:52

Forrest

This will be the last time I respond to you on this issue as you continue to misrepresent my views.

How so? I apologize if that is the case. I have been asking you to be up front and answer my questions concerning your views; largely to no avail...

Do you view men who hold to the scriptures I posted below as written, as head over their wives as Christ is over the church, as "misogynists"?

Re: Headship: ruling? - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/20 14:57

Quote:
-----by brenda7 on 2016/7/19 6:42:52
A man is to be the head and leader of his family. I do not name brothers as misogynists but I will speak against that spirit which is common in the church. That spirit will say that men are to rule over women, in the way it is meant, which is a step further than headship.

You seem to assert that (and correct me if I'm wrong):

1) Headship is not considered "ruling over".

and

2) That for one to "rule over" another is always wrong.

Is this your position? And if so, can you support this position with scripture?

I would assert that headship (in love and gentleness, of course; albeit with boldness, courage and steadfast resolve when need be), submission and subjection are the will of God for man.

Ultimately the Headship of Christ for eternity, and our submission and subjection to Him - but here and now, for the time being, the headship of man over his wife and family and their submission and subjection to him.

Re: , on: 2016/7/20 21:46

Quote:
-----by forrests on 2016/7/20 14:22:45

Quote:
-----by Julius21 on 2016/7/20 9:11:30
Headship is so much different than "ruling" over other people.

May I ask plainly: Is Christ the head of man and the church? And if so, as such: does He rule him and it?

Hi forrest,

I wrote a long, thoughtful, biblical response, but lost the page. I had a long day and too tired to recreate it.

Re: , on: 2016/7/21 12:05

Quote:

-----forrests wrote:

1) Headship is not considered "ruling over".

and

2) That for one to "rule over" another is always wrong.

Is this your position? And if so, can you support this position with scripture?

Tell me what you mean by rule over - I mean give some examples.

Quote:

-----Ultimately the Headship of Christ for eternity, and our submission and subjection to Him - but here and now, for the time being, the headship of man over his wife and family and their submission and subjection to him.

No. The headship of Christ is for now and is for the whole family, men included - now.

Is a woman to be ruled if her husband is outside of the will of God?

Quote:

-----Do you view men who hold to the scriptures I posted below as written, as head over their wives as Christ is over the church, as "misogynists"?

Men are to be the head of the family - I repeat. Men who regard women as inferior to them are misogynists.

It is plain that there are some men on this forum who think that women are inferior when they will not say anything regarding the quotations I made from the church fathers who were saying that women are inferior. It has obviously not shocked them to hear their views so one must assume them to be in agreement with them.

I have to wonder why the moderators allow those with such views on a Christian forum.

Re: , on: 2016/7/21 12:08

Quote:

-----savannah on 2016/7/20 8:45:44

Brenda, you continue to make up your own theological system. You say,

"Sins are those actions which are known to be against the law of God."

And also that Eve was,

"... a transgressor but not a sinner."

In a prior post you said,

""Eve transgressed or broke the law first..."

What confusion is this!
What contradiction!

If you'd hear what God hath said, you'd repent of this and much more of your false teaching your attempting to promote to others. Stop following in the footsteps of Eve, trying to get others to eat the fruit of your bad doctrine.

Hear the Word of the LORD,

Everyone who commits sin also breaks the law; sin is the breaking of law. 1 John 3:4

Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.

Quote:

-----Everyone who commits sin also breaks the law; sin is the breaking of law. 1 John 3:4

The verse is saying that that you can break the law and not sin. Sin is the breaking of the law also - both but you can break the law without intent.

Re: , on: 2016/7/21 12:20

Nowhere in scripture does it say that Eve sinned first. Adam sinned and sin entered the world because of him, not because he carried the 'seed' but because he sinned.

1. "Adam was not deceived," 1 Timothy 2:14.
 2. "In Adam all die," I Corinthians 15:22.
 3. "By one man sin entered into the world" - Romans 5:12.
 4. "Through the offense of one many be dead" Romans 5:15
 5. "it was by one that sinned," Romans 5:16
 6. "The judgment was by one to condemnation," Romans 5:16
 7. "By one man's offense death reigned"
 8. "by one" Romans 5:1
 9. "By the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation," Romans 5:18
 10. "By one man's disobedience" - Romans 5:19.
 11. "Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of Him that was to come." Romans 5:14.
- "By the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation," Romans 5:18 (Bushell)

Please quote the verse that says he only sinned because he carried the seed.

Re: Brenda - "Rule Over" and other issues and questions. - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/21 13:29

Quote:

-----Tell me what you mean by rule over - I mean give some examples.

Well, instead of examples, here is the Strong's definition of the original Hebrew word used in Genesis 3:16.

Original Word: רָבָה

Part of Speech: Verb

Transliteration: mashaal
Phonetic Spelling: (maw-shal')
Short Definition: rule

Definition: to rule, have dominion, reign

NASB Translation

dominion (1), gain control (1), govern (1), had charge (1), have authority (1), master (1), obtain dominion (1), really going to rule (1), rule (27), ruled (5), ruler (18), ruler's (2), rulers (6), rules (9), ruling (3), wielded (1).

That says it better than I could. Does that help?

I said:

Quote:
-----Ultimately the Headship of Christ for eternity, and our submission and subjection to Him - but here and now, for the time being, the headship of man over his wife and family and their submission and subjection to him.

You say:

Quote:
-----No. The headship of Christ is for now and is for the whole family...

The scripture says:

Quote:
-----But I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman, and God is the head of Christ.
~ 1 Cor. 11:3

And:

Quote:
-----Wives, be subject to your own husbands, as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the church, He Himself being the Savior of the body. But as the church is subject to Christ, so also the wives ought to be to their husbands in everything.
~ Eph. 5:22-24

So, to clarify: Christ is the Head of the church, which includes women - so in that way He is certainly Head of the woman too; but the scripture is clear that in a more tangible and immediate sense (and only under/in agreement with Christ's Headship) the man is the head of his wife.

You continue:

Quote:
-----"...men included - now."

Amen, I say, "men included"! The scripture is clear about this:

Quote:
-----"But I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man..."
~1 Cor. 11:3a

You ask:

Quote:
-----Is a woman to be ruled if her husband is outside of the will of God?

The scripture answers:

Quote:
-----"In the same way, you wives, be submissive to your own husbands so that even if any of them are disobedient to the word, they may be won without a word by the behavior of their wives, as they observe your chaste and respectful behavior.
~1 Peter 3:1-2

So, yes; a woman is also to submit to her unbelieving/disobedient (to the word) husband.

May I also add that the "In the same way" in the above passage seems to be referencing chapter 2 verses 15-25; which, if carefully read, helps shed some light on the matter.

But to clarify: Should a woman obey her husband if he is clearly telling her to sin?

Scripture says:

Quote:
-----Act as free men, and do not use your freedom as a covering for evil, but use it as bondslaves of God. Honor all people, love the brotherhood, fear God, honor the king.
~1 Peter 2:16-17

And:

Quote:
-----But Peter and the apostles answered, "We must obey God rather than men."
~Acts 5:29

So, the answer to whether a wife or "virgin daughter" (or any person for that matter) ought to obey a human head (such as a husband/father/or even king) when he is clearly requiring them to rebel against the revealed will and word of their Divine Head is a clear and resounding: "No!"

You go on:

Quote:
-----It is plain that there are some men on this forum who think that women are inferior when they will not say anything regarding the quotations I made from the church fathers who were saying that women are inferior. It has obviously not shocked them to hear their views so one must assume them to be in agreement with them.

To make an argument that a person hates women (or views them as inferior) simply because of what he has not said in regard to some quotes from ancient Christians is unrighteous and likely sin.

I didn't comment on (nor even thoroughly read) the quotes you posted. I have multiple reasons for both (choosing neither to read nor comment on them).

If you'd like to hear my reasons, you can ask - I'd be glad to share them with you.

And finally:

Quote:
-----I have to wonder why the moderators allow those with such views on a Christian forum.

Are you advocating for the censorship of people based on nothing more than what you perceive they believe based largely on their choice not to respond to something you posted online?

Not good...

Re: Sin is the breaking of the law. - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/21 13:38

Quote:
-----The verse is saying that that you can break the law and not sin. Sin is the breaking of the law also - both but you can break the law without intent.

What about this?

Hebrews 9:6-7:

Now when these things have been so prepared, the priests are continually entering the outer tabernacle performing the divine worship, but into the second, only the high priest enters once a year, not without taking blood, which he offers for himself and for the ****sins of the people committed in ignorance.****

Even their transgressions of the law in ignorance needed blood atonement and they are translated as "sin of ignorance" in the NASB, NKJV and the NIV.

The word translated as "sins of ignorance" is:

agnoŹma: a sin of ignorance

Definition: an offence committed through ignorance, an error due to (willful or culpable) ignorance.

Link: <http://biblehub.com/greek/51.htm>

Link: <http://biblehub.com/nas/hebrews/9.htm>

Re: , on: 2016/7/21 16:16

All very well said (& Biblical) Forrests:

The sneaky thing of feminism in thinking (if done "in ignorance" is still sin as the old saying goes and scripture confirms - "ignorance of the law is no excuse in a court of law") is that if wrongly perceived is taken as "holding one back" or whatever, but it's actually freeing (God's design ALWAYS is). And in the same way submitting to the authority of Christ is viewed wrongly by the world but is freeing. Or submission is counted as "harsh, abusive" or whatever (which may be the case in some out of balance contexts no doubt), but can just be an innate rejection of the total dependence & humbling in God's design too. I ALWAYS had a MAJOR problem with authority (parents, bosses, the Law - as in the legal system) before Christ. But once I got Born again and read the Word and allowed its truths to penetrate deeply, problem solved. Sometimes it's nearly instant & sometimes it's more engrained (like a feministic mindset can be) & takes time.

Interesting thing is that people make wrong assumptions often of what this means and looks like. For example, my wife is going through Carolyn Mahaney's book right now, "Feminine Appeal". Someone could see that and say, "yep, he's Lording it over her to keep her under His thumb" wrongly perceiving it because of pre-existing internal bias. Fact is, I didn't ask her to do anything. The Lord led her to pick it back up and go through it. Without any influence from me. Elizabeth Elliot & many of the "older women" in the faith (like Titus 2 speaks of) wrote of such things. But we all have grown up in a society & even a largely "Christian/Church culture" deeply influenced by Feminism & all its subtle tentacles. That may be blown out of proportion or misperceived by some, but it's Biblical. Forrests has done an excellent job showing & explaining that. ŒŸ~%ŒŸ•

God Bless,
Jeff

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2016/7/21 20:23

This is what we say down yonder here on the farm. "Gal's, if you treat your Man like a King, he'll treat you like a Queen.

Re: , on: 2016/7/21 20:58

Eph 5:25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;

Christ loves us NOT based on how we love Him,,,thankfully.

Think of all the many ways that Christ loves His Church... This is how we love our wives.

Re: , on: 2016/7/21 22:09

This is true. But again, that's only one side of the coin. To deny one side of the coin while focusing on the other is to treat the Word of God deceitfully. That may be a little strong. I don't mean to imply a bad motive. But it at least totally out of balance and is not "rightly dividing the Word of truth". It's like those who focus on only the Love of God & never touch on the Wrath to come. Or to only preach on heaven and never hell. Or anything else. The kindness of God while neglecting the severity of God. Or preaching the Love husbands should have for their wives (a good and true thing) while shying away from the submission & respect a woman is called to).

Re: , on: 2016/7/21 22:25

Eph 5:25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;

Re: , on: 2016/7/21 23:25

Yep,

Amen. Let that sink in and be put into practice! And, let's also not neglect the three verses that directly precede verse 25 in the church (in the Christian family) as well:

22Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord. 23For the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Savior. 24Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit in everything to their husbands.

Both sides of the coin are like a chair with 4 legs instead of 2-3 legs (imbalanced and bound to tip over at some point)

Re: , on: 2016/7/21 23:26

As men, let's just concentrate on what God said to us and leave the other verses that were not spoken to us to the women. Those verses are not given to men to hang over their wives head. Just work on your side of the coin and stop reminding your wife about her side. Don't treat them like idiots.

Re: , on: 2016/7/22 1:10

Tell that to Paul who penned it and the Holy Spirit who said to teach it. Nobody said anything about holding it over. Did you read all the posts?

Teaching it in a wrong spirit maybe generations ago caused it to be rejected against, but the last generation of not faithfully & Biblically teaching on it has allowed the feminist spirit (rebellion) of the world stay in tact within the church too. God forbid.

Re: , on: 2016/7/22 7:58

Unanswered question:

If Adam and Eve were acting in the perfection of God's ruling for male and female interactions and roles before the fall, why did he not 'rule' over her when she took the fruit to eat? He was right beside her, with Satan as scripture tells us yet the church has claimed right down through the ages that Eve committed the first sin and is to blame for the fall of creation.

He had also failed to stop Satan from entering into the garden: he had been told to dress and keep it therefore to act as protector and also of Eve, he failed to protect her from the deception of Satan though scripture says he was there at the

temptation. He satan and Eve standing together, Adam no doubt already in league with satan, as he saw his chance of trying out the fruit in a way where he could cast the blame on Eve and God. Perhaps arranged by him?

He did not name the cause, which was satan. Eve did so, she said it was because of him deceiving her which was the truth. She could have said it was her husbands fault for not warning her that she was being deceived. But she admitted she had taken the fruit and because she blamed satan, she incurred his wrath for eternity. Adam did not because he had sided with satan against God and said YOU gave me the woman.

Quote:

----- wrote forrests : Hebrews 9:6-7:

Now when these things have been so prepared, the priests are continually entering the outer tabernacle performing the divine worship, but into the second, only the high priest enters once a year, not without taking blood, which he offers for himself and for the **sins of the people committed in ignorance.**

Indeed the Lord our God has always treated acts done in ignorance in a different manner to deliberate sins.

Eve did not get cast out of Eden as her husband. She chose to leave with him, desiring her husband rather than the Lord God. There is not one verse that says she was told to leave.

Adam was the first sinner. Eve was set up.

Re: - posted by StirltUp (), on: 2016/7/22 8:10

Hi brothers,

Clearly this is an issue of contention among many of us, probably because we are all at different levels of maturity and understanding. I.O.W. what one means is not necessarily the way the message is received, as it is filtered through our own experience and grasp of the truth. May we all apply ourselves to learn to love as Christ loved / loves the church, as Julius referred to.

Yes, the whole counsel of God must be taught to the church and we should all, men and women be taught to love the scriptures and obey them.

BUT.....I have never found it useful or edifying for a husband to "teach" his wife these principles. In this case, I lean to a agreement with brother Julius.

Men, let us lead by example, loving our wives (not only with words, but in deed and truth / sincerity), living with them in a understanding way, seeking to be sensitive to their needs and meeting them, emotionally and physically. Let us share revelation from the Word with them as equal spiritual heirs and companions, to bless and encourage them, not to talk down to them.

By the way, I am far from the ideal husband, but my heart finds a witness in the Spirit for what I have just written! May we all "pursue" love in all our relationships and show our faith and our spiritual learning by HOW we LOVE!

In His Love.

William

Re: , on: 2016/7/22 8:16

forrests

"NASB Translation

dominion (1), gain control (1), govern (1), had charge (1), have authority (1), master (1), obtain dominion (1), really going to rule (1), rule (27), ruled (5), ruler (18), ruler's (2), rulers (6), rules (9), ruling (3), wielded (1).

That says it better than I could. Does that help?"

No it does not. Is this how Christ deals with us? He gains control of us? A wife will only accept her husband as head if he has gained her respect and admiration. I think you have a perverted sense of what a leader is. Christ said that He came to serve and not be served.

Re: How do you know? - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/22 9:14

Julius,

You say:

Quote:

-----...stop reminding your wife...Don't treat them like idiots.

Why assume anyone is "reminding" their wives and "treating them like idiots"?

And who said anything about "hanging" verses "over their heads"?

In my opinion these words reveal that you have a certain image of what men are acting/leading like when they hold to the truth of the word in this area and that is the reason for your bias against the clear truth.

When it gets too hard to argue the truth of scripture then it appears that you resort to "straw man" tactics and turn the conversation toward a presumed fault in the lives and practice of those on the other side of the discussion (instead of just discussing the objective truth of the word and will of God - as this discussion began).

Also, scripture tells me to teach my wife the word. That includes God's commands to women too...

Re: Hath God said, "Men Love your Wives?", on: 2016/7/22 11:20

Quote:

-----by StirltUp on 2016/7/22 8:10:15

Hi brothers,

Clearly this is an issue of contention among many of us, probably because we are all at different levels of maturity and understanding. I.O.W. what one means is not necessarily the way the message is received, as it is filtered through our own experience and grasp of the truth. May we all apply ourselves to learn to love as Christ loved / loves the church, as Julius referred to.

Yes, the whole counsel of God must be taught to the church and we should all, men and women be taught to love the scriptures and obey them.

BUT.....I have never found it useful or edifying for a husband to "teach" his wife these principles. In this case, I lean to agreement with brother Julius.

Men, let us lead by example, loving our wives (not only with words, but in deed and truth / sincerity), living with them in an understanding way, seeking to be sensitive to their needs and meeting them, emotionally and physically. Let us share revelation from the Word with them as equal spiritual heirs and companions, to bless and encourage them, not to talk down to them.

Thank you, brother.

I believe there has been much teaching for how wives are to respect their husbands, almost to the point of weariness on

their part as many have had their spirits broken, but how much teaching is there on how "Christ loves the Church", for husbands? I know there is some, but the focus always seems to be on the weaknesses and mistakes of the women and they seem to be blamed for all the problems of the husband and the family. Very unfair.

"Adam" is still blaming "Eve" for his sin. He blames her for his bad attitude, pornography addiction, alcohol, drug, sex addictions, outbursts of anger, lack of patience, lack of cherishing of his wife (he says it is actually her fault), lack of politeness, etc, etc. He withholds love and intimacy from her which is very controlling and oppressive. Many Christian men have become insecure and controlling due to lack of desire to love their wives as Christ loves the Church. They have become bitter.

If Eve sinned, why did Adam get the blame?

Eve took the first bite, but Adam was right there, not protecting his wife. Then, when he saw that she was OK, he followed her lead into sin. How cowardly to let her be ambushed. We all share in that as not one of us men have always treated out wives as Christ does His Church.

Eve heard God's rule second hand. If you read carefully, you will see that God gave Adam the commandment, then created Eve. Eve was not even around when God gave the commandment to Adam. Not only that, but Adam was the head of the relationship and should have refused even when Eve told him to eat it. Adam was being tested by God, not Eve. Adam failed the test.

Eve was beguiled by the serpent and deceived, but Adam did nothing to correct the situation or prevent her from carrying out the temptation. Adam allowed Eve to be beguiled and transgress the "eating of the fruit". Then, when God confronted Adam, his first response was, "This woman you gave me..."

God didn't talk to Eve, he spoke to Adam. He told Adam to not eat of the Tree of Knowledge. Adam turned around and told Eve, "don't even touch the tree". Was Adam the first "false teacher" who added to the Word of God? Eve was faithful to Adam to represent that God said not to eat of the fruit, but where did "do not even touch the fruit" come from? Eve has always been blamed for that, but Adam was standing right there and did not correct her. So, it seems he also told her not to touch it. The serpent deceived Eve by showing her that she could touch the tree and not die (which was not part of God's rules for the Garden to begin with)... Sin, in this case, didn't enter the world through Eve, but through Adam because he was taught, directly, by God himself...he was given the responsibility, he was the one being tested, whereas Eve listened to a man and got the wrong information to begin with.

Romans 5:14 Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.

Rom 5:17 For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)

1 Corinthians 15:22 For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

In the end, Eve (regarding the eating of fruit not the touching of it) and Adam are both punished for the transgression. If God had destroyed Eve, Adam would have died of loneliness and the inability to procreate would end the human race. In God's mercy and love for Adam, he allowed Eve to stay. I think you all understand why God could not make a new Eve.

Our sins make us worthy of death (physical and spiritual death), but God offers us a way to avoid spiritual death, by accepting Jesus as a sacrifice in our place.

Through Jesus Christ, relationships are restored and elevated to the quality that God originally had in mind. Husband and Wife do not need to blameshift to one another or seek to control one another by wielding God's Word over each other's head. They should see themselves as "heirs together of life and grace", recognize each other's strengths and realize that they complement one another and should be related to each other in the love of Christ and mutuality.

Our relationships to one another are our witness to the world of the reality of Jesus Christ and the Love of God.

"Two are better than one; because they have a good reward for their labour. For if they fall, the one will lift up his fellow:

but woe to him that is alone when he falleth; for he hath not another to help him up. Again, if two lie together, then they have heat: but how can one be warm alone? And if one prevail against him, two shall withstand him; and a threefold cord (Jesus in the middle) is not quickly broken." (Ecc 4:9-12)

Re: - posted by StirltUp (), on: 2016/7/22 13:46

Thanks Julius for the detailed exposition.

We start growing when we take personal responsibility for our sins and failures and perversions, as and when the Lord reveals these to us.

As men, we must set the example for our wives of the love of Jesus Christ and the redemption found in Him.

Our wives are often a mirror of our own lives...and to my dismay I must confess the image I see is not always pleasing to our loving Lord.

May we all humble ourselves and be taught of the Lord in this part of our lives before Him

In His Love,

Re: Julius - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/22 13:50

Quote:

-----I believe there has been much teaching for how wives are to respect their husbands, almost to the point of weariness...

Really? Where? By whom?

Quote:

-----...but how much teaching is there on how "Christ loves the Church", for husbands?

This is a constant theme in my home and church - love in all it's depth and applications: for God first and then man...and in many of the sermons and teachings I listen to. I can give examples if you'd like.

Quote:

-----...the focus always seems to be on the weaknesses and mistakes of the women and they seem to be blamed for all the problems of the husband and the family. Very unfair.

Examples?

Quote:

-----"Adam" is still blaming "Eve" for his sin. He blames her for his bad attitude, pornography addiction, alcohol, drug, sex addictions, outbursts of anger, lack of patience, lack of cherishing of his wife (he says it is actually her fault), lack of politeness, etc, etc. He withholds love and intimacy from her which is very controlling and oppressive. Many Christian men have become insecure and controlling due to lack of desire to love their wives as Christ loves the Church. They have become bitter.

Again, very broad and general terms...who is doing this? Am I? Is Savannah? Is anyone in this discussion forum (that you know of)? Seriously, where are these accusations and supposed all encompassing generalities coming from?

Quote:

-----If Eve sinned, why did Adam get the blame?

What does any of this have to do with the will and word of the Lord concerning headship and submission? The discussion was on whether "men rule" or not, no? Not, "Who sinned first"...

Quote:

-----...Adam was right there, not protecting his wife..

What? How do you know? What do you suggest he should have done? Perhaps he said, "Honey, I don't think that's a good idea," and she did it anyway? In your theology he had no real authority over her... And even in my (Complimentarian) theology, even though he has authority over her to forbid and compel, he can't forcibly exact obedience and submission without violating love and freewill - so his hands are tied (assuming Adam wanted/tried to stop her, which I am not sure he did, we are merely speculating here).

Quote:
-----How cowardly to let her be ambushed.

Careful... You weren't there and don't know all of the details - yet you not only have apparently made a judgment based on conjecture, you have apparently allowed that judgement to foment pretty strong feelings of condemnation and the LORD knows what else..

Quote:
-----God didn't talk to Eve, he spoke to Adam.

What? Where do you get this stuff?

To the woman said,
"I will greatly multiply
Your pain in childbirth,
In pain you will bring forth children;
Yet your desire will be for your husband,
And he will rule over you."

Then to Adam He said...
~ Genesis 3:16-17a

Quote:
----- Adam was being tested by God, not Eve. Adam failed the test.

Amen! I think this says a lot about headship and accountability and how that God/Christ is the head of man and he is accountable to Him directly, though the man is the head of the woman and she is accountable to him directly. I don't doubt that Adam could have covered the transgression of Eve by remaining faithful to God himself. Instead he partook of it and sold the whole world into sin and thus Satan's dominion.

Quote:
-----Eve has always been blamed for that, but Adam was standing right there and did not correct her.

More conjecture...and an argument from silence...

Quote:
-----The serpent deceived Eve by showing her that she could touch the tree and not die..

Is this statement supported by scripture?

I could go on, but suffice it to say that your teaching regarding the fall of man sounds almost Gnostic in a way... Woman was completely innocent and guiltless and it is that big bad man and his patriarchy that is the problem... The world would just be so much better if men just sat down and let women call the shots - heck, we would never have fallen if a man didn't mislead Eve in the first place!

Yikes!

Sure, sin entered through one man - Adam. And he is directly accountable to God and to fault for the fall, no doubt in my

mind. But what was Eve's role in this? Had she heeded her head and never strayed from his (good) commandment to her, would Satan have been able to lead mankind into a seditious uprising? Perhaps not.

Did Satan perhaps subvert and destroy man and the world by starting with the woman and seducing her to 'lean on her own understanding' and come out from under her head in an effort to entice Adam to come out from under his (the LORD God)...?

Seems very likely to me.

Again, I repeat, Adam is ultimately to blame as he is the head and accountable directly to God...but could it all have been avoided if Eve had not strayed from the word of the LORD first herself?

So, Julius, do you still assert that Eve transgressed in "Innocence and ignorance" as you stated previously or do you now see that she is also accountable to God for not obeying her head and ultimately disobeying God in failing to obey Adam...?

But I digress, as this is not the subject of this thread in the first place.

Hath God said, "Men Love your Wives?", on: 2016/7/22 14:44

Funny how people constantly talk about the "fallen away church", on SI and the need for repentance and revival, yet some on here declare nothing at all is wrong with marriages. Naivete, ignorance or "head in the sand", I really don't know.

Quote:
-----Again, very broad and general terms...who is doing this? Am I? Is Savannah? Is anyone in this discussion forum (that you know of)? Seriously, where are these accusations and supposed all encompassing generalities coming from?

This is not a private conversation. It is open up to the whole internet and "if the shoe fits, wear it." These are not accusations but common knowledge regarding testimonies all over the internet, from friends (face to face) and even public exposures of even Pastors and other spiritual leaders. Surely, you are not unaware that the Enemy attacks marriages.

Is it an accusation that the visible church in many ways is "fallen away". If it is an accusation and untrue then we better stop propagating that many Christians are fallen away and need revival.

How is this? All Christian marriages are wonderful and no husband thinks their wife is inferior and no Christian is backslidden. I guess we don't need revival, then.

Why are you taking all of this personally? Re-read William's posts and thoughtfully consider them.

Re: Hath God said, "Men Rule"? - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/22 16:30

Quote:
-----Why are you taking all of this personally?

I'm not.

I am a bit jealous for the word of the Lord and His people, and don't like to see my Father misrepresented...

Re: Hath God said, "Men Love your Wives?", on: 2016/7/22 16:34

Fact is that it's both: for men their part and women theirs. And the fact is that men have been placed in the primary role of teaching in the church. Particularly concerning the Word itself, doctrine, authority, etc.

So while women (especially those with feminist tendencies within the old flesh) may be resistant to their husbands pointing out these things (these scriptural commands out), that doesn't negate the responsibility to teach it. And that has ZERO application to this discussion because I wasn't telling my wife all these things in this conversation while she is in a resistant (Biblically rebellious) state to not receive it, but this is a public forum & I'm doing what the Bible says (& then people who come across as the "saviors of the day" come and offset this truth with weakness in regards to the Word). We should never beat people over the head, but we should never as men, especially if we are "presuming to teach" (which this in a way definitely is) be effeminate & apologetic for the truth of God's Word in these matters. That is actually "part" (not all, but part) of what allows the problem to remain. And then straw men get thrown in about wife beaters, porn using blame shifters, etc. That's frankly...well....it ain't good. I'll say that and leave it at that.

God bless,

Jeff

Re: Amen, Jeff. - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/22 16:55

Quote:

-----And then straw men get thrown in about wife beaters, porn blame shifters, etc. That's frankly...well....it ain't good. I'll say that and leave it at that.

Hear, hear!

I'm signing out of this discussion now.

Re: - posted by jochbaptist (), on: 2016/7/22 18:42

Warning:

Attempt at joke-

Adam blamed Eve.

Eve blamed the Serpent.

The Serpent had no legs to stand on.

:D

Blessings

Re: - posted by jochbaptist (), on: 2016/7/22 19:05

Gen 4:7

King James Bible

If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his DESIRE, and thou shalt RULE over him.

Gen 3:16

King James Bible

Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy DESIRE shall be to thy husband, and he shall RULE over thee.

Interesting parallel.

Re: - posted by jochbaptist (), on: 2016/7/22 19:24

Esther 1:15

King James Bible

What shall we do unto the queen Vashti according to law, because she hath not performed the commandment of the king Ahasuerus by the chamberlains?

:16

And Memucan answered before the king and the princes, Vashti the queen hath not done wrong to the king only, but also to all the princes, and to all the people that are in all the provinces of the king Ahasuerus.

:17

For this deed of the queen shall come abroad unto all women, so that they shall despise their husbands in their eyes, when it shall be reported, The king Ahasuerus commanded Vashti the queen to be brought in before him, but she came not.

:18:

Likewise shall the ladies of Persia and Media say this day unto all the king's princes, which have heard of the deed of the queen. Thus shall there arise too much contempt and wrath.

A good example of the curse in operation

Re: more and more, on: 2016/7/22 20:57

the more and more, I see 100 plus post threads JUST like this, the less and less, I feel inclined to share my heart, and post on this forum.

this is all just so abysmal and entirely dispiriting.

I hadn't even read this thread before today, and only had to read LESS than one page to come to this conclusion. I'm wondering who the "OP" is, and my suggestion to them would be to take a time out chair hiatus...in fact, a lot of ya'll, who OC D post, should self restrict yourselves to one or two posts a day, and I say that in love, because if you knew you had one or two times in class to speak....you would deliberate more...with the Lord, and mayhap be a tad more anointed when you post, instead of just coming off as a tightly wound religionist with too much time on your hands, and a mean spirit.

Re: Hath God said, "Men Rule?" , on: 2016/7/22 20:59

oh, okay..."savannah" is the OP.

why am I not surprised.

(i'm listening to the sermon, and the pastor is coming to the part, where he's slamming at a woman's right to vote, and he's getting ready to link up abolitionists with sodomites...)

I feel you might be lonely in some way, and NEED reaction slash interaction, and that makes me sad, for you, IF i'm true in that assessment.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2016/7/22 21:50

Neil, something happened here, it's like the same 8 or 10 posters on every single thread, and that's fine, but what concerns me is, why is there no other posters? I guess maybe just a lot of readers, or folks that just don't want to get caught up in the threads that to me are not meaningless, but surely we can find more edifying things to debate.

Re: , on: 2016/7/22 22:16

Greg should put up serial poster blocking code into this web site.

Also include within the code parameters that remove non essential topics that have been discussed here approximately 100,000 times over the years would help.

And enabling agenda blocking would be swell too.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2016/7/22 22:20

Carmine, I do believe in miracles. :-)

my brother Bill , on: 2016/7/22 22:52

you first testified, then asked a question:

"it's like the same 8 or 10 posters on every single thread, and that's fine, but what concerns me is, why is there no other posters? "

they probably don't feel safe to get real and unburden their hearts.

its a like a healthy family, where we share everything, victories, defeats, food, love, and you KNOW you could be TOTALLY transparent, because that love is unconditional....you don't have to hide when done wrong, you can confess, unburden your soul, before God and man.....that's in a healthy family.....

so I ask , is this is healthy situation we got here?.....can you imagine what "unposting lurkers" must be feeling?.....or what about those who are searching for God?....will all THIS embolden them or show them the steadfast love and mercy of Jesus?

oh Bill, is it EVER going to change on this forum?

Re: views? - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/23 0:09

Brenda wrote,

"I have to wonder why the moderators allow those with such views on a Christian forum."

Brenda,

You were removed from the SI forum some time ago by Paul the moderator at the time!

Your views and your unsubmitive spirit were the cause of your removal. And now you are back doing the same thing and promoting your false doctrine which defies God's authority at it's core.

I have tested your spirit as Paul did, and am persuaded that you are self-willed, and that you are a usurper of authority.

Re: , on: 2016/7/23 0:20

Brenda, Savannah has now exposed himself that he was intent on setting traps for you as soon as you came back. This has been on my mind as I have seen the posts that he has created and now he basically admits it. There are some people and posts that you have to choose not to engage with.

You have brought many good things to the discussion and by the way no one, absolutely no one would address the terrible quotes from early church fathers and leaders that you posted. Savannah's relentless assaults on you have been viewed by all and there is no reason for you to continue in this thread. There is no reason for anyone to continue.

Thank you for the Christlike spirit you display in the face of such animosity and false accusations.

Re: traps - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/23 0:34

J,

No intention whatsoever on my conscience to set traps.

I was blessed by Reg Kelly and thought others would be as well. So I posted it. The last ten minutes alone are worth the listen. Humility and repentance and sincere love for the brethren and God's truth is evident in this man's spirit.

That and that alone was my intent.

The first reply was an attack on me from Brenda. I don't say this with a poor me syndrome of any sort. Only as a matter of fact.

So began this long thread.

Re: posting - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/23 0:46

Rev,neil, bill,

Why not e-mail one another with your personal conversation, rather than adding more posts to this thread that have nothing to do with the subject!

If you're that concerned for unbelievers not witnessing love between Christians then why have you posted what you have to the public eye!

Re: , on: 2016/7/23 2:04

Julius

Thank you, I think that you are right and that the thread was intended to provoke me. Sorry that you had to bear the brunt of it but thank you again.

I wrote earlier, and again without any comment from the detractors, that Kelly the preacher in the link in the OP, demonstrated his own attitude very clearly when he spoke about Sarah's sin in choosing Hagar to bear a child in the fruitless marriage, when he said that if it had been him, he would have *yelled* at Sarah 'I can't believe what just came out of your mouth but it must never come out of your mouth again. Don't you EVER say anything like that again, *how stupid are you, shut your mouth and go back to your canning pickles'.* This was followed by chuckles by the men in the congregation.

It is the most shocking and most disrespectful thing I have ever heard from a preacher. I knew that misogyny was in the church, as it has always been, but this made me see just how bad it is.

The subject under discussion ie the fall has everything to do with what is meant by ruling women in the church.

I hope that this discussion has encouraged the brethren to look more closely at the scriptures and not just to take for granted what has been taught by men about them.

"savannah", on: 2016/7/23 7:19

here me clearly, don't even dare tell me what to post.

unlike many here, who post strong words, while "hiding" behind a cyber mask, hiding at the other end of a fiber optic cable....BELIEVE ME when I tell I would no compunction to be up in your face, mano a mano, telling you EXACTLY, what I wrote above.

none.

I listened to ALL of what Reg Kelly had to say, and have no desire to post, what I think or my opinion or how I lense it all thru the Holy Ghost, because we will all one day, stand alone before the Judgment Seat, and be held accountable by a Holy God. all of us.

I can read, I can see the accusations hurled about like cow pies, and all I have to say is.....have fun. Of course said "fun" being had at another's expense, but again, that's just a whole new ball of wax under the Lord's purvey.

I have learned one thing thru the years, "independent Fundamental" Baptist churches, assemblies, etc, hold little attracti on for me, and feel free to accuse and label me, as "rebellious" or whatever hard brittle religious adjectives you wanna h url my way, as I regard such as mere words, lacking any anointing or power, my only query is what is REALLY behind y our cyber mask?...and its sad to me we come to such dialogue, which is why I posted prior, that the more and more I rea d here, the less and less I desire to post her.....the field is yours, enjoy.
heartbroken, neil

sister Brenda, on: 2016/7/23 7:48

I feel your pain and grief, and beloved sister, you have not be the only one to suffer under such fleshling tyrant's....I foun d these "boards" one day, took a few to read them to discern the "story", and then was just laid out in grief.

(warning, it aint pretty)

<http://bgbc survivors.blogspot.com/>

the bgbc church itself, still chugging along

<http://www.beavertongracebible.org/>

this the new "survivors" website, headed of course by what are termed "women in rebellion"
<https://spiritualsoundingboard.com/>

or should I even bring up the terrible witness of the "quiver full" movement and the Duggars family "story"?

here's the google hits, you'll notice that many of those hostile to our Dear Messiah Jesus just love when ungodly trainwr ecks like the Duggars are shown into the light of the secular press....but you know what my beloved sister, when this trul y ugliness is exposed?.....my Love and Passion for our Beloved Messiah Jesus only grows stronger....STRONGER!! Ho w I love Him so!!.....amen?

https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#newwindow=1&safe=off&q=quiverfull+movement+duggars

we have NO ONE but Jesus! and the Blood that cleanses from all sin....Sister Brenda, me and the Lord "cut" this compil ation for my then 9 year old son, to let him KNOW who he is IN Christ....I send it to you now, in the hope you just listen p rayerfully , and be encouraged in the Name of Jesus....its entitled "A Kingdom of Priests", God love you ever so richly sis ter, in Jesus's love, your brother neil

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=12043>

Re: sister Brenda - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2016/7/23 9:21

I am not going to comment on the actual sermon on the OP but the Scripture stands that sisters should have a more submissive meek spirit towards brothers and have modesty in their dress.

1 Peter 3 New International Version (NIV)

3 Wives, in the same way submit yourselves to your own husbands so that, if any of them do not believe the word, they may be won over without words by the behavior of their wives, 2 when they see the purity and reverence of your lives. 3 Your beauty should not come from outward adornment, such as elaborate hairstyles and the wearing of gold jewelry or fine clothes. 4 Rather, it should be that of your inner self, the unfading beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is of great worth in God's sight. 5 For this is the way the holy women of the past who put their hope in God used to adorn themselves. They submitted themselves to their own husbands, 6 like Sarah, who obeyed Abraham and called him her lord. You are her daughters if you do what is right and do not give way to fear.

This thread is locked.