



## Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is Paul's writings apart of scripture?

### Is Paul's writings apart of scripture?, on: 2007/10/29 10:50

Quote:  
-----2 Timothy 3:16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:  
-----

We know that Paul only had the Old Testament and the witness of the Spirit to fall back on. (Lucky him)

I am posting this because a member of my immediate family believes that somethings that Paul wrote were indeed inspired, while other times he was causing more trouble by saying, "I, not the LORD" as in 1Cor7:12.

Of course I rebutted such nonsense. Certainly Paul spoke things that the LORD had not commanded, but I must not look at the words, but at his title. He's an Apostle and is qualified to speak. The man was a Pharisee, he knew the law and kept it. He was considered an holy man, the type who would have walked softly in the Temple and before his God, he was zealous for the things of God. Though ignorant before his conversion, still he would have shown the same reverence for the word of God when giving any advice. Consider this example:

Quote:  
-----John 11:49 And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all,50 Nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.51 And this spake he not of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation  
-----

Even though this prophecy sounded wonderful and good, but notice that they used this information to plot against Jesus to kill him as it says,

Quote:  
-----John 11:53 Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death.  
-----

I said all that to say this, even tho Caiaphas didn't know that he was speaking the oracles of God, he still spoke truth. Even tho Paul said, "I, not the LORD" doesn't mean that what he has said was not from the LORD.

When David was crying his head off in the Psalms, I am sure he didn't think that his words were inspired. Who ever thinks that they are speaking anything good when they are in agony?

My question for everyone is, do you believe that Paul's writings are considered scripture.

Thank you

How many of us have spoken inspiration to someone and we didn't even know that it was inspirational?

### Re: Is Paul's writings apart of scripture? - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/10/29 10:56

Peter believed Paul's writings were inspired.

2Pe 3:15 And account the longsuffering of our Lord salvation; even as our beloved **brother Paul** also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you;

2Pe 3:16 As also in all epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, **as also the other scriptures**, unto their own destruction.

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is Paul's writings apart of scripture?**

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2007/10/29 12:34**

Greetings Dear Saints in Jesus' Name by Whose BLOOD we are Saved.AMEN.

sis Jeannette indeed as the word says, all scripture is breathed of God so even where Paul said that he and not the Lord had said certain things, he remained under the inspiration of Holy Spirit. Paul experienced God in such a manner that it left him with an abundance of Revelation Knowledge of God so even the way he reasoned things was affected by that to the point where God could speak through him without necessarily say to him "write this". in essence Paul knew what God would have him say in a certain situation because of the closeness of the relationship with God.

Grace and Peace are ours in Jesus.AMEN.

**Re: Is Paul's writings apart of scripture? - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/29 14:47**

Quote:

-----Compliments wrote:

My question for everyone is, do you believe that Paul's writings are considered scripture.

Thank you

How many of us have spoken inspiration to someone and we didn't even know that it was inspirational?  
-----

**1Corinth 2:13** Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teaches, but which the Holy Spirit teaches; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

They were taught.

**Gal 1:12** For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it (by man), but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

It is more like they Knew God and/or Christ along with the Old Testament so well that they wrote the Truth that exactly agrees with Who, what, and how God is.

God gives the Scriptures that they wrote authority to be His Word because the Apostles had authority.

2Tim 3:16a All scripture is inspired by God..

Like prophecy, word of wisdom, word of knowledge.

There was a wife of a witch Dr. in Africa that my pastor lead to the Lord through an interpreter, she didn't know a bit of English. Once she was saved, she was afraid of her husband and she spoke in perfect English "No weapon that is formed against you shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against you in judgment you shall condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the LORD, and their righteousness is of me, says the LORD."(Isa 54:17)

The Holy Spirit did not "control" her mind or tongue, She yielded herself to the Spirit and He gave her the utterance. So it is with the Holy Scriptures.

The Holy Spirit "dictated" to the authors what he wanted them to write through impressing on the author what the mind and heart of God is.

There was no mind control but a yielding of spirits.

Quote:

-----I am posting this because a member of my immediate family believes that somethings that Paul wrote were indeed inspired, while other times he was causing more trouble by saying, "I, not the LORD" as in 1Cor 7:12.  
-----

When it is Pauls saying it and not the lord, he is saying that it is only his opinion based on the as in **1Corinth 7:40b** according to my opinion. Now I presume that I also have God's spirit.

That would be equivalent to saying, "according to my opinion, you shouldn't gamble, even though, there is no command in scripture about that, however, I presume that I also have God's spirit on this matter."

Notice what Luke said in the beginning of his Gospel:

**Luke 1:3-4** It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, **to write to you**

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is Paul's writings apart of scripture?**

u in order, most excellent Theophilus, That you might know the certainty of those things, in which you have been instructed.

God didn't compel the authors to write.

They wrote from what was on their hearts concerning certain matters.

**Re: - posted by intrcssr83 (), on: 2007/10/29 15:40**

16For we did not follow cleverly devised myths when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty. 17For when he received honor and glory from God the Father, and the voice was borne to him by the Majestic Glory, "This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased," 18we ourselves heard this very voice borne from heaven, for we were with him on the holy mountain. 19And we have something more sure, the prophetic word, to which you will do well to pay attention as to a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts, 20knowing this first of all, that no prophecy of Scripture comes from someone's own interpretation. 21For no prophecy was ever produced by the will of man, but men spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit.

2 Peter 1:16-21

So what is the Bible? Does it represent a hallmark of mere human literary achievement? Or is it indeed the inspired word of God, that is without error or contradiction, having been inspired and preserved by God himself?

If you adhere to the former, then there is a logical fallacy. If man's relationship with God is indeed fully conditional on the part of free will, and hence man at any time could fall into sin and thus lose his salvation altogether, why should we trust the inspiration of the Bible when in fact it's authors could have at any time simply lost their standing before God? Would not such a possibility open the door for the probability of the Bible not being fully inspired and innerant?

How can we say that the inspiration of scripture was genuinely safeguarded from human error unless God himself intervened in the thought processes of free men?

On the otherhand, if the above were not the case and scripture was written by people who had attained sinless perfection without God needing to directly intervene in their thinking, 2 Peter 1:16-21 would have to be wrong, thus making the Bible contradictory and containing error.

It is also interesting to note how Peter regarded scripture; he saw the manifest glory of the Son of God with his own eyes, yet even so, he held God's inspired word as being more trustworthy than his own subjective experience.

By saying that "no prophecy of Scripture comes from someone's own interpretation", he immediately shoots down any idea of bias within the scriptures on the part of the author. I've been to a lot of Bible studies where instead of examining the texts via historical and grammatical contexts, the focus is "What does it say to you", as though when you examine the scriptures according to personal opinion there may be the possibility of a subjective insight, and when these insights are mutually shared in a group setting the whole group supposedly becomes edified. Simple fact of the matter is that the Bible isn't written that way in the first place! (This is yet another reason why the Emerging Church's postmodern take on things is so erroneous).

**Re: Is Paul's writings apart of scripture?, on: 2007/10/29 17:48**

Quote:  
-----I am posting this because a member of my immediate family believes that somethings that Paul wrote were indeed inspired, while other times he was causing more trouble by saying, "I, not the LORD" as in 1Cor7:12.

Of course I rebutted such nonsense.  
-----

*"But to the rest **speak I, not the Lord:**" (1 COR 7:12)*

*"Now concerning virgins **I have no commandment of the Lord:** yet I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful." (1 COR 7:25)*

*"**I suppose** therefore that this is good for the present distress, I say, that it is good for a man so to be." (1 COR 7:26)*

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is Paul's writings apart of scripture?**

*"...and I think also that I have the Spirit of God." (1 COR 7:40)*

I agree with your family member; Paul is giving his personal opinion, not the Word of God. "To the rest speak I", "I have no commandment of the Lord", "I suppose", "I think"...

If he spoke from the Lord, it would read something like, "To all the Word of God saith", "I have commandment of the Lord", "the Lord wills", "the Lord knows".

Quote:

-----Certainly Paul spoke things that the LORD had not commanded, but I must not look at the words, but at his title.  
-----

Paul's "title" as an apostle trumps the Word of God?

*"Thy word is true from the beginning: and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever." (PSA 119:160)*

*"For the word of the LORD is right; and all his works are done in truth." (PSA 33:4)*

*"Ye shall not respect persons in judgment; but ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man; for the judgment is God's: and the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it." (DEU 1:17)*

Thus, *"if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors." (JAM 2:9)*

To say that one ought to take everything Paul wrote in his epistles as the Word of God because of his "title" is like saying Peter was under the influence of God by not eating with gentiles for the simple fact that he, too, was an Apostle.

But Peter and Paul couldn't both be right in that instance. One of the two Apostles was wrong.

Much less if Paul himself acknowledged that certain advice was formulated by his own opinion ("I think", "I suppose") and not the Word of God.

The epistles are not the Gospel. The promises and commands of Jesus, are. Please don't lose sight of that.

**Re: - posted by BenWilliams (), on: 2007/10/29 18:26**

**I Corinthians 14:37 If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, (let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.)**

I think Paul makes it pretty clear in this verse that when he writes, it should be taken as though God himself is speaking.

So you either have to accept all that he says, or throw out all he says.

**Re: Is Paul's writings apart of scripture?, on: 2007/10/29 18:38**

Quote:

-----My question for everyone is, do you believe that Paul's writings are considered scripture.  
-----

Paul's Epistles are to the Gospels as Ecclesiastes is to Isaiah.

Jesus lived and spoke as the Lord commanded. Isaiah spoke and wrote as the Lord commanded.

Solomon experienced everything to logically explain the world - and came up with vanity. It's in the Bible, but it's not necessarily God's words.

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is Paul's writings apart of scripture?**

Paul logically expounded the Gospels for the sakes of the philosophically-inclined Greeks and Romans. He wrote letters and gave advice concerning everything from Ceaser-cut hair styles to women speaking in the church - but his epistles were written to specific audiences in specific cultures in the past. His letters are in the Bible, but aren't necessarily God's word.

Unlike the Gospel or the Prophets, Paul's advice isn't an eternal law that transcends time and space.

**Re:, on: 2007/10/29 18:52**

BenWilliams said

Quote:  
-----I Corinthians 14:37 If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, (let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.)

I think Paul makes it pretty clear in this verse that when he writes, it should be taken as though God himself is speaking.  
-----

Paul was a logician as well as a theologian.

Logically, if one says, "*If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, (let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.)*" (I COR 14:37)...

...he can then nullify the first statement with "but", "except", "excluding", "save for"...

**"But to the rest speak I, not the Lord:"** (I COR 7:12)

Quote:  
-----So you either have to accept all that he says, or throw out all he says.  
-----

Paul himself wrote, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." (I THE 5:21)

And he approved of the Bereans who didn't take him at his word, "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so." (ACT 17:11)

**Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2007/10/29 20:03**

this is like asking is flour apart of a cake?

**Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/10/29 23:56**

If we can assume higher criticism's position of judgement over the content of the New Testament', insisting that there is a disparity of credibility between the 4 Gospels and the New Testament letters, then we must ultimately share higher criticism's conclusion that Paul invented Christianity; a proprietary concocted religion that is distinct from Jesus' original intentions.

In short, the New Testament letters are either God's word, or they are antique writings with no more authority than any of her ancient scrolls. We might as well include the sayings and ethics of Jesus as presented in the gnostic gospels too. Without the New Testament letters we have little cause to believe in justification through the righteousness of God by faith, the crucifixion and resurrection life of Christ and the walk in the Spirit, the Gospel's triumph over inherent sin, (Romans) the Gospel of Grace (Galatians), the believers position in Christ through faith, or revelation concerning the body of Christ (Ephesians), the experiential and authenticating relationship between faith and works in true religion,(James) or the qualifications and functions of elders and the pastoral work of a true elder (Philemon).

We've mentioned a related topic in previous threads but it makes sense to bring it up here. The inspiration to highlight Jesus' human language utterances with red ink in our bibles is not divine, but commercial...about a hundred years ago some en

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is Paul's writings apart of scripture?**

terprising publisher came up with 'red letter edition' for a marketing feature. This modern practice of using two colors of ink can suggest two levels of scripture that does not exist...namely that within the pages of the bible some words are from God while other words are merely about God, from man's mind. However, any scholastic methodology for separating the divine from spurious in either testament of the bible is subjective and prejudiced at best. Nothing wise, or even honest is achieved by this, except that honest doubt is put into the weaker brethren regarding the whole counsel of scripture.

Let's not be critics and judges of scripture...but rather the reverse brethren.

MC

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/11/1 19:41**

MC wrote:

Quote:  
-----Without the New Testament letters we have little cause to believe in justification through the righteousness of God by faith, the crucifixion and resurrection life of Christ and the walk in the Spirit, the Gospel's triumph over inherent sin, (Romans) the Gospel of Grace (Galatians), the believers position in Christ through faith, or revelation concerning the body of Christ (Ephesians), the experiential and authenticating relationship between faith and works in true religion,(James) or the qualifications and functions of elders and the pastoral work of a true elder (Philemon)  
-----

I suggest adding to this list the teaching how Jesus' sacrifice made the OT animal sacrifices obsolete. So, if you really want to be logical, you will need to resume the sacrifice of animals if you want to discard the epistles and adhere strictly to Jesus' teaching. He hinted at this in his preaching but did not go into detail like the epistles do.

And there are other laws you need to observe, like the washings, the dietary laws, the stoning of certain sinners...

Just my thought..

ginnyrose

**Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2007/11/1 19:52**

Excellent point ginny.