



**Scriptures and Doctrine :: A couple more hard verses?...**

**A couple more hard verses?... - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/23 0:50**

1. Paul said all things are lawful. Does this mean that a Christian can do anything and not be damned? I do not think I am persuaded to that. So do you think he contextually mean all things are lawful pertaining to the ceremonial law instead of the moral part of the law? I mean he can talk of meat sacrificed to idols as lawful, but is it if its against your conscience? certainly murder is not lawful?
2. Again Paul says the ascetics say do not touch, see, taste, ect. And then goes on to say this is wrong. Is he again saying it is not wrong to touch a dirty dish and eat from it, but not meaning it is okay to see filthy movies or something. Again a distinction between ceremonial and the moral law? Or are things actually lawful for us and in one sense we can do anything and not be damned but in another sense we never could actually do those things because we are slaves to righteousness?
3. Women are to wear head covering while praying? I do believe that the scriptures say this and see no honest interpretation that says otherwise. However, my question is is this just for really formal prayer or something? Because I mean can a woman not wake up and pray without a covering or can she not pray while she is driving or some other thing?
4. Women are not to speak in Church. I think the scriptures actually say that. But, I am wondering is this just during certain very formal meetings? I am sure at least it is saying they are not to speak doctrinal things not just generally. This is somewhat hard to take in. I don't think I would mind a women speaking in a bible study. I mean what if they have no husband or something. I guess that may be an exception that would not change the rule though. I don't know any thoughts?

**Re: A couple more hard verses?... - posted by hulsey (), on: 2009/7/23 2:01**

Well at least I might be able to answer your first question. All things are lawful for the Christian because the Christian uses all things lawfully. At the same time he is the master of those things as opposed to the world who is mastered by them.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/23 15:56**

thanks for you input.

**Re: A couple more hard verses?..., on: 2009/7/23 16:29**

Question 1&2, These two questions can be answered with these verses, Deut 4:4-9 (replace "nation" for Church in verse 7&8).

Question 3, The covering is authority. If she is rebellious and she prays her prayers are hindered. Her hair is supposed to be the sign that she is under authority.

Question 4, A woman who is under authority has the right to repeat what the authority has laid down. She can't establish new teaching nor should she go about speaking of dreams and visions she has had. She needs to submit all those things to whom she is under, her husband if she is married and to the Pastor if she is single.

\*\*\*\*\*

I wonder where my adversary is lurking at? :-P

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/23 21:08**

Hulsey,

yeah I think that is what he is saying.

I think hes saying all things are lawful for you since you are no longer under the law. However, at the same time that the se things are lawful they are not good. And then, we would also put this into context with other things he has said. Like.. what then shall we sin that grace may about certainly not for how shall we who died to sin live any longer in it. Or be not deceived that those who practice such things will not inherit the Kingdom of God and if you sow to the flesh you will reap to it. Or maybe there is also the "law of faith" if you are not having faith then you are not under grace ect. It is not beneficial it is grieving it is the flesh it is wrong.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/23 21:23**

As for the covering thing I do not hold to the same understanding so in context to the hair as a covering comment so...

It is a hard thing to say that the woman cannot speak in the Church. Many would say well that was just because of the messed up culture back then. I would have a hard time receiving that. I guess your understanding is that she cant make new doctrine or or share prophecies and such not that she cant speak on a less formal level or that at least they need to be first brought through certain men. Im not sure if I can receive that, but maybe. When he says she cannot speak in the Church you either have to say he means exactly that or.

1Co 14:33 For God is not a God of confusion but of peace. As in all the churches of the saints,

1Co 14:34 the women should keep silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be in submission, as the Law also says.

1Co 14:35 If there is anything they desire to learn, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church.

1Co 14:36 Or was it from you that the word of God came? Or are you the only ones it has reached?

1Co 14:37 If anyone thinks that he is a prophet, or spiritual, he should acknowledge that the things I am writing to you are a command of the Lord.

1Co 14:38 If anyone does not recognize this, he is not recognized.

1Co 14:39 So, my brothers, earnestly desire to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking in tongues.

1Co 14:40 But all things should be done decently and in order.

The context of the passage is that there should be order in the Church with tongues and prophesy and such so maybe that is why you said she cannot share those things? I didn't think of that before. However I also read that it says if they have questions to learn. So they cannot even ask questions?

It even says that it is shameful.

It is a command from the Lord if not receive not recognized.

He says as the Law also says. What verses do you think he is referring to?

So I guess I am leaning toward the women being able to speak in the Church for at the very least they have to teach you younger women and fellowship and even sing, but maybe they are not to speak about doctrine or something. Maybe the Church setting was much different then many today. Maybe they had a similar set up to a synagogue and would speak about doctrine or something?

Re: , on: 2009/7/23 21:46

Well you know the fundamentalists believe that tongues and prophecies and the gifts of the Spirit have been done away with in the first century, maybe a lot more have been done away with besides what they believe. I don't subscribe to what they say, they are gravely in error.

Re: Eve was deceived, Adam was not., on: 2009/7/23 21:49

**The answer about Eve in particular, and women in general, is found in the Bible:**

(1 Timothy 2:12-15)

**12. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. 13. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. 14. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.**

**15. Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.**

What this tells us is that Eve was deceived by Satan, while Adam was not deceived by Satan. Adam knowingly ate of the apple, not because of what Satan had to say, but because he did not want to lose Eve. If at that point, instead of following Eve, if Adam would have called out to God, none of this mess would have happened.

I heard Pastor Jon Courson preach once about taking over the Applegate Church in Oregon. It had been several years since they had a Pastor, and a woman was acting as the self appointed Pastor. Actually, no men were involved with the leadership of the Church at all--it was all women. Anyway, long story short, the Church was in a doctrinal mess, with false teaching 24/7. Jon had to finally ask them to leave the Church, to get everyone straightened out.

Women are the weaker vessel. The problem is, and has been for a very long time, that men have no understanding of their God Given, Biblical responsibility to be the Family Priest, as well as to be the head of the house. Women have done their best to come forward to fill the void, created by their Spiritually dead husbands.

Sincerley,

Walter

Quote:

-----  
anonymity wrote:

As for the covering thing I do not hold to the same understanding so in context to the hair as a covering comment so...

It is a hard thing to say that the woman cannot speak in the Church. Many would say well that was just because of the messed up culture back then. I would have a hard time receiving that. I guess your understanding is that she can't make new doctrine or or share prophecies and such not that she can't speak on a less formal level or that at least they need to be first brought through certain men. I'm not sure if I can receive that, but maybe. When he says she cannot speak in the Church you either have to say he means exactly that or.

1Co 14:33 For God is not a God of confusion but of peace. As in all the churches of the saints,  
1Co 14:34 the women should keep silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be in submission, as the Law also says.  
1Co 14:35 If there is anything they desire to learn, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church.  
1Co 14:36 Or was it from you that the word of God came? Or are you the only ones it has reached?  
1Co 14:37 If anyone thinks that he is a prophet, or spiritual, he should acknowledge that the things I am writing to you are a command of the Lord.  
1Co 14:38 If anyone does not recognize this, he is not recognized.  
1Co 14:39 So, my brothers, earnestly desire to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking in tongues.  
1Co 14:40 But all things should be done decently and in order.

The context of the passage is that there should be order in the Church with tongues and prophesy and such so maybe that is why you said she cannot share those things? I didn't think of that before. However I also read that it says if they have questions to learn. So they cannot even ask questions?

It even says that it is shameful.

It is a command from the Lord if not receive not recognized.

He says as the Law also says. What verses do you think he is referring to?

So I guess I am leaning toward the women being able to speak in the Church for at the very least they have to teach younger women and fellowship and even sing, but maybe they are not to speak about doctrine or something. Maybe the Church setting was much different then many today. Maybe they had a similar set up to a synagogue and would speak about doctrine or something?

-----  
**Re: , on: 2009/7/23 22:29**

Quote:  
-----I heard Pastor Jon Courson preach once about taking over the Applegate Church in Oregon. It had been several years since they had a Pastor, and a woman was acting as the self appointed Pastor. Actually, no men were involved with the leadership of the Church at all--it was all women. Anyway, long story short, the Church was in a doctrinal mess, with false teaching 24/7. Jon had to finally ask them to leave the Church, to get everyone straightened out.

-----  
Good example, there was absolutely no headship. What a mess indeed.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/24 1:20**

Deepthinker,

yes I agree. to say that gifts are no longer active is such a sad and serious essential error. I wish more people like Paul were around to say I am going to come to you that I might impart a spiritual gift to you that you may not be lacking.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/24 1:30**

Walter,

Yes.. this is a very good example. I did not know that about Courson's flock. I agree with you that the woman was deceived and Adam was willful I think there is actually a verse that says that. The verse you quoted didn't come to mind at first man I am getting rusty I guess I use Bible search engines too much. I have over the years been praying to God to show me things I do not know and not wanting to follow the strong tide of the worlds philosophies. Biblical manhood and womanhood is something that is being so wrecked and it is not only because of liberals but because of what you said men are not stepping up and so therefore the women have to. I'm not sure I would say women should never teach nor that every Church would turn out like Courson's if women taught because there are Deborah types and I will also say that an on fire mature sister could probably Pastor a flock better then many soft men Pastor's today so we might actually think much of it like Jackie Pullinger for instance or others. Thanks for the encouragement on the matter I am able to better understand why women are not to be doctrinal heads in the Church. I still though am not sure how hard I would be about it, but I will say that they should not be the main heads doctrinally. None of the Apostles were Deacons. I think in Timothy it even says that Deacons ought to be male and none among Stephen were female either. If I took a hard stand on females not speaking about doctrine then women shouldn't even be speaking about doctrine here on this forum :) haha. hmm...

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/7/24 18:27**

You know I was thinking more on this issue. The thought shortly came to me that since there were no female Apostles maybe there are no female prophets. However, I soon remembered that Philip had a number of daughters who were prophetesses. So I would say to say a woman could not prophesy in a Church would be a hard thing to be persuaded of. Maybe then this silence only pertained to doctrinal discussions. I mean how could a gifted prophet not be allowed to use her gifts especially if it first went through a husband or leader or something. hmm.

Oh and I wanted to note another verse that was once in the past hard for me to grasp. Since you mentioned it namely about a woman being saved by child birth. I believe that the word "saved" does not necessarily mean that she was "saved" in the way that we normally take it to mean salvifically. But, the word can and also does mean delivered or just saved and that can be used in numerous senses. For instance she can be delivered/saved from becoming idle or in some ways without ability to bring much to the household or other things. Bearing children is a high calling and it is the bringing forth of life into this world. Man was cursed with the sweat of his brow and woman with the pain of childbearing so our main roles or service as men are work and women as childbearers. Though I am not advocating for all Christians to have a multitude of children unless called for some reasons and I am not in some senses all that against it either.

Re: , on: 2009/7/28 9:48

Hi anonymity,

Quote:  
-----The thought shortly came to me that since there were no female Apostles maybe there are no female prophets. However, I soon re  
membered  
-----

According to Paul, there **were** female apostles. Rom 16:7 (Junia)

Strong's New Testament Greek Definition:

2458 Iou-nias {ee-oo-nee'-as}

of Latin origin;; n pr f

AV - Junia 1; 1

Junia = "youthful"

1) a Christian woman at Rome, mentioned by Paul as one of his kinsfolk and fellow prisoners

Also, if 'missionary' nowadays = apostle, then women outnumber men 2:1... or, is it 3:1? (It's a long time since I heard the statistic, but I've heard testimony of a woman who suggested to God when He called her, that He call a man instead, to which He is said to have replied 'I've asked *fifty* men'.)

There is also Rom 16

1 I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea: 2 That ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you: for she hath been a succourer of many, and of myself also.

Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/8/2 18:28

AlivetoGod,

Hi. Sorry I didn't see your post til now.

As for Romans 16:7. When it says they are of note among the Apostles. I am pretty sure that I would interpret that to say that the Apostles note them in high esteem as respected not that they are among the Apostles in that they are Apostles.

I think there are different levels of Apostles. In a sense I guess Apostle can mean missionary or some strong pioneering leadership role.

I think though that in the strictest sense Apostles are given supernatural power by God to show their authority and are used in unusual ways. So for the average missionary I would be hesitant to say they are Apostles.

So, again I'm not sure if I can come to that conclusion again. The Patriarch's and the leaders of the tribes of Israel and the Apostles of the Church were all Jewish men.

There is always the Deborah factor though in that you mentioned when no man is willing to stand up to the challenge.

It is an interesting thing to think about that most missionaries are women I think that also most of those who go to Church are women as well.

I guess I am still thinking and praying over the whole women in the ministry in the Church thing. I know that they have a central place and are much used. I am not sure though if they are ever called by God as Apostles though it would seem prophets but to what level of authority I don't know ect...

Re: A couple more hard verses?... - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2009/8/8 23:42

Quote:  
----- Women are to wear head covering while praying? I do believe that the scriptures say this and see no honest interpretation that says otherwise. However, my question is is this just for really formal prayer or something? Because I mean can a woman not wake up and pray without a covering or can she not pray while she is driving or some other thing?  
-----

All Christian females wore a head covering for worship and prayer until about the past century or so. In the 1900s it took on the form of a hat and some females still do. Today this practice is more common among the Mennonites, Amish, Brethren, Hutterites and Charity groups. There are others who also wear a headcovering but they are more scattered.

The reason it is worn is to that she acknowledges the headship roles of God-Jesus-husband-self. It is also worn because of the Angels; it also says she is to be covered so she will have authority/power on her head. So the reasons are varied as to why it is worn. All this can be found in 1 Corinthians 11:1-16.

Yes, a woman can pray while driving, working and those that believe in the application/obedience of this scripture will wear it at all times. Some will even wear one to bed - some have seen demonic activity and the wearing of it will assist them in this battle.

Hope this helps.

ginnyrose

Re: A couple more hard verses... - posted by twayneb (), on: 2009/8/9 9:35

Several times in scripture Paul makes a distinction between what God says through him, and what he says of his own accord. Is it possible that 1 Timothy 2:12 is another one of those places? In other words, is it possible that Paul is giving his own advice here, based more on a social norm among the people he is addressing rather than what God is commanding? I say this partly because I see so many places in scripture where women were indeed actively involved in ministry. Why were they accepted and not rebuked?

Re: A couple more hard verses?..., on: 2009/8/9 13:09

Hello brother anonymity,

Quote:  
-----I guess I am still thinking and praying over the whole women in the ministry in the Church thing.  
-----

I am too - and I'm a woman! But, that should not prevent either of us from accepting scripture in the simplicity it is presented. For instance, there is absolutely no doubt that 'of note among the apostles' does not mean 'that the Apostles note them in high esteem as respected not that they are among the Apostles in that they are Apostles', as you suggest. This is clear from both Strong's definitions and Young's Literal. Please check them both out.

Note also, 'Andronicus and Junia, **my kinsmen, and my fellowprisoners**'. Perhaps you have too elevated an idea of an apostle's calling?

1 Corinthians 4:1 Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God. 2 Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful. 3 But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment: yea, I judge not mine own self. 4 For I know nothing by myself; yet am I not hereby justified: but he that judgeth me is the Lord. 5 Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts: and then shall every man have praise of God. 6 And these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and Apollos for your sakes; that ye might learn in us not to think above that which is written, that no one of you be puffed up for one against another. 7 For who maketh thee to differ? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received? 8 Now ye are full, now ye are rich, ye have reigned as kings without us: and I would to God ye did reign, that we also might reign with you. 9 **For I think that God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were appointed to death: for we are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men.** 10 **We** for

ols for Christ's sake, but ye wise in Christ; we weak, but ye strong; ye honourable, but we despised. 11 Even unto this present hour we both hunger, and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwellingplace; 12 And labour, working with our own hands: being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it: 13 Being defamed, we intreat: we are made as the filth of the world, the offscouring of all things unto this day. 14 I write not these things to shame you, but as my beloved sons I warn .

Quote:

-----The Patriarch's and the leaders of the tribes of Israel and the Apostles of the Church were all Jewish men.

-----  
Could I ask you to think about this statement very carefully?

The reason I ask, is that neither was Eve 'Jewish' when God promised the Messiah would be her descendant, nor was Abraham 'Jewish', when God called him. Dropping down the geneology to Jesus, only His mother was Jewish, and Joseph, her husband, was descended from David only by adoption. In a similar way, Jesus was adopted into Joseph's family, seeing He was not his natural son, but His Father was God.

Now, Jewishness is not determined by natural birth, but by the inward circumcision of faith, and is equally open to women as to men - Rom 2:29.

Lastly, there were many apostles who were Gentiles, adopted into God's family with the Jews who believed, all born again by the will of God, grafted into the olive tree, the root of which is Christ.

Just in passing, we know that Timothy was of Greek paternity, and yet Paul sent him out to ordain elders in certain places.

God has deliberately allowed all these conflicts - which are completely compatible with the Old Covenant openness to 'strangers' joining themselves to Israel through certain religious rituals (which included circumcision), to show that the Church is spiritual, not temporal.

This is not to take away from its Jewish root, insofar as Jesus was humanly Jewish. Nevertheless, Jewish flesh was crucified with Him, just as Gentile flesh was also, and crucified Him (literally). Thus, in writing to a Gentile church Paul makes clear that natural Jewishness no longer counts for anything, except as the promises were committed to the forefathers of the Jews, and Jews can now obtain them. Peter makes a similar point in the passing, at the start of his second epistle.

Rom 9:1 I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, 2 That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. 3 For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: 4 Who are Israelites; to whom the adoption ...

2 Cor 5:14 For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: 15 And he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again. 16 Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, **though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we no more.** 17 Therefore if any man in Christ, a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.

2 Pet 1:1 Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ: 2 Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord, 3 According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue: 4 Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust.

**are** circumcised in heart that they are true *Israel*, and, like Paul, is using 'Gentile' as a term for those who choose not to believe. See also Acts 5:13, 14. *It's nothing to do with natural, 'first' birth.* John 10:16

Quote:

-----I think though that in the strictest sense Apostles are given supernatural power by God to show their authority and are used in unusual ways. So for the average missionary I would be hesitant to say they are Apostles.

Maybe you would, but, are you really in a position to judge whether they are or not? I believe there is a great deal of supernatural power at work in the circumstances of a missionary, to keep him or her from being brought down by Satan's emissaries, and the powers of darkness which they oppose by their very presence there, in the name of Jesus Christ.

I think your questions about authority are confusing. God gives authority to those who obey Him, regardless of their gender. That's the definition of sonship which Jesus modeled for us. If you mean 'status' (in the Church), or *in the eyes of men*, then this may be something different, and not something to which a Christian need attain, or, by which he should be detained.

**Re: A couple more hard verses? ..., on: 2009/8/9 13:26**

twayneb wrote:

Quote:  
-----Several times in scripture Paul makes a distinction between what God says through him, and what he says of his own accord. Is it possible that 1 Timothy 2:12 is another one of those places? In other words, is it possible that Paul is giving his own advice here, based more on a social norm among the people he is addressing rather than what God is commanding? I say this partly because I see so many places in scripture where women were indeed actively involved in ministry. Why were they accepted and not rebuked?  
-----

This last question is a point touched on by the testimony of Duncan Campbell, who was invited to speak at a church which did not admit the ministry of women. He restricted his testimony to what God had done through the brethren, but when questioned afterwards, openly acknowledged that he had missed out what God had done through the ministry of sisters, so as not to offend the congregation to whom he had spoken. What this shows, is that a man of God recognises when he doesn't have the anointing in a particular situation, and he is happy to give place to whomever has it, whether it happens to be a brother **or** a sister.

God sees every heart, and would not be able to use a sister who was not in right relationship to Him, same as he can't use a brother who is out of honest relationship with Him.

There is a further discussion to be had, around the matter of how does one know where another person is in God, if one never hears him (or her), speak or pray?

Regarding the verse you quote, I think it's fair to say that Paul, as an ex-Pharisee, was correct to imply that a woman couldn't teach him anything, and that in general, women should be taught by men. This does not preclude a woman being called by God to 2 Tim 2:15, - a teaching ministry - but, this doesn't seem to be a common occurrence, and most women who know the Lord, would want to be able to share revelation and get feedback from elder brethren (both inside and outside her local situation), for her own guidance and spiritual covering.

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2009/8/9 16:27**

If one studies the book of Acts and Romans 16:1-27 it becomes apparent that godly females were very much involved in the ministry of the church, be it in helps, mercy, prophesying, rendering aid to whoever needed it. 1 Corinthians 11:10 informs us that when a godly female is properly veiled she will have authority/power on her head. The veiling reminds her of her place in the hierarchy of authority. For example, I know my husband very well: I know about his wishes and how and what he would do. Knowing all this and wanting to please him in all things, gives me a lot of power and authority to act in his place when he cannot be there and to assist him in our life and work.

Another example: ten years ago I worked for the US Census Bureau, canvassing the community accumulating information. To do so, we were given IDs worn on a chain around our neck. Our vehicles had a similar ID card in its windows. Whenever I wore that ID I had the responsibility to go to people's doors and ask them some personal questions. And they were required to respond to us in an appropriate manner. One day as I was driving along musing on the authority invested in me by the wearing of this ID (which also meant I was trained by the US Census Bureau and passed appropriate tests) my mind went to 1 Corinthians 11:1-16. The parallels were striking, similar. And I thanked God for this valuable insight. And I worshipped, thanking Him for giving this to me.

Blessings,  
ginnyrose

Re: a couple more hard verses ? ..., on: 2009/8/12 5:54

ginnyrose said

Quote:  
-----For example, I know my husband very well: I know about his wishes and how and what he would do. Knowing all this and wanting to please him in all things, gives me a lot of power and authority to act in his place when he cannot be there and to assist him in our life and work.  
-----

I found this a very challenging statement, in the context of *Christ, my Husband* and it brought to mind this verse from Annie Cousin.

*The Bride eyes not her garment, but her dear Bridegroom's face;  
I will not gaze at glory but on my King of grace.  
Not at the crown He giveth but on His pierced hand;  
The Lamb is all the glory of Immanuel's land.*

Tune: (<http://www.hymntime.com/tch/mid/r/u/rutherford.mid>) Rutherford

Thank you. I believe I have changes to make in how I spend my time.