

## General Topics :: Feminist translation

**Feminist translation - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/21 21:40**

"Lilith and Eve"

God formed Adam and Lilith from the dust of the ground and breathed into their nostrils the breath of life. Created from the same source, both having been formed from the ground, they were equal in all ways. Adam, being a man, didn't like this situation, and he looked for ways to change it. He said, "I'll have my figs now, Lilith," ordering her to wait on him, and he tried to leave to her the daily tasks of life in the garden. But Lilith wasn't one to take any nonsense; she picked herself up, uttered God's holy name, and flew away. "Well now, Lord," complained Adam, "that uppity woman you sent me has gone and deserted me." The Lord, inclined to be sympathetic, sent his messengers after Lilith, telling her to shape up and return to Adam or face dire punishment. She, however, preferring anything to living with Adam, decided to stay where she was. And so God, after more careful consideration this time, caused a deep sleep to fall on Adam and out of one of his ribs created for him a second companion, Eve.

For a time, Eve and Adam had a good thing going. Adam was happy now, and Eve, though she occasionally sensed capacities within herself that remained undeveloped, was basically satisfied with the role of Adam's wife and helper. The only thing that really disturbed her was the excluding closeness of the relationship between Adam and God. Adam and God just seemed to have more in common, both being men, and Adam came to identify with God more and more. After a while, that made God a bit uncomfortable too, and he started going over in his mind whether he may not have made a mistake letting Adam talk him into banishing Lilith and creating Eve, seeing the power that gave Adam.

Meanwhile Lilith, all alone, attempted from time to time to rejoin the human community in the garden. After her first fruitless attempt to breach its walls, Adam worked hard to build them stronger, even getting Eve to help him. He told her fearsome stories of the demon Lilith who threatens women in childbirth and steals children from their cradles in the middle of the night. The second time Lilith came, she stormed the garden's main gate, and a great battle ensued between her and Adam in which she was finally defeated. This time, however, before Lilith got away, Eve got a glimpse of her and saw she was a woman like herself.

After this encounter, seeds of curiosity and doubt began to grow in Eve's mind. Was Lilith indeed just another woman? Adam had said she was a demon. Another woman! The very idea attracted Eve. She had never seen another creature like herself before. And how beautiful and strong Lilith looked! How bravely she had fought! Slowly, slowly, Eve began to think about the limits of her own life within the garden.

One day, after many months of strange and disturbing thoughts, Eve, wandering around the edge of the garden, noticed a young apple tree she and Adam had planted, and saw that one of its branches stretched over the garden wall. Spontaneously, she tried to climb it, and struggling to the top, swung herself over the wall.

She did not wander long on the other side before she met the one she had come to find, for Lilith was waiting. At first sight of her, Eve remembered the tales of Adam and was frightened, but Lilith understood and greeted her kindly. "Who are you?" they asked each other, "What is your story?" And they sat and spoke together of the past and then of the future. They talked for many hours, not once, but many times. They taught each other many things, and told each other stories, and laughed together, and cried, over and over, till the bond of sisterhood grew between them.

Meanwhile, back in the garden, Adam was puzzled by Eve's comings and goings, and disturbed by what he sensed to be her new attitude toward him. He talked to God about it, and God, having his own problems with Adam and a somewhat broader perspective, was able to help out a little—but he was confused, too. Something had failed to go according to plan. As in the days of Abraham, he needed counsel from his children. "I am who I am," thought God, "but I must become who I will become."

And God and Adam were expectant and afraid the day Eve and Lilith returned to the garden, bursting with possibilities, ready to rebuild it together.

by Judith Plaskow

Any thoughts on this translation of the Genesis account?

**Re: Feminist translation - posted by SteveHale (), on: 2016/7/21 21:49**

If it wasn't so serious I would laugh...How sad!

**Re: Feminist translation - posted by dolfan (), on: 2016/7/21 21:52**

Yeah. It is not a translation. It IS though a fairy tale.

**Re: Feminist translation , on: 2016/7/21 22:07**

Is that from the "new NIV Gender Neutral (feminist) version"? That was the most ridiculous nonsense I have ever read, but I'm sure there are some who would prefer that version with all of its nuances, blame shifting, slanderous & blasphemous Allusions to the truth.

**Re: Feminist translation - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2016/7/22 5:48**

Where did Lilith come from? I know Eve and where she came from. I know who came from the seed of Eve, The Son of God by the Holy Spirit through the seed of Eve, Mary.

I wonder who came through Lilith? Maybe she turned into a serpent, you think?

What does a Christian woman think about this Lilith?

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: , on: 2016/7/22 5:58**

Not worth reading.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/7/22 7:22**

**Re: link - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/22 7:56**

TMK

You ought to remove that link immediately and find another one with text only, no pictures.

Please do so NOW!

I do not want this thread locked.

Thanks

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/7/22 10:39**

Ok savanah I removed it. Make sure you stay away from any art museum with Renaissance paintings.

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2016/7/22 10:43**

Does anyone know where I went? I'm still looking for it.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/22 12:28**

1 Timothy 4:7 King James Version (KJV)

7 But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness.

**Re: Feminist translation - posted by narrowpath, on: 2016/7/22 16:31**

This post is void of any edification. Not even funny.

**Re: feminist theology - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/22 23:01**

Feminists adopt a variety of hermeneutical techniques, applying them to the Biblical text.

For example, one feminist theologian insists that four structural elements are essential for a correct interpretation of the Bible:

1) A hermeneutic of suspicion:

readers can and must question the Biblical writers' interpretation, as the texts are androcentric and reinforce patriarchy. Since the Bible was written by men and was most often interpreted by male theologians, it could not be trusted. This hermeneutic of suspicion allowed the reader to raise questions regarding the validity of the Biblical authors' interpretation. They raise suspicion of the church "fathers" as being sexist and biased to do away with traditional beliefs, opening the door to re-interpretation.

2) A hermeneutic of proclamation:

those parts of the Bible which affirm liberation should be proclaimed, the rest rejected. Namely, those portions of the Bible that proclaim liberation for oppressed women should be accepted, and those that don't should be rejected, attributing them to historical patriarchal structure.

3) A hermeneutic of remembrance:

reclaim and honour the suffering of all women who were victims of patriarchy. This hermeneutic of remembrance focuses on abused and disparaged women. Its work is to remember and emphasize the misogynistic attitudes and behavior of the past in order not to repeat it.

4) A hermeneutic of creative actualisation:

rewrite the biblical text to "put back" the forgotten women into their rightful place. This allows you to embellish or augment the Biblical text by entering the Biblical story and retelling it from a feminist perspective.

I'll elaborate more on these in my next post.

**Re: Feminist theology 2 - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/22 23:54**

Feminist theologians encourage all Christian women to become involved in theology. Theology being the basis of liberation is an act of freedom! One should search out the right questions about the Bible and Ecclesial tradition, and rather than accept a certain text as being inspired, question everything because it was written by men and not women.

If a doctrine or text does not agree with a woman's experience of oppression and quest for liberation, then you are free to revise it. Since the message of the Bible is liberation to all, specifically to women from the rule of men, then this evil spirit of misogyny that is ostracizing women is the sin that must be exposed.

These feminist theologians believe that the Bible is male-biased, and in its traditional translation can be used by men for the self-perpetuation of patriarchy. According to these feminist theologians, the Bible itself needs liberation from the human fetters of misogyny which have shackled it. Therefore it must be re-translated.

So to excise the root of patriarchy from the church and society, two major theological mistakes must be corrected, feminist theologians say. A wrong view of God, and His Word the Bible. This theology of theirs they say, will heal the built-in misogyny on many levels and liberate women. They say that the effects of the fall must be reversed. For it is in the beginning, the fall of Adam that this patriarchy began.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2016/7/23 2:12**

Is this what you believe Savannah? What do they do with Jesus Christ a man who saves them?

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: believe - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/25 7:42**

Phillip,

You ask,

Is this what you believe Savannah?

I answer, No! I'm not a feminist nor do I believe their false feminist theology. It is satanic, as it attempts to dethrone the LORD God Almighty, and devilish as it slanders God's Holy Name and His Holy Word.

I believe what God hath said, not the fables, myths and lies made up by these deceivers.

Here, for example is what God hath said;

"...yet your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you" Gen 3:16b

"...its desire is for you,  
but you must master it." Gen 4:7b

"...and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. Gen 3:16b

"...and unto thee shall be its desire; but do thou rule over it. Gen 4:7b

In regard to these verses in Genesis I believe;

In Genesis 4:7 sin's desire is to enslave Cain, to possess or control him, but the Lord commands, urges Cain to overpower sin, to master it. An active struggle between Cain and sin is implied.

The woman has the same sort of desire for her husband that sin has for Cain, a desire to possess or control him. This desire disputes the headship of the husband. As the Lord tells Cain what he should do, i.e., master or rule sin, the Lord also states what the husband should do, rule over his wife.

The words of the Lord in Genesis 3:16b, as in the case of the battle between sin and Cain, do not determine the victor of the conflict between husband and wife, but merely mark the beginning of the battle of the sexes.

As a result of the fall, man no longer rules easily; he must fight for his headship. Sin has corrupted both the willing submission of the wife and the loving headship of the husband. The woman's desire is to control her husband (to usurp his divinely appointed headship, and he must master her, if he can. So the rule of love founded in paradise is replaced by struggle, tyranny and domination. Experience also corroborates this interpretation of God's judgment on the woman.

The desire of the woman in Genesis 3:16b does not make the wife (more) submissive to her husband so that he may rule over her. Her desire is to contend with him for leadership in their relationship. This desire is a result of and a just punishment for sin.

Consequently, the man must actively seek to rule his wife. This interpretation is true because:

(1) It is consistent with the context, i.e., it is judgment for sin that the relation between man and woman is made difficult. God's words in Genesis 3:16b destroy the harmony of marriage, for the rule of the husband, part of God's original intent for marriage, is not made more tolerable by the wife's desire for her husband, but less tolerable, because she rebels against his leadership and tries to usurp it.

(2) It permits a consistent understanding of the Hebrew word translated desire in the Old Testament also consistent with its etymology.

(3) It recognizes the parallel between Genesis 3:16b and 4:7b. The interpretation of 4:7b is clearer; we know from the context that sin's desire to Cain involves mastery or enslavement and that Cain did not win the battle to rule sin.

(4) It explains the fact that husbands do not rule their wives as a result of God's proclamation in Genesis 3:16b. (Further support is implied by the New Testament commands for wives to be submissive to their husbands and the requirements for elders to rule their families.) "Shall rule" is not an indicative statement in the Hebrew, if God states that something will come to pass, it will. A.F.

**Re: No - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2016/7/26 6:45**

How refreshing is your answer. So also the rest of your answer.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: Love - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/26 10:20**

Quote:  
-----Ok savanah I removed it.  
-----

Thank you for in love and the fear of God being mindful of your brothers conscience.

(Probably could have done without the "teasing" afterward though. It may surprise you that some of us likely wouldn't attend an "art" museum that displays nudes.)

**Re: Taunting and unedifying scoffing - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/26 10:36**

Quote:

-----Does anyone know where SI went? I'm still looking for it.  
-----

What purpose does such commenting serve? Couldn't this be seen as "trolling"? If you have nothing to add, why comment at all?

And more importantly, do you have a biblical basis for posting such comments? Is this in accordance with the Law of Christ?

I find matters such as the one this brother is seeking to discuss and bring attention to, be as politically incorrect as they may, deserve our consideration in this hour.

Thus says the LORD, "Stand by the ways and see and ask for the ancient paths, Where the good way is, and walk in it; And you will find rest for your souls. But they said, 'We will not walk in it.'"

~ Jeremiah 6:16

**Re: , on: 2016/7/26 11:42**

Savannah,

I hate feminism but my reasons are completely different. This how I see it now without deeply going into study this subject:

God did not intend that Adam rule Eve. They were partners, Eve did not want to rule either. They were both under God, He ruled both of them and they were obedient. The problems started after the fall, when they were separated from God. I believe it was not the will of God but part of the curse that they were under that they desired to rule over each other. Both the wife's "desire" and the man's rule were the expression of their fallen nature. God designed the man to lead but not to rule. What is the difference? Think of the difference between the judges and the kings of Israel, the judges lead the people according to God's counsel while the kings ruled (meaning selfishly, exploitatively, without the counsel of God). God did not want Israel to have a king He wanted to be their king, He allowed this situation because the people asked for it. I think God allowed the unredeemed man to rule over unredeemed wife, but that was not his perfect will. We Christians are the redeemed children of God. Our curse is taken away by the death of Jesus, and we are born again to live an abundant life for Him with his resurrection power. We are not separated from God Jesus came to put an end to that separation. Each and every believer men as well as women received the holy spirit and through him the rule of Jesus over our life. This is not a forceful rule we gave our life voluntarily. This divine rule is the essence of our Christianity. We all (including women) are called to have a personal relationship with God and do not need a mediator other than Jesus. He is the one that saved us from our sins and from the rule of Satan, as well as from our self will. We are now in a similar state that Adam and Eve were in the Garden, except that we have a flesh that is unredeemed and needs to be crucified. When we walk in the spirit, we all obey God, men lead the women as God intended but do not rule them God is the one who rules. However God did not take us out of this world and in order to live in it peacefully we obey the authorities as commanded by God. So for example if a Christian woman has a fleshly husband who wants to rule over her she obeys God by submitting to this husband's rule as long as it does not require to commit sin against God. If the husband is walking in the spirit but the wife is fleshly and wants to rule over the husband, the husband should refuse her rule and patiently lead her to bring her under the rule of God, but not rule over her. If both are walking in the spirit, they are equal partners where the husband leads and both equally obey God who rules over them. If a wife obeys God she knows and understands all about the leadership of the husband. The worst case that could happen is that they both walk in the flesh, this is when the old curse comes to effect and the wife "desires" and the husband rules. (Please observe that God is not even in the picture). This is what fuels the dynamic of many marriages in the world, but should not be with us.

**Re: "Rule Over" - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/26 13:03**

I think the confusion lies in one's connotations of the words "rule over." If we understand all "ruling over" to be harsh lording and an unwilling obedience to a forceful dictator - then of course that is not the will of God for husbands and wives.

But: If 'ruling over' can be done in peace and gentleness and love, and if the subjection to the ruling of the other can likewise be done in obedience to God and love for Him and willfully (as is the case with Jesus' rule over us) - then we are saying essentially the same thing.

This does not minimize the command of God that women are to be subject to their husbands in everything. That is to say, he is to be the head - in authority and over the wife. That doesn't need to be harsh or exacting, but for a woman (or man for that matter) to resist this teaching is to reject and deny God's authority over her (at least in that area).

I look for the submitting to the teaching as a principle and heart condition. The practice takes grace and time to perfect. Just like I agree with the command to "walk in the Spirit" and to "be perfect" as my Heavenly Father is Perfect - though I often fail at the practice. At least the will is perfected and desires to fulfill the holy commandment. The flesh is now the culprit. Thus we learn to allow the Spirit of God to rule over us by resting in Him and thereby yielding ourselves to Christ to serve Him.

The problem in the previous threads (in my estimation) arises when brothers and sisters deny that it is the will of God for a wife to 'be subject' to her husband 'in everything.' That is what is concerning, for that is a distortion of the word of God.

So I agree that the husband is not to be brutal and harsh, but to 'nourish and cherish' his wife - but she is commanded of God to arrange herself under him in the Lord nonetheless.

It is not my duty to exact subjection out of my wife, but I do teach and assert that the LORD requires it of her and seek to make that as easy a task as possible.

The below passage reveals that Christ 'rules over' and He has people (really, "all things") in subjection to Him - and this doesn't necessarily make Him harsh or unloving.

I see those who willfully subject themselves to Him in love and grace, and those (His enemies) who will one day be forcefully subjected to Him.

For those that are His, it is a willful subjection and a ruling over in love and life (not to mention that He is God and thus has an inherent right to rule, however He chooses, really - but thank God it's not His Nature to be contrary to love):

Quote:  
-----But each in his own order: Christ the first fruits, after that those who are Christ's at His coming, then comes the end, when He hands over the kingdom to the God and Father, when He has abolished all rule and all authority and power. For He must reign until He has put all His enemies under His feet. The last enemy that will be abolished is death. For "HE HAS PUT ALL THINGS IN SUBJECTION UNDER HIS FEET."

But when He says, "All things are put in subjection," it is evident that He is excepted who put all things in subjection to Him. When all things are subjected to Him, then the Son Himself also will be subjected to the One who subjected all things to Him, so that God may be all in all.  
~ 1 Cor. 15:23-28

And again:

Quote:  
-----"But now having been freed from sin and enslaved\* to God, you derive your benefit, resulting in sanctification, and the outcome, eternal life."  
~ Romans 6:22

The "enslaved" here is "doulos" and Strong's Concordance gives the meaning: "to enslave, bring under subjection."



This is the ideal subjection, the one that God desires - "love-slaves." God desires that the wife's love for Christ and His love in her would cause her to willfully subject herself to her husband in the Lord (which is truly subjecting herself to Him more fully). Just as the husband nourishing and cherishing his wife is to subject himself to the Lord more fully.

But insofar that we fall short, we need commandments and thus the apostle and "beloved brother" Paul (as well as Peter) admonish women to ensure that they are submitting to their husbands. Just as he has to admonish men to love their wives as Christ loved the church: self sacrificially and to death - and with an everlasting (and all-consuming) love (under God).

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2016/7/26 13:14**

Forrests, the reason "YOU" can't relate to my post is because you just joined a few months ago, anyone that has been here for years, probably know exactly what I meant. Also, please don't scrutinize my posts, when I have read some threads here lately that you have participated in, that probably have made the devil rejoice. Also, my email is in my profile if you feel the need to correct, you don't have to do it in front of the whole world and make us both look stupid, how edifying is that?

**Re: you don't have to do it in front of the whole world - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/26 13:35**

Quote:  
-----by MrBillPro on 2016/7/26 10:14:24  
  
...Also, my email is in my profile if you feel the need to correct, you don't have to do it in front of the whole world and make us both look stupid, how edifying is that?  
-----

I agree. But don't you see the irony here?

You publicly made an unedifying remark in a public forum, so I replied. I did not rebuke or correct your doctrine or practice, I merely questioned your motive for and/or intent in making a comment that didn't seem to offer anything edifying to the discussion itself - one that seemed only to scoff and not to bless. That was it.

We are all agreeing to put our input out there and submit it to the "others" and let them "judge" (1 Cor 14), no?

My email is also available in case you would like to attempt a civil and edifying discussion of personal/private matters. I have no such desire at the time.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/26 13:55**

Forrest, God commanded the wife to submit her husband (good or bad husband) but this command does not mean that God commanded the husband to rule. I see nowhere in the bible saying "you husbands rule your wife really well" instead it said love your wife. Christians who are ruled by god do not need to rule each other but love each other and submit to each other. In summary the command submit does not necessarily mean that the other was commanded to rule. Take an example from the traffic rules: the yield sign means that I have to yield, but the fact that others have a yield sign does not mean that I can enforce my right of way even if they did not yield. If I would try that I would be guilty of causing injury.

**Re: Husbands/Fathers "Ruling" - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/26 15:18**

Quote:  
-----I see nowhere in the bible saying "you husbands rule your wife really well" instead it said love your wife.  
-----

What about this requirement for an elder/overseer?

"He must be one who \*manages\* his own household well, keeping his children under control with all dignity (but if a man does not know how to manage his own household, how will he take care of the church of God?)..."



~ 1 Timothy 3:4-5

The word rendered "manages" here, and as "ruleth" in the KJV, is:

\*proisthēmi: to put before, to set over, to rule\*

**Re: Head vs. Ruler - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/26 16:11**

Quote:

----- "...but this command does not mean that God commanded the husband to rule."  
-----

I disagree. Let me make my case. We do agree that God says that man is the head of the woman, right? I assume so, so let me build on that premise/foundation.

In Exodus (18:25) we read:

"And Moses chose able men out of all Israel, and made them heads\* over the people, rulers\*\* of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens."

The word rendered "head" here is:

\*rosh: head

(This same word is used in the sense of "heads of their fathers houses", "chief/captain" and similar ways in Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, etc, etc..)

The word rendered "ruler" here is:

\*\*sar: chieftain, chief, ruler, official, captain, prince

The word "head" here is synonymous with and used interchangeably with "ruler" in this verse and really all through out the Old Testament.

And in the New as well. What does the word of God mean when it says:

"...is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation. For by Him all things were created, both in the heavens and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities—all things have been created through Him and for Him. He is before all things, and in Him all things hold together. He is also head of the body, the church..."

~ Colossians 1:15-18a

In what way is Christ Head of the church? As ruler, no?

Here is another example:

"...which brought about in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead and seated Him at His right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age but also in the one to come. And He put all things in subjection under His feet, and gave Him as head over all things to the church, which is His body, the fullness of Him who fills all in all."

~ Ephesians 1:20-23

And then there is this, in the word of God:

"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..."

~ Ephesians 5:22a

And:

"In the same way, you wives, be submissive to your own husbands...For in this way in former times the holy women also, who hoped in God, used to adorn themselves, being submissive to their own husbands; just as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord\*, and you have become her children if you do what is right without being frightened by any fear."  
~ 1 Peter 3:1a,5-6

\*kurios: lord, master

So, if the word of God says we are the head - does it mean that God expects us to "rule" or "manage" our homes and have authority? I believe the answer is "certainly yes" and I believe this is clear from scripture.

Now, can a man exact obedience from his wife? No. But could she be held accountable/rebuked for willful sin if she rejects this commandment and goes on in perpetual insubordination? I would say so. I imagine no Christian husband would wish this on his wife - to be humiliated in front of the brothers/elders/church - but the word of God may require it in severe enough cases.

So my question to you is, how is a man being "head" of his wife any different from his being her "ruler/authority" - biblically speaking (keeping in mind that Christ is "Head" of the church and the wife is to submit to her husband \*as unto the Lord.\*)?

On the subject "enforcing rule":

As I said before, I cannot exact obedience, but I can teach it as a requirement of God and have grace, patience and mercy/understanding in the sanctification process (i.e: Love my wife as Christ loves the church).

Paul instructs Titus that the older women are to encourage the younger women to be "subject to their own husbands" ("so that the word of God will not be dishonored").

How do you suppose Titus was to instruct the older women to encourage the younger women to be subject to their husbands if he were to never teach them this principle or admonish them to encourage the younger women in it?

My point is: somewhere along the way it was a man's duty to teach and instruct the women that she is to 'be subject' to her husband. Can we make them obey? No. That would either make us abusive or God. And God we are definitely not.

So we love them like Christ loves the church and teach them the truth, pray for them, help them, and bear long with their frailty and failure and sin - and try to captivate their hearts and will with our self sacrificial love. That is how we "enforce" such a commandment/ordinance of the Lord.

Blessings, brother.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/26 17:46**

Forrest, I made my case before, I have nothing to add, or take away, the answers to your questions can be found included in my previous posts.

All is well if we walk in the spirit.

Ephesians 5:17-21 King James Version (KJV)

17Â Wherefore be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is.

18Â And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit;

19Â Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord;

20Â Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ;

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

**Re: Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God. - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/26 18:11**

Quote:

-----by Tozsu on 2016/7/26 14:46:39

Forrest, I made my case before, I have nothing to add, or take away, the answers to your questions can be found included in my previous posts.

I don't think you have...you assert that to be "head of" is different than to "rule", and I contested your position. You are yet to show that the bible either:

- A) Condemns all "ruling" and/or only speaks of "ruling" in a negative way - or,
- B) Makes a clear difference between "headship" and "ruling/authority over".

And it is not wise to seek to cancel whole passages of apostolic instruction (by the Spirit) by citing one verse that you interpret as a contradiction. To do so is to say that there is a contradiction in the word of God - and thus to imply there is contradiction/imperfection in God. Either they agree or God is the responsible for confusion/disorder. It is our duty to, by the Spirit, reconcile them and thus fully understand the mind of Christ in any particular matter.

I have at least two explanations of the "submitting to one another" that don't contradict with "Wives, submit to your husbands" and "wives, be subject to your husbands in everything".

One is that the submission to one another is detailed in the following verses, and it follows certain guidelines:

Quote:

-----"...and be subject to one another in the fear of Christ.

"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...

"Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself up for her...So husbands ought also to love their own wives as their own bodies...

"Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right...

"Fathers, do not provoke your children to anger, but bring them up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord.

"Slaves, be obedient to those who are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in the sincerity of your heart, as to Christ; not by way of eyeservice, as men-pleasers, but as slaves of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart...

"And masters, do the same things to them, and give up threatening, knowing that both their Master and yours is in heaven, and there is no partiality with Him."

The apostle instructs us to submit to "one another" in the fear of Christ, and then goes on to expound on who should submit to who and how.

The idea is quite the opposite than the more Egalitarian brothers (and sisters) use it. They to basically eliminate positional authority in the home and society, but Paul to reaffirm it and to show that submission to it in general (under God), as well as the proper use of it (in the case of Husbands, Fathers, and Masters) is to live and walk "in the fear of Christ."

My other explanation is that if my wife is operating by the Spirit and it is thus Christ and His authority she is operating in in that moment (for instance, a prophetic word, uttered under the influence of the Holy Spirit) - then I must submit to/fear Him in and through her. This is primarily applicable to and in the context of the assembly.

Does this make sense, brother?

**Re: , on: 2016/7/26 18:37**

Quote:  
-----Does this make sense, brother?  
-----

You did not supply who you were quoting so just in case, Tozsu is a sister.

Quote:  
-----My other explanation is that if my wife is operating by the Spirit and it is thus Christ and His authority she is operating in in that moment (for instance, a prophetic word, uttered under the influence of the Holy Spirit) - then I must submit to/fear Him in and through her. This is primarily applicable to and in the context of the assembly.  
-----

Not at home? Is Jesus not able to operate through your wife at home? You don't submit to Jesus operating in and through your wife at home? Does it have to be a prophetic word? What if she is just walking in the Spirit as a blood bought saint of God?

Are you in a Brethren Assembly? Just curious, because I know this type of statement and thinking is prevalent with them .

**Re: Julius21 - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/26 18:56**

Quote:  
-----by Julius21 on 2016/7/26 15:37:00

Tozsu is a sister.  
-----

My apologies, sister.

Quote:  
-----Not at home? Is Jesus not able to operate through your wife at home? You don't submit to Jesus operating in and through your wife at home? Does it have to be a prophetic word? What if she is just walking in the Spirit as a blood bought saint of God?  
-----

There is a lot going on here, so let me break it down and seek to answer you.

Quote:  
-----Not at home?  
-----

I guess if she was moved of the Spirit and operating under His direct influence in the course of day to day life, then yes, also at home. But this would still seem to be in the context of spiritual edification/instruction/revelation. Because, and to answer your next question:

Quote:  
-----Is Jesus not able to operate through your wife at home?  
-----

Yes, He is. But He is not contrary to His word and has already said in His word that He works in the home (in the natural managing of it) in and through the head, the man. So, He will keep His word and use that structure. Now, in a spiritual sense, men and women are equal and He sure can and will use women to "pray or prophesy" - as His word declares.

Which also answers the next question:

Quote:

-----You don't submit to Jesus operating in and through your wife at home?  
-----

Sure I do, if and when she is operating in the Name of Christ and not contrary to His word - as I explained above.

Quote:

-----Does it have to be a prophetic word?  
-----

Not necessarily - but that seems to be one primary way that the Lord would use her in my life and the life of the local body (in accordance with His word). That and prayer. I'm sure there are some others, but they are similar in nature and I was merely giving an example - hence the "for instance" right in front of the "prophetic word".

Quote:

-----What if she is just walking in the Spirit as a blood bought saint of God?  
-----

Fantastic! Amen! Then she will be subjecting herself to me in the management/ruling of the family in the fear of Christ and in accordance with His word. And in spiritual matters, she will exercise godly humility, a quiet and peaceable spirit and the decorum that the word of God prescribes for a woman and wife to walk in - and I (hopefully) will recognize it as the word of the Lord and not the word of man (or a woman) and submit myself to Him in her in the fear of Christ.

Otherwise, the way I "Submit to" her in the fear of Christ is explained in the above passage - patience, love, understanding, not being bitter, nourishing and cherishing her - treating her how Christ treats me, knowing that I am under His Authority and will stand before Him and give an account one day (and to whom much is given, of him much will be required).

Quote:

-----Are you in a Brethren Assembly?  
-----

No. Never even visited one. Remember, it is the word of God and Christ that I am seeking to obey and conform to - in the fear of Christ. Not a denomination or my "own understanding."

Blessings, brother(?)

**Re: , on: 2016/7/26 21:10**

Well brother, all I can say is God bless you and your wife and children. I will also say I know exactly where Tozsu is coming from and don't see any conflict with her understanding of the word as the Lord has given her.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/27 0:42**

Forrests,

This type of plain speaking from the scriptures on this matter is rare and usually not quickly accepted by the masses of even those within the church in the West (at least in America it isn't I know), but it is what it is. It's Bible. You can't get away from it (without twisting it or running from it) honestly & I applaud you for dealing with & speaking to it purely from the Word of God. After all "the fear of men and the praise of men, both are a snare" & "Let God be true and every man a liar", amen?

God Bless!

Jeff

**Re: Praise of man and fear of man. - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/27 11:51**

Jeff,

Amen! And thank you for the encouragement, it is genuinely appreciated.

May the Lord help us to submit to His word and not resort to twisting it to spare our flesh. He is both willing and able to enable us to meet it's demands by His Spirit through faith - the grace of life.

May God continue to encourage and strengthen you as you have strengthened and encouraged me today.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/27 13:13**

ðŸŒŠ that was refreshing to my soul! You have no idea! But ah, when we submit to the Lord, His Word, His ways & will (which are laid out for us in the word) & become "willing sacrifices, holy & pleasing to the Lord" (Romans 12) what a sweet fragrance of life in Christ springs forth from this truth & the Cross Demonstrated (not just theologized upon) brings! Beauty from ashes! Strength from weakness! Trust me, I was just as prewired in my flesh to not "live with my wife in a patient and understanding way" as she was to not "submit to your husband in all things". I am still not perfect in these things, but the Grace of God that comes when we submit to His Word & confess our failures rather than attempting to redefine them to meet our expectations, rather than the other way around! You have encouraged me brother!

**Re: "Submit to one another in the fear of Christ" - posted by forrests (), on: 2016/7/27 15:29**

The more I think about it, the more clear it is that many are using the very instruction to recognize positional authority in the world and home and to submit to it; as one of their favorite verses (removed completely from it's immediate context, might I add) to use to teach and practice the exact opposite.

The "problem" that Paul seems to be trying to correct - or the potential peril that he is trying to avoid - is a thinking that says:

Premise: "We are all equal in God's eyes and brothers and sisters in Christ and, 'there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free man, male nor female' in Christ and we 'are all one in Christ Jesus'..."

Conclusion: "...so therefore we should all be equals in the world and we shouldn't have to submit to one another based on certain 'societal' or 'traditional' roles any longer."

It's pretty scary that we could take a teaching that was written to refute a certain belief, and use it to support the very belief it contradicts...

I exhort all of those who are using the biblical imperative, "submit to one another in the fear of Christ", as proof that the wife is not to "be subject" to her own husband "in everything", to humbly and honestly pray and study this one out...

In love I warn you that you are likely twisting the scripture to support a worldly/rebellious/antichrist philosophy and sentiment which is at odds with the word of the LORD.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/27 18:49**

Exactly! And in fact, when discussing elsewhere not permitting a woman to teach or have authority over men (in the ekklēsia), he actually goes on to make it so clear "a caveman could get it" (to quote Geico ðŸ˜Š).

"If anyone thinks himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let them acknowledge the words I write to you are from God and not from man.." 1 Corinthians 14:37

And elsewhere (1 Timothy 2 I believe) goes into how it was Eve who was deceived when setting authority/headship/leadership parameters. And says Adam was created first & Woman was created for man (which lines up with the language of a helpmate).

As well as the clear language for what the older women should be teaching the younger (to love & submit to their husbands, love and care for their children, be keepers at home, meek & quiet spirit, etc.) in Titus 2.

Pretty clear.

Feminism has so many subtle "twists" and perversions of the Word of God and so many culturally deeply engrained roots that people just can't take it for what it is (& the Word for what it plainly says). Uprooting them is not a small thing, but totally necessary & mandated in the New Testament throughout. That BY NO MEANS takes away from the likewise scriptural mandate for husbands to love their wives and live with them in an understanding way, but both together are the scriptural picture & balance clearly laid out. Anyone who argues with that isn't arguing with man ultimately, but with God and His Word.

**Re: Ephesians 5:21 - posted by savannah, on: 2016/7/27 18:57**

"Submit to one another in the fear of Christ."

The semantic meaning of the Greek word for *hēsūbmitō* almost exclusively refers to someone subjecting himself or herself to another who is in authority over that person. It is used elsewhere in the New Testament to refer to Jesus's submission to His parents (Luke 2:51); of demons being subject to the apostles (Luke 10:17, 20); of citizens being subject to governing authorities (Rom. 13:1; Titus 3:1; 1 Pet. 2:13); of the universe being subject to Christ (1 Cor. 15:27; Eph. 1:22); of unseen powers being subject to Christ (1 Pet. 3:22); of Christ being subject to God the Father (1 Cor. 15:28); of wives being subject to their husbands (Col. 3:18; Titus 2:5; 1 Pet. 3:5; Eph. 5:22, 24); of the church being subject to Christ (Eph. 5:24); of servants being subject to their masters (Titus 2:9; 1 Pet. 2:18); and of Christians being subject to God (Heb. 12:9; James 4:7). It is significant that none of these relationships are ever reversed. The word is never *mutual* in its force; it is always one-directional in its reference to submission to an authority.

While in a fallen world, those in authority often abuse their position, it does not negate the necessity for proper authority. Those in authority also incur responsibility and accountability to God. To whom much is given, much will be required (Luke 12:48).

When those in authority live in the fear of Christ, they will not abuse their authority. They will exercise authority in love and out of a desire to seek the highest good of those under authority. They know that one day they will give an account to the Judge of all. So they view leadership not as an opportunity for personal advantage, but as a solemn responsibility to be exercised in the fear of Christ.

Surely, all defiance against God-given authority originates from Satan and puts those who resist authority in opposition to God Himself. With the exception that when God given authority tells us to disobey God, we must not submit. Piper & Gudem



**Re: , on: 2016/7/27 18:58**

The fact that the unbelieving world would disagree with these plain passages of scripture & despise them, should be a clue I think to those in the church aligning themselves with their sentiments? ðŸ˜Š It ain't popular, but neither is love your enemies, lay down & lose your life for Christ's sake, Jesus is the only way, etc.

**Re: , on: 2016/7/27 19:07**

I don't disagree with those sentiments of not abusing authority, not Lording it over them, not letting an ungodly leader tell me to do something God said not to, etc. Totally agree. It's just like how I am called by the Word to submit to the ruling & governing authorities & bosses (not just the kind, but even the forward/harsh) & with a humble & genuine heart UP TO the point they tell me to break a clear command of the Lord (& then of course God's law trumps men's directives). Totally agree.

I do think using one verse out of context that says to submit "to one another out of reverence for Christ" to say men should submit to their wives is not rightly dividing the Word in light of all the other CRYSTAL CLEAR scriptural commands concerning the man as the head under Christ in the Home (& even the ekklesia). And it's men's job to teach this to the ekklesia & older women in the faith's job to teach it to the younger women. This is crystal clear in light of all the NT doctrinal epistles (& what was obvious & understood in the OT).

God Bless!  
Jeff

The fact is we rarely get that far in our society. It's like telling children many parents beat their children so no children should take seriously the clear command to honor & obey their parents. It's a non-sequitur (mostly straw man) defense of a non-Biblical view/position

**Re: , on: 2016/7/28 3:04**

savannah,

A submits to B means that if A and B have different will: A gives up his/her will and they both do the will of B. This is the case every time when someone submits to authority. But also when you give up your will so another person's will can come to pass, you submit to that person. This act does not necessarily require the other person to have authority over you. It could be that you submitted because you are generous. You want to buy vanilla ice cream for your son but he insists that he wants chocolate ice cream if you submit to his will and buy the chocolate ice cream does it mean that your son has authority over you? Of course not. Does being generous decrease your authority? I don't think so. Your authority is given to you by God, not by those who submit (or fail to submit) to you, and your occasional generous submission only strengthens your authority. (Note that generous submission is not the same as being constantly coerced by nagging individuals against our will) When you walk with God you will have authority, you do not need to take extra special care to enforce it.

Mutual submission:

Suppose that you want to go through the exit door after church and at the same time your christian brother (same level of authority, same age etc.) want to go through the same door. What happens is that neither of you will force his way out but both of you stop wanting to let the other go first. You submitted to each other in the fear of God. There was no authority involved in this submission (other than God's)

When you and your wife both want to eat that last piece of cake in the fridge, often - if you love each other- you both end up insisting that the other should eat it. What happened is that both you and your wife gave up your will so that the other can have his/her will. You submitted to each other in the fear of God.

To learn to submit to her husband belongs to the wife's sanctification. Her being or not being submissive to you doesn't make you a better or worse christian (remember she submits to the good and bad husband) You may look better in people's eyes with a submitting woman on your side, but God looks at your heart and actions.

In my opinion every christian should primarily take care of his/her own sanctification.

A good husband who encourages his wife to walk with God because he loves her and loves God and without the agenda of "...then she would always obey ME.." will be blessed with an orderly family, because his wife's submission to God INCLUDES her submission to the husband, and not the other way around.