Are there Still Elders in the Church? by B. L. Cocherell

(Nevada)

PAGE 2 Articles

In regard to: 5 Reasons Genesis 3:16 is Not a Model for Christian Marriage Article by Eddie Hyatt Comments by Alfio La Spina (Victoria British Columbia)

PAGE 6 Iron Sharpening Iron

The Christian Sabbath

by Catholic Mirror 1893 (Baltimore, Maryland)

PAGE 11 A Blast from the Past

In regard to: Junia, a Woman Apostle Article by Dianne D. McDonnell Comments by John Taylor (Lyle, Washington)

PAGE 6 Iron Sharpening Iron

In regard to: 5 Reasons Genesis 3:16 is Not a Model for Christian Marriage Article by Eddie Hyatt Comments by Crystal Burson (Big Sandy, Texas) and Laura Lee (Bismarck, North Dakota) PAGE 7 Iron Sharpening Iron

Holy Days 2021

Trumpets - September 7, 2021 Atonement - September 16, 2021 Tabernacles - September 21 to 27, 2021 Last Great Day - September 28, 2021

To Unsubscribe from this newsletter: Send a blank email to church-of-god-bismarck@hotmail.com with "Unsubscribe" in the subject line.

To Subscribe to this newsletter: Send a blank email to church-of-god-bismarck@hotmail.com with "Subscribe" in the subject line.

To Submit Items for Print: Send to: church-of-god-bismarck@hotmail.com or Mail to Darwin & Laura Lee, PO Box 2333, Bismarck, ND 58502

The "New" Church of God Messenger is an independent publication. All newsletters may be copied and given to others if they are copied and sent in their entirety.

Publisher: Church of God, Bismarck, Darwin & Laura Lee, **Editor:** Laura Lee, **Assistant Editor:** Darwin Lee We do not necessarily agree with all contributors, or their works submitted and printed in this newsletter. It is up to you to get out your Bible and see whether these things are true. Iron sharpens Iron

Contributors: Crystal Burson, Catholic Mirror, B. L. Cocherell, Alfio La Spina, Laura Lee, John Taylor

Website: Church of God, Bismarck https://www.church-of-god-bismarck.org



Articles

Are there Still Elders in the Church? by B. L. Cocherell (Nevada) Continued from Issue #28

The Bishop

As the church grew in numbers, it became evident that more men were needed to serve in various capacities. In First Timothy, chapter 3, verses 1 through 13, Paul lists recognizable qualities a man must possess before being selected and placed in an official capacity to serve and supervise a congregation:

"This is a trustworthy saying, If a man desires the office of a bishop, he desires a good work. A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach" (1 Tim.3:1-2 KJV Para.). See also verses 3-13.

In verse 1, the English word bishop is translated from the Greek word episkope, which by implication means superintendence and in verse 2 the word bishop is translated from the Greek word episkopos; which basically means a superintendent.

It makes no sense for Paul to give Timothy a long list of qualifications a man must have, if that man was not to be placed in a position of authority within the church. What is clearly shown in chapter 3 and other instructions to Timothy is that men were being selected to serve the elect in various official functions and responsibilities within the church.

Note: The English word deacon used in chapter 3, verses 8,10, 12, and 13 gives the impression that Paul is giving a separate instruction about a function and responsibility other than that of a bishop. However, this is not the case. A study of the Greek language shows the words deacon and deacons in chapter 3, to be a translation of the Greek words diakoneo and its derivatives diakonia, and diakonos, which basically describe individuals that serve or attend to something. These Greek words do not describe a distinct position of authority or the title of an office within the early church.

Payment for Services Rendered

Paul's clear instructions in 1 Timothy 5:17-18 show that those who serve Christ as spiritual leaders of the elect and labor in the proclamation of the gospel have the right to receive support from those they serve:

"Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine. For the scripture says, You shall not muzzle the ox that treads out the corn. And the laborer is worthy of his reward. Against an elder do not accept an accusation, except before two or three witnesses. Those that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear" (1Tim.5:17-20 KJV Para).

In verses 17 and 19 the words elders and elder are translated from the Greek word presbuteros; comparative of presbus (elderly); older; as noun, a senior; specifically, an Israelite Sanhedrist (also figuratively, a member of the celestial council) or Christian "presbyter."

The phrase that rule is translated from the Greek word proistemi; which basically means to stand before, i.e., (in rank) to preside, or (by implication) to practice.

The word honor is translated from the Greek word time, which means a value i.e., money paid, or (concretely and collectively) valuables; by analogy, esteem (especially of the highest degree), or the dignity itself.

The word reward is translated from the Greek word misthos; a primary word; which means pay for services (literally or figuratively).

Verse 19 tells us how to deal with an elder (i.e., a man in a leadership capacity) accused of a sinful act and what to do if he is found guilty.

Laying on of Hands

In First Timothy chapter 5, verses 21 through 22, Paul instructs Timothy to be objective and to not be influenced by

personal feelings or opinions when selecting men for positions of service.

"I charge you before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that you observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality. Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins: keep yourself pure" (1 Tim.5:21-22 KJV).

Some might think the ritual of laying on of hands as strange and unnecessary during this gospel age of salvation. However, the biblical record shows this ritual being performed before and after the advent of Christ to set men apart for a function, responsibility, or task, and to sometimes impart supernatural abilities and an authorization to use spirit-power to help these men perform their task.

Paul also cautions Timothy not to make a snap decision when selecting and placing a man in a position of authority, lest he choose a sinner and thereby share responsibility for this man's wrong attitude, behavior, and etcetera.

Letter to Titus

The apostle Paul wrote the following to Titus the Greek telling him to select men and place them in positions of authority and service in every city as he had previously told him to do:

"To Titus, my own son after the common faith: Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ our Savior. For this cause left I you in Crete, that you should set in order the things that are absent, and ordain elders in every city, as I appointed you" (Tit.1:4-5 KJV Para.).

During the effort to preach the good news in several Crete cities, many people accepted God the Father's offer of salivation through Christ's sacrifice, after which Paul and others with him went elsewhere to continue their evangelistic effort before the church was properly organized. Therefore, Paul left Titus in Crete to establish congregations in cities where there were new converts and set in place a functioning ministry to serve them.

Here, the word ordain is translated from the Greek word kathistemi; which can mean to place down (permanently), i.e., (figuratively) to designate, constitute, convoy.

The substitution of the word ordain in place of the Greek word kathistemi does convey the essence and meaning of what Paul instructs Titus to do, which is to select men and place them in positions of service to the elect.

In verse 5, the word elders is translated from the Greek word presbuteros; comparative of presbus (elderly); older; as noun, a senior; specifically, an Israelite Sanhedrist (also figuratively, a member of the celestial council) or Christian "presbyter."

If as some believe and teach, these elders were just older men, it makes no sense to identify them as being old, because old men are easily recognized. What makes sense and becomes obvious when we review verses 6 through 9 is that these men were to be selected, authorized, and placed in an official leadership capacity to supervise, serve, teach, and govern congregations of the elect in Crete.

The Bishop

"If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children not accused of riot or unruly. For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; But a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate. Holding fast the faithful word as he has been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers" (Tit.1:6-8 KJV).

Here, the word bishop is translated from the Greek word episkopos, which means a superintendent. Clearly, the use of the Greek word episkopos in Paul's letter to Titus describes a position of authority and an authorization to supervise other people in one fashion or another. Where the elect are concerned, this supervision has to do with the spiritual welfare of the elect.

In verse 7, the word steward is translated from the Greek word oikonomos which basically means a manager or overseer, i.e., an employee in that capacity; by extension, a fiscal agent (treasurer). If a man is God's steward, that man is managing

something for him, and in God's family that something is his children's spiritual welfare. See 1 Cor.4:1-2.

Peter the Apostle and Elder

In Peter's letter to the elect living in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, he writes the following specifically to the elders among them:

"The elders who are among you I exhort, I who am a fellow elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that will be revealed: Shepherd the flock of God which is among you, serving as overseers, not by compulsion but willingly, not for dishonest gain but eagerly; nor as being lords over those entrusted to you, but being examples to the flock" (1.Pet.5:1-3 NKJV).

Here, the word elders is translated from the Greek word presbuteros; comparative of presbus (elderly); older; as noun, a senior; specifically, an Israelite Sanhedrist (also figuratively, a member of the celestial council) or Christian "presbyter." And the word elder is translated from the Greek word sumpresbuteros; which means a copresbyter, i.e., a fellow elder.

In Peter's introduction to these men, is he just saying, I am an old man just like you, or is he in essence saying, I am a leader of the elect just like you.

Notice that Peter tells these men to shepherd God's flock. The word shepherd is translated from the Greek word poimaino, which means to tend as a shepherd or (figuratively), one who supervises.

The phrase serving as overseers is translated from the Greek word episkopeo; which in the context of verse 2 means to oversee.

If these men are not in a leadership capacity, why is Peter addressing them as men who are? Obviously, these men are in a leadership capacity; otherwise, Peter would not have given the kind of instructions he gave in verses 1 through 3.

Summary

Did Christ establish an organizational entity consisting of men in leadership positions who were to supervise, serve, teach, and govern his Father's earthly children as they work out their salvation and proclaim the good news message? Yes, he did. Does what he established still exist today? Yes, it does. If not, Christ lied, and if he lied, we do not have a Savior. See Matt: 16:18.

According to the apostle Paul, the organizational entity Christ built consisted of individuals who had accepted his Father's call to salvation and men chosen among them to perform functions and responsibilities for the following reasons:

"And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors [shepherds] and teachers; For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive " (Eph.4:11-14 KJV). See also 1 Cor.12:28-31.

This is the basic organizational structure Christ built to help his Father's children grow toward spiritual maturity and proclaim the good news message. This is the structure which the apostles expanded to include other men, which were to also serve in leadership positions.

Around 300 A.D., the historical record of the early church and its spiritual leadership seems to have almost completely disappeared. The records that do exist of individuals who attempted to maintain the teachings of the early church show a total lack of continuity in the succession of spiritual leadership. But does this mean that its spiritual leadership ceased to exist? No, it does not.

Christ promised that what he would build would endure the test of time; therefore, somewhere on earth men who are authorized to lead and serve the Father's earthly children are doing just that. The problem is finding these individuals and the people being led by them.

Chaos

If the belief were true that no men were ever selected to lead and govern the Sovereign God's earthly children in an official leadership capacity, then the same situation shown in the Book of Judges would exist:

"In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Judg.17:6 KJV). See also Judg.21:25; Deut.12:8.

Although it is evident today (2021) that some chaos, false belief, and teaching exists within various congregations of the elect, this condition does not negate the fact that men have been and are being selected and given authority within the Father's earthly family to supervise, serve, teach, and govern congregations.

The Problem

The problem is to determine the difference between those whom Christ has sent to serve as elders, those whom Satan has sent to mislead the elect, and those who think Christ has sent them, but have actually sent themselves.

Jesus said what he would build would endure (Matt.16:18); therefore, we know this body of true believers still exists on earth. Because we know it exists, logic follows that there are still men being selected and given the responsibility to guide and teach true believers in the path of righteousness and in the performance of the work of the church.

What is evident today (2021) as it was during the days of the apostles, is that there is still a relentless effort by individuals and evil spirits to distort God's truth and destroy the Father's earthly children.

It seems that few pay attention to the following warnings by Christ, Paul, and Peter:

"Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves" (Matt.7:15 KJV).

"For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also, of your own selves [i.e., the eldership] shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts 20:29-30 KJV).

"Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walks about, seeking whom he may devour: Whom resist steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world" (1.Pet.5:8-9 KJV). See also Jude 3-4.

Paul told Timothy the following which applies to issues, wherein people use vague or difficult to 11understand scriptures and Greek or Hebrew words with multiple meanings to promote their particular belief:

"If these things put them in remembrance, charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers" (2 Tim.2:14 KJV).

Whether or not individuals who teach that no authorized leadership exists within the Father's earthly family today, are deceived themselves, ignorant of what the scriptures actually say and mean, or are attempting to lead others astray, the result is the same.

The belief and teaching that no authorized leadership exists within God the Father's earthly family of believers strikes at the foundation of what Christ built and leads to chaos, distrust, division, and away from the many benefits Christ intended through proper leadership, when he said, "I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not overpower it."

What Christ built may have partially malfunctioned through the centuries, but it has not totally disappeared; it still exists today along with individuals placed in leadership positions to supervise, serve, teach, and govern congregations. And it will continue to exist, and it will be brought back to its full potential to perform a powerful witness to this world before Christ returns. See Acts, 13:40-41; Hab.1:5.

Iron Sharpening Iron

New American Standard Bible (Proverbs 27:17) As iron sharpens iron, so one person sharpens another.

In regard to: Junia, a Woman Apostle Article by Dianne D. McDonnell Comments by John Taylor (Lyle, Washington)

First, the word episeemoi is only used twice in the NT and both are translated as notable, or note, not outstanding

Matthew 27:16: "And they had then a notable prisoner, called Barabbas."

Romans 16:7: "fellow prisoners, who are of note among the apostles, who"

Second, to claim she was an apostle is not quite accurate if one also claims she was outstanding and begs the question, if she was one of the greatest among them where are the churches she founded, the manuscripts she wrote, the individuals that wrote about her? All of which suggest she was just a run of the mill apostle, and if the part of her being outstanding is not true, it is most likely the part of her being an apostle is not either.

Which means the correct reading is the one translated, she was noted by the Apostles.

It is also odd, if they were outstanding apostles they would be greeted so far down on the list. And one cannot argue the first will be last because their greeting is in the middle.

It also begs the question if they were apostles, never mind outstanding, what was Paul doing working there?

It makes it even more curious if they were outstanding apostles.

In regard to: 5 Reasons Genesis 3:16 is Not a Model for Christian Marriage

Article by Eddie Hyatt

Comments by Alfio La Spina (Victoria British Columbia)

Gen <u>3:16</u> Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

Scripture gives instructions to the converted. The carnal mind will not and cannot follow instructions given in scripture. In the verse below we see that converted women are not under the curse.

1 Timothy 2:14-15 (ESV)

14 and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. 15 Yet she will be saved through childbearing—if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control.

The scriptures below are clear how husbands and wives are to be with each other.

Ephesians 5:22-33 (ESV) Wives and Husbands

22 Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord. 23 For the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Savior. 24 Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit in everything to their husbands. 25 Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her, 26 that he might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word, 27 so that he might present the church to himself in splendor, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, that she might be holy and without

blemish. 28 In the same way husbands should love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself. 29 For no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, just as Christ does the church, 30 because we are members of his body. 31 "Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh." 32 This mystery is profound, and I am saying that it refers to Christ and the church. 33 However, let each one of you love his wife as himself, and let the wife see that she respects her husband.

Verse 33 says it all, about how husbands and wives are to be with each other.

In regard to: 5 Reasons Genesis 3:16 is Not a Model for Christian Marriage

Article by Eddie Hyatt

Comments by Crystal Burson (Big Sandy, Texas) and Laura Lee (Bismarck, North Dakota)

Crystal Burson writes:

Laura, we've never met or spoken, but since you decided to launch a hateful attack against my husband in my defense, it seemed only right that I be the one to respond to you, to set the record straight.

Laura Lee writes:

There was no hateful attack launched against Nathaniel. Nathaniel sent an "Iron Sharpening Iron" response to an article by Eddie Hyatt titled "5 Reasons Genesis 3:16 is Not a Model for Christian Marriage".

What Nathaniel wrote did nothing but denigrate women, not just me, but all women and that includes you. I suggest that you read the article Eddie Hyatt wrote and then read your husbands response to it.

Because of Nathaniel's response it is pretty clear what he thinks about women and when men denigrate women like Nathaniel did there is always some form of abuse going on. If there is no abuse going on, then Nathaniel would have defended himself instead of sending you.

Crystal Burson writes:

The picture you have of my life couldn't be farther from the truth. And as anyone who actually read Nathaniel's comments can see, nothing he said supported abuse; his only "crime" was quoting words of God that show the man is the head of the house, which everyone with a Bible knows is true.

Laura Lee writes:

Crystal I was you once defending a husband who beat me for 4 years. He did not deserve my defense of him and neither does Nathaniel. If Nathaniel wants to defend his denigration of women, then he should do so and not you.

Every abusive husband, boyfriend and partner quotes all the scriptures about what the woman is to do but he always leaves out the part the man has.

Read what your husband wrote about women, it was disturbing to say the least.

Crystal Burson writes:

Your venomous reaction would be impossible to explain were it not for the fact that you told us where you got your beliefs from. And it wasn't the Bible; it was the fears of a little girl. You said it yourself, that you decided then never to let a man rule over you.

Laura Lee writes:

I was 16 almost 17 years old when I saw my dad throw his food across the room and watched two times that night while my mother was on her hands and knees cleaning that mess up. There is nothing Godly about any man who denigrates any women in that manner.

I am the oldest of seven kids and my job was to keep the rest of the kids from getting caught in the middle of my dad's



rath. My dad was a strong man, and he could have hurt each and every one of us if we had tried to stop him and we all knew from past experience that if one of us escaped the house to go next door for help, no one would help. We were on our own.

No, I said then and there that I would never let any man do that to me. Meaning I would not let any man throw food at the wall and make me clean it up. This particular kind of rulership where a man can throw food at the wall and make his wife clean it up is abuse and if this is the kind of rulership Nathaniel has over you, you better run before you have children with him. It is harder to get out when you have children.

Genesis 3:16 is talking about the curse that was given because of sin. All of these things in this verse are the penalty for sin. There is no command here for a man to rule over his wife. If Nathaniel has God's Holy Spirit, he should not be ruling over you or anyone else in a denigrating manner.

Gen 3:16 Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire *shall be* to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

Crystal Burson writes:

You hadn't read the Bible then, but you decided right then what the Bible was going to say. That's why these scriptures didn't change your mind, because it was made up by a scared little girl long ago, and now you're just defending her fear of authority at any cost.

Laura Lee writes:

As a kid, I never had a lot of money, so it took a long time to save it up to buy anything. How many third graders do you know that would save the little money they did get until they had enough to buy a Bible, so try again on this one.

Also, I would have cleaned the catsup off the wall if I had been afraid of authority from an abuser. So, try again. The point was that I would rather take the beating than to let an abuser think he could keep on doing stuff just to denigrate me.

Crystal Burson writes:

In your defense, the Church offers embarrassingly lame examples of men to choose from, so I can see why you've concluded that you are the equal of men; because you are *their* equal, if not better than most. But only because today's world has only the bottom of the barrel for comparison.

Laura Lee writes:

Perhaps you and Nathaniel deserve each other, because now here you are denigrating men just as he denigrates women.

The biggest problem with both you and Nathaniel is that you don't read very well and what you do read you don't understand.

Nathaniel had no idea what Eddie Hyatt's article was even talking about. To sum it up Eddie Hyatt was saying that you can't use Genesis 3:16 for how to conduct a Christian marriage because Genesis 3:16 is a curse for unconverted people. It is a statement as to what is going to happen to women because of sin. A converted person is not going to be treating their wife or their marriage in that manner that is not what God intended for marriage in the beginning.

There are many scriptures throughout the Bible showing how God's people are to treat each other and it is not for one person to lord it over another person.

Equality in marriage means a lot of things. For example, Darwin started fixing our patio last year and he is finishing it up now. He didn't just go to the store and pick out the brick without talking to me first, because I have to like it too or it won't work between us. He showed me the brick he liked, and I liked it to. This year I suggested a brick wall between the patio and the cat pen, and he liked the idea so now we are getting the brick wall also.

Mutual understanding is what keeps marriages from falling apart. Depending on what Nathaniel is asking of you in his rulership over you, your marriage won't last very long if he doesn't include your likes and dislikes in his decision making. Equality in marriage is nothing more than two people working together for the good of each other and the marriage.

If someone is standing over you telling you what you like and don't like and telling you what to do all the time chances of that marriage being happy are nil to none even if it lasts for decades.

Crystal Burson writes:

Authority figures have let you, and many other women (and men), down. But there are a few men today, like Abraham, who use their authority to make their wives and children more like God (Genesis 18:19). A rebellious woman might call such men "little Caesars", but I am honored to say one is my lord (verse 12), like all *holy women* in history have done, according to Peter.

Laura Lee writes:

There is nothing wrong with a man or a woman teaching others the ways of God. Abraham was not lording it over his wives and children and if you can prove he was, book, chapter, and verse, please.

Gen 18:19 For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the LORD, to do justice and judgment; that the LORD may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him.

Gen 18:12 Therefore Sarah laughed within herself, saying, After I am waxed old shall I have pleasure, my lord being old also?

1Pe 3:6 Even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement.

Lord or My Lord was used a lot in ancient times, it is a title of respect as is calling someone Mr., Mrs., Mr. President or even just addressing a person by name. Being in subjection to someone is the same as obedience to someone. Subjection or obedience to each other in marriage puts everyone on equal footing to make the marriage work.

Did you ever watch two dogs submit to each other? One of our dogs died in 2003. She was a rather large cocker spaniel named Spice. We thought our other cocker spaniel who was much smaller needed a companion, so we bought Jadie who was part border collie and red healer. Jadie looked like a red healer and was at least 2.5 times taller than our cocker spaniel Sugar was. Jadie always showed submission to Sugar even though she was bigger than Sugar. Jadie knew that Sugar was here first, and she would bow down to her, or curtsy. Jadie was not being ruled over by Sugar nor was Jadie ruling over Sugar. Jadie was just showing respect for the older dog and that she wanted to get along with her.

This is how marriage works, it is a mutual relationship and that is all Peter is talking about. He wants all women to respect their husbands in a Godly manner.

Crystal Burson writes:

And like Sarah, I don't *call* him "lord", he simply *is* my lord – another word for "head". Because like all *wives*, I made a vow "to love, honor, and obey" my husband and "follow him whithersoever he goeth", in exactly the same way as he follows *his Lord*, Jesus; in exactly the same way as Christ follows His own Lord, the Father (Psalms 110:1).

Laura Lee writes:

No one disagreed with Nathaniel, or you that the order of things is God, Jesus, Man, Woman. It is in the Bible, however there is a difference between obeying a Godly man and one who is not Godly. When Nathaniel wants to send stuff over here for print that denigrates women as he did, I will not keep my mouth shut. He did the wrong thing, perhaps he should apologize to women everywhere for denigrating them all.

Crystal Burson writes:

And even that scared little girl knows... the head and the body are not equal, even though they are one flesh, and share many things in common. And she knows that in everybody the head has the last word. That's why God and Christ are not equal, Christ and the church are not equal, and my husband and I are not equal.

Laura Lee writes:

Please read my response to your husband, I said all of that in my response to Nathaniel. I even gave an example of when he wants to go to one place and she to another place that generally a couple will compromise and go to one place one

year and the other the next if there is the money to do so. If the money is not there for both places, then it is the husband who decides. That would apply to anything. You need to read things before you respond.

Also, there is no scared little girl here or even back where I grew up. I read my Bible and I knew the difference between right and wrong even back then. It is not right for a woman to have to clean up the floor and the wall because "Little Caesar" threw his food at it to prove he was the ruler, and she needs to obey. It is more noble to take the beating to show that what was done was not right.

The term "Little Caesar" was used by me to show what unconverted men do to their wives that is not right. When Nathaniel sends items for print that denigrate women, he is in all regards acting as an unconverted man. There are many other ways he could have gotten his point across without denigrating others. Nathaniel is a very arrogant person and how do I know that? Because he thinks he is far above everyone else and believes he knows everything so there by you can't point anything out to him. He has an unwillingness to learn from others. Nathaniel and I used to email a lot during the years of the last newsletter 2001 to 2009 and I told him he was very arrogant then and it has gotten worse over time. His arrogance is not just my opinion my husband sees it also and he is a man.

Crystal Burson writes:

And if you are equal to your husband, then it's because he's not your husband at all; he's your "life partner".

Laura Lee writes:

I sincerely do hope that my husband is my "life partner", after all that is the point of marriage among other things. In April of 2021 we were married for 22 years. Eddie Hyatt and his wife have been married for 44 years.

I sincerely hope you and Nathaniel last that long, but if he is abusing you, you really need to get out before you find yourself with lifetime injuries as I have from being beaten for 4 years. There are many forms of abuse and that you are writing to me instead of Nathaniel shows me that you will defend him even when he is wrong and that in and of itself is the wrong thing to do.

As far as me being rebellious because I don't obey my husbands every command as you seem to believe I should from what you have written here, let me tell you two more true stories.

- 1. My "Little Caesar" sent me into a convenience store to steal something. He didn't care what I took, but I was to do it to prove my loyalty to him. Stealing is wrong so I had no idea what to do. I went into the store alone and sat down at one of those tables they have in their coffee/food area. As I sat there, I noticed a cigarette lighter that someone had left. So, I took the cigarette lighter and gave it to him as he waited for me outside. In this case it was better to do it this way because I was in a completely different state far from home and if he had left me there, I would have had no place to go and no money to call anyone with. (So even though I did not steal, I led my husband at the time to believe I had.)
- 2. While living in Arizona, we ran out of my money for he had no money. He was not one to work much. He told me that if I wanted to eat, I needed to go and sell my body for money. My response to him was, word for word, "I would rather starve to death."

Do you yet understand the problem with blindly obeying anyone including your own husband? If you still don't understand perhaps, I can tell you of the many women who have been abused by these "Little Caesars" and how some are dead now and others like myself are injured for life.

Physical abuse can start with just a small shove and escalate from there. An arrogant man does not see that he is hurting anyone because you are not a person to him, you are an object, a possession for him to use in whatever way he wants. Nathaniel is so arrogant that he saw nothing wrong with what he was submitting for print. I sincerely hope you are not being abused in anyway but just the fact that he has you believing that he is commanded by God to rule over you says otherwise to me. And just the fact that you believe it is your duty to be ruled over shows me that you are not reading your Bible and if you are you do not understand what it says.

Mental abuse is just as bad if not worse than physical abuse. If either of these are happening to you in your marriage you

need to walk away. God does not tell men to lord it over their wives and He does not tell women to stay in these kinds of situations. I am well aware that "The Worldwide Church of God" taught men and women that they should stay in these ungodly abusive situations, and I am sorry they taught you that kind of garbage. We will not teach it here.

A Blast from the Past

The Christian Sabbath by Catholic Mirror 1893 (Baltimore, Maryland) Continued from Issue #28

CATHOLIC MIRROR--BALTIMORE, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1893

(From page 8 of the Catholic Mirror of Sept. 9, 1893)

THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH

THE GENUINE OFFSPRING OF THE UNION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH HIS SPOUSE. THE CLAIMS OF PROTESTANTISM TO ANY PART THEREIN PROVED TO BE GROUNDLESS, SELF-CONTRADICTORY, AND SUICIDAL

"But faith, fanatic faith, one wedded fast, To some dear falsehood, hugs it to the last." -Moore.

Conformably to our promise in our last issue, we proceed to unmask one of the most flagrant errors and most unpardonable inconsistencies of the Bible rule of faith. Lest, however, we be misunderstood, we deem it necessary to premise that Protestantism recognizes no rule of faith, no teacher, save the "infallible Bible." As the Catholic yields his judgment in spiritual matters implicitly, and with the unreserved confidence, to the voice of his church, so, too, the Protestant recognizes no teacher but the Bible. All his spirituality is derived from its teachings. It is to him the voice of God addressing him through his sole inspired teacher. It embodies his religion, his faith, and his practice. The language of Chillingworth, "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is the religion of Protestants," is only one form of the same idea multifariously convertible into other forms, such as "the Book of God," "the Charter of Our Salvation," "the Oracle of Our Christian faith," "God's Text-Book to the race of Mankind," etc., etc. It is, then, an incontrovertible fact that the Bible alone is the teacher of Protestant Christianity. Assuming this fact, we will now proceed to discuss the merits of the question involved in our last issue. Recognizing what is undeniable, the fact of a direct contradiction between the teaching and practice of Protestant Christianity - the Seventh-day Adventists excepted - on the one hand, and that of the Jewish people on the other, both observing different days of the week for the worship of God, we will proceed to take the testimony of the teacher common to both claimants, the Bible. The first expression with which we come in contact in the Sacred Word, is found in Gen., 2d chapter, 2d verse "And on the seventh day He (God) rested from all His work which He had made." The next reference to this matter is to be found in Exodus 20, where God commanded the seventh day to be kept, because He had himself rested from the work of creation on that day; and the sacred text informs us that for that reason He desired it kept, in the following words: "wherefore, the Lord blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." (The scriptures quoted throughout in these editorials are from the Douay, or Catholic, Version) Again we read in 31st chapter, 15th verse: "Six days you shall do work; in the seventh day is the Sabbath, the rest holy to the Lord;" sixteenth verse: "it is an everlasting covenant," "and a perpetual sign," "for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and in the seventh He ceased from work."

In the Old Testament, reference is made one hundred and twenty-six times to the Sabbath, and all these texts conspire harmoniously in voicing the will of God commanding the seventh day to be kept, because God Himself *first kept it*, making it obligatory on all as "*a perpetual covenant*." Nor can we imagine anyone foolhardy enough to question the identity of Saturday with the Sabbath or seventh day, seeing that the **people of Israel** have been keeping the Saturday from the giving of the law, A.M. 2514 to A.D. 1893, a period of 3383 years. With the example of the **Israelites** before our eyes today, there is no historical fact better established than that referred to; viz., that the chosen people of God, the guardians of the Old Testament, the living representatives of the only divine religion hitherto, had for a period of 1490 years anterior to Christianity, preserved the weekly practice the living tradition of the correct interpretation of the special day of the week, Saturday, to be kept "holy to the Lord," which tradition they have extended by their own practice to an additional period of 1893 years more, thus covering the full extent of the Christian dispensation. We deem it necessary to be perfectly clear on this point, for reasons that will appear more fully hereafter. The Bible - the Old Testament- confirmed by the living tradition of a weekly practice for 3383 years by the chosen people of God, teaches, then, with absolute certainty, that God had, Himself, named the day to be "kept holy to Him", - that the day was Saturday, and that any violation of that

command was punishable with death. "Keep you My Sabbath, for it is holy unto you; he that shall profane it shall be put to death; he that shall do any work in it, his soul shall perish in the midst of his people." Ex 31 Ch. 14 v.

It is impossible to realize a more severe penalty than that so solemnly uttered by God Himself in the above text, on all who violate a command referred to no less than one hundred and twenty-six times in the old law. The ten commandments of the Old Testament are formally impressed on the memory of the child of the Biblical Christian as soon as possible, but there is not one of the ten made more emphatically familiar, both in Sunday School and pulpit, than that of keeping "holy" the Sabbath day.

Having secured the absolute certainty the will of God as regards the day to be kept holy, from His Sacred Word, *because* He rested on that day, which day is confirmed to us by the practice of His chosen people for thousands of years, we are naturally induced to inquire *when and where* God changed the day for His worship; for it is patent to the world that a change of day has taken place, and inasmuch as no indication of such change can be found within the pages of the Old Testament, nor in the practice of the **Jewish people** who continue for nearly nineteen centuries of Christianity obeying the written command, we must look to the exponent of the Christian dispensation; viz., the New Testament, for the command of God canceling the old Sabbath, Saturday.

We now approach a period covering little short of nineteen centuries, and proceed to investigate whether the supplemental divine teacher - the New Testament - contains a decree canceling the mandate of the old law, and, at the same time, substituting a day for the divinely instituted Sabbath of the old law, viz., Saturday; for, inasmuch as Saturday was the day kept and ordered to be kept by God, *divine authority alone*, under the form of a canceling decree, could abolish the Saturday covenant, and another divine mandate, appointing by name another day to be kept "holy," other than Saturday, is equally necessary to satisfy the conscience of the Christian believer. The Bible being the only teacher recognized by the Biblical Christian, the Old Testament failing to point out a change of day, and yet another day than Saturday being kept "holy" by the Biblical world, it is surely incumbent on the reformed Christian to point out in the pages of the New Testament the new divine decree repealing that of Saturday and substituting that of Sunday, kept by the Biblicals since the dawn of the Reformation.

Examining the New Testament from cover to cover, critically, we find the Sabbath referred to sixty-one times. We find, too, that the Saviour invariably selected the Sabbath (Saturday) to teach in the synagogues and work miracles. The four Gospels refer to the Sabbath (Saturday) fifty-one times.

In one instance the Redeemer refers to Himself as "the Lord of the Sabbath," as mentioned by Matthew and Luke, (Read also Mark 2:28), but during the whole record of His life, whilst invariably keeping and utilizing the day (Saturday), *He never once hinted at a desire to change it.* His apostles and personal friends afford to us a striking instance of their scrupulous observance of it *after His death*, and, whilst His body was yet in tomb, St. Luke, 23d chap. 56 verse informs us: "And they returned and prepared spices and ointments and *rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment.*" "but on the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came, bringing the spices they had prepared." The "spices" and "ointments" had been prepared Good Friday evening, because "the Sabbath drew near." 54 Verse. This action on the part of the personal friends of the Saviour, proves beyond contradiction that *after His death* they kept "holy" the Saturday, *and regarded the Sunday as any other day of the week*. Can anything, therefore, be more conclusive than the apostles and the holy women never knew any Sabbath but Saturday, up to the day of Christ's death?

We now approach the investigation of this interesting question for the next thirty years, as narrated by the evangelist, St. Luke, in his Acts of the Apostles. Surely some vestige of the canceling act can be discovered in the practice of the Apostles during that protracted period.

But, alas! we are once more doomed to disappointment. *Nine* (Should be Eight) *times* do we find the Sabbath referred to in the "Acts," but it is the *Saturday* (the old Sabbath). Should our readers desire the proof, we refer them to chapter and verse in each instance. Acts I3c., 14v.; again, same chapter, 27v., again, 42v.; again, 44v. [Acts 13:14, 27,42, 44] Once more, 15c., 31v. [Acts16:13] Again, I7c., 2v.; [Acts 17:2] again 18c., 4v. [Acts 18:4] "And he (Paul) reasoned in the synagogue *every Sabbath*, and persuaded the Jews and Greeks." *thus the Sabbath (Saturday) from Genesis to Revelation*!!! Thus, it is impossible to find in the New Testament the slightest interference by the Saviour or his Apostles with the original Sabbath, but on the contrary, an entire acquiescence in the original arrangement; nay a *plenary endorsement* by Him, whilst living; and an unvaried, active participation *in the keeping of that day and no other by the apostles*, for thirty years after His death, as the Acts of the Apostles has abundantly testified to us.

Hence the conclusion is inevitable; viz., that of those who follow the Bible as their guide, the **Israelites** and **Seventhday Adventists** have exclusive weight of evidence on their side, whilst the Biblical **Protestant** has not a word in selfdefense for his substitution of Sunday for Saturday. More anon. **To be continued in Issue #30**