

Command to Love

by Church of God Group
(Christchurch, New Zealand)

PAGE 2 **Articles**

What does BC and AD (B.C. and A.D.) Mean?

by BibleStudy.org
(Farmington, Michigan)

PAGE 3 **Articles**

Dancing with God

Sent by Carolyn Klosowsky
(Unknown)

PAGE 4 **Other Items**

The Christian Sabbath

by Catholic Mirror 1893
(Baltimore, Maryland)

PAGE 4 **A Blast from the Past**

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

Article by Eddie Hyatt

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

PAGE 8 **Iron Sharpening Iron**

In regard to:
Are there Still Elders in the Church?

Article by B. L. Cocherell

Comments by Ray Daly
(Lincoln, North Dakota)

PAGE 12 **Iron Sharpening Iron**

In regard to:
Are there Still Elders in the Church?
Article by B. L. Cocherell
Comments by James Steinle
(Swanville, Minnesota)

PAGE 12 **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

The “New” Church of God Messenger
A Newsletter for the People of God
September 11, 2021 --- Issue No. 32

Contributors: BibleStudy.org, Catholic Mirror, Church of God Group, Nathaniel Burson, Ray Daly, Carolyn Klosowsky, Laura Lee, James Steinle

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

Articles

Command to Love

by Church of God Group (Christchurch, New Zealand)

To the Children of God, brothers, and sisters of Jesus Christ in whom the Holy Spirit dwells, this is a call to attention and a call to action.

Jesus said, “A new commandment I give, that you love one another”. This Love is the ultimate gift of the Holy Spirit and yet is the greatest challenge to us, as humans.

The church is the body of Christ, and as such is the Temple in which the Holy Spirit resides. All that Christ achieved and His miraculous powers were the work of the Holy Spirit and He passed on this mantle of responsibility to us, His followers and His brothers and sisters. All that He achieved and then “greater than this” was to be accomplished in this collective body – us - the church.

As the Love of the Church waxes and wanes, the power of the Spirit ebbs and flows. At this time, we struggle with relationships, we have trouble maintaining the bond and we feel helpless to reconcile when a rift has occurred. We are human and we will at times offend and be offended. This has separated us from each other. We are human and this will happen, but we are the children of the living and almighty God, and we are empowered by the glorious Holy Spirit of grace, that we will surmount these contentious barriers. The primary driver in our relationships, Love, which we are to seek first and foremost, will empower us to overcome. Let us also be aware that we must not allow ourselves to be tools of Satan whose primary aim is to denigrate and disempower God's people.

As the Passover season draws near, some of us have committed to fast and pray to petition our Father, the Source of Love, to strengthen Love in the Church.

We will fast and ask God to inspire and guide us as individuals in how we can change to express this mighty love.

We hope that people will applaud this concept and allow it to transcend the current barriers and “groupings”. It is our hope that love will rise above all the individual ideas and thoughts, and thus triumph over the “fortresses of our minds”.

There is a blueprint for love – to esteem each other as greater than ourselves and there is also an elaborate description of what Love looks like in a functioning relationship in 1 Corinthians 13, the Love chapter which we are all familiar with.

Let us all unite with the Father and Son, in strengthening Love amongst the brethren. Let's regard each other as if each were Christ Himself. “If you have done this (to) for these the least of my brethren, you have done it (to) for me.” Please let's uphold, respect, and Love each other as we would our most beloved friend – Jesus, our Lord and Saviour. We invite you to fast and pray with us prior to the Passover service.

With hopeful Love, in Jesus Name. **(To Be Continued in Issue #33)**

Editor's Note: Article was probably written before Passover. Laura Lee

What does BC and AD (B.C. and A.D.) Mean? by BibleStudy.org (Farmington, Michigan)

What is the meaning of BC (B.C.) and what does AD (A.D.) stand for? Why are these abbreviations utilized less and less in the world in lieu of BCE (B.C.E.) and CE (C.E.)?

BC (B.C.) is an abbreviation used in the Julian calendar, then later the Gregorian calendar (introduced in October 1582), that means "before Christ." The letters AD (A.D.), although commonly thought to represent "After Death," actually stand for "Anno Domini," a Medieval Latin phrase that is translated as "in the year of our Lord." The original designation for this type of year also included the Latin words "Jesu Christi" or "Jesus Christ" written after the word "Lord."

Years "before Christ" are traditionally written with the year followed by the abbreviation (e.g., 100 BC). Any year at or after his believed birth can be written with the abbreviation either before or after the number (e.g., AD 100).

Assumptions

Our modern numbering system for years got its start in 525 AD by a Catholic monk who sought to compute the dates for the church's Easter festival. He laid the groundwork for the later use of BC and AD (Origin & History of the BCE / CE Dating System) which began to receive widespread acceptance during the reign of Charlemagne.

Based on this system it is natural to assume Jesus was born in 1 A.D. This, however, is not correct. Many historians and researchers have determined that the original numbering of years is off from between one to six years! Biblestudy.org's detailed timeline of Christ's birth places it in 5 BC.

The change

B.C.E. stands for "before common era" while C.E. is short for "common era." Their popularity has grown significantly in the 21st century. Today, everything from scientific publications, school textbooks, news reporting and even Biblical commentaries have changed to using the new abbreviations.

Why has the change from BC and AD to something different and generic become more pervasive? It certainly isn't for the sake of accuracy, as the same year numbering system is still used! In September 2011, the British newspaper The Daily Mail wrote about the BBC moving to use BCE / CE for all their dates.

"The BBC has been accused of 'absurd political correctness' after dropping the terms BC and AD in case they offend non-Christians." (BBC turns its back on year of Our Lord).

The article went on to quote the BBC who officially stated it was using the new terms because they were a "religiously neutral alternative" compared to the old format.

Reasons

Many have changed from using BC and AD because they feel it removes a "religious bias" toward Christianity brought by their use. The drive to be viewed as inclusive, and at least appearing to not overtly "offend" a group of people (although offending Christians seems to be OK), is also a part of the change.

The meaning of BC and AD, and what they stand for, revolves around the words "Christ" and "Lord." These titles (Strong's Concordance #G5547 and #G2962) identify Jesus as mankind's one and only Messiah. They declare that He (with the Father), as members of the Godhead, are the only ones worthy of man's undivided worship. It is therefore not surprising that many are offended when His name and authority are referenced.

Have a Really Great Sabbath!

Other Items

Dancing with God Sent by Carolyn Klosowsky (Unknown)

When I meditated on the word Guidance,
I kept seeing "dance" at the end of the word.
I remember reading that doing God's will is a lot like dancing.
When two people try to lead, nothing feels right.
The movement doesn't flow with the music,
and everything is quite uncomfortable and jerky.
When one person realizes that, and lets the other lead,
both bodies begin to flow with the music.
One gives gentle cues, perhaps with a nudge to the back
or by pressing lightly in one direction or another.
It's as if two become one body, moving beautifully.
The dance takes surrender, willingness,
and attentiveness from one person
and gentle guidance and skill from the other.
My eyes drew back to the word Guidance.
When I saw "G": I thought of God, followed by "u" and "i".
"God, "u" and "i" dance."
God, you, and I dance.
As I lowered my head, I became willing to trust
that I would get guidance about my life.
Once again, I became willing to let God lead.
My prayer for you today is that God's blessings
and mercies are upon you on this day and every day.
May you abide in God, as God abides in you.
Dance together with God, trusting God to lead
and to guide you through each season of your life.
This prayer is powerful and there is nothing attached.
If God has done anything for you in your life,
please share this message with someone else.
There is no cost but a lot of rewards;
so let's continue to pray for one another.

A Blast from the Past

The Christian Sabbath by Catholic Mirror 1893 (Baltimore, Maryland) Continued from Issue #31

[CATHOLIC MIRROR EDITORS' NOTE:

It was upon this very point that the Reformation was condemned by the Council of Trent. The Reformers had constantly charged, as here stated, that the **Catholic Church** had "apostatized from the truth *as contained in the written word*." "The written word," "The Bible and the Bible only," "Thus saith the Lord," these were their constant watchwords; and "the Scripture, as in the written word, the sole standard of appeal," this was the proclaimed platform of the Reformation and of Protestantism. "The Scripture *and tradition*." The Bible as interpreted by the Church and according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers," this was the position and claim of the Catholic Church. This was the main issue in the **Council of Trent**, which was called especially to consider the questions that had been raised and forced upon the attention of Europe by the Reformers. The very first question concerning faith that was considered by the council was the question

The "New" Church of God Messenger
A Newsletter for the People of God
September 11, 2021 --- Issue No. 32

involved in this issue. There was a strong party even of the **Catholics** within the council who were in favor of abandoning tradition and adopting *the Scriptures only*, as the standard of authority. This view was so decidedly held in the debates in the council that the pope's legates actually wrote to him that there was "a strong tendency to set aside tradition altogether and to make Scripture the sole standard of appeal." But to do this would manifestly be to go a long way toward justifying the claims of the **Protestants**. By this crisis there was developed upon the ultra-Catholic portion of the council the task of convincing the others that "Scripture *and tradition*" were the only sure ground to stand upon. If this could be done, the council could be carried to issue a decree condemning the Reformation, otherwise not. The question was debated day after day, until the council was fairly brought to a standstill. Finally, after a long and intensive mental strain, the Archbishop of Reggio came into the council with substantially the following argument to the party who held for Scripture alone:

"The **Protestants** claim to stand upon the written word only. They profess to hold the Scripture alone as the standard of faith. They justify their revolt by the plea that the Church has apostatized from the written word and follows tradition. Now the **Protestants** claim, that they stand upon the written word only, is not true. Their profession of holding the Scripture alone as the standard of faith, is false. PROOF: The written word explicitly enjoins the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath. They do not observe the seventh day but reject it. If they do truly hold the scripture alone as their standard, they would be observing the seventh day as is enjoined in the Scripture throughout. Yet they not only reject the observance of the Sabbath enjoined in the written word, but they have adopted and do practice the observance of Sunday, for which they have only the tradition of the Church. Consequently, the claim of 'Scripture alone as the standard,' *fails*; and the doctrine of 'Scripture *and tradition*' as essential, is fully established, the **Protestants** themselves being judges."

[The Archbishop of Reggio (Gaspar [Ricciulli] de Fosso) made his speech at the last opening session of **Trent**, (17th Session) reconvened under a new pope (**Pius IV**), on the 18th of January 1562 after having been suspended in 1552. - J. H. Holtzman, *Canon and Tradition*, published in Ludwigsburg, Germany, in 1859, page 263, and Archbishop of Reggio's address in the 17th session of the **Council of Trent**, Jan. 18, 1562, in Mansi SC, Vol. 33, cols. 529, 530. Latin.]

There was no getting around this, for the Protestants' own statement of faith - the **Augsburg Confession**, 1530- had clearly admitted that "the observation of the Lord's Day" had been appointed by "the Church" only.

The argument was hailed in the council as of Inspiration only; the party for "Scripture alone," surrendered; and the council at once unanimously condemned **Protestantism** and the whole Reformation as only an unwarranted revolt from the communion and authority of the **Catholic Church**; and proceeded, April 8, 1546, "to the promulgation of two decrees, the first of which, enacts under anathema, that Scripture *and tradition* are to be received and venerated equally, and that the deuterocanonical [the apocryphal] books are part of the canon of Scripture. The second decree declares the **Vulgate** to be the sole authentic and standard Latin version, and gives it such authority as to supersede the original texts; forbids the interpretation of Scripture contrary to the sense received by the Church, 'or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers,'" etc. (See the proceedings of the Council; **Augsburg Confession**; and Encyclopaedia Britannica, article "Trent, Council of.")

This was the inconsistency of the **Protestant** practice with the **Protestant** profession that gave to the **Catholic Church** her long sought and anxiously desired ground upon which to condemn **Protestantism** and the whole Reformation movement as only a selfishly ambitious rebellion against the Church authority. And in this vital controversy the key, the chiefest and culminative expression, of the **Protestant** inconsistency was in the rejection of the Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day, enjoined in the Scriptures, and the adoption and observance of the Sunday as enjoined by the Catholic Church.

And this is today the position of the respective parties to this controversy. Today, as this document shows, this is the vital issue upon which the **Catholic Church** arraigns **Protestantism**, and upon which she condemns the course of popular **Protestantism** as being "indefensible", self-contradictory, and suicidal." What will these **Protestants**, what will this **Protestantism**, do?]

Should any of the Rev. Parsons, who are habituated to howl so vociferously over every real or assumed desecration of that pious fraud, *the Bible Sabbath*, think well of entering a protest against our logical and scriptural dissection of their mongrel pet, we can promise them that any reasonable attempt on their part to gather up the "dissecta membra" of the hybrid, and to restore to it a galvanized existence, will be met with genuine cordiality and respectful consideration on our part. But we can assure our readers that we know these reverend howlers too well to expect a solitary bark from them in this instance.

And they know us too well to subject themselves to the mortification which a further dissection of this anti-scriptural question would necessarily entail. Their policy now is to "lay low," and they are sure to adopt it.

The "New" Church of God Messenger
A Newsletter for the People of God
September 11, 2021 --- Issue No. 32

APPENDIX I

These articles are reprinted, and this leaflet is sent forth by the publishers, because it gives from an undeniable source and in no uncertain tone, the latest phase of the Sunday-observance controversy, which is now, and which indeed for some time has been, not only a national question with the leading nations, but also an international question. Not that we are glad to have it so; *we would that it were otherwise*. We would that **Protestants** everywhere were so thoroughly consistent in profession and practice that there could be no possible room for the relations between them and Rome ever to take the shape which they have now taken.

But the situation in this matter is now as it is herein set forth. There is no escaping this fact. It therefore becomes the duty of the **International Religious Liberty Association** to make known as widely as possible the true phase of this great question as it now stands. Not because we are pleased to have it so, but because it is so, whatever we or anybody else would or would not be pleased to have.

It is true that we have been looking for years for this question to assume precisely the attitude which it has now assumed, and which is so plainly set forth in this leaflet. We have told the people repeatedly, and **Protestants** especially, and yet more especially have we told those who were advocating Sunday laws and the recognition and legal establishment of Sunday by the United States, that in the course that was being pursued they were playing directly into the hands of Rome, and that as certainly as they succeeded, they would inevitably be called upon by Rome, and Rome in possession of power too, to render to her an account as to why Sunday should be kept. This, we have told the people for years, would surely come. And now that it has come, it is only our duty to make it known as widely as it lies in our power to do.

It may be asked, Why did not Rome come out as boldly as this before? Why did she wait so long? It was not for her interest to do so before. When she should move, she desired to move with power, and power as yet she did not have. But in their strenuous efforts for the national, governmental recognition and establishment of Sunday, the **Protestants** of the United States were doing more for her than she could possibly do for herself in the way of getting governmental power into her hands. This she well knew, and therefore only waited. And now that the **Protestants**, in alliance with her, have accomplished the awful thing, she at once rises up in all her native arrogance and old-time spirit, and calls upon the **Protestants** to answer to her for their observance of Sunday. This, too, she does because she is secure in the power which the **Protestants** have so blindly placed in her hands. In other words, the power which the **Protestants** have thus put into her hands she will now use to their destruction. Is any other evidence needed to show that the Catholic *Mirror* (which means the Cardinal and the Catholic **Church** in America) has been waiting for this, than that furnished on page 21 of this leaflet? Please turn back and look at that page, and see that quotation clipped from the **New York Herald** in 1874, and which is now brought forth thus. Does not this show plainly that that statement of the **Methodist** bishops, the *Mirror*, all these nineteen years, has been keeping for just such a time as this? And more than this, the **Protestants** will find more such things which have been so laid up, and which will yet be used in a way that will both surprise and confound them.

This at present is a controversy between the **Catholic Church** and **Protestants**. As such only do, we reproduce these editorials of the CATHOLIC MIRROR. The points controverted are points which are claimed by **Protestants** as in their favor. The argument is made by the **Catholic Church**; the answer devolves upon those **Protestants** who observe Sunday, not upon us. We can truly say, "This is none of our funeral." If they do not answer, she will make their silence their confession that she is right and will act toward them accordingly. If they do answer, she will use against them their own words, and as occasion may demand, the power which they have put into her hands, So that, so far as she is concerned, whether the **Protestant** answer or not, it is all the same. And how she looks upon them henceforth is clearly manifested in the challenge made in the last paragraph of the reprint articles.

There is just one refuge left for the **Protestants**. That is to take their stand squarely and fully upon the "written word only," "the Bible and the Bible alone," and thus upon the Sabbath of the Lord. Thus, acknowledging no authority but God's, wearing no sign but His (Eze. 20: 12, 20), obeying His command, and shielded by His power, they shall have the victory over Rome and all her alliances, and stand upon the sea of glass, bearing the harps of God, with which their triumph shall be forever celebrated. (Revelation 18, and 15:2-4.)

It is not yet too late for **Protestants** to redeem themselves. Will they, do it? Will they stand consistently upon the **Protestant** profession? or will they still continue to occupy the "indefensible, self-contradictory, and suicidal" position of professing to be **Protestants**, yet standing on Catholic ground, receiving Catholic insult, and bearing Catholic condemnation? Will they indeed take the written word only, the Scripture alone, as their sole authority and their sole standard? or will they still hold the "indefensible, self-contradictory, and suicidal" doctrine and practice of following the authority of the **Catholic Church** and of wearing the sign of her authority? Will they keep the Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day, according to Scripture? or will they keep the Sunday according to the tradition of the **Catholic Church**?

Dear reader, which will YOU do?

The "New" Church of God Messenger
A Newsletter for the People of God
September 11, 2021 --- Issue No. 32

APPENDIX II

The following appeared in an editorial on pages 8 and 9 of the Catholic Mirror of Dec. 23, 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-CONTRADICTIONARY, AND SUICIDAL

We beg leave to invite the attention of our readers to our advertisement in this issue, of the above pamphlet of 32 pages, containing four editorial articles published in the columns of THE MIRROR in our issues of 2nd, 9th, 16th, and 23rd of September of this year. The daily appeals to us, from all sections of the country, for copies of the above issues, very soon exhausted the supply on hand, and we were obliged last month to issue a reprint of the articles in the issues of Nov 18th and 25th, to meet the wishes of our subscribers.

This arrangement failing to meet the persistent and increasing demand for additional copies of the articles we deemed it necessary to issue the same in pamphlet form, revised and enlarged by the writer, whose attention had been called to the propriety of developing more fully the spiritual grounds of the argument sustaining the command of the Redeemer to [pg. 9] hear the voice of His church as they would His own. "He that heareth you heareth me." The avidity with which these editorials have been sought, and the appearance of a reprint of them by the **International Religious Liberty Association**, published in Chicago, entitled, 'Rome's Challenge: Why Do **Protestants** Keep Sunday?' and offered for sale in Chicago, New York, California, Tennessee, London, Australia, Cape Town, Africa, and Ontario, Canada, together with the continuous demand, have prompted the *Mirror* to give permanent form to them, and thus comply with the demand.

The pages of this brochure unfold to the reader one of the most glaringly conceivable contradictions existing between the practice and the theory of the **Protestant** world, and unsusceptible of any rational solution, the theory claiming the Bible alone as teacher, which unequivocally and most positively commands Saturday to be kept 'holy,' whilst their practice proves that they utterly ignore the unequivocal requirements of their teacher, the Bible, and occupying Catholic ground for three centuries and a half, by the abandonment of their theory, they stand before the world today the representatives of a system the most indefensible, self-contradictory, and suicidal that can be imagined.

We feel that we cannot interest our readers more than to produce the 'Appendix' (At the close of this editorial, Appendix I of this pamphlet was reprinted in full.) which the **International Religious Liberty Association**, and ultra-**Protestant** organization, has added to the reprint of our articles. The perusal of the Appendix will confirm the fact that our argument is unanswerable, and that the only recourse left to the **Protestants** is either to retire from Catholic territory where they have been squatting for three centuries and a half, and accepting their own teacher, the Bible, in good faith, as so clearly suggested by the writer of 'Appendix,' commence forth-with to keep the Saturday, the day enjoined by the Bible from Genesis to Revelation; or, abandoning the Bible as their sole teacher, cease to be squatters, and a living contradiction of their own principles, and taking out letters of adoption as citizens of the kingdom of Christ on earth - His Church - be no longer victims of self-delusive and necessary self-contradiction.

"The arguments contained in this pamphlet are firmly grounded on the word of God, and having been closely studied with the Bible in hand, leave no escape for the conscientious **Protestant** except the abandonment of Sunday worship and the return to Saturday, commanded by their teacher, the Bible, or, unwilling to abandon the tradition of the **Catholic Church**, which enjoins the keeping of Sunday, and which they have accepted in direct opposition to their teacher, the Bible, consistently accept her in all her teachings. Reason and common sense demand the acceptance of one or the other of these alternatives; either **Protestantism** and the keeping of Saturday, or **Catholicity** and the keeping of Sunday. Compromise is impossible."

(This article has been updated and re-printed from "The Church of God Messenger" January/February 2002— Issue No. 7)

Have a Really Great Feast!

Iron Sharpening Iron

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

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

Article by Eddie Hyatt

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

Nathaniel writes:

You said, "No one disagreed with Nathaniel, or you that the order of things is God, Jesus, Man, Woman." **Then what are we arguing about?** Because that's all I said. In the parable of the bricks or of the vacations, my wife and I would do similarly. **So, what are we really arguing about here?**

Laura writes:

We are talking about the first email you sent here in which you denigrated all women.

Nathaniel writes:

The Bible teaches that men are the heads of their houses, with the last word on decisions – provided he doesn't command her to sin. Since you agree ("...then it is the husband who decides. That would apply to anything") ... **again, what are we arguing about?**

Laura writes:

We are talking about the first email you sent here in which you denigrated all women.

Nathaniel writes:

Because you say these things, yet you simultaneously believe the opposite – that "there is perfect equality and mutuality between the sexes". But it is not possible to believe that, and also believe "as the church is subject to Christ, let wives be subject to their husbands in everything" (**Ephesians 5:24**).

Laura writes:

Perhaps you should read the entire set of scripture here:

- [Eph 5:21](#) Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God.
- [Eph 5:22](#) Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord.
- [Eph 5:23](#) For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body.
- **[Eph 5:24](#) Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so *let* the wives *be* to their own husbands in everything.**
- [Eph 5:25](#) Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;
- [Eph 5:26](#) That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word,
- [Eph 5:27](#) That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.
- [Eph 5:28](#) So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself.
- [Eph 5:29](#) For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church:
- [Eph 5:30](#) For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.
- [Eph 5:31](#) For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh.
- [Eph 5:32](#) This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church.

The “New” Church of God Messenger
A Newsletter for the People of God
September 11, 2021 --- Issue No. 32

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

Looks like an equal relationship to me and not one where a husband is ruling over his wife.

Nathaniel writes:

These two views cannot fit together, but you are trying very hard to believe both. That's why you said "obey, but it is a mutual obedience". So, you obey your husband... but not really, because you really obey each other; you submit to one another, and yet somehow, he is also your head.

Laura writes:

From Web Page:

http://www.relevantbibleteaching.com/site/cpage.asp?cpage_id=140034636&sec_id=140001239

- The immediate conclusion many draw when they hear submission or subjection in relation to marriage is that it implies lesser humanity, diminished dignity, and reduced equality. But since all of those things regarding women are unbiblical, we can flee from any teaching that infers this kind of belief or behavior.
- ...a husband who enjoys a relationship of superiority and dominion over his wife is operating not in Christ's paradigm but in the way of fallen, cursed mankind, a way pleasing to the devil (Genesis 3:16). The wife is not the husband's doormat, ...
- Despite the authority hierarchy within the Godhead, there was still unity, equality, oneness, and shared responsibility. It had nothing to do with Jesus being bossed around, but it had everything to do with He and His Father being on the same page, accomplishing the same goals, united in spirit, and perfected in love.

All people should perhaps read this web page for a better understanding of what headship, equality, love etc. are and how they fit together.

Nathaniel writes:

Which is why you said, "Eve was in no way a lesser person than was Adam". But Eve was in *every* way less than Adam (**1 Timothy 2:13**). She was created second; she was made *for* him; she was made *out of* him. She *sinned* before he did and *helped* him sin.

Laura writes:

Again, why do you continue to quote only the scriptures you like and that fit your narrative?

- **1Ti 2:13** For Adam was first formed, then Eve.
- **1Ti 2:14** And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.
- **1Ti 2:15** Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.

Eve was deceived, she did not willingly and knowingly sin. Adam was not deceived, he knowingly and willingly sinned. Not at all sure how you can twist this into making Eve lesser than Adam. They both sinned but Adam knew it was sin and Eve did not. And verse 15 here shows that women with God's Holy Spirit in them are not under the curse of Genesis 3:16.

Nathaniel writes:

By literally every metric, she was inferior to him. Just as all of us, individually and collectively, are inferior to Christ. Again... isn't that what we both believe? Christ is not first among equals in the church. Christ is the head of the church, and we both believe that; **so why are we arguing about this?**

The “New” Church of God Messenger
A Newsletter for the People of God
September 11, 2021 --- Issue No. 32

Laura writes:

What are these metrics that make women a lesser being than you are?

- **Gen 1:26** And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.
- **Gen 1:27** So God created man in his *own* image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.
- **Gen 1:28** And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

I don't know, but this looks like equal status to me. God even made both men and women in the image of God himself, so it does not look at all like God thought women were lesser human beings than men are.

Nathaniel writes:

Because again, you also say the opposite: “Christ does not tell us or make any of us do anything”. But that's simply not true; *you* don't even believe that's true; **Christ tells us, nay, commands us to do a great many things and I know you believe that (John 15:9-10, Philippians 2:9-11 for instance).**

Laura writes:

This is basic Bible 101. We all have free moral agency because God created us that way. God and Christ do not stand over any of us with a club and tell us what to do. God chooses us and calls us. We read our Bibles and we choose whether to do what God says we should do, or we simply choose not to do it.

Nathaniel writes:

You know these verses, yet you struggle to reconcile them with Adam and Eve's perfectly harmonious marriage in Eden; but here's the thing... *they weren't married in Eden*. Adam did not “know” his wife until **Genesis 4:1**. Therefore, they had not been “one flesh”, in any sense! So how could they be considered married?

Laura writes:

Why would God create Eve if she was not to be Adam's partner for life and to have children with him? What is your definition of marriage? Today we have to go buy a license to get married and say vows before a minister or justice of the peace. In the bible they just had sex and they were now man and wife. Adam and Eve were both naked in the Garden before they sinned. God meant for them to be husband and wife, or he would not have created a partner suitable to Adam.

Nathaniel writes:

Adam himself said that when a man was married “he would leave his father and mother”. Did Adam not, at that time, still LIVE with his Father? Thus, **Genesis 3:16 was their marriage ceremony** – when they left their Father's house, and cleaved to one another.

Laura writes:

I think you have the wrong marriage ceremony. It was here in Genesis 1:28 in the Garden of Eden.

- **Gen 1:28** And God blessed them, and God said unto them, **Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth**, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

Genesis 3:16 is a curse because they sinned. I see no marriage ceremony in this set of scriptures as the man Adam also was given his own set of curses.

- **Gen 3:14** And the LORD God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou *art* cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou

The “New” Church of God Messenger
A Newsletter for the People of God
September 11, 2021 --- Issue No. 32

eat all the days of thy life:

- **Gen 3:15** And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.
- **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.
- **Gen 3:17** And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed *is* the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat *of* it all the days of thy life;
- **Gen 3:18** Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field;
- **Gen 3:19** In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou *art*, and unto dust shalt thou return.

Read this stuff in context. If this is a marriage ceremony as you say, all marriages would end in divorce. Not only did Eve get a curse or two, but Adam got his own set of curses and don't leave out the serpent because God also cursed him for what he did.

Nathaniel writes:

Until then, as an unmarried man and a woman, they were each free to choose their own path as they saw fit (**1 Corinthians 7:32-34**). But when they became husband and wife, they were bound by God to the exact same rules by which the Lamb and the Bride will be bound in marriage; He to give his life for her, and **she to obey His commandments (John 14:15-21)**.

Laura writes:

So, if push comes to shove, are you truly willing to give up your life to save the life of your own wife? Because that is how much you as a husband are supposed to love your wife. If you believe she is inferior to you then why would you have to give up your life for something that is so flawed that you must rule over her?

Nathaniel writes:

Isn't that what we both believe? As you said yourself **“it is the husband who decides”**. This doesn't mean he shouldn't care about your opinion, your needs, and have many obligations of his own to you; **it just means you agree that he has the right to win every argument that doesn't directly conflict with the commands of your mutual Father.**

Laura writes:

So, is this what it boils down to, is that you must win every argument with your wife? Do you have a lot of these arguments with your wife? If you do, I can see why that would happen. Neither you nor your wife understand the scriptures relating to marriage.

No one ever wins an argument because there is always one injured party and one party who is licking their chops and patting himself on the back because he won the argument. Again, I feel sorry for your wife that she even goes along with your version of marriage. Sometimes she may well be very right in an argument, but because you as “Little Caesar” have declared yourself as winner of all arguments you are laying the groundwork for your wife to resent you and you certainly will never respect her or how she feels.

Nathaniel writes:

You wanted a perfect pattern of New Covenant marriage; it's not found in Eden, among unmarried siblings; but in the New Jerusalem, between Jesus and His Bride. **And since we obey Him exactly as a New Covenant wife obeys her New Covenant husband... why are we still talking about this? (Ephesians 5:24).**

Laura writes:

“Why are we still talking about this?” The short answer is because you keep sending me emails hoping to win

The “New” Church of God Messenger
A Newsletter for the People of God
September 11, 2021 --- Issue No. 32

your argument that “all women are inferior to men, and it is the man’s job to denigrate them every chance he gets.”

You have not even mentioned your original email where you denigrated all women, and I don’t think you ever will because you see nothing wrong with having done that.

And marriage in the eyes of God is the same throughout the entire bible. There is no New Covenant marriage that gives you license to mistreat your wife in anyway. Marriage is the same from Genesis to Revelation.

Nathaniel writes:

Do you really want to defend the position that Jesus and His Bride are equal partners in all things? Can you argue with a straight face that **Jesus and His Bride submit themselves one to another? That we obey Him, but it’s a mutual obedience?** No, because **He is not first among, we, His equals, and you know that.** Therefore, neither is any New Covenant husband.

Laura writes:

So do you now feel better after taking my every word and twisting it into pretzels as you do also with scripture. You have a narrative doctrine which you plan to hang onto no matter what the cost to you or your wife. To sum it up, you believe all women are inferior to men, you believe you are to rule over your wife, and you believe you get to win all arguments. What a lonely man you will be with that attitude.

To sum it up, no, I and you do not believe the same things in regard to marriage. I thank God that there is a public record of what I said and what you and your wife said because people can now look at that and perhaps give advice or corrections where they are needed. And I sincerely hope that people do have something to say in regard to all of this. Denigrating women is wrong and hopefully you will understand that someday.

In regard to: Are there Still Elders in the Church?

Article by B. L. Cocherell

Comments by Ray Daly (Lincoln, North Dakota)

A good response in your closing comments on the purposes for "helping" works. As to the Sanhedrin. I read somewhere that one of the main purposes for the Sanhedrin was also to vote on what should or should not be placed into the written records of the Hebrews. They had 70 to begin with, but apparently added one more to be sure to break any ties.

Anyway, a very good response to a lot of thoughts on Scripture. But please take note on the listing of gifts in the church. And Paul's response when he uses "prophets" first and says that this is the one that should be pursued the most. Also, the Scripture that says. "Surely the Lord God will do nothing unless he reveals it [first] to his prophets". Also, in a comment on prophets meant for all people. Para: "You will not believe, even though a man tells you". Basically, saying that at this time in history, only the very few will heed, even if they hear.

In regard to: Are there Still Elders in the Church?

Article by B. L. Cocherell

Comments by James Steinle (Swanville, Minnesota)

I read with interest Laura, the struggles you have gone through over the years. Trying to make a difference in the world and for the brethren is a struggle and it can wear on a person. It certainly did for you, and Darwin had to deal with the results also, I'm sure. Thank you for not giving up entirely – and I think I can speak for that, for many of your readers. Who knows what awaits us yet... and there is some hope some may not have to go through the tough stuff that is coming... (Luke 21:36)