



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Kingdom Authority or Crazy Buffoonery?

Kingdom Authority or Crazy Buffoonery? - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/3/14 11:37

Is anyone familiar with 'Kingdom Authority' teaching? Where we as Christians need a 'spiritual covering' of leadership before embarking to do this or that? If this sounds strange to anyone: good. If anyone does indeed believe this or is familiar with it, could they please explain this a bit to me with Scripture? Thank you.

Brother in Christ,
-Eli

Re: Kingdom Authority or Crazy Buffoonery?, on: 2005/3/14 13:12

I'm not sure if I've ever come into contact with this doctrine, or if I came in contact with power hunger church leaders. I once formed a group of 3 other men (back when we were in the institutional church... charismatic to be exact) and we got together weekly to pray for the pastor of the church. A way to spiritually support him, ya know.

He found out about it, and hauled me into his office and rebuked me, saying that I "had no authority" to form any such group without approval from he and the leadership.

When i left his office, that was the last time I've ever seen him. We never went back.

How ridiculous!

I know there is a Kingdom Authority doctrine, but I think it's something different than what you are describing. I know Jack Hayford believes in "Kingdom Authority", but it's more of a doctrine that promotes that Christians have available to them all the power of the apostles.

I dont subscribe to it... the apostles had certain giftings and "powers" for a specific reason, and that was to lend authenticity to their message. It was a sign from God that what they were preaching was real. We have the Bible now... and I have yet to see one single believer in this age who is spiritually gifted in the same way the apostles were. I've seen a lot of pretenders... but nothing real.

Krispy

Re: Are you sure? - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/3/14 13:24

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

I dont subscribe to it... the apostles had certain giftings and "powers" for a specific reason, and that was to lend authenticity to their message. It was a sign from God that what they were preaching was real.

We have the Bible now... and I have yet to see one single believer in this age who is spiritually gifted in the same way the apostles were.

Hi Krispy,

What Apostles were those, not all the apostles wrote scripture?

For a list of what they do etc Try here

Re:, on: 2005/3/14 14:03

Quote:
-----What Apostles were those, not all the apostles wrote scripture?

I never said they all wrote scripture.

There were only ever 12 Apostles.

Krispt

Re: - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/3/14 14:13

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:
There were only ever 12 Apostles.

I would encourage you to read Acts onward, and again try the link it is full of scriptures not opinions.

Re:, on: 2005/3/14 14:20

Quote:
-----I would encourage you to read Acts onward

Ummm... this is where I bite my tongue and not respond in the flesh. :-)

There were 13... I made an error in my math. There was the one who replaced Judas Iscariot, and then there was Paul. All of the apostles had been eye witnesses to Jesus Christ... including Paul. If you have reference to any other apostles mentioned in scripture, I'd love for you to share that info with me.

I've read beyond Acts... thank you for the suggestion tho.

Krispy

Re: - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/3/14 14:31

The Kingdom authority I'm talking about sounds like what you were describing to me about the pastor who didn't want you to pray for him outside his authority. That's exactly it.

As for apostles and power... brother, I agree that there are many that give the Acts side of the gospel a bad name because of the lust for money and fame etc. But I do not agree that the church is void of that pentecostal power today. The same Holy Spirit the Apostles had is also available to us, according to the measure of our faith.

Check out Smith Wigglesworth. He was a true brother in the Lord and one of the most dangerous to hell!

God bless,
-Eli

Glory to Glory - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/3/14 14:31

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:
Ummm... this is where I bite my tongue and not respond in the flesh.

At least you are aware of it. Besides you should now by know that I like poking a bit of fun at you, you are a very serious fellow. Anyway staying godly without causing your brother to stumble is an area I need work on.
Blessings,

p.s. Read that thread you will find out all the scriptures you need, we are already ambushing this persons thread.

Re: Glory to Glory - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/3/14 14:33

Ambush me, will you! :-x

Your onto us! - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/3/14 14:40

Quote:

Eli_Barnabas wrote:
Ambush me, will you!

Well okay its pretty hard when you see the dust storm coming from a mile away. I'm trying to respect the fact that you po sted wanting answers not wanting to see some individuals having fun.

Re: Your onto us! - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/3/14 14:46

Has anyone anything else to say about the Kingdom Authority teaching? Anyone to rise to it's defense? (Which is what I' m hoping because I want to hear it's Scriptural sense)

Re: Glory to Glory, on: 2005/3/14 15:47

Quote:
-----At least you are aware of it. Besides you should now by know that I like poking a bit of fun at you, you are a very serious fellow. Any way staying godly without causing your brother to stumble is an area I need work on.

I think we are both poking fun at each other... and neither is getting it! LOL

I will admit tho, sometimes you can get so used to people challenging you on every little thing that you tend to respond i n kind...

but believe it or not, I was not being all that serious with you.

As for me being a serious "fellow" ... all I can say is that everyone who knows me (not in cyberspace) would bust a gut la ughing if they read that!

After all ... my nickname is Krispy Kritter. Not exactly reverent or serious.

Krispy

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2005/3/14 15:59

John Bevere (who is acctully on this site somewhere) has a book out called Under Cover. Ive read it. He talkes alot abo ut being under people of authority. I dont remember him every saying that you have to be under authority. What he brin g out in his book is the blessings and privlidges of being under a pastor and being obedient to what he says, even thoug h you might not agree (not a biblical disagreement but a method or way of doing something disagreement). My church t eaches that you have to be under someone at all times. This is a staple to the g-12 movement. (thats awhile other thre ad that is out there.. though I'm not 100% sure what i think of it) My youth pastor told me once that you have to be under someone elses authority no matter how far you move up (pastor or whatever). I disagree, I belive you should be mentor ed by someone but in the end your only authority is the Word of God. I'm not saying you can rebel against all authority j ust because they are not the final authority. Paul says in (i belive it is) Hebrews to be obedient to those who are over yo u.

I belive there is a difference, which some dont know, between a leader (who is over you in a since) and a dictator. I lead er leads in example and by encouragement. A dictator reigns and rules over someone. See the difference? I think you do. :-)

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/3/14 18:18

Quote:

There were only ever 12 Apostles.

Not so. Check out an article at www.christiansteps.com/doctrine/apostles.html for a list of about 20 or so.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2005/3/14 18:35

John Bevere's "Under Cover" book, while it has many positive features to it, such as talking about the nature of submissi on being an attitude of the heart and the like. He shows how you can submit to those in authority even if you do not obe y them (such as if somebody ordered you to disobey God).

However, there are also some negative features to the book, which I think probably is linked to the doctrine in question. Bevere is operating under the premise of a hierarchical form of church gov't, with Sr. Pastors, State overseers and the lik e... which simply has no biblical basis to it whatsoever. Thus, he (like many do) believes that if you are going to do anyt hing within the local context, you need a "covering" over you to be properly in the will of God. Thus, if God tells you to st art a ministry within the Church, let's say, a prayer meeting, but the Sr. Pastors says no... then you must obey the Sr. Pa stor in this instance, because everything that happens within the Church is "his" ministry.

My problem with this entire concept of ministry (one of which I've had much personal experience, both good and bad wit h), is that it usurps the headship of Jesus Christ within the Church. Christ has appointed in the Church each to their own ministry (1 Cor 12). He doesn't use the Sr. Pastor as a sort of funnel or mediator by which one receives the "covering" t o operate in such a meeting.

The fact of the matter is, because we are all united with Christ, who is the head of the Church, we have authority to act within whatever ministry Christ appoints us to. For example, if Christ calls you to preach on the streets, you don't need y our pastors permission or approval to do such. If a pastor thinks he has authority to tell you to stop such a thing, he is in gross error, and overstepping the bounds of his own authority. Sadly though, Bevere would say that you must obey your pastor in this regard because you are essentially on his turf and under his covering.

Of course, we are to obey those over us in the Lord. If one of my pastors tells me to do something, I will do it so long as it doesn't cause me to step out of the will of God. But I don't have to seek his blessing or approval to do a particular mini stry. I only need the blessing that comes from the headship of Christ... of which no pastor or pope can claim as office.

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2005/3/14 19:02

I agree Jimmy.

Re:, on: 2005/3/15 8:40

Quote:

-----Not so. Check out an article at www.christiansteps.com/doctrine/apostles.html for a list of about 20 or so.

I looked at this... I think they're making a stretch or two. Also, I would need to examine which translation (i.e. which school of manuscripts they are using) before I can come to any conclusion.

This will make a good study tho. Hey, I'm still learning. I'm not going to say you're wrong... I'll wait till I've studied it out... lol

Krispy

Re: - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/3/15 14:52

We are most certainly suppose to submit to those in authority over us, but the teaching I am questioning stresses a "spiritual" covering...for example:

So and so told me a story about a guy who decided to pray downtown in his city and ended up being demonically attacked because he left his 'spiritual boundaries'. The man was only responsible for his house territory and if he wanted to pray downtown without getting ambushed in the spirit he would have to receive permission from the spiritual leader of the city.

This is crockery in the highest degree if you ask me. You ask, "Who is your covering?" **The blood of Jesus is my covering!**

In Christ,
-Eli

A side dish - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/3/15 15:00

For me I have understood it to be that someone in some for of authourity knows what I am doing, not in a Lording it over you style, just so someone knows. There is power in bringing things into the light. In many ways it may break the lone ranger in some, in others it is just a means of keeping those who are entrusted in looking after the heads-up.

Allot of this has the underlying base that those that are leading you are men you respect and that they are shepherds of Gods flock not hirelings.

Re: A side dish - posted by PTywama3 (), on: 2005/3/15 16:59

Submitting to authority can also take on the boundaries of council. If I plan on doing some zealous thing that I am not prepared for, and I introduce it to someone more versed than I, they may just tell me not to proceed.

Sometimes its really annoying, because I don't find out why, but it forces me to do a check on myself. --A slate of grey to be added to the mix.

Re:, on: 2005/3/16 6:41

Quote:

-----So and so told me a story about a guy who decided to pray downtown in his city and ended up being demonically attacked because he left his 'spiritual boundaries'. The man was only responsible for his house territory and if he wanted to pray downtown without getting ambushed in the spirit he would have to receive permission from the spiritual leader of the city.

Back when my wife and I were into the whole WOF thing after we got saved (another way of putting it is "back when we were deceived!") we went to a church where a woman was healed of breast cancer. Now, I believe that God did allow her a healing, and she was in remission.

After being there awhile I really started to study the scriptures on my own, as did this other family. Eventually a bunch of us left that church about the same time because we all came to the conclusion that WOF is a false doctrine.

About a year later the cancer came back on this woman with a vengeance. The leadership of the church that we had left came to the family and declared to them that the cancer had come back because they had left the spiritual "covering" of that church and were in rebellion.

She eventually died... and not one person who was still in that church came to the funeral. Not one word from the pastor there.

We do not always understand why God allows things to happen, but she did not get sick again and die because we left their covering. That's manipulation at it's worst.

And she was healed... permanently, the moment she passed from this life to glory... **praise God!**

By the way... they went to a Benny Hinn crusade (against my counsel...) 3 months before she died, seeking a healing.

I think this is the type of Kingdom Authority (or as I call it: spiritual abuse) you are referring to.

Krispy

Re: - posted by MarkDaniel (), on: 2005/3/16 8:13

Quote:
-----The leadership of the church that we had left came to the family and declared to them that the cancer had come back because they had left the spiritual "covering" of that church and were in rebellion.

Quote:
-----She eventually died... and not one person who was still in that church came to the funeral. Not one word from the pastor there.

Is it no wonder why I weep and beat my chest for those who are under such hate and oppression by these ministers of satan who claim to come in the name of my LORD?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/3/16 8:56

Quote:
-----Quote:
The leadership of the church that we had left came to the family and declared to them that the cancer had come back because they had left the spiritual "covering" of that church and were in rebellion.

Quote:
She eventually died... and not one person who was still in that church came to the funeral. Not one word from the pastor there.

Is it no wonder why I weep and beat my chest for those who are under such hate and oppression by these ministers of satan who claim to come in the name of my LORD?

This is certainly a tragedy. If it is of any consolation, rest assured that things are not handled like this every where.

Anyone wish to discuss with me what Kingdom Authority really is Biblically? :-)

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by dann (), on: 2005/3/16 12:18

Quote:

KingJimmy wrote:

Quote:

There were only ever 12 Apostles.

Not so. Check out an article at www.christiansteps.com/doctrine/apostles.html for a list of about 20 or so.

The word transliterated as Apostle is the KoinÃ© word: 'apostolos', and, as I am sure everyone with even a passing knowledge of how to use a lexicon is aware - means delegate, envoy, or messenger; That would be the 'translation'

Christ, however, hand picked certain men to be His personal envoys - which introduced a technical use of the word. It behooves then, as we study scripture, to be careful to make a distinction between the technical term, and the common usage of the word. Greek writers didn't throw out the word for 'envoy' out of their vocabulary just because Christ introduced a -technical- spin to the word that wasn't there before.

That is, when Christ named His Apostles, He introduced a technical distinction - the twelve, hand-picked envoys of Christ became known, (technically) as -the- envoys; while there are other envoys - it is understood that these other 'apostles' are not part of the twelve.

In Revelation 21:14 we see that the term speaks only of the twelve - "Now the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and on them were the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb." But in Galatians 1:19 we see that the term is used generically as James the Lord's brother was not named as one of the twelve - "But I saw none of the other apostles except James, the Lord's brother."

Sometimes, in our zeal, we either forget or overlook the notion that it is wrong to translate a word all the time in its most technical sense. Therefore, unless the word is describing one of Christ's twelve hand-picked Apostles - it is very, very likely being used in a non technical sense - and should be understood as such - that is, James, the Lord's brother was certainly an apostle (messenger, envoy) but even though he was highly regarded in the church at Jerusalem, even though he wrote a book in the New Testament - even though he was -an- apostle -yet he was not one of -the- 'Apostles'

Dan
/\
\<

Re: - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/3/16 14:25

Quote:

-----By the way... they went to a Benny Hinn crusade (against my council...) 3 months before she died, seeking a healing.

That truly is a sad story... unChristian.

I would like to remark on your comment above:

Though we all acknowledge false doctrine, strange teachings, and questionable antics in certain ministries, my heart goes out to those people who attend looking for help (like the lady above). I compare it to when Jesus saw the crowd as a flock without a shepherd. It is sad because they are being led astray or being taught sour milk.

However, (and this is nothing more than a thought), but in trying to understand God's heart, I believe he does, in fact, bless and heal people who come, say, to Benny Hinn crusades or whoever it may be. Firstly:

1. The person is genuinely in need of help and they acknowledge that Jesus can heal them, so they come in expectation to be healed. I believe God's mercy extends despite the leader.

2. Either innocence or ignorance, people truly believe in the words of the spiritual leader. They may not be in willful rebellion against God, but are rather deceived. Though the leader may know to be false, the people may be true. I believe God's mercy extends to them.

I guess this is a matter of mercy. Hosea 6:6 - "*I desire mercy, not sacrifice.*" When I hear of people that are healed at these special meetings, I am glad, and I believe Jesus has done it, for his glory, in his compassion.

Compassion... yes. There is a flock out there. There are hired hands that aren't true, but Jesus loves His sheep, and there is most certainly real Christians in the wrong place.

Jesus is my Lord,
-Eli

Re:, on: 2005/3/16 14:29

Quote:
-----Sometimes, in our zeal, we either forget or overlook the notion that it is wrong to translate a word all the time in its most technical sense. Therefore, unless the word is describing one of Christ's twelve hand-picked Apostles - it is very, very likely being used in a non technical sense - and should be understood as such - that is, James, the Lord's brother was certainly an apostle (messenger, envoy) but even though he was highly regarded in the church at Jerusalem, even though he wrote a book in the New Testament - even though he was -an- apostle -yet he was not one of -the- 'Apostles'

Thank you... you just clarified my position on this. I just couldn't formalize it into words. That helped.

Krispy

Re:, on: 2005/3/16 14:30

Quote:
-----Though we all acknowledge false doctrine, strange teachings, and questionable antics in certain ministries, my heart goes out to those people who attend looking for help (like the lady above). I compare it to when Jesus saw the crowd as a flock without a shepherd. It is sad because they are being led astray or being taught sour milk.

However, (and this is nothing more than a thought), but in trying to understand God's heart, I believe he does, in fact, bless and heal people who come, say, to Benny Hinn crusades or whoever it may be. Firstly:

1. The person is genuinely in need of help and they acknowledge that Jesus can heal them, so they come in expectation to be healed. I believe God's mercy extends despite the leader.

2. Either innocence or ignorance, people truly believe in the words of the spiritual leader. They may not be in willful rebellion against God, but are rather deceived. Though the leader may know to be false, the people may be true. I believe God's mercy extends to them.

I guess this is a matter of mercy. Hosea 6:6 - "*I desire mercy, not sacrifice.*" When I hear of people that are healed at these special meetings, I am glad, and I believe Jesus has done it, for his glory, in his compassion.

Compassion... yes. There is a flock out there. There are hired hands that aren't true, but Jesus loves His sheep, and there is most certainly real Christians in the wrong place.

Jesus is my Lord,

-Eli

mmm... good word, Eli

Krispy

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2005/3/16 15:18

Quote:

-----Either innocence or ignorance, people truly believe in the words of the spiritual leader.

Deception can grip even the innocent. Deception is no respecter of persons. Deception purely comes from lack of knowledge. People parish because of lack of knowledge. I believe there are many people who truly love God and want him to move, but are just lacking knowledge of what God likes and dislikes, what he approves and disapproves.

My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge Hos. 4:6a

Jam 1:5 If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.

Re: Kingdom Authority or Crazy Buffoonery? - posted by dadman, on: 2005/5/6 0:22

http://www.livingway.org/GRAPHICS/Gods_dominion1.pdf#search='jack%20hayford%20on%20kingdom%20authority'

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/6 4:37

Quote:

-----That is, when Christ named His Apostles, He introduced a technical distinction - the twelve, hand-picked envoys of Christ became known, (technically) as -the- envoys; while there are other envoys - it is understood that these other 'apostles' are not part of the twelve.

would that exclude Paul too? I doubt that you want to say that. However, Paul seems to imply that Barnabas was an apostle too

Quote:

-----"Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?" (1Cor. 9:5, KJVS)

Paul also regards James, the Lord's half brother as an apostle...

Quote:

-----"But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother." (Gal. 1:19, KJVS)

by implication he calls Silas as apostle too

Quote:

-----"Nor of men sought we glory, neither of you, nor yet of others, when we might have been burdensome, as the apostles of Christ." (1Th. 2:6, KJVS) cf. Acts 17:10

the simple fact is there have been (and may yet be) different kinds of apostles. I do not regard Paul as one of the 12 Apostles but that does not mean he was not apostle, only that he was not one of the 12. Titus was also an 'apostle'

Quote:

-----"Whether any do enquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellowhelper concerning you: or our brethren be enquired of, they are the messengers of the churches, and the glory of Christ." (2Cor. 8:23, KJVS)

where the word has been translated 'messenger'. But it does not mean he had the same kind of 'apostleship' as the 12 or Paul. The same is true of Epaphroditus;

Quote:
-----"Yet I supposed it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother, and companion in labour, and fellowsoldier, but your messenger, and he that ministered to my wants." (Phil. 2:25, KJVS)

where again the word is translated as 'messenger'.

I think our problems stem from the fact that we stereotype so many of the 'functions' referred to in the NT and make them into formal offices. We then get into the territory of defending the word 'apostle' against people who misuse it. In doing so we are really defending our definition of apostle. but the word 'apostle' is not a title; it is simply what people do.

I have made this point before (just a couple of dozen times) but Paul did not give himself the 'title' of apostle, neither did anyone else during his lifetime. He is simply describing what he does and under whose authority he does it.

The Lord hardly ever admitted to being the Messiah; why? Because His definition of the word and that of the Jews of His day were so different that to admit to 'Messiahship' could only confuse them more. It is interesting that He had no such reservations with a Samaritan woman. I am sure that if you transported Epaphroditus into our current culture and said 'are you an apostle?' he would have a similar dilemma. We have the same struggle with many NT words which have now acquired such a meaning that we can hardly use them without adding to the misunderstanding.

The folly of the shepherding movement was that they defined words like 'apostle' from the accounts of people like Paul and then thought they could model their own authority on what they perceived his to have been. Crazy circular thinking which caused immense damage to many souls.

Re: - posted by dann (), on: 2005/5/6 11:36

Quote:
-----would that exclude Paul too? I doubt that you want to say that. However, Paul seems to imply that Barnabas was an apostle too

Revelation 21:14 says, "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.

Here we see that twelve foundations of the new Jerusalem are named for the twelve apostles.

Will Judas' name be there? I personally do not think so. Will it be Matthias? There is room for doubt, as he was selected by lot, at Peter's prompting prior to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Paul on the other hand, was hand picked by Christ.

I think the 12 names will include the 11 apostles (no Judas Iscariot), and Paul. It isn't an opinion that I can go to scripture and -prove- never the less it fits my theology rather snugly. ;-)

Scripture does refer to other men as apostles - I don't think anyone is denying that. I do however wish to keep plain the distinction between the twelve who are named apostles - and the remainder of mankind who make titles for themselves.

Perhaps in stressing the distinction I have swung the pendulum in the other direction? I do not profess to be an expert in these things, I just gravitate to the simplest explanation.

Dan
/\
\\

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/6 11:46

Dan

I know many who agree with you in substituting Paul for Matthias, but the Holy Spirit inspired Luke to write Acts which includes these verses;

Quote:
-----Â“But Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice, and said unto them, Ye men of Judaea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken to my words:Â” (Acts 2:14, KJVS)

Â“Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables.Â” (Acts 6:2, KJVS)

Both of these verses are 'after' Matthias' inclusion and before Paul's conversion.

I like 'simple' too, but when the evidence doesn't fit we have to look for another suspect! ;-)

Re: Kingdom Authority or Crazy Buffoonery?, on: 2005/5/6 14:50

I have heard of the "Kingdom Authority" movement. It's a play on words, and it should not be associated with the believers Authority in the Kingdom.

I don't know the ins and outs of this teaching, but I believe John Wimber, Benny Hinn and a others ran with it. I was told by a friend of mine who went to those meetings that when they prayed for people, they didn't pray in Jesus name, they'd touch the person and say, "kingdom come".

And that doesn't mean that that is wrong, what is important is what kind of Word is being presented, is it truth or error, or a little of both.

The Word says, "He sent forth His word and healed them all". I am not so concerned how they are healed or what method is used, what is important is what kind of word is being sent forth, Truth or Error.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/6 15:07

I don't think Hinn was ever part of this movement.

Re: - posted by dann (), on: 2005/5/6 16:16

Quote:

philologos wrote:
I like 'simple' too, but when the evidence doesn't fit we have to look for another suspect! ;-)

Thank you sir, your response was, as always, full of grace.

These verses demonstrate two things plainly:

- 1) The other Apostles considered Matthias to be one of the twelve
- 2) The people considered Matthias to be one of the twelve.

I think that is a very accurate assessment - everyone presumed that Matthias was among the twelve - something I could hardly dispute.

But I don't see, from these verses, enough evidence to conclude that -God- endorsed Peter's lottery. Indeed, I only see that -men- endorsed it - a fact well proven by these verses.

So while it would be a tidy thing indeed to dismiss Paul as one of the twelve based on these verses, I do not have enough convincing evidence to do so.

That is not to say that I have enough evidence the other way either - I don't. Hence it remains a "wait and see" sort of theology for me. I suspect - but I cannot go beyond suspicion.

I hope that makes sense :-)

Dan

∨

∨

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/6 17:19

Quote:
-----But I don't see, from these verses, enough evidence to conclude that -God- endorsed Peter's lottery. Indeed, I only see that -men- endorsed it - a fact well proven by these verses.

but the verses are part of Luke's history which is inspired by the Holy Spirit. It is not people who are regarding Matthias as completing the 12 but Luke; and Luke is under inspiration.

There is another interesting point. The lot has quite a good press in the Old Testament. The land was apportioned by lot, as was the choice of the sin offering. So were the responsibilities of the priests as we read in the story of Zacharias, the father of John. There are a couple of proverbs which praise the lot as a fair method of choice.

Quote:
-----"The lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of the LORD. The lot causeth contentions to cease, and parteth between the mighty." (Prov. 16:33; 18:18, KJVS)

The picture here is that God is guiding the lot.

Now I am not saying that we should use lots, although John Wesley did on occasion and was rebuked by George Whitefield! There is almost a sense in which the choice of Matthias by lot was the last act of an Old Covenant; the New Covenant coming into full force in Acts 2. When the Spirit took up residence within these external methods of guidance became unnecessary, but the choice of Matthias was part of the older order.

Unless the scripture says so I am always reluctant to think I know better than the apostles. :-)