



Articles and Sermons :: Late Entry

Late Entry, on: 2013/6/2 14:22

Quote:
 -----Andrew,
 I cannot understand,how a person of your studying...reading,..to gain knowledge...(I can tell that by your writings) cannot understand this ,...one of the most plain-spoken subjects / truths of the Word.And to throw His WAY / TRUTH / COUNSEL / WORDS to the ground,and KEEP your words,...Do you know the cost in that ?...Elevating your word above His Word / Counsel ?

2:Tim.3:16 ,.."ALL scripture is given by inspiration of God,and is profitable for doctrine,for reproof,for correction,for instruction in righteousness,.."

I ask you again,' Have you really considered the cost to ANYONE who decides to throw out some of the Words in the Bible ?'
 Well ! ..I know this is hard but,.....We lose something of great value,...our credibility.

1Sam.3:19,..(Samual,.. great and humbled man unto God,)"And Samual grew,and The Lord was with him,and he did let none of His Words fall to the ground."

Mt.18:3,..(Jesus speaking), "Verily I say unto you,Except ye be converted, and become as little children,ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven."

A 'little' child is humble / bendable :

* real example of a true child of God: Mt.5:3-12,...'the beatitudes'

* Jn.3:12,...' But as many as recieve Him,to them gave He power TO BECOME the CHILDREN of God.(He gives us Grace : "The Devine enffence upon our heart and it 's reflection in the Life.)Power..working through the Holy Spirit,...drawing us to His will.

* Lk.12:47-48,..' And that servant,..(which we really are a child,servant, (serveing the Lord) son's,etc,..who knows the will of the Father)...who knew his Lord's will and doeth it not,prepareth not himself,neither did His will,"shall be beaten "...? with many stripes."
 Question: you mean,The Father would acually BEAT us?...where there are marks on our skin ?

Andrew,What these brethren patiently and lovingly were trying to help you to see,...Why would you scoff at ? And the Denny Kenaston artical,that Proud Papa brought forth,.....I believe was as good and Godly way,as I have ever heard,...you scoffed at.
 I do believe this man studied the Words of this Godly instruction on raising Godly children,and The Spirit of God taught this man the most perfect way,...not abuse but through patience,love,much work care and time,..to bring up his children in the way that they should go,..
 And yet you scoofed at it.To me there is something to be feared here,....because when we scoff at something The Lord has taught,..according to His Word and Spirit,..Then really ,..aren't we really scoofing at The Lord' work ?

And there is another important factor here,....children need not only the guidance,correction, trained,switched when needed,but to learn the joy of work. Which is taboo,,,a crime, for them to labor these days.

As for 'the times that we live in'..'?"The Lord is the same yesterday,today and forever,....He changes not.His Word shall never pass away.

It is most unfortunate if a child does not have more than a near nothing to do,...where they can be tired when night comes,..and need their rest, and not be a late sleeper In the day as some,....getting into things,at night like the gangs etc...not just leting their children go to waste....having loving,patience ,parents that care...that take the time,care and hard work,to raise,..teach,..correct,..with the rod when it is neccasary,....according to the Word.

And too,you mentioned the hand vs the switch,..
 Did you not realize,..Hitting the child with the hand,jar's the child,it could Be so light,as to do nothing,or hitting them with the hand could be so hard That it could break their bones.where a little keen switch could apply topical switch marks,and the hurt that is needed,and not damage them deep .
 They will learn to fear the....ever so small keen switch,at an early age.

And finally,

Eph.5:1,..(Paul teaching).. 'Be ye followers of God,as dear children.'
 * who is God ?But He who speaketh,He is the Spirit / Word
 ...also the inspired Word because it comes from Him.

It is with great care, that I write this to you, ... as well as I know all the other encouragements to you were.
Lovingly always,
elizabeth

Well that was somewhat of a late entry.

Sorry I missed the encouragements. But I see the clean up job. Still this won't go away you have been warned.

Re: Late Entry - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/2 15:38

////Still this won't go away you have been warned.////

could you please articulate clearly what you are implying by this seemingly threatening statement.

Re: proudpapa - posted by Lysa (), on: 2013/6/2 17:25

Quote:

-----proudpapa wrote:

///They seem to have a vested interest in beating and bruising toddlers and children.///

why must we speak evil like this about believers in and of the Lord Jesus Christ whom love their children more than their own life ?

I've been at work all day but forgive me I didn't feel that I was speaking evil of anyone, I'm sorry you misconstrued what I was saying. Let's go about this logically...

1. Are you or are you not defending that Christians have a Biblical right to beat/bruise their toddlers and children?
2. Are you or are you not defending the right that if Christians do in fact beat their toddler/children with the rod and bruises are left behind that Biblically this is acceptable?

If you said yes to 1, 2 or then please provide how was I speaking evil about "believers in and of the Lord Jesus Christ whom love their children more than their own life??" Thank you.

Re: Late Entry, on: 2013/6/2 17:51

Quote:

-----Could you please articulate clearly what you are implying by this seemingly threatening statement.

Yes of course brother I can. The single most difficult problem we have as believers with regards to our children may seem to us as if it is their conduct from the outset which matters. And whilst this is a concern, obviously, it is just one concern which faces us. The other concern is how we express what we believe regarding the issue of disciplining our children, and how that will be used against us in the future. What we publish, what we put into writing and of course what we do ourselves. It is no good me pretending that I don't already understand that when we openly state that we set about to break the will of our children by using our children's own involuntary inclinations as a means, (called psychological entrapment), nor that this does not already carry with it a risk. So the warning is a simple one, and I thought I had already expressed it clearly, we need to be wise in what we say and do.

What I didn't realise until this last few days was just how even a believer's concerns would be viewed as a threat and seen as a throwing the word of God to the ground. This problem does not exist in England, save for on a very small scale, but it may be a huge issue in the USA. I am learning all the time, mostly because I say things which are a provocation and from that I can extrapolate an understanding of the issues involved. Its not pleasant and I am not heartless. I could explain this in some detail but I can see that as long as some believers insists that God Himself requires them to break their children and then go on to provide examples which include acknowledging that the child itself cannot help but act in a certain way, yet we nevertheless use that against them, we are going to have problems in the end. These things attend to the detail of the way legislation is framed and as most of the new child protection legislation is based on Social Policy and Health Policy advisement (Psychological & Physical) along side existing legal frameworks, the outcome is inevitable. It is a guaranteed clash in the end.

I spoke with my wife Helen this evening about this subject and she reminded me that when our children were little I actually took the complete opposite position with them. She tells me that I continuously taught them to recognise injustice. She then reminded me of my son James who was treated badly by a teacher at private school and how he dealt with it. Similarly how my daughter Sarah would not be part of the "in crowd" because she recognised the injustice of excluding the other children. She was hated for this and for the first time in her life she experienced the cost of preferring the least of the children in favour of the greatest. I know that this may seem irrelevant but it is how I am led of the Lord and how I have taught my children to live. The irrelevance may simply be in a seeming connection between my use of the term injustice and the issue of using a switch to discipline children.

However, the connection is not even the switch in reality, it is the nature of the world we live in and whether we desire to exercise wisdom or not. Again despite what has been said, especially the post by Elizabeth, which is more clear than any other post in condemning my position, the issue may in the end come down to whether we really are able to recognise the basis for future problems of persecution. For me personally the problem is even worse than this because I couldn't care less about persecution I know how to stand and I know how to be hidden and when to spring into the open. The problem for me will come when I am myself faced with the situation in which I either support or stand against a believer who has wilfully set about to break their children and have in the end done them great harm, so that this harm can be seen measured and comprehended in actions of self harm and the harm of others. We can play semantics all day. But in the end I am completely against the idea of breaking children. I simply cannot see it scripturally and if I thought that God truly required it of me or any man, I would have to seek the Lord's face and set aside everything, and in the end that may even have to be the Lord Himself. If that seems too strong brother then so be it. I care nothing for my so-called reputation one way or another. But I could not serve God easily if I knew that He required me to wilfully break children in order to require them to an unquestioning obedience to me a mere man. If my children respect me and are willing to obey me when they are little children it is because as little children they are in any event willing. As they grow they need to be able to work out their own understanding and either continue in obedience or else suffer in disobedience. But to break them as a mechanism to avoid reality, that I cannot accept.

You should not be under any illusion about how strong this issue is going to become. I am not, and it makes me tremble with fear. I have demonstrated many times here on SI that I put no store by way of Sociology, Psychology or the other Humanity subjects. Neither am I blind to their lies and effects. I simply cannot escape from the conviction that using a switch on children on occasions or the hand, or for that matter even a strap, would amount to very little if that was in fact truly necessary for their sakes. But to set about to break the will of a child as a way of avoiding future parental efforts, by using switches systematically and continuously until a child has been broken in their will...that completely appalls me if I am really honest. It doesn't mean that I hate anyone or that I doubt their integrity or sincerity, it simply goes beyond my ability to ignore it. So there you have it brother.

Re: glad I asked instead of jumping to conclusions. - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/2 18:10

Hi amrkelly, I am working on my response to lya, but read your response to my question, thank you

It is sometimes easy to jump to wrong conclusions as I almost was before your response.

I am not sure what you were implying by "clean up job", But nothing I personally wrote was any attempt to a clean up job, (I am not sure if that was what you were implying to or not) If it were I can explain how it was not a clean up job.

a couple of thoughts - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/2 18:51

///What I didn't realise until this last few days was just how even a believer's concerns would be viewed as a threat and seen as a throwing the word of God to the ground. This problem does not exist in England,///

England is more secular and brainwashed in darwin than the US is, and this secular brainwashing even effects Christians.

I agree that political christianity is not the gospel (even hinders the Gospel) but it does offer some protection in our country as of right now, to Kingdom Christians.

I do not fear a super soon persecution to those whom hold and express my views on this subject because as the last thread testifies, to do so would be to persecute the masses in our country.

But I agree that evil is at work in trying to change the minds in the general populace, from that which was deemed even by secular society as proper parenting 50 years ago is now heavily being pressed by the entertainment media as abuse. (in which is a strategy of Satan to persecute God's people)

Another thought, even Corporal punishment is still applied in our local school systems.

my mom is in public school administration and has legally by our states laws applied the procedure fairly recently.

When I was in jr high in the mid 90s many of the teachers had paddles, some with holes in them, one of the coaches had a large leather strap attached with a handle, when spanked by him he would make a deal with the student, that when they were spanked by him, if he did not lift them off of their feet, they could spank him, (He never received a spanking.)

I used to date the daughter of the head DHS administrator over several counties, of what I remember of discussing this type of issue with him, he would be in total agreement with me.

If we are in agreement with the world on this subject than we are probably on the wrong side of the issue.

If we are confused on rather we would help prosecute and truly persecute fellow lovers of Christ, whom love their families more than life, on any issue than we probably need to reexamine our position.

Re: Late Entry, on: 2013/6/2 19:06

You simply don't comprehend anything brother save for your fixation on a semantic of corporal discipline expressed in terms which have nothing whatsoever to do with anything I have shared.

Well it is as it is. I am finished.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/2 19:33

Hi amrkelly,

no contention at this time on my part.

I can appreciate your desire to protect children, I will probably if I have time respond to some more of your statements.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/2 19:41

Hi, lisa

Lisa asked ///1. Are you or are you not defending that Christians have a Biblical right to beat/bruise their toddlers and children?

2. Are you or are you not defending the right that if Christians do in fact beat their toddler/children with the rod and bruises are left behind that Biblically this is acceptable? ///

I am opposed to abuse!

when we hear the word "beat" we get the impression of abuse ,which I am opposed to.

You have wrongfully supposed that because In the 'fosterparent jailed' thread where I mentioned that a bruise is not a sign of abuse, but a scar is, that somehow is evidence that I am defending beating children.

The point I was trying to make was that in that particular case of which, I found no evidence given to the severity of the bruising, which I personally would assume was because the bruising was not severe.

To me, I would not deem a bruise in and of itself as abuse! and I gave some reasons of why in that post.

At any given time, I can look myself over and I will have a bruise, different people bruise at different degrees. You probably have a bruise some where on your body right now, if not, than either you are not an easy bruiser or you have a very nonactive life.

your children neither learned to walk nor ride a bike nor play a sport with out bruising.(that is a Fact!) and if they did indeed bruise (and they did!) than by your own judgment you are guilty of neglect!

In that post I made a clear statement that a scar is a sign of abuse, and I made the clear understanding that this both included outward scars as well as inward scars.

Let me make the point that Children that have (extensive) bruising outwardly have been inwardly scared !

that would be abuse!

but I would not deem a light bruise on a butt or leg in and of its self as a sign of abuse, (and from the reading of my state laws I do not believe they would either!)

I am sure that I had many bruises from spankings as a child, I was not physically abused by any means , any feelings that I was is self pity (a wicked and destructive form of pride that is fuelling the hostility to biblical chastisement)

If someone would have seen a bruise on me, from a spanking when I was a child and felt they were doing the will of God by taking me from my Loving parents and have me put in an emotionally scaring foster system, those people rather aware of it or not would have been emotionally scaring and separating me from the safety of my parents and placing me in the danger of real abuse such as sexual abuse.

and taking me from a good road and placing me on a bumpy road, Those people would have been Doing the (WILL OF SATAN!)((no argument on that reality!)) (That would not have been the will of the GOD of Scripture, for them to do that!

Lysa wrote : ///If you said yes to 1, 2 or then please provide how was I speaking evil about "believers in and of the Lord Jesus Christ whom love their children more than their own life??" Thank you///

lysa you had wrote ///They seem to have a vested interest in beating and bruising toddlers and children.///

you were speaking of several of Gods children that had responded in that thread

Yes that was an evil statement!

I do not beat nor bruise my children neither physically nor emotionally nor do the other Christians that posted in that thread.

Edit: sermon index propagates an excellent video sermon on this topic, It would sum up my view

watch it and tell me if you deem it as propagating abuse.

video sermon, the rod is love: <http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/myvideo/photo.php?lid=2905>

Re: proudpapa - I am done too! - posted by Lysa (), on: 2013/6/2 22:33

proudpapa, you really are proud. I will reiterate what amrkelly said to you because it is my response as well since you danced around my questions.....

Quote:
-----You simply don't comprehend anything brother save for your fixation on a semantic of corporal discipline expressed in terms which have nothing whatsoever to do with anything I have shared. ~ amrkelly

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/2 23:07

"The church in America is going to suffer so terribly and we laugh now but they will come after us. They will come after our children. They will close the net around us while we are while we are playing soccer mom and soccer dad, while we are arguing over so many little things and mesmerized by so many trinkets. The net even now is closing around you and your children and your grandchildren and it does not cause you to fear. You will be isolated from society as is already happened. Anyone who tries to run for office who actually believes the Bible will be considered a lunatic until finally we are silenced. We will be called things that we are not and persecuted not for being followers of Christ but for being radical fundamentalists who do not know the true way of Christ which of course is "love and tolerance". You'll go down as the greatest bigots and haters of mankind in history. They've already come after your children and for most of you, they got them. They got them through the public schools and indoctrination in the university and you wonder why your children come out not serving the Lord. It's because you fed them right into the devil's mouth. So little by little the net is closing around and then it's not little by little. Look how fast things are going downhill in just a matter of weeks, but at the same time, know this, persecution has always been for evil but God always means it for good and is it not better to suffer in this life to have an extra weight of glory in heaven. You must settle this in your mind, this is the one thing I want to say over and over:

Do not believe...down through history, you have a wrong idea of martyrdom and persecution. You think that these men were persecuted and martyred for their sincere faith in Jesus Christ. That was the real reason but no one heard that publicly. They were martyred and they were persecuted as enemies of the state as child molesters, as bigots, as narrow-minded, stupid people who had fallen for a ruse and can contribute nothing to society.

Your suffering will not be noble, so your mind must be filled with the Word of God when all people persecute you and turn on you and if the spirit of God and common grace pulls back and you see even your children and your grandchildren tossing in the lot that you should die. This is no game. You want revival and awakening. but know this, for the most part great awakenings have come only preceding great national catastrophes of the persecution of the church. I believe God is bringing a great awakening, but I believe he is raising up young men who are strong in trust in the providence of God to be able to wade through the hell that's going to break loose on us. And it will be on us before we even recognize it unless, unless in God's providence, He is not done, He is not done. And note, this is not silly talk, apart from great awakening, these things are going to come upon you. Be ready to lose your homes, your cars, everything." - Paul Washer

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hakL0Je5XCw>

Re: - posted by romanchog (), on: 2013/6/3 1:22

I stayed out (except for one post in the initial thread) of the discussion over several threads on the issue of corporal punishment because I can see valid points on both sides.

First, it must be understood that all children are not the same and all children do not need the same kind of punishment do they receive it the same way. I have 9 children. I have some children who have never needed a spanking to be corrected. One would start crying if I just looked at the child harshly because of some wrong the child had committed. Spanking for those children was totally unnecessary.

I have others who could not be corrected without a spanking. Sometimes rather harsh punishment was necessary because of the rebelliousness in their heart. I will say, the spanking did not really help the heart. Although it changed the behavior, inwardly the rebelliousness remained and became bitterness.

Does this mean that the Bible is wrong? It means that we follow a new law. We no longer follow the law, but we are to be led by the Spirit. We follow the new "law of the Spirit" (Rom 8) and we should be led by the Spirit in this matter as in ALL other matters. God created these children, He knows their heart and He knows the form of discipline that each child needs to be guided in the right path. We should submit to prayer what God the Father would have us do to discipline each child.

Note also that the key word is discipline, not spanking. Discipline involves more than spanking; it means to create disciples.

Another great concern that I have is the complete lack of understanding on this forum of what is called the "child protection system" in the US. Contrary to what has been said, there is almost a zero tolerance for physical punishment. While it is true that most state laws SAY that corporal punishment is not in itself abuse, this is not what is seen in practice. If any bruises are seen on a child, they are most likely going to remove the child from the home first and you will be answering questions before a judge, who likely has NO tolerance for Christians or spankings and will not care about your religious beliefs. You will not get your child back until you go through their hoops, which includes attending parenting classes, therapy, etc. If the doctor sees a bruise, you better have an explanation, or the same thing will happen.

How do I know this? Two ways: I have been there. I was accused falsely, trumped up because I refused to bow to the mighty doctors and when social workers saw we had 9 kids, home schooled, they went crazy (my lawyer's words) and said there must be something going on in this family. All these things were said to us in court and by everyone who knows of the system. We were later told that the worst thing we said was that we were Christians, because there is an intense prejudice in these courtrooms for Christians, because they are perceived as abusers. I saw many other parents stuck in court for ridiculous things as well. While I did not get into court on the issue of spanking, it was immediately stressed on us not to use corporal punishment.

Second, while I was in law school I studied this a lot. The practical side of the system does not follow the written law. Social workers have almost unbridled authority to remove children for anything THEY consider to be abuse. They do not have to do much to justify the removal, and they sometimes lie by saying that they have tried other less drastic means before removing the child. (That is what the law requires them to do in Florida, but they did not do it in my case.) I am sure that you all have heard of ridiculous reasons for removing children. Whatever you have heard on the news is only the tip of the iceberg. Some social workers are reasonable, some are lax, and some are radical. It all depends on who you get knocking at your door. God forbid you are poor and a social worker comes knocking, because you will be considered to be neglectful for not having enough food, etc. in the home. If they are part of child protective services, they will not offer to help you, they will simply take your kids away and they will see you in court. You won't get your kids back until you can rectify your poverty, keep a steady job, but still somehow attend court hearings sometimes several times a week, at least several times a month, attend therapy, etc. It is a very sad situation. It is a mission field here in our own nation.

Once you get to court, the social worker is assumed to be correct by the judge, and you have to prove her/him wrong in court. No one says this outright, but it is the practical truth.

Please be aware of this. I would hate to see anyone's kids removed and placed in foster care because they assume the laws protect them and after all, "I am not doing anything wrong." This kind of mentality is what got me and my husband in trouble. Do not risk the welfare of your children over your principles on spanking, if it comes to that.

Said in love and concern and I hope it is received in that way.

Re: - posted by Lordoitagain (), on: 2013/6/3 8:14

Quote:

----- Do not risk the welfare of your children over your principles on spanking, if it comes to that. - romanchog

Roman, this is a sad piece of conclusive advice to the dilemma that you have described. It reminds me of another group of people who said:

Num 14:3 And wherefore hath the LORD brought us unto this land, to fall by the sword, that our wives and our children should be a prey? were it not better for us to return into Egypt?

When we give up ANY Biblical principles so as not to "risk" the welfare of our children ... we are basically saying that we don't trust the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob ... the omnipotent Creator of the universe.

In the above cited case, ONLY TWO men out of the whole generation acted on FAITH in Biblical principles, and went to the promises of God.

What if Daniel had said: "Do not risk the welfare of your life over your principles of eating"?

What if Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego had said: "Do not risk the welfare of your life over your principles of bowing"?

What if Esther ... what if David ... what if Jeremiah ...

the list goes on.

We either stand in faith or join the multitudes of cowards who according to Rev. 21:8 cannot enter the kingdom of Heaven.

- posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/3 8:22

Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2013/6/3 11:51

Roman, thanks for an excellent post!!

I saw the heart of what you were saying as well as the many posts of Andrew.

I was just wondering -is Proverbs and the old testament the only books in the bible that some on here read concerning discipline of children.

Here is something to think about in the Pulpit Commentary:

Chasten thy son while there is hope; or. seeing that there is hope. Being still young and impressionable, and not confirm

ed in bad habits, he may be reformed by judicious chastisement. The same expression occurs in Job_11:18 Jer_31:16. "For so he shall be well hoped of" (euelpiv), Septuagint. (comp. Pro_23:13) And let not thy soul spare for his crying. "It is better," says a German apothegm, "that the child weep than the father." But the rendering of the Authorized Version is not well established, and this second clause is intended to inculcate moderation in punishment. Vulgate, Ad interfectionem autem ejus ne ponas animam tuam; Revised Version. Set not thine heart on his destruction. Chastise him duty and sufficiently, but not so heavily as to occasion his death, which a father had no right to do.

The Law enjoined the parents who had an incorrigibly bad son to bring him before the judge or the elders, who alone had the power of life and death, and might in certain cases order the offender to be stoned. (Deu_21:18, etc.)

Col 3:21 Fathers, provoke not your children to anger, lest they be discouraged.

Ye fathers, do not irritate your children, lest they be disheartened. (Eph_6:4) Ereqizw ("irritate" or "provoke") St. Paul uses once besides, (2Co_9:2) in a good sense. It implies a use of parental authority which, by continual exactions and complaints, teaches the child to look on the father as his enemy rather than his friend. The synonymous parorgizw ofw (Eph_6:4, found here in many copies, is, more definitely "to rouse to anger." Aqume) (only here in the New Testament) means "to lose heart," to have the confidence and high spirit of youth broken; "fractus animus pestis juventutis" (Bengel). In place of this treatment, "the discipline and admonition of the Lord" are recommended in Eph_6:4.

The duties of fathers.

"Fathers, provoke not your children, lest they be discouraged.

I THE DUTY OR PARENTS. It is here exhibited on its negative side. They are not to abuse their authority over their children by too great severity either in words or deeds. Some parents spoil their children by indulgence; others, by unwise severities. Bitter words are used, unreasonable commands are given, immoderate correction is administered. Parents are to behave lovingly to their children, even while maintaining their just authority over them.

II THE DANGER OF NEEDLESS HARSHNESS. "Lest they be discouraged." They may lose heart; their spirit may be broken; they may become morose, sullen, and reckless. Thus they may be turned aside from the service of God, lose the capacity to do great things, become pusillanimous, and eventually become a sad disappointment to their parents. T. C.

Christianity recommended moderation in punishment. (see Eph_6:4 Col_3:21) Septuagint, "Be not excited in the mind to spiteful treatment (eiv ubrin);" i.e. be not led away by passion to unseemly acts or words, but reprove with gentleness, while you are firm and uncompromising in denouncing evil. This is much the same advice as that given by the apostle in the passages just cited.

Family Bible Notes

Colossians 3:21 Provoke not your children; by unkindly and improperly finding fault with them, being difficult to please, or failing to commend and encourage them when they do well. Lest they be discouraged; despair of being able to please you, and so become broken in spirit and reckless in regard to your wishes. A most important admonition to all parents who would retain their influence over their children.

Eph 6:4 And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord

Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible

Ephesians 6:4

Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath - Avoid all severity; this will hurt your own souls, and do them no good; on the contrary, if punished with severity or cruelty, they will be only hardened and made desperate in their sins. Cruel parents generally have bad children. He who corrects his children according to God and reason will feel every blow on his own heart more sensibly than his child feels it on his body. Parents are called to correct; not to punish, their children. Those who punish them do it from a principle of revenge; those who correct them do it from a principle of affectionate concern. Bring them up, etc - ¶17; ¶954; ¶964; ¶961; ¶949; ¶966; ¶949; ¶964; ¶949; ¶945; ¶965; ¶964; ¶945; ¶949; ¶957; ¶960; ¶945; ¶953; ¶948; ¶949; ¶953; ¶945; ¶954; ¶945; ¶953; ¶957; ¶959; ¶965; ¶952; ¶949; ¶963; ¶953; ¶945; ¶922; ¶965; ¶961; ¶953; ¶959; ¶965; literally, Nourish them in the discipline and instruction of the Lord. The mind is to be nourished with wholesome discipline and instruction, as the body is with proper food. ¶28; ¶945; ¶953; ¶948; ¶949; ¶953; ¶945; , discipline, may refer to all that knowledge which is proper for children, including elementary principles and rules for behavior, etc. ¶25; ¶959; ¶965; ¶952; ¶949; ¶963; ¶953; ¶945; , instruction, may imply whatever is necessary to form the mind; to touch, regulate, and purify the passions; and necessarily includes the whole of religion. Both these should be administered in the Lord - according to his will and word, and in referen

ce to his eternal glory. All the important lessons and doctrines being derived from his revelation, therefore they are called the discipline and instruction of the Lord.

If you will notice in the new testament the teaching concerning children is more concerned with not provoking them to wrath but to bring them up in the admonition of the Lord. It talks more to the Father about gentleness to children and encouraging children.

Maybe the Lord was trying to get the Father's attention concerning the abuse of reading too much into the wisdom of Solomon.

Maybe we need to get out from under the Law and into the new covenant. Let's not think that just because we are so much bigger and stronger that we must beat them into submission. They need our love and we need their love. They need our heart and we need their heart. We need to do everything that we can to stay connected to our children in a relationship to influence them for the Lord Jesus Christ.

We may be able to force our children after much beating to comply to some things, but if we have lost their love and respect for us then we have failed to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

Blessings to all!

Re: - posted by Lordoitagain (), on: 2013/6/3 13:41

rbanks, please look at Adam Clarke's commentary on this verse:

Pro 13:24 He that spareth his rod hateth his son: but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes.

Pro 13:24

He that spareth his rod hateth his son - That is, if he hated him, he could not do him a greater disservice than not to correct him when his obstinacy or disobedience requires it. We have met with this subject already, and it is a favourite with Solomon. See Psa_34:10 (note) and Psa_37:3 (note).

The Rev. Mr. Holden makes some sensible observations on this passage: "By the neglect of early correction the desires (passions) obtain ascendancy; the temper becomes irascible, peevish, querulous. Pride is nourished, humility destroyed, and by the habit of indulgence the mind is incapacitated to bear with firmness and equanimity the cares and sorrows, the checks and disappointments, which flesh is heir to."

The issue that seems to be coming back over and over in this discussion is the well known fact that mis-use of the rod is bad.

The main concern of the discussion is the fact that the proper use of the rod is being equated to child abuse and SHOULD NOT be. As Clarke points out, there are times in the lives of some children "when his obstinacy or disobedience requires it". To withhold physical pain inflicted from an instrument is a damaging and hateful act that many cowardly parents are putting their children through because of our society's swing in the direction of chaos.

Re: , on: 2013/6/3 16:28

Quote:
-----The main concern of the discussion is the fact that the proper use of the rod is being equated to child abuse and SHOULD NOT be. As Clarke points out, there are times in the lives of some children "when his obstinacy or disobedience requires it". To withhold physical pain inflicted from an instrument is a damaging and hateful act that many cowardly parents are putting their children through because of our society's swing in the direction of chaos. lordoitagain

I think you and I have been posting in parallel universes.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/3 21:53

///We may be able to force our children after much beating to comply to some things, but if we have lost their love and respect for us then we have failed to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.///

Who is advocating much beating ??

Not even one post is advocating much beating! To suggest so, is a LIE! a false accusation toward Gods Children.

Do you believe Paul Washer Beats his children ??

Do you believe Keith Daniels Beats his children ??

Do you believe Denny Kenaston used to beat his children ??

If not, than do not try to confuse what we are discussing with 'much beating'!

And if you do believe that they are promoting beating children, than you need to take that up with SI ministries for promoting their material!

Re: imperative necessity that children find discipline, for it is the mark of love. - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/4 1:30

Eph 6:4 And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture ("Paideia") and admonition of the Lord.

RE: RB wrote/// If you will notice in the new testament the teaching concerning children is more concerned with not provoking them to wrath but to bring them up in the admonition of the Lord. It talks more to the Father about gentleness to children and encouraging children.///

the word nurture in EPH 6:4 as cited is actually the greek word : "Paideia" which is the same greek word as chastening and chastisement found in Hebrews 12

And ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children, My son, despise not thou the chastening ("Paideia")of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him:

If ye endure chastening,("Paideia") God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth , ("Paideia")not? ,8 But if ye be without chastisement ,("Paideia"), whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons

Now no chastening ("Paideia")for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby

Strong's

Definition

the whole training and education of children (which relates to the cultivation of mind and morals, and employs for this purpose now commands and admonitions, now reproof and punishment) It also includes the training and care of the body whatever in adults also cultivates the soul, esp. by correcting mistakes and curbing passions. instruction which aims at increasing virtue

chastisement, chastening, (of the evils with which God visits men for their amendment)

Your attempt of trying to divide Gods word on child training is without foundation.

Here is what Ray Stedman another preacher that is presented on SI has to say concerning this exact subject.

/EPH 6:4

It has been pointed out that this word translated Fathers could well be translated Parents because it includes both the fa

ther and the mother. It is also true that the emphasis is laid largely upon the father, for it is his responsibility as to what the children become. That is sobering, is it not, fathers? But it is true. Mothers may enforce policy but it is the father's task to set it, and to see that his children are raised properly. There is nothing that is more dishonoring to the spirit of Christianity than the attitude adopted by many fathers: "It is my job to make the living; her job is to raise the children." Not in the Word of God! In the Bible, the ultimate responsibility for what a home becomes is the father's. So the word is addressed to fathers: "Fathers, do not provoke your children to anger, but bring them up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord."

That is the way a father subjects himself to his children -- by deliberately avoiding the things which make a child rebel. "Proverbsoke them not to anger." The word for anger here is not the common word which describes irritation or temporarily upset, for obviously in any home even proper discipline can sometimes make a child angry. Children are not mature, they do not always react as they ought, and even necessary discipline will make a child angry. This word is not saying anything against that. The word used here means "anger which results in a rebellion." It is the word from which we get our English word paroxysm. "Fathers, do not provoke your children to the place where they completely lose control and break out against authority." That is the word to the parents. What causes this?

There are two things which cause rebellion in children, two things which provoke a child ultimately to rebel against his parents: Indulgence and harshness. These two things are the negative of the two things he instructs the father to do: "Bring them up in the discipline and the instruction (or the exhortation) of the Lord." The opposites of these are indulgence and harshness. Those are the things which provoke a child to wrath.

During the last century the father was often a tyrant in his family. Children had to toe the mark and often had very little contact with their parents in a loving relationship. Consequently there was a breaking out against this. In our day it is the other way around. We have swung to the extreme of indulgence. We give our children everything and let them have their own way, let them raise themselves.

But notice that the word says, "Fathers...bring your children up." Do not let them bring you up. Once, in a church in which I was speaking, I saw that the subject of the young people's meeting in the evening was "What's Wrong With Our Parents?" That indicated the difficulty those children were having in raising their parents. But the word is not, "Children, bring up your parents," but, "Parents, bring up your children," and do so by avoiding harshness and indulgence, for either one will produce the same results -- rebellion and an outbreak of violence.

Lack of discipline will make a child insecure, miserable, and self-centered. That is what we call "a spoiled child" -- one who grows up to expect to have his way in everything and who rides rough-shod over the feelings of everyone else. This is created, in our day, by a spirit of indulgence on the part of parents who allow their children to make decisions which no child is capable of making. Parents must learn that they need to make decisions for their child for quite a while in his life, and only gradually help him to learn to make those decisions as he is able to do so. In the early years of childhood parents must make almost all the decisions. One of the terribly tragic things about life today is the degree to which many parents let children make decisions they are totally incapable of making.

I was in a home not long ago with a Christian father and his little three-year-old daughter. The little girl was watching the television set. She had turned on a murder mystery, or something similarly unsavory. The father saw what she was watching and, whether it was because I was there or not, something made him feel that this was an improper diet for his child. He stood at the set, and said to her, "Now, dear, you don't want to watch this, do you?" She nodded her head, "Sure!" He said, "But I don't think this is good for you. Don't you think you'd better turn it off?" "No." "Well," he said, "you ought to turn it off. This is not the kind of thing you should watch." But she shook her head again indicating she wanted to watch it. He stood there for three or four minutes, pleading with her, and, since she would not give her consent, he finally let her watch the program.

A three-year-old child is totally incapable of making that kind of moral decision. Though it need not have been made with harshness, the decision should have been made with firmness that the child was not to watch that program. It was no wonder that I observed that the child was a bundle of frustrations, striking out against everyone, for she had no security. A lack of proper discipline, more than anything else, will create insecurity in a child. The child without discipline feels unwanted and terribly unhappy. The limits which parents set for their children are like walls. I know that walls can sometimes be prisons, frustrating us, but that is usually the extreme. Walls are much more frequently beneficial to us, and we often long for them because they are symbols of safety. Who does not feel more secure at home at night because of the walls which are there. Disciplinary limits are like that to a child.

Some time ago, the Saturday Evening Post had a story of a stepfather who was trying to win the acceptance and approval of his new stepson by indulging him, buying him everything he wanted. But he was getting nowhere. Finally, they went out on a hike together and came to a place where a waterfall came down over a cliff and spread out in a big pool at its foot. Suddenly the father noticed the son's blue cap floating in the middle of the pool. Without hesitation he dived in and tried to find the boy. He made several dives, and at last, unavailing, he flung himself exhausted on the bank. Just then he heard a noise and there was the boy standing behind a tree. He said to him, "Did you throw your cap in the pool?" The boy said, "Yes, I did." The father said, "What did you do that for?" The boy answered, "I wanted to see what would happen." The stepfather said, "Well, you're going to find out right now," and he spanked him as few boys have ever been spanked. On the way home in the car, he suddenly found hot little fingers gripping his hand, and choked voice saying,

((("I'm sorry, I'm awful sorry, but I didn't know whether you really liked me, because you never spanked me like the other children's fathers do."))))

It is an imperative necessity that children find discipline, for it is the mark of love. As the apostle tells us in Hebrews no father ever had a son but that he chastened him because he loved him. God's chastening is that to us, a sign of love. It is the same to a child./

you can read the entire excellent article at: <http://www.raystedman.org/new-testament/ephesians/parents-and-children>

Re: Late Entry, on: 2013/6/4 2:55

Quote:

-----Who is advocating much beating ??

Not even one post is advocating much beating! To suggest so, is a LIE! a false accusation toward God's Children. proudpapa

"I want to say this also: We use this at our house. We use it often at our house. It gets used more on the younger ones than the older ones. But we use it often at our house, and my children love me." "

"The Godly Home" a video preaching session by a brother speaking about his own home.

The word I presume you really object to is the word beating. That objection is founded on a belief that striking your children with a "switch", which in translation means a small branch or sapling taken from a tree, made of wood and does not mean a tree made of say duck feathers or say cotton wool... amounts to the same in meaning as the word "beating" used in the quotation by Mr Banks. Just a normal tree. You know brother the type which kills you if you drive your car into it at 70 miles per hour. Just one part thereof just one little part. The smallest of its branches even its outer parts yeah a "switch".

Does that help to clarify it brother or is this too just a game of words.

I would post some of Mr Pearl's expressions about what "much" means but I have a feeling that the tomahawk throwing gentleman in question is watching. I truly hope so. He can throw one of his tomahawks at me. Not on this site though. I ha

ve one of my own and intend to use it.

Re: Late Entry, on: 2013/6/4 4:00

The Mercy of The Lord

It isn't always possible to comprehend what the meaning of something is until it passes into sight. By which time it is of course more than likely too late. Yet with the Lord there is always an opportunity presented in plain sight for anyone to apprehend the thing which is intended. What cannot be done is to "prove" that a thing is of the Lord. It can only be stated and beyond that it cannot be pressed any further. Moreover, it is one thing to hear something and it is another to understand it even when we are hearing the Lord Himself.

The book of 1 Samuel contains a clarity which cannot be ignored because it is stated plainly. The substance of this clarity is simple. If you fail to rebuke your disobedient sons there will be consequences for the whole house. This means consequences for the head of the house and all those under him. What was the thing which Eli's sons did which necessitated his rebuke? Was it in their childhood? Perhaps when they were little babies? Perhaps Eli which means "My God" simply didn't know that children needed to be disciplined. Perhaps he failed completely and miserably to discipline his children. Perhaps he was just weak minded. Or perhaps he looked out of the land of Israel as High Priest and custodian of the Law of God and just thought, hey if anyone brings their rebellious children to me I will just let them off. Or perhaps perhaps perhaps. All speculation and rhetoric.

The explanation begins in 1 Samuel 12:13 in which we are told that Eli's two sons were worthless men and did not know God nor the custom of the priests before the people. In short they did not know how to behave as priests. They despised that portion of the sacrifice which was set unto the Lord and which ought to have been consumed by fire. This was for no other reason than because they did not want to eat of the portion which was boiled. They wanted the raw meat before it was consumed by fire so that they could roast it with the fat portion because it is more flavoursome and desirable to the belly. One might ask why did these two priests not comprehend that their desire for the fat as well as the meat, was an offence to the Lord?

Clearly they neither knew the Lord, which 1 Samuel tells us, and clearly they did not comprehend the need in obedience to burn the meat with the fat portion, so as to consume the fat unto the Lord. It is inconceivable that they didn't actually know the order of events or the requirement, because the servants or young men who went to collect the portion for the priests went precisely, to draw without sight, a "fork" of meat, boiled for consumption by the priests who were not actually present at the sacrifice. The two sons of Eli took their daily food precisely from this method of distribution. First of the fat portion unto the Lord and thereafter of the pot unto the priests. Something made them incapable of seeing that their actions in sending the young men to bring their portion and instructing them to take the fat portion by means of violence if necessary were the demand resisted, was an offence to the Lord. The something was nothing less than their hearts. How did they harden their hearts?

As priests the very least thing which was required of them was to remain clean unto the Lord in their own bodies. These two sons of Eli were sleeping with prostitutes and then still demanding their daily portion. These same two sons of Eli in the end thought it acceptable to take the Ark of the Covenant into battle, to great shouts of confidence from Israel, against the philistines, and yet they lost 30 thousand men and the Ark was taken into captivity in a single day.

In short they comprehended nothing of their own uncleanness and by taking the Ark they demonstrated their contempt for God and the belief that they themselves could wield the power of God. All in all a very serious condition to be in and a costly mistake for the whole of Israel. Of one of these two sons is come ichabod, a wicked and evil priest.

What would have been the effect or benefit if Eli had rebuked his sons in a timely manner? One thing is for sure when he did rebuke them after the people complained to Eli about their behaviour it was too late. God had already decided to take their lives. After all they were God's priests. It must be clear in reading these things in scripture that by this practise of taking the best portion for themselves, Eli's sons were acting in a manner which reflected a deeper issue than the outward and visible action. They were in fact men who did not know the Lord, even though they were priests. Yet their father was the high priest and they grew up with the Ark of the Covenant in their sight. By committing sexual sins with prostitutes they made themselves unclean and unfit to serve the Lord of Hosts before the Ark. This underlying attitude led to an

even greater attitude of neglecting their priestly duties by reason of their sins and inability to be clean before the Lord. This led directly to the Lord deciding to put these men to death. In fact their deaths were no more than a sign to Eli, concerning the Lord's words to him directly that He would remove the ephod from his house. To his sons it was the price they paid for their own wickedness. The price Eli paid was living long enough to hear of the Ark of the Covenant being taken in battle by the philistines, to which news specifically he fell off his chair a dead man, no doubt having comprehended momentarily not the loss of his sons, but the cost of his own failure as their father. In the end his house was removed from wearing the ephod and it was given to another man by Solomon more than 100 years later.

It would be ever so easy to spiritualise all of this and fail to comprehend that these men were not little children, they were priests unto God in the place of the Ark of the Covenant. They themselves did not demand the portion which was set aside for God directly they sent their servants to do it and threatened violence if the Lord's portion was not given to them. Thus they were themselves corrupting the youth who came into the Tabernacle, who themselves would become incapable of comprehending the Lord either. Call me picky but I get the impression these men had an exceptional reason to have sought God with their hearts. They had everything necessary to serve faithfully. Save for one thing. Willing hearts. Eli, despite his mistake in not rebuking his wicked sons sufficiently to vindicate the Lord's portion, nevertheless was the man who in the end spoke the blessing which gave Hannah her peace and led to the Lord blessing her with her first born son, Samuel. He also blessed Hannah and her husband with a prayer for more children to replace Samuel. God Himself answered both of these prayers in full. On the other hand perhaps Eli just didn't beat them sufficiently when they were little babies.

And that would be the end of the matter but for Samuel himself. It would be a really great account with all the right ingredients to just so prove that failing to punish and break our children when little, leads to evil and rebellious men in their adult lives. One thing is very definitely true. Eli ought to have disciplined his sons throughly the moment he heard the reports about them sleeping with prostitutes and what the implication for that would have been regarding their ability to minister. In failing in that did Eli, not only receive to himself some of the portion of the fat, which was for the Lord but he failed to put the Lord's name above His own sons welfare. Not little children, but fully grown men.

Samuel as a child slept in the same room as the Ark of the Covenant. Yet he still did not know God. Verse 3:1 clearly states that Samuel was ministering to the Lord, before Eli. And verse 3:7 clearly shows that at this time Samuel did not know God because God had not yet revealed His word to Samuel. In short Samuel physically lived in the presence of the Ark, he served God, by ministering before the High Priest of God, and yet he did not personally know God.

In all of this Samuel was a child. Yet when the moment came God called his name and he heard the call, yet did not comprehend its true meaning. No one can be deaf when God calls them. They may not understand that it is the Living God, but they cannot but hear Him. God knows how to speak and be heard. Because Samuel was yet a child and reliant in obedience upon Eli to show him the way, Eli was therefore the one who explained what Samuel must do when the Lord called again. Having been instructed, Samuel was able to say "speak for your servant is listening." on the fourth time of being called. The first thing Samuel heard was confirmation of the word previously spoken to Eli concerning his sons death as a symbol of God's judgement on the house of Eli, in the removal of the ephod of High Priest.

It is hard to differentiate between what type of man our children will become when they are yet babes. We have such hope in them and when they don't turn out the way we expect it is easy to blame ourselves, or we can just wait for the accusing finger of our brethren. Either way it is the heart at the end of the day which separates men unto God. And it is the heart which God Himself looks upon when He chooses vessels for honour or dishonour. None of this has to do with life, anymore than having no part in the millennium kingdom is evidence that a man's name is not written in the Book of Life.

If we then go on to the end of Samuel's life we see that it was Samuel's own sons who's corruption formed the basis for the people of Israel to demand a king, recognising that Samuel was already old and would go to be with the Lord. Imagine that! An obedient Samuel with corrupt sons. If everything in life could be put down to dog training our children then of all people, ought not Eli and Samuel have understood and insured that their children would not have fallen away into wickedness and injustice.

Today we have a better covenant than either Eli, Samuel, David or Solomon had and it is written in the blood of Christ. By this are we and our children able to come into a living relationship with God, yet just as with Samuel, though our children dwell in a righteous house if we do in fact believe, until they hear from God Himself, they will not know Him. What will separate them from God in eternity will be a matter of God Himself looking upon the heart and revealing Himself according to His own knowledge. It is in the end the heart which matters and not the outward obedience to the letter. Being una

ble to even express ones own mind on a matter or comprehending that the world is an evil system against God in finality , does not make for salvation in our children. It is in the way of children to express themselves. It is in the way of parents to explain what that means and its consequences. It is not necessary to provoke our children's natural distractions from the centrality of our total will, in order to entrap them and thus to punish them for being no more than a child.

I notice that there are some who insists on the rod but neglect to strike a balance in their speech regarding compassion and mercy. I also note that this leads to some extraordinary harsh attitudes towards others and their children, little realising that they are instructing widows and orphans. Does anyone imagine that God will not fulfil His promise that when widows and orphans pray he will hear them. If the whole of this thread is read through and the locked thread as well, I think you will find that no one at all has denied the need for correcting children in any way. It has been shown that the Hebrew word translated as rod in English whilst it is used several hundred times throughout the OT is variously translated tribe, branch staff as well as rod. whilst it is used hundreds of times in a variety of ways it is used only twice to denote an actual physical switch of a tree. And one of these is a branch and not a switch. The sad lament in all of this is a simple one. Those who say beat your children and break them in this post at least also say and "if you don't you are serving Satan". Its no wonder that we cause unbelievers to stumble when they read such things.

You will find all of the above points clearly set out in 1 Samuel.

Edit Addition

If I have misunderstood or misrepresented the scriptures please say so. I have no difficulty with that. But please say it meaningfully and not anecdotally by posting lovely stories about how grateful children are when we beat them, because we have thereby expiated their guilt. If the scriptures are given for our instruction and training then of course we need to have an accurate understanding of them. Not necessary a dogmatic one.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/4 8:00

Hi amrkelly,

pp asked

Quote:

-----Who is advocating much beating ??

Not even one post is advocating much beating! To suggest so, is a LIE! a false accusation toward Gods Children. proudpapa

amrkelly response was a quote of Bro Denny Kenaston ://// "I want to say this also: We use this at our house. We use it often at our house. It gets used more on the younger ones than the older ones. But we use it often at our house, and my children love me." "

The Godly Home" a video preaching session by a brother speaking about his own home.////

The brother that you are referring to is bro Denny Kenaston, the sermons that you are referring to are promoted by SI, If you trully believe that these sermons are promoting abuse, than do as I asked and take that up with SI ministries.

amrkelly do you have an honesty problem ?

We all make mistakes, myself included, but when men countinuly say one thing and countinuly do the opposite, my respect for their opinion fades more and more every time they do so.

and for that reason more than any other my respect for your opinion is becoming very little.

Re: , on: 2013/6/4 8:28

Quote:
-----amrkelly do you have an honesty problem ?

We all make mistakes, myself included, but when men countinuly say one thing and countinuly do the opposite, my respect for their opinion fades more and more every time they do so.

and for that reason more than any other my respect for your opinion is becoming very little. proudpapa

You will have to explain this question of my honesty to me more plainly. I have no idea what it means.

I presume that those reading these posts are capable of determining for them selves who said what and identifying what the name of an individual attached to a particular sermon may or may not be if the sermon itself is identified by name and corresponds to a relevant post by that name. Still who knows what men may or may not think or comprehend. Thats my most politest assumption as to what your use of the term "honesty" may mean, so unless you explain yourself further it is most likely all I can say as well on that question.

Finally brother I haven't expressed any opinions in these posts. I have expressed matters pertaining to the Law in the U K. Others have expressed how things work in the USA as a matter of reality, and I completely agree with their assessment even though they have been said to be serving the devil in their explanations as well. As to what you or other men think of me is of no consequence to me whatsoever. I thought I had made that reality very clear.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/9 17:02

///You will have to explain this question of my honesty to me more plainly. I have no idea what it means.///

It has nothing to do with this topic, I am referring to the numerous times in the past year that you have seemingly lost composure and made statements like this : ///Well it is as it is. I am finished./// only to find you once again posting within a short period of time.

To me this much more discredits an individuals influence to me, than does that of an individual because they throw a knife or tomahawk at a target.

Re: proudpapa - posted by Lysa (), on: 2013/6/9 19:52

Quote:
-----proudpapa wrote:
I am finished./// only to find you once again posting within a short period of time.

To me this much more discredits an individuals influence to me, than does that of an individual because they throw a knife or tomahawk at a target.

This is a bunch of baloney (PRETENTIOUS NONSENSE), every single person who posts regularly on here says their leaving only to return!

I've done it! And I believe you've done it as well.

Re: Leaving the site, on: 2013/6/10 10:02

Quote:
-----It has nothing to do with this topic, I am referring to the numerous times in the past year that you have seemingly lost composure and made statements like this : //Well it is as it is. I am finished.// only to find you once again posting within a short period of time. proudpapa

Thanks for your clarification. I took a little time to reflect on what you have shared and decided that perhaps a clarification may help to make sense of your comment.

In the last year I have "left" the site three times in the way ordinarily understood by that term. The first was in respect to a young man who used the name TheEphah in which I proudly stood against him and was rebuked by Paul West. In response I took myself off the site. The second time was when I proudly resisted Robert Wurtz II (Moderator) and again decided to leave the site. The third time was when I wrestled a little with Appolus (Frank) and used the term "falling of a cliff" to denote a sense of stumbling. In each of these instances I acted against myself in response to having a wrong attitude to others. I have also occasionally expressed within a particular thread an intention to resist posting into that thread again, and then have posted again. That has been true with regard to http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=49248&forum=34&9 in which I wisely stated that I would resist posting any further on that subject. Then after a while decided to posts in contradiction to my own recognition that the subject was going to be a difficult one for me to resist and could have easily become contentious.

As Lysa has said many members have done similar things.

I think what matters in regard to this thread which is in effect a continuation of the above link which was eventually locked is what I know to be true myself.

I can tell you that when I have said "I am finished" it is because I partly realise that I ought to finish and partly because I feel I have said something which ought to be more weighty than the responses would suggest was true. In your case brother you have taken this to mean that I won't respond if you once again post material from a particular ministry. So this is what you have done. The effect on me is a simple one. It grieves me, and necessitates a response. Perhaps I am wrong in that attitude or belief but that is the singular reality of it.

I could simply repeat what I have said before. I would welcome a response from the inferred ministry or its lawyers and have both the means and the will to resist them in open court in the USA and in the spirit. This is because of a conviction and not because of pride. It is a matter of conviction. I know that you already understand this attitude of mine very well as it has been discussed several times before. To that extent as Lysa said your comment is baloney because that which has gone before already informs the deeper reality of things. No ill feeling intended. I just want to be plain speaking.

Re: - posted by jochbaptist (), on: 2013/6/10 15:54

Amrkelly,

I have sometimes wondered whether you might be schizophrenic. Please don't take it as an insult, because it is merely put (and meant) as an observation.

Sometimes I am amazed at your insights, and sometimes at the volatility of your reactions to reasonable posts, where you aggressively attack something that I can't even see that was mentioned. For instance:

This chap would have been better putting his much education to something useful. It's frankly incredible that he begins with an issue regarding the discipline of children and end with the words "criminals". In my view that just about sums it up. Shame on such men as these!

Someone once described you as "passive aggression cloaked in eloquence" (or something in that vein) after you reacted to their post. I agreed.

I feel that you are sometimes instrumental in turning good posts/topics into confusion with your longwinded, opinionated

responses. I get the sense that you are doing this to impress. Sometimes your contributions to a topic, such as the one where you reported on the revival in Wales, were a great blessing to all.

If I could only read as much Scripture as I have to read through your voluminous contributions (to try and make sense of post) but that is what you are forcing those involved in posts to do.

Hope this did not come over in the wrong way, because it was not easy for me to say this.

I think this scripture sums it up pretty well.

Proverbs 10:19.

When there are many words, transgression is unavoidable, But he who restrains his lips is wise.

Joch

Re: , on: 2013/6/10 16:59

Quote:
-----I have sometimes wondered whether you might be schizophrenic. Please don't take it as an insult, because it is merely put (and meant) as an observation. Jochbaptist

It was in a discussion about home schooling in which you previously told me:

Quote:
-----And your (AK's = amrkelly) academic and longwinded (it would be very interesting to make a word-count on your contribution to this specific thread) opinions on all you managed to extrapolate from the article, makes me sympathize with the OP, as I too have felt the brunt of reactions to something shared in a desire to participate and offer something that has been of personal value. Posted on 2012/10/9 3:25 in http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=46942&forum=34&start=30&viewmode=flat&order=0

It was ceedub who said:

Quote:
-----"I'm sorry, somehow I got into the "Resort to personal slander in a passive-aggressive yet eloquent fashion" blog. I was just hoping to discuss the talents and yet be able to have an opinion at the same time" on 2013/2/22 14:16

in response to my comment to him

Quote:
-----"Then there is nothing to say is there and your question becomes more like a lion in the thicket who's quiet murmurings are mistaken for pain. Then as you draw closely to give some comfort the lion roars and makes good its escape into the night. Oh the fool who mistook the lion in the thicket for pain and saw not the lion who devours"

in the same post http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id=48374&forum=36&start=0&viewmode=flat&order=0

Now I am asked if I have a mental illness. From which question I can perhaps assume that you believe that a symptom of Schizophrenia is evident by a dichotomy of insightfulness on the one hand and seeming aggression on the other. How you could voice such an "observation" and not insult someone is difficult to imagine objectively, but to put your mind at rest I am not offended.

As for the lack of scriptural references and the necessity of searching scriptures yourself to test what I have shared, I can tell you that this is deliberate. I am quite capable of citing scriptural references but I take the view that the reader will benefit more from making their own effort than by being given chapter and verse by myself. Apart from that the scriptures are living to me and not chapter and verse. Anyone with a good knowledge of scripture will see the "scripture" and no doubt make up their own minds regardless.

As to the question of my confusing posts by reason of asserting those things which you or another cannot see in the originating post is surly a matter of insight and relevance, which at very least may lie in the mind or heart of the originator and therefore cannot be easily seen by others. Only the recipient would be able to establish that.

To which end I wrote the following:

Quote:

This chap would have been better putting his much education to something useful. It's frankly incredible that he begins with an issue regarding the discipline of children and end with the words "criminals". In my view that just about sums it up. Shame on such men as these!

Which you have cited as an example of my seeming mental illness. Perhaps you ought to read the whole post brother and digest its fuller contents then the context and relevance of something may become apparent.

Well thanks for sharing brother I accept that you have meant well and will give the matter some more thought.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/10 22:33

amrkelly wrote RE: ////In the last year I have "left" the site three times in the way ordinarily understood by that term. The first was in respect to a young man who used the name TheEphah in which I proudly stood against him and was rebuked by Paul West. In response I took myself off the site. The second time was when I proudly resisted Robert Wurtz II (Moderator) and again decided to leave the site. The third time was when I wrestled a little with Appolus (Frank) and used the term "falling of a cliff" to denote a sense of stumbling. In each of these instances I acted against myself in response to having a wrong attitude to others. I have also occasionally expressed within a particular thread an intention to resist posting into that thread again, and then have posted again. That has been true with regard to http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=49248&forum=34&9 in which I wisely stated that I would resist posting any further on that subject. Then after a while decided to posts in contradiction to my own recognition that the subject was going to be a difficult one for me to resist and could have easily become contentious.///

You forgot this one of which you wrote:

RE:// Public discussions simply don't make any sense to me at all. I think in the end I will leave and put my time to other things. That can only mean preaching the gospel, I sincerely and truly hope so.//

RE:// I am going to share this simple point and then I'm finished. By that I mean I am finished posting on SI altogether.//

RE:// None of this matters. I am in any event finished. Why this should be so, precisely now has more to do with the fact that I am unable to go on due to several posts which I have contributed to of late and which finally and completely convince me that nothing is to be had with so many minds of dissension where even the smallest detail of truth can be argued over as though truth were a matter of opinion. It is better for me to accept that I am unable to contribute any further and that I ought to return to that which produces the better outcome. How I feel about this is also irrelevant. When I am crossing over a precipice and the options before me are likely to lead to my own dissension I would rather cut the rope and fall than stumble others.

http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id=48639&forum=36&start=10&viewmode=flat&order=1

Re: , on: 2013/6/11 2:51

Is there a purpose brother to your efforts? If so why don't you state it openly and then it will have a chance to grow healthily. If it grows in the shadows it will be deformed and the fruit bitter.

Don't see my own willingness to strike myself with a rod and miss the cost to others that believe they can strike me at will.

And yes I did forget that one.

Words brother, they carry the power of life and death, and an absence of them does not the meaning veil.

Quote:
-----RE:// Public discussions simply don't make any sense to me at all. I think in the end I will leave and put my time to other things. That can only mean preaching the gospel, I sincerely and truly hope so.//

RE:// I am going to share this simple point and then I'm finished. By that I mean I am finished posting on SI altogether.//

RE:// None of this matters. I am in any event finished. Why this should be so, precisely now has more to do with the fact that I am unable to go on due to several posts which I have contributed to of late and which finally and completely convince me that nothing is to be had with so many minds of dissension where even the smallest detail of truth can be argued over as though truth were a matter of opinion. It is better for me to accept that I am unable to contribute any further and that I ought to return to that which produces the better outcome. How I feel about this is also irrelevant. When I am crossing over a precipice and the options before me are likely to lead to my own dissension I would rather cut the rope and fall than stumble others.//

As a matter of reality I did stop reading and posting on SI for one month after writing these comments and instead put my time to creating a website in order to state plainly what cannot be stated plainly on this site. In the end brother you will come to comprehend this.

Apart from that, contributing to public discussions does not make any sense to me if it is truth we are after. So many opinions will not make for a sound understanding of anything. I am quiet happy to dwell alone brother. I seek no friends and I require no friends. It is the way of it and this is the man the Lord has made. We would all be better served to find such a satisfaction in the Lord and recognise that being alone is not the same as ignoring others needs. It simply means recognising that it is possible to serve others needs and to ignore your own. By God's grace I lack for nothing in life. Yet before I was found by Christ I lacked even the most basic things. Today, though I have asked for nothing, I have everything, all of which I am willing to share with any man. Compassion is balanced by the ability to stand. It is not a weak thing as some would imagine. Neither is standing, evidence of a lack of compassion. If your confidence is in Christ, who can disturb you? The only thing which can disturb you is yourself.

Re: - posted by davidc (), on: 2013/6/11 3:39

"I have sometimes wondered whether you might be schizophrenic. Please don't take it as an insult, because it is merely put (and meant) as an observation. jochbaptist"

The scriptural word for schizophrenia is "being besides oneself"; for this is truly what this condition is.

Jesus Himself was accused of being beside himself by His friends early in His ministry Mark 3.21.

Paul was accused by Festus of the same Acts 26.24 "Paul, thou art beside thyself; much learning doth make thee mad."

And Paul admits to being beside himself . 2 Cor 5.13.

" For whether we be beside ourselves, it is to God: or whether we be sober, it is for your cause. For the love of Christ constraineth us;"

We must all as Christians have to face this condition in ourselves and find only in Christ the balance of it.

(2Ti 1:7) For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.

David

Re: - posted by romanchog (), on: 2013/6/11 4:00

Brothers and sisters:

I am so saddened by some of the posts that I see here. Not just on this thread. Can we not disagree civilly? Must we resort to personal attacks? I am NOT speaking to one person in particular, for there are many (including myself in one post). I pray that the Lord will convict those who need to be convicted.

How does the Lord look at his quarreling children, calling each other names, taunting each other, etc.? As a mortal mother, I am quite saddened when I see division among my children. How does our Father feel about ours? It is the one prayer that the Lord Jesus still has not had answered: "Lord, that they be one, just as You and I are one."

What a shame to us. What a shame. And what a terrible witness to the unsaved, for it is by the love that we have for one another that they will know that Christ was sent by the Father.

Is this how much we think of our Lord and His sacrifice?

May God have mercy on us.

Re: , on: 2013/6/11 4:34

Quote:

-----We must all as christians have to face this condition in ourselves and find only in Christ the balance of it. DavidC

Thank you for posting this David. I cannot tell you how much this has comforted me. I also want to thank jochbaptist for his honest post. In a desire to be open and to demonstrate how merciful the Lord is in these things I can share that just in the last week I have wrestled with this issue of my own attitude and strong mind on the one hand and at the same time the need to be gentle in that mind as well. I can't explain the circumstance which led to this crisis but in it I cried out to the Lord and specifically asked about my mind. Realising that to comprehend that there is nothing beyond Christ Himself, Who's mind we have been given, is both a condition and an answer to all things in life, now and eternally. Such a condition exposes oneself to the finality of being just one man before God and needing to utterly depend on Him for everything. In that we can serve Him as well and in Him we are made complete. The rest is service to others for His sake.

Re: , on: 2013/6/11 4:34

Double Post

Re: , on: 2013/6/11 4:34

Double Post

Re: , on: 2013/6/11 4:34

Double Post

Re: - posted by jochbaptist (), on: 2013/6/11 4:34

Dear amrkelly,

Thank you for your kind response to a difficult situation where you allowed me the freedom to express issues that I have with your posting.

I appreciate that very much.

Joch

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/11 8:05

amrkelly wrote ///I would post some of Mr Pearls expressions about what "much" means but I have a feeling that the tomahawk throwing gentleman in question is watching. I truly hope so. He can throw one of his tomahawks at me. Not on this site though. I have one of my own and intend to use it. ///

Could you explain what you are metaphorically implying by
///I have one of my own and intend to use it.///

amrkelly wrote ///I could simply repeat what I have said before. I would welcome a response from the inferred ministry or its lawyers and have both the means and the will to resist them in open court in the USA and in the spirit. This is because of a conviction and not because of pride. It is a matter of conviction. I know that you already understand this attitude of mine very well as it has been discussed several times before.///

It is writings like this that I find most bizarre.

as it would appear that you have imagined that the tomahawk throwing gentleman in question is watching your threads and is so offended by your post on SI that he is going to contact you personally or his lawyers will and bring you to open court in the US.

(The inferred ministry has much more powerful and harmful naysayers to worry with, than you, such as the entertainment media, I highly doubt that they are at all concerned or even watching your naysaying post on SI)

Or where you speaking somehow metaphorically ?

amrkelly, I do not have as much ill feelings towards you as you probably suspect.

I have felt and I would believe that you would agree that ever since the "The Cloistered Homeschool Syndrome" thread in which you misunderstood the article, and for some reason became very offended. that ever since then, you have made it a point to follow at the heels of any post of mine that you deem as possibly being influenced by the inferred ministry, and you have went to great lengths to discredit what ever I post.

We either need to respectfully settle our differences or we need to stop responding to each others post because we are becoming very close to falling in to the trap of Gal 5:15

"But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another."

Re: , on: 2013/6/11 9:57

I have nothing further to say about Michael Pearl directly on this site for obvious reasons. I have a site of my own which I will use for that when the time comes. Which means I don't have a Tomahawk, I have a web site.

As for biting one another! Brother you have no idea what being bitten is if you imagine these few words amount to biting. You ought not to confuse a fear of consequences with biting. Also I am not in the entertainment media circus so I don't employ their methodologies or their rhetoric, or their arguments. Neither does the Lord use the entertainment media, Satan does however. Therein lies the separation.

The first part of this post which you started yourself was predicated on an article which was written for a single purpose. Very different to Mr Pearls approach I grant you, but in that article a claim was made in which it is stated that a failure to use the rod on children is evidenced by a complete break down of society. The man who wrote the article even went to s

ome lengths to "prove" that the rod means a switch. For me the term switch needs to be stated plainly. . . . in that it means part of a tree. The break down of society cannot be put down to a lack of corporal discipline either in the home or in the school. It is simply a myth. In that post some very unpleasant things were said about me. No one took exception to them and I chose to ignore them. If you want to really make a sound judgement then read things as they are actually written and ask yourself who has been attacked in these posts! You my friend have not been attacked personally once. As for my own feelings and thoughts about those things said about me, it has passed already, I had my dark night and woke up stone cold sober.

I am not going to get into the business of attacking you yourself personally or anyone else for that matter because that would as you have said give rise to an ill effect. Apart from that it would be unrighteous and prove self defeating. I will agree to desist from making any further posts to your own if that means wisdom, especially on the centrality of my concern regarding the treatment of children or the theologies which are employed to assert particular views on that subject. Beyond that there should be no issue.

Re: - posted by Koheleth, on: 2013/6/11 10:58

romanchog wrote:

Quote:
-----Brothers and sisters:
I am so saddened by some of the posts that I see here. Not just on this thread. Can we not disagree civilly? Must we resort to personal attacks?

People generally act according to their nature. For a person who claims to be a Christian, we must hope that bad behavior is just out of character. Unfortunately, many who claim to follow Christ show by their nature that they are not of him.

romanchog, your signature line says "Holiness is coming and it is going to burn everything that is unholy." How true, as the Scriptures tell us, there is going to be a great burning. And there is much that is unholy, including on these forums.

You lament that God's children treat each other so. Do not be deceived, because for the most part God's children are true to their master and "love the saints"! Jesus said you shall know people by the fruits of their life. While there may be carnality among believers, as when Paul cautioned the immature to beware not to bite and devour one another. Unfortunately, people who have the poison of asps within their lips often sink their teeth into others and never return to draw out the venom, thus killing many and revealing their true serpent nature.

But I appreciate your appeals to peace. May they reach the heart of those who know the Lord of Peace, and those who do not. Let each of us consider, when we post, that Jesus will ask us about every word we have placed on these forums.

Quote:
-----Is this how much we think of our Lord and His sacrifice?

Yes, that is absolutely correct. The words of all of our discussions do reveal what we think about the Lord and his sacrifice.

Re: Late Entry, on: 2018/12/31 17:53

Quote:
-----Andrew,
I cannot understand, how a person of your studying...reading...to gain knowledge...(I can tell that by your writings) cannot understand this ,...one of the most plain-spoken subjects / truths of the Word. And to throw His WAY / TRUTH / COUNSEL / WORDS to the ground, and KEEP your words,...Do you know the cost in that ?...Elevating your word above His Word / Counsel ?

2:Tim.3:16 ,.. "ALL scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness,..."

I ask you again, 'Have you really considered the cost to ANYONE who decides to throw out some of the Words in the Bible ?'
Well ! ..I know this is hard but,.....We lose something of great value,...our credibility.

1Sam.3:19,..(Samual,.. great and humbled man unto God,)"And Samual grew,and The Lord was with him,and he did let none of His Words fall to the ground."

Mt.18:3,..(Jesus speaking), "Verily I say unto you,Except ye be converted, and become as little children,ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven."

A 'little' child is humble / bendable :

* real example of a true child of God: Mt.5:3-12,...'the beatitudes'

* Jn.3:12,...' But as many as receive Him,to them gave He power TO BECOME the CHILDREN of God.(He gives us Grace : "The Divine effluence upon our heart and it 's reflection in the Life.)Power..working through the Holy Spirit,...drawing us to His will.

* Lk.12:47-48,..' And that servant,..(which we really are a child,servant, (serveing the Lord) son's,etc,..who knows the will of the Father)...who knew his Lord's will and doeth it not,prepareth not himself,neither did His will,"shall be beaten "...? with many stripes."
Question: you mean,The Father would actually BEAT us?...where there are marks on our skin ?

Andrew,What these brethren patiently and lovingly were trying to help you to see,...Why would you scoff at ? And the Denny Kenaston artical,that Proud Papa brought forth,.....I believe was as good and Godly way,as I have ever heard,....you scoffed at.
I do believe this man studied the Words of this Godly instruction on raising Godly children,and The Spirit of God taught this man the most perfect way,...not abuse but through patience,love,much work care and time,..to bring up his children in the way that they should go,..
And yet you scoffed at it.To me there is something to be feared here,....because when we scoff at something The Lord has taught,..according to His Word and Spirit,..Then really ,...aren't we really scoffing at The Lord' work ?

And there is another important factor here,....children need not only the guidance,correction, trained,switched when needed,but to learn the joy of work. Which is taboo,,,a crime, for them to labor these days.

As for 'the times that we live in'.."The Lord is the same yesterday,today and forever,....He changes not.His Word shall never pass away.

It is most unfortunate if a child does not have more than a near nothing to do,...where they can be tired when night comes,..and need their rest, and not to be a late sleeper In the day as some,....getting into things,at night like the gangs etc...not just letting their children go to waste....having loving,patience ,parents that care...that take the time,care and hard work,to raise,..teach,..correct,..with the rod when it is necessary,....according to the Word.

And too,you mentioned the hand vs the switch,..
Did you not realize,..Hitting the child with the hand,ja's the child,it could be so light,as to do nothing,or hitting them with the hand could be so hard That it could break their bones.where a little keen switch could apply topical switch marks,and the hurt that is needed,and not damage them deep .
They will learn to fear the....ever so small keen switch,at an early age.

And finally,

Eph.5:1,..(Paul teaching).. 'Be ye followers of God,as dear children.'
* who is God ?But He who speaketh,He is the Spirit / Word ...also the inspired Word because it comes from Him.

It is with great care,that I write this to you,....as well as I know all the other encouragements to you were.

Lovingly always,
elizabeth

Well that was somewhat of a late entry.

Sorry I missed the encouragements. But I see the clean up job. Still this won't go away you have been warned.

Sometimes we ought to simply remove ourselves from insulting others whilst simultaneously insisting we are being righteous. It is one of the most fortified abilities that believers have. It is the capacity to tell others who are plain, that they are abusive - and at the same time to infer or else state that they are mentally ill, abusive, unloving and then assert ones own niceness. It may take some time to work things out but things always do get worked out. Shalom