



1989  
Preachers'  
Study Notes

# *1989 Preachers' Study Notes*

The following manuscripts were submitted for publication by participants in the 1989 preachers' study. The 1989 study was conducted December 25-28 at the Garden's Edge congregation in Wichita Falls, Texas. Moderators for this study were brethren Edwin Morris and Alan Bonifay.

Printed June 1990

A Christian Expositor Publication  
705 Vandiver Drive, G-803  
Columbia, Missouri 65202

# Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction to First John	7
1 John 1	25
1 John 2	33
1 John 3	51
1 John 5	65
Judging	71
Carnal Warfare	99
Headship-Helpership: And the Curse of Genesis 3:16	117
The Prophecy of Joel	133
Conflicts in the Body	141
The Employer/Employee Relationship	153
The Evangelist	163
Financial Support of Preachers, Elders and Teachers	177
The Teacher	201
Works of the Flesh, Part 1	209
Works of the Flesh, Part 2	257
Available Notes and Ordering Information	271

## **Introduction to First John**

*by Jim Crouch*

God's people have always loved and appreciated this letter, and for good reason. The author writes in a very authoritative manner in fighting heresies, and yet it overflows with love, tenderness and affection. Equally noteworthy is that the author writes of profound Christian truths, and yet the language and expression is among the simplest of the Bible. Diligent study of this great writing cannot help but leave a positive impact on each of us.

### **Authorship of the Letter**

In one sense exact authorship of the letter is not crucial, for the evidence of inspiration is without question. Yet we are able to better understand the letter if we can confidently attach a name to it. Such criticism becomes even more important due to the bombardment of the Scriptures by higher critics. In recent years so-called scholars have called into question the authorship of nearly every New Testament book. It is comforting to know that careful study reveals the accuracy of the New Testament Canon, and the fallacious reasoning of enemies of the truth who have deceived many into believing that the Scriptures are unreliable.

In noticing the evidence regarding the authorship of this Epistle, we must first examine the external evidence extant that may suggest authorship. We must then examine the internal evidence of the Epistle to see if it verifies or negates the validity of the external evidence.

### **External Evidence**

Authorship of First John is better substantiated by external evidence than the other general epistles. Polycarp, a student under John and bishop in Smyrna, is the first to quote from the letter of First John, and this from 4:2-3 (A.D. 115, *Epistles to the Philippians*, ch. 7). Polycarp was a contemporary of the Apostle John for twenty years before being martyred at age eighty-six. While Polycarp does not attribute this quotation to any author, as he had been a student of John (according to Eusebius) it strongly suggests that John was probably the author.

Irenaeus (A.D. 80-155) quotes 1 John 2:18-19 and expressly says that he is quoting from John's letter. On yet another occasion, he verifies the Epistle as being by the Lord's disciple John, the writer of the Fourth Gospel. The Muratorian Canon (A.D. 170) includes this letter and ascribes it to the Apostle John. Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 155-215), Tertullian (A.D. 150-

# *1 John—Introduction*

---

222), Origen (A.D. 185-253), and other early writers similarly cite John as the author of this letter.

This evidence is sufficient to show that from a very early date, the church recognized this Epistle not only as inspired Scripture, but also as a writing of the Apostle John. Add to this the fact that the early church never disputed the authorship of this letter, and that no other theory regarding authorship was ever propagated by those of the second and third centuries; and we are left with very strong evidence indeed that John was its writer. But before drawing a definite conclusion, we also must examine the internal evidence to see that it verifies, or at least supports, this judgment.

## Internal Evidence

The writer does not declare his name to his readers within this Epistle, the letter to the Hebrews being the only other of the New Testament having this distinction. But, unlike Hebrews, the introduction to First John does provide some information about the author.

That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked at and our hands have touched—this we proclaim concerning the Word of life. The life appeared; we have seen it and testify to it, and we proclaim to you the eternal life, which was with the Father and has appeared to us. We proclaim to you what we have seen and heard, so that you also may have fellowship with us. And our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ (1:1-3).

The author writes about what he had heard, seen, looked upon and touched, viz. Jesus Christ. In no more clear a manner could the author have stated that he had been an eyewitness of the life and suffering of Jesus Christ. His claim from the outset is that the basis for his teaching is his own personal experience. While others could make such a claim, John would definitely be in a position to do so. Thus this would not violate the external evidence already noticed that suggests that he was the author.

In addition, as we read the letter, we note that it was obviously written by one deserving of much respect and authority. The phrase "little children," which would be used only by one who was in a position of respect and authority, occurs nine times in this letter of five chapters. John, as an apostle, would certainly be qualified to use such terminology. Jesus used this phrase once toward the end of His ministry (Jn. 13:33), and Paul uses it once (Gal. 4:19). This is also an expression that would be used by an elderly man,

## 1 John—Introduction

---

thus fitting the historical evidence that John wrote this letter late in life. But besides this phrase, the entire tenor of the letter suggests that the writer was a person of authority. He writes, expecting not only to be heard, but obeyed. He writes in categorical, matter-of-fact, language.

Still another piece of internal evidence that should not be overlooked is the strong connection of the Epistle to the Fourth Gospel. The unbiased reader can hardly question that these two writings came from the same author. There are many unique phrases that are common to both works, most of which do not appear in any other New Testament writings: *Jesus as the Word* (1:1 & Jn. 1:1), *to do the truth* (1:6 & Jn. 3:31), *the truth is not in us* (1:8 & Jn. 8:24), *he is of the devil* (3:8 & Jn. 8:44), *he is of God* (3:10 & Jn. 8:47), *to be of the world* (2:16 & Jn. 8:23), *Spirit of truth* (4:6 & Jn. 14:17), *children of God* (3:1 & Jn. 1:12), *to lay down His life* (3:16 & Jn. 10:11-18), *to have sin* (1:8 & Jn. 9:41), *having eternal life* (3:15; 5:13 & Jn. 3:16, 36), *to pass from death to life* (3:14 & Jn. 5:24), *to overcome the world* (5:4 & Jn. 16:33), *to take away sin* (3:5 & Jn. 1:29), *abide in Christ* (2:28 & Jn. 15:4-5), *speaking of the world* (4:5 & Jn. 3:31), *walking in darkness* (4:5 & Jn. 8:12), *walking in light* (1:7 & Jn. 8:12), and others.

There are also similarities of style in both the Gospel and this Epistle. One interesting practice in each is the setting of pairs of opposites against one another. For example, the writer in each contrasts light and darkness, life and death, love and hate, truth and lies, the Father and the world, children of God and children of the devil, to know God and not to know God. These parallels are enough to show that either the same man wrote each book, or else the author of one was intimately acquainted with the other and copied his writing style. Considering the external evidence suggesting the Apostle John as the author of each treatise, we must conclude that the internal evidence corroborates this testimony. Reaching the same conclusion, W. M. Ramsay declares in his *The Church in the Roman Empire Before A.D. 170*,

There can be no doubt that the same hand can be traced in the First Epistle and the Fourth Gospel. No two works in the whole range of literature show clearer signs of the genius of one writer, and no other pair of works are so completely in a class by themselves, apart from the work of their own and of every other time (p. 302).

There is an obvious close connection of this Epistle to the John's Gospel. They were written at about the same time and with similar objectives in mind. Some scholars believe that the First Epistle may have served as a

## *1 John—Introduction*

---

cover letter for the Gospel when John first sent it forth. While this is possible and interesting to consider, historical evidence for such a claim is lacking.

We conclude then, after considering the external evidence and comparing it to the evidence from within the Epistle itself, that the Holy Spirit inspired and guided Apostle John to write this treatise. The reason for not identifying himself was probably due to his readers being well aware of who had sent the letter. Also, it should be noted that John does not identify himself by name in three of his other writings; his name does not even appear in the Gospel he penned. Therefore, this seems simply to be his custom. Higher critics have propagated other theories in recent years regarding authorship, but these simply do not provide an adequate explanation for the unwavering position held by the early church.

### **John the Apostle**

The name "John" is from the Greek *Ioannes*, meaning, "Jehovah is gracious." His home town was Bethsaida, which Jesus frequented in His early Galilean ministry (Jn. 1:44; Lk. 5:10). His parents were Zebedee and Salome, and his fleshly brother and fellow apostle was James (Mk. 1:19-20; 15:40; Mt. 27:56). Salome was one of the women who followed Jesus, and was one who was present at the crucifixion (Mt. 27:56). John, James, and his father were fishermen on the Sea of Galilee (Mt. 4:21). Their family was probably prosperous. This is suggested by the fact that they had hired servants, materially supported Jesus' ministry, owned their own home, and were familiar enough with the high priest that he allowed John to attend Jesus into His trial (Mk. 1:20; Mt. 27:56; Lk. 8:3; Jn. 18:15-16; 19:27).

John was first a follower of John the Baptist. He was one of the first two called to follow Jesus (Jn. 1:35, 40). He was one of the three who constituted Jesus' inner circle. With his brother James and Peter, he witnessed events no other disciples were privileged to behold (Mt. 17:1; 26:37; Mk. 5:37). He was one of the two sent to prepare for the last Passover (Lk. 22:8). He was the only disciple to remain with Jesus during His trial (Jn. 18:15), and was the sole disciple at the foot of the cross (Jn. 19:26-27). Here, Jesus committed to John the care of His mother, Mary (19:25-27). He was the "disciple who Jesus loved" (Jn. 13:23; 19:26; 20:2; 21:7, 20), and one who loved the Lord greatly. In keeping with this, the Scriptures distinguish John as the one who reclined against the body of Jesus at the last supper (Jn. 13:23-25; 21:20).

In the opening chapters of Acts, which chronicles the earliest period of the church, John and Peter are leaders of the apostolic company, and probab-

## 1 John—Introduction

---

ly close friends (Acts 3:1; 4:13; 8:14). They suffered persecution and imprisonment together during the early growth of the church, and preached together on many occasions. Paul declares that John was one of the pillars of the church during this period of infancy (Gal. 2:1ff).

After Acts 12, Peter, John and the Palestinian work recede into the background. Luke refocuses his history upon Paul and the work among the Gentiles. It would be a mistake, however, to think that John played an insignificant role in the church's growth during this period. His activity is merely not the focus of Luke's inspired record. It is certain that John continued a tireless worker in his Lord's Cause.

After Peter and Paul were martyred, John proved to be an invaluable worker for the church. Most, if not all the apostles, had met with violent death before the destruction of Jerusalem. John was perhaps the last apostolic witnesses to Jesus' life and resurrection. During this time, the diverse elements that composed the church—Jew and Gentile—had to be melded into one. It was a time when the church came under attack. Persecution had taken its toll, and now an even greater threat confronted the church from within: heresy. He whom Jesus had chosen first, came into his finest hour at the last, as he tirelessly sought to save the church from apostasy.

History suggests that before the destruction of Jerusalem, after faithfully discharging his duty to care for Mary the mother of Jesus until her death (A.D. 50), John relocated to the Asian city of Ephesus (A.D. 65?). Justin Martyr (A.D. 100-165) of Ephesus wrote in his *Dialogue With Trypho*, "There was a certain man with us, whose name was John, one of the Apostles of Christ" (ch. LXXXI). Eusebius, Irenaus, Jerome, Origen, Tertullian, Clement, Polycrates, and others also bear witness to the fact that John had a lengthy residence in Ephesus. Here he worked as an evangelist in the Asian province for perhaps as long as thirty years (A.D. 68-98). We believe that it was during this time that John penned the Gospel that bears his name (attested to by Irenaus, *Against Heresies*, 3. 1.1) and the three general epistles that have been preserved, evidence showing that he probably penned each toward the end of this period.

While at Miletus, Paul foretold to the elders of Ephesus (A.D. 56-57) that grievous wolves would come upon them, and would not spare the flock (Acts 20:29). By the time John arrived, such wolves were already within the camp and reeking havoc upon the church. Ephesus was a center for Greek philosophy and the many mystic cults that accompanied. As such philosophy worked itself into the church and melded with Christian doctrine, it gave birth to a Gnostic danger that would afflict the church for years to



## 1 John—Introduction

---

come. One of John's great tasks while in Ephesus was to fight off these Gnostic wolves. This fierce struggle is evidenced in each of his writings.

Under the reign of Domitian (A.D. 81-96), toward the end of his reign, the church again came under heavy persecution, resulting in John's exile to the Isle of Patmos where he received the Revelation. History suggests that he returned to the city of Ephesus after Domitian's death, where he soon died and was buried. Jerome records that John, in his extreme old age, was unable to walk, and therefore had to be carried to church. Until the time of his death, he repeatedly uttered to the congregation the five words for which he is best-known: "Little children, love one another." Five books that he penned have been preserved in the New Testament canon: the Fourth Gospel, three general letters, and the Revelation—about one-fifth of the whole.

### Date of the Writing

There is very little material to which one may appeal in order to dogmatically affix a date to the writing. There are obvious elements of Gnosticism present, which would suggest a probable date of the late first century (after A.D. 80). John began fighting the seeds of this heretical group that, by historical accounts, began to take root near the end of the first century, and blossomed into maturity during the first decades of the second century.

Polycarp, a student under John and bishop in Smyrna, quotes from 1 John 4:2-3 (A.D. 115, *Epistles to the Philippians*, ch. 7). This early quotation proves John penned the letter no later than the end of the first century.

Another way to acquire a tentative date is to recognize its close connection with John's Gospel. As each of these writings seems to have occurred during the same historical period, whatever conclusions one comes to in dating the Fourth Gospel could also apply to the First Epistle. In 1931, archaeologists unearthed an early papyrus fragment of John's Gospel in Egypt, labeling it "the John Rylands Fragment." It is the earliest known portion of the New Testament in existence. It dates from the first half of the second century, and probably from A.D. 117-138. Inscribed on both sides, this papyrus contains portions of John 18:31-33, 37-38. Again, this confirms that the writings occurred no later than the close of the first century.

Early Christian writers say the Apostle John wrote his Gospel, and this Epistle, from Ephesus in the last part of the first century. Irenaeus (A.D. 120-200), after noting the books of Matthew, Mark and Luke, remarks, "Afterwards, John, the disciple of the Lord . . . did himself publish a Gospel during his residence at Ephesus in Asia" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. I, p.

## *1 John—Introduction*

---

414). Many others, including Ignatius (martyred not later than A.D. 116), Tatian (c. A.D. 160), Justin Martyr (martyred A.D. 165), and Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 155-220) attest to the same. These writers had access to sources who were contemporaries of John.

All other pieces of internal evidence point to the same period of history as the origin of the writing. The writer was obviously an elderly man, this by the style of writing, and the oft occurring address of his readers as "little children." John being the author, this would naturally lend to a late first century date. One also could argue that, as John says nothing about the destruction of Jerusalem, the writing is likely far enough removed from this event that it was no longer of preeminent importance to the Christian society.

There is no mention in the letter of outward persecutions affecting the church, suggesting a date that would lend to such a period of peace. This would rule out the period from A.D. 55-75, as there were constant persecutions during this period stemming from the Jews, Nero and Vespasian. It would also rule out the period from A.D. 94-96, as Domitian persecuted the church greatly during this period, this being when John was exiled to the Isle of Patmos. Further, we may presume that sufficient time has elapsed since Nero's persecutions, in order for the church to put the thoughts of such behind them, and become concerned about philosophical ideas such as those involving the incarnation of Jesus. Normally, internal strifes and heresies do not develop during times of outward strifes. Time had passed so as to allow false doctrines of Greek philosophy to begin to slowly infiltrate the teaching of the church, creating differences of opinion. Such is the situation that John addresses in his writings. It is unlikely that such heresies developed during bitter persecution, nor is it likely that they developed "overnight," once the persecutions were ended.

When we combine all the available evidence, a date of A.D. 80-93 is most likely, with the most commonly accepted date being toward the end of these extremes. It was about this time when Cerinthus began actively exerting his influence in the Asian churches, and this would give the most viable explanation for the content of First John.

A possible scenario would be as follows. Paul established the church of Ephesus (Acts 19, A.D. 54-55) and remained there for three years. On his way back to Jerusalem, at the close of his third missionary campaign, he visited with the elders of Ephesus at Miletus, warning them of the wolves that would soon enter the church (A.D. 56-57). Toward the close of his life, he sent Timothy to Ephesus, leaving him in charge of protecting the church from false doctrine (1 Tim. 1:2-3, A.D. 64?). Sometime after the death of

## *1 John—Introduction*

---

Paul (A.D. 64-65?) and after Timothy was gone, John arrived in Ephesus. John worked with the congregations of this area, as they were a vital link to the Christian world. Slowly, pagan mysticisms began making inroads into the thinking and teaching of these churches. With John's age ever increasing, and his strength slowly waning, he could no longer personally aid all the congregations being affected by the false doctrines. Therefore, he determined to fight for the purity of church and its doctrine through the written word, writing an account of the life of Christ and three general epistles.

### **Occasion of the Writing**

There is no evidence that John's audience was suffering any outward persecution. The persecutions under Nero had passed, and the persecutions under Domitian were yet to come. The church was enjoying a time of peaceful relations with Rome. The problem that John addressed came from within the church; the problem was heresy. A group of teachers arose who taught a doctrine that differed from that of the apostles. John regarded these men as "false prophets," and their doctrine as a denial of both the Father and the Son (2:22-24). This situation threatened the fellowship with the body of Christ, and out of this arose the occasion for the writing.

"Gnosticism" is derived from the Greek word *gnosis*, which means "knowledge." These individuals who John opposed claimed a superior knowledge that came from above (4:1-6), and believed that they would be saved based on this knowledge. They considered themselves the elite of the church, the spiritual leaders in natural succession to the apostles. It is probably due to this heretical influence that John places great emphasis on the word "know" (occurring 32 times). For example, he stresses that those who live a life of sin or deny the deity of Jesus (the Gnostics did both), do not "know" the Father, nor did they ever "know" Him (cf. 3:3-9; 4:1-6).

There are many doctrines that have been termed "Gnostic," and so-called Gnostic leaders seldom agreed among themselves. Even so, the teachings of one particular Gnostic named Cerinthus seem to be in view by John. Irenaeus declared that John wrote his Gospel specifically to undermine the false teachings of Cerinthus, and this seems to be the occasion for John's epistles as well. Cerinthus was a forerunner of the heretics called "Gnostics." He lived during the latter part of the first century and into the second century, being a contemporary of John in the city of Ephesus. His teaching, like that of the other Gnostics, centered on the problem of evil in the world.

The common thread of Gnostic teaching was the belief that all matter was either unreal or evil, while the eternal spirit of the Christian and all

## 1 John—Introduction

---

within the heavenly realm were completely pure. This presented several difficulties. For example, If God is completely good and pure, how could He create a world that was wholly evil? The most common Gnostic explanation was that the world was not created by the eternal God, but that it was created by a lesser god who was not completely good and pure. Cerinthus believed that this lesser god was the "God" of the Old Testament, while the eternal God did not begin to assert His will on the earth until the advent of Jesus Christ.

Gnostic teaching also had a bearing on the doctrine of the incarnation. Since all earthly matter is evil (including the body itself), how could the eternal God clothe Himself in human flesh and yet remain pure? In order to deal with this problem, Cerinthus taught a doctrine of dualism, commonly called "docetism." According to Cerinthus, Jesus was the natural son of Joseph and Mary; He was a common man until His baptism, at which time the natural Jesus ceased to exist and the Christ took on the appearance of the man Jesus; the Christ remained in this form until the time of the crucifixion, at which point the Christ left and the man Jesus came into existence again and died on the cross. The gist of this doctrine is that God never shared a human body, nor did He ever really suffer. Rather, He only "seemed" to suffer. The name "Docetism" was given to this doctrine by Ignatius, the term being from the Greek word *dokeo*, meaning "to seem." So Cerinthus denied that the Messiah ever came in the flesh (He only seemed to) or that He ever suffered; He never lived as a man, and He never died as a man. Therefore there was nothing extraordinary about the sinless life He lived or the suffering He endured.

Gnosticism also directly affected the individual lives of its adherents. Since all matter (including the body) is evil, how can one best deal with the evil around him and live in the spirit? Two views prevailed in this regard. Some Gnostics leaned toward asceticism, believing that the sinful body had to be brought under control by severe discipline. This led to separatism, self-mutilation, abstinence of nourishment and all sexual contact. Other Gnostics, including Cerinthus, went to the other extreme. As the body was already inherently evil and belonged to the sphere of matter, it mattered not how a person lived in this life; the inner spirit would remain pure despite what the body did. This, of course, led to licentiousness. According to Cerinthus, a man could participate in any sinful practice to fulfill the desires of the flesh, and yet remain pure in spirit.

Now, when we reconstruct this situation in the first century church, the occasion of John's writing becomes apparent. He confronts these false

## 1 John—Introduction

---

doctrines head on. In objection to the denial of the deity of Jesus, twenty-three times John refers to Jesus as the "Son of God," an average of nearly five times per chapter. As proof of Jesus' humanity, John states that he himself had heard, seen and touched Jesus (1:1-3). Those who deny that Jesus came in the flesh are to be regarded as being of the antichrist (4:1-3; 2 Jn. 7). This could be John's specific object in 5:6 when he insists that Christ came not only by water (in His baptism), but also by blood (in His death). And concerning the false teaching that the body can live a life of sin while the spirit remains pure, John gives numerous teachings:

1:5-7—If we walk in darkness, we cannot have fellowship with God

1:8-10—If we say we have no sin, or have not sinned, we are liars

2:1-7—If we say we know God and do not obey Him, we are liars

2:15-17—If we love the pleasures of the world, the love of God is not in us

3:3-9—If we habitually sin, we do not know Him.

Irenaeus is our best and most reliable source for the teachings of Cerinthus. He writes of a story that Polycarp used to tell, of when John, "the disciple of the Lord, going to bathe at Ephesus, and perceiving Cerinthus within, rushed out of the bathhouse without bathing, exclaiming, 'Let us fly, lest even the bathhouse fall down, because Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is within'" (*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. I, p. 416). Whether true or not, such adequately portrays John's attitude toward heretics and their teaching.

### Purpose

In John's day, heretics and false teachers were challenging the truth regarding Jesus. John was possibly the only inspired writer of Scripture during the last portion of the first century. The church faced heresy from within the body, and so John rose to the occasion, sounding the warning against false prophets and teachers: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world" (1 Jn. 4:1). This was a critical period for the church, and John recognized this. But, it is obvious that John wrote with the purpose of not only combating these errors, but primarily of assuring the faith of those who were believers in Jesus Christ. As A. E. Brooke states,

It is probably true that the writer never loses sight altogether of the views of his opponents in any part of the Epistle. But it is important to emphasize the fact that in spite of this, the real aim of the Epistle is not exclusively, or even primarily, polemical. The edification of his "children" in the true faith and life of Christians is the writer's chief purpose.

## *1 John—Introduction*

---

John's Gospel and Epistles were written at about the same time, and share this common purpose. In his Gospel, John clearly sets forth the facts of the gospel in order to defend the truth: "But these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name" (Jn. 20:31). Notice the similar statement of purpose in this Epistle: "I write these things to you who believe in the name of the Son of God so that you may know that you have eternal life" (1 Jn. 5:13). This verse is the stated purpose of the Epistle: to stimulate faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, and provide an assurance of salvation. Even so, this goal is best understood against the backdrop of the historical scenario already noted, and the content of the letter. In order to reassure Christians; in order to offer a defense of the gospel; and in order to combat heretical teaching, John penned the words of this Epistle.

### **Distinguishing Characteristics of 1 John**

The letter of First John is unique in many ways. The author does not identify himself, he does not identify his readers, he does not greet his readers, and he does not salute his readers at the closing of the letter—it ends as abruptly as it begins. It does not contain a single proper name (save that of Jesus Christ), nor does it refer to any specific historical event or geographical setting. This is unlike any other book of the New Testament.

Though clothed in this obscurity, it is equally obvious from the writing that it was not a general treatise intended for all Christians of any circumstance. It is obvious that the author is addressing a group of people with whom he is well acquainted, being aware of their history, accomplishments, dangers and needs. Further, the letter springs from a specific historical situation, as heretical teachers were endangering the peace and safety of the church. Because of no mention of the readers, it is probable that the author intended this letter to circle to several congregations within the same locale, who were facing similar circumstances, and therefore had the same needs. With these Christians he was very familiar, therefore the absence of a personal introduction. Further, history bearing out John's lengthy residence in Ephesus, it seems most likely that he wrote from this city to the churches of the Asian province. There are many other distinguishing characteristics.

**Language and Style.** The writing of First John, like that of John's Gospel, is in very simple language. The sentences are unusually short and choppy, unlike the complex sentence structure of Paul's writings. His method of argument is that of categorical affirmation, as opposed to lengthy reasoning so common in Paul's writings. Being guided by the Spirit, he speaks with

## 1 John—Introduction

---

a tone of authority, giving no room for opposition. His writing is colored black and white; he does not entertain the possibility of any gray area. First John, like the other writings of John, contains a great deal of contrasting: he speaks of light and darkness (1:5; 2:9), life and death (3:14-15), love and hate (2:8-11; 4:20-21), truth and lies (1:6-10; 2:21-22), the Father and the world (2:15-16; 4:1-5), children of God and children of the devil (3:8-10), to know God and not to know God (4:6-8), Spirit of truth and spirit of error (4:6). This style is especially peculiar to John's writing.

**Structure.** What makes the structure of First John unique is that such is absent: it is without any detectable structure. This is not to say that it is disorderly or reeks of confusion. Rather, there is perfect harmony within the letter, flowing together so smoothly that it is impossible to detect any specific outline that the author may have followed. Many have characterized this Epistle as the ramblings of an elderly man, without system or sequence. It is though John had a purpose in mind, and then began to write. He then allowed one thought to flow from the other, until finally he had accomplished his goal; and seemingly at this point, he simply quit writing and dispatched the letter. As Lenski described, John seems to write in cycles rather than in a simple, forward moving manner. For this reason, there are no natural breaks in the Epistle, nor is it easily outlined.

**Companion to the Fourth Gospel.** Another distinguishing characteristic is the Epistle's close relationship to John's Gospel. The two writings are complementary of one another. While it cannot be proven that John distributed these two writings simultaneously, it seems obvious that he penned them during the same period and under similar circumstances.

At once one is struck by the similarity in language and thought of these two writings. The introduction of each is remarkably similar (comp. Jn. 1:1-18 and 1 Jn. 1:1-5). Such words as: beginning, word, life, light, darkness, witness, manifest, behold, Father, walk, know, true, confess, children of God, cleansing, love, boldness, flesh, etc. are used in very similar fashion in both writings. They come from the same mind, the same heart, and similar situations. One would do well to study these two writings together.

While the stated purpose of each writing is the same (comp. Jn. 20:31 and 1 Jn. 5:13), the specific design of each writing is unique. The Gospel was written to prove that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, while the Epistle was written to show the Jesus Christ was the Son of Man, that He came in the flesh. Plummer states in his *Epistles of St. John*,

## 1 John—Introduction

---

The Gospel is objective, the Epistle subjective; the one is historical, the other moral; the one gives us the theology of the Christ, the other the ethics of the Christian; the one is didactic, the other polemical; the one states the truth as a thesis, the other as an antithesis; the one starts from the human side, the other from the divine; the one proves that the Man Jesus is the Son of God, the other insists that the Son of God is come in the flesh (p. 36).

### The Authenticity of 1 John 5:7-8

The Textus Receptus, upon which the King James Version (A.D. 1611) is based, contains a passage that has received much attention by textual critics. It appears that part of the passage has been interpolated, there being no rational, textual basis for its inclusion in the letter. The passage reads as follows, with the interpolated portion in italics:

For there are three that bear record *in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.* And there are three that bear witness *in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one* (5:7-8).

The external evidence against the authenticity of this passage is overwhelming. These words do not appear in any Greek uncial manuscripts (the most valuable and reliable text sources), nor do they appear in any Greek cursive manuscripts prior to the fourteenth century. In all, only two Greek cursive manuscripts contain the words at all: Cursive 629 dated of the fourteenth century, and Cursive 61 of the sixteenth century. Cursive 635 of the eleventh century contains the wording in the margin, though it was placed there by a seventeenth century hand; and Cursive 88 also has it in the margin, but by a modern hand. No ancient version of any language prior to the fifth century contains the words, and no early writer ever quoted from it.

Evidence shows that the words began as a gloss on the text of First John, and later, mistakenly found their way into some later century Latin texts. In Greek texts, the words were first printed in the Complutensian Polygot of 1514. Erasmus did not find them in any previous Greek manuscripts, and therefore refused to print them in his first two copies of the Greek New Testament. However, when questioned regarding this decision, he rashly promised that he would include them if they could be found in any Greek manuscript (not believing that any such manuscript could be found). He was soon after confronted with Codex Montfort (Cursive 61 of the sixteenth century) that did contain the wording (one of only two extant). He suspected



# *1 John—Introduction*

---

that these words had been added to the manuscript to comply with a Latin text, yet he inserted the words in order to avoid being accused of being a liar. From here, it made its way into the King James Version.

We conclude therefore that this portion of 1 John 5:7-8 was not a portion of John's original writing. This is borne out by the tremendous amount of external evidence that is now extant. Accordingly, modern translations have deleted this phrase, or set apart from the text to show the lack of authenticity for its inclusion in the text. The context even suggests that the words do not belong—a much better flow of thought occurs without these words.

This is He that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. For there are three that bear record, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one (5:6-8).

## **Contents of Epistle**

- I. The Message Authenticated (1:1-4)
  - A. The author's eyewitness testimony to the Word of Life (v. 1)
  - B. The historical manifestation of the Word of Life (v. 2)
  - C. The resulting fellowship of the believers (vv. 3-4)
- II. The Principles of Fellowship Explained (1:5 - 2:17)
  - A. The Basis for fellowship explained (1:5-7)
  - B. Hindrances to fellowship (1:8-10)
  - C. Manifestations of a life of fellowship with God (2:1-17)
    - 1. Purity of life (vv. 1-2)
    - 2. Obedience to God's commands (vv. 3-6)
    - 3. Love for the brethren (vv. 7-11)
    - 4. Fellowship is incumbent upon all groups (vv. 12-14)
    - 5. Separation from worldliness (vv. 15-17)
- III. The Conflict Between Truth and Error (2:18-27)
  - A. Readers made aware of the crisis (vv. 18-19)
  - B. Resources of the believers (vv. 20-21)
  - C. Antichrists defined as those denying Christ (vv. 22-23)
  - D. Remain in Christ, and to allow His words to remain in us (vv. 24-27)
- IV. The Children of God (2:28 - 3:10)
  - A. Believers must remain in Christ (2:28)

## *1 John—Introduction*

---

- B. Obedience as a sign of regeneration (2:29)
- C. Privileges of believers stated (3:1-2)
- D. Practice of sin forbidden (3:3-10)
  - 1. Implications of the practice of sin (vv. 3-6)
  - 2. Practice of sin identifies believers from children of Satan (vv. 7-10)
- V. The Conflict Between Love and Hate (3:11-24)
  - A. Practice of love commanded; practice of hate forbidden (vv. 11-12)
  - B. Summation of those who love and those who hate (vv. 13-15)
  - C. The manifestation of love and hate (vv. 16-18)
    - 1. Definition of love based on the example of Jesus—sacrifice (v. 16)
    - 2. Love requires action rather than words alone (vv. 17-18)
  - D. The assurances accompanying a proper love (vv. 19-24a)
    - 1. Our hearts do not condemn us (vv. 19-20)
    - 2. God answers our prayers (vv. 21-22)
    - 3. Union with Christ (vv. 23-24)
- VI. The Spirit of Truth and Spirit of Error (4:1-6)
  - A. The charge to test the spirits (v. 1)
  - B. The test: how to distinguish between the spirits (vv. 2-3)
  - C. The actions of the world as compared with those of believers (vv. 4-6)
- VII. More On the Theme of Love (4:7 - 5:5)
  - A. Injunction to love (4:7-8)
  - B. God's love for man demonstrated in Christ (4:9-10)
  - C. Our love for one another (4:11-21)
    - 1. We should follow God's example in love (vv. 11-12)
    - 2. Assurance of God's love for us through Christ (vv. 13-16a)
    - 3. Love as the assurance of God dwelling in us (16b-18)
    - 4. Loving brethren mandatory in loving God (vv. 19-21)
  - D. Our Love for the Father (5:1-5)
    - 1. To love the Father is to love Jesus (v. 1)
    - 2. Is manifested by our obedience to Him (vv. 2-3)
    - 3. Is manifested by our overcoming the world through faith (vv. 4-5)
- VIII. God's Witness to the Gospel (5:6-12)
  - A. External testimony regarding Jesus (vv. 6-9)
  - B. Believer's acceptance of the testimony (vv. 10-12)
- IX. Spiritual Assurances (5:13-20)
  - A. Assurance of eternal life (v. 13)

# *1 John—Introduction*

---

- B. Assurance of answered prayer (vv. 14-17)
- C. Assurance that believers do not habitually sin (v. 18a)
- D. Assurance of God's care for the believer (v. 18b-19)
- E. Assurance of the purpose of the incarnation (v. 20)

## X. Warning Against Idolatry (5:21)

4710 Rice Road, Columbia, MO 65202

## References

- Bruce, F. F. **The Defence of the Gospel**. (In the New Testament). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1965, 105 pp., paper.
- Buttrick, George Arthur. **The Interpreter's Bible: Vol. 12**. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1957, 817 pp., cf. pp. 209-215.
- Guthrie, Donald. **New Testament Introduction**. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970, 1054 pp.
- Haas, C. and M. De Jonge, J. L. Swellengrebel. **A Translator's Handbook on the Letters of John**. New York, New York: United Bible Societies, 1972, 171 pp.
- Hastings, James. **A Dictionary of the Bible: Vol. II**. New York, New York: Scribner's Sons, 1903, cf. pp. 187-189.
- Hiebert, D. Edmond. **An Introduction to the New Testament** (Vol. III: The Non-Pauline Epistles and Revelation). Chicago, Ill.: Moody Press, 1981, 294 pp.
- Lange, John Peter. **Commentary On the Holy Scriptures: Vol. 23**. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, 1867, cf. "The First Epistle General of John" pp. 1-18.
- Lightfoot, J. B. **The Epistles of St. Paul: Colossians and Philemon**. London: Macmillan and Company, 1879, 430 pp. (cf. pp. 73-113, "The Colossian Heresy").
- Plummer, Alfred. **The Epistles of St. John**. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1980, 204 pp.
- Roberts, Alexander and James Donaldson. **The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I**. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1956, 602 pp., cf. Irenaus: "Against Heresies" pp. 302-567.
- Roberts, J. W. **The Living Word Commentary: The Letters of John**. Austin, Tex.: R. B. Sweet Company, 1968, 182 pp.
- Robertson, A. T. **Epochs In the Life of the Apostle John**. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1974, 253 pp.

### Appendix:

#### The Church Fathers Regarding Cerinthus and His Doctrines

##### Quotes by Irenaus: "Against Heresies"

Cerinthus, again, a man who was educated in the wisdom of the Egyptians, taught that the world was not made by the primary God, but by a certain Power far separated from him, and at a distance from that Principality who is supreme over the universe, and ignorant of him who is above all. He represented Jesus as having not been born of a virgin, but as being the son of Joseph and Mary according to the ordinary course of human generation, while he nevertheless was more righteous, prudent, and wise than other men. Moreover, after his baptism, Christ descended upon him in the form of a dove from the Supreme Ruler, and that then he proclaimed the unknown Father, and performed miracles. But at last Christ departed from Jesus, and that when Jesus suffered and rose again, while Christ remained impassable inasmuch as he was a spiritual being (I, ch. 26, no. 1).

There are also those who heard from him [Polycarp] that John, the disciple of the Lord, going to bathe at Ephesus, and perceiving Cerinthus within, rushed out of the bath-house without bathing, exclaiming, "Let us fly, lest even the bath-house fall down, because Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth is within" (III, ch. 3, no. 4).

John, the disciple of the Lord, preaches this faith, and seeks, by the proclamation of the Gospel, to remove that error which by Cerinthus had been disseminated among men, and a long time previously by those termed Nicolaitans, who are an offset of that "knowledge" falsely so called, that he might confound them, and persuade them that there is but one God, who made all things by His Word; and not, as they allege, that the Creator was one, but the Father of the Lord another, and that the Son of the Creator was, forsooth, one, but the Christ from above another, who also continued impassable, descending upon Jesus, the Son of the Creator, and flew back again into His Pleroma; and that Monogenes was the beginning, but Logos was the true son of Monogenes; and that this creation to which we belong was not made by the primary God, but by some power lying far below Him, and shut off from communion with the things invisible and ineffable (III, ch. 11, no. 1).

##### Quote by Polycarp: "Epistle to the Philippians"

For whosoever does not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh, is antichrist; and whosoever does not confess the testimony

# 1 John—Introduction

---

of the cross is of the devil; and whosoever perverts the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts, and says that there is neither a resurrection nor a judgment, he is the first-born of Satan (7:1-3).

## **Quote by Hippolytus: "Refutation of All Heresies"**

But a certain Cerinthus, himself being disciplined in the teaching of the Egyptians, asserted that the world was not made by the primal Deity, but by some virtue which was an offshoot from that Power which is above all things, and which (yet) is ignorant of the God that is above all. And he supposed that Jesus was not generated from a virgin, but that he was born son of Joseph and Mary, just in a manner similar with the rest of men, and that (Jesus) was more just and more wise (than all the human race). And (Cerinthus alleges) that, after the baptism (of our Lord), Christ in form of a dove came down upon him, from that absolute sovereignty which is above all things. And then, (according to this heretic) Jesus proceeded to preach the unknown Father, and in attestation (of his mission) to work miracles. It was, however, (the opinion of Cerinthus) that ultimately Christ departed from Jesus and that Jesus suffered and rose again; whereas that Christ, being spiritual, remained beyond the possibility of suffering (VII, 21).

## **Quotes of Ignatius regarding Docetism: "Epistle to the Trallians"**

Stop your ears, therefore, when any one speaks to you at variance with Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was descended from David, and was also of Mary; who was truly begotten of God and of the Virgin, but not after the same manner. For indeed God and man are not the same. He truly assumed a body; for "the Word was made flesh," and lived upon the earth without sin. For says he, "Which of you convicteth me of sin?" He did in reality both eat and drink. He was crucified and died under Pontius Pilate. He really, and not merely in appearance, was crucified, and died, in the sight of beings in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth (ch. 9).

But if, as some that are without God, that is, the unbelieving, say, He became man in appearance only, that He did not in reality take unto Him a body, that He died in appearance merely, and did not in very deed suffer, then for what reason am I now in body, and long to be exposed to the wild beasts? In such a case, I die in vain, and am guilty of falsehood against the cross of the Lord . . . But as for me, I do not place my hopes in one who died for me in appearance, but in reality (ch. 10—similar teaching is found in his letter to Smyrna, ch. 2-4).

## 1 John 1

*by Murl R. Helwig*

As John begins to write, he writes with a definite purpose. He wants to cause or promote fellowship among men and also fellowship with God. Whatever fellowship man finds with his fellow man and with God is made possible only through Christ. John would like to bring joy to the Christian through a knowledge of Christ and through the fellowship with the Father and His Son, Jesus Christ, and also with other Christians. His aim is to set Jesus Christ before men as a real man, not as one who "cannot be touched with the feelings of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15).

### **John's Right to Speak (vv. 1-2)**

It may be asked of anyone what authority that they have to write or speak on a particular subject; the same is true of John. What credentials did John have to write this letter? John evidently knew that this thought would be in the mind of the people. Therefore, he wanted to answer that question in the very beginning. First of all, he was going to write concerning that which was from the beginning. The "beginning" that he mentions is the same "beginning" as mentioned in Genesis 1:1 and John 1:1. In Genesis 1:1 "in the beginning" marks the exact moment when time began in the process of creation. John 1:1 makes note of the same moment, however, it tells us a little more than Genesis 1:1. It tells us that at that point the Word already was. By using the phrase "from the beginning" it looks forward from that moment to all time that follows. The reason that John makes mention that the Word was from the beginning is because he wanted to point out that the Word existed long, long before his manifestation in the fulness of time. He mentioned three points that we need to consider. He had heard, seen, and touched Jesus Christ. John also pointed out that he had considered all that Jesus was during his time here on this earth. Let us consider each of these points separately.

The first point was, "Which we have heard" (1:1). John had heard the Master speak with his own ears. He was not going to give testimony of something that he had been told but that which he had actually heard. John was not relating hearsay nor folk tales that had been told and retold for generations. His testimony was strong and sure because he was present and listening. A word from the Lord has always been what man has longed to hear. In Jeremiah 37:17 the king, Zedekiah, asked Jeremiah if there was any

## *1 John 1*

---

word from the Lord. He was not concerned about the word of a man, but he wanted to know about the word from the Lord. Today we should be concerned about the word of the Lord instead of the word from mortal man. John was prepared and willing to reveal that which he had heard from the Lord.

Next he said, "Which we have seen with our eyes" (1:1). John not only heard the Lord speak, but he saw Him with his very own eyes. He did not see Him with the "eye of faith," as we do, but with the physical eye. The first and most important requirement of a credible witness is whether or not he was an eye witness to the fact. Peter and John declared in Acts 4:20, "For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." Peter and John were eye witnesses to the life and ministry of Christ.

The last point he stated, "Our hands have handled" (1:1). John did not hear and see Jesus from a distance as did many of the multitude, but he actually touched Jesus. He was one of the disciples who was the closest to Christ. Jesus said in Luke 24:39, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." John had the privilege to have been one who had touched the Lord and knew that Jesus was real. He was not a spirit but a real person like other people. John had witnessed Jesus at the very height of his popularity and ministry and had been with Him during the most trying hours. He was a witness of the nail scarred body of Christ.

John went a step further than the three points just mentioned. He gazed upon Him or, as the KJV says "which we have looked upon" (1:1). It is interesting to note that he had just related that he had seen the Lord, but now was apparently restating that very thing. However, John was not restating a previous point but making another very persuasive one. We should look at the original word in the Greek to appreciate what he was saying. There are two different words used. One means to see (*horan*) which he used when he said, "which our eyes have seen". The other (*theasthai*) means more than to just see, but it brings forth the idea of it not being just a passing glance but one of considering and contemplating. This word can be found in other passages which better illustrate its meaning. For example, in Luke 7:24 Jesus asked, "What went ye out into the wilderness for to see?" The word "see" comes from the Greek word *theasthai* which means more than to just see with the eye, but they went out to consider what John the Baptist was preaching. Also, in John 1:14 when it says, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth." The word that is

translated "beheld" also comes from the Greek word *theasthai* which means they considered and contemplated His glory. These two passages clearly show that it was not a passing glance but a very careful and contemplative examination. John had spent time with the Lord listening and considering all that Christ said and did. He was not just considering one aspect of Him. He contemplated over His whole manner of life.

Christ was manifested to the apostles in a way that no one could deny that He truly was the Son of God. They did not see just for themselves, but they had to testify of the manifestation to others. Jesus said in Acts 1:8, "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." The witness of the apostles is just as vital today as it was while they all lived. Abel still testifies even though he is dead because the apostle Paul, or the writer of Hebrews, said in Hebrews 11:4, "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh." John writes to show in what form his readers have the apostolic testimony and declaration.

### **Fellowship of the Believers (vv. 3-4)**

John described Jesus as the Word just as he did in the fourth gospel. However, it was not just the Word, but it was the life of the Word in the flesh, the same life that the apostles saw and examined. They heard the most powerful lessons that mankind had ever heard fall from the lips of Jesus. They were there when He healed all manner of sickness. They witnessed his agonizing death on the cross knowing the pain that he was suffering because He had a fleshly body as they did, and it was that same body that came forth from the grave. They knew beyond the shadow of a doubt that Jesus was the Christ. No grave could hold Him nor could any power silence the preaching of the Gospel. His desire, therefore, was to show to these disciples the eternal Word which was from the beginning and manifested in the flesh unto them. John wanted the disciples to enjoy the same fellowship that the apostles enjoyed. We must note that this fellowship is conditioned upon the knowledge that we have of Christ. John wanted to declare unto the disciples the things that he received of the Lord. By imparting these truths to them they might be brought into the same fellowship that the apostles had with the Father and the Son. John knew that there is joy, peace of mind, and security found in the fellowship with the Lord. These qualities can only be realized by a knowledge of the Lord.



# 1 John 1

---

The things concerning the fellowship with the Father and His Son, Jesus Christ, was what John wanted to write. As a result of this, they could have a joy that is complete. The knowledge of this security gives one peace of mind in the face of whatever trials or temptations that may come.

## John's Message (vv. 5-6)

The message that John revealed was that God is light. It did not say that He is "the Light," but that He is light. It described the splendor and the glory of God. There is nothing more glorious than when the light shines in the darkness. It reveals all that is hidden by the darkness. There is nothing hidden or secretive about God. Light tells us of the purity and holiness of God. God has not been defiled or contaminated by sin, and, therefore, we can see the perfection of Him. Man's pathway is illuminated by the light, and God is that light that will light up the way for man. Man can walk in the pathway of God by following the light. Darkness conceals the pitfalls and dangers that are encountered in life. However, the pathway of righteousness is clearly marked and can be seen by all that desire to walk therein. Flaws that were once covered by the darkness are clearly visible in the light.

In the New Testament darkness represents the opposite of the Christian life. The life of the individual before obeying the Gospel was in darkness. In 1 John 2:8, John spoke of the darkness being past. He was writing to individuals who had obeyed the Lord's command, and they had become the children of God. The apostle Paul stated in Ephesians 5:8, "For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light." Paul further stated in Colossians 1:13, "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." We can conclude that one cannot be in darkness and be in the light at the same time. Darkness is hostile to the light. It is always trying to overcome its natural and inevitable enemy, the light.

Darkness stands for the ignorance of a life apart from Christ. Jesus said in John 12:35, "Yet a little while is the light with you. Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you: for he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth." A little further in the same chapter, verse 46, Jesus said, "I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness." If faith then comes by hearing the Gospel, one can escape the darkness through a knowledge of the truth and obeying it. However, to remain ignorant of the Word of God is to remain in darkness.

Darkness represents the chaotic life of the sinner. In 2 Corinthians 4:6 Paul declared, "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." The knowledge of God brings order to one's life. The giving of light was the very first act of creation. The darkness that had once ruled no longer had power to dominate because now order had been established in the order of creation.

Immorality is characterized by darkness. Jesus said in John 3:19, "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." The immoral acts of man are usually committed in the cover of darkness. However, Paul said in Romans 13:12, "The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light."

Darkness is unfruitful. We should have "no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them" as Paul said in Ephesians 5:11. In order to be productive a man needs light. A Christless life is a life of one continually groping in darkness. When one hates his brother, he is in darkness as John wrote in I John 2:9-11 saying, "He that saith he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in darkness even until now. He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him. But he that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that darkness hath blinded his eyes." One cannot love God and hate his brother, nor can one be in the light and harbor hate in his heart. It is hate that abides in darkness, and love abides in light. Paul also referred to the darkness as being the abode of the enemies of Christ. In Ephesians 6:12 he said, "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

### **Necessity of Walking in the Light (v. 7)**

John does not give the Christian the option to walk in the light or not to walk in the light. Many would like to think that it is the privilege of a Christian to make such a choice. However, to claim religious fellowship implies fellowship with God. In order to have fellowship with God, one has to be in the light, or the fellowship is not possible. Our fellowship with God is through believing and obeying the Gospel. Claiming fellowship with God and continuing in darkness is to make oneself a liar, and the truth is not in him. John wanted to counteract a thought that was prevalent then just as it is today: there are people who claim to be spiritual but show no

## *1 John 1*

---

signs of it in their outward lives. Walking in the light is a very definite and positive activity. It includes certain things and excludes certain things. One cannot be a passive Christian, nor can one give just mental assent that there is a God and expect to be in fellowship with the Lord. There are many in the world today who claim fellowship with God, but they are not doing the truth or, that is to say, not keeping His commandments. Fellowship or communion with God necessarily implies a partaking of the divine nature. Therefore, God is light, and there is no darkness in Him. If man is to partake of that fellowship, he then must abide in the light, or, in other words, he must be holy as God is holy. This is not a new thought, but it was demanded of the children of Israel by the Lord when he spoke to Moses in Leviticus 19:2 saying, "Speak unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, and say unto them, Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy." C. H. Dodd writes, "The Church is a society of people, who, believing in a God of pure goodness, accept the obligation to be good like Him." Doing the truth is not just an intellectual knowledge that exercises only the mind, but it involves the whole being of man. Man can only "do truth" when he is keeping and obeying the Father's Will.

### **Test of Truth (v. 7 cont.)**

There is a test that can be applied to truth. Truth is the begetter of fellowship. Therefore, that which destroys fellowship cannot be true. Those who abide in the truth have, not only, fellowship with the Father and Jesus Christ, His Son, but with everyone who also abides in the same truth. It is then true that all fellowship is based on truth.

### **How to Achieve Fellowship (v. 7 cont.)**

John very bluntly attacks the false teacher who claims fellowship with God, but who continues to walk in darkness. The Scriptures declare such a one to be a liar. A little later he repeats the charge in a little different way in 1 John 2:4 where he said, "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." The man whose profession does not fit his practice is a liar. John is not thinking of the one who tries his hardest and yet often fails. He is not thinking of the one who genuinely loves Jesus Christ but is bitterly aware that his life is far from the perfection that is seen in Christ.

H. G. Wells illustrated it this way when he said, "A man may be a bad musician, and may yet be passionately in love with music." Therefore, according to the example, a man may recognize his weaknesses and failures

but still be passionately in love with Christ and the way of Christ. John is speaking to that one who claims great knowledge of spiritual things and of superior spirituality and yet deliberately allows himself to do that which is forbidden. That man is a liar.

When one walks in the light, he is cleansed from all his sins. Walking in the light implies a conforming to the Will of God. When a man obeys the Lord's Will, the blood of Christ cleanses him from all his sins. However, he will remain cleansed from his sins as long as he continues to walk in the light. He will also have fellowship with all of like faith and practice.

### **Self-deception (v. 8)**

The sinner may deceive himself when it comes to sin. Hardly anyone wants to admit to sin, therefore, he tries to make excuses for or claim no responsibility for sin. Usually it falls in one of two areas. He says that he has no responsibility for his sin, or he can sin, and it will not harm him in any way. John insisted that when a man sins, there is no defense or excuse of self-justification. Man is responsible for his sins. A denial of sin means that there is no guilt of sin. Man will not repent of a sin in which he feels no guilt. John pointed out that this man is deceived. We must never excuse sin. Matthew Henry said in his commentary,

The Christian life is a life of continued repentance, humiliation for and mortification of sin, of continual faith in, thankfulness for, and love to the Redeemer, and hopeful, joyful expectation of a day of glorious redemption, in which the believer shall be fully and finally acquitted, and sin abolished for ever.

### **Confession of Sin (v. 9)**

The guilt of sin that one feels causes him to confess his sin. Repentance and confession of these sins brings about pardon from God. Pardon is made possible by the blood of Christ. All sins must be confessed. It must be remembered that John was writing to believers or Christians. He was not writing to the one who has never obeyed the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Scriptures declare the mercy of God. Therefore, we can be assured that God will forgive us our sins if we confess our sins. Confession of sin is the acknowledgement of sin and the believer's deliverance from the guilt of sin. God is faithful and promises forgiveness to the penitent confessor.

## Denial of Sin (v. 10)

The man that says that he has not sinned has in actual fact sinned. The word "sin" literally means "missing of the target". He condemns the man who has not yet realized that he is a sinner because Romans 3:23 plainly teaches that all men have sinned when it says, "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." One makes God a liar by denying the plain teaching of the Scriptures. Therefore, the man that says that he has not sinned shows his ignorance, and he is still walking in darkness. The word is not in him who is in darkness.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, the life of the Word was manifested to the apostles who, in turn, testified to all mankind of the manifestation of Christ. The light of fellowship is free to all who will do the Will of the Father. When one does the Will of God, he is brought, not only into fellowship with the Father and the Son, but with all others of like faith and practice. As long as one continues in this fellowship, or, that is to say, walking in the light, he is continually cleansed from sin. To refuse the fellowship of God is to remain in darkness, and also, out of the fellowship with those who are walking in the light. It should be the desire of each one to strive to be in the light and to remain there. 6111 Townwood, San Antonio, TX 78238

## 1 John 2

*by Terry Baze*

John is writing to Christians, whom he often calls his "little children," in order that they would have fellowship with God, Jesus Christ, and one another. There were false teachers in their midst who were attempting to deceive them by false doctrines and therefore destroy their fellowship with God. These false teachers (probably Gnostics) denied the testimony about Jesus Christ that had been given from the beginning (2:7, 22, 24; 3:11; 4:2f; 2 Jn. 7, 9). They evidently had made claims of sinlessness (1:8-10), of having fellowship with God and His Son (1:7; 2:6), of being guided by the Spirit (4:1-6), and of having a spiritual knowledge of God (2:3f). Because of their "superiority," they felt no need for brotherly love, on the contrary they hated their brothers (2:9, 11). The bulk of chapter two deals with John's reply concerning these false teachers.

### Outline

The letter almost seems to have no clear divisions. Commentators provide many attempts at dividing it and yet all seem lacking in some respect. The first two verses are a continuation of 1:5-10, which teaches that fellowship with God and sin cannot go together. Thus for the sake of an outline:

verses 1 - 2, To have fellowship with God one must not sin.

verses 3 -11, True knowledge of God comes through obedience.

verse 12 - 17, Those who know God should not love the world.

verses 18 - 29, The spirit of antichrist is already present.

### Fellowship with God and Sin (vv. 1-2)

John calls his readers "little children" (*teknia* seven times in 2:1, 12, 28; 3:7, 18; 4:4; 5:21 and *paidia* twice 2:13, 18). This no doubt is indicative of his great age and affection for his readers. "I am writing to you" (also 2:7, 12, 21, 26; 5:13, 16) denotes a personal exhortation. He no longer uses "we" as representing the eye witnesses (1:1-4), nor "we" as including both himself and his readers (1:5-10; 2:2, 5). It is helpful in understanding the entire epistle to note such changes, yet at the same time it is often difficult to discern them.

He writes the following in order to avoid potential misunderstandings concerning the words of 1:8-10. He doesn't want his readers thinking they have a license to sin, that sin is a natural phenomenon in the Christian life,

## 1 John 2

---

neither does he want them drowning in despair if they do sin. He therefore writes "that ye may not sin." The aorist tense of the verb indicates isolated acts of sin, not sin as a lifestyle. If in spite of this injunction "any man" does commit sin, his case is not hopeless.

"We (Christians) have an Advocate with the Father." The verb is in the present tense showing the reference is to what is a fact now and will continue to be so. "Advocate" is literally, "one who is called to one's side." The Greek word is *parakletos*. The word is found only five times, all in John's writings. In his Gospel, Jesus spoke of the Holy Spirit as being another "Comforter." The sense of "Comforter" in John 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7 is used in a wider sense of one who helps or aids. Here the meaning is that as our Advocate, Jesus is with the Father to plead our case when we sin. He is qualified to do so by virtue of his righteousness, thus "Jesus Christ the righteous." Other verses to consider are Romans 8:26, 27, 34 and Hebrews 7:25; 9:24.

John goes on to say that "he is the propitiation for our sins." The Greek word is *hilasmos*. The word occurs only here and in 4:10. Other forms of the word are found in Romans 3:25, Luke 18:13 and Hebrews 2:17. It means "to placate or pacify someone; to appease or conciliate."

Thus the picture of propitiation is one of sacrifice. John is writing concerning fellowship with God. Sin destroys that fellowship and by sacrifice for sin, fellowship is restored. Jesus was the atoning sacrifice for the sins of mankind. Through his death on the cross he paid the penalty for sin with his own blood. He took upon himself the guilt of sin and thereby removed the alienation between man and God.

Perhaps the word expiate better describes the atonement. God is not reconciled to man, but man to God (2 Cor. 5:18). Man did not provide the sacrifice in order to appease God and restore fellowship, rather God Himself provided (4:10) the sacrifice to expiate man's sin. It is man's acceptance of and dependence on Jesus Christ, the righteous Advocate who appears in the presence of God and is Himself the propitiation for sins, that appeases the wrath of God.

### True Knowledge of God (vv. 3-11)

The structure of this section is in some respects similar to that of the preceding section. The first verse states the theme that to know God means to keep his commandments. Then in verses 4, 6-8, and 9, three propositions of the false teachers are alluded to, as in 1:6; 1:8; and 1:10-2:2.

1. Verse 4 speaks of their boast of superior knowledge and spiritual insight.
2. Next, in verse 6 he again alludes to their professed fellowship with God.
3. Finally, in verse 9 he mentions their claim of walking in the light.

John makes it clear in verse 3 that the test of true knowledge of God is to be found in "keeping his commandments."

"Hereby we know" is found often in this epistle when a practical test of verbal profession is laid down (2:5; 3:10, 16, 19, 24; 4:2, 13; 5:2).

The verb to "know" (*ginosko*) means "to have become intimately acquainted with; to know by experience." The expression implies communion and fellowship with God. It is only by the day to day experience of keeping God's commands that one truly comes to be intimately acquainted with God. The verb *ginosko* is distinguished from *oida* (also translated "know") which likewise occurs many times in this letter. The latter means to know through study and mental deduction. It is intellectual knowledge that does not necessarily have an effect on the soul.

The word "keep" means to guard carefully. The present subjunctive indicates continuous action. Keep on keeping His commandments. The word for "commandment" is *entole* which refers to what God orders. It is not *nomos* which refers to the law.

Verse four introduces a proposition of the false teachers. The same pronouncement is made upon the one who claims a knowledge of God apart from obedience to his will, as the one in 1:8 who claimed not to have any sins. Such persons are liars. Failing to keep God's commandments proves we do not love him.

Verse 5 states positively what the previous verse said negatively. While the disobedient is a liar, meaning that he does not know God, the one who continues to obey his word can know that he is in Him.

"In him is the love of God is perfected." Translators and commentators alike dispute as to whether the love of God here is the love the Christian has for God, or the love that God has for the Christian. Is it the love one has for God that is brought to its goal, or the love God has for man that is made complete through obedience? The same type of phrase is found in 3:16 and 4:9, undoubtedly in the sense of God's love to man. Though expressed differently the same sentiment is found in 3:1, 9, 16. In several places the sense of the phrase is doubtful (2:5; 3:17; 4:12). Then we find man's love to God clearly intimated in 2:15 and 5:3. Neither rendering



## 1 John 2

---

would be necessarily incorrect and it is perhaps unwise to be dogmatic wherein such doubt exists.

I prefer that it is our love for God that the apostle has in mind. John seems to be providing another test of our knowledge of, and fellowship with, God. As our obedience is a determining factor in these matters, so also is our love. 1 John 5:3 says, "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." God's love for man is clearly defined in 4:10-19.

Verse 6 has a transitional function. It serves to introduce the discussion of the command of Christ to love one another in verses 7-11. One can only be in and remain in God if he lives as Christ lived while on earth. The reference to Christ's example implies the command to follow him. We must love as Christ loved.

The word "abide" is the Greek term *meno* and means to remain in or with. "To abide in," is an expression John often uses. It is used of the Christian's remaining in God or Christ in 2:24, 27, 28; 3:6, 24; 4:13, 16. It is also used of God's remaining in us in 3:24. See the appendix for further study on John's use of this word.

The word translated "ought" means to have the obligation to walk as Jesus did. The verb "walk" is a present infinitive emphasizing habitual, continuous action. The demonstrative pronoun "he" (*ekeinos*—that one) occurs also in 3:3, 5, 7, 16; and 4:17. In every passage it refers to Christ. Obviously then, if a person does not live as Jesus did, such an one does not abide in God.

The correct address of verse 7 is not "brethren," rather "beloved" as the word is *agapetoi*, not *adelphoi*. "Beloved" is a common way John addresses his readers (3:2, 21; 4:1, 7; 3 Jn. 1, 2, 5, 11). John has instructed them that they must walk as Jesus walked and now explains that walk by giving a command that he says is both old and new. The command was that of loving one another.

The command is old in the sense that they had learned it from the beginning of their Christian life. The command to love God and one's fellow brother was even as old as the Law of Moses (Dt. 6:5; Lev.19:18). In fact Jesus had said that all the law and the prophets hang upon this command (Mt. 22:34ff).

The last clause of verse 7 defines "old." The imperfect tense indicates duration and says they were having it ever since the beginning. "From the

beginning" refers to the time they first had the gospel preached to them and became Christians. The phrase occurs also in this sense in 2:24; and 3:11.

As old as the commandment was in one sense, it was new in another. Jesus gave the commandment to love one another in John 13:34-35 and called it new. *Kainos* is the Greek word translated "new" here and means new in reference to quality, while the synonym *neos* means new in regard to time. It was not the command that was new, rather the measure or extent of the love commanded. This extent John says is found "in Him and in you." Jesus explained it in John 13:34-35 by commanding them to love one another "even as I have loved you." Never had love been exemplified to this degree, much less commanded.

"Because the darkness is past and the true light now shineth." The present tense of the verb "past" (*paragetai*) means the darkness is passing away. The text does not say the darkness is already past. It is passing away as the true light is shining. The shining of the light causes the disappearance of the darkness. Hate, disobedience and darkness are intertwined in the letter as are love, obedience to the word and light. As long as we are obedient to God's word and love one another, we are walking in the light. "I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life" (Jn. 8:12).

"He that saith" (verse 9) is no doubt another reference to the false teachers claiming knowledge of and fellowship with God (2:4; 1:6). One who claims fellowship with God while at the same time hates his brother is yet walking in darkness.

"To hate" is the opposite of love (also 2:11; 3:15; 4:20). The "brother" is a fellow Christian (2:10; 3:10, 12-17; 4:20; 5:16).

In verse 10 the commandment is identified. Brotherly love is an important theme in this epistle and is discussed at length throughout (also 3:11-18, 23; 4:7, 11, 20; 5:1). It is another test for determining true fellowship with God. The word "abide" again carries with it the idea of remaining or continuing.

"There is none occasion of stumbling in him." The meaning of this verse is either: There is nothing in him to make others stumble; or there is nothing in him to make him stumble himself. Romans 14:13 and 1 Corinthians 8:13 clearly refer to causing someone else to stumble. The fact that verse 11 says he does not know where he is going indicates the meaning here is that the stumbling is his own. The Greek word is *skandalon*. It means a trap or snare. It is used metaphorically for what causes a person to sin. Out of

## 1 John 2

---

fourteen translations consulted, eleven translated this "caused him to stumble," while the other three translated it, "caused others to stumble."

Verse 11 elaborates on verse 9 and serves also to counteract verse 10. It forms the climax in John's refutation of the false teachers. These men claim to be in the light (1:6), yet they blindly walk around in the darkness. The verbs in the verse are in the present tense indicating durative action, except for the last one (blinded). It is in the aorist tense. Although these false teachers boasted that they alone see, the darkness has blinded their eyes (see also Jn. 12:35).

### Love not the world (vv. 12-17)

After refuting the propositions of the false teachers, John now addresses the true believers. He gives reasons as to his writing by reminding them of the blessings they have received (vv. 12-14). He then exhorts them not to love the world (vv. 15-17).

The section found in verses 12-14 is admittedly difficult and has given rise to a number of interpretations. There are six clauses, divided into two series of three. Each series is distinguished by the different tenses of the verb *grapho*, "I write." The entire section is almost poetic and rhythmic in style. The two sets of three clauses are almost parallel.

There are a number of problems with this passage. Why the repetition? Why does he say "I am writing" in the first section and then "I have written" in the second? Who are the three classes represented? Why did he use a different word for children in verses 12 and 13? In what sense are the children, fathers and young men to be understood?

In verses 12-13b John uses the present tense of "to write," while in 13c-14 the aorist tense. The latter indicates "I have written." There is probably little significance in the repetition. John continually repeats thoughts and phrases throughout the letter for the point of explanation or emphasis. The difference in tense was a common form of writing called the epistolary aorist. Simply stated, when the writer is writing from his own perspective he uses the present tense "I am writing." When he writes from the perspective of his readers, they will be reading what he has written. There is therefore no real significance in the discrepancy. When John mentions "I have written," he is not speaking of a previous letter. This letter is the only one under consideration.

Commentators disagree as to who the three designations refer. Of fifteen commentaries consulted on this passage, five were of the opinion that the

"children" mentioned were all John's readers, while the "fathers" and "young men" classified those readers into two groups, older and younger Christians. Seven commentaries stated the belief that these were three levels of maturity within the church. Some felt the reference is to spiritual maturity (new converts, the older mature Christian, and those who are the active, enthusiastic Christians more or less in the midst of their Christian life). Still others attribute the classes to literal age groups (up to 20, above 40, and 20-40 years of age). Then others holding to this position of three distinct groups assume a combination of both spiritual and physical age is implied. Finally, three commentaries consulted believed these to be poetic figurative designations that are true of every Christian.

Those who contend for two classifications within the context of all the "children," do so for a number of reasons. There are two different words translated children in this passage (*teknia* in verse 12, and *paidia* in verse 13). John uses these terms throughout the letter undoubtedly in connection with all his readers (*teknia* in 2:1, 28; 3:7; 4:4; 5:21 and *paidia* in 2:18). There is no apparent difference in the meaning of the words and what is said of the "children" is true of every Christian.

On the other hand, the three designations as they are found, appear to have a limited meaning as compared with one another. If all Christians were intended, why the differences in description?

Regardless of this dispute, John reminds his beloved children of some important truths. By the work, authority and power of Jesus, we have our sins forgiven and therefore can know that God is our Father. Those who are older and mature in their faith have come to know God through years of experience and obedience. It is this true knowledge of God that John wishes for all God's children to attain.

"Young men" (*neaniskoi*) refers to physical age. The term for those young spiritually is *napioi*, which is not our term (Mt. 11:25; Lk. 10:21; Rom. 2:20). These "young men" are persons entering adulthood and in the prime of life. The reference is to vigour and energy characteristic of this age group. These are strong and victorious, having overcome the Devil. Note that it is the indwelling of God's word that characterizes their strength and success.

John now exhorts those mentioned in the previous verses to not love the world or the things in it. The interpretation of this passage depends on the meaning of the word "world." John uses the word (103 times of the 183 in the N.T.) in a wide range of meanings. The context must determine which aspect of its meaning is to be understood. Sometimes the reference is to

## 1 John 2

---

physical creation (Acts 17:24), at other times the human race (Jn. 3:16), or even metaphorically symbolizing man's way of life (3:17).

It is used here however in regard to all that is at enmity against God. The world and the people in it are considered an evil system. It is a way of life under the influence and control of Satan. Love for this evil sphere will sever fellowship with God. Demas (2 Tim. 4:10) is said to have loved it and therefore deserted the truth.

John uses the present tense of the verb indicating continuous action. This is a prohibition against one preferring or striving after the evil system rather than God's. Compare Luke 11:43, James 4:4 and John 3:19. If one strives after such, love for God does not exist in him. There is no gray area. John thinks in black and white. You cannot serve two masters. He informs us of three components which make up this evil system. These are not an exhaustive enumeration of what makes up the world, rather characteristic examples.

"The lust of the flesh." This is literally what the flesh lusts after. This would include unlawful sensual and sexual desires, but is by no means confined to that. It is a desiring or longing for anything that is evil. "Flesh" is another term that has various shades of meaning. Here it is human nature ruled by sin. It is to live a life dominated by the senses.

"The lust of the eyes." This is what the eyes lust after. Man's desires are often aroused by what he sees. This seems to move from a mere physical to a mental gratification of lust. In 2 Peter 2:14 and Matthew 5:28, the phrase "eyes full of adultery" is both stated and expounded upon.

"The pride of life." This word (*alazonia*) is defined as vainglory, or pretense. The word "life" (*bios*) is distinguished from the eternal "life" (*zoa*) of the Christian. This is the behavior of the pretentious, conceited hypocrite who is self-serving in contempt of God's will.

One or more of these appellations can usually be found in connection with every sin committed. This was true in the garden of Eden when Eve was tempted by the serpent, in the wilderness when Jesus was tempted of the Devil, and is true today whenever we are tempted to sin.

John reveals however that this evil system and its lust is passing away. The verb is durative. It is in process, but is not yet completed. The world is coming to its end. This is another reason John gives for not loving it. He first stated that if one loves the world, he does not love God. Secondly, the things of the world do not come from God. Finally, the world is passing away.

He concludes this section with a strong contrast to what has just been stated. "He who does the will of God abides forever." Why should heirs of the eternal world concentrate their interests and ambitions on such a wicked, transient order?

### **The Anti-Christ's Have Come (vv. 18-29)**

John has made reference to the passing away of the world in verse 17 and therefore prepared his readers for the next section. He tells them it is the "last hour." This phrase appears only in this verse. The article is absent in the Greek therefore it is not "the" last hour. This is another of the many phrases in this chapter over which there is confusion and debate.

A very small minority of commentators believe this is a reference to the destruction of Jerusalem. The primary evidence given is that they had heard before of the coming of antichrists, the antichrists were there, and this would be a sign of the time before the destruction of Jerusalem according to Jesus in Matthew 24:24. The "false Christs" of Matthew 24:24 are the "antichrists" of 1 John 2:18. The greatest detraction from this view is that the overwhelming majority agree that this letter was written long after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Some interpret the "last hour" to mean the end of time. This is obviously wrong as it ascribes to John a position that 19 centuries has proven to be false.

The word *hora* has a figurative meaning here. It describes a determined period fixed in God's mind. It points to the last of the events predetermined by the Father. This is the last in the succession of periods determined by Him. Therefore many regard this "last hour" as the period of time that Jesus came to reveal God's plan to man. The last dispensation of time, the Christian age (Is. 2:2-4; Acts 2:17; Heb. 1:2). The terms "last hour" and "last days" seem to be interchangeable.

John informs his readers that many antichrists have come thus proving this is the last hour. It is clear that these antichrists are the forerunners of the antichrist. But just who is the antichrist? The term occurs only here, in verse 22, in 4:3, and in 2 John 7. John identifies these antichrists who've already appeared in verse 22. They are simply those who deny that Jesus is the Christ. The word literally refers to one who opposes Christ.

Though John is the only inspired writer to use this word, a similar idea is expressed by Paul in 2 Thessalonians 2:3-4. The "son of perdition" opposes God's will, exalts himself against God, sits in the temple of God and

## 1 John 2

---

sets up himself as God. There also seems to be some correlation here with the "beast" of Revelation 13. History has born out that the culprit in each passage found fulfillment in either imperial or papal Rome, or perhaps even a combination of the two.

If this is so, it explains to us more clearly the meaning of the "last hour." In the context of this epistle, John constantly stresses the concept of his readers abiding in God. He mentions in verse 19 the failure of the false teachers to do so. He has already contrasted the eternal system of God with that of the temporal evil system. The warnings and exhortations have to do with the coming apostasy that has already begun, not the destruction of Jerusalem. The crux of the matter is this: will they in this last hour identify with that which is passing away or that which is eternal? In some respects, every hour is the last in the Christian age. The constant throughout the New Testament is to continue to persevere and abide in order to be prepared for His coming.

The antichrists introduced in verse 18 become the main topic of the discourse. Verse 19 serves to show the relationship that existed between the true believers and these false teachers. The false teachers were members of the church and had left her. They were not really Christians at all. No one can be who denies the deity of Jesus. They were either false from the start, or became so and left. This is not a proof for the doctrine of the impossibility of apostasy. An apostate is simply one who has mentally subscribed to the doctrines of Christianity and then rejects those doctrines. These had evidently done so and remained in their midst posing as Christians. They finally left of their own volition.

The last clause, "they were not all of us" means either that none of them is of us, or that not all of us are true believers. I think the first is closer to the intent of the text.

From the antichrists, John now focuses on his readers. John writes that they have "an unction from the Holy One." The word "unction" (**chrisma**) literally means anointing. The noun "anointing" occurs only here and verse 27 in the New Testament. It may refer to the anointing oil itself (Ex. 29:7; 30:25), or to an event: the act of anointing; or the result of being anointed. The New Testament has seven verses that deal with this subject. Four of these refer to Jesus Christ (Lk. 4:18; Acts 4:27; 10:38; Heb. 1:9).

The word Christ is from the Greek word (**Christos**) which means the Anointed. The Hebrew word translated Messiah means the same thing. Ancient prophets, priests and kings were anointed for the purpose of setting

them apart to do the work God had prepared for them (1 Kgs. 19:15, 16; Ex. 29:7; 1 Sam. 9:16; 16:6; Ps. 84:9; Is. 45:1). Luke 4:18 states that Jesus was anointed "to preach the gospel." He was set apart to be our Prophet, Priest and King. Acts 10:38 says that Jesus was anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power. The anointing oil therefore may be a symbol or metaphor of the Holy Spirit. The metaphor is especially fitting as the Holy Spirit is spoken of as being "poured out" (Acts 10:45).

Christians are the ones anointed in the other three uses of the word in the New Testament. The only other passage that mentions this other than this one, is 2 Corinthians 1:21. The anointing there is mentioned in connection with the sealing and giving the earnest of the Spirit to Christians (v. 22). It is necessary to mention that in 3:24 and 4:13 John specifically mentions the giving of the Spirit. The evidence seems to be overwhelming that the "unction" must be some reference to the Holy Spirit who was given to John's readers.

There are at least three possible interpretations as to exactly what this "unction" consists:

1. The miraculous gifts of the Spirit.
2. The personal indwelling of the Spirit.
3. The gospel which the Spirit gave them.

I will first look at what the text states, then address each of these interpretations, considering their strengths and weaknesses.

The unction came from the "Holy One." While some think this refers to the Spirit, it is probably speaking of Christ (Rev. 3:7; Jn. 6:69; Acts 3:14; 4:27, 30).

The last clause is rendered either, "you know all things" or "you all know." Those who prefer to interpret the unction as miraculous spiritual gifts maintain the former reading. This is supposedly a parallel to Jesus' promise of giving the apostles another Comforter, which would guide them to all truth and teach them all things (Jn. 14:26; 16:13). The problem however is that most translations render the phrase "you all know." The question is over whether the Greek word is "**pantes**" (you all know) or "**panta**" (you know all). Of the fifteen translations I consulted, ten rendered it "you all know," while the other five "you know all." The overwhelming majority of commentators agree with the translation of "you all know."

From a contextual standpoint, we should consider that John is dealing with the problems created by the false teachers. They claim to be an elite,



## 1 John 2

---

select group having a superior knowledge (2:4). In contrast to this claim, John is telling his readers that all of them have true knowledge. This is evident by the statements made in the next verse ("because ye know it"—the truth). The truth they all know is that of the deity of Jesus according to verses 22 and 23. They had heard this truth from the beginning (2:24) and were exhorted to abide in it. All this leads me to believe that the proper understanding of the last clause in verse 20 is "you all know."

They all knew the truth of Jesus' deity by virtue of the anointing Christ had given them. The word "know" is *oida*, which is to know by the mind and intellect. This "know" is the same as that referred to in verse 21. John is saying in verse 21 that it is his readers, not the false teachers, who know the truth. He emphasized this fact by stating it both negatively and positively. John calls the teaching of the false teachers a lie as in 2:4. He then explains clearly what the lie is and who the liars are. Those who deny the Sonship of Jesus are the liars. Such ones have no fellowship with the Father. To deny that Jesus is the Christ is to deny He is the Son of God (5:5), or that He has come in the flesh (4:2).

John exhorts his readers in verse 24 to "let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning." What they had heard from the beginning was the gospel. This was the message the apostles had delivered. This has virtually the same meaning as in verse 7. If the truth of the gospel remains in them, they will remain in Christ and God. Only by virtue of the gospel can one come to Christ and only through Him can one have access to the Father. The repetition of the verb stresses the close connection between abiding in the gospel and in fellowship with God.

Verse 25 serves as a conclusion to the thoughts just presented. The pronoun "he" refers to Christ. To know God is to have eternal life (Jn. 17:3). The Greek phrase *zoe aionios* relates to the life of the age to come. Since eternal life consists in the knowledge of the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He has sent (Jn. 17:3), then it cannot be divorced from the message of the Gospel which conveys that knowledge. Jesus made the promise of eternal life in John 3:15, 16; 5:24; and 8:51.

What John now writes (v. 26) is in regard to what he had just written in verses 18-25. "Those who would deceive you" is in the present tense indicating continuous action. The false teachers are still trying to deceive them.

"But" (v. 27) serves to emphasize the contrast between his readers and the false teachers. The "anointing" is that of verse 20. As already mentioned,

the anointing refers to either: miraculous spiritual gifts; the indwelling Spirit; or the gospel or Word of God.

"You received" is in the aorist tense, which has the same force as "you have heard" in verse 24. "Of Him" is the same as the "Holy One" of verse 20. John says this anointing remains in you. Again we see a similarity to verse 24 in this.

"You have no need that anyone should teach you." Those who prefer the anointing to be spiritual gifts take this in a literal, unlimited sense. Along with the next statement that "the anointing teacheth you of all things," these appear to imply the reference is in fact to miraculous spiritual gifts. The context demands however that the first clause is limited. John is saying that you are not at the mercy of these false teachers. If taken in an unlimited sense, why would John be teaching them through this letter? "Any man" must be limited in some respect. Perhaps it is limited to only those who are inspired teachers, but it is limited none the less.

The "anointing teaches you of all things." Many believe this to be parallel with John 14:26 and 16:13. The "concerning all things" is limited to what they heard in verse 24 from the beginning, and the truth they all knew in verse 20. This teaching is true John says, which reminds us of verse 21 and 24. They are exhorted to abide in Christ just as the anointing has taught them to. Once again we note the similarity with verse 24. "Teaches" is in the present tense expressing continuity. The teaching is an ongoing process.

"Just as it taught you." "It" refers to the anointing. "Taught" is in the aorist, pointing out that what they have been taught first, or in the beginning, is the same as what they are being taught now. "Abide in him" expresses what the teaching has told them to do. The next verse (28) makes it clear as to who the "him" is (Christ).

In regard to the three possible interpretations of the anointing, we note the possibilities here in verse 27. The teaching done by the anointing is either: done by miraculous inspiration; an illumination given by the indwelling Spirit to all believers that helps them determine the truth; or the message itself, the word of God.

All three interpretations have strengths and weaknesses. Let's consider some of them:

### **1. The anointing is miraculous spiritual gifts.**

This may very well be the meaning in this passage. This interpretation is consistent with the metaphorical usage of "anointing." Spiritual gifts were

## 1 John 2

---

used as a means of teaching the word. That the anointing taught them concerning "all things" is consistent with John 14:26 and 16:13. If they had these gifts, they didn't need anyone else to teach them. The anointing came from Christ and so did the Holy Spirit. Related passages in 4:1,13 seem to agree with the interpretation of spiritual gifts.

There are some problems with this view. It appears from the text that everyone received this anointing. If it be spiritual gifts, it must be maintained that everyone had them, which is an unscriptural affirmation. It cannot be proven that all Christians had the miraculous gifts of discerning spirits, or were led into all the truth. Both "all things" and "any man" have been shown to be limited in verse 27.

The time at which the letter was written also hurts this view. If it was indeed written near the close of the first century, many advocates of this conclusion believe spiritual gifts were done away with about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD. Others, who believe spiritual gifts ended about the close of the first century, must explain the present tense of the verbs "abide" and "teaches" in verse 27. The force of these verbs are continuous action. It makes little sense that John would write of this anointing as continuing to abide in and teach them if the anointing (spiritual gifts) was to be nonexistent within a very short time.

**2. The anointing is the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit that every believer receives at baptism.**

The proponents of this view generally maintain that the "anointing" is not miraculous spiritual gifts, rather it is the ordinary measure of the Spirit given to all believers at baptism (Acts 2:38). The argument goes as follows:

The anointing is a metaphor referring to the Holy Spirit. Just as prophets, priests and kings were anointed (set apart) in the Old Testament to do God's work, Christians are likewise set apart by virtue of the gift of the Holy Spirit. Christians today are prophets, priests and kings in a spiritual sense and have been anointed. The very term "Christian" literally is a reference to "anointed ones." John is making a play on words here that is evident in the Greek. He speaks of the anointing (**chrisma**), the Christ (**Christos**) and the antichrist (**antichristos**). The anointed ones are in opposition to the antichrists.

The anointing is also to be found in 2 Corinthians 1:21, 22 where it is tied to the sealing of the Christian and earnest of the Spirit, all of which have to do with the personal indwelling of the Spirit.

The verses here agree with their interpretation of John 14:26 and 16:13. The indwelling Spirit teaches the difference between the spirit of truth and the spirit of error, therefore exposing the false teachers with whom John was dealing.

This view is not without its problems. There are even advocates of a personal indwelling who suppose that the anointing in this text is a reference to miraculous gifts. Such a doctrine indicates in these verses that the indwelling Spirit continues to teach them to the extent that they need no man to do so. The problem is one of some kind of miraculous intervention or revelation. To quote one writer, "Read it again (v. 27) and see if you do not at least sense the suggestion of direct intuitive instruction from the Holy Spirit?" I am not convinced the Scriptures teach that Christians have a direct intuition from the Holy Spirit that enlightens them concerning what is true. This belief is essentially the same as the aforementioned one. The difference being that the miracle of revelation or inspiration comes from the indwelling Spirit rather than miraculous spiritual gifts. In what sense does the indwelling Spirit teach the Christian? This is a vital question, for the text states that the anointing teaches.

### 3. The anointing is the Word of God.

There is a third possibility in interpreting the anointing of 1 John 2:20, 27. The anointing may very well be the Gospel, or Word of God. Consider that verse 20 is explained by verses 21, 24 and 27. Verses 24 and 27 are virtually parallel. That which they had heard from the beginning and the anointing seem to be the same thing. The reception of and continuing in those things are the true test of one abiding in Him. The anointing that every Christian receives is the body of truth revealed by the Gospel message. So long as one remains in that body of truth, he abides in God and God in him. Jesus said the truth is what sanctifies (Jn. 17:17). Peter said we are born again by the Word of God (1 Pet. 1:23). The Hebrew writer quoted Jeremiah the prophet in Hebrews 8:8-12. Verse 11 says, "And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest." John said those anointed ones did not need any teachers teaching this false doctrine. They all already knew the truth in these matters. They all knew it by virtue of the preaching of the gospel.

This interpretation seems to be the most consistent in keeping with the context. John does not seem to be concerned with the particular agent or medium that was used in getting the truth to them, rather his focus is on the truth itself. It is the truth that would combat the antichrist and keep the

## 1 John 2

---

saints in Christ. Neither spiritual gifts nor a personal indwelling are the thrust of John's arguments. I would not be dogmatic in refusing to consider the possibilities of either interpretation, but at this time I believe the anointing to be the truth of the Gospel.

In verse 28, John explains the necessity of their abiding in Christ. He emphasizes the point by saying, "And now, little children." The clause "when he appears" and the last phrase of the verse "at his coming" have virtually the same meaning. Both refer to Christ's second coming. They are to be constantly abiding in Him in view of the uncertain time of his coming.

"To have confidence" sometimes is used in the letter with reference to the future coming of Christ and the day of judgment (4:17). It is also used in regard to the present in which the Christian turns to God in 3:21 and 5:14. The noun here means to have boldness or courage. It is courage in the sense of not being afraid or ashamed at His coming.

"At his coming" or when He will come. The Greek noun is *parousia* and occurs only here in John's writings. It means presence, or arrival. Jesus is coming and those who have not remained in Him will shrink from Him in shame aware that they are unprepared to meet him.

Verse 29 is in one sense a conclusion to the preceeding thoughts showing how one can abide in Him, and at the same time it serves as a transition to the following thought developed more fully in chapter 3.

The pronoun "he" agrees with "him" in verse 28 referring to Christ. The pronoun "him" at the end of the verse is God as agrees with 3:1. Jesus has been called "the righteous" in 2:1 and also in 3:7. The thought is expanded in 3:7, 10. Those who do what is right are born of God. This righteousness obviously is explained by the keeping of God's commands, love of brethren, walking as Jesus walked, and abiding in Him.

To "abide in" and to "be born of" are practically synonymous. "To be born of" is literally to be begotten out of. The verb is in the perfect tense. It indicates past completed action, having present results. Other occurrences are found in 3:9; 4:7; and 5:4, 18.

That God is righteous is a biblical axiom. John makes it clear that membership in the family of God is to be recognized by the family likeness. If anyone claims to belong to his family and does not practise righteousness, his claim cannot be accepted. 16852 Timberidge, Tyler, TX 75703

**Appendix**  
**What John says concerning "abiding."**

**I. In regard to the Christian abiding, dwelling, or continuing in God, or Christ.**

walk as he walked	given us of his Spirit
if his word remains in you	whosoever confesses Jesus
as the anointing has taught you	dwelleth in love
to have confidence at his coming	keep commandments
sinneth not	

**II. Consider what is said of God dwelling in the Christian. Each of these things have a reciprocal effect in that they prove that God dwells in us and we in Him.**

if we keep commandments	whosoever confesses Jesus
if we love one another	dwelleth in love
given us his Spirit	

**III. Other things that dwell in the Christian.**

truth dwells in us	anointing abides in us
love of God dwells in us	word abides in us
seed remains in us	

**IV. Other things that the Christian dwells in.**

love	anointing
light	doctrine

All of these things both abide in the Christian and the Christian in them. The word, love and the Spirit are all intricately interwoven throughout this epistle so as to lead me to conclude that they are all necessary for maintaining fellowship with God and He with us. You cannot have one without the other. In that sense they all depend on one another and are synonymous.

## 1 John 3

*Carl Johnson*

### **Theme: The Children of God**

#### **I. The Divine nature is manifested in God's children (1-18).**

##### **A. In their being like Christ (1-3)**

1. In what they are (1)
2. In what they shall be (2)
3. In what they should be (3)

##### **B. In doing right (4-10)**

1. Definition of "sinneth" (4, 6)
2. Definition of "righteousness" (7)
3. Practice of sin identifies believers from Satan's children (7-10)

##### **C. In loving the brethren (11-18)**

#### **II. It is in practical obedience that we have assurance and confidence (14-19).**

##### **A. Our love should be genuine (19).**

##### **B. A good conscience results in confidence (20-21).**

##### **C. Answer to prayer depends on obedience (22).**

##### **D. Three earmarks of true children (23-24)**

1. love
2. obedience
3. faith

This entire chapter, including also the last verse of chapter 2, is a discussion dealing principally with the children of God. It is not a treatise on the "love of God," although, of course, that subject is prominently mentioned. Aside from the opening verse, love is not mentioned till verse 11, and there it is not the love of God, but God's command that we should love one another. The concept of "the children of God" is begun here and dominates the whole present section (1-24).

### **Verse 1**

Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not.

The word "Behold" (*ιδετε*) means "to see with the mind, to perceive, know" (Thayer). It is in the second person, plural, and literally means, "Be-

## 1 John 3

---

hold ye" (*Analytical Greek Lexicon*). John is calling upon all the saints to wonder at the peculiar kind of love God has bestowed upon them.

"What manner of love" (ποταπην) means "of what manner? of what kind of sort?" (AGL). "Of what sort of quality?" (Thayer). Wuest says that the word speaks of something foreign. The translation would read, "Behold what foreign kind of love the Father has bestowed upon us." The love of God is foreign to the human race. It is not found naturally in humanity.

"The Father hath bestowed upon us." "Christ used the expression 'my Father' and taught His disciples to pray, 'our Father,' but the meaning includes both." (Coffman).

"Hath bestowed." "Emphasizes the endowment of the receiver" (Vincent), as contrasted with the good will of the giver.

"That we should be called the sons of God." "the sons" (τεκνα), better translated "children" (Vincent),

denotes a relation based on community of nature while son (υιος) may indicate only adoption and heirship. See Galatians 4:7. Except in Revelation 21:7, which is a quotation, John never uses υιος to describe the relation of Christians to God, since he regards their position not as a result of adoption, but of a new life. Paul, on the other hand, regards the relation from the legal standpoint, as adoption, imparting a new dignity and relation (Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:5, 6) (Vincent).

Paul's sense carries all the privileges of sons by generation, having also the advantage of illuminating the truth that sonship is all of grace.

"Therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not." "world" refers to the people of that system spoken of in 2:15-17, the people of the world system of evil.

"Knoweth." "To acquire knowledge through the medium of experience" (Wuest). Intimate understanding and knowledge of another person is based upon fellowship with him. Since the people of the world have nothing in common with children of God, they have no fellowship with them, and therefore no intelligent appreciation and understanding of them. Children of God could just as well have come to earth from a strange planet so far as the people of the world are concerned. They are strangers to them.

The reason for the world's hatred of Christians lies in their hostility to truth and righteousness. They did not recognize Jesus as the Son of God.



In connection with the rejection of himself, Jesus foretold the hatred of his followers (Jn. 16:3).

## Verse 2

Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.

The two thoughts of the present and future condition of God's children are placed side by side. The Christian condition, now and eternally, centers in the fact of being children of God. In that fact lies the germ of all the possibilities of eternal life (Vincent).

"It doth not yet appear" (Aorist passive). "It has not yet been made manifest of visible. The force of the aorist tense is, 'was never manifested on any occasion' " (Vincent).

Sinclair thought that John made this statement in response to questions which Christians had raised regarding their future state; and it may well be true. Men have always been curious regarding such things; 'But we cannot say. It is not good for us to know.' We shall be like Christ, and that must be enough for us (Coffman).

"What we shall be." "This 'what' suggests something unspeakable, contained in the likeness of God" (Vincent).

"When He shall appear."

Correctly, "if He (or it) shall be manifested." We may render either "if it shall be manifested; that is, what we shall be; or, 'if He, etc.'" The preceding "it is" (not yet) made manifest, must, I think, favor rendering it "it." We are now children of God. It has not been revealed what we shall be, and therefore we do not know. In the absence of such revelation, we know (through our consciousness of childship, through His promise that we behold His glory), that if what we shall be were manifested, the essential fact of the glorified condition thus revealed will be likeness to the Lord . . . for that manifestation will bring with it the open vision of the Lord. When the "what we shall be" shall be manifest, it will bring us face to face with Him, and we shall be like Him because we shall see Him as He is (Wuest).

## 1 John 3

---

Paul (Phil. 3:20, 21): "change" (μετασχηματίζει). "to change the outward expression by assuming one put on from the outside" (Wuest). "to remodel, transfigure" (AGL). "To change the figure of, to transform. The spiritual body being developed from the natural, as the butterfly from the caterpillar" (Thayer).

We shall be like our Lord as to His physical, glorified body. The word συμμορφον ("be fashioned like") speaks of that outer ensowment of glory that now covers the body of the Lord Jesus, and which will at the resurrection cover ours. Only at the resurrection will we be able to see the Lord as He is now, for physical eyes in a mortal body could not look on that glory, only eyes in glorified bodies. And that is the reason we shall be like Him, for only in that state can we see Him just as He is.

### Verse 3

And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure.

Verse one tells us what we are and verse two tells us what we shall be. Now, in verse three he tells us what we should be. The hope of being like the Lord Jesus arouses the determination to be pure like Him, and this brings into play the Christian's will to carry that resolve out in action. Apparently some denied the practical obligation to moral purity involved in their hope.

### Verses 4-5

Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is transgression of the law. And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin.

John turns here from the future appearing of Jesus to His past appearing. "Manifest" includes Christ's whole life on earth and its consequences. John gives two reasons why Jesus came and died: (1) to take away our sins (vv. 4-6); and (2) to destroy the works of the devil (vv. 7-8). For a child of God to sin indicates that he does not understand or appreciate what Jesus did for him on the cross.

There are several definitions of sin in the Bible:

"Whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 14:13).

"The thought of foolishness is sin" (Prov. 24:9).

"To him that knows to do good and doeth it not . . . it is sin" (Jas. 4:17).

"All unrighteousness is sin" (1 Jn. 5:17).

But John's Epistle defines sin as "lawlessness" (ἀνομία). It views sin as defilement 1:9-2:2), but here it views it as "defiance."

That God is love does not mean He has no rules and regulations for His family (1 Jn. 2:3; 3:22; 5:2). God's children are not in bondage to the Old Testament law, for Christ has set us free and has given us liberty (Gal. 5:1-6). But God's children are not to be lawless either! They are not without law to God, but under the law to Christ (1 Cor. 9:21).

Sin is basically a matter of the will. For us to assert our will against God's will is rebellion, and rebellion is the root of sin. It is not simply that sin reveals itself in lawless behavior, but that the very essence of sin is lawlessness. No matter what his outward action may be, a sinner's inward attitude is one of rebellion.

## Verse 6

Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: Whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him.

"Abideth." "Compare John 15:4-10. To 'abide' in Christ is more than to be in Him, since it represents a condition maintained by communion with God and by the habitual doing of His will" (Vincent).

"Sinneth not." "From what John had already said in chapter one, we know that he had no intention here of contradicting himself with any teaching to the effect any one having committed sin was in no sense a Christian" (Coffman).

Like the verb in other languages the Greek verb has tense, voice, mood, person, and number. "Tense" is the quality of the verb which has to do with action. There are two outstanding things in the manner of action. i.e., "time" of action and "kind" of action. As to "time," there are three possibilities; past, present, or future. As to "kind" of action there are (for present consideration) two possibilities: linear or punctiliar. Linear action is action regarded as a line (—). It is also called progressive, or continuous action. Punctiliar action is action regarded as a point (·), i.e., action contemplated as a single perspective.

The present tense indicates progressive action at the present time. The aorist tense indicates action in the past. The kind of action is punctiliar. e.g., a moving picture; a snapshot (*Essentials of New Testament Greek*, Ray Summers).

## 1 John 3

---

"Sinneth" (αμαρτανει). "3 pers. sing. pres. indic." (AGL).

The tense of the verb is present, the kind of action, continuous habitual. Thus, "everyone who habitually is abiding in Him," is a saved person, and "everyone who habitually is sinning," an unsaved person. A Christian as a habit of life is abiding in fellowship with the Lord Jesus. Sin may at times enter his life. But sin is the exception not the rule. The unsaved person, as a habit of life sins continually. (Wuest).

John does not teach that believers do not sin, but is speaking of a character, a habit. Throughout the Epistle, he deals with the ideal reality of life in God, in which the love of God and sin exclude each other as light and darkness. He does not deny that A Christian sins at times. Indeed he admits the possibility of sin in Christian's life in (1:9) and forbids it in (2:1). What John decries here is that a Christian sins habitually (Vincent).

"Whosoever sinneth hath not seen . . ."

Everyone who keeps on continually sinning, has not seen Him neither known Him. The verbs "seen" and "known" are in the perfect tense, implying that he has neither seen nor known God in times past, with the present result that He is still invisible and unknown to him. "See"—to see with discernment (Wuest).

### Verse 7

Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous.

In this verse there is a strong suggestion that some of the false teachers who were troubling the Church of that era were teaching that one could be saved without living a pure and godly life. What John said here is: "Make no mistake about it, living the Christian life is the one and only proof of a person's being a Christian" (Coffman).

"Even as he is righteous."

This is possible only through perfect unity with and identification with Christ who is truly righteous. Nothing short of the perfect righteousness of Christ can ever save anyone. Let every man decide, therefore, if he will dare to appear before God in judgment clad in his own personal righteousness alone, or if

he will deny himself and be baptized "into Christ." thereby becoming a participant in that righteousness which alone is sufficient and efficacious (Coffman).

### Verse 8

He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.

Certainly it is wrong to think of Satan's sharing, in any manner, the control of the universe with God. That he was the leader of a band of rebellious angels would appear to be a proper deduction from Jesus' mention of "Satan and his angels" (Mt. 25:41), leading to supposition that Satan himself was, at first, an angel of God who led some of his fellow-angels into rebellion. This is an awesome subject, and little more than a few suggestions may be confidently offered. That there is indeed a being of great magnitude of powers, an inveterate enemy of mankind, the prince of this world, the ruler of the world's darkness, a prince of evil, who has organized and directed the wickedness of mankind is a fact so plainly set forth in the N.T. that only unbelievers may deny it. The Lord's Prayer is a constant testimonial to the existence of Satan: "Deliver us from the evil one" (Coffman).

Satan is a rebel, but Christ is the obedient Son of God. Christ was "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross" (Phil 2:8). Christ was God but was willing to become a servant. Satan was a servant and wanted to become God (Wiersbe).

"For the devil sinneth from the beginning." " 'Sinneth'—present tense indicates continuousness. He sinned in the beginning and has never ceased to sin from the beginning, and still sinneth" (Vincent).

"For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil."

"destroy" (λύω) means "to dissolve, loosen." The works of the devil are represented as having a certain consistency and coherence. They show a kind of solid front. But Christ, by His coming, has revealed them in their complete unsubstantiality. He has 'undone' the seeming bonds by which they were held together (Vincent).

## 1 John 3

---

Jesus compares this world to a palace that contains many valuable goods. A strong man is guarding this palace (Lk. 11:14-23). Satan is the strong man, and his 'goods' are lost men and women. The only way to release the 'goods' is to bind the strong man, and that is just what Jesus did on the cross. Jesus, in coming to earth, invaded Satan's palace. When He died, He broke Satan's power and captured his goods! Each time a sinner is won to Christ, more of Satan's 'spoils' are taken from him.

For many months after the close of WWII, Japanese troops were discovered hidden in the caves and jungles of the Pacific islands. Some of these stragglers were living like frightened savages; they didn't know the war was over. Once they understood that it was no longer necessary for them to fight, they surrendered.

Christians may rest in the truth that Satan is a defeated enemy. He may still win a few battles here and there, but he has already lost the war! Sentence will be pronounced on him, but it will be a while before punishment is meted out. A person who knows Christ, and who has been delivered from the bondage of sin through Christ's death on the cross, has no desire to obey Satan and live like a rebel (Wiersbe).

### Verse 9

Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.

"Born." "The perfect participle indicates a condition remaining from the first: he who hath been begotten and remains God's child" (Vincent).

"Doth not commit sin." "As long as one who has believed in Christ, repented of sin, and has been baptized into Christ, and in consequence of such obedience has received the earnest of the Holy Spirit—as long as a person continues in that status, he will not sin"(Coffman).

"For his seed remaineth in him." "seed" (σπέρμα) means "a seed or principle of spiritual life" (AGL). "Whatever possess vital force or life-giving power; {(but ἀναπνευστός)}, the Holy Spirit, the divine energy operating within the soul by which we are regenerated or made, 1 Jn. 3:9" (Thayer). "Seed—the divine principle of life" (Vincent). "That principle of faith which is wrought by God in the heart of believers" (Macknight).

The germ of piety which has been produced in the heart by the word and Spirit of God, and which may be regarded as having been implanted there by God himself, and which may be expected to produce holiness in the life (Barnes).

The N.T. supplies abundant proof of what the "seed" is which is here mentioned. It is the word of God. Paul told Colossians to let "the word of Christ" dwell in them richly, etc. (3:13), and John had in mind the same thing here. Jesus said of the Kingdom of Heaven, "the seed is the word of God" (Lk. 8:11). In speaking of the new birth, Peter also mentioned the "incorruptible seed" which he promptly identified as the "word of God," which liveth and abideth forever (1 Pet. 1:23). Therefore it is the word of God which is eternal, incorruptible and continually abiding in Christian hearts. The word is no mere "dead letter," but "living, active . . . and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Heb. 4:12); and, with such a monitor of their conduct, Christians are strongly persuaded to continue in the path of honor. Indeed, if the child of God will walk fully in that holy light, he will be effectively restrained from all sin. God, however, has given men the freedom of their will; and a failure of the human will can always result in the commission of sin (Coffman).

Just as physical children bear the nature of their parents, so God's spiritual children bear His nature. The divine "seed" is in them. A Christian has an old nature from his physical birth, and a new nature from his spiritual birth. The N.T. contrasts these two natures and gives them various names:

<u>Old Nature</u>	<u>New Nature</u>
"our old man" (Rom. 6:6)	"the new man" (Col. 3:10)
"the flesh" (Gal. 5:24)	"the Spirit" (Gal. 5:17)
"Corruptible seed" (1 Pet. 1:23)	"God's Seed" (1 Jn. 3:9)

One way to illustrate is by contrasting the outer man with the inner man (2 Cor. 4:16). The physical man needs food, and so does inner, or spiritual man. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the Mouth of God" (Mt. 4:4). Unless a Christian spends time daily in meditating on the word of God, his inner man will lack power.

A converted Indian explained, "I have two dogs living in me—a mean dog and a good dog. They are always fighting. The

## 1 John 3

---

bad dog wants me to do bad things, and the good dog wants me to do good things. Do you want to know which dog wins? The one I feed the most!"

A Christian who feeds the new nature from the word of God will have power to live a godly life. We are to "make no provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof" (Rom. 13:14) (Wiersbe).

"And he cannot sin, because he is born of God." "Cannot sin" is the same as in verse 6 (Vincent, Wuest, Woods, Barnes, Macknight, etc.)

"Cannot sin." "A declaration of what is forbidden; (eg. 'you cannot turn right on red.'). Not an impossibility, but illegal to do so. In view of what John said in 2:1, 2, there could hardly be any doubt that this is exactly what he meant" (Coffman).

### Verse 10

In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother.

Christians may be identified by their conduct. Any and all transgressions of the law of Christ deny such transgressors any status whatever as Children of God. Those who speak loudest about their faith in Christ, but do not display the type of behavior set forth in the N.T. as Christian conduct, may in no sense establish by their profession a status which their unchristian lives deny. People who do not make a serious and consistent effort to do what the N.T. teaches that Christian should do, are "the children of the devil" (Coffman).

"Whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he . . ."

The first clause in this verse relates to what has just been said; the second expands it and makes it applicable not only to the spiritual, but also to the social side of life. The love mentioned here has special reference to the Christian brother in faith. We are brothers with mankind at large through Adam; but the particular viewpoint of the N.T. is that of the "brotherhood in Christ;" and there is a world of difference in these. Significantly, Paul did not go about among the churches raising a collection for the oppressed heathen in the ghettos of Rome, but for



the "poor saints" in Jerusalem. Although, there is a true sense in which the Christian loves every man on earth, it can never be the same as that for the beloved "in Christ" (Coffman).

We are taught here that he who does not love his brother actually has no brother to love. For in his failure to comply with this normal and natural principle, he demonstrates that God is not his Father. In refusing to love one of God's family, he simply excludes himself from the family itself (Woods).

### Verse 11

For this is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another.

From the beginning of their acceptance of Christianity. The great basics of Christianity are unchanging, fixed and permanent.

### Verse 12

Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous.

"Slew." This sheds light on Genesis 4, where it is recorded merely that Cain rose up and slew his brother. The word John used means, "slaughtered; butchered, by cutting the throat (jugular) like an ox in the shambles."

"And wherefore slew he him?" Not for any offense of Abel's against his brother, but simply and only because, Cain's works were evil, and his brother's righteous. Thus, quite early in human history the hatred of darkness against light was revealed, e.g., Cainites.

### Verse 13

Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you.

Jesus repeatedly warned the apostles of this: (Jn. 15:18-19, 25; 16:1; 17:14; cf. 1 Pet. 4:12). The reason the wicked hated the righteousness is,

The good man is a walking rebuke to the evil man, even if he never spoke a word to him. His life passes a silent judgment. Alcibiades, said to Socrates, "I hate you because every time I meet you, you show me what I am." There is still a Cain, the world, hating its Abel, the church.

# *1 John 3*

---

## **Verse 14**

We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death.

"We." "whatever the world may say, we know! Emphatic" (Vincent).

"Know." "to know absolutely" (Wuest).

"Because." "this is the sign of having passed into life" (Vincent).

"Abideth in death" "The absence of love is not the cause of his death, but the sign of it which it is evidenced to others" (Vincent).

## **Verse 15**

Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him.

"That is he has the spirit of a murderer; he has that which, if it were acted out, would lead him to commit murder, as it did Cain" (Barnes).

"Where love is not, there is hatred; where hatred is, there is murder; where murder, there can be no eternal life: (Mt. 5:21-22)" (Coffman).

## **Verse 16**

Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.

"In such a verse as this the unattainability of the full Christian ideal is starkly clear. John did not command Christians to lay down their lives for each other, but thundered the principle, they ought to do it. Why? Because Christ died for us" (Coffman).

## **Verse 17**

But whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?

This is a much more common and practical test, which all may be called upon to meet. A stingy Christian is a contradiction of terms.

## **Verse 18**

My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth.

The prohibition here is not against expression of love and concern for others; for, in their place, these are beautiful and helpful. What is forbidden is the substitution of loving words for needed assistance.

#### Verses 19-20

And hereby we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him. For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things.

"Heart" (καρδιά) means "the conscience" (AGL). Opinion is divided on whether these verses are meant to inspire awe, or afford consolation. "It could mean: since our hearts condemn us and God is infinitely greater than our hearts, God must condemn us even more" (Coffman).

#### Verse 21

Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God.

Whatever consolation may have been intended in the preceding verses, a greater consolation is promised for the Christian who will keep his conscience clean.

#### Verse 22

And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight.

"This declaration is limited by the conditions, which in other passages of scripture, are made necessary to our petitions being granted by God" (Macknight). The prayers of the obedient are the ones that are answered.

#### Verse 23

And this is his commandment, That we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment.

"Orr pointed out that 'belief and love' as used in this verse have the meaning as 'trust and obey.' Barclay also agreed to this: 'When we put these two commandments together, we find the great truth that the Christian life depends on right belief and right conduct combined' " (Coffman).

## Verse 24

And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.

This refers to the Christian's abiding in Christ and Christ's abiding in the Christian's, "a metaphor derived ultimately from our Lord's allegory of the vine and branches (Jn. 15:1)." It is not, however, some mystical experience which is meant by this; "its indispensable accompaniments are the confession of Jesus as the Son of God come in the flesh, and a consistent life of holiness and love." In this connection, it is also appropriate to point out that no one was ever truly "in Christ" who was not baptized "into Him" (Rom. 6:3-5; Gal. 3:26-27) (Coffman).

"And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us." "Another way of saying, 'hereby we know we are truly Christians'" (Coffman).

"By the Spirit he gave us." "We have called this the 'Gift Ordinary' of the Holy Spirit, given to the Christians as an earnest in consequence of and subsequently to their being baptized into Christ (Acts 2:38 & Eph. 1:13). This is also called in the N.T. the 'earnest' of the Holy Spirit" (Coffman).

"This verse declares, (1) God abides in us; (2) we have a knowledge of His abiding presence; (3) we possess this knowledge by the Spirit which He has 'given.' It should be observed that it is not the manner of entrance nor the mode of the Spirit's dwelling which is referred to, but the fact of it" (Woods).

No man can be a true Christian in whom that Spirit does not constantly dwell, or to whom he is not "given." And yet no one can determine that the Spirit dwells in him, except by the effects produced in his heart and life . . . when these effects exist, we may be certain that the Spirit of God is with us; for this is the "fruit" of that Spirit, or these are the effects which He produces in the lives of men (Gal. 5:22-23) (Barnes).

"He gave" (ἔδωκεν). "3rd pers. sing. aor., ind. act." (AGL). "The aorist refers to the special occasion of Pentecost" (Plummer). 1400 Northcrest, Ada, OK 74820

## 1 John 5

*by Richard Bunner*

I want to thank the brethren in charge of this study for asking me to be a part of it. I have thoroughly enjoyed this perusal of the First Epistle of John. Since my colleagues before me have done such an excellent job of giving the background and occasion for writing, I would like for us to begin immediately with chapter five.

### Verse 1

John makes reference to a faith that is obedient. One cannot be born of God unless his faith is strong enough to move him to obedience of the gospel. As has been noted earlier in our study of this epistle, John is emphasizing faith because of the doctrine of the Gnostics. If I love him that is begotten—I love my brother. For “if a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?” (4:20).

### Verse 2

Love and obedience to God will assure us of the truth of our love to others. If love of God is absent then our love of our fellows is not genuine—is earthly, it is a mockery. If love of our fellows is absent, then we have no love for God; all love to Him must be tested by our charity. Man was originally created in the image of God. In his fallen state he left much to be desired. But when he is born from above he again begins to take on the characteristics of his heavenly Father. That’s why “he who loves God loves his brother also.” How do we know if we are passing the test?

Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren. But whoso hath this world’s good, and seeth this brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth (3:16-18).

### Verse 3

Jesus had said, “If ye love me, keep my commandments” (Jn. 14:15). John says His commandments are not grievous. This is not because the

## *1 John 5*

---

commands themselves are light or easy to obey, but because of the new relationship one has with the Father and His Son. This is in keeping with what Jesus said in Matthew 11:28-30, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light." What actually makes the yoke easy and burden light is our love for Christ. Perhaps I can give you an illustration to help you see this more clearly. Let us say that a man and woman are united in marriage and that their love for one another is as deep and pure as any could be. As the years go by this love becomes even stronger. Then one, say the husband, is smitten with a devastating illness that leaves him an invalid. The wife now takes on added responsibilities. But she and her husband still have each other. Despite the hardships that they may suffer the days go by swiftly and they are happy because they are in love. When we love Jesus His commandments certainly do not seem grievous.

### **Verses 4-5**

When John speaks of overcoming the world he has reference to being victorious over all that is opposed to God. Only those who have been born again can do this. The people of the world are powerless against the world. But we can do all things through Christ who strengthens us.

### **Verses 6-8**

Our faith must be in Jesus for all of God's witnesses point to Him. The first witness to which we are introduced, John simply refers to as the "water." Upon a close examination we shall conclude that this "water" refers to the baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist. Here is how we arrive at that conclusion: The Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask John the Baptist who he was (Jn. 1:19). After John denied that he was the Christ, Elijah, or the Prophet, they then asked him, "Why are you baptizing?" (Jn. 1:25). John answered them, saying, "I baptize with water: but there standeth one among you, whom ye know not; He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose." Again the next day John replies, "I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water" (Jn. 1:25-27, 31). John proclaimed that he was baptizing in order that the Messiah might be "made manifest" unto Israel. The NIV puts it this way, "the reason I came baptizing with water was that he might be revealed to Israel." John's baptism may have served several purposes, but primarily it was the

vehicle through which God would reveal His Son the Messiah to Israel. And it happened just that way:

Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbade him saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou unto me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well please (Mt. 3:13-17).

The record does not tell us how many were present on that occasion, but I'm sure that those who were rejoiced greatly even more than old Simeon or Anna the prophetess had decades earlier. John's work was accomplished; he would decrease but Jesus would increase.

Not by water only, but by water and blood. Since the testimony of two establishes the truth (John 8:17), John brings forth the second witness "blood." And a credible witness he (blood) is. From the very beginning blood sacrifices had been offered. Abel had offered the first-born of his flock, the blood of a lamb had been smeared on the houses in Egypt, thousands of offerings were made at the altar before the tabernacle. Why? Why was there such an emphasis on a bloody sacrifice? "Almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission" (Heb. 9:22). That's what Jesus came to do. Every animal sacrifice, every drop of blood that had flowed down the sides of the altar pointed to "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (Jn. 1:29). From the outset of His ministry Jesus proclaimed that this was His goal. "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," He told the Jews. In His memorial feast the night of His betrayal He revealed, "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Mt. 26:28). The next day He was hanged on a cross to die for us. "One of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water" (Jn. 19:34).

Thus a witness from the beginning of His ministry and a witness at the end of His work declared Him to be the One.

But there were three. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. The Holy Spirit bore witness to the Person of Christ not

# 1 John 5

---

only through prophecy but also through signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name" (Jn. 20:31).

These three witnesses all point to Jesus as the Christ: the water, the blood, and the Spirit.

## Verses 9-13

God's witness is that of the Holy Spirit. The philosophy of men concerning the nature, character, being, and identity of the Son of God has that witness in himself that is the words of eternal life which the Holy Spirit has given. Believing in Him means that one has Him and has been born of God (5: 1). It is only in His name that we can have life (Acts 4:12).

## Verses 14-15

Since we have this confidence that we are God's children and that we have eternal life, we should have confidence to go to Him in prayer. His desire is that we communicate with Him. Just as we desire our fleshly children to converse with us, our heavenly Father wants us to speak to Him.

## Verse 16

"If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death." This has reference to seeing a brother in Christ sinning a sin that neither requires church discipline nor has it become a way of life. This is obvious from the context. Perhaps we should first clarify what a sin unto death is, then the other will be clearer. Various views exist as to what this sin may be. Some say it is a willful sin, others, a sin of obstinate unbelief. There are those who say it is the sin against the Holy Ghost, or perhaps any sin that is unrepented. None of these views are satisfactory. John was speaking of something that his readers should have a ready understanding. A sin unto death would be a sin which led to death. Under the law there were sins which required physical death. Such sins resulted in spiritual death under the gospel. John says such sins should not be prayed for. Certainly, the Old Testament taught the same thing. In the seventh chapter of Joshua we have the account of three thousand Israeli soldiers attacking the city of Ai. Israel was defeated soundly and thirty-six brave soldiers lost their lives that day. Joshua was anguished and tore his clothes and fell face-down in prayer before the ark of the covenant. The Lord spoke to Joshua and told him to stand up. It was not a time for prayer. It was a time for action because there



was sin in the camp. This wasn't a time for prayer but rather a time for discipline. The same is true today. There are sins that brethren may commit (some are listed in 1 Cor. 5:11) which demand that the church act immediately to withdraw fellowship. But what about a sin not unto death? Certainly there are sins that would not require disfellowship, but neither can they be allowed to continue. John says that the one who sees the brothers in should pray. It is a sin that is observable. Perhaps there is more than one reason he should pray. Paul says, "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such a one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted" (Gal. 6:1). It would seem only natural that one would pray for wisdom on how to handle the matter best. Certainly one would pray to have the proper attitude to speak to his brother who has sinned. The intended results are that the brother who has sinned will realize his sin, repent, and pray to God for forgiveness. God shall give him life.

### Verses 17-18

John clarifies that he is not talking about one that is habitually sinning. Even sins not unto death can lead to eternal punishment for all unrighteousness is sin. But we know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not that is, he does not continue in sin.

### Verses 19-20

The world may be under the influence of Satan, but we are of God. We have confidence that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God. We now understand that which had been a mystery, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed through his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit. Through what is written we may know Him and have eternal life.

### Verse 21

One final exhortation is given: Little children, keep yourselves from idols.  
*Rt. 6, Box 313 B, Fairmont, WV 26554*

## **Judging**

*Allen Bailey*

There are four distinct Greek words used for the word judging and its cognates. These four Greek words are **krima**, **krino**, **kriteerion**, and **kritees**. They carry sixteen definitions. Sometimes an extensive word study uncovers hidden meanings of words that shed a different light on the subject than expected. In a careful study of the Greek words for judging and the definitions, however, nothing out of the ordinary was made known. Each definition simply pinpoints or stresses a thought noted by the context.

This study is designed to address specifically the subject of judging one another—when is it right and when is it wrong. We have purposely avoided passages that directly refer to the judgment day in order to spend our time on the assigned subject. This lesson is divided into the following divisions:

- (1) Brief discussion of definitions.
- (2) Other ways these Greek words are used in the New Testament.
- (3) Why is there so much confusion on judging?
- (4) When is judging right?
- (5) When is judging wrong?
- (6) Are we obligated to judge immoral Christians?
- (7) Consequences of erroneous judgments.
- (8) Examples of judgment calls.
- (9) Biblical principles to aid us in passing proper judgments.

**Note:** All numerical references in Greek word definitions are from **Strong's Exhaustive Concordance**; and all definitions, unless otherwise noted, are from **Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament**.

### **Brief Discussion of Definitions**

**krima** "a decree" (p. 360, #2917, definition #1).

**krima** "judgment" (p. 360, #2917, definition #2).

**krima** "A matter to be judicially decided, a lawsuit, a case in court:" (p. 360, #2917, definition #3).

**krino** "To separate, put asunder; to pick out, select, choose" (p. 360, #2919, definition #1).

**krino** "To approve, esteem, to prefer" (p. 360, #2919, definition #2).

**krino** "to be of opinion, deem, think:" (p. 360, #2919, definition #3).

## *Judging*

---

**krino** "to determine, resolve, decree" (p. 360, 361, #2919, definition #4).

**krino** "to judge" "to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;" (p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

**krino** "to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure" (p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

**krino** "to rule, govern; to preside over with the power of giving judicial decisions" (p. 361, #2919, definition #6).

**krino** "to contend together" "to dispute" "to go to law, have a suit at law;" (p. 361, #2919, definition #7).

**kriteerion** "the instrument or means of trying or judging anything; the rule by which one judges," (p. 362, #2922, definition #1).

**kriteerion** "the place where judgment is given; the tribunal of a judge; a bench of judges" ( p. 362, #2922, definition #2).

**kriteerion** "the matter judged, thing to be decided, suit, case." (p. 362, #2922, definition #3).

**kritees** "a judge" (p. 362, #2923, definition #1).

**kritees** "the leaders or rulers of the Israelites" (p. 362, #2923, definition #2).

### **Other Ways These Greek Words Are Used in the New Testament**

It is very common for one Greek word to be translated into several different English words, such is the case with the words for judging. The following list is an example of several ways these words are translated. I have given one verse for each; however, in some cases several scriptural references could have been sighted.

(1) Matthew 5:40—"at the law;" (2) Matthew 23:14—"damnation;" (3) Luke 23:40—"condemnation;" (4) Acts 15:19—"sentence;" (5) Acts 16:4—"that were ordained of;" (6) Acts 23:6—"am called into question;" (7) Acts 27:1—"determined;" (8) Roman 2:12—"shall be judged;" (9) Romans 14:5—"esteemeth;" (10) 1 Corinthians 6:7—"go to law;" (11) 1 Corinthians 7:37—"hath so decreed;" (12) 2 Thessalonians 2:12—"might be damned;" (13) Revelation 18:20—"have avenged."

### **Why So Much Confusion On Judging?**

#### **I. Apparent Contradictions**

### A. Christian judges those within, God judges those without.

"For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person" (1 Cor. 5:12-13).

1 Corinthians 6:2 says, "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? God will pass the final judgment on those in the world." This point is clearly established in many Bible references (Rom. 14:10-12; 2 Tim. 4:1, etc.). Saints will judge the world and fallen angels simply by their obedience to God's commandments. The world disobeys God, the fallen angels disobey God, but we as faithful saints by obeying God judge the world and fallen angels.

Some verses have been removed from their contextual setting and misapplied which initiates improper understandings of God's word. Wrong conclusions are often generated from such careless and imprudent actions!

### B. Matthew 7:1 Judge not, that ye be not judged.

It was the tendency of those who opposed Jews to make unjust judgments. This prompted Jesus to say: John 7:24 Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment.

Matthew 7:1 has been quoted by millions of people and genuine misapplies a point that was truly never intended by the inspired writer. The context of Matthew 7 further explains "with what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged (Mt. 7:2). It is abundantly clear in the New Testament references that we judge those within (1 Cor. 5:12, etc.).

The only reasons an apparent contradiction exist here is by pulling a verse out of its context and abusing and misusing it unmercifully.

It is very important to remember to get all the verses on a thought, study them carefully within their context, then you can draw a true and proper conclusion.

We know assuredly there are no contradictions in the Bible. Verses like these and others clearly establish there are different ways the word "judge" and its cognates are used in the New Testament.

# *Judging*

---

## **II. Poor translations in certain passages of certain phrases.**

### **A. King James Version 1 Corinthians 6:4 says,**

If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life,  
set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church.

The KJV seems here to advise or encourage allowing the least esteemed in the church to judge matters of indifference among Christians. The KJV simply makes a direct statement rather than posing a question.

### **B. New King James Version**

If then you have judgments of things pertaining to this life, do you appoint those who are least esteemed by the church to judge?

### **C. American Standard Version**

If then you have to judge things pertaining to this life, do you set them to judge who are of no account in the church?

### **D. New American Standard Version**

"If then you have law courts dealing with matters of this life, do you appoint them as judges who are of no account in the church?"

A careful observation from reliable translations of the New Testament clearly shows that Paul was asking a question to shame the brethren and to establish an important point. The next phrase is easily understood—"I speak this to your shame" (1 Cor. 6:5).

## **III. Judging is both encouraged and discouraged.**

### **A. Sometimes judging is discouraged (forbidden).**

Matthew 7:1 says, "Judge not, that ye be not judged."

James 4:11-12 says, "Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that speaketh evil of his brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law: but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge. There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that judgest another?"

### B. Sometimes judging is encouraged

John 7:24 says, "Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment." Luke 12:57 says, "Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?" Paul taught, "For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person" (1 Cor. 5:12-13). It is apparent that judging is used in different ways in the New Testament.

People often interpret the statement of Jesus in Matthew 7:1-2 to mean one should never voice critical opinions about others—or even form such opinions. Whatever Jesus meant when He said not to judge, it could not mean that we are to have no opinion whatever of other people. In that sense, we inescapably "judge" everyone we encounter. Obviously, I must form some impressions when I meet another. I have a generally favorable or unfavorable impression of each person I meet.

We should understand that Christians are not always what they seem. This verse does not mean a person should never judge people's actions. If I catch a person in a lie, or telling an obscene story, or using God's name in vain, there is no reason for me to pretend those actions are anything but sin.

For me to condemn an action condemned by God's Word is not a judgmental act on my part. It is simply a case of accepting God's judgment which He has already clearly expressed. I am not only justified in condemning such actions but I am expected to do so. Jesus commended the church at Ephesus for condemning sin (Rev. 2:6). Jesus commended the Ephesians for hating certain doctrines and practices, not hating the people involved in them. Yes, it is appropriate, then, to disapprove certain actions of others. We need to be sure, however, that the action in question is something clearly condemned by God's Word and not simply something contrary to our tradition. Jesus was constantly being judged by his enemies for violating their rules, which, though merely traditions of men, assumed all the force of moral law in their mind. It was this tendency to make unjust judgements that prompted Jesus to tell his opponents—"Stop judging by mere appearance, and make a right judgment" (Jn. 7:24). All of this is implied in Jesus' warning to judge righteously. His words plainly reveal that appearances and reality are likely to be two different things. Mistrust the appearance and search for the reality is the counsel of Jesus.

## When Is Judging Right?

### 1. Judgment of the Civil Courts

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour (Rom. 13:1-7).

### 2. Judgment of the church upon disorderly members

1 Corinthians 5:13 "But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person."

2 Thessalonians 3:6 "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us."

### 3. Judgments by individuals with regards to wrong doers and evil people.

Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye (ML 7:1-5).

Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them

by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them (Mt. 7:15-20).

3 John 9 "I wrote unto the church: but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them, receiveth us not."

Titus 3:10-11 "A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject; Knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself."

#### 4. Judgment which recognize and disapproves of the faults of others.

Galatians 6:1 "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted."

James 5:19-20 "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins."

#### 5. Judgment done by decisive preaching that draws the line between truth and error, the lost and the saved.

And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; (2 Thess. 1:7-9).

But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of (2 Pet. 2:1-2).

#### 6. Judgment which identifies false teachers



## Judging

---

- 1 John 4:1 Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.
- 1 Thessalonians 5:21 Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.
7. Judgment when scriptural authority is being exercised, as long as it is done "with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" (1 Cor. 5:8).
8. Judgments based on known fact, "it is reported commonly" (1 Cor. 5:1).

### When Is Judging Wrong?

"All judging from surmise, or from insufficient promises, or from ill-will is prohibited" (J. W. McGarvey).

"The habit of censoriousness, sharp, unjust criticism. Our word critic is from this very word" (A. T. Robertson).

Regarding James 4:11-12, Guy Woods says that the judging condemned

is to impute unworthy motives to others, to put the worst possible interpretation on their work and action . . . Forbidden here as also in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 7:1ff), are all censorious judgments exercised without sufficient information by people who are without right to do so, and whose design is destruction and defamation of character (*Gospel Advocate Commentary*).

1. The judging forbidden by the Lord is harsh, hasty, unfounded, censorious, hypocritical, uncharitable, malicious, slanderous, ill-natured judgment.
2. Judgment is wrong when we pass negative judgment on others in regard to Christian liberties.

Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him . . . But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ . . . Let us not therefore judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumblingblock or an occasion to fall in his brother's way (Romans 14:3, 10, 13).

3. Judging is wrong when done with "leaven of malice and wickedness" (1 Cor. 5:8).
4. Judging is wrong when done without mercy (Jas. 2:13).

5. Judging is wrong if you're doing the same thing that you are condemning others for. "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things" (Rom. 2:1).
6. Judging is wrong when you show respect of person (Jas. 2:3, 4, 9).
7. Judging is wrong when judgment is made only by appearance and not by righteous judgment (Jn. 7:24).
8. Judging is wrong when questioning another's motives.

### **We Are Obligated to Judge Immoral Christians (1 Cor. 5)**

1. Paul the apostle states in 1 Corinthians 5:3, "For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed." Paul has already "determined, resolved, decreed" what should be done with this fornicator. Immorality, along with other sins, are to be dealt with by we as Christians.
2. Paul, further states in 1 Corinthians 5:12 "For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within?" The word judge here means "to pronounce judgment on immoral Christians."
3. Christians are not only obligated to judge immoral Christians but any baptized believer who is guilty of the sins in verse 11, who has not corrected their wrong.

But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat (1 Cor. 5:11).

fornicator—4205— pornos—"a man who indulges in unlawful sexual intercourse, a fornicator" (p. 532; W. E. Vine, volume 2, p. 125).

covetous—4123—"greedy of gain, covetous" (p. 516, W. E. Vine, p. 253).

idolater—1496—"a worshipper of false gods, an idolater" (p. 174).

railer—3060—"a railer, reviler" (p. 382).

drunkard—3183—methusas—"drunken intoxicated" (p. 396).

extortioner—727—harpax—a robber, an extortioner.

4. A careful overview of this chapter reveals the judgment to be taken by the church and by all Christians.

He that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you . . . To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus . . . Purge out therefore the old leaven . . . Now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator . . . Do not ye judge them that are within? . . . Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person (1 Cor. 5:2, 4-5, 7, 11-13).

5. Attitude by which we Judge. One word of caution needs to be mentioned. When Christians are compelled to judge immoral Christians or any other specific case mentioned in 1 Corinthians 5:11 let it be sure that our attitude is kept correct. "Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" (1 Cor. 5:8). Judge not with "malice or wickedness;" rather, judge with "sincerity and truth."

### Consequence of Erroneous Judgments

1. We will be judged by the same judgment we render.

Matthew 7:2 "For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

2. We will reap what we sow.

Galatians 6:7-8 "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting."

Matthew 5:7 "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy."

James 2:13 "For he shall have judgment without mercy, that hath shewed no mercy; and mercy rejoiceth against judgment."

Then came Peter to him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but, Until seventy times seven. Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king, which would take account of his servants. And when he had begun to reckon, one was brought unto him, which owed him ten thousand talents. But forasmuch as he had not to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, and payment to be made. The servant therefore fell down, and wor-

shipped him, saying, Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him, and forgave him the debt. But the same servant went out, and found one of his fellow servants, which owed him an hundred pence: and he laid hands on him, and took him by the throat, saying, Pay me that thou owest. And his fellow servant fell down at his feet, and besought him, saying, Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. And he would not: but went and cast him into prison, till he should pay the debt. So when his fellow servants saw what was done, they were very sorry, and came and told unto their lord all that was done. Then his lord, after that he had called him, said unto him, O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst me: shouldst not thou also have had compassion on thy fellowservant, even as I had pity on thee? And his lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him. So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses (Mt. 18:21-35).

3. We will receive judgment from God.

James 2:12-13 "So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty. For he shall have judgment without mercy, that hath shewed no mercy; and mercy rejoiceth against judgment."

4. We will give account in the day of judgment for every idle word and idle judgmental statement we have made.

Matthew 12:36-37 "But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned."

### Examples of Judgment Calls

2 Timothy 4:10 "For Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica; Crescens to Galatia, Titus unto Dalmatia."

2 Timothy 4:14 "Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the Lord reward him according to his works:"

Acts 8:21 "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God."—Peter knew the heart wasn't right as a result of Simon's actions.

# Judging

---

## 1 Corinthians 5:1-13

### **Biblical Principles to Aid Us In Passing Proper Judgment**

Matthew 7:20 "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

Matthew 7:12 (Golden Rule) "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets."

John 7:24 (Judge according to the facts) "Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment."

1 Corinthians 5:1 (Do not formulate judgment on hearses, gossip, or rumors only on established facts.) "It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife."

Matthew 18:15-17 (Remember how to handle one on one conflict.) "Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican."

### **Exhaustive Word Study on Judging**

#### Reference Work

**krima** #2917; Thayer, p. 360; Arndt/Gingrich, p. 451; Moulton & Geden, p. 560; Kittel volume 3, p. 921; Strong's p. 43.

**krino** 2919; Thayer, p. 360; Arndt/Gingrich, p. 452; Moulton & Geden, p. 560; Kittel volume 3, p. 921; Strong's p. 43.

**kriteerion** #2922; Thayer p. 362 Arndt / Gingrich, p. 454 Moulton & Geden, p. 562; Kittel volume 3, p. 921; Strong's p. 43.

**kritees** #2923; Thayer, p. 362; Arndt/Gingrich, p. 454; Moulton & Geden, p. 562; Kittel volume 3, p. 921; Strong's p. 43.

#### **krima—#2917**

"a decree" (Thayer p. 360, #2917, definition #1).

Romans 11:33 O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!

“judgment” (Thayer p. 360, #2917, definition #2)

Matthew 7:2 For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.

Matthew 23:14 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.

Mark 12:40 Which devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive greater damnation.

Luke 20:47 Which devour widows' houses, and for a shew make long prayers: the same shall receive greater damnation.

Luke 23:40 But the other answering rebuked him, saying, Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation?

Luke 24:20 And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him.

John 9:39 And Jesus said, For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind.

Acts 24:25 And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, Felix trembled, and answered, Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season, I will call for thee.

Romans 2:2 But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth against them which commit such things.

Romans 2:3 And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?

Romans 3:8 And not rather, (as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say,) Let us do evil, that good may come? whose damnation is just.

Romans 5:16 And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.

## *Judging*

---

Romans 13:2 Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.

1 Corinthians 11:29 For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.

1 Corinthians 11:34 And if any man hunger, let him eat at home; that ye come not together unto condemnation. And the rest will I set in order when I come.

Galatians 5:10 I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be.

1 Timothy 3:6 Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil.

1 Timothy 5:12 Having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith.

Hebrews 6:2 Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.

James 3:1 My brethren, be not many masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation.

1 Peter 4:17 For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?

2 Peter 2:3 And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not.

Jude 1:4 For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

Revelation 17:1 And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talked with me, saying unto me, Come hither; I will shew unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters:

Revelation 18:20 Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her.

Revelation 20:4 And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.

"A matter to be judicially decided, a lawsuit, a case in court:" (Thayer p. 360, #2917, definition #3).

1 Corinthians 6:7 Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?

### **krino—#2919**

"to contend together" "to dispute" "to go to law, have a suit at law:" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #7).

Matthew 5:40 And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.

"to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

Matthew 7:1 Judge not, that ye be not judged.

Matthew 7:2 For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.

"to rule, govern; to preside over with the power of giving judicial decisions" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #6).

Matthew 19:28 And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

"to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).



## *Judging*

---

Luke 6:37 Judge not, and ye shall not be judged: condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: forgive, and ye shall be forgiven:

"to be of opinion, deem, think:" (Thayer p. 360, #2919, definition #3).

Luke 7:43 Simon answered and said, I suppose that he, to whom he forgave most. And he said unto him, Thou hast rightly judged.

"to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

Luke 12:57 Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?

Luke 19:22 And he saith unto him, Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked servant. Thou knewest that I was an austere man, taking up that I laid not down, and reaping that I did not sow: "to rule, govern; to preside over with the power of giving judicial decisions" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #6).

Luke 22:30 That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

"to judge" "to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

John 3:17 For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.

John 3:18 He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

John 5:22 For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son:

John 5:30 I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me.

"to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

John 7:24 Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment.

“to judge” “to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;” (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

John 7:51 Doth our law judge any man, before it hear him, and know what he doeth?

“to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure” (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

John 8:15 Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man.

John 8:16 And yet if I judge, my judgment is true: for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me.

John 8:26 I have many things to say and to judge of you: but he that sent me is true; and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him.

“to judge” “to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;” (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

John 8:50 And I seek not mine own glory: there is one that seeketh and judgeth.

John 12:47 And if any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world.

John 12:48 He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.

John 16:11 Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.

John 18:31 Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye him, and judge him according to your law. The Jews therefore said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death:

Acts 3:13 The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus; whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go.

## *Judging*

---

"to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

Acts 4:19 But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye.

"to judge" "to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

Acts 7:7 And the nation to whom they shall be in bondage will I judge, said God: and after that shall they come forth, and serve me in this place.

Acts 13:27 For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him.

"to be of opinion, deem, think;" (Thayer p. 360, #2919, definition #3).

Acts 13:46 Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles.

Acts 15:19 Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God:

"to determine, resolve, decree" (Thayer p. 360, 361, #2919, definition #4).

Acts 16:4 And as they went through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem.

"to be of opinion, deem, think;" (Thayer p. 360, #2919, definition #3).

Acts 16:15 And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us.

"to judge" "to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

Acts 17:31 Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.

“to determine, resolve, decree” (Thayer p. 360, 361, #2919, definition #4).

Acts 20:16 For Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia: for he hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost.

“To separate, put asunder; to pick out, select, choose” (Thayer p. 360, #2919, definition #1).

Acts 21:25 As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from strangled, and from fornication.

“to judge” “to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;” (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

Acts 23:3 Then said Paul unto him, God shall smite thee, thou whited wall: for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?

Acts 23:6 But when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee: of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question.

Acts 24:6 Who also hath gone about to profane the temple: whom we took, and would have judged according to our law.

Acts 24:21 Except it be for this one voice, that I cried standing among them, Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day.

Acts 25:9 But Festus, willing to do the Jews a pleasure, answered Paul, and said, Wilt thou go up to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these things before me?

## *Judging*

---

Acts 25:10 Then said Paul, I stand at Caesar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest.

Acts 25:20 And because I doubted of such manner of questions, I asked him whether he would go to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these matters.

"to determine, resolve, decree" (Thayer p. 360, 361, #2919, definition #4).

Acts 25:25 But when I found that he had committed nothing worthy of death, and that he himself hath appealed to Augustus, I have determined to send him.

"to judge" "to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

Acts 26:6 And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God, unto our fathers:

"to be of opinion, deem, think;" (Thayer p. 360, #2919, definition #3).

Acts 26:8 Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?

"to determine, resolve, decree" (Thayer p. 360, 361, #2919, definition #4).

Acts 27:1 And when it was determined that we should sail into Italy, they delivered Paul and certain other prisoners unto one named Julius, a centurion of Augustus' band.

"to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

Romans 2:1 Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things.

Romans 2:3 And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?

"to judge" "to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

Romans 2:12 For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law;

Romans 2:16 In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.

"to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

Romans 2:27 And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law?

"to judge" "to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

Romans 3:4 God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged.

Romans 3:6 God forbid: for then how shall God judge the world?

"to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

Romans 3:7 For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto his glory; why yet am I also judged as a sinner?

Romans 14:3 Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him.

Romans 14:4 Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand.

"To approve, esteem, to prefer" (Thayer p. 360, #2919, definition #2).

## *Judging*

---

Romans 14:5 One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.

“to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure” (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

Romans 14:10 But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.

Romans 14:13 Let us not therefore judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumblingblock or an occasion to fall in his brother's way.

Romans 14:22 Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God. Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.

“to determine, resolve, decree” (Thayer p. 360, 361, #2919, definition #4).

1 Corinthians 2:2 For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.

“to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure” (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

1 Corinthians 4:5 Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts: and then shall every man have praise of God.

“to determine, resolve, decree” (Thayer p. 360, 361, #2919, definition #4).

1 Corinthians 5:3 For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed,

“to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure” (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

1 Corinthians 5:12 For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within?

"to judge" "to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

1 Corinthians 5:13 But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person.

"to contend together" "to dispute" "to go to law, have a suit at law;" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #7).

1 Corinthians 6:1 Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints? "to judge" "to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

1 Corinthians 6:2 Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters?

1 Corinthians 6:3 Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?

"to contend together" "to dispute" "to go to law, have a suit at law;" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #7).

1 Corinthians 6:6 But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers.

"to determine, resolve, decree" (Thayer p. 360, 361, #2919, definition #4).

1 Corinthians 7:37 Nevertheless he that standeth stedfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart that he will keep his virgin, doeth well.

"to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

1 Corinthians 10:15 I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say.

1 Corinthians 10:29 Conscience, I say, not thine own, but of the other: for why is my liberty judged of another man's conscience?

"to be of opinion, deem, think;" (Thayer p. 360, #2919, definition #3).



## *Judging*

---

1 Corinthians 11:13 Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?

"to judge" "to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

1 Corinthians 11:31 For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged.

1 Corinthians 11:32 But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world. "to determine, resolve, decree" (Thayer p. 360, 361, #2919, definition #4).

2 Corinthians 2:1 But I determined this with myself, that I would not come again to you in heaviness.

"to be of opinion, deem, think;" (Thayer p. 360, #2919, definition #3).

2 Corinthians 5:14 For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: "to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

Colossians 2:16 Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:

"to judge" "to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

2 Thessalonians 2:12 That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.

2 Timothy 4:1 I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom;

"to determine, resolve, decree" (Thayer p. 360, 361, #2919, definition #4).

Titus 3:12 When I shall send Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus, be diligent to come unto me to Nicopolis: for I have determined there to winter.

"to judge" "to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;" (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

Hebrews 10:30 For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people.

Hebrews 13:4 Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.

James 2:12 So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty.

“to pronounce judgment; to subject to censure” (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5b).

James 4:11 Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that speaketh evil of his brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law: but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge.

James 4:12 There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that judgest another?

James 5:9 Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned: behold, the judge standeth before the door.

“to judge” “to pronounce an opinion concerning right and wrong;” (Thayer p. 361, #2919, definition #5a).

1 Peter 1:17 And if ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear:

1 Peter 2:23 Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously:

1 Peter 4:5 Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead.

1 Peter 4:6 For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.

Revelation 6:10 And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?

## *Judging*

---

Revelation 11:18 And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth.

Revelation 16:5 And I heard the angel of the waters say, Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art, and wast, and shalt be, because thou hast judged thus.

Revelation 18:8 Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.

Revelation 18:20 Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her.

Revelation 19:2 For true and righteous are his judgments: for he hath judged the great whore, which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand.

Revelation 19:11 And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war.

Revelation 20:12 And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.

Revelation 20:13 And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works.

### **kriteerion—#2922**

“the place where judgment is given; the tribunal of a judge; a bench of judges” (Thayer p. 362, #2922, definition #2).

1 Corinthians 6:2 Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters?

“the matter judged, thing to be decided, suit, case.” (Thayer p. 362, #2922, definition #3).

1 Corinthians 6:4 If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church.

"the place where judgment is given; the tribunal of a judge; a bench of judges" (Thayer p. 362, #2922, definition #2).

James 2:6 But ye have despised the poor. Do not rich men oppress you, and draw you before the judgment seats?

### kritees—#2923

"a judge" (Thayer p. 362, #2923, definition #1).

Matthew 5:25 Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison.

Matthew 12:27 And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges.

Luke 11:19 And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges.

Luke 12:58 When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, as thou art in the way, give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him; lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison.

Luke 18:2 Saying, There was in a city a judge, which feared not God, neither regarded man:

Luke 18:6 And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith.

Acts 10:42 And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead.

Acts 18:15 But if it be a question of words and names, and of your law, look ye to it; for I will be no judge of such matters.

Acts 24:10 Then Paul, after that the governor had beckoned unto him to speak, answered, Forasmuch as I know that thou hast been of many years a judge unto this nation, I do the more cheerfully answer for myself:

## *Judging*

---

2 Timothy 4:8 Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.

Hebrews 12:23 To the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect,

James 2:4 Are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts?

James 4:11 Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that speaketh evil of his brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law: but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge.

James 5:9 Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned: behold, the judge standeth before the door.

“of the leaders or rulers of the Israelites” (Thayer p. 362, #2923, definition #2).

Acts 13:20 And after that he gave unto them judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years, until Samuel the prophet. 905 W. Grauwlyer Rd., Irving, TX 75061

### **Carnal Warfare**

*by George Battey*

One of the best documented facts in the Christian religion is that early Christians refused participation in carnal warfare. A significant change, however, occurred in the third century when Constantine gave official support to Christianity. A compromise was made between church and state and men claiming to be Christians soon became soldiers as well. The writings of Augustine on the "Just War Theory" finally influenced church leaders and the church officially sanctioned Christian participation in the armed services.

Mohandas Gandhi once said:

The only people on earth who do not see Christ and His teachings as nonviolent are Christians! (*Biblical Pacifism*, Dale Brown, p. ix).

Unfortunately, what Gandhi said is true!

A few through the ages, however, have remained true to the New Testament call for peace. During the Civil War, General Stonewall Jackson said:

There lives a people in the Valley of Virginia, that are not hard to bring to the army. While there, they are obedient to their officers. Nor is it difficult to have them take aim, but it is impossible to get them to take correct aim. I, therefore, think it better to leave them at their homes that they may produce supplies for the army (*Biblical Pacifism*, p. 24).

I would like to think that some of our own brethren were from that Valley of Virginia!

#### **Old Testament Prophecies**

The Biblical case for non-participation in war begins in the Old Testament. The prophets of old looked forward to a day when God's new kingdom would be established and His people would "learn war no more."

Isaiah 2:4—This prophecy teaches God's people would beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks.

Isaiah 9:6-7—Isaiah foresaw Jesus as the "Prince of peace" and "of the increase of his government and peace there would be no end".

Isaiah 11:6-9—This passage predicts that men with ferocious, violent spirits would dwell peaceably within the kingdom of heaven.

## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

Other prophecies include: Isaiah 60:18; Hosea 2:18; Zechariah 9:10.

### **New Testament Passages**

As we come to the New Testament Scriptures we see almost immediately these prophecies starting to unfold.

Luke 1:79—John the Baptist was born and would lead God's people into the "way of peace."

Luke 3:14—After John began preaching, he warned the soldiers to: "Do violence to no man."

Matthew 5:3-12—Jesus began His Sermon on the Mount with the beatitudes: "Blessed are the poor in spirit . . . Blessed are they that mourn . . . Blessed are the meek . . . Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness . . . Blessed are the merciful . . . Blessed are the pure in heart . . . Blessed are the peacemakers . . . Blessed are the persecuted." No one could enumerate eight other qualities that are more antagonistic to war!

Matthew 5:21-22—We are not to kill, nor even to be angry with our brother.

Matthew 5:39—We are to "turn the other cheek."

Matthew 5:44—We are to love our enemies AND to such a degree that we bless them, do good to them and pray for them.

Matthew 10:16—Jesus sent His disciples out with the charge to "be wise as serpents, and harmless as doves."

Luke 9:53-56—Jesus rebuked James and John for wanting to call down fire from heaven to destroy a city. Jesus stated that He came to save the lives of men, not to destroy them.

Luke 10:27—Jesus taught us we should love our neighbor as ourselves and in the rest of that chapter Jesus taught us that our neighbor is any man on earth that needs our help!

Matthew 26:52—When Peter used violence to protect Jesus, the Lord rebuked him: "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

John 18:36—When on trial for His life Jesus told Pilate: "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight."

Romans 12:17-21—"17Recompense to no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men. 18If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. 19Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine;

## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

I will repay, saith the Lord. <sup>20</sup>Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. <sup>21</sup>Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

2 Corinthians 10:3-4 "<sup>3</sup>For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: <sup>4</sup>For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal."

Ephesians 6:12—"For we wrestle not against flesh and blood."

1 Thessalonians 5:15—"See that none render evil for evil unto any man."

The point is that the call to be peaceable and gentle toward all men is not based on just one or two isolated "proof texts." The call for peace is an underlying message throughout the entire New Testament!

In view of all that the Bible teaches concerning war, God's people cannot consistently serve in the armed services. In the event of a draft we must file as conscientious objectors.

That brings us now to the major thrust of my assignment: What are the current laws governing conscientious objection?

### **Conscientious Objection**

Many feel that filing for a CO status is simply an easy and automatic way to "get out" of the draft, but if you have had any dealings with the Selective Service, you know it is not easy, nor automatic. Conscientious objectors are subject to the draft. The difference is: a CO does not participate in two years of combat.

### **The Constitution**

Many people feel that the conscientious objection status stems from the First Amendment of the constitution which guarantees freedom of religion. This is incorrect. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1931 (in the case of *U.S. vs. MacIntosh*) that there is no such constitutional right. We have this right only because the draft law, passed by Congress, allows it to exist.

Justice Sutherland wrote:

The privilege of the native-born conscientious objector to avoid bearing arms comes, not from the Constitution, but from the acts of Congress. That body may grant or withhold the exemption as in its wisdom it sees fit; and, if it be withheld, the native-born conscientious objector cannot successfully assert the privilege (*U.S. v. MacIntosh*, 283 US 605, 624).



# Carnal Warfare—CO Status

## Other Countries

As of 1985 there were only four countries in the world that constitutionally guaranteed conscientious objection to military service: West Germany, the Netherlands, Austria and Finland.

Although the CO status in this country is not guaranteed by the constitution, we are fortunate to at least have a law providing for it. In other countries the situation is much worse.

1. France—A CO provision was granted in 1963, but it was illegal to publish or distribute literature that mentioned the statute until 1983!
2. Greece—Only Jehovah's Witnesses are recognized as COs. Other objectors are serving prison sentences, or leaving the country.
3. El Salvador—As of 1985, the armed forces recruited men by abducting them off the streets; the conscience of a man played no part in the process!

## What Is Conscientious Objection?

To qualify as a CO the law says:

... a person must show that his deeply and sincerely held religious, moral or ethical beliefs cause him to feel opposed to taking part in all war in any form (**Draft, Registration and The Law**, R. Charles Johnson, p. 82).

Notice that this definition contains three distinct requirements of a CO applicant:

1. A man's beliefs must be based on religious, moral, or ethical grounds
2. He must be opposed to all wars
3. He must be sincere in what he believes.

Receiving this classification is more involved than simply writing that sentence down and sending it to the draft board!

## Two Classifications

There are two classifications of COs:

- 1-A-O: opposed to combat, but willing to serve in non-combatant positions
- 1-0: opposed to ALL military service.

Of the two, the 1-A-O classification is the easier to get because this man will go into the military and fill the draft quota. However, no one should

## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

request a 1-A-O status just because it's easier to get. If a 1-A-O later requests a 1-O status he stands a poor chance of success and could lose his 1-A-O status in the process.

### **The 1-A-O**

If given the 1-A-O status the draftee will:

1. Enter the military as a non-combatant
2. Go through complete military training and orientation
3. BUT, will not be trained or used in bearing arms.

Instead, he will be trained to perform a non-combatant job. During Vietnam the majority of these men were trained to be medics. The odds are extremely high that this CO will end up in a combat zone working on the front lines—since that is where medics are needed.

**Note:** The only difference between a 1-A draftee and a 1-A-O is that the 1-A-O will not bear firearms: (1) Both are in uniform; (2) Both are sworn to support the military and its missions; (3) Both are subject to military rules and regulations. The 1-A-O will not be called upon to kill, but there is nothing preventing him from being killed.

### **Should Christians Apply for the 1-A-O Status?**

Many COs believe that being a medic is a humanitarian job because it helps the wounded, but I think a closer look will drive us to a different view. There are at least three reasons why the Christian cannot consistently apply for the 1-A-O status:

#### **1. The philosophy of the Medical Corps**

In the medic school one is taught simply to "patch up" soldiers, not necessarily to heal their wounds. Just hurry up and get them back on the front line so they can fight again. The **Army Field Manual** (1970) states in paragraph 2-1:

The Army Medical Service supports all elements of the Army and is primarily concerned with maintaining the health and fighting efficiency of the individual soldier.

Saving lives and easing suffering is not even mentioned in the entire manual. That is not the "mission" of the Army Medical teams. The manual further states:

## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

Since the objective of military medicine is to conserve trained manpower, medical resources must be employed to do the most good for the greatest number. When a wide disparity exists between requirements (i.e., the number of wounded) and available means [of caring for them], it may be necessary to favor those patients who can be returned to immediate duty, rather than those more seriously injured (paragraph 2-6).

Obviously this job is not quite as "humanitarian" as some originally think.

### **2. We are helping others do what we oppose.**

If the 1-A-O were trained to be a supply sergeant he would order munitions. Is there really any difference between ordering bombs, or dropping them? As a cook the Christian would be aiding and abetting men to do the very thing we are opposed to doing.

To illustrate, suppose I had been the camp cook for Billy the Kid, or Jesse James. How would it have worked for me to plead that I was only the cook? Even the military can see this reasoning! If I fed the enemy and gave him a drink (Rom. 12:20), I could be court-martialed for treason! If they can see that feeding the enemy is betrayal to the country, then they ought to be able to see that feeding one's fellow soldiers is aiding and abetting a cause for which we are opposed!

2 John 11— "He that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."

Ephesians 5:11—"And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them."

### **3. I could not fulfill my Christian obligations.**

How could a 1-A-O:

- a. Worship God with a faithful congregation each first day of the week in the middle of a jungle?

It's true . . . if I'm thrown in prison for my CO beliefs I won't be able to worship each week with a faithful congregation, but if I have a choice, I will not willfully place myself in a position that will hinder my obligations to God. If they take me away and prevent me from worshipping it will be against my will and I will not go voluntarily.

- b. Preach the gospel to all the world when he is assisting in destroying part of the world?

## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

- c. "Do good to all men" (Gal. 6:10) when he is in an organized effort to destroy part of "all men?"

For these reasons, if for no others, a Christian could not consistently apply for a 1-A-O status.

### **The 1-O**

Now let us examine the 1-O status. As a 1-O draftee a man will serve two years—just like anyone else, but instead of serving in the military he must perform two years of civilian work that is approved by the Selective Service which they deem essential to the welfare of this nation.

Many of these jobs are menial and boring: hospital orderly, a truck driver for Goodwill, etc. But there are some very good jobs available. One bonus is that the 1-O can locate his own job and submit it for approval to the Selective Service.

### **Misconceptions About Who Qualifies**

There are several misconceptions about who qualifies as a CO. First, let me begin by telling you who will NOT make it as a CO:

1. Those opposed to certain kinds of war (nuclear wars), but would fight in other wars (conventional wars), do not qualify as COs.
2. Those opposed for political reasons. Perhaps they disagree with U.S. foreign policy—a widely used reason during the Vietnam era. This person does not qualify as a CO under current laws.
3. Those opposed for sociological reasons—they believe it is wrong for this society to waste its healthy men—do not qualify.
4. Those opposed for pragmatic reasons—"I don't want to get killed"—will not qualify. The question is not, "How do you feel about dying?" but rather, "How do you feel about killing?"

### **Those Who Can Qualify**

1. Not just "church goers"

In the past only religious objectors of an orthodox church were recognized. A man pretty much had to be a Mennonite or Quaker to qualify. But there were two important Supreme Court decisions that changed that: U.S. vs. Seeger in 1965, and U.S. vs. Welsh in 1970 (Johnson, p. 85).

## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

These two Supreme Court cases broadened the meaning of what it means to be "religious." No longer does a person have to be a member of a church, or even believe in God to be classed as a CO.

Army Regulation 600-43 states:

Conscientious objector beliefs must be held personally by the applicant. Membership in a certain church group is not necessary or sufficient, even if that group professes conscientious objection. The person who belongs to such a group must clearly show that he embraces the group's beliefs as his own. Similarly, a person cannot base a claim on the beliefs of a friend or relative (D-2).

In other words, just because your church is opposed to war this does not guarantee that you have an automatic right to a 1-O classification. Conversely, just because your church believes in war you are not disqualified from the 1-O status. You are allowed to disagree with your church.

2. A person does not necessarily have to be a pacifist to qualify as a CO. Technically a person can believe in self-defense of his loved ones and still qualify as a CO. The question is of course, "Do most local draft boards know about this technicality?"
3. It is not necessary to convince the Selective Service that your beliefs are right. You only have to convince them that you are sincere! One man who was raised on a Pacific island based his claim of conscientious objection on his belief that God lived in a volcano in his homeland. The draft board was not converted to his religion, but they were convinced he was sincere and they granted him a 1-O classification!

### **Applying For CO Status**

Putting together a complete and accurate application for a CO can be long and difficult. If the draft were fired up again you might find yourself with only two weeks to submit the application. If the application is haphazardly thrown together under the pressure of a ten-day deadline you could find yourself denied the 1-O classification.

**Advice:** Begin now thinking and studying these matters through. Putting your thoughts down on paper and collecting a file would not be foolish.

Although the forms change over the years, the Selective Service will invariably ask the following four questions:

## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

### **1. What are your beliefs?**

The Selective Service is interested in knowing:

- a. Do you believe in God?
- b. If so, what are the teachings of your God?
- c. Are you a church member?
- d. What are the teachings of your church about war?
- e. To what extent do you believe in using force for self-defense?

Simply stating what you believe is not enough here. You need to explain why these beliefs have led you to be a CO. Remember, there are many who claim they believe all the Bible like you, yet they are not COs. What makes you different?

This scares me! Some of our kids can't even give the plan of salvation and they may someday have to give a biblically based reason for objecting to war!

### **2. Which kind of CO are you?**

If you claim the 1-O classification you must explain why your conscience will not allow you to participate in a non-combatant position. Be prepared to answer questions like:

- a. Why do you pay income taxes?  
(over half the national budget pays to support the military.)
- b. What is wrong with being a cook?
- c. What is wrong with being a supply sergeant?

### **3. Where did your beliefs come from?**

- a. How did your parents rear you?
- b. What people have influenced your beliefs?
- c. What books have influenced your beliefs?
- d. How long have you held these beliefs?

The draft board is not supposed to deny a request based solely on recent development (U.S. vs. Ehlert—Johnson, p. 91). But, a man who can point to a long history of beliefs is certainly more believable than a neophyte!

### **4. What shows your sincerity?**

This is the most difficult area, but perhaps the most important! The most common reason for denying CO claims during the Vietnam era was that the local draft boards did not believe the applicant was sincere! Be prepared to demonstrate that you "practice what you preach!"

## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

**Illustration:** Brother Alton Baker described his case to me several years ago. He was denied his I-O request by the local draft board, and had to appeal his case to the State Appeals Board. The appeal board asked several interesting questions:

"What kind of T.V. shows do you watch?" (He didn't have a T.V.)

"What kind of movies do you go to?" (He didn't go to movies.)

"What kind of magazines do you read?" ("Progressive Farmer.")

The FBI was called in to investigate his life. He was found to be blameless! Later he was allowed to read his file the FBI composed and he discovered one of his neighbors had said: "Yes, I believe Alton is a conscientious objector . . . the whole family is kind of weird!"

How would it fare with you? Would there be enough evidence to prove to a draft board that you were sincere in your claim as a CO?

Just remember, you can fool the brethren, you can fool your friends and you can fool yourself, but you cannot fool a local draft board! It's high time we either shaped up, or shipped out!

**Note:** The Selective Service forms are designed to encourage brief, one paragraph answers to these questions. Draft experts say, "Don't fall for it." Use extra paper to fully explain all questions, but don't go overboard and submit a forty-page application because the local board will not take the time to read that much.

### **When Should One File For CO Status?**

The last draft calls were issued in 1972, and the President's authority to draft men expired on July 1, 1973. Since that time the U.S. has relied on volunteers for its armed forces. Registration continued until 1975 and was then suspended, but reinstated in the summer of 1980. Today this country is on "standby" registration. All men must register with the Selective Service within thirty days of their 18th birthday and must notify the Selective Service of any changes until their 26th birthday. At the present, no one is being classified by the Selective Service.

However, in the event a war breaks out and the draft is reinstated, a man must file for CO status only after he has received an induction notice, but

## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

before he reports for induction. This can be as little as ten days. If you do not file during this brief period, you may lose all chance of filing at all!

**Advice:** Although the Selective Service does not classify men at this time here are some suggestions that are worth considering:

1. When registering, write on the registration form that you are a CO.
2. When sending a change of address form, write on the form that you are a CO.
3. Some have submitted letters and some complete written applications that they are COs.

**Advice:** During the present peacetime, young people and their parents could prepare a document stating: (1) what they believe and (2) why they believe it. Then have it notarized. This notarized document could help prove the "sincerity" requirements and would help establish that the CO plea is not newly founded just to avoid war.

### **More Points to Consider**

CO applicants are required to appear personally before the local draft board for a hearing. If you cannot attend the meeting it can be rescheduled, but if you do not attend the rescheduled hearing your claim will be denied and you cannot appeal the decision!

Some draft boards automatically deny the request to test the sincerity of the CO. If you do not appeal the case, or if you do not attend the scheduled hearings you will bring doubt upon the sincerity of your claim.

If an appeal board is unanimous in rejecting a CO request, there is no further appeal (Johnson, p. 100). However, there are other recourses.

### **Further Recourses**

1. The National Selective Service Director has the power to order reconsideration of claims regardless of the vote of the appeals board. He could help if you sent your file to him and requested his intervention. A sympathetic member of Congress could aid in presenting your case to the National Selective Service Director.
2. The local board must consider any substantial new evidence you present, and they could re-open your case, entitling you to a new set of appeal rights (Johnson, p. 100).



## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

3. Refusing induction. Some men find there is no relief in sight and when ordered to appear for induction they refuse induction rather than enter into the military and violate their consciences! Statistics show that only one in a thousand objectors who refuse induction, after trying every avenue of appeal, will be imprisoned for refusing induction . . . but that's little comfort if your that one guy in a thousand!

The government simply cannot win a case where a person: (a) files a valid CO claim; (b) pursues all his avenues of appeal; and (c) follows through by refusing induction.

If anything, his refusal of induction is further proof of his CO claim. Here is a man that would risk prosecution rather than violate his conscience! In many cases the U.S. Attorney will review the case, decline prosecution and send the file back to the local board with recommendations to "reconsider" the claim in light of the new evidence of sincerity.

**Note:** Those who refused induction and violated some other regulation (e.g. late registration, failure to send in change of address, etc.) were sure to land in a prison cell! Persons considering refusal of induction are advised to keep their records clean. A conviction carries a maximum five year prison sentence and \$10,000 fine, but the usual sentence (during Vietnam) was three years of probation with two years of alternate service work. Plus you will now have a police record as a convicted felon.

### **Alternate Service Work**

Once you receive a 1-O classification it is up to you to find a job that is approved by the Selective Service. If you do not find your own job the Selective Service will assign you a job . . . and you can be sure they will assign you the lousiest job they can find!

If you refuse to comply with a work order you can be prosecuted the same as if you refused an induction. Those convicted for refusing to comply with a work order stand a stronger chance of conviction than someone who refuses an induction order. Apparently the courts feel that a CO has already been given a break.

### **What If . . . ? (Case #1)**

Before closing, I would like to look briefly at two of the more commonly used arguments used against conscientious objection. The most common objection offered against conscientious objection is the hypothetical case:

## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

"What would you do if someone broke into your house and tried to attack your wife?"

We're going to have to answer this question better than we have in the past! One preacher among us said in the pulpit that he didn't know what he would do . . . he might even beat the intruder to death with a baseball bat. You can rest assured that such an answer will not impress a draft board!

This "what if" argument is designed to say that if you defend your family from an evil villain, then you are not really a CO. There are at least two major weaknesses in this argument:

**First:** This argument does not compare with war. Even if I admitted that I could shoot and kill an attacker to defend my family, I could still, with consistency, reject war.

Self-Defense	vs.	War
If I killed the intruder the man guilty of the crime is the only one killed. I would not go to his house and begin killing his wife and kids and parents and aunts and uncles!		But in war millions of innocent people are destroyed. Entire villages and cities are ransacked—not just the innocent ones guilty of wrong-doing.
If an attacker intrudes my home, he is clearly the guilty party. He has no right for his attack.		But in war, a nation that is completely innocent and one that is completely guilty difficult to pinpoint.
If I kill the intruder my actions will be reviewed by a court of law. If the court determines that I used unwarranted, excessive force I will go to prison.		But in war there is no higher court to decide whether one nation acted justly, or not.

Even our government recognizes the fact that a man defending himself in his home is not equivalent to fighting in a war:

Army Regulation 600-43:

## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

A conscientious objector is not necessarily a pacifist. An applicant may be willing to use force to protect himself or his family and still be a conscientious objector (D-2).

**Second:** There are unwarranted assumptions in this argument. To some people conscientious objection requires that:

1. A man must sit passively in a chair and twiddle his thumbs while his wife is being attacked.
2. He cannot yell.
3. He cannot lift a phone and call for the police.
4. He cannot interpose himself between his wife and the attacker.
5. He cannot interfere in any fashion, but must allow the attacker unobstructed access to his wife.

Furthermore, this argument assumes some rather vital points. It assumes that killing the intruder is the only possible solution. We cannot disarm the intruder. We cannot restrain the intruder. We cannot flee. We cannot stop short of lethal force! Foy Wallace wrote:

R. L. Whiteside said, that if he should see a criminal dragging an innocent woman or girl into a secluded spot to assault her, he would have no more compunction of conscience against shooting down that criminal than to shoot a mad dog attacking a child. We subscribe to that statement UNRESERVEDLY (*Sermon on the Mount*, p. 225).

In other words, Wallace would not try to restrain the man. No, he would skip over every possible alternative and jump immediately to the most destructive force available. This reasoning is invalid, unscriptural and anti-Christian! No one can review the life of Jesus Christ and honestly reach these conclusions made by Wallace!

### **The Use of Force**

**Question:** May a Christian ever use force in subduing an intruder in our homes?

To answer this question we must first recognize that force comes in two basic forms: (1) passive force, and (2) active force. Let us begin with the first form of force and analyze it.

# *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

## **Passive Force**

Passive force may be broken down into various subdivisions:

### **1. Barricades**

Examples of this type of passive force would include:

- a. A lock on a door
- b. Bars on a window
- c. A fence with a barbed wire at the top
- d. A big dog in the yard

These things are designed to “force” intruders to stay on the outside. None of these things violate any scriptural principle. In John 20:19 the disciples met behind “shut” doors for fear of the Jews (those “shut” doors were probably barred). And in Acts 12:13-16 the saints met behind a “shut” gate through which Peter could not enter. We could, scripturally, make proper use of locks and bars to prevent intruders!

### **2. Flight**

This “forces” an intruder from fulfilling his intentions. We could flee our homes if an intruder came in.

- a. Jesus told the disciples to flee when being persecuted (Mt. 10:23).
- b. Paul fled Damascus to save his life (Acts 9:25).

### **3. Appeal to the Police**

This is what God “ordained” them for (Rom. 13:1-4). Paul appealed to the civil authorities for protection (Acts 25:10-11). But, the Christian is strictly warned by God not to become a civil law enforcer and administer the vengeance (Rom. 12:17-21).

## **Active Force**

Active force comes in two forms: (1) destructive force; (2) restraining force.

**1. Destructive Force**—“the intentional taking of life in order to achieve some given goal.” Killing in self-defense and war are examples of destructive force. These are forbidden to the Christian.

### **2. Restraining Force**

- a. This is not intended to destroy life.

## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

- b. It does not seek to inflict bodily injury, or harm of any kind.
- c. Its purpose is to restrain so as to prevent injury, or death.
- d. It is prompted by love and executed so that all concerned will benefit.
- e. There is no destruction of any kind.

"Restraining force" does not mean that violent actions of all kind are excluded! The issue is not violence vs. non-violence, but rather destruction vs. preservation.

An example of active, restraining force is spanking a child. If you asked the child he would agree this was restraining force of a violent nature. This type of active force is approved of in both the Old Testament and New Testament (Prov. 13:24; 22:15; 29:15; Heb. 12:9-11). This active, restraining force protects a child from future harm to himself, or to society. Injury or death are the farthest things from the parents' intentions!

Another example of "active, restraining force" might be found in a mental institution. Suppose a mental patient goes berserk. Active, restraining force might be necessary to stop him from harming himself, or others. William Paul wrote:

The motive must always be to preserve BOTH the violent person AND those he may injure. To take the one's life to spare the others would be a destructive force unacceptable to the Christian (A Christian View of Armed Warfare, 100).

In view of the command to "Recompense to NO MAN evil for evil" (Rom. 12:17), I can arrive at no other possible conclusion! Even if my life were on the line, I cannot return evil for evil to this man that has intruded my home.

### **Summary**

To answer the question we would say:

1. A Christian should lock his doors
2. Call for the police
3. If possible, flee for safer quarters
4. If necessary, use active restraining force that would be designed to protect both the violent offender and those he may injure.

## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

I realize this would not be an easy course to follow, but I thank God that He will not allow us to be tested above what we are able to withstand! (1 Cor. 10:13).

### **What If . . . ? (Case #2)**

The second most commonly asked question is: "What if everyone believed like you did?" To that I would say, "Wonderful!" At last there would be peace in the world!

But the antagonist would reply, "I worded that wrong. What I meant to say was: "What if all Americans believed like you did? Wouldn't the Communists march right in and take away our freedoms?"

In response, I would offer a five point reply:

#### **1. It will never happen!**

Matthew 7:14—"Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and FEW there be that find it."

#### **2. It would be a great testimony to the faith!**

If all 250 million Americans believed so strongly in Jesus that they would suffer martyrdom for His cause, it would be the noblest witness to Christianity the world has ever seen!

#### **3. Think of the implications of this argument.**

This argument implies that if every American became a Christian and lived like Jesus that would be the worst thing that could happen!

The possibility of all Americans becoming and acting like Christians is a wonderful thought. There's no telling what would happen, but I would like to witness it myself!

#### **4. Would not God protect us?**

Barton W. Stone said,

We may imagine a thousand difficulties; but have we not a king in Zion, who is zealous for the glory of His Church upon earth? Is He not almighty? Can He not check and restrain the opposing power? Will He not hear prayer, and impose in time of need? To these queries our enlightened judgment answers in the affirmative; but where is our faith? Can we trust in this king? (Rogers, pp. 15-16).

## *Carnal Warfare—CO Status*

---

**5. I know this much, we would gain life.**

**Matthew 10:39**—He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.

Lee Rogers wrote:

If religious convictions are not worth suffering, yes, even dying for, then that religion is not the religion of Jesus Christ. There is something more precious than life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness . . . and that something is the standard of spiritual values which makes the Christian every man's neighbor and every man's brother (p. 107).

If we are not careful in our reasonings, we will reason away the need to ever lay down our lives for the sake of Christ! We will keep reasoning and debating until we convince ourselves that under no circumstances, at no time, and for no reason should a Christian have to die for that which he believes! God forbid that we should think like that! I know that someday our faith in Christ is going to cost some of us our property and our lives!

**2 Timothy 3:12**—"Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution."

May God give us the strength to endure!

**Matthew 5:11-12**—"11 Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. 12 Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you."

*2710 Somerton Dr., Morrow, GA 30260*

### **Headship-Helpership: And The Curse of Genesis 3:16**

*by Ron Courter*

Our topic of study and focus is not the total judgment sentence of Genesis 3:14-19; where judgment is pronounced upon the serpent (v. 14-15), the woman (v. 16) and Adam (v. 17-19). Our attention will fall upon Genesis 3:16 which reads:

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

To the woman he said, I will greatly increase your pains in childbearing; with pain you will give birth to children. Your desire will be to your husband, and he will rule over you (NIV).

Specifically, we shall examine what this passage says or implies regarding the relationship of husband and wife in marriage, since sin has entered the world and tainted the divine institution. In reality, the study becomes an examination of Bible teaching regarding headship and helpership.

Marriage is associated with dreamy ideas of bliss and peace, but it is no secret in our day that marriage is strongly associated with the problem of conflict. Genesis 3:16 appears to signal this conflict that could now be expected.

It is not absolutely necessary, but it is important by way of introduction to say a few words regarding God's Word and our present day cultural setting. We are living in a world that appears almost daily to loose itself from Bible moorings and to disregard Bible values. This age cries for help, explanations and standards; but shuns the revelation from heaven, when it teaches contrary to present-day cultural values. We are told the Bible must be deculturized. There is probably no area where this plea has been raised more than the topic of headship and helpership.

People are constantly saying the Bible reflects a first century life-style, but surely this is not true. A very casual reading of the New Testament reveals a calling away of people from the typical first century life-style. The first century society was not living as the Bible outlines the Christian home. The life-style presented Biblically is not a choice between a first



## Curse of Genesis 3:16

century life-style and a present century life-style, but a question of a godly life-style in contrast to an ungodly life-style.

When the world appears to want less and less of the Word of God, we can be sure we are in a period when we need more and more of God's Word to understand what is happening. We cannot expect the child of God to view the changing world in which he lives properly without awareness and acceptance of foundational truths found in the Genesis record. Men are going to be tossed with every human opinion unless they focus on the basic truths in Genesis. A perspective that is Bible in origin and Christian in content cannot be pressed or maintained without considering what the Bible says about the world that was, the world that is and the world that shall be.

The world that God created is different from the world we now live in (Gen. 1:31). Sin and its consequences have marred that original creation. There were ordinances at creation regarding man made in the image of God, mankind's role of dominion over the earth and its creatures, and marriage and the procreation of offspring.

The ordinances of God ordained in the creation are still in effect, but they have been altered by sin. "The fall did bring revolutionary changes into man's life; yet these ordinances are still in effect and they indicate that the interests and occupations which lay closest to man's heart in original integrity must still lie close to his heart in the fallen state" (Murray, p. 44). Our world still has identity and continuity with the created order, but it also has distortion and disruption with the created order. We dare not forget either in our search for truth. Genesis 3:14-19 bears testimony to the world that is, and the tension of the hour (Rom. 8:22) cannot be understood without awareness of the concept of sin. Man is in a preternatural condition.

We are living in a world marred by sin, but a world that does not want to admit the idea of sin, let alone it practice (Rom. 5:12). Genesis 3:14-19 is a statement of the judgment due to sin that reveals change in the original order.

The judgment in Genesis 3:16 relates to the woman in her relationship as wife and mother. The judgment in Genesis 3:17-19 relates to the man in his relationship as husband and provider. The woman feels the effects of sin in her role as wife and mother. The man feels the effects of sin in his role as husband and provider. Both feel the effects of sin in their marriage relationship.

The effects upon both are due to the judgment caused by sin and is described with the words pain and toil. The bringing forth of life from the

## *Curse of Genesis 3:16*

---

womb or the bowels of the earth will involve pain and toil. The consequence of sin is death and it will affect the reproduction of human life, animal life and plant life.

The original relationship and condition of God to mankind, mankind to God, man to woman, and woman to man are disrupted and marred. The harmony of Eden is replaced by domination and struggle. This is true whether we speak of:

1. Humanity's relationship to God
2. Humanity's interrelationship of male and female
3. Humanity's relationship to the rest of the creation.

There is no surprise to the Bible reader when Paul writes "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now."

Let us note the curse is not childbearing. Genesis 1:28 reads, "And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Procreation was in the creative ordinances and sin affects it, but does not cause the suspension of procreation.

Let us note the curse is not labor. Genesis 2:15 reads, "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it." Labor was not introduced by sin or suspended by sin, but it was affected by sin.

When Satan attacked the creation of God and its order, where did he attack? It was upon God's order of headship and helpers. The sins of mankind usually are tied somewhere to the root problem of self-rule (Gen. 3:5; Jer. 10:23).

It is critical to a proper Bible perspective to realize that woman was made subordinate to man before sin entered into the world. The headship of man and the helpers of woman was from the beginning. Let us establish this truth from the Bible. The creation account mirrors the mutuality of male and female, but also reflects the headship of the male from the beginning. Genesis 1:27 is a general statement regarding the creation of mankind and it then states, "male and female created he them" (cf. Gen. 5:2). The details of these opening statements regarding creation of mankind is found in the second chapter of Genesis (Gen. 2:7-8, 15, 19, 22). Genesis 2:18 reads, "And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him and help meet for him." Verse 20 reads, "And Adam gave names

## Curse of Genesis 3:16

to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him." Headship is founded upon the fact that the man Adam was:

1. First made
2. Named creatures and Genesis 3:20 states he named Eve
3. Woman was made from man.

1 Corinthians 11:8, 9 reads, "For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man." 1 Timothy 2:13-14 reads, "For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." The New Testament affirms headship before sin (we will say more about verse 14 later in this writing).

It seems highly contradictory to the previous Bible statements to declare that headship was only established after sin. There was headship in the original creation ordinances, but due to the equality and mutuality of the male and female nature, and the likeness and oneness of their work, it was not stated explicitly before sin. It was not necessary to be as explicit prior to sin.

There is one essential statement that needs to be declared regarding the original headship. It was loving headship (Eph. 5:28-29). Woman was made from man and we know that no man ever yet hated his own flesh. It is unfortunate that teaching on headship-helpership over the years has not spent more time on emphasizing loving headship. This is especially true, since the impression has often been left that helpership is due to an inferior nature in the helper. The Bible does not base submissiveness on inferiority, but due to distinction of function for orderly accomplishments and maintaining the ordained order of God. This is essential to man's well being and to God's glory.

The Bible declares that headship was established prior to sin and it only follows that helpership was likewise established. Recall Genesis 2:18 reads, "I will make an help meet for him." The thought is, "I will make a helper, who is fit or appropriate for man." The word "helper" does not imply inferiority in nature. Headship and helpership are not really concerned with making a statement regarding inferiority or superiority. The word "helper" is applied to the Lord. Psalms 33:20 reads, "Our soul waiteth for the Lord: he is our help and our shield" (cf. Ps. 146:5). Ephesians 5:22 reads, "Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord." The word

## *Curse of Genesis 3:16*

---

"submit" saying nothing regarding individual differences in nature of husband and wife, but it is referring to the functional order of rank.

There is one essential statement that needs to be declared regarding the original helpship. It was submissive helpship. Ephesians 5:22 reads, "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is head of the church: and he is the savior of the body" (cf. v. 33). It was to be submissive helpship, because it was to help the head and is rendered as obedience unto the Lord.

The mutuality of male and female and their equality is clear from the original Bible statements. Genesis 1:26-28 reveals they were to be co-regents for God of His creation. The mutuality of nature is seen in being made in the image of God and the one was made from the other. Foh wrote, "God's creation of humanity is one act which begins with the man and ends with the woman" (p. 61). The equality of the sexes is found in the fact that together they make up the aggregate of humanity.

The mutuality of husband and wife is cited in many passages. Actually, the statement made about marriage in Genesis 2:22-24 could not be more precise regarding a mutuality. The New Testament reads, "Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman: but all things of God" (1 Cor. 11:12). Paul touched upon the mutuality of husband and wife when he wrote, "The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife" (1 Cor. 7:4).

Woman was created, not for a separate and independent existence, but in response to man's need, to help him. Man, already created and called to his life work by the voice of God and by his physical, mental and moral endowments, was not equal to the right performance of his work; and woman came, not to another and different work of her own, but to enter into man's work supplementing and completing his efficiency. She was not to do it for him, releasing him, and bearing his burden in his stead; but with him, helping him to do it (Wilkin, p. 95).

It is probably true that God's Word does not say near as much about the difference of man and woman's nature, as has been typically inferred. We would do better teaching and emphasizing the significance of the concepts of loving headship and submissive helpship to God's ordained order. These

## Curse of Genesis 3:16

principles are absolutely essential for the welfare of mankind and a society that has concepts where the gospel can take root. How could you evangelize a society that knows nothing of headship and submissiveness? When headship and helpship die within a society, where is the good soil going to be found for the seed?

It is very important to realize that mutuality of nature and even ability does not mean equality is found in uniformity or role-interchangeability. Christians need to realize the call for equality, role-interchange, self-actualization and human rights today are frequently founded upon a cultural concept of equality that is non-Biblical and opposes the authority structures of God's ordained order.

The problem of headship and helpship appears to be twofold. The world emotionally has been permitted to leave the impression submission and helping teaches inferiority of one's nature. This is not true. The church has done more than a little teaching on the submissive helper, but may be guilty of not giving the appropriate Bible reasoning. For example, submissiveness has been strongly permitted to rest on some suspicion inherent inequality of nature between male and female. Typically, this is related to Eve and her role in sin, but such is surely a two-edged sword. Adam sinned, but many are quick to add that Eve was deceived. The point is Adam also sinned. Does the fact Adam sinned means we now look for a different inherent weakness or inequality of nature in the man? Do we conclude the woman's nature is lacking a certain something, so she is more easily deceived? Do we conclude man's nature is lacking a certain something so he tends to be more irresponsible? It would seem more sensible and Biblically correct to view these words about deception; not so much as a reflection on the nature of the person, as the nature of the sin and the great Tempter.

Recall 1 Timothy 2:13-14 reads, "For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." I am skeptical that verse 14 is a statement regarding the distinctiveness of nature between Adam and Eve. I do suspect the statement relates to the nature of the first sin and the cleverness of Satan to hide the truth being violated.

Paul states in 1 Timothy 2:13 that headship and helpship were established by the order of creation. He adds the position of headship and helpship are supported due to the nature of the fall. We learn:

1. Adam was not deceived. The word deceive means "to cheat, deceive, beguile, mislead, or delude" (Jas. 1:26, Eph. 5:6, Gen. 3:13).

## *Curse of Genesis 3:16*

---

2. Eve was definitely deceived. The original wording emphasized this fact. Again, the word means to deceive or cheat someone (Rom. 7:11; 16:18; 1 Cor. 3:18; 2 Cor. 11:3; 2 Thess. 2:3).

We tend to take the thought of deception and begin to perceive something mystical concerning the nature of woman and begin to cultivate sexual stereotypes. But does the Bible leave it there or even lead us there? I think not. Paul wrote in 2 Corinthians 11:3, "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtility, so your minds be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." Paul seems to find that the deception of Eve was more due to the subtility of the serpent, than a fallacy in the woman's nature.

There is nothing in Genesis 1-3 to suggest that the woman was inferior to the man in any way or more susceptible to temptation than he; she was a part of him (one flesh). The cleverness of the serpent consists in his method of temptation, his half truths, his slight distortion of God's truth, not in his choice of victims . . . they are on equal footing regarding their susceptibility to sin. (Foh, p. 63).

The word "subtility" means literally "readiness to do anything." It conveys here evil cunning, craftiness, trickery. We can examine the word in Luke 20:23 (craftiness); also 1 Corinthians 3:19; 2 Corinthians 4:2 and cunning in Ephesians 4:14. The deception that overwhelmed Eve could overtake any of us due to Satan's extreme cunningness in evil ways. The lesson here is to consider the nature of the sin and learn a very important lesson regarding headship and helpship. Do not be deceived by the modern sound of rights and equality.

Paul does not aver that the woman was mentally, morally or spiritually inferior to man. But it was she who was deceived in the matter of doctrine. By taking headship over the man, she ate first and then gave to her husband to eat. Thus the fall was caused not only by disobeying God's command not to eat, but also by violating the divinely appointed relation between the sexes. Woman assumed headship, and man with full knowledge of the act, subordinated himself to her headship and ate of the fruit (Rom. 5:19). Both violated their positions. This subordination of woman to man is not Paul's invention. It is rooted in the very nature of the sexes and was put there by God himself. Disaster comes when this relationship is violated (Kent, p. 114-115).

## *Curse of Genesis 3:16*

---

Headship and helpship are dying in the social order about us. The maintenance of society depends on the reinforcement of the headship-helpship concept. Marriage, family, church, government and even labor relationships are all dependent on this order. Let us awake to the thrust of Satan's attack. It is right where he began. The cry for equality from the world that has the ear of many Christians this very day is not a Bible cry. We recall someone wrote that both Adam and Eve were out of place. Paul is stating one is to lead and one is to follow in 1 Timothy chapter two. We need to grasp that truth and not become involved in theories regarding male and female differences. Do you recall what was said to Adam in announcing judgment upon him? "And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it" (Gen. 3:17).

Sin changes things, especially loving headship and submissive helpship when Satan successfully attacks that God-given order. They were so perfectly functional in God's original order and there was little need for explicit attention. But sin entered and that brought conflict. Headship and helpship once the implement of peace, will now become an implement of war. They will no longer necessarily become an aid to the mutuality of humanity and God's order, but can easily become a source of tension. It can now become a focal point in the spiritual battle for the souls of mankind. This brings us specifically to words of Genesis 3:16.

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

There shall be an increase, an intensity of labor, pain and trouble in the bearing of children. We do not know what degree of difficulty there was to originally be in the birth of children, but we do know that once sin entered death became a possibility at childbirth. It has been written, "Henceforth must the woman purchase the gain of children, with the danger of her life—in a certain degree with spiritual readiness for death, and the sacrifice of her life for that end" (Crawford, vol. 2, p. 157).

I am not sure this passage should be restricted as a reference only to the time of birth. Motherhood will now be associated with the difficulties of rearing children in a sinful environment. It will be associated with a home environment where the roles of headship and helpship could possibly be in conflict, neither loving or submissive.

## *Curse of Genesis 3:16*

---

Nor should we overlook the fact that implicit in this penalty is the portrait of the many mother's hearts which have been broken by the neglect, waywardness, the carelessness, the rebelliousness of sons and daughters: e.g., as in the story of mother of Eve and her son Cain (Crawford, Vol. 2, p. 157).

The words that capture our utmost interest is "and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." This is a statement of judgment due to sin. It is a declaration of what shall be since sin entered the world by attacking the principle of headship and helpship. Note, it is not a statement of the original normal order or nature given by God in creation.

How is this phrase typically interpreted? "Desire" is commonly associated with the thought of sexual desire. It is often implied it is inherent within woman's nature to be controlled by a man. These typical interpretations need some critical examination before being permitted to dominate the day. The original order of woman from man and the completing of mankind by the making of woman would include the sexual desires. Therefore, the most common interpretation of this phrase is suspect. This is something beyond the original order in this verse, because it is a judgment due to sin.

The word "desire" means "to compel, to impel or urge, to seek control." It seems difficult to derive a basic meaning from our readings. But the root does not mean excitation, loving or psychological desire. The etymology of the word does not fix the term to mean sexual desires. Its used in Genesis 4:7 would certainly agree with this understanding.

Does the common interpretation of Genesis 3:16 seem to agree with the experience of mankind? The answer seems to be "no." For example:

1. Do not men have strong sexual desires at least equal to women?
2. Do we find it is historically true that women have loved and enjoyed being dominated by a husband?

Some view the words "thy desire shall be to thy husband" as simply being restated by the words "he shall rule over thee." We recognize Hebrew poetry does use repetitious statements, but what is the judgment or hardship from sin if this is the case? What would be the hardship if the woman merely loses her will to her husband? This verse is a statement of hardship and struggle, since sin has entered the original harmony is disrupted.

The key objection to the common interpretation is that Genesis 3:16 is not a statement of the normal relationship of God's order, but it is a state-



## *Curse of Genesis 3:16*

---

ment of judgment and curse. The normal relationship of loving headship and submissive helpship is corrupted and changed.

1. Does the common view of desire meaning "seeking her husband's protection" fit the idea of judgment due to sin? The answer is no.
2. Why does the Word of God constantly instruct the woman to submit to and reverence her husband, if the common interpretation of desire to her husband is correct? It would be innate and a given.
3. The common interpretations all have the desire of the woman aiding in the husband's ruling over her. Yet, this passage is speaking of difficulties due to the violation of that original order. This is what shall be with sin influencing the relationship.

Genesis 3:16 then is God's judgment because of sin. We have a picture of what it shall be like since sin has attacked loving headship and submissive helpship. I ask the reader to consider and test the idea that these clauses regarding desire and rule are expressions that are antithetical. They express the conflict and struggle between husband and wife since sin has marred God's original order. It is now evident, due to the nature of the first sin, that the woman's desire will be to control her husband when sin functions in her life. The husband will respond unlovingly to suppress her desire for control when sin functions in his life.

Sin has brought conflict into the marriage relationship. Why is that true?

1. Submissive helpship has been corrupted.
2. Loving headship has been corrupted.

The desire of the woman will not contribute to the rule of her husband. Sin has entered and helpship and headship will be in conflict due to sin. Indeed, the passage indicates struggle. This is reality and this is why we need the Word of heaven to prepare us for marriage, not the dreams woven by the musical lyrics of man.

Let us consider a comparison between Genesis 3:16 and Genesis 4:7. "The Hebrew of these two verses is exactly the same, except for appropriate changes in person and gender" (Foh, p. 68). Herein is an expression of struggle.

1. Genesis 3:16 "And thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."
2. Genesis 4:7 "And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him."

## *Curse of Genesis 3:16*

---

Genesis 4:7 reads, "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him."

What is happening here? Cain is given another opportunity by God, but is warned that sin desires to control him. Therefore Cain, you must master sin and control it. Sin is crouching at the door and is striving to overwhelm you. This passage depicts the struggle between Cain and sin. Genesis 3:16 depicts the struggle over headship and helpship, since sin has entered. The wife shall through sin desire to have headship and the husband shall suppress through sin to maintain his headship. The word "rule" means to reign or rule. The idea seems to be "install in an office or elevate to an official position." Possibly, we have a hint here at the difference between holding a position out of strength rather than respect.

It is unlikely that Genesis 3:16 is any more indicative than Genesis 4:7. Did Cain rule over sin? No. Does a husband always rule over his wife? No.

1. Do all husbands rule their wives? NO.
2. Do all women desire their own husbands? NO.
3. Do we live in a society where the struggle for headship is constant among mankind? Yes!

Genesis 3:16 is a picture of the normality of conflict with sin's influence on headship and helpship. Here is the real origin of the so-called "battle of the sexes." This is why marriage is universally associated with conflict.

The woman's desire is to control her husband (to usurp his divinely appointed headship), and he must master her, if he can. Sin has corrupted both the willing submission of the wife and the loving headship of the husband. And so the rule of love founded in paradise is replaced by struggle, tyranny, domination and manipulation (Foh, p. 69).

Foh writes, "Genesis 3:16, which is a judgment rather than a prescription or commandment, implies the subordination of the wife to her husband; the curse of Genesis 3:16 is that the woman will resist the headship of her husband and so marriage will involve struggle" (p. 48).

It is evident Adam and Eve from the nature of your sin the principle of headship and helpship will be the battleground of the future due to sin. Adam and Eve, you have both lost and so has mankind. The headship of man will not be seasoned with love, as before, but now a supremacy, an

## *Curse of Genesis 3:16*

---

installation over and a tendency to despotic rule when challenged. The headship becomes harsh due to sin, not because of headship. Remember, there was headship before sin. The helpership's desire to control will bring the very opposite of what is most helpful. Eve you usurped headship, so now ironically you will experience harsh rule. Adam, you were not a responsible head and sinned, so now she will continue to try to lead. How very true this is to patterns of conflict today. She shall desire to control and he shall rule without love. Hence, cometh wars and fightings among you. (Jas. 4:1).

This solemn judgment due to sin gives marriage a different perspective than the typical anticipations expressed. One might be tempted at this point to say if this is true, it would be better not to marry. This is not the first time the words of heaven have made the Lord's disciples consider the merits of marriage. Matthew 19:10 reads, "His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry." But we can thank God of heaven for the rest of the story.

The Bible teaches that due to sin a tremendous conflict regarding headship and helpership can mar the life of the family and the order of the world. Family life will be very difficult with the tensions of headship and helpership unattended properly. The only answer to resolving this conflict is in Christ. We must permit the word of Christ to dwell in us richly to combat and overcome the judgment of Genesis 3:16. Genesis 3:16 is well comprehended in the words of Ephesians 5:33. "Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband." The guidance of this teaching translated into daily living will bring us as close to the restoration of the original order as is possible in a world where our spirits are housed in fleshly bodies and we live in a world so drastically influenced by the consequences of centuries of sin.

We will do well to turn again to the Word of God and examine the teaching on headship and helpership. It is essential truth to God's restored order. A Bible perspective does not make us surprised when Paul wrote, "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord." The wife will do well to see her subjection rendered to her husband is also to the Lord. The Scriptures are not saying the husband's authority is the same as Christ's authority (1 Cor. 11:3), but that "wives cannot obey Christ without yielding obedience to their husbands" (Foh, p. 131; A quote from Calvin in Lenski). Wilkins wrote, "The subjection which is rendered by the wife to the husband, is at the same time rendered to the Lord Christ himself" (p. 255). The manner of submission is as unto the lord, the motive is that the husband is the head of the wife and the model is Christ and the church.

## *Curse of Genesis 3:16*

---

A Bible perspective does not make us surprised when Paul wrote, "Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it." The husband should be loving in his headship, because it is ordained as a duty and not a privilege. Let the husband remember they are one flesh and that in God's authority structure of marriage, she is distinguished as the weaker vessel. She is not noted as an inferior vessel. She is the weaker vessel because she has agreed in marriage to place herself under you (cf. 1 Pet. 3:1-7). The wife can only appeal to you to change, even when your decisions are unwise. A husband may have unwise tendencies. They may be annoying to his wife. But let her confidence and trust remain in the Lord and aid her husband helpfully and singly. Therefore, consider her preciousness and fragile state in marriage to you and honor her. The church is under Christ for her spiritual well-being, so the wife under you should be for spiritual well-being and not your own selfish ends. Husband, love the wife who willingly placed herself under your headship in marriage, lest the spiritual heritage of both of you are hindered.

Bible truth is lovely indeed when seen in its entirety and can lift us above the best of human thought when we gladly and fully receive it. Kittel wrote,

The tensions in the relationship between husband and wife, recognized already in Genesis, are resolved in Christ. For the self giving of the wife acquires a new dedication, and the impulse of the husband a new content and standard, in agape. The wife is no longer surrendered to the husband; she is entrusted in him. He does not have rights of Lordship over her, he takes responsibility for her. (Vol. 1, p. 656).

When the desire to not be a submissive helper and the temptation to not be a loving head arises within our bosoms it can only be offset by examining ourself under the headship of Christ. We must permit His will to mold and cause our responses when sin attempts to contaminate our marriage. The critical key at this point is not to go to the Word of God to find our spouse's fault, but to learn what God asks us to do in the situation to be a submissive helper or a loving head.

Lenski wrote of marriage and sin saying,

Sin entered and disturbed this relation. Eve fell, Adam followed, God's order was subverted. In the state of sin the divine and blessed order is disturbed in two directions: wives seek to rule their husbands and refuse loving subjection; husbands tyrannize their wives often to the point of enslaving them. End-

## Curse of Genesis 3:16

less woe results. Christianity restores the divine order with all happiness (**Interpretation of Galations, Ephesians, Philip-pians**, p. 628).

The Bible clearly reveals the mutuality of male and female, while calling for distinctiveness for functional order founded upon the wisdom of God. The enjoined duties given to guide husbands and wives in the Bible receive their greatest clarity when it is seen that these matters of living are to prevent our stumbling. They are to help us not stumble by the subtility of Satan, as Eve and Adam did in the garden. May children of the kingdom realize that whether the issue is of home duties, providing for the family, raising children, dressing appropriately, letting the hair grow, or permitting or not permitting to be a teacher; the issue is not a question of first century culture, but the preservation of God's ordained order. It relates to our spiritual welfare and the glory and honor of the creator and sustainer of the universe.

May godly men and women everywhere realize the cultural theme of the hour is very often not the best, but may be a snare to their spiritual heritage. Frankly it is often contrary to God's teaching regarding headship and helpship. May godly men and women everywhere realize submissiveness does not imply inferiority of nature.

Bible submissiveness casts no reflection on the delicate and honored being of godly women. Truly, the word "submit" means "to put under and be subject." But "**buotosso** refers to a functional lining up and in no way implies a difference in essence" (MacArthur, p. 14). The word literally means "to rank under." It is a matter of order and authority, not value or ability. We surely all recognize a higher rank does not necessarily mean a better person. It is necessary to realize that structure and function calls for authority and submissiveness, while the personal relationships within those structures calls for mutual respect and helping one another.

The world's teaching about equality is leading us astray from appropriate authority structures. The very relationship of God the Father and Christ the Son and the relationship of Christ and the church reveals subordination in will and sphere of work does not necessitate a badge of dishonor or inferiority of nature. 1 Corinthians 11:3 reads, "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is man; and the head of Christ is God."

Let us permit the words of Christ to reinforce the role of submission and honor. "Jesus said unto them, My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work" (Jn. 4:34). Again it reads, "Then answered Jesus

## *Curse of Genesis 3:16*

---

and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise" (Jn. 5:19). Finally it says, "I have glorified thee on the earth; I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do" (Jn. 17:4). There is no attachment of inferiority upon our Lord in His being under the Father to carry out the will of heaven. If we can understand this (and we can), then the teaching of subjection and headship of wife and husband can also be understood. Wilkin wrote, "As therefore, Christ came to do his Father's will and work, man's sphere is to do Christ's will and work and woman's sphere is to help man serve Christ" (p. 251). It would certainly be a very different world from husband down to child if we all put our lives more fully under the authority of Jesus Christ.

The subjection of the wife to her husband is no more a mark of inferiority, than it was for Christ to be subject to the Father. The analogy of Christ and the church, husband and wife in the Ephesian letter should be more clear to us now. The helper is to be subject in will and work. "The subjection of the wife to the husband is parallel to the subjection of man, or of the church of Christ" (Wilkin, p. 103). The work of the church and the will of the church is not its own, but it is the work and will of Christ.

The subjection to Christ and husband is resolved for the wife when the marriage is directed by the authority structure of heaven. How foolish it would be to enter marriage with a head not under Christ. How foolish it would be to enter marriage with helper that does not see her duties being unto the Lord. The conflicts in the flesh will be difficult enough, let alone being bound in a relationship that does not recognize the will of Christ and is aimed to fully experience the judgment pronounced in Genesis 3:16.

The Word of God is not offering suppression of women of the exaltation of men or the reverse. The New Testament teachings for everyday decisions are attempting to protect the truths of loving headship and submissive helpship. It is necessary our decisions in Christ regarding priority work and home be founded on Bible guidelines. We cannot permit human reasoning that shifts the principles of headship and helpship to be contrary to the Word of God. An orderly universe cannot survive a wrong concept of headship and helpship. Eventually, God's authority structures are perverted and sin will dominate the heart of every person.

Men and women are protected and perfected by God's ordained order and children are blessed by a home that manifests loving headship and submissive helpship. Godly attitudes founded on these two Bible truths wed the power of position given to man and the obvious power of influence seen

## Curse of Genesis 3:16

in the life of woman. Thus, we shall have homes where Christ is at home. Lives will be spiritually oriented in function, godly seed will be raised and there will be another generation to take the message of salvation by the gospel of Jesus Christ to the world. 7120 Banks St., Union Lake, MI 48085

### References

Cottrell, Jack, **Tough Questions-Biblical Answers-Part One**, College Press Publishing Company, Joplin Missouri, 1985.

Arndt, W. F. & Gingrich, F. W., **A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament**, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1957.

Crawford, C. C., **Genesis, The Book of the Beginnings**, Vol. II, College Press, Joplin, Missouri, 1968.

Foh, Susan T., **Women & the Word of God**, Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1979.

Kent, Homer A., Jr., **The Pastoral Epistles**, Moody Press, Chicago, 1958.

MacArthur, John, Jr., **The Fulfilled Family**, Word of Grace Communications, Panorama City, California, 1981.

King James Version, **The New Chain Reference Bible**, B. B. Kirkbride Bible Co., Inc., Indianapolis, 1964.

Kittel, Gerhard, **Theological Dictionary of the New Testament**, Vol. 1, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1964.

Lenski, R. C. H., **Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles To Galations, Ephesians, Philippians**, The Wartburg Press, Columbus, Ohio, 1937.

Murray, John, **Principles of Conduct**, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1957.

New International Version, **The Holy Bible**, Zondervan Bible Publishers, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1978.

Thayer, J. H., **A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament**, American Book Company, New York, 1889.

Wigram-Green, **The New Englishman's Greek Concordance and Lexicon**, Associated Publishers and Authors, Inc., Lafayette, Indiana, 1982.

Wilkin, F. G., **The Prophesying of Women**, Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago, 1895.

### **The Prophecy of Joel**

*by Doug Edwards*

At the conclusion of the Old Testament there are twelve short books known as the Minor Prophets. They are minor in length only, not importance. Generally speaking, most of us are like tourists when we come to visit these books. We hurry to reach the place we want to see, and then just as quickly, we head back for more familiar grounds. This is sad because these great men provide for us a wealth of material. It is the purpose of this article to make an introduction to the book of Joel.

#### **The Scheme of Redemption**

Before we look into the book of Joel, there is some preliminary material that we must cover. I firmly believe that before we can understand these prophets we must understand the scheme of redemption. We must get the overall picture before we can enjoy the details.

The promise of redemption begins in the garden of Eden. When man sinned God started the process of redemption. In what is believed to be the first Messianic prophecy, God told the woman her seed would bruise the head of the serpent (Gen. 3:15). After the world had gone into sin and had been destroyed by the flood, God chose Abraham through whom the seed would come. In Genesis 12 God made certain promises. It is critical to a study of the Scriptures to understand these promises. An understanding of these Abrahamic promises puts together the pieces of the puzzle of salvation. A misunderstanding of these promises will keep one in confusion. The promises are found in these words:

The LORD had said to Abram, "Leave your country, your people and your father's household and go to the land I will show you. "I will make you into a great nation and I will bless you; I will make your name great, and you will be a blessing. I will bless those who bless you, and whoever curses you I will curse; and all peoples on earth will be blessed through you." . . . The LORD appeared to Abram and said, "To your offspring I will give this land." So he built an altar there to the LORD, who had appeared to him (Gen. 12:1-3, 7).

Notice there was a two-fold promise made to Abraham. The first promise involved a nation coming from him that would receive a land. The second promise dealt with the coming Seed, through which all families of the earth



## *Joel—Introduction*

---

would be blessed. It is important to see that the first promise was national and physical, and the second promise was spiritual. The revealing of these two promises is the theme of the entire Bible. The Old Testament basically deals with the fulfillment of the first promise—the Jewish nation receiving their land. The New Testament deals with the fulfillment of the second promise, which involved the coming of the Messiah and His bringing salvation from sin. The ultimate aim of these promises was to bring about the redemption of man. The first of these promises was used to bring about the accomplishment of the second. The ultimate aim of God was to bring salvation through Jesus Christ. This He accomplished through the death of Jesus and the establishment of the church. The Old Testament prophets talked about this very thing. They looked forward to the coming of the Messiah and His kingdom. They were not prophecying of some future Millennial age, but rather of the Christian age. How do I know this? I know it because Peter said the prophets spoke about these days, referring to the Christian age.

Indeed, all the prophets from Samuel on, as many as have spoken, have foretold these days. And you are heirs of the prophets and of the covenant God made with your fathers. He said to Abraham, "Through your offspring all peoples on earth will be blessed." When God raised up his servant, he sent him first to you to bless you by turning each of you from your wicked ways (Acts 3:24-26).

### **The Man**

We know very little about this man, except he was the son of Pethuel (Joel 1:1). His name means "Jehovah is God." It seems, though, that this name was a common one. At least a dozen other men in the Old Testament are named Joel. For example, the oldest son of Samuel wore this name (1 Sam. 8:2), as did one of David's mighty men (1 Chron. 11:38). We are only able to determine his character based on his book. He was a pious, godly, courageous preacher who came in the hour of opportunity to preach to the people. Some have concluded because of internal evidence that he was a priest or the son of a priest, but that is conjecture. His ability to describe is very forceful and minute. Everything is set before us as though he saw it. Through his description of repentance we see him as a man of deep religious feeling. His writing seems to characterize him as a poetic man of strength, tenderness, compassion and dignity.

### **The Date**

Joel is one of the most difficult books of the prophets to date, for the reason that he gives us no internal evidence as to when he wrote the book. Some of the prophets mention the kings who were reigning during the time of their prophetic work (Hos. 1:1; Amos 1:1). Other prophets such as Jeremiah, tell us of major historical events, such as the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem, occurring during their times. As a result, scholars are divided as to the date of this book. Some, such as Keil, Young and Hailey, take the position that the book is very early among the prophets (ca. 800 B.C.). Others, such as Driver, Farrar and Pfeiffer, maintain that the book occurs after the Babylonian exile (ca. 400 B.C.).

Those who prefer the late date for Joel (ca. 400 B.C.) base many of their arguments upon the silence of the book. There is no mention made of the Assyrians or Babylonians in Joel. This could be explained if it were a late book and these countries were no longer powers. There is no mention of the kings of Judah in the book. This would certainly describe the post-exilic times of Israel. There is also no mention of the northern kingdom nor the high places, which the early prophets often described. It is also argued that the day of the Lord, which occurs five times in Joel, was not found in the early prophets, hence it must be late.

Those who prefer the early date (ca. 800 B.C.) also make equally convincing arguments. In both the Hebrew canon and the Septuagint, Joel is placed with the books that are pre-Assyrian. This position was formulated as early as 300 B.C. and was in the position used by Jesus and the apostles. If the book was written late it would seem strange to place it with the early ones. Some believe the book was written during the reign of Joash the boy king (2 Kgs. 11-12). During these times conditions were the same as those pictured in Joel. The early date will explain the absence of Babylon and Assyria. In Joel those causing problems are the Edomites, Egyptians, Philistines and Phoenicians. The early date of the book seems to be the most correct, although it may be better not to be too dogmatic over either view.

### **The Occasion**

The occasion of the book was a locust plague of unparalleled magnitude. It was so bad, those who lived previously had not seen its parallel (1:2). It would also be spoken of in generations to come (1:3). When conditions are right, millions of locust eggs can be deposited into the soil. When they emerge, they can move across the land in hordes eating and evolving as they travel. In their winged stages they can fly as much as one thousand

## *Joel—Introduction*

---

miles looking for food. They can devour a large area, devastating it completely and giving it the appearance of being scorched by fire. Joel gives two very graphic descriptions of this locust attack (1:3-7, 2:3-11).

Scholars are divided as to how this locust attack should be interpreted. One position is that the locusts are to be seen as allegorical or figurative. They are merely representing the hostile armies that would invade Israel such as the Assyrians and Babylonians. Another position is that the locusts are to be understood as literal. In this case I would lean more toward the literal. One of the promised curses to come upon Israel for their disobedience would be a locust plague (Deut. 28:38-42). One of the fundamental rules of Bible interpretation is to allow passages to be understood as literal unless it is impossible to so understand them. It is very possible to understand these locust attacks as being literal.

### **The Book**

The book of Joel contains seventy-three verses, divided into three chapters in our English Bibles, but four chapters in the Hebrew Bible. It divides itself into two equal sections. In 1:1-2:17 Joel seems to do the speaking, calling the people to prayer and repentance. In 2:18-3:21 God speaks, promising to remove the plague, bestow prosperity and give rich spiritual blessings. The following is an outline of the book:

- I. The judgment of God and the prophet's call to repentance (1:1-2:17)
  - A. Devastation of Judah (1:1-1:20)
    - 1. Description of locust plague (v. 2-4)
    - 2. Call for people to mourn (v. 5-14)
    - 3. The day of the Lord (v. 15-20)
  - B. A more urgent summons to repentance and prayer (2:1-17)
    - 1. The urgent summons (v. 1-11)
    - 2. An urgent call to repentance (v. 12-17)
- II. The blessings of God upon repentance (2:18-3:21)
  - A. Immediate blessings (2:18-2:27)
    - 1. Removal of plague (v. 18-20)
    - 2. Restoration of crops (v. 21-27)

### **B. Future blessings (2:28-3:21)**

1. God preparing a new people (v. 28-32)
2. God's victory over his enemies (3:1-16)
3. God's presence among His people (3:16-21)

Joel depended on the Mosaic covenant of the Pentateuch for the basic points of his message. The covenant's curses must come as a result of national disobedience, but after a period of correction, God will restore His people and bless them with both immediate and future blessings.

### **Joel in the New Testament**

The Day of Pentecost, after the resurrection of Christ, marked the beginning of the church. Jesus had told His apostles to remain in Jerusalem until they received power from above (Lk. 24:49). This power came to them in the form of the baptism of the Holy Spirit as recorded in Acts 2:1-4. On this occasion the apostles began to speak in tongues, and this in turn, caused a crowd to gather to watch them. Some even mocked them, saying they were full of new wine. Peter defended their actions and at the same time began his announcement of the gospel by appealing to the book of Joel.

No, this is what was spoken by the prophet Joel: "In the last days, God says, I will pour out my Spirit on all people. Your sons and daughters will prophesy, your young men will see visions, your old men will dream dreams. Even on my servants, both men and women, I will pour out my Spirit in those days, and they will prophesy. I will show wonders in the heaven above and signs on the earth below, blood and fire and billows of smoke. The sun will be turned to darkness and the moon to blood before the coming of the great and glorious day of the Lord. And everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved" (Acts 2:16-21).

There are three points of interest in this quotation. The first deals with Joel's promise of the outpouring of the Spirit. Joel is emphasizing that the blessings of the gospel age would be for all without any distinction. Under the Jewish age a clear distinction was made between Jew and Gentile, between man and woman, and between slave and free man. Joel, however, said the Spirit would be poured out on all people, that is without distinction between Jew and Gentile. The Spirit also would be poured without distinction of sex (sons and daughters), without distinction of age (old men and

## *Joel—Introduction*

---

young men), and without social distinction (servants). Joel's prophecy contemplated the entire miraculous age of the church, when the apostles conferred miraculous spiritual gifts upon the ones mentioned in this prophecy. Although Peter said "this is" what was spoken by Joel, he was not limiting it to Pentecost Day. The prophecy of Joel began that day but was not just limited to it.

The second point of interest deals with the day of the Lord. It is a mistake to place the day of the Lord only at the end of time at the second coming of Christ. It is a phrase that refers to some judgment or deliverance of God. In carrying out the day of the Lord, God made use of natural calamities, of captivity and of oppression (Obad. 15; Joel 1:15; Zech. 14:1). The timing of this prophecy seems to indicate that in Joel 2:30-31 (Acts 2:19-20) the prophet is discussing the destruction of Jerusalem which occurred in 70 A.D. In support of this, the day of the Lord is often used to refer to God's judgments on wicked nations such as Babylon (Isa. 13:9-10) and Egypt (Ezek. 32:7-8). Malachi describes a time of destruction before the great and dreadful day of the Lord (Mal. 4:1-2). John the Baptist seemed to be referring to this destruction of the Jews when he told them the axe was laid at the root of the trees (Mt. 3:10). Jesus also referred to the strange behavior of the sun and moon, as did Joel, when he referred to the destruction of Jerusalem (Mt. 24:29). So Peter, in pointing to this prediction of Joel did not omit its terror. It would be a time of great blessing, but also a time of terror. In order for the blessing to be fully received, there would have to be a destruction of the old system.

A third point of interest deals with the calling on the name of the Lord. As the Spirit's work would be for the benefit of all, so would the escape through His provision be for all. To call upon the name of the Lord is to respond by obeying His commands. This phrase will be discovered with reference to the gospel and our obedience to it, and as a consequence of being forgiven of sin (Acts 2:36-38, 22:16; Rom. 10:13).

### **Joel For Today**

A prominent theme of Joel was repentance. The people were told, "Rend your heart and not your garments. Return to the LORD your God, for he is gracious and compassionate, slow to anger and abounding in love, and he relents from sending calamity" (2:13). As a result of repentance, God would bless them (2:18). People do not change over the centuries. Names and faces may change, but the basic needs of people remain the same. People still need the message of repentance.

We live in a sophisticated age. We want to think of ourselves as being more highly advanced than our ancestors. We no longer view sin the way the Bible does. Alcoholism is no longer a sin but a disease. Homosexuality is an alternative lifestyle. Selfishness is no longer discouraged. On the other hand, our own personal happiness receives top priority. The great need for our age is an emphasis on sound teaching concerning repentance. This is not a new message, but rather an old one. Jonah was sent to Nineveh to preach repentance. Both John the Baptist and Jesus emphasized repentance in their preaching. The New Testament still teaches, "In the past God overlooked such ignorance, but now he commands all people everywhere to repent" (Acts 17:30).

Repentance is a change in mind or will that leads to a change in life. The sinner turns from the practice of sin and goes in the opposite direction. Just as God promised to bless the people of Joel's day for their repentance, He promises to bless us for our repentance through the forgiveness of sin (Acts 2:38, 3:19) and the direction of a new life.

In Joel we also learn that we must take advantage of special opportunities that come our way. The opportunity for Joel came in the form of the locust plague. It affected the people enough to listen to the prophet. Because of their problems, they were glad to hear the message from God.

We can see the same situation today. Situations will occur that will cause some to meditate upon things they might not normally. Disasters such as earthquakes, car accidents, illnesses and deaths can make people more aware of their spiritual needs. We need to be ready to take advantages of these opportunities. Paul said, "Therefore, as we have opportunity, let us do good to all people, especially to those who belong to the family of believers" (Gal. 6:10). So let us learn from Joel to use our special opportunities while they are here lest they slip away never to return. 205 W. 5th, Edmond, Oklahoma 73034

## **Conflicts in the Body**

*by James D. Orten*

### **Introduction**

In 1 Corinthians, Paul described a conflict that had paralyzed the church in that city. Although this happened early in the history of Christianity, it has a surprisingly modern ring.

- A. One could just make blank spots for the names of congregations and people, and it would become a universal statement that could be applied to churches of all ages.
- B. The fact that this type of thing occurs in secular organizations and other religious bodies with equal or greater frequency is not a great comfort to those who love the Lord and His body.
- C. Conflict has several distinct and decidedly negative effects on the church.
  - 1. It always shames the church, and it has the power to destroy it.
    - a. Galatians 5:15, "But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." NIV says "destroyed"
    - b. 1 Corinthians 6:5-6, "I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren? But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers."
    - c. This has not happened just in Corinth. A judge recently ordered a congregation of our brethren to arbitrate their dispute which had been brought before him. This is an example of "The children of this world being wiser than the children of light" Luke 16:8.
  - 2. Division and contention actually generate other sins.
    - a. James 3:16, "For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work."
    - b. What a terrible statement, but we know by experience that it is absolutely true. Spurred on by anger and contention, brethren will often do things which horrify objective bystanders and even themselves in saner moments.
  - 3. The pain caused to those who love the Lord and the Lord's church.

## *Conflicts In the Body*

---

- a. 2 Corinthians 11:27-28, "In weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Beside those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches."
- b. Can you believe that Paul would list the worries caused by conflict among brethren along side beatings and stonings as great troubles in his life? YES!
- 4. No wonder then that early in His ministry Jesus said (Matthew 5:9) "Blessed are the peacemakers."
  - a. I am glad Jesus said He would bless peacemakers because that may be the only place on earth they will get blessed.
  - b. I learned a long time ago, while growing up on the farm, that if you try to separate a dog fight you are apt to get bitten by both dogs—even if one is your own.
  - c. And this does not just happen among dogs—experienced policemen know they are much more likely to get shot trying to stop fights between husbands and wives than they are trying to stop robberies.
  - d. And the danger is not just between brawling spouses. Try to keep a brother in the church that others are putting out, or try to keep a church in the fold that others are ostracizing and then see, to paraphrase Rodney Dangerfield, how much respect you get.
  - e. These facts about our spiritual existence really ought to change.

### **Categories of Conflict**

Examples within the Scriptures illustrate at least four types of conflicts. They arise from different circumstances and different actions are required to cure them. Knowing the type of conflict will not automatically solve it, but it will give guidance as to what needs to be done.

#### **I. Disagreements over matters of judgment about what is best for the work of the church.**

The distinguishing feature of this type of conflict is that originally it does not involve a matter of right and wrong.

A. Paul and Barnabus Acts 15:36-40.



## *Conflicts In the Body*

---

- B. Please note that these were good men, of good motives, who loved the Lord.
- C. One sincerely believed it was not good to take Mark on their missionary journey because Mark had gotten fainthearted and deserted on an earlier trip. The other thought he should be given a second chance.
- D. Note that what these men were dealing with was not a matter of right and wrong: "Barnabus wanted to take John, but Paul did not think it wise" (NIV). Paul did not argue that it would be a sin to take Mark, and Barnabus did not insist they were morally required to take him.

But arguments have a way of escalating. And they began to behave "as if" they were dealing with moral absolutes. They disagreed over John Mark, but they separated because they got angry (for so the definition of the word "contention" implies) with each other.

- E. Authorities disagree on whether these two brothers sinned. I do not believe they did. I believe they made a wise decision to separate before it got to that point.
- F. There is a hint that the church sided with Paul: "And Paul chose Silas and departed being recommended by the brethren unto the grace of God." But about Barnabus it simply says: "And so Barnabus took Mark, and sailed unto Cyprus."
- G. The goal in matters of judgment is to keep in mind that they are judgments—human judgments—not matter of right and wrong, not matters of divine law.

Sin is a transgression of the law (1 Jn. 3:4). If we have difficulty pointing to the law that is being violated, we are probably dealing with judgment.

- H. One of our greatest problems in the church and in the home is dealing with matters of judgment AS IF they were matters of law.

Husbands and wives argue over how much money to spend on a couch, where to go on vacation, or how often to make love, when the only important thing about any of these is that they agree.

- I. The list of judgments that churches argue over is equally creative.
  - 1. Which preacher to have for meetings
  - 2. Whether to continue to support the preacher

## *Conflicts In the Body*

---

3. What type of building to erect
  4. Which site to choose for mission work
  5. How to get the church lawn mowed, or even what type of lawn mower to buy, and on and on.
- J. Who is right in matters of judgment? Both if they simply discuss in love and good will what they think is best for the church. Who is wrong? Either side when they push it to the point of division or even to the point of ill will.
- K. Judgments are not to be struggled over: Romans 14:1, "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations." NIV, "Accept him whose faith is weak, without passing judgments on disputable matters."
- L. The reason judgments should not be struggled over is illustrated in this case. Paul and the church were so certain Mark would not become a good worker. Yet, in 2 Timothy 4:11, Paul acknowledges Mark as of great value to his ministry.
- M. We are taught to submit ourselves to one another (Eph. 5:21; 1 Pet. 5:5). I am sure this applies to matters of judgment. The same apostle who taught "we ought to obey God rather than men" would not have said we should submit to one another in matters of doctrine. I believe a brother sins who makes trouble over matters of judgment.
- N. See Acts 1:23-26 for an example of this type that was handled without harmful results. The Greek word for "appointed" (verse 23) suggests there were advocates for each of these men. The apostles handled the matter in an exemplary fashion.
- II. Another type of conflict arises out of accusations of personal wrongdoing.
- A. Fortunately not all sins of individual Christians make conflicts in the church, only a very small fraction do.
- B. There are two conditions in which a personal sin may create congregational conflict.
1. The sin is against a brother who demands restitution.
    - a. 1 Corinthians 6:1, "Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?"

## *Conflicts In the Body*

---

- b. The definition of the word "matter" suggests this was an illegal act as well as a sin. Probably one brother was accused of cheating another in a business deal or some similar matter.
- c. 1 Thessalonians 4:3-6 shows that Christians committing adultery with the spouses of others is a "defrauding" of this type.
- d. Paul shows that it is not wrong for a brother who has been wronged to want to get justice, but the way justice is sought must be done so as to protect the church.

Verse 7, "Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?"

- 2. The second situation in which a personal sin becomes a conflict in the church is when Christians line up behind the accuser and the accused rather than exerting unified community pressure to see that the matter is settled equitably.

This is what happened with the fornicator in 1 Corinthians 5:1-2

- 3. It is tremendously important for Christians to understand the appropriate and scriptural attitude to take toward a brother who sins. If we get ANGRY, which is the most common response, we tempt those who sympathize with the brother, or even tender-hearted Christians, to defend him. Then the stage is set for the church to have conflict over what ought to be, and can only successfully be, dealt with by the church from a united front.
- 4. The proper attitude toward those who sin is sorrow or grief: grief for the brother who has sinned and jeopardized his soul, for the church that has been shamed, for weaker brethren he has discouraged, and for the Holy Spirit he has grieved.

- a. 1 Corinthians 5:2, "And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned."
- b. Matthew 18:31, "So when his fellowservants saw what was done, they were very sorry, and came and told unto their lord all that was done."
- c. There are some good directions here: 1. Feel sorry; 2. Go to the Lord.
- d. Psalms 119:158, "I beheld the transgressors, and was grieved; because they keep not thy word."

## Conflicts In the Body

- e. To get angry at someone who sins actually suggests envy. We get angry at people who cheat on their taxes because we wish we did not have to pay taxes. But more than that it is likely to have the effect of hardening the sinner and causing others to defend him. Anger is an alienating, distancing emotion. Sorrow is a clinging emotion, notice people at funerals, deaths, and so forth. See 1 Corinthians 5:2, 2 Corinthians 12:21.
  - f. This attitude does not imply that a brother who sins should not be dealt with firmly, even to the point of disfellowship, if he does not repent and change. Rather it means that whatever actions are taken should be taken out of a deep sense of love and sorrow over the loss of the brother and the effect of sin on the body.
- III. A third form of conflict is one that occurred often among Jesus' disciples while He was on earth, and I suspect occurs often among them today: A struggle over who is going to be the greatest.
- A. A few years ago a young man named Cassius Clay (Mohammed Ali) taunted people by saying "I am the greatest." A lot of people stepped into the boxing ring and fought him to prove him wrong. I used to look with disdain on Mr. Clay. Seeing so much of the same attitude at closer range has made me more humble in my judgments.
  - B. Mark 9:33-34, "he asked them, What was it that ye disputed among yourselves by the way? But they held their peace: for by the way they had disputed among themselves, who should be the greatest."
  - C. I was surprised at how many times this conflict occurred: 6 sets of passages describe it, on at least 3 different occasions, the last time right after the institution of the Lord's Supper.
    - 1. Matthew 18:1-3; 20:23; Mark 9:33-34; 10:37; Luke 9:46-47; 22:24-34.
    - 2. The original disciples were not the only ones who were plagued by this conflict. 3 John 9, "I wrote unto the church: But Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them, receiveth us not."
    - 3. Other examples: Korah and his followers in Numbers 16; the false teacher at Corinth who opposed Paul, and on and on.
    - 4. These examples show that such conflicts may be between persons of equal authority, such as the disciples, or between one person of

## *Conflicts In the Body*

---

legitimate authority, such as Moses and Paul, and another who is challenging that authority.

### **D. Characteristics of Struggles Over Supremacy (The characteristics are understandable from the motives).**

1. **Personal attacks:** Of Diotrephes, John said, "Wherefore if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words." Are you amazed, as I am, at how we can debate denominational preachers or digressive brethren on grave issues that divide the church and be perfect gentlemen and then behave toward our own brethren as if they were beasts and we were Attila the Hun?
2. **The imputation of evil motives:** The false teacher at Corinth inferred that Paul would not take money for preaching because he knew he was not a real apostle. In making these types of statements, we judge the motives of men's hearts, which only God can do (1 Cor. 4:5).
3. **Bringing in extraneous and irrelevant matters:** The false teacher argued that Paul was not a good speaker (2 Cor. 10:10).
4. **Attempts to unofficially cast people out of the church:** 3 John 10, ". . . neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbideth them that would, and casteth them out of the church." Authorities agree this was an unofficial ostracizing, not a formal disfellowship.
5. **Projective blaming:** Have you ever heard or read descriptions of conflicts and it sounded as if the two sides were accusing each other of the same thing?
  - a. Korah (Num. 16:3) accused Moses of wanting the pre-eminence, "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy."
  - b. This could not have been true. The Bible says Moses was the meekest man on the earth (Num. 12:3). Thus, it was a projection on Korah's part.
6. **Covering up the real issue with bogus, after the fact, doctrinal issues:** The disciples (Mk. 9) refused to tell Jesus what their argument was really about.

## Conflicts In the Body

Have you noticed that in the midst of conflict, people take "positions" you never heard them take before, and sometimes positions no one ever heard of before?

7. Ambition for authority over others: In Matthew 20:25, Jesus' story about princes and the authority they wanted was occasioned by the disciples' argument over who would be the greatest.

### E. The Goals in Struggles Over Supremacy

1. To prevent the church from lining up behind the struggling parties.

- a. 1 Corinthians 1:11-13, 3:3-4, 3:21, 4:6; 2 Corinthians 10:6

- b. 2 Corinthians 10:6 shows that Paul was delaying punishment of the false teacher until the church could be pulled away from his influence.

2. The goal for the struggling parties is conversion or excommunication. The attitudes and behavior of these persons require a change so complex that Jesus described it, on more than one occasion, as conversion.

- a. Matthew 18:1-3, The disciples wanted to talk about who would be the greatest—Jesus said the real question was whether they would get in at all.

- b. Repentance means a "turning around." Since these disciples were trying to climb upward in human preeminence, repentance for them meant going down. Hence, Jesus' instructions that they must become the servants of all.

- c. The root word for repentance means pain. Thus, repentance is the change of attitude and life that grows out of pain.

This is the reason Alcoholics Anonymous says that alcoholics do not really change until they hit bottom and feel the full force of their problem.

As long as they are still struggling they cannot change, and as long as antagonists of this type are still struggling for control, they cannot change.

- d. I believe Jesus knew this. Even after the Lord's Supper, Luke 22:24, the disciples had not repented and were still arguing about the top spot. This particular argument was occasioned by Jesus'

## *Conflicts In the Body*

---

statement that one of them would betray him. "You are worse than I am" and "I am better than you are" are just opposite sides of the same coin. (They seemed to have completely overlooked the fact that their Master would be betrayed and killed).

- e. Peter must have been prominent in this argument. Luke 22:31, "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat . . ." Satan knows he has easy pickings among those who engage in this kind of struggle. The repetition of the name in Hebrew was an indication of sadness, indicating Jesus's attitude of sorrow toward Peter's behavior (cf. Lk. 10:41).

Peter actually seemed offended at a special prayer of the Lord for his weakness. Still arrogant, he says (v. 33) "Lord, I am ready to go with you both into prison, and to death."

But, a few hours later, Peter did hit bottom. After three denials of the Lord, one with an oath, Peter remembered (Lk. 24:62) and "went out, and wept bitterly."

In John 21:15-18, Jesus seems to be testing Peter. This time Peter does not rise to the bait.

I used to wonder about the difference between sorrow of the world and godly sorrow as described in 2 Corinthians 7:10. I believe I understand it now. The responses of others to one's sins frequently bring pain. But the pain alone does not determine whether one will repent.

Pain + Anger + Arrogance = Sorrow of world, Sin and Death.  
Pain + Sadness + Humility = Godly sorrow and Salvation

- f. In order to settle a conflict of this type, peace-makers must be prepared to work patiently to unhook the church from the antagonists, taking strong positions against them.

### **IV. The fourth form of conflict is Disagreements Over Doctrinal Matters**

#### **A. The problem over circumcision, Acts 15:1-2**

These men tried to add to the plan of salvation, "Except ye be circumcised . . . ye cannot be saved."

- B. "They," which means the church, decided that Paul and Barnabus and others should go up to Jerusalem about this matter. Why did not Paul and Barnabus deal with it there?

## *Conflicts In the Body*

---

I do not believe that Paul and Barnabus were ignorant of the truth on this matter. They dealt with it patiently in order not to divide the church.

- C. Real doctrinal differences have arisen in the church and they do arise in individual churches from time-to-time. But not very often.
- D. The distinctive character of these conflicts is that clear principles from God's Word are at issue.
- E. The way the apostles dealt with this matter gives a clear technology for settling disputes of this type.
  - 1. Be patient.
  - 2. Let everybody have their say.
  - 3. Go to inspiration (they used the Old Testament and the inspiration of the apostles).
  - 4. Make a determination and declare it settled.
  - 5. If we can not do that, we probably are dealing with some other kind of struggle.
- F. These four types of conflict are all I am able to identify from the Scriptures. They may exist in pure form such as the case with Paul and Barnabus. More often, attempts are made to cover less "admirable" forms of conflict with more acceptable forms, or a conflict that started in one form may develop into another.
  - 1. Struggles over supremacy are often covered with after-the-fact doctrinal issues or charges of being wronged
  - 2. A conflict may start as a disagreement over judgment and, going unsettled, turn into a struggle over who will rule or be the greatest.
- V. **How does a church go about settling conflict?** (That, to be sure, is the \$64,000 dollar question).
  - A. As a preventive measure, congregations should learn to discuss all matters openly and in goodwill.
    - 1. This means openly, straight forwardly, in respectful words, and without anger.
    - 2. If there are brethren who can not do this, it should be signaled to them that they need growth and are expected to develop it.



## *Conflicts In the Body*

---

- B. Congregations should make solid agreements (when not in conflict) that whenever significant anger or conflict arises, the group will stop talking about the subject and start talking about what type of conflict they have.
1. The typical, human, and deadly thing to do when conflict arises is to stiffen positions and plow ahead.
  2. We have seen this happen repeatedly, sometimes over amazingly petty things, until extremely hard feelings or outright division resulted.
  3. In some cases, such as conflict over matters of judgment, just reminding the group that a human judgment is what they are dealing with and restating the goals, will have a calming effect.
  4. Even in cases of struggles over supremacy, which are the hardest to settle, this type of discussion would send a useful message to the antagonists in terms of what is expected, and to the church to not empower the struggle by lining up behind the antagonists.
- C. Once significant conflict has developed, I believe it is absolutely essential to not continue to do "business as usual." Doing so is a prescription for disaster. Since "business as usual" allowed the conflict, it probably will allow it to continue. Something must be done differently to stop it.
- D. The chart that follows summarizes most of what has been said and gives further ideas about settlement techniques.

### **Conclusion**

I would like to conclude the talk by noting that there have been dramatic examples of conflict in the church within the last year. None of what I have said was intended to highlight those situations nor to draw conclusions about the persons involved. If I have done my job well, the principles enunciated here will be relevant and for that I cannot apologize. But my interest in this topic goes back many years. Much of what I have done in twenty-three years of professional life has been concerned with conflict resolution, such as between troubled husbands and wives. I first began formulating some of these principles in that context. But I am absolutely convinced that the church will never do anything more important to its survival and growth, and hence to the salvation of souls, than to learn effective methods of conflict resolution. 1937 Stonebrook Dr., Knoxville, TN 37923

# CONFLICTS IN THE BODY: A SUMMARY

by James D. Orten

Types of Conflict	Examples	Characteristics	Goal(s)	Settlement Techniques
Matters of Judgment	Paul and Barnabas, Acts 15 Disciples, Acts 1:23-26	Begins as Discussion of what is "Best" for the work, No sin initially involved	Agreement Without Alienation	1. Keep aware that "Human" Judgment is at issue 2. Appeals 3. Submission 4. Prayer & Casting Lots, Acts 1:26, Prov. 16:33, 18:18
Accusations of Personal Wrongdoing	Matt. 18 I Cor. 6	A Disciple Feels Cheated by Another Disciple	1. Determination of Wrong 2. Just Settlement 3. Protection of Church	1. Appeal by Offended 2. Mediation by one or Two 3. Arbitration backed by Church
Struggles Over Supremacy	Disciples Matt. 18:1-3, 20:23, Lk. 22:24, Diotrephes III Jno., False Teacher at Corinth Korah Nm. 16	Anger Personal Attacks Malicious Gossip Attempts to "Cast Out" Projective Blaming Seeking Power	1. Conversion of Antagonist(s) 2. Prevention of Church from "Lining Up" Behind the Antagonists	1. Appeals to Antagonist(s) and to Church 2. Patient Teaching of the Church 3. Authority of Church to Antagonist(s)
Doctrinal Differences	Circumcision Controversy Acts 15	Difference in Belief on Significant, "Non-doubtful" Matter	Establishment of Truth Without Division	Patient Consultation of Inspiration

# *Employer/Employee Relationship*

---

## **The Employer/Employee Relationship**

*by William St. John*

I have been asked to address the subject of the Employer-Employee Relationship, and whether or not it is parallel to the Master-Servant relationship. Although the relationship is not absolutely parallel, it is very similar.

The following words are both translated "master:" **despotes** and **kurios**.

**Despotes** is defined as: "master, a despot, sovereign master. Lord, owner. One with absolute ownership and uncontrolled power." This word is found in the following passages:

Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort (1 Tim. 6:1-2).

Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things; not answering again; Not purloining, but shewing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things (Tit. 2:9-10).

Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward (1 Pet. 2:18).

**Kurios** is defined as: "master, lord, sir. One who exercises power." This word is found in the following passages:

So that servant came, and shewed his lord these things. Then, the master of the house being angry said to his servant, Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and the blind (Lk. 14:21).

And it came to pass, as we went to prayer, a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination met us, which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying: and when her masters saw that their hope of gain was gone, they caught Paul and Silas, and drew them into the marketplace unto the rulers (Acts 16:16, 19).

## Employer/Employee Relationship

Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him (Eph. 6:5, 9).

Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as fearing God: Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal' knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven (Col. 3:2; 4:1).

Obviously, employers are not lords with absolute power and ownership over their workers. Also, in 1 Corinthians 7:23, Paul advised, "Be not ye the servants of men" ["become not bondservants," ASV]. If the employer/employee relationship was parallel to the master/slave relationship, then we should not be or become employees. Again, it should be obvious that they are not parallel.

### **What God Requires of Servants.**

Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort (1 Tim. 6:1-2).

1. Honor their masters
2. Do not despise believing masters.

Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things; not answering again; Not purloining, but shewing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things (Tit. 2:9-10).

1. Obey their masters
2. Seek to please their masters
3. Do not contradict or speak against
4. Do not pilfer or steal from their masters—be honest.

Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward (1 Pet. 2:18).

## Employer/Employee Relationship

### 1. Be in subjection with respect.

Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; Not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men: knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free (Eph. 6:5-8).

1. Be obedient with respect
2. Not working only when the master is watching, but from the heart
3. Serve with good will
4. Work as to the Lord.

Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God; And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons (Col. 3:22-25).

1. Obey your masters
2. Not with eyeservice, but sincerely
3. work heartily, as to the Lord.

We conclude then, that servants are to honor and respect their masters, and they were not to contradict nor speak against them. Servants were to seek to please their masters. Because it would be easy to despise a believing master, servants were specifically warned against it. (Perhaps they would despise their master because they would expect to be freed.) Servants were to obey or be in subjection to their masters in all things. They were to be honest and not steal from their masters. They were to work sincerely and heartily, not with eyeservice but as to the Lord.

### **Why This Behavior Was Necessary**

We need to make careful note of the reasons for this behavior because they have a direct bearing upon our subject.

## Employer/Employee Relationship

1. "... that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed" (1 Tim. 6:1).

A disobedient servant who professed Christ would cause men to speak evil of Christ and his teachings. It is likely that the masters would proclaim that Christ and his teachings were the cause of the problem.

In the case of believing masters, the added reason for the servants to obey was that their masters were "faithful and beloved" and were partakers of the benefit. The servants were helping a brother in Christ.

2. "... that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things" (Tit. 2:10).

A servant who followed the commands given to him would cause Christ and his teachings to be exalted. Just as Jesus taught in Matthew 5:16, "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

In John 15:5, Jesus said, "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples." Rebellious and disobedient servants would not glorify God.

3. Notice the context of 1 Peter 2:18. (Read vv. 11-25.)

By our honest behavior among Gentiles, we cause them to glorify God. Christians should always strive to live in such a manner before the world, that the world cannot help but acknowledge that following the doctrine of Christ is beneficial and good, even though they hate us. It is by "well doing" that we "put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." In verse 19, Peter teaches that we are to endure for conscience toward God.

4. "Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free" (Eph. 6:8).

"Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ" (Col. 3:24).

Bondage would not in any way lessen our reward from God for faithful obedience to His will.

The conclusion is that servants are to follow these commands because of conscience toward God and that Christ and His doctrine will not be spoken against. Men, upon seeing the servant's obedience, would glorify God. And faithful obedience to God's commands would cause the servant to gain heaven.

## *Employer/Employee Relationship*

---

The reasons for a servant to obey his master and the reasons that Christians should honor all men and submit to every ordinance are the same. This would certainly include the employer/employee relationship.

Another reason for servants to be faithful, diligent, and honest is because of the heathens who needed conversion to Christ. Why should employees today be faithful, diligent, honest? For the same reason.

Society can greatly influence our thinking. In Luke 17:7-10, Jesus taught, "But which of you, having a servant plowing or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he is come from the field, God and sit down to meat? And will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink? Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not. So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do." We must, as Christ's servants, remember that nothing is too menial for us to do. Where many today would refuse to humble themselves (preferring to think of themselves as equals or even better than equals), Christians must be willing to serve so that Christ and His doctrine will not be blasphemed. Jesus taught this great lesson when He washed the disciples feet (Jn. 13:3-17).

Our lives may lead others to Christ, or our lives may be a stumblingblock. Just as the little maid Naaman captured (2 Kgs. 5:2), directed her master to the prophet of God, we can lead others to Christ. Notice also 1 Peter 3:1-2, "Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husband; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; While they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear."

As employees, we should:

1. Honor all men. 1 Peter 2:17 reads, "Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king."

2. Deal honestly. Romans 12:17 says, "Recompense no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men."

3. Use pure speech. Ephesians 4:29-31 reads, "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers. And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption. Let all bitterness

## Employer/Employee Relationship

and wrath, and anger, and clamour and evil speaking, be put away from you, will all malice."

4. Live peaceably. Romans 12:18-19 says, "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord."

5. Not steal. Ephesians 4:28 reads, "Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth."

The teaching of Paul to Titus in Titus 3:1-4, 8 is certainly appropriate to our subject:

Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work, to speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, shewing all meekness unto all men. For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared . . . This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men.

The freedom that we have in Christ must never be used as a license to sin. Peter warns, "As free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness, but as the servants of God" (1 Pet. 2:16).

An additional obligation of an employee is found in Matthew 20:1-15 and Luke 3: that they should be content with their wages.

Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness. And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins: . . . Then came also publicans to be baptized, and said unto him, Master, what shall we do? And he said unto them, Exact no more than that which is appointed you. And the soldiers likewise demanded of him saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages (Lk. 3:2-3, 12-14).



# *Employer/Employee Relationship*

---

## **Employee Responsibilities and Lord's Day Worship**

I have also been asked to address the question: When a man who holds a job requiring Sunday work obeys the gospel, what should he do? What did slaves do in New Testament times?

I know of no New Testament Scripture that forbids working on the Lord's day. However, the Scriptures do teach that we are not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together.

Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; (for he is faithful that promised;) And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works: Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another; and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching. For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace? For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God (Heb. 10:23-31).

As I understand it, the Jewish Christians whom the writer of Hebrews addressed were considering apostasy, partly because of persecutions and the possibility of death when they assembled. Even so, they were commanded not to forsake the assembling of themselves together. If they were to assemble—even if it meant death—how can we justify forsaking the assembly because we might lose our job?

## **What Should the New Convert Do?**

The Scriptures teach that a child of God is not to sin. 1 John 2:1 teaches, "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not."

The question would then be, Is it a sin to forsake the assembling of ourselves together? The answer should be obvious. It is a sin to forsake the

## *Employer/Employee Relationship*

assembly. A child of God should do all in his power to follow the commands of God. If a Christian's job requires him to sin, then he needs a new job.

In Revelation 2:8-11, Jesus said,

And unto the angel of the church in Smyrna write: These things saith the first and the last, which was dead, and is alive; I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich) and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan. Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches; He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death.

The Christians at Smyrna refused to belong to the trade guilds because it involved idolatry. As a result, there was little work available for them, which resulted in their poverty.

What did servants do? The servants of Rome refused emperor worship.

Also, in 1 Corinthians 7:21-23, the Apostle Paul taught,

Art thou called being a servant? care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather, for he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant. Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men.

Servants were to obtain their freedom if they could.

### **Employee Responsibilities and Bible Obedience**

I have also been asked to answer the question: What should the Christian do if his employer requires of him something contrary to his belief?

I believe he should discuss it with his employer and make his refusal kind, but firm. (Many are understanding when they realize the Christian's situation and commitment.)

### **The Christian Employer's Responsibility**

Finally, I have been asked to answer the question: What should be the Christian master's responsibility to his employees?

## Employer/Employee Relationship

And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him (Eph. 6:9).

1. do the same things (good will)
2. forbear threatening (cease to threaten)

Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven (Col. 4:1).

1. give what is just and equal (no favoritism)

Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days. Behold, the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of sabaoth. Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton; ye have nourished your hearts, as in a day of slaughter. Ye have condemned and killed the just; and he doth not resist you. Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned: behold, the judge standeth before the door (Jas. 5:1-9).

Those who are over others must remember that they also have a Master in heaven and that our Master is no respecter of persons.

If I did despise the cause of my manservant or of my maidservant, when they contended with me; What then shall I do when God riseth up? and when he visiteth, what shall I answer him? (Job 31:13-14).

Do not assume that the commands given to servants and masters apply only to them. Most of the commands to them would apply to everyone else. But certain ones needed to be specifically mentioned. A similar example is found in 1 Corinthians 7:39, concerning widows. A widow is only free to marry a Christian. We should not construe this to mean that a widow may

## *Employer/Employee Relationship*

only marry a Christian but everyone else may marry an unbeliever. The widow needed to be specifically warned against marrying an unbeliever; everyone else should know better. In the same way, servants and masters needed to be specifically warned about certain areas; threatening, fair wages, being obedient, despising believing masters, purloining.

Slavery had two principle sources:

Captives in time of war.

Debtors in time of peace.

The gospel of Christ worked as a leaven against slavery. It did not throw out the bread, but worked within and changed it. *P.O. Box 832, Paris, TX 75460*

## **The Evangelist**

*by Johnny Elmore*

### **I. Who Is An Evangelist?**

- A. An official office?
- B. Same as preacher?
- C. How ordained and by whom?
- D. How long an evangelist?
- E. Does he have authority? If so, over whom?
- F. To whom is he answerable?

### **II. Qualifications of An Evangelist**

### **III. What Is His Work?**

- A. In an established congregation
- B. In a new work

I believe we may infer from the Scriptures that such a one as the evangelist is necessary for the church today and that he is, in fact, indispensable to the church and its mission in the world. The apostle Paul has written:

And he gave some, apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ (Eph. 4:11-13).

I think it is generally agreed that there are two classes of officers or workers in the New Testament: temporary and permanent. The temporary officers would be the apostles and prophets. We have often represented them as the scaffolding on a building project. I like to think of them as Paul did: a part of the foundation. In Ephesians 2:20, he said: "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." When we erect a building, we do not build the foundation up to the roof. The foundation is laid at the bottom or the beginning and the structure is raised upon it. In a sense, our claims rest upon the testimony of the apostles and prophets, and the Word of God which came through them is the foundation upon which our fondest hopes rest. These

## *The Evangelist*

---

mighty and venerable men served the church during its childhood period. However, the apostle also mentions evangelists and pastors and teachers. Most of the Bible scholars that I have read consider the "pastors and teachers" to be the same person and it is sometimes rendered "pastor-teachers" or "teaching pastors." A. T. Robertson says: "There are four groups." Marvin Vincent says: "The omission of the article from teachers seems to indicate that pastors and teachers are included under one class." This is also suggested in such passages as Acts 20:28 and 1 Timothy 5:17. The word "evangelist" is found three times in the New Testament and Vine says that it means "lit., a messenger of good . . . denotes a preacher of the Gospel." Bullinger says it means "a messenger of glad tidings, a proclaimer of the gospel story, of the facts of redemption."

There are some who say that the office of evangelist has been extinct since the close of the first century because (1) it is unnecessary, and, (2) because there have been no apostles since that time to send them forth. But I ask: Is there not as much necessity for evangelists now as there ever was? Is the world Christianized? Do all men believe in Jesus Christ? Are his enemies all subdued? Are there no churches that need to be set in order? Are there no officers to ordain? Such a claim is too preposterous to require refutation. Also, if it could be shown that none but apostles have authority to select, ordain and send forth evangelists, the second objection might have some currency but I deny it and ask anyone who will to try to prove it. Evangelists are necessary for the following reasons:

1. Many have not heard the gospel. Romans 10:14 says, "And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?"
2. Many cannot read, and thousands who can read do not understand it. Acts 8:31, "How can I [understand the gospel], except some man should guide me?"
3. Many who can read and understand do not do so. It takes preaching to attract the attention of sinners—to wake them up from their sinful slumbers, and to bring them back to God, against whom they have sinned. God has ordained preaching to make the truth effectual to the salvation of all who believe it. 1 Corinthians 1:21, "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." In keeping with what I have been asked to do, I have arranged our study under three main points or question: (1) Who is an evangelist? (2) What are his qualifications? (3) What is his work?

### **Who Is An Evangelist?**

There is a sense in which every apostle, every prophet and every preacher is an evangelist. Even Christ was an evangelist in that sense, and in that sense every member of the church is an evangelist. This was certainly true in Judea for Acts 8:4 says, "Therefore they that scattered abroad went every where preaching the word." It was at this point, evidently, that Philip became Philip, the evangelist. Alexander Campbell said,

Please observe, that while we contend that every citizen has a right to be heard, as well as to hear, in the christian community; and that every one who, in his intercourse with society, finds an unbeliever, has a right and command to preach to him the gospel, and to baptize him if he ask it of him; yet we have no idea that every disciple is to become a public preacher, baptizer, teacher, critic, commentator, at his own volition, option, or solicitation, by virtue of his discipleship; or to act in any public capacity in any society, or as its agent or functionary abroad, except by special designation and appointment of the community of communities in which or for which he acts. (*Millennial Harbinger*, 1832, p. 501).

No, not everyone is an evangelist in the official sense. You will note that Ephesians 4:11 says, "And he gave . . . some, evangelists." Here the word is used in contrast with other officers of the church. Also, note that it says "He gave some," not all.

I think we will all agree that there is much that any Christian may do and should do in the area of teaching and encouragement, but to act in behalf of the church or Christian community, he must have authority. If it is his duty to preach in behalf of the church, set in order imperfect churches, or ordain elders, then he must have the authority to do so. There must be a formal appointment to do these things. How will this appointment come? Will a paper signed by a fellow preacher or a few cronies be sufficient authority or is there a precedent in the word of God for appointing a man to do such work? I believe we can show that there is such a precedent. The words "evangelist" and "preacher" are not merely honorary titles conferred upon a man to give him distinction but terms to indicate that he performs a certain work.

Look at Acts 13:2-3, "As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their

## *The Evangelist*

---

hands on them, they sent them away." The separation here commanded is what we mean by "ordination" of "setting apart." This was not the selecting or choosing men for the work because they had already been chosen and called by the Holy Spirit. This was to be a formal consecration to their life's work and it was done by fasting, prayer and imposition of hands.

The Spirit said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." What was the work? It can only be determined by what they did. They went to Salamis, where they "preached the word of God." Next, to Paphos, answering the invitation of the Roman proconsul, who "desired to hear the word of God." Next they were at Antioch in Pisidia and Paul in his sermon says, "We declare unto you glad tidings." In Derbe, "they preached the gospel;" at Perga, they "preached the word," and Acts 14:26 says, "And thence sailed to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God for the work which they fulfilled." The work which they fulfilled was the work to which they had been called. This shows that the work was preaching the gospel. The fact that Saul or Paul was an apostle does not invalidate this case as a precedent to be followed because he was ordained on the same ground that Barnabas was and Barnabas was not an apostle in the official sense.

I also believe that Timothy was ordained or appointed to the work of an evangelist. In 1 Timothy 4:14, Paul said, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Surely we could not deny that the word "presbytery" here means "eldership," and as spiritual gifts were imparted only by apostolic hands, the eldership did not lay hands on Timothy for this purpose, therefore, it must have been for the same purpose for which they were laid on Paul and Barnabas.

What is the need of ordination? It is not to make a man a preacher for Paul and Barnabas had taught and preached for several years. It does not give a man ability, capacity, knowledge, experience, prudence, sociability, practice or success; these are all attained by diligent work. Ordination rather implies a recognition of these qualities and it is only with these qualifications and a solemn promise to devote his time and talent to the Lord that a man should be ordained to the work of an evangelist. Just here, I would like to note several statements from respected Bible scholars on this point.

Alexander Campbell says on Acts 13:2-3,

As to the solemn ordination and mission of the first preachers, we have a full example given; and one example of this sort



fully detailed, is enough for all nations and for all time . . . This, then, is clearly a divinely authorized custom, and, doubtless, should be practiced in all cases of special appointment to office in the kingdom of Christ, by those persons in authority in every church. We have seen that in Jerusalem the mother and the model church, there was a similar ordination in the case of the seven (*Millennial Harbinger*, 1847, p. 153).

McGarvey says that,

the imposition of hands, accompanied by fasting and prayer, was, in this case, as in that of seven deacons, merely their formal separation to the special work to which they had been called . . . It was a ceremony deemed by infinite wisdom suitable to such a purpose; and, therefore, whenever a congregation has a similar purpose to accomplish, they have, in this case, the judgment and will of God, which should be their guide (*Commentary on Acts*, pp. 157-158).

Moses Lard said:

The Holy Spirit now requires him (Barnabas) to be separated to a particular work to which he had been called. That this work was simply preaching the gospel and doing whatever else is necessarily connected therewith, needs no proof. It was, in other words, simply the act of the church, in setting apart one of its teachers to the work of an evangelist. To this work Barnabas was set apart by fasting, prayer, and the imposition of hands. Thus, then, I conclude, should every evangelist be set apart to do his work.

How long is one an evangelist? We do not have any word of inspiration on this point but since an evangelist is one who evangelizes, it would seem to me that when work ceases, the title is obsolete.

Does an evangelist have authority? Yes, the evangelist has authority correspondent to the magnitude and extent of his duties, as we have already pointed out. I believe that all authority must be viewed in light of Jesus' statement in Matthew 20:24-29. Jesus pointed out that the Gentiles exercise dominion (authoritarian rule) and then said, "But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." The elder or evangelist who tries to rule in an authoritarian way may win the battle but do much damage in the process. Paul said, "And the servant of the Lord

## *The Evangelist*

---

must not strive; but be gentle unto all men" (2 Tim. 2:24). It accords more with the spirit of Christ for authority gained by moral power and influence than by authoritarian control. Remember the words of Peter: "Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility" (1 Pet. 5:5).

To whom is an evangelist answerable? Obviously, he is answerable to every other brother or sister, as we all are. Paul's example of rebuking Peter face to face is an example for us to follow when we see someone fall into sin or error. Every evangelist must also be aware that he is accountable to God as a steward of the grace of God. But, more immediately, he is accountable to the local congregation in which he claims membership. If he does not claim membership in a local congregation, or in a congregation which sends him out, then there is a passage he does not have to obey. Hebrews 13:17 says, "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves." I think it would devolve upon the congregation that supports him or sends him out to recall his letter of recommendation in the event that such becomes necessary. But let us talk about the qualifications of an evangelist.

### **The Qualifications of an Evangelist**

I am certain that I could spend the entire time allotted to me and not exhaust the subject of the qualifications of an evangelist. I consider the subject to be of tremendous importance and one that is taken too lightly among faithful churches. One reason for this might well be stated by Alexander Campbell when he said: "It is remarkable that while the Apostles Paul and Peter formally describe, or specially teach, the qualifications and duties of Elders, or bishops, and deacons, they do not so formally and minutely develop the character and duties of an Evangelist" (*Millennial Harbinger*, 1862, p. 250). Campbell believed that the word "evangelist" determined the character and obligations of the preacher.

Campbell also wrote:

The letters to Timothy and Titus, and the frequent allusions in the other epistles to such men as Epaphras, Tychicus, Sylvanus, Aristarchus, Mark, Aquila, Stephanus, Fortunatus, Secundas, and Achaicus, abundantly show what sort of persons ought to be selected to perform the work of an evangelist. The eloquence of an Apollos, without prudence, humility, and patience, would be unavailing. The Apostles themselves, who acted sometimes as deacons, sometimes as bishops, but oftener as evangelists, furnish us the best and fullest models for those who should be

chosen by the congregations to repromulge the gospel in our own times and country (*Millennial Harbinger*, 1835, p. 523).

As to the qualifications of an evangelist, probably no better profile could be found than that recorded in First and Second Timothy and Titus. I want to make a quick survey of these, knowing that I will probably leave out something that should be mentioned. I have put these under four general categories: (1) Courage, (2) Knowledge, (3) Loyalty, and (4) Righteousness.

1. Courage is an indispensable quality. It will enable the evangelist to:
  - a. Rebuke false teachers sharply (Tit. 1:3)
  - b. Reject heretics, after the first and second admonition (Tit. 3:10)
  - c. Receive accusations against elders before two or three witnesses and rebuke those that sin before all (1 Tim. 5:20)
  - d. Teach the rich their duty (1 Tim. 6:17)
  - e. Observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality (1 Tim. 5:21).
2. Knowledge of God's Word is also necessary. The passage in 2 Timothy 2:15 has an application here, although it is not the one we customarily hear. The word "study" probably would be better rendered "give diligence." This relates to Timothy's attitude. Also, the phrase "rightly dividing the word of truth" is sometimes rendered "handling aright the word of truth." If he does not seek to be approved of God in this, he is a "workman that needeth . . . to be ashamed." Campbell said there were two outstanding things that had hindered the Reformation: (1) failure to teach those who had been converted, and (2) evangelists who bring shame because of ineptitude and lack of knowledge. The right kind of knowledge will enable the evangelist to:
  - a. Speak things which become sound doctrine (Tit. 2:1)
  - b. Teach aged men, young men, aged women and young women (Tit. 2:2-5)
  - c. Instruct people to be subject to civil authorities, speak evil of no man, but be gentle, showing meekness to all (Tit. 3:1)
  - d. Avoid foolish questions, contentions and strivings about the law (Tit. 3:9)

## *The Evangelist*

---

- e. Rebuke not elders (older men), treat elder women as mothers, and young women as sisters (1 Tim. 5:1)
  - f. Lay hands suddenly on no man or be a partaker of other men's sins (1 Tim. 5:22)
  - g. Avoid profane and vain babblings (1 Tim. 6:20)
  - h. Teach servants their duty (Tit. 2:9).
3. Loyalty to God is another quality that must be present in one who would be an evangelist. This will cause him to:
- a. Speak the forgoing things, exhorting and rebuking with all authority, allowing no one to despise him (Tit. 2:15)
  - b. Keep that which is committed to one's trust (1 Tim. 6:15).
4. Piety or godliness is demanded of one who would be an evangelist. It was said of one very inconsistent preacher, albeit an able preacher, that when he was in the pulpit, he ought never to come out of it; and when out, he behaved so badly that he ought never to enter it. Alexander Campbell said, "Learning, talent and piety were, in my youthful days, the three great acquisitions presented to me as essential prerequisites to the gospel ministry. The last of these was always presented as the greatest and most indispensable of all" (*Millennial Harbinger*, 1845, pp. 385-386). Piety and godliness will enable a man to meet these qualities:
- a. In all things showing oneself a pattern of good works (Tit. 2:7)
  - b. Use speech that no evil thing can be said of one (Tit. 2:8)
  - c. Keep oneself pure (1 Tim. 5:22)
  - d. Follow righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, and meekness (1 Tim. 6:11).

In addition to these qualities, there are some that deserve special mention. One of these qualities is what is rendered "gravity" in several places. Paul said to Titus, "Young men likewise exhort to be soberminded. In all things showing thyself a pattern of good works: in doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, a sound speech, that cannot be condemned" (Tit. 2:6-7). The KJV renders this "honest" in Philippians 4:8, and several scholars render it "probity," defined by Webster as: "adherence to the highest principles and ideals," and gives as a synonym "honesty." Gravity is just the opposite of levity. Grave intimates weight, while levity indicates lightness or the want of weight. Life and death are solemn and grave realities and the evangelist's

conduct demands an honest, sincere, earnest approach to preaching. Those who consider preaching one big party and attempt to joke and jest people into the kingdom cannot win souls that are fit for the kingdom of heaven. If there is one thing we fail in sometimes, I believe it is not approaching the great work of evangelism and preaching with enough gravity. I have known of preachers who appeal to sinners to obey the gospel with such chaffy phrases as, "Don't you like to play in the water?"

But the theme of honesty must not be overlooked in this connection. Do we abuse the freedom we have in preaching to attend to personal needs that working brethren cannot afford to do? Do we offend the church by running up bills we cannot pay? Would we hunt birds out of season and think nothing of it? Would you pursue secular business on the church's time? We must be honest with God and with those we serve or we will bring reproach on the cause of Christ.

Paul mentions another trait—sincerity. Gravity is rather the effect than the cause of sincerity. One who is sincere will be grave. Surely the man who purports to speak on the sublime, glorious and awful themes of the Bible must be sincere. He will speak "as a dying man to dying men." Many desire to be eloquent but earnestness, sincerity, springing from a clear vision of things unseen and eternal, fully and cordially embraced, will make a man more of an Elijah or a Paul than all the learning, genius and taste of the most splendid orator. The celebrated actor Garrick was once asked by an eloquent clergyman why it was that the gospel minister who had such solemn truths to utter, could not affect or interest his auditors as he could on the stage, when everyone knew what he said was all fiction. "Why, sir," replied the distinguished actor, "you speak truth as though it were fiction, while we speak fiction as though it were truth." In condemning that desire for publicity and admiration that drives some men to seek to be preachers, Campbell said, "Better for them to seek admiration in a safer market, and to cater for that reward on terms that will not imperil their own salvation in the day of righteous reward" (*Millennial Harbinger*, 1845, p. 387).

I want to mention one more thing along this line that came to be while I was preparing this study. To the one whom Paul commanded to "do the work of an evangelist," he also wrote:

Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all. Take heed unto thyself,

## *The Evangelist*

---

and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee" (1 Tim. 4:13-16).

I am going out on a limb here just a little to say that I believe the "gift" that is mentioned which came with the "laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (elders) was the appointment or ordination to the work of an evangelist. Now! Have you noticed the multiplying of terms here—neglect not; give thyself wholly to them; continue in them. I ask you, brethren, in the light of these statements: Is preaching and being an evangelist a part-time job? Has a man met the qualifications of an evangelist when he preaches only on weekends and summer vacations? What is the reason we do not have more evangelists in the field day and night, in season and out of season? Surely it is not because there is no need! Surely it is not because we cannot find work to do! Is it because there would be sacrifices that we would be unwilling to make? Is it because we cannot bear to be outdone by prosperous brethren in the church who are able to wear better clothes and drive better cars than we? Is it because we love the comforts of home so much that we are unwilling to leave to seek the lost? Is it that we crave the praise and admiration of a sinful, old world more than we love the praise of God? Just really, now, what is the reason? I think we should also ask the citizens of the kingdom of heaven: Why do we have capable men who are not "continuing in them," who are not "giving themselves wholly to these things," and who are "neglecting the gift?" Why not ask them? I wish I could say more on this theme but that is not my topic. I will say just this: All some evangelists have asked for is the "crumbs" that fall from the tables of many prosperous, well-blessed brethren, but many have not received that. And even if they did, men cannot live on crumbs. But now, to my last point.

### **What Is His Work?**

1. The prime duty of an evangelist, as the term imports, is to proclaim the good news of salvation; as Paul says to Timothy, "Preach the Word." So many of the reformers have pointed out that the term "evangelist" indicates "a herald of good news." Campbell said:

He is not theorist, no speculative genius, no dogmatist. He announces the glad tidings of great joy to every one who has not heard, who has not understood them; and consequently has not embraced them, Paul's Epistles to Timothy and Titus are his manual. He is commanded to preach the word—not doctrines, not theories, not speculations, not human traditions.

He is a workman; not a theorist, not a speculative genius  
(*Millennial Harbinger*, 1862, pp. 251-252).

Isaac Errett wrote something so inspiring and so wonderful about preaching that it makes me want to "go right out," as the song says and find someone to preach to. Listen to his words:

His words never die. They live in hearts and consciences which tremble to their eternal reverberations, and in lives which they have quickened unto holy activity in the cause of God. His affectionate utterance of the love of God, is as sweet to the sin-sick soul as "strains which angels use." His exhortation to obedience is like a trumpet-call, rousing the dead to life. His rebuke of sin is like the scathing thunderbolt. His exposures of falsehood and delusion like the sweep of the tempest. Nay, when the last echo of the songs of earth shall be drowned in the crash of falling worlds—when trumpet-call, and lightning blast, and tempest-sweep, are all annihilated and forgotten; and all earth's potentates howl amid the empty and blasted ruins of their vaunted greatness, the "man of God" shall stand sublimely among ten thousand glad monuments of his earthly labors; the echoes of his pleadings, prayers, songs, and rebukes, will come rolling joyfully back through the halls of memory; and, as he places one hand on the cross he bore, and the other on the crown he has won, he will "rejoice in the day of Christ, that he did not run in vain, neither labor in vain" (*Millennial Harbinger*, 1856, pp. 619-620).

And one who wrote under the pen name of Justus wrote:

Preaching is but a small part of the duty of an Evangelist. He should visit from house to house; confute such as oppose themselves to the truth; establish the wavering; comfort the mourners and afflicted; pray with the sick, and for them; labor with the disaffected; exhort the lukewarm and careless, and worldly-minded professors; reprove and rebuke with all long-suffering and perseverance; and give to all their meat in due season. A man who labors in this office will be constantly employed; he will eat no idle bread. He will have no time to make pills, and write declarations and pleas, and measure tape, and trade in fine stock, and cultivate cotton farms, or

## *The Evangelist*

---

to engage in any other secular pursuit. The duties of his calling will constantly employ his head, and heart and hands, and his whole soul, body, and spirit. One who is qualified for this blessed employment and gives himself entirely to it, will, beyond all doubt, do much good, and be the means of saving many from the pit of fire eternal. He will occasion many a shout in heaven at the return of sinners to God, and be the means of bringing many souls to glory (*Millennial Harbinger*, 1838, p. 246).

2. It is the duty of an evangelist to teach those whom he has converted. To leave new converts without food or shelter, a prey to devouring wolves, is neither humanity nor wisdom. The example of the apostles at Jerusalem and of Paul and Barnabas at Antioch shows that every territory gained was carefully, diligently cultivated. Campbell said that many evangelists reminded him of the Bible description of the ostrich,

Which leaveth her eggs in the earth, and warmeth them in the dust, and forgetteth that the foot may crush them, or that the wild beast may break them. She is hardened against her young ones, as though they were not hers: her labor is in vain without fear; because God hath deprived her of wisdom, neither hath he imparted to her understanding (Job 39:14-17).

Surely it is not time spent in vain to strengthen and teach the disciples we make, according to Jesus' commission in Matthew 28:19-20.

3. A third outstanding duty of evangelists would be to organize and inaugurate leadership and ministry in every congregation planted. Our example in this is the Apostle Paul and Barnabas, acting under their commission by the church at Antioch.

And when they had preached the gospel to that city, and had taught many, they returned again to Lystra, and to Iconium, and Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God. And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed (Acts 14:21-23).

It is significant that the apostolic instructions relative to the qualifications and ordination of bishops and deacons, are given to evangelists, not to



churches. Taking the example of Paul and Barnabas, we can see that the evangelist is not bound to tie himself down to that particular church, but to provide for them suitable leadership and to return, ere long, to see "how they do."

4. It is the duty of the evangelist to correct disorders in existing churches, as per Paul's instructions in Titus 1:5. If false doctrine is taught and the existing eldership cannot remedy it, the evangelist is to confute the gain-sayers (1 Tim. 1:3-4; 6:3-5; 4:1-5). If the eldership is at fault, he is to investigate and restore order and peace (1 Tim. 5:19-22).
5. Finally, it is the duty of the evangelist to educate other faithful men for the work, that they may be able to teach others also (2 Tim. 2:2). Paul and Barnabas did this. The work of an evangelist is such that no man can learn in a school or college somewhere how to do it. This is something which is trouble to the one who trains—trouble and inconvenience. Boys and young men who go with evangelists should know that it is not a lark or a pleasure trip—it is work. I believe the young man should be recommended by his home congregation and the evangelist who trains him should not have to bear the total expense of such training.

### **Conclusion**

Before I close, let me say that many congregations are dying today for want of good, effective teaching and good, effective song leading. Not one man out of ten in the local congregation is an effective teacher (many times) and certainly not one out of a hundred is an effective song leader in most congregations. We need improvement in waiting at the table, wording prayers, preparing lessons, leading singing, and doing personal work. The logical one to teach much of this is the evangelist.

We have noticed the duties of an evangelist in a very brief way. They demand all his time and all his energy. *P.O. Box 1657, Lebanon, MO 65536*

### **Financial Support of Preachers, Elders and Teachers**

*by Gregory P. Gay*

The fact that the Lord allows certain individuals to be supported monetarily out of a congregation's treasury should not be a surprise to my audience. Whether we want to admit it or not, money is important and vital to the church as described in the Bible. This is probably an area where we have allowed the abuses of the denominational world to keep us from really emphasizing what the Bible says and means on the subject.

There are quite a few verses in the New Testament that prove God intended certain people in the church to be paid out of the treasury. These include 1 Timothy 5:17-18, Galatians 6:6, Titus 3:13-14, 3 John 5-8, 2 Thessalonians 3:6-13, Acts 15:2-3, Philipians 4:10-19, 1 Corinthians 9:1-18.

Let us begin by examining the Scripture's references to paying preachers, elders, and teachers.

In the case of paying an elder, the instruction is given in 1 Timothy 5:17-18 "The elders who direct the affairs of the church well are worthy of double honor, especially those whose work is preaching and teaching. For the Scriptures says, 'Do not muzzle the ox while it is treading out the grain,' and 'The worker deserves his wages' " (NIV).

In other words, these verses say that the amount of labor and the quality of the labor can determine whether or not the individual is worthy of pay. The principal is, just like the ox could work and eat from his labor, so an elder could be paid for his work. Would any farmer begrudge his best ox a lot of food if the ox ate while he worked? No, but he might have a dim view of an ox that got so busy eating he forgot to work. While it is quite likely that it would be acceptable for all elders to receive some pay because of the honor of their office, those who work especially hard in the congregation in preaching and teaching could and should be paid much more for their labor.

In looking into the subject of what constitutes a teacher, in order to determine whether or not they should be paid for their labor, it would appear we have not maintained the distinction that existed in the First Century church. 1 Corinthians 12:28 and Romans 8:7 both mention teachers. Moses E. Lard in his *Commentary on Romans* says, on page 385,

## *Support of Preachers*

---

The teaching here mentioned, I doubt not, consisted strictly in instructing the church. It did not include preaching the gospel to those without. This was the work more particularly of the prophet. The *didaskalia* (teacher) who works well laboring in preaching and teaching in the congregation was for members of the church, and had for its object their complete enlightenment in duty. It bore the same relation to those within the church, that preaching did to those without. The design of preaching was to bring men in; the design of teaching, to perfect them when in. Teaching was the work chiefly of the overseers of the congregation.

It would appear from Acts 13:1 that the apostle Paul served for a while in the congregation at Antioch as a teacher. And Paul says in 2 Timothy 1:11, "Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles." Like Paul, today's preachers must also be teachers, and of course, an elder must be a teacher. Whether or not it is correct for a congregation to pay what we call "local teachers" is not something I am prepared to prove. I do not find anyone being supported because they were a local teacher. We can know without a doubt that it is correct to pay elders who are also teachers, and preachers who are also teachers, but I think in their case we are paying them primarily because they are elders and preachers. In my opinion to pay a local teacher for teaching would be a bit like the wife asking her husband to pay for his supper, that's just not something you do at home. And as one brother recently asked me, "If we start paying local teachers for teaching at home, will we start paying men to lead songs?"

Next, not only is it suggested that gospel preachers are worthy of support for their labors, it is commanded. "In the same way, the Lord has commanded that those who preach the gospel should receive their living from the gospel" (1 Cor. 9:14, NIV). Just how serious is the Lord about paying preachers? Serious enough to command that preachers should be paid for their work. The word "living" or "live" in the King James means "to get a living from a thing" according to Thayer, (p. 270). W. E. Vine (p. 348) says it means "the maintenance of physical life." Zerr comments (vol. 6, p. 19), "To live of the Gospel means to obtain a living from those to whom the Gospel is preached."

Before we discuss what should or should not be happening today, let us go back and look at some things recorded in the Law of Moses. Romans 15:4 reads, "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for

## *Support of Preachers*

---

our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope."

When we look in the Law of Moses, we find God provided for the priests through the sacrifices of the people. It would appear that they were cared for quite well.

The Old Testament gives very specific guidelines about supporting priests: In Leviticus 2:10 we find these words, "The rest of the grain offering belongs to Aaron and his sons" (NIV). In Leviticus 10:15, "This (the meat of the wave offering) will be the regular share for you and your children, as the Lord has commanded" (NIV). Numbers 5:9-10 says, "All the sacred contributions the Israelites bring to a priest will belong to him. Each man's sacred gifts are his own, but what he gives to the priest will belong to the priest" (NIV). Numbers 18:25-32 reads,

the Lord said to Moses, Speak to the Levites and say to them: When you receive from the Israelites the tithe I give you as your inheritance, you must present a tenth of that tithe as the Lord's offering . . . You and your households may eat the rest of it anywhere, for it is your wages for your work at the Tent of Meeting (NIV).

Deuteronomy 18 gives further instructions.

The priests, who are Levites—indeed the whole tribe of Levi—are to have no allotment or inheritance with Israel. They shall live on the offerings made to the Lord by fire, for that is their inheritance. They shall have no inheritance among their brothers: the Lord is their inheritance, as he promised them . . . You are to give them the firstfruits of your grain, new wine and oil, and the first wool from the shearing of your sheep, for the Lord your God has chosen them and their descendants out of all your tribes to stand and minister in the Lord's name always. If a Levite moves from one of your towns anywhere in Israel where he is living, and comes in all earnestness to the place the Lord will choose, he may minister in the name of the Lord his God like all his fellow Levites who serve there in the presence of the Lord. He is to share equally in their benefits, even though he has received money from the sale of family possessions (Deut. 18:1-8, NIV).

Even though Levites did not inherit any of the land God gave the Israelites they were still allowed an inheritance. Numbers 35:2-3 reads, "Command

## *Support of Preachers*

---

the Israelites to give the Levites towns to live in from the inheritance the Israelites will possess. And give them pasturelands around the towns. Then they will have towns to live in and pasturelands for their cattle, flocks and all their other livestock" (NIV). In verses 7-8, we find God gave the Levites forty-eight cities that were to be given in proportion to the inheritance of each tribe.

Obviously God intended His priests to be taken care of in an acceptable manner. In fact, during the time the Law was obeyed, it can be concluded that the priests would have had more than the average person, because there was always a smaller number of priests than there were sacrificing families from the other tribes. Remember, under the Law each family was to give a tithe or a tenth. Therefore, it should have only taken ten givers to support one priest. What he would have received would have been the average of all their best.

Keil and Delitzsch (Fourth book of Moses, p. 120) quote J. D. Michaelis

A tribe (the Levites) which had only 22,000 males in it, and therefore could hardly have numbered more than 12,000 grown-up men, received the tithes of 600,000 Israelites; consequently one single Levite, without the slightest necessity for sowing, and without any of the expenses of agriculture, reaped or received from the produce of the flocks and herds as much as five of the other Israelites . . . But this leaves out of sight the fact that tithes are never paid so exactly as this, and that no doubt there was as little conscientiousness in the matter then as there is at the present day, when those who are entitled to receive a tenth often receive even less than a twentieth.

Some in the church today honestly believe that preachers have always had it real easy, and that they have made a lot of money for very little effort.

Early in 1922 my Grandfather, Homer A. Gay submitted his field report for 1921 to the Apostolic Way. He reported,

My last meeting for 1921 was at Hatchel, Texas. It lasted from the 23rd of December until the 2nd of January, and was a pleasant meeting. Four baptisms. I reached home—Brady—on the 3rd of January for the first time since the first part of August. The year that has just passed was the busiest year I have ever spent in the Master's work. I held nineteen protracted meetings, preached three hundred and seventy-one sermons,

## *Support of Preachers*

---

traveled a little over seven thousand miles, preached in Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Missouri, and Louisiana, established three new congregations, had one hundred additions. For this work I have received \$347.30. My railroad fare was about \$200.00. Other traveling expenses are not counted in. I hope to do even more good this year than I did last, if I can get upon my feet again by "big meeting time" (*A Good Soldier, Sermons and Writings of Homer A. Gay*, p. 37).

Lest anyone think that \$347.30 was big money for a preacher in 1921, W. E. Garrison reported in 1918 that the average preachers salary was \$937.00 (Winfred Ernest Garrison, *The March of Faith, The Story of Religion in America Since 1865*, Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1933, page 251).

Have our preachers always been paid so disporportionately? Or is that just something that happened then but not now—that a preacher in the church would make less than half of the average of what denominational preachers make? I will present some figures at the end of my talk that will let you know how we have done in the last 68 years since my Grandfather preached in 1921.

### **Attitudes of Supporting Congregations**

Let us examine the attitude of those giving support to preachers, elders, and teachers. In the New Testament we can find two extremes in congregations by comparing Corinth with Philippi. Notice first what Paul wrote to Corinth about him being an Apostle. "Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord? Are you not the result of my work in the Lord?" (1 Cor. 9:1, NIV). The phrase, "am I not free?" is a very important statement because in those days all free men were entitled to wages for their work. Only slaves were not entitled to pay for their labor.

This is my defense to those who sit in judgment on me. Don't we have the right to food and drink. Don't we have the right to take a believing wife along with us, as do the other apostles and the Lord's brothers and Cephas? Or is it only I and Barnabas who must work for a living? (1 Cor. 9:3-6, NIV).

What were the brethren at Corinth like? While Paul was with them, at least a year and a half according to Acts 18:11, he supported himself by making tents. The church at Corinth thought that meant he was not worthy of support. Then they took their reasoning one step further and determined

## *Support of Preachers*

---

that Paul must not be an Apostle since he did not take any support from them. Obviously they were wrong. 2 Corinthians 11:7-8 reads, "Was it a sin for me to lower myself in order to elevate you by preaching the gospel of God to you free of charge? I robbed other churches by receiving support from them so as to serve you" (NIV). In looking through 1 Corinthians 9, I cannot see any indication that the brethren at Corinth were really interested in helping to support Paul. In fact, it might be said that the silence of the scriptures is quite eloquent here, because, while he says over and over he had the right to support just like the ox, the farmer, and the shepherd, nowhere are we told he continually turned down their earnest offers of support. Not only were they content not to pay him for his labor, they even turned his good example into a way to discredit him as an Apostle. Contrast the Corinthian attitude with:

Yet it was good of you to share in my troubles. Moreover, as you Philippians know, in the early days of your acquaintance with the gospel, when I set out from Macedonia, not one church shared with me in the matter of giving and receiving, except you only; for even when I was in Thessalonica, you sent me aid again and when I was in need (Phil. 4:14-16).

Notice about the church at Philippi: They had chosen voluntarily to support Paul. They sought opportunities to help him. They were willing to sacrifice to help him with even more than he needed. They supported him even though he was not with them. They supported him even though he supported himself whenever he could. They were so eager to support him, they sent Epaphroditus with their money. What the brethren at Philippi received in return was an overwhelming compliment, and the assurance that what they had done was wellpleasing to God.

Today the spirit of both Corinth and Philippi is alive and well. There are those today, after the fashion of Corinth, that look for any opportunity to discredit those who labor among them and look for the slightest excuse not to pay them anything. They can speak in these terms:

"Must that man bring his wife with him?"

"Can't she stay home and work?"

"Oh, your wife stayed home to work? Doesn't she care about the brethren?"

"He probably makes good money at his job, lets just pay his expenses."

"Preachers shouldn't preach for money should they?"

"What is the least amount we can pay him?"

"He's single so he doesn't need near as much as someone who is married."

## *Support of Preachers*

---

"How much do you need to get by? Which is really saying, What is the least amount you need to get by?"

"Now you know we don't have much here so we won't be able to support you like some other places."

"A lack of money keeps you humble you know."

"Wow, I didn't know preachers could afford that kind of a car."

"He lives in a better house than I do, I'm not for supporting him any more."

"A preacher should expect to sacrifice shouldn't he?"

Can you imagine a modern version of Epaphroditus bringing Philippi's gifts to Paul,

What is that Paul, you are working on a tent in the back room?  
Are you a fulltime Apostle or part time? Just how much is that tent worth anyway? We will have to deduct that from what we give you, you know.

In sharp contrast to that poor attitude, we also have the wonderful spirit of Philippi among us today. Where a congregation says:

"He may not have done so well at his last meeting, let's give him some extra, we can handle it."

"Did you notice the tires on his car? Lets give him enough to get a new set and tell him that is what it's for."

"They have expenses we don't think of, lets help them."

"Let's try to make sure he can thank God for being a laborer for us."

God intended supporting those who are worthy to be a loving privilege.

How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things! (Rom. 10:14-15).

However, supporting preachers should also be considered a debt. This idea was presented regarding helping the poor saints in Jerusalem:

Now, however, I am on my way to Jerusalem in the service of the saints there. For Macedonia and Achaia were pleased to make a contribution for the poor among the saints in Jerusalem. They were pleased to do it, and indeed they owe it to them. For if the Gentiles have shared in the Jews' spiritual blessings,



## *Support of Preachers*

---

they owe it to the Jews to share with them their material blessings (Rom. 15:25-27, NIV).

Even though this was a debt, look how the Macedonian churches responded.

And now, brothers, we want you to know about the grace that God has given the Macedonian churches. Out of the most severe trial, their overflowing joy and their extreme poverty welled up in rich generosity. For I testify that they gave as much as they were able, and even beyond their ability. Entirely on their own, they urgently pleaded with us for the privilege of sharing in this service to the saints (2 Cor. 8:1-4, NIV).

The Apostle Paul expressed the same concept regarding preacher's support in 1 Corinthians 9:11-12: "If we have sown spiritual seed among you, is it too much if we reap a material harvest from you?" (The obvious answer to this question is no.) "If others have this right of support from you, shouldn't we have it all the more?" (The obvious answer is yes.)

Would it not be wonderful today if congregations were pleading for the privilege of financing the spreading of the gospel around the world? We have congregations with treasuries large enough to choke a horse. And what are they doing with the Lord's money? Are they pleading, like the Macedonian churches, to be part of a work? No! They ignore pleas for help! It is high time that money be put to work in the Lord's vineyard!

Those giving the support must plan to be able to provide the support. Just because we do not live under the law of the tithe does not mean we cannot think ahead and share giving goals with the congregation. In business, the business that fails to plan, plans to fail and I think the same thing could be said of the church. Too many times a congregation saves up some money, divides it by the number of years they want a preacher to come work with them, and then divided the annual sum by 12 to arrive at their monthly wage. That is not what I would call responsible planning. A congregation needs to carefully plan before they commit to a man's support. Then they need to communicate that plan carefully so each member of the congregation knows exactly what they are giving for and how much the average contribution needs to be per family, or per working individual.

Even with the best plan a congregation may not be able to support a preacher by itself which may mean the congregation will have to ask for help from other congregations or they may have to ask the preacher to take a secular job while he labors with them to help support himself. A primary

example of congregational financial planning can be seen by examining Paul's letters to Corinth. From the way Paul writes about helping the poor saints in Jerusalem in 1 Corinthians 16 and 2 Corinthians 9, it is obvious that they had a congregational financial goal that was broken down to family or individual goals. They were to carefully keep track of how they were doing so they could provide the service they had promised. If there was no goal involved, how could Paul ask them if they were ready? (2 Cor. 9:3). Yet many times in our congregations we have no goals! We have no proposed budget. We have no idea how much money we may get in the next six months, and neither do we know for sure if we want to spend what we get. Neither would we be comfortable asking a congregation about giving commitments. I can hear the cry now, "That sounds just like the denominations!" I agree what the denominations have done in this area is wrong because they have taken it too far. Brethren, we do not even give suggested guidelines! And I think that is wrong.

Now then, if planning and setting giving goals sounds distasteful to congregations here today let me tell you a really distasteful way of planning. And that is when a congregation determines how much to support a preacher by his answer to the question, "How much do you need to get by?" Do you know what that does brethren? That forces the preacher to do the congregation's work! It also means the brethren asking that question are considering that man, not as a free man that is worthy of a living wage in return for his labor, but they are considering him barely above the level of a slave, worthy to "get by," but not ever worthy to "get ahead." Worthy to eat today, but not worthy enough to have meat in his freezer. Worthy to be paid, but not ever worthy to have a little money left over at the end of the month. Truly these individuals have treasures in heaven, because it should be obvious they have none on earth, not with the wages we pay!

### **What Constitutes Support?**

Is money the only support we can give? It should not be thought that all the support that one can receive must only be money and that it can only come out of the treasury.

Preachers have not always been supported only with money. For example:

In 1833, the churches of Christ in Eastern Indiana, then numbering fifteen, employed John O'Kane to travel, preach, and organize churches, fixing his salary at two hundred dollars, payable chiefly in produce (*The Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin*, by Joseph Franklin, and J. A. Headington. St. Louis:

## *Support of Preachers*

---

John Burns, Publisher, 1879, Reproduced and Distributed by Old Paths Book Club, 1956, p. 149).

When my Dad, Sonny Gay, wrote about paying preachers in the *Old Paths Advocate*, May 1974, he said,

We could all do more as individuals for the preachers and their families. It doesn't all have to be done through the treasury of the church. When I was a small boy, a brother here in the church at Lee's Summit, MO gave us a pig, then brought us corn to feed it until it was big enough to eat.

It would appear that this is scriptural from Titus 3:13-14, "Do everything you can to help Zenas the lawyer and Apollos on their way and see that they have everything they need. Our people must learn to devote themselves to doing what is good, in order that they may provide for daily necessities and not live unproductive live" (NIV). Lenski, commenting on this verse says it means "to outfit and to expedite for a journey. This implies 'to provide necessary funds, clothing, and baggage,' and usually also to accompany a part of the way" (R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, To Timothy, To Titus, and to Philemon*, Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1964, p. 946).

Galatians 6:6 states, "Anyone who receives instruction in the word must share all good things with his instructor" (NIV). How can individual Christians share good things with those who instruct them? Is this intended to be totally fulfilled when they contribute on Lord's day? I think not. Individual Christians can give much that does not cost them anything. Such as, encouragement, appreciation and prayers.

Some brethren have also chosen to share their talents. For example, some brethren among us are automobile mechanics or carpenters. What can they do? They can fix and repair things for others. Other brethren among us are gardeners or farmers and many are very willing to share their blessings. I am sure many of us have left these brethren's homes laden with their generosity. There are also individual Christians among us who not only contribute willingly, generously, and cheerfully on Lord's Day, but they also choose to use their money privately as individuals to help others. There are many brethren that are so hospitable you could knock on their door any time and you know you would be welcome. Hospitality is not cheap, yet there are many who are willing to share their home and food with others. I, like others, know what it is like to shake hands with some dear brother or sister and be given

## *Support of Preachers*

---

a folded bill. Perhaps some of you in my audience today may have had your plane ticket bought by some generous friend. There are some that have bought books, computers, automobiles, furniture, and yes, sometimes they even give gifts of money to someone they thought worthy. These things produce wonderful memories. In my own experiences a congregation once took up a collection so we could buy a vacuum cleaner. Since I had volunteered to do all the vacuuming at the time, I can't say I was overjoyed to see the purpose of that gift.

Who among us would condemn the attitude that fulfills Jesus' words as quoted in Acts 20:35 ". . . It is more blessed to give than to receive." No one, I trust.

I am always amazed though, at the attitude of some who are very afraid that a preacher is going to have too much. One thing I do as I travel from place to place is sell books and tapes, all brotherhood materials. Someone always says, "How much are you making out of this?" As though it would be a terrible thing for me to make something for my labor. While all I am doing is providing a service, I wonder how many of our brethren avoid buying such things because they are afraid someone in the church will make some money. Believe me brethren, those who write books and make tapes to sell are usually financed by generous brethren who realize the return on their investment will be non-existent, and not only will there not be any profits, they will be doing good to get their money back. Those who publish papers do not get rich doing it, neither is their intention to get rich—they are providing a service because of a commitment to spread the gospel.

Those doing the giving should do so with no strings attached. If what appears to be liberality and generosity has conditions attached then it is not a loving gift but rather a manipulative tool. Remember the Law says, "All the sacred contributions the Israelites bring to a priest will belong to him. Each man's sacred gifts are his own, but what he gives to the priest will belong to the priest" (Num. 5:9-10, NIV). No one who is given something should be made to feel like the gift is an attempt to dictate what will or will not be preached or practiced.

### **The Attitude of Those Being Supported**

Next, let us look at the attitude of those doing the receiving. The Bible prohibits preaching for money. In fact one qualification for an elder is that he must not be a lover of money (1 Tim. 3:3). A qualification for a deacon is that he must not pursue dishonest gain (1 Tim. 3:9). All would agree that Timothy the Evangelist could not be inconsistent in this attitude toward

## *Support of Preachers*

---

money, and still properly develop elders and deacons. Here is Paul's advice to Timothy about the love of money:

But godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing into the world, and we can take nothing out of it. But if we have food and clothing, we will be content with that. People who want to get rich fall into temptation and a trap and into many foolish and harmful desires that plunge men into ruin and destruction. For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil. Some people, eager for money, have wandered from the faith and pierced themselves with many griefs (1 Tim. 6:6-10, NIV).

One thing that caused Alexander Campbell's publication, **The Christian Baptist**, to be such a popular journal was his unceasing attack on what he called the clergy. Here are some excerpts from what he wrote in the July, 1825 issue on the subject of "The Clergy's Reward".

"In all your gettings" get money! Now, therefore, when ye go forth on your ministerial journey, go where there are silver and gold, and where each man will pay according to his measure. For verily I say ye must get your reward.

And when ye shall hear of a church that is vacant and hath no one to preach therein, then be that a call unto you, and be ye mindful of the call, and take ye charge of the flock thereof and of the fleece thereof, even of the golden fleece.

And when he shall have fleeced your flock, and shall know of another call, and if the flock be greater, or rather if the fleece be greater, then greater be also unto you the call. Then shall ye leave your old flock, and of the new flock shall ye take the charge.

Those who have "freely received" let them "freely give," and let not men have your words "without money nor without price," but bargain ye for hundreds and bargain for thousands, even for thousands of silver and gold shall ye bargain.

And over and above the price for which ye have sold your service, take ye also gifts, and be ye mindful to refuse none, saying, "Lo! I have enough!" but receive gifts from them that go in chariots, and from them that feed flocks, and from them that earn their morsel by the sweat of their brow.

## *Support of Preachers*

---

Those doing the receiving must be thankful for whatever they are given. When Jesus sent out the seventy He gave them some specific instructions about receiving.

And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house. And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you (Lk. 10:7-8).

Norval Geldenhuys in his commentary (*The New International Commentary on the New Testament Series: Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*, p. 300) says,

Whenever they had taken up their abode with a family, they were not to regard themselves as intruders, but had to live together with the household as full members of it, for the food and maintenance received by them are not charitable doles but the just reward of their labour. They are fully entitled to it because they have been sent by Him to carry out that work. They were also not to regard themselves as a burden to the family and then go from house to house, thus wasting time and strength. The household where they were originally taken in must remain their abode and centre throughout their stay in the town visited by them. From there they must minister to the town.

Lenski commenting on the verse says, (*The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel*, R. C. H. Lenski, Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1946, p. 571) says, "The thing that Jesus forbids is that they keep going from house to house, hunting out the best quarters, casting reproach on their Lord and his message." The idea conveyed in all of this, is that a preacher is not to have his nose so high that he cannot eat anything except the best food and stay anywhere except the best house. Now, I know sometimes we are called on to stay places and eat things that are really a test of faith, but even in times like that our attitude must be right! When we sit down at a dear brother's table, no matter how fancy or plain the food may be, we are to receive it with thanksgiving as part of our wages.

Brethren, if someone singles out you and your family as being worthy of their hospitality, attention, encouragement, or even their money, be very careful if you accept their gift; but be even more careful if you do not accept their gift. Do not cheapen their wonderful generosity by making them

## Support of Preachers

ashamed of what they have offered. If something is not accepted, that's fine, but make sure the gift is not being turned down because it is not acceptable to you!

Even though there were times the Apostle Paul chose not to let a congregation support him for various reasons, look how graciously he received the support from Philippi. "Yet it was good of you to share in my troubles . . . I am amply supplied, now that I have received from Epaphroditus the gifts you sent. They are a fragrant offering, as acceptable sacrifice, pleasing to God" (Phil. 4:14, 18, NIV).

Sometimes preachers among us have determined not to accept anything that even remotely resembles a gift from the brethren and in the process they have really conveyed the idea that what they have been offered is not good enough. I not only think that attitude is wrong, I think it shows an ignorance of the Scriptures. If we make someone doing a good deed ashamed by the way we receive their gift or by the way we turn down their gift, how encouraged do you think they will be to do those things again? Many times people are reluctant to accept things from others because they are afraid there may be strings attached, or it may be they simply do not know how to say a sincere "thank you."

Those doing the receiving must be contented with their support. The Apostle Paul said in Philippians 4:10-13,

I rejoice greatly in the Lord that at last you have renewed your concern for me. Indeed, you have been concerned, but you had no opportunity to show it. I am not saying this because I am in need, for I have learned to be content whatever the circumstances. I know what it is to be in need, and I know what it is to have plenty. I have learned the secret of being content in any and every situation, whether well fed or hungry, whether living in plenty or in want. I can do everything through him who gives me strength (NIV).

To be contented with support does not mean if you go somewhere to hold a meeting, and you are only supported a little, that you are to spread the word about that congregation so others will not waste their time. It could be those brethren paid for what they got. There are congregations that cannot afford to support anyone to preach for them yet they need it a lot. Should preachers refuse to go to these places? I hope not.

There must be total communication between those giving support and those receiving the support. Are there to be paid vacations? If so, how many

## *Support of Preachers*

---

weeks? Are there to be any days off during the week? If so, which days? Can he go to the preacher's study? If so, will the congregation pay his way? Can he go to the fourth of July meetings? If so, will the congregation pay his way? How many meetings can the preacher hold? Does he use his vacation for that? Will he be supported during that time?

If these questions sound like a lack of trust, please let me correct that. Trust can only come from understanding what is expected. Is the one being supported expected to work so many hours a day? If so, how many is enough? Is the preacher or elder expected to report his activities to the congregation? If so, how often and in what detail?

In business, employees are expected to give an account of their time. If those who are supported refuse to account for their time in the presence of a congregation full of people that must account for their time that is asking for trouble. If anything, those who are supported should account too much for their time lest there be any doubt. A congregation can never doubt the work ethic of their leaders. Also elders, whether supported or not, need to get used to accounting for their time. Many times it appears to a congregation that a preacher and elder show up for worship but past that they do not do much. Perhaps a some accountability would be a healthy change. Remember, when we have done that which is our duty to do we are still unprofitable servants (Lk. 17:10). Should preachers or elders ever ask for support? Even though the scriptures appear to give a preacher the right to ask for money, I do not think that it is a very wise thing to do. And it should never be necessary. 1 Corinthians 9:11-12 reads, "If we have sown spiritual seed among you, is it too much if we reap a material harvest from you? If others have this right of support from you, shouldn't we have it all the more?" (NIV).

For any preacher on his own to send out a letter asking for his monthly support, or for help for one problem or another in his life, may be effective, but it is not very wise in my opinion. For one thing it ignores the need for a congregation to recommend the man for a work, which I think is essential. I personally do not like to see letters from one man asking for help for himself. Most preachers, like Paul, would much rather work at a second job to support themselves than to ever ask those who support them for more money.

Someone may be thinking, "Our preachers preach, they are not caught up in secular jobs." Do these professions sound familiar? Farmer, school supply sales, barber, school bus driver, school teacher, school principal, social worker, carpenter, gas station attendant, painter, book publisher, janitor,



## *Support of Preachers*

---

psychologist, truck driver, antique sales, craft sales, Amway, real estate sales, office machine repair, banker, life insurance sales, accountant. These should sound familiar to some of us, because these are the other jobs that some of our preachers have. But, just like Paul was a tentmaker and an apostle at the same time, it is possible to be a preacher and something else, or an elder and something else at the same time.

One reason preachers are many times underpaid in our brotherhood today is because of a lingering effect from the early days of the restoration movement. Alexander Campbell was very much against what he called "the clergy," as you can tell from what I quoted from the *Christians Baptist* a few moments ago. He considered those who were in the clergy as hirelings, or men that were only working for the money, and he very clearly rebuked such. Homer Hailey, writing in reference to Alexander Campbell's writing in the *Christian Baptist*, July 4, 1825 about preachers and money said,

The influence of these early articles against the clergy continued to be felt for many years thereafter. Mr. Campbell himself never accepted salaries for his work as a preacher, but supported himself and his family by farming, teaching school, and through his publishing company. It was the general practice of the times for preachers of the movement to support themselves by their own hands, although men sent out by congregations, or engaged in meetings, sometimes received support from others in their work . . . (*Attitude and Consequences In the Restoration Movement*, The Old Paths Book Club, 1945, pages 84-85).

When Racoon John Smith decided to travel the countryside and preach in 1825, here is what John Augustas Williams says he did.

He threw down his ax at the thought, and went to his house; he dropped off his coarse apron at the feet of his wife; and filled with enthusiasm, he exclaimed: "Nancy, I shall work no more! Get whom you please to carry on the farm, but do not call on me! In all the land, there is not one soul to open his mouth in defense of the best cause under the sun! I am determined, from this time forth, to preach the Gospel, and leave the consequences to God."

His wife had cordially entered with him into all his little schemes of economy and finance, and, with frugal and industrious hands, had been toiling and saving to help him pay

off his debt. Now, she as readily caught his new spirit, and as cheerfully accepted the responsibilities of her new position—agreeing to carry on the farm, to provide for the family, and to relieve him of every temporal care, while he should give himself wholly to the preaching of the Word. (*Life of Elder John Smith*, by John Augustus Williams, The Standard Publishing Company, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1904, p. 154)

Raccoon John Smith had been preaching for years and farming at the same time. While he wasn't very good at providing for his family as a farmer, he was much worse providing for them as a preacher. In the same work (p. 193) we read,

For all his labor and sacrifices, John Smith received but little compensation. From the day of his bold renunciation of Calvinism, at Spencer, in 1822 to the year of grace 1825, he had received nothing for this preaching from any source whatever, save that, in 1825, a kind-hearted merchant of Mount Sterling gave him the amount of his account for merchandise that year, which was about \$18.00. Though not a professor of religion, he did the same in 1826, and also in 1827. In 1828, that merchant, charmed with the simple Christianity which Smith taught so well, and illustrated so consistently in his life, embraced it himself.

Someone may think, John Smith should not have let his wife provide for the home. Well brethren, let me tell you there is many a preacher that wouldn't be preaching if it were not for the labors of his dear wife to help with the family finances. It is indeed strange to me that we who are so careful not to let a woman usurp authority over a man would let women all over the brotherhood do the work that rightly belongs to the church!

### **Guidelines for Paying Those Worthy of Support**

How do we determine if someone should be supported? The most important principal about paying preachers, teachers, and elders is the one introduced in the law about not muzzling the ox, which is the foundation for the principle "the laborer is worthy of his hire," found in Luke 10:7 and 1 Timothy 5:18. The way I would encourage all to understand this principle is, if you hire a man, you owe a man for his work. If he worked poorly, then pay him poorly, but if he worked well, then pay him well. To hire a man and then not pay him is a form of fraud. On this the Law says in Leviticus 19:13, "do not defraud your neighbor or rob him. Do not hold

## *Support of Preachers*

---

back the wages of a hired man overnight" (NIV). In other words, do not promise to pay at a certain time and then not keep your promise. Congregations must not be guilty of this. Those being supported must know they can depend on that support at the agreed to intervals. Also in the law, in Malachi 3:5 among those the Lord will be quick to testify against is included "those who defraud laborers of their wages." How much should anyone be paid? The best advice, as always, comes from the word of God. Proverbs 30:8-9 says, "Keep falsehood and lies far from me; give me neither poverty nor riches, but give me only my daily bread. Otherwise, I may have too much and disown you, and say, 'Who is the Lord?' Or I may become poor and steal, and so dishonor the name of my God" (NIV). Paul said in 1 Timothy 6:8, "But if we have food and clothing, we will be content with that" (NIV). The standard of complete contentment should be if we have food and clothing for today. Anything over and above that should be considered abundant blessings from God.

As far back as I can remember there have been problems and continual debate over how much to pay a preacher. In years to come elders will be included in the conversations as well. Hopefully, as we get more elders who are worthy of support we will know how to pay them acceptably.

I would suggest that anyone that wants to consider the responsibility of paying a preacher, teacher, or elder, do some research into proper wages before attempting to think about it. One way that some have used to determine how much to pay a preacher is to take an anonymous survey of the congregation to determine the average wages of the congregation. To that I would add, the survey then should be checked against wages for the area to see if the average of the congregation is indicative of the area as a whole. One way to check average wages is to go to the public library and look at wage statistics.

One source that I found is the "Statistical Abstract Of The United States." It is published annually and should be available in most libraries. There are some very important tables in this book that I think are relevant to our study. One is the "Poverty Level" by year and by family size. For example, in 1986 the poverty level for a family of 4 was \$11,203. Therefore if a congregation wants to support a man and pay him \$11,000 a year, they need to realize they are only paying him poverty wages. I have a feeling some congregations are paying wages no higher than this but actually think they are paying good wages. This table proves they are not.

Another important table in the same work is the Average Annual Pay table by state and for the country as a whole. In 1987 the average annual

## *Support of Preachers*

---

pay for all wage earners in the United States was \$20,855. I would say that the approximate average that a full-time preacher is supported today would be about \$20,000 a year. So does that mean that preachers are doing real well? No it does not, because the average wage earner has quite a few benefits provided for him while the preacher is self-employed. Therefore, for a preacher to have these same benefits he must pay for them. Often, if a preacher is to have insurance it is because he pays it himself out of his wages, while the average wage earner probably has his insurance partially, if not wholly, paid for him. There are also taxes that a preacher must pay that the average worker does not pay. According to an article in **Leadership Magazine** (Winter, 1987) we would need to add at least 40% to the preacher's gross salary for his wages to be like the wages of a person that works for a company. Expressed another way, for a \$20,000 job that a member has to be equivalent to a preacher's wages the preacher would have to make \$28,000. But remember, I have been using average worker wages for the basis of our talk. Is a preacher an average worker? For example, is a preacher's wardrobe average? No, and it can't be average or else he is not properly dressed. Can a preacher's automobile be average? No, not if he must be ready to travel from one end of the country to another. There is a big difference in having a car that will get you to the store and back and having one you could jump in and drive 1000 miles. Can his wife and children's wardrobes be average? Not really, they must dress up as often as the preacher. Can the amount of company a preacher has be considered average? No. Preachers are a magnet for visitors, and are usually more hospitable than most. Can a preacher's study materials be average? Not if he is to properly prepare himself to teach others.

Now then, the tragedy is, we expect and even demand that preachers be special in all areas except in the area of what we pay them. Too many times when we talk about using the treasury to help the needy and to pay a preacher we may be talking about the same man! When congregations intend to support someone they also need to investigate the latest tax laws by consulting the Internal Revenue Service or a local expert. There are legitimate, legal ways to give a preacher his wages in which part of them are not taxable. For example, part of a preacher's wages can be designated as a housing allowance, and the preacher does not have to pay income taxes on that portion of his support. The amount depends on the preacher's housing costs and must be noted properly in the church's minutes to be acceptable. Please don't think this is wrong in any way. These are tax laws that are especially for preachers and most people have no reason to ever hear about them. While there are legitimate ways for preachers to avoid paying

## *Support of Preachers*

---

some tax on their income, there are of course any number of ways to avoid paying taxes that are not legal. I hope congregations will consult experts in these areas and I hope preachers will use very good judgment in what they do in this area. Preachers, please do not ask a congregation to do anything that is questionable to help you avoid taxes. To deliberately not report income or to manipulate the facts to say you were not paid wages is wrong.

So how are we doing in the pay department? In talking with individuals about paying preachers I find we have several guidelines that congregations have decided to use and most of them involve whether or not the man has delivered a sermon. Some congregations pay one rate for those they invite and another for those that drop in. Some congregations have one rate for full-time preachers and another for preachers with a secular job. Some have one rate for Sunday morning and another rate for Sunday night. Some pay expenses, some do not.

In my own experiences my pay for preaching on a Sunday ranges from \$0 to \$300. Obviously, when I am paid nothing I may be getting what I was worth that day, but you could also say to receive nothing is not enough. I do try to preach my best at such places and I would never turn them down because they do not pay. On the other hand when I am paid \$300 many would consider that too much. But, as you can see, the average of the two amounts would be \$150 which is about the average wage throughout the brotherhood for preaching on a Sunday.

Again, in my own experiences, my pay for preaching a week-end meeting has ranged from \$0 to \$1000. On average that works out to be about \$500 which is about the average for a weekend of preaching. I have noticed that the congregations that pay the best usually have a preacher there that has some influence in the decision of how much to pay.

In my opinion the pay for those that go places to preach on a Lord's Day is very adequate today. And I think congregations are to be commended for their consideration. However, it is possible to preach a Sunday, be paid, and still lose money. A recent trip to preach ended up being a loss for me. I drove 300 miles, and bought my family and myself two meals at fast food restaurants. By the time I deduct \$.25 a mile for travel expense and the cost of the food, I lost money that day even though the congregation paid me \$100.00. I'll gladly go again, but believe me, those who preach do not preach for the money.

I have heard that the energy used in delivering a sermon can be the equivalent of working an eight hour day on a regular job. So brethren, if it

## *Support of Preachers*

---

helps, when you pay a man for preaching for you on Lord's Day, think of it in terms of two days work and you will see you are not over paying him at all.

There are some dangers in paying so much per sermon. It can lead to paying so much for other things as well. Some congregations have given preachers additional money after there were confessions or baptisms leading some to think there must now be a pay scale for those things in some places.

One real danger in paying a preacher by the sermon is that we miss the opportunity to practice what the first century church called "sending someone on their way" (cf. Tit. 3:13-14; 3 Jn. 5-8; Acts 15:2-3). When we take part in sending someone on their way we are rewarding them as much for being one of God's special servants as we are for what they may have done for us. This is a very important difference that has far reaching consequences. How are we going to support elders? By the sermon? I doubt it. How would we support a gospel preacher that can no longer preach because he is to old or because he is not able physically, mentally, or emotionally? Such individuals, if they are going to be supported, will need be supported for "being" instead of for "doing." This is a drastic difference from what we are accustomed to thinking about, yet it is biblical. It can be seen in how the brethren from Philippi helped Paul (Phil. 4:14-19). It can also be seen in supporting worthy widows (1 Tim. 5:3-16).

And why must we only pay a preacher for preaching publically? I remember a time years ago that two preachers happened through where I was living. One preached, the other waited on the table. We paid the one who preached and thanked the one that waited on the table. Who edified the congregation more that day? To me, the one that waited on the table. Another area paying by the sermon keeps us from thinking about is the private work of evangelists. We think nothing about calling a man to come to our congregations to hold us a meeting for a week while the ones who really need it stay at home and only show up on Sunday morning. But does it ever occur to us to call a man to come and work with our congregation from house to house for a week working with the people who never attend meetings? Not usually. And when and if we start, we will have a real problem about how much to pay them since we tie our pay to public preaching.

I think we have probably reached the point where most would agree that holding meetings really does not pay by the time you pay your travel expenses. It would appear that preachers today do not travel nearly as much as they did in the last generation and I will guess that the next generation will travel even less, unless the pay improves drastically. Not only is it not

## *Support of Preachers*

---

very wise economically for the one doing the traveling, congregations must wonder about the effectiveness of paying so much for someone to come half-way across the country to preach what someone from the next state could have probably said just as well. Remember, as Ronny Wade said in an article in the *Old Paths Advocate* (July 1981) "A preacher who travels with his family and spends the night on the road will spend anywhere from one to two hundred dollars per day. I know that figure seems high. But that's just the problem. Everything is high." That article was written over eight years ago. Preachers weren't being paid enough to cover their travel expenses then and they still aren't today. If a congregation wants to call a man to come from a distance that is fine but they had better count the cost and be ready to pay the man. If a man is called from the middle of the country to the West coast his travel time will likely be six days for the round trip. At \$150.00 a day, which is a conservative amount, his travel costs will be \$900.00. Only after he is paid \$900.00 is he able to start meeting his bills at home.

While I think those that work one day and are paid by the sermon are supported adequately, on the other hand I do not think those preachers that are being supported to preach full time are supported near enough! Many of our preachers would gladly not work at their other job if they were adequately supported. But brethren they are not! Let's go back to the example of the man that is paid to preach twice on Lord's day. If he is paid \$150.00 for that one day's work, would the congregation maintain that same standard if the man lived there and was working with them? Would the congregation be willing to pay that same man \$750 per week, which would be \$39,000 per year, or \$3250 per month. Are congregations willing to pay those kind of wages? I don't think so. Please don't misunderstand me! I am not saying lower wages for the man that works for you one day a week. I'm saying raise the wages for the man that works day and night, often six or seven days a week, that teaches publically and from house to house to help the congregation.

At the beginning of my talk I mentioned my Grandfather received less than half of what denominational preachers were receiving in 1921. Have we improved today? A survey published in the Fall, 1988 issue of *Leadership* magazine gives the average denominational preacher's wage in 1988 as \$35,499. Where are we? I think we are somewhere around \$20,000 a year. What that proves to me is that in 68 years we haven't improved very much.

## *Support of Preachers*

---

### **Suggestions For the Future**

Congregations need to be thrilled and eager to help spread the gospel.

Congregational leaders need to lead with financial planning that has both local and world evangelism as goals.

Congregations need to be very careful to help those they support all they can, as opposed to how little they can.

Communication needs to improve between the one being supported and the congregation.

Let those who are being supported report their work and prove that they truly are workers in the Lord's vineyard.

Let those who are being supported be content with what they are given, but at the same time be willing to work with their own hands if necessary to provide what they lack.

May God bless congregations everywhere with the wisdom and practical knowledge they need to properly pay the Lord's servants.

And may God's servants everywhere strive to be worthy to receive the Lord's money. *7821 Saybrook Dr., Citrus Height, CA 95621*



## **The Teacher**

*by Don McCord*

There is no greater need in the church of Christ, His glorious Kingdom, today or ever, than the teacher—qualified, committed, dedicated to this high, noble, God-ordained calling. Indeed, the need is universal, great, and unending as long as time shall last, for preachers, evangelists, elders, deacons, members of the Body; but, I dare say, the need is no greater for them, than for qualified teachers in the local congregations of the upright all over this rocking, reeling world! This crying, abiding, desperate need cannot be stressed too much, or too often among the Lord's people. I humbly consider this a privilege indeed today to once more be given the opportunity to expound this great need in so much as in me is, the Lord being my Helper.

In any presentation, lesson, or sermon, a careful and sound definition of terms is in order. The teacher, preacher always does well when he makes sure his listeners know precisely what he is talking about. In defining terms, a Webster's dictionary, preferably unabridged, is not to be discredited for sure, but of pre-eminent use in defining Biblical terms is a lexicon and/or an expository dictionary of Biblical words. Webster will not always give the precise scriptural meaning of a scriptural term. For example, a Webster's dictionary will give the definition of baptism as immersion in water, which it is, but it will also define it as sprinkling and pouring, which it is not. A lexicon or dictionary of Biblical words will usually give a reliable definition of scriptural terms, or at least can be expected to do so. The term "teacher" comes from the Greek *didaskalos*, sometimes translated "master" in the King James Version and others; sometimes Jesus speaking of Himself; in John 3:2, Nicodemus speaking of Christ; in John 3:10, Jesus speaking of Nicodemus; of teachers in the church (Acts 13:1; 1 Cor. 12:28-29; Eph. 4:11; Heb. 5:12; Jas. 3:1); Paul speaking of himself (1 Tim. 2:7; 2 Tim. 1:11). Not always does *didaskalos* speak of teachers of the right kind. In 2 Timothy 4:3-4, *didaskalos* is used by Paul in reference to teachers of fables, accommodating those with "itching ears." Paul speaks of "aged women" as "teachers of good things" in Titus 2:3-4, using not *didaskalos*, but *kalodidaskalos*, *kalos*, denoting that which is intrinsically good. Peter speaks of false teachers in 2 Peter 2:1 as *pseudodidaskalos*, *pseudo*, denoting false.

In passing, I have already mentioned 1 Corinthians 12:28-29 and Ephesians 4:11, companion verses. We dare not study the teacher and his importance in the church without an elucidation of these key verses. Paul

## *The Teacher*

---

avers that God, and Christ, in their infinite wisdom and foreknowledge set some in the church, teachers, among apostles, prophets, miracles, gifts of healings, diversities of tongues, evangelists, pastors. Of more than passing concern is the inspired fact that God no less did the setting; He set them in the church—note, in the church, not in the cults, sects, denominations, the world—the church. How special in the infinite mind of God must be the church that wears and bears the wonderful name of His Son! This surely adds a dimension to the importance of the teacher in the church. Notice the divine order: first, apostles; secondarily prophets; thirdly, teachers—suggesting again, mightily, the importance of teachers in God's arrangement. I dare say no one in this town on Lord's Day has a great a responsibility, as important a task, as does the teacher in this pulpit. I can say that about every place in this world where the Lord's people meet. Let us never underestimate the value of the teacher in the church; let the teacher never forget his awesome responsibility—feeder of the hungry sheep, breaker of the bread of life to the dying, sustainer of the weak and stumbling. His responsibility is no less grave on Lord's Day evening and Wednesday evening, let him and us not forget, ever.

Paul teaches for all time that God set in the church, among other important things, gifts of healings, miracles, and tongues. Forgive my brief diversion from the main subject "The Teacher," as I beg leave to take you a little side excursion about healings, miracles and tongues. I aver today that if miracles were performed, if people were divinely healed, if people spoke in tongues, it would be in the church of Christ, and nowhere else. Notice for all time where God set these things—miracles, healings, tongues—in the church; in the church, nowhere else! I earnestly, humbly contend that the denominations have no part nor lot in this matter. I become righteously indignant, therefore, when a Jim Baker, a Jimmy Swaggart, notorious for their love of money, and their lack of morals, an Oral Roberts, and all other impostors, with their ungodly presumption, publicly to a gullible world, try to take things out of the church of Christ that God, yes, God set there and nowhere else, nowhere else—such pompous usurpation! Surely, the gates of hell gape open wide to receive the souls of such poor, degenerate mortals, a sad day in prospect, indeed!

Thirdly, Paul says, teachers—direct, divine sequence, right after apostles and prophets. That is wonderful! At the beginning, I proposed that of all the Kingdom's needs, nothing could be greater than qualified teachers—this is borne out by the inspired account of the sequence. When God does a thing in the church, for the church, He does it well; man cannot improve on that, and no man dare try, and get by!

Again, that teachers in the early days of the church were important, and still are, is borne out pre-eminently in Acts 13:1-2. Here we find Barnabas and Saul being separated for a special work, the prophets and teachers, fasting, praying and laying hands on them. I humbly suggest that even today, there are times that the teacher and others in the congregation will be found praying, fasting and imposing hands—not because they are qualified to do anything extraordinary any more than those teachers then were.

In Hebrews 5:12, Paul indicates the existence of a sad, inexcusable situation. Listen to him, his gentle, yet pointed rebuke: "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God." What a sad commentary is this! Brethren are capable of teaching, but have not qualified, equipped themselves. Paul in his second letter to Timothy, chapter 2, verse 2 commissioned the following: "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." That a teacher is a faithful man is no mean requirement; "reliable and faithful" is the Amplified rendition; "reliable" is what the New International says. The faithful man is a good man; the good teacher is first a good man. He practices the precepts he teaches. The teacher is an example, and should ever bear this reverently in mind. Who said long since past something like this, "What you are speaks more loudly than what you say?"

The only means whereby a faithful man will be able to teach others also is to do what Paul says in the same chapter at verse 15: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." The Amplified reads this way: "Study and be eager and do your utmost to present yourself to God approved (tested by trial), a workman who has no cause to be ashamed, correctly analyzing and accurately dividing—rightly handling and skillfully teaching—the Word of Truth." Brother, I do not know about you, but when I read this verse, and meditate upon it, I conclude Paul right here talks hard work, hours and days of hard work—time and energy-consuming hard work. The teacher in the Lord's work cannot dilly-dally; he will be up and about his Father's business; he will "burn the midnight" and early morning oil; the teacher in the Lord's church will soon learn that his name is toil. Oh, yes, the toil and time of study; study what? The Grand Old Book is what! The teacher studies the Book for learning's sake—not to teach, preach, sermonize, necessarily, but to learn, remembering that nothing can take the place of a solid, genuine and general knowledge of the Book, and that does not come easy. No one can do this for the man, the teacher; he must do this for himself; it is he who must pay the price and none other. No one can do this for him. Study

## *The Teacher*

---

is the teacher's watchword if he would be worthy of his noble calling. Brother, if a faithful, reliable teacher you would be, get acquainted with the Book, meditate on its riches day and night; make haste to keep His commandments, for His are listening; study hard and long its precepts, principles and practices; hide them deep in your heart; long for them; as did Job, esteem the words of His mouth more than your necessary food; delight yourself in the Book's statutes that you may teach them to others; behold as did David, the wondrous things out of God's law; keep the testimonies steadfast and sure, stick to them, be sound. Let His statutes as did David, be your "song in the house of (your) pilgrimage." The teacher must let the law of his mouth be "better than thousands of gold and silver" (Ps. 119:72). The teacher must remember the words of David, "Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven." It is not settled in meetings, studies like this; in meetings large or small; on the pages of religious journals; in conventions, conclaves and committees of men; in places like Rome, Salt Lake City, Boston, London, but in heaven itself. May the teacher never forget this! To the teacher, the word and nothing else will be to his feet a lamp, and to his path a light (Ps. 119:105). The teacher, too, must take His "testimonies as a heritage forever" (Ps. 119:11), for "the entrance of this word giveth light" (Ps. 119:130). The teacher will, as David, stand in awe of His word. Yes, study prayerfully, diligently, zealously the Book.

If other books he would choose, the teacher would choose them with wise and candid discrimination. The teacher would do well to seek out the experienced guidance of others who teach, preach the Word, in making his choices. This may come as somewhat of a surprise, but I am convinced that the teacher does not need many books of men; I would say this to the preacher, to the evangelist. I dare say that most of us have many more books that we do not use, than those that we do use. If I were advising the teacher about the books of men, I would advise with a sort of "take-it-or-leave-it" proviso, not intending to leave the impression that books of men are not good and helpful, please bear in mind. I would suggest a good exhaustive concordance, a good lexicon, a good series on word studies, a good expository dictionary, a good set of commentaries (such as Burton Coffman's, E. M. Zerr's, Gospel Advocate series). The teacher needs a good study Bible; translations, such as the New International, New American Standard, Amplified. I would kindly warn against conclusions based on one-man translations; be wary of a paraphrase, one man's commentary, much of it biased with his own sectarian, denominational leanings. Emphatically, I would advise the teacher to take care in particular about what is called "The Living Bible," one man's paraphrase, and he a sectarian, denominational preacher,

so-called. The Living Bible—what a misleading misnomer! Since it is called “Bible,” people get the mistaken idea that it is a translation, and on par with the King James Version, New International Version, and other safe, reputable translations. A translation The Living Bible is not; the Bible, it is not; a misleading and dangerous paraphrase it is. I would offer this suggestion about what we call sermon books. Do not buy them “sight unseen.” Take the time to sit down with them, critically peruse them, lest you virtually throw your money away. Understand me, please; I am not saying there is no such thing as a good sermon book; I am saying, however, that there are some that are indeed better than others, and what might fit the needs of one man would not necessarily fit the needs of another. Just beware, I would kindly advise. The teacher, the preacher, would do well to be extremely cautious about reading books, booklets, tracts written by denominational men. I see and hear this among us too much, and I get concerned, disappointed, and to be honest, at least a little exasperated when I hear our teachers, and our preachers, quoting from James Dobson, Josh McDowell, Chuck Swindoll, Norman Vincent Peale, and some others instead of quoting from Christ, Paul, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, David, and Moses; too, quoting from newspapers and magazines instead of from the Grand Old Glorious Book. To the teacher I would dare say, there is not an illustration or example that you will ever need to use to make your point that you cannot find somewhere in the Book. What a compendium of illustrations, examples is the Book, in the illustrious lives of its worthy characters! Why do we need to go to some sectarian preacher’s book to make a scriptural, Biblical point? I emphatically aver, we do not need to! I am opposed to such unequivocally.

Brethren, we need to appreciate the teacher, and not be hesitant to let him know. Compliment him when he does well; do not compliment him when he does not do well, having shown you that he ascended to the pulpit unprepared; be genuine with him, do not tell him he did something he did not do. Paul must include the teacher in 1 Thessalonians 5:12-13, where he writes of those who “admonish you,” and says “to esteem them very highly in love for their work’s sake.” The teacher is in an unenviable position; he has more of a challenge than does the preacher or evangelist who comes and goes. The teacher stays with the flock, with the responsibility of feeding them; he does not dare do too many “re-runs;” he is criticized enough without that. The teacher is worthy of honor. Christ said, “A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country, and in his own house” (Mt. 13:57). Sometimes we hear this said as though Christ was sanctioning such actions—that is, not giving honor to the one who is home doing His work. Christ was simply stating a fact, not approving it. I never like to hear the

## *The Teacher*

---

hard-working teacher in a congregation referred to as "just one of the boys," or have it said, "We can hear him anytime;" this smacks or disrespect; the teacher is worthy of much more than that. What would congregations do without the teacher? God thought so highly of the church, that is where He set him from the very beginning. I am convinced He thinks highly of the teacher, too. Let us do no less.

In James 3:1, James says, "My brethren, by not many masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation." This is the King James Version. The New American Standard Version reads, "Let not many of you become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we shall incur a stricter judgment." The New International Version reads, "Not many of you should presume to be teachers, my brothers, because you know that we who teach will be judged more strictly." I do not understand that James was discouraging a man from being a teacher. Certainly, the man with the ability to teach had better teach, lest he come up short with a buried talent. I understand James here was issuing a solemn warning. We teachers had better know whereof we speak; we need to prayerfully undertake every lesson; this is another reason why the teacher must know the Book. In Revelation 22:18-19, John warns those who would add to and take from with these two expressions: "the words of the prophecy of this book" and "the words of the book of this prophecy," I understand, not only does the prohibition apply to the book of Revelation but to the Grand Old Book itself. The teacher stands on holy ground; he dare not carelessly tread where angels fear and quake.

The teacher not only has a responsibility to the church; he has one to the world. The teacher represents to the world what the church stands for. The critical world will "size up" the church by the teacher's performance; fair or not, this is the way it is. The teacher must be "all for the church," "all for the Christ;" it shows if he is or if he is not. In his teaching, the teacher must show sincerity; he must be tactful without compromising; there is never an excuse for sarcasm, innuendoes in the pulpit; the teacher's business at hand is serious business, the most serious in town really. The teacher by virtue of his responsibility has to be a man of courage; he needs the hide of an elephant and the spirit of a saint, with a real forgiving and forgetting disposition. The teacher in the church who does his honorable work effectively is quite a man!

It is indeed commendable to encourage every young man we have. If he has the ability to teach, we need to tell him so. So often, though, if he has teaching ability, we encourage him not to be a teacher, but a preacher or

an evangelist. Certainly preachers and evangelists are needed, too, but let us not forget the teacher who stays home and helps keep the light shining. The pendulum swings the other direction, too; we seem to think, and so act sometime, that if a member of the body is of male gender, it follows that he must teach regardless of ability or desire. We thus make him feel a sense of guilt and inadequacy in the Kingdom. Not all men are teachers by desire or ability; we should not discourage a man by insisting he work in a capacity for which he is not qualified or desires.

The teacher, by virtue of his position in the church, needs to guard well his language; he needs to speak as the oracles of God, and practice those old-fashioned maxims that we need to hear more of, "Speak where the Bible speaks," "Call the Bible things by Bible names," and teach others to do the same. Evangelists are still evangelists wherever their noble work may find them, at home or across the sea; why substitute the word "missionary" for the Bible word; why "mission work" instead of "evangelistic work" which sounds more like the Book? We hear in some circles today things like seminars, retreats, ministries of this and of that; as goes digression so do we if care is not taken. The teacher can help us talk right. Dare anybody call him a "lay teacher" or "lay preacher!"

In Ephesians 4:11, Paul writes of "pastors and teachers", King James Version, New International Version, New American Standard Version. Marvin Vincent, in his Word Studies says, "The omission of the article from teachers seems to indicate that pastors and teachers are included under one class." We have heard the interpretation "teaching pastors" or "teaching elders." After Paul spoke here of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, he mentions a three-fold purpose for all of them. Surely the teacher still is expected to assist in fulfilling this purpose. First, perfecting the saints; what an awesome responsibility is this! Surely no one can question the importance of the teacher in the church. Second, for the work of the ministry; this I understand goes back to the underlying purpose of the teacher's responsibility of perfecting the saints in their work. Third, for the edifying of the body of Christ; I can think of nothing more important in this world than building up the church, the body of Christ. Surely the teacher has a role in the church to play; may he or we never underestimate this.

In conclusion, we will touch three questions that were included in the prospectus; the other questions have hopefully been dealt with.

**1. In the absence of elders do teachers have the authority in the local congregation?** Certainly, by virtue of his function, the teacher is thrust into a leadership role; in the absence of elders, someone must lead, and usually

## *The Teacher*

---

it is the teacher or teachers who are expected to do this. Brethren authorize either by action or word as a matter of course; hopefully, the planting evangelist would assume some delegating or vesting or authority. As I see it, the teacher has the authority only as he is authorized.

**2. What is the teacher's place in a congregation with elders?** Certainly, the teacher, as is true of every other member is under the authority of the eldership when one is present; this would hold true with the evangelist or any other member who might be under the eldership.

**3. How can we train effective and edifying teachers?** This is not an easy question, therefore, we cannot expect an easy answer. It is my sincere conviction that the prospective teacher in the church must have a lot of self-motivation, a deep desire, and ability; he is the one who has control here. I am not saying that training is not necessary, please understand. As has been said before, much that makes a teacher effective and edifying is within himself and his own preparation and determination. However, there are things the congregation can do to help. A young man needs a place and time for practice that is to him the least threatening. This is what we are trying to do where I live. We have every other Friday night set aside for study for any young man who chooses to attend, at which time he can get used to the pulpit, the feel of its surroundings, by orally reading or saying what he pleases. I must say, it is disappointing and even discouraging to me at the few at home right now who take advantage. Certainly preachers, older men should make themselves available to young men and older men to help them study, formulate a lesson; help on the mechanics of lesson-giving seems to be the area of greatest need. Classes in public speaking, English, expository writing in the public schools and colleges should be encouraged. For the teacher in the church, just like most undertakings, nothing takes the place of prepared practice; there is nothing any less effective for the teacher or the church than practice without preparation. The teacher would do well to attend every meeting he can to learn from preachers and others. The congregation should encourage this. What would be wrong with a congregation of believers sending young men to a meeting such as this to help them become effective and edifying teachers? Anything we can scripturally do to help as many men as we can to become effective and edifying teachers in the local congregations should be zealously and speedily done. There is no greater work, I humbly contend. *Box 1773, Covina, CA 91722*



## **Works of the Flesh, Part 1**

*by Smith Bibens*

In Galatians 5:19, the Apostle Paul introduces one of several lists of vices found in the New Testament with the words, "Now the works of the flesh are manifest." The NASV uses the word "evident." Moffat uses "quite obvious," to translate the Greek word *phaneros*, "open to sight, visible" (Vine, iii., p. 35).

It is a sad commentary on the pathetic state of our society, that the "works of the flesh" are openly flaunted by many. Gays have "come out the closet." Brandishing their shame, they now parade sin in the streets. In the halls of government and businesses, cut-throat competitors seek for advantage over others, and in doing so they plumb the depths of depravity.

These things shock and disgust those of us who are called by the gospel to hold before the world an example of God's righteousness and brotherly love. Sadly, many of these sins we shall consider today are "manifest," "evident," and "quite obvious" within our own ranks. In the words of James, "My brethren, these things ought not to be." (Jas. 3:10). If in studying these gross sins of the flesh our reaction is one of disgust, that is commendable. Better yet, we should turn an introspective eye, and using the infallible mirror of God's Word, examine ourselves and prove ourselves, lest we be found reprobates (2 Cor. 13:5).

In defining the various terms, I will draw upon three standard authorities of the Greek language that are familiar to the readers: Vine, Thayer and Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich (abbreviated BAGNT). I have consulted many others, on various words, but including all the authorities in this article would unnecessarily lengthen it. Occasional reference is made to Kittel. (See reference list at end for complete bibliographical information.) I have also found R. C. Trench's *Synonyms of the New Testament* an invaluable aid.

### **The First Group**

**Implacable (Rom. 1:31) & Truce Breakers (2 Tim. 3:3)**  
**Covenant Breakers (Rom. 1:31) Perjured persons (1 Tim. 1:10)**  
**Perverse disputings (1 Tim. 6:5) Traitors (2 Tim. 3:4)**  
**Lawless (1 Tim. 1:9)**

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

I. ASPONDOS, (#786), "implacable," (Rom. 1:31); "trucebreakers" (2 Tim. 3:3).

### A. Data

#### 1. The translations

**Romans 1:31** Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, **implacable**, unmerciful:

**2 Timothy 3:3** Without natural affection, **trucebreakers**, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good,

**irreconcilable** (NASV) **unforgiving** (NIV) **implacable** (RSV, ASV) **never forgiving an enemy** (Beck) **implacable in their hatreds** (NEB) **bitter haters** (Basic English) **accepting no truce** (Rotherham's)

#### 2. Definition

"irreconcilable" (BAGNT, p. 116)

"lit. denotes 'without a libation'. . . i.e. without a truce, as a libation accompanied the making of treaties and compactsl then, one who cannot be persuaded to enter into a covenant, 'implacable,' 2 Tim. 3:3 (A.V. 'trucebreakers'). *Note: Trench (Syn. lii) contrasts ASPONDOS with ASUNTHETOS; see note under 'covenant-breakers.'* ASPONDOS may signify 'untrue to one's promise;' ASUNTHETOS, 'not abiding by one's covenant, treacherous.' " (Vine, v. ii, p. 250)

"cannot be persuaded to enter into a covenant, implacable . . . joined with astorgos, Rom. 1:31 Rec.; 2 Tim. 3:3" (Thayer, p. 81).

### B. Exposition

In Romans 1:18-32, Paul is describing the awful spiritual condition of the Gentile world. Paul is here speaking as a Jew, acting as a spokesperson for the Jewish view of the Gentile world, expressing the typical Jewish revulsion to the manners and practices of the heathen world. But Paul is also speaking as the spokesman of God, who is "angry with the wicked every day" and who promises that "the wicked shall be turned into hell, and all nations that forget God" (Ps. 7:11; 9:17) Paul probably wrote the Roman epistle while he was laboring in Corinth. Few places in the Roman Empire could have afforded such a display of the gross iniquities and vices that Paul lists in vs. 29-31. But it was not just at Corinth that Paul found these sins. As the Apostle

## Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1

---

John says, "the whole world lieth in wickedness" (1 Jn. 5:19). At the time John wrote this, he was a resident of Ephesus, another great pagan metropolis. In their evangelistic travels, Paul, John and the other preachers of the Word, must have come across many scenes that would justify the denunciations of the heathen world found in Romans 1. Having rejected the true God, God had abandoned them. In this abandonment, mankind was delivered to himself, with the resulting practice of that which is "not convenient;" or that which is not fitting; that which is forbidden and shameful; what "ought not to be done" (NIV, v. 28).

Catalogs or lists of vices were well known in the ancient world, particularly among the Greek Stoics and Jewish Rabbis. They are also common in the New Testament. Such lists may be found in Mk. 7:21-11; Rom. 13:13; 1 Cor. 5:10-11; 6:9-10; 2 Cor. 12:20; Gal. 5:19-21; Col. 3:5,8; 1 Tim. 1:9-10; 2 Tim. 3:2-5; Tit. 3:3; 1 Pet. 4:3; Rev. 22:15; as well as here. The one in Rom. 1:29-31 is the most formidable of the lot. There are twenty-three things mentioned here (or twenty-one, for the words *porneia* and *aspondos* do not appear in the revised texts of the Greek New Testament [Greisbach, Lachmann, Tishendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth, Westcott & Hort, Nestle]. They do in the Recieved Text [Stephans 1550 and Elziver 1624]. *Porneia* was probably a copyist's addition owing to the the similarity of sound with *poneria*, the next word in the list (p. 47).

Inspecting this list of the immoralities of humanity, we find that some are sins of the mind or attitude, others of the tongue, and others concern the actions and relations between human beings and God and each other. Verse 29 says that the wicked are "filled" and "full" of these things. Conybeare and Howson render the latter word, "they overflow with." It is not just sexual sin that marks man's breakaway from God, as Paul has described in preceding verses (24-27), but the general chaos in society as well. The daily envy, disobedience, deceit, treachery and malignity in the world express rebellion against God just as much. The everyday vices that poison human relationships proclaim man's rejection of God just as sexual perversion does.

Second to the last in this list we find the Greek word *aspondos*, which is translated "implacable." The same Greek word is used in another list of vices in 2 Timothy 3:3. In fact, there are several sins from Romans 1 that are also listed in 2 Timothy 3:2-4. Only in 2 Timothy 3, Paul is describing what the Spirit has revealed to him about future

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

outrages against God's righteous will. "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come" (2 Tim. 3:1). The phrase "last days" in this context is an expression often used in Scripture to refer to Messianic times. This period began with the advent of the gospel of Christ and includes the time we now live in. New Testament writers regarded Christians as living in the last days (1 Jn. 2:18; Acts 2:16-17).

Paul indicates that the things he mentions in 2 Timothy 3, are to be guarded against in Timothy's day: "from such turn away" (v. 5). However, Paul does indicate that as the period of the "last days" progresses, "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived" (v. 13). This passage proves, along with many others, that the gospel of Christ was not going to result in the annihilation of sinful rebellion among humanity, and an attendant "paradise on earth."

Here in 2 Timothy 3, the list has nineteen items, and in the middle of the list, *aspondos* is translated "truce-breakers." However, the translation in Romans, "implacable" is preferable. (A closely related term, *asunthetos*, translated "covenant-breakers" in Romans 1:31 will be noticed next.)

*Aspondos* literally mean "without a libation (drink offering)." Libations were offered by previously warring parties when an armistice or truce was declared in their conflict. So *aspondos* came to refer to those who would not declare a truce to hostilities they were involved in. "Irreconcilable," the definition given in Arndt and Gingrich (p. 16), has been adopted by some modern translations, but "implacable" well represents the idea, and that is the definition given by Thayer (p. 81) and several others. Conybeare and Howson translate it "ruthless" in both passages. Trench treats the word in *Synonyms of the New Testament*, but we shall take that up when we come to "covenant-breakers."

Those who are *aspondos* are callous in their dealings with their fellowman. Their feuds never end. Very often, men justify their implacable hatred of others on the ground that the other has been guilty of some injustice or iniquity. But Jesus displayed the attitude that we must have, when He prayed "Father, forgive them" as he was crucified. An unwillingness to be reconciled to others or to brethren; to forgive and "bury the hatchet;" to seek for peace; to put away the stony heart that only wants to war, bite and devour; this unwillingness is the sin comprehended by *aspondos*. Many, too many, are *aspondos* toward

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

God, irreconcilable, even though God gave His only begotten Son, that by Him He might "reconcile all things unto himself" (Col. 1:20).

King Saul was implacable in his hatred and pursuit of David. On two occasions (1 Sam. 24, 26) David had mercy on Saul and spared his life, even while a fugitive from Saul's wrath. But Saul never gave up the enmity he had for David.

In the Middle East, implacable foes face each other in ongoing wars and strife. The Jews, the Muslims, and yes, even those Maronite Catholics in Lebanon, who claim to be Christians, consider it a righteous thing to hate their enemies. With that attitude, there will never be peace in those troubled lands. They are *aspondos*, implacable in their hatreds.

But we don't have to go 10,000 miles to find such. It is quite probable that you have met someone like that. You may even have seen him in the mirror when you shaved this morning. When *aspondoi* are in the church, it always brings trouble to the Cause. As Paul told Timothy, "from such turn away."

### II. ASUNTHETOS (#802), "covenant-breakers," Rom. 1:31

#### A. Data

##### 1. The translations

**Romans 1:31** Without understanding, **covenantbreakers**, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful:

"untrustworthy" (NASV) "faithless" (NIV, RSV) "covenant-breakers" (ASV) "regardless of covenants" (Rotherham's) "not true to their undertakings" (Basic English) "false to their word" (Moffat) "treacherous" (Goodspeed)

##### 2. Definition

"faithless, lit. covenant-breaking . . . or undutiful." (BAGNT, p. 118)

"1. uncompounded, simple 2. covenant-breaking, faithless: Rom. 1:31 (so in Jer. 3:8,11 . . . *asunthetien* to be faithless [Ps. 73:15; . . . Neh. 1:8, etc.] [1 Chr. 9:1 and Jer. 3:7])" (Thayer, p. 82).

## Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1

"from *suntithemi*, with the negative prefix *a*, hence signifies 'not covenant keeping,' i.e., refusing to abide by covenants made, covenant-breaking, faithless, Rom. 1:31. In the LXX, it is found in Jer. 3:8-11. Cp the corresponding verb, *asuntithemi*, in the LXX of Ps. 73:15, to deal treacherously (R.V.), and the noun *asunthesia*, transgression, or covenant breaking, e.g. Ezra 9:2,4; 10:6. [V. has note here referring to Trench, sec. 52, which treats this word and ASPONDE. "The words are clearly not synonymous" (Vine).]" (Vine, i., p. 251).

SUNTITHEMI - lit., to put together, is used only in the Middle Voice in the N.T., and means to determine, to agree, John 9:22 and Acts 23:20; to assent, Acts 24:9; to covenant, Luke 22:5. See AGREE, ASSENT. (Vine, i., p. 251)

### B. Exposition

The word *asunthetos*, appears only once in the Greek New Testament, but it bespeaks a vice frequently referred to and condemned in God's Word. The word is compounded from *suntithemi* plus the negative prefix *alpha*, which negates *suntithemi*. *Suntithemi* means "to make an agreement, engage" (Thayer, p. 606); "to agree, assent, covenant" (Vine, i., p. 251). Therefore, *asunthetos* signifies "not covenant keeping." It carries with it the idea of treacherous faithlessness. In the LXX, the word *asunthetos* is used in Jeremiah 3:7-11 in reference to Judah. In the KJV, it is rendered "treacherous."

Trench (p. 194) comments on the difference between *asunthetos* and *aspondos*, saying, "*Asunthetos* presumes a state of peace, which they who are such unrighteously interrupt; while *aspondos* presumes a state of war, which the *aspondoi* refuse to bring to an equitable close."

It may be observed that this word in Romans 1:31, refers not so much to breaking covenant with God as with man. If such find that they have made an agreement or promise they decide would be unprofitable for them to honor, they will renege, with or without a pretext. The covenant-breaker is someone you trust only to your hurt. His covenant, with God or man, is worthless, because he will not honor that to which he agrees, and he will not fulfill his covenanted duties.

The two World Wars were precipitated by men who had no conscience when it came to discarding their solemn agreements. The Emperor of

Germany referred to a peace-treaty as a "scrap of paper," and Hitler was a penultimate example of a covenant-breaker.

Those who are honest only when it is in their interest are displeasing to God. But the Lord honors those who are faithful to their word and agreements, even when it is inconvenient to do so (Ps. 15:1-4).

Again, our own experience may furnish us with several instances of faithlessness on the part of others. I want to mention one type of covenant-breaker in particular. In fact, several works of the flesh that we will notice today touch upon this subject, and that is marital infidelity. It is indisputably true that we live in a society of "covenant-breakers," when over half of those who enter into this covenant, will not abide by the vows they made on their wedding day. Over half of the marriages contracted in the country today end in divorce. And we are seeing more of it in the church. This is a species of covenant-breaking that must be condemned. "Take heed . . . let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth" (Mal. 2:15), for "whoremongers and adulterers God will judge" (Heb. 13:4).

### III. ANOMOS (#459) "lawless," 1 Tim. 1:9.

#### A. Data

##### 1. The translations

**1 Timothy 1:9** Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers,

"lawless" (ASV, NASV, Alford, Rotherham) "lawbreakers" (NIV)  
"those who have no respect for law" (Basic English)

##### 2. Definition

"w. ref. to God's moral law. *though I do not reject God's law*, 1 Cor. 9:21. Hence *godless, wicked* in gen. w. ANUPOTAKTOS [disobedient in KJV-shb] 1 Ti. 1:9" (BAGNT, p. 71)

"ANOMOS, without law. also denotes lawless, and is so rendered in the R.V. of Acts 2:23, 'lawless (men),' marg., '(men) without the law,' A.V. 'wicked (hands);' 2 Thess. 2:8, 'the lawless one' (A.V. 'that wicked'), of the man of sin (ver. 4); in 2 Pet. 2:8, of deeds

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

(A.V. 'unlawful'), where the thought is not simply that of doing what is unlawful, but of flagrant defiance of the known will of God. See LAW, C, No. 3" (Vine, ii., p. 317).

"ANOMIA, lawlessness, akin to A, is most frequently translated 'iniquity;' in 2 Thess. 2:7, R.V., 'lawlessness' (A.V. 'iniquity'); 'the mystery of lawlessness' is not recognized by the world, for it does not consist merely of confusion and disorder (see A); the display of lawlessness by the lawless one (ver. 8) will be the effect of the attempt by the powers of darkness to overthrow the Divine government. In 1 John 3:4, the R.V. adheres to the real meaning of the word, 'every one that doeth sin (a practice, not the committal of an act) doeth also lawlessness: and sin is lawlessness.' This definition of sin sets forth its essential character as the rejection of the law, or will, of God and the substitution of the will of self. See INIQUITY and synonymous words." (Vine, ii., p. 317).

"1. *destitute of (the Mosaic) law*: used of Gentiles, 1 Cor. 9:21 (without any suggestion of iniquity . . .) 2. *departing from the law, a violator of the law, lawless, wicked*: Mk. 15:28; Lk. 22:37; Acts 2:23; opp. to HO DIKAIOS, 1 Tim. 1:9; HO ANOMOS, he in whom all iniquity has as it were fixed its abode, 2 Thess. 2:8; an unlawful deed, 2 Pet. 2:8; *free from law, not subject to law*, 1 Cor. 9:21. [SYN. see ANOMIA] (Thayer, p. 48)

"ANOMOS (adv.), *without the law* (see ANOMOS, 1), *without a knowledge of the law*: to sin in ignorance of the Mosaic law, Rom. 2:12; to perish, but not by sentence of the Mosaic law, *ibid.*" (Thayer, p. 48)

"ANOMIA 1. *prop. the condition of one without law,—either because ignorant of it or violating it*. 2. *contempt and violation of law, iniquity, wickedness*: Mt. 23:28; 24:12; 2 Thess. 2:3,7; Tit. 2:14; 1 Jn. 3:4; opp. to HE DIKAIOSUNEE, 2 Cor. 6:14; Heb. 1:9; to do iniquity, to act wickedly, Mt. 13:41; 1 Jn. 3:4; . . . plur. HAI ANOMIAI, manifestations of disregard for law, iniquities, evil deeds: Rom. 4:7 (Ps. 32:1)[Psalms 32:1 { [A Psalm] of David, Maschil.} Blessed [is he whose] transgression [is] forgiven, [whose] sin [is] covered.], Heb. 8:12; 10:17. [SYN. Trench, sec. 66; . . . Ellicott on Tit. 2:14]" (Thayer, pg.48).

### B. Exposition



Our next word is found in a list of vices where Paul is charging Timothy to be on guard against false teachers. However, this list is not given in reference to the false teachers, but rather, that which they presumed to teach. The preceding context (v. 7) has been discussing certain would-be Law teachers who were attempting to expound the Law of Moses. This exposition however did not partake of the wholesome doctrine that can be had from the Law. "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope" (Rom. 15:4). The standards of morality, ethics and righteousness, which the Law upheld, are more than brought over into the New Covenant. But that is not what these teachers were giving out. The use of the Law so wonderfully displayed in Hebrews, to bring men to Christ and the righteousness in Christ, was not what these teachers were doing. Apparently trying to "Judaize" the church and its Gentile converts, they were engaged in what Paul styles "fables and endless genealogies" and "vain janglings." He then comes to the list, which follows the Ten Commandments given in Exodus 20. See chart on following page.

First in the list is *anomos*, "lawless," which is an adverb compounded from the negative prefix *alpha* and the word *nomos*, "law." The word literally means, "without law," and it is so translated in 1 Corinthians 9:21. "To them that are **without law**, as **without law**, (being not **without law** to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are **without law**." In this passage the word simply refers the Gentiles, as persons who did not know it and were not bound to it. The word is used of Sodom in its more usual sense of "lawless, iniquitous" in 2 Peter 2:8. "(For that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their **unlawful deeds**;)."

The LXX of Genesis 19:15 has the corresponding noun *anomia*, "And when the morning arose, then the angels hastened Lot, saying, Arise, take thy wife, and thy two daughters, which are here; lest thou be consumed in the **iniquity** of the city."

In indicting the crowd on Pentecost, Peter says, "ye have taken the Christ, and by **wicked** (*anomos*) hands have crucified and slain" (Acts 2:23).

### **Comparison of 1 Timothy 1:9-10 with Exodus 20:1-17**

**1 Timothy 1:9-10** Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, 10) For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine;

"From the order of terms in Paul's list of sins, it seems assured that he had the Decalogue in mind as he named a flagrant violator of each commandment. A study of the following table will show this. The sins are listed in Paul's order. The first table of the Decalogue is covered in general terms by these three pairs of words. The examples of violators are more clearly seen in the next listing" (Kent, p. 87).

#### **1 Timothy 1:9-10**

Lawless and disobedient

Ungodly and sinners

Unholy and profane

Father-smiters and mother-smiters

Murderers

Fornicators, Sodomites

Kidnapers

Liars, perjurers

Any other thing

#### **Exodus 20:1-17**

1. Thou shalt have no other gods before me.
2. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image.
3. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.
4. Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy.
5. Honor thy father and thy mother.
6. Thou shalt not kill.
7. Thou shalt not commit adultery.
8. Thou shalt not steal.
9. Thou shalt not bear false witness.
10. Thou shalt not covet. (Covetousness is hard to detect, so Paul does not name a flagrant example.)

## Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1

---

In 2 Thessalonians 2:8, *ho anomos* is "that Wicked" (KJV) or "the Lawless one," the man of sin who would be revealed in the apostasy of the church.

The corresponding noun, *anomia*, "lawlessness," is generally translated "iniquity" in the KJV. It appears in 1 John 3:4, "Every one who doeth sin also doeth lawlessness; and sin is lawlessness" (ASV). As Vine observes (ii., p. 317), "This definition of sin sets forth its essential character as the rejection of the law, or will, of God and the substitution of the will of self."

A synonym of *anomos* in the New Testament is *athesmos*, from *thesmos*, "law, custom," with the negative prefix. It is used of "one who breaks through the restraints of law and gratifies lusts" (Thayer, p. 13). I bring this up because this word is found in a passage with *anomos* we have already referred to. I will read the passage again, indicating both words.

And delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked (*athesmos*): (For that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful (*anomos*) deeds;)

As used here in 1 Timothy 1:9, *anomos* persons are not those who are ignorant of the law, but those who live as if there were no law. "Not paying heed to the law that exists" (TDNT, 4:1085). While we do not live under the Old Law, we do live under the Law of Christ (1 Cor. 9:21). In Hebrews 1:9, it says of Christ, "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity (*anomia*) . . ."

### IV. EPIORKOS (1965) "perjured persons" 1 Tim. 1:10

#### A. Data

##### 1. Translation

**1 Timothy 1:10** For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for **perjured persons**, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine;

"perjurers" (NASV, NIV) "false swearers" (ASV, Rotherhams) "[those who] make false oaths" (Basic English) "false witnesses" (Weymouth)

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

### 2. Definition

"a false swearer, a perjurer: 1 Tim. 1:10" (Thayer, p. 241)

EPIORKEO - to swear falsely, to forswear oneself: Mt. 5:33" (Thayer, p. 241)

**Forswear** - "EPIORKEO signifies to swear falsely, to undo one's swearing, forswear oneself (*epi*, "against", *orkos*, an oath), Matt. 5:33. Cp. *epiorkos*, a perjured person, a perjurer, 1 Tim. 1:10, "false swearers." (Vine, ii. p. 126)

### B. Exposition

Further in the list of 1 Timothy 1, we read of "perjured persons." This phrase is translated from the Greek word *epiorkos*. Paul uses the word as a reference to the ninth commandment. The Greek word is a compound of *epi*, "against" and *orkos*, "an oath." The word refers to a perjurer. The verb *epiorkeo*, "to swear falsely, to forswear oneself," is found in Matthew 5:33: "Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths." Those who swore falsely were subject to God's wrath under the Old Covenant (Zech. 5:3). But Jesus goes on to say,

But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil (Matt. 5:34-37; cf. Jas. 5:12).

As Schneider observes in the entry on *epiorkeo* in TDNT (p. 5:467):

"Mt. 5:33 maintains that the law-giver of the old covenant forbade false swearing, Lv. 19:12; Nu. 30:3,4. In contrast, the Law-giver of the Messianic age gives a commandment which prohibits swearing altogether."

Every so often the American public is treated to the spectacle of high government officials being indicted for giving false testimony or perjury.

**V. PARADIATRIBE (or DIAPATRIBE) (#3859), "perverse disputings", 1 Tim. 6:5.**

**A. Data**

**1. Translation**

**1 Timothy 6:5** Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.

"incessant quarrelings" (Rotherham) "constant friction" (NASV, NIV, Moffat) "wranglings" (ASV) "incessant quarrels" (Alford) "perpetual contention" (Berkley) "mutual irritation" (Goodspeed) "bitter talk" (Basic English)

**2. Definition**

"DIAPATRIBE - denotes a constant or incessant wrangling (*dia*, through, *para*, beside, *tribo*, to wear out, suggesting the attrition or wearing affect of contention), 1 Tim. 6:5, R.V. "wranglings," A.V. "perverse disputings." Some mss. have the word *paradiatribe*, in the opposite order of the prefixed prepositions" (Vine, i., p. 323).

"PARADIATRIBE, *useless occupation, empty business, misemployment*: 1 Tim. 6:5. . . See *diapatribe*. (Thayer, p. 480)

"DIAPATRIBE, *constant contention, incessant wrangling or strife, (patribe, attrition, contention, wrangling)*; a word justly adopted in 1 Tim. 6:5 by G L Tr WH (for Rec. *diapatribe*, q.v.)" (Thayer, p. 140).

**B. Exposition**

In 1 Timothy 6, Paul turns his attention once more upon the false teachers who plagued Ephesus. He says,

**1 Timothy 6:3-5** If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; He is proud *tuphoo*, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

These false teachers who are to be withdrawn from are known by their pride and desire for gain. Their pride is shown by their "doting about questions and strifes of words" which results in envy, strife, blasphemies, abusive language, evil suspicions and constant wranglings ("perverse disputings"). There are many like this in the religious world, and sadly, there are even some in the Lord's church. One translation that I did not put on the chart, through an oversight, is Conybeare and Howson's (p. 820): "violent collisions." A footnote indicates "the original meaning of the uncompounded word is friction."

There are actually two different words that appear in the Greek manuscripts. The modern revisors have adopted *diapatribe* instead of *paradiatribe* in this place, its only occurrence in the the Greek New Testament. A look at the definition chart will demonstrate why. While both words could fit the context, the preponderance of evidence seems to be in favor of *diapatribe*, and the KJV translators so understood the word.

Well acquainted with the wranglings and fractious disputes of the Jewish rabbis and the Greek philosophers, Paul knew whereof he spoke when he styled their debates "perverse disputings." In Paul's time, such wrangles were already being seen in the church. In the centuries since that time, ecclesiastical history and our own experience provides us with numerous examples of like friction. The "perverse disputes" of the Jews are preserved for us in the Talmud, and other sources that record the debates of the ancient rabbis. One of the hotly debated questions among these men was "Is it permissible on the Sabbath to throw away the pits of dates?" One answers: "The pits of dates to which some meat adheres may be thrown away. Other pits must not be thrown away." Another disagrees and expresses his opinion in no uncertain terms. Again, the question might be asked, "If it is permissible to throw them away, where and how should they be thrown?" And the answer of someone is: "They should be thrown outside." To which another replies, "No, indeed, they should be thrown under the bed!" And another: "The person confronted on the Sabbath about what to do with datepits should turn his face toward the back of the bed and throw out the pits with his tongue." Such are the wrangles of those who have rejected sound doctrine. They are spiritually sick. Conybeare and Howson translate the phrase "doting about questions and strifes of words," as: "filled with a sickly appetite for disputations and contentions about words" (p. 820).

There are two other words I would like to mention which are used in connection with disputes. The Greek word *zetesis*, from *zeteo*, "to seek," is used in Acts 15:2, 7. It means "a debate, dispute, a questioning" (Vine, i., p. 322).

2) When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and **disputation** with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question. 7) And when there had been much **disputing**, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe.

A cognate of this verb is found in Acts 6:9:

Then there arose certain of the synagogue, which is called the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, **disputing** with Stephen.

In Acts 19:8,9, we find Paul disputing.

And he went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, **disputing** and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God. But when divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and separated the disciples, **disputing** daily in the school of one Tyrannus.

The word used in this passage is *dialogomai*, a verb which means "to reason or deliberate, to argue, dispute" (Vine, i., p. 323). So not all disputes are bad, if you are disputing to defend the truth. But Paul labels some as "perverse"—they are obstinent and wilful arguments and wrangles for the purpose of defending a 'position,' without regard for the truth. Those who engage in such do so from a corrupt mind, thinking highly of themselves for what they are doing.

The Scriptures teach what demeanor should characterize the servant of the Lord who is trying to teach others in error:

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

**2 Timothy 2:23-25** But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes. And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth;

If we are unwilling, or unable to deal with others after this fashion, we have no business professing ourselves to be preachers and evangelists of the gospel of peace.

### VI. PRODOTEES (#4273), "traitors," 2 Tim. 3:4.

#### A. Data

##### 1. Translation

**2 Timothy 3:4** Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God;

"traitors" (ASV, Rotherham) "treacherous" (NASV, NIV) "false to their friends" (Basic English)

##### 2. Definition

"PRODOTES, denotes a betrayer, traitor; the latter term is assigned to Judas in Lk. 6:16, virtually as a title; in 2 Tim. 3:4 it occurs in a list of evil characters, foretold as abounding in the last days" (Vine, iv., p. 148).

"a betrayer, a traitor: Lk. 6:16; Acts 7:52; 2 Tim. 3:4." (Thayer, p. 538)

#### B. Exposition

We turn our attention back to the list in 2 Timothy 3 to notice those whom Paul terms *prodotees*, "traitors." When members of the church place gain and their own will above faith and duty toward God, they are guilty of being traitors to the Cause. But the word here primarily refers to betrayal of one's fellow man. In the two places where the word is applied to specific individuals, the "traitors" were guilty of "giving over" to death someone(s) who were sent to do them good. The Basic English translation, "false to their friends," is certainly a good commentary on what this word means. Judas, "which also was the traitor" (Lk. 6:16), was motivated by avarice (Jn. 12:4-6; Mt. 27:3).



His name has become synonymous with "traitor." (The thesaurus in my word processing software gives two synonyms for "traitor"—"betrayer" and "Judas.") Mark 14:11 says Judas "sought how might conveniently betray him" (from *eukairos*, "well-timed," elsewhere, 2 Tim. 4:2; cf. Lk. 22:6). The sneaking traitor does his evil work when the eyes of the masses cannot behold his perfidious actions.

The Jewish nation, whom Stephan accuses in the persons of the Sanhedrin members, were the "betrayers and murderers" of those men of God who were sent in their interest to warn them and turn them back to God (Acts 7:52; cf. 2 Chron. 24:19-22; 36:13; Neh. 9:26; Jer. 26:23).

The opposite of betrayal is fidelity. Fidelity toward God, church, family and friends (Rev. 2:10; Prov. 27:5-6).

### The Second Group

**Jestings (Eph. 5:4) Filthy communication (Col. 3:8)**  
**Foolish talking (Eph. 5:4) Corrupt communication (Eph. 4:29)**  
**Filthiness (Eph. 5:4) Cursing (Jas. 3:10)**

#### I. AISCHROTEES, (#151), "filthiness," Eph. 5:4.

##### A. Data

##### 1. Translation

**Ephesians 5:4** Neither **filthiness**, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks.

"**shamelessness**" (Rotherham) "**filthiness**" (ASV, NASV)  
"**obscenity**" (NIV) "**indecent**" (Goodspeed) "**low behaviour**" (Basic English)

##### 2. Definition

"*baseness, dishonor*: Eph. 5:4" (Thayer, p. 24)

"AISCHROTEES, baseness (from *aischos*, "shame, disgrace"), is used in Eph 5:4, of obscenity, all that is contrary to purity. Notes: (1) Broadly speaking, *aischrotes* signifies whatever is disgraceful; *rhuparia*, that which is characterized by moral impurity; *molusmos*

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

that which is defile by soiling the clean; *aselgia*, that which is an insolent disregard of decency." (Vine, ii., p. 99).

### B. Exposition

The English word "filthiness" is used four times in the KJV, and every time it translates a different Greek word. In our text, it is from *aischrotes*, "baseness, dishonor, disgraceful, obscene."

Just what does "filthiness" involve? A few years ago, the Supreme Court was hearing a case which involved questions of obscenity and censorship. As the justices wrestles with a definition of "obscenity," one of them observed, "I may not be able to define it, but I know it when I see it." And we see a lot of it these days. It is used to sell everything from liquor to cars. It is seen in the foul jesters, known as "comedians," who entertain the fleshly minded with their indecent humor. It is seen in the work-a-day world, in those we rub shoulders with in this world, who spew forth the corruption of their minds in talk that is full of sexual innuendo and ribaldry; dirty, gutter mentalities that mistake a sharp, foul tongue for a superior wit and intelligence. "Filthiness," *aischrotes* is really a very comprehensive term, that imbraces all that is vile and opposed to purity of life, word and mind. We shall be able to see its manifestations more particularly as we comprehend the other words of this group.

## II. AISCHROLOGIA, (# 148), "filthy communication," Col. 3:8.

### A. Data

#### 1. Translation

**Colossians 3:8** But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, **filthy communication** out of your mouth.

"shameful speaking" (ASV) "shameful talk" (Rotherham)  
"abusive speech" (NASV) "abusive talk" (Goodspeed) "filthy language" (NIV) "foul-mouthed utterance" (Knox) "foul-mouthed abuse" (Weymouth) "unclean talk" (Basic English)

#### 2. Definition

"evil speech in the sense of *obscene speech* or *abusive speech* Col. 3:8 (BAGNT, p. 24)

AISCHROS, AISCHRON "ugly, shameful, base . . . it is disgraceful for someone: for a woman to cut her hair, 1 Cor. 11:6; to speak in a meeting, 1 Cor. 14:35. Without the person, Eph. 5:12" (BAGNT, p. 24).

"foul speaking, low and obscene speech, [R.V. shameful speaking]: Col. 3:8. [Cf. Trench, sec. 34]. (Thayer, p. 17)

Vine, ii., p. 98,99:

"AISCHROTES, baseness (from *aischros*, shame, disgrace), is used in Eph. 5:4, of obscenity, all that is contrary to purity. Notes: (1) broadly speaking, *aischrotes* signifies whatever is disgraceful . . . (2) In Col. 3:8 *aischrologia*, which denotes any kind of base utterance, the utterance of an uncontrolled tongue, is rendered 'filthy communication' in the A.V.; but this is only part of what is included in the more comprehensive R.V. rendering, 'shameful speaking.' In the papyri writings the word is used of abuse. In general it seems to have been associated more frequently with foul or filthy, rather than abusive, speaking (Moulton and Milligan)."

"AISCROS (-ON) base, shameful, is used of base gain 'filthy lucre,' Tit. 1:11, and translated 'shame' in 1 Cor. 11:6, with reference to a woman with shorn hair; in 14:35, of oral utterances of women in a church gathering (R.V. 'shameful'); in Eph. 5:12, of mentioning the base and bestial practices of those who live lascivious lives."

### B. Exposition

In the context, Paul is teaching the Colossians to fully "put off" the old manner of life from before their conversions.

**Colossians 3:5-8** Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry: 6 For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience: 7 In the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived in them. 8 But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth.

The verb translated "put off," *apotithemi*, means "to put away, lay aside like old clothes." This metaphor of clothing Paul uses with several verbs. This bunch of filthy rags belonging to the old life out

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

side of Christ are to be taken off like some old garment that is worn and worthless, and tossed out.

As the word literally means, this is filthiness in talk—shameful speaking that includes both the ideas of obscenity and abuse. It is to be put “out of our mouth.” Trench (p. 120f), in a section covering this word and the two I shall presently notice, explains the distinction between *aischrologia* and *morologia* and *eutrapelia*. *Aischrologia* is obscene discourse that leads to wantonness, fornication, and lasciviousness. But even more often, the word is used to denominate “all foul-mouthed abusiveness of every kind,” including that talk characterized by sexual references and innuendo. Trench believes, the word as used in Col. 3:8, “includes therein every license of the ungoverned tongue employing itself in the abuse of others; all the wicked condiments of saucy speech.”

What we call profanity is included in *aichrologia*.

“Who pays you to swear?” asked a man of one whom he heard using profane language. “No one pays me anything for it,” was the subdued reply. “Well,” said the man, “then you surely work cheap to lay aside the character of a gentleman, to inflict pain on your friends and civil people, and to risk the loss of your soul—all for nothing. you certainly work cheap, very cheap, indeed.”

*Profanity defined.*—Someone has given this definition to profanity: “the effort of a feeble mind to express itself forcibly.” Lord Byron remarked of an acquaintance: “He knew not what to say, so he swore.”

*His master.*—A Christian was in the company of a man who used coarse and vulgar talk. In the course of the conversation the man made many references to the devil. Finally he began taking the name of the Lord in vain. “Stop,” said the Christian, “I said nothing while you were talking about your master, but I insist upon it that you shall not speak lightly of mine.”

“The foolish and wicked practice of profane cursing and swearing is a vice so mean and low that every person of sense and character detests and despises it”—George Washington

III. MOROLOGIA , (#3473), "foolish talking," Eph. 5:4.

A. Data

1. Translation

Ephesians 5:4 Neither filthiness, nor **foolish talking**, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks.

**"foolish talking"** (ASV, Rotherham) **"silly talk"** (NASV) **"foolish talk"** (NIV, Basic English) **"buffoonery"** (Conybeare)

2. Definition

"MOROLOGIA, from *moros*, foolish, dull, stupid, and *lego*, is used in Eph. 5:4; it denotes more than mere idle talk (Syn. sec. 34). (Vine, iv., p. 109)

**"foolish talking:** Eph. 5:4 [Cf. Trench, Syn., sec. 34]" (Thayer, p. 420)

**"foolish, silly talk w. AISCHROTEES and EUTRAPELIA** Eph 5:4. (BAGNT, p. 533)

B. Exposition

Foolishness and talking go together like "tuna" and "fish." Ungodly talk is the mark of a fool. Several years ago I received a small book titled **The Wit and Wisdom of Abraham Lincoln**. One of my favorites was "Better to keep your mouth shut and be thought a fool, than to open it and remove all doubt." I thought that was awfully perceptive and wise. Some while later though, I discovered that Mr. Lincoln was not as original as I thought. Over 2700 years earlier, Solomon said, "Even a fool, when he holdeth his peace, is counted wise: and he that shutteth his lips is esteemed a man of understanding" (Pro. 17:28). But it is just not in a fool to hold his tongue, and many are the sins of his tongue.

**Proverbs 10:18** He that hideth hatred with lying lips, and he that uttereth a slander, is a fool.

**Proverbs 19:1** Better is the poor that walketh in his integrity, than he that is perverse in his lips, and is a fool.

**Proverbs 29:11** A fool uttereth all his mind: but a wise man keepeth it in till afterwards.

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

**Proverbs 29:20** Seest thou a man that is hasty in his words? there is more hope of a fool than of him.

**Ecclesiastes 10:3** Yea also, when he that is a fool walketh by the way, his wisdom faileth him, and he saith to every one that he is a fool.

**Ecclesiastes 10:12** The words of a wise man's mouth are gracious; but the lips of a fool will swallow up himself.

**Ecclesiastes 10:14** A fool also is full of words. . .

Of *morologia*, Trench (p. 121) says, "It is that 'talk of fools' that is foolishness and sin together."

### IV. EUTRAPELIA, (#2160)

#### A. Data

##### 1. Translation

**Ephesians 5:4** Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks.

"jesting" (ASV, Rotherham) "coarse jesting" (NASV) "coarse joking" (NIV) "ribald jesting" (Conybeare) "scurrilous talk" (Goodspeed) "suggestive jesting" (Williams) "words said in sport" (Basic English)

##### 2. Definition

"EUTRAPELIA properly denotes wit, facetiousness, versatility lit., easily turning, from *eu*, well, *trepo*, to turn). It was used in the literal sense to describe the quick movements of apes and persons. Pericles speaks of the Athenians of his day (430 B.C.) as distinguished by a happy and gracious 'flexibility.' In the next century Aristotle uses it of 'versatility' in the give and take of social intercourse, quick repartee. In the sixth century, B.C., the poet Pinda speaks of one Jason as never using a word of 'vain lightness,' a meaning approaching its latest use. Its meaning certainly deteriorated, and it came to mean coarse jesting, as in Eph. 5:4, where it follows *morologia*, foolish talking. (Vine, ii., p. 274)

" . . . in our lit., only in a bad sense *coarse jesting*, *buffoonery* Eph. 5:4." (BAGNT, p. 327)

## Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1

---

"fr. EUTRAPELOS, fr. EU, and TREPO to turn: easily turning; nimble-witted, witty, sharp) *pleasantry, humor, facetiousness, . . .*; in a bad sense, *scurrility, ribaldry, low jesting* (in which there is some acuteness): Eph. 5:4. (cf. Trench, sec. 34). (Thayer, p. 263)

### B. Exposition

This word was used in a good and bad sense among Greek writers. It is compounded from *eu*, "well," *trepo*, "to turn." It was used in the literal sense to describe the quick motion of persons and apes. It could be used in the sense of "flexibility." With regard to speech, it could refer to one who is adept at uttering a "well-turned phrase." So in its good sense it means "nimble-witted, witty, pleasantry, humor." But the meaning of the word deteriorated in time, and came to mean "coarse, ribald or low jesting."

It certainly includes the off-color humor and banter exchanged between carnally minded persons. While thinking that they are displaying their "smartness," they are only displaying the filth of their mind.

Comparing the three words we have just noticed, Trench says (p. 125),

While then by all these words are indicated sins of the tongue, it is yet with this difference,—that in *morologia* the foolishness, in *aischrologia* the foulness, in *eutrapelia* the false refinement, of discourse not seasoned with the salt of grace, are severally noted and condemned.

## V. LOGOS SAPROS , (#3056 + #4550), "Corrupt communication," Eph. 4:29.

### A. Data

#### 1. Translation

**Ephesians 4:29** Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers.

"corrupt speech" (ASV) "putrid discourse" (Rotherham) "unwholesome word" (NASV) "unwholesome talk" (NIV) "foul word" (TCNT) "evil talk" (Basic English)

## Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1

### 2. Definition

#### SAPROS

"corrupt, akin to *seepo*. A, No. 5; see BAD, No. 3. (Vine, i., p. 244)

"SAPROS, corrupt, rotten (akin to *SEEPOO*, *to rot*), primarily, of vegetable and animal substances, expresses what is of poor quality, unfit for use, putrid. It is said of a tree and its fruit, Mt. 7:17,18; 12:33; Lk. 6:43; of certain fish, Mt. 13:48 (here translated 'bad'); of defiling speech, Eph. 4:29. (Vine, i., p. 95)

NOTE: Cf. Pro. 15:4, 1 Tim. 6:3

"rotten, putrid 2. corrupted by age and no longer fit for use, worn out; hence in general, of poor quality, bad, unfit for use, worthless, [A.V. *corrupt*], Mt. 7:17sq.; 12:33; Lk. 6:43; fishes, Mt. 13:48 [here A.V. *bad*]; trop. [trop. means "figuratively"-shb] *logos*, Eph. 4:29" (Thayer, p. 568).

"decayed, rotten 1. lit., of spoiled fish Mt. 13:48. Of plants and their products: of decayed trees Mt. 7:17f; 12:33a; Lk. 6:43b. Of rotten fruits Mt. 12:33b; Lk. 6:43a; . . . of stones LITHOI SAPROS stones that are unsound or crumbling Hs 9,5,2. But in 9,6,4 the transition to the more general mng. unusable, unfit, bad is complete; this meaning also recommends itself for some of the passages dealt w. above (e.g., do 'rotten' fish swim into a net, and do 'rotten' tree bear fruit at all?). 2. fig. bad, evil, unwholesome, LOGOS SAPROS an evil word, evil speech Eph. 4:29." (BAGNT, p. 749)

### B. Exposition

This term may be taken as synonymous with *aiskrologia*. The basic meaning of *sapros* is "decayed, rotten, putrid." It is a cognate of the word *seepoo*, "to rot." The word *sapros* is primarily used of animal or vegetable substances that are rotten, unwholesome and unfit for human consumption. The word is used in Lk. 6:43, "For a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit;" and in Matthew 13:48, "Which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away."

In the latter part of Ephesians 4, Paul is teaching that Christians are not to conduct themselves as the heathens of the world do: "This I



say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind" (v. 17). He says we are to "put off" the old man "which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts (v. 22) (the word "corrupt" here is *phtheiro*, "to destroy by means of corrupting, and so bring into a worse state" Vine, i., p. 242), and "put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" (v. 24). Paul then gives several illustrations of such "putting on" and "putting off": put away lying and speak truth (v. 25); don't steal, but labor, so you can give to the poor (v. 28); put away all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, and all malice (v. 31); and instead be kind one to another, tender-hearted, and forgiving of one another (v. 32). Something evil is put away, and something positively good is to replace it. In this context, Paul tells us to not allow corrupt communication out of our mouths, "but that which is good to the use of edifying" (v. 29). Consistent with the other illustrations in this chapter, "corrupt communication" must be that which is the opposite of edifying, wholesome speech. Therefore, this is an all-embracing term that could comprehend many of the sins of the tongue, including those like whispering, backbiting, gossip, slander, etc., that impugn and assassinate men's characters. "Corrupt communication" is also the opposite of encouragement, exhortation, thanksgiving and comfort—all those uses to which the tongue may be put that enoble, edify and serve to bestow favor and goodwill upon the hearer.

**Psalms 5:9** For there is no faithfulness in their mouth; their inward part is very wickedness; their throat is an open sepulchre; they flatter with their tongue.

**Psalms 73:8** They are corrupt, and speak wickedly concerning oppression: they speak loftily.

**Proverbs 15:4** A wholesome tongue is a tree of life: but perverseness therein is a breach in the spirit.

**Proverbs 15:23** A man hath joy by the answer of his mouth: and a word spoken in due season, how good is it!

**Proverbs 25:11** A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver.

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

### VI. KATARA, (#2671), "cursing," James 3:10.

#### A. Data

##### 1. Translation

**James 3:10** Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not so to be.

"cursing" (general translation)

##### 2. Definition

Vine , i., p. 262

"1. ARA, in its most usual meaning, a malediction, cursing (its other meaning is "a prayer"), is used in Rom. 3:14 (often in the Sept.). 2. KATARA, *kata*, down intensive, and No. 1, denotes an execration, imprecation, curse, uttered out of malevolence, Jas. 3:10; 2 Pet. 2:14; or pronounced by God in His righteous judgment, as upon a land doomed to barrenness; upon those who seek for justification, in part or completely, to the Law, Gal. 3:10, 13; in this 13th verse it is used concretely of Christ, as having "become a curse" for us, i.e. by voluntarily undergoing on the cross the appointed penalty of the curse. he was thus identified, on our behalf, with the doom of sin. 3. ANATHEMA, transliterated from the Greek, is frequently used in the Sept., where it translates the Hebrew *cherem*, a thing devoted to God, whether, (a) for His service, as sacrifices, Lev. 27:28 (cp. *anatheema*, a votive offering, gift), or (b) for its destruction, as an idol, Deut. 7:26, or a city, Josh. 6:17. Later it acquired the more general meaning of disfavour with Jehovah, e.g. Zech. 14:11. It is used of (a) the sentence pronounced, Acts 23:14 (lit., 'cursed themselves with a curse;' see *anathematizo* below); (b) of the object on which the curse is laid, "accursed;" in the following the R.V. keeps the word "anathema," Rom. 9:3; 1 Cor. 12:3; 16:22; Gal. 1:8,9, all of which the A.V. renders by "accursed" except 1 Cor. 16:22, where it has "Anathema." 4. KATATHEMA, or, in some mss., the longer form *katanathema*, is stronger than No. 3 (*kata*, intensive), and denotes, by metonymy, an accursed thing (the object cursed being put for the curse pronounced), Rev. 22:3."

"an execration, imprecation, curse, opp. to EULOGIA, Ja.3:10." (Thayer, p. 335)

### **B. Exposition**

The word is formed by adding the prefix *kata* to the root word *ara*, "a malediction, a curse." The prefix *kata* intensifies *ara*. The verb form of this word is *kataraoimai*, which primarily signifies "to pray against, to wish evil against a person or thing."

The word may be used of the righteous judgment of God against sinners. "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (Mt. 25:41).

Christians are forbidden to curse anyone, even their enemies. "Bless them which persecute you: bless, and curse not" (Rom. 12:14). Speaking of the iniquity the tongue is capable of, James says,

Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God. Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not so to be (Jas. 3:9,10).

The man who curses his fellow man, and then blesses God, is like a man who professes the profoundest admiration for a superior, but insults and castigates the members of his superior's family. Will his superior be pleased? If God is sincerely and honestly praised, there will be no cursing of His children. But if there is such cursing, God cannot acceptably be praised. Such words of praise are hollow mockeries. They will be an offense to Him.

### **The Third Group**

**Highminded (2 Tim. 3:4) Lovers of own selves (2 Tim. 3:2)**

**Proud (Rom. 1:30) Boasters (Rom. 1:30)**

**Disobedient to parents (Rom. 1:30)**

**Without natural affection (Rom. 1:30)**

**Self-willed (2 Pet. 2:10) Swellings (2 Cor. 12:20)**

"Everyone admires humility—especially in the other fellow." Humility is the foundation upon which a virtuous Christian life is built. **Humility entails respect of and acquiescence to divinely constituted authority: of God, (1**

## Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1

Pet. 5:6) "Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time;" *of parents, and elders*: (1 Pet. 5:5) "Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder. Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility: for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble;" and for *the law of the land*. Humility is essential for happy relations with our fellow man and brethren in the church. (Phil. 2:3-4) "Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves. Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." Humility is a virtue that men tend to admire in the other guy. The carnal mind despises or eshews humility as "weakness." But it is the humble who shall dwell with God. "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones" (Isa. 57:15).

In the group of "works of the flesh" we are about to consider, we find sins that are a adverse to the humble, submissive and unselfish spirit that should stamp the genuine Christian.

### I. TUPHOMAI, (5187), "highminded," 2 Tim. 3:4.

#### A. Data

##### 1. Translation

2 Timothy 3:4 Traitors, heady, **highminded**, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God;

"**puffed up**" (ASV) "**beclouded**" (Rotherham) "**swollen with self-importance**" (NEB) "**conceited**" (NIV, NASV, Berkeley) "**lifted up in mind**" (Basic English)

##### 2. Definition

"TUPHOO, *becloud, delude*, but only in a fig. sense and quite predom., in our lit. exclusively, in the pass. TUPHOMAI, for our lit. the mngs. are surely, 1. *be puffed up, conceited* 1 Tim. 3:6. Cf. 2 Tim. 3:4. The ancient versions also understand 1 Tim. 6:4 in this sense, though the pass. may belong to mng. 2. 2. *be blinded, become foolish* pf. pass. *foolish, stupid*. (BAGNT, p. 838)

"TUPHOO (TUPHOS, *smoke, pride*); prop. *to raise a smoke, to wrap in a mist*; used only metaph. 1. *to make proud, puff up with*

pride, render insolent; pass. *to be puffed up* with haughtiness or pride, 1 Tim. 3:6. 2. *to blind with pride or conceit, to render foolish or stupid*: 1 Tim. 6:4; pf. ptc. *beclouded, besotted*, 2 Tim. 3:4." (Thayer, p. 633)

"1. TUPHOO properly means to wrap in smoke (from *tuphos*, smoke; metaphorically, for conceit); it is used in the Passive Voice, metaphorically in 1 Tim. 3:6, 'puffed up,' R.V. (A.V. 'lifted up with pride'); so ;4, A.V. 'proud,' and 2 Tim. 3:4, A.V. 'highminded.' Cp. *tuphomai*, to smoke, Matt. 12:20 and *tuphonikos*, tempestuous wind (with *anemos*, wind understood), Acts 27:14" (Vine, ii., p. 220)

### B. Exposition

The basic significance of the word is "to be puffed up with haughtiness or pride; to be conceited." Its root is *tuphos*, "smoke." Thayer defines it here as "beclouded," meaning that those who are "highminded" are blinded by pride. The word is used in 1 Timothy 6:4 in reference to those who do not consent to the wholesome doctrine of Christ.

In the KJV, we find "highminded" used elsewhere to translate *hupselophroneo*, "to be highminded; to have proud thoughts."

"Because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear" (Rom. 11:20)

"Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy" (1 Tim. 6:17).

Whereas *tuphos* refers to the effect of pride: a beclouded understanding and apprehension of the truth about things; *hupselophroneo* refers to the actual thoughts and opinion of one's self that are blown out of proportion to the truth. Paul teaches

**Romans 12:3** For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith.

God smote Herod with death from worms because he gloried in himself, and gave not God the glory (Acts 12:23). Remember, "God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble" (Jas. 4:6).

# *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

## II. HUPEREEPHANOS, (#5244), "proud," Rom. 1:30.

### A. Data

#### 1. Translation

**Romans 1:30** Backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents,

"arrogant" (NASV, NIV, Rotherham) "haughty" (ASV)

#### 2. Definition

"in our lit. only in an unfavorable sense . . . *arrogant, haughty, proud* Lk. 1:51; Rom. 1:30; 2 Tim. 3:2; Jas. 4:6; 1 Pet. 5:5" (BAGNT, p. 849)

"HUPEREEPHANOS signifies showing oneself above others, pre-eminent (*hyper*, above, *phainomai*, to appear, to be manifest); it is always used in Scripture in the bad sense of arrogant, disdainful, proud" (Vine, iii., p. 226)

"HUPEREEPHANIA *pride, haughtiness, arrogance*, the characteristic of one who, with a swollen estimate of his own powers and merits, looks down on others and even treats them with arrogance and contempt: Mk. 7:22" (Thayer, p. 641)

"HUPEREEPHANOS 1. *showing one's self above others, overtopping, conspicuous above others, pre-eminent*. 2. esp. in a bad sense *with an overweening estimate of one's means or merits, despising others or even treating them with contempt, haughty* [cf. Westcott, Epp. of St John, p. 64b]; Rom. 1:30; 2 Tim. 3:2; opp. to TAPEINOI ["humble"-shb], Jas. 4:6; 1 Pet. 5:5 (in these two pass. after Pr. 3:34); with DIANOLA KARDIAS added ["imagination of heart"—shb], Lk. 1:51. (Sept.) [See Trench, Syn., sec. 24; Schmidt ch. 176,8]" (Thayer, p. 641).

### B. Exposition

The word *hupereephanos* appears in Romans 1:30 between two other words that are concerned with the sin of pride. "Despiteful" is translated from *hubristees*, which is also used in 1 Timothy 1:13 by the Apostle Paul to describe his life before conversion. It is there translated "injurious." The word "boasters" is from *alazon*, which we will consider next.

*Hupereephanos* is a compound word from *huper*, "above" (akin to the Latin *super*) and *phainomai*, "to appear." *Phainomai* is from the word *phaino*, "to shine." I like to think of the word as meaning "super-shiner." And that is really what the proud individual is all about—appearance is everything.

God hates the proud look (Pro. 6:17). James 4:6 and 1 Peter 5:5 are quotations of Proverbs 3:34, where the word appears in the Septuagint. "Surely he scorneth the scorers: but he giveth grace unto the lowly" (Pro. 3:34). The proud are scornful and hateful toward those who they consider their inferiors. If they could only see themselves as God sees them! While it has an outward manifestation, pride is preeminently a sin of the mind (Mk. 7:22-23, *hupereephanos* - the verb translated "pride"). It is an "imagination of the heart" (Lk. 1:51) that is totally out of touch with objective reality. It is puny mortal flesh aspiring to have the glory and power that God alone, by virtue of His righteousness, has the right to possess.

In the Old Testament, the displeasure of God with the vice of pride is mostly displayed in the wisdom literature and the prophets. While the proud usually think themselves wise, pride is antithetical to true wisdom (Pro. 8:13; 11:2; 13:10; 14:3; 16:8; 29:23). The prophets are full of denunciations against Israel, Judah, Edom, Moab and other peoples for their pride. Nebuchadnezzar, one of the greatest monarchs of all time, had to learn the hard way about the folly of pride (Dan. 4). His verdict, after his ordeal was over, was this: "Now I Nebuchadnezzar praise and extol and honour the King of heaven, all whose works are truth, and his ways judgment: and those that walk in pride he is able to abase."

### III. ALAZON, (#213), "boasters," Rom. 1:30

#### A. Data

##### 1. Translation

**Romans 1:30** Backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents,

"boastful" (ASV, NASV, NIV)

"vain boasters" (Rotherham)

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

### 2. Definition

"boaster, bragger Rom. 1:30; 2 Tim. 3:2" (BAGNT, p. 34).

"ALAZONEIA a. in prof. writing generally *empty, braggert talk*, sometimes also *empty display in act, swagger*. [for illus. see Trench, sec. 29]. b. an *insolent and empty assurance, which trusts in its own power and resources and shamefully despises and violates divine laws and human rights*. c. an *impious and empty presumption which trusts in the stability of earthly things*: Jas.4:16 (where the plur. has reference to the various occasions on which this presumption shows itself); *display in one's style of living*, [R.V. *vainglory*], 1 Jn. 2:16" (Thayer, p. 25)

"ALAZON (ALE, *wandering*), an *empty pretender, a boaster*: Rom. 1:30; 2 Tim. 3:2" (Thayer, p. 25)

Vine, i., 135ff:

1. ALAZON, a boaster, Rom. 1:30 and 2 Tim. 3:2, A.V. "boasters," R.V. "boastful," primarily signifies a wanderer about the country (from *ale*, wandering), a vagabond; hence, an imposter.

2. ALAZONEIA, the practice of an ALAZON, denotes quackery; hence, arrogant display or boastings, JAs. 4:16,R.V. "vaunting;" in 1 Jn. 2:16, R.V. "vainglory;" A.V. "pride."

### B. Exposition

The word *alazon* is from the word *alee*, "wandering." The word originally referred to a vagrant. In ancient Greece they had wandering charlatans who professed to have cure-alls for people's ailments and boasted themselves of other feats they could not perform. They were quacks. So the word came to signify any empty boaster, an imposter.

The word occurs twice in the Septuagint (Hab. 2:5; Job. 28:8). In the New Testament, besides those given above, the verb form is found in James 4:16 ("boast") and 1 John 2:16 (in the phrase "pride of life"). While a person could be proud of things he possesses, like wealth or good looks, the *alazon* boasts of things that he does not have. This is important to remember in relation to James 4:16: "Boast not thyself of the morrow." The rich fool of Luke 12 made this mistake. He was an *alazon*.



Trench has a fine article on *alazon*, *hupereephanos*, and *hubristees* (p. 98ff). He points out that, primarily (though not exclusively), *alazon* (Rom. 1:30, "boasters") refers to the boastful in words, *hupereephanos* ("proud") the proud and overbearing in thoughts, and *hubristees* ("despiteful," cf. 1 Tim. 1:13) the insolent and injurious in acts.

### IV. PHUSIOO, (#5448), "swellings," 2 Cor. 12:20

#### A. Data

##### 1. Translation

**2 Corinthians 12:20** For I fear, lest, when I come, I shall not find you such as I would, and that I shall be found unto you such as ye would not: lest there be debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, **swellings**, tumults:

"swellings" (ASV) "**arrogance**" (NASV,NIV) "**puffed up pretensions**" (Rotherham) "**high thoughts**" (Basic English) "**puffings up**" (Marshall Literal English)

##### 2. Definition

"*a puffing up of soul, loftiness, pride*.; plur. 2 Cor. 12:20." (Thayer, p. 661)

"PHUSIOOSIS, denotes a puffing up, welling with pride (akin to *phusioo*, to puff up), 2 Cor. 12:20." (Vine, p. 99).

PHUSIOO "(a later substitute for PHUSAO; it is largely limited to Christian lit. . . .) . . . *to become puffed up or conceited, put on airs*, 1 Cor. 4:18f.; 5:2; 13:4; . . . *groundlessly inflated by his fleshly mind* Col. 2:18; . . . *in order that no one of you might be puffed up in favor of the one* (apostle and thus) *against the other* 1 Cor. 4:6." (BAGNT, p. 877)

### V. APIETHEES, (#545), "disobedient to parents," Rom. 1:30

#### A. Data

##### 1. Translation

**Romans 1:30** Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, **disobedient to parents**,

## Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1

"disobedient to parents" (ASV, NASV) "unyielding to parents" (Rotherham) "they disobey their parents" (NIV) "undutiful to parents" (Conybeare) "no loyalty to parents" (NEB)

### 2. Definition

"disobedient 1. w. dat. of the pers. to parents Rom. 1:30; 2 Tim. 3:2." (BAGNT, pg.82).

"APEITHEES, signifies unwilling to be persuaded, spurning belief, disobedient, . . . Rom. 1:30, 2 Tim. 3:2" (Vine, i., p. 319)

APEITHEES, "*impersuasive, uncompliant, contumacious*, [A.V. *disobedient*]. absol. . . Rom. 1:30; 2 Tim. 3:2 . . . (Dt. 21:18; Num. 20:10; Is. 30:9; Zech. 7:12)" (Thayer, p. 55).

### B. Exposition

All pride is a revolt against authority. The "pride of life" is a revolt against the authority of God. Those who are *apeithees* ("disobedient") to parents revolt against the authority of parents. The verb, *apeitheia* denotes the condition of being unpersuadable; and hence, obstinate. Those who are disobedient to parents then, are those who have an entrenched enmity to their parents' will. This is not referring to the occasional breaches of the parents' will that every child commits and receives chastisement for.

Children, in their youthful inexperience with life, are sometimes guilty of thinking they know better than their parents, or that they do not need to follow their parents' will. Like the prideful, they are deceived in their imaginations. Those who are raised with proper correction, in word and deed (Eph. 6:4; Pro. 22:6) will soon discover their folly. Mark Twain once said, "When I was fourteen, my father was the stupidest man in the world. By the time I was twenty-one, he was about the smartest man I knew. Amazing what he learned in just seven years!" However, some never learn the value of obedience to parents and God. God created the home for the welfare of the race, and those who despise its authority, and obstinately rebel against it, will find by and by that they do so to their hurt. Paul wrote, "Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. Honour thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth" (Eph. 6:1-3). Under the Law, the "stubborn and rebellious" son was put to death (Deut. 21:18-21).

### VI. PHILAUTOS, "lovers of their own selves," 2 Tim. 3:2

#### A. Data

##### 1. Translation

**2 Timothy 3:2** For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy,

"men shall be lovers of self" (ASV, NASV, Basic English) "lovers of themselves" (NIV) "fond of themselves" (Rotherham) "people will be self-lovers" (Berkeley) "men shall be selfish" (Conybeare)

##### 2. Definition

"*loving oneself, selfish* 2 Tim. 3:2" (BAGNT, p. 866)

"PHILAUTOS, loving oneself, 2 Tim. 3:2" (Vine, iii., p. 23)

(PHILOS and AUTOS) "*loving one's self; to intent on one's own interests, selfish: 2 Tim. 3:2*" (Thayer, p. 653).

#### B. Exposition

The catalog of vices in 2 Timothy 3:2-4 begins with *philautos*, "lover of self," and ends with *philedonos*, "lover of pleasure." It is fitting that this list begins with *philautos*, for all sin and vice is ultimately selfishness—the exaltation of self before God and fellow man. Flowing to its natural conclusion, the *philautoi* become the *philedonoi*, and everything in between.

Our generation does not have a monopoly on self-centeredness, but it is not called the "me-generation" for nothing. Psychologists use the word "individualism," a technical term for the selfishness so prevalent today. Examples are so abundant in our society, they need no special mention here. One sinful result of this vice however needs mentioning—covetousness. "For the wicked boasteth of his heart's desire, and blesseth the covetous, whom the LORD abhorreth" (Ps. 10:3). Covetousness is idolatry (Col. 3:5), which is the ultimate rejection of God (Rom. 1:18-23). Jesus often warned against this sin (Lk 12:15; 21:34; Mk. 7:22; et. al.). Those guilty of this brand of selfishness will make ship-wreck of their souls (1 Tim. 6:9-10). Where Satan has failed to destroy the church through persecution and false teaching, he is succeeding with the enticements of materialism. Let us beware, lest we be found as the Laodiceans (Rev. 3:17). (cf. "self-willed" below.)

## Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1

### VII. ASTORGOS, (#545), "without natural affection," Rom. 1:31

#### A. Data

##### 1. Translation

**Romans 1:31** Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful:

"without natural affection" (ASV, Rotherham) "unloving" (NASV, Goodspeed) "heartless" (NIV, RSV) "callous" (Moffatt)

##### 2. Definition

"unloving in a catalogue of vices Rom. 1:31; 2 Tim. 3:3" (BAGNT, p. 117)

"ASTORGOS signifies without natural affection (*a*, negative, and *storge*, love of kindred, especially of parents for children and children for parents, Rom. 1:31; 2 Tim. 2:3" (Vine, i., p. 37)

"without natural affection: Rom. 1:31; 2 Tim. 3:3" (Thayer, p. 82)

#### B. Exposition

There are four Greek words for "love." There is *eros* which refers to carnal love. There is *phileo* which refers to affectionate, friendly love. There is *agape* which refers to sacrificial love expressed in deeds. A fourth word for love is *storge*. This word specifically refers to family affection, the love of one's family. The adjective *philostorgos* is found in Romans 12:10, "kindly-affectioned." (This emphasizes the family quality that should exist in the church.) It appears twice with the alpha privative as negating *storge* (Rom. 1:31; 2 Tim. 3:3). In both places it is properly translated "without natural affection." The breakdown of the home, the willingness of so many to throw away their marriages and families in pursuit of carnal pleasures, child-abuse, neglect of children in pursuit of the almighty dollar, neglect of elderly parents, might all be classed under this vice. However, the clearest example that our society is "without natural affection" is the national crime of abortion. Over 20 million unborn have died to serve the convenience of the parent(s). Millions more have been aborted in other lands where abortion has been permitted for many years. Let us pray that our courts and people awaken to outlaw this terrible sin. God vented His wrath on those sacrificed their new-born children in idolatrous worship (2 Chron. 33:6; Jer. 15:4). Will this country go unpunished?

VIII. AUTHADES, (#829), "self-willed," 2 Pet. 2:10

A. Data

1. Translation

2 Peter 2:10 But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government. Presumptuous are they, **selfwilled**, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities.

"**self-willed**" (ASV, NASV) "**wilful**" (Rotherham) "**arrogant**" (NIV) "**uncontrolled**" (Basic English) "**headstrong**" (Goodspeed)

2. Definition

"AUTHADEES, self-pleasing (*autos*, self, *heedomai*, to please), denotes one who, dominated by self-interest, and inconsiderate of others, arrogantly asserts his own will, "self-willed," Tit. 1:7; 2 Pet. 2:10 (the opposite of *epieikees*, gentle, e.g. 1 Tim. 3:3), "one so far overvaluing any determination at which he himself has once arrived that he will not be removed from it" (Trench, who compares and contrasts *philautos*, loving self, selfish; Syn., sec. 93). In the Sept., Gen 49:3,7; Prov. 21:24" (Vine, iii., p. 342)

"*self-pleasing, self-willed, arrogant*: Tit. 1:7; 2 Pet. 2:10. (Gen 49:3,7; Prov. 21:24) [Trench, sec. 93]" (Thayer, p. 83ff)

B. Exposition

*Authadees* is a compound word that means "self-pleasing." This person is dominated by self-interest and inconsiderate of others. Nothing could be further from the spirit that should be seen in the Christian. Paul said, "Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves. Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." The only other place where this word appears in the Greek New Testament is in the list of qualifications given for the elder in Titus 1:7—"For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God; not **self-willed**, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre" (Tit. 1:7).

Trench compares *authadees* with *philautos* (p. 349ff). The *authadees* person "cares to please nobody." He is a man both soft and hard—soft on himself and hard on everybody else. The emphasis in this word is on the unpleasantness he forces on others in his self-interest. On the

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

other hand, the *philautos* person is "sparing of himself and providing things easy and pleasant for self." The emphasis in this word is on the coddling and pampering of one's self. Trench sums up the difference between these two words very well:

In some sinful men their *authadeia*, the ungracious bearing towards others, the self-pleasing which is best pleased when it displeases others, is the leading feature of their character; in others the *philautia*, the undue providing of all that shall minister to their own ease, and keep hardness aloof from them (p. 352f).

### **The Fourth Group**

**Emulations (Gal. 5:20) Envyings (Gal. 5:21)  
Malice (Col. 3:8) & Maliciousness (Rom. 1:29) Malignity (Rom. 1:29)  
Bitterness (Eph. 4:31) Clamour (Eph. 4:31)**

#### **I. ZEELOS, (#2205), "emulations," Gal. 5:20**

##### **A. Data**

##### **1. Translation**

**Galatians 5:20** Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, **emulations**, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies,

"jealousies" (ASV) "jealousy" (NASV, Rotherham, NIV, Literal English, Conybeare) "desire for what another has" (Basic English) "envy" (NEB)

##### **2. Definition**

"ZEELOS, zeal, jealousy, is rendered 'jealousy,' in the R.V. (A.V. 'envyings') in Rom. 13:13; 1 Cor. 3:3; Jas. 3:14, 16; in 2 Cor. 12:20 (A.V., 'envyings'); in Gal. 5:20, R.V. 'jealousies' (A.V. 'emulations'); in Acts 5:17 (A.V., 'indignation'); in 13:45 (A.V., 'envy'); in 2 Cor. 11:2 it is used in the phrase 'with a godly jealousy,' lit. 'with a jealousy of God' (R.V., margin)" (Vine, ii., p. 273f.).

"ZEELOO (verb), akin to A., to be jealous, to burn with jealousy (otherwise to seek or desire earnestly), is rendered 'moved with jealousy,' in Acts 7:9 and 17:5, R.V. (A.V., 'moved with envy'); in 1 Cor. 13:4, 'envieth (not),' A.V. and R.V.; in Jas. 4:2, R.V. marg., 'are jealous' (text: 'covet;' A.V. 'desire to have')" (Vine, ii., p. 273f.).

"PARAZEELOO, to provoke to jealousy (*para*, beside, used intensively, and No. 1), is found in Rom. 10:19 and 11:11, of God's dealings with Israel through His merciful dealings with Gentiles; in 11:14, R.V., 'I may provoke to jealousy' (A.V. ' . . . emulation'), of the Apostle's evangelistic ministry to the Gentiles with a view to stirring his fellow-nationals to a sense of their need and responsibilities regarding the Gospel; in 1 Cor. 10:22, of the provocation of God on the part of believers who compromise their Divine relationship by partaking of the table of demons; in Gal. 5:20, of the works of the flesh" (Vine, ii., p. 273f.).

"*excitement of mind, ardor, fervor of spirit* 1. *zeal, ardor in embracing, pursuing, defending anything*: 2 Cor. 7:11; 9:2; Phil 3:6; with a gen. of the obj., *zeal in behalf of, for a person or thing*, Jn. 2:17 fr. Ps. 69:10 [sic. 69:9—shb]. . . 2. *an envious and contentious rivalry, jealousy*: Rom. 13:13; 1 Cor. 3:3; Jas. 3:14, 16; Acts 5:17; 13:45; plur. . . . now the stirrings and emotions of ZEELOS, now its outbursts and manifestations: 2 Cor. 12:20; Gal. 5:20 . . . [On the distinction between ZEELOS (which may be used in a good sense) and PHTHONOS (used only in a bad sense) cf. Trench, Syn., sec. 26]" (Thayer, p. 271)

"1. in a good sense, *zeal, ardor*. 2. in a bad sense, *jealousy, envy*" (BAGNT, p. 338)

### B. Exposition

*Zeelos* is a word that had both good and bad applications. From this Greek word comes both our English word "zeal" and our word "jealousy." The basic meaning is "excitement of mind, ardor, fervor of spirit." Such excitement of mind might be applied to good ends or bad. The word is used of Jesus' attitude toward the temple of God in John 2:17: "And his disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up." It is also used of the Corinthians concerning helping their destitute brethren in Judea: "For I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Mace-

## Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1

donia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many" (2 Cor. 9:2). It has been said that zeal in a good cause makes it better, and zeal in a bad cause makes it worse. Hitler and the Nazis might never have amounted to anything, if it were not for their all-consuming zeal. The Jewish enemies of the cross were zealous, but not according to knowledge (Rom. 10:2).

The English word "emulation" means "effort or desire to equal or excel others" (Random House). As with *zeelos*, this can take a good and bad form. We can try to "emulate" those who are truly better than ourselves, out of a wholesome desire to be like them (cf. Rom. 10:19; 11:11, 14). "The emulator is impatient of a superior, not by depressing or maligning another, but by perfecting himself" (Trench, p. 87). On the other hand we can engage in jealous rivalry with someone, vying with them for superiority. This would be wrong.

We often see these two meanings of "emulate" manifest in church leaders. For example, one preacher notes the work, industry, knowledge and spirituality of another, and appreciating these excellent qualities in his brother, and noting perhaps his own shortcomings, he strives to be like his friend. Or, a preacher notes the same qualities already mentioned in a fellow minister of the gospel, but is filled with jealousy instead, and works to malign the other preacher's work and character. He tries to make himself look better by making the other look worse. This is the sin condemned in Galatians 5:20.

### II. PHTHONOS, (#5355), "envyings," Gal. 5:21

#### A. Data

##### 1. Translation

**Galatians 5:21** Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told [you] in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

"envyings" (ASV, NASV, Rotherham) "envy" (NIV, Basic English, Goodspeed)

##### 2. Definition

"envy, jealousy" (BAGNT, P. 865)



"*envy*: Rom. 1:29; Gal. 5:21; 1 Tim. 6:4; Tit. 3:3; 1 Pet. 2:1; *for envy*, i.e. prompted by envy: Mt. 27:18; Mk. 15:10; Phil. 1:15" (Thayer, p. 652)

"*PHTHONOS* is the feeling of displeasure produced by witnessing or hearing of the advantage or prosperity of others; this evil sense always attaches to the word, . . . so in Jas. 4:5, where the question is rhetorical and strongly remonstrative, signifying that the Spirit (or spirit) which God made to dwell in us was certainly not so bestowed that we should be guilty of envy" (Vine, ii., 37)

### B. Exposition

*Phthonos* is a synonym of *zeelos*, but differs from *zeelos* in some important respects. It is always used in a bad sense in the Scriptures. It is "the feeling of displeasure produced by witnessing or hearing of the advantage or prosperity of others" (Vine, ii., p. 37). Solomon describes this sin as "rotteness of the bones" (Pr. 14:30). As one ancient writer said, "Envy is that strange disease of being sick at another's health" (cf. Trench, p. 90).

The verb form of this word is found in Galatians 5:26: "Let us not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, *envying* one another." Sadly, there are many who profess the faith of Jesus Christ, but they cannot "rejoice with them that do rejoice" (Rom. 12:15). When a brother or sister comes into possession of some temporal or spiritual benefit, it provokes envy in them. Envy is a sure sign that a person is being ruled by the lusts of the flesh and not the Spirit. When we are Christ's, we should lay aside all envyings (1 Pet. 2:1).

## III. KAKIA, (#2549), "malice," Col. 3:8; "maliciousness," Rom. 1:29

### A. Data

#### 1. Translation

**Colossians 3:8** But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, **malice**, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth.

**Romans 1:29** Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, **maliciousness**; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers,

## Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1

### Colossians 3:8

"malice" (ASV, NASV, NIV)  
"baseness" (Rotherham) "bad  
feeling" (Basic English) "ill  
will" (Weymouth) "spite"  
(Goodspeed)

### Romans 1:29

"maliciousness" (ASV)  
"malice" (NASV) "depravity"  
(NIV, Goodspeed) "baseness"  
(Rotherham) "hate" (Basic  
English)

## 2. Definition

"*badness, faultiness* 1. in the moral sense— a. *depravity, wickedness, vice* gener. opposed to virtue . . . *excess of wickedness* Jas. 1:21 . . . W. PONEERIRIA in the same general meaning, 1 Cor. 5:8; . . . *be a child as far as wickedness is concerned* i.e. have as little wickedness as a child 1 Cor. 14:20; . . . Ac. 8:22; . . . 1 Pet. 2:16. b. a special kind of moral inferiority, with other deficiencies, something like *malice, ill-will, malignity*, w. other vices: Rom. 1:29; Eph. 4:31; Col. 3:8; Tit. 3:3; 1 Pet. 2:1 . . . c. *trouble, misfortune* . . . each day has enough trouble of its own, Mt. 6:34." (BAGNT, p. 397).

"KAKIA, badness in quality (the opposite of *aretee*, excellence), "the vicious character generally" (Lightfoot) . . ." *Note:* In 2 John 10, A.V. *poneeros*, evil, wicked, is translated "malicious." (R.V. "wicked") (Vine, iii., p. 32).

"1. *malignity, malice, ill-will, desire to injure*: Rom. 1:29; Eph. 4:31; Col. 3:8; Tit. 3:3; Jas. 1:21; 1 Pet. 2:1. 2. *wickedness, depravity*, 1 Cor. 5:8; 14:20; Acts 8:22; wickedness that is not ashamed to break the laws, 1 Pet. 2:16. 3. Hellenistically, *evil, trouble*: Mt. 6:34." [SYN. KAKIA, PONEERIA: associated Rom. 1:29; 1 Cor. 5:8" (Thayer, p. 320).

## B. Exposition

Both "malice" (Col. 3:8) and "maliciousness" (Rom. 1:29) are translated from *kakia*. This word comes from *kakos*, "bad, evil" (Thayer, p. 320). *Kakos* is usually translated "evil" in the New Testament. *Kakia* is mostly translated "malice (maliciousness)" (Rom. 1:29; 1 Cor. 5:8; 14:20; Eph. 4:31; Col. 3:8; Tit. 3:3; 1 Pet. 2:1, 16), but is also translated "evil" (Mt. 6:34), "naughtiness" (Jas. 1:21) and "wickedness" (Acts 8:22). In Acts 8:22, Peter warns Simon the Sorcerer, "Repent

therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee."

As indicated by the quote from Acts 8:22, *kakia*, is a disposition of the mind. It is "badness in quality" (Vine, iii., p. 32), expressed in a vicious, malevolent character. The English word "malice" captures the significance of *kakia*, for it is a evil disposition of mind toward others. Herod the king was such a man. "Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth his hands to vex [from *kakoo*, the verb form-shb] certain of the church" (Acts 12:1). This verb and a related word (*kakoosis*, "affliction") are used to describe the evil treatment of the Israelites by the Egyptians (Acts 7:6, 19, 34; cf. Exodus 1:9-16, etc.). *Kakologeoo* is speaking so as to abuse and revile someone. It is the speech of those who are *kakos*, as the Jews who refused to hear and obey the gospel (Acts 19:9).

This word is treated as a synonym of "malignity" by Trench (p. 37ff), which we take up next.

#### IV. KAKOEETHIA, (#2550), "malignity," Rom. 1:29

##### A. Data

##### 1. Translation

**Romans 1:29** Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, **malignity**; whisperers,

"**malignity**" (ASV) "**malice**" (NASV, NIV) "**evil disposition**" (Rotherham) "**ill-nature**" (Goodspeed) "**cruel ways**" (Basic English)

##### 2. Definition

*bad character, depravity of heart and life . . . ; spec. used of malignant subilty, malicious craftiness*: Rom. 1:29 . . . Arist. rhet. 2,13 defines it [taking all things in the evil part, Genevan N.T. Cf. Trench sec. 11] (Thayer, p. 320).

"*malice, malignity, craftiness . . . in a catalogue of vices*: Rom. 1:29" (BAGNT, p. 398)

## Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1

"KAKOEETHEIA, lit., bad manner or character (*kakos*, bad, *ethos*, manner), hence, an evil disposition that tends to put the worst construction on everything, malice, malevolence, craftiness, occurs in Rom. 1:29, as the accompaniment of *dolos*, guile." (Vine's iii., p. 32)

### B. Exposition

Literally, the word means "evil manner(s)" (cf. Vine). It is used only once in the New Testament, but is a vice often seen in modern life. Trench brings out in an excellent fashion the diabolical attitude that is signified by this word (p. 39ff). He says it is "that peculiar form of evil which manifests itself in a malignant interpretation of the actions of others, a constant attribution to them of the worst imaginable motives." It is the vice of a thoroughly evil person, who believes he sees in others what is really in his own heart. He finds it impossible to believe anything but evil in others. Satan is the father of all such as behave this way (Job 1:9-11; 2:4-5). The presumptuous sin of the malignant person is that he claims to know what is in another's heart—to know what motivates another. When he sees someone do a good deed to someone, he says, "Oh, he's just trying to ingratiate himself to them." He puts everything in a bad light. He cannot imagine that someone would do good simply because they are good, because he cannot imagine himself doing so. We see this vice in the counselors of an Ammonite king in the Old Testament (2 Sam. 10:1-4). When David tried to act kindly toward the king of the Ammonites, his counselors imputed evil motives to David, and set their king and nation upon a course that ultimately resulted in their destruction (2 Sam. 11).

## V. PIKRIA, (#4088), "bitterness," Eph. 4:31

### A. Data

#### 1. Translation

**Ephesians 4:31** Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking [BLASPHEMIA], be put away from you, with all malice [KAKIA] :

generally translated "bitterness" or "bitter feeling"

#### 2. Definition

"bitterness 1. lit. of a plant that has a bitter taste . . . bitter gall Ac. 8:23 . . . a bitter root, Heb. 12:15. 2. fig. bitterness, animosity, anger, harshness . . . in a list of vices Eph. 4:31; . . . the mouth is full of curses and bitter words Rom. 3:14." (BAGNT, p. 663).

"bitterness: . . . bitter gall, i.q. [i.q. = same as-shb] extreme wickedness, Acts 8:23; . . . a bitter root, and so producing a bitter fruit, Heb. 12:15; . . . metaph. bitterness, i.e. bitter hatred, Eph. 4:31; of speech, Rom. 3:14, after Ps. 10:7." (Thayer, p. 509).

PIKRIA, denotes bitterness. It is used in Acts 8:23, metaphorically, of a condition of extreme wickedness, "gall of bitterness" or "bitter gall;" in Rom. 3:14, of evil speaking; in Eph. 4:31, of bitter hatred; in Heb. 12:15, in the same sense, metaphorically, of a root of bitterness, producing bitter fruit. (Vine, i., p. 129).

### B. Exposition

The word carries with it all the associations we attach to the English word "bitter" in speaking of human relationships. The word carries with it the idea of "harshness" in dealing with others. It is the attitude that creates lasting wrath and sustains anger for a long time.

The verb form, *pikraino*, is found in Colossians 3:19: "Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them." Bitterness arises when one is unforgiving and impatient with the irritations and short-comings of others. No one is perfect, and even the closest companions we have can pöeve us. Forbearance is called for in all our human relationships. It is necessary for us to remember that sometimes people are just as exasperated with us, as we may be with them. The person who keeps a record, in their heart, of all the times they have been inconvenienced, put upon and irritated by others, will doubtless become embittered toward that person. Instead of bitterness, and the other vices mentioned in Ephesians 4:31, we should be "kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you" (Eph. 4:32). There are people who cannot forgive others. They carry around grudges for years. You can see their bitterness in their faces. They look like they have been sucking on a lemon, and they have a disposition to match.

## VI. KRAUGEE, (#2906), "clamour," Eph. 4:31

### A. Data

# *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

## 1. Translation

**Ephesians 4:31** Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice:

"clamor" (ASV,NASV) "outcry" (Rotherham) "brawling" (NIV)  
"noise" (Basic English)

## 2. Definition

"1. lit., a. a shouting, clamor of excited persons Eph. 4:31. Of people shouting back and forth in a quarrel: *there arose a loud outcry* Acts 23:9. Also, crying in grief or anxiety, Rev. 21:4. b. a loud (articulate) cry, Lk. 1:42; Rev. 14:18" (BAGNT, p. 450).

"a crying, outcry, clamor: Mt 25:6; Lk. 1:42; Acts 23:19; Eph. 4:31; Rev. 14:18; of the wailing of those in distress, Heb. 5:7; Rev. 21:4" (Thayer, p. 359).

"KRAUGEE, an onomatopoeic word, imitating the raven's cry, akin to *krazo* and *kraugazo*, to cry, denotes an outcry, "clamour," Acts 23:9, R.V.; Eph. 4:31, where it signifies the tumult of controversy" (Vine, i., p. 194).

## B. Exposition

This is one of those words that is borrowed from a sound in nature. It is an onomatopoeic word, meaning it is an imitation of a sound in nature. This word is from the raucous cry of the raven. The word *kraugee* is not always used in a bad sense (cf. Mt 25:6; Heb. 5:7; Rev. 14:18; 21:4). However, the word is used of tumultuous shouting on one occasion (Acts 23:9).

In Ephesians 4:31, where this word appears, it reads: "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice." Note the progression from the inner state of the heart to the outward manifestation of evil words. "Clamour" is characteristic of one who covers up for the lack of sound reasoning by the use of volume—arguing and protesting with lots of sound, instead of soundly. *P.O. Box 725, Buffalo, MO 65622*

## Lexical References

Arndt, W. F. and Gingrich, F. W. **A Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.** Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957. (Abbreviated BAGNT)

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 1*

---

- Kittel, Gerhard and Geoffrey W. Bromiley, **Theological Dictionary of the New Testament**. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1985.
- Thayer, Joseph Henry. **Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament**. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Associated Publishers, n.d., reprint of 1889 revised edition.
- Vine, W. E. **An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words**. Westwood, N.J.: Fleming Revell, 1940, 1952 reprint.

## **The Works of the Flesh, Part 2**

*by Taylor A. Joyce*

"They which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:21). What a sobering thought! Here, as elsewhere (1 Cor. 6:9-11; Eph. 5:5) the apostle solemnly warns that there are certain activities (he calls them "works of the flesh") which preclude the practitioner from inheriting the kingdom of God.

Such a prospect is ample motivation to carefully study the "works of the flesh." We need to know both their names and their nature, so we can nail them to the cross (Gal. 5:24).

There are fifteen specific works identified in this passage. The list, however, is not exhaustive. Paul's use of the expression "and such like" at the end of his catalog indicates that there are many similar activities as repulsive and damning as those specified here.

But why does Paul denominate these activities "works of the flesh?" Was he differentiating between sins originating in the flesh as opposed to those arising in the spirit (2 Cor. 7:1)? Was he making a distinction between sinful works and sinful thoughts (Mt. 15:19)? The answer is not entirely clear.

### **What is Meant by Works?**

But, it is clear that Paul's enumeration in Galatians 5:19-21 consists of activities—of things people habitually do. First, he calls them "works" from the Greek *ergon*. Thayer defines the word as follows: "1. business, employment, that with which anyone is occupied . . . 3. an act, deed, thing done: the idea of working is emphasized in opp. to that which is less than work."

Second, Paul says, "The works of the flesh are manifest . . ." ("open to sight, visible"—Vine) Deeds are open to sight and visible. Thoughts, beliefs and motives are not. Hence, the "works of the flesh" must be overt actions rather than covert attitudes.

This is further confirmed by a grammatical construction found in these verses. William Barclay explains:

When a Greek abstract noun is used in the plural it often means manifestations or demonstrations or examples of that quality which the singular noun denotes. For instance, *thumos*, which is the singular form, means "temper," and *thumoi*, which is the plural form means "outbursts of temper." *Phthonos* means



## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 2*

---

"envy," and *phthonoi* means "displays of envy." Many of the words in the list of works of the flesh are actually plural forms and mean displays and acts of the quality which they denote.

Finally, Paul concludes by saying, "They which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." It is tragic to commit a single act of sin. But, Paul's concern here is with the repetitive act. As Wuest says,

The word "do" is from *prasso* which means "to do, to practice." It is a durative in action, thus speaking of the habitual practice of such things, which indicates the character of the individual. The Word of God bases its estimation of a person's character, not upon his infrequent, out-of-the-ordinary actions, but upon his habitual ones.

### **What is Flesh?**

That leads us to ask: "What is flesh?" "What Paul meant by the flesh . . . is not easy to understand . . . for he very obviously does not use it always in the same way. He uses it in many different connections and with many different connotations . . . It is a word of which there is no adequate English translation, a word of which the meaning cannot be sharply and simply defined" (Barclay). Vine shows thirteen different shades of meaning.

When used in its literal sense, flesh simply means the body of a fish, a bird, a beast, or a man (1 Cor. 15:39). In our text, however, the word has an ethical meaning. "For Paul the flesh stood for all the weakness, all the inadequacy, all the liability to sin, which are inherent in human nature without Christ. The idea is the helplessness, the fallibility, even the sinfulness of human nature without Christ" (Barclay). Vincent agrees that "flesh" has "a suggestion of weakness, frailty, mortality."

Commenting on Romans 8:7, Coffman says, " 'In the flesh' is here a reference to the condition that exists when the soul rejects its Creator, sacrifices all hopes of immortality and of the eternal world, and decides to make the present life of flesh its one and only concern."

According to Thayer, flesh "has an ethical sense and denotes mere human nature, the earthly nature of man apart from divine influence, and therefore prone to sin and opposed to God."

Vincent says,

Flesh is the human nature without the divine Spirit; the state of the creature before or in contrast with his reception of the

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 2*

---

divine element whereby he becomes a new creature in Christ: the whole being of man as it exists and acts apart from the influence of the Spirit. It properly characterizes, therefore, not merely the lower forms of sensual gratification, but all the highest developments of the life estranged from God, whether physical, intellectual or aesthetic.

Carl Ketcherside says,

"The flesh" is simply "the lower nature," and the word is so translated in the New English Version. The flesh is man pursuing his own stubborn way, rejecting the guidance of the Spirit, and resisting the lordship of Jesus. It is life undisciplined and unrestrained by the power of God, asserting itself without reference to the divine will or purpose. Men who never committed an act of sexual impropriety may be walking in the flesh as certainly as the most flagrant adulterer.

Ketcherside goes on to say,

To "walk after the flesh" means more than simply to cater to passion. It entails this, but it means to live in such a state that Christ is left out of consideration. He is ignored. Decisions are made, and steps are taken without recourse to the demands of God. No authority is recognized except that of one's own wish and pleasure.

A study of the "works of the flesh" is fraught with both danger and difficulty. The difficulty (as we have already seen) stems from the fact that many of the words used to describe them are susceptible of various shades of meaning, and it is hard to arrive at exact definitions.

The danger lies in the way the mind works. It has a tendency to mold behavior out of its meditations. Solomon provides a double warning. "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life" (Prov. 4:23). "For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he" (Prov. 23:7). Jesus also says, "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries." (Mt. 15:19).

It is imperative that we remember that we are studying these works of the flesh in order to inactivate them, not to indulge in them. As Moffitt said, "We will be sitting at the campfires of the enemy, but all to learn better how to defeat him." We are seeking to overcome them. We dare not allow them to overcome us.

We are all comprised of both a human and a divine nature.

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 2*

---

I'm a man, and a man's a mixture  
Right down from his very birth;  
For part of him comes from heaven,  
And part of him comes from earth.

But the part that comes from heaven must be dominant. The part that comes from earth must be subjugated.

The secret to successful living is to learn to "walk in the Spirit" (Gal. 5:13). "'Walk' is the favorite biblical metaphor to describe the whole course of man's life, including his conduct toward God and his treatment of his fellow men" (*The Interpreter's Bible*). And according to Paul, so long as we walk in the Spirit, we "shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh."

### **Works of the Flesh**

Let us look then at eight selected works not covered in the previous study.

**1. Uncleaness.** Because this word is sometimes listed with sexual sins, it is assumed to refer to sexual improprieties. Yet, this seems too narrow a definition. Thayer says the word has reference to "the impurity of lustful, luxurious, profligate living." Barclay says it "stands for a moral depravity" which has the following characteristics: "It is the quality of that which is soiled and dirty . . . In this impurity there is a certain repulsive quality. It awakes disgust and loathing in any decent person who looks at it . . . In this word there remains the idea of that which separates a man from God." Scant wonder that "God hath not called us into uncleaness, but unto holiness" (1 Thess. 4:7). "But fornication, and all uncleaness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints" (Eph. 5:3).

**2. Lasciviousness.** This sin finds its source in an evil heart (Mk. 7:22). It is characteristic of one who has not yet been converted to Christ (1 Pet. 4:3), although a Christian may also be guilty. False teachers may turn "the grace of God into lasciviousness" (Jude 4). "And many shall follow their pernicious ways (lasciviousness); by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of" (2 Pet. 2:2). Thayer uses eight synonyms in defining this term: "unbridled lust, excess, licentiousness, lasciviousness, wantonness, outrageousness, shamelessness, insolence." Vine says it "denotes excess, licentiousness, absence of restraint, indecency, wantonness . . . The prominent idea is shameless conduct." One is inclined to agree with Barclay:

In many ways *aselgeia* (The Greek word translated lasciviousness—*taj*) is the ugliest word in the list of NT sins . . . the man in whose soul *aselgeia* dwells is so much in the grip of sin,

so much under its domination, that he does not care what people say or think so long as he can gratify his evil desires. He is the man who is lost to shame.

In another of his writings Barclay said: "*Aselgeia* indicates a love of sin so reckless and so audacious that a man has ceased to care what God or man thinks of his actions." Sin is most harmful to that person who sees no harm in it. Or, as Bartlett put it: "We are most hurt by sin when we are least hurt by it." What an apt description of a lascivious person!

**3. Variance.** The Greek word here is *eris*, and it is defined by Thayer as "contention, strife, wrangling." Vine adds that it "is the expression of enmity." It is twice rendered "debate" in the King James Version (Rom. 1:29; 2 Cor. 12:20). However, it does not refer to a debate in the sense of public discussion of religious issues, unless the discussion degenerates into contentious wrangling.

"A morbid fondness for controversy and disputes and strife about words" (1 Tim. 6:4, Amp.), can indeed produce strife (variance). Hence, Paul's admonition in Titus 3:9, "But avoid foolish questions, genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law, for they are unprofitable and vain." This word occurs nine times in the New Testament.

And although Barclay misstates the number of occurrences, he does make an observation worthy of our careful consideration.

But the really significant fact about Paul's use of the word *eris* is that four out of its six occurrences are connected with life in the church. Three of them come from the Corinthian letters (1 Cor. 1:11, 3:3; 2 Cor. 12:20). It is *eris* which divides the Corinthian church into sects and parties, claiming to be of Cephas, of Apollos, of Paul and of Christ. It is *eris* which has split the church, and which has brought enmity where there should be love. Since Christians may be especially prone to variance, they must be especially prepared to quell it each time it rears its head.

**4. Seditions.** The Greek word here is *dichostasia*. Thayer defines it: "to stand apart, dissension, division." Barclay says, "The word denotes a state of things in which men are divided, in which feuds flourish, and in which unity is destroyed . . . a state in which all community, all fellowship, and all togetherness are gone." It is a "work of the flesh" (Gal. 5:20). It is evidence that "ye are yet carnal . . . and walk as men" (1 Cor. 3:3). It is

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 2*

---

"contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned" (Rom. 16:17). The doctrine that we have learned is that Jesus prayed for the oneness of his followers (Jn. 17:21); and that He died to reconcile both Jew and Gentile "unto God in one body . . . therefore ye are . . . fellow citizens . . . and of the household of God . . . builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit" (Eph. 2:16, 19, 22). Paul summarized the doctrine of Scripture with reference to unity: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" (1 Cor. 1:10). And the Spirit makes it the responsibility of every Christian to "be eager and strive earnestly to guard and keep the harmony and oneness of (and produced by) the Spirit in the binding power of peace" (Eph. 4:3, Amp). We must take that responsibility seriously.

It is perfectly true that often a Christian has to stand alone, but a man will do well to examine himself when he finds that the opinions he holds are separating him from the community of which he forms a part. He may be right, but it is a grave responsibility to be a cause of division in any church or community. Before he separate himself from others a man ought to remember the solemn words of Cromwell to the intransigent Scots: "I beseech you by the bowels of Christ, think it possible that you may be mistaken."

**5. Heresies.** This is a transliteration of the Greek word *hairesis* which, according to Barclay, means "an act of choosing or a choice . . . most commonly it denotes a body of people . . . who have all made the same choice . . . It is the breaking up of the unity of the Church into cliques who shut their circle to all but their own number." Vine says it denotes "an opinion, especially a self-willed opinion, which is substituted for submission to the power of truth, and leads to division and the formation of sects, Gal. 5:20." However, Buchanan says, "It is obviously to separation, rather than to error, the term specifically and directly applies" (Quoted by Bales in *Soils and Seeds of Sectarianism*). Alexander Campbell agreed: "Still, in its scriptural application, whether used by Luke, Paul, or Peter, (and it is found in no other writer,) it never relates to doctrine, tenet, opinion, or faith. There is not, in sacred usage, any tenet, or doctrine, which is called heresy, or sect . . . It is now still more evident that heresies are not mere opinions, tenets, or theories." Barclay noted: "The tragedy of life is that people who hold different views very often finish up by disliking, not each others' views, but each other. It should be possible to differ with a man and yet remain friends." Campbell concluded his dissertation on heresy by saying,

It behooves all men, then, who wish to be approved by the Lord at his coming, to be up and doing to purge and cleanse the Christian profession from every root and branch of sectarianism, and to endeavor to destroy those destructive sects that have been a sort of Pandora's box to the human race; that filled the profession with hypocrites, the world with infidels, and retarded for so many centuries the conversion of both Jews and Gentiles to the Christian faith . . . We need neither telescopes nor microscopes to detect heresies in the New Testament sense of that word. They are neither more nor less than sects—plain, palpable sects and parties. Every party in Christendom, without respect to any of its tenets, opinions, or practices, is a heresy, a schism—unless there be such a party as stands exactly upon the Apostles' ground.

**6. Drunkenness.** Vine says the original word (*methe*) "denotes drunkenness, habitual intoxication." Billy Graham says, "This Greek word means overindulgence in alcohol." He adds that alcohol "is a self-inflicted impediment that springs from 'a man taking a drink, a drink taking a drink and drink taking the man.'" Barclay and others have noted that drinking wine in a very diluted form was socially acceptable in the ancient world, but drinking to excess was always viewed as abhorrent and utterly shameful. He says, "It hardly occurred to (the ancient world) either to enjoin or to practice total abstinence." Billy Graham also affirmed that "teetotalism or nontectotalism cannot be proven from Scriptures." Barclay concedes, however, that total abstinence may be a Christian duty despite the lack of definite statements and prohibitions of Scripture. Citing the great principle laid down by Paul in Romans 14:21 and 1 Corinthians 8:9, 13, Barclay says, "The argument (that total abstinence is required by Scripture) cannot be based on definite injunctions of Scripture; only in the principle that it is not right to claim permission to indulge in any pleasure which can be the ruin of someone else." That drunkenness involves excessive drinking is suggested by the use of a Hebrew synonym in Ezekiel 23:32-33 where it is said that drunkenness results from drinking from a "cup deep and large . . . it containeth much." And who can forget the graphic description of drunkenness supplied by Isaiah (28:7-8): "But even these reel from wine and stagger from strong drink . . . they are confused from wine, they stagger and are gone astray through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble (their speech is slurred—tj) when pronouncing judgment. For all the tables are full of filthy vomit." Anyone who has ever been around a drunk will certainly recognize that picture. Those who recommend "social drinking" today should consider

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 2*

---

two facts. First, the weakest alcoholic beverage sold today is probably stronger than any beverage consumed anywhere in the world in Bible times. Second, the human tragedies resulting from alcohol abuse. One of the better summations is provided by Jerry Moffitt:

64% of all homicides are alcohol related; 30% of all suicides; 20% private, fatal air crashes; 50% of fatal car wrecks. Each year 28,000 of the above die due to alcohol. Then we include 58% of the fire death, 45% of all drownings, and 20% of all narcotic deaths. Right now 10% of the people in the U.S. are alcoholics. That is about 9,000,000. It is estimated that 28 million American children live in the total abuse caused by alcoholic homes . . . Alcohol is deadly, affecting the liver, muscles, bones, stomach, mouth, throat, and pancreas. It causes heart disease, destroys brain tissue, and causes personality disorders. There are due to it, 8,000 teen deaths per year, while 40,000 teens annually are disfigured and maimed.

Need more be said? An activity that can do so much damage in the here and now, and bar you from the Kingdom of heaven after a while, must be avoided. Period! And while it is trite, it is still true—the person who never takes that first drink will never be drunk.

**7. Revellings.** This word occurs only three times in the New Testament (Gal. 5:21; Rom. 13:13; 1 Pet. 4:3), and each time it is associated with excessive drinking. Thayer says it describes “a nocturnal and riotous procession of half-drunken and frolicsome fellows . . . used generally of feasts and drinking parties that are protracted til late at night and indulge in revelry.” Vine defines it as a “carousal, the concomitant and consequence of drunkenness.” Barclay says, “It describes the kind of revelry which lowers a man’s self and is a nuisance to others.” He also says it “expresses a lustful excess in physical and sexual pleasure which is offensive to God and to man alike.”

**8. And such like.** This expression, according to Vine, means “like, resembling, such as, the same as.” He says a literal rendering of the words here in Galatians 5:21 would be “and the (things) similar to these.” This category of works of the flesh is broad enough to include virtually every sin in the New Testament.

And in spite of the conviction expressed earlier that the works of the flesh involve deeds rather than thoughts, it is conceivable that the words “and such like” may even encompass the thoughts, lusts, attitudes and traits

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 2*

---

of character in their capacity as inceptive actions. If so, then the despisers of those that are good (2 Tim. 3:3) would find a place here. They simply have no love for those who are (and that which is) good. Inordinate affection and evil concupiscence (Col. 3:5) would likewise be covered—the former referring to passionate desires and the latter, the more comprehensive term, referring to all manner of lusts and desires. The double-minded man (Jas. 1:8; 4:8) would also be here, vacillating between sin and sanctification, faith and doubt, flesh and Spirit. Evil surmisings (1 Tim. 6:4), inferences resting upon inconclusive evidence, will become words of the flesh as they lead to a rejection of “the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the doctrine which is according to godliness” (1 Tim. 6:3). Evil thoughts (Jas. 2:4), perverse reasonings that result in showing respect of persons, will also make the list.

Evil speaking of every class and color will surely qualify as a work of the flesh. False accusers (2 Tim. 3:3), those who make verbal assaults on others, are engaged in fleshly works. So, too, are the backbiters (Rom. 1:30), because backbiting is followed by biting back, and the word battles which follow are as disruptive of unity as heresy. Whisperers (Rom. 1:29), those who practice secret slander, are included. The double-tongued (1 Tim. 3:8), join the club by speaking out of both sides of their mouths—“Saying a thing to one person and giving a different view of it to another” (Vine). The incessant wrangling which galls and wears people out (Paul calls it “perverse disputings,” 1 Tim. 6:5) will be at home here.

And without doubt there are numerous “deeds of the body” not specified in Galatians 5:10-21 which are, nevertheless, the same as or similar to the works of the flesh. The spiteful (Rom. 1:30) is a “violent, insolent, injurious person” (Vine) and is far from walking in the Spirit. Confusion (1 Cor. 14:33; Jas. 3:16) takes its place with seditions, revolution or anarchy within the local assembly. Inventors of evil (Rom. 1:30) are dominated by the flesh, plotting and scheming to introduce what is morally and ethically wrong and that which is ultimately “injurious, destructive, baneful, pernicious” (Vine), all in antithesis to the fruit of the Spirit. Banquetings (“not simply a banquet but a drinking bout, a carousal, 1 Pet. 4:3”—Vine) and surfeiting (“the giddiness and headache resulting from excessive wine-bibbing, a drunken nausea,” Lk. 21:34—Vine) both bear a family resemblance to drunkenness, a work of the flesh. Deceit (Rom. 1:29) and guile (1 Pet. 2:1), different translations of the same Greek word meaning “a bait, snare; hence, craft, deceit, guile” (Vine), are descriptive of one who is bent on another’s harm. “How dwelleth the love of God (a fruit of the Spirit) in him?” The unmerciful (Rom. 1:31), pitiless and unforgiving, have none of



## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 2*

---

the traits of the Father who is both pitiful (Jas. 5:11) and forgiving (1 Tim. 1:13-15).

The traits of character, thoughts, words, and deeds which we have been describing are sordid indeed. Those who possess such traits, think such thoughts, speak such words, who habitually do such deeds may be aptly described as profane (1 Tim. 1:9). They lack "all relationship or affinity to God" (Cremer, as quoted by Vine). Make no mistake about it. THEY WHICH DO SUCH THINGS SHALL NOT INHERIT THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

### **Circle the Wagons**

How, then, do we deal with works of the flesh? Paul gives a clue when he says, "Only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh" (Gal. 5:13).

"Occasion" is the Greek **aphorme**, "a place from which a movement or attack is made, a base of operations" (Thayer). "In military language a bridgehead. An **aphorme** is the point at which an attack can be launched with the greatest possibility of success" (Barclay). He also says, "The body with all its instincts, mental, emotional and physical, is the bridgehead where sin can launch its attack with the greatest prospect of success." We must not allow that to happen. Like the early pioneers, we must learn to circle the wagons so as to afford the greatest possible protection from the enemy's onslaught regardless of the direction from which it comes.

Paul's analysis of the human dilemma is that there are only three possible ways to live. One is the way of legalism, "but that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident." (Gal. 3:11).

The second is the way of license—the way of the flesh—and "they which do such things shall no inherit the kingdom of God."

The third, and the one recommended by Paul, is the way of liberty, "for brethren, ye have been called unto liberty" (Gal. 5:13). This is the lifestyle of those who "walk in the Spirit" (v. 16), who are "led of the Spirit" (v. 18), who "live in the Spirit" (v. 25). And this life begins with crucifixion!

But how is man to crucify his flesh? Abstaining from every form of evil is only the negative part; on the positive side there must be newness of moral life (Rom. 6:4), testing all things and holding fast that which is good (1 Thess. 5:21-22). The first step is for a man to admit that the sinful drives in human nature deserve to be crucified, and that he must have nothing more to do with them. Then he puts himself so completely

under control of the love of Christ, who died and was raised from the dead (2 Cor. 5:15), that he no longer lives for himself, but suffers with Christ and is thereby transformed by beholding his glory (2 Cor. 3:18). He undertakes a mission for Christ and becomes so busy in the service of others that all sinful "flesh-works" die of starvation (2 Cor. 4:8-10). He nourishes his new life in the Spirit by thinking about whatever is true and honorable, just and pure, gracious, excellent, and praiseworthy (Phil 4:8). He co-operates to build the Christian society, and thereby he himself is encouraged and built up (1 Thess. 4:10-11). In short, he lives and walks with the Spirit, which is the most strenuous of all ways of living (*The Interpreter's Bible*).

Coffman puts it this way:

Continuing to walk in the Spirit, entering and continuing the thoughts and meditations of the heart upon the teachings of the Lord, actively seeking to maintain identity with the mind of Christ, consciousness of the indwelling Father, Son and Holy Spirit—these things will indeed "crucify" the lusts and evil imaginations which feed them.

Wuest offers these insights:

The responsibility of the saint is to desire to live a Christlike life, to depend upon the Holy Spirit for the power to live that life, and to step out in faith and live that life. This fulfilled, will bring all the infinite resources of grace to the aid of the saint, and put in operation all the activities of the Spirit in his behalf.

The Holy Spirit spelled it out for us in Paul's letter to the Romans (12:1, Amplified) "I appeal to you therefore, brethren, and beg of you in view of [all] the mercies of God, to make a decisive dedication of your bodies—presenting all your members and faculties—as a living sacrifice, holy [devoted, consecrated] and well pleasing to God, which is your reasonable [rational, intelligent] service and spiritual worship."

The divine resources available for destroying the works of the flesh and replacing them with the fruit of the Spirit are adequate and limitless. Yet man must cooperate in the grand enterprise by exercising his own will. "The great general fact of our Christian life must be that, with masterly will, we control the flesh. The exceptions are to be accidental and unwilling" (Lard). John Oxenham wrote:

## *Works of the Flesh, Pt. 2*

---

To every man there openeth  
A high Way and a low:  
And every man decideth  
The way his soul shall go.

God help us to make right decisions. 1713 Savannah, Ft. Smith, AR 72901

### **Bibliography**

- Bales, James D., **Soils and Seeds of Sectarianism**, Kansas City, Mo.: The Old Paths Book Club, 1947.
- Barclay, William, **Flesh and Spirit**, Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1962.  
**The Daily Bible Study Series**, Philadelphia, Pa.: The Westminster Press, 1976.  
**The Mind of St. Paul**, New York: Harper and Row, 1975.
- Bartlett, C. Norman, **Galations and You**, Chicago, Ill.: Moody Press, 1948.
- Campbell, Alexander, **The Christian System**, Nashville, Tenn.: Gospel Advocate Company, 1980.
- Coffman, James Burton, **Commentary on Galations**, Austin, Tex.: Firm Foundation Publishing House, 1977.  
**Commentary on Romans**, Austin, Tex.: Firm Foundation Publishing House, 1973.
- Graham, Billy, **The Holy Spirit**, Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1978.
- The Interpreter's Bible**, Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1953.
- Jones, Jerry, **From Slavery to Sonship**, Nashville, Tenn.: Gospel Advocate Co., 1989.
- Ketcherside, W. Carl, **Heaven Help Us**, Cincinnati, Ohio: The Standard Pub. Co., 1974.
- Moffitt, Jerry, "The Works of the Flesh Are These," **Exegetical Studies of Great Bible Themes**, Bedford, TX: Christian Supply Center, 1986.
- The Pulpit Commentary**, New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1950.
- Thayer, John Henry, **A Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament**, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1889.
- Vincent, Marvin R., **Word Studies in the New Testament**, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1957.
- Vine, W. E., **Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words**, Westwood, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1964.
- Wuest, Kenneth S., **Word Studies**, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1957.

## Available Notes

		<i>Cost</i>
1982 Preachers' Study	(Oklahoma City, OK)	\$ 5.00
1983 Preachers' Study	(Wichita Falls, TX)	N/A
1984 Preachers' Study	(Oklahoma City, OK)	\$ 5.00
1985 Preachers' Study	(Wichita Falls, TX)	\$ 5.00
1986 Preachers' Study	(Oklahoma City, OK)	\$ 8.00
1987 Preachers' Study	(Wichita Falls, TX)	\$ 10.00
1988 Preachers' Study	(Oklahoma City, OK)	\$ 10.00
1989 Preachers' Study	(Wichita Falls, TX)	\$ 10.00

*To Order, Please Write To:*

Christian Expositor Publications  
705 Vandiver Drive, G-803  
Columbia, Missouri 65202

Please include \$1.00 to help cover postage costs.