

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Workers Of Iniquity****Workers Of Iniquity - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/17 8:21**

I hope to start a discussion of Psalm 5:5.

The foolish shall not stand in thy sight: thou hatest all workers of iniquity.

I am trying to square the current trend of preaching God's love with what scripture says about who and what God hates. I hope we can make an accurate biblical contrast that will bring justice again to the full counsel of God in this matter. Few things are more important to our presentation of the Gospel than our understanding of this.

Some opening commentary:

Thou hatest all workers of iniquity

Some sin now and then, others generally; some constantly, and some labour in it with all their might. These are the WORKERS of iniquity. Such even the God of infinite love and mercy hates. Alas! what a portion have the workers of iniquity! the hatred of God Almighty! (Adam Clarke)

God is a prayer-hearing God. Such he has always been, and he is still as ready to hear prayer as ever. The most encouraging principle of prayer, and the most powerful plea in prayer, is, to look upon him as our King and our God. David also prays to a sin-hating God. sin is folly, and sinners are the greatest of all fools; fools of their own making. Wicked people hate God; justly are they hated of him, and this will be their endless misery and ruin. Let us learn the importance of truth and sincerity, in all the affairs of life. Liars and murderers resemble the devil, and are his children, therefore it may well be expected that God should abhor them. These were the characters of David's enemies; and such as these are still the enemies of Christ and his people. (Matthew Henry Concise)

Let those therefore who delight in sin know that God has no delight in them... (MH fragment)

"Those whom thou hatest thou shalt destroy;" particularly two sorts of sinners, who are here marked for destruction:-- Those that are fools, that speak leasing or lying, and that are deceitful. There is a particular emphasis laid on these sinners (Revelation 21:8), All liars, and (Psalms 22:15), Whosoever loves and makes a lie; nothing is more contrary than t his, and therefore nothing more hateful to the God of truth. Those that are cruel: Thou wilt abhor the bloody man; for inh humanity is no less contrary, no less hateful, to the God of mercy, whom mercy pleases. Liars and murderers are in a particular manner said to resemble the devil and to be his children, and therefore it may well be expected that God should a bhor them. These were the characters of David's enemies; and such as these are still the enemies of Christ and his church, men perfectly lost to all virtue and honour; and the worse they are the surer we may be of their ruin in due time.

It is a stanza that will not find itself in any modern hymns, long or short that I am aware of. Yet, this Psalm was no doubt sang as a reminder of God's position on sin and impenitent sinners.

Let the search for truth begin and may we prayerfully search out the fullness of the plurality of God's greatness and majesty that we may draw near to a right representation and presentation of Him in every situation and to every people.

Re: Workers Of Iniquity - posted by Rahman, on: 2004/11/17 9:29

Brother Robert ...

No reflection on you, but when i first read your thread the first thing that popped up in my head was, "I hate that we saints do so much dissection of the Word, but not much doing" ...

2Tim.3

Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.

Jas.1
But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves.
For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass:
For he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was.
But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.

You quoted'
"The foolish shall not stand in thy sight: thou hatest all workers of iniquity".

i guess it's ok for God Himself to hate the workers of iniquity, even tho i don't think His hatred of them is out of angry emotion as debased as our own fallen human nature ... i know that God is love, and so i think His hatred of the workers of iniquity is based out of the pain He feels that they choose to be vessels of His wrath, instead of vessels of His mercy, because it pains Him that any of us should choose to be relegated to an existence of eternal fiery torment in Hell ...

But i'm very well aware as a Christian that i don't have the option of hating the sinner, but only the sin that the workers of iniquity commit, for i was once one of them, and even tho now saved my own self righteousness is STILL as but filthy rags, as it is only my being drenched in the righteousness of Christ that justifies me, and frees me from self or satan's continued condemnation of me, because by faith i now that there is no condemnation in Christ ... So i thank God for Jesus, ask the Holy Ghost to ever keep me mindful and empowered to witness, pray for and love the sinner, all the while hating and rebuking the sin which we all know boils down to satan, which is why we're told in Ephesians that our battle is not against the sinner, but the force behind sin ... If we saints of God could ever get to getting our eyes off of "flesh and blood" as the objects of our hatred, and on to "powers, principalities and spiritual wickedness in high and low places" we could turn this world upside down! ... That's why i pray for Revival so much, for the Church of Christ is in definite need of His eyesalve to open up our vision into the spiritual realm, as we're obviously blinded by the natural ... i'm sorry to run on so, but Christ is definitely doing a new work in me and it just comes out ...

Below is something i ran across on the web ...

THE CHRISTIAN'S HATE LIFE

by Dr. Jack Hyles

Pastor, First Baptist Church, Hammond, Indiana

What should the Christian hate? He should hate what God hates.

1. He should hate quitting ...

Psalm 101:3, "I will set no wicked thing before mine eyes: I hate the work of them that turn aside; it shall not cleave to me."

2. He should hate every false way ...

Psalm 119:104, "Through Thy precepts I get understanding: therefore I hate every false way." When someone says a person can go to Heaven by good works, the Christian should hate it. Now he should not hate the person who says it but he should hate the false way. When someone says that one can go to Heaven by taking of the sacraments, joining the church, or getting baptized, the Christian should find hatred swelling in his heart for the false way. There is no way to love God's way to Heaven without hating Satan's false ways to Heaven.

3. He should hate empty ritual ...

Amos 5:21, "I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies."

4. He should hate an evil heart against his neighbors ...

Zechariah 8:17, "And let none of you imagine evil in your hearts against his neighbour; and love no false oath: for all th

These are things that I hate, saith the Lord.Â”

5. He should hate lying ...

Psalm 119:163, Â”I hate and abhor lying: but Thy law do I love.Â”

6. He should hate idolatry ...

Jeremiah 44:4,5, Â”Howbeit I sent unto you all my servants the prophets, rising early and sending them, saying, Oh, do not this abominable thing that I hate. But they hearkened not, nor inclined their hearts to turn from their wickedness, to burn no incense to other gods.Â”

7. He should hate vain thoughts ...

Psalm 119:113, Â”I hate vain thoughts but thy law do I love.Â”

8. He should hate a proud look, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood ...

Proverbs 6:16-19, Â”These six things doth the Lord hate: yea, seven are an abomination unto Him:

- a proud look,
- a lying tongue,
- and hands that shed innocent blood,
- an heart that deviseth wicked imaginations,
- feet that be swift in running to mischief,
- a false witness that speaketh lies,
- and he that soweth discord among the brethren.

9. He should hate the narcotics which is ruining our young people.

10. He should hate the liquor which destroys so many lives and homes.

11. He should hate communism which is dedicated to the destruction of our Christian society.

12. He should hate the atheism and humanism that is pervading our college campuses.

13. He should hate the nudity that is destroying our morals.

14. He should hate the permissiveness which is ruining our youth.

15. He should hate the adult bookstores, the sensitivity parlors, the dirty movie industry.

16. He should especially hate the sin of his own life that causes he and God so much heartache.

Yes, the Christian does have a hate life ... because God does! (end)

May all we saints of God allow the Holy Spirit a continual and constant examination of ourselves to a conviction of hate for sin period! ... beginning with our own lives first ... Amen

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/17 10:11

Hi Bro. Rahman,

I am hoping to come to terms with our presentation of the Gospel as it pertains to communicating with the unrepentant.

So often we hear, "God loves you, God loves you, etc." and yet the person trodds that love under foot and goes away (apparently) thinking they are in no real danger because, after all, "God loves me."

The writers of old were willing to admit that there were such sinners that God hated (as we see with both Adam Clarke and Matthew Henry); yet in our day, such a statement almost seems blasphemous. What has happened and what is the tr

uth about how God feels about impenitent sinners?

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by Rahman, on: 2004/11/17 12:14

Brother Robert you wrote;

"The writers of old were willing to admit that there were such sinners that God hated (as we see with both Adam Clarke and Matthew Henry); yet in our day, such a statement almost seems blasphemous. What has happened and what is the truth about how God feels about impenitent sinners"?

What has happened? ... The way i see it is, "Ear tickling from the pulpit to the laity in trade for the laity's mammon back to the pulpit" ... In my own church circle an emphasis on what was once considered hell fire preaching is shunned, and replaced by an emphasis on "sweet Jesus", "Jesus Claus", and "Christ Genie" ... The emphasis now is on the giving Christ, instead of what the sinner/saint has to give up ... Such saints conceived in such one sided preaching produces weak, always needy, weepy tossed to and fro, retarded Christians ... Read all of the OT prophets and they'll show us all the results of what happens when anyone hasn't the proper fear of God ...

When i witness to an unsaved one first i tell them a Genesis synopsis of the why we need salvation, and God's how to attain it from this scripture

John.3

For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

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

Then what such a true repentance will free us from in our submitting to Christ ...

Eph.2

And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins;

Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience:

Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.

But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us,

Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;)

And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus:

Eph.5

Be ye therefore followers of God, as dear children;

And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.

But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints;

Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks.

For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God.

Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience.

1Cor.6

Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind,

Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.

Then what our rejection of Christ condemns us to, namely God's wrath ...

John.3

He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

Then the actual eternal sentence one must serve if he dies in his unrepentance ...

Rev.20

And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them.

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.

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.

And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.

And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.

Rev.21

But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.

After which point i've had many say, "You're trying to scare me"! ... At which point i acknowledge, "Duhhhhhh ... do you think"! ... with this scripture ...

Prov.1

The fear of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge: but fools despise wisdom and instruction.

Then i just point blank let em know that without a pure, true and Spirit led repentance to, and acknowledgment of Christ as their only means of salvation, they're staring in the face an eternity in hell where the flame is ever constant, and the worm dieth not, to contemplate their foolishness ...

Well brother Robert in so many cases today an individual witness in this manner to the unsaved is frowned upon, let alone being fired from a pulpit with any relevant constancy ... It's just not popular with the masses ... God draws men by the fishermans hook of Jesus Christ, but He cares, gets and keeps us in line by the Shepherd's crook of Jesus Christ ... i think too many preachers today are lopsided with the saving grace hook of Christ, while neglecting His crook, and it shows in the ineffectiveness of His Church ...

God help us ... and I know He will ... Amen

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/11/17 12:45

Quote:
-----The writers of old were willing to admit that there were such sinners that God hated (as we see with both Adam Clarke and Matthew Henry); yet in our day, such a statement almost seems blasphemous. What has happened and what is the truth about how God feels about impenitent sinners?

This is an important topic. I believe that in order for impenitent sinners to fully understand their condition they need to see how God reacts to sin. Verses like Psalm 5:5 and Romans 1:18 are useful in presenting His reaction to sin;

For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness;
(Romans 1:18)

A problem comes when fallen human minds have a hard time understanding words like 'hate' and 'wrath' as having to do with anything other than some emotional outburst of rage. We need to make it clear that, as a compass points to the north, so God's settled reaction to sin is the outpouring and unfolding of His wrath. He doesn't look upon sin, He doesn't wink at sin, he can't abide sin. Until an impenitent sinner understands this he is in a most perilous place.

I believe this is an important part of using the law in bringing an awareness of sin, righteousness, and judgment. As Allistar Begg has put it, you have to lay down the black velvet of the law before you bring out the diamond of grace through Jesus Christ. Too many people are walking around showing off diamonds without ever laying down the velvet.

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by Rahman, on: 2004/11/17 13:16

Wow brother Ron this is good ...

"I believe this is an important part of using the law in bringing an awareness of sin, righteousness, and judgment. As Allistar Begg has put it, you have to lay down the black velvet of the law before you bring out the diamond of grace through Jesus Christ. Too many people are walking around showing off diamonds without ever laying down the velvet".

... although i've never thought of the Law as velvet ... The Law (to me) puts me to mind of the burlap potato sack underwear my mom told me that she and her siblings had to wear during/after the Great Depression ... most uncomfortable ...

But man are you right, sinners are being made to feel comfortable via grace before being made uncomfortable by an understanding of the condemnation of the Law, therefore no real appreciation for the Means, Giver and consequences of grace ...

Thanks!

Re:, on: 2004/11/17 13:54

Hey Brother Robert,

Great thread. I brought up alot of these very same things in "The Anger of the Lord" artical.

Heres a few quotes from that artical that state my say on the whole thing.

"*“God is love”* is a message we have all heard countless times. *“God is love”* and *“God loves you”* is preached so often that I think maybe some churches don't have any other messages. Everybody from saints to sinners absolutely love to hear this message. Politicians, prostitutes, and every type of pleasure pursuer delight in the message that *“God is love”*. However there is another message that the bible has which is not so well received among sinful men. That message is that *“God is angry”*. These two messages are not opposed one to the other as some people assume. They are two sides to the same coin. The biblical truth that *“God is love”* and *“God is angry”* are so tightly connected that I do not believe you can remove them from each other. It is not the one or the other as I can see how some may believe. Rather, because God loves godliness, He is angry when ungodliness is committed. Because God loves righteousness, He is angry when unrighteousness is committed. Because God loves the truth, He is angered when lies are taught. His love is the source of His holiness, His justice, and His anger."

And then in a different place:

"We seem to have it all wrong today! What can the current church do with a scripture like Ps 5:5 that says *“God hates all workers of iniquity”* considering modern messages? We say *“God hates sin but loves the sinner.”* So what do you

do with Ps 5:5? It certainly throws a wrench into our theological gears. Leonard Ravenhill said in an interview right before he died "the menace of many of our meetings is; we are trying to get people saved who don't know their lost. 'Come forward. The Lord loves you. The Lord loves you.' The Lord hates you! Instead of a bumper sticker 'God loves you', 'God is angry with the wicked everyday' (Ps 7:11) or 'The wicked shall be turned into hell.' (Ps 9:17)" That is what a man of God said after roughly 70 years of being in the ministry. No one can deny his experience, so there are some important truths to learn from that quote.

I only wish that I could begin to explain the mysteries of God, but I cannot adequately do so. As large ships need large rivers to sail through and can not move in small rivers, the fullness of the truth of God can not be fully comprehended by our shallow minds. Let me appeal to men greater than I to help us understand. In C. H. Spurgeon's "A Treasury of David" he has a quote from William Gurnall for Ps 5:5. William Gurnall (author of Christian in Complete Armor) wrote this, "Thou hatest all workers of iniquity." For what God thinks of sin, see Deut vii. 22; Prov. vi.16; Rev. ii. 6,15; where he expresseth his detestation and hatred of it, from which hatred proceeds all those direful plagues and judgments thundered from the fiery mouth of his most holy law against it; nay, not only the work, but worker also of iniquity becomes the object of his hatred."

Spurgeon also put a quote from David Clarkson, B.D. 1621-1686, in his commentaries who said, "Those whom the Lord hates must perish. But he hates impenitent sinners, "Thou hatest all workers of iniquity." Now, who are so properly workers of iniquity as those who are so eager at it that they will not leave this work, though they be in danger to perish for it? Christ puts it out of doubt. The workers of iniquity must perish. Luke xiii. 27. Those whom the Lord will tear in his wrath must perish with a witness; but those whom he hates, he tears &c. Job xvi. 8. What more due to such impenitent sinners than hatred! What more proper than wrath, since they treasure up wrath? Rom ii. Will he entertain those in the bosom of love whom his soul hates? No; destruction is their portion. Prov. Xxi. 15. If all the curses of the law, all the threatening of the gospel, all the judgments in earth or in hell, will be the ruin of him, he must perish. If the Lord's arm be strong enough to wound him dead, he must die. Psalms lxxviii. 21... Avoid all that Christ hates. If you love, approve, entertain that which is hateful to Christ, how can he love you? What is that which Christ hates? The psalmist (Psalm xlv. 7) tells us, making it one of Christ's attributes, to hate wickedness... as Christ hates iniquity, so the "workers of iniquity." You must not love them, so as to be intimate with them, delight in the company of evil doers, openly profane, scorers of godliness, obstructers of the power of it. 2 Cor. vi. 14-18. If you love so near relations to wicked men, Christ will have no relation to you. If you would have communion with Christ in sweet acts of love, you must have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, or those that act them."

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/17 13:55

Quote:
-----We need to make it clear that, as a compass points to the north, so God's settled reaction to sin is the outpouring and unfolding of His wrath.

It is a most difficult topic I know. I have often felt that the wrath was generated from the betrayal of the great love that He has for His creation. For example, let a person find their spouse in a compromising way and love can change to wrath quickly.

I think it is interesting to note that Jesus wept over Jerusalem (a city) and John 3:16 reads "For God so loved the world... " World is the Greek word Kosmos.

When we read in Proverbs of the 7 things God's hates there are hands, feet, etc. mentioned; but what is the extent of the hatred there. Does it extend only to the offending member or the one who was yielding their members as instruments of unrighteousness?

My desire is not to try to prove that God hates anyone; but we have to account for Esau and these afore mentioned passages in our understanding of God's love. As it stands these passages are anomalies to our theologies that don't get dealt with. We need to know biblically how God is perceiving the sinful world in which we live in terms of individuals. Good news makes no sense without the backdrop of a bad situation. Yet, when we declare God's wrath we offset it with his love to the very same sinner. :-? We tell a man the law has declared Him guilty before God and he is in danger of Hell fire and then tell him God loves him unconditionally. Then we wonder why the person is content to keep on sinning.

Re:, on: 2004/11/17 13:58

ps. Heres a link to the artical I mentioned: <https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?view=article&aid=13692>

Re: - posted by Rahman, on: 2004/11/17 14:07

Brother Robert,

i think i've jumped to quick regarding my statement about dissecting the Word, for brother Ron's statement has answered a question for me that had puzzled me for some time ...

A while back my church sponsored a "Home Buyers" seminar in our annex bldg (which we older saints treat with the same respect as the sanctuary) ... In the midst of a class one young Christian woman answered a question in which she unabashedly volunteered that she lived with her boyfriend ... i was amazed that she'd said such a thing without the slightest hint of conviction ... Then another young sister uttered a phrase out of her mouth making use of street terminology regarding male & female sexual anatomy, that had to be addressed by one of the ministers in the class, but even so she still couldn't see that no such talk should come forth out of a child of God's mouth, because she said she was just keeping it real ... Then there's the puzzle of how so many young saints can identify themselves as Hip Hop Christians, and it's all because they've not been made to understand their sinful condition prior to, or in conjunction with their being told about the saving grace of Christ ... They in essence don't know any better, which is why they don't even try to hide such sin ... It's all ok, Christ understands is all they initially heard, and all they're still hearing now, except by the likes of such saints appalled by such ignorance in Christ, who get labeled legalist sticks in the mud...

We really, really do need God help, and like Joel states it's got to start in the pulpit first, or we'll never have solemn assemblies ... Please God, convict your anointed, that You may convict us all by their mouths ... Amen

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/17 14:22

Quote:
-----I believe this is an important part of using the law in bringing an awareness of sin, righteousness, and judgment. As Allistar Begg has put it, you have to lay down the black velvet of the law before you bring out the diamond of grace through Jesus Christ. Too many people are walking around showing off diamonds without ever laying down the velvet.

Hi Ron

I think we have touched on this before and I find myself thinking the same thoughts. I know that all the greats have said 'don't preach grace until you have preached law' but is there really a biblical basis for this methodology?

I have frequently scoured the Acts to see what gospel they preached and it seems so different from what we usually hear. A liberal English theologian (C.H.Dodd) differentiated between what he called *kerugma* and *didache*. Kerugma is the herald's proclamation and didache is the deposit of truth trusted to the church. I don't recommend Dodd but this is an important distinction. The kerugma was the content of the herald's message, while the didache was the content of the deposit trusted to the Church.

In the New Testament we seem to see several different styles of 'meeting'.

1. The public proclamation in the market place as in Acts 17 **Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious.** (Act 17:22 KJV) The word 'said' means 'to reveal one's thoughts'. You might almost translate it 'expressed himself'.

2. The formal meeting for 'seekers' in a public hall. Acts 19:9 The verb used of Paul's actions here is *dialegomai*, the word that we get 'dialogue' from. It means to reason, to talk-through literally. This is a reasoned statement of truth and is frequently used of Paul's work. (Acts 17:2; 17:17; 18:4; 18:19; 19:8; 19:9; 20:7; 20:9; 24:12; 24:25;) That all-nighter 'sermon' in Troas was a 'dialogue'. 'dialegomai' is also used to describe Paul's work in the synagogue.

3. Then there is the kind of meeting described in 1 Corinthians, which is not our topic I think.

So I think Paul's 'gospel preaching' is to be found in two places. There is the 'reasoning' place, synagogue or public hall, where Paul is at work to convince by reasoned application. (obviously dependent upon the Spirit). Then there is the New Testament equivalent of 'street preaching' although the scene at Athens was in a setting where it was customary for people to listen to 'orators'. Their fellowship was 'house to house' but their evangelism was not. I'm not trying to say our patterns must be absolutely the same as theirs; I'm just trying to work out what was happening.

I think much of our church preaching is probably most similar to Paul in the synagogue. The audience was attentive if not always sympathetic. In this context we almost call Paul's style 'expositional' but with definite 'heraldic' elements. **And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God. But all that heard him were amazed, and said; Is not this he that destroyed them which called on this name in Jerusalem, and came hither for that intent, that he might bring them bound unto the chief priests? (Act 9:20-21 KJV)** 'preached' here we take to mean proclaimed) He was plainly taking familiar OT scriptures and expounding them to demonstrate the authenticity of Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ. **But Saul increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is very Christ. (Act 9:22 KJV)**

As far as I am aware there is no indication that Paul ever spoke to his Jewish synagogue listeners about their personal sins. He was 'preaching Christ'. I get the same impression from his 'heraldic preaching' in Athens. He preaches the certainty of judgment and hence accountability but again no reference to personal sin and certainly no reference, to these Gentiles, of a broken law. If Paul's 'kerugma' (the content of the herald's proclamation) in Athens is any kind of indication they were ordered to 'repent now' of their idolatry and warned of inevitable day of judgment but again not a word about personal sins.

I can understand the logic of the 'great preachers' who say 'no grace before law' but I struggle to find a scriptural justification for it. Can anyone help me?

Hate the Sin or the Sinner? - posted by couch (), on: 2004/11/17 14:28

Here is my question.

I have heard many say, "God does not hate the sinner, he hates the sin!" But is that true?

Psalm 5:5 does not say "You hate all the iniquities of the evildoers." It plainly says "You hate all workers of iniquity."

The focus of the hating is obviously on the worker of iniquity, the person.

I know this shouldn't change OUR attitude of love towards those whom have gone astray as we once had, but surely we do not want to give anyone a false impression of what it is that God hates and loves.

Has anyone had to correct this misunderstanding either in the "church" or with the lost? How was it approached?

Re: Hate the Sin or the Sinner? - posted by Rahman, on: 2004/11/17 14:48

Brother Ron you wrote;

"I can understand the logic of the 'great preachers' who say 'no grace before law' but I struggle to find a scriptural justification for it. Can anyone help me"?

I ask this in all sincerity, "Then how about a dispensational justification for it via" ...

2Tim.3

This I know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come.

For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy,

Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good,

Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God;

Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.

For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts,

Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.

But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived.

All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.

i don't know about England (although i know she ain't what she used to be with Jesus either), but over here in the U.S. ignorance, apathy and anestization to sin is so amazingly apparent that i think it must be called out, for folk over here, even in some churches, seem so amazingly numb to it ... As i've stated i go to a rather large, affluent church that looks pretty good from the outside, but is found wanting on the inside, and not many have the boldness to speak up about it, and most find themselves in the minority that do ...

Why is it anathema to speak up about sin, conviction, repentance and hell anymore? ... What is the history of what the Holy Ghost was preaching during the great Revivals of old? ... If ALL scripture is inspired of God, inclusive of that that tells us ALL we're hell bound without Christ, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, then why should we shun those that point out our sin(s)? ... Feels like a trick of the enemy to me.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/17 14:55

Hi Bro. Ron,

Quote:
-----I can understand the logic of the 'great preachers' who say 'no grace before law' but I struggle to find a scriptural justification for it. Can anyone help me?

When Stephen was preaching he was directing their attention to their personal sin of always resisting the Holy Ghost and their continuance in a policy of killing the prophets who foretold the coming of the Messiah and then killing the messiah Himself. (Acts 7:51-53) That was their great sin and none could be greater. The blood of righteous Abel down through Christ and on to James who was beaten to death with a fuller's club, was heaped on their heads. This was not just preaching about the commandment of murder, but it carried with it the implication of breaking other commandments such as blasphemy of God's name.

Paul also confronted idolatry, the 1st and second commandment; Being therefore the offspring of God, we ought not to think that which is divine to be like gold or silver or stone, the graven form of man's art and imagination. (Acts 17:29 Darby). He went on to tell them; And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: (Acts 17:30 KJV)

Many circumstances that we can see a bit what was happening in practice. Certainly Romans opens up with a strong rebuke against the transgressors of the unwritten laws of conscience and creation. This applied directly to the Gentiles. Everyone knows they are guilty of transgressing their conscience and trying to ignore God (they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, etc.). This approach is the method for those not knowing the law. It can be proven to the people that they loved darkness rather than light, etc.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: Hate the Sin or the Sinner? - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/17 14:59

Quote:

-----Has anyone had to correct this misunderstanding either in the "church" or with the lost? How was it approached?

Hi Couch,

Hopefully we can shed some light on the subject and deal with it from here. It has not been discussed in my circles.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/11/17 15:39

Quote:

-----I can understand the logic of the "great preachers"; who say "no grace before law"; but I struggle to find a scriptural justification for it. Can anyone help me?

I think the following may be helpful;

But we know that the law good, if a man use it lawfully; Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners...(1 Timothy 1:8-9)

As you know this verse tells us that the lawful use of the law for a Christian is not as a means of righteousness but as a means of awakening the sense of sin in the ungodly.

Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.(Galatians 3:24)

The moral law shows us what we ought to do, and so we learn our inability to do it. The judicial law shows us what we deserve, thus the law leads us to Christ where we find righteousness and peace.

The Bible shows us the pattern, the effect of preaching is to show people their sins and prepare them for receiving the pardon found in Jesus, as you said the steps of law then grace seem logical, must we have a specific example of preaching from Acts to follow this logic?

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/17 16:08

Hi Robert, thanks for your reply.

Quote:

----- When Stephen was preaching he was directing their attention to their personal sin of always resisting the Holy Ghost and their continuance in a policy of killing the prophets who foretold the coming of the Messiah and then killing the messiah Himself. (Acts 7:51-53) That was their great sin and none could be greater. The blood of righteous Abel down through Christ and on to James who was beaten to death with a fuller's club, was heaped on their heads. This was not just preaching about the commandment of murder, but it carried with it the implication of breaking other commandments such as blasphemy of God's name.

Was not this the nation's sin rather than personal sin? After all this was his address to the Sanhedrin **They did stir up also the people, and the elders, and the scribes, and having come upon him, they caught him, and brought him to the sanhedrim;** (Act 6:12 YLT) I think this was the nation's last chance. How different the two responses?

Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? (Act 2:37 KJV)

When they heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth. (Act 7:54 KJV)

Quote:
----- Paul also confronted idolatry, the 1st and second commandment; Being therefore the offspring of God, we ought not to think that which is divine to be like gold or silver or stone, the graven form of man's art and imagination. (Acts 17:29 Darby). He went on to tell them; And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent: (Acts 17:30 KJV)

I'm not sure that he did confront idolatry. I think he confronted the idolaters telling them that the previous ignorance would no longer be 'overlooked' by God. Surely 'repent' in this context means 'change your behaviour'?

Quote:
----- Many circumstances that we can see a bit what was happening in practice. Certainly Romans opens up with a strong rebuke against the transgressors of the unwritten laws of conscience and creation. This applied directly to the Gentiles. Everyone knows they are guilty of transgressing their conscience and trying to ignore God (they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, etc.). This approach is the method for those not knowing the law. It can be proven to the people that they loved darkness rather than light, etc.

But Romans is not part of the kerugma but of the didache. Romans was addressed to the saints in Rome, not the idolaters of Athens. Paul is not preaching the gospel in Romans, he is defending it.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/17 16:19

Hi Bro. Ron,

Quote:
-----I'm not sure that he did confront idolatry. I think he confronted the idolaters telling them that the previous ignorance would no longer be 'overlooked' by God. Surely 'repent' in this context means 'change your behaviour'?

Yes, he was confronting the idolaters for their idolatry.

Quote:
-----But Romans is not part of the kerugma but of the didache. Romans was addressed to the saints in Rome, not the idolaters of Athens. Paul is not preaching the gospel in Romans, he is defending it.

I don't disagree. Certainly we hear his answers, but don't know all the questions involved. However, surely if he was defending the Gospel we can glean a parakaleo from his didache to form a pattern of how the Gospel is kerugma. :-)

Go ahead, let me have it :-)?

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/17 16:34

Hi Ron

Quote:
----- But we know that the law good, if a man use it lawfully; Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners...(1 Timothy 1:8-9)

As you know this verse tells us that the lawful use of the law for a Christian is not as a means of righteousness but as a means of awakening the sense of sin in the ungodly.

This certainly seems to give a place to a lawful use of the law, but what is it? Paul is criticising 'teachers of the law' who don't understand its purpose. **From which some having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling; Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.** (1Ti 1:6-7 KJV)

Quote:

----- Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.(Galatians 3:24)

The moral law shows us what we ought to do, and so we learn our inability to do it. The judicial law shows us what we deserve, thus the law leads us to Christ where we find righteousness and peace.

The 'we' here is in contrast to the 'you' of verse 26, contrasting the Jew with the Gentile. **But before faith came, we were kept in ward under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. So that the law is become our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now faith that is come, we are no longer under a tutor. For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus.** (Gal 3:23-26 ASV) The 'law' as paedagogos was the unique experience of those under the law. This was God's methodology not the preacher's. As that covenant is now ended and no-one is under that law how can we justify our use of it in this context.

Quote:

----- The Bible shows us the pattern, the effect of preaching is to show people their sins and prepare them for receiving the pardon found in Jesus, as you said the steps of law then grace seem logical, must we have a specific example of preaching from Acts to follow this logic?

This is certainly a legitimate position if we are happy that the effect of preaching was intended to show them their sins and then show them their Saviour. What I am asking is 'was this the purpose of the preaching in Acts?' I know it was the effect of the preaching but was it the purpose. The purpose of the preaching in Acts seems to have been to declare Christ and hence the kerugma. The kerugma has been identified as having the following elements, although not all are present in every example; this is an accumulation.

1. The Scriptures predicted the coming of the Christ.
2. Christ has fulfilled those predictions, even to the death of the cross.
3. God has raised Him from the dead and exalted Him to His own right hand.
4. He will judge all men at the day of God's appointment.
5. In between that coming day and the present day there is an amnesty.
6. Men must acknowledge Christ for who He is and submit to Him.

It is number 4. which is the point of our conversation. God will judge men according to what standard? It seems from Acts 17 that a man becomes culpable when he knows what he does. **"Therefore having overlooked the times of ignorance, God is now declaring to men that all people everywhere should repent,** (Act 17:30 NASB)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/17 16:59

Quote:

----- Yes, he was confronting the idolaters for their idolatry.

Paul instructs them as at that time that **God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; Neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things;** (Act 17:24-25 KJV)

He then illustrates from their own poets that God is greater than any idol made with hands, and tells them how they should think **Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device. And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: 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.** (Act 17:29-31 KJV)

I don't think Paul publicly opposed idolatry. What? you cry... I am intrigued always by this statement from the Ephesian town clerk **And when the town clerk had appeased the people, he said, Ye men of Ephesus, what man is there that knoweth not how that the city of the Ephesians is a worshipper of the great goddess Diana, and of the image which fell down from Jupiter? Seeing then that these things cannot be spoken against, ye ought to be quiet, and to do nothing rashly. For ye have brought hither these men, which are neither robbers of churches, nor yet blasphemers of your goddess.** (Act 19:35-37 KJV) In fact the original charge brought against Paul was not that he had condemned the idolaters but **... this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no**

gods, which are made with hands: (Act 19:26b KJV)

The consequence of Paul's preaching had been that many were turning from idolatry but I do not read that he had condemned for idolatry. Now the revelation-didache of Romans 1 is that men turned to idolatry when they turned from God. **Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things.** (Rom 1:21-23 KJV) In that sense, idolatry is the consequence of sin rather than sin itself.

For the Jew, of course, idolatry was sin. Their history had been different. **The secret things belong unto the LORD our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law.** (Deu 29:29 KJV) You will understand, I hope, that I am not advocating idolatry, only that Paul did not 'accuse' the Gentiles of that sin as he would inevitably have done if he had been using the law to prepare them for grace.

Quote:
----- I don't disagree. Certainly we hear his answers, but don't know all the questions involved. However, surely if he was defending the Gospel we can glean a parakaleo from his didache to form a pattern of how the Gospel is kerugma.

Er, pardon? :-o

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/17 17:03

Hi Bro. Ron,

Depending on the depth to which we want to answer this I would offer a short answer and maybe come back and try to look at it and answer polemically. Here is my immediate thoughts:

Quote:
-----It is number 4. which is the point of our conversation. God will judge men according to what standard? It seems from Acts 17 that a man becomes culpable when he knows what he does.

And that servant, which knew his lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more. (Luke 12:47-48)

The servant knew? Knew what? His Lord's will. How did he know and how much did he know? But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more. (V49) Given? What were they given? How were they given? Did they know they were given it? Certainly, the judge of all the earth will do right.

A few questions we can tackle.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by Rahman, on: 2004/11/17 18:40

Whoa ... Brother Robert ...

You and brother Ron don't waste any time getting into the ionosphere of a topic ... Again, way over my head, feeling dizzy, can't breath ... '0) ... i'm bowing out after this post because i got my epiphany with "In the light's" post ... Have fun with yall's further dissection! ... In the meanwhile i'll be stepping up my alarm to unrepentant sinners (saved and unsaved alike) with the manic intensity of the robot on Lost In Space, "WARNING WILL(FUL) SINNER!!! ... DANGER!!! ... DANGER"!! ...

Oh, one last question tho ... You stated;

"Let the search for truth begin and may we prayerfully search out the fullness of the plurality of God and His majesty that we may draw near to a right representation and presentation of Him in every situation and to every people".

Other than being triune, is God a "plurality"? ... What do you mean by this, as i've always thought of God as a "singularity" in will, word, way, purpose, the same yesterday, today and forever, tho He is Father, Son and Holy Ghost?

i guess my problem is i see God to simplistically, as black and white, and even tho we're now under grace i still sense there's a limit as to just how far we can push that envelope of gray, especially when we've went as far as to add our own colors ...

Later,

Bro. R

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/17 20:56

Quote:

-----Other than being triune, is God a "plurality"? ...

Sorry brother Rahman,

God is Triune. I meant to say "the plurality of God's greatness and majesty, not the plurality of God" (Elohyim)

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/17 21:53

Hi Bro. Ron,

Quote:

-----I don't disagree. Certainly we hear his answers, but don't know all the questions involved. However, surely if he was defending the Gospel we can glean a parakaleo from his didache to form a pattern of how the Gospel is kerugma.

That was a bit confusing. :-(Looks almost encrypted or something. I should have proof read it but I was in a hurry leaving.

What I mean to say is I don't disagree that Romans is doctrine (didache), but I would argue that we can glean from Romans a means to both beseech (parakaleo) sinners to turn to Christ (say in personal evangelism) and herald (kerugma) the message of salvation (in the marketplace). Paul is writing out his presentation (euangelizo) of the Gospel in written form. I have no reason to believe he could not have used this as his sermon notes. I see no indication in the opening chapter leading to verse 18 that Paul intended to do anything other than preach the Gospel. We know Paul was set for the def

ense of the Gospel (Philippians 1:17, etc.), but I don't see that hindering our ability to glean a strategy for preaching to the lost from his Gospel, even if it was written primarily as an apology.

If we look at Paul's common method of preaching, we find it in Acts 26:20; But shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judaea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance. KJV This is near to the message of John the Baptist, if not identical. If we wonder what his means of demonstrating the guilt of the sinner is, we will find it in Romans 1:18. The people hold the truth in unrighteousness. Many of them were aware of at least some of the commandments because of the Diaspora. A little Algebra, again, would be: revelation = responsibility. We are responsible for every measure of light, no matter how we obtained the rays, we have received.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/11/17 22:55

Quote:
----- What I mean to say is I don't disagree that Romans is doctrine (didache), but I would argue that we can glean from Romans a means to both beseech (parakaleo) sinners to turn to Christ (say in personal evangelism) and herald (kerugma) the message of salvation (in the marketplace). Paul is writing out his presentation (euangelizo) of the Gospel in written form. I have no reason to believe he could not have used this as his sermon notes. I see no indication in the opening chapter leading to verse 18 that Paul intended to do anything other than preach the Gospel.

Yes, I believe this start to Romans is very relevant to this topic. Paul makes the incredible declaration of the gospel, of mercy, grace and good news in verse 16 of chapter 1; *For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.*

And then Paul immediately launches into the context of our sorry state. Paul is saying that he's delighted to declare the good news because, *the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness;*(v.18)

Paul links God's wrath directly with two words, 'ungodliness' and 'unrighteousness'. Modern man is hardly willing to accept he is unrighteous let alone godless. Modern man accepts that there are problems but doesn't believe they are moral problems. It is just here that the moral law is very valuable in bringing man's condition to light. The law pinpoints and brings sin out of its hiding place. *Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.*(Romans 3:20)

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/18 3:24

Quote:
-----The servant knew? Knew what? His Lord's will. How did he know and how much did he know? But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more. (V49) Given? What were they given? How were they given it? Did they know they were given it? Certainly, the judge of all the earth will do right.

Hi Guys

I think the key to this section is that we are dealing with servants. Servants have a responsibility to know their masters will. On occasion the Lord would say 'have ye not read'. **Then what advantage has the Jew? Or what is the benefit of circumcision? Great in every respect. First of all, that they were entrusted with the oracles of God.** (Rom 3:1-2)

NASB) Ignorance of the law is no excuse when the law has been fully published. In the servants in this passage we have servants who knew and servants who ought to have known.

I know this particular reference is not to old Israel but I am using them as an example. To the servants (us) we should know now. If we do know and don't do we are blameworthy. If we don't know and ought to have known we are also blameworthy.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/18 3:40

Quote:
----- Paul is writing out his presentation (euangelizo) of the Gospel in written form. I have no reason to believe he could not have used this as his sermon notes.

Boy! I would have loved to have heard this sermon! :-? Can you imagine a street preacher using Romans as his notes? I don't mean an occasional verse, I mean Romans. Remember the original didn't even have chapters let alone verses.

My point was that Romans was not addressed to the crowd but to the 'converted'. It is explanation not proclamation. You will recall how the Lord only gave the explanation of the Sower parable to his disciples. Romans is 'mystery' revealed for the saints. I'm not saying that we can't use Romans in our evangelisation but just that like most of the scriptures it was a targeted mail shot and the target group is Christians.

Quote:
----- I see no indication in the opening chapter leading to verse 18 that Paul intended to do anything other than preach the Gospel.

Well he was looking forward to visiting Rome so that he could preach the gospel and although this is the gospel according to Paul it is not at all like the street preaching he would have done in Athens. It is probably much more like the 'dialogue-ing' he did in the school of Tyrranus and in the synagogues.

Quote:
----- If we look at Paul's common method of preaching, we find it in Acts 26:20; But shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judaea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance.

Clearly the Gentiles were 'commanded to repent' as we see in Athens in Acts 17. That is not my question. My question is did he use the Law to induce repentance? **Therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not; But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.** (2Co 4:1-2 KJV) All men have conscience but not all men have the Law.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/18 3:45

Quote:
----- Paul links God's wrath directly with two words, 'ungodliness' and 'unrighteousness'. Modern man is hardly willing to accept he is unrighteous let alone godless. Modern man accepts that there are problems but doesn't believe they are moral problems. It is just here that the moral law is very valuable in bringing man's condition to light. The law pinpoints and brings sin out of its hiding place. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. (Romans 3:20)

Hi Guys

I've just realised that there are two other questions lurking behind the one we are asking.

What is the Law?

To whom is the Law given?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/18 8:20

Hi Bro Ron, (Philologos)

Quote:
-----Boy! I would have loved to have heard this sermon! Can you imagine a street preacher using Romans as his notes? I don't mean an occasional verse, I mean Romans.

Of course Paul had been known for lengthy sermons (Acts 20:9). I'm sure he would have never made it far into the message before he took another stoning or beating in the streets. Reminds me of Richard Wurmbrand when he told of being beaten in prison for preaching and then being thrown back into the cell only to exclaim; "Now where was I?" The synagogues wouldn't have been much better. People were prepared to swear oaths to the death to kill the man. What was it? Was it his mean looks? It was his message. Certainly not all of it would be included, but the basic content would have. And certainly I'm not referring merely to the Roman's Road passages. That is a gross oversimplification of the message, in my opinion.

Quote:
-----Well he was looking forward to visiting Rome so that he could preach the gospel and although this is the gospel according to Paul it is not at all like the street preaching he would have done in Athens. It is probably much more like the "dialogue-ing" he did in the school of Tyrannus and in the synagogues.

True. On the streets, as in the various schools, I am sure he would be leaning on the Holy Spirit for direction. With all of the gifts of the Spirit at his disposal he was probably calling out people's sins like Jesus with the woman at the well. And thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth. (I Corinthians 14:25 KJV)

I think we need to realize that Paul was operating at a very different level than we are today. The Apostles watched people fall dead at their feet and be smitten with blindness at their command. He told the Corinthians that he would not know the speech of the puffed up ones, but the dynamis. He used not enticing words of men's wisdom; 'I was with you in weakness and in fear and in much trembling, and my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of men's wisdom but in a demonstration of the Spirit and power'.

Quote:
-----My question is did he use the Law to induce repentance?

I would say he used whatever the Holy Ghost quickened in his mind under the circumstances. He may not have consciously even known that what he was sharing was piercing people's hearts, and that the Holy Spirit was convincing the people of sin. I have had this happen to me before as I was teaching. People though I was preaching at them, when I was only sharing what the Lord placed on my heart to say.

I think I would concur that the Law of Moses would be of limited use. The 10 Commandments are pretty standard rules of right and wrong as revealed in the conscience. Men knew lying is wrong and murder is wrong and stealing is wrong, etc.

I found an interesting quote last night in George Foxes autobiography. It deals with when he came to America.

And truly his opposing us was of good service, giving occasion for the opening of many things to the people concerning the Light and Spirit of God, which he denied to be in everyone; and affirmed that it was not in the Indians.

Whereupon I called an Indian to us, and asked him whether when he lied, or did wrong to any one, there was not something in him that reprov'd him for it. He said there was such a thing in him, that did so reprove him; and he was ashamed when he had done wrong, or spoken wrong. So we shamed the doctor before the Governor and the people; insomuch that the poor man ran out so far that at length he would not own the Scriptures.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/18 9:11

Hi Robert

Quote:

----- Ron's Quote:

My question is did he use the Law to induce repentance?

Robert's quote:

I would say he used whatever the Holy Ghost quickened in his mind under the circumstances. He may not have consciously even known that what he was sharing was piercing peoples hearts, and that the Holy Spirit was convincing the people of sin. I have had this happen to me before as I was teaching. People though I was preaching at them, when I was only sharing what the Lord placed on my heart to say.

I think I would concur that the Law of Moses would be of limited use. The 10 Commandments are pretty standard rules of right and wrong as revealed in the conscience. Men knew lying is wrong and murder is wrong and stealing is wrong, etc.

This is my question restated. I am not questioning the Lord's right to commission His servants to preach as He wills, or to use the law of Moses or a Poem of Aratus. I am not questioning any man's inspiration, only their methodology, and especially when that methodology is laid down as **THE** methodology..

Ps. I love your Fox quotation.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/18 9:46

Quote:

-----I am not questioning any man's inspiration, only their methodology, and especially when that methodology is laid down as THE methodology..

Hi Bro. Ron,

I didn't take what you were saying in a negative way at all. I figured we were just trying to shed some light on how this all plays out.

As far as THE methodology goes, I have to say that there is no certain way to win all people to Christ. I did a tractate on all this yesterday and its lost in cyberspace now. :(It must not have been the Lord's will. However, in it I talked about how Paul used whatever means was necessary to win a person to Christ. if by any means I shall provoke to jealousy them which are my flesh, and shall save some from among them. (Romans 11:14 Darby) "Means" here is ei pos or simply pos: "perhaps" or "possibly." I think he exhausted all possibilities. He even wished himself accursed from Christ if that were a possibility. For I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh: (Romans 9:3 ASV) He "wished" or Euchomai. This is not the mentality of a man who had "THE" method for winning people to Christ, but one that used whatever means necessary.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/11/18 9:54

Quote:
----- I would say he used whatever the Holy Ghost quickened in his mind under the circumstances. He may not have consciously even known that what he was sharing was piercing peoples hearts, and that the Holy Spirit was convincing the people of sin.

This is really the heart of the issue isn't it? The Holy Ghost must quicken the speaker to truly be a witness for God. *That* is the methodology. I believe the Spirit of God awakens men to the subject of their sin and the plan of salvation, He can do that in any number of ways, for example, I believe miracles are used by God to get the attention of sinners in some cases but I don't believe that is the case very often.

God uses people and this is why He has scattered His children all over the world. So, of what are we to testify? Generally, to the truths of the Bible. We are capable witnesses because we have experienced this truth. I believe if we stick to the truths we have experienced we will be faithful witnesses.

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/18 10:38

Quote:
-----I believe miracles are used by God to get the attention of sinners in some cases but I don't believe that is the case very often.

Hi Bro. Ron,

I agree. One of the reasons I started this thread is to discover if telling sinners that God is angry with them is valid or not. And secondly to discover if sinners reach a level of defiance that God hates them. I am looking for additional legit means to be used with sinners. If I believe that it is wrong to tell a sinner God is angry at them, I do not believe the Holy Spirit will press me to say it, even if it is not in fact wrong. If I study and discover in the word that it is true; the facts are then on the table. Right now, the two things above mentioned, are virtually off the table in the Church.

Remember in Hebrews when the writer says, "Who the Lord loveth he chasteneth..."? Can we deduce from this that God expresses His love for man differently based upon relationship? In other words, He loves the Saints in a different way than He loves the sinner. We often hear "God loves the sinner just as much as He loves you." If this is true, why are they not chastened as sons as an expression of His love?

Maybe someone would know if storgos is ever used either in the New Testament or the Septuagint to describe God's love for His 'children.'

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/11/18 11:29

Quote:
-----Remember in Hebrews when the writer says, "Who the Lord loveth he chasteneth..."? Can we deduce from this that God expresses His love for man differently based upon relationship? In other words, He loves the Saints in a different way than He loves the sinner. We often hear "God loves the sinner just as much as He loves you." If this is true, why are they not chastened as sons as an expression of His love?

This leads me to think about the modern cliché "love the sinner but hate the sin". Doesn't this lead to a condescending image of the parent saying to his child, "I'm not ashamed of *you*, but of what you *did*". I'm not sure this is biblical. There is a sense in which we love the sinner and hate the sin. But there is also a sense in which we are to hate the sinner *because* of his sins.

Are we supposed to always be super nice and happy and forget about light and darkness not co-existing? And what do we do with verses like this? *Do not I hate them, O LORD, that hate thee? and am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee? I hate them with perfect hatred: I count them mine enemies.*(Psalms 139:21-22)

Charles Spurgeon put it this way;

" To love all men with benevolence is our duty; but to love any wicked man with complacency would be a crime. To hate a man for his own sake, or for any evil done to us, would be wrong; but to hate a man because he is the foe of all goodness and the enemy of all righteousness, is nothing more nor less than an obligation. The more we love God the more indignant shall we grow with those who refuse him their affection. ¶ We pull up the drawbridge and man the walls when a man of Belial goes by our castle. His character is a casus belli; we cannot do otherwise than contend with those who contend with God."

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/18 11:58

Quote:
----- we cannot do otherwise than contend with those who contend with God

Thanks Bro. Ron,

So do you see our method changing towards the way in which we preach to people who openly reject the Gospel? Or do we even preach unto them at all who refuse to repent? Do we wipe the dust from our feet and go to the heathen?

Is it Biblical to keep on feeding people the Gospel week after week as they reject the word in hopes that "someday they'll repent"? If we do keep preaching, Does it stand to reason that the messages will keep intensifying until they either repent or walk out or stone us?

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by Rahman, on: 2004/11/18 12:34

Brother Robert ...

i havent the slightest idea of what "storgos" means, but i do know that the preaching of repentance to a sinner is like stre wing seed, as i'm not interested in where the seed falls, that to me is the job of the Holy Ghost ... i may have strewn the seed, somebody else may water it, but if that seed has fallen in one predestined and called, fertile ground, then God will make it grow, with the bottom line being that all stages are of the Holy Ghost anyhow, for seed slingers don't strew the G ospel on ones own accord and/or power ... i guess it's not important to me to know if a heathen is either here or there wit h God, that's God's realm to me, but what's important to me is to let any heathen know that God has provided them a me ans of choice to determine their eternity in heaven or hell, and this i do out of love ... Love for Christ because by His bloo d i'm saved, and am commisioned to tell others ... And love for my fellow man because an eternity is a long, long time to burn ...

Anyhow i came across this, in line with brother Ron's (In the light) analogy of the velvet and diamond which was an epip hany for me ... i find this an even greater analogy, and will incorporate it into my "repentance" witnessing ... God bless yo u bruh! ...

Does God Love Everyone?
(Speaking on Reconciliation)

By Nick Bibile

http://www.sounddoctrine.net/Nick/Does_God_Loves_Everyone.htm

Then how can someone tell an unbeliever that God loves you?

If God loves the unbeliever, then there is no need of a mediator, as there is no enmity, there should be peace between t he unbeliever and God, there should not be any need of reconciliation. But in the gospel, we see enmity, mediator, reco nciliation and peace. This is the true gospel. Telling the unbeliever "God loves you" is a false gospel. The false gospel will bring false conversions.

Telling an unbeliever "God loves you." Will not bring true conviction to his heart on sin. Only a person who is truly co nvicted of sin will realize his need for Christ. Nowhere in the New Testament, we see the apostles telling the unbeliever s "God loves you." Instead, we see just the opposite.

Acts 2:37 Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles , Men and brethren, what shall we do?

Why were these men convicted of their sins? Because Peter did not say, "Jesus loves you." Instead he said, "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucifi ed and slain." (Ac 2:23)

First the unbeliever need to be convinced of his need of Christ, and need to be convinced of his horrible sin against God , his guilt, the power of sin and the wrath of God that is going to come upon all who are disobedient. Remember when th e Israelites were in the wilderness the fiery serpents bit them and many died. Then the Lord told Moses to make a braze n serpent and set it on a pole, anyone who was bitten by a serpent will live when he looks at the brazen serpent on the p ole. (Numbers 21:6-9) Jesus said, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up." (Joh 3:14) My friend, no one will look to Christ unless first the serpent bites them, they will realize the dan ger of death as the serpent has bitten them. Telling the unbeliever God loves you will not make the unbeliever see the d anger. But telling the unbeliever, that the wrath of God is going to come upon all who are disobedient to God. (Col 3:6) I n this, he will see the danger, the danger that he is in, as he is heading towards the wrath of God. Then he will realize he needs to be saved, (salvation) from the wrath of God. When you say, "God loves you." The unbeliever will not see th e danger or the wrath of God that is going to come upon him, instead the unbeliever will be comforted. This is not from G od as it is not biblical it is from Satan. Today

The English great theologian John Owen (1616-1683) said, "Before people will come to Christ, they need to know that

they are lost, condemned sinners, standing accursed in God's sight." The Americas greatest theologian Jonathan Edwards said, "In his word we have his threatening against sin denounced by himself. He tells us, that if we go on in sin, he will destroy us, and cast us out of his sight, and pour out his wrath upon us, and hold us eternally under misery."

The gospel is called the good news; the good news is we are enemies of God, living in sin, God was angry with the sinner and God's wrath was upon us, yet because of his grace and mercy He sent His Son to those whom he elected. God reconciled the believer and loves the believer.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/18 13:32

Hi Rahman

storgE: Greek for Parental affection; the instinctive affection which animals have for their young.

Hi Robert

(Rom 1:31 KJV+) Without understanding,801 covenant breakers,802 without natural affection,794 implacable,786 unmerciful:415

(2Ti 3:3 KJV+) Without natural affection,794 trucebreakers,786 false accusers,1228 incontinent,193 fierce,434 despisers of those that are good,865

In both of the above the 'without natural affection' is **astorgos**

Thayer Definition:

1) without natural affection, unsociable (Rom_1:31 marg.), inhuman (2Ti_3:3 8 RSV), unloving (2Ti_3:3 4 NKJV)

In other words 'storgos-less'. I'll see what I can do with my LXX. OK had a look and can't find either storgos or astorgos in the LXX.

I picked this up on the web

Storgos has an unselfish side (unlike eros), which is best understood from the definitions of the only way storgos is used in the Greek New Testament—in its ugly, negative side. Astorgos means "without natural affection" (cf. Romans 1: 31 & Second Timothy 3:3); the words "heartless" and "inhuman" describe it (2:542). Pa

rents love their children by caring for their well-being, nurturing them for the future; so when a parent leaves her living newborn in a dumpster, that's pretty good evidence of someone lacking that natural concern for one's own kin. Why is this? Because storgos is the "love of kindred, especially of parents for children and children for parents". {Interestingly, etymology associates the stork (you know, the bird in the cartoon that brings a mother her newborn in a small blanket) with the word storgos; stork—storgos.} So back to the baby dumping mom, she is astorgos which "designates the unfeeling and hard, whose heart is warmed by no noble sentiment; it is applied to parents, but also to animals who do not love their young" (110). See, storgos "is a natural movement of the soul ... something almost like gravitation or some other force of blind nature." It is the love which the animal has for its offspring. It is a love of obligation, the term being used here not in its moral sense, but in a natural sense. It is a necessity under the circumstances" (110). In our day and time, we have either met or heard of many people who lack this important kind of love, probably because they were raised without it.

Storgos has a selfish side (like eros) as indicated in this description: "a comfortable old-shoe relationship comprised of natural affection and a sense of belonging" (60). In other words, children love parents because of the feeling of security they have in their parents' care. Storgos is a warm comfortableness, a satisfaction in being together; we see it between a man and his dog or with a man and his favorite chair. So it could be said, "By eros we are conceived and by storge we are reared." Storgos is obviously the primary love we refer to when we say that we love our children.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/18 14:07

Quote:

-----Storgos is obviously the primary love we refer to when we say that we love our children

Hi Bro. Ron,

Thanks for the research. Would it be accurate to say that God expresses AgapE love for sinners, but not phileo and storgos? Or is it even accurate to say that the relationship we have with God fits the term storgos?

God Bless!

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/18 14:29

Quote:

-----I havent the slightest idea of what "storgos" means,

Hi Bro. Rahman,

Bro Ron did an awesome job with storgos. The other Greek words for 'love' are:

AgapE
Phileo
Eros

Eros is never used in the New Testament and is the root word for erotic. It is found in the LXX (Septuagint) which is the Greek version of the Old Testament. I have decked my bed with coverings of tapestry, with carved works, with fine linen of Egypt. I have perfumed my bed with myrrh, aloes, and cinnamon. Come, let us take our fill of love until the morning: let us solace ourselves with loves. (Proverbs 7:16-18) As I understand it, there word for 'loves' in this passage is EROS. Bro. Ron can correct me on that if I'm wrong.

LXX is the Roman numeral '70'; because there were roughly 70 scholars sent to Alexandria Egypt before the time of Christ to translate the Hebrew scriptures. This was needed because Alexander the Great conquered the then known world and spread the Greek language throughout. It was God's providence, because the scriptures were known in Greek and read in Greek before Christ was born laying a foundation for the Greek New Testament to likewise spread around. In time the language of the Universal Church shifted to Latin. When that happened Jerome translated the Greek into Latin and the Bible was locked up in Latin until John Wycliff. I think the Venerable Baede may have translated John into English, but that was about it. This caused the world to fall into darkness due to the deadness in time of the Latin tongue. Only monastics and priests knew the language and the people were ignorant of the bible. This came to be known as the Dark Ages. Wycliff changed all that. He translated the Latin Vulgate of 405 AD into English; but it was a translation of a translation. Desiderius Erasmus reprinted and compiled the Greek New Testament. Luther and Tyndale took that Greek and translated it directly into English. The rest is history.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/18 14:47

ps

Rom 12:10 KJV) **Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honour preferring one another;**

kindly-affectioned is ***philostorgos***

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/18 14:53

Quote:
-----philostorgos

Wow! Now there is a word! :-) This is an alloy of love.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/18 18:49

Quote:
----- Thanks for the research. Would it be accurate to say that God expresses AgapE love for sinners, but not phileo and storgos? Or is it even accurate to say that the relationship we have with God fits the term storgos?

(Joh 5:20 KJV) For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel.

(Joh 11:3 KJV) Therefore his sisters sent unto him, saying, Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick.

(Joh 11:36 KJV) Then said the Jews, Behold how he loved him!

(Joh 16:27 KJV) For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God.

(Joh 20:2 KJV) Then she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him.

(1Co 16:22 KJV) If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha.

(Tit 3:15 KJV) All that are with me salute thee. Greet them that love us in the faith. Grace be with you all. Amen.

(Rev 3:19 KJV) As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten: be zealous therefore, and repent.

in all these instances the word for love is *phileO*. On the basis of this I don't think that we could say that God does not *phileO* sinners. *storgE* is really instinctive affection/care such as a mother feels for her baby or a hen for her chicks. It is not a choice but an inherent function of family.

The distinction between *agapE* and *phileO* is interesting. Some commentators saying one and others the other is the greater word.

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/11/18 22:55

Quote:
-----So do you see our method changing towards the way in which we preach to people who openly reject the Gospel? Or do we even preach unto them at all who refuse to repent? Do we wipe the dust from our feet and go to the heathen? Is it Biblical to keep on feeding people the Gospel week after week as they reject the word in hopes that "someday they'll repent"? If we do keep preaching, Does it stand to reason that the messages will keep intensifying until they either repent or walk out or stone us?

I see our methods needing to change not just with those who openly reject the gospel but with those who have accepted a 'easy' gospel.

The past century of conservative evangelicalism in this country has bolstered our notions of our own supposed goodness. Many preachers today are telling their congregations that they need to do this kind thing and that kind thing, but they never tell them they need to proclaim the gospel. Why? Because many don't believe that "God's wrath is revealed from heaven against wickedness" therefore they have no gospel to proclaim.

Is there really 40-50 million truly born-again Christians in America? If so, what is going on here?

In Christ,

Ron

Re: agapos v philos - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/19 5:00

Some time ago I chatted to a web-friend, on a forum on another site, about the distinction between phileo and agape (the verbs) and philos and agapos (the nouns). Others were involved in the discussion so this answer is not directly to my questions. My correspondent teaches Biblical Greek and reads the LXX and the New Testament in Biblical Greek easily. This is an extract and the most helpful comment I have ever seen on this topic

He writes:

I think part of the problem is that, while agapao and phileo are NOT true synonyms, in some contexts, agapao actually INCLUDES the full meaning phileo, but goes beyond it as well. In other words, phileo can be seen as a sub-category under agapao.

So while agapao can INCLUDE everything in phileo, phileo never includes the full strength of agapao.

The topic of most of sermons is the idea that "Phileo" supposedly means a more "friendly" or "brotherly" type of "love", whereas "Agape" is more a "Godly" type of "love." That IS how most sermons present the meanings of these words. It is NOT, however, an accurate portrayal of what they mean.

In reality, agapao has two aspects: the FEELING of love, and the EXPRESSION of that love. Some contexts emphasize BOTH aspects, while some only emphasize the expression. The superior concept in this definition is the EXPRESSION of love. The emotion may or may not be present, but that love is NOT agapao unless it is expressed (usually by action...I can think of no verses in which words are considered an adequate expression of agapao).

Agapao is NOT, strictly speaking, "Godly love." It is simply love expressed as an action. The reason it got the "reputation" as "Godly love" is that John stresses in his first epistle that agape, love expressed in active form regardless of how we FEEL, is impossible without God. But the "God" part of it comes from Christian TEACHING, it is NOT inherent in the meaning of the word.

Keep in mind that agapao CAN include FEELINGS of love, but that is more of a "secondary" concern, and not absolutely necessary for something to be considered agape. The expression of that love, primarily in something that we DO, is absolutely necessary.

If we do not FEEL loving, we can still have agape.
If we do not DO loving actions, we do not have agape.

Phileo is not "brotherly love" (that is philadelphia), it is simply the "emotion" of love. The best definition of phileo is probably "loving affection," and it can reference ANYONE we happen to love. No actions of any kind are required in order to have philia. It is simply what we feel. In other words, it references the HEART itself.

If we do not FEEL affection for someone, we do NOT have philia, regardless of what we DO.

If we feel affection for someone, but do nothing, we STILL have philia. Philia does NOT require any kind of action or expression.

This is NOT to say that in real life philia does not cause us to behave in a certain fashion, but that when philia is used, it is the HEART, the AFFECTION itself that is being referenced. When I use the word "affection" for phileo, keep in mind that I mean a STRONG, DEEPLY FELT, VERY EMOTIONAL LOVE, not the way we normally think of "affection" as a mild, "I kind of like you" type of emotion.

In summary, phileo means "loving affection." Agapao means "loving action," but CAN also include "loving affection."

Many of the scriptures below appear to be using the words as synonyms because the only difference in the two are emphasis (one emphasizing affection, the other action).

So, as we examine your scripture examples below, all you have to remember is that if the word used is phileo or philia, the AFFECTION is being emphasized. If the word is agapao or agape, the ACTION is being emphasized (although the affection may ALSO be present).

John 3:35 "The Father loves the Son, and has given all things into His hand." (agapao)

The speaker here is John the Baptist, and he is emphasizing that the authority given to the one who comes after him, the Son, is an ACT of love from the Father. He is emphasizing the ACTION.

John 5:20 "For the Father loves the Son, and shows to Him all things which He does. And He will show Him greater works than these in order that you may marvel." (phileo)

The speaker here is Jesus, and He is emphasizing that the reason the Father shows the Son all these things is because of the great AFFECTION the Father has for the Son. He is emphasizing the FEELING.

Two different speakers, two different aspects being emphasized.

John 13:23 "...disciple Jesus loved..." (agapao)

John 19:26 "...disciple whom He loved..." (agapao)

John 20:2 "...disciple Jesus loved..." (phileo)

John 21:7 "...disciple Jesus loved..." (agapao)

John 21:20 "...disciple Jesus loved..." (agapao)

This is a case in which context shows that each use of agapao INCLUDES phileo as well.

The difference is that in the 20:2 reference, Jesus is not PRESENT, so emphasis is placed on how Jesus FEELS about John.

In 13:23, 19:26, 21:7 and 21:20, Jesus is present, so the fact that Jesus also EXPRESSES His affection for John is included.

John 20:2 is the only time phileo is used in this phrase, and it is the only time Jesus is not present when this is mentioned.

Remember, I mentioned that John is delightfully, and to the untrained eye, sometimes nearly imperceptibly subtle. This is one of hundreds of examples of his precision and subtlety.

In the examples you give below, the differences between when agapao and phileo are used is frequently a matter of emphasis only. In other words, when speaking about "loving the world," agapao would emphasize the ACTION of a corrupt heart, where phileo would focus on the simple fact that the heart IS corrupt. The difference is occasionally subtle, but there is a difference.

The first set of examples, of verses where phileo is used, are simply places where "affection" is being emphasized. In these, the emphasis is primarily on the heart, and how because it naturally loves evil, or material things, or the self, it needs to be changed, or trained, or cleansed, etc.

When Greek wishes to be more specific as to WHO is to receive that affection, it attaches the appropriate word to phileo (such as philandros, a combination of philia and aner - the stem of aner is andro...it would take too long to explain why - meaning, "affection for a man" and philoteknos, a combination of philia and teknon meaning, "affection for a child").

The examples you gave of agapeo are simply verses in which the emphasis is on the fact that the person did not just FEEL the love, but actually DID something to express that love. In negative contexts, it emphasizes the ACTION or BEHAVIOR of a person with a corrupt heart.

John 3:19 "This is the judgment, that the Light has come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the Light..."

Men EXPRESSED their love for the darkness in their behavior, it was NOT affection only.

John 12:43 for they loved the approval of men rather than the approval of God.

Emphasis on the fact that they DID something to get the approval of men.

2 Pet 2:15 forsaking the right way, they have gone astray, having followed the way of Balaam, the son of Beor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness;

If you know the story of Balaam, you know how he did his absolute best to EARN his unrighteous pay, and God kept thwarting him.

2 Tim 4:10 for Demas, having loved this present world, has deserted me...

Emphasis on what Demas DID, and how it was not just fear, immaturity, or some other excusable cause (we find out in another place that Mark also deserted, but NOT because of a morally corrupt heart), but his desertion was an outgrowth of his character, an expression of a corrupt heart that loved the world more than God.

Luke 11:43 "Woe to you Pharisees! For you love (agapeo) the chief seats in the synagogues and the respectful greetings in the market places."

Emphasis here on what they DO. Jesus lists a series of evil things they do, and emphasizes here the fact that what they are DOING is an expression of their true love: human recognition. Yes, their hearts are corrupt, but it is their BEHAVIOR that is the topic of discussion right now.

Luke 20:46 "Beware of the scribes, who like to walk around in long robes, and love (phileo) respectful greetings in the market places, and chief seats in the synagogues and places of honor at banquets...."

This is a slightly more complex construction. Phileo is a present active participle here, and the sentence is better translated

"beware of the scribes, the ones desiring to walk around in long robes loving respectful greetings in the market places . . ."

The main verb is "to walk," while "desiring" and "loving" are abstract nouns standing as emotional modifiers. In other words, the construction indicates that their desire to get, and affection for respectful greetings is a characteristic of these particular scribes. That is, it is a character trait . . . i.e. a heart problem.

In other words, the emphasis is NOT on them "walking around," but on the REASON they walk around: they have corrupt hearts.

As I think I've shown here, the differences are often very subtle (usually a matter of emphasis only), but they ARE different. It would be a huge mistake to assume these words are complete synonyms. All you will be doing if you do that is guaranteeing that you miss some of the subtext of the teaching or interaction.

And finally, because Greek writers DID understand the difference between these two words, if these documents were translations of Aramaic, the translators DID add a subtext NOT found in the Aramaic. The words CANNOT be used interchangeably without changing the meaning or emphasis of the verse.

But if you understand what the words REALLY mean, you see that not only are they NOT synonyms, their usage gives a major clue as to whether behavior stemming from the heart, or the heart itself, is the primary reference.

Â...end of extract.

This fits perfectly with my own rule of thumb definitions that philo emphasises, primarily, affection (deep affection) whereas agapos is the love that is measured by its cost. Both are genuine and we should not denigrate one to enrich the other, but agapos is 'love wherewith He loved us' ie demonstrated by its selfless givenness.

Re: more on agapE - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/19 5:22

Agapos continued.

agapeO and agapE are used in the Septuagint but there is no record of them being used by heathen writers (so says Trench). The first use of the word is, I think, very significant.

Genesis 22:2 (ASV) And he said, Take now thy son, thine only son, whom thou lovest, even Isaac, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt-offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of. In other words the readers of the Greek Bible would have been introduced to the word in the context of the love relationship between a Father and an only-begotten Son.

Genesis 29:20 (ASV) And Jacob served seven years for Rachel; and they seemed unto him but a few days, for t he love he had to her. In the LXX this is agapos.

Exodus 20:6 and showing lovingkindness unto {1} thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments. {1} Or }

Leviticus 19:18 (ASV) Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people; but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: I am Jehovah.

Deuteronomy 4:37 (ASV) And because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed after them, and brought thee out with his presence, with his great power, out of Egypt;

In fact agapeO and agapE are to be found in 139 verses in the Greek LXX. However I think this is one of the words that my old Greek teacher used to liken to Aristotle Onassis's ships! He used to say that sometimes the New Testament claimed a word, emptied of its cargo, and filled it with a new one. (ekklesai is another) It is in the New Testament that we shall find the real significance of agapE although the LXX uses can trigger some precious meditations.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/19 5:43

Some bits on erOs.

Neither erOs nor its cognates are ever used in the NT, although they appear occasionally in the LXX

erastEs

Ezekiel 16:33 She has even given rewards to all that went a-whoring after her, and thou hast given rewards to all thy lovers, yea, thou didst load them with rewards, that they should come to thee from every side for thy fornication.

Hosea 2:5 And their mother went a-whoring: she that bore them disgraced : for she said, I will go after my lovers, that give me my bread and my water, and my garments, and my linen clothes, my oil and my necessities.

Proverbs 4:6 And forsake it not, and it shall cleave to thee: love

Proverbs 7:18 Come, and let us enjoy love (phileas) until the morning; come, and let us embrace in love (erOti).

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/19 8:53

Thanks Bro. Ron,

That's some awesome stuff. It brings some real clarity to the issue.

A final question on eros. Does it seem that eros is always used in a sinful way or does it merely define physical relations irrespective of whether they are sinful or not.

Thanks!

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/19 9:17

Quote:
-----A final question on eros. Does it seem that eros is always used in a sinful way or does it merely define physical relations irrespective of whether they are sinful or not.

I think it is merely sensual without. The LXX translators were not always consistent with their translations of words. The Prov 7:18 reference is a linked to several very similar words; one of which is the noun used in Abraham, My Friend (quick plug). It derives from the sound of 'heavy breathing'! It is passion and passion is part of the way God made us. However passion is only to be released within stated parameters.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/19 9:38

Does Philostorgos seem to indicate a familial love or could the words have been joined together to give us a glimpse into how we were ought to relate to each other as brothers and sisters in Christ? I always associated storgos as 'familial' love in the sense of relatives loving each other. Maybe that is a false notion.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/19 11:15

I think storgE is instinctive, natural, love. It could be used of an animal's instinct. Although we may speak of a dog loving its pups, does it really? There is certainly a bond and great distress if it is broken, but there is no passion in a dog's sexual encounters, no relationship and no commitment. It is we say 'instinct'. I think this is the area we are in. If a mother or father is without this 'love' they are not unromantic (without erOs), or unfriendly (without philos) they are un-natural. It is symbiotic in that it creates a stable setting for each member of the storgE. So it operates between mother and son, brother and brother, across the family, across the tribe. I think it is familial but my feeling is that it is familial 'instinct' rather than familial 'love'. It seems to increase with the increase in quality of the host. The little red hen on our Sunday School days was too stupid to get off the nest when the fire came, she was bound there by storgE! (don't tell the kids!) A human being is more conscious of other things and consequently self-interest may quench storgE.

The great feature of agapE is that there is a far greater element of choice. It consciously, not instinctively, lays down its life for others. It is not the result of an outside attraction in the way that erOs and phileO might be. AgapE does not love 'because'. This is a divine enabling and I think this is what Peter may have been groping for in his persistent use of phileO when the Lord used agapeO on the first two occasions. When Christ accommodated His question to the level of Peter's consciousness, Peter was offended because on that occasion Christ asked do you phileO me?

Peter was a great character but he did not have the agapE that would lay down its life, and the John 21 episode is his confession of this. There was no question of his philos; his words were not an arrogant boast but a declaration of intent. **Peter said unto him, Lord, why cannot I follow thee now? I will lay down my life for thy sake.** (Joh 13:37 KJV) but when it came to the crunch he just did not have the 'agapE' of God poured out within his heart by the Holy Spirit.

In all our endeavours for the Lord and His people God will bring us to the consciousness that all our aspirations must fail; erOs, storgE, philia must fail only agapE will get the job done. **But now faith, hope, love (agapE, abide these three; but the greatest of these is love (agape).** (1Co 13:13 NASB)

Incidentally, I'm pretty sure that the root noun is agapE and storgE and philia and erOs. The first three are feminine and the last one masculine.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/19 11:36

Thanks Bro. Ron,

To wrap this all up; what is your feeling on the whole Esau thing? There have been a lot of inputs from the writers of the past; but do you have any light to shed on this? If not, we can just move on.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/19 13:41

Quote:

To wrap this all up; what is your feeling on the whole Esau thing?

...the whole Esau thing? would you like to be bit more specific?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/19 14:01

Quote:

-----the whole Esau thing

The whole Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated issue.

Malachi 1:2-3

I have loved you, saith the LORD. Yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the LORD: yet I loved Jacob, And I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness.

Romans 9:13

As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.

We know the story of Esau. He sold his birthright for a bowl of beans. Hebrews 12:16; lest 'there be' any fornication, or profane person, as Esau, who for one mess of meat sold his own birthright. ASV 'Profane' here is *Á Bebelos* and the word seems to indicate people who trod upon holy things. Like Belshazzar when he took the articles of the Temple to get drunk with or maybe even people who use their body, the Temple of the Holy Spirit, for fornication. I gather that thought from the comparison of fornication and profane in Hebrews 12:16. God is said to 'destroy' those who defile the Temple (I Corinthians 3:17). Destroy here is *Phtheiro*, which is similar (so it seems) to the idea of profaning. The passage reads, as I recall, "If you corrupt the Temple I will Corrupt you." It seems to be an "eye for an eye" when it comes to Holy things.

My questions are:

1) What was it about Esau that effected God's love for him?

2) What is meant by 'hated' in the above passages?

Thanks!

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/19 15:08

Oh, that Esau thing!

First some preliminary skirmishes... I note that the famous quotation from **I have loved you, saith the LORD. Yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the LORD: yet I loved Jacob, And I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness.** (Mal 1:2-3 KJV) was not written until Esau had been in his grave for a thousand years, and that the context makes it very plain that this prophecy is not relating to an individual but to a people. The first half of the quotation is one of the most poignant comments in the Book. God sums up 1300 years of His dealings with Israel by saying "I have loved you, saith the LORD, Yet ye say... " It is the strong accusation of Isaiah **I am inquired of by them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not: I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name. I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, that walk in a way that is not good, after their own thoughts;** (Isa 65:1-2 ASV) but Malachi puts it in the minor key... **I have loved you... yet you say...**

Secondly, what was it that Esau, the man, lost? **lest there be any fornication, or profane person, as Esau, who for one mess of meat sold his own birthright. For ye know that even when he afterward desired to inherit the blessing, he was rejected; for he found no place for a change of mind in his father, though he sought is diligently with tears. For ye are not come unto a mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, and unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest,** (Heb 12:16-18 ASV) He lost the blessing and unique destiny that awaited him. This is not personal salvation in view, but calling.

The contrasting of love and hate is challenging in the scriptures. Have you ever noticed this little couplet?

And he went in also unto Rachel, and he loved also Rachel more than Leah, and served with him yet seven other years. And when the LORD saw that Leah was hated, he opened her womb: but Rachel was barren. (Gen 29:30-31 KJV) It is curious how 'loved less' becomes 'hated'. How should we understand this? Does 'to hate' then really mean 'to love less'? Is that how we should interpret **If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.** (Luk 14:26 KJV)?

However we understand Paul's quotation of Malachi in Rom 9:13 it seems plain to me that the statement was made in retrospect rather than prospect. It would seem that predestination may be the result of a final judgment rather than a guarantee of a destiny. (now that could get some feathers flying) in that predestination is the result of judgment rather than the other way around? In other words, it was only after the death of the people of Esau that God revealed his judgment; long after.

In this couplet

It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. (Rom 9:12 KJV) This is not a judgment but a prophecy.

As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. (Rom 9:13 KJV) But this is not a prophecy, it is a judgment.

The consequence of Esau's despising of his birthright was ultimately that his people became set in their opposition to those who gained the birthright, and that finally brought about their condemnation. In the light of the first use of love and hate together (above in Gen 29) we have to ask is this simply an idiomatic way of saying that the blessing of God rested on the progeny of Jacob and his displeasure on the progeny of Esau?

In case I haven't expressed it clearly enough above, I will simply say, that I do not regard 'Esau have I hated' as a predetermined disposition of God towards a single man, but as His final judgment upon that people.

You may want to come back on these statements so I will pause...

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/19 16:32

Quote:
-----I will simply say, that I do not regard 'Esau have I hated' as a predetermined disposition of God towards a single man, but as His final judgment upon that people.

That people ('Esau') being metaphorically those who by their own works desire to attain unto righteousness, but have not attained it, because they sought it not by faith, but by the works of the Law. And by the works of the Law shall no man be justified. Therefore they persecuted the heirs of the righteousness of God by faith, as did Ishmael persecute Isaac. I don't want to sound too much like Origin, but in this scenario the bowl of beans would represent a persons (nations) forfeiting of position in exchange for the temporal gratifications of this world (lust of eyes, lust of flesh, PRIDE of life).

So, in short, God loved Esau less than Jacob based upon his handling of his birthright. And metaphorically, He shed His love abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit that we received by faith. Those who did not receive the Spirit have been "LOVED LESS", because they do not have the Holy Spirit, by their own decision. they could not receive the Spirit, and hence the Love, by the works of the law. In this way they have "less love" and therefore can be said to be "loved less."

Is that right?

God Bless,

-Robert