

General Topics :: What is love???**What is love???, on: 2005/5/6 7:43**

Well, God is love. Amen. But what about us? What is love to us? The NT abounds in love. The centerpiece of all of christianity is love, the sacrafice of Jesus in our place.

I guess the thing that is bugging me is that some of the modern tranlations use the word "love" for "agape", when the KJV used the word "charity". Virutally all of 1 Cor 13, the "love" chapter, the KJV uses the word charity.

Many think that love is a heart condition. But unless there is demonstration of that love, is it really "love". If I say that I love someone, and there is no outward evidence, who will believe me? If I say that I love God, an there is no outward evidence or demonstration of that love, who will believe me? Will you? Will God?God's love, that is "agape" love is unconditional love. But it is more than that, for God so loved the world, that even while we were yet sinners, He gave His only begotten Son to die in our place, that we may be restored by faith to eternal life. The word "charity" indicates benevolent activity. It is "doing love" instead of just "having love". Charity is an action word.

1Cr 13:1 Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.

1Cr 13:2 And though I have prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so t hat I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.

1Cr 13:3 And though I bestow all my goods to feed , and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it pr ofiteth me nothing.

and so on it goes all down through the chapter, ending with this verse:

1Cr 13:13 And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these charity.

I can see where the believers have been robbed by some translations using the word "love" instead of "charity". It will be even worse when Jesus comes again. If you dont' believe me, read Matthew 25:31-46. (Please take the time and read it now) This is extremely important to Jesus as you can see. What He is pointing out here is those who either lived by char ity, or they did not live by charity.

I'm not a KJV only guy. I have a parallel KJV/Amplified Bible. I read mostly the Amplified side of the page, and then use t he KJV for study helps and so forth. But you know, if deception were obvious, nobody would be decieved. I am not afraid to say that there is some serious deception intended by the "modern" translations, designed to rob us from our eternal hope.

James said that faith without works is dead faith. The works,beloved, are works of love,ie, charity, even to our enemies. Why is it then, that many pulpiteers would have us believe that church presence on Wednesday and Sunday is the comp leteness of our religious obligation?

All through the bible God is exhorting us to remember the poor. We are even told to preach the Gospel to the poor. Let me ask you a question. Where you hear the "gospel" preached, how many "poor" people are present on any given day? Now, be careful how you answer, because I can show you some pictures from India where really poor folks live. Even m ost of the so called "poor" in this country are far better off than in places like India. So, how many "poor" folks are presen t when you hear the Gospel preached"? Is there something wrong with this picture? Or am I just a crazy old man? Am I i n a cloud here, or does this make sense to you?

What happened to the word, "Love" - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/5/6 8:27

Quote:

-----I can see where the believers have been robbed by some translations using the word "love" instead of "charity"

I'm not convinced that any Bible translation is the cause of the distorted use of the word "love". Words typically come to mean whatever meaning we attach to them - based on the common use of those words. In other words, we fit words into our own thinking and experience. Clearly the meaning of the word "love" has been perverted by sinful desires of the heart. (Isn't that what has happened to many countless Biblical terms?)

Words always have limitations. They are the way we put labels on concepts, ideas, things - which may very possibly be beyond what one's mind can fathom.

I believe that people will never be able to define or understand "love" as long as they have not experienced it for themselves. They are like blind men explaining the meaning of "color"

I believe that people can only understand love to the extent that they themselves have received love. They can only love as much as they KNOW love- ultimately God's love.

I'll bet that those who truly love don't think, "Here, now, I am showing LOVE". They just do what flows from their hearts - never mind any labels.

Diane

Re: What is love??? - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/6 13:59

Quote:

-----I guess the thing that is bugging me is that some of the modern translations use the word "love" for "agape", when the KJV used the word "charity". Virtually all of 1 Cor 13, the "love" chapter, the KJV uses the word charity.

The KJV uses 'charity' at the direct insistence of King James who wanted ecclesiastical language in the translation. He wanted the KJV to support his state church with its liturgy and institutions and expressly instructed his committee of translators to use words which did this.

Tyndale had changed 'charity' in Wycliff to 'love' because he knew that 'charity' would have all the wrong connotations of merit-earning almsgiving. The word 'charity' does not appear in his translation. The Geneva Bible used the word 'love' in 1 Cor 13 too. The KJV translators changed it back again.

It is not the folks with 'love' in their bibles who are disadvantaged but those who have the word 'charity'.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2005/5/6 15:06

There are 4 different Greek words for love.. they are as follows and this is not the right spelling for all of them.

storge - family love
phileo - friendship
agape - God love (un-selfish love)
eros - passion (selfish love)

I hope that helps a bit.. it would be neat to know that if everytime the KJV uses 'charity' that it is **agape** love?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/6 17:29

The word 'charity' or 'charitably' is found 29 times in 25 verses in the KJV. In each case the underlying Greek word is 'agape' which should be translated 'love'.

Rom. 14:15; 1Cor. 8:1; 13:1-4,8,13-14:1; 16:14; Col. 3:14; 1Th. 3:6; 2Th. 1:3; 1Tim. 1:5; 2:15; 4:12; 2Tim. 2:22; 3:10; Titus 2:2; 1Pet. 4:8; 5:14; 2Pet. 1:7; 3John 1:6; Jude 1:12; Rev. 2:19

eros - passion is not used in the scriptures.

Re: Hmmm, on: 2005/5/6 20:59

I'm quite surprised at your responses. While I do find them interesting, I respectfully disagree. Love is not love until you give it, demonstrate it, use it. Love of self will never satisfy the heart of man or the Holy Spirit. It's love thy neighbor, folks. How do you love your neighbor? Jesus said in Matthew 25:31-46. God said it in Isaiah 58:1-12. Read it. It's something you do, not something you have. If I am allowed my humble opinion, I will stay with charity for "agape". It's unconditional love. For that to happen, it has to be bestowed on a receiver. It's more than a feeling, beloved. It's love in action. Do we tell our hungry brother be filled with love and not give him something to eat? Do we turn from he who is cold and say be warm with love? Come on folks, this is not hard. It just requires surrender of self, and submission to God who proved His love by giving all.

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/5/6 23:33

Isn't there a couple of different renderings of agape? Variations?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/7 2:08

What you are doing is redefining 'charity'. It would be more useful to redefine 'love'. Are you saying that every time the KJV has love is does NOT mean a love which reaches out to others? Of course not. Agape means a self-less love which surrenders its rights for the benefit of the one loved. It is the love with which God 'loved' the world. Are you saying that God's love is less than charity? It is the love which causes us to lay down our life for the brethren. (1 John 3:16) It is not 'less' than 'charity' but much greater.

There is a word which modern versions often add to Romans 5:8 to bring out the significance.

Quote:
-----Â“But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.Â” (Rom. 5:8, KJVS)

but there is a word in the original whose significance is seen in Youngs Translation

Quote:
-----Â“and God doth commend His own love to us, that, in our being still sinners, Christ did die for us;Â” (Rom. 5:8, YNG)

Agape is not just 'love' it is God's own love. The Romans passage gives some examples of human love but contrasts God's 'own' love in that it reached out to the undeserving. 'charity' is a 'contribution' from my supply, but agape is a total given-ness. It is the love that not only gives but gives itself in the laying down of its life. 'charity' just does not do justice to 'agape'. Tyndale knew that 'charity' was not unconditional love but often a gesture with the motive of acquiring merit; he rightly rejected the word as being unworthy to translate 'agape'.

Vincent's Word Studies

Charity (???????)

Rev., love. The word does not occur in the classics, though the kindred verbs ?????? and ?????? to love, are common. It first appears in the Septuagint, where, however, in all but two of the passages, it refers to the love of the sexes. Even of the passages are in Canticles. See, also, 2Sa_13:15, Sept. The change in the Rev. from charity to love, is a good and thoroughly defensible one. Charity follows the caritas of the Vulgate, and is not used consistently in the A.V. On the contrary, in the gospels, ?????? is always rendered love, and mostly elsewhere, except in this epistle, where the word occurs but twice. Charity, in modern usage, has acquired the senses of tolerance and beneficence, which express only single phases of love. There is no more reason for saying Â“charity envieth not,Â” than for saying Â“God is charity;Â” Â“the charity of Christ constraineth us;Â” Â“the charity of God is shed abroad in our hearts.Â” The real objection to the change on the part of unscholarly partisans of the A.V. is the breaking of the familiar rhythm of the verses.

Robertson's Word Pictures

But have not love (agap?n de m? ech?). This is the crux of the chapter. Love is the way par excellence of 1Co_12:31. It is not yet clearly certain that agap? (a back-formation from agapa?) occurs before the lxx and the N.T. Plutarch used agap?sis. Deissmann (Bible Studies, p. 198) once suspected it on an inscription in Pisidia. It is still possible that it occurs in the papyri (Prayer to Isis). See Light from the Ancient East, p. 75 for details. The rarity of agap? made it easier for Christians to use this word for Christian love as opposed to eros (sexual love). See also Moffatt's Love in the N.T. (1930) for further data. The word is rare in the Gospels, but common in Paul, John, Peter, Jude. Paul does not limit agap? at all (both toward God and man). Charity (Latin caritas) is wholly inadequate. "Intellect was worshipped in Greece, and power in Rome; but where did St. Paul learn the surpassing beauty of love?" (Robertson and Plummer). Whether Paul had ever seen Jesus in the flesh, he knows him in the spirit. One can substitute Jesus for love all through this panegyric.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/7 2:12

Quote:

----- Isn't there a couple of different renderings of agape? Variations?

What do you have in mind? agape is the noun, agapa is the verb, agape is the adjective. This is another reason for sticking with 'love' it keeps the connection between all three forms.

Re: ah Phil..., on: 2005/5/7 21:28

I'm not sure we are on the same page. You seem to be repeating what I've already said and then getting in a sweat over it.

I never said that everywhere the word agape appeared, it should be charity. I'm not redefining anything. I said just what you said, only in different words. Hope your adenoids didn't flare up too bad there, my brother. :)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/8 12:10

No adenoids, no sweat, not even a glow...

but we are not saying the same thing. I am saying that 'charity' should never have been used in 1 Cor 13. If this is what you are saying, we agree, but I think not.

adenoids???

a mass of enlarged lymphatic tissue between the back of the nose and the throat, often hindering speaking and breathing in the young.

Re: Does it matter?, on: 2005/5/8 17:23

Charity, Agape, Love, does it really matter? We have the knowledge of this written word, but is it streaming from our innermost being, are we experiencing it?

Re: Phil, on: 2005/5/8 17:53

I'm saying that to my understanding of what the Gospel message is all about and that fruit which out of the fountain of love must grow is love that is expressed in our actions and service to other saints first, and then to all men. Given a choice of two words, love/charity, I feel that charity best communicates that doctrine.

One of the griefs on my heart is that far too many in this hour think that love is a state of amorous euphoria inside the heart. Love can be expressed without feelings. But what is the value of love that has no expression of itself?

I certainly respect your entitlement to your viewpoint. I just respectfully disagree. That is not to say in any way that I think any less of you (not that my opinion matters) as a teacher. I do not. I believe you have the anointing of a teacher and you have obviously studied to show your self approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed. I am continually blessed by your knowledge and teaching. Thank you for being here.

In Him,

Lahry

Re: What is love??? - posted by ravin, on: 2005/5/9 3:05

1 John 3:18

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

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/9 3:20

Quote:
-----One of the griefs on my heart is that far too many in this hour think that love is a state of amorous euphoria inside the heart. Love can be expressed without feelings. But what is the value of love that has no expression of itself?

I certainly share this view. Many years ago I was talking to a missionary with Wycliffe Bible Translators. He said, "we don't have a word for love in the language I am working with". I said; "neither do we".

Quote:
-----Given a choice of two words, love/charity, I feel that charity best communicates that doctrine.

God so loved that... Real 'love' always has a consequence, always has a 'that'. I don't want to leave the word 'love' beached without its absolutely inevitable expression in 'giving'. Love without giving is not love; it is sentiment.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/5/9 8:15

Quote:
-----God so loved that... Real 'love' always has a consequence, always has a 'that'. I don't want to leave the word 'love' beached without its absolutely inevitable expression in 'giving'. Love without giving is not love; it is sentiment.

Maybe this is a bad place to ask this question- but I have never fully understood what the term 'hate' means biblically. I have known it to mean 'to love less.' If we contrast the word with love and its definition- would it be possible to hate someone without in some tangible way expressing that hate? Can hatred be just a feeling and still be hatred?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/9 11:19

Quote:
-----Maybe this is a bad place to ask this question- but I have never fully understood what the term 'hate' means biblically. I have known it to mean 'to love less.' If we contrast the word with love and its definition- would it be possible to hate someone without in some tangible way expressing that hate? Can hatred be just a feeling and still be hatred?

I think you are probably aware of the verses...

“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)
) Where 'to love less' is regarded by God as 'hate'. I feel there is deep significance here but have not been able to fully grasp it.

The classic NT word for love is 'agape' which is an example of what my old Bible School principal, who was a classical scholar, used to call the 'Onassis Syndrome; Onassis after the ship owner. He reckoned that the 'lesser used' Greek word for love was taken over, emptied of its old cargo, and charged with a new one; hence Onassis. The NT Greek word can consequently only be defined by its NT use. The word used 'outside' the church will not steer us in the right direction. Even its use in the Septuagint is no guide to its use in the NT.

The NT definition for 'agape' is to be found in Romans 5:8 where it is referred to as 'His own love' and contrasted with the most noble human 'love' of self-sacrifice for a 'good man'. God's 'own' love by contrast is revealed in the death of His

General Topics :: What is love???

Son for the sinner. If it is true that "Greater love (agape) hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." (John 15:13, KJV) what shall we say of the Father's 'agape' in which He laid down the life of His Son for His enemies?

Agape, in NT Greek, is the love which spends itself for those who do not, and never will, warrant it. It is love 'in spite of' not 'because of'.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/5/9 11:54

Thanks Bro. Ron,

Quote:
-----Agape, in NT Greek, is the love which spends itself for those who do not, and never will, warrant it. It is love 'in spite of' not 'because of'.

Could we say then that 'hate' is the absence of love?

The contrast you show is staggering. I had not seen it quite that way. Time for some serious reflection...

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/9 12:27

Quote:
-----Could we say then that 'hate' is the absence of love?

I don't think so, although that Genesis reference might suggest something similar. I think 'hate' is much more than an absence of 'love'. If the equation were that simple we could express 'thou shalt not have an absence of love for the LORD thy God'; which can't be right?

Re: - posted by taco, on: 2005/5/9 12:43

I think that hate is in many ways a part of love. You hate that which is contrary to the one you love. We hate sin because it is contrary to our Father; He hates it because it destroys us whom he loves.

Selfishness is probably the opposite of love, true love. It is love of self which is really no love at all given that love is giving. But of course such 'love' of self will ultimately lead to the hatred of all that seeks to take the place of self on the throne. God himself ends up being hated.

This is why friendship with the world is enmity with God.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/5/9 13:26

Quote:
-----If the equation were that simple we could express 'thou shalt not have an absence of love for the LORD thy God'; which can't be right?

Maybe more correctly we would say, "Thou shalt not take the love that belongs to God and give it to another." If we take this angle it would seem that words such as 'affections' and 'delight' come into play. I have heard the definition of 'whoredom' to be, "To take the love that belongs to the one and give it to another." Could it be that 'hate' is the refusal to rightly allocate our love to someone that God has said deserves it?

God Bless,

General Topics :: What is love???

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/5/9 13:57

Hi Taco,

Quote:

-----Selfishness is probably the opposite of love, true love. It is love of self which is really no love at all given that love is giving.

I am thinking about another way that love seems to be defined:

"Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." (Romans 13:10)

This seems to indicate a conscious carefulness not to bring evil or destruction upon a person. So could it be that love has both positive and negative characters. Love 'does' certain things and 'does not do' certain things towards a neighbor, etc.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/9 14:52

Quote:

-----I am thinking about another way that love seems to be defined:

"Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." (Romans 13:10)

This seems to indicate a conscious carefulness not to bring evil or destruction upon a person. So could it be that love has both positive and negative characters. Love 'does' certain things and 'does not do' certain things towards a neighbor, etc.

I think this is an attribute of love rather than a definition. It is not really comprehensive enough to be a 'definition'.

Here is an interesting verse: "For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." (Gal. 5:14, KJVS) The pedants among us might be tempted to say 'how is that "one word"?' In fact the English phrase 'thou shalt love' is "one word" in Greek; *agape* meaning 'thou shalt love...' This single Greek word gathers together the whole law; "Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." (Matt. 22:37-40, KJVS) These two commandments are simply an exposition of the single Greek word "thou shalt love".

It is easy to see why the Wesleyans' preferred expression for "Full Salvation" was "Perfect Love".

Bro. Ron B - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/5/9 16:03

That's what I meant exactly. Now could you fine tune the use of each? I know it's important to understand the differences but don't have a good handle on those differences, or a good working knowledge of greek. (I think that's what it was written in?). Thank you---Bro. Daryl

Re: from a PM....., on: 2005/5/9 21:21

...my response:

Please console yourself with John 14:21. Jesus promises that if we keep His commandments, that is love our neighbor as ourselves (charity = love in action that expects nothing in return), we will be loved by the Father, and Jesus Himself will manifest Himself to us. Glory to God. Don't keep love bottled up. Give it away. Warning, it takes an investment of time and some labor to love. Love God with all your heart in all we do and say. Love our neighbor as ourselves. Praise God, we will be loved by the Father...Alleluia, and Jesus will manifest Himself to us. Somebody ought to shout.

Re: Bro. Ron B - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/10 2:38

Hi dohzman

do you mean the two 'English words' love and charity? The word 'love' as properly understood by the context of the NT does not need an extra contribution from the word 'charity'. To say that charity is 'love given without thought of payback' is really to dilute the word love as a translation of 'agape'; as love, God's love, is just that 'love without thought of payback'.

Everything that Lahry want to put into the word 'charity' is already in the word 'love' and to suggest that 'charity' adds something is really only possible by diluting the concept of love.

Imagine an equation. If Lahry is right then the equation is

love + charity = true love

but if this is right and you remember your algebra then

love = true love - charity

but the Bible word 'love' does not mean love without expression, and to imply that it does seriously weakens the word 'love' to the extent of redefining it; which is why I have stuck so tenaciously to this point.

I am being pedantic but not out of stubbornness but out of a passionate belief that love must not be seen to be less than the far weaker concept of charity.

Re:, on: 2005/5/10 8:05

Hi Ron,

I'm having a hard time discerning why you would address Doz with comments about what I wrote.

I think I'm finally understanding our failure to communicate. I'm not disagreeing with you.

When I was young, charity was a common word. Especially with my religious upbringing. When the modern translators substituted charity for love, they did not change the scripture, they changed what was being communicated. I think the position I hold is that charity better communicates the intent of scripture, unconditional, deep, personal enderement better than the word love. When I hear love, I think of a condition of the heart, a feeling. But when I hear the word charity, I think of love in action without thought of payback.

What God gave to us as agape was clearly beyond our ability to payback. We were hopelessly lost. The expression of His love was Yeshua, the Messiah, and what He did for us on Calvary. For God so loved..... Would it be so incorrect to say that "God so lavished the world with charity"? That does not bother my spirit. If it does yours, I think it may be because of our being from different spots on the planet and different walks. But to me, just as faith without expression is dead, so is love without expression. Charity is expression of love to me. I'm not tryin to alter anyone's theology. I just think that many church people today have lost this understanding and have a false sense of obedience to God. That is the bottom line. I'm concerned for anyone who may not clearly understand what being a christian is all about.

Once again, God bless you for your wonderful gift and your gracious sharing here. I know I can speak for all, you are a blessing and a treasure in an earthen vessel.

In His mercy and grace,

Lahry

General Topics :: What is love???

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/5/10 8:59

Hi Bro. Ron,

Quote:

-----I think this is an attribute of love rather than a definition. It is not really comprehensive enough to be a 'definition'.

Here is an interesting verse:

"For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." (Gal. 5:14, KJVS)

When I read your post yesterday I immediately thought- "silly me!" Sometimes I wonder if my brain is fully engaged. Of course, after a little reflection it comes back into focus.

Galatians 5:14; **the whole law is fulfilled in one word...** takes me right to the commandments. We know that there were 10 at first, but the Jews claim there were laws before that known as the 'noachide' or 'noachain' laws. This would have been 7 laws basically that they called 'categories.' Then after the New Testament period they sat down and wrote out 365 'negative' and 248 'positive' commandments beginning in Genesis from the 'Torah.' I don't give a ton of weight to this but it is interesting that there are many do's and don'ts that describe all the various characteristics of love. Yet, how can one *define* love?

I have to think about how "Christ loved the Church" in contrast to how Paul says we should love our wives. Two things he said was to "nourish" and "cherish." When I think of 'nourish' I think of 'provision' or giving; or of... "providing for his own..." lest he be worse than an infidel. When I think of 'cherish' I am thinking of undivided affection. Giving all the affection that rightly belongs to her. Now the word *epithumia* comes to mind as when our Lord said he desired with desire to eat the Passover with the Disciples. Where did this great desire come from? Was it a manifestation of the deep feeling of affection He had for His sheep? What gave rise to this 'longing' (as it were) to spend that time with them?

This was not 'mechanical' love. This was not a love that is taught. The law was not made for a righteous man and surely it was not made for those who really love 'someone'. It was made for those who did not love 'everyone'. Surely everyone loves someone. But there was never someone that loved everyone. The law exposed to us those whom we 'loved less'. By our behavior we know who we do not 'love.' Yet, can we mechanically go through and obey the commandments and is it really be love? Can love be fabricated by keeping the law? Maybe it could- but it would seem to lack the deep affection that when present needs no law.

Could this be so?

God Bless,

-Robert

Bro. Ron B. - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/5/10 9:15

I know that the word *agape* in its different tenses means something different, almost like looking at different facets of a diamond. I just don't have a working knowledge of the ancient languages (greek/hebrew/latin/syric--sp?) to be able to refine and mine out the fuller picture of God's love. I was wondering if you could give me some examples of how love (*agape*) is used with its different tenses and how that can translate into life. Thank you. Bro. Daryl

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/5/10 9:30

I'm concerned for anyone who may not clearly understand what being a christian is all about.

.....>>>> that's a Lahry quote... Bro. I think you're right here. Most people in the church have a mixture of improper teaching on the subject as well as the influence of hollywood and advertising medias. I don't think the church really understands what love is. Maybe if we had to choose physical death in order to spare our fellow christians lives in a persecution type environment we'd be better equipped for *agape* toward one another?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/10 11:22

Quote:
-----When I was young, charity was a common word. Especially with my religious upbringing. When the modern translators substituted charity for love, they did not change the scripture, they changed what was being communicated. I think the position I hold is that charity better communicates the intent of scripture, unconditional, deep, personal enderement better than the word love. When I hear love, I think of a condition of the heart, a feeling. But when I hear the word charity, I think of love in action without thought of payback.

OK this is my last attempt... for a while anyway. I want to re-educate you ;-) so that every time you read the word 'love' in the NT you think 'Calvary'. I can't do so if you insist of your own personal definitions of both love and charity. Love is not a sentiment in the NT, nor an emotion (although it will certainly affect the latter) It is not a general mood of benevolence towards folk. It is not the impersonal, unknowing generosity of charity; it is love focused. A verse which I often delight in is "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us," (Eph. 2:4, KJVS) 'love with which He loved us'. This is what God's love is like; it is never academic love, or love in theory, but always 'love which loves'. The verse is also interesting because the word translated 'mercy' here is one which is much closer to the English word 'charity'. It is the Greek word 'eleos'. Perhaps you know the English word 'eleemosynary' which the dictionary may define as 'charitable'? It comes from this word 'eleos'. In other words 'charitable acts' are 'acts of mercy'. Now God is certainly a God of mercy, but He is also the God of grace, and grace is a bigger word than mercy.

The word mercy has the feel of someone stooping down in condescension and compassion. The word grace has enabling power in it. We need both; "Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." (Heb. 4:16, KJVS) Mercy for our lacks, grace to equip us for the future. Charity is a stooping down in compassion and condescension, but love will lift the begger to a throne.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/5/10 11:39

Quote:
-----Can love be fabricated by keeping the law? Maybe it could- but it would seem to lack the deep affection that when present needs no law.

There is a Shakespeare sonnet which speaks of 'love'. I suppose he had 'eros' in mind mostly but it has a ring about it which constantly challenges me. Let me not to the marriage of true minds
Admit impediments. Love is not love
Which alters when it alteration finds,
Or bends with the remover to remove:
O no! it is an ever-fixed mark
That looks on tempests and is never shaken;
It is the star to every wandering bark,
Whose worth's unknown, although his height be taken.
Love's not Time's fool, though rosy lips and cheeks
Within his bending sickle's compass come:
Love alters not with his brief hours and weeks,
But bears it out even to the edge of doom.
If this be error and upon me proved,
I never writ, nor no man ever loved. A duty-love may have the appearance of the real thing but when the tempests come it will be seen for what it is; a mere duty-love.

"Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened: burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart." (Psa. 40:6-8, KJVS) The Love of God poured out in our hearts will turn every duty into a delight.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/5/10 12:01

Quote:

-----The Love of God poured out in our hearts will turn every duty into a delight.

Thanks Bro. Ron,

So are we safe to say that man in of himself/herself is not capable of loving as God has commanded that we love apart from the love of God being shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost? If this be true then it only reinforces the Gospel and spells the doom of all who in the arm of the flesh attempt to love by keeping the law. Man could neither love his fellow man or God as He should unless the love of God fill His heart.

I think of the passage:

...who, subsisting in the form of God, did not esteem it an object of rapine to be on an equality with God but emptied himself, taking a bondman's form, taking his place in the likeness of men;... (Darby)

Where do we learn more of the selfless abandonment nature of God than from here to the Cross? Love must be simply to esteem others better than ourselves as a permanent state of mind or being. It makes the needs of others to be as important to us as our own needs- unconditionally. Even as we love our own 'flesh' unconditionally. it makes me think of a definition for agape I heard once- and it was that of a 'decision.' If it is a decision to love all unconditionally it would have to be a once and for all decision. What other means than by the Holy Spirit could one ever carry out such a decision?

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/5/10 13:41

By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, by the love you have one to another. When I see charity I see the world as having the ability to fulfill this. Just look at all the acts of charity that poured out after 9/11. These deeds I'm sure were done with some emotion, but not as a result of regeneration, We love God because He first loved us. But out a response toward social action. I keep thinking of the sermon 10 shekels and a shirt and his example as to try he went to the mission field and how God dealt with him and changed the true motivation for his ministry. And while I know that to a certain extent love is a choice we make, I also know that the feelings should come eventually. Is that accurate to say?

Re: Ron, Daryl, Robert..., on: 2005/5/10 20:57

Very good posts. Thank you so very much. Christian hugs all around.

Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2005/5/14 19:47

1Jo 4:16 - Show Context

And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him.

Re: what is love - posted by free, on: 2005/7/13 8:14

Im a new comer and have been struggling about this very subject. Perhaps the way to define what a thing is to define what it isnt. Its appropriate then when someone asked "What is Hate". There is a wonderful book by Rebecca Peppard (?) called "Out of the Salt Shaker" where she defined what she thinks is Hate and I will try and paraphrase:

The opposite of Love is Hate. And the ultimate expression of hate is INDIFFERENCE.

So, sometimes love can come in the form of anger and even rage. We are angry with someone, we are still loving them (to a certain extent), especially if we see them destroying themselves. Its when we dont care (indifferent), we show most our hatred.

General Topics :: What is love???

Now, we all know that love is an action, not ONLY an emotion (altogether its nice to have that too). So my question is : is Duty then love. I struggled with that a lot.

Over to you all.

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2005/7/13 8:43

Good post! It sure does check my heart. I find that I'm often too busy to be anything but indifferent. Time to slow down and look around. Bro. Daryl