



Worship
A Living
Sacrifice

by
Jess Hall, Jr.

Worship **A Living Sacrifice**

by
Jess Hall, Jr.

Published by Hall Publications
1999

Introduction

The collection of material in this book demonstrates overwhelmingly that the Bible teaches the child of God is to present his body a living sacrifice, which is spiritual (reasonable) service (worship). This is also the consensus of world-class scholarship and the united opinion of Greek/English lexicographers.

To have the full benefit of the information presented in this book, its arrangement must be understood. The *Preface* gives the background that provoked the effort necessary to prepare this material. Following the *Preface* is an outline of the teaching of Romans 12:1, which is critical to a correct understanding of the subject discussed. The article, *Is All of Life Worship*, by Jim Dearman gives his incorrect understanding of worship as he presented it in a sermon, and later submitted it in written form to *Contending for the Faith*, where it was printed. This is followed by a chapter entitled, *Comments to Jim Dearman's Response to Jess Hall's Comments on His Sermon on Worship*. As indicated this is not a refutation of the Dearman article, but a response to comments made about his sermon, yet it does answer the Dearman article and corrects some of his mistakes. Next is an article dealing with Gary Workman's misunderstanding and misrepresentation of worship and service, titled, "*A Workman That Needs to be Ashamed*," an important and necessary analysis. This is followed, in Appendix A, with some correspondence between

Jess Hall and Jim Dearman. Appendix B gives two articles by Guy N. Woods that were discussed in the Hall/Dearman exchange. Appendix C gives some information about the different types of worship, which helps to show that confining worship to one or more of five specific acts is too narrow and contradicts Bible teaching. Appendix D shows that respected leaders and teachers in the churches of Christ understand that the sacrifice of one's body to God as a holy service is worship.

This is sent out with the prayer that it will help prevent un-scholarly, insubstantial, and unbiblical teaching on worship, and provoke a deeper and better understanding of the teaching of God's Word and make us better people – more dedicated to holiness and consecrated to service, which is worship.

Teach me, my God and King,
In all things thee to see;
And what I do in anything
To do it as to thee.
A servant with this clause
Makes drudgery divine;
Who sweeps a room, as for thy laws,
Makes that and the action fine.

Preface

Controversy has been with the church almost from the beginning. From the Gnostics and the circumcision party in the first century up to the issues of mechanical instruments, premillennialism, and the necessity of baptism in the last two centuries, the church has always had to deal with important doctrinal disputes. Although these and other disputes continue to confront the church as important controversies that must be refuted, such a time of controversy is *not* upon us now with regard to the issue dealt with in this book. Instead, the church is faced with another problem that has also been with it almost from the beginning: small men who want to become big men by creating controversy and division in the body of Christ. Such men have created a controversy where none should exist, and it is that sad situation (rather than some momentous doctrinal dispute) that has required this book to be published.

So, you ask, what is the teaching that has caused all of this furor? It is simply the idea that there is a sense in which a Christian worships God by leading a life that is totally devoted to obeying and pleasing God. And what is the basis for that idea? Romans 12:1 commands us to present our bodies as a living sacrifice to God, and Hebrews 13:15-16 commands us to continually offer sacrifices of praise and good works to God. If you accept the seemingly incontrovertible proposition that sacrifice to God is worship to God, then the argument is over — there must be some sense in which we are commanded to worship God

all the time and in everything that we do since we are commanded to sacrifice all the time and in everything we do. If you agree that sacrifice is worship, then you can put this book down — this controversy is not for you

But wait, you say, there must be some that disagree with that simple thesis. Yes, and their response has been a reasoned chorus of “Heretics! Bring the thumbscrews! We can’t fellowship with anyone who thinks that all of life is worship.” But how can they disagree with Romans 12:1 and Hebrews 13:15-16, you ask? Simple. To confine our worship of God to the well-known list of five acts (a list, by the way, that NO ONE on either side of this dispute wants to modify in any way), they logically must conclude that sacrifice is *not* worship. Why? Because if sacrifice is worship, then they will find that the Romans and Hebrews passages mentioned above are insurmountable. At this point, if you are like me, you are probably wondering how anyone could possibly believe that sacrifice to God is not worship to God. Well, let me briefly summarize their argument and then tell you why they are wrong — although you can no doubt spot the flaws in their arguments without my help.

One oft-quoted proponent of the idea that sacrifice is not worship has pointed to 2 Kings 17:35 to support his view. There God tells the people not to bow down to other gods, not to serve other gods, and not to sacrifice to other gods. Since “to bow down” means “to worship” and since bowing down is listed separately from sacrifice, it must follow (they assert) that sacrifice is not worship. But what about Psalm 66:4 where worshipping is listed separately from singing? Are we to conclude that singing is not worship? And what about Psalm 95:6 where worshipping is listed separately from bowing down? Are we to conclude that bowing down is not worship? And what about Genesis

22:5 where Abraham says that he is going up to worship on the mountain? What did Abraham do on that mountain? He sacrificed. Sacrifice and worship are inseparable. Indeed, I would assert that without sacrifice there can be no worship. And once we agree that sacrifice is worship, then Romans 12:1 and Hebrews 13:15-16 (and 2 Corinthians 2:14-16, Philippians 4:18, etc.) put an end to the controversy about whether there is some sense in which we are commanded to worship God all of the time and in everything we do.

At this point you may be wondering how such a simple and obviously true proposition has created so much controversy. As with most such controversies, the furor has had more to do with personality conflicts and petty jealousies than with the word of God. (The history I am about to recount is not intended to be a complete history of this controversy. Instead, it is based entirely on my personal knowledge of events and my opinions about those events. I have not included in this account any events in which I was not personally involved.) The starting point for the current controversy was a sermon that my father, Jess Hall Jr., preached at the Fleetwood congregation in Houston, Texas, in which he quoted Romans 12:1 and said that, in the sense that a Christian is to present his entire life as a living sacrifice, all of life is worship. This was not a new idea, and it was not a "liberal" idea. Guy N. Woods, for example, taught exactly the same thing — despite the attempt by some to mischaracterize brother Woods' view and to deceive their readers and listeners into believing that he taught just the opposite. (I guess they never thought anyone would take the time to check the quotations and determine what brother Woods really believed. As you read through the documents in this book, other examples of academic dishonesty will be pointed out. Perhaps it comes from my seven

years as a university professor, but I have been very distressed by the seeming dishonesty and lack of integrity shown by those who would refute the idea that, in some sense, all of life is worship. Weak arguments seem to have given way to dishonest arguments intended to deceive those who fail to check the speaker's sources.)

After the sermon, a few in the congregation began to complain that error had been taught from the pulpit. They did not complain directly to my father or approach him to ask for clarification. Although he had taught their Bible classes and led their singing for six years, he was not given the benefit of any doubt. The Fleetwood elders said (in my presence) that they had listened to the sermon and had heard no error. A meeting was held with the disgruntled members in which they were specifically given an opportunity to voice their complaints directly to my father. They refused to defend their position, lending credence to my view that their position is in fact indefensible. (Although they have since compared their silence to that of Christ before Pilate, I would only point out that they had no trouble speaking when they were doing so behind my father's back to stir up trouble. Their desire to stand mute seems to have come upon them suddenly and at a very odd time since the meeting had been called at their request for them to express their views.) Their next step after their dismal defense at the meeting was of course to write us all up in a "brotherhood" newsletter. Copies of the newsletter were mailed to all of the members at Fleetwood, but it had little impact since its defects were laughably obvious. At this point, the controversy seemed to have subsided. Most of the complainers had departed, and the elders had publicly stated that they had heard no error in the sermon.

The next eruption occurred when Buster Dobbs preached a

similar sermon at Fleetwood in which he too affirmed that, in some sense, all of life is worship. This would hardly have seemed a controversial statement at Fleetwood at this point since the elders had publicly agreed with the statement and most of those who disagreed had departed for congregations unknown. Yet here is where the story takes a weird and inexplicable turn. The Fleetwood elders changed their minds and decided that what they had previously declared to be error free was in fact error filled. A statement to that effect was read from the pulpit and their newly hired preacher dutifully preached a sermon to refute the vile heresy that up until a few weeks before the elders had publicly affirmed. Further, the elders mailed a statement to the Fleetwood members in which they extolled their own courage and their intention to stamp out error wherever it occurred. Despite their self-proclaimed courage, not one elder approached my father to tell him about the impending pronouncement. (But, of course, ambushes are rarely quite as effective when they are preceded by warnings.) Further, the elders (to my knowledge) have never explained why they changed their minds on the issue of worship. After the statement was made, however, two of the three elders indicated that they still agreed with their former view on the issue, which their statement (looking more like a papal edict everyday) now labeled as error! My father asked to meet with the elders on this issue, but one of the elders told him that the other two elders had said that although they would meet with him, they would rather not. It was at this point that our association with the Fleetwood congregation came to an end. The book that you now hold contains, among other things, the correspondence that resulted from these events.

Eric B. Hall, Ph.D., J.D.

June 15, 1999

A Review of Issues Related to Romans 12:1

- I. Is “present” (Rom. 12:1) a verb in the Greek aorist tense indicating that the presentment is done in the past and once and for all accomplished? (Extreme care should be taken in making points based on the Greek. Hearers can read the English for themselves. They generally must take the preacher’s word for the Greek.)
 - A. The assertion that “presenting” was a “past act accomplished once and for all” contradicts the assertion that the context of Romans 12:1 is sanctification.
 1. Sanctification (holiness) is a continuing and growing process, not something that is accomplished in the past in a once and for all time completed act.
 2. Further, it contradicts the assertion that the problem that Paul was dealing with was those who had been converted but who *had not yet* reached the point of fully presenting their bodies as a living sacrifice, and that Paul was urging them to do so. Something cannot be both “not yet done” and “done in the past” (aorist) at the same time.
 - B. The immediate context of Romans 12:1 is worship, not sanctification.
 1. The immediate context is one of worship. The pre-

sending of the body (life) as a living sacrifice is cultic (sacrificial) in nature. Does anyone seriously contend that offering sacrifices is not worship?

2. The attempt to tie Romans 12:1 to Romans 6, and thus to sanctification, misses the boat. While presenting our members as servants of righteousness and presenting our bodies a living sacrifice both continue after conversion, one cannot conclude that the offering of a sacrifice (Rom. 12) cannot be worship because the presenting of our members as servants of righteousness (Rom. 6) does not mention sacrifice.
 - a. Romans 12:1 still mentions sacrifice.
 - b. Romans 6 tells us “to present,” but it does not tell us how. Romans 12 tells us how — in sacrifice or worship.
 - c. The fact that we present our members as servants does not mean that the presentment is “service” and not “worship.” Even if you use the phrase “All worship is service but not all service is worship” (which makes no sense unless you define what you mean by those terms), the presenting of our bodies can still be worship since “all worship is service.” The truth is that the language of Romans 6, of itself, neither precludes nor requires the presenting of our members to be done as worship. If the two passages are to be tied together, it is clear that Romans 12 is the only passage of the two that tells how the presenting of our bodies (or members thereof, both standing for our lives) is to be done — as a sacrifice, which is a worship word.

- C. The assertion that “present” is a Greek verb in the aorist tense incorrectly states the Greek.
1. While the definition of the aorist tense is correct, it is irrelevant because, in the Greek, “present” is not a verb. It is an infinitive. Verbs have tense and are time indicators; infinitives have tense but are not time indicators. While not all Greek grammars discuss the temporal aspect of the infinitive, those that I have that do stated that it was not a time indicator.
 - a. “The infinitive is a verbal noun. In many cases the use of the Greek infinitive is so much like that of the infinitive in English as to call for no comment. ... There is ordinarily no distinction of time between the tenses of the infinitive, but the distinction is the same as that which prevails in the subjunctive. The present infinitive refers to the action in its continuance or as repeated; *the aorist infinitive refers to it in no such special way*. It is usually impossible to bring out the distinction in an English translation” (*New Testament Greek for Beginners*, Machen, J. Gresham, p. 137).
 - b. “The *Aorist Infinitive* (ainf) refers to simple action, as opposed to the linear action represented by the present infinitive. ... It does not signify the time of action” (*Hebrew Greek Key Study Bible*, p. 1701).
 2. Though it is unclear in the King James where the translation makes “present” a verb, the American Standard correctly translates the Greek “to present.” It is an infinitive. Thus, it is not a time indicator. The time must be derived from the context.

3. Does the context indicate that the presenting of our bodies as a living sacrifice is a past act fully accomplished? Not even the King James translators thought so. They knew the sense (and common sense) of the passage requires present tense — *which* (referring to the presenting of our bodies as a living sacrifice) *is your reasonable service*.
- II. Does the scripture distinguish between “worship” and “service” because there are passages in scripture that use both “worship” and “service” in the same context, and the use of two separate and distinct words in the same context demands the conclusion that “worship” and “service” are two separate and distinct things and cannot, therefore, be the same thing.
- A. The underlying logic of this argument is that anytime (every time) two different words are used they always refer to two separate and distinct things, proving that they do not and cannot refer to the same thing.
1. This ignores the use of repetition for the sake of emphasis.
 2. This ignores the use of related terms to describe different aspects of the same thing.
 3. Worse, it ignores that this alleged principle of hermeneutics and exegesis (which I have never found in any book on either of those subjects) is demonstrated to be false when applied to other passages of scripture.
 - a. And this man went up out of his city yearly *to worship and to sacrifice* unto the LORD of hosts in Shiloh. And the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, the priests of the LORD, were there.

(If the logic of the assertion is true, worship and sacrifice, being different words, do not and cannot refer to the same thing.)

- b. Other passages demonstrate the same error.
- (1) 2 Kings 5:18 — *worship ... bow myself ... bow down myself.* ... (Worship and bowing down cannot refer to the same thing.)
 - (2) 2 Kings 17:36 — *him shall ye worship and to him shall ye do sacrifice.* ... (Worship and sacrifice cannot refer to the same thing.)
 - (3) 1 Chronicles 16:29 — *Give unto the LORD the glory due unto his name: bring an offering, and come before him: worship the LORD in the beauty of holiness.* (Giving the Lord glory, bringing an offering, coming before Him, and worshiping Him in the beauty of holiness must all refer to different things.)
 - (4) 2 Chronicles 32:12 — *worship ... and burn incense.* ... (Worship cannot include burning incense.)
 - (5) Psalm 66:4 — *worship thee ... sing unto thee ... sing to thy name.* (Worship and singing are separate and distinct words that do not and cannot refer to the same thing.)
 - (6) Psalm 86:9 — *come and worship before thee ... shall glorify thy name.* (Worship and glorifying God's name cannot be the same thing.)
 - (7) Psalm 95:6 — *let us worship and bow down.* ... (Bowing down cannot be worship.)
 - (8) Psalm 138:2 — *I will worship ... and ...*

praise thy name. (Praising God's name is not worship.)

(9) Matthew 4:9 — *fall down and worship me.* (Even though what Jim described as the “primary” Greek word for worship — *proskuneo* — means to “bow down before, kiss the hand toward, “fall[ing] down before” cannot be worship because in this passage they are two separate and distinct words.)

(10) 1 Corinthians 14:25 — *falling down on his face he will worship.* (The comment on Matthew 4:9 is also applicable here.)

B. It is still a correct principle of logic that “that which proves too much proves nothing.”

1. When the principle that the use of two separate words demands that they refer to two separate and distinct things is applied to other passages of scripture it clearly proves too much, and thus proves nothing.

2. Even in the passages relied on to demonstrate the alleged distinction between “worship” and service,” one thing is clear — each of them places the service mentioned in the context of worship. It is enough to make even the casual reader wonder if there is some connection.

III. Any reasoned conclusion relating to life as worship must recognize and deal with Paul's teaching that the Christian's life is to be a sacrifice — “present your bodies a living sacrifice.”

A. It is the sacrifice that is the “reasonable service” or “spiritual worship,” whichever translation is correct.

1. Why would one go to the Old Testament, or any other passage for that matter, to determine what the definition of “service” is when Paul defines it in the passage as “presenting our bodies as a living sacrifice”?
 2. The only plausible reason is that the point could not be made by using Paul’s language in Romans 12:1.
- B. How should the Greek be translated — “service” or “worship” (if we are to use a definition either in addition to or instead of Paul’s definition in the verse itself)?
1. It is easy to denigrate a translation:
 - a. By reminding people that it is found in the dreaded NIV.
 - (1) This is only an emotional argument, lacking in rationality. A translation is neither right nor wrong because it is in the NIV anymore than it is right or wrong because it is in the KJV.
 - (2) Would such tactics be necessary if Greek scholars agreed that the word translated “service” does not mean “worship” in Romans 12:1?
 - b. By relegating it to a “footnote” status not having the standing of the body of the text.
 - (1) If the argument is to have validity, the principle upon which it is based must be that textual translation is always right; footnotes are always wrong. (If the principle is rejected, the argument must be as well. A valid conclusion cannot be premised on an invalid principle.)

- (2) If the principle is valid, then “Easter” is the correct translation in Acts 12:4 and the footnote in some King James Versions that translates the term as “Passover” must be rejected because it is not in the main body of the text.
- c. While it was admitted that lexicographers do say that worship is one translation of the word translated “service” in Romans 12:1, brief reference was made to only one. Doesn’t it seem logical to go to the lexicographers to determine what type of “service” is referred to in Romans 12:1? What do they say?
 - (1) Arndt & Gingrich — In religious usage, worship or service.
 - (2) Thayer — The service or worship of God according to the requirements of Levitical law. In the N.T. to render religious service or homage, to worship.
 - (3) Moulton & Milligan — In biblical Greek, always refers to the service or worship of the true God or heathen deities.
 - (4) Vincent — worship through special rites or sacrifices.
 - (5) Kittel — Means more precisely to serve or worship cultically, especially by sacrifice. With one exception, the meaning is always cultic. It denotes very generally cultic worship. The LXX influence may be seen in the fact that the word never refers to human relations, let alone to secular services. Means to worship cultically.

- (6) *Baker's Dictionary of Theology* — another word rendered service. This was the old Attic Greek to indicate service to the gods; worship. This aspect is basic in the N.T.
- (a) Some may say that the Greek word translated “service” doesn’t speak of worship. The Greek scholars say otherwise.
 - (b) The scriptures demonstrate the “worship relationship” of the word translated “service” in Romans 12:1.
 - (c) Paul uses a form of the word in Hebrews when speaking of the work of the Levitical priests in the tabernacle. See, for example, Hebrews 9:4.
 - (d) When Paul speaks of the Christian’s high priestly activity, he uses the word *latreuo* (Heb. 9:9).
- d. If there is not a “worship relationship” to the word translated “service” in Romans 12:1, the translators of the KJV did not seem to know it. See Acts 7:42; 24:14, where it is translated “worship” in the KJV.
- C. The truth is that it is difficult to impossible for those who teach that the presenting of the Christian’s life is not worship to deal with the concept of sacrifice (worship) in Romans 12:1 because Paul elsewhere speaks of daily activity as sacrifice (worship).
- 1. Hebrews 13:15-16 — “By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name. But

- to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.”
2. Verse 15 must include such public assembly activities as singing (the verse is used to demonstrate that God wants the fruit of our lips and not mechanical instruments), praying, and preaching.
 - a. In any event, the activity — offering the fruit of our lips — is referred to as a “sacrifice of praise.”
 - b. Can a reference to worship be any plainer?
 3. Verse 16 places doing good and communicating (benevolence) in the same category — “with such sacrifices God is well pleased.”
 - a. Which sacrifices are worship and which are not?
 - b. Paul clearly considered such acts to be worship — an odor of a sweet smell acceptable to God. Philippians 4:18 — “But I have all, and abound: I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God.”
 4. Since *proskuneo* is the formal Greek word for worship, Paul would have used it in Romans 12:1 if he had meant worship.
 - a. Although I have not done an exhaustive review, I doubt that any lexicographer defines *proskuneo* as the “primary” Greek word for worship. I did quickly check Thayer, and he did not. But the truth is the argument is irrelevant. The issue here is not the meaning of *proskuneo*, but the meaning of “service” in Romans 12:1. Additionally, even if the primacy of *proskuneo* be admitted, the ar-

- gument backfires because “primary” admits (if not demands) the existence of “secondary,” and thus other word(s) that translate as “worship.”
- b. Why should Paul have used *proskuneo* if the Greek scholars cited above are correct, and he had in mind a particular type of worship associated with *latreia* — sacrifice?
 - c. That aside, surely those who make the argument are prepared to demonstrate in the N.T. where *proskuneo* is used in relationship to each of the “acts of worship.” Otherwise, how shall we be certain that praying, singing, study of the word, the Lord’s Supper, and giving are each authorized acts of “worship”?
 - (1) The truth is that they cannot do it because *proskuneo* is never used in scripture in relation to an act of worship in the public assembly.
 - (2) Even though *proskuneo* comes from a word that means to fall down, or kiss the hand toward in reverence, I have yet to see that done in any worship assembly.
5. What weight should be given to the argument that “golf is not worship”?
- a. This argument is designed to ridicule the position that “service” means “worship” in Romans 12:1. Ridiculing a position neither makes it right or wrong, though it may demonstrate something about the position of the “ridiculer.” If the arguments are strong otherwise it is unnecessary to ridicule (even unintentionally).

- b. The real problem with the golf argument (and other earthier illustrations some have used, such as changing a baby's diaper) is that, as the saying goes, "the gun kicks as hard as it shoots."
 - (1) All admit that everything is to be done as a servant (i.e., in the service) of God (Col. 3:17; 1 Cor. 10:31).
 - (2) Are we to conclude that, while one cannot play golf in worship to God, he can play golf in service to God?
 - (3) While I contend that this is the wrong basis upon which to make an argument (impossible to make a reasoned argument), if the battle is to be joined on these texts, there is a greater argument for worship than for service.
 - (a) 1 Corinthians 10:31 — do all to the glory of God (sounds like worship).
 - (b) Colossians 3:17 — giving thanks to God and the Father by Him (sounds like worship).
 - (c) Certainly neither of these phrases is inconsistent with worship.
- c. The mistake is concentrating on each separate act of the Christian's life instead of concentrating on the Christian's entire life.
 - (1) The act of worship is not the offering of each act, but the offering of the entire life to God as a living sacrifice.
 - (2) The Christian lives his or her entire life to the glory of God, having laid it (and con-

tinuing to lay it) on His altar in the ultimate act of worship — the giving of self.

(3) This may be something that some folks feel can be done on Sunday morning between the hours of 10 and 11, but I suggest that with them God is not well pleased.

(4) If it is true that the greater includes the lesser, and it is, then the offering of our lives includes the offering of every act of our lives. No other reasonable conclusion can be reached.

6. But are there not only five authorized acts of worship?

a. That depends on the worship of which you speak — that of the public assembly or of Romans 12:1?

b. If you speak of the public assembly, then scripture supports that proposition. If you speak of the worship of Romans 12:1, then scripture does not support that proposition.

c. The fact that presenting our lives as living sacrifices is an act of worship does not speak at all to what shall be done by the body assembled on the Lord's Day.

(1) Presenting our lives as a living sacrifice is something that is done at all times, in or out of the public assembly.

(2) However, the scripture has limited what is acceptable in the public assembly.

D. The key word is acceptable — acceptable worship is offering to God what he has commanded in the way he has commanded at the time he has commanded.

1. He has commanded us at all times to present our bodies as a living sacrifice.
 2. He has commanded us to sing (without mechanical instruments), pray, study, partake of the Supper, and give in the public assembly.
- E. We have no problem in other areas with the concept that what is permitted on one occasion or under one circumstance may be forbidden on other occasions or under other circumstances.
1. Women are forbidden to teach in the public assembly; they are permitted to teach in private (1 Tim. 2:12ff; 1 Cor. 14:34).
 - a. No one has argued that both are not teaching.
 - b. Yet, God has permitted it at one time and not at another.
 2. In the days of miracles, God permitted (in fact enabled) men to speak in tongues in the public assembly, yet he forbade it when no interpreter was present (1 Cor. 14:28).
 - a. No one has ever argued that both were not speaking in tongues.
 - b. Yet, God permitted it under one circumstance and not under another.
 - c. God prohibited the eating of pork under the Jewish dietary laws but permits it now.
 - d. God prohibits cake and lemonade on the Lord's table, but it is perfectly appropriate at a birthday party.
 - e. God prohibits mechanical instruments in singing unto him, preferring the sacrifice of the fruit of our lips, but permits it in singing secular songs.

- F. One who respects the word of God would never consider offering to God that which he has not authorized at a time or in a manner that he has not authorized. Strange fire that he has not commanded is still forbidden (Lev. 10:1-2).



Worship: A Living Sacrifice _____

Is All of Life Worship?

By Jim Dearman

My purpose is to show from the scriptures that all life is not worship to God. We will study the matter in the following manner: definition of worship in the scriptures; distinction between worship and service in the scriptures; and disputed passages of scripture on this subject. From these areas we hope to make a scriptural determination that all life is not worship according to the scriptures.

Worship Defined

First of all a definition of worship — certainly mans' [sic] ideas of worship vary — we would expect that perhaps. The English word *worship* comes from the Anglo-Saxon word, the root of which indicates worthiness, or honor. Worship in the dictionary is defined in the following way: in its noun form, worship is defined as “reverence or devotion for a deity, religious homage or veneration, a church service or other rites showing this.” In the intransitive verb form of worship, the definition is: “to engage in worship, or perform an act of religious devotion specifically to offer prayers, to attend church services, etc.” Both of those definitions come from Webster’s New World Dictionary. They are mans’ [sic] definition. Of course, as we said, mans’ [sic] definition may vary. We might expect that, but we would

like to think that we could all think alike on the subject. Surely, if we go to the scriptures we can make specific determinations. The following statements are from two of our brethren, one of whom is deceased, Guy N. Woods; one who is still living, Gary Workman. Their statements indicate how brethren generally understood worship in scripture. Woods wrote:

It should be noted that worship consists of acts of reverence not merely reverence. Thus, emphasizing that it involves vastly more than a disposition of heart and mind. It is not enough simply to be worshipful in spirit; we must allow this disposition to find expression in acts of reverence — acts, of course, approved of God (*Questions and Answers*, Vol. 1, p. 336).

Workman, in a 1986 article in the *Firm Foundation* in which he refuted the idea that all life is worship, wrote the following concerning worship:

Worship has always been an overt act rather than a continued attitude or relationship. It is giving reverence or homage to God by either thoughts or words or deeds or a combination of all three. It requires specific actions. It has a starting place and a stopping place. It is not an ongoing state (*Firm Foundation*, Jan. 28, 1986).

As I said these two statements from these brethren also reflect the view of many brethren over the years in general. I believe these two statements also reflect the view that was just expressed in the statement from the Fleetwood elders regarding worship. I believe these statements are in agreement with Bible teaching on worship.

The Primary Greek Word for Worship

There are several Greek words translated “worship” in the New Testament. Of course, Greek is the language in which the New

Testament was originally written. There is a primary word for worship, the Greek word *proskuneo*. Literally it means to “kiss toward, or to kiss the hand toward.” Again, Woods, who was an outstanding student of the Hebrew and the Greek, said this about *proskuneo*, the primary Greek word for worship. Its first occurrence in the New Testament is in Matthew 2:2, and very often thereafter. In the *American Standard Version*, there is a footnote to Matthew 2:2 which contains an excellent definition of the word. The Greek word denotes (and this is quoting that footnote — J.D.) “an act of reverence, whether paid to a creature or the creator.” Woods then adds, “In as much as worship consists of acts, it follows that such acts are as much involved in worship and are as essential to it as the attitude which prompts them.” I believe these thoughts are supported scripturally. Especially in a passage that is very familiar to all of us, and that is John 4:24. You probably know it by heart. “God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth.” I believe that is a divinely given definition of what worship is. “God is spirit; those who worship him must worship him in spirit and truth.” The word *worship* in John 4:24 is this primary word in the New Testament for worship. That is the Greek word *proskuneo*. What the verse teaches obviously is that the worship here, (that is the acts of reverence that are paid to our creator) — *paid to our creator*, must be in spirit. That is with the proper attitude of mind. They must be in truth, which means with the appropriate or authorized actions. We have long taught, and rightfully so, in the Lord’s church that one cannot eliminate either of these elements from worship and still be worshipping God as God directs. I believe that to be the case. This is why we have long contended that one could be present in this worship assembly, for example, but could fail miserably in his effort to worship

God. How? By not having his mind on the worship. By not having the proper attitude of mind. Thus, failing to worship God in spirit. By the same token, one could be very sincere. His mind completely focused on what he is doing in religious assembly, but if in that assembly he is seeking to worship through an unauthorized action such as with a mechanical instrument of music, then his worship is not in truth. It fails from that standpoint. It is not worship according to truth. Scriptural worship must be directed toward God with proper attitude (spirit) and in authorized acts (truth). I believe that is what John 4:24 clearly teaches. So we see from this familiar text that worship does involve both attitude and authorized action. Thus, the definition scripturally of what worship involves.

Do the Scriptures Distinguish Between Worship and Service?

The second point of our study deals with the distinction between worship and service in the scriptures. Is there a distinction? Do the scriptures make a distinction between worship and service? They do. First of all the Old Testament makes a distinction between worship to God and service to God. In his excellent article in the *Firm Foundation* of Jan. 28, 1986, Workman lists 20 verses from the Old Testament, which make such a distinction. I will not read all 20 of them, but a few of them. Deuteronomy 4:19 reads:

And take heed lest you lift your eyes to heaven, and when you see the sun, the moon, and the stars, all the hosts of heaven, you feel driven to worship them, and serve them, which the Lord your God has given to all the peoples under the whole heaven as an heritage.

This is a prohibition against both worshipping and serving the creation rather than the creator. In Deuteronomy 8:19 these words are found, "And it shall be, if you by any means forget the

Lord your God, and follow other gods, and serve them and worship them, I testify against you this day that you shall surely perish.” Worship and serve, two distinct words. Deuteronomy 17:3 reads, “Who has gone and served other gods, and worshipped them, either the sun, or moon, or any of the hosts of heaven, in which I have not commanded.” Again, “worshipped” and “served” are two distinct Hebrew words. 1 Kings 9:6 reads: “But if you or your sons had altered in following from me, and do not keep my commandments and my statutes in which I have set before you, but go serve other Gods and worship them.” Then finally Jeremiah 25:6 reads, “Do not go after other Gods to serve them and worship them, and do not provoke me to anger with the works of your hands; and I will not harm you.” In these Old Testament passages (more could be cited as we said) different Hebrew words are used for worship and service. This shows a distinction between worship and service in the old Testament.

This same distinction also exists or is seen in the New Testament — the distinction between worship and service. In response to Satan’s temptation to worship him, Jesus said to Satan, “You shall worship the Lord your God and him only you shall serve.” Notice, he said, “You shall worship only the Lord your God and him only you shall serve.” In this passage Jesus used just one word for worship. That word is, *proskuneo*, that primary Greek word that we have already discussed.

“Divine Service”

When Jesus used the word “serve,” he used another Greek word altogether, the word *latreuo*. Now we have noticed what Woods said about the word for worship (*proskuneo*) in this verse, but he also wrote about the word that Jesus used for “serve” in Matthew 4:10. Of the word *latreuo* he wrote:

It is worthy of note that another Greek word, *latreuo*, whence our English word *liturgy* comes, means divine service, and is often applied to the duties of the Jewish priests in their work under the old order. They were typical of Christians today who are engaged in divine service to Jehovah.

Then he mentions 1 Peter 2:9 and says compare Romans 12:1. Romans 12:1 is a critical passage we will examine in just a minute. Please note that he gives this as a passage supporting the divine service concept that he is writing about here. Again, that is from his *Questions and Answers*.

Why did Jesus use two distinct words “worship” and “serve” in Matthew 4:10? When I ask that question, I have to answer that there has to be a distinction between our worship to God and our service to God. This is because the Greek language is very specific. The Lord used two very specific and very different words in that passage. Thus, if there is no distinction between our worship and our service, why did he use those two distinct words? So we have seen that both the Old Testament and the New Testament make a distinction between worship and service.

Disputed Passages

Thirdly, let us examine some disputed passages regarding this question of all life is worship. Romans 12:1 is perhaps the most talked about or discussed passage along this line. Romans 12:1 reads “I beseech you therefore brethren by the mercies of God you present your bodies as living sacrifice, wholly acceptable to God which is your reasonable service.” Controversy arises over the translation of the word *service*, the last word of the verse. It is the word *latreuo*, which we have talked about. It has as its general meaning service, but admittedly lexicographers also list

worship as a meaning of this word. The *New International Version* translates the word as “worship” in Romans 12:1, “which is your spiritual act of worship.” There is a marginal reference in the *American Standard*, which mentions worship. [Keep in mind that it is a marginal reference. It is a footnote. It is not in the text. The *New International Version* puts the word *worship* in the text.] Do I believe that is the accurate translation? No, I do not, nor do I recommend the *New International Version* for that matter and for other reasons. I think serious reasons, but that is not the subject of our lesson today. I do not believe that worship would be the preferred translation.

Some contend that it should be worship. They further argue that this means that our whole lives are presented to God as worship. From that day forward, and thereafter, after we have made the presentation of our lives to God, every single thing we do in our lives is worship to God — *everything!* I do not believe that is the case. I do not believe the scriptures support that concept. Are we to have a reverential attitude in our lives? Yes. Are we to have an attitude that reflects that we are children of God in our lives? Yes. But there is a vast difference between that and saying everything that we do, everything, is worship to God. So, I do not believe worship is the best translation. I believe that the scriptural evidence supports service as the proper translation in Romans 12:1. In keeping with the general meaning of the Greek word and also in keeping with the context of the book of Romans, especially this first section of Romans. I want to look at that for just a moment. The context of this section of Romans leading up to Romans 12:1 needs to be considered. Again, I quote from Workman’s article in the *Firm Foundation* because I believe that it is an excellent summary of the context here in Romans in this part of the book. He says:

Paul tells his readers to present their bodies a living sacrifice, Romans 12:1. This does not speak of living a life of constant continual worship as some are inclined to believe. Paul is urging sanctification on his hearers. The thought is simply an expansion on Romans 6:13, and we will read Romans 6:13 in a moment. Some had not turned themselves over to the Lord in the conversion process, they were inclined to continue in sin, Romans 6:1. Paul, therefore, urged them to present themselves once and for all to the Lord, Romans 6:13.

He mentions 12:2. (He mentions then the verbs are aorist in both cases. — J.D.) We will talk about that very briefly in just a moment.

The Greek Aorist Tense

Now let's review some important points about the word *present*. First of all, when Paul says, "I beseech you, therefore, brethren by the mercies of God that you present. ..." What is involved in the word *present*? Well, first of all it is in the aorist tense in the Greek, as Workman points out. The aorist tense versus the present active tense basically indicates punctiliar action rather than progressive action. It is like a period. It is basically a one-time action. In other words, make this presentation of yourselves once and for all. Do it once and for all. You really have not done it to this point. You have not fully given yourselves over to the Lord. You are in effect halting between two opinions. Now, determine once and for all that you are going to present (punctiliar action — the aorist tense in the Greek) yourselves once and for all to the Lord. Now, I believe that is an important concept for us to keep in mind.

Also, something else about the word *present*; it has a meaning in this context that I think is significant. According to the

New Analytical Greek Lexicon, it means “to present to God, dedicate, consecrate, devote” — consecrate and devote. Then, the *Lexicon* adds some scriptural references to illustrate this use of the word in this context, and Luke 2:22 is mentioned. That is where they brought Jesus to present him to the Lord. Romans 6:13, 19 are mentioned. Now it does not mention Romans 12:1, but the same idea of consecration or devotion would also be in this word *present* in Romans 12:1. This is because it is in the same general context. So what does the word *present* mean? First of all, it is a specific one time action and it means to consecrate or to dedicate once and for all your lives to God. This is the idea expressed in Romans 12:1. It is the idea of complete consecration of one’s self once and for all. Paul was calling upon these brethren in Rome to once and for all separate themselves and to become slaves — literally to *become slaves*. Not a halfhearted commitment, but a full commitment where you become slaves of the Lord. That is something we all need to appreciate, and it is something we at Fleetwood need to emulate in becoming slaves of the Lord and devoting our entire lives to God. In Romans 6:13 he told them (leading up to this statement in Romans 12:1):

And do not present (there is that word again — J. D.) your members as instruments of unrighteousness to sin, but present yourselves to God as being alive from the dead and your members as being instruments of righteousness to God.

Then, in Romans 6:19 he says:

I speak in human terms because of the weakness of your flesh, for just as you presented your members as slaves of uncleanness and of lawlessness leading to more lawlessness, so now present your members as slaves of righteousness for holiness.

Present yourselves as what? Slaves. These brethren had

obeyed the gospel yes, but they had not fully, once for all, truly presented themselves as slaves of the Son of God in their daily living. Some were having some problems. The emphasis here is on consecrating one's life as a slave. What does a slave do? He serves primarily. Well should he ever worship? Well certainly, as a part of our service we are going to worship, aren't we? But the emphasis here is on becoming the slave, the slave of the Son of God. Now given the primary meaning in the original language of *latreuo*, which means primarily and generally "to serve," given the context in which this passage Romans 12:1 is seen, I see no basis for translating it worship, but rather divine service. This is because we are to become slaves once and for all, and to make that total and complete commitment. What a wonderful, beautiful thought that is.

There may be some right here this morning who have yet failed in doing that. You have become Christians. You have been obedient to the gospel, but have you once and for all made the kind of commitment that Paul was enjoining here upon the Roman brethren. It is something to think about. And so, I don't believe Romans 12:1 supports the idea that all life is worship, and that everything we do is worship.

"Pray Without Ceasing"

Now I want to notice two other passages. One is the passage in 1 Thessalonians 5:17, which says, "Pray without ceasing." Does this verse teach that we are literally to pray 24 hours a day and therefore, it implies that we are always worshipping God 24 hours a day. Can you pray 24 hours a day? Well, certainly you cannot pray 24 hours a day. What is this verse teaching? This verse simply admonishes us to maintain a strong and regular prayer life. It teaches us to pray consistently, not continually, but

to pray consistently. In other words, don't cease to give up your prayer life [sic]. Do not cease to neglect your prayer life [sic]. Keep it strong, keep it regular, keep it consistent, but it cannot be literally continuous. It is not even within the realm of possibility.

A reading of other verses where Paul used this same expression, the very same expression, will clearly prove that we are not to pray literally without ceasing 24 hours a day. Listen to Romans 1:9, Paul writes, "For God is my witness, whom I serve with the spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers." The very same expression, "without ceasing, I make mention of you always in my prayers." Did Paul say, "I am praying always"? No, he said I am mentioning you when I do and I am not ceasing to do that. A beautiful thought. In 1 Thessalonians 1:3 he wrote to the Thessalonians saying, "Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, labor of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ in the sight of God, or our God and father." Remembering without ceasing — 24 hours a days remembering? Certainly not. Regular remembrance? Certainly so. In 1 Thessalonians 2:13 we read:

For this reason we also thank God without ceasing, because when you received the word of God which you heard from us, you welcomed it not as the word of man, but as it is in truth the word of God, which also effectively works in you who believe.

We thank God he says without ceasing. Consistently? Yes. Continually? Certainly not. Prayer is never to be neglected. We are to pray without ceasing, yes, but not literally in a continuous way, but regularly and constantly. This verse in no way teaches that all life is worship.

Do All in the Name of the Lord

Finally, notice Colossians 3:17. And, I appreciate the songs that we have sung on this beautiful theme of Christ because this is what this verse speaks of. Colossians 3:17 “In whatever you do in word or deed do all in the name of the Lord Jesus giving thanks to God the Father through him.” This passage does not teach that all life is worship. The larger context (I mean by that, verses 16-25 of Colossians 3) will reveal to us what Paul had in mind. I invite you to turn to Colossians three and read with me from verse 16 forward down through the end of the chapter.

Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord, and whatever you do in word or in deed do all in the name of the Lord Jesus giving thanks to God the Father through him. Wives submit to your own husbands as is fitting in the Lord. Husbands love yours wives and do not be bitter toward them. Children obey your parents in all things for this is well pleasing to the Lord. Fathers do not provoke your children lest they become discouraged. Bondservants obey in all things your masters according to the flesh, not with eye service as men pleasers, but in sincerity of heart fearing God, and whatever you do, do it heartily as to the Lord and not to men knowing that from the Lord you will receive the reward of the inheritance for you serve the Lord Christ, but he who does wrong will be repaid for what he has done and there is no partiality.

Now think about Colossians 3:17 in this larger context. Notice verses 22 and 23 tell us that as the Christian works at his job, he gives his best effort. Why? Because of this relationship to God and Christ. He serves not as a man pleaser but as pleasing the Lord because he sustains that relationship to God. He is a

Christian; he is going to do his best. Then, verse 24 “knowing that from the Lord you will receive the reward of the inheritance: for you serve the Lord Christ.” Verse 24 reminds us that we will receive our reward from the Lord as what? As servants. There is the emphasis here, as servants of the Lord Jesus Christ. What are you doing when you are doing the best at your job? You are serving. The emphasis is not on worship. You are serving. You are serving out of a reverential respect and attitude for your Lord and for the relationship that you sustain. But, to say that everything you do on your job is worship is to go beyond the biblical principle or concept of what Paul is teaching here and what the scriptures in general teach. Certainly it is good to maintain at all times to the best of our ability a kind of attitude that will never allow us to slacken in our labors, in anything and everything that we do. This verse does not teach that everything we do in our lives is worship to God. There is a distinction between the service we render and the worship we offer to God.

David Lipscomb in his commentary (*The Gospel Advocate Series on Colossians*) wrote this about Colossians 3:17. [I thought it was an excellent summary of what is enjoined upon us here by the apostle Paul]. Lipscomb said:

We should associate Christ with everything we do. Doing all as his servants and under his eye, and in such a way that in every part of our work he may be glorified in us, and this will be a safeguard to the Christian. If he is to do every thing in Christ's name, he must do nothing unworthy of that name, nothing with which he cannot associate it. Nowhere in any company or in any business must he forget whatsoever ye do in word or deed. That this worthy name is the name, which he bears and whose honor is in his keeping.

I think that is a beautiful statement. But it is not a statement

that says everything we do is worship. It is saying that everything we do, we do keeping in mind the relationship that we sustain to our Lord. We are Christians. We should never forget that as Christians we are to glorify God in our lives. However, that does not imply or suggest that we worship God in everything we do. It simply means that in all we do, we must consider God in Christ and make sure that our thoughts, our words, our actions would be approved rather than condemned by them.

When a Christian, for example, is playing golf and he makes a bad swing (I have done that a few times. Many times — most often.) When a Christian does that, he does not curse, does he? Why not? Not because he is worshipping God as he plays golf, but because he is a servant of the Lord who knows that such actions would reflect shamefully upon his Christian vocation and that is the difference. Golf is not worship, but when I play golf, I am still a servant of the Lord, therefore, I will play golf without cursing.

In our study today we have looked at the definition of worship, the distinction between worship and service and the disputed passages on the subject. Our conclusion is: All life is not worship to God.



Comments on Jim Dearman's Response to Jess Hall's Comments on His Sermon on Worship

1. *The Guy N. Woods articles*: The fact that you can find similar language in both articles does not address the fact that the quotes were taken from two different articles.¹ Neither does it address the principle that similar language does not establish

¹The existence of similar language in the two articles is basically your only defense of your "mix and match" use of the articles. Both of them do refer to acts of worship and state that worship is an *act* of reverence. However, to say that the term means the same in both articles ignores what you say needs to be considered — the context. It is difficult for me to understand how you can make the argument that the "acts" referred to in the separate articles are the same acts, given your admission that the first article treats acts of benevolence as worship. More puzzling is the fact that you apparently never thought to ask the question, "Is the Christian's presenting his life as a living sacrifice an act of reverence?" If you answer that question "yes," your position fails. If you answer that question "no," then you do not believe a portion of the scripture. Try this syllogism:

- All acts of reverence are worship.
- Presenting one's life as a living sacrifice is an act of reverence.
- Therefore, presenting one's life as a living sacrifice is worship.

To argue that presenting the body as a living sacrifice is not authorized or commanded obligates you to teach that Paul's entreaty in Romans 12:1 was, at most, a suggestion. Which of Paul's other statements in Romans are suggestions and which are commands? How do we tell the difference? What standard are we use?

that the meaning is the same or similar. That must be done from the context. The two articles are clearly addressed to different contexts. One is addressed to worship in the assembly. The other is addressed to the subject that we are discussing.² In the first paragraph brother Woods states that “there is not nearly as much difference between these concepts as some apparently believe.” He then adds that the concept “enter [the assembly] to worship and leave to serve ... results from ignorance about what the New,

²You suggest that perhaps I did not compare the two articles carefully. I certainly agree that one of us did not. Your assertion that “[t]here is absolutely no difference in the meaning of the two statements” establishes which of us it was. The statement that you quoted from the second article as if it were contained in the first one refers to acts of worship in the assembly. The quote that you now attempt to force into the same meaning was in an article that we both agree said that there are acts of worship other than the “five” that are performed outside of the assembly and performed at different times than the time of assembly. The disagreement is over what falls within the admitted exception. To now say that you were free to mix and match because both statements mean the same thing is 1) an after the fact justification 2) that is not true and 3) does not address the need to use the second quote if the first one had said what you wanted it to. I repeat, the acts to which brother Woods refers in the first article are not limited to acts in the assembly or authorized for the assembly, but to acts (not the “five”) done on different days and in different settings. While you may have been honest in using brother Woods articles in that manner in your sermon, I do not believe that you can honestly do so again. I stand by my statement that your use of brother Woods comments in the manner that you used them was inappropriate, however honest it may have been. Your assertion that brother Woods clearly stated that there was an element of worship in our acts of Christian service implicitly admits that your use of brother Woods’ articles was inappropriate. That admission is even stronger since brother Woods did not say as you write, “that there is an element of worship (broad sense) in our acts of Christian service....” What he said was, “Therefore, we worship God in serving others.” Of course, Guy Woods aside, Paul taught the same thing (Heb. 13:15-16). Knowing that brother Woods had made that statement when you preached, it was a misrepresentation not to reveal that to your hearers and to explain exactly what acts of Christian service are worship according to brother Woods, and which are not, and the basis upon which you make the distinction.

Testament teaches about service and worship to God.” Thus, brother Woods states in the beginning that the position you espouse“ arises from ignorance.”³ Brother Woods clearly concludes that Christians “Indeed worship and serve God, if [they] are his faithful children, always and everywhere...”Even you admit that brother Woods taught that worship in the scripture involves more than the five acts authorized for the assembly. You also admitted that you made a deliberate decision to keep that from your hearers. While that might not be quite as bad in a non-controversial area, to leave the impression that brother Woods agreed fully with your position is improper at best, regardless of motive. The truth is that even given your interpretation of brother Woods’ article, you only know where he *begins* with other acts of worship, you don’t know where he ends. He

³To say that brother Woods was teaching that the statement “enter to worship and leave to serve” was too narrow because we may worship in our homes is pure sophistry. Your charge that I did not listen to your sermon because you and the elders’ statement that you endorsed both said that we may engage in the five acts of worship with our families (or alone) in our homes (or elsewhere), fares no better. Your entire lesson, the elders’ statement, and the whole discussion centers not on what are the acts of worship authorized for the assembly, the mid-week service, or family worship, but it centers on whether presenting the Christian’s life as a living sacrifice is an act of worship. We have no disagreement on the former; we do on the latter. Addressing the first issue does not address the second, it dodges it. Thus, my point remains unanswered. You are still arguing that there are only five possible avenues of worship wherever or whenever done.

Your admission that you, too, agree that the statement “enter to worship and leave to serve” is too broad is something that no one would ever have suspected from your sermon because, while you did not use that expression, you did make that distinction (with the exception that Christians *may*, not *must*, engage in the five acts at places other than the building and at times other than the assembly). The truth is that your admission is a weak attempt to salvage your position. Given your position, the statement isn’t too broad, it just needs clarification. You would have it read, “Enter to worship, depart to serve (unless you are engaged in one of the acts of worship which has been authorized for the assembly).”

mentions acts of benevolence only by way of “example,” not by way of limitation.⁴

Your contortion of brother Woods’ statement that limits “always and everywhere” to service and disconnects it from “worship” is an argument of which the Baptists could be proud. Take, for example, your morning sermon three Sundays ago in which you asserted that to believe in Jesus you must also believe in baptism’s being essential to salvation because Jesus taught “he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” Why should I believe that “shall be saved” goes with both “believeth” and “baptized” if the logic in your explanation of brother Woods state-

⁴It does no good for you to argue that brother Woods only extends worship to “acts of Christian benevolence” because “acts of Christian benevolence” covers a range of activities as wide as life itself. For example, consider the case of a widow who cannot mow her lawn and a brother who mows it for her as an act of Christian benevolence. Mowing the lawn becomes worship as long as he is not mowing his own lawn (even if he mows it because as a part of presenting his life as a living sacrifice to God he wants to be a good neighbor and keep his yard presentable). Again, consider a young mother who is disabled due to difficulties with the birth of her child. A Christian woman as an act of Christian benevolence volunteers to care for the mother and her child. As part of that Christian benevolence she changes the baby’s diaper. Thus, changing the diaper becomes an act of worship as long as the Christian woman is not changing her own baby’s diaper (even if she changes it because as a part of presenting her life as a living sacrifice to God and as *commanded and authorized* by God she wants to be a good, loving mother, be a keeper at home, take good care of her child, and raise her or him in the nurture and admonition of the Lord). Even brother Woods’ illustration is broad. Is “taking a basket of food to the needy” worship, but not “laboring with your hands to be able to give to them that have need”? Is “laboring with your hands to be able to give to them that have need” worship, but not the same labor performed to feed those of your own household and avoid being classified as worse than an infidel and a denier of the faith? Was brother Woods right or wrong? If he was right, worship is as broad as life. If he was wrong, the fact that you misrepresented him is established.

ment is correct?⁵ The truth is that you cannot get to that position by either grammar or Greek. You can only get there because you declare yourself to be there. That is, you can only consider it to be correct because you declare it to be correct.

Aorist Tense

2. Your response on the aorist is a misleading attempt to correct after the fact what you taught. You referred to the “aorist” as a verb, not as an infinitive that is not a time indicator. You now say that your point had nothing to do with the temporal aspects of the aorist in the infinitive. Could your present position be generated by the fact that you thought it was a verb and referred to it as such (not as an infinitive) when the sermon was preached? You now agree that the temporal aspects of the aorist are lost in the infinitive. My recollection of what you said on the Wednesday night we had our first discussion is different from that, i.e., you were still arguing that even the infinitive retained its temporal aspects. But I don't have that in writing and I have read a great deal since then. What I am certain of is that at that time we did not agree on what the infinitive did or did not indicate. It could be that our disagreement was limited to what you refer to as the “kind of action” involved. You call it “punctiliar” and “one time” action. First, you cite no authority for that. Second, it is a not-so-artful dodge. If something is past, punctiliar, and one time then that is something that is done once and for all in the past. Contrary to your letter, that is a temporal argument any way you slice it.

⁵Your position is that the phrase “always and everywhere” does not go with “worship” (because it is the first mentioned of the two words joined by the coordinate conjunction “and”), but goes only with “service” (because it is the second of the two terms joined by “and”).

The truth is that the aorist is not always punctiliar. In a recent issue of the *Firm Foundation* (Dec. 1998), brother Hugo McCord, one of the brotherhood's best Greek scholars, discusses that very subject in responding to erroneous teaching on marriage, divorce, and remarriage. In that article he points out that the aorist can be punctiliar, but that it can also be linear (durative) and iterative (repetitive).⁶ I also enclose two articles by Greek scholars who are not brethren that establish the same thing. This establishes that dabblers in Greek do best not to base arguments on matters of which they know very little, especially when they are more interested in making a point than in ascertaining the truth. Your quotation of Dana and Mantey is a perfect illustration. It is a general statement forced into a specific application. I would like to see what else they may have to say on the subject specifically at hand. Frankly, one of my problems now is that, given your forced construction of what brother Woods says, I no longer have confidence that your statement of a writer's position accurately represents that position.

Verbal Accuracy

3. Has anybody even suggested that Paul, inspired by the Holy Spirit, would have somehow failed to use the words needed to express exactly what God intended? I certainly haven't. Your

⁶His full statement reads: My brother speaks of the Greek aorist as "always punctiliar or point action, one time action" (p. 13). If I understand properly, the Greek aorist never tells what kind of action is involved; it only specifies some act is mentioned. (For those who want to check the derivation, the word *aorist* is made up of the *alpha privative* [meaning "no" or "not," as in *atheist* — no God, JH] plus *horidzo*, set limits.) An aoristic action sets no limits on the kind of action. The context determines whether the action is point (punctiliar, as Matt. 13:14; 27:38), linear (durative, as Matt 25:8; John 5:7), or iterative (repetitive, Matt. 15:23; 1 Cor 15:31). Grammarians illustrate point action by a dot (.), linear action by a line (—) and iterative action by a series of dots (...).

point is designed to generate emotion, not rationality. The question is what Paul means by those words. Straw men arguments just waste paper.

Worship and Service

4. Distinction between “worship” and “service”: You may believe that the material that you presented on this issue is accurate, but that does not make it so. Neither does it respond to my argument. You need to deal with the following matters that you have, thus far, chosen to ignore. I pointed out the illogical basis of your argument — anytime and everytime two different words are used, they always refer to two separate and distinct things, proving that they do not and cannot refer to the same thing.

In your response you never dealt with this principle, which has to be true if your argument is correct and if your conclusion as to “worship” and “service” is true. My entire argument was to demonstrate that that principle was not true and that, therefore, your argument was incorrect and your conclusion was false. However, even though you did not respond to that argument beyond declaring that you were correct, the argument that you did make demonstrates that your first argument is incorrect, which in turn demonstrates that your conclusion is false. You do this by recognizing the existence of an exception to the principle — synonymous parallelism. If you recognize the existence of such an exception, then you need something more than a fiat of correctness to establish that each of the passages that you used plus all of the others in Gary Workman’s list do not fall within that exception. You haven’t even attempted that.

To assert or imply that I dismissed the distinction that you drew between “worship” and “service” as parallelism is another straw man. I did not do so. I dismissed it because the principle

upon which it was based was faulty as demonstrated by the passages that I cited. I never mentioned Hebrew poetry at all. While some of the passages that I cited were from the Psalms, some of them were not. Some were from the New Testament. If your argument is that the passages I cited are Hebrew poetry, what does that establish? The words are still there and used the same way. If your suggestion is that the passages that I cited are poetry and therefore figurative, then you are obligated to identify the language that is figurative, the basis upon which you conclude that it is figurative, and the reality of which the language is a figure.

Meaning of Service

5. *Translation (meaning) of "service" in Roman 12:1:* The information that I supplied from lexicographers established not only that they include "worship" in the definition of *latreuo*, but also that the "service" referred to was a particular kind of service. Your discussion of Kittle was enlightening. No one can read Kittle as you read him ("to reinforce the conclusions I reached in the lesson") unless he is blinded by an *a priori* assumption. In the preceding paragraph (not in the same section and addressing the noun form, not the verb), he says:

Latreuein means to worship cultically. In the OT its primary reference is to the sacrificial cultus. In the NT, however, this is almost completely secondary, except in Hebrews. It gives place to the ministry of prayer, and then more broadly to the total view according to which the whole life of the Christian is fundamentally brought under the concept *latreuein*, so that he alone seems to be capable of a *latreuein*, a *worship of God*, which is worthy of the name. The cultic concept is now spiritualized [emphasis added.]

It is then in the next paragraph (and section) that, in discussing the noun form (*latreia*), he says:

The concrete idea of sacrifice [worship(?)] seems always to cling to the noun no less than to the verb. This is also true in the last verse (Rom. 12:1), though the use here is metaphorical. The service, which Christians are to offer, consists in the fashioning of their inner lives and their outward physical conduct in a way which plainly distinguishes them from the world and which corresponds to the will of God. *This is the living sacrifice [worship(?)] that they have to offer.* Using a term which was current in the philosophy of his day, Paul describes this sacrifice [worship (?)] as a *logike lateria*, a service [obvious reference to sacrifice, "worship (?)] of God⁷ which corresponds to human reason, in which, however, divine reason is also at work. If man listens to the voice of reason, he must acknowledge that this [an obvious reference to sacrifice, worship (?)] is the true service of God. The biblical history of the cultic term *latreia* reaches its climax in this interiorisation, which is also the most comprehensive exteriorisation, and which takes up again the initial prophetic statement in Deuteronomy 10:12 ff. The saying of Paul in Romans 12:1 is the crown of this whole development. [Emphasis added.]

Your response to Vincent's definition is no response at all. It is true, and I knew at the time, that he references Romans 9:4. The major part of the discussion that you quoted related to the meaning of "reasonable." There is nothing in the statement that you quoted that is different from or that contradicts his

⁷Clearly Kittle relates the "sacrifice" to the "service." If the offering of sacrifice is worship, then so is the service of Romans 12:1

definition of “service,” so what is the point that you were trying to make? The truth is that the reference to Romans 9:4 does not help you at all. The “service” to which reference is made in Romans 9:4 is generally understood to be the Levitical services of the temple. If that is correct, it merely underscores that *lateria* is a word of worship. As for the references to John, Luke, Revelation, and Philippians, not only are they not self explanatory, they don’t support your position. As you noted, following their listing Vincent (as quoted by you) states, “Here the sum-total of the Levitical services instituted by the law.” Doesn’t that sound just a little bit like worship?

Finally, you wound up arguing against yourself even in your own sermon. In your discussion of Romans 6, you argued that Romans 12:1 must be translated service because Romans 6 says that we are to present our members as servants of righteousness. “What does a servant do?” you asked. “Renders service,” you answered. Therefore, offering our bodies in Romans 12 must be translated service. If your argument is true that, when two different words are used they must refer to two separate and distinct things, and if the Holy Spirit had not intended reference to two separate and distinct things He would not have inspired the use of two separate and distinct words, then your argument here is false. You had to know when you preached the sermon that: 1) the word “service” is not used in Romans 6; and 2) the “service” rendered by a servant (Rom. 6) is not the type of service that relates to sacrifice or the Levitical service (Rom. 12). If your first argument (two words [*proskuneo* and *latreno*] demand two separate and distinct meanings and can never refer to the same thing) were true, then this argument (two words, *douleno* and *latreuo*) can refer to the same thing and have one meaning even though they are separate and distinct) was false. Or they were

both false (which is what I believe). One of the problems with eisegesis is that you are often forced to make arguments in which you meet yourself coming back.

Other Matters

6. Other matters that you did not address:

a. Whenever it is done (past or present), is presenting our lives as a living sacrifice something that is done one time for all time? If it is punctiliar and past then doesn't it follow that it has been done once in the past for all time? If so, were the Romans saved without it since you argued that Paul still wanted them to do it? If one can be saved with less than a full presenting of his life as a sacrifice to God, to what extent is it necessary? What is the basis for that conclusion? How can an act have been done completely and yet remain to be done at the same time? If the Romans had done it sufficiently to be saved, and if it is punctiliar, then how can it be done again?

b. If the "presenting" is punctiliar, how can this possibly be a reference to sanctification unless sanctification is something that is done one time for all time?

c. Isn't worship the immediate context of Romans 12:1 (offering sacrifice)? If not, why not?

d. If you say the immediate context of Romans 12:1 is not worship because of Romans 6, is it appropriate to look to other passages (even assuming they constitute the remote context) and use them in a manner than contradicts the immediate context'?

e. Where in Romans 6 does it tell us how we are to offer our members as a living sacrifice? When is it to be done? Is it done only once for all time? Are we told in

Romans 12 that we accomplish the presenting of our members by offering our bodies as a living sacrifice?

f. Is the Christian to offer his body to God as a living sacrifice? Is he commanded to do so? Is offering our bodies as a living sacrifice an act of reverence? Is the offering of the Christian's body as a living sacrifice the act referred to by the phrase "which is your reasonable service"? If so, then why is that not a definition of "service" as used in Romans 12:1?

g. Is something true or false just because it is: a) In the NIV, or 2) in a footnote." If not, is that a valid principle upon which to base an argument?

h. Is it a valid approach in dealing with the lexicographers to admit that they say that a word can be translated (in this case) worship, and then ignore what they say specifically about it and make up your own definition from a passage (Rom. 6) that does not use the word? Is it honest to do so when you know that the type of service rendered by servants is not the type of service to which reference is made in Romans 12? Is it better to look to other passages that at least use the word being defined, such as Hebrews 9:4, Hebrews 9:9, Acts 7:42, Acts 24:14, and Hebrews 13:15-16? Is it reasonable, when a preacher defines a word by referring to texts in which the word is not used, to conclude that texts in which the word *is* used do not support that preacher's position? If not, why not?

i. Since the Holy Spirit inspired Paul, and since in Romans 12:1 he used the word for service that relates to cultic worship instead of the word for common service, is it not reasonable to conclude that Paul had in mind a special kind of service that was associated with sacrifice

(worship)? If not, why not?

j. Does the whole include the sum of its parts? Does the greater include the lesser? If this is so, and if we are to present our entire life as a sacrifice to God, then are we not required to present each of the component parts of our life as a sacrifice to God? If not, which parts of our life are excluded? Upon what passages are the exclusions based?

k. Does this mean that playing golf is worship? If the life of the Christian includes golf, and if the life of the Christian is presented as a living sacrifice, the only possible conclusion is yes. It is silly, however, to dwell on such matters. You admitted that one plays golf and doesn't swear because he is a servant of God. Thus, in playing golf the Christian recognizes that he is to render service to God. If you say that it is silly to speak of worshipping God by playing golf, why is it any sillier than to speak of serving God by playing golf?

l. Don't both 1 Corinthians 10:31 and Colossians 3:17 have worship in their context ("do all to the glory of God" and "giving thanks to God the Father by Him," respectively)? Can you give glory to God without worshipping Him? Isn't it worship to give thanks to God the Father by Christ?

m. Is God omnipresent? If so, then does that mean that we are always in his presence. Can the Christian be in the presence of God and not worship? If all of the Christian's life is lived in the presence of God and if all of the Christian's life is not worship, then is not the Christian at least some of the time in the presence of God but not worshipping? If the only acts of worship that are ever accept-

able are the five authorized for the assembly, then is the Christian obligated to always be engaging in one of the five acts?⁸

⁸Of course, he would not be worshipping when he is sinning. But wouldn't he be sinning at all times that he is in the presence of God without worshipping? You may dismiss these questions as silly, but since they are the logical conclusion of your position, what does that tell you about your position? It is called *reductio ad absurdum*



A Workman That Needs to Be Ashamed

By Jess Hall Jr.

Gary Workman's article, "Thou Shalt Worship the Lord Thy God," is the major source of most of the writing that has been done in opposition to the teaching that, in some sense, all of the Christian's life is worship. Most subsequent articles either quote it heavily or plagiarize it freely. It was first delivered in the Fort Worth Lectures in 1986. Since that time it has largely gone unchallenged except for an occasional lonely voice.

There are several possible causes for this lack of challenge. First, the article could be so logical and scriptural that few have dared to raise a voice against it. The contents of this book and this review should dispel that notion. Second, it could be that some brethren think that the whole discussion is "much ado about nothing" (Shall I give Shakespeare credit for that phrase?) and that, therefore, refutation of Workman's article is not worth the time and trouble that it would take. Third, it could be that some consider the argument so silly that it should not be dignified with a response.

For years I have fallen into the second and third categories, regarding the controversy as a "tempest in a teapot" reserved for those who would rather fight than reason. What finally moved me

to review the article was that I found myself in the midst of the teapot. While teapot tempests are not large in the overall scheme of things (the National Weather Bureau will never get excited about one), they blow with intensity when you are in the teapot. Thus, this review of Gary Workman's article has been written and this book has been published for those who are interested.

For two reasons, it is not my purpose to review the Workman article as thoroughly as I have the Dearman sermon. First, the article was not directed at me as was the sermon. Second, and more importantly, the Dearman sermon was in large part taken from and patterned after the Workman article. Thus the review of that sermon also demonstrates the errors of the Workman article. What I propose to do here is to demonstrate the Workman article's intellectual dishonesty. Intellectual dishonesty is bad under any circumstances, but it is especially reprehensible when it occurs in the context of a lecture purporting to present the results of a search for truth. In that context there is no one to answer. There is no one to point out that the speaker has read and considered material contrary to his position and has not informed his readers of its existence or answered the arguments that it makes. Worse yet, there is no one to point out that quotes from writers have been taken out of context to make it appear that scholars have positions that agree with the speaker when it is clear, when read in context, that the scholar's position is the exact opposite of the speaker's position. (For another illustration of this improper use of sources, see the discussion of Jim Dearman's use of Guy N. Woods' articles on worship.)

While Workman admits that lexicographers list "worship" as one of the meanings of *λατρευω* or *λατρεια*, he asserts that "many do so tentatively, and there are frequent differences of emphasis." He makes that assertion based upon Thayer's defini-

A Workman That Needs to Be Ashamed

tion of λατρευω as “to render religious service or homage, to worship,” while Arndt & Gingrich, he asserts, define the basic meaning as “serve.” He adds that Arndt & Gingrich then define λατρεία as “service or worship.” Based upon these quotations of partial definitions, Workman concludes:

One is left with the impression that many authorities are somewhat undecided on some of these definitions, and there is some disagreement.

Really? Here is Arndt & Gingrich’s entire definition of λατρεία and λατρευω: (While the reader may be discouraged by the citations, abbreviations, and Greek in the complete definitions included in this article, as well as their length, it is worthwhile to work through them to get a flavor for the English definitions and translations given by the lexicographers.)

λατρεία - [I]n religious usage *service* or *worship* (of God) (Pla., Apol. 23B του θεου, Phaedr. 244E; Sb 1934, 3[?]; LXX; Philo, Ebr. 144 al.; Jos., Bell. 2, 409) Ro 9:4; λογικη 1. 12:1 (s. λογικοσ). δικαιωματα λατρειασ *regulations for worship* Heb. 9:1. τασ 1. επιτελειν *perform the rites* vs. 6 1. προσφερειν τω θεω *offer a service to God* J 16:2. Of idolatry 1. θεων νεκρων Δ 6:3; cf. Dg. 3:2. M-M.*

λατρευω - fut. λατρευσω; 1 aor. ελατρευσα (τραγ. et al.; inser., LXX, En. Πηλιο, Sib. Or. 4, 104) *serve*, in our lit. only of the carrying out of relig. duties, esp. of a cultic nature, by human beings: 1. θεω (Eur., Ion 152; Plutl, Mor. 405c; 407E; Philo, Spec. Leg. 1, 300 ολη τ. ψυχη. Cf. En. 10, 21) Mt 4:10; Lk 4:8 (both Dt 6:13); 1:74; Ac 7:7 (cf. Ex 3:12); 24:14; 27:23; Hb 9:14; Rv 7:15; 22:3; Pol 2:1. τω ονοματι (θεου) 1 Cl 45:7; τω διαβωλω 1. *serve the devil* (in reality) I Sm 9:1. Of the Jews 1. αγγελιοσ PK 2 p. 14, 26. Of idolatry (Ex 20:5; 23:24; Ezk 20:32; En. 99, 7) Ac 7:42; Ro 1:25.—

W. indication of the manner in which the service (τῷ θεῷ) is performed ἐν καθάρᾳ συνειδήσει *serve God w. a clear conscience* 2 Ti 1:3. (δια χάριτος) ἰ. εὐαρεστῶς τῷ θεῷ μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέουσιν (*in thankfulness*) *serve God acceptably with reverence and awe* Heb. 12:28. (τῷ θεῷ) ἰ. ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ *I serve God with my spirit in the gospel* Rom. 1:9.—Without the dat. of the one to whom the service is given: ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ νυκτᾶ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ ἰ. *serve (God) earnestly night and day* Ac 26:7. νηστειᾶς καὶ δεήσεων ἰ. νυκτᾶ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ *serve God night and day w. fasting and prayer* Luke 2:37. οἱ πνεύματι θεοῦ λατρεύοντες *those who worship by the Spirit of God* Phil. 3:3. ὁ λατρευὼν *the worshiper (who is concerned w. the rituals prescribed by the law)* Heb. 9:9; 10:2.—Hb also adds to ἰ. in the dat. the holy objects by means of which the priest renders service 8:5; 13:10.—WBrandt, Dienst u. Dienen im NT '31; HStrathmann TW IV 58-66. M-M.*

Where in that definition does it say that “the basic meaning is ‘serve’”? Why did Workman not mention that Arndt & Gingrich add after “serve” the phrase “in our lit. *only* of the carrying out of relig. duties, *esp. of a cultic nature*, by human beings”? How can he honestly assert that Arndt & Gingrich and Thayer seem to be at odds? If you read Arndt & Gingrich’s entire definition instead of Workman’s assertion, doesn’t Arndt & Gingrich’s definition sound almost exactly the same as Thayer’s — “to render religious service or homage, to worship”? Thayer’s entire definition of λατρεύω (which follows and from which Workman lifted his partial quote) raises further questions about Workman’s intellectual integrity:

Fut. λατρεύσω; 1 aor. ἐλάτρευσα; (λατρίσθαι hireling, Lat. λατρο in Enn. and Plaut.; λατρον hire); in Grk. writ. a. *to serve for hire*; b. univ. *to serve, minister*

A Workman That Needs to Be Ashamed

to, either gods or men, and used alike of slaves and of freemen; in the N.T. *to render religious service* or *homage, to worship*, (Heb.; Deut. vi. 13; x.12; Josh. xxiv. 15); in a broad sense, λατρ. θεῶ: Mt. iv. 10 and Lk. iv. 8, (after Deut. vi. 13); Acts vii. 7; xxiv. 14; xxvi. 23; Heb. ix. 14; Rev. vii. 15; xxii.3; of the worship of idols, Acts vii. 42; Ro. i. 25, (Ex. xx.5; xxxiii.24; Ezek. xx. 32). Phrases relating to *the manner of worshipping* are these: θεῶ [so RG] λατρευεν πνευματι (dat. of instr.), with the spirit or soul, Phil. 111.3, but L T Tr WH have correctly restored πνευματι θεου, i.e. prompted by, filled with, the spirit of God, so that the dat. of the pers. (τω θεῶ) is suppressed; εν τῷ πνευματι μου εν τῷ ευαγγ., in my spirit in delivering the glad tidings, Ro. i. 9; τῷ θεῶ εν καθαρα συνειδησει, 2Tim. i. 3; μετα αιδουσ και ευλαβειας or [so L T Tr WH] μετ ευλαβ. κ. δεουσ, Heb. xii. 28; εν οσιοτητι κ. δικαιοσυνη, Lk. ii. 37; λατρευειν, αβσολ., *to worship* God [cf. W. 593 (552)], Acts xxvi. 7. In the strict sense; *to perform sacred services, to offer gifts, to worship God in the observance of the rites instituted for his worship: absol.,* Heb. ix. 9; x. 2; *spec. of the priests, to officiate, to discharge the sacred office:* with a dat. of the sacred thing to which the service is rendered, Heb. viii. 5; xiii. 10. [(Eur., al.)]*

Workman did not even mention, much less deal with, the portion of Thayer's definition that was much stronger than the part that he quoted: "absol[utely] to worship God ... In the strict sense; *to perform sacred services, to offer gifts, to worship God in the observance of the rites instituted for his worship: absol.,* Heb. ix. 9; x. 2; *spec. of the priests, to officiate, to discharge the sacred office...*" (Emphasis added.)

Workman may attempt to justify his failure by suggesting that Thayer speaks only of Jewish priestly functions, including

the references to the “observance of the rites [God] instituted for his service.” This argument fails for at least two reasons: 1) Thayer’s definition of N.T. usage describes the service as homage and worship. While it is based on O.T. practice, it finds expression in the priesthood of believers. 2) It is the infinitive of the verb that is used in Rom. 12:1 where God defines “the rite instituted” for the Christian — the presenting of the body (life) to God as a living sacrifice.

The leading Greek linguistic scholar, at least if one judges by the size of the work, is Kittel. Since four of the thirty-three footnotes in Workman’s article cite Kittel’s ten-volume work, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, one may reasonably conclude that Workman regards him as authoritative. Here is Kittel’s entire definition of the usage of λατρευω and λατρεία in the New Testament. Decide for yourself how he defines the terms. Ask yourself why Gary Workman omitted and ignored Kittel’s language that is contradictory to Workman’s position and whether it was honest for him to conceal that language from his hearers.

C. λατρευω and λατρεία in the New Testament.

1. λατρευω

a. Occurrence. λατρευειν occurs in the NT 21 times, of which 8 are in Luke (Lk. 1:74; 2:37; 4:8; Ac. 7:7, 42; 24:14; 26:7; 27:23), 6 in Hb. (8:5; 9:9, 14; 10:2; 12:28; 13:10), 4 in Paul (R. 1:9, 25; Phil. 3:3; 2Tm. 1:3), 2 in Rev. (7:15; 22:3) and 1 in Mt. (4: 10). Three of these verses derive from the OT (Mt. 4: 10; Lk. 4:8; Ac. 7:7). The particularly strong usage in Hb. corresponds to the significance of cultic ideas in this epistle.

b. The Purely Religious Character of the Word as Determined by the LXX. The influence of the LXX may be seen in the fact that the word never refers to

A Workman That Needs to Be Ashamed

human relations, let alone to secular services. The ministry denoted by λατρευειν is always offered to God (or to heathen gods: ελατρευσαν τη κτισει παρα τον κτισαντα, R. 1:25; τη στρατια του ουρανου, Ac. 7:42). Both in the OT and the NT (in spite of the dominant use of the word as a tt.) λειτουργειν, λειτουραγια always enable us to detect the broader potentialities of usage found in non-biblical Greek, but in neither OT nor NT is this true of λατρευειν.

c. λατρευω of the Sacrificial Ministry. Obliteration of the Distinction between λατρευω and λειτουργεω in Hb. According to LXX usage the primary reference of λατρευω is to the sacrificial ministry which is to be offered to Yahweh in contrast to other gods. This usage recurs in Ac. 7:7 (cf. Ex. 3:12); 7:42 (cf. Jer. 7:18 LXX); also R. 1:25. A similar reference is to be seen in Hb. at 8:5; 9:9; 10:2; 13:10. But the distinction between λειτουργειν (priestly sacrificial ministry) and λατρευειν (cultic worship generally), which is so strict in the LXX except at 1 Esdr. 4:54, is now obliterated. For in Hb. 8:5 and 13:10 λατρευειν refers primarily to the sacrificial ministry of the priests. According to 8:5 the earthly sacrificial ministry in the tabernacle is a ποδειγματι και σκια των επουρανιων λατρευειν, since the true tabernacle is in heaven. Similarly, the priests are described as οι τη σκηνη λατρευοντες in 13:10. The more precise meaning of the verse is contested. It need not concern us here. For there is in any case no doubt that the phrase has the priests in view and not the Jewish community in general, no matter what deductions are made from what is said about the priests. Again, the λατρευειν of Hb. 9:9 refers, not just to participants in the cultus, but to the priests who offer sacrifice. This is clear from the fact that in the λατρευειν of this verse there is further reference only to the ιερεις τας λατρεοασ επιτελουντες of 9:6. The

λατρευοντες in Hb. 10:2 are also the priests. The LXX translators would certainly have chosen λειτουργειν in all these cases. cf. The way in which the λατρευειν of 8:5 is taken up in the λειτουργια of 8:8. Cf. also 10:11.

d. λατρευω of the Ministry of Prayer. In the other NT verses the reference of λατρευειν is to the cultic worship of praise and prayer which all may offer, or else the word is used in an extended, loose and almost figurative or spiritualised sense to include every form of divine worship.

In the sense of adoration λατρευειν occurs in the temptation story (Mt. 4:10; Lk. 4:8; cf. Dt. 6:13), where it stands in antithesis to the προσκυνειν demanded by the tempter; cf. also Rev. 7:15 (of the blessed martyrs who serve God day and night in his temple) and Rev. 22:3. But the unwearying prayer of Anna in the temple (Lk. 2:37) and the incessant supplication of Israel for the fulfilment of the promise (Ac. 26:7) are also called λατρευειν, and indeed in the second of these two verses the word simply means "to pray." The verses are worth noting because the dative to denote the recipient is absent. The word is thus used here as a tt. for the ministry of prayer.

e. λατρευω in a Generalised Figurative Sense. The comprehensive use of λατρευειν for the whole conduct of the righteous towards God is found first in Lk. 1:74. Zacharias confidently awaits the time when God will grant that, undisturbed by the oppression of enemies, we may λατρευειν αυτω εν οσιοτητι και δικαιοσυνη ενωπιον αυτου. The worship of God to which he here looks forward with yearning is impossible without a true holiness and a keeping of the commandments which is valid in God's eyes too. λατρευειν then has the same comprehensive sense in Ac. 24:14, where Paul gives the assurance that he serves the God

A Workman That Needs to Be Ashamed

of the fathers. Though this λατρευειν now takes place κατα την οδον ην λεγουσιν αιρεσιν, i.e., according to the standard of the Gospel, this does not imply any loss of fidelity to the Law and the prophets. Part of the service is that he strenuously exerts himself (ασκω), απροσκοπον συνειδησιν εχειν προσ τον θεον και τουζ ανθρωπους δια παντοζ. Cf. also Ac. 27:23 (του θεου ου ειμι, ω και λατρευω αγγελος) and 2 Tm. 1:3 (χαριν εχω τω θεω ω λατρευω απο προγονων εν καθαρα συνειδησει). Hb. 12:28 may be cited in this connection. We receive, says the author, an incorruptible kingdom. This pledges us to gratitude (εχομεν χαριν), δι ηζ λατρευομεν (πλ. λατρευομεν) ευαπεστωζ τω θεω, μετα ευλαβειασ και δεουζ. A manner of life which is pleasing to God, and which is sustained both by gratitude and by a serious sense of responsibility – this Christian τω θεω λατρευειν. The word thus serves as a transition to the admonitory section which follows (c. 13). Perhaps the λατρευειν of Hb. 9:14 also belongs here. The blood of Christ will purge our conscience from dead works ειζ το λατρευειν θεω ζωντι. Purging of the conscience implies remission of sins (cf. v. 22). One possible rendering is that the Christian now has the ability to come to God, to approach Him, like the priest in sacrificial ministry. In this case there is a figurative reference to priestly λατρευειν. But another possible meaning is that the goal and result of this purging of conscience is a new manner of life which is true λατρευειν θεω ζωντι (cf. 12:28). In this case the term is used as in Lk. 1:74. R. 1:9 has in view the same active religious service except that here the reference is specifically to Paul's missionary work. In R. 1:9 Paul, asserting his unceasing remembrance of the Roman Christians in prayer, calls God to witness, ω λατρευω εν τω πνευματι μου εν τω ευαγγελιω του υιου αυτου. The

conclusion of this observation can only mean that the apostle's service is rendered in the sphere of preaching the Gospel of the Son of God (εν τῷ ευαγγελιω as in 2 C 8:18; 10:14). Hence Paul refers to his missionary work. He calls this a λατρευειν, an act of religious service, of the worship which he offers to God. Worth noting is the addition εν τῷ πνευματι μου. Paul obviously does not mean that his missionary service is rendered inwardly. Does he mean, then, that his service is rendered "through his spirit," and by "his spirit" does he mean the Holy Spirit imparted to him, i.e., the Spirit of God? But why does he not say this? And what is the point of describing his apostolic office as a charisma in this context? Another suggestion is that he is emphasising that he does this work with his whole heart. But would he express this in the phrase in question? Perhaps two thoughts are present, first, that Paul's λατρευειν, or service, is rendered outwardly in his missionary work, and second, that it is also rendered in his prayer life, the chief concern of which is, of course, the progress of the Gospel. This thought would supply the reason for Paul's appealing to God as witness of his intercession. As an inner process, this is concealed from the congregation but well known to God.

Finally, in Phil. 3:3 we again find λατρευειν in a broad metaphorical sense in which it comprises the whole of the Christian existence. Paul contrasts himself and Christians with the Judaisers, for whom he has very sharp words. We are the true circumcision οὐ πνευματι θεου (ὄλ. θεῷ) λατρευοντεζ. They put confidence in the flesh. Their whole worship of God is in the flesh. Christians worship God through the Spirit of God. This is not to be restricted to prayer. It includes all that to which we are impelled by the Spirit. The Christian life fashioned by the spirit is true λατρευειν.

A Workman That Needs to Be Ashamed

λατρευειν means to worship cultically. In the OT its primary reference is to the sacrificial cultus. In the NT, however, this is almost completely secondary, except in Hb. It gives place to the ministry of prayer, and then more broadly to the total view according to which the whole life of the Christian is fundamentally brought under the concept λατρευειν, a worship of God, which is worthy of the name. The cultic concept is now spiritualized.

2. λατρεία

Of the five occurrences of this word in the NT, three refer to the sacrificial ministry. In R. 9:4, with the giving of the Law and the promise, λατρεία, the sacrificial cultus, is one of the religious advantages which accrue to Israel. The δικαιωματα λατρείας of Hb. 9:1 are cultic ordinances. In Hb. 9:6: οι ιερεις τας λατρείας επιτελουντες, the ordinances are again those of the sacrificial ministry. In Jn. 16:2 : ερχεται ωρα ινα πας ο αποκτεινας υμας δοξη λατρειαν προσφερειν τω θεω, the word λατρεία virtually means sacrifice, as shown by the verb προσφερειν. The concrete idea of sacrifice seems always to cling to the noun no less than to the verb. This is also true in the last verse (R. 12:1), though the use here is metaphorical. The service which Christians are to offer consists in the fashioning of their inner lives and their outward physical conduct in a way which plainly distinguishes them from the world and which corresponds to the will of God. This is the living sacrifice which they have to offer. Using a term which was current in the philosophy of his day, Paul describes this sacrifice as a λογικη λατρεία, a service of God which corresponds to human reason, in which, however, divine reason is also at work. If man listens to the voice of reason, he must acknowledge that this is the true service of God. The biblical history of the cultic term λατρεία reaches its

climax in this interiorisation, which is also the most comprehensive exteriorisation, and which takes up again the initial prophetic statement in Dt. 10: 12 ff. The saying of Paul in R. 12:1 ff. is the crown of this whole development.

In a last ditch effort to convince his hearers and readers that the lexicographers are “undecided” and in “disagreement,” Workman turns to the *Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary* and the *New Bible Dictionary*. I cannot check those references because, although I have several thousand books in my library, those two have never found their way into my collection. Suffice it to say that, even after reading Workman’s article, I have never seen a serious scholar use a Bible dictionary (with or without pictures) to establish that lexicographers are uncertain of the meaning of the words that they define. The articles to which he refers seem to be on worship in general and not λατρευω or λατρεια in particular. Even so, I wonder if Gary Workman accepts as true the *New Bible Dictionary’s* assertion, which he quotes, that “so far as the New Testament is concerned our notions of Christian worship are very vague.” His article doesn’t sound as if he believes that. One could reasonably conclude that he uses an assertion that he doesn’t believe in order to convince his readers that what he does believe is true.

What Gary Workman believes is stated in his conclusion: “The fact remains that λατρευω and λατρεια refer to service in general, and not worship in particular.” While I have not exhausted all sources, I have not found a single lexicographer who says that either word, as used in the New Testament, refers to “service in general and not worship in particular.” That is a pure Workmanism unsupported by Greek scholars.

Workman’s reference to passages that speak of “worship

and serve” is rebutted in the review of Jim Dearman’s sermon. However, one — Matthew 4:10 — deserves special attention. If “service” is not worship in some sense, Jesus’ reply to the Devil’s temptation is, in legal terms, unresponsive. The Devil had said that he would bestow “all these things” on Jesus if Jesus would “worship” him. Jesus responded, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve (λατρευσεις).” If Jesus did not understand the Greek word λατρευσεις to mean worship in some sense, then why did he not just say, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God”? In fact, why did he not say, “Thou shalt worship only the Lord thy God”? Instead, he said, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and Him *only shalt thou serve.*”

Further, if “service” in Matthew 4:10 is not worship in some sense, why did Jesus mention it at all in response to the Devil’s temptation to worship him? Satan never asked Jesus to “serve” him. Not only does Matthew 4:10 not speak of a distinction between worship and service, it identifies both προσκυνεω and λατρευω as worship. Workman teaches that there is no overlap between the two. Jesus’ response in Matthew 4:10 clearly establishes that there is at least overlap, and, in some sense, identity.

I will not repeat the discussion of Guy N. Woods which appears in the review of Jim Dearman’s sermon. I would add that Workman and his cohorts are not sure what to do with brother Woods. Some, such as Dearman just misquote him and use outrageous reasoning (if it can even be called reasoning) to assert that brother Woods actually agrees with them. Daniel Denham is a bit more honest in the December 1998, issue of *Contending for the Faith*, p. 1, when he writes:

The beloved Guy N. Woods in *Questions and Answers*, volume I, took a position on worship and service that equates the two within certain parameters though he

sought to emphasize that there were two different definitions that he was using for "worship." The first definition involved what he termed "broader aspects of the matter," while the second definition involved "a more narrow and restricted sense in which we are *commanded* to engage in specific *acts* in an assembled capacity (pp. 336-337).

Frankly, that is all that anyone is contending today with whom I am familiar — there are two senses in which worship is used in scripture. One of those senses, the "broader aspects of the matter," includes the offering of the Christian's life, all of it, as a sacrifice to God.

If λατρευω and λατρευω are "service in general" as Workman asserts, no man dare serve any other — not his wife, not his neighbor, not his employer. In truth, there seems to be a contradiction in the scripture if Workman's position is correct. How can a person serve only Jehovah and yet be the servant of all. Mark 9:35. Workman may be tempted to say that the service to which Jesus refers is service offered directly to God and not to man, such as the priestly offering of sacrifice. However, such an argument is inconsistent with both the past practice and vocabulary of the brotherhood. I am not suggesting that practice and vocabulary determine truth. I am suggesting that if it were unscriptural surely Workman or some other brotherhood browbeater would have discovered it before now. Has Workman ever said that he "serves" as a minister or evangelist? Has he spoken of men "serving" as elders or deacons, or "serving" at the Lord's Table? Does his bulletin contain a section listing "Men to Serve The Congregation" for worship services? Clearly, he cannot escape his dilemma by asserting that Jesus spoke of only religious service. The truth is that there is no way that he can escape the dilemma without changing his position since he has already said

A Workman That Needs to Be Ashamed

that λατρευω refers to “service in general.” “Service in general” is much more than religious duties offered solely to God.

Gary Workman is so intent on making his point instead of learning and teaching the truth that he declares as saved “Some [who] had not turned themselves over to the Lord in the conversion process.” According to Workman, in Romans 12:1 Paul urges those “who had not turned themselves over to the Lord in the conversion process” to do so by presenting themselves as a living sacrifice. In what sense is one converted who has not turned himself over to the Lord? It doesn’t save Workman’s position to assert, as he does, that the Roman Christians had not *truly* turned themselves over to the Lord. Upon what passage does Workman rely to establish that one who has not *truly* turned himself over to the Lord is converted in any sense? Where does any Bible writer distinguish between the converted and the truly converted? To what extent does Workman believe that one can be converted “in the conversion process” without “turn[ing] themselves over to the Lord”? For example, can one turn himself over to the Lord on everything but baptism for the remission of sins? Can one make a mental reservation that he will turn himself over to the Lord on everything but adultery? Who draws that line and what standard is used to draw it?

Lest you stagger in unbelief that a gospel preacher can teach such nonsense, listen to what Workman says about those (including the Roman Christians) who have finally presented themselves once and for all to the Lord (see the refutation of the Dearman sermon for a discussion of the error that the Christian’s presentment of his life to the Lord as a living sacrifice is a “once and for all” event): “Having once been truly converted, we can continue to ‘offer service well pleasing to God with reverence and awe’ (Heb. 12:28).” Note that he contradicts himself by saying

that our reasonable service, i.e., the presenting of our body as a living sacrifice, is "once and for all" in Romans 12:1, but then asserts that once we are "truly converted" we can *continue* to "offer service (λατρεία) well pleasing to God with reverence and awe." Not even the partisan Workman can get away from the continuing nature of λατρεία!

Workman's intellectual dishonesty is so strong that he clings to his error rather than admit that sacrifice is worship. In this regard he is at least consistent, though consistently wrong. He has argued that there is a distinction between "worship" and "service" because of passages that speak of them both. (For a refutation of the illogic of this principle, see the review of Dearman's sermon.) What then shall he do with passages such as 2 Kings 17:35 that forbid "bow[ing] down" (which he admits is there and elsewhere a reference to worship) and "sacrific[ing]" to other gods? Shall he surrender his position, or at least question it? Rather than do either, he proceeds to take the position that "sacrifice" is not "worship." In particular, he writes:

It is instructive to notice that worship is listed separately from the performance of religious duties. Note its separation from 'sacrifice' in the last mentioned passage (2 Kings 17:35) as well as in verse 36. And there are other references where it is distinguished from sacrificing (Ex. 32:8; 2 Chron. 29:29; 1 Sam. 1:3; cf. v. 4 with v. 19). It is also distinguished from 'offering the first-fruits' (Deut. 26:10) and 'incense' (2 Chron. 32:12). In Ezekiel's vision the prince worships while the priests present sacrifices (Ezek. 46:2). Worship was something that every Israelite was expected to do (Ex. 33:10). The bowing and worshipping connotes the idea of *bending to the will of God*. When the people 'bowed the head and worshipped,' they 'went and did ... as Jehovah had commanded' (Ex. 12:27-28).

A Workman That Needs to Be Ashamed

Workman's memory is exceedingly short. Does he not recall that he cited Abraham as an example in his attempt to establish that worship has a beginning and an ending. Abraham went yonder to worship and came again, Workman argued. But what did Abraham do when he went yonder? He sacrificed a ram that God himself provided. Didn't God know why Abraham had gone to the mountain? Was God confused about whether sacrifice was worship? Or could Workman possibly be mistaken? In any event it is strange that Workman would use a passage where, according to him, there is no record that worship occurred to prove that worship has a beginning and an ending.

Not only does Workman affirm that sacrifice is not worship because it is spoken of in tandem with worship, he places giving and preaching or reading the word of God outside of worship for the same reason. He writes:

A free-will offering sometimes accompanies worship: 'Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name: bring an offering and come before him: worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness' (1 Chron. 16:29; cf. Psa. 86:8-9). However, giving itself may not be an act of worship. Notice that the wise men 'worshipped' Jesus and then offered him gifts (Matt. 2:11). Bible reading was evidently not considered worship since Nehemiah 9:3 tells that the people 'read in the book of the law of Jehovah their God a fourth part of the day; and another fourth part they confessed, and worshipped Jehovah.'

Who can believe it? It would certainly shorten the assembly since according to Workman there are now only three acts of worship in which we are authorized (commanded) to engage. In fact, if Workman were totally consistent he would reduce them to two. For some inexplicable reason he includes singing in worship even though the psalmist wrote: "All the earth shall *worship*

thee, *and* shall *sing* unto thee; they shall sing to thy name. Selah.” (Psa. 66:4.) Why does not the same principle that demands that service or sacrifice or giving or reading God’s word cannot be worship because each is used in tandem with worship, also demand that singing cannot be worship? If the answer is that “worship and serve” is used far more times in Scripture than “worship and sing,” then Workman must answer the question that he has undoubtedly asked many times, “How many times does the Bible have to say a thing for it to be true?” Workman refers to Psalm 66:1-4 in his article. He knew the passage existed. Was it honest for him not to deal with it?

Workman’s attempt at consistency finally and completely breaks down on the concept of praise. He writes: “Throughout the Bible, the central element of all true worship stands out as praise.” But, in light of Psalm 138:2, how can Workman consider praise to be worship at all, much less its central element? “I will *worship* toward thy holy temple, *and praise* thy name for thy lovingkindness and for thy truth: for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name.” “Worship” and “praise” are used in tandem in the same sentence. Thus, Gary Workman’s premise demands that they cannot mean or refer to the same thing. Which is true, his premise or his statement that praise is the central element of worship? One or both of them has to be wrong.

Workman’s 17th footnote cites the *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* edited by Colin Brown. Specifically, he cites to the article on prayer. Do you think that perhaps, since he was writing on worship, he had the intellectual curiosity (if not the obligation of scholarship) to read vol. 3, pp. 550-551 where the use of λατρευω and λατρεια in the New Testament is discussed? Read what the *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* says of the words and see if

A Workman That Needs to Be Ashamed

you think it was honest for Workman not only to ignore them in his study, but also to fail to present them to his hearers:

NT 1. All 21 cases of λατρευο in the NT are used in a religious sense, which includes the worship of strange gods (Rom. 1:25; Acts 7:42). Its use through out, and not merely in the 3 quotations (Matt. 4:10 par. Lk. 4:8 = Deut. 6:13; Acts 7:7 = Exod 3:12) is fixed by the OT. This is true of passages like Lk. 1:74; 2:37 and those where the God of the fathers is mentioned, whom Paul (Acts 24:14) or the twelve tribes (Acts 26:6, 7) worship. It is just in passages like this that we see that λατρευο had largely lost its cultic connotation in favour of that of the inner worship of the heart by faith (cf. Acts 24:14b), and → prayer (see above, OT 2).

Hebrews shows the closest links with the OT. Of the 6 uses, 4 refer to the → temple (tabernacle) cultus (Heb. 8:5; 9:9; 10:2; 13:10; → Tent). There is no need, however, to restrict these passages to the priest's vicarious acts for the people in the sacrificial worship; they can refer to the old worship in the tent, including that of the people in general, which was temporary, and not final and perfect. For as Heb. 9:14; 12:28 show, only the conscience which has been cleansed and brought to life by Christ, only the one who has been received into the true and eternal community of God (Heb. 12:22 ff.) can worship God acceptably "with reverence and awe."

When Paul wishes to describe the Christian's → walk, he also uses the OT cultic term (λατρεία, Rom. 12:1; → Prayer, art. εντινυχηανο) and says of himself that he serves God with his spirit in the gospel (Rom. 1:9). Similarly in Phil. 3:3, he writes of those "who worship God in spirit" or "by the Spirit of God". Both passages give clear expression to Jesus' statement that true and genuine worship as God wills it must be in Spirit and

through the Spirit, for God himself is Spirit (Jn. 4:23 f.; → Prayer, art. προσκυνεο NT 4). [This is probably how Workman knew to look in the article on prayer which he cited in his article. If so, it clearly establishes that he did read this article and chose not to inform his readers of it. JH] Such worship is freed from all the restrictions of cultic rules, circumcision and the struggle to attain righteousness through works. The man who has been reconciled and renewed carries out his worship of God through the Spirit by presenting his whole being. Since the Spirit of God takes control of a man's spirit for service in the gospel (Rom. 1:9), it leads to the surrender of the whole life, which is spiritual worship (Rom. 12:1; NEB "the worship offered by mind and heart"). The expression "in the gospel" (Rom. 1:9) includes for Paul everything, prayerful mention (v. 9b), witness and proclamation, which are inseparably linked with prayer and pastoral care.

2. λατρεία, apart from Rom. 12:1 (see above, 2), is found another 4 times in the NT. In Rom. 9:4, Heb. 9:1, 6 it refers to the OT cultus; in Jn. 16:2 it expresses the service which those who hate the gospel think they bring God when they persecute and kill Christ's witnesses.

3. There is little difference between λατρεία and τηρεσκεια, which means worship of God (Jas. 1:26 f.; RSV, NEB 'religion'), worship of angels (Col. 2:18) and religion in general (Acts 26:5). Correspondingly the adj. τηρεσκοσ (Jas. 1:26) can be rendered pious (RSV, NEB "religious").

Many good people have believed Gary Workman's article as truth because he claims to be a preacher of the gospel. They realize that they have personal responsibility to search the scripture to determine whether the things taught are true. Yet in many instances they have neither the resources nor the ability to grapple

with quotes taken out of context and with illogical and deceitful reasoning. For this reason it is imperative that the teacher be honest in his scholarship and scrupulous with his hearers. In his article on "Worship," Gary Workman fails on both counts. Indeed, it appears at times that he is intentionally misleading his hearers. As James admonished, "Be not many of you teachers knowing that ye shall receive the greater condemnation" (James 3:1).

If Gary Workman were a lawyer and presented a brief containing such blatant misrepresentations to the Court, he would lose all credibility with the Court. Indeed, under some rules and in some courts he could be severely sanctioned. There is a Court before which he stands and to which he shall answer. Perhaps it shall change, but for now Gary Workman is a Workman who needs to be ashamed (2 Tim. 2:15).



Worship: A Living Sacrifice _____

Appendix A

Dearman/Hall Correspondence

December 28, 1998

Dear Jim:

I have reviewed brother Woods' article since our conversation. I can reach no other conclusion (subject to hearing what you have to say) than that your reading of the article is not a fair reading and your quoting of them in the manner used misrepresented both what brother Woods said and his position on worship and life.

While the quotes were accurate as far as they went, they were taken from two different articles discussing two different subjects. Further, they were used in a manner that made it sound as if brother Woods agreed with the position espoused in the sermon. Based on the articles that position cannot be fairly taken. I will quote portions of the articles although you have them.

➤ Question: "Would you please comment on the difference between serving God and worshipping God?"
[One cannot read the entire article without knowing that it addresses at least in part the very issue addressed

in Workman's article and your sermon. Using only a part of Woods' article that ignored its context (especially when coupled with a quote from another article discussed below) to agree with your position, and by ignoring parts that show Woods' position was the exact opposite, was inappropriate.]

Answer: [First paragraph.] There is not nearly as much difference between these concepts as many today apparently believe. Occasionally, we see over the entrance to a church auditorium these words, *"Enter to worship and leave to serve."* *This concept results from ignorance of what the New Testament teaches about service and worship to God. It is not possible properly to make the distinction the above alluded to concept implies.* [Your entire sermon made the point that you worship in the assembly and nowhere else. Brother Woods says that you cannot biblically make the very distinction that you made. This establishes that the construction that you placed upon "everywhere and in all places" in the article is a forced construction not intended by brother Woods. Further, your position that two words conjoined by "and" are not both modified by the prepositional phrase that follows them both is exactly the argument that the Baptists make on Acts 2:38.]

[Fifth paragraph.] It is worthy of note that another Greek word (*λατρευω*) whence our English word liturgy comes, means "divine service," and is often applied to the duties of the Jewish priests, in their work, under the old order. They were typical of Christians today who are also engaged in divine service to Jehovah (1Pet. 2:9; and cf. Rom. 12:1). We serve God in worshipping him. [This paragraph very clearly states that the divine service in view in Romans 12:1 is worship — related to the duties of priests and typical of Christians today.]

Dearman/Hall Correspondence

[Sixth paragraph.] On the other hand, there is definitely reverence, respect, and adoration involved in acts of Christian worship. *When, for example, a basket of food is carried to a needy family, the action is grounded in the concept of service, but it is done out of regard for our relationship to God, and to this extent involves an act of worship. Therefore, we worship God, in serving others!*

[Part of seventh paragraph.] [After discussing the fact that some were pressing the concept discussed in paragraph 6 beyond scriptural limits by saying that, since there is an element of worship in all service, worship is not limited in time or space, and that it is not correct to speak of “acts” of worship performed “in church,” brother Woods states:] This view overlooks the fact that in the broader aspects of the matters *we do indeed worship and serve God, if we are his faithful children, always and everywhere*; but there is also a more narrow and restricted sense in which we are *commanded* to engage in specific *acts* in an assembled capacity, which cannot be performed acceptably in any other fashion. [Here he contrasts the narrow sense or worship in the assembly with the broader sense in which we worship and serve God always and everywhere. This makes sense when you consider the omnipresence of God. Can you be in his presence without worshipping Him? Are you in his presence only in the assembly?]

► [Woods article 2:] Question: Of what does worship consist? [The opening sentences state the concept addressed by brother Woods — some were saying that, since worship was in the heart and it is the inner man that worships, and since a mechanical instrument can never be put in the spiritual heart even though one is placed in the assembly, instrumental music can be used in the assembly. It is addressing that problem and in that context, obviously worship in the assembly, that brother

Woods made the second quote attributed to him. It is taken from paragraph (1) on page 365.] Inasmuch as worship consists of acts, it follows that such acts are as much involved in worship, and are as essential to it, as the attitude which prompts them. [It is not appropriate to introduce this quote from another article and discussing another subject immediately after the first quote with the words, "brother Woods then adds. ..." Yet this was the precise language used in the sermon to tie the two quotes together.]

Jim, even if the position taken in the sermon were correct, which it is not, such misrepresentations should not be used even in the defense of truth. Frankly, I thought this was probably a part of the Workman article until you told me that it was your interpretation of the Woods' articles.

Please look this over and let me know what you think. I suppose the greatest problem with which I am wrestling is the fact that the elders' statement placed the position that I hold in the area of doctrinal error that required a statement by them and renewal of their commitment not to "compromise with error." I will be happy to consider anything that you have to say. For your convenience I have enclosed what Kittle has to say on the Greek (it clearly does not comport with what you said about the meaning of the Greek for "service"). Although I have not enclosed copies of the Greek grammar or the Hebrew/Greek Study Bible to which reference is made, I will either copy them or let you see them if you care to do so.

In Christian love,
Jess Hall, Jr.

Dearman/Hall Correspondence

Dear Jess,

Let me thank you for your prompt response to the request for the name search. The name "Pathways to Peace," which is already registered, would apparently prohibit efforts to register "Pathway to Peace." Therefore, we would like to try to use "Journey To Joy." Could you ask the attorneys to do a search on that name? In talking with Norman and Johnnie yesterday in my office, they wanted me to make this request, and they asked if your firm could invoice the church after making the search. Thanks so much for your assistance in this matter,

As for the material you gave me, I would like to respond briefly, but sufficiently. First of all, I reiterate that my sermon on the subject, "Is All Of Life Worship?" was a Scriptural sermon, and I have seen nothing in your material which would, in any way, alter the material I presented in the lesson. I hope I can clear up some misunderstandings I believe you have concerning the lesson.

In the bulk of your letter of December 13, you asserted that I had taken quotes from two of brother Wood's articles on worship, as though I had deliberately misrepresented his position by so doing. I can assure you there was no intention to misrepresent brother Woods, and I do not believe I misrepresented him. If you will read closely the article on Page 336, you will find brother Woods' statement which was not quoted in the lesson

"It should be noted that worship consists of acts of reverence-not merely reverence-thus emphasizing that it involves vastly more than a disposition of heart and mind. It is not enough simply to be worshipful in spirit; we must allow this disposition to find expression in acts of reverence, acts of course, approved of God" (Acts 2:42)

Now read the quote from the other article on worship, which

I chose to use in the sermon from page 365. Here is that quote:

“Inasmuch as worship consists of acts, it follows that such acts are as much involved in worship, and are essential to it, as the attitude which prompts them.”

There is absolutely no difference in the meaning of the two statements. Therefore, it is incorrect for you to assert that such use of brother Wood's comments on worship was inappropriate. I assume you simply did not carefully compare the full content of the two articles. In fact, the material from the two articles simply points out the consistency of brother Woods' teaching on what constitutes worship.

Your assertion that I ignored “parts that show Woods' position was the exact opposite” is also inaccurate. As I have expressed to you personally, I do not believe brother Woods believed that all of life is worship. Did he believe there was an element of worship in our acts of Christian service? Yes, he clearly stated so. However, that, in no way, equates to the position that all of life is worship. I firmly believe that brother Woods would have considered the “all life is worship” concept as going beyond what he taught. As to brother Woods' statement that there is a broad sense in which we “worship and serve God always and everywhere,” I believe that statement must be interpreted in its context. The context is that there is an element of worship in our acts of Christian service, according to brother Woods. Therefore, according to his position, as we serve God in acts of Christian service, there is a broad sense in which worship may be involved. That is brother Woods' position. I recognize the word “and” joins the phrase “worship and serve” as a coordinating conjunction. However, we must not take the statement beyond the context in which brother Woods made it. Brother Woods warned about taking this “broad sense” of worship in

acts of service too far. The position that all of life is worship does take it too far. Brother Woods made it clear that worship involves both an attitude and an approved action. *Everything* one does in life cannot meet these criteria. Therefore, everything in life cannot be worship. Had brother Woods publicly espoused the position that all life is worship, I believe there would have been a widespread concern expressed by brethren toward this teaching, as has traditionally been the case when this position is publicly taught. Again, brother Woods simply taught that there is an element of worship (broad sense) in our acts of Christian service in which Christians are regularly engaged.

I agree that the distinction between worship and service which some make as expressed by the phrase "Enter to worship and leave to serve," is too restrictive, as brother Woods stated. We may engage in approved acts of worship as a part of our private devotions or with our families, as the elders stated in the comments read prior to my sermon. All worship does not take place in the assembly. However, the necessary ingredients for worship, as brother Woods clearly states in *both* the articles from which I quoted, are proper attitude and proper, authorized actions. Therefore, all life cannot be worship.

This brings me to another point in your letter. You stated: "Your entire sermon made the point that you worship in the assembly and nowhere else." Jess, that is simply not the case. The statement from the elders, which was read by Johnnie Laman before the sermon, made it clear that we may worship in private or family devotions outside the assembly, but that these occasions of worship do not *substitute* for the worship in the assembly. On more than one occasion in my sermon, I expressed total agreement with the elders' statement. How, then, could one possibly contend the lesson argued for something other than what

was contained in the elders' statement? The whole purpose of the lesson was to prove *from Scripture* that the elders had made a completely *Scriptural* statement about worship. The second point in the conclusion of my lesson outline reads: "The statement from our elders this morning is in harmony with the Scriptures." My sermon simply reinforced the Scriptural soundness of the statement from the elders. Worship involves both the proper attitude and the proper, authorized actions.

I include here a part of the elders' statement read before my sermon, November 22, 1998: "...We also believe the Scriptures allow for families and individuals to have private periods of devotion in which they worship God. However, these private occasions cannot substitute for the public assemblies in which the whole church is to come together..." Jess, I commended that statement in my lesson and proceeded to demonstrate its Scriptural soundness in the sermon I preached. You are the only person who has suggested otherwise.

As to my argument from the Greek infinitive in the sermon, it was made on a valid basis. My point was not that the aorist tense indicated the presentation of ourselves was a past time event. That would be impossible. The argument I made had nothing to do with the temporal aspects of the aorist in the infinitive. I agree the temporal aspects are lost in the infinitive. It is the *kind* of action I was referring to in the aorist which has significance in Romans 12:1. The kind of action in the aorist is "punctiliar" (also called simple, or unspecified) versus "linear" (progressive or continuous) in the present tense in the Greek. This is the point of the argument. While the infinitive has no temporal significance in the aorist it retains its significance as to the "kind" of action involved.

This was my point in the sermon. Paul used the aorist tense,

which, I said, indicates punctiliar or “one-time” action, versus the continuous action of the present tense. Again, while the temporal element of the aorist tense is obviously lost in the infinitive form, the “kind” of action remains. Therefore, the basis of the argument is sound.

Notice the quote you included in your material from the Hebrew Greek Study Bible on the aorist infinitive: “The Aorist Infinitive refers to simple action and not linear, the present infinitive ... It does not signify the time of action.” (Hebrew Greek Study Bible, p. 1569). Now notice this quote, from the same source. The Hebrew-Greek Study Bible says of the present infinitive: “The Present Infinitive refers to continuous or repeated action, without implying anything about the time of the action.” With both these statements I totally agree. I made no reference to the temporal element in the lesson. I referred to the kind of action as “punctiliar, one-time action versus progressive, or linear. Paul used the aorist infinitive in Romans 12:1.

Notice this comment from Dana and Mantey:

“A Greek writer instinctively knew what tense to use in expressing an idea accurately. The more one studies Greek the more this conviction grows upon him. At times the same verb is repeated in succeeding clauses, but the tense is changed, because the writer was acutely conscious of the distinctive force of each tense in expressing the state of an action. The play is entirely upon whether the action is punctiliar - viewed as a single whole-or whether it is the opposite, continuous or repeated” (Dana and Mantey, *A Manual of the Greek New Testament*, pp. 194, 195).

Certainly, Paul, inspired by the Holy Spirit, would have used the very words needed to express exactly what God intended.

Jess, you included material on the matter of distinctions

between the words for “worship” and “service.” I believe the material I presented in the lesson is accurate. I certainly recognize the employment of synonymous parallelism in Scriptures, especially in Hebrew poetry. However, the argument I made concerning a clear distinction between worship and service in Scripture cannot be dismissed on that basis. One cannot attribute to parallelism every simultaneous occurrence of the words “worship” and “serve.” Many passages make a distinction in the two concepts, as I pointed out in the lesson.

In your material, you state the definitions for “latreueo” from lexicographers which mention “service *or* worship” in their renderings. I mentioned in my sermon that lexicographers list “worship” as a possible meaning. I believe these matters were dealt with in the lesson adequately, as I discussed the reasons for rendering the word “service” in Romans 12:1, rather than “worship.” However, I will address the extensive material from Kittel which you copied and included. This material actually reinforces the conclusions I reached in the lesson. On page 65 of Kittel, under the heading “2,” where Kittel specifically discusses “latreia” in Romans 12:1, he says this:

“The concrete idea of sacrifice seems always to cling to the noun no less than to the verb. This is also true in the last verse (R, 12:1), though the use here is metaphorical. The service which Christians are to offer consists in the fashioning of their inner lives and their outward physical conduct in a way which plainly distinguishes them from the world and which corresponds to the will of God. This is the living sacrifice which they have to offer. Using a term which was current in the philosophy of his day, Paul describes this sacrifice as a $\Xi\Delta\psi\Lambda\Box\omega$ *καρπεταω*, a service of God which corresponds to human reason, in which, however, divine reason is also at

Dearman/Hall Correspondence

work. If man listens to the voice of reason, he must acknowledge that this is the true service of God."

You quoted Vincent's definition of the word in question as "worship through special rites or sacrifices." However, in his comments on the phrase, "Which is your reasonable service" in Romans 12:1, he says:

"Explaining the whole previous clause. *Service*, see on ch. ix.4. The special word for the service rendered by the Israelites as the peculiar people of God is very significant here. *Reasonable*, not in the popular sense of the term, as a thing *befitting* or *proper*; but *rational*, as distinguished from merely external or material. Hence nearly equivalent to *spiritual*. So Rev., in margin. It is in harmony with the highest reason" (Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament*. Vol. 111, p.154).

The above quote refers the reader to Vincent's comments on Romans 9:4 concerning the word "service." That comment on the phrase "the service" in Romans 9:4 reads: "See on John xvi. 2; Luke i. 74; Apoc. xxii. 3; Philip. iii.3. Here the sum-total of the Levitical services instituted by the law" (*Vincent, Word Studies in the New Testament*. Vol. III, p. 101).

I believe these quotes speak for themselves concerning the emphasis of Romans 12:1.

Having rendered this response, Jess, I would now like to put the matter to rest and move forward in the work here at Fleetwood. You and your family have been a great encouragement to us, since it was known that we would be coming to work together here in Houston. I deeply appreciate that. You have also been most encouraging concerning my preaching. I realize you have disagreed with the lesson I presented on "Is All of Life Worship." You have expressed that disagreement strongly, but without personal malice, while, at the same time, reaffirming

Worship: A Living Sacrifice _____

your support for our being here at Fleetwood. My response has been written in a spirit of love and concern for truth and for you, and with the fervent desire that we may both endeavor “to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.”

In Christian love,
Jim Dearman

Dearman/Hall Correspondence

January 5, 1999

Dear Jim,

I apologize for the delay in responding to your letter. The end of the year has been very busy from the standpoint of my caseload. That's the good news. The bad news is that it doesn't look like it will improve much during 1999. In a sense, I guess that is good news as well. First things first — I am enclosing a memo regarding the search on "Journey to Joy." Looks like another strike out. There will be no legal fees for the work. I will forward a bill for the expenses involved.

I understand your desire and the elders' desire to put the "life is worship" issue behind you. I have problems with that from three standpoints. First, it is difficult for me to put behind having been called, however indirectly, a teacher of error by you from the pulpit, by the elders from the pulpit, and by a statement mailed to each of the members. Second, it is made more difficult by the fact that I was not consulted in advance and at least told that the statement and sermon were coming. While it now appears that nothing could have been worked out, had I been warned, Millie and I would not have felt "ambushed," to use Eric's description of the event. Third, I cannot let your (non)answer go without response. Your response was nothing more than a reiteration of your position and an expression of confidence in it. You totally failed to deal with any of the issues related to the principles upon which your logic was based. Further, you failed to deal with any of the issues pointed out that were not dealt with in your sermon, *e.g.*, the fact that however "service" is translated, it is the offering of a spiritual *sacrifice* to

which it refers — obviously an act of worship.

If, as you assert in your letter, you think that I am the only one who disagrees both with what was taught and the manner in which it was handled, then you have not been listening. More importantly, even if I were the only one who disagreed with your sermon, the truth of what you taught or what I teach is not determined by nose-count. It is determined by scripture. Further, it could be that I am the only person who has the incentive of having been singled out as a teacher of error. Incidentally, no one who was around when this subject first came up could have missed the fact that I don't care much for being labeled as a teacher of error.¹ I care even less for brethren who throw that label around loosely and who have set themselves up as brotherhood watchdogs swaggering through the brotherhood labeling as liberal anyone who dares to disagree with them.²

I do not expect an answer to this second response (though I would appreciate one) since everybody but me wants to get the matter behind them. I do feel uncomfortable at Fleetwood, however, both in the pulpit and in worship. There are those who now feel that there is a teacher of error leading singing. I question in worship whether prayers that mention my name as a leader of worship are truly a giving of thanks or merely an attempt to soothe the effect of having categorized me as a teacher of error. I react negatively when your sermons use logic that you rejected in your sermon on worship to establish a point in another area. I question the accuracy of quotes that you use from the works of others. All in all, it makes it difficult for me to worship. Accordingly, with no resolution reached and none in sight, Millie and I think it is best if we leave Fleetwood. Along with copies of this letter and my comments on your response, I have sent the elders

Dearman/Hall Correspondence

a letter resigning as a deacon and informing them of our decision to worship and work elsewhere. I bear you no ill will in the matter and I wish both you and Fleetwood well. However, that does not change the fact that your response and reasoning on this issue comprise one of the worst cases of eisegesis that I have ever seen.

Your answer did meet its first stated objective of being brief. Though well intentioned, it did *not* meet its second stated objective of being sufficient. I expected more from one who joined with the elders in classifying me as a teacher of error. I am disappointed that the response only skimmed across the surface, ignored and created major problems with both logic and scripture, and rushed to set the matter aside. That said, as far as I am concerned the matter is at rest for me and, with me gone, will be at rest for Fleetwood. I do not want to disturb the peace of the congregation, but I do not want to continue where I have been falsely charged with teaching error.

I regret that this has become necessary. Millie and I did and do believe that you have much to offer Fleetwood. Our prayer is that both you and Fleetwood will grow in every right way in the gospel.

In Christian love,
Jess Hall, Jr.

¹The label is even more difficult to take when those who have assigned it cannot or will not (at least have not) adequately responded to the arguments that I have presented, and have even less adequately defended their own position.

²I do not put you in this category, but I do think that these brethren may account for the poor scholarship and the illogic used in your sermon and response. For example, when you quoted from and used Gary Workman as a source, you linked your credibility to his.



Worship: A Living Sacrifice

Appendix B

**Articles
by Guy N. Woods**

referred to by

Jim Dearman

and

Jess Hall Jr.

Service and Worship

By Guy N. Woods, deceased

Question: “Would you please comment on the difference between serving God and worshipping God?”

Answer: There is not nearly as much difference between these concepts as many today apparently believe. Occasionally, we see over the entrance to a church auditorium these words, “Enter to worship and leave to serve.” This concept results from ignorance of what the New Testament teaches about service and worship to God. It is not possible properly to make the distinction the above alluded to concept implies.

The word “worship” often occurs in the Bible. Nearly a dozen-and-a-half Greek and Hebrew terms are used to reflect some aspect of the matter. The most common of these is *proskuneoo*, literally, to kiss the hand toward, and, in use, to signify devotion, adoration, and love. Its first occurrence in the New Testament is in Matt. 2:2, and very often thereafter; and, in the American Standard Version there is a footnote to Matt. 2:2 (and frequent references to this note in subsequent appearances of the term), which contains an excellent definition of the word: “The Greek word denotes an act of reverence whether paid to a creature (see ch. 4:9; 18:26), or to the Creator (see ch. 4:10).”

It should be noted that worship consists of acts of reverence not merely reverence — thus emphasizing that it involves vastly more than a disposition of heart and mind. It is not enough simply to be worshipful in spirit; we must allow this disposition to find expression in acts of reverence, acts, of course, approved of God (Acts 2:42).

It follows, therefore, that there is very definitely service involved in our devotions to Jehovah. Inasmuch as he has commanded us to worship him (Matt. 4:10; John 4:24; cf. Rev. 22:9), we are engaged in service to God when we thus do.

It is worthy of note that another Greek word (*latreuoo*) whence our English word liturgy comes, means “divine service,” and is often applied to the duties of the Jewish priests, in their work, under the old order. They were typical of Christians today who are also engaged in divine service to Jehovah (1 Pet. 2:9; and cf. Rom. 12:1). We serve God in worshipping him.

On the other hand, there is very definitely reverence, respect, and adoration involved in acts of Christian worship. When, for example, a basket of food is carried to a needy family, the action is grounded in the concept of service, but it is done out of regard for our relationship to God, and to this extent involves an act of worship. Therefore, we worship God, in serving others!

But, we must keep this concept within proper scriptural limits — not always done today. Some are suggesting that because there is an element of worship in all service, worship is not limited in time or place, and that it is not correct to speak of “acts” of worship performed “in church.” This view overlooks the fact that in the broader aspects of the matter we do indeed worship and serve God, if we are his faithful children, always and everywhere. But there is also a more narrow and restricted sense in which we are commanded to engage in specific acts in an assembled capacity, which cannot be performed acceptably in any other fashion. The early disciples “continued steadfastly in the apostles’ teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers” (Acts 2:42). Five items are specified or implied here, teaching, singing, the contribution, the Lord’s supper, and

prayer (Eph. 5:18-19); and these are essential to acceptable worship on the Lord's day (1 Cor. 16:1-2; Acts 20:7; Heb. 10:25.) Observe that these acts were thus engaged in according to "the apostles' teaching," who, in turn, were instructed to teach these matters to all who were disciples. We thus have both apostolic example and divine command for the observance of these "acts" in the church in Lord's day worship. (Matt. 28:18-20.)

(Questions and Answers Open Forum, Freed-Hardeman College Lectures, By Guy N. Woods, pp. 336-7).

More on Worship

By Guy N. Woods

Question: "Of what does worship consist?"

Answer: The American Standard Version at Matthew 2:8 has a reference to a footnote defining the word worship as follows: "The Greek word denotes an act of reverence whether paid to a creature (see ch. 4:9; 18:26), or to the creator (see ch. 4:10)."

1. Worship, then, involves an act. It is incorrect to say that worship is simply and solely an attitude of heart. Inasmuch as worship consists of acts, it follows that such acts are as much involved in worship and are as essential to it as the attitude that prompts them.

2. The Greek word for worship denotes an act ... paid. Worship involves an attitude, but an attitude that expresses itself in acts, which find acceptance in the will of another. Worship, therefore, necessitates acts. The effort to disassociate acts from

attitude in worship was born of the desire to escape the opprobrium of adding unauthorized practices to the worship of God. Knowledgeable people who use instrumental music in worship are well aware of the fact that there is no authority in the New Testament for its use. They seek to avoid the charge of adding to the divine will by the allegation that, after all, worship does not involve acts but attitudes, and therefore the instrument is really no part of the worship.

The effort fails for at least two reasons: (1) We have seen that it is based on the erroneous concept of what worship is; (2) it does not elude, but merely postpones the fatal dilemma. For, this worship which is alleged to be solely a matter of the heart and expresses itself, not by divine law but by the will of the worshiper, is either restrained or unrestrained. If unrestrained, then the will of the worshiper becomes the sole arbiter of the suitability of the act thus leaving the one who worships free to resort to whatever expressions of it one desires. The pompous worshiper behind stained glass windows in a great cathedral, the Salvation Army lass with her tambourine, and the religious snake handler may all properly claim justification for their choices of expression. Acts 2:42 may be disregarded as the expression of the divine pattern, and thenceforth each of us may be governed by our own wishes and preferences in our worship to God.

If, however, no will worship is acceptable but proper worship is restrained (as is the case, Col. 2:20-23), we may inquire, What is the restraining influence? We are thus brought back to the place where we should have started in any matter involving our duty to God: What does the New Testament authorize us to do in worship? The early church, under the guidance of inspired men, continued "steadfastly" in the apostles' teaching, which included singing, the Lord's supper, the contribution and

prayers. These divinely given items are specifically said to have been the means by which the first Christians worshiped. (Acts 2:42; 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:1,2.) Less than these we cannot offer him and be in conformity to his will; more than these are an unwarranted and officious intermeddling with the will of God.

It follows, therefore, that in this, the Christian age, the use of instrumental music is unauthorized and unacceptable in the worship of God. "It was used in the Old Testament." Yes, along with the burning of incense, the offering of animal sacrifices and the practice of polygamy. These are not patterns we may properly follow today. The shadows of the old order have given way to the substance of the better way and under the clear light of Christianity such matters are conspicuous by their absence. (Hebrews 8:6-13.) Let it be remembered and never forgotten that our Lord never commanded the use of instrumental music in worship, no apostle ever sanctioned it, no New Testament writer ever authorized it and no apostolic church ever used it!

(Questions and Answers Open Forum, Volume 2, Freed-Hardeman College Lectures, by Guy N. Woods, pp. 149-50)



Appendix C

Types of Worship

If we do not make a distinction between the various aspects, circumstances, or conditions of worship, we will be confused. The Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament use several words for worship. For the most part, the English reader is confined to a single word, although we do use some synonyms, such as glory, religion, and service. It has been said that definition of terms is ninety percent of the discussion. Here are four types of worship:

1. First-day-of-the-week assembly-worship in which five prescribed acts are done in a prescribed manner.

2. Assembly-worship when some but not all of the five prescribed acts of first-day-of-the-week assembly-worship are engaged in (such as gospel meetings, midweek service, youth meetings, etc.).

3. Individual devotionals that do not require an assembly. We may think of this as inner-chamber worship (Matt 6:6), this may include, prayer, private-almsgiving, and volunteer fasting (Matt. 6:4, 17-18).

4. Presenting the body to God as a holy, living sacrifice. Sacrifice is a metaphor connoting worship (when Abraham said, "We shall go yonder and worship," he had in mind sacrifice).

Paul pleads for us to take into account the mercies of God and be moved to present our bodies as a living sacrifice, holy (unblemished) and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual service (Rom. 12:1). The “which is” of that statement shows that the service the apostles had in mind was the living sacrifice. Note: “Present you bodies a living sacrifice ... *which is your* spiritual service.” Other passages to consider are: Colossians 3:17 (Note: Paul connects “giving thanks to God the Father” through Jesus with doing all things in his name. The required gratitude suggests worship). Also, 1 Corinthians 10:31 where the apostle connects a common meal with glorifying God. The word translated “glorify” suggests worship. James 1:27 describes pure religion as serving the needs of the poor (widows and orphans). The word translated “religion” is defined as worship.

All of life is not worship of God in any of these senses. It is not worship in the sense of items one through three because each of these has a beginning time and an ending time. All of life is not worship in the sense of number four because we sin (1 John 1:6-10), and when we sin we necessarily stop offering our bodies a living sacrifice. We cannot serve sin and God at the same time (Matt. 6:24).

To say all of life ought to be worship(ful), does not mean there are no specific acts of worship, nor does it blur or diminish the specific, commanded acts of cultic worship. The presenting of one’s body as a living sacrifice is an act. There are acts of worship in addition to the five prescribed acts typical of first-day-of-the-week assembly-worship (volunteer fasting and private almsgiving, for instance).

When any of the five prescribed acts characteristic of first-day-of-the-week assembly-worship are done, they must be done in the way prescribed in the New Testament. Offering musical

praise to God, whether in or out of the assembly must be vocal because the New Testament tells us to sing. When we pray in the closet of our hearts, it must be done according to the instructions of the New Testament. When we sing to God that, too, must be done in the way God tells us to do it — every time and everywhere.



Worship: A Living Sacrifice _____

Appendix D

Comments from Respected Men

Children of God are urged to present their bodies “a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your spiritual service” (Rom 12:1). If the whole life of the saint is to be a “living sacrifice,” and if sacrifice is worship, then it follows that all of the life of the redeemed should be worship to God. Notice what the following respected brethren say about sacrifice, service, and worship.

Foy E. Wallace Jr: [Commenting on Romans 12:1] “Present bodies — their Jewish system of sacrifices — annulled — removed — dissolved — altars of Judaism replaced by sacrifice of own bodies — in worship to God” (*Commentary on Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians*, p. 55, by Foy E. Wallace).

John Shannon: “The dedication of the body to God is every Christian’s reasonable or spiritual service. The word *reasonable* in the KJV is translated from *logiken* (from which our English word *logic* derives), meaning “rational, intelligent, logical, spiritual.” Thinking and figuring out what to do and how to do it is an act of the mind. The word *service* has to do with “service, ministry, or worship to God” (*Studies in Romans*, edited by *Dub McClish*, Fifteenth Annual Denton Lectures, p. 222).

Robertson L. Whiteside: "The body is the instrument through which the spirit acts either for good or bad. ... "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your spiritual service" (Rom. 12:1). Instead of "spiritual" the King James Version has "reasonable." But the word "reasonable" has been greatly abused. It is true that the word frequently means *fair, equitable*, as when we speak of a reasonable price; but that is not its meaning here. Certainly Paul did not pass judgment on God's requirements and recommend them to the brethren on the grounds that he considered them fair and equitable. The word "spiritual" comes closer to Paul's meaning; at least, it is freer from the possibility of being misunderstood. Hence, to present our bodies a living sacrifice is a spiritual service, or worship [Emphasis added]. It is spiritual because every act of acceptable obedience comes from the heart, or spirit. We obey from the heart (Rom. 6:17), and every transformation in conduct comes from renewing the mind (Rom. 12:2). The spirit serves through the instrument of the body" (*The Body an Instrument*, Doctrinal Discourses, 1955, pp. 57, 59, by Robertson L. Whiteside).

Robertson Whiteside: [Commenting on the word *holy* in Romans 12:1] "With the Greeks the word here translated "holy" meant, "devoted to the gods." Any gift made to their gods was said to be *devoted, holy*. It is easy to see its application. Our bodies, as living sacrifices, are devoted to the worship and service of God" (*A New Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Saints at Rome*, Robertson L. Whiteside, p. 247).

Moses Lard: "[T]o present your bodies. Not present them once and no more, but present them continually; present them once for all, or present them and let them remain presented. These bodies are to be 'living,' not dead and inactive, but alive

and active in the service of God ... [w]hich is your reasonable service. This clause is in apposition with the expression 'present your bodies a living sacrifice,' and to a certain extent is explanatory of it. *Presenting our bodies to God in the manner prescribed, is latreia, service, or worship paid to him. This much is clear*" [Emphasis added].

Roy Deaver: "If we raise the question, Who is to do the presenting? The answer is: "You ... brethren" — each individual ... each individual can (and must) present his own sacrifice. ... If we ask: To whom is the sacrifice to be presented? the answer is: To God ... 'Living' also emphasizes the essentiality of one's remaining faithful to God. ... Paul says the sacrifice is to be holy. ... Paul says the sacrifice must be 'acceptable' to God. In John 4:24 the Lord gave the standard for true and acceptable worship. For worship to be acceptable to God it must be addressed to God, it must be in the right spirit, and it must be in truth, divinely authorized. If an item does not meet this standard it will not be acceptable to God. God has given the instructions regarding the Christian's use of his body. When these instructions are respected and heeded the sacrifice will be acceptable to God. Only God can reveal to the human being what is acceptable to Him. This He has done through His Word. I must know what God has said will be acceptable to Him. 'And whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him. ...'" (*Commentary on Romans*, by Roy C. Deaver, pp. 437-440).

David Lipscomb: [The question put to brother Lipscomb began, "Will you please explain the difference between the service of God and the worship of God? ..."] Lipscomb answered: "Worship more specially refers to praise, prayer, adoration, and thanksgiving: service, to obedience to the law of God in carry-

ing out his will in the world. *It has always been difficult to draw the line between service and worship. It is especially difficult under Christ, inasmuch as all service must spring from faith in and love to God, and so becomes an expression of praise and honor to him. The same rule governs both — that is, we must both worship and serve God in his own appointments, and not through man's inventions*" (*Questions and Answers*, by Lipscomb and Sewell, pp. 749-50).

J.W. McGarvey & Philip Y. Pendleton: "Paul proceeds to first define the life of faith (12:1, 2). It is a sanctified, sacrificial life. ... Of the four sacrifices demanded by the law two were offered before propitiation and to obtain it. These were the sin and trespass offerings; ... there were two other sacrifices offered after propitiation and expiation. These were the burnt-offering, offered as an act of worship daily and also on occasions of joy and thanksgiving (2 Chron. 29:31,32), and the peace-offerings, which spoke of restored fellowship and communion with God. Now, the faith-life was exempted from the expiatory of sin and trespass offerings by the cross of Christ, but it was not relieved of the burnt and peace offerings, the former of which required that the entire carcass of the victim be consumed in the flame (Ex. 29:38-42; Num. 28:3-8) as a symbol of the entire consecration of the offerer or devotee to the service of God, for the life of the offering stood for his own life." [Footnote by McGarvey and Pendleton: The sincere worshipper, whether Jew or Gentile, saw in the sacrifice which he presented on the altar a symbol of his own self-devotion. This symbolic purpose determined the choice of the proper material for an altar-sacrifice: it must represent the offerer's life. For this reason, in all the chief sacrifices, it must be itself a living creature: and in every case, without exception, it must be the offerers own lawful property, the fruit of

96

his life-work, and also fit, as food, for the support of his life. In presenting such a sacrifice the worshiper was presenting a portion of his own life as a symbol of the whole” (Gifford).] The Christian, therefore, as a living, never-to-be-recalled sacrifice, is required to keep up and perpetuate his holiness and acceptability as “an odor of a sweet smell” (Eph. 5:2; Phil 4:18; Lev. 1:9), lest he become a castaway. For this reason Paul lays emphasis on the ‘body’ as the corpus or substance of the sacrifice ... Moreover, this direct reference to the body corrects the heresy that the faith-life is purely mental or spiritual, and devoid of bodily sacrifice or works (Gal. 5:13; James 2:14-26). ‘How,’ asks Chrysostom, ‘can the body become a sacrifice? Let the eye look on no evil, and it is a sacrifice. Let the tongue utter nothing base, and it is an offering. Let the hand work no sin, and it is a holocaust. But more, this suffices not, but, besides, we must actively exert ourselves for good; the hand giving alms, the mouth blessing them that curse us, the ear ever at leisure for listening to God.’ Moreover, the sacrifice of the body includes that of mind, soul and spirit, for ‘bodily sacrifice is an ethical act’ [Meyer] (*Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans*, By J.W. McGarvey and Philip Y. Pendleton.

Guy N. Woods: [The question was asked: Would you please comment on the difference between serving God and worshipping God?] Here is an excerpt from brother Woods answer: “There is not nearly as much difference between these concepts as many today apparently believe. Occasionally, we see over the entrance to a church auditorium these words, “Enter to worship and leave to serve.” This concept results from ignorance of what the New Testament teaches about service and worship to God. It is not possible properly to make the distinction the above alluded to concept implies. ... It follows, therefore, that there is very

definitely service involved in our devotions to Jehovah. Inasmuch as he has commanded us to worship him (Matt. 4:10; John 4:24; cf. Rev. 22:9), we are engaged in service to God when we thus do. ... On the other hand, there is very definitely reverence, respect, and adoration involved in acts of Christian worship. When, for example, a basket of food is carried to a needy family, the action is grounded in the concept of service, but it is done out of regard for our relationship to God, and to this extent involves an act of worship. Therefore, we worship God, in serving others!

[Incidentally, H.A.W. Meyer in his commentary on Romans, Vol. 2, p. 252, (commenting on Romans 12:1, and quoting Buttman with approval), says, "*latreia*, service of worship, as in John 16:2." Further, James Macknight, b. 1721, in his highly respected *Apostolical Epistles*, renders *latreia* "reasonable worship."]

