

Dr. Gary Meadors, 1 Corinthians, Lecture 10, Paul's Response to the Oral Communique from Chloe's Household, Part 1, 1 Corinthians 1:10-4:21

© 2024 Gary Meadors and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Gary Meadors in his teaching on the book of 1 Corinthians. This is lecture 10, Paul's Response to the Oral Communique from Chloe's Household--Chapter 1, verse 10 through chapter 4, verse 21.

Well, welcome to our 10th video as we're thinking through 1 Corinthians. You should have notepad number 7, which is the notepad that gives you information on 1 Corinthians 1, chapter 1, verse 10, actually through chapter 4, the end of the chapter. Now, this is a very, very important unit as we think through 1 Corinthians because thinking through this particular unit is going to exercise us greatly on how to think of a whole unit like this 1, 10 through the end of chapter 4, rather than just one paragraph or a verse.

I'm afraid that many times in our church settings, when we use phrases like expository preaching, I'm not sure if that's the language that's familiar to you. I hope it is, but it's the idea of where a preacher preaches through a book of the Bible, for example, and they talk about being expository. Well, what does it mean to be expository? I hear a lot of people talk about that, and then they preach a verse at a time. There are certain books, for example, that are the products of famous preachers, like preaching through Romans, and when you look at those, they preach this verse, they preach this verse, they preach that verse.

I'm sorry, but that's not preaching through Romans. Romans is preaching this unit, this unit, this unit, and sometimes those units may take several verses, maybe sometimes as much as 10 or 20 verses. The Bible communicates these big ideas to us, like in a 1901 American Standard Version Bible, where you've got these large paragraphs.

You never want to break a paragraph up because a paragraph is an idea, and there are different ways that the Bible uses literary genres to give us ideas. And we've already seen in 1 Corinthians that 1 Corinthians 11 tells us that Paul got some information from Chloe's household, and he's going to respond to that, and that unit begins at 1:10 and goes up through the end of chapter 4, and it becomes very important for us to think about that as an entirety, not just to check off little phrases and so forth as we move through the various categories or the various verses in this passage. So, I want to challenge you to think of chapters 1 to 4 as a unit and try to think from the standpoint of each piece of that unit having a meaning that

contributes and relates to the entire unit. That's the way we're going to think about it.

That's the way I want to try to lead you through it. Now, when you sit down to do your homework and reading, as I've mentioned to you, one way to do that is to read the book by Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*. Now, this is a limited volume.

It primarily looks at the structure of the text that you're dealing with. Now, we won't always agree. No one always agrees with one take on that, but at least Talbert tries to look at the units, not just an individual verse, but how verses mean within the unit.

In chapters 1 to 4 that we're looking at now, Bruce Winter's book, *After Paul Left Corinth*, is exceedingly important, and I'm going to start my analysis of these chapters with these two individuals, and then I'll do some more in addition to that. Now, so we've entered the text of 1 Corinthians, and we need to reflect on the best way for me to try to lead you through mass amounts of material without getting lost in the woods, to see the forest but not be looking at the trees in such a way that we don't understand what kind of forest that we're operating in. And so, to walk through the paragraphs and verses of each section, I'll be leading you, and I'm going to try to show you structural issues more than just individual verses, even though we will certainly comment on a lot of phrases and verses, but within their context.

See, this idea of a unit is an issue of context. All right, now, so first of all, I want to observe Talbert's treatment of this at the bottom of page 53 in your notes. He points out, rightly so, that in chapter 1:13, there are three rhetorical questions, and here they are.

In 1:13, Paul says, and by the way, this is internal to a paragraph. The paragraph begins with verse 10 and goes at least through verse 17, but internal to it, he makes this comment in verse 13. Has Christ been divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptized in the name of Paul? Those three questions.

Talbert sees the structure of entire chapters 1 through 4 from the standpoint of these three rhetorical questions. And if you'll notice in the chart that I've given you at the bottom of page 53, he points out that the answers come in the reverse order. The first question is, but that's not what's answered in chapter 1:14 to 16.

But the third question, were you baptized in the name of Paul? Then, chapters 1:14 to 16 answer, were you baptized in the name of Paul? Then, secondly, was Paul crucified for you? And, of course, the answer is no. And that answer comes in 1:17 through 34, according to Talbert. Was Paul crucified for you? And then he unpacks that answer.

Then, at the end of chapters 3:5 to 4:7, he answers, is Christ divided? So, you have the three questions, 1, 2, 3, and then you have the answers 3, 2, 1. Now, that's called a chiasm. And as you read Talbert, you'll find out that he likes chiasms, where you have this kind of structure, A, B, C, and then C, B, A. 1, 2, 3, 3, 2, 1, call it what you will in that regard. But you'll notice it's not absolutely clean because he has to stick 4, 8, to 21 into a conclusion.

So, this is handy, but it may not be exactly the last word. But there's one thing for sure, that when we look at the totality of chapters 1 to 4, we're going to see in a little while that 2, 6 to the end of chapter 2 is right in the center of it and becomes very crucial in that regard. Now, besides Talbert's looking at it and giving you a feel for how that structure may work, and certainly that it's answering these questions, at least from his standpoint, there's the issue of Wynter's analysis.

Now remember, Bruce Wynter is an expert really in Greco-Roman materials, and he's a New Testament scholar. He comes in and looks at this as a unit. And he realizes that the key to this unit is in chapter 3, verse 3. Let me read this to you. this may seem to be a long way over, but this is the verse that becomes extremely important for the entire unit.

In 3.3, and in fact, it's right in the middle of the sentence, the sentence begins in verse 2, I fed you with milk, not solid food, for you were not ready for solid food. So Paul is, in chapter 3, sort of coming back and analyzing what he's been saying in 1 and 2, and the key to this whole unit comes up now. You're not ready, verse 3, for you, are still of the flesh, for as long as there is jealousy and quarreling among you, there are all those divisions of the earlier statements, are you not of the flesh and behaving according to human inclinations is the way the RSV translates that.

Let's listen to the NIV. This is a good verse to lay out your versions. In chapter 3.3, in the RSV, it reads this way: I'm excusing; in the NIV, you are still worldly.

He's talking about the wisdom of the world in the earlier units, for since there is jealousy and quarreling among you, are you not worldly? Are you not acting like mere humans? So, there's something interesting in this phraseology of verse 3, and that's where Winter focuses as a means of coming back and evaluating the entire unit of chapters 1 through 4 from this vantage point of what it means to be worldly, to be speaking worldly. The characteristics of this cultural context are reflected very much in this phrase but in the content of the entire unit. Notice on page 54, the second paragraph, the theme verse that is noted to govern this cultural context of chapters 1 to 4 is actually 3.3. Here are some renditions of the final key phrase, which is that you're acting, walking according to men.

That's what the Greek is there. But here's the ASV, do you not walk after the manner of men? Notice they're adding some phraseology, this kata anthropon, according to

man. You could say by the standard of men, but men are not men in terms of sex here, but humanity.

The larger category for what man would cover, men, women, the whole nine yards of created beings. Do you not walk after the manner of men? That's the ASV. The NIV of 2011 says, are you not acting like mere humans? Then we have Fitzmeyer, are you not behaving in a secular human way? Now, notice Fitzmeyer being very formal in the way he approaches the text, bringing in the word secular to go with human.

Are you not acting in a secular human way? And then Winter comes in, and Fee, are you not operating in a secular fashion? Here's the key. So when you look at this information about divisions, when you look at this hero worship, I'm of Peter, I'm of Paul, I'm of Apollos, and then somebody who's really spiritual says, I'm of Christ. And you're reading all this information, and the message of the cross is all confused.

What's going on? Well, the answer is in 3. They're applying a secular way of unpacking what's going on within Christianity. They're pouring Christianity into their mode rather than being poured into the Christian mode. And so consequently, they've messed up the message.

You will read about Mediterranean teachers in both Winter and Talbert and in others. Paul was a part of the Mediterranean world. As Mediterranean teachers, these teachers had authority over their students.

We'll talk about this, too, in just a second. The word disciple was used for students. And so, these Corinthians were trying to pour the gospel, trying to pour the teaching of Paul into a mode that they like and that they're familiar with, rather than letting the teaching of Paul reframe them.

You see, in Scripture, we're to be transformed by the renewing of our mind, Romans 12. It's a mental occupation. We're to be transformed in the way that we think.

Instead of allowing themselves to be transformed into gospel thinking, the Corinthians tried to transform the gospel into a way of thinking that they were familiar with. It was a nasty way. It was the Roman way.

It was a way of competition. It was a way of almost worshipping your teachers. We're going to see how that influences the first four chapters.

Let's go on with Winter's analysis on page 54. Winter's analysis of this phrase, secular fashion, or walking, teaching according to men. The word in the Greek, peripateo, tete, in the text that I've given you.

Walking, according to men, is a metaphor. It's kind of like in Ephesians, where the word walk in the old King James set up a lot of sermons. But walking means a manner of life.

You're living a manner of life according to the human way of doing it. That's not the gospel way, you see. All right, so Winter goes on.

Secular discipleship is reflected in what we see in chapters one and four. This Christian competitiveness. My teacher, your teacher.

My message, your message. All of this vying for position was a part of Roman competitiveness and Corinthian culture. These new Christians had adopted a secular fashion in their Christian behavior, but first of all, in their Christian worldview.

They brought the worldview of Roman Corinth to apply to gospel material, and that messed it up. All right, now notice the bullet points—the term disciple.

Now, let me clarify this. You won't find the term disciple in First Corinthians. In fact, you won't find the term disciple in any epistle in the New Testament.

In the Bible, in the New Testament, we come across the term disciple in the book of Acts and in the four gospels. Since it is in the book of Acts, we know that it covers the time period that was contemporary with the writing of some of these epistles, and at least with the practice that was going on in the epistles. So, we have to be careful that we don't get over analysis of a word not being in the epistles.

But the disciple is locked into certain cultural mores. You'll remember that there were disciples of the Pharisees in the gospels, and now we've got, by not saying the word but having the concept, disciples of Peter, disciples of Apollos, disciples of Paul, disciples of Christ. Even though the word's not there, the framework and the cultural mindset is there.

What was a disciple in the Greco-Roman world, whether it's in Palestine or whether it's out in the larger Roman world? Well, the term disciple was quite common in that world. It basically indicated someone who was an apprentice or a student of another. For example, when Paul was a tentmaker, he would have had apprentices, people he was teaching.

That's the way they did trades. You learned a trade. You applied a trade.

You took students in. They became your disciples. They became your apprentices, and you taught them that trade.

Well, the same thing was true with public speaking. Public speaking was a very, very big thing in the Mediterranean world in the first century. Why? Well, they didn't have a printing press.

They didn't have the privilege of distributing copies. Things were oral, and to have oral power meant everything. And as a result of that, in a Roman city like Corinth, they had bought into this oral power idea.

And there were oral speakers, and there would be disciples or apprentices of these speakers. And they revered their teacher. That's all part of the kind of cultural mix that was going on in Corinth and reflected in chapters one to four.

When we talk about the wisdom of the world, it's underneath that. When we talk about worshiping other people, like Paul is Paul, Peter, even Christ, it's underneath of that. It's part of the concept of what it meant to be a student of a famous teacher, a famous orator within that first century.

All right. So, a disciple is best to be thought of, whether in the Gospels or anywhere else, as an apprentice. You see, the idea of disciple, particularly in the Gospels, and some of it as it comes into the Acts out of the Gospels, was changed when you come into the Epistles.

The metaphor was changed, even though it's still in the undercurrent, and the verb is used a couple of times, meaning to teach. The imagery was changed to brethren and to the idea of a family or filial imagery within the Epistles. That's the way it's addressed there.

It doesn't mean it's not in the culture, but it was a different way of at least framing verbally the way these things are said. There were disciples of the Pharisees, disciples of Jesus, disciples of the various philosophers, and disciples of the various teachers of the day. That meant they were apprentices.

By the way, in the Gospels, you'll remember that there were disciples of Jesus who quit following him. There's a lot of confusion in the study of the Gospels over the concept of disciple. Disciple is not equivalent to salvation in the Gospels.

It's equivalent to an apprentice. There were people following Jesus who had not yet really become what we would call true believers, and the proof of that was they quit following Jesus. They were apprentices who chose not to continue.

It wasn't so much a term of salvation as it was a term of a follower. To judge whether a follower was true or not true takes a great deal more context to deal with. Be very careful.

There is a lot of poor understanding and teaching in relation to the Gospels along the lines of discipleship. It comes up in one of the controversial domains called lordship salvation, where a lot of people have a lot of ideas that are poorly informed—a second bullet point.

The disciple's role was to learn about his mentor's trade. That trade might be tent making. It might be civil service, such as the courts.

It could be a trade like silversmith that we find in the book of Ephesians. In that time, in the first century, trades were guilds, and guilds were like community centers of their own. They stuck together.

They had their community. People found their meaning within their guild. You could think of it in our culture like are you a member of the Teamsters if you drive a truck, or are you a member of the union if you're an electrician in New York.

Our culture has fallen at different times in relation to the meaning and usage of unions and so forth, but those were guilds, and those still are guilds in some settings. Well, they had that in the first century, and it was important to be attached to a guild. In our culture in America, there are other sorts of guilds.

You've got the American Legion, which is a military guild. You've got the Moose. You've got the Masons.

You've got all kinds of these clubs where people find their meaning in their community. It's very important to them, regardless of what you think about any of those given organizations. Well, in the first century, most of these guilds were centered around trades, and being an orator and a public speaker was very much a trade in the Roman world.

So, the role of disciples was to learn his mentor's trade. That trade might be just about anything. In a trade like oratory, a disciple would learn to imitate.

Remember, Paul said in Thessalonians, be imitators of me, as I am an imitator of Christ. That feeds into this whole concept of following your teacher. Be an imitator of his master in the manner of speech, behavioral traits, and even including one's appearance.

In the first century, that was another issue in being a disciple of a certain oratorical person. You've got to get into the historical literature to really get your arms around this, but I think you can get the idea—the third bullet point.

Winter points out that there was a renaissance of what's known as the Sophists. This was a group of teachers in the first century. In fact, he has written a book on this, among the titles that you can easily pull up from Bruce Winter.

It's called the Second Sophist Street. It was in the first century. The term disciple is used in this Sophist literature 181 times.

Now, I'm going to go into that particular guild in the first century, but it was behind much of the mannerism if you please, of what was going on here in Corinth. This paradigm of disciple in Roman culture was training the orators of the time. These orators argued a variety of views and cases in many different public venues, whether it was in the agora, which was the marketplace, kind of a public speaking setting, whether it was in a civil court or some other level of court within Roman law.

In the first century, the orator was a major career path. Become a great speaker. Become one who persuades others to a certain position.

That wins you power. It wins you what they call a sense of dignity. It was a part of the status idea.

Those are all very crucial and internal to the culture of the Corinthians. Furthermore, in the last bullet on page 54, in Roman Corinth, there were a number of traits of the orator. What were some of these traits? Now, I'm still working off of Winter's article here, and you can read that and get the idea.

What were some of the traits of the orator in the first century? There was an intense professional competitiveness among teachers, which was passed on to their student disciples. We can see that so much. I'm a disciple of Paul.

I'm a disciple of Peter. I'm a disciple of Apollos. I'm a disciple of Christ.

Just don't you hear that competitiveness in there? And focusing on that one teacher, probably acting like that one teacher and trying to imitate perhaps the rhetoric of that particular teacher. By the way, if you happen to hear some thunder, I'm in Florida, remember, and it's rainy season. So, if you're in the Philippines or somewhere, you'll understand when you hear some of the rumblings that are going on out there.

Okay, so the role of the disciple was to learn his mentor's trade. Imitate them, particularly in oratory. To imitate a tentmaker, how they stitch, and how they do their work is one thing, but imitating an orator is very different.

It goes to a level that people could recognize, oh, they're a student of so-and-so. Listen to the way he speaks. Listen to his argument.

It's not very far removed from some of our own culture, is it? When you're a disciple of a certain famous person, you often take on their traits for good or bad. Furthermore, this competition, this professional competitiveness was often to gain honor. In Latin, they called it dignitas.

Gain honor in the city system. One of the books by Bruce Winter is *Seek the Welfare of the City*. The city was at the center of Roman culture.

The rich people in the city were to promote the city as a whole, which meant they were to do good for the city, which included every citizen of the city. It was not a communist approach to things, but it was a way of approaching the city to look after those who were of less dignity or of less status, of less means, and to be sure they were taken care of. It was a, if you please, social security city, social security system.

The city was that system. If you were in the system, you were taken care of, and it had its structures within that culture. So, it was to be the public speaker and to gain honor was to gain honor in the city.

At the same time, if you lose your oratorical setting, you could suffer a loss of dignity, which could influence your privilege and your standing in the city. Now, I want you to think about that. When we come into the details of 1 Corinthians, we see some of the Christians who seem to have status, either ignoring those who don't sometimes, like in 1 Corinthians 11, and how the Lord's Supper was applied, or in the court systems in chapters 5 and 6 issues, or in human relationships and how they related to one another, they were operating still in a secular fashion.

1 Corinthians 3:3 is influencing the way that they were thinking. They were doing it their way, not God's way. It's a little bit like that song that I frankly pretty much despise by Frank Sinatra.

I did it my way. That is one of the most secular, ungodly songs ever written. I did it my way.

Well, that's what the Corinthians were doing. They were doing it their way. Their way was the Roman way, not the gospel way.

The next bullet at the bottom of page 54, Corinth was a notoriously litigious society. Everything to gain power, to gain prestige, to gain honor of whatever sort it was in the city often took place in the courts. The courts were not like our courts, not at all like American courts or English courts.

I don't know about all the courts of the world from which you may come. These courts revolved around the power of an orator to influence judges, so-called juries

that were often bought and set up, to be able to get a judgment for the person the orator represented. It gained status for that person.

If that orator lost, that person lost status. But it is all related to public speaking and the ability to persuade audiences. Corinth was notoriously litigious.

The Roman cities and Rome itself was notoriously litigious. Public speaking was a way to win in that kind of culture. The lawyers of that time, while they may have known the premises of Roman law, their success and their fame were related to their ability to persuade and to use oratory to bring judges and juries into their persuasion.

The rivalry that was a part of this oratory structure and culture was a time so bad that Rome itself actually had to intervene in the history of what was going on within the Roman cities. On page 55, the top bullet, disciples were expected to have exclusive loyalty to their teachers. Now listen again to those earlier passages in chapters 1 to 4, and I hope you've read these before we get into this.

I'm of Paul. I'm of Apollos. I'm of Peter.

I'm of Christ. There are the real pious ones, eh? Disciples were expected to have exclusive loyalty to the teacher to whom they attached themselves. Those rivalries, those divisions, they were acting worldly.

What does it mean to act worldly? It means to act in a secular fashion. To be like the world means to be like your setting. Let me use an illustration here.

I heard this from a preacher that I liked a lot. He used this phrase. He said that before I was a Christian, I loved things and used people.

After I became a Christian, I discovered that I'm supposed to love people and use things. Love things, use people. Love people, use things.

Two major different world views. A secular worldview in America is to love things and use people. A Christian worldview is to love people and use things.

Major worldview difference. Disciples were to reflect the worldviews of their teachers. And they got this so messed up that they latched on to some things about the personalities of these individuals.

And personality was big and oratory, you see. And they attached themselves to that. That's what the divisions were.

That's the undercurrent of these divisions. It's not. While we might find analogies within our culture, they are not our culture. It's not my culture in America.

Yes, there can be some analogies, but the fact is it was a Roman culture, and everything rested upon the power of the orator. The term zealot was applied to some of them. Here, zealot has the idea of being fiercely loyal to their teacher and his views.

Man, that is chapters one to four, right to the very core of it. Bruce Winter has nailed this issue from one chapter three three, acting in a secular fashion. So verse chapter, or excuse me, page 55.

So, when Paul accuses the Corinthians of living in a secular fashion, they were actually living in a way they had learned in their own culture. Some of them were probably deeply ingrained in achieving dignity of the city. We can see as we look through the text of 1 Corinthians, there were some people of means.

There were a lot of Christians who didn't have those means, and there were rivalries that were going on. They were acting like the world in which they lived. They had much to lose if they chose another lifestyle.

In other words, the people who had this dignity and status within Corinth, if they adopted the ethics that Paul was teaching, could undermine their power, wealth, and influence. That's tough. They were having a hard time making that transition.

We could say that they were acting naturally, but naturally is not Christianly. Paul reverses this in at least five ways, according to Winter, pages 42 to 43, and here they are. Number one, contrary to pledging loyalty to a person like Paul, Apollos, or Peter, all believers are one in loyalty to Christ, chapter 3, verses 21 to 23.

Now listen to these verses, chapter 3:21 to 23, in light of what we've been constructing here in terms of this paradigm of the loyalties to orators and so forth. I'm reading from the New Revised Standard Version. So, let no one boast about human leaders.

Wow. Are you starting to get this? See, if you read this on the surface and don't think anything about what it was like to live in Rome, you can bring in some analogies, sure, from the competitiveness of your own culture, but you're not going to get it like you need to get it if you don't get your mind back into first century Corinth. For all things are yours, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world of life, or death, or the present, or the future, all belong to you, and you belong to Christ, and Christ belongs to God.

Get rid of the rivalries. Quit dividing by your falsely placed loyalties. We are all of Christ, and we are all to be committed to Christ, not to all these bits and pieces.

Secondly, believers' roles are for functional tasks, not status. Functional task, not status. Listen to three, five through seven.

What, then, is Apollos? What is Paul? Servants through whom you came to believe. Man, and then chapter four is going to follow up on what it means to be a servant. Servants.

I don't know if I can reconstruct this illustration as well as I'd like to, but I was part of a faculty, and the administration hired a group of marketing people to come up with a phrase for marketing. That's always a bad idea in my opinion, but anyway, they did it, and they brought them into a faculty meeting to present their great results, and they came up with the idea of leaders and servants, and what they did is they had a certain order, and they put leader first and servant second, and they had spent probably thousands of dollars paying these people, and they came in with that, and as a faculty, we sat there, and we pointed out to them that you're not first a leader than a servant. You're first a servant than a leader.

That's the Christian way and bang, they got it, but they never got it before they walked into that room because they were thinking in a secular way. Power comes first, and then service. No, in a Christian worldview, service comes first, and then power.

They had it all messed up in Corinth. They were thinking worldly. They were thinking in a secular fashion.

They were following the ethics of Roman Corinth rather than the ethics of the Bible, and every time you do that, you're going to get in big trouble. The third item. Believers are to view their leaders as servants, stewards of God's mysteries, as Paul says in 4:1-4. Paul's statement in 2:1 to 5 undermines the power plays of the teacher-disciple motif of the Roman culture.

Paul says to them, I didn't come to you in a power play. I came to you with the cross of Christ. The only way up is down.

Corinth thought the only way up was to push your way up on top of other people. They had it reversed. Get into what's going on here.

You can get into it by reading my notes and by listening to what I'm telling you, but to really get into it, you have to do some homework of your own. Read the things that I'm asking you to read—number five.

Paul shifts the image from disciple, which in Roman culture would be understood as filial family imagery. Excuse me. Let me say this again because I didn't get my parentheses in the right place.

Paul shifts the image from disciple. That's the imagery that the Romans had. In fact, you know, if we ask the question, why in the world don't we have the word disciple in the epistles? Well, the epistles are dominant, not all of them, but dominantly because Paul didn't write the most, but he wrote the most individual epistles, and they're out in the Roman world.

He doesn't use disciple. He uses the filial, the family imagery. That would have been a new thought to many within those cities.

Paul shifts the image from disciple, that is, the Roman image, the apprentice, to a family imagery. That's different. That's looking at things from a new worldview, from a different ethic.

In the family, you don't rise to prominence by beating down the members. You rise to prominence by lifting up the rest of those members. The noun disciple is never used in Pauline literature.

The term brothers, which includes sisters, beloved brothers and sisters, is used 29 times. Paul uses the image of being their father. He doesn't use the image in this sense of being their oratorical example.

The metaphor has shifted. The noun disciple never occurs in the New Testament outside the Gospels and Acts. Interesting.

I think in the Gospels, there's a little different nuance, even though it's still a Greco-Roman nuance of being a student and a teacher. But when we get into the epistles, which are dominantly linked to this Greco-Roman world, Paul avoids their imagery of secularization of a disciple, of an apprentice, and the oratorical influence of that like a plague. He just doesn't use it.

So, those are two major things to think about. Talbert gives us that chiasm, answering the three questions. That's nice, but you're not going to get into the meaning of what's going on in Corinth, in any of the chapters that we look at, until you realize that the rivalries and the divisions and the jealousies and the strife that we're seeing are because people are not being transformed by the renewing of their minds.

They're trying to take Christian ideas and pour them into the mode of a secular fashion, a secular worldview that they were so used to. Remember, does a fish feel wet? They didn't feel wet. They thought they were doing the right thing, because they hadn't been transformed by the renewing of their mind and accept the worldview that was coming to them, albeit very new, that would have been very difficult to do.

It was a major paradigm shift. Now, as we take the gospel out into the world, most of the time, we're calling for a major paradigm shift. Think for a second.

Say, I'm out on the street. I'm walking down the street. I see this Porsche, Porsche or whatever you want to say.

I'll call it a Porsche. And this fancy, expensively dressed dude with gold hanging from every part of his body, or her body, steps out of the car. And I look at the bumper of the back of this vehicle, and this very ostentatious person and the bumper sticker says this, she who dies with the most toys wins.

Think about that. That's a worldview. That is a very, if you please, American, Western culture, power, money, worldview.

Their view of life is to get things. Use people, get things. Accrue to yourself all of these things, and you'll have it.

And that person walks around the car. I like to look him in the eye, and I haven't had this opportunity because usually the cars are on the road, and you can't run them down. But I'd like to look him in the eye and say to them, wow, I didn't know that dying was winning.

And they'll look at you like, well, you missed the point of my bumper sticker. It's not that I want to die. It's that I want to have all these toys.

And then I look at them and say, yeah, but you are going to die, aren't you? There's your door. Walk through it. You see, as we spread the gospel in the world like Paul did in the first century, we have to get in touch with the mindset of the people to whom we're speaking.

Now, that's not easy. That takes some educational time. That takes some wise reading and thinking and teachers who can help you do that in whatever culture you're in.

Your culture has a secular way of doing things. It may be a religious culture, but it still has its way of doing things according to its own authority. And you bring the Christian truth into that culture, and it's like smacking two things together.

You see, evangelism and teaching have to do with this right here. The mind. As a person thinks in their heart, so are they.

The Bible uses the word heart not in emotional terms. That's Western culture. Oh, I love you with all my heart.

That's an emotional statement in our culture. I love you with all my heart in the Bible is this. I love you with all of my thoughtful being.

Heart in the Bible is dominantly a term that relates to the rational domain, not to the emotional domain. Splankna, which is the Greek word for bows. You remember that phrase in the King James Version, bows of compassion.

That's an emotional thing. But to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ with all of your heart is not Splankna. It's the mind to process and understand.

So, if you're going to preach the gospel as it's intended by Jesus and the apostles, you're going to have to think the way they want you to think. You're going to have to be renewed, be transformed in your minds because when you get this transformed, everything else follows. You shift from she who dies with the most toys wins to share your toys with the world and help them to go along with you.

Transformation of the way we think and the ethics that we apply to life. Love people, use things, not use things, not use people, and love things. It's a completely different way of thinking.

So, when you take the gospel, whether it's in America, which is a pagan nation these days, almost to the hilt, we may have a lot of presence of church. We may be in the news.

Even the word evangelical is considered a powerful word in politics. But the average person on the six o'clock news can't even define what it means to be Christian or define what the good parts of the word evangelical mean. They don't have a clue.

I listen to them, and I sit there and wish that I could walk into that studio and say, do you know how absolutely ignorant you are? Let me tell you what that means. Feel like Paul walking into Athens. This thing about the unknown God.

I'm going to explain that to you. Listen to me. Well, Paul walked into a world very much like all of us walk into our worlds.

Worlds that work according to a secular fashion and a secular mindset. We've got to change the way people think to change the way people act. It's not the reverse.

You don't change behavior to change thinking. You change thinking to change behavior. The Bible is consistent from Genesis to Revelation about that motif.

We're going to talk about that a little bit in 1 Corinthians 13 under the idea of love. You'll have to wait till we get there. This is a little shorter lecture than what I've been doing, but I want to stop at this point.

And I want you to do some homework. I want you to think about what I've been talking about. I want you to get your minds filled with this kind of cultural background that we're looking at in the book of 1 Corinthians so that when we read these details, you don't enculturate it to something you're familiar with.

But you try to find the links between your setting and what was going on in Roman Corinth. If at all possible, try to read. Get a hold of the book by winter so you can read some of those chapters to get your minds around this so that the nomenclature and the behavioral aspects that we're reading about in 1 Corinthians make sense out of a 1st-century setting, not out of a 20th century setting where you've morphed it completely out of its original context.

Sure, there are some things that can come through, but to really get into this, we need to get into it the way it was with Paul and with his audience. When we come back in our next session, we're going to look more specifically at the text of 1 Corinthians 1:10 through the end of chapter 4, but we'll be constantly bringing back 3:3. You're thinking in a secular way, thinking in a secular way. Well, what was Paul's secret to getting around that? That secret is in chapters 2:6 to 16, and that's why I'm going to want to really spend some time with you next time.

Read my notes, handout number seven I believe it is, notepad number seven, read through them. And we'll try to complete this section in our next lecture. Thank you for listening.

Thank you for putting up with this talking head. And I pray that you'll do your homework so that you can think biblically.

This is Dr. Gary Meadors in his teaching on the book of 1 Corinthians. This is lecture 10, Paul's Response to the Oral Communique from Chloe's Household--Chapter 1, verse 10 through chapter 4, verse 21.