# Liberty is the theme thru Ch. 10

# Principle:

1 Corinthians 8:13 (NASB) <sup>13</sup> Therefore, if food causes my brother to stumble, I will never eat meat again, so that I will not cause my brother to stumble.

My rights are subservient to the interests of Christ and His people.

My rights are not for self-glorification or the indulgence of the body.

All Christian ministry is of Christ the Lord, not earthly man, and if the spirit of the world, is allowed to intrude it will ruin Christian ministry.

<sup>1</sup>Am I not free?
Am I not an apostle?
Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?
Are you not my work in the Lord?

- 1. Paul had the same freedom that any believer had.
- 2. He was an Apostle.
- 3. He had seen the resurrected Jesus Christ.
- 4. The Corinthians existence as believers was the the seal and proof of his Apostleship.
  - <sup>2</sup> If to others I am not an apostle, at least I am to you; for you are the seal of my apostleship in the Lord.

## <sup>3</sup> My defense to those who examine me is this:

As to the rights of the servant of the Lord, Paul, in common with other apostles, had a perfect right to participate in the ordinary blessings of the present life

The word right is exousia, which means authority to act.

# <sup>4</sup> Do we not have a right to eat and drink?

1. A right to eat and drink, that is, a right to personal care and compensation for services rendered.

<sup>5</sup> Do we not have a right to take along a believing wife, even as the rest of the apostles and the brothers of the Lord and Cephas?

## 2. a right to take along a believing wife

Not only to marry a believing woman but to introduce her where he himself went, to be an object of loving care to the saints with himself.

# <sup>6</sup> Or do only Barnabas and I <u>not have a right to</u> refrain from working?

- 3. a right to refrain from working with his own hands
  - a. The Corinthians had acknowledged the right of the other apostles to cease from secular employment.
  - b. Paul and Barnabas chose to work with their hands at times so their financial support would not burden their converts (4:12; 1 Thess. 2:9; 2 Thess. 3:7-9; Acts 20:34).

These three illustrations support the fact that Paul as a servant of the Lord had a right to accept support from those to whom he ministered.

<sup>7</sup> Who at any time serves as a soldier at his own expense? Who plants a vineyard and does not eat the fruit of it? Or who tends a flock and does not use the milk of the flock?

That this is so natural and makes common sense it would seem obvious,

Therefore he asks 3 more rhetorical questions.

- 1. Who at any time serves as a soldier at his own expense?
- 2. Who plants a vineyard and does not eat the fruit of it?
- 3. Or who tends a flock and does not use the milk of the flock?

Does God's word agree or disagree with the logic of verse 7?

8"I am not speaking these things according to human judgment, am 1? Or does not the Law also say these things?"

Human logic is sometimes contrary to God's truth; is this the case here?

This is the transition into the Scriptural teaching concerning material support of those whose **full attention** is given to the ministry of the gospel.

#### **Answer from Moses**

<sup>9</sup>"For it is written in the Law of Moses, 'You shall not muzzle the ox while he is threshing.' God is not concerned about oxen, is He?

#### from Deuteronomy 25:4

God made special provision in the Mosaic Law for the oxen that served people by threshing their grain.

#### Oxen were used to thresh grain in two ways.

- 1. First, they were led across the piles of grain, so they trampled it with their feet.
- 2. Second, they were often attached to a sledge which they dragged over the grain.

  McCalley

Oxen were not to be muzzled to prevent their eating of the grain. Does verse 9 apply only to oxen, or is there a higher significance involved?

<sup>10</sup> Or is He speaking altogether for our sake? Yes, for our sake it was written, because the plowman ought to plow in hope, and the thresher to thresh in hope of sharing the crops.

If God spoke of not muzzling the ox when treading out corn, He had not cattle in view but His people, His servants in the word.

#### 1 Corinthians 9:10 (NLT2)

<sup>10</sup> Wasn't he actually speaking to us? Yes, it was written for us, so that the one who plows and the one who threshes the grain might both expect a share of the harvest.

### Does compensation apply to spiritual labor?

# <sup>11</sup>If we sowed spiritual things in you, is it too much if we should reap material things from you?"

Spiritual labor is to be compensated in the same way that physical labor is.

Paul has every right to compensation for the spiritual labor he bestowed on the Corinthians.

- "Is it too much" reveals that Paul was contending with the Corinthians, not just exhorting them.
- Spiritual things last forever, carnal things are temporary.

# 12a"If others share the right over you, do we not more?"

As the planter of the Corinthian church Paul had a right to the support of the Corinthians more than any of their other ministers.

#### 1 Corinthians 3:6 (NASB)

<sup>6</sup> <u>I planted</u>, Apollos watered, but God was causing the growth.

If others availed themselves of this right to take of their material things, how much more could Paul, who had served them so faithfully?

The verb translated *share* is present tense, plural number.

- The tense indicates continual practice, and
- the number points to a whole group.

12b"...Nevertheless, we did not use this right, but we endure all things, that we may cause no hindrance to the gospel of Christ."

He did not insist on his rights.

- He chose rather to support himself so his work of establishing the church might not suffer from criticism.
- The words *no hindrance* should be interpreted by the words *without Charge*.
- Paul did not want anyone to say that he was commercializing the gospel.

### This fact leads us to the next principle.

Having argued vigorously **for his right to** the Corinthians' support,

Paul now proceeded to argue just as strongly for his right to give up this right, which was his point from the beginning.

He explained why he had deliberately not accepted their support.

If he ceased from taking of their carnal things, it was no proof that he was not an apostle, nor that he had no right to receive from them,

<sup>13</sup>"Do you not know that those who perform sacred services eat the food of the temple, and those who attend regularly to the altar have their share with the altar?"

- Paul appealed to the common Jewish practice.
- It was the right of the Old Testament priests to eat part of the sacrifices that they offered at the altar.
- This practice was also prevalent in pagan religions.
- It allowed those who minister in spiritual matters to gain physical support from those they serve.

<sup>14</sup> "So also the Lord directed those who proclaim the gospel to get their living from the gospel."

The word *also* shows that the Old Testament principle of compensation of the priests applies to ministers of the New Testament as well.

The Lord Jesus taught the same right

*Luke 10:7 (NASB)* 

<sup>7</sup> "Stay in that house, eating and drinking what they give you; for the laborer is worthy of his wages. Do not keep moving from house to house.

Matthew 10: 8-10

.....for the worker is worthy of his support.

The rights of the servant remained, according to the typical teaching of the service in connection with the temple and its altar.

Above all, the Apostle asserts that these rights are according to that which the Lord has ordained,

"that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel."

- Whether it was nature (verse 7), or
- Scripture (verses 9, 10),
- or the direct ordinance of the Lord (verses 13, 14),

all concur in maintaining the rights of the one ministering in spiritual things to receive the carnal things of the saints.

Paul is putting his right side by side with his refusal.