

JUDGING RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENT

Marion R. Fox

Introduction

Perhaps few passages of Scripture are known more than Mt. 7:1: “Judge not, that ye be not judged.” But few people know that Jesus said: “Judge not according to appearance, but judge righteous judgment.” (Jn. 7:24). How can these two passages be reconciled? Remember that the immediate context of Jn. 7:24 is found in Jn. 7:14-24. In this article, I will deal with Jn. 7:24 and reserve Mt. 7:1 for a later article.

Definitions of the Words “Righteous” and “Judgment”

Jesus is preaching to the Jews (who at that time were under the Law of Moses). Therefore, the words *righteous* and *judgment* are defined both by the Law of Moses and by the context of John 7. In fact, the children of Israel were to judge righteous judgment (Deut. 16:18-20).

Each city was to have judges who would judge at the gates of the city (Deut. 16:18). (This means that the judgment was public.) These city judges were to: “(J)udge the people with righteous judgment” (Deut. 16:18). These judges were not to have: “(R)espect of persons” (Deut. 16:19, Lev. 19:15, etc.).

These judges were not to allow themselves to be influenced by bribes (Deut. 16:19). A bribe does not always have to be in the form of money, it could be: “If you do this for me, I will do such and such for you.” The bribe might even be implicit and not explicit. (Just the knowledge that one of the persons being judged can affect his life, might prejudice the judge.) These judges were not to allow the words of the righteous to be perverted (Deut. 16:19). The judges were to do that which is altogether just (Deut. 16:20). The judges were to condemn the wicked and justify the righteous (Deut. 25:1). Judges must neither justify the wicked nor condemn the just (Pro. 17:15). There are two ways that one might be unrighteous in his judgment set forth in this passage. *First*, one might justify the wicked and *second*, one might condemn the just.

The Lord defined *righteous judgment* for the children of Israel in many passages of Scripture. The Lord defined the word *righteous* (or *just*) when He declared that they were not to have diverse weights (Lev. 19:33-37, Deut. 25:13-16, Pro. 11:1, 20:23, Mic. 6:11, etc.). The word *righteous* is also defined in the New Testament (Lk. 1:6). The participle translated *walking* explains how they were righteous. We are righteous when we walk in the commandments and ordinances of God blameless. A man is not blameless, if he is not righteous.

Justice comes from God (Pro. 16:11, Ezek. 45:10, etc.). Without knowledge of God, man will not be just (righteous) in his dealings with other men. We can see injustice in the world because man refuses to have God in his knowledge (Rom. 1:18-23, 28-29, etc.). God serves as our example of true righteousness.

The *a fortiori* Principle Applies This Principle to Christians

Jesus used a principle of Bible interpretation where He argued that whatever is true of the lesser is true of the greater. He used this principle in Mt. 12:9-12, Lk. 13:10-17, and 14:1-6. This principle was also used by Peter in Acts 10:27-28 (God has cleansed animals, men are greater than animals; therefore, God has cleansed men). One cannot understand the book of Hebrews without using this principle. The *a fortiori* principle explains how the just balance and scales applies to us in the Christian dispensation. The following argument establishes the point being made by Jesus in Jn. 7:14-24: If the Jews were required to use a just balance and just scales in secular matters, then the Jews were required to use just measurements in determining spiritual matters (matters of right and wrong or good and evil).¹

The Context of John 7:24.

Jesus went up into the temple to teach (Jn. 7:14) and the Jews marveled because he had not gone to the right schools (Jn. 7:15). That is, Jesus had not studied under any prominent rabbi. In fact, He had not studied under any rabbi. They seemed to forget that Jesus had understanding without studying under a rabbi (Lk. 2:46-47). Jesus responded that His teaching was not His own, but that it came from God (Jn. 7:16). The point here is that the Scriptures (the Word of God) are the standard, not what some rabbi teaches. Jesus informed them that one must “will to do his will” in order to know of the doctrine (Jn. 7:17). It is the aim of The Oklahoma City School of Biblical Studies (where I serve as director) that honest students (cf. Acts 17:11) should be helped to learn how to understand the Scriptures for themselves. It is our goal to make our students into independent students of the Word of God and send them forth with the injunction to study the Word for themselves.

Jesus informs them that one who speaks from himself seeks his own glory, but if one seeks the glory of Him (God) that sent him, he is true and there is no unrighteousness in Him (Jn. 7:18). A man who seeks his own glory will elevate his will above the Will of God and will interpret the Scriptures incorrectly.

Jesus points out to them that they were not following the Law of Moses because they were rejecting Him and seeking to kill Him (Jn. 7:19). The Jews claimed that Jesus had a demon and asked: “(W)ho seeketh to kill thee?” (Jn. 7:20 [Some in the audience knew that the Lord’s charge was true [Jn. 7:25].)

Jesus pointed out that they marveled at one work (Jn. 7:21), but the miracles that He worked proved Him to be *approved of God* (Acts 2:22). He is almost certainly referring to His healing on the Sabbath (Mt. 12:9-14). This event is one event for which they sought to kill him (Mt. 12:14). This is where the Lord introduces the *a fortiori principle* of biblical interpretation.

Jesus proves that they are unrighteous in their judgment, because Moses had instructed the priests to circumcise a boy on the eighth day (even if it fell on the Sabbath day – Jn. 7:22-23 [Lev. 12:1-3]). With this background, Jesus commands them to judge righteous judgment (Jn. 7:24).

¹ The *a fortiori principle* is discussed extensively in Fox, Vol. I, 2003, pp. 590-597.

Jn. 7:24 Judge not according to appearance, but judge righteous judgment.

They were judging according to appearance of the eye, not according to the reasoning of the heart. They should have reasoned from the Scriptures that such an act would not be sinful, but they were so blinded by their traditions and unsound interpretations of the Scriptures that they falsely accused a righteous person (Jesus) of sin.

Righteous judgment demands that we apply the same standard to all persons that we judge. The Jews did not condemn the priests for circumcising a boy on the Sabbath day. However, they condemned Jesus for healing on the Sabbath day. (Therefore, they were unrighteous in their judgment.) They were unrighteous because both acts were acts that were enjoined by God. *First*, the children of Israel were commanded to circumcise every male child on the eighth day (Gen. 17:12, Lev. 12:1-3, etc.). *Second*, the children of Israel were commanded to love their neighbor (Lev. 19:18). Love for our neighbor entails helping him in his time of need. Jesus was displaying His love and compassion for people by healing their diseases. We must also judge righteous judgment.

JUDGING RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENT PART 2

In the first article written under this heading we learned some aspects of the Lord's words of Jn. 7:24. Clearly, they were commanded to judge righteous judgment and that judgment was based upon the Law of Moses. Under the New Testament we have a system of righteousness that is superior to the Old Testament. However, what is righteous today was righteous under the Old Testament. The definition of the word "righteous" has not changed from the Old to the New.

The Nature of God Serves as a Pattern for Our Judging Righteously

God is no respecter of persons (2 Chron. 19:7, Acts 10:34, Rom. 2:11, Eph. 6:9, Col. 3:25, and 1 Pet. 1:17). If we would take upon ourselves the divine nature, we would also not have respect of persons. In fact, the Children of Israel were often told not to have respect of persons: Lev. 19:15, Deut. 1:17, 16:19, Ps. 82:2, Pro. 18:5, 24:3, 28:21, and Mal. 2:9. Christians are also forbidden to have respect of persons: Jas. 2:1, 9, and Ju. 16.

Evidence That is Necessary When Judging Righteous Judgment

Under the Law of Moses the children of Israel were forbidden to convict a person without adequate evidence (Num. 35:30, Deut. 17:2-7, and 19:15-20). To what does the Lord refer when he speaks of the two or three witnesses? This Old Testament principle applied to a tribunal or trial (Num. 35:30, Deut. 17:2-7, and 19:15-20). Note that they were to have at least two witnesses (Deut. 19:15), they were to inquire diligently (Deut. 19:18), the witnesses were to have a severe penalty for lying (Deut. 19:18-19), and both were to stand trial (Deut. 19:17). In the judicial system of the United States, only the accused is tried, but under the Law of Moses, both the accused and the accuser were under trial. Paul made this binding upon the church and elders (1 Tim. 5:19-21).

There are several important principles associated with the two or three witnesses in the Old Testament. *First*, they should inquire diligently into the matter (Deut. 17:4). *Second*, they should be sure it was true (Deut. 17:4). *Third*, they were to make sure it was certain (Deut. 13:14 and 17:4). *Fourth*, the accusers were to be first in line to punish the person (Deut. 17:7). And *fifth*, no person was to be convicted on the testimony of only one witness (Deut. 17:6).

The word translated *diligently* in Deut. 17:4 and 19:18 is also translated *thoroughly* in 2 Kgs. 11:18. The word translated *inquisition* in Deut. 19:18 is translated *search for* in Ezek. 34:8 and *examine* in Ezra 10:16. Hence, the witnesses should thoroughly search for or examine the matter to determine the truth. Under the Law of Moses, the Children of Israel were to go to the priests for judgment in matters that they could not decide (Deut. 17:8-9). They had miraculous guidance, in these matters, that we do not have today.

It is unbecoming to a child of God for him to judge another by unrighteous methods or standards. Jesus commanded not to judge by appearance (John 7:24), but to judge righteous

judgment. Jesus, by contrasting these two, made it clear that judging only by appearance is unrighteous. Isaiah contrasted righteous judgment with judging by sight of the eye and hearing of the ear (Isa. 11:3-4). Solomon points out that the first one to present his case seems just (Pro. 18:17 – ASV). Therefore, if one only hears one side of a matter, he is prone to make an unjust decision (judgment). This alone without Mt. 18:15-17 should prohibit a Christian from going to others with an alleged wrong before going to the person he is accusing of sin (*such is unrighteous – unfair*). The Christian will recognize that his perception of the matter may be wrong (Jer. 10:23).

The Old Testament law did not convict a person of sin without evidence and the person charged with sin having an opportunity to defend himself (John 7:51). It is shameful that brethren who are under the new and better law should do this (Pro. 18:13).

Judgments Made by the Church

When brethren have problems (just like in the Old Testament) the Lord has designated a method of solving them (Mt. 18:15-20). These instructions relate to matters where there are personal problems (sins against a person). These instructions do not relate to such matters as marking false teachers (Rom. 16:17-18) or heretics (Tit. 3:10). However, we must always be righteous in our judgment of others (including false teachers and heretics) and a failure to be righteous is sinful.

Note the pattern in Mt. 18:15-20: (1) We are to go to the brother who has sinned against us and try to reconcile the matter (Mt. 18:15). (2) We are to take witnesses, who will try to determine the guilt or innocence of the accused (Mt. 18:16-17). These witnesses are to exhort the person they determine to be guilty to repent (after they have judged righteously – Mt. 18:17). (3) We take it before the whole church (Mt. 18:17) who also must judge righteously and determine who is guilty. If the church determines that one is guilty, the person who is innocent will treat the guilty party: “... as a Gentile and a publican.” However, the church must exhort the guilty party to repent (Mt. 18:17). Only after he refuses to hear the church is fellowship to be withdrawn from the person.

It is possible that the truth may not be evident (1 Tim. 5:24) and that the church may not be able to determine who is guilty and who is innocent in the matter to be judged. In this case, we must wait upon God to settle the matter. Is the church qualified to settle every matter that might come up between brethren? The answer is: *No*. The smaller matters are to be brought before the church (1 Cor. 6:1-2). The church may not grant a divorce because that is the domain of the civil government. Remember we must render to Caesar what is Caesar’s (Lk. 20:25). The church does not have the authority to probate a will. The church does not have the authority to punish a criminal (perhaps one member of the church murders another member). The church may withdraw fellowship, but the family of the murdered person may go to the civil government for justice without violating 1 Cor. 6:1. In fact, God decreed that a murderer must be punished for his crime (Gen. 9:6). What if a Christian goes to the church and gets an unrighteous judgment? In this event, he must live with the judgment (1 Cor. 6:5-7).

If the church cannot determine who is guilty in the matter, they should defer to decide. Note the words of 1 Tim. 5:24: “Some men’s sins are evident, going before unto judgment; and some men also they follow after.” Just like in the Old Testament the judges might not be able to determine guilt or innocence. If it amounts to the word of one person against the word of the other person, the church cannot decide. Remember, the church must have two or three witnesses (Mt. 18:16, 1 Tim. 5:19, etc.) to establish a matter.

JUDGING RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENT PART 3

In our first two articles we determined the necessity of judging by the righteous standard of truth. We learned that it is wrong to be partial or to have prejudice in our judgment of others (1 Tim. 5:21). We learned the necessity of having sufficient evidence to convict a person of sin before we condemn him. We also learned the necessity of evaluating the evidence properly before making a decision of either guilt or innocence.

What About the Prohibition of Matthew 7:1?

Few passages of Scripture are more well-known than this passage. Many people think it is wrong to judge under any circumstance because of their misunderstanding of this passage and its context. Some interpret this passage in a manner that contradicts other passages of Scripture (i.e. Jn. 7:24). Jesus said:

Mt. 7:1 Judge not, that ye be not judged. 2 For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you. 3 And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? 4 Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me cast out the mote out of thine eye; and lo, the beam is in thine own eye? 5 Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

Many people can quote Mt. 7:1, but few are aware of the four verses that follow verse 1. In verse 2 Jesus used the Greek word *gar* that means: “*Gar* may express: (1) a *ground* or *reason*, (b) an *explanation*, (c) a *confirmation* or *assurance*,” (Dana and Mantey, p. 242) It is evident that verse 2 begins an explanation or the reason for the words of verse 1. We ask the question: “Why did Jesus say: ‘Judge not that ye be not judged’?” The answer is: “You will be judged by the same standard and by the same measure that you apply to those that you are judging.” This passage is a warning about judging capriciously.

Jesus also warns about being a hypocrite in our judgment. He warns about judging others by a standard we are not willing to apply to ourselves. Note how the man judging has a beam in his eye; but is trying to get the mote (small speck of wood) out of his brother's eye. Obviously, he is not willing to live by the same standard he applies to others. He is a respecter of persons and is unrighteous because he has respect of persons. He respects himself more than he respects others.

Other Characteristics of Unrighteous People

Unrighteous people frequently follow the crowd (Ex. 23:1-3). There is a psychological phenomenon called: *Groupthink* that comes to bear in this matter. We see this occurring when the crowd cried out: “Crucify, crucify him” (Lk. 23:20). Note how the crowd moved like a herd of cattle to all shout the same thing (Lk. 23:20-23). Even Pilate (who knew Jesus was innocent – Lk. 23:14-15) was caught up in the frenzy (Lk. 23:20-24). Groupthink comes into play when a prominent person or group of people push a matter and the other

people (frequently those who do not have the prestige of the group) go along with the wishes of the group rather than think for themselves. We see this occurring in the church today when a prominent clique of preachers or a school pushes a particular matter. Many jump upon the bandwagon and get involved without even thinking for themselves.

Unrighteous men have an improper thought pattern (Isa. 55:6-8). The unjust (unrighteous) man has no shame (Zeph. 3:5). Unrighteousness even deceives men (2 Thess. 2:10). God is righteous in His thoughts (Isa. 55:8). Unrighteousness in little matters leads to unrighteousness in big matters (Lk. 16:10). Love does not rejoice in unrighteousness (1 Cor. 13:4-6).

Unrighteousness hinders the cause of the truth (Rom. 1:18). Unrighteousness among God's people becomes a stumblingblock to the conversion of aliens. Unrighteousness among alien sinners hardens the hearts of people and it makes them less receptive to the gospel. Those who live in sin are presenting themselves as instruments of unrighteousness (Rom. 6:12-13).

We must remember that every unrighteous thought, word, and/or act is sin (1 Jn. 5:17). When our thoughts are unrighteous, we sin. When our words are unrighteous, we sin. When our actions are unrighteous, we sin.

The leaders of God's people must hate unjust (unrighteous) gain (Ex. 18:21). It is a sad day when the leaders of the people are unjust (unrighteous) in their decisions. It is indeed a dreadful thing to see men decide their stand on matters based entirely upon what they will gain by standing for a certain matter. (Will I be accepted by a lot of people? Will I retain my popularity? Will I be evil spoken of or will all men speak well of me [Lk. 6:26]?)

Both the just (righteous) and the unjust (unrighteous) shall be resurrected (Lk. 14:13-14 and Acts 24:15). Both will be resurrected, but both will not receive the same reward (Jn. 5:28-29 and Rev. 20:11-15). They will not receive the same reward because God is a righteous judge (Ps. 7:11, Ecc. 3:17, Jn. 5:30, 2 Tim. 4:8, and Rev. 19:11).

Questions for All to Answer

How do you make decisions on where you will stand on a doctrinal matter? Do you see which way the crowd is going (Eph. 4:14)? Do you follow the multitude (the crowd) in making your decisions (Ex. 23:2-3)? Do you see which way certain prominent men in the brotherhood are going? Do you see which way your favorite school is going? Do you see which way your parents are going? Do you see what many brethren (men born since the end of the age of miracles) taught and/or practiced in the recent past?

Are you on the strait and narrow way or are you on the broad way? (Mt. 7:13-14). Do you follow the Scriptures as your guide or do you follow men as your guide?

JUDGING RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENT, PART 4

In the three prior articles I defined the words: righteous (just), righteousness (justice), and righteously (justly). These words were defined both by lexicons and by the context of the Scriptures. A righteous man only condemns a person when he has adequate (sufficient) evidence and he has evaluated the evidence properly. A righteous man will neither justify one who has sinned nor will he condemn one who has not sinned (Deut. 25:1, Pro. 17:26, 24:24, etc.). The judgment of a righteous man is righteous because he judges by the standard of the Scriptures (Jn. 5:30). Note the words of the Lord:

Jn. 5:30 I can of myself do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is righteous; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.

In this article we will be considering examples of unrighteous men from the Scriptures. This will enable us to make application of the principles set forth in the three prior articles.

Was Timothy Conducting Himself in an Unrighteous Manner?

Paul wrote to Timothy in 1 Tim. 5:19-21:

Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at *the mouth of* two or three witnesses. 20 Them that sin reprove in the sight of all, that the rest also may be in fear. 21 I charge *thee* in the sight of God, and Christ Jesus, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without prejudice, doing nothing by partiality.

The reader should remember that the requirement of having two or three witnesses is found in the Old Testament. It required adequate (sufficient) evidence to establish a matter. In addition, the Old Testament required that the evidence be evaluated correctly. These principles have been established in the three earlier articles on the subject of righteousness.

The one making a judgment must be unbiased and without partiality (otherwise he is not just [or righteous]). A righteous man will get sufficient evidence before he judges a matter (Pro. 18:17). A righteous man recognizes that it is a shame and a folly to judge before he has sufficient evidence (Pro. 18:13).

A Consideration of 1 Tim. 5:19-21

Against an elder receive not (The Greek syntax is in the form of a commandment to stop doing something. This indicates that Timothy was guilty of violating the principles set forth in this passage.) **an accusation** (Here Paul is instructing Timothy to judge elders by the same standard that he judged other people.), **except at** (The Greek literally reads: “If not upon ...”) **the mouth of two or three witnesses** (The fact that this is a prohibition against continuing his actions proves that Timothy was guilty of being unrighteous in his dealings with this elder or these elders. Timothy may have been guilty of receiving an accusation from only one witness or of presuming evil without evidence of any kind [perhaps not even having one witness]. It is possible that Timothy saw something that looked like sin, but was totally innocent.) 20 **Them that sin** (The verb translated “sin” is in the Greek present tense [indicating that he is writing about one or ones who persist in their sin].) **reprove** (Trench defines this Greek word as: “*Elencho*, however, is a much more pregnant word. It

means to rebuke another with the truth so that the person confesses, or at least is convicted, of his sin [Job 5:17; Prov. 19:25]. This is also the case in juristic Greek, where *elencho* is not merely to reply to but to refute an opponent.” [p. 30] It is evident that Timothy was not only required to know of their sin, but he also was required to be able to prove that they were guilty of the sin.) **in the sight of all**, (Clearly, Timothy must not only know what sin they are guilty of committing, but he must be able to prove their guilt before all.) **that the rest also may be in fear**. (The purpose of his not only pointing out their sins, but proving that they were guilty, was to cause others to fear committing the same sin.) 21 **I charge thee in the sight of God, and Christ Jesus, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without prejudice**, (Prejudice was to judge without evidence and was to be unrighteous. “*an opinion formed before the facts are known, a pre-judgment, a prejudice ...*” [Thayer, p. 540]) **doing nothing by partiality**. (“*an inclination or proclivity of mind, a joining the party of one ... partiality ...*” [Thayer, p. 547] This word literally means: “To lean toward” a person. Partiality could work wrongly in two ways: [1] One could be partial toward his friends and not expose their sin and [2] One could be partial against those with whom he was not friends and be harsh in judging them.)

It is plain that while Timothy was a good man, he was guilty of being unrighteous in his dealing with an elder or some elders. I have seen this same thing occur when a preacher will tell other preachers something like: “The elders at church ‘X’ mistreated me” and the preachers who heard this would condemn the elders without hearing all of the evidence. I have seen (and heard) preachers who repeatedly have problems with the elders where they have preached (the elders were always at fault). I know of preachers who had problems almost everywhere they had preached.

The Mob Was Unrighteous

The mob that condemned the Lord to be crucified was unrighteous (Mt. 27:20-25). Most of the mob did not know the charge against Jesus (Mk. 15:12-14 and Lk. 23:13-23) and yet they condemned Him to be put to death. Of course Jesus was totally innocent of any wrongdoing (1 Pet. 2:22).

Clearly, the mob condemned Jesus without even knowing the specific charge against Him, but they did not have sufficient evidence to support any charge that might have been made. In doing this, they were certainly unrighteous.

Concluding Remarks

Let us all strive to be righteous in our dealings with everyone. Let us not condemn anyone without sufficient evidence. Let us not ignore evidence against our friends and manufacture evidence against those who are not our friends. Being righteous is not optional, it is mandatory for all Christians. Let us seek to be more like our God, who is righteous in all His dealings.

JUDGING RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENT, PART 5

We shall consider the unrighteous acts of Job's three friends, in this article. These men accused Job without evidence and did not even know (specifically) what charge to make against Job. Their unrighteousness was based upon their misunderstanding of the nature of God. Because of this, they were unrighteous in their false accusations against Job.

Job's Character

In order to understand the nature of Job's character we must look at his character at the beginning of the book of Job and the development of his character as he endured trials. In the beginning of the book of Job, Job was upright (Job 1:1, 8, and 2:3). This same word is translated *righteous* (KJV) or *upright* (ASV) in Job 4:7 and 23:7.

The Unrighteous Judgment of Eliphaz

Eliphaz made an unrighteous judgment when he said:

Job 4:7 Remember, I pray thee, who *ever* perished, being innocent? Or where were the upright cut off? 8 According as I have seen, they that plow iniquity, And sow trouble, reap the same. 9 By the breath of God they perish, And by the blast of his anger are they consumed.

Eliphaz did not understand the righteous nature of God linked with His longsuffering nature (2 Pet. 3:9-12). He did not know what charge he was making against Job, but he *knew* Job must be guilty (Job 5:17). Eliphaz claimed that his counsel was for Job's good (Job 5:27). Job asked Eliphaz to reveal his sin (Job 6:24-25), but Eliphaz did not give him an answer. Even the reproof of Eliphaz was without substance. Job appealed to Eliphaz to be righteous (Job 6:29-30) when he said: "... let there be no injustice." (ASV – vs. 29) This is the same word translated *unrighteousness* in Lev. 19:15 and 35.

Eliphaz continued in his unrighteous judgment of Job in Job 15:5-6. In chapter 15 he even ignores the evidence that Job had set forth. The ignoring of evidence is another mark of an unrighteous man. Job was made a byword because of their false accusations against him (Job 17:6).

After Job had refuted the claims of Eliphaz, Eliphaz made slanderous charges against Job (Job 22:5-11). Note how Job denied these charges in Job 29:11-17.

The Unrighteous Judgment of Bildad

Bildad did not understand the righteous nature of God either (Job 8:4-5, 13, and 20). Job still was not told by Bildad what sin Bildad was accusing him of committing (Job 10:2). Because Bildad did not know what sin he was accusing Job of committing, he was unrighteous to charge Job without either knowing the charge or having evidence.

In chapter 18 (cf. vs. 21 etc.), Bildad ignored the evidence that Job gave (Job 12:6 etc.). The ignoring of evidence is another mark of an unrighteous man. Job pointed out that Bildad had neither given a specific charge, nor evidence of Job's sin (Job 19:4). Job said: "4 And be it indeed that I have erred, Mine error remaineth with myself." The NKJV reads: "And if indeed I have erred, My error remains with me." The NESB reads: "And even if it be true that I have erred, my error remains with myself." To paraphrase Job he is saying: "Suppose (for the sake of argument) that I have erred, you have no evidence of my erring." To make a judgment without evidence is to be unrighteous.

The Unrighteous Judgment of Zopar

Zopar did not understand the righteous nature of God either (Job 11:6), because he also falsely accused Job of sin. Zopar claimed that God had given Job less than he deserved (Job 11:6). Note his words:

Job 11:6 And that he would show thee the secrets of wisdom! For he is manifold in understanding. Know therefore that God exacteth of thee less than thine iniquity deserveth.

Zopar did not have any specific charges to make against Job and certainly did not have any evidence of wrong-doing on the part of Job. Therefore, Zopar was an unrighteous man. Job gave an answer to the claims of these men when he said: "The tents of robbers prosper, And they that provoke God are secure; Into whose hand God bringeth *abundantly*." (Job 12:6) Job pointed out that they had the same evidence that Job possessed and they had not drawn the correct conclusions from it (Job 13:7). They were unrighteous in their speech (Job 13:7-10). They showed partiality (unrighteousness) by not judging Job by the same standard that they judged robbers.

Job accused his friends of neither having a specific charge against him, nor having evidence (Job 13:23). Note Job's words: "23 How many are mine iniquities and sins? Make me to know my transgression and my sin. 24 Wherefore hidest thou thy face, And holdest me for thine enemy?" (Job 13:23-24) Job properly interpreted their actions of accusing him of sin and neither having a specific charge of sin nor having evidence of sin as holding him as their enemy (cf. 2 Thess. 3:15 also).

The Response of Elihu

I am convinced that Elihu was a prophet and that he probably wrote the book of Job. Second, if he were a prophet, then his words were the revelation of the mind of God. Note the words of Elihu:

Job 32:2 Then was kindled the wrath of Elihu the son of Barachel the Buzite, of the family of Ram: against Job was his wrath kindled, because he justified himself rather than God. 3 Also against his three friends was his wrath kindled, because they had found no answer, and yet had condemned Job. 4 Now Elihu had waited to speak unto Job, because they were elder than he. 5 And when Elihu saw that there was no answer in the mouth of these three men, his wrath was kindled.

Notice that the wrath of Elihu was kindled against Job's three friends because they could not answer Job's arguments, but they still condemned him (Job 32:3, 5, and 12).

Before Elihu addressed Job's three friends he had to rebuke Job (Job 33:8-33). Job's three friends were rebuked by God (Job 42:7-9). They had taught error concerning the nature of God and falsely accused Job of wrongdoing.

Conclusion

It is important that we not be guilty of accusing anyone without evidence, for this would be an act of unrighteousness. It is important that we be able to answer a person who responds to our charges, otherwise we do not know that they are guilty. It is important that we properly evaluate the evidence both for and against the guilt of a person.

JUDGING RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENT, PART 6

THE SIN OF EVIL SURMISINGS

This is a sin that is often committed, but it is not even recognized as a sin by many people. Paul wrote of this sin in: 1 Tim. 6:4. This is the only passage where this sin is explicitly mentioned.

1 Tim. 6:4 he is puffed up, knowing nothing, but doting about questionings and disputes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings,

What is the Sin of Evil Surmisings?

The word that is translated: *surmisings* in 1 Tim. 6:4 is defined as:

ὑπόνοια (pronounced: *huponoia*) “a surmising.” (Thayer, p. 644) “*suspicion, conjecture ...*” (BAG, p. 854) “suspicion” (Moulton and Milligan, p. 659) The verb form of the same word ὑπονοέω (pronounced: *huponoeō*) means: “to suppose, surmise.” (Thayer, p. 644); “*suspect, suppose ...*” (BAG, p. 854)

With respect to *huponoeō* TDNT writes: “ὑπονοέω, class. and Hell., with acc. of person or object. acc. and inf., or clause following, means ‘to think in secret.’ Hence in a bad sense ‘to suspect,’ ‘to hold a [or in] suspicion,’ (Vol. IV, p. 1017)

Webster: “to imagine or infer on slight grounds.”

Kittel explains 1 Tim. 6:4 as:

In the list of vices in 1 Tim. 6:4 f., which depicts the terrible effects of the pathological penchant of false teachers for debate and wordy warfare, ὑπόνοιαι πονηραί, alongside βλασφημίαι, are wicked intrigues and common insinuations which in the disputes, moving from the material aspect to the personal, they raise against their opponents in an attempt to discredit them in every possible way² and to magnify themselves. (TDNT, Vol. IV, pp. 1018-1019)

When one surmises evil (imagines on slight grounds [without adequate evidence – cf. the first five articles on righteousness]) of another person, he is violating several biblical principles: *First*, it violates the golden rule (Lk. 6:31 and Mt. 7:12).

Lk. 6:31 And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.
Who would like to have others to condemn them upon slight or even nonexistent evidence?

Second, it is unjust or unrighteous (2 Pet. 2:9), because we are condemning another without proper evidence (two or three witnesses – Mt. 8:16, 1 Tim. 5:19, 2 Cor. 13:1, etc.). This was strictly required in the Old Testament. (Num. 35:30, Deut. 17:2-7, etc.). If the lesser covenant

² Kittel is writing about *ad hominem* arguments here.

(the Old Testament) required that we have sufficient evidence to condemn a person, then the greater covenant (the New Testament) requires that we have sufficient evidence to condemn a person. (*a fortiori* principle)

Third, we are judging by a standard we will not live by ourselves (Mt. 7:1-3 and Jn. 7:24). I exhort the reader to read the earlier articles where I discuss these passages in some greater detail.

Fourth, it is a shame and a folly (Pro. 18:13) to surmise evil about someone else without knowing the facts. How will we correct a false assumption, if we act upon our evil surmisings? Remember, we must repent of our sins in order to be forgiven. (How do we repent and correct our sin of surmising evil?) How do we correct our sin if we act (publicly) upon our evil surmising? What if we either say or do things that are incorrectly based upon the presumption of evil on the part of another person? This is where both repentance and a public confession must be made.

How do People Commit This Sin?

Some surmise that others are guilty of sin without evidence (Jn. 7:51) and commit this sin. As my *first* example of one surmising evil without adequate evidence I set forth Eliab (the brother of David) who surmised evil about David (1 Sam. 17:28).

As my *second* example of one surmising evil without adequate evidence I set forth Saul, who surmised evil about David (1 Sam. 18:7-9). Saul wrongly assumed (surmised) that David was “out to get him.” Saul was wrong, but he became paranoid because of his surmisings about David.

Some Surmise That Others are Guilty of Evil Motives

Amaziah (the priest of Bethel) surmised that the motives of Amos were evil (Amos 7:10-13). Since one who surmises gets his ideas from the thoughts of his own heart (mind), it is the corruption of the evil heart that causes one to surmise evil in others. Amaziah surmised that Amos was preaching for financial gain, but he was wrong. (It is almost certain that Amaziah was serving as an idolatrous priest for financial gain.) Remember that evil thoughts flow out of an evil heart (Mt. 12:34, 15:18-19, Lk. 6:45, etc.). Amaziah’s heart was evil, therefore he both surmised evil of Amos and he falsely accused Amos of having evil motives.

Let me set forth a couple of modern-day examples of this sin. Note that a person may say something to us and we assume that they intended to hurt our feelings. It is possible that they did not intend to hurt our feelings, but that the words were innocently spoken. Remember the words of Solomon: “The wicked flee when no man pursueth; But the righteous are bold as a lion.” (Pro. 28:1)

Some surmise that others know of their secret sins or secret evil motives (Pro. 28:1) and they even flee. Permit me to give some modern-day examples of this sin. *First*, a person is questioned about some wrongdoing, and he breaks down and confesses. *Second*, I have

preached on a sin and had people to come out of the assembly after worship and accuse me of preaching at them. (In many instances I was not aware of their private sin.)

The verb form of the same word ὑπονοέω is found in several passages: Acts 13:25, 25:18, 27:27, and Dan. 7:25 in the LXX. It is plain that the words *huponoia* and *huponoeō* are not always used for sinful actions. We must allow the context to determine if the surmising is evil or good. While the words *huponoia* and *huponoeō* are not used in 1 Cor. 13:7, the thought of assuming good of a person (unless we have evidence to the contrary) is a mark of love. Christians will assume that other people's secret thoughts, motives, words, and/or actions are good, unless we have solid evidence to the contrary. This is what a righteous person will do.

JUDGING RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENT, PART 6

Pacifism and Righteousness

One of the claims of pacifism is that there are two laws for mankind. The pacifist is forced to this conclusion by passages that speak of the government having the right to bear the sword (Rom. 13:1-6).

Rom. 13:1 Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the *powers* that be are ordained of God. 2 Therefore he that resisteth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of God: and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment. 3 For rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. And wouldest thou have no fear of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise from the same: 4 for he is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil. 5 Wherefore *ye* must needs be in subjection, not only because of the wrath, but also for conscience' sake. 6 For this cause *ye* pay tribute also; for they are ministers of God's service, attending continually upon this very thing.

The sword was used by the Roman government by soldiers who functioned both as soldiers and as policemen. In this context, it seems to be the police side that is being emphasized, but this would preclude Christians participating in a rebellion against the constituted government. This same principle is also found in 1 Pet. 2:13-17.

1 Pet. 2:13 Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether to the king, as supreme; 14 or unto governors, as sent by him for vengeance on evil-doers and for praise to them that do well. 15 For so is the will of God, that by well-doing *ye* should put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: 16 as free, and not using your freedom for a cloak of wickedness, but as bondservants of God. 17 Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the king.

It is clear, from this passage, that the civil government has the right (duty) to bear the sword. It follows that if a Christian may not: "... bear the sword" and the civil government has the right to bear the sword, then the Christian must not be amenable to these passages (Rom. 13:1-6 and 1 Pet. 2:13-17). If the prohibition against murder prohibits a Christian serving in the military or serving as a policeman, then either the prohibition against murder must not be binding upon a non-Christian or there are two definitions for the word *murder*. If this is true, there must be two laws for mankind: (1) the New Testament must only be for Christians and (2) there must be some other law for non-Christians. James Bales applied this principle to marriage; others have applied it to a Christian serving in the military. Still others have applied it to a Christian serving as a policeman.

Murder is a capital sin (one for which a person is to be put to death [Ex. 20:13, Rom. 13:9, and Jas. 2:11]) because man was created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26-27 and 9:6). All non-Christians will be judged by the word of the Lord (Jn. 12:48).

Jn. 12:48 He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my sayings, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day.

Note in this passage that those who reject the Lord and do not receive His sayings will be

judged by His word (those who reject the Lord and do not receive His sayings are non-Christians).

The Doctrine of Righteousness Disproves the Bales Doctrine

Since God is righteous, He has the same standard of conduct for all mankind (both Christian and non-Christian). This point has been developed in the first five articles. God is not guilty of equivocation (changing the definition of the word *kill*). God does not: (1) define the word *kill* to allow executing a person or killing a person in the line of duty (as either a soldier or as a policeman) for the non-Christian and (2) redefine the word *kill* (not to allow executing a person or killing a person in the line of duty, as either a soldier or as a policeman) for the Christian.

Other Unrighteous Implications of the Bales Doctrine

James Bales applied his false doctrine (that the non-Christian and the Christian are under two different laws) to divorce and remarriage. However, this false doctrine does not just apply to the two areas discussed (above), but it applies to the role of men and women in the spiritual realm.

Certain brethren have made the unsound claim that a non-Christian man has no spiritual authority that a Christian woman could usurp. These brethren are teaching that 1 Tim. 2:12 does not apply to the role of a Christian woman to a non-Christian man. There are two serious implications of this false doctrine: (1) It means that if the teaching of 1 Tim. 2:12 is authoritative teaching, then a woman is not forbidden (by 1 Tim. 2:12) to teach a non-Christian man in the way she is forbidden to teach a Christian man. If this were true, she would teach a Bible class containing non-Christian men or even preach to non-Christian men. (2) It means that no authoritative act that she would be forbidden to practice over a man (1 Tim. 2:12) would be forbidden for her to practice over a non-Christian man. If women leading singing and leading prayer are forbidden because they are authoritative acts, then a Christian woman would be permitted to lead singing and lead prayer with non-Christian men present (as long as no Christian men were present). This false doctrine has split churches already and threatens to split more churches. I have refuted this false doctrine in my two books: *The Role of Women*, Vols. I & II.

Concluding Remarks

The Bales doctrine was soundly defeated in the Bales-Deaver Debate. This false doctrine has other serious implications and sound brethren must oppose this doctrine. God is righteous and has one law for all mankind.

DOES CALVINISM LOGICALLY PRODUCE RIGHTEOUSNESS OR UNRIGHTEOUSNESS?

Introduction

If Calvinism produces unrighteousness, then Calvinism is a dangerous system of religion filled with false doctrine which will cause souls to be lost. We have defined righteousness in the earlier lessons.

Definitions from usage in the Scriptures. Righteousness is a system by which man is forgiven of his sins (his unrighteousness). This is what is contemplated in Rom. 1:16-17.

Rom. 1:16 For I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. 17 For therein is revealed a righteousness of God from faith unto faith: as it is written, But the righteous shall live by faith.

This system of righteousness was designed to reconcile both Jew and Gentile in the same body (the church). The system by which man is made righteous is revealed in the gospel. This is what is contemplated in Rom. 10:3-4.

Rom. 10:3 For being ignorant of God's righteousness, and seeking to establish their own, they did not subject themselves to the righteousness of God. 4 For Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness to every one that believeth.

When the gospel is obeyed it will make one righteous (2 Thess. 1:7-9 and 1 Pet. 4:17-18).

2 Thess. 1:7 and to you that are afflicted rest with us, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire, 8 rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus: 9 who shall suffer punishment, *even* eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might,

1 Pet. 4:17 For the time *is come* for judgment to begin at the house of God: and if *it begin* first at us, what *shall be* the end of them that obey not the gospel of God? 18 And if the righteous is scarcely saved, where shall the ungodly and sinner appear?

Those who do not obey the gospel will be punished (2 Thess. 1:8). Those who obey the gospel are righteous (1 Pet. 4:17-18).

The Nature of God and Intended Nature of Man

There is no unrighteousness in God (Ps. 92:15).

Ps. 92:15 To show that Jehovah is upright; He is my rock, and there is no unrighteousness in him.

We are to be as our heavenly Father (Mt. 5:48 etc.).

Mt. 5:48 Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.³

³ Perfect means mature or full-grown.

Since the Calvinist has God to be a respecter of persons and respect-of-persons is unrighteous, Calvinists will pattern themselves after their false view of God. The god of Calvinism does not have the same nature as the God of the Bible.

Calvin's View of Righteousness

John Calvin wrote a systematic system of salvation (systematic but false), he wrote:

Our Lord Jesus Christ communicates his righteousness to us, and so by some wondrous ways in so far as pertains to the justice of Gods transfuses its power into us. That this was the Apostle's view is abundantly clear from another sentiment which he had expressed a little before: "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous," (Rom. 5:19.) To declare that we are deemed righteous, solely because the obedience of Christ is imputed to us as if it were our own, is just to place our righteousness in the obedience of Christ. (Calvin's Institutes, p. 844)

Calvin claimed that man inherited the sin of Adam (Adam's sins were imputed to all of his offspring). This claim entails the "total hereditary inability" or "total hereditary depravity" of Adam's offspring. Because of this total depravity, man is supposedly unable to do anything that is good (do anything righteous).

The Calvinist's answer to this problem is to claim that the righteousness of Christ is imputed or transferred to us. (It is as if all the good of Jesus is imparted to us arbitrarily and our sin is transferred [imputed] to Christ.) Because the sins of man are supposedly transferred (imputed) to Christ, He must have become a sinner. Jesus could not be a fit sin-offering if He had sin (blemishes).

Calvin has righteousness being something given to man, not something man does. John Calvin stated:

"Faith is imputed for righteousness," and therefore righteousness is not the reward of works, but is given without being due. Because "we are justified by faith," boasting is excluded. (Institutes, p. 840).

Righteousness must be sought (Mt. 6:33).

Mt. 6:33 But seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

Righteousness must be worked (Acts 10:35).

Acts 10:35 but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him.

Righteousness must be kept (Rom. 2:26).

Rom. 2:26 If therefore the uncircumcision keep the ordinances (righteousness - KJV) of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be reckoned for circumcision?

Righteousness must be done (1 Jn. 3:10).

1 Jn. 3:10 In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother.

Righteousness must be done in order to be born again (1 Jn. 2:29).

1 Jn. 2:29 If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one also that doeth righteousness is begotten of him.

We are justified (made righteous) by works of obedience (Jas. 2:20-26).

Jas. 2:20 But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith apart from works is barren? 21 Was not Abraham our father justified by works, in that he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? 22 Thou seest that faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect; 23 and the scripture was fulfilled which saith, And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of God. 24 Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith. 25 And in like manner was not also Rahab the harlot justified by works, in that she received the messengers, and sent them out another way? 26 For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead.

Without works of obedience man is unrighteous. Calvinism leaves off obedience; therefore, it makes man unrighteous. Calvinists see only one kind of works “meritorious” works.

Unrighteousness in the Scriptures.

If one has respect-of-persons, he is unrighteous (Lev. 19:15).

Lev. 19:15 Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment: thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honor the person of the mighty; but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor.

God would be unrighteous if He had respect-of-persons. There is no respect-of-persons with God.

The Nature of God and Intended Nature of Man

There is no unrighteousness in God (Ps. 92:15).

Ps. 92:15 To show that Jehovah is upright; He is my rock, and there is no unrighteousness in him.

We are to be as our heavenly Father (Mt. 5:48 etc.).

Mt. 5:48 Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

Since the Calvinist has God to be a respecter of persons and respect-of-persons is unrighteous, Calvinists will pattern themselves after their incorrect view of God.

Calvinism Demeans the Nature of Both God and Man

Calvinism implies that God is unjust. If man cannot help doing wrong (sinning), then he cannot be guilty of his sinful deeds.

God forbade punishing the children for the sins of their parents (Deut. 24:16), but Calvinism implies that man is punished for the sins of his parents.

Deut. 24:16 The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin.

God said that man will not bear the sins of his parents (Ezek. 18:20).

Ezek. 18:20 The soul that sinneth, it shall die: the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.

Since the Scriptures frequently admonish us to be more like God, men who view God as being unjust will become unjust (unrighteous).

Calvinism implies that God is a respecter of persons because He arbitrarily chooses one person to be saved (the elect) and arbitrarily chooses another person to be lost (the reprobate). Respect-of-persons is a sin (Jas. 2:9) because it is unrighteous (Lev. 19:15).

Jas. 2:9 but if ye have respect of persons, ye commit sin, being convicted by the law as transgressors.

Lev. 19:15 Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment: thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honor the person of the mighty; but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor.

God is not a respecter of persons (Acts 10:34, Rom. 2:11, Eph. 6:9, and 1 Pet. 1:17).

Acts 10:34 And Peter opened his mouth and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: 35 but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him.

Rom. 2:11 for there is no respect of persons with God

Eph. 6:9 And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, and forbear threatening: knowing that he who is both their Master and yours is in heaven, and there is no respect of persons with him.

1 Pet. 1:17 And if ye call on him as Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to each man's work, pass the time of your sojourning in fear:

God is not unrighteous (Ps. 92:15).

Ps. 92:15 To show that Jehovah is upright; He is my rock, and there is no unrighteousness in him.

We are to be as our heavenly Father (Mt. 5:48 etc.).

Mt. 5:48 Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.

Since the Calvinist has God to be a respecter of persons and respect-of-persons is unrighteous, Calvinists will pattern themselves after their God.

Other ways that Calvinism Leads to Unrighteousness

It teaches that nothing we can do will either cause us to be saved or to be lost. There is no reason to fear doing evil and to be encouraged to do good. We will be judged by our works (Rev. 20:11-13).

Rev. 20:11 And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat upon it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. 12 And I saw the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne; and books were opened: and another book was opened, which is *the book* of life: and the dead were judged out of the things which were written in the books, according to their works. 13 And the sea gave up the dead that were in it; and death and Hades gave up the dead that were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works.

Gospel preachers have debated Calvinistic preachers and pressed them into admitting that one could: commit murder, commit idolatry, and commit any other sin and not be lost if he was one of the elect.

Calvinistic preachers have opposed teaching ethics.

The Calvinistic preacher, Cotton Mather, argued against teaching ethics in college in 1716. "Ethics, after all, is a guide to good works, as Cotton Mather recognized in his complaint in 1716 against 'employing so much time in Ethik in college, a vile form of paganism.'" (Rudolph, p. 41)

This is the logical implication of Calvinistic doctrine. While the Calvinist may deny this his doctrine implies that it does not matter what one does because his eternal destiny is sealed.

The Scriptures teach that we can do something about our salvation (Acts 2:40 and Phil. 2:12).

Acts 2:40 And with many other words he testified, and exhorted them, saying, Save yourselves from this crooked generation.

Phil. 2:12 So then, my beloved, even as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling;

Calvin was unable to see the difference between works of obedience to the will of God and meritorious works.

The Fruit Test

Jesus taught that we can know the nature of a doctrine by the fruits of the doctrine (Mt. 7:15-20 and 12:33).

Mt. 7:15 Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves. 16 By their fruits ye shall know them. Do *men* gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? 17 Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but the corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. 18 A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. 19 Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. 20 Therefore by their fruits ye shall know them.

Calvinism is false doctrine (a bad tree). False doctrine (in this passage it is referring to false prophets) produces bad fruit. When a Calvinist is morally good it is "in spite of" Calvinism, not "because of" Calvinism.

APPENDIX A

LEXICAL DEFINITIONS OF KEY WORDS

WORDS RELATED TO RIGHTEOUSNESS

δικαιοκρισία “*righteous judgment*” (Thayer, p. 148) This word is found: Rom. 2:5.

δίκαιος “*observant of ἡ δίκη, righteous, observing divine and human laws; one who is such as he ought to be*” (Thayer, p. 148) This word is found 81 times in the New Testament.

δικαιοσύνη “*the virtue or quality or state of one who is δίκαιος; 1. in the broad sense, the state of him who is such as he ought to be.*” (Thayer, p. 149) This word is found 92 times in the New Testament.

δικαίω “*to make δίκαιος; to render righteous or such as he ought to be ... to show, exhibit, evince, one to be righteous, such as he is and wishes himself to be considered.*” (Thayer, p. 150) This word is found 40 times in the N. T. (translated “justify[ied, ier] in all instances except Rev. 22:11 [in the KJV]).

δικαίωμα “**1.** *that which has been deemed right so as to have the force of law; a. what has been established and ordained by law, an ordinance ... 2. a righteous act or deed.*” (Thayer, p. 151) This word is found 10 times in the New Testament.

δικαίως “*adv. ... 1. justly, agreeably to right ... 2. properly, as is right ... 3. uprightly, agreeably to the law of rectitude.*” (Thayer, p. 151) This word is found 5 times in the New Testament.

δικαίωσις “[fr. δικαίω, equiv. to τὸ δικαιοῦν, the act τοῦ δικαιοῦντος; in extra-bibl. writ. fr. Thuc. on, the justification or defence of a cause; sentence of condemnation; judgment in reference to what is just], *the act of God’s declaring men free from guilt and acceptable to him; adjudging to be righteous ...*” [Thayer, p. 151] Word found in: Rom. 4:25 and 5:18.

δικαστής “[δικάζω], *a judge, arbitrator, umpire ...* Syn. δικαστης, κριτης: acc. to etymol. and classic usage δ. is the more dignified and official term; κ. gives prominence to the mental process, whether the ‘judge’ be a magistrate or not.” [Thayer, p. 151] Word found in: Lk. 12:14, Acts 7:27, and 35.

δίκη “fr. Hom. Down; **1.** *custom, usage ... 2. right, justice. 3. a suit at law. 4. a judicial hearing, judicial decision, esp. a sentence of condemnation ... 5. execution of the sentence, punishment ... 6. the goddess Justice, avenging justice*” (Thayer, p. 151) This word is found 4 times in the New Testament.

WORDS RELATED TO UNRIGHTEOUSNESS

ἀδικέω “literally *to be* ἄδικος. **1.** absolutely; **a.** *to act unjustly or wickedly, to sin*: ... **b.** *to be a criminal*, to have violated the laws in some way ... **2.** transitively; **a.** τί, *to do some wrong, sin in some respect* ... **b.** τινά, *to wrong some one, act wickedly towards him*” (Thayer, pp. 11-12) This word is found in: Mt. 20:13, Lk. 10:19, Acts 7:24, 26, 27, 25:10, 11, 1 Cor. 6:7, 8, 2 Cor. 7:2, 12 (twice), Gal. 4:12, Col. 3:25 (twice), Phle. 18, Rev. 2:11, 6:6, 7:2, 3, 9:4, 10, 19, 11:5 (twice), and 22:11.

ἀδίκημα “(ἀδικέω), ... *a misdeed*” (Thayer, p. 12) This word is found in: Acts 18:14, 24:20, and Rev. 18:5.

ἀδικία “**1.** *injustice*, of a judge ... **2.** *unrighteousness of heart and life* ... **3.** *a deed violating law and justice, act of unrighteousness*” (Thayer, p. 12) This word is found in: Lk. 13:27, 16:8, 9, 18:6, Jn. 7:18, Acts 1:18, 8:23, Rom. 1:18 (twice), 29, 2:8, 3:5, 6:13, 9:14, 1 Cor. 13:6, 2 Cor. 12:13, 2 Thess. 2:10, 12, 2 Tim. 2:19, Heb. 8:12, Jas. 3:6, 2 Pet. 2:13, 15, 1 Jn. 1:9, and 5:17.

ἄδικος “descriptive of *one who violates or has violated justice*; **1.** *unjust*, ... **2.** of one who breaks God’s laws, *unrighteous, sinful* ... **3.** spec., of one who deals fraudulently with others” (Thayer, p. 12) This word is found in: Mt. 5:45, Lk. 16:10, 11, 18:11, Acts 24:15, Rom. 3:5, 1 Cor. 6:1, 9, Heb. 6:10, 1 Pet. 3:18, and 2 Pet. 2:9.

ἀδίκως “adv., *unjustly, undeservedly, without fault* ... *wrongfully*” (Thayer, p. 12) This word is found in: 1 Pet. 2:19.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bales, James D.; Deaver, Roy C. (1988). *Bales-Deaver Debate on Aliens and the Covenant*. Pensacola, FL: Firm Foundation Pub. House.

Bauer, Walter; Arndt, William; Gingrich, F. Wilbur (1957). *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (often listed as BAG)

Calvin, John. (McNeill, John editor, 1960). *Institutes of the Christian religion, Vols. I and II*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Dana, H. E.; Mantey, J. R. (1955). *A manual grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Toronto: The Macmillan Co.

Fox, Marion R. (2003) *The Work of the Holy Spirit, Vol. I* (2nd ed.). Okla. City, OK: Five F Pub. Co.

Fox, Marion R. (2006). *The role of women. Vol. I*, Oklahoma City, OK: Five F. Pub. Co.

Fox, Marion R. (2006). *The role of women. Vol. II*, Oklahoma City, OK: Five F. Pub. Co.

Kittel, Gerhard (ed. 2006) *Theological dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. V*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

Rudolph, Frederick (1978). *Curriculum, a history of the American undergraduate course of study since 1636*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Thayer, Joseph (1970). *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House.

Trench, Richard Chenevix (1989). *Synonyms of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker book House.

Notes on Matters to be Developed

New ideas: The Jews were unrighteous when they condemned the actions of Jesus (healing on the Sabbath), but they would tend to their animals on the Sabbath (Lk. 14:3-6).

Note also that our courts are unrighteous when they will prosecute a person for two murders if he kills a pregnant woman, but will allow an abortionist to murder the unborn baby.

Our government is unrighteous when it prosecutes a person for destroying the eggs of birds like eagles, but condones killing human babies.

A policeman is unrighteous when he violates the law regularly – by speeding, failure to signal when changing lanes, rolling stop at a stop-sign, driving too close to a car in front of them, etc. and arrests other people for doing the same thing.

cf. The Gist of the Bible with Scripture notes (p. 16) for more notes on righteousness and unrighteousness (2 Thess. 2:10-12).

More notes filed under file 326 (Imputed righteousness).