

# FIRE THE CLERGY!

---

*Cease the Fleecing of the Flock!*

Mark Smith 1973, 1999 [www.JCnot4me.com](http://www.JCnot4me.com)

\*\*\*\*\*

## ***Proposition:***

**The New Testament teaches that only Apostles had the right to be paid by the church for their preaching.**

## ***Introduction:***

If you are like most people, you have always felt a bit queasy about the way money & religion has been mixed together. When your preacher gets up and begs for money like some (well-dressed) homeless bum outside a 7-Eleven, deep in your gut you have felt that something wasn't right. You have known instinctively all these years that money and religion don't mix. Guess what? You were right!

You probably also felt queasy when you learned how much some of these preachers and religions were taking in. To really put the following paragraphs in perspective, keep in mind that the very first Christian preacher, the Apostle Peter, was broke- not even a thin dime to his name (Acts 3:6). Things have really changed over the years!

**The PTL Club:** Reverend Jim Bakker, and his clown-clone of a wife Tammy Faye, were paid \$1,600,000 for the year of 1986. And if you'll recall, in almost every single broadcast, they would boo-hoo about how they were broke and needed even **more** money "for the Lord's work". Even the assistants to these frauds were making a killing. Richard Dortch, David Taggart, and two other administrators all pulled in more than \$350,000 each, in 1986. (#17)

Jim & Tammy lived it up for many years- wearing gold and diamonds, while driving Mercedes-Benz and Rolls-Royce and Corvette cars. They bought a house in Palm Springs for \$449,000, and paid \$375,000 for a condo in Florida. (#19) The thing to remember about this whole PTL scandal is that these people, ridiculous as they were, were heroes to the flaming fundies. Everybody else could see, before the scandal even broke, that these people were frauds. Even after all the facts came out, many of their true believers still refused to believe- gold plated bathroom faucets and air conditioned dog houses notwithstanding.

**The Worldwide Church of God:** In 1979 the leadership of the Worldwide Church of God was actually sued by the state of California for pilfering church funds, selling off assets for personal gain, and "living extravagantly". More than \$80 million in assets were at stake. The church's weekly take from donations alone? (Use your best Dr. Evil impression): One **million** dollars. Total revenue amounted to nearly \$70 million per year. (#18)

**Churches in General:** Churches now own about 25% of **all** the real estate in America. In Los Angeles county alone, the churches own \$1.3 billion dollars worth of real estate. And according to the IRS, the donations made to churches average \$19 **billion** dollars a year. (#20)

If in spite of all the above, you gave money to a church anyway last Sunday to help support a clergyman, because you were told the Bible says to, you were swindled, per the dictionary definition:

**Swindle:** 1. To cheat or defraud of money or property. 2. To obtain by fraudulent means. (#11)

And if you believe the Bible, then you also believe that no one who swindles- even preachers- will inherit the kingdom of Biblegod, per 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians 6:10}

...nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revelers, nor **swindlers**, shall inherit the kingdom of God. (#3: NASB)

Those people that took your money are swindlers. They have twisted the Bible to suck money out of you. You have probably been swindled like this week after week, going on many years by now. Those uneasy feelings you've always felt regarding "the offering" are correct. Yes, you are the victim of a fraud.

**Fraud:** Intentional perversion of truth in order to induce another to part with something of value. (#15)

This weekly rip-off known as “the offering”, to support professional pulpit-pounders, is not even authorized within the New Testament, and is in fact, plainly condemned. No where is to be found even a hint that “the offering” is to be a part of a “worship service”, nor that this money should go to “the minister”. The swindlers who perpetuate this fraud distort and twist the Christian scriptures for the purpose of wringing ever-increasing amounts of money from unsuspecting saps. As the Apostle Paul said,

“Such teachers are not working for our Lord Jesus, but only want gain (i.e. money) for themselves. They are good speakers, and simple-minded people are often fooled by them.” (#6: The Living Bible, Rm 16:18)

This study will build a case, verse by verse, brick by brick, which will show that your beloved clergyman is just another form of con artist- tricking you out of your money. But some will say, what about his motives? What if he doesn’t know he is ripping you off? What if he is ripping you off because he thinks it’s the right thing to do? For you Christians who believe in an absolute morality, you believe that the end (however noble) doesn’t justify the means. Therefore, even if he is ripping you off “for a higher good”, he is wrong to do so. What about if he doesn’t know he is doing wrong? As the old saying goes, “ignorance of the law is no excuse”. Regardless of his words, his actions do not follow what he hypocritically tries to force everyone else to follow- the New Testament. The bottom line is, if he were really a man of honor, motivated by good intentions, he would quit his deceptions and get a *real* job.

I intend to show that the New Testament teaches only Apostles were authorized to get paid for preaching and teaching. There are no Apostles alive today, and therefore no one today should be getting paid to preach. The whole subject of Apostles, however, is another booklet, available from the author. If I manage to convince you within *this* booklet that only Apostles had the right to be professional preachers, then your next step is to research Apostles. Ask for my booklet “*Authority in Church Government*.” Here, it is enough to show you that only Apostles had the right to be paid by the church for their preaching.

## **The Study**

### **Acts 20:29-35**

I know that after my departure savage (*burdensome*- #4: CLNT) wolves will come in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves men will arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them. Therefore be on the alert, remembering that night and day for a period of three years I did not cease to admonish each one with tears. And now I commend you to God and to the word of His grace, which is able to build you up and to give you the inheritance among all those who are sanctified. I HAVE COVETED NO ONE'S SILVER OR GOLD OR CLOTHES. YOU YOURSELVES KNOW THAT THESE HANDS MINISTERED TO MY OWN NEEDS AND TO THE MEN WHO WERE WITH ME. In every thing I showed you that by working hard in this

manner you must help the weak and remember the words of the Lord Jesus, that He Himself said, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive. (#3: NASB)

## Commentary

As seen from context, Paul is contrasting himself against the ones to come to the Ephesian church sometime in the future. The early church, as I will show, only supported those it thought to be Apostles. Therefore, those that sought support would have to first pass themselves off as Apostles. Did the Ephesian church have men who, claiming to be Apostles, were burdensome to the church, like Paul feared would happen? Indeed, false Apostles did show up, thus confirming my theory. Some years later, John, while on the Island of Patmos, wrote to the church at Ephesus,

I know your deeds and your toil and perseverance, and that you cannot endure evil men, and you put to the test those who call themselves Apostles, and they are not, and you found them to be false. (#3: NASB, Rv 2:2)

One way these Christians had of testing an Apostle is given by Paul:

The signs of a true Apostle were performed among you with all perseverance, by signs and wonders and miracles. (#3: NASB, 2C 12:12)

Paul left the example of being self-supporting at their church, to contrast himself to the ones to come in the future who would be mooching off of the church. Thus in deeds, as well as words, Paul warned against having a professional clergy.

These men to come to Ephesus were to be a burden to that church. From the context, and the meaning of that word in the Greek, it becomes clear that the burden was a burden of living off of the church. They would let others support them, instead of supporting themselves. Most translations, done as they are by professional clergymen, do not translate "bareis" in this verse as *burdensome*. They try to hide its meaning behind such words as savage, oppressive, grievous, vicious, or ferocious. But how well does their reasoning hold up? "Bareis" is also used in 1Tm 5:16. Let's see how it looks through their spectacles--

"If any woman who is a believer has dependent widows, let her assist them, and let not the church be **burdened** (savage? oppressive? grievous? vicious? ferocious?)..."

It is easy to see that for the clergy the end (keeping their easy jobs) justifies the means (mistranslating the Greek). I think they are mistaken in making "Burdensome" in Acts 20:29 into an adjective rather than a noun. I believe these men would not have been burdensome wolves, as much as they were both burdensome **and** wolves, two separate but related functions.

### **Matthew 7: 15,16**

Be on your guard against false religious teachers, who come to you dressed up as sheep but are really **greedy wolves**. (#25: Phillips)

## COMMENTARY

Jesus himself is seen here warning against a professional clergy. The Greek word, here translated "greedy", is "harpax," which means a robber, an extortioner.

**Extortion:** "To obtain from a person by force or undue or illegal power or **ingenuity**." (#15: Webster's)

Note that Jesus compared these false teachers- as did the Apostle Paul- to wolves. He did this because wolves, like the clergy, make their living by feeding off flocks of sheep- except the wolf has more honor than to hide its true mission under a religious cloak.

### 1 Thessalonians 2:1-12

- 1 You know, brothers, that our visit to you was not a failure.
  - 2 We had previously suffered and been insulted in Philippi, as you know, but with the help of our God we dared to tell you his gospel in spite of strong opposition.
  - 3 For the appeal we make does not spring from error or **impure motives**, nor are we trying to trick you.
  - 4 On the contrary, we speak as men **approved by God** to be **entrusted** with the gospel. We are not trying to please men but God, who tests our hearts.
  - 5 You know we never used flattery, **nor did we put on a mask to cover up greed**-- God is our witness.
  - 6 We were not looking for praise from men, not from you or anyone else. **As Apostles of Christ we could have been a burden to you,**
  - 7 but we were gentle among you, like a mother caring for her little children.
  - 8 We loved you so much that we were delighted to share with you not only the gospel of God but our lives as well, because you had become so dear to us.
  - 9 Surely you remember, brothers, our toil and hardship; **we worked night and day in order not to be a burden to anyone while we preached the gospel of God to you.**
  - 10 You are witnesses, and so is God, of how holy, righteous and blameless we were among you who believed.
  - 11 For you know that we dealt with each of you as a father deals with his own children,
  - 12 encouraging, comforting and urging you to live lives worthy of God, who calls you into his kingdom and glory.
- (#16: NIV)

#### ***Other Translations...***

(#4: CLNT) For neither did we at any time become flattering in expression, according as you are aware; neither with a pretense for **GREED**, God is witness; neither seeking glory from men, neither you, nor from others, when **WE COULD BE A BURDEN AS CHRIST'S APOSTLES**.

(#7: NWT) Neither have we been seeking glory from men, no, either from you or from others, though **WE COULD BE AN EXPENSIVE BURDEN AS APOSTLES OF CHRIST**.

(#8: KJV)...when we might have been **BURDENSOME**, as the **APOSTLES** of Christ.

(#14: TCNT)...although, as **APOSTLES** of Christ, we might have **BURDENED** you with our SUPPORT.

## COMMENTARY

Paul here has written enough to put every clergyman on this planet to shame- and out of a job. Maybe the place to start with these verses is to notice that Paul was “entrusted” with the gospel by Biblegod himself. This is one of the main ingredients to being an Apostle. A good comparison of an Apostle would be a modern day ambassador-, none of which are self-appointed. The bozo’s who are manning the pulpits nowadays have no such mandate. They are all frauds.

In verse nine, Paul points out that in addition to working DAYS, he also worked NIGHTS. And he is talking about REAL work- working with his hands building tents. And as if that wasn’t enough, on top of working nights AND days HE ALSO PREACHED to the Thessalonians- month after month after month. He did all this so that the church there wouldn’t have to pay a cent to hear the gospel preached. Contrast **THAT** behavior with a modern clergyman- Rev. Cream Puff. Rev. Puff has lily white uncalled hands, manicured nails, a \$200 hair cut, and expensive Italian suits. Even if he wanted to, he’s not allowed to mow his own lawn! Too “degrading”. Too “blue-collar”. And too damn “humble”. As far as getting a real job, he’d rather continue to suck pension money away from lonely old people who don’t know any better. It would be so nice to see a dirty, sweaty, haggard Apostle Paul walking up to one of these lazy-ass, over-paid, over-weight pulpit-pounders doing their shtick, and “shtick” it up his ass.

Paul also mentions that he wasn’t hiding greed behind a false front. His motivation was not to suck money out of these people, even though “**AS APOSTLES**” they had every right. “As Apostles”, and not as anything else. Evangelists did not have this right, preachers did not have this right, pastors did not have this right, and you the reader do not have this right. This right to be supported for preaching the gospel was reserved only for the Apostles.

It should also be noticed that Paul does **not** equate working with preaching the gospel. The two activities are clearly separate in Paul’s mind. This pulls the rug out from under those who say their preacher **works** when he preaches the gospel, and is therefore entitled to be paid for his working.

The word translated “burden” in verse six comes from the Greek word “Bareis”. All too often in Bible translations, you will see this word butchered- by clergymen with a vested interest, bent on protecting their livelihood rather than promoting the truth. Having these people do Bible translations is like asking the wolf to guard the hen house. The word means “burden”, and is translated as such most of the time- EXCEPT, that is, when it becomes a threat to the cushy jobs of the clergy, as it does in verse six. In such cases, the word is magically transformed in all sorts of fanciful ways- without any justification whatsoever. In verse six, it clearly means “financial burden” but is seldomly translated that way. The rank

hypocrisy of the Christian translators in regards to the word “burdensome” really shows thru after studying various Bible translations. One notices that the word gets mutilated in verse six, but somehow the exact same word survives intact in verse nine. The only difference is that in verse nine, it is less threatening to the job security of the translators. To demonstrate this, and show you to what lengths the clergy will go to protect their livelihood, several of the more dishonest MIS-translations this word “burdensome” has suffered are tabulated for your enjoyment:

Bible Version	Translation of “Burdensome” in:	
	Verse 6	Verse 9
Smith & Goodspeed	Stood on our Dignity	Burden
Green’s Literal Translation	Weight of Glory	Burden
New American Standard Bible	Asserted our Authority	Burden
New Revised Standard Version	Made Demands	Burden
Weymouth’s	Stood on our Dignity	Burden
Amplified New Testament	Asserted our Authority	Burden
Emphasized New Testament	Assumed Dignity	Burden
The New Berkeley Version	Claim Authority	Burden
The Living Bible	Honor	Burden
The New English Bible	Made Our Weight Felt	Burden

You have to admit- some of these “translations” are *really* stupid! It is obvious their over-riding concern in translating here was not truth, but rather protecting their income. Religionists protecting their sacred cash-cows is nothing new. Even ancient pagans had a similar need, as shown in the New Testament book of Acts, chapter 19. It seems that a certain silversmith named Demetrius, who built idols for a living, saw his income threatened by the (then) new-fangled religion of Jesus- which had no need of idols. Like all good religionists, rather than compete fairly against the other religion in the open marketplace of ideas, Demetrius instead resorted to threats and violence to try to get his way.

### ***Jude 16***

These men are grumblers, dissatisfied with life. They go where their passions lead, their talk is arrogant and they cultivate people in **the hope of gain**. (#13: S&G)

### ***Acts 8:20***

But Peter said to him, 'May your silver perish with you, because you thought you could obtain the gift of God with **money**!' (#3: NASB)

### ***Other Translations...***

(#6: The Living Bible)

...thinking God's **gift** can be **bought**!

## COMMENTARY

Christians believe that the gospel is Biblegod's free gift to the world. Imagine how upset a god would be to find preachers have turned around and sold the gift so freely given them- a gift that cost the life of the god's son to acquire. These clergymen have taken what was freely given them, slapped a price tag on it, and sell it week after week for a pay check. Peter condemned one who tried to buy; how much more those that would try to sell!

Of course, there are some naïve readers that are thinking to themselves "Oh no! **Our** minister isn't in it for the money! He just **looooooves** the Lord!" Let them try this experiment: stop paying the preacher. See how long he sticks around as an unpaid volunteer. See how much he "looooooves the Lord" when he isn't getting paid to "love the lord. Tell him he can still preach, but he'll have to get a real job during the week like everyone else. I guarantee you, 99.999% of all preachers will be out of there, scrambling for a new pulpit to fill. "Loooooves the Lord" my ass! It's that damn paycheck that he's loyal to, and if he can't get it at your church, he'll follow it to somewhere else!

### ***Micah 3:11***

Her leaders pronounce judgment for a bribe, her priests instruct for a price, and her prophets divine for money. Yet they lean on the Lord saying, 'Is not the Lord in our midst? Calamity will not come upon us.' (#3: NASB)

### ***1 Timothy 6:5-10***

And constant friction between men of depraved mind and deprived of the truth, **WHO SUPPOSE THAT GODLINESS (i.e. religion) IS A MEANS OF GAIN**. But godliness actually is a means of great gain, when accompanied by contentment. For we have brought nothing into the world, so we cannot take anything out of it either. And if we have food and covering, with these we shall be content. But those who want to get rich fall into temptation and a snare and many foolish and harmful desires, which plunge men into ruin and destruction. For the love of money is a root of all sorts of evil, and some by longing for it have wandered away from the faith, and pierced themselves with many a pang. (#3: NASB)

### ***Other Translations...***

(#6: The Living Bible) These arguers--their minds warped by sin--don't know how to tell the truth; to them the Good News is just a means of making money. Keep away from them.

(#9: Amp) ...men who are corrupted in mind and bereft of the truth, who imagine that godliness or righteousness is a source of profit--a money-making business, a MEANS OF LIVELIHOOD. From such withdraw.

## COMMENTARY

In the clearest of terms, the Apostle Paul condemns those that have turned



preaching into a full-time job. He condemns those that have made a career out of it. He condemns those that have turned the gospel into “a means of livelihood”. In short, he condemns every single paid preacher that exists today.

Why haven't you heard of this before? Why hasn't this doctrine of Paul been shouted from the rooftops, and echoed from pulpits across this land? Why have the clergy consistently avoided preaching on verses like these? To even ask such questions is to answer such questions. The reason the clergy have engaged in such a massive conspiracy of silence on this issue is because they themselves are the target of Paul's wrath. They are the ones guilty of having turned preaching into a full-time job. For them to preach this from their pulpits would be to commit economic suicide. They have been forced to choose between their god, and mammon- and they've chosen mammon. They have been faced with the choice of picking what they love more- their paycheck, or the truth; and truth has lost out. The very people who are in the best position to inform their congregations of the truth of this matter, turn out to be the same people who have a vested interest in hushing this up. Indeed, the wolves have been placed in charge of the hen house, and are doing their best to keep the hens ignorant of the slaughter of truth going on.

The clergy of your city have turned religion into a "means of livelihood". A clergyman is a professional religionist- one who gets paid to preach. And, as we've seen, is unequivocally condemned by Paul in the clearest of terms. Anybody who can read the verses of Paul above, and go away with any other conclusion, is retarded, or a clergyman with a vested interest to protect. Just like the tobacco lawyers- trying to blind others to the dangers of cigarettes- so also clergymen have blinded their congregations to verses like the above. The day they start to deal honestly with verses like the above, will be the day they quit their jobs. So don't hold your breath- they have shown a much stronger desire to paying their debts to bill collectors, than paying their obligations to Biblegod.

The original Greek word here translated "contentment," in the primary meaning means

A perfect condition of life, in which NO AID or SUPPORT is needed.  
(#1: Thayer's)

In other words, if someone in our era really wants to preach the gospel, he has to be able to support himself with a real job, so that no outside “aid or support is needed.” He should not be sponging off of the church. The same Greek word is also used in 2C 9:8, where Paul says we all should be taking care of ourselves, and not mooching off of others (such as clergymen do):

And God is able to make all grace, every favor and earthly blessing, come to you in abundance, so that you may always and under all circumstances and whatever the need, be SELF-SUFFICIENT--possessing enough to require no aid or support and furnished in abundance for every good work

and charitable donation. (#9: Amp)

## **2 Corinthians 2:17**

For we are not like many, **peddling the word of God**, but as from sincerity, but as from God, we speak in Christ in the sight of God. (#3: NASB)

### ***Other Translations...***

(#10: RSV) For we are not, like so many, **PEDDLERS of God's word...**

(#6: The Living Bible) ...we are not like those hucksters--and there are many of them--whose idea in getting out the Gospel is to **MAKE A LIVING OUT OF IT**.

(#4: CLNT) For we are not as the **M A J O R I T Y**...

## **COMMENTARY**

ANY preacher, regardless of how popular he is, regardless of how well he tickles the ears of his groupies, and regardless of how good an orator he is- ANY preacher that makes his living from a church is nothing but a crook. Nothing could be more obvious as Paul himself condemns those who “make a living” out of preaching the gospel.

And was that the **M A J O R I T Y**, or minority of preachers, who are, contrary to plain Bible teaching, making their living from preaching the gospel???? I believe Paul said that it was the *majority*. And guess what? It's the same in our era as well! 99.999% of all clergy have managed to turn their religion into their livelihood, in clear and direct violation of this verse. Yet these same hypocrites have the audacity to stand in their pulpits and condemn others for ignoring the same book they themselves ignore. And their stupid brainless sheep keep putting up with it! Thus proving once again that maybe indeed those that are conned deserve con men in their lives.

The word “peddling” that was used in this verse by Paul to describe the professional clergy of his age is a very pregnant word, full of meaning. Thayer's defines the word thusly-

"A petty retailer, a huckster, peddler, to make money by selling anything; to get sordid gain by dealing in anything, to do a thing for base gain." (#1: Thayer's)

I can't think of a better word to describe most modern televangelists! What is really interesting is that this word, in the Greek, has its root in the practice of some of the wine dealers of Paul's day. Their practice, in order to sell more, would be to dilute their wine with water. Paul chose an appropriate description of gospel peddlers. In order to please more hearers and thus sell more gospel, they dilute the message. Paul knew the time would come when the people would not listen to real gospel preaching, but wanting their ears tickled, they would hire their own teachers, putting them on the payroll- where they could be controlled.

Notice also Paul describes his group as being "**from** God." The very word *Apostle*, if you'll recall, means exactly that: "one sent." Apostles, having been sent by Biblegod, were the only ones authorized by Biblegod to accept support. Non-Apostles, i.e. those men not sent by Biblegod, are not authorized to accept money from others for their preaching.

### **Matthew 21:13**

And He said to them, 'It is written, "'My house shall be called a house of prayer;"' but you are making it a robbers' den! (#3: NASB)

### **Titus 1:10-12**

For there are many (Note: **MANY**) rebellious men, empty talkers and deceivers, especially those of the circumcision, who must be silenced because they are upsetting whole families, teaching things they should not teach, for the sake of SORDID GAIN. One of themselves, a prophet of their own, said, 'Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, lazy gluttons.' (#3: NASB)

## **COMMENTARY**

This word that Paul used- "sordid"- just what does that mean? It is not commonly used much anymore.

"**Sordid**: dirty, filthy, marked by baseness." (#15: Webster's)

It should be noted that it was the "gain" these men were making, that is, the profit, the fact that they were profiting off the death of Jesus, and **not** the money itself, nor the teaching, which was sordid. Their teaching was of course "something that should not be taught," but the money was just common everyday money. It is the profiting off the death of Christ that is being objected to. Even if they were teaching things that were 100% true, they would still be in the wrong for "doing a Judas", i.e. making a profit off the Christian prophet.

Notice that Paul also calls these men "lazy gluttons". The fact that they were "lazy gluttons" has a lot to do with the profession they picked. Ministers, contrary to their constant public protestations, are in reality some of the laziest people around. They are both lazy & over-eaters- gluttons. The Reverend's of today are continuing this tradition- they are so usually overweight, that it is indeed rare to see any that aren't.

Another occupational trait Paul brings up is the fact that professional clergymen are full of hot air. They can just go on and on spinning a yarn. It does seem to make sense that an empty talker and a deceiver could really profit in this profession.

## 2 Thessalonians 3: 6-15

Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our lord Jesus Christ, that you keep aloof from every brother who leads an unruly life and not according to the tradition which you received from us. For you yourselves know how **you ought to follow our example**; because we did not act in an undisciplined manner among you, nor did we eat anyone's bread without paying for it, but with labor and hardship we kept working **night and day** so that we might not be a

### B U R D E N

to any of you; not because we do not have the right to this, but in order to **offer ourselves as a MODEL** for you, that you might

### **FOLLOW OUR EXAMPLE.**

For even when we were with you, we used to give you this order: If **anyone** (Note: includes preachers too!) will not work, neither let him eat. For we hear that some among you are leading an undisciplined life, doing no work at all, but are acting like busybodies. Now such persons we command and exhort in the Lord Jesus Christ to WORK in quiet fashion and eat their OWN bread. But as for you, brethren, do not grow weary of doing good. And if **anyone** does not obey our instruction in this letter, take special note of that man and do not associate with him, so that he may be put to shame. And yet do not regard him as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother. (#3: NASB)

## COMMENTARY

Once again, Paul manages to hit the nail right on the head. In the previous section, he pegged the professional clergy as being lazy and full of hot air. Here, he condemns their acting like "busybodies". They make it their job to busy themselves sticking their noses into the business of others. They oft times end up acting like self-appointed "moral police", busying themselves with the private affairs of others. The root definition of "busybodies" sheds even more light on the matter:

To bustle about uselessly, to busy one's self about trifling, needless, useless matters. Used apparently of a person *OFFICIOUSLY* inquisitive about others' affairs. (#1: Thayer's)

Paul busted his ass working not just one, but **TWO** jobs, while on top of that continuing to preach, never once complaining or taking even a nickel from them for preaching. In light of this, I tend to laugh at lazy preachers publicly complaining *they* don't have enough time or money. Let them try to get some sympathy from Paul! Paul suffered all these troubles for just one purpose and one purpose only: to leave an example to be followed. He even clearly labels it: "as a model for you, that you might **follow our example**." Paul goes out of his way to make it clear that there are NO exceptions to this rule, that it applies to "**anyone**" which certainly means clergy as well. But what do modern clergy do today in response to that? Not a damn thing. They totally ignore applying Paul's example to themselves. They have a vested interest in NOT applying it to themselves. As the author Upton Sinclair said, "It is difficult to get a man to understand something when his salary depends upon his not understanding it." So they will look at clear passages like this, and pretend to not

understand how it could possible apply to little ol' them. They make themselves completely blind to this whole section of the New Testament, as if it doesn't exist. I have actually witnessed this from a pew, listening to a clergyman dance around this section, careful to avoid any areas that might nail *his* ass to the wall. Such verbal tap dancing seems to be a skill of both the clergy and politicians. The clergy loudly point to Paul's *right* to be supported, while ignoring Paul's example of *not* being supported. They play "smorgasbord restaurant" with the Bible, grabbing what they like, ignoring what they don't like.

Of course, clergymen are going to say that none of this applies to *them*. That's a given. They are special. It applies to you- the scum of the earth- not to him. Remember- he's special. His shit doesn't stink. Well, Paul would disagree. Paul says that this applies to EVERYBODY: "if *anyone* will not work" neither let him eat." I think "anyone" would include "everyone" which includes your lazy ass preacher as well. In fact, Paul himself *was* a preacher- and PAUL WORKED- real jobs, at that. This passage proves that Paul did NOT equate preaching with working. And since this *applied* to Paul, and Paul was a *preacher*, then it certainly applies to *YOUR* preacher as well- even more so. They are to work REAL jobs to support themselves, do their preaching for free, and not take even a nickel from the churches they preach at. As Paul says, "if *anyone* does not obey our instructions in this letter... do not associate with him." (v. 14). That "anyone" includes "everyone" which includes your preacher.

### **1 Thessalonians 4: 11,12**

And to make it your ambition to lead a quiet life and attend to your *own business and work with your hands*, just as we commanded you; so that you may behave properly toward outsiders and not be in any need. (#3: NASB)

#### ***Other Translations...***

(#8: KJV) ...and that ye may have lack of nothing.

(#10: RSV) ...and be *dependent* on *nobody*.

### **Titus 3:14**

And let our own people really learn to apply themselves to good deeds--*to honest labor and honorable employment*--so that they may be able to meet necessary demands whenever the occasion may require and *not* be living *idle* and uncultivated and unfruitful lives. (#9: Amp)

## **COMMENTARY**

Has the "ministry" earned a reputation for honest labor, lack of idleness? On the contrary. Literature for the past thousand years or more has recognized the slothfulness, the laziness, of full-time religionists. Paul rightfully refused to equate preaching with working. Preachers should find honest, honorable

employment- i.e. a **real** job, and not be free-loading off of a church, for which they have no right to do so anyway. Paul not only commanded this of Christians, but even set examples several times, to back up his words with deeds. It is high time the clergy start following Paul's specific examples of working a **real** job, while preaching on the side.

### **1 Corinthians 4:12**

And we toil, *working with our own hands*. (#3: NASB)

### **Acts 28:30, 31**

He (Paul) lived there (in Rome) two whole years at his own expense and welcomed all who came to him, proclaiming the kingdom of God and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness and without hindrance. (#21: NRSV)

## **COMMENTARY**

Paul refused to accept a salary from the church at Rome, and instead, paid his own bills with his own earned money. Paul did not mind being helped on his way by the Romans, (Rm 15:24) but he, unlike the clergy, would not impose upon their hospitality to the extent that he would let them support him like he was some kind of deadbeat. Paul, even though he had the right as an Apostle to be paid for his preaching, usually declined. He knew it would set a bad example. How seldom, if at all, does one hear of any clergyman in our era working a real job to pay his own way, having turned down a salary from a church.

### **Acts 3:6**

But Peter (to a beggar) said, 'I do not possess silver and gold, but what I do have I give to you: In the name of Jesus Christ the Nazarene--walk! ' (#3: NASB)

## **COMMENTARY**

Peter was the leader of the church in Jerusalem. By the time Peter was confronted by this beggar, his church had grown to over 3000 members (Acts 2:41). It would be very improbable for a modern day minister of such a large congregation to have no money, to be flat broke. Yet this is one of the things that separates the modern day professional clergy from their forefathers. A minister of such a prestigious church in our era would certainly have a pocket full of money. He would also probably have a new car, a gold watch, a pension plan, stock options, and a nice house in a nice gated neighborhood- where such beggars as Peter ran into are not even allowed.

Peter was flat broke because he was not siphoning off church money into his own pockets. His church supported those that were **truly** in need (Acts 4:35, 6:1), and not those who put *themselves* in need by refusing to get a real job, such as

clergymen. In our era, if money were being handed out at a church, clergyman would have already pushed themselves to the front of the line beforehand, with whatever's remaining going to feed the hungry etc.

### ***Titus 1:7***

For a bishop, as God's steward, must be blameless; he must not be arrogant or quick-tempered (i.e. taking pleasure in personal combat, belligerent) or addicted to wine or violent or **greedy for gain** (#21: NRSV)

### ***Matthew 10:5-10***

These twelve Jesus **sent out** (i.e. Apostlized them) after instructing them, saying, 'Do not go in the way of the Gentiles, and do not enter any city of the Samaritans; but rather go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as you go, preach, saying, 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand.' Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out demons; **freely you received, freely give.** Do not acquire gold, or silver, or copper (i.e. money) for your money belts; or a bag for your journey, or even two tunics, or sandals, or a staff; for the worker is worthy of his **support**. (#3: NASB)

## **COMMENTARY**

Jesus commanded them not to sell what they had gotten for free. "Freely you received, freely give." Yet in direct violation of this, the clergy have made a full-time business of selling the gospel message. For x amount of gold or silver every week, your church can buy a clergyman who will sell you what Jesus gave freely. This is such a blatant hijacking of Jesus' intent, Christian's should be out rioting in the streets- yet nothing happens. The sheep continue to act like... sheep. They continue to get sheared at every opportunity.

Preachers who have been sent by Jesus (i.e. made into Apostles) are allowed support. It is their right. The Bible here says "These twelve Jesus **SENT OUT**..." Jesus sent these men, thus making them Apostles. Your minister is NOT an Apostle, thus has no right to be supported. All of the real Apostles died out over 1,900 years ago.

The word translated "support" means, in the Greek, "food, nourishment." (#1: Thayer's) The same word in the Greek is used in Acts 2:46; 9:19; 14:17; 27:33,34,36,38. All it means is food. Not money, houses, medical care, late model cars and ad infinitum. You might get fat from such support, but you'd never get rich. In fact Peter, one who was sent by Jesus, said that he had no money at all (Acts 3:6). More than likely, the Apostles in the early church, when being supported by the church (i.e. food, and a place to sleep), received their food the same way the widows did.

Now at this time while the disciples were increasing in number, a complaint arose on the part of the Hellenistic Jews against the native Hebrews, because

their widows were being overlooked in the daily serving of food. (At 6:1)

If anyone can prove he has been sent by Biblegod or Jesus, then you may support him. Let him humbly sit in with your widows in the daily serving of food. Give him a meal, and a corner he can sleep in.

### **Acts 18:1-5**

After these things he (Paul) left Athens and went to Corinth. And he found a certain Jew named Aquila, a native of Pontus, having recently come from Italy with his wife Priscilla, because Claudius had commanded all the Jews to leave Rome. He came to them, because he was of the same trade, and he stayed with them and **they were working**; for by trade they were tentmakers. And he was reasoning in the synagogue every Sabbath and trying to persuade Jews and Greeks. But when Silas and Timothy came down from Macedonia, Paul began devoting himself completely to the word, solemnly testifying to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ. (#3: NASB)

## **COMMENTARY**

Paul at first did not make use of his apostolic right (1Th 2:6) to burden the church while at Corinth. Instead, he worked at his trade, which was tentmaking, and preached on the weekends. Paul continued this until his two friends arrived with support from Macedonia, to give Paul, at which time he quit working and then lived off the money from Macedonia. As Paul says elsewhere:

...and when I was present with you (Corinthians) and was in need, I was not a burden to anyone; for when the brethren came from Macedonia, they fully supplied my need, and in everything I kept myself from being a burden to you, and will continue to do so. (#3: NASB, 2C 11:9)

This is a good example of Paul's right as an Apostle to get money for preaching. More light is shed on this in the next section, in which Paul proves to the same Corinthians that because he had this right, therefore he must have been a real Apostle.

### **1 Corinthians 9:1-18**

1. Am I not free? **Am I not an Apostle**? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord? Are you not my work in the Lord?
2. 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.
3. My defense to those who examine me is this:
4. Do we not have a **right** to eat and drink?
5. 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?
6. Or do only Barnabas and I not have a **right** to refrain from working?
7. 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?
8. I am not speaking these things according to human judgment, am I? Or does not the Law also say these things?
  9. 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?
  10. 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.
  11. If we sowed spiritual things in you, is it too much if we should reap material things from you?
  12. If others share the *right* over you, do we not more? Nevertheless, we did not use this *right*, but we endure all things, *that we may cause no hindrance to the gospel of Christ*.
  13. 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?
  - 14. So also the Lord directed those who proclaim the gospel to get their living from the gospel.**
  15. But I have used none of these things. And I am not writing these things that it may be done so in my case; **for it would be better for me to die** than have any man make my boast an empty one.
  16. For if I preach the gospel, I have nothing to boast of, for I am under compulsion; for woe is me if I do not preach the gospel.
  17. For if I do this voluntarily, I have a reward; but if against my will, I have a stewardship entrusted to me.
  18. What then is my reward? That, when I preach the gospel, I may offer the gospel **without charge**, so as not to make full use of **my right** in the gospel. (#3: NASB)

## COMMENTARY

"The **LORD** directed those that preach the gospel" of verse 14 should be the big hint here. The only ones "The Lord" has commissioned, directed, and sent out to preach the gospel are the Apostles- who are ALL DEAD NOW. Before any discussion takes place on this chapter and paid preachers, it should be made clear that unless "The Lord" is the one who has commissioned and sent out those that are preaching the gospel, unless those preaching are Apostles, they have no business turning preaching into a business.

Now for some background on this chapter. Paul, the Apostle, had a hard time convincing the church at Corinth that he was enough of an Apostle to be worthy of the right of Apostolic support, even though he had no intention of using said right. So why the concern with proving his right to Apostolic support? Because, if he could prove his right to support, he also proves at the same time his Apostleship: Support = Apostleship. Thus, Paul's logic behind this whole chapter directly supports my basic thesis that: only Apostles had the right to be paid by the church for their preaching, and if you could prove your right to be supported for preaching, you also proved your Apostleship.

Some of the people at Corinth thought Paul was *not* accepting support because there was something "wrong" with Paul's Apostleship. The very fact that this was

the case totally supports my thesis. Paul defends himself by showing that he is *just* as qualified to these rights as the rest of the Apostles (thus proving his Apostleship), but has decided not to make *use* of said rights.

## **Verse-By-Verse Analysis**

**1-2** The questions asked refer to Apostleship. Some had doubted his being an Apostle.

**3** Paul is defending his Apostleship. But how does he defend his Apostleship? He defends his Apostleship by proving his right to be supported. Now why would he do a crazy thing like that, unless my thesis is correct? He used that line of defense because only Apostles could lawfully burden the church in exchange for their preaching. Example: A man claims to be a tax-collector. You doubt him. For proof, he could show you his right to "take your money." Likewise, Paul. Now modern clergymen claim the only qualification to get paid for preaching is... to preach. But if that is the case, then Paul only had to prove his being a preacher in order to prove his right to burden the church. Dear clergy, pray tell: how could any one save a fool doubt that Paul was a preacher, and as such, if *your* thesis is correct, entitled to support? But they could, and did, doubt his being an Apostle: a preacher sent by Biblegod. And apart from this tidbit of knowledge, this chapter makes no sense whatsoever.

**4-6** Paul is asking them if Barnabas (also an Apostle- Acts 14:14) and himself have these rights to free food & drink. He is comparing Barnabas and himself with all the other Apostles. But why only with Apostles? Why not preachers, if one only had to preach to have this right, as the clergy claim? It is clear to Paul's readers that only Apostles have these rights, and that this whole discussion is on apostolic rights.

**7** Who owns the army? Who owns the vineyard? Who owns the flock? In the Kingdom of Biblegod, Joe Hovah is the owner, and if you are going to be supported by Biblegod's army, you'd better have authorization first from "the captain of salvation." And if you are going to be eating in the vineyard, you better have permission from "the lord of the vineyard." And if you will be feeding yourself from the flock, you better be a friend of "the great Shepherd of the sheep."

**8-10** Again, if a stray ox wanders in and starts to eat, will the owner let it stay? Will the owner let just any ox do the threshing? Of course not. Only the Apostles have Biblegod's permission to feed off of the church. Notice also verse ten. Paul says Biblegod is speaking "altogether for our sake." Who's sake? The class of people of whom include Paul and Barnabas. What are Paul and Barnabas? "But when the Apostles, Barnabas and Paul, .... " (At 14:14). Biblegod is speaking altogether for the sake of *Apostles*. That leaves everyone else out.

**11** Once again, remember, it was Apostles doing the planting.

**12** The others, to whom he refers, are probably Apollos, Cephas, and "they." (IC 1:12; 15:11) The reason that Paul is more deserving is because "I labored even more than all of them." (IC 15:10) Paul thought that being a burden to the church would also be a burden to the good news. Paul thought that being "full time" was a hindrance, not a help, to "the power of God for salvation to every one who believes." Most clergymen in our era claim, contrary to what Paul said, want you to believe that being full time is the best way- the only way. And you are going to hell if you disagree with their theory. Their real motivation in calling Paul a liar is to protect their livelihood, their cushy job. Most of them have training for nothing else, and it's a bitch to start from scratch on a career path. Therefore, they will do whatever deed, and tell whatever lie is necessary, to keep their jobs. In their actions, they show- according to Paul, that they don't put the gospel first. They don't mind hindering the gospel to help their wallets. Paul, unlike your clergy, put the gospel before an easy job. The clergy claim that being full time is a help to the gospel. The Bible- the "inspired" Apostle Paul in particular, calls it a hindrance. Choose you this day which side you're on.

**13** Could just any Joe Blow be a priest in the temple? Of course not. Only Levites were allowed to become priests, and only then after meeting many requirements, and only then after being duly authorized. Going through the motions were not enough. A priest had to be approved of by Biblegod.

**14** The Lord directed for the support of the preachers which he sent out. The tenth chapter of Matthew has the account. It must be remembered that Paul, in this ninth chapter of 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians, is making a defense of his Apostleship, and not of his "preachership." This 14<sup>th</sup> verse must not be isolated and ripped out of context to change its meaning. For example, Acts 16:31 ("Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved..."), when isolated, refutes any tract on baptism. 1P 3:21, when isolated, refutes any tract on faith. In fact, even IC 9:14, when isolated, would mean that female preachers would also have to be supported, along with any one else who wanted to preach- Christian or not. Hell, even Gorilla's that can communicate via sign language could apply for the job! But we know better than to rip verses out of their context, we know that other verses bear on this verse, to mold and make clear its meaning. And so also we can see, from the careful way that I have walked you thru this entire 9<sup>th</sup> chapter of 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians, that the context supports my conclusion. The context shows that it takes more than just being a preacher in order to qualify for support, i.e. preaching in and of itself is not the only prerequisite required for getting paid to preach. One must be a preacher sent by Biblegod himself, an Apostle. Non-apostolic preachers are **not** sent by Biblegod and are **not** to be supported.

**15-18** The "reward" Paul speaks of is to offer the gospel free of charge. Paul's reward was not money. In fact, Paul makes it clear that he would rather die than take money from them for preaching. Preachers are always overlooking this fact in their rush to find anything to justify their paychecks. As for the "boast" Paul

mentions, I believe that the boast is one of the following two: "Therefore, if food causes my brother to stumble, I will never eat meat again, that I might not cause my brother to stumble." (1C 8:13) That is the boast if Paul was offered, as support, meat offered to idols. The other possible boast is "...and in everything I kept myself from being a burden to you, and will continue to do so. As the truth of Christ is in me, this **boasting** of mine will not be stopped in the regions of Achaia." (2C 11:9,10) Paul also says that he had not written in order **to** burden the church, which shows that he was proving his right to support in order to prove his Apostleship, and ***not*** in order to get their money. Paul, as being one sent by Jesus to preach, was under compulsion. Because he was told to preach, he has no reason to boast, for he is but doing as he has been ordered. But to accept support is in his own power, he is free to accept or decline. And since he declined, he has reason to boast. In preaching, he had no choice. In support, he had a choice, and thus room for boasting. And this, offering the good news without charge, was his boast. He also talks of his *right* in the gospel. This is probably the *right* recorded in the gospel according to Matthew, chapter ten. In this chapter, Jesus is recorded as giving this right to his Apostles. Once again, we see that getting paid to preach is a right, for which no one qualifies today.

## **9<sup>th</sup> Chapter of 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians: Conclusion**

At first glance, the 14<sup>th</sup> verse of this chapter seems to support the contention of the professional clergy that they deserve to get paid for doing whatever it is they claim they do all day. And, if you are one to rip a verse out of context, ignoring the rest of the chapter and Bible, they may have a point. However, for the rest of you, it should be clear now that we've completed a careful examination of this chapter. It should be clear that Paul taught, and the early church believed, that only Apostles were authorized to get paid for preaching. It is upon this belief the entire argument of Paul within this chapter rests. To claim as the clergy do, that the only requirement to get paid is to preach, is to make total nonsense out of this entire chapter. The only way this chapter makes any sense at all is if, as my proposition states:

"The New Testament teaches that only Apostles had the right to be paid by the church for their preaching."

## **2 Corinthians 11:6-15**

But even if I am unskilled in speech, yet I am not so in knowledge; in fact, in every way we have made this evident to you in all things. Or did I commit a sin in humbling myself that you might be exalted, because I preached the gospel of God to you **without charge**? I robbed other churches, taking wages from them to serve you; and when I was present with you and was in need, **I was not a burden to anyone**; for when the brethren came from Macedonia, they fully

supplied my need, and in everything I kept myself from being a burden to you, and will continue to do so. As the truth of Christ is in me, this boasting of mine will not be stopped in the regions of Achaia. Why? Because I do not love you? God knows I do! But what I am doing, I will continue to do, that I may cut off opportunity from those who desire an opportunity to be regarded just as we are in the matter about which they are boasting. For such men are **false Apostles, deceitful workers, disguising themselves as Apostles of Christ**. And no wonder, for even Satan disguises himself as an angel (#1: Thayer's: "messenger") of light. Therefore it is not surprising if his servants (KJV "ministers:") also disguise themselves as servants (KJV "ministers") of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their deeds. (#3: NASB)

## Commentary

Paul implies that it is mostly the "ministers of Satan" who are getting paid to preach the gospel. Paul also once again is having to explain his stay in Corinth- why he refused to accept any money from them for preaching. As you'll recall, the Corinthians knew that Apostles got paid to preach. Paul was *not* paid- at least not by them. Therefore, some reasoned, Paul must not be a real Apostle, or at least not on the same level as the other Apostles. Paul explains the reason he refused their money (not to be a burden to them), and also says he'll continue to refuse their money, more or less daring their (false) Apostles (the "ministers of Satan") to follow suit. He knows they won't- just like your minister also won't. They will all refuse to "put their money where their mouth is" and instead will continue to pocket money that doesn't belong to them.

## 2 Corinthians 12:12-18

The signs of a **true Apostle** were performed among you with all perseverance, by signs and wonders and miracles. For in what respect were you treated as inferior to the rest of the churches, **except that I myself did not become a burden to you? Forgive me this wrong!** Here for this third time I am ready to come to you, and **I will not be a burden to you; FOR I DO NOT SEEK WHAT IS YOURS, BUT YOU; for children are *not* responsible to save up for their parents, but parents for their children**. And I will most gladly spend and be expended for your souls. If I love you the more, am I to be loved the less? But be that as it may, I did not burden you myself; nevertheless, crafty fellow that I am, I took you in by deceit. Certainly I have not taken advantage of you through any on those whom I have sent to you, have I? I urged Titus to go, and sent the brother with him. Titus did not take any advantage of you, did he? Did we not conduct ourselves in the same spirit and walk in the same steps? (#3: NASB)

## Commentary

Once again, Paul is having to explain his actions to the Corinthians. Once again, Paul himself combines the topics of **Apostleship** and being **paid to preach**. Why would he himself keep connecting the two, unless my thesis is correct? Paul also lays down a principle that destroys the modern clergy system. Paul says that he does not seek what is *theirs* (i.e. their money), but rather seeks *them*. He then

backs it up with an analogy, showing that if anyone is to be paid, the people in charge of a congregation out to be paying the congregation! Children, he says, are not the ones who are to “save up” for the parents. Let’s see the filthy rich televangelists try that shoe on for a change! Modern clergy fear to tread the path laid down by Paul. They say (with words) they will pay any price for Jesus, but with their deeds, they do the opposite. They claim they’d “die for Jesus”, but in reality they won’t even get a job for Jesus! Lazy hypocrites!!!

### ***Philippians 4:15-18***

And you yourselves know, Philippians, that at the first preaching of the gospel, after I departed from Macedonia, no church shared with me in the matter of giving and receiving but you alone; for even in Thessalonica you sent a gift more than once for my needs. Not that I seek the gift itself, but I seek for the profit which increases to your account. But I have received everything in full, and have an abundance; I am amply supplied, having received from Epaphroditus what you have sent, a fragrant aroma, an acceptable sacrifice, well pleasing to God. (#3: NASB)

### ***Luke 8:3***

And Joanna the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others who were contributing to their (Jesus- an Apostle Hb 3:1, and the twelve, also Apostles) support out of their private means. (#3: NASB)

### ***Ephesians 4:28***

If anyone is stealing he must stop it and begin using those hands of his for honest **work** so he can give to others in need. (#6: The Living Bible)

## **Commentary**

A thief is defined as someone who is taking something that he has no right to be taking. A clergyman has no right to be taking money for preaching. Therefore, clergymen are thieves.

### ***2 Timothy 3:13***

Yet wicked men and swindlers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. (#4: CLNT)

## COMMENTARY

A swindler is someone who takes our money by fraud or deceit (#15: Webster's). Paul may have been talking about the false Apostles in the Ephesian church, since some think that Timothy was in Ephesus at the time.

### ***Romans 16:18***

Such teachers are not working for our Lord Jesus, but only want gain for themselves. They are good speakers, and simple-minded people are often fooled by them. (#6: The Living Bible)

## Commentary

Little has changed since then. Look at the televangelists who rake in the most money- they are excellent entertainers (“good speakers”) while their followers are “simple-minded people” who’d enjoy watching a Jerry Springer as much as a Jerry Falwell.

### ***2 Corinthians 8:12-14***

If you are really eager to give, then it isn't important how much you have to give. God wants you to give what you have, not what you haven't. **OF COURSE, I DON'T MEAN THAT THOSE WHO RECEIVE YOUR GIFTS SHOULD HAVE AN EASY TIME OF IT AT YOUR EXPENSE**, but you should divide with them. Right now you have plenty and can help them; then at some other time they can share with you when you need it. In this way each will have as much as he needs. (#6: The Living Bible)

## Commentary

One thing you will seldom, if ever see, is the above being carried out. It will be a cold day in hell when the Bakker's, the Swaggart's, the TBN's and whatever start to give back as much as they've suckered in. And as far as preachers having “an easy time of it at your expense”, with the Bakker's even the good preacher's *dog* got an easy time. Viewers may have gone hungry, sending their food money to the PTL club, but god-damn! The Bakker's dog sure appreciated the air conditioning in his dog house that money paid for!

### ***Exodus 20:17***

You shall not covet your neighbor's house; you shall not covet your neighbor's wife or his male servant or his female servant or his ox or his donkey or ANYTHING (including his money) that belongs to your neighbor. (#3: NASB)

## COMMENTARY

Does your minister covet, i.e. desire to have for his own, your money or your tithe? Does he try to make you believe that your love for Biblegod is measured in the dollars and cents you give to your clergyman? Paul, unlike the preachers of

today, did not desire your money--Acts 20:33.

### **Jude 11**

Woe upon them! For they follow the example of Cain who killed his brother; and like Balaam (an Old Testament paid preacher), they will do **anything** for money, and like Korah, they have disobeyed Biblegod in the hope of gain and will die under His curse. (#6 The Living Bible)

### **2 Peter 2:1-3**

But there were false prophets, too, in those days, just as **there will be false teachers among you.** They will cleverly tell their lies about God, turning against even their Master who bought them; but theirs will be a swift and terrible end. Many will follow their evil teaching that there is nothing wrong with sexual sin. And because of them Christ and His way will be scoffed at. **THESE TEACHERS IN THEIR GREED WILL TELL YOU ANYTHING** (even lies about religion????) TO GET HOLD OF YOUR **MONEY**. But God condemned them long ago and their destruction is on the way. (#6: The Living Bible)

### **2 Peter 2:14,15**

...having a heart trained (at the seminary???) in **greed** accursed children; forsaking the right way they have gone astray, having followed the way of Balaam, the son of Beor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness. (#3: NASB)

### ***Other Translations...***

(#6: The Living Bible) ...they train themselves to be greedy.

### **Isaiah 56:9-11**

Come, beasts of the plain, beasts of the forest, come, eat your fill, for Israel's watchmen are blind, all of them unaware. They are all dumb dogs who cannot bark, stretched on the ground, dreaming, ***lovers of sleep***, **GREEDY DOGS THAT CAN NEVER HAVE ENOUGH**. They are shepherds who understand nothing, absent each of them on his own pursuits, each intent on his own **gain** wherever he can find it. (#12: NEB)

### **Jeremiah 6:13**

For **all**, high and low, are out for ill-gotten gain; **prophets** and **priests** are frauds, **every one of them**. (#12: NEB)



## **2 Corinthians 11:20**

For you endure it if a man assumes control of your souls and makes slaves of you, or devours your substance, **spends your money**, and preys upon you, or **deceives and takes advantage of you**, or is arrogant and puts on airs, or strikes you in the face. (#9: Amp)

### ***Other Translations...***

(#22: The Jerusalem Bible) ...makes slaves of you, ***makes you feed him***, imposes on you, **orders you about** and slaps you in the face.

## **Matthew 11:5**

The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and THE **POOR** HAVE THE GOSPEL PREACHED TO THEM. (#8: KJV)

## **Commentary**

In a listing of miracles such as this, they will save the most impressive miracle for last. Did you notice, therefore, what was saved for last? It appears that the greatest miracle of all these miracles is that the poor will have the gospel preached to them! This even out-ranks resurrections!

Now the poor mentioned here- we are not talking American poor- you know, our “poor” that have a house, a car, indoor plumbing, electricity, TV, heat, food stamps, food banks, and most importantly welfare money with which to send to televangelists. When Rev. Billy Bob gets 5 million “poor” suckers like this sending in just \$1 each per week, Rev. Billy Bob is set for life. No, we are talking 1<sup>st</sup> century poor- no house, no food, no welfare, and zero money. Starvation is a daily possibility. And the miracle in that someone would preach the gospel to these people is the realization that someone would preach for free, with no chance whatsoever of making any money out of it!!!!

Even in our era, someone preaching without getting paid is such a rarity as to count as a true miracle. Even the most pathetic of churches seem to always burden themselves with a full-time minister, regardless of the financial load it places upon the church. For example, I was at the Newland Street Church of Christ, in Garden Grove, California this past Sunday. They have a building that could seat maybe 200, but an attendance of about only a dozen, and only eight of those adults. Pathetic. But they have their full-time minister! Oh no, can’t live without that! Heaven forbid that their minister should have to go out and get a real job!!! He can’t stoop to *that* level- to the level that the Apostle Paul did.

## **2 Timothy 2:6**

The hard-working farmer ought to be the first to receive his share of the crops. (#3: NASB)

## COMMENTARY

Paul is not speaking of "paying the minister" but of eternal life. Once again, notice the context leading up to verse 6: *Verse 4-* Please Biblegod. *Verse 5-* Obey Biblegod. *Verse 6-* Harvest eternal life

### **1 Timothy 5:16-18**

If any woman who is a believer has dependent widows, let her assist them, and **let not the church be burdened**, so that it may assist those who are widows indeed. Let the elders who rule well be considered worthy of double honor, especially those who work hard at preaching and teaching. For the Scripture says, 'You shall not muzzle the ox while he is threshing,' and, 'The laborer is worthy of his wages.' (#3: NASB)

### Commentary

You will notice that the main emphasis of Paul here is to not burden the church down with unnecessary financial obligations. With such an emphasis, it is surprising that some clergymen point to this verse as a "proof text" to justify themselves bumming off the church. I guess this shows their desperation and blindness- they've totally missed the point of the passage! Paul is being so fussy with even poor old destitute widows being supported by the church, it would be strange in the same breath for Paul to be opening the feeding trough doors wide enough for clergymen as well. And, in case the clergy hasn't noticed, Paul isn't even talking about them here- they are not even under discussion. Paul is talking about widows, and church elders. He is not talking about anyone else.

Some Greek lexicons define *honor*, in this passage alone, as meaning money. The hired clergymen who wrote the lexicons, as we all know, have a vested interest in preserving their jobs. But there is no excuse for their inconsistent translation of the word *honor* in other passages. If *honor* really means money, as they claim, let's be consistent and "translate" it as such in the other passages where it's used, to show these men that *honor* means *honor*, and not money. You will see, (unless you're a hired gun for Religion, Inc.), that these verses, using their logic, make no sense at all. Likewise, neither does rendering *honor* into money, in 1Tm 5:17.

Rm 2:10    "~~honor~~ money, and peace, to every man..."

Rm 13:7    "...fear to whom fear; ~~honor~~ money to whom ~~honor~~ money..."

Mk 7:6    "This people ~~honors~~ monies me with their lips..."

Hb 13:4    'Marriage is ~~honorable~~ moneyable in all, and the bed undefiled..."

The Bible claims that church elders should, when deserving, be honored twice as much. But certain hired guns (i.e. theologians) say that honor means honor in all passages except 1Tm 5:17, where the word magically turns into money, which ends up in their pockets. Which do you believe? And, in reality, what do the clergymen *really* believe about this verse? If they *really* believed that church

elders should be getting paid, then church elders would be getting paid. Do they get paid? No, they don't. Therefore, by their actions, by their refusing to pay the church elders, even clergymen agree with me on this verse. Their actions speak louder than their words- as usual.

### **3 John 7 & 8**

For they went out for the sake of the Name, accepting nothing from the Gentiles. Therefore we ought to support such men (i.e. receive as Guests), that we may be fellow-workers with the truth. (#3: NASB)

### **Commentary**

The Greek word for support means "to receive hospitably, welcome." (#1: Thayer's) As you can see, the word "support" as used by the NASB, is deceiving. John commends Gaius, to whom this letter was written, for his hospitality. Others verses on hospitality are Rm 16:23; Hb 13:2; G1 6:10; 1Tm 5:10. As shown elsewhere in this paper, hospitality does not mean making a habit of supporting someone. (2Th 3:10)

### **Galatians 6:5-10**

For each one shall bear his own load (i.e. don't let anyone- preachers included- freeload off the church). And let the one who is taught the word share all good things with him who teaches. Do not be deceived, God is not mocked; for whatever a man sows, this he will also reap. For the one who sows to his own flesh shall from the flesh reap corruption, but the one who sows to the Spirit shall from the Spirit reap eternal life. And let us not lose heart in doing good, for in due time we shall reap if we do not grow weary. So then, while we have opportunity, let us do good to all men, and especially to those who are of the household of the faith. (#3: NASB)

### **Commentary**

The word twisters, who get such a kick twisting the word "honor" in 1Tm 5:17, also enjoy twisting this verse about. Here they claim the word *share* means to pay a salary, a fixed compensation regularly for services. How about that?

I shall now, by some questions, attempt to show that the word share means, of all things, share! Please answer these questions. Do you...

( ) Pay your Sunday School teacher a monetary compensation regularly for his teaching services  
**--OR--**  
( ) Share all good things with him who teaches.

( ) Pay your clergyman a salary  
**--OR--**  
( ) Share all good things with him who teaches

# EARLY HISTORY

## Early History

Love your Maker with all your might, and do not leave his ministers without support. Fear the Lord and honor the priest and give him his dues, as you have been commanded, the firstfruits, the guilt-offering, and the shoulder of the victim, the dedication sacrifice, and the firstfruits of holy things. (#12: NEB, The Apocrypha, Ecclesiasticus 7:30, 31)

## **Commentary**

True, this does say to honor the priest and not leave him without support. It also says to give him the fair portion of your animal sacrifices. What? You don't do animal sacrifices? Well, if you were a Jew living before Christ's time, you might. That is when this was written, and who it was written for.

## Early History

But give to all, for God will have us give to all, of all his own gifts. They therefore that receive shall give an account to God, both wherefore they received, and for what end. And they that receive *without a real need* shall give an account for it; but he that gives shall be innocent. (#23: The Lost Books... Hermas 2:7,8)

## **Commentary**

Would hunger caused by a self-imposed condition, such as being too damn lazy or proud to get a real job, qualify as "a real need"??? If not, then clergy do not qualify for support under these rules.

## Early History

Anxiety on this very point meets us in Didache 11:6. The Apostle (Note: Apostle, not preacher) traveling abroad is to receive only bread when leaving a place, and only enough to enable him to reach his next Christian night's lodging: ***'But if he ask for money, he is a false prophet.'*** ...The Didache, in this connection, takes such a completely different point of view that it considers a longer stay for the Apostle in a given community to be especially improper: he must stay no longer than one or two days at the most- otherwise he is a false prophet who is trying to make himself comfortable at the expense of his missionary task (11:5f). (#24: Earliest Christianity, pp. 679, 680)

## **Commentary**

The one sure-fire way to tell if a man is a false prophet, is if he asks for money. I repeat, if a man asks for money, there is no way in hell he is a prophet of Biblegod. Do you understand the ramifications of this? This one line is enough to

damn 99% of all the clergy, for rarely does a week go by without their explicitly asking the congregation for money. For televangelists, you're lucky to go 15 minutes without a beg. In fact, you'd be hard pressed to find five clergymen in this entire country that ***don't*** accept money for preaching!

Notice also how stingy the churches are to be with those they ***do*** support- they are to take in the Apostle for two days at the most!!! And, when they kick the guy out, give him bread, and ***only*** bread, enough to reach his next stop. No money, no car, no house, no retirement fund, no medical, no nothin'!!! These preachers that scream for "that old time religion", why, I can't hear them on this part of "old time religion"??? We need not wonder why- we all know they value their jobs and security ***more*** than they value the truth and their gods. Die for Jesus? Hell, they won't even get a simple ***job*** for Jesus!

Yet another thing to point out, is that it is Apostles which are under consideration for being supported. Not preachers, not teachers, not clergymen. Apostles- just like I've said over and over. And notice- Apostles travel. They don't park their rear end in one spot, fighting off all attempts to pry them out. The very word itself- Apostle- means one who's been sent.

### **Early History**

Agbarus, therefore, commanded his subjects to be called early in the morning, and to hear the annunciation of Thaddeus; and after this, he commanded **gold and silver** to be given him; but he would not receive it, saying, If we have left our own, how shall we take what belongs to others? These things were done in the three hundred and fortieth year. (#2: Eusebius, p. 47)

### **Commentary**

The very thought of a modern clergyman turning down a kingly offer of solid gold is impossible to imagine. The clergymen that suck social security checks away from destitute lonely old people- turn down money on moral grounds? Ha ha ha ha ha. Times have really changed. Once again, they want that "old time religion", but not if it's going to cost them any money.

### **Early History**

And why should we say more? It is impossible to tell the number of the gifts which the church throughout the world received from God, and the deeds performed in the name of Jesus Christ, that was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and this too every day for the benefit of the brethren, without deceiving any, or extracting their money. For as she has received freely from God she also freely ministers. (#2: Eusebius, page 187)

### **Commentary**

What ever happened to this principle? Did the vaunted "absolute" moral code the Christians claim to follow turn out to be mere situational ethics? This moral code that Jesus himself first laid down: "freely receive, freely give"} does it or does it not apply nowadays? If not, why not? Who changed it, and when and why? Why

do 99.999% of all clergymen in our era violate an ethic that cost the early church so much to uphold? Have they no shame?

### **Early History**

'But who' says he, 'is this new teacher? His (i.e. Montanus') works and his doctrines sufficiently show it. This is he that taught the dissolution of marriage, he that imposed laws of fasting, that called Pepuza and Tymium, little places in Phrygia, a Jerusalem, in order to collect men from every quarter thither; who established exactors of money, and under the name of offerings devised the artifice to procure presents; who **provided salaries for those that preached his doctrine** that it might grow strong by gormandizing and gluttony.' Thus far concerning Montanus; and further on he writes concerning his prophetesses: 'We show, therefore,' says he, 'that these same leading prophetesses, as soon as they were filled with the spirit, abandoned their husbands. How then can they utter this falsehood, who call Prisca a virgin?' He afterwards proceeds again: '**Does it not appear to you that the Scripture forbids any prophet to receive gifts and money? When therefore I see a prophetess receiving both gold and silver and precious garments, how can I fail to reject her?**' (#2: Eusebius, pp. 200, 201)

### **Commentary**

*How can I fail to reject anyone that accepts money for preaching?* It can't get any clearer than this. Only an idiot or clergyman could read the above, yet fail to understand that money and religion shouldn't mix. I don't know of any way to communicate the concept any better. What is being clearly condemned here is a forerunner of every single clergyman alive nowadays that accepts a salary. Would that the average Billy Bob Christian of our age share the same moral conviction that, when they see a preacher getting paid to preach, they could not but fail to reject that preacher. The question raised, "Does it not appear to you that the Scripture **forbids** any prophet to receive... money" is what this paper of mine is all about. Yes, it does appear to me also that the Scriptures forbids a preacher from profiteering off the death of Jesus. When Judas did that, people called him a scumbag. Why are they pulling punches with their own clergy, who are guilty of exactly the same crime- selling their savior???

### **Early History**

In another part of the same work, he adds the following, respecting their boasted prophets: 'If,' says he, 'they deny that their prophets took presents (i.e. money and things), let them at ***least*** acknowledge that **if** they should be proved to have received them, ***they are no prophets.***' (#2: Eusebius, p. 202)

### **Early History**

Both of these were disciples of Theodotus the currier, the first that had been excommunicated by Victor, then bishop, as before said, on account of this opinion or rather insanity. Natalius was persuaded by them to be created a bishop of this heresy, with a **salary** from them of one hundred and fifty denarii a month. Being connected, therefore, with them, he was frequently brought to reflection by the Lord in his dreams. For the merciful God and our Lord Jesus Christ, would not that he who had been a witness of his own sufferings, should perish, though he was out of the church. But as he paid but little attention to these visions, being ensnared both by the desire of presiding among them, and that foul gain which destroys so many, he was finally lashed by holy angels, through the whole night, and was thus most severely punished; so that he... repented. (#2: Eusebius, p. 214)

### **Early History**

(He) has now arrived at excessive wealth, by his iniquities and sacrileges, and by those various means which he employed to exact and extort from the brethren, depressing the injured and promising to aid them for a **reward**; and yet how he deceived them, and without doing them any good, took advantage of the rediness of those who were in difficulties, to make them **give any thing** in order to be freed from their oppressors. We shall say nothing of his **making merchandise of piety**; nor how he affected lofty things... (#2: Eusebius, p. 305)

### **Not-So-Early Church History: Paid Preachers Finally Accepted**

Constantine Augustus to Caecilianus bishop of Carthage: As we have determined, that in all the provinces of Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania, something should be granted to certain ministers of the legitimate and most holy **catholic** religion, to defray their expenses, I have given letters to Ursus, the most illustrious Lieutenant-Governor of Africa, and have communicated to him, that he shall provide, to pay to your authority, three thousands folles (~ \$10,000). (#2: Eusebius, p. 431)

### **Commentary**

We have now moved up in history closer to our era; to the era of the founding of the Catholic Church. By now the apostasy is in full swing, and we have the clear beginnings of the professional, full-time clergy. Christianity has never been the same since.

## The Apostles

*Peter*

*Andrew, brother of Peter*

*James, son of Zebedee*

*John, brother of James*

*Philip*

*Bartholomew*

*Thomas*

*Matthew*

*James, son of Alphaeus*

*Thaddaeus*

*Simon*

*Judas Iscariot*

(Mt 10:2-4)

*Matthias*

(Acts 1:26)

*Paul*

*Barnabas*

(Acts 14:14; 13:2-4)

*Timothy*

*Silas*

(1Th 2:6-- trace the plurals, such as "we," "us," "our," from 2:6, where it says "Apostles," back to where it tells who these plurals refer to--in verse one, of chapter one.)

*Antipas*

(Rv 2:13-- the term "witness" is used in speaking of Apostles. Lk 24:48; Jn 15:27; At 1:8; At 4:33; At 10:39-42; At 13:31; At 22:14,15)

*Unknown*

*Unknown*

(Rv 11:3-- the term "witness" is used in speaking of Apostles.)

*Andronicas, a relative of Paul*

*Junias, a relative of Paul*

(Rm 16:7)

*Apollos*

(1C 4:9-- the term, "us Apostles," trace the plurals back to who the "us Apostles" refers to--"myself (Paul) and Apollos" verse 6, chapter 4.)

*Philip*

("...was the first of the Gentiles that received of the mysteries of the divine word from Philip. The Apostle, led by a vision, thus instructed him,...") (#2: Eusebius, p. 50)



## Bibliography

- 1) **Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament**, Joseph H. Thayer, AP&A, Grand Rapids, MI (reprint of 1889 original)
- 2) **Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History**, Eusebius Pamphilus (~324 AD), Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, MI, 1971
- 3) **New American Standard Bible**, The Lockman Foundation, La Habra CA, 1963
- 4) **Concordant Literal New Testament**, Concordant Publishing Concern, Canyon Country, CA 1976
- 5) **Today's English Version**, Thomas Nelson Publishers, Nashville, TN 1976
- 6) **The Living Bible**, Tyndale House Publishers, Wheaton, IL, 1971
- 7) **The New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures**, Watch Tower..., Brooklyn, NY 1984
- 8) **King James Version**, Church of England, 1611
- 9) **The Amplified New Testament**, Lockman Foundation, La Habra CA, 1958
- 10) **Revised Standard Version**, Thomas Nelson Inc., NY 1971
- 11) **The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language**, Third Edition, Houghton Mifflin Co, 1992
- 12) **The New English Bible**, Oxford University Press, 1970
- 13) **The Complete Bible: An American Translation**, J.M. Powis Smith & Edgar J. Goodspeed, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1963
- 14) **The Twentieth Century New Testament**, Fleming Revell Co., NY 1904
- 15) **Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary**, G. & C. Merriam Co, Springfield, Mass, 1965
- 16) **The New International Version**, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, MI, 1976
- 17) **The Albuquerque Tribune**, Saturday, April 18, 1987
- 18) **The Sarasota Herald Tribune**, Feb. 24, 1979
- 19) **The Orange County Register**, March 29, 1987, page A-22
- 20) **The Book Your Church Doesn't Want You To Read**, Tim Leedom, Kendall/Hunt Pub, Debuque, Iowa 1993, page 341
- 21) **New Revised Standard Version**, National Council of Churches, Oxford Univ. Press, NY 1989
- 22) **The Jerusalem Bible**,
- 23) **The Lost Books of the Bible**, World Publishing Co, New York, 1971
- 24) **Earliest Christianity**, Johannes Weiss
- 25) **The New Testament in Modern English**, J.B. Phillips, Macmillan Company, New York, 1966