

What has been our theme? The power in the proper, or rightful, observance of the Lords Supper. We have preached on the power of praise, the power of the spoken word, the power of repentance and we will bring a message Sunday on The Power - There's Great Power - In Certain Things, in The Xtn Life.

Now tonight in the Corinthian epistle, we're gonna be dealing with <sup>division</sup> ~~the division~~ that was in this church and having stated the division that was in the church he goes immediately into a discussion of the cross. Now I want you to just think of this: why would Paul talk about the cross in the context of talking about the division in the church? Let's look at 1 Cor. 1: 10 following and I want to ask you some questions as we go along.

In the first nine verses, Paul has pointed out that this church is gifted. That they are behind in no gift. He says in V. 5 that these gifts are especially in the area of utterance, or speaking, and in all knowledge. In V. 7, he says 'you come behind in no gift, as you eagerly await the coming of the Lord.' Yet, when we come to V. 10, we have a very serious prayer that he prays. When you see the word 'beseech' that's always the language of prayer or entreating. He says in

V. 10(read) 'beseech' or 'pray' you. As it was, God was on His knees, through Paul. 'By the name of the Lord Jes. Christ' and he is appealing to their relationship to Christ and the Lordship of Christ and the authority of Christ. That's the highest appeal to the Xtn. He appeals they do three things:

#1. That you all speak the same thing. Now notice in V. 5, he says that one of their major gifts was the utterance or 'speaking'. This was a talking church. They even spoke in tongues. Much of which was false, we believe. Some of it authentic but much of it was false. There was a lot of gossip and so in V. 10, Paul says 'oh, you're speaking all right, but you need to be speaking the same thing. What is he saying? You need to be speaking the Gospel. You need to be speaking the fundamentals of the faith, rather than just talking. And rather than babbling about that which amounts to nothing.



Here was a church filled with pride and talk and you find a church that talks and full of pride, you've got a problem. So he prays that they will speaking one message of Christ and ~~not~~ quit their little talking. This is a word to us and it's always a word to the Xtn., who would help build his church and not tear it down. That ye speak the same thing and

*Not uniformity  
Schismata*

#2. That There Be No Divisions among you. And that word 'division' is 'marta' and the word 'scism' (?) comes from it. He's praying that there be no division. Now he's not praying for uniformity. The Bible NEVER commands us to be all alike. But if we are united in the Gospel and in the vision Gods given us, there will not be division. You're united when you're united around Christ and the purpose of Christ for us. Then he says

#3. That Ye Be Perfectly joined together. That's a medical term which means ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ 'to mend together' like broken bones. There are some broken parts in this body and he's praying that 'ye may be perfectly joined together, in the same mind (that's the mind of Christ) and in the same judgment (or thought). Now this seems to be a tremendous thing to pray, doesn't it? Yet, this is Gods Will for our church; this is Gods will for every local church and it's perfectly attainable in Christ and when our objectives are Christ and the Gospel and not our own little world.

In the next verse, he gives the basis for V. 10. Let's look at it.

V. 11(read) Who was Chloe? Does the Bible tell us, Bro. Steve Matthews, does the Bible tell us in another verse who Chloe was? Or Chlo-e, if you want to pronounce it that way? Does the Bible tell us anything about Chloe? Bro. Bill? Yeah, this Bill. Does anyone know if the Bible tells us anything about Chloe? Far as I know, it does not. But we don't know who she was or where she was from. We just deduce that she, probably, had lived in Corinth and some of her slaves went over to Ephesus where Paul is and just orally reported to Paul of the internal divisions that were in the church and seems that they were responsible witnesses and it was enough for Paul to have a basis for writing.



So he says that I've just heard from Chloe, of her household, that there are contentions among you. Now in V. 12, he tells what he means. He says

V. 12(read) 'What I mean is this: one of you says 'I belong to the Pauline Party, he's my leader'; another says 'I belong to the Apollos party' and another says 'of Cephas' - who was Cephas? Peter. Why is he called Cephas? What's the difference in Peter and Cephas? Well, it means the rock but here you have Cephas and you have Peter. What's the explanation? Anybody? No, they both mean rock. One is - Peter is Greek and Cephas is what? No, it's Aramaic. It's just a change of language.

Who gave the name Peter to Cephas? Jesus. His original name is Cephas. 'Thou art Cephas' see? 'But I am going to call you Petros' but it's just a change in language. Well, let me ask you this: had Peter ever been to Corinth? Bro. Bill Tripp? Is there any record of Peter ever going to Corinth? We have no record. Well, how did they know about Peter and how did a faction in that church revolve around Peter? Anybody.? You can guess, I don't know, what would be your guess? O.K., Jessie. Well, it's possible. He says that Peter led somebody to the Lord and they moved to Corinth and he got his 'Peter Party' started. I don't know. Who else? Who wants to speculate a little - not revealate - but speculate?

Bro. Amos? That's a good word, I think. Paul probably mentioned him in his preaching there. Who else has a - Kelly? EXACTLY. You're thinking. O.K. Somebody else - how did they know about Peter? Anybody? What? Well, he was a fisherman, but how did they hear about fishermen? Well, we don't know. We don't know, but we DO know ~~that there has~~ there has emerged a group of people who said 'we're gonna follow Peter'. And then, another who said 'we belong to Christ'. Now, actually, you might say that those who say 'I belong to Paul' they could have been the older people.

Because Paul was the founder of the church and the first pastor. Then, Apollos, that could have been the young people. It was a charismatic, eloquent fellow that they liked. And Cephas, we might say these were the traditionalists. Then 'I belong to Christ'. You say



'well, that group was alright'. They probably were the super-spiritual people and the greatest problem in the church. Often your super-spiritual people create the greatest problems. It's generally agreed that those who said we belong to Christ were the worst off. Most commentators think that those who said we belong to Christ - that that's the type of spiritual ego. So you have these four factions in the church. Paul asks a question in

V. 13(read) these are rhetorical questions? IS Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? or Were you baptized in the name of Paul? Of course, it would be ridiculous to say that Christ is divided, or that Bro. Paul was crucified for anyone or that anyone was baptized in the name of Paul. Yet, that's the way they are acting. See? Then he suddenly says in

V. 14 (read) now in V. 16, he's gonna say 'the household of ~~Stephanas~~ Stephanas. He says I baptized Chrispus and Gaius'. Is Paul saying here that baptism is not important? No. This would be an embarrassment to what false doctrine is propagated pretty publically in Ft. Smith. What doctrine is it, Terry? Baptismal regeneration. This is kinda embarrassing to those who teach that you have to be baptized to be saved. If people had to be baptized in order to be saved, do you think Paul would have failed to baptize them? Well, it's very, very doubtful.

XX Did Paul baptize other places where he preached? We believe he did. He backed off here because he says in

V. 15 (read) Paul did not want a cult to develop around himself. A Christ-led, Christ-honoring leader will never build things around himself. This is a very dangerous thing and Paul ~~wasn't~~ would not even baptize, to avoid a personality cult around himself. One of the very amazing things that's happening in America today is that people are gathering around strong personalities. In every part of the country, people are gravitating around



a strong personality. The Personality Cult, we call it. Paul refused to let this happen. Who were Crispus and Gaius? Anyone know who Crispus and Gaius is? Well, Crispus was - he's mentioned in Acts 18, as the Ruler of the Synagogue. You know who Gaius was? Turn back there to Rom. 16: 23 and there we have the insight on Gaius. (read) this would imply that in the beginning days of the Corinthian church that they met in the home of Gaius.

*Rom. 16: 23 - Gaius my host*

But these were probably two converts - two of the first converts in Corinth. He just naturally baptized them. Then he says in

V. 16 (read) who was Stephanas? Who? No, it's not generally thought that that was the same as Stephen. Turn to 1 Cor. 16: 15 (read) so he's identified there as the first fruit of Achaia, which would be Asia and here was one of those first converts and so you have Gaius and Crispus and Stephanas were those early converts. Now notice he says that he baptized the household of Stephanas. This is used as a proof-text for infant baptism. Is this a proof of infant baptism? But those who would use it as a proof-text are interpreting it how? That in the household would be children, or even an infant and so this is one of the proof-texts.

This is an argument from what? No, what I mean it's an argument for silence which just doesn't hold. In the Scrip., who qualifies to be baptized? When it's really spelled out, who qualifies? Who? Well, I hear much murmuring but I don't get a message! Those who what now? Yeah, those who have repented and trusted the Lord, who are old enough to have perception of the Gospel. Is there any record, in Scrip., of an infant ever being baptized? Where is another text that speaks of being baptized? Anybody? More famous than this. Jessie? The Philippian jailor. See?

What does it say? Well, it says 'he believed and his household'. But can you prove infant baptism from that? No. Now he goes on to say, in the latter part of V.16 'I know not whether I baptized any other or not'. What does this tell about him? Yes, we're sure that



they were baptized, probably by Silas or Timothy. I'm sure they were. In the N. T., when people were saved, they were baptized. You can follow it through the Book of Acts. While Baptism doesn't regenerate, the emphasis in Scrip. is very, very strong in water baptism. Absolutely! If we surrender it, we surrender an Article of the Gospel. The Inter-Denominational Para(?) churchpeople have jettisoned it; they've pushed it off to the side; said it's not important. That is absolutely not true! It's in the Great Commission and I went through and researched it in Acts and I've given it to the schools of Evangelism, if you want it. I've documented it where baptism after baptism after baptism.

No, Paul certainly was not degrading baptism but he certainly does not believe in baptismal regeneration. He would not say that it's before the Gospel. But he says 'I know not whether I've baptized any others'. Somebody has said this proves, conclusively, that Paul is not a Southern Baptist! You think so? That this is the proof text that he's not a Southern Baptist. If he'd been a So. Bapt., he certainly would have kept account of his baptisms. What's the favorite/of So. Bapt., in the Bible? Why, the Book of Numbers! And that's good, there's nothing wrong with that. Nothing wrong with that.

Churches that have forgotten numbers have died. They have died and closed - when you cease to be interested in numbers, you cease to be interested in people and you have nothing after while. But notice he says 'I don't know whether I baptized any more or not'. Now he's inspired, isn't he? Were the people who were inspired, did they have all knowledge? Did they not have all knowledge? To be inspired to write Scrip., does that mean that you have all knowledge of all facts? Not at all and here's a very important point.

The doctrine of inspiration says that the H. S. guided the writers, so that they didn't write error. But the doctrine of inspiration does not teach that the writers were omniscient, as liberals have said to those who taught inerrant Scrip. They've used this Scrip., but that is not the teaching of inspiration. Paul, himself, did not have perfect memory, but when he wrote what he wrote, we believe to be without error.



V. 17(read) 'Christ sent me not' and that's the word 'apostello' that's the word apostle. The word 'preach' is the word 'evangelize'. Was Paul a pastor? Not basically, he was an evangelist. God did not send Billy Graham to Baptize. But this does not mean that he would not baptize if he ~~was~~ were pastor of a local church. And he certainly had these people baptized. We have every reason to believe that.

He says 'not with the wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ be made of none effect. Can we make the cross of none effect? By hifaluting language? Can the Gospel be hid by the way we ~~express~~ it? The Bible says if our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them who are lost. One of the best ways to hide the Gospel is to cloak it in philosophical language that people cannot understand; where there is no offence; where there is no appeal to make a decision or to come to Christ. I read that this man, preaching to a fashionable congregation, preached on Luke 13: 3 and he said to them 'except ye repent, in a measure and be converted, as it were, you may suffer serious escatological consequences'.

Have you ever heard preaching that you could not understand? That it was so flowery and in such hifaluting language that you didn't understand? Raise your hand if you have. Sometimes people do that who are not educated. That amazes me. It amazes me. They use language, when they, themselves, have not studied particularly. That is very, very bad and that is very, very sinful. One man preached a sermon on repentance and he used hifaluting language and the congregation didn't understand a thing about repentance. When he got through, an old man got up at the front of the church and walked right down the center aisle and was screaming out 'I'm going to hell, I'm going to hell' and went clear to the end of the church and when he got to the back of the church, he turned back toward the pulpit and said 'I'm going to heaven, I'm going to heaven'.

Then when he got to the front, he said 'I knew you all didn't understand a word of this message and I just wanted to act out what he's been saying. Repentance is you're going away from God and you make an about face and come back to the Lord. My experience has been; the



longer I preach and teach, the simpler the H. S. lays upon my heart to make the message of the Lord. Enticing words of mans wisdom are not to hide the Gospel.

V. 18 (read) 'is to them (and that's 'who ARE perishing' - it's present tense - foolishness (that's the word 'moron') . Why is the preaching of the cross to those who are perishing, moronic? Now that doesn't mean that a person would necessarily be intellectual deficient; that means it's an absurdity - that's the way I would translate the word in the context. 'For the preaching of the cross is to them who are perishing an absurdity'. It's just absurd. Why is the message of the cross absurd to those who are perishing? What? Think it's too simple? Let's get just a little more specific. What IS the message of the cross?

Bro. Scott Secrest, what is it? O.K. Gary has pointed that out, that'll be in the 2nd Chap. But let's get just a little closer 'for the preaching (and that's the message of the cross. That's the word 'logos') for the message of the cross is to them who are perishing absurdity. What is the message of the cross? That is so absurd to a lost man or to an intellectual or an unbeliever? What is so absurd about it? Well, they don't know they're lost. Doris? O.K. Well, there's something else I want somebody to say. O.K. Well, the cross declares - Reba? yes. All these things are good. Cathy? O.K. Well, all these things are great.

I was just thinking that the cross declares us lost. It declares us lost sinners, helpless and hopeless; that our mind cannot help us; that education cannot help us for it is not the answer. It declares that ALL men lost and condemned with no hope except the cross. And the preaching of that message is an absurdity to those who are perishing. What does the word 'perish' mean? It's the word 'appalume' - does that mean just being blotted out? Br. Harry White, does 'perishing' in Scrip. mean just ceasing to exist? Does it mean annihilation? No, it doesn't, Bro. Harry, my goodness, you're not a Jehovah Witness!!! Notice it says 'they are perishing. Annihilation would indicate just being blotted out.

What does it - what is meant in John 3: 16 when it says 'shall not perish'? It means - that's



right - actually the word is made up of 'to be separated from' and it means to be separated from the life of God. But it doesn't mean to be blotted out, as the Jehovah Witnesses teach and some other people. It doesn't mean that we will cease to be, but will be in separation from God, which will be an Eternal perishing. Notice it says that's going on right now. 'To those who ARE perishing'. Don't have to wait until we come to eternal hell. Do you know anybody perishing? Oh, all of us know so many who are perishing. But notice it says 'but unto us who are being saved' it's a present participle - 'to those who are being saved, it is the 'dunamus' of God'. The cross is the dunamus of God.

Are we being saved? I thought we were already saved? How many of you are saved, raise your hand? Well this says we are being saved. Somebody tell me what that means? We're still growing in Christ. All right, Doris? If you're not being saved right now, something's terribly wrong. You were saved yesterday but you better be being saved right now. PTL? Well, why is it to those who are being saved that the cross is the power of God? All right, Virginia Wren says 'we always go back to the blood'. Good. O.K. The blood keeps on cleansing us constantly. How many of you think of the cross as being power, raise your hand? Man, it is the power of God! It's the power of God! Now, in closing, why does Paul suddenly move from a discussion of the divisions in the church, including the four factions, and make a beeline to the cross and probably give the finest discussion on the Cross in the Bible.

Anybody? Why? What's the relationship between the divisions in the church and the cross? That's the only solution. Is it? If we're living under the cross, what was their problem? It was just pride. They were stuck on themselves. They were ~~XXX~~ promoting themselves. What does the cross do to us? Absolutely!! And says 'we are nothing except ~~XXXXXX~~ through the grace of God'. NOTHING! How many of you ever heard Oswald Hoffman of the Luthren Hour preach, raise your hand? Well, you've missed something. He's a great preacher of Luthrenism.

Someone gave him a flowery introduction before he preached and I remember this, more than



anything about him. 'Dr. Hoffman, and so forth and so on...' When he got up, he said to the audience 'I'm Doctor Nobody. I'm just a nobody just like you are'. In Calvary church, Washington, the Chief Justice of the U. S. joined that church and a washer woman and Dr. Abernathy made this famous statement as they stood before that congregation 'the ground is level at the foot of the cross'. When I survey the wonderous cross, on which the Prince of Glory died, my richest gains I count but loss and pour contempt on all my pride.

That's where we need to be - at the foot of the cross. ARE we at the foot of the cross tonight? Realizing that we're just trophies of the Grace of God. Not promoting ourselves, our own interest, but Jes. and the cause of Jes. That's what unifies a church.

Let's bow our heads.