

## *Introduction*

No! This is not yet another cookbook on worship: *Public Worship: How To Do It Better*. Far from it!

Indeed, I toyed with the title *Public Worship: Who Wants It?*

The short answer would have been: God doesn't.

Oh, in the days of the old covenant, God certainly required the children of Israel to observe the appointed feasts, attend the temple, and so on, and that might, I suppose, be called 'public worship' within Israel as long as that covenant lasted. But 'public worship' in the new covenant? No!<sup>1</sup>

Wait a minute! I've started on the wrong foot – deliberately, I hasten to add, in order to draw attention to the way most believers think about this subject; namely, after 1800 years of Christendom, the overwhelming majority of believers simply assume what 'public worship' is, that it is a fact of life, that it is 'a good thing', and wouldn't it be great if everybody 'came to church' and participated in 'public worship'? Think of the evangelistic opportunity *that* would present! It rarely – if ever – crosses their minds to define 'public worship', let alone question its practice.<sup>2</sup> That is why I launched into a discussion of the issue without defining what it is we are talking about. I wanted to draw your attention to what most people (including believers) do – if not worse.

Worse? Yes indeed. Take this definition of 'public worship' by a prestigious legal company in America:

Public worship means worship conducted according to the ritual propriety, ecclesiastical authority, and rules and regulations of a

---

<sup>1</sup> See my *Performance*.

<sup>2</sup> Words such as 'thoughtless, mechanical, rote, tradition, custom, ignorance, lifeless, habit, prejudice, superstition, set form, liturgy (written or not), external', and the like, often apply. I am talking about believers!

## *Introduction*

religious society. It also means worship performed in a public place by all members of the public equally, without privacy and under public authority.<sup>3</sup>

Notice how this legal definition of ‘public worship’ includes the words ‘worship’ and ‘public’. Clearly, such a definition is circular at best, and, consequently, practically useless. Take an example from Mathematical Physics: ‘Simple Harmonic Motion is motion that is harmonic, but only simply so’. So now you know! Or do you?<sup>4</sup>

Here is another attempt – this time by an evangelical (Reformed) writer – at defining ‘public worship’, one which tries harder to be watertight:

Corporate worship... is sometimes referred to as ‘gathered’, ‘assembled’, ‘public’, or ‘congregational’ worship. All of these names are helpful, and bring out different dimensions of this important aspect of biblical worship... The importance of public worship is featured in both the Old and New Testaments. When Psalm 100:2 and Hebrews 10:25 speak of ‘coming before the LORD’ and ‘assembling together’, they are both addressing public or gathered worship.<sup>5</sup>

Unfortunately, this definition has within it some huge assumptions, assumptions which require biblical proof, not mere assertion; not least: ‘Public worship is featured in... the... New Testament... Hebrews 10:25 speak[s] of... “assembling together”... addressing public or gathered worship’. Oh? Could we see the proof?

And do not miss the cavalier way the old covenant has been moved into the new, and amalgamated with it – repeating the dreadful mistake of the Fathers (those influential political-philosopher-theologians who lived in the 2nd to the 5th

---

<sup>3</sup> uslegal.com

<sup>4</sup> Simple Harmonic Motion is the periodic motion produced when the force on a moving object is directly proportional to the object’s distance from a central position, that force being directed towards the central position.

<sup>5</sup> ligonduncan.com

## Introduction

centuries) which led to Romanism, and still bedevils Protestants, evangelicals not excepted. The fact is, ‘public worship’ is nothing less than Christendom-speak.

Let me explain, with a brief historical survey.

\* \* \*

Christ fulfilled the old covenant, rendered it obsolete (Heb. 7:19,22; 8:13), and ushered in the new covenant which superseded the old. The Fathers flew in the face of this by going back to the old covenant, taking its principles and practice, and imposing old-covenant shadows on the *ekklēsia*. By mixing the two covenants wholesale, the Fathers had set about doing precisely what Christ said was impossible; that is, forcing the new wine of the gospel – in particular, the *ekklēsia* – back into the old, worn-out wineskins of the old covenant (Matt. 9:16-17; Mark 2:21-22; Luke 5:36-38).<sup>6</sup> Well, it was possible, but only by ruining the new covenant. The Fathers compounded their error by adopting pagan ideas, turning them into Christianised paganism, it is true, but paganism all the same, and bringing those ideas into the *ekklēsia*.<sup>7</sup> All this was a disaster of the first magnitude, one which has lasted until today.

What a legacy!

As a consequence, what most believers experience in the matter of ‘church’, what most believers are used to and want in this regard, is either old covenant or pagan in principle: such things as priesthood, hierarchy, sacramentalism and virtual sacerdotalism; in a word, clericalism. Of course, much of this has been disguised by playing with words, tinkering with terms and titles, but that is what Christendom remains – a kind of Christianised pagan-Judaism.

The Fathers’ work was consolidated and extended by the combination of State and Church under the Emperors Constantine and Theodosius. In this way, Christendom came to

---

<sup>6</sup> I will return to this seminal parable.

<sup>7</sup> See my *Battle; Infant; Pastor*.

## Introduction

rule the roost in the medieval Church. In the matter of ‘public worship’, while, in the days of the old covenant, the Israelites had to go three times a year to Jerusalem to attend the temple, keep the feasts, and so on – place, building and dates were vital in the old covenant – none of this comes over into the new; that is, biblically speaking.<sup>8</sup> We are talking of terms such as gates, courts, sanctuaries, priests, sacrifices, feasts, altars, robes, dance, trumpets, cymbals, tambourines, incense, lifting hands, and the like, which have become accepted Christendom language. These things had their place in the old covenant, yes, as shadows, illustrations, silhouettes, pictures or types of Christ and his worship, but in the days of the new covenant all such shadows are abolished in the reality – Christ, himself – and believers must never go back to the shadows of the old covenant but read and use them as fulfilled in Christ (Col. 2:17).

In putting into practice the principles of Christendom, Rome, at least, has been pretty consistent down the centuries, and, with the invention of certain massive additional corruptions (transubstantiation, the cult of Mary, papal infallibility, and so on) remains so; evangelicals, however, pick and choose.

The Reformers, while they did much to break with Rome, failed to make a full reformation; sadly, they preserved much medieval thinking and practice, not least concerning the *ekklēsia*. One of the many residual – grievous – consequences in the Reformed Churches (as well as Rome) was this confusion of State and Church, combined with infant baptismal regeneration;<sup>9</sup> all the

---

<sup>8</sup> See my *Relationship; Performance; New-Covenant Articles Volume 8; The Priesthood* and the ‘The Place of “Place” in the New Covenant’ and ‘The Temple and the New Covenant’ on my [sermonaudio.com](http://sermonaudio.com) page. See D.M.Lloyd-Jones: *Westminster Chapel (1865-1965): Centenary Address*, for his ambivalence on – and weak defence of – a building.

<sup>9</sup> The regeneration of infants by baby-sprinkling was sometimes thinly veiled in the teaching of the Reformers, but mostly it was explicit; see my *Infant*. The Westminster documents still teach it – along with the usual double-speak escape clauses. In any case, the overwhelming

## Introduction

citizens of a State or city were ‘made’ ‘believers’, and treated as such, with all participating in church life, such as it was. Naturally, this included ‘public worship’ (for centuries compulsory),<sup>10</sup> which enforced this blurring of the regenerate and the unregenerate in church life.

The Anabaptists resisted both Rome and the Reformers, who responded by severely persecuting the radicals. Even so, the Separatists took resistance a further stage. In this way, a measure of recovery of the nature of the *ekklēsia* came about. Instead of being a part of the Establishment, these courageous believers became what believers used to be: an obscure, rejected, despised and persecuted minority; they had recovered something of the spirit of the New Testament. The Victorians – their reign was a disastrous time for nonconformity<sup>11</sup> – through their emphasis upon buildings, their sucking up to the Establishment, their

---

majority of the ‘laity’ believe the sprinkled baby is, somehow or another, ‘safe’.

<sup>10</sup> In England, at least. Clive D.Field quoted J.J.Scarisbrick’s *The Reformation and the English People* to note that ‘many pre-Reformation English men and women probably did not go to church very regularly, and some hardly ever or not at all’. Field shone the spotlight on how – and why – this changed with the Reformation: ‘In England, for four centuries after the birth of Protestantism, the situation changed dramatically. From that time forward, regular attendance at religious services on Sundays and holy days was, under statute law, technically mandatory for every person, and enforceable through civil as well as ecclesiastical judicial procedures, by the mechanism of constables and justices of the peace, and church wardens and officers of the church courts’ (Clive D.Field: ‘A Shilling for Queen Elizabeth: The Era of State Regulation of Church Attendance in England, 1552-1969’, *Journal of Church and State*, Vol. 50, No. 2, Spring 2008, pp213-253, Oxford University Press, emphasis mine). Note the dates: from 1552 until 1969. For many years this punishment was not only ‘technically possible’; it was rigidly enforced. See my *Battle*. See *Hansard* for 11th Feb. 1842 for a debate on fines and incarceration imposed ‘for the non-attendance on divine worship’. And so on.

<sup>11</sup> D.Martyn Lloyd-Jones spoke very strongly against the Victorian age in this regard; see his *Westminster Chapel (1865-1965): Centenary Address*.

## Introduction

return to liturgy and feasts – witness their emphasis on Christmas, for instance – inflicted immense damage on the *ekklēsia*.<sup>12</sup> In recent decades, ‘seeker-friendly’ churches, bent on attracting pagans<sup>13</sup> to church services (more accurately, performances), have further blurred the distinction between believers and unbelievers.<sup>14</sup>

All this signals a grievous departure from the early believers – who were punctilious about keeping their distance from unbelievers in the matter of service for Christ; John commended those who refused help from the ungodly in their efforts to spread the gospel: ‘They have gone out for the sake of the name, accepting nothing from the Gentiles’ (3 John 7).

This brief historical survey has not been a waste of time. It will have a large bearing on what I want to say about ‘public worship’.

\* \* \*

---

<sup>12</sup> Evangelicals increasingly like the ‘church calendar’, despite clear apostolic rebuke: ‘Now that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, how can you turn back again to the weak and worthless elementary principles of the world, whose slaves you want to be once more? You observe days and months and seasons and years! I am afraid I may have laboured over you in vain’ (Gal. 4:9-11). Why are evangelicals becoming eager advocates of the church calendar? It gives increased opportunities for attracting ‘the unchurched’ into church, ‘carol services’ being number one on the list! The same goes for memorial services instead of funeral services. The latter tend to be private; the former public. As for the latter, the absence of the coffin, and the increased distance from the death, lightens the mood and makes it easier for the preacher to take ‘the evangelistic opportunity’ to address a captive audience in a non-threatening way.

<sup>13</sup> I am using the word as set out by Merriam-Webster: ‘Early Christians often used the term to refer to non-Christians who worshipped multiple deities’. Further: a pagan is ‘an unconverted member of a people or nation that does not acknowledge the God of the Bible’. Evangelicals sanitise this by their growing use of ‘un-churched’. In this work, I use ‘unbelievers’ and ‘pagans’ as interchangeable.

<sup>14</sup> See my *Battle; Infant; Relationship; Attracting; Performance; Evangelicals; Dilemma; Mistaken; New-Covenant Articles Volume 12*.

## Introduction

Before I move on, I need to flag up a further aspect of all this – one of even greater significance. Not only is it wrong to slide back and forth between the old and new covenants, in the cavalier fashion that so many do, such abuse of Scripture ignores the fundamental requirement God laid on Israel in the observation of the old covenant, including their public assemblies; namely, to be a separate people. And this plays directly – and with high significance – into this question of ‘public worship’ today. All will become clear as we proceed.

\* \* \*

To return to attempts to define ‘public worship’: let the Puritan David Clarkson have a go. He wrote a book in which he argued the relative merits of public and private worship:

Public worship is to be preferred before private. So it is by the Lord, so it should be by his people. So it was under the law, so it must be under the gospel.<sup>15</sup>

He defined public worship:

Let me briefly explain what public worship is. Three things are requisite that worship may be public: ordinances, an assembly, and an officer. 1. There must be such ordinances as do require or will admit of public use: such are prayer, praises, the word read, expounded, or preached, and the administration of the ordinances.<sup>16</sup> The word must be read, and prayer is necessary both in secret and private, but they both admit of public use, and the use of them in public is required and enjoined. These must be used both publicly and privately; the other [that is, the ordinances] cannot be used duly but in public. 2. There must be an assembly, a congregation joined in the use of these ordinances. The worship of one or two cannot be public worship. Of what numbers it must consist we need not

---

<sup>15</sup> David Clarkson: *Public Worship To Be Preferred Before Private*, in *The Practical Works of David Clarkson*, Vol.3, James Nichol, Edinburgh, 1865, p187, being an exposition of Ps. 87:2. I disagree with Clarkson. What a man is in himself and in secret (Matt. 6:4,6,18) is what he is. No amount of ‘public worship’ gets close.

<sup>16</sup> Original ‘sacraments’. It is an abominable word. See my *Infant*. The same applies throughout this extract.

## Introduction

determine; but since what is done in a family is but private, there should be a concurrence of more than constitute an ordinary family. 3. There must be an officer. The administrator of the ordinances must be one of public quality, one in office, one set apart by the Lord, and called to the employment by the church. If a private person in ordinary cases undertake to preach the word or administer the ordinances, if it be allowed as worship, which is not according to ordinary rule, yet there is no reason to expect the blessing, the advantage, the privilege of public worship... The Lord is more glorified by public worship than private.<sup>17</sup>

With respect to Clarkson, good man though he was,<sup>18</sup> on this occasion he was simply repeating religious claptrap derived from Christendom, heavily influenced by Reformed theology.<sup>19</sup>

Here is an up-to-date example of what I am talking about: Wayne Grudem's 'Worship' in his *Systematic Theology*.<sup>20</sup> His opening sentence, speaking about believers – those 'in the New Testament age [better, new-covenant age – DG]' – is not very wide of the biblical mark:

---

<sup>17</sup> Clarkson p189.

<sup>18</sup> See my *Offer* for my view of Clarkson's excellent preaching the free offer of the gospel. I wrote: 'In light of his words, I am bound to ask myself if I have ever preached'.

<sup>19</sup> He is far from being alone. Iain H.Murray linked D.Martyn Lloyd-Jones, John Owen, John Calvin and himself to say: 'Public worship is under God; it is not for us [that is, men] to decide what its content should contain. The form has stayed the same through time, not because of mere tradition [phew! – DG] but because Christians sought to keep close to Scripture and to a biblical principle. In the words of John Owen, believers "will receive nothing in his worship, but what is of his appointment"'. For Lloyd-Jones this also comes down to theology' (Iain H.Murray: *Seven Leaders: Preachers and Pastors*, The Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, 2017, pp144-145). Even so, in these assertions, Murray quoted no scripture whatsoever, but cited the *Shorter Catechism*, quoted (briefly, as above) Owen and, more extensively, Calvin. Men not Scripture! Is it not amazing that good men can dogmatically assert a principle they manifestly contradict in the same breath?

<sup>20</sup> Wayne Grudem: *Systematic Theology: An Introduction To Biblical Doctrine*, IVP, 1994.



## *Introduction*

The term ‘worship’ is sometimes applied to all of a Christian’s life, and it is rightly said that everything the church does should be considered worship, for everything we do should glorify God.<sup>21</sup>

As I say, not bad. But this, by David Peterson, is far better:

The theme of worship is far more central and significant in Scripture than many Christians imagine. It is intimately linked with all the major emphases of biblical theology such as creation, sin, covenant, redemption, the people of God and the future hope... Contemporary Christians obscure the breadth and depth of the Bible’s teaching on this subject when they persist in using the word ‘worship’ in the usual, limited fashion, applying it mainly to what goes on in Sunday services... Worship in the New Testament is a comprehensive category describing the Christian’s total existence. It is coextensive with the faith-response wherever and whenever that response is elicited.<sup>22</sup>

To go on with Grudem: despite getting close (but not quite close enough in the above-extract), in his next sentence Grudem immediately pulled off the wraps, signalling a warning with his ominous ‘however’:

However, in this chapter I [that is, Grudem] am not using the word [‘worship’] in that broad sense. Rather, I am using ‘worship’ in a more specific sense to refer to the music and words that Christians direct to God in praise, together with the heart attitudes that accompany that praise, especially when Christians assemble together.<sup>23</sup>

Let me translate: Grudem was admitting that he was going to ignore the scriptural meaning and use of the scriptural words which Bible versions translate as ‘worship’ – does he even look at them? – and replace all that with Reformed Christendom-speak. This is a highly-significant admission. This is how he started:

---

<sup>21</sup> Grudem p1003.

<sup>22</sup> Peterson pp17-19.

<sup>23</sup> Grudem p1003.

## Introduction

The primary reason that God called us into the assembly of the church is...

Is what? Reformed Christendom! Grudem quoted with approval Edmund Clowney who applied the old covenant to believers without any nuance.<sup>24</sup> In addition, Clowney was categorical in asserting that the opening verses of Acts 2 speak of the church worshipping in a Reformed-Christendom way, and that Hebrews 12:18-29 refers to the Reformed Church doing its Christendom stuff in worship.<sup>25</sup>

A travesty.

And so it goes on. A list of the Bible preachers, teachers and writers who more or less assume Christendom *mores* in the matter of ‘public worship’ would be endless.<sup>26</sup> It would be far simpler to speak of those who don’t make that mistake.

Let me draw attention to the most obvious fact in all this discussion: nobody can define ‘public worship’; that is, nobody

---

<sup>24</sup> Edmund Clowney quoted Ex. 7:16 and Israel’s deliverance from Egypt. Grudem went on: ‘But Clowney explains that the worshipping assembly at Mount Sinai could not remain in session for ever. Therefore God established other festivals in which the whole nation would assemble before him three times a year. He says that “Israelites are a nation formed for worship, called to assemble in the courts of the Lord, and to praise the name of the Most High”’. Citing several prophecies from Isaiah and Jeremiah about the assembly of nations, Grudem went on: ‘Clowney notes that the fulfilment of that promise began only when Jesus started to build his church: “Pentecost... the Spirit had been poured out, the worship of the new age had been ushered in. The church, the assembly for worship, was praising God... In our worship in Christ’s church we approach the throne of God... We enter the festival assembly... Reverent corporate worship... brings to expression the very being of the church’ (Grudem pp1003-1004). While this contains wheat, because of Clowney’s cavalier movement between the old and new covenant, the grain is heavily buried in chaff.

<sup>25</sup> Grudem pp1003-1004.

<sup>26</sup> See Warren W. Wiersbe (compiler): *Classic Sermons on Worship*, Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, 1988 – sermons by John A. Broadus, C.H. Spurgeon, James S. Stewart, Andrew A. Bonar, and others.

## *Introduction*

can give us the post-Pentecost Scriptures' – the new-covenant's – definition of the phenomenon.<sup>27</sup> And that for one very good reason: it is impossible; 'public worship' does not exist in the new covenant; the new covenant knows nothing of it. So much so, the first believers would be staggered if they came back and saw what is going on today – church premises (often akin to theatres) erected for 'public worship' (performances which often have far more in common with a TV spectacular than the New Testament), adverts for 'services' which every Tom, Dick, Harry and Joan can attend; indeed, those early believers would discover – to their amazement – believers actually doing everything they can think of (or copy from some other church practice or head-office handout) to attract all and sundry to attend 'public worship', and to hold them in such for a life-time.

What justification is there for it? None, none whatsoever – taking the New Testament, especially the apostolic letters, in accordance with Christ's declaration, as our authority, that is (John 14:16-17,26; see 1 Cor. 4:6,16; 11:1-2; Phil. 3:17; 4:9; 1 Thess. 1:5-6; 2:13-14; 4:1-2,8,10-11; 2 Thess. 2:15; 3:4,6-18; 1 Tim. 1:18; 3:14-15; 4:6; 6:13-14; 2 Tim. 3:10-11; 2 Pet. 3:1-2).

Thus we know Christ's mind in Scripture as to our duty; and we know, from Scripture, the way in which the first believers carried out that duty in their day. For all these reasons, the fundamental source for believers in all things must be the Scripture, especially the apostolic Scriptures. And in those Scriptures there is not a shred of evidence for 'public worship' in the new covenant.

In any case, before talking about 'public worship', let us remember that the very concept of 'church attendance' is, in itself, utterly unbiblical.

Ah, but what about Hebrews 10:24-25? Surely, that is our warrant for 'church attendance' – at least by believers!

---

<sup>27</sup> By 'post-Pentecost [or apostolic] Scriptures', I mean Romans-Revelation. All Scripture is equally inspired, but the clearest unfolding of the new covenant is to be found in those books – as Jesus promised (John 16:12-15).

## Introduction

No! It is not! Nothing could be further from the truth, even though almost all believers think those two verses tell believers to turn up at a special building at an appointed time, and play their designated role (often virtually passive) in ‘a service’, hoping as many as possible of the public will attend and partake. How tragic! I will justify my claims.

As for the public worshipping God... words fail. How can an unregenerate John Doe or Joe Bloggs worship God? Such shenanigans are an abomination to the Almighty! And the notion that saints and pagans might meet to worship God in one body – really! As I will show, the *ekklēsia* and the world must be separate, not mixed. Unless a sinner is born again, regenerated, he will never see let alone enter the kingdom (John 3:3-5).<sup>28</sup> Oh, he can enter a ‘church’, a ‘house of God’, take part in ‘public worship’, get into a pulpit, be ‘a worship leader’ or ‘service leader’, be the lead vocalist in the ‘worship group’, strum a guitar, beat the living daylights out of a set of drums, be master of an organ, keyboard, or synthesizer, efficiently manage a coffee or hot-dog stall, organise an audio suite, direct live-streaming, and all the rest, but unless he is born again he will never even see, let alone enter, the kingdom.<sup>29</sup>

I would not be misunderstood. Although no unregenerate sinner can truly worship God, this does not excuse men in their failure to worship him. Inability is never the measure of responsibility;<sup>30</sup> rather, inability is a mark of the sinner’s fall in Adam, and adds to his guilt. God requires all to worship him – in the biblical sense of ‘worship’ – and at the last day all men will worship him (Isa. 45:23; John 5:22-23; Rom. 14:11; Phil. 2:9-11; Rev. 14:6-7; 15:4; 16:9; 19:7). But the notion that ‘attending church’ to engage in ‘public worship’ is what God requires of all men is ludicrous.

---

<sup>28</sup> See my ‘Thoughts on the Kingdom’ on my sermonaudio.com page.

<sup>29</sup> See my *Evangelicals; Relationship; Attracting*. See also my discourses on regeneration in my ‘Thoughts on the Kingdom’ on my sermonaudio.com page.

<sup>30</sup> See my *Offer*.

## *Introduction*

Let the full force of the following sink in:

God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth (John 4:24).

That statement alone rules out the worship of God by the unregenerate, and, as a result, makes ‘public worship’ utterly out of order. Believers and believers only:

...are the circumcision [that is, we believers are the true Israel], who worship by the Spirit of God and glory in Christ Jesus and put no confidence in the flesh (Phil. 3:3).

Pagan worship is worse than useless:

And when you pray, do not heap up empty phrases as the Gentiles do, for they think that they will be heard for their many words (Matt. 6:7).

They think they will, but they won’t!

Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born again he cannot see the kingdom of God (John 3:3).

Whoever believes in [Christ] is not condemned, but whoever does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God... Whoever believes in the Son has eternal life; whoever does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God remains on him (John 3:18,36).

So how can unbelievers worship God? Only the regenerate can do that. The unregenerate are in an appalling state:

Those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh, but those who live according to the Spirit set their minds on the things of the Spirit. For to set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace. For the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God, for it does not submit to God’s law; indeed, it cannot. Those who are in the flesh cannot please God (Rom. 8:5-8).

The natural person does not accept the things of the Spirit of God, for they are folly to him, and he is not able to understand them because they are spiritually discerned (1 Cor. 2:14).

## Introduction

Without faith it is impossible to please [God], for whoever would draw near to God must believe that he exists and that he rewards those who seek him (Heb. 12:6).<sup>31</sup>

Mixing believers and unbelievers in ‘public worship’ does immense harm, not least to the unbelievers themselves:

The eyes of the Lord are on the righteous, and his ears are open to their prayer. But the face of the Lord is against those who do evil (1 Pet. 3:12).<sup>32</sup>

There is only one prayer for the unconverted man: ‘God! Have mercy upon me, a sinner’ (Luke 18:13), or the equivalent. And that should be personal, individual.

For all these reasons, since worship is so dominated by Christendom-speak, since the word ‘worship’ is so common in our Bible versions, even though the apostolic writers strictly never used it, I will take the huge liberty of inserting inverted commas thus – ‘worship’, ‘service’ and the like – even in extracts. Though I have found it impossible to be consistent, I have done this, not only to draw attention to these words, but because Scripture uses a variety of expressions for which translators employ ‘worship’ or ‘service’. This is not obvious to those who do not know Greek, but it is vital in thinking about this question.

Well, I have made some big claims, sweeping claims; it is high time I justified them. I will start with the old covenant.

---

<sup>31</sup> To see what is meant by ‘believe’ and ‘seek’, look at the context – the writer is clearly speaking of regenerate men and women who worship God from the heart and show their faith by sincere and persevering obedience to his commands. See my *Seeking*.

<sup>32</sup> See C.H. Spurgeon’s ‘True Worship’, sermon 3464.