

19. The analogous venom of the reversionist is the result of mental attitude sins. His venom sacs are systematically refilled by the constant production of arrogance and hatred from the cosmic systems.
20. His mental-attitude sins produce the venom while the tongue functions as the fangs.
21. This habitual behavior pattern is expressed in numerous ways. The advanced reversionist, having lost touch with reality, is mentally deranged. Therefore, he can vacillate between apparent cordiality toward others and then suddenly spin on a dime by expressing hostility.
22. Such a person is obviously unstable, but his fluctuating behavior patterns cause others to never quite know where they stand because they never know what personality trait will emerge next.
23. The venom of the unstable believer has an arsenal of ordnance to deploy: gossiping, criticizing, maligning, judging, et. al., while assigning all sorts of sins and indiscretions to the poor bloke caught in his crosshairs.
24. A mature believer has the stability of soul to allow these assaults to bounce off his doctrinal armor. To do so provides an example of the situation James is describing and wishes to prevent.
25. In fact, James introduces chapter three with the example of how a believer ought to behave:

James 3:2 For we all fall into sin in many ways. If anyone does not sin in what he says, he is a mature believer, able to restrain his tongue by bridling his entire body with his volition. (EXT)

1. The volition of this believer has the power to make a good decision from the inventory of doctrines in his *kardía*. This is a problem-solving device that empowers the believer to regulate his entire body and most importantly his tongue.
2. This is made possible by his volition complying with his conscience to apply doctrine in his soul as the working object of his faith.
3. The sin nature may tempt him to say something verbally, but his conscience restrains and overrides that temptation thereby suppressing the lust patterns of the sin nature.
4. By suppressing the desires of the sin nature, the believer has bridled his entire body with the result that his tongue is not used to utter sinful comments.



5. The soul therefore avoids uttering a sinful remark and thereby maintains the filling of the Holy Spirit.
6. This is an example of how the Royal Law and the law of freedom function so that the believer is able to “love his neighbor as himself.”
26. Such a response expresses unconditional love for his adversary. He transfers the adjudication of the assault over to the Supreme Court of Heaven while maintaining poise and grace.
27. The illustrations given in verses 7 and 8 continue James’s exposition about the overwhelming impact the untamed tongue can have and the ramifications of its cosmic assaults from the venom sacs of the reversionist’s free will.
28. James continues his dissertation on the tongue by discussing the dichotomy illustrated by the inconsistencies of its use.

James 3:9 With it we bless our Lord and Father, and with it we curse men, who have been made in the likeness of God. (NASB)

1. A dichotomy is defined as “a division into two especially mutually exclusive or contradictory groups of entities.”¹ The pronoun “it” refers to the tongue. It is reflexive and should be translated, “By means of this, i.e., the tongue.”
2. The instability of this believer’s volition is again addressed by James. First, he writes that with the tongue, this reversionist uses his volition to verbally “bless our Lord and the Father.”
3. The word “bless” is the present active indicative of the verb, **εὐλογέω (eulogéō)**: “we bless, praise, extol, glorify.” The direct objects of these encomiums are cited as, **κύριος (kúrios)**: “Lord,” and **πατήρ (patḗr)**: “Father.”
4. In James’s context, he establishes that his primary and overriding concern is the flagrant, unbridled use of the tongue to communicate human viewpoint, human good, and evil in his criticism of others.
5. Overwhelmingly, these excoriations are laced with venom that contains gossip, criticism, accusations, argument, false finding, sins, and behaviors directed toward other believers.
6. Somewhere in the process, this spiritual reprobate occasionally realizes that his castigations are ill-received, rejected, and rebutted—sometimes done argumentatively and in other times by clear, biblically-based responses.

¹ Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, 11th ed. (2014), s.v. “dichotomy.”

7. For various reasons, by a guilt complex, by a desire to publicly portray spirituality, or an effort to take the spiritual high ground, the antagonist uses his tongue to arrogate Christ and God as witnesses on his behalf.
8. This is hypocrisy of the most dangerous order. One must not use God to support sin. Use of the tongue to criticize a fellow believer is an overt, verbal sin. The latter is bad enough; the former is blasphemous.
9. When aggrandizing his comments by implying support by God and Christ is a dangerous game to play. For example, take this tactic and combine it with Matthew 7:1–2 and the confluence of divine wrath is sure to follow.
10. James wants to impose quietus on that tactic and get back to the central issue of his commentary which begins with the phrase, “and with it, namely the tongue,” or “and by means of the tongue.”
11. It is by means of the tongue that reversionists “curse men.” The verb “curse” is the customary present middle indicative of **καταράομαι (*kataráomai*)**: “to curse or execrate; to wish anyone evil or ruin.”
12. James uses the verb, *kataráomai*, to describe the motivation of this reversionist. The verb is generally translated “curse,” but the context demands a more precise definition which is supplied by the word “execrate.” Here’s are extended definitions of the word:

Execrate. To denounce evil against, or to imprecate evil on; hence, to detest utterly; to abhor; to abominate.²

Execrate. To imprecate evil upon; hence to detest utterly; to abhor. Execrate implies intense loathing and, usually, a fury of passion.³

Execrate. To imprecate evil upon (as an expression of hatred); to express or feel intense loathing or abhorrence for; utter detestation.⁴
13. *Kataráomai* is also defined as a curse, but the dictionary definitions noted above show that execrate carries a more intense application to the verb. Its customary present tense indicates that this execration regularly occurs or is part of an ongoing state that occurs regularly.
14. The impact of this verb is further intensified by the middle voice indicating that the person’s volition employs this tactic consistently.

² Noah Webster, *An American Dictionary of the English Language*, vol. 1 (1828), s.v. “execrate.”

³ *Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary*, 2d ed. (1953), s.v. “execrate.”

⁴ *The Oxford English Dictionary* (1971), s.v. “execrate.”



15. The tongue is simply an organ in the body. It has several functions, one of which is the enunciation of ideas fed to it by the thought processes contained in the believer's stream of consciousness.
16. The tongue is being scolded by James, but his Letter makes it clear that the organ is just the means of communicating the thoughts and ideas contained in a person's soul.
17. Therefore, as we have noted earlier, "The medium is the message." The medium in context is the tongue. What it communicates has the power to persuade or dissuade.
18. Either way, the tongue is only the medium by which the soul is enabled to communicate its ideas to others.
19. Loosely using the vocabulary of herpetology as an example, the soul contains a person's inventory of ideas, beliefs, and attitudes. The volition contains the venom sacs that expectorates through their fangs the soul's poison, and the tongue communicates by its hiss what warns of incoming ordinance.
20. Consequently, it is the tongue that receives the condemnation because it is the medium of communication. It was Marshall McLuhan who cleverly characterized the emerging power of electronic media in the early 1960s:

Marshall McLuhan. Canadian communications theorist and educator, whose aphorism "the medium is the message" summarized his view of the potent influence of television, computers, and other electronic disseminators of information in shaping styles of thinking and thought, whether in sociology, art, science, or religion.⁵

NOTE: Television, including its spinoffs, is the most effective medium for electronic influence because it presents video images of a person who, accompanied by his audio commentary, addresses his audience face-to-face. The cosmic believer has always had this same power because his thoughts are expressed by the use of the tongue while his personal presence is accompanied by the visual nuances of facial expressions, body language, and eye contact.

What a person says is the expression of what is contained in the stream of consciousness of his soul which remains dormant until volition makes the decision to express these thoughts verbally to others. Therefore, the tongue becomes the most effective and powerful medium for a message.

⁵ McLuhan, (Herbert) Marshall, in *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica: Micropaedia* (2010), 7:643.

21. The verse continues with a nod to the Royal Law which is being completely ignored by the believer who uses his tongue to execrate others who, whether being guilty or innocent, is not the issue.
22. The targets of these execrations are mentioned next with the perfect active participle of **γίνομαι (gínomai)**: “have come into being.” In other words, they are individual Homo sapiens with the same essence of soul as everyone else: **(1)** self-consciousness, **(2)** mentality, **(3)** volition, and **(4)** conscience.
23. The enemy in opposition to this essence is the propaganda disseminated by the sin nature’s agent provocateurs which are deployed by its lust patterns.
24. The essence of the soul is intended by God to emulate the system of thought He possesses. The person in context speaks with a forked tongue, just as a snake possesses by nature. From the source of one fork he praises the Lord and the Father while from the other fork he execrates mankind.
25. Because of reversionism, he expresses sins of the tongue; he ejects poison from his venom sacs first with blasphemous expressions of blessings to God but with execrations of cursing toward his fellowman.
26. Elsewhere in James’s letter he uses the term “double -minded” in:
- James 1:7** For that man ought not to expect that he will receive anything from the Lord,
- v. 8** being a double-minded [**δίψυχος (dípsuchos)**⁶] man, unstable in all his ways.
- James 4:8** Draw near to God and He will draw near to you. Cleanse your hands, you sinners; purify your hearts, you double-minded. (NASB)
27. Timothy uses a similar expression in:
- 1 Timothy 3:8a** Deacons likewise must be men of dignity, not double-tongued [**δίλογος (dílogos)**: “deceitful in one’s words”] ... (NASB)
28. The English language has several words that describe the mentality of the individual described by James. The one which correlates best with **dípsuchos**, “double-minded, and **dílogos**, “double-tongued,” is, “two-faced” which has the following synonyms: deceitful, hypocritical, backstabbing, duplicitous, and perfidious.”⁷

⁶ “δίψυχος. Such a person suffers from divided loyalties. On the one hand, he wishes to maintain a religious confession and desires the presence of God in his life; on the other hand, he loves the ways of the world and prefers to live according to its mores and ethics” (Spiros Zodhiates, ed., *The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament*, rev. ed. [Chattanooga: AMG Publishers, 1993], 473).

⁷ *Oxford American Writer’s Thesaurus*, 3d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), s.v. “two-faced.”



29. These expressions are dichotomous since a believer should never be involved in practicing these mutually divergent acts. This exposes the person's irrational behavior that is common among those whose mentality has declined to the stage of *dipsuchos* or *dilogos*.
30. This is also treachery since James points out in James 3:9 that such types were "made in the *likeness* of God" in the NASB and NIV. The KJV uses the word *similitude*, while the NET employs *image*. The Greek word is the noun, **ὁμοίωσις (*homiōsis*)** and is defined as follows:

ὁμοίωσις means a. "making similar or like," b. "being like," c. "comparison."

In the LXX [Septuagint] it is mostly used in the sense of "similarity," especially Genesis 1:26. The word does not mean "image"; there is a fundamental distinction from εἰκών [*eikōn*], which presupposes an original from which there is derivation, whereas ὁμοίωσις, simply denotes the likeness, which has not arisen by derivation.

The only New Testament instance is at James 3:9, where, on the basis of Genesis 1:26 it is said: "... ὁμοίωσιν θεοῦ γεγονότας [according to the image of God]."⁸

31. Interestingly, the best English noun to distinguish the association the human being has with God is "similitude":

Similitude. 1. A person resembling, or having a likeness of, some other person. Bearing a relation to something moral of which it is the similitude and type. 4. The quality or state of being like; resemblance, similarity, likeness.⁹

James 3:9 By means of the tongue we praise the Lord, and our Father; and by means of this tongue we keep on execrating mankind, having come into being according to the similitude of God; (EXT)

James 3:10 from the same mouth come both blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not to be this way. (NASB)

⁸ Johannes Schneider, "ὁμοίωσις," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967), 5:190.

⁹ *The Oxford English Dictionary* (1971), s.v. "Similitude."



1. This verse is very straightforward in its English translation. There are a few things to observe. First of all, James makes a statement that condemns and scolds the congregation with two summary statements.
2. The first is, "... from the same mouth come both blessing and cursing." This is the instability of the believer who cannot control his thinking due to reverse process reversionism.
3. The word "mouth" is the noun **στόμα (stóma)**: "mouth." This is the cavity from which the words exit, but the content of what is expressed is provided by the tongue.
4. It is from that source that ideas come, indicated by the customary present middle indicative of **ἐξέρχομαι (exérchomai)**. The prefix, **ἐξ- (ex-)**, refers to something that goes from the inside to the outside while **έρχομαι (érchomai)** is the verb, "to come." What is on the inside comes outside.
5. The customary present tense is used to signal either an action that *regularly occurs* or an *ongoing state*. It can be said that the *customary* present describes an event that occurs *regularly*.¹⁰
6. This reversionist regularly produces dichotomous ideas produced by the tongue that are defined as both "blessing and cursing."
7. There is no stability of thought when a believer uses his tongue to make statements that glorify God and then uses it to curse a fellow believer.
8. The word "blessing" is the noun, **εὐλογία (eulogía)**: expressions of praise and glory toward God.
9. Then with his second breath, out comes what he really thinks which is cursing, **κατάρρα (katára)**: "cursing" or better "*execration*."
10. For the believer, the tongue is designed to communicate blessing. A feeble attempt is made at the beginning with the use of the verb, *eulogía*: blessing.
11. This is the usual setup designed to associate the individual with genteel society. His tactic is to present himself with a positive approach before he follows up with his execration of a fellow believer.
12. The pattern of behavior by this individual, reveals him to be two-faced. There are multiple personalities that are applicable, but include these synonyms: backstabbing, duplicitous, dishonest, treacherous.
13. These examples depict instability of soul expressing the darkness that prevails there. Through propaganda, he asserts an association with God but then follows by assaulting another person's character or beliefs.

¹⁰ Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 521.



14. This person may have the ability to control many aspects of his life and the circumstances he confronts, but what he cannot control is his tongue.
15. His behavior pattern becomes an example for James to issue his own certified condemnation which follows next, beginning with the phrase, “these things.”
16. “These things”—**ταῦτα οὗτος (taúta houítos)**—refer to the relentless attacks made by the sins of the tongue. This is one of the manifestations of reverse process reversionism, defined as:

The total influence of evil and divorcement from reality. What was previously considered right is now considered to be wrong and vice versa. It is the status quo of unrestrained and perpetual sinfulness, fragmentation, and excessive cosmic involvement. Such a believer has been brainwashed by satanic propaganda.¹¹

17. Regardless of how a believer functions in this environment, it is condemned by James with the phrase, **οὐ χρέη (ou chré)**: “should not.” This is followed by the present middle infinitive of **γίνομαι (gínomai)**: “in this manner.”

James 3:10 words that regularly proceed from the very same mouth comes praises toward God, but also execrations toward believers. Fellow believers, these things should not occur in this manner. (EXT)

James 3:11 Does a fountain send out from the same opening both fresh [**γλυκύς (glukús)**]: “sweet” (KJV) i.e., “potable”] and bitter water? (NASB)

1. In verses 9–10, James points out the clues to identify the reversionistic believer: he speaks out of both sides of his mouth. He pays verbal homage to the Lord and Father but grants his volition the privilege to regularly chastise, belittle, accuse, and criticize a fellow believer.
2. Verse 10 once again places blame on the tongue. He uses the noun “mouth,” but what the mouth contains is the tongue which enunciates the dichotomous comments toward the Godhead and to fellow believers.
3. Beginning in verse 11, James illustrates his displeasure with believers who betray their decline into reversionism with contradictory comments. With their tongues they praise the Lord and the Father and later fellow believers.
4. James summarizes his conclusion of the behaviors presented in verses 10–11 with the critique, “These things should not occur in this manner.”

¹¹ See expanded definition from the visual, “Reverse-Process Reversionism,” posted with this lesson.



5. James then amplifies the obvious contradictions verses 10–11 illustrate with four indisputable examples of how they expose reversionism.
6. Verse 11 begins with the negative interrogative particle, **μήτι (mēti)**: “does” which sets up a series of questions. Its use here introduces circumstances by which one may rightly respond with only one answer.
7. These are described as “rhetorical questions” and are defined as follows:

Rhetorical Question: A question posed for its rhetorical effect and not intended to induce or require a reply. The rhetorical question is frequently used in persuasion and in oratory. Since the answer is obvious, it makes a deeper impression on the hearer than a direct statement would.¹²

8. The first of James’s four rhetorical questions is, “Does a fountain send out from the same opening both fresh and bitter water?”
9. The noun, “fountain,” is, **πηγή (pēgē)**. It is translated not only by the word fountain but also, “cistern, spring, and well.”

In a country where no rain falls for half of the year, springs assume an importance unknown in more favored lands. Wherever a spring exists it is very apt to be the nucleus of a village. It may furnish sufficient water to be used in irrigation, in which case the gardens surrounding the village become an oasis in the midst of the parched land. The water of the village fountain is often conveyed by a covered conduit for some distance from the source to a convenient spot in the village where an arch is built up, under which the water gushes out.¹³

10. Obviously, these springs provide a water source for communities over the course of a rain-deprived area for most of the year. These water sources are always depended upon to provide clear drinking water for everyone in the area.
11. They consistently expect the spring to supply fresh water, never both fresh and bitter. Such a thing never actually happened nor was it expected to.

¹² *Dictionary of Literary Terms* (Toronto: Coles Publishing Co., 1980), s.v. “Rhetorical Question.”

¹³ Alfred Ely Day, “Fountain,” *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956), 2:1141–42.



13. Principle: It is impossible to acquire from the same fountain both sweet, or potable, and bitter water. That the tongue is able to do this is proof that the one doing so is in reverse process reversionism.
12. Consequently, the people never considered the idea that a fountain would supply both fresh and bitter water. The first rhetorical question therefore exposes the logical fallacy revealed in verses 9 and 10.

James 3:11 Does a spring supply to a fountain both fresh [γλυκύς (*glukús*): “sweet” (KJV) i.e., “potable”] and bitter water? (EXT)

13. The second, third, and fourth rhetorical questions follow in:

James 3:12 Can a fig tree, my brethren, produce olives, or a vine produce figs? Nor can salt water produce fresh. (NASB)

1. In rhetorical question number two, James asks if a fig tree can produce the fruit of an olive tree. These two trees have vastly different growing seasons and harvests.

In Palestine and other warm climates the fig yields two crops annually—an earlier one, ripe about June, growing from the “old wood,” i.e. from the midsummer sprouts of the previous year, and a second, more important one, ripe about August, which grows upon the “new wood.”

By December, fig trees in the mountainous regions of Palestine have shed all their leaves, and they remain bare until about the end of March, when they commence putting forth their tender leaf buds, and *at the same time*, in the leaf axils, appear the tiny figs.¹⁴

2. The olive trees’ growing season is quite different from the figs’:

The olive is in flower about May. The first olives mature as early as September in some places, but, in the mountain districts, the olive harvest is not till November or even December.¹⁵

(End JAS3-40. See JAS3-41 for continuation of study at p. 401.)

¹⁴ Ibid., E. W. G. Masterman, “Fig, Fig-Tree,” 2:1109

¹⁵ Ibid., “Olive Tree,” 3:2185.

