From The Pulpit Of

IMMANUEL BAPTIST CHURCH

Taking Every Thought Captive

No. 23 **2 Corinthians 10:1-6** **November 8, 2026**
Series: 2 Corinthians **Nathan Carter**

Text

10 *I, Paul, myself entreat you, by the meekness and gentleness of Christ—I who am humble when face to face with you, but bold toward you when I am away!—* ***2*** *I beg of you that when I am present I may not have to show boldness with such confidence as I count on showing against some who suspect us of walking according to the flesh.* ***3*** *For though we walk in the flesh, we are not waging war according to the flesh.* ***4*** *For the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh but have divine power to destroy strongholds.* ***5*** *We destroy arguments and every lofty opinion raised against the knowledge of God, and take every thought captive to obey Christ,* ***6*** *being ready to punish every disobedience, when your obedience is complete.*

Introduction

If you're a Christian, how do you interact with those who hold opposing positions to you? Do you?

There's a temptation for some to become angry and antagonistic, repulsed by people outside our camp, demonizing them, and constantly in a posture of fighting. Maybe you feel attacked and so you attack back. You can be a bit of a jerk.

My guess is that most of us are tempted another way. We're tempted not to interact. We want to avoid conflict. Christians can often ghettoize – live in a bubble, trying to be sheltered from the world and not engage it that much at all. Sometimes we can be afraid of non-Christians and those who think differently from us and keep things perpetually pleasant with them, never wanting to rock the boat or ruffle feathers, keeping our Christianity very private.

Which ditch do you find yourself falling into when facing false ideas? Are you contentious? Or do you never "contend for the faith that was once for all delivered to the saints" (Jd. 3), content to just have your personal beliefs and let others have theirs?

We're starting into ch. 10 today in our study of 2 Corinthians. "It is here that 2 Corinthians takes [a] turn. Whereas chapters 1-9 were directed to the repentant majority in Corinth, chapters 10-13 focus on the unrepentant minority."[1] There were some false teachers that had infiltrated the Corinthian Christian community – outsiders, intruders, people who were promoting worldly ideas that are opposed to the truth of Christ.

How does Paul approach dealing with those who have errant notions? What does he want the Corinthians to do? And how does he encourage us to handle similar situations? In short, what we're going to see today as we delve into this passage is just this: **Christians should try not to be offensive, but still be on the offensive**. Not give unnecessary offense, but still be on offense.

© 2026 Nathaniel R. Carter

We can use the word "offensive" to refer to a demeanor that is unappealing, objectionable, hurtful, insulting, impolite, unbecoming. We can also use the term "offensive" to talk about the offensive line of the Bears. We hope that tonight they dominate in time of possession, that they aren't playing defense all the time, but Ben Johnson's offense is on the field a lot. Or if that's not your thing, think about the other football – you want your team to have more shots on goal than the other team, right? That means you're not just trying to stop your opponent from scoring, but you're going on the offensive yourself. **Christians should try not to be offensive** (in the first sense), **but still be on the offensive** (in the second sense). We see both of these truths in this text.

Let's pray and then get into it…

Not Being Offensive (vv. 1-3)

As I said, 10:1 marks a shift in this book. For the last two chapters Paul's been talking about giving. He's been guiding the church which, though it has significant issues, is generally regenerate and responsive to instruction. But now he pivots and addresses the fact that there are detractors who are bringing alternative 'gospels' to the Corinthians, disputing with Paul, accusing him of being wrong and trying to confuse the real Christians with their worldly ideas. This will occupy him for the remainder of the letter. Such realities cannot be ignored.

In vv. 1-2 Paul is speaking in the first person singular – I. "I, Paul, myself entreat you…" He's been primarily using "we" in this letter, and he will return to it soon. He's part of a team that includes people like Timothy (see 1:1) and sometimes Titus (7:6). But as the Apostle, he represents the main target of the detractors' opposition and so here he speaks clearly for himself.

Paul is responding to a charge that he is pathetic. Look at what he says in v. 1 – "I who am humble when face to face with you, but bold toward you when I am away!" Do you see that in v. 1? Now skip down to v. 10. There you see that he's quoting his detractors – "For they say, 'His letters are weighty and strong, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech of no account.'" Remember: Paul has recently written a tearful, painful, forceful letter in between what we call 1 Corinthians and what we call 2 Corinthians. But by and large his demeanor is soft and tender. And these detractors disdained that about him. They were making fun of him that his bark was bigger than his bite.

These worldly opponents valued strong oratory, imposing charisma. They were movers and shakers, motivational speakers, big and flashy. They were selling the Corinthian Christians something other than authentic Christianity, something that made them feel important rather than impotent and totally dependent on God's grace; something that championed success and victory, not suffering and the *via crucis* (the way of the Cross).

But recall what Paul said back in 1 Corinthians 2:1-5 about how he conducted his ministry in the beginning days of the Corinthian church? "And I, when I came to you, brothers, did not come proclaiming to you the testimony of God with lofty speech or wisdom. For I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified. And I was with you in weakness and in fear and much trembling, and my

speech and my message were not in plausible words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, so that your faith might not rest in the wisdom of men but in the power of God." Paul is not a peddler of God's Word. He's not playing those games. He's not competing according to those rules, trying to gain followers for himself. He's all about Jesus (cf. 4:5).

And Jesus himself was not bombastic. Jesus was not full of himself, a master manipulator, a spiritual abuser who drew people to himself by tickling people's pride to pad his own pocket. He was not the cool kid, the popular guy in the usual kind of way. He was humble. He was weak. "He was despised and rejected by men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; and as one from whom men hide their faces he was despised, and [people] esteemed him not" (Is. 53:3). He took the form of a servant (Ph. 2:7).

And Paul took this same approach. He followed in the footsteps of his Lord and Savior. As one observer has put it – "[H]e makes it clear at the outset of this section that it is always incumbent upon him as an apostle of Christ to have in mind in his ministry *the meekness and gentleness* of Him whom he is commissioned to serve."[2] Think about how Jesus entreated people. How did he appeal to them? He wooed. He didn't really wow. He invited through displays of kindness. Power, yes; but power in display of compassion. He said, "Come to me, all who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me, for I am gentle and lowly in heart, and you will find rest for your souls" (Mt. 11:28-29). "Gentle" there is the same word translated "meekness" here. Jesus didn't bash people over the head, but he let himself be bashed on the head. "A bruised reed he [would] not break, and a smoldering wick he [did] not quench" (Mt. 12:20). That's the Jesus way.

That's not the worldly way. The way leaders – be they political leaders, business leaders, even religious leaders – usually amass a following is through bravado, brashness, harshness. It can draw people in a Machiavellian way, making you feared/respected, but not loved. It's cold and calculating, and **offensive** to most people, even though it kind of 'works' by appealing to a base. But it doesn't have broad appeal.

What we're seeing in 2 Corinthians is that Paul's ministry, modeled after Christ, did not resort to worldly methods – "ingenuity, rhetoric, showmanship, splashiness, spiritual pretension, personal charisma."[3] What do you think Paul's Tik Tok account would look like? Would he even have one?? It certainly wouldn't have been braggadocious or obnoxious. He was meek, to the point of being mocked by his detractors as inconsequential. He was not a jerk, but gentle. He genuinely cared for people. His correspondence with the Corinthians shows great patience and restraint and a heart that was given to them for their good. People mattered to Paul; they weren't just reduced to followers or enemies. His discourse was never coarse. He was a gentleman. "Paul defends his reputation [here], but it is more to save the community from fools and a false gospel than to save his reputation."[4]

The point Paul's making at the beginning of this passage is that he was **trying not to be offensive**. He's said earlier – "We put no obstacle in anyone's way" (6:3). He wanted the only offense to be the gospel itself, not his tactics. And the gospel of grace calls for compassion, not coercion, not clubbing people over the head, not dunking on people. Likewise, Christians today should not be pugnacious, overbearing, insensitive. We should be soft-hearted, inviting, servant-minded… We want to win people with love.

Now even though Jesus was overall meek and mild, he could on occasions get quite angry and forceful, like in his denunciations against the Pharisees (Mt. 23:13ff) or when he made a whip and drove the money changers out of the temple courts (Jn. 2:14ff). Paul, similarly, could be firm if he needed to be. But that was his last resort, not his first choice. He says in v. 2 – "I beg of you that when I am present I may not have to show boldness with such confidence as I count on showing against some who suspect us of walking according to the flesh." He was being accused of all extremes – of being too passive and pathetic, but also of being corrupt, sinful, trying to play the same game as his detractors himself. People will level whatever charge they can against Christians to try to discredit them.

But Paul, returning to the plural 'we', says in v. 3 – "For though we walk *in* the flesh, we are not waging war *according to* the flesh." He fully acknowledges his weakness, his frailty, his limitedness. He's just an ordinary human being. That's what it means to walk *in* the flesh ('flesh' meaning the finite human nature). But he strongly denies fighting dirty, using the world's strategies, operating in a mindset of 'the ends justifies the means'. That's what it means to wage war *according to* the flesh ('flesh' meaning the fallen human nature, our sin). Paul, in all the attacks lobbed at him, kept his cool and responded with calmness, compassion, and character.

In these first 3 verses we see that, like Paul, **Christians should try not to be offensive**. We should seek to diffuse situations, not stoke them. We should be calm and deflective of attention, not loud and self-promoting. Approachable, not harsh. Humble, not arrogant. Courteous, not rude. We should be winsome and kind and caring and listen well and absorb vitriol instead of react. If you are here today and you are a Christian, who was the human agent that led you to the Lord? What was he or she like? What is it that persuaded you? Probably not disdainful meanness and an overpowering browbeating, but it was long-suffering love that disarmed you. Am I right? The meekness and gentleness of Christ.

Being on the Offensive (vv. 4-6)

Christians should try not to be offensive, but we should **still be on the offensive**. 1 Peter 3:15 tells us that we should "always be… prepared to make a defense to anyone who asks [us] for a reason for the hope that is in [us]; yet do it with gentleness and respect." That's a great verse. It reinforces the need to not be **offensive**. But what Paul says next in 2 Corinthians 10:4-6 tells us that we should not just be prepared with a defense for those who come to us with questions. We should also have an offense. We do not wage war according to the flesh, but we do wage war. And the military imagery that Paul uses here is not that of a defensive war, but an **offensive** one, going on the attack.

Verse 4 says, "For the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh but have divine power to destroy strongholds." The image is that of a siege. A stronghold is a fortress or a tower that people seek refuge and protection within. And we assault it, go towards it and mount an **offensive** against it. Christians aren't to be the ones just holed up inside bulwarks against the world. We are supposed to be the ones making incursions, charging the hill, going on the **offensive**.

Again, we don't wage war according to the flesh. That won't work. You can't fight sinful flesh with sinful flesh. As one person has put it – "*Carnal* weapons, such as

eloquent diatribe, powerful propaganda, or reliance on charm or forcefulness of personality, are all in themselves quite unavailing in the ceaseless task of *pulling down* the *strongholds,* in which evil is entrenched. Such carnal weapons may win superficial or temporary victories, but it soon becomes evident that evil has not been driven from its fortress."[5]

So what weapons do we use? Well, first, we need to understand more of what the strongholds represent in this military metaphor. So let's read a little further – "We destroy arguments and every lofty opinion raised against the knowledge of God." We're not literally fighting wars, trying to take territory. That should go without saying, but I just want to point that out. Christians don't form geo-political states that try to advance our cause by the sword. And we're not fighting against people per se. We must always keep that in mind that "we wrestle not against flesh and blood" (Eph. 6:12; KJV).

So what are the strongholds? They are ideas, philosophies, ways of thinking that are designed to protect oneself from the claims of Christ's lordship. They are all at the core pride – lofty, raised up. Prideful humans try to defend themselves against the truth claims of God in Scripture by constructing elaborate systems that make them feel safe and secure from God. Notions that create illusions of being independent of God, even like God himself – determining good from evil, truth from fiction. Charles Hodge described these arguments and lofty opinions raised against the knowledge of God as the "convictions of those who set themselves and the deductions of their reason against the truth of God," which has been made clear in general and special revelation.[6]

When people like Paul or his companions or the Corinthians or us encounter those who espouse ideas contrary to the Bible, we shouldn't be unconcerned, we shouldn't be complacent, we shouldn't be scared, we shouldn't retreat, we shouldn't be merely defensive. We must be loving, yes, but it's not loving to let people remain in their imaginary castles that they think can keep them from God's dominion. Like a good boxer, we can't just get backed into a corner with our gloves up. We must at some point go on the **offensive**.

Because we have the knock-out punch. We have weapons with divine power to destroy strongholds of deception and pretension. We have God with us. We are the ones in tune with reality. We have the truth. We have reason on our side. We have the better arguments. And we're not just trying to win arguments. Paul "means something far more," writes D.A. Carson: "his weapons destroy the way people think, demolish their sinful thought patterns, the mental structures by which they live their lives in rebellion against God."[7]

Philip Hughes explains:

> This [military] metaphor emphasizes the defiant and mutinous nature of sin: sinful man does not wish to know God; he wishes himself to be the self-sufficient centre of his universe. The knowledge of God is available to him, indeed he cannot escape from it: it is a knowledge which is constitutional to him, for he himself is God's creature, made, moreover, in the image of his Creator; it is a knowledge which the whole created order clearly and ceaselessly proclaims, witnessing as it does to the eternal power and godhead of the Creator (cf. Ps. 19:1-4; Rom. 1:19f.); and it is a knowledge… graciously revealed in Christ Jesus, preserved in Holy

> Scripture, and presented in the preaching of the gospel (cf. 4:6). But sinful man rebels against this knowledge of God. He holds down the truth in unrighteousness. Knowing God, he refuses to glorify Him as God. His senseless heart is darkened, so that, though professing himself to be wise, he becomes a fool.[8]

But we don't just let people stay there. Praise God that other Christians didn't just let us stay there. And so we kindly confront them with the truth. We storm the gates of human pride and delusion. Paul continues the metaphor. After battering the stronghold and tearing it down, we take prisoners. He says, "…and take every thought captive to obey Christ." We bring people's minds into submission to Jesus, which is ultimately to liberate them. "Batter my heart, three-personed God," wrote the poet John Donne, "…o'erthrow me, and bend//Your force to break, blow, burn, and make me new…. Take me to you, imprison me, for I,//Except you enthrall me, never shall be free."[9]

There's a siege, a capture, and a prosecution. Verse 6 – "…being ready to punish every disobedience, when your obedience is complete." Paul wants the Corinthian Christians to push back against these false teachers and when he arrives everything will get sorted out, perhaps through church discipline on those who persist in holding these wrong ideas.

What Does This Look Like?

Okay, so there's the passage. It has two parts. In the first half Paul is clear about his tactics. He will emulate Christ, who was meek and gentle. He will **try not to be offensive**, but patient, kind, humble, polite. But in the second half he is clear that we should **still be on the offensive**. It's not loving to let people remain trying to hide from God in their irrational systems of thought. We use godly weapons to dismantle strongholds, bring them into submission, and try and punish those who fail to surrender.

What does this look like, in practice? And what exactly the weapons of our warfare?

First, we need to engage those who resist God and the gospel. If you're a Christian, think right now of not-yet-Christians in your life. How could you advance the conversation? Love them enough to care, to attempt to bring up Jesus and get them to identify their defenses, their objections to him. I think we are often way too passive. That's not love. Jesus came to seek and save the lost and sent us on that mission.

Second, we must commit to engaging with respect, without annoyance or disdain, being willing to suffer discomfort and ridicule. We must renounce any underhanded tactics. Be fair. Show genuine interest. Don't just make people a project.

But then third, engage in the debate. Use arguments. Do apologetics. What weapons do we have?

There are the classical proofs for the existence of God.

- There's the Ontological Argument – God is by definition that being than which nothing greater can be conceived. A being that exists in reality is greater than one that exists only in the mind. If God existed only in the mind, we could conceive of something greater: the same being existing in reality. But this would contradict

the definition of God as the greatest conceivable being. Therefore, God must exist in reality, not merely in the mind. Anselm first fully articulated this in the 11th century and others have elaborated on it, like Alvin Plantinga today.

- There are the various forms of the Cosmological Argument – Why is there something rather than nothing? Everything that begins to exist has a cause. The universe began to exist. Therefore, the universe must have a cause. We call that cause God. Aquinas is best known for working this out in the 13th century. Contemporary people like William Lane Craig have proven capable explainers of it.
- There is the Teleological Argument – Where there is design, there must be a designer. The universe exhibits remarkable evidence of design. Therefore, the universe must have a designer. We call that designer God. You don't expect an explosion at a junkyard to create a Tesla or dropping a box of Scrabble tiles to produce Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The fine-tuning of the universe and stuff like that… Watch the movie *The Story of Everything* that just came
- There's the Moral Argument – If there is no God, there is no objective moral law. But objective moral laws do exist. Therefore, God exists. C.S. Lewis was brilliant at using this.
- There are more and variations and elaborations. But there is a rich heritage of classical, philosophical arguments.

There is a branch of apologetics called Evidentialist Apologetics that bring out facts in favor of Christianity.

- There are discoveries in science that point to God.
- There are discoveries in archaeology that corroborate the Bible.
- There is great textual evidence that demonstrates the reliability of the Biblical manuscripts.
- There is the argument from fulfilled prophecy.
- There are strong historical arguments for the reality of the resurrection of Christ, for example.
- There is so much more that can be marshalled in a case for Christ, evidence that demands a verdict. Investigate it and faced with all the evidence you have to choose between four logical possibilities. Jesus was a legend. Jesus was a liar. Jesus was a lunatic. Or Jesus is Lord! All the clues point to the latter.

There are many more arguments. Together with classical and evidentialist arguments, the arguments from experience can't be discredited. I've personally encountered the God of the Bible and been transformed. Millions have from the simplest commoners to the greatest thinkers. One person put it so well:

> One of the most astonishing and undeniable arguments for the truth of the Christian religion, and for the omnipotence of God, is the fact that, when faced with the gospel, which is a scandal to the human intellect and folly to proud, unregenerate men, some of the most subtle of human intellects have been led to render submission to the Savior. Many of the wisest have

> been content to become as fools for Christ's sake, and not a few of the 'freest' of thinkers have surrendered their 'freedom' to become slaves of Him who took upon Himself the form of a servant.[10]

There is a vast array of well-reasoned arguments at our disposal for refuting the counter claims of atheists or alternative religions.[11] Get to know them. Get equipped. Maybe pick up a copy of a new book that just came out by Gavin Ortlund entitled *Why Christianity Makes Sense: A Book about Jesus, the Mysteries of the World, and the Longings in Your Heart*. Or there are hundreds of other resources. We're not weaponless in the war.

Perhaps my favorite apologetic approach is that of Presuppositionalism, that puts forward the Transcendental Argument for God. Simply put – If God does not exist, rational thought and knowledge are impossible. But rational thought and knowledge are possible. Therefore, God exists. Or put another way – Christianity is true because of the logical impossibility of the contrary. The proof of the Christian worldview is that without it you couldn't prove anything. This really does the best job of climbing up into the imagined strongholds set up in opposition to God and dismantling them. Cornelius Van Til and Greg Bahnsen are generally best known for this school.

I think Tim Keller in *The Reason for God* and *Making Sense of God* does this well. Listen to this quote – "[Naturalistic e]volutionists say that if God makes sense to us, it is not because he is really there, it's only because that belief helped us survive and so we are hardwired for it. However, if we can't trust our belief-forming faculties to tell us the truth about God, why should we trust them to tell us the truth about anything, including evolutionary science? If our cognitive faculties only tell us what we need to survive, not what is true, why trust them about anything at all?"[12] In other words, there is no reason for reason in a purely naturalistic world. It is therefore an utterly illogical leap of faith to assume that one's own reason is the starting place for determining all truth and meaning, in addition to being insanely arrogant. The whole tower is a house of cards that collapses.

I'm scratching the surface of all these legitimate lines of attack against the untenable position of unbelief in the God of Christianity. Look into them more. Be encouraged in your faith. And get equipped to use these arguments in your arsenal to combat the bad arguments against the Bible.

But these arguments are not are greatest weapon. They can help clear away some obstacles. They can build siege works. But the greatest weapon that has divine power is the Word of God itself. The sword of the Spirit (Eph. 6:17), "[f]or the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing to the division of soul and of spirit, of joints and of marrow, and discerning the thoughts and intentions of the heart. And no creature is hidden from his sight, but all are naked and exposed to the eyes of him to whom we must give account" (Heb. 4:12-13).

This week our family finished reading a biography of Lottie Moon, the little woman who went to China in 1873 sharing the gospel until her death in 1912. There were a lot of cool stories in there. I love reading Christian biography. But there was one about an old man named Li-Qin who became a Christian through Lottie's ministry, but his family became very angry and started mistreating him. "They tried to take [his Bible]

from [him], but he would not part with it. They hit him, spat on him, and locked him away in the storage room, but still he sang happily of the God who loved him….

"Since [this old man] could not read, they… commissioned the family's Confucianist scholar and Li-Qin's nephew, Li Show-ting, to read the New Testament aloud to him. They were sure that this would show Li-Qin how foolish his new beliefs were and he would soon return to worshipping the family's ancestors.

"Li Show-ting set out to mock the teachings of Jesus with great gusto. He could hardly wait to point out all the mistakes and inconsistencies to his old uncle. However, Li Show-ting was in for a surprise. As he read aloud, he was held spellbound by what he read. It made so much sense to him, much more sense than anything he had heard from his Confucianist teacher. When he had finished reading to his uncle, Li Show-ting read on into the night alone.

"By the next morning Li Show-ting was standing in Lottie's house asking her to explain what he had read.

"Before long, Li Show-ting was convinced he wanted to become a Christian like his uncle. He was baptized and welcomed into the stunned Sha-ling Baptist Church…. Li Show-ting would go on to become a serious Bible scholar. He would travel all over North China preaching the gospel and baptizing those who believed. In his lifetime he would baptize over ten thousand people."[13] The most potent weapon you have is the Word of God, so quote it and get people to read it and see what happens.

And pray. It's ultimately not proofs that will persuade people to repent of their pride and put their trust in Jesus alone. It's the power of the Spirit. So prayer is a great weapon. Are you praying for your enemies?

And what is the center of the Bible? Not ethical teachings, but the evangel – the gospel, the good news of what God has done in Christ to reconcile sinners to himself, the terms of peace offered to those inside the crumbling walls of irrational unbelief telling them that they can be forgiven for their treason, they can be accepted by the God they've lobbed grenades at, the God that they know is there. He is merciful. He is kind. He is patient. Jesus did not come the first time to judge the world (though he could have), to destroy all opposition. He came meek and gentle, riding on a donkey, not a war horse, going to the Cross to take the death penalty that we all deserve in our place. It's a stumbling block to Jews and folly to Gentiles, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. For the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men" (1Cor. 1:23-25).

Christian: do not be "ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes" (Rom. 1:16). Believe it again and preach it to others.

Non-Christian: repent of your pride, of trying to substitute yourself for God (thinking you know better, thinking you are more righteous than he) and throw yourself on his mercy in substituting himself for you. Do this now, before it's too late. Because Christ will come again, we don't know when, but it could be any time. And when he makes the next visit, he will not be meek and gentle, but bold and punishing and there will be no ability to doubt that he is real but you will be punished in hell. All your proud thoughts will be utterly demolished and shown to be nothing and cannot protect you from his wrath. So surrender now.

The Lord's Table

"For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it, and said, 'This is my body, which is for you. Do this in remembrance of me.' In the same way also he took the cup, after supper, saying, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me.' For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (1Cor. 11:23-26).

This sermon was addressed originally to the people at Immanuel Baptist Church, Chicago, Illinois, by Pastor Nathan Carter on Sunday morning, November 8, 2026. It is not meant to be a polished essay, but was written to be delivered orally. The mission of Immanuel is to be a multiplying community that enjoys and proclaims the Good News of Christ in the great city of Chicago.

End Notes:

[1] R. Kent Hughes, *2 Corinthians: Power in Weakness* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2006), 180.
[2] R.V.G. Tasker, *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974 [1958]), 131-32.
[3] Kent Hughes, 183.
[4] David E. Garland, *2 Corinthians*, NAC (Brentwood: B&H, 1999), 425.
[5] Tasker, 134.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Donald A. Carson, *From Triumphalism to Maturity, a New Exposition of 2 Corinthians 10-13* (Leicester: IVP, 1984), 47.
[8] Philip E. Hughes, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), 352.
[9] John Donne (1572-1631), "Holy Sonnet XIV."
[10] Tasker, 135.
[11] I'm focusing here mostly on the atheistic worldview because that's what I've been dealing with in my personal evangelism currently, but the principles Paul puts forward here are to be used to refute any false thinking.
[12] Timothy Keller, *The Reason for God: Belief in an Age of Skepticism* (New York: Riverhead Books, 2008), 142.
[13] Janet & Geoff Benge, *Lottie Moon: Giving Her All for China* (Seattle: YWAM Publishing, 2001), 144-46.