


Mary and Martha — One Thing is Needful, but Most Miss It In This Commonly Mishandled Story

 2020scripturalvision.com/post/mary-and-martha-one-thing-is-needful-but-most-miss-it-in-this-commonly-mishandled-story

Reuben

September 1, 2025



*“One Thing is
Needful”*
—
But Most
Miss It In This
Commonly
Mishandled Story
of Mary and Martha

Many, many sermons are preached, devotions penned, blogs written (especially by women), virtuous and pious comparisons delivered, on the account found in Luke 10 of the well-known sisters Mary and Martha who lived in the village of Bethany, near Jerusalem, especially a particular focus on contrasting the two behaviours, dialling in on Martha specifically, her cumbersome servitude at the expense of her sister who sat at the Lord's feet. Out of all the characters of the Bible, Mary and Martha are of the most popular, with the text out of Lk 10:38-42, while the sisters are also mentioned in the following passages of Scripture: Lk 7:36-50 and most of John chapter 11.

There are innumerable examples that could be given and most are very similar in content and doctrine, typically going something like this:

"The crux of the matter comes up in verse 40: "But Martha was distracted with much serving." What was the distraction? Was she distracted because she was left in the kitchen to prepare a meal for Jesus, her sister, herself, and perhaps her brother? Or was it that she had the even greater responsibility to prepare a meal to feed all the disciples, if they had come with Jesus into the home? Or was the serving not simply the preparation of the meal, but perhaps the clean-up afterwards? . . . It was not a bad thing that Martha was so busily engaged and, as it were, distracted by service. However, she was becoming more and more annoyed as she was left to do all the service while her sister was sitting down and having a nice conversation with Jesus. . . . Notice that Jesus did not say, "Martha, Mary has chosen the good part, and you've chosen the bad part." Jesus was not saying that serving the way Martha had been serving was a bad thing to do. This was not a contrast, but a comparative analysis. Jesus said that what Martha had been doing, working to prepare and serve, was a good thing. However, the better thing, the higher calling, was the one Mary had undertaken. What I want us to think about is this: Why did Jesus say that? Why was it better that Mary seemingly neglected the regular duties of preparation and service to spend time in conversation? Beloved, we know one thing: this was not chit-chat. . . . She was conversing with the Son of God. She was attending His teaching. She was devoting herself to a means of grace that was far more powerful than even service itself. . . . Finally, Jesus said, "Mary has chosen that good part, which will not be taken away from her." If we choose to spend time with Christ, if we choose to devote ourselves to being at His feet, to take everything we can from His teaching, whatever we get will not be taken away. That is God's promise for you..." ("Martha & Mary" by R.C. Sproul)

Taking aside the perverted version of Scripture, the [ESV](#), utilized by the reformed heretic Sproul (whom we expose here: [Exposing R.C. Sproul of Ligonier Ministries; a Blasphemer and Ravening Wolf in Sheep's Clothing](#)), he adds a lot of unnecessary conjecture and hypothetical ideas into the passage, which is very common in the heretical world of reformed theology where "sacred Scripture" can be mutilated and butchered through the Critical Text yet somehow remain "sacred" in their eyes, where they claim to believe in the words of God while rejecting the preservation of His Word, where doubt and uncertainty is entertained habitually as some cruel form of "humility" (while they are in fact some of the proudest people we have ever met), where practical application of Scripture is rejected to keep their worldliness and sins. So adding sound bites to a text by way of conjecture is not far-fetched by any stretch, since the idea is to come across as intellectual as possible. Repeatedly Sproul speaks not the truth and completely misses the point. Nowhere does *"Jesus [say] what Martha had been doing, working to prepare and serve, was a good thing."* Complete fabrication, found nowhere in the text, an ear tickling fable (cf. 2 Tim 4:3-4). It was indeed a contrast, a contrast between a saved person, a true follower/disciple of Christ, and an unsaved person, a true follower/disciple of self. A comparative analysis would mean they were both saved, and this is the beginning of the train derailment by Sproul like most others on the critical subject of salvation. He was an intelligent man but he lacked true Biblical knowledge and fear of the Lord, and that was evident continually in his works.

Consider some further erroneous examples of this story.

1. David Cloud misinterprets and mishandles the story. In his Bible Study Series (ABSS), *Four Gospels*,

"To 'take thought' for something means to be anxious and worried about it. Compare 1 Sam. 9:5. This is a warning not to be so overly consumed with worldly matters that these crowd God out from first place in our lives. An example of this is Martha in Lk. 10:41." (p. 32).

While in principle it is partially true what he says, it is untrue that Martha is an example of this. Cloud is implying that Martha was a saved woman *"overly consumed with worldly matters"* which were *"crowd[ing] God out from first place in [her] li[fe]."* Wrong. Because of a faulty interpretation of the text, he gets it completely incorrect what is actually wrong with Martha, very likely in large part due to his infatuation with commentaries. Martha's issue had nothing to do with being overly concerned with worldly matters, except for the fact that she was unsaved and simply doing what an unsaved woman does, only aware of her natural flesh and tendencies, and absent of a spiritual thirst and hunger for Godly things, including following Christ.

2. Like David Cloud (above), in the neo-evangelical [EBMC denomination](#) they teach that these are two believers, with one exercising *"undivided attention"* to Him, *"sitting at the Masters feet,"* while the other is *"striving for perfection."* (*"Be perfect as the Father is perfect,"* Peter Goertzen, Apr 28, 2019). Yet there is not even one inclination that Martha is a born again believer (contextually or by rightly dividing God's Word), nor any mention of anything to do with perfection — it's just pure eisegesis and wresting of Scripture (2 Pet 3:16-17). Turning this into two-tiered or two-types of Christianity, is a perversion of both the doctrine of salvation and sanctification. Almost everything stated by this preacher, hypothetically or otherwise, was pure conjecture, anecdotal and eisegesis. The idea he was attempting to bring across, as he continued, stems from the [Keswick heresies](#) of rest/quietism and the traditional possession doctrine. We must sit and do nothing at the feet of Jesus, and let Him work through us. Anything beyond that means you are working for perfection which he equates here to working for your salvation. Rubbish, turning God's Word on its head, opposing and contradicting hundreds of scripture and doctrine. This is incompetent and heretical preaching by someone who doesn't appear to understand Scripture, and the end result is the charge of wresting the Scriptures, which is always the mark of a false teacher, an *"error of the wicked"* (2 Pet 3:16-17).

3. The female reformed calvinist blogger Michelle Lesley, an alleged discipleship maker of Christian women, regurgitates the same error on this account. In an article written in 2024, about getting back to the basics which starts with sitting at His feet, she spends the entire second part writing about serving God in the defence of Martha, sort-of, and even *"jokingly said that God needs Marthas like me, because without us, nothing in the Kingdom would get done."* Yikes, she completely falls out of the boat on this one, a seriously faulty and unscriptural understanding and basis for her article, utterly unable to understand the spiritual nature of Martha, which practically makes her statement

blasphemous. Once she gets past her semi-joke she continues with, *"But I'm discovering that's not true. God doesn't need the efforts of any human being in order to get Kingdom work accomplished. He's quite capable of getting the work done on His own."* Oh boy, or rather, oh girl, she moves from a perverted soteriology to a toxic concoction of reformed theology and Keswick theology, advocating for the Keswick heresies of rest/quietism and the traditional possession doctrine, while severely perverting Jn 6:28-29 to bring across her point (Jn 6:28-29 refers to salvation, not practical sanctification!). God does use mankind upon the earth, while He sits on His throne. He is fully capable of returning to earth and continuing His work in the present, but that's not what His will is, nor what His Word says. This doesn't occur until the end of the Great Tribulation. The most common thing these pious reformers propagate is smoke and mirrors, obscuring or embellishing the truth of Scripture (in this case Mary and Martha, especially the latter) with misleading and irrelevant information.

Luke 10:38-42

The account where this dialogue occurs between Mary, Martha and the Lord Jesus Christ comes out of Lk 10:38-42, where we read the following:

"Now it came to pass, as they went, that he entered into a certain village: and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house. [39] And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat at Jesus' feet, and heard his word. [40] But Martha was cumbered about much serving, and came to him, and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone? bid her therefore that she help me. [41] And Jesus answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things: [42] But one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her."

This text of Lk 10:38-42 concerning Mary and Martha has nothing to do with the hypothetical questions and ideas and truck loads of anecdotal conjecture put forth by many people including the above as to why Martha was serving and Mary wasn't, keeping the "exposition" at a very superficial and man-centred level, while entirely ignoring the context and the words that Christ specifically stated, along with the remainder of Scripture that mentions the two sisters. The greatest issue is that most clearly don't understand the text, and of these, many don't want to understand the text, because it won't fit a preconceived philosophy or agenda.

In the text of Lk 10:38-42, Mary was saved and Martha was lost, that is what Jesus is illustrating, revealing the behaviour and mind-set of the saved, and the unsaved. Mary was saved in Lk 7:36-50 (Jn. 11:12 tells us that this was Mary), while Martha doesn't get saved till after Lazarus dies in Jn 11:25-27, at the point immediately preceding his resurrection from the dead by the Lord Jesus Christ.

Jesus said to Martha in Lk. 10 that she was anxious and troubled about things of temporal value while Mary heard the word of God, *"But one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her."* (Lk 10:41-42). These words itself and the context wherein we find this, makes it pretty evident what

Jesus means here. One thing is needful: salvation. Mary had chosen that part, and it could never be taken from her. She chose it in Lk 7. Salvation can never be lost. It's eternal and no one can pluck the true born again believer from the hands of God the Father or God the Son. They are already sitting in the heavenlies in Christ.

Mary was Saved, Martha Was Not, Their Affections Expressing Their Nature — This is the Lesson Ladies, Pastors and Everyone Else

Mary was saved and Martha was lost, she had never chosen that one needful thing, and that is exactly what Jesus is illustrating here. It is the moral of the story. It is precisely the teaching that Christ is bringing forth in these five verses. Throughout Scripture we find a constant contrast taking place between a saved nature and an unsaved nature, NOT some kind of comparative analysis between two types of Christians, and that is no different in this account found in the Gospel of Luke, which is consistently teaching the way of salvation from Luke 9 to 20.

The account of Mary and Martha is certainly NOT about one believer spending her time in the Word of God, at the feet of Jesus, while another believer is busy serving the needs of the people around her, and is troubled over the matter of her sister not helping with the hospitality duties. This is not what the story is about, at all, though it is essentially always spun in that direction. The matter is deeper and spiritual. They were not both believers, only Mary was. This is clear from the interaction and what Jesus says to Martha, and further established by the rest of Scripture. This account is a contrast between a true believer and an unbeliever.

When a person is genuinely converted to Christ, their affections, desires, wants, and needs change. They become an entirely new creature in Christ Jesus, with ALL old things passed away. Not some old things; ALL old things. The saint has a new heart, new life, new nature.

The difference is seen in Col. 3:1-3,

"If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God."

Martha's affections were on things of the earth (making food, cleaning, serving guests, etc), while Mary's affections were set on things above (listening to Christ, His Word, following Him, etc). While the true believer can certainly have moments in their life where their affections are in disorder, Martha was missing the eternal priority altogether; she had not "*chosen that good part*," which is the "*one thing*" that "*is needful*:" while Mary had (Lk 10:42).

How do we know that Martha was not saved at this point? Mary is on her own when she comes to Christ in repentant faith and for redemption in Lk 7. When Jesus comes to visit their home (Luke 10:38-42) she continues to sit at His feet, in other words desiring to be fed with the bread of Scripture. At no point does Martha indicate a desire to feed on the eternal words of God rather than the temporal food for the belly; her desire was not to sit

at the feet of the Lord Jesus Christ and be a disciple of the Master (a follower of Christ), nor are we told of Martha's conversion anywhere up to this point. Her misplaced affections confirms her fleshly precedence:

"But Martha was cumbered about much serving, and came to him, and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone? bid her therefore that she help me. And Jesus answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things:"

How do we know Mary is saved at this point? Scripture gives us her testimony of conversion in another place, and it is truly remarkable, which we will explore next point. But there are further reasons, found right in this passage, v. 39, *"And she [Martha] had a sister called Mary, which also sat at Jesus' feet, and heard his word."* Mary was a disciple of the Lord sitting at her Lord's feet, but v. 39 however on its own is not conclusive evidence of salvation for many are false disciples/believers (see Jn. 2:23-24; 6:60-66; 8:30-59; 1 Jn 2:23) — but what makes her love for and allegiance to Christ genuine and her salvation clear in this passage is the truth that she *"heard his word,"* i.e., she had *"ears to hear,"* and all that have ears to hear and eyes to see, have a heart that understands and is converted (Matt 13:15).

And Jesus knows the heart and He knows who His sheep are for they hear His voice and follow Him, meaning they obey Him and keep His words, expressed in many places throughout Scripture including Jn 10:2-5, 27:

"But he that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep. To him the porter openeth; and the sheep hear his voice: and he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out. And when he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him: for they know his voice. And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers . . . My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me:"

True believers hear Gods Word but false-fake "believers," though they pretend to "hear" Gods Word, actually do not hear the truth because they desire not to understand it in their heart, for they are spiritually dead and the Spirit of God, the Teacher of truth, does not dwell in their inner man, evident by their not keeping God's Word but following after the lusts of their own flesh (e.g., neo-evangelicalism with its love for the world and the flesh, and hatred for godly and holy biblical standards, religious groups not following and teaching the doctrines of Christ in truth, but corrupting and wresting truth to fit their pogroms and agendas), exemplified in many places but John 8 comes to mind:

"Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. . . . Verily, vefrily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. . . . If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed. Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me. Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word. . . . He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God."
(vv. 31-36, 42-43, 47)

Yet these very same people were pretending to be "believers" (Jn 8:30-31), but Jesus exposed their false and deceptive position.

But there is even further proof in the text of Lk 10, v. 42, which in fact is really the central point of this dialogue between Jesus and Martha, Christ confirming the spiritual birth of Mary:

"But one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her."

Mary chose that good part, and it can never be taken away from her. What is that needful thing and good part that Mary had chosen and anxious and troubled Martha did not have? Well it could only be one thing, considering the contrast that is being made with Martha's fleshly behaviour. It is to be a follower, disciple of Christ, which occurs through the new birth. So the "*good part*" is to be born again, the very best and most needful part of life, for all true believers are disciples and followers of Christ (in Scripture, [the call to discipleship, to follow Christ, is a call to salvation](#)), and that is indeed very "*needful*"!, known better by the Lord than anyone. This is CLEARLY and obviously the reference being made here. Salvation. It can only refer to the new birth, nothing else could be defined by these terms. Mary's hunger and thirst after God's truth is evident, while the same is not occurring with Martha, whose affections are misplaced given the magnitude of the situation. She was "*careful [anxious] and troubled about many things,*" for she could not cast her cares upon the Lord whom she did not know. She did not sit at His feed because she had never surrendered to Him.

It is crucial to understand that in the days of Christ's earthly sojourn, in the earthly incarnation of the Son of man, to be a true disciple and follower of Christ meant to actually physically follow Him and be with Him. This is what was expected of true born again believers -- they came to Him (Matt 11:28-30) and they followed Him (Mk 1:14-20; Lk 5:27-32; etc), everyone, from the demoniac of the Gadarenes (Lk 8:38-39) to the blind man healed (Lk 18:41-43), but those that were false believers stopped following Him (cf. Jn 6:60-66). Mary was a true believer of Christ, and we know this by the recorded testimony of her salvation (Jn 7). Martha was not a true believer of Christ, evident by her absence of following Christ. This is how things were in Lk 10:38-42.

Jesus was calling Martha to salvation, exposing her rejection of Christ and His way (reasons we are not told why) by way of contrast with her sister, who was saved, but that doesn't mean that she didn't have a desire to be with Jesus and to know Him. She did, there is no doubt about it. It was Martha after all that had "*received him into her house*" (Lk 10:38). Later after Lazarus has died and Jesus is approaching Bethany, she is the one that runs out to meet Him, like the unregenerate prodigal son running to see his Father and repent of his sin and love of self, in [The Parable of Two Sons Who Hated Their Father \(Luke 15\)](#). She undoubtedly believed that Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh, that He was the Messiah, but an intellectual knowledge of the gospel and even everything in Scripture is not enough for the new birth. Faith must be based and built upon repentance or its no true faith at all. It'll merely exhibit itself as a dead faith and a feigned faith, stony or thorny or wayward faith.

God does not seek empty, vain, self-centred and dead religious faith that cleanses the externality of the house and in the process emptying it of demons, but never genuinely repents and surrenders to Christ as Lord and Saviour, whose end "*is worse than the first.*" (Lk 11:24-26).

How did we get to this point in time in Lk 10?

The Conversion of Mary

The wonderful account of a very repentant sinful woman that comes to Jesus Christ in godly sorrow and deep contrition in Lk 7:36-50, is Mary. This is the point of her dramatic conversion (but aren't all conversions dramatic!) where both repentance and faith are plainly demonstrated by this woman, who would go on to tell her sister Martha about the Great Saviour that had saved her wretched soul. It is worthy to print the entire text, of quite possibly the greatest believer in NT Scripture (based upon a very important [Biblical truth](#), which is Mary):

"And one of the Pharisees desired him that he would eat with him. And he went into the Pharisee's house, and sat down to meat. [37] And, behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment, [38] And stood at his feet behind him weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment. [39] Now when the Pharisee which had bidden him saw it, he spake within himself, saying, This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him: for she is a sinner. [40] And Jesus answering said unto him, Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee. And he saith, Master, say on. [41] There was a certain creditor which had two debtors: the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty. [42] And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell me therefore, which of them will love him most? [43] Simon answered and said, I suppose that he, to whom he forgave most. And he said unto him, Thou hast rightly judged. [44] And he turned to the woman, and said unto Simon, Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath washed my feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head. [45] Thou gavest me no kiss: but this woman since the time I came in hath not ceased to kiss my feet. [46] My head with oil thou didst not anoint: but this woman hath anointed my feet with ointment. [47] Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little. [48] And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven. [49] And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves, Who is this that forgiveth sins also? [50] And he said to the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace."

First of all, how do we know that this is Mary the sister to Martha and Lazarus, since at least five different Mary's are present in the Bible? Because Jesus tells us so in Jn 11:1-2,

"Now a certain man was sick, named Lazarus, of Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha. (It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick.)"

Secondly, this is what repentance looks like in its fullness, where all three faculties of man are involved (and always must all three faculties be present for it to be true and genuine): the mind, the volition, and the emotion. Mary exhibited the repentance that saves.

Thirdly, Mary was a great sinner, indicating that she very likely was a harlot, though Scripture tells us not. She was converted to Christ in the house of Simon the Pharisee (which may well have been the father of Judas Iscariot, the betrayer of the Lord) and sat at His feet because she loved Him and followed Him.

But the Story Thankfully Doesn't End with Lk 10:42 — The Conversion of Martha

"One thing is needful."

In Lk 10 Jesus was calling Martha to salvation, reproving her false gospel of self-fulfilment, exposing her rejection of Christ and His way, uncovering her unrepentant and non-surrendered estate, but this doesn't mean she didn't have a desire to be around Jesus and to know Him. She did, there is no doubt about it. It was Martha after all that had "*received him into her house.*" (Lk 10:38). Later after Lazarus has died and Jesus is approaching Bethany, she is the one that runs out to meet Him, in similitude to the unregenerate prodigal son.

We know that Martha was certainly interested in the things of God and in salvation, and that is where the path to salvation starts. It must begin there. We see proof of this by the fact that it was Martha that invited Jesus into their home for this dialogue to take place:

"Now it came to pass, as they went, that he entered into a certain village: and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house." (v. 38)

It was also Martha that would run to meet Jesus as He approached Bethany after Lazarus died, while Mary remained in the home in sorrow.

It is here that Martha comes to know Jesus Christ as her personal Lord and Saviour, in Jn. 11:20-27. Consider Martha's salvation testimony:

"Then Martha, as soon as she heard that Jesus was coming, went and met him: but Mary sat still in the house. [21] Then said Martha unto Jesus, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. [22] But I know, that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee. [23] Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again. [24] Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day. [25] Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: [26] And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this? [27] She saith unto him, Yea, Lord: I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world."

Jesus confirmed Lazarus' salvation by guaranteeing his resurrection (v. 23), using that as His foundation to reach Martha's heart, peaching His gospel that produces eternal life and the passing of death forever (vv. 25-26), which, by all implications was Martha's struggle with coming to faith, the new birth:

"Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this?" (Jn 11:25-26)

At the preaching of His gospel by God the Son, the Word of God like a sword to Martha's heart exposing her infidelity and denial of Christ (Heb 4:12), brought God's Spirit convicting, reproving, counselling, confronting her infidelity with frank sharpness: "*Believest thou this?*" The Son of God, the giver of life and eternal life, presents the question that all sinners must come to acknowledge and acquiesce, if they seek to be saved. Martha at long last came to the salvation knowledge and fear of God that only can

save a sinner (Pr 1:20-32), confessing with her mouth the Lord Jesus Christ simultaneously to believing in her repentant heart that He indeed was the long awaited Messiah, "*She saith unto him, Yea, Lord: I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world.*" (Jn 11:27).

And so we have one of the greatest testimonies in Scripture, but it wasn't always like that. It took some time for Martha to come to repentant faith, and the death of her brother whom her and Mary loved dearly, as his Saviour did. We note importantly that Martha's salvation did not come *after* Christ brought Lazarus back to life, but *before*, where she finally submitted herself to the King of kings, longing to have what her dear brother and sister already possessed.

Conclusion

For me, this family, namely the two girls because we do not know the circumstances behind Lazarus's salvation, yet not the two sisters only, is one of the most powerful testimonies of salvation in all of Scripture. A lot of Scripture space is given to them, and for good purpose. Both repentant sinners, one fled to Christ in great sorrow and regret for her great wickedness and sinfulness, while the other fled to Christ in her infidelity.

EVERY women (and men for that matter, but especially women because it pertains to women specifically), ought to examine themselves and carefully scrutinize the desires of her heart and where it sits in these two scenarios of Lk 10:38-42, and bearing in mind that you cannot fool God: 1) your immediate or primary heart's desire is to sit at the feet of Christ, to be fed and watered by Him, not in a false deceptive manner but truly and genuinely, or 2) your immediate or primary heart's desire is to serve and feed Him and other company. The first response does **not** mean a neglect of one's duties to feed one's children or spouse, but rather given the remarkable opportunity to host the Lord Jesus Christ, what would be your first instinct and will? You can't make it up. You might be able to fool man, those around you, but you cannot fool God. You are who you are based upon a permanent position of being in-Christ or out-of-Christ, not both. You are either the natural man or the spiritual man, not both. You do not and cannot become someone by feigning a nature that isn't genuinely converted and changed. You cannot do this any more than the leopard change his spots, or a man his stature.

Martha was lost, unsaved, unregenerate, hence why she was cumbered about and anxious with fleshly serving (making food, serving her guests) which was troubling her soul, while Mary was truly converted hence why she sat at Jesus's feet and was more interested in hearing the Word of God than pursuing fleshly accolades. Mary had been converted in Lk 7:36-50 while Martha was unsaved in our text, only to be converted later in Jn 11:25-27.

Next time someone preaches a sermon on Mary and Martha and treats them as two believers, correct them or direct them to this article. When someone asks whether you are a Mary or a Martha, consider the question based upon the truth of the passage, and not what majority of preachers falsely teach, or what commentaries bare forth; rather speak the truth of what Christ is genuinely teaching in Lk 10:38-42.