I am thoroughly enjoying this meeting, and appreciate the interest that is being manifested by all of you. I have a text in mind that occurred to me during the day in connection with some things I wanted to say tonight. Paul wrote Titus in something like the same manner that he did Timothy. He said, "But speak thou the things which befit sound doctrine; that aged men be temperate, grave, sober-minded, sound in faith, in love, in patience: that aged women likewise . . . . . . . . . . . . train the younger women . . . . the younger men likewise. exhort . . . . in all things showing thyself an example . . . . in thy doctrine uncorruptness, gravity, sound speech."

All that is worthwhile in life and in religion has to do with sound doctrine. When I'm talking about the problems that confront the church, it is mighty hard for me to get away from the subject of the preaching. There are other problems, but this preaching problem is so tremendously important, and so much depends on it, that my observation and my conviction from what I read and know about the church, and about the divine plan, are that just about all the excellencies a church can manifest, and about all the problems it can develop, have to do with the kind of preaching it receives, and the kind of preacher it depends on. In fact, church troubles are not particularly hard to diagnose. I never have been too much impressed by a specialist in the church along certain lines. Any man who loves the church and knows what it is, and knows the divine plan, is a pretty good judge of what is the matter with a church. It reminds me of the story of a fellow who had a terrible ringing in his ears, and his eyes poached out. He went to see a physician, who told him to consult an eye, ear, nose and throat doctor. He told him it was his tonsils, and he took his tonsils out. But he still had the same trouble. He then went to a dentist. The dentist told him his teeth needed to come out, and he took his teeth out. But that didn't help him any. He then went to a surgeon who told him it was his appendix, and they removed his appendix; but when he got out of the hospital the trouble recurred. Having lost his teeth and tonsils and his appendix, he finally went to see a specialist who told him that he had only a short
time to live, possibly three or four months. The fellow said, in that case, he was going to have a good time, doing some things he had wanted to do all his life. He went downtown and bought him a $350.00 suit of clothes, and ordered a dozen expensive made-to-measure shirts. Taking his measurements, the tailor said sleeves thirty-three inches, so many inches around the waist, and a 16 collar. And the man said, “No, 15,” The tailor said, “The tape says 16.” The man said, “I know what size collar I wear. I’ve been wearing them for years, size ‘15.” The tailor said, “All right, 15 it is, but you just wear size 15 awhile, and your ears will ring and your eyes will be bug out!”

After all, nearly anybody who knows the Bible, and knows the divine plan, can take the measure of a church and know just about what is the matter with it.

I want to call attention to some of these principles again, along the line of preaching.

When I note in the Bible the apostasy of Israel, find that nation in a terrible state, see how it started, recall the divine promises and the divine laws, think of all the safeguards that nation had, and then in the days of the prophets find it in such a bad way, we know how it happened. They got dissatisfied with God’s plan, and decided that they wanted to be like the nations around them. They desired to imitate the government and the customs of these tribes of peoples about them. They wanted a king. Samuel said it was not God’s will that they have a king. They said, “We will have a king; we’ll be like the nations around us.” God said, “Let them have a king.” The prophets later charged that they had turned away from the fountain of living water and had hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns that can hold no water.” They turned away from the divine plan, turned away from God appointed teachers, going after strange traditions, strange ways and strange men. The matter of fact is—the teachers they had were of their own selection.

In reading the prophets rebuke of the people and the teachers, among other things I read this: “I have heard what the prophets said, that prophesy lies in my name, saying, I have dreamed, I have dreamed. How long shall this be in the heart of the prophets that prophesy lies? Yea, they are prophets of the deceit of their own heart.” Regarding them the prophet further says: “I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they have prophesied.” Again, “the prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. Is not my word a fire and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces? Therefore, behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that steal my words everyone from his neighbor.”

The principle is that God spoke to the fathers by the prophets, he sent the prophets to them; but we know he speaks to us through his Son. Then the spoken message of the Son was made known through preaching. It was God’s good pleasure through the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. Faithful preachers and faithful preaching make the will of God known to the people. A preacher is not a sounding board for public opinion, neither is it his business to find out what people want, then give it to them. Rather in the spirit that the apostle answered some of his critics in the fourth chapter of I Corinthians, when he was under fire, let preachers now defend sound doctrine even under criticism. Paul defended himself personally, and did it sometimes in (bitter, sarcastic) language. I remarked sometime ago, when I was reading some things that Paul said in answer to criticisms that were made against him, that it appeared that Paul wasn’t too much nicer than some of the rest of us. He didn’t have the non-combatant, sweet-spirited attitude that has become so common, especially in connection with compromise. The only reason that he defended himself was because this personal criticism was related to the welfare of
the cause of Christ. In answering his critics, he said, "With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you or of man's judgment, for I know nothing against myself, yet I am not hereby justified, but he that judgeth me is the Lord. It is required in stewards that a man be found faithful." He said, "I am a steward of the mysteries of God." A steward for whom? He was the Lord's steward. A debt of responsibility from the Lord had been laid upon him, and whether you criticize me or justify me, or whether I justify myself, means absolutely nothing. The only thing that counts is — am I accounted by the Lord faithful as a steward. In other words, have I attended to his business, made his will known. Have I done what he commissioned me to do? That is the only thing that matters, the only thing that counts. Writing to the Thessalonians he said: "When ye received from us the word of the message, even the word of God, you accepted it not as the word of man, but as the word of God, which indeed it is." And it is a preacher's business to preach the word of God. If he doesn't do it, he may please men, but Paul said if he were still pleasing men, he would not be a servant of Christ. Now if preaching the truth and being loyal to it pleases some people, that's fine—but if it takes compromise, if it takes surrender of the truth to please people, the man who does it is a traitor in the sight of God.

Some rather amusing incidents have happened in my experience and under my observation. I heard my father tell about closing a sermon one evening, and a very daintily dressed woman came prissing down the aisle. She looked up at my father, and said, "Brother Wallace, that was a very fine sermon of its kind," but Paul said if he were still pleasing men, he would not be a servant of Christ. Now if preaching the truth and being loyal to it pleases some people, that's fine—but if it takes compromise, if it takes surrender of the truth to please people, the man who does it is a traitor in the sight of God.
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said, “Brother Blank, I want to close this meeting.” He said, “You’re not going to do anything of the kind, we’re getting just exactly what we need, and you’re going to stay and fight it out, and I’m going to back you up.” Well, that evening I preached on “Contending For The Bible Faith,” and I asked to borrow a mourner’s bench from the Methodists to use on some of the brethren there who couldn’t stand to hear the gospel preached. The Methodists and the Baptists were enjoying it, but the brethren just couldn’t stand it!

I know the preacher is not running the church, he is not the boss of things, and I don’t like the idea at all of “clergy and laity,” but I’m telling you that a strong eldership, strong deacons, strong teachers in the church, men and women of faith and dependability in every part of the work, depend on the right kind of preaching. It is fundamental. Neutral preaching doesn’t recognize trends and meet them. We need a lot of preventative preaching. When an issue arises a preacher is supposed to know enough about the Bible, enough about the divine plan, that he can detect tendencies that threaten the church. Paul told the elders of the church at Cephus, “Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood. I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them.” When some heretical teaching comes up, a preacher ought to be able to recognize it and do a lot of preaching to prevent a lot of harm being done. You don’t have to wait until a house is half burned down to call the fire department.

This preaching business is an important proposition. That thing I made reference to all last evening—that we don’t like doctrinal preaching. I mean the Bible, enough about the divine plan, that he can detect tendencies that threaten the church. I’m telling you that a strong eldership, strong deacons, strong teachers in the church, men and women of faith and dependability in every part of the work, depend on the right kind of preaching. It is fundamental. Neutral preaching doesn’t recognize trends and meet them. We need a lot of preventative preaching. When an issue arises a preacher is supposed to know enough about the Bible, enough about the divine plan, that he can detect tendencies that threaten the church. Paul told the elders of the church at Cephus, “Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood. I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them.” When some heretical teaching comes up, a preacher ought to be able to recognize it and do a lot of preaching to prevent a lot of harm being done. You don’t have to wait until a house is half burned down to call the fire department.

This preaching business is an important proposition. That thing I made reference to all last evening—that we don’t like doctrinal preaching. Now it would be fine if somebody would say I do not like false doctrinal preaching. I guess that’s what they would say they mean, but it isn’t what they say. “Take heed to thyself and to thy doctrine” — “preach the word,” — “prove, reprove, exhort, with all long suffering and doctrine.” Did you ever hear anybody say, ‘I don’t like a teaching sermon’? The word doctrine is synonymous with teaching, comes from the same word. That’s what it really means. Nobody ought to like sectarian doctrines. Nobody ought to like false doctrines, denominational doctrines, not found in the Bible. All false teaching is speculative in its nature, but everything that the Bible says about everything that it discusses, comes in the realm of doctrine.

“They continued steadfastly in the apostles’ doctrine.” Preach a sermon on honesty, on prayer, on giving or on spirituality, and they say that is not doctrine. But preach a sermon on baptism, and they say that is doctrine. What the Bible says about baptism, what the Bible says about the kingdom and the establishment of the church, old and new covenants, or anything else that it discusses, including maintaining good works, is strictly doctrinal. You don’t find that distinction between the doctrinal and the practical; doctrinal things are practical, and practical things are doctrinal in New Testament.

I know it is pretty hard to always measure up to these high standards of courage in preaching. Nobody who hasn’t preached, and hasn’t been under pressure, knows how hard the pressure is sometimes to let down and detour around some unpleasant truths, under some circumstances. Why, I’ve been under pressure. I remember one time I preached a sermon on “What Must I Do to Be Saved.” Yes, I preach sermons like that. A preacher told me that he hadn’t preached a sermon on the establishment of the church in ten years. He wasn’t doing his duty. Anyway, I preached a sermon on “What Must I Do to Be Saved,” and a woman (she was a pretty thing) came right down the aisle, and she said to me, “I understood you to say that people had to be baptized in order to be saved.” I said, Peter said, “Repent ye, and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins”. She said, ‘Yes, but I know some mighty good people.”... “Wait a minute, here is what Peter said,” and I read it to her again. ‘Well, but what about all these pious”... “Wait a minute, let’s get back to the text.” Then she’d take a lounge on to some sort of a contention, and I would pull her right back to the text. You know, the way she looked at me, I almost wished Peter hadn’t said it! But he did, it is there in plain language. You know what happened? Her eyes flashed, and she stamped her foot, and she said, “I know Peter said it, but I don’t believe it.” That was what was the matter with her all the time. I had to make her mad before she would acknowledge it. A preacher must preach the truth, and he must be urgent about these things.

THE TREND TOWARD PROFESSIONAL PREACHING

Another trend in preachers, and maybe it is past the trend stage and has become a real problem—is professional preaching, professionalism in preaching. I have watched these trends a good long time. Everybody has heard about J. N. Armstrong and some of his ideas. He was one of the leaders of so-called “Christian Education” for many years. Shortly before he died,
in a heart to heart talk with W. W. Oney, he said that he was disillusioned and disappointed. Things were not going as he meant for them to go. It never was his idea, he said, to develop an institution that would manufacture and turn out professional preachers. His idea, he said, of Christian education, referring to the matter of schools, was to give young men and young women in the church and out of it, a liberal education in a Christian atmosphere to make men and women out of them, to develop Christian character, so that whatever his calling he'd be dependable and honest as a business man; and if it turned out that he wanted to be a preacher, all right, he was developed in character, then let them do whatever they were capable of doing. But he said that the colleges are turning out a class of professional preachers. And professional preachers are a good deal like professional politicians, they don't always lead, they follow. They sometimes, and often, put their ear to the ground to find out what people want, and give them what they want. You know, there is a professionalism about it that takes away that individual reservedness of character that has courage and persistence and fearlessness as its main characteristics. A man who preaches the gospel 'because he loves it and because he loves the church, will preach it regardless of circumstances. If he is paid he will preach it, and if he is not paid he will preach it anyhow.

You can hear today in some of our institutions, the 'boys on the campus talking about when they can get out and take charge of some church. Professionalism in preaching. That doesn't mean that a man who preaches ought not to be prepared, ought not to be educated, and all that sort of thing: but you can take a professionally minded young man, put him through college and put him through "seminary" — we call ours "departments of religion" — but you can put him through, put a scissor tailed coat on him, give him as many degrees as a thermometer, turn him loose, and there'll be some "ignoramus" rise right out from behind a bush somewhere, out in the country, and preach circles all around him. And that doesn't mean that education is a bad thing, it just simply means that there is something to preaching that you can't get unless you know the Book, unless you love the Lord, and unless you feel a good deal like Paul did when he said, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel." If a man feels that way about it, he is not going to be neutral, he is not going to lag when it comes to taking a stand on an issue that involves the welfare of the church. He is not going to be reticent and backward when it comes to speaking out on what the Bible says. He can be reasoned with, but he can't be bulldogged into compromise.

THE INSTITUTIONAL PROBLEM

80 much on that preaching proposition. It is closely connected with another subject. We hear the word a good deal today, it is not a new word, it's the word institutionalism. By the time I tell you what some of the college presidents have said, what some of the heads of institutions have said, you will be warned against the trends of institutionalism. Well, what does that mean, what are the dangers of institutionalism?

A good woman said to me a while back, what's the matter with institutions? Institutions are doing a lot of good, why are you so worried about institutions? Well, suppose we go right back to fundamentals. We subscribe to the scriptural statement: "If any man speak, let him speak as it were the oracles of God;" otherwise worded: 'Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent." We propose to give chapter and verse for what we believe and what we teach in religion. We talk a great deal about the restoration of the New Testament order. I believe that the Bible is inspired and that the church is divine, and that Christianity has a divine origin, and all that. Well, what do I find in the New Testament? There is no need for us going out here preaching to the world that we stick to the New Testament if we can't give chapter and verse for what we believe and what we practice. What do we find in the New Testament? The New Testament order is one of the simplest things in the world. I find three things in the New Testament order. I find the individual Christian, made so by hearing and accepting the gospel. I find the local congregations of these Christians, and I find the body of Christ, the church, including all of them. There is the New Testament order, and you can't find anything else outside of it. The church, the body of Christ, including all Christians. Here is a proposition that will stand any kind of scrutiny. The church is the body of Christ and it includes all the people of God, and whatever it takes to make a man a Christian, it takes that, all that and nothing but that to make him a member of the church. And the only organization known in the New Testament is the local congregation of Christians.

The word church is used in two senses in the New Testament. You find the church referring to those that meet together to worship on the Lord's day. Sometimes you speak of the church in somebody's house, you find the term church limited by some geographic expresion, like the church of God at Corinth — and that included
all the people of God in that place. The church in its broadest sense 'that Jesus said he would build, and which God made him the head of when he raised him from the dead, is the entire body of Christ, including all Christians. It has no ecclesiastical organization, on earth, no pope, no councils, no ecclesiastical machinery, no organization of a national, state or county character, nothing. Of the kind, but each church is independent of every other church. Christ set us a perfect standard for the individual life. Not all of us measure up to it perfectly, but there is a perfect standard. The teaching of the New Testament sets up a perfect standard for the church, in the local, independent congregations; sets forth its mission, sets forth its duty, and gives a good many examples of it.

Well, (what's the matter with an institution? Any institution in religion that is bigger than the local church and smaller than the entire body of Christ is unscriptural 'and anti-scriptural, as far as the matter goes. I have had people ask me what is the matter with a denomination? Well, aside from a lot of things that I could point out that is the matter with them, there is this. Is this denomination bigger than a local congregation of disciples as described in the New Testament? Yes. Well, does it include all Christians? No. Could a man be a Christian and not be a member of it? Yes. All right, it is smaller than the entire body of Christ, and it is bigger than a local church. Well, it is not the church in any sense. God ordained that the New Testament church do its work as local congregations, and there isn't anything in the way of an institution or an organization bigger than the local congregation with its elders.

What is the mission of the church? It's to preach the gospel. That's what we call "missionary." And I'll have a lot to say about this missionary problem, that's one of our problems. That will have to come later. The work of the 'church then is to preach the gospel, it is missionary. Further, it is benevolent, to look after the needs of the poor. I won't make a separate item of self-edification, which would possibly come under the first heading, but let's just take this for the time being, to preach the gospel and look after the needs of the poor. The whole world was evangelized in a generation. Paul said that every nation under heaven had heard the gospel. They 'didn't have any missionary societies, they didn't have any ecclesiastical set-ups, they didn't have any organization of 'any kind bigger than the local church and smaller than the entire body of Christ. The body of Christ was bound together as members, not by an earthly organization, but Christ as the head, on the common ground of faith and loyalty to Him among the members of the body within the local church. It's the business of a church — now get it, and I am on safe ground here — it's the business of a church to select it's own field of activity; to choose its own workers, then to raise its own money, and spend it and supervise it, and attend to its own affairs without any dictation or uninvited advice from anybody.

Now, the church might not be composed of hundreds of members, it might be rather small and unimpressive from a worldly point of view, but if it is a church of Jesus Christ, and has the scriptural qualifications of a congregation, if all the preachers in the church, and all the elders were to come together in a meeting and dictate to that church what it should do, and go over there With a program and tell that church how to conduct its affairs, it would not only be the privilege, but it would be the duty of that congregation to tell them exactly where to head in.

What do I mean by institutionalism? I mean anything in the way of an organization that comes between the church and its appointed work. A church has no right to turn its obligations and responsibilities over to any kind of an institution. Now that's New Testament teaching. Twenty-five years ago, forty years ago, why, we would have found absolutely no opposition to these principles except from the progressives. You know they emphasized the need of preaching the gospel, and emphasized the insufficiency of the church to preach the gospel, and said we had to have some missionary societies. Of course, they were just voluntary organizations through which the churches developed until the first thing we knew they were dictating to all the churches. And when we called attention to the fact that they would and could dictate to the churches when they got bigger, they just ridiculed the idea. The idea of a society dictating to the church! The churches could do as they pleased. But it wasn't many years until these organizations had grown to such huge proportions and had assumed such power, that they could dictate to the preachers as well as to the congregations, their policies and everything else and the churches became slaves to the organization — the missionary society — and a denomination was born. That's the Christian church today. It is just as modernistic as the Episcopal, the Presbyterian or the Methodist, and more so in some respects. We, of course, were loyal, and still are. We are loud, if not noisy. We wouldn't do anything unscriptural. Well, it was perfectly scriptural and perfectly right for men who were educationally minded, as a private enterprise, to establish a school, when they looked around and saw how the state schools would undermine the influ-
ences of the home, and all that. We want to build schools where Christian instructors teach righteous principles, teach the Bible, and help preserve the influences of the home. The school would be an adjunct of or an auxiliary to the home. Fine. Everybody admitted their right to do it. But, some of these schools were doorstep babes and cried to be adopted by the churches.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION AND THE CHURCH

You know a lot of members of the church now think that when we talked about Christian education we have to be talking about a “Christian college.” I began to get my eyes open wider on this point when an elder of the church where I was preaching said to me: “Brother Wallace, I have something here that I want to ask you about; I don’t understand it; I don’t know what’s the matter; it puzzles me.” I said, “What is it?” He said, “I’ve got a questionnaire from Abilene Christian College.” I looked at it, this questionnaire sent by this college to the churches of this state, and they wanted a file on the resources and activities of every church in the state, and all of its members. What’s your weekly contribution? How much missionary work? What’s the attitude of your members toward Christian education? How big is your budget? What is your property worth? I said to this elder, that is none of their business, put that thing in the waste basket. Let them run their business, and you run yours. An institution can be private as an auxiliary to the home, but when they began to get statistics from all the churches as to their property, their attitude, their budget and their this and their that, and the other, including their preachers and their members it ceases to be a private institution and becomes the headquarters of all the churches. In other words, when a college attends to its business and lets the churches alone, it is a legitimate institution. The churches as such are not only not obligated to, they have no right to support it. It is not the church’s business to support human institutions, or to work through their boards and organizations. Roy E. Cogdill can operate a publishing company, take in printing, sell commercial supplies, books, bibles, and publish a paper, if he wants to; the Firm Foundation and others can do the same, but the church is not in that business. It is the church’s business to preach the gospel and look after the needs of the poor, and institutions that propose to take over the work of the church, having the church to operate and act through the boards of their organizations are infringing on and violating these sacred principles, and the church that does so, is doing an unscriptural thing.

Digression did not spring from missionary so-
A SPECTACULAR TOUR AND AN UNScriptURAL TREND

Brother J. D. Tant repeatedly emphasized in his writing, "Brethren, we are drifting". The tense of the verb in his statement can now well be changed. Almost every day something gives emphasis to the fact that we have drifted. An example of this fact can well be seen in some modern tendencies in what many brethren describe as “missionary” work and methods.

In the first place there is no such thing in the New Testament as a “missionary.” Gospel preachers in the New Testament were evangelists whether in Asia, Africa, Judea or Europe, and that is all we need today. “Missionary work” so-called has given rise to some practices and expressions that are definitely the “language of Ashdod” instead of “sound words” of New Testament origin.

We have tolerated among us in ‘missionary” activity and “Sunday School” promotion a work that borders on if not altogether coinciding in principle with women preaching. Addressing a mixed group of church members on a “missionary program” or about Sunday School comes mighty near to preaching to such an assembly about something else and the New Testament prohibits women doing that. It is a mighty convenient door through which to introduce the other. There is such a close margin between addressing such a mixed assembly on the importance of teaching the Word of God to either the heathen or a Sunday School class and actually teaching the word of God to such an assembly, that for one I cannot see the distinction.

Recently one of our colleges brought one of “our missionaries” all the way from Germany by plane to make a speech on their “Summer Lecture Program.” That lecture program, summer or winter, amounts to holding a meeting, or as sectarianists commonly say, and some of the brethren sometimes, a “preaching mission”. Of course the schools are not trying to preach the gospel or “sponsor missionaries”, but both of these are being done by nearly a 11 of our schools. Yes I have had a part a time or two in the past, in such a ‘lectureship’, but the temptation to do so again in the future has been entirely removed by my opposition to the schools ibecoming “church institutions” through being given a place in the “budget of the church”. Whenever you raise the voice of criticism against any of “our schools” you are immediately removed from the roll of eligibles for use by the schools in any capacity.

I came near being tempted again last year, according to reliable informtion. One Of “Our school” presidents saved me though when the senior class voted to a tie between Brother A. R. Holton and me to preach the "Baccalaur-
elders, or an elder of such a congregation? Is the day coming when a few of the larger churches among us will direct the work of the whole brotherhood? Are we not on our way? One church "sponsors" the work in Europe and another in Asia, and smaller churches either operate through them or have no part in such a highly, promoted spectacular program. Such glamorous publicity would inspire almost any church to participate and would turn those who are engaged in other fields, perhaps just as worthy, from the good they are doing in order to have a part in a thing as big as that.

Do you say I am "seeing things”? Well, I am, but Brother, they are real and don’t forget it.

An announcement comes from a congregation in a nearby city that they have been "designated" by the "sponsoring" church as the place in south Texas where the brethren are called upon to gather in and hear the "Missionary’s" report. I sort of read between the lines the request, "and don’t forget your pocket-books."

What right does one church have to "designate" — that is their term — another church for anything? They ran an ad in the city paper announcing the "Missionary's" speech, and from that ad I learned that he was even bigger than I had realized. They advertised him as the "supervisor of the church of Christ missionary program in Germany". Of course many of us learned that during a good while ago not to be surprised at any kind of announcement coming from that particular church. The only thing that surprised me about it was that they had condescended to be "designated" instead of being the "designators".

A peculiar thing in this connection is that the "sponsoring" church reached across the state and "designated" a church that is out of fellowship with and not recognized by the other congregations of the city. Maybe these other congregations in this area — some of them almost as large and many of them older than the one designated — maybe they just would not be "designated." What is it coming to? The Lord only knows. Do you say, "Pshaw! you are having hallucinations"? Well I imagine that when the congregations of Antioch, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome, and Constantinople were spreading their control over the adjacent churches and voices were raised in protest against their assumption of power, there were those who mockingly said, "Pshaw! you are having hallucinations. You are just jealous. You are just trying to be destructive and make trouble. You are just trying to gain a reputation as a defender and a guardian of the faith by criticizing the work of others". But trouble didn't need to be made. They already had it and so do we. There is scarcely a thing about the whole picture that manifests any indication of loyalty and respect for the simple truth.

R. E. C.

PS. I have just discovered that I have written a whole article without calling the names of those about whom I have written. I should deserve some commendation from some severe critics for that unless they are just critics of criticism in general. If you don’t know the parties described you shouldn’t have any trouble finding out who they are.

R. E. C.

BROTHER BREWER GETS PERSONAL IN THE ADVOCATE

Some weeks ago In the Gospel Advocate appeared an article by G. C. Brewer in which he gave expression to some of his feelings toward Brother W. W. Otey and incidentally toward me. Were it not for some other matters in connection with some things mentioned in the article, I would have passed it by. Brother Brewer has shown an ugly attitude toward him, but I am sure the personal angle does not bother Bro. Otey any more than it bothers the rest of us.

Abraham Lincoln once said, "If I were to stop to read, much less try to answer all the false accusations and uncomplimentary things said against me, I would not have time for anything else, I decided long ago to do the best I can to do right. If I in this I succeed, nothing else matters, and if in this I fail, ten angels swearing I was right would not make any difference."

Brother W. W. Otey is a fine example of this attitude. I have known him for 23 years and he has been an encouragement and help to me. In spite of his years his mind is clear and he is abundantly able to take care of himself with G. C. Brewer on any matter in my judgment.

There is at least one glaring inconsistency in Bro. Brewer’s article as is most often the case. He is the Bro. Brewer of “I did and I didn’t” fame, and about the poorest explanation I have ever seen him make of his inconsistencies was made in his little pamphlet on the “college question” trying to get out from under the record in which he said “he did and he didn’t” advocate putting the college in the church budget. He has been on both sides of that question just as he has been on both sides of premillennialism and almost every other issue which has confronted the church. That should no longer need proof but it can be proven.

In his recent article he severely condemns Brother Otey for seriously giving him credit for the proposition Bro. W. L. Totty forwarded to Bro. Otey challenging him to meet Bro. Brewer
on the college question. Then he turns around and condemns me for not taking Bro. Totty seriously when he wrote me challenging me to do the same thing. It seems that Bro. Brewer challenges someone to meet Bro. Totty and Bro. Totty challenges someone to meet Bro. Brewer. I seriously doubt if either of them want to be taken seriously. Surely, Bro. Brewer had no right to so severely condemn Bro. Otey for doing so.

Brother Brewer has passed by two opportunities to debate the issue. He refused to meet Bro. Otey on propositions submitted by Bro. Otey and yet condemns Bro. Otey for refusing the propositions he submitted.

He completely ignored the suggestion of a written discussion with Bro. Cled Wallace to be published in the Bible Banner and Gospel Advocate (if they were willing) yet he thinks I should be made to take Bro. Totty seriously when he challenges me to come to the church where he preaches and debate Bro. Brewer, and upon his own propositions too.

As for Bro. Totty, yes, I have ignored his letters—about five long epistles—as I do all written to me of the same kind. He started the first one with a personal attack, accusing me of compromising on the premillennial issue—too ridiculous and false to be taken seriously—and I had never seen him but one time and never exchanged a letter with him in my life, if I remember correctly. I do not have the time or disposition to answer any of the mail I receive of that kind and don't even read the most of it after the first installment or two.

Besides I happen to know Bro. Totty is under obligation first to carry out his agreement to debate with Bro. Joseph Cox. He backed out of that one because he saw no need of holding it in his city since Bro. Cox didn't represent anybody there. Well, that one eliminates me too. Then Bro. Charlie Campbell offers to prove that Bro Totty also has changed his position on the college question, and I wouldn't be surprised if he did it.

I'm suggesting that Bro. Brewer and Totty promote one of Bro. Brewer's sham debates. They could either one take either side and both represent Bro. Totty's flock by a little side choosing. If they just must debate and don't want to debate the church-school question at the present, then I suggest Bro. Totty let Bro. Brewer affirm that people will be saved in all the denominations or—it is all right to call on sectarian preachers to pray in a worship service, or it is scripturally permissible under the law of expediency to allow Baptists to have fellowship with Churches of Christ by placing membership. I am pretty reliably informed Bro. Brewer advocates all three.

As for a debate on the "college in the church budget" question, if Bro. Totty and Bro. Brewer will pardon me for leaving them out, as well as myself, I would like to suggest that we have a written discussion to be published jointly in the Gospel Advocate and the Bible Banner, and we will make the Banner a weekly beginning with the first issue. The Advocate has aligned itself with that side of the issue by publishing everything written in favor of putting the college in the church budget and refusing to publish articles by men like R. L. Whiteside and C. R. Nichol. They shouldn't feel slandered when classified as advocating such a position. Let them select the man to represent that side of the issue, and we will let Bro. C. R. Nichol present the other side. Since Bro. N. B. Hardeman championed the supporting of a school out of the church treasury, and has always practiced that, he would be an excellent man to discuss it with Bro. Nichol. For the benefit of all the faint hearted we could agree to leave all personalities out and let the brotherhood have the benefit of a full and free discussion of this question. What will they say?

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING --
(Continued from Page 7)

education. That's the kind you find in the book.

All right, if a man's going to conduct a school, and if it's going to grow into an institution, and it's a private affair, an adjunct of the home, to be supported by individuals, just like a publishing house, a hardware store or something else, well and good; but it must not assume power and reach out to control churches. It must leave the church's business strictly alone. The church is the independent body of Christ, a divine organization, and we oppose the efforts to farm out its work to the colleges and turn it over to the institutions among us.

This is all I have time for tonight—but here's the principle in the main. The church is to raise its own money, select its own workers, its own field of activity, and conduct its own work under the oversight of its own elders, and it must not allow any institution, big or little, to come in to absorb its work, take charge of its budget and carry out its mission.

Next in this series is the missionary problem. Then, you know, the fellowship problem is bound to come in for discussion before this matter is over, and various other problems of local and general interest are going to be touched up. If I leave out anything before I get through, I don't aim to do it. I am going to bring in everything that I can think of during this series, and I will try to think of everything.
BROTHER WITTY’S CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST

JAMES W. ADAMS

"Chickens always come home to roost" was a familiar saying in my boyhood days in the section where I was reared. This is a truism which every person familiar with farm life can appreciate. The inspired apostle expresses the same truth in the use of a different figure of speech. He says, “Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.” Several months, in fact, more than a year ago, the editor of the Bible Banner handled me some correspondence from Brother Claud F. Witty of Detroit, Michigan, to deal with as I saw fit in the Bible Banner. Other things arose occasioning articles and nothing was done about the Witty correspondence. This same material has recently appeared in the Firm Foundation and reminded me of the necessity of some things being said with regard to it. Incidentally, things that have not yet been said. As you who have read recent Firm Foundations know, Brother Witty is at the “wailing wall” weeping over the defection of Brother Ernest Beam of Long Beach, California, who has to all intents and purposes become “digressive” with reference to the question of instrumental music in the worship. This article concerns itself with Brother Beam only incidentally, however. Brother Witty, past and present, is our concern. Our brother has reversed the Bible statement, “They that sow in tears shall reap in joy” (Ps. 126:5). Brother Witty has sown in jay, now he reaps in tears. His incubator product that was his pride and joy but a few years past has to his utter chagrin and grief come home to roost, and the full grown product is so monstrously ugly and palpably evil that he gasps in surprise and sob in dismay.

THE INCUBATOR PRODUCT

Some of my readers may not know what is meant when I speak of Brother Witty’s “incubator product.” Reference is made to the Witty-Murch “Unity Movement” that was hatched in Detroit less than a decade ago. This movement purported to be for the purpose of uniting the Christian Churches and the Churches of Christ. In view of the fact that the Christian Churches had no intention of giving up instrumental music in the worship, the movement actually was a wire walking experiment with the innovators. In this movement, Brother Witty took great pride and joy. It was effectively killed, however, by a vigorous fight made by the Bible Banner and its valiant editor. Others, of course, opposed the movement, but the brunt of the battle was borne by the Banner and its editor. This is not boasting. It is simply stating a fact known to the brotherhood generally.

TIME VINDICATES THE WARRIOR

The things that follow are written without the knowledge or consent of the man about whom they are written. They are the author’s sole responsibility, and he takes pleasure in saying them because they are true. The editor of the Bible Banner, Foy E. Wallace Jr., did not escape unscathed from the battle already mentioned. The Unity Movement promoters and sympathizers descended upon him en masse with their barbed weapons of fury. To no avail they attacked him. He stood his ground and fought and won. Though his enemies were legion and his critics on every hand, he waged his battle unto victory. Benevolent Father Time now comes, as he has a way of doing, to vindicate the warrior and the warfare. Brother Wallace predicted with precise accuracy the monstrous character of the full grown product of the Detroit incubator. Time vindicates his prophecy in Ernest Beam’s teaching and practice, and Brother Witty moans at the “wailing wall” that it should be thus.

THE CHICKENS HAVE CERTAINLY COME HOME TO ROOST

The legitimate fruit, the logical conclusion, the inevitable and inescapable consequence of the “Unity Movement” hatched and launched into life in Detroit by brother Claud F. Witty is the very attitude toward digression now preached by Brother Beam. When Brother Witty saw his chicken coming into the roost, he was aghast. Could this be his chicken? Undoubtedly it was. Could nothing be done about it? Try he must, and he did, to no avail. The letters you have read in the Firm Foundation which passed between Witty and Beam show you how earnestly he tried, but it was too late. Now, Brother Witty hastens to the “wailing wall” to mourn the character of his full grown product. He is your chicken, Brother Witty, what are you going to do about him? Far be it from the editor of the Bible Banner to tell you, “I told you so”, but I do not mind telling you that he told you so.

THE MORAL OF THIS SAD STORY

The moral of this sad story is found in the saying, CHICKENS ALWAYS COME HOME TO ROOST. The brotherhood at large should learn from this the crying need of eternal vigilance. There are movements and tendencies today just as fraught with evil possibilities as the “Unity Movement” of bygone days. Premillennialism still rears its ugly head. Institutionalism is on the march. Modernism slithers its crooked (Continued on Page 15)
REFUSED PUBLICATION

R. L. WHITESIDE

Last Fall I wrote a short article to show that a charge Brother Hrdeman made against Brother Foy 'Wallace, even had it been true, was a serious reflection on Thomas and Alexander Campbell, Walter Scott, John Smith, Benjamin Franklin, and most of the other pioneer preachers. I sent the article to the Firm Foundation and the Gospel Advocate. Brother Showalter published the article; Brother Goodpasture returned it without any comment. About the middle of March I wrote an article to correct a mistake Brother DeHoff made in the Gospel Advocate concerning priests; and also to counteract a notion advanced by sprinklers ever since I began to pay any attention to religious matters, namely, that Christ was baptized at the age of thirty, the age they said priests were consecrated to the office of priests, and that sprinkling was a part of the rite of consecration. They were wrong on both points; for it is nowhere said that priests began to function at the age of thirty, or that mere water was sprinkled on Aaron and his sons. (See Lev., chapters 8 and 9). That ceremony was the consecration of a family to the priesthood rather than the consecration of Aaron and sons as priests. There is no evidence that such a ceremony was required or performed any more. I mailed the short article to the Apostolic Times. When some months passed and Brother Allen had not published it, I sent him a self-addressed stamped envelope and asked him to return my article: but he did not, nor did he write me a word, Some time ago Brother C. R. Nichol wrote an article in which he made some comments on some fake debates that had been held east of the Mississippi River, and sent it to the Gospel Advocate. It was returned without comment. Is there a conspiracy in Nashville not to publish any sort of criticism of what any preacher east of the Mississippi says or does, no matter how just or courteous the criticism may be. Here is my article on

THE PRIESTS

Concerning a priest under the law, Brother DeHoff says, "He became a priest at thirty and retired at fifty." — Gospel Advocate, January 1, 1948. How wide spread that notion is I do not know. I heard it when I was a young man, but it has no scriptural support. — it is, in fact, as contrary to Bible statements as any notion can be. But let us get a few facts before us concerning the priests and the Levites.

Levi, son of Jacob, was the father of three sons. Gershen. Kobath, and Merari. Amram was the son of Kobath, and the father of Aaron and Moses. (Ex. 6:16-20). Aaron and his sons were set apart as priests at Sinai. (Ex. 28:1; Lev. 8). About forty years later, on Mount Hor, at the command of Jehovah, Moses "stripped Aaron of his garments, and put them upon Eleazer his son, and Aaron died there on the top of the mount." (Num. 20:22-26). "And Aaron was a hundred and twenty years old when he died in Mount Hor." (Num. 33:38, 39). Aaron was therefore about eighty-three years old when he was made priest, and continued to be priest till he died at the age of one hundred and twenty three. Eleazer must have been several years above fifty when he took the place of his father as high priest, for he was made priest forty years earlier: and if he began to be priest at thirty, then he was seventy when he took his Father's place.

By consulting Numbers 35:25, 28, 32; Joshua 20:6, you will see that the priest — the high priest — continued to be priest till death. And in speaking of the priests under the law, the writer of Hebrews says, "And they indeed have been made priests many in number, because that by death they are hindered from continuing." (Heb. 7:23). And Zacharias, though not a high priest, still executed the priest's office before God when he was old — well stricken in years. (Luke 1:1-9).

The 30-50 idea about priests grew out of unwarrantable conclusions from what is said in Numbers 4. The age limit there had nothing to do with priests, and only with a portion of the Levites who were assigned special duties in moving the tabernacle from one camp to another. It is an instructive chapter, unless a person sees nothing in it except the 30 to 50 age limit. In preparing to move the tabernacle, Aaron, then eighty-three years old, went with his sons into the tabernacle wrapped up some of the things and covered others, according to specific directions so that no Levite would see any of the contents of the tabernacle. The Kobathites, Gershonites, and Merarites, each group, had special tasks, directed by Eleazer and Ithamar, sons of Aaron. Moving that tabernacle was not a work, for boys and old men, hence the age limits. It seems that different age limits on the part of the Levites applied to different kinds of service. Notice Numbers 8:23-26: "And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying. This is that which belongeth unto the Levites; from twenty and five years old and upward they shall go in to wait upon the service in the work of the tent of meeting: and from the age of fifty years they shall cease waiting upon the work, and shall serve no more, but shall minister with their brethren in the tent of meeting, to keep the charge, and shall do no service." Here it (Continued on page 15)
ELDERS, THE WATCHMEN OF THE CHURCH

GEORGE T. JONES

Every student of the New Testament knows that the Divine arrangement of church government calls for a plurality of elders in every congregation. The authority of these men does not extend beyond the limits of the congregation served by them. (I Pet. 5:2) There is no organization or unit of government besides the local congregation. These several congregations are presided over by their respective elders.

There is no higher or nobler work than serving faithfully as an elder of the church. "If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work." (I Tim. 3:1) The qualifications for this office are high, having been made so by the Lord. Not every male member of the church can or does qualify for the eldership. Likewise, the duties of an elder are diverse. Paul declares that elders who faithfully discharge their obligations are worthy of signal honor. (I Tim. 5:17) Various titles are applied to elders in the New Testament. All of these seem to imply some phase of their work. As an elder (Acts 20:17), he is a man of some maturity and experience. As a pastor (Eph. 4:11), he is to feed the flock (Acts 20:28). As a bishop (I Tim. 3:21; Acts 29:28), he is an overseer, superintendent and watchman.

It is not feasible that one article should give even a sketch of all the duties of elders. The design of this paper is to focus attention on elders as watchmen of the church. That the good men chosen to serve in this capacity have a distinct responsibility as vigilantes is not to be questioned. In commanding Christians concerning the proper attitude toward elders, the author of Hebrews wrote: "Obey them that have the rule over you. and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you." (Heb. 13:17) After charging the elders of the Ephesian church to take heed to themselves and to all the flock, he further admonished them: "Therefore watch." These passages should set forth the particular watchfulness to which elders are to be devoted. They are on vigil as those who shall account for the spiritual welfare of the souls under their charge. These men are on guard as a shepherd is over his sheep. They watch as one who shall give account to the Great Shepherd for the safe conduct of the flock. (I Pet. 5:3, 4) What a weighty charge: what a solemn obligation! What strength of character and spiritual discernment are required for this office!

We like to picture an elder as a spiritual watchman on the spiritual walls or outposts of Zion. If an army should encamp, having fear of being attacked unawares by the enemy, sentries will be posted propitiously along the outwirks of the camp to warn of the approach of unfriendly forces before it is too late to repel them. At the same time, these sentinels will be on the lookout for any sign of a traitor within the camp who might lend comfort to the enemy. This illustration presents a graphic picture of the work of elders as watchmen. In cautioning the elders at Ephesus, Paul described dangers from within and without. "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." (Acts 20:29, 30)

Because of the purity of the church and the imperious need of maintaining that purity, the elders must be on constant watch against encroachments from without. Faithful elders of the church will not allow any foreign factor or influence to disturb the peace and purity of God's people. In the first instance, dutiful elders will have fortified the flock against such anticipated onslaughts by seeing that they are fed on the wholesome nutriment of God's word instead of skim milk lectures on ethics and social customs. At the same time, the elders must be in constant observation of the flock to make sure that any among the disciples is not "speaking perverse things" to stir up trouble.

Watchfulness is the only safeguard from apostasy. There have been two major apostasies in the ranks of those who claim to be Christians only since the Restoration. One was over instrumental music and the missionary societies: the other over vain, fanciful and speculative theories concerning prophecy, known as Premillennialism. We of the present generation can only contemplate the havoc and destruction wrought by these departures from the ancient faith. Twice a united brotherhood has been torn asunder. Twice have the ranks of those who sought to call people out of denominationalism been split. No man can estimate accurately for how much loss we have been thrown by these two catastrophes—tragedies that vigilance on the part of God's watchmen could have avoided.

Let us ponder a bit. The instrument was introduced into worship at Midway, Kentucky in 1859. Benjamin Franklin, able preacher of the era, immediately denounced the practice along with others. But suppose the elders of the church at Midway, Kentucky, had met those innovators at the door of the meetinghouse with a firm "You shall not pass". Suppose that the elders of the other churches where the organ was subsequently introduced had taken similar action.
Could not the tragedy have been averted? Instead, the fight was left to faithful preachers and a few faithful elders who could not be intimidated by the popular clamor. But it was too late; the innovations already had a foothold. Consider again what would have been the outcome had the elders of the churches refused the speculative theories of R. H. Boll when they were first announced and before a large segment of the disciples had been drawn after him. Eternity only will reveal what the difference might have been.

Watchfulness now on the part of elders is one of the greatest needs of the church. Certain ominous sounds from within the camp of spiritual Israel ring untrue and portend disaster unless checked. An apostasy is not improbable. Churches are being told that they can support human institutions (educational) either by occasional donations or by placing said institution in the budget and contributing to it regularly. There are other signs. Too many pulpits do not have the familiar ring they once had. From too many pulpits there is never a word of reproof and rebuke. Have we become so angelic that we need no correction? Too many evangelists no longer point out specific sins; they are no longer "allowed" to refer to denominations by name and warn against the errors taught by them.

Who is responsible? Are not the elders? If a preacher teaches error or fails to preach the truth, all of the truth; and, refuses to "reprove and rebuke" all error and sin in a plain and unequivocal manner, should not the elders "mark" him? But, alas, to too many in the eldership, the preacher possesses a "rebuking complex", if he dares to execute the charge Paul delivered to Timothy. Instead of desiring a preacher who will declare the whole counsel of God, there are too many elders who are looking for preachers who can preach in such a "sweet" manner that none is ever offended! If he ever rebukes, he must do it so tactfully that the one rebuked hasn't the slightest idea for whom the rebuke was intended! Let a preacher follow this course and he will be mighty popular with some elders. Why, some "elders" even want their preachers to join the "Ministerial Alliance" and rub elbows with the big shot denominationalists.

What a blessing it would be to the Cause of Christ if all elders would stand up like men on all such occasions. When a preacher who will not preach the truth come along, let them stand up to him and see that he is properly disposed of. If an unscriptural proposal is made, let the elders literally meet the innovators at the door telling them they will receive no sympathy. Only in this way can another apostasy be missed.

We should be thankful for the faithful elders among us. If another apostasy is to be avoided, they will have no small part in the fight. Every disciple owes a great debt to the elders, who watch for his soul. Those who want to see the church kept pure should pray fervently for such faithful servants of God. May the Lord bless the churches with more faithful Watchmen on the Walls of Zion!

"FLOATERS"

W. EARL MANSUR

In most metropolitan areas where a number of congregations are located in close proximity there is always the problem of the "floater". A "floater" is one who refuses to align himself with any particular congregation but chooses to "float" and 'flit' to and fro among various congregations. He is free from all responsibilities as a church worker and goes on his merry way doing little if anything for the Lord's Cause. If one preacher gets a little too firm or too strict in his preaching, the 'floater' drifts over to another congregation and tries out that preacher for awhile. The 'floater' does not consider himself under any eldership, therefore, will not take rebroof, rebuke or correction from anyone except just what he happens to absorb from various pulpits. The 'floater' does not go to one church long enough to get acquainted with the brethren so that he might 'help bear one another's burden', but rather gets all the gossip and scandal he can at one place then spreads it to near-by congregations: The 'floater' has an easy time of it but the sad fact is that he doesn't do himself very much good and does less good for the church.

It is commonly reported that in one large mid-western city there are at least one thousand 'floaters' floating from one congregation to another and none of them actually working for the Lord. Certainly all 'regular' members are not working as they should but it is more conducive to activity than being a 'floater". This situation exists in many cities over the brotherhood.

Every member of the church needs to be aligned with some congregation. He should help shoulder responsibilities: he should sit under and encourage sound Gospel preaching; he should have elders over him so that they might instruct and lead in the right paths; he should know his 'brethren that he might bear their burdens. In short, he should settle down and get to work: it would do him good as well as the

(Continued on Page 15)
July 25, 1948

Roy E. Cogdill Pbl. Co.
For Bible Banner Publication
Lufkin, Texas

To Brethren Everywhere, Greeting:

The elders and deacons of the Van Nuys church of Christ, have for sometime desired to show appreciation to brother Foy E. Wallace Jr., and, brother Roy E. Cogdill, and a host of other faithful men who have been writing articles to the Bible Banner on issues of the day that threaten to divide and disturb the church of the Lord. We feel a keen sense of responsibility to encourage the good work you brethren have been doing so effectively.

The church here stands opposed to the college being tacked on to the church. We do not believe it ought to be a parasite, to bleed and drain the church of money in support of that which is material. We do not believe in extolling the praises of that which is material above that which is spiritual. With us, the church is enough.

We are opposed to softness in the pulpit and pew. We stand for the ‘old paths’ that lead to God and glory. We believe in fighting every evil that attacks the church and its glorious truth! Too many are not taking a stand, do not stand for anything.

In the fight against premillennialism we are with you. It is a wily doctrine fostered by false piety and self righteousness. Its purpose is to divide and spoil the unity and happiness of the church;

Too, we are opposed to any recreational organization that lives by the support of the church, that hides behind the plea that something must be done for “our children and young people.” Furthermore, we are opposed to the “youth church” movement, and sectarian “youth rallies.”

We take full responsibility for this stand. We pray that the church may awake and fight with you the evils that face us. We simply wanted to let the readers of the Bible Banner, but especially you, know where to put us, and to tell you how much we appreciate the battles fought to sustain the truth of the New Testament. May the heavenly Father abundantly bless you. We firmly believe the Bible Banner ought to be a weekly paper.


Check your expiration date. Renew now and avoid missing a single issue.

BROTHER WITTY’S CHICKENS--
(Continued from Page 11)

course and licks its forked tongue at our very doorsteps. WorlJliness sings her siren song and rolls her wanton eyes in the programs of New Testament churches. Will a decade hence find legions at the “wailing wall” weeping over Zion and the bitter fruits of apostasy? We will most certainly unless those who recognize the baneful tendencies of the hour stand and stand together in crying out in the name of Jesus against every departure from the simplicity of the New Testament gospel. May it be the unswerving determination of every loyal citizen of the kingdom that “They shall not pass”!

REFUSED PUBLICATION --
(Continued from page 12)

is plain that Levites did not entirely retire at the age of fifty. By reason of age and experience Levites above fifty years old would be very helpful in teaching those just entering the service, and in overseeing all the services. For certain services David appointed Levites “from thirty years old and upward.” (1 Chron. 23:3-5). No age of retirement is here mentioned. Others are mentioned in verse 24, “who did the work for the service of the house of Jehovah, from twenty years old end upward.” The rest of chapter 23 gives additional light on the age limit and the work of Levites.

“FLOATERS” --
(Continued from Page 14)

church.

Each member, upon moving into a community, should make himself known. It doesn’t matter whether he goes forward to ‘place membership’ (that expression is misleading) or just tells the elders or ministers privately, but he should let it be known in some way that he is one of them and wants to be put to work.

May the Lord help each one of us to bear our responsibilities in the church.

(Note: Until we have some floating “elders” there will not be any place in the church for floating members such as brother Mansur describes here. Christians are told to be subject to the elders. Until elders extend their jurisdiction beyond the local congregation, I fail to see how Christians can be under some elders without belonging to some congregation. A good article and timely. LB.)
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