
TEACHING THE WORD

By Van Bonneau

FOREWORD

Several years ago, Van Bonneau, preacher, writer, and debater in the Church of Christ, wrote a series of articles entitled "Teaching The Word" which appeared in *The Church Messenger*. The editor of this journal put the articles in tract form. Later the Gospel Tidings reprinted it. However, to the best of my knowledge it is now out of print.

I have always thought that the tract was an excellent work on the classes and women teachers. In my opinion the tract is worthy of reprinting and circulating, and for this reason, I have obtained permission from Van Bonneau to do so. Van Bonneau is a paradigm of the kind of men who were called on to defend the truth against the class method of teaching several years ago. I believe this tract covers and considers every argument made by the class advocates current with their day.

In the past few years the Sunday School advocates have tried to stream line and update their arguments. We will have something to say about this approach in the final chapter.

We wish to express our thanks to Bro. Van Bonneau, for his permission to reprint this informative tract.

Clovis T. Cook

TEACHING THE WORD (No. 1)

Human beings move in schools. Let a Darwin arise and the whole country is filled with evolutionists. Introduce instrumental music into the worship and everybody begins twanging a stringed instrument. Let a popular method of teaching sweep the schools of the country and a great clamor goes up for it as the only Saviour for the church. It seems to matter little how unscriptural a practice may be, in time, brethren become tolerant of it, if it attracts sufficient attention. I have prayerfully read every document, tract and debate that I can find on the class method of teaching lately, and I still fail to discover one vestige of proof for the system. I am at a total loss to see why brethren who cry for a "Thus saith the Lord" can be charmed by such an unscriptural work.

I am going to give my reasons both affirmatively and negatively against the class method of teaching. These points are open to the criticism of the world for all time. Apply the acid test to them, brethren; I believe they will stand. To start things off we need to ask, where is the issue?

The Issue

In every discussion I have ever had on this question the opposition has tried to put the Sunday School on a par with private teaching in the home. They often quote Acts 20:20 where Paul says that he taught "publicly and from house to house." I usually step to the board and draw two circles. Over one I write "Publicly" and over the other I write "House to House." I then challenge the opposition to place class teaching in either circle. This is where they squirm. Most of them deny that it is public, so they dare not put it in that circle. If they classify it under "house to house" teaching, they know that foot washing can be put into it (1 Timothy 5:10). And realizing that Paul used only two methods, neither of which resembled the Sunday School, they beat a quick retreat from this passage. Then where should class teaching be placed?

Nobody can deny the fact that class teaching as practiced by our brethren represents some kind of an assembly of the church. They all recognize this, while some of them deny, that it is the same church assembly as contemplated in 1 Corinthians 14. Then why try to put it on a par with the teaching in the home? We all believe that women can teach in the home as individuals. But many of us oppose their teaching in church assemblies. We have sound Biblical reasons for this. Paul says emphatically in 1 Corinthians 14:33 that the shamefulness of women's speaking in the church applies to "all the churches (assemblies) of the saints." In other words this is true of all church assemblies that are convened for the purpose of teaching. There is absolutely no escape from this. And this is exactly the assembly that the classes represent. Let our Sunday School friends deny that the classes are assemblies of the church. Then what? Why, then, we can move foot washing into the classes. Instrumental music can also be used in them per this position. Why? Because they all believe that instruments of music can be used in the home, provided we do not try to praise God with them. I once pressed an opponent with this and insisted that he tell the audience just how he could consistently keep instrumental music out of his classes. He replied: "By making assemblies of the church out of the classes." I then showed that the sisters were speaking in these assemblies in open violation of 1 Corinthians 14:35. Here the issue hangs. There is no difference over methods of teaching as individuals in homes. The question hangs on the right of the church to use classes and women teachers in any of its assemblies. Here is the issue, brethren. Step up and acknowledge it like men or forever hold your peace!

Individual and Church Work

It is easy to differentiate between church assemblies and ordinary gatherings of people as individuals. When the church calls a group together, that group constitutes a church assembly. No doubt about that. And the church calls the classes for the specific purpose of teaching them. This brings them directly under the scope of 1 Corinthians 14. Will our Sunday School brethren tell us what particular assembly of the church Paul is describing in 1 Corinthians 14? He says

"all" (v33). Did he mean only the communion assembly? If so, then women may preach publicly in all other assemblies of the church. No escape whatever from this.

There are many things that we may practice as individuals in the home that would be sinful in church assemblies. Physical meals are Scriptural, if we eat them as individuals. But they are sinful in church assemblies (1 Corinthians 11:34). Secular occupations (Titus 3:14), lodging of strangers, relieving the afflicted and washing the feet of the saints (1 Timothy 5:10), are all good works when practiced from an individualistic standpoint. But how would these things look in a church assembly? Will our Sunday School brethren tolerate these things in their classes? Why not, if class teaching is parallel to individual teaching in the home? We can use a piano in the home provided we sing good moral songs and do not praise God with it. Can it be used in this sense in the classes? Yes? Gone with instrumental music! No? Then there is a difference in class teaching, and the teaching we do as individuals in our homes. Advocates of the class system have long recognized this distinction in their debates on instrumental music. But they suddenly erase it from their memories when the Sunday School needs defense. But in spite of their shift in opposition, the Lord made the distinction. We shall ever keep it in mind.

TEACHING THE WORD (No. 2) **How Teach Them?**

1) Jewish Assemblies

Of course it goes without saying that the regulations under the Law are not necessarily applicable today. They should not be regarded as definite proof by either side. But they do shed some light on the subject as to how the Jews taught their children. We shall study a few cases.

"When all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing. Gather the people together, men and women, and children, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may learn, and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of this law: And that their children, which have not known any thing, may hear, and learn to fear the Lord your God, as long as ye live in the land whither ye go over Jordan to possess it."
(Deuteronomy 31:11-13)

Summing all of this up just what do we find? First, the people were to be gathered together, not divided into classes. Second, men, women, children, and strangers were in the same assembly without any regard to classification according to their mental status. Third, the law was to be read before all of them in this assembly. Fourth, the purpose in reading this law in this hearing of all was that all "may hear and learn to fear the Lord." Fifth, children who had not "known anything" came to this assembly to be taught. Sixth, the influence of this teaching was to last "as long as ye live in the land whither ye go over Jordan to possess it." How emphatic!

Would our Sunday School brethren detail such instructions to a mixed assembly today? We wonder if the Lord did not know that those little children could not be taught adequately in an assembly composed of men and women! The influence of this method of teaching was to last "as long as ye live." How does this compare with the complaint of the class advocates to the effect that children cannot learn much in a mixed assembly? The cry of these moderns puts the Lord in a bad light. Others may follow their modern methods if they wish, "but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord."

"And afterward he read all the words of the law, the blessings and cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the law. There was not a word of all that Moses commanded, which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel, with the women and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them."
(Josh. 8:34-35)

Now what shall our reaction be to this passage? Shall we continue to indict the Lord's methods by contending that the "little ones" must be separated from the men, women and strangers? I am perfectly satisfied that the Lord knew what was best. But the class advocates remind us that Joshua must have had a very strong voice to have reached so many people. Well it so happens that Bro. McGarvey had a weak voice. Yet he tells us in "Lands of the Bible" (pages 507-508) that he tested this very place and that his voice carried sufficiently well to have been understood by that multitude. Some have suggested that Joshua probably "read all the words of the law" by having others read for him. Let it be so. They certainly did not all read at the same time. Summing up again what do we find? (a) One assembly composed of "women," "strangers," "little ones," and "all the congregation of Israel" —no division into classes. (b) One man speaking at a time.

Here I pause to weigh the strongest argument our class brethren offer on the Old Testament. In Deuteronomy 27:11-26 God charged six tribes of Israel to "stand upon Mount Gerizim" to pronounce blessings and six tribes to "stand upon Mount Ebal" to pronounce the cursings of the Law. The Levites were to speak to the people with a loud voice. When the Levite read the blessings and the cursings of the Law, all the people were to answer and say, "Amen." This they did in Joshua 8:33, and afterward Joshua read the Law to all of them as given in the foregoing. The points stressed are that there were two classes — one on Mount Gerizim and the other on Mount Ebal, and that the Levites (plural) spoke to both.

In this connection I will say that I know of nobody who teaches that all the people of a given audience must assemble at one exact spot. A crowd may assemble on both sides of a river or on the slopes of two mountains as these people did. But where is the proof that an audience can assemble at two different points in hearing distance of each other and permit two persons to teach them simultaneously? Bro. McGarvey tested the spot we are now talking about. He found these mountains to be close enough that a strong voice can be understood from both of them when the speaker is equidistant from them. The fact that the Levites (plural) taught them avails nothing. Did all of the Levites speak at the same time? There is absolutely no proof of it. When

one man acts as spokesman for a group, it is perfectly Scriptural to say they spoke. As proof, read Acts 3:12-26 and 4:1-2. A plurality of Levites spoke to be sure. But they did not all speak at the same time. And there is no issue over the number of people that may say "Amen" at once. Joshua may have performed this by placing the Levites at designated distances to repeat his readings. Thus, when Joshua read a certain blessing or curse, the Levite nearest to him could have waited until Joshua's voice died away then repeated his words to those within hearing distance of him, and so on to the end of the line. And so Deuteronomy 27:11-26 and Joshua 8:33 fall far short of giving any comfort to those who advocate class teaching.

TEACHING THE WORD (No. 3)

Jewish Assemblies (Continued)

"And all the people gathered themselves together as one man into the street that was before the water gate; and they spoke unto Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel. And Ezra the priest brought the law before the congregation both of men and women, and all that could hear with understanding, upon the first day of the seventh month. And he read therein before the street that was before the water gate from the morning until midday, before the men and the women, and those that could understand; and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book of the law."

(Nehemiah 8:1-3).

As I do not have the space to insert the next five verses, in this connection, I ask my readers to study them carefully. Please observe these points. In verse 4 Ezra stood upon a pulpit of wood with thirteen men "beside him." In verse 5 Ezra opened the book in the sight of all the people. In verse 6 he blessed the Lord and all the people answered, "Amen, Amen, with lifting up their hands." In verse 7, thirteen other men and the Levites "caused the people to understand the law." In verse 8 it says, "they read." So let us summarize again. (a) "All the people," "men," "women," and "all that could hear with understanding, gathered themselves together as one man into the street." (b) Ezra being in "the sight of all the people," opened the book and read to them. No division of classes. (c) All the people were attentive to the reading. We shall now consider the opposition.

Large Crowds

Our Sunday School friends say that the crowd of Nehemiah 8 was so large that no one voice could have reached all the people. Thus they contend that classes were spread out over miles of territory, and that each one of those twenty-six men had a separate class. Now that is indeed singular. The passage says distinctly that they assembled in the street before the water gate. Ezra stood on a pulpit of wood and the other thirteen men "stood beside him." Does that sound

as though they were spread out over miles of territory? But most spectacular of all is the fact that all those people saw Ezra open the book (v5). Talk about somebody having a strong voice to reach so many, it appears to me that a man would have to possess reasonably good eyes to see some one open a book miles away! The fact is that Ezra was close enough to be seen and heard by all in that audience.

But what about those thirteen men that "caused the people to understand the law"? Why that question is easy to answer. They assisted Ezra in reading (v8), and in causing the people to understand (v7). But they absolutely did not all read at the same time. If they did, the Sunday School people would not accept the example, for they say it is wrong for a plurality of teachers to speak to one audience at the same time. And there was only one audience in Nehemiah 8. Read verses 1-3. Then Nehemiah 8 sustains the point that the Jews knew how to teach children in their assemblies without segregating them into a class by themselves.

But to be generous, suppose we admit that when a crowd is so large that a man's voice cannot reach the people that it would be all right for them to form separate congregations, each one directing its respective assembly. Does this help the class brethren any? Not one whit, for they do not divide into classes for this reason. And if those tribes in Deuteronomy 27:11-26 and Joshua 6:33 divided into two groups with simultaneous speakers (which they did not) because one man's voice could not reach all of them, what of it? That certainly doesn't sustain the class method of teaching, for this case would have been temporary to have taken care of a large multitude where blessings and cursings were concerned. Afterward, local synagogues could have easily handled the crowds. Nobody denies that a vast multitude of many thousands can organize separate local congregations with their respective assemblies at some distance from each other. But what about one small local congregation dividing into classes for an entirely different reason? I think that even the blind can see the distinction here.

Jethro and Moses

Drowning men grab at straws. We are often confronted with Exodus 18:13-27, and Deuteronomy 1:12-18 as proof for a Sunday School. It reminds me of the man who tried to fit a square peg into a round hole. Let us examine the case. Because the burden was too heavy for Moses to judge the differences between his brethren, Jethro suggested that Moses appoint rulers of thousands and hundreds and fifties and tens. These rulers were to "judge the people at all seasons" and the greater cases were to go to Moses. A brother in debate with me once said in substance, "Here is our Sunday School." I then informed the gentleman that Moses and his men were judging civil cases and differences among their brethren, and asked him if he summoned his classes to settle disputes among the children and adults because the burden was "too heavy" for the preacher. Again, I remind my readers of the issue. We are not discussing how to run a civil court and judge criminals as Moses did.

In Luke 4:16-20 Jesus stood up in the synagogue at Nazareth to read. "And the eyes of all of them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him" (v20). The very fact that every person

in that synagogue saw him proves conclusively that they were not divided into separate class rooms.

TEACHING THE WORD (No. 4)

Church Assemblies

When finally faced with the fact that the church was going to have the Sunday School, division or no division, many, who professed neutrality, jumped on the band wagon and claimed to see no difference between church assemblies and individual work. Frequently they would ask: "Is not the woman in the church while busy with her household duties in the home?" To this we reply that she is not in the church as an assembly while performing such duties, and this is the sense in which Paul spoke of the church in 1 Corinthians 14:35. He was not speaking about the church merely as an institution. Of course, our class brethren are compelled to make this distinction, just as the Bible does, when they tolerate instrumental music in the home. But they seem utterly unconscious of any such distinction when class teaching comes up. But right here is the issue. There is no controversy over the right of women to teach as individuals in the home. But let us consider some cases as to how the church can teach in its assemblies.

The Church Assemblies—Does Not Divide Into Classes.

"Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus, for to seek Saul: And when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch. And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people."
(Acts 11:25-26)

Notice that for a whole year this church "assembled themselves" and "taught much people," yet there is no mention of dividing into classes even once. What a marvelous opportunity for the class system! "Much people" being taught, yet all the teaching was done without division into classes. There is only one conclusion to be reached, and that is that the Lord evidently did not want the classes or he certainly would have used them under such conditions.

"And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles. And there they abode long time with the disciples."
(Acts 14:27-28)

It is significant that there is no mention of classes again. Will our brethren say there was no need of them? According to their arguments there was evidently a dire need of them in "rehearsing all that God had done" on the missionary tour of Paul and Barnabas. However, the Lord seemed to think that all that was necessary for the rehearsing was to "gather the church together."

"And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter."
(Acts 15:6)

"It seemed good unto us being assembled with one accord ..."
(Acts 15:25)

"So when they were dismissed, they came to Antioch: and when they had gathered the multitude together, they delivered the epistle."
(Acts 15:30)

These verses need no comment to show how early churches were taught in their assemblies. In this Jerusalem meeting four men, (Peter, Barnabas, Paul, and James) spoke consecutively to an audience they had assembled together to learn. And when Paul and Barnabas went back to Antioch they "gathered the multitude together" to deliver the epistle, thus leaving no room whatever for a division of classes with women teachers.

"And upon the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them."
(Acts 20:7)

I have often wondered why our Sunday School brethren generally contend that it would be wrong to divide the Communion assembly into classes to observe the Lord's Supper. There is only one passage that says that the disciples "came together to break bread." They understand this to mean that it would be wrong to divide into classes to break bread. But wait a minute! How about the numerous passages which show that the church came together to be taught? If one passage saying that the church came together to break bread makes it essential for us to assemble to observe this communion, would not a number of passages saying that the church came together to teach, make it obligatory for the church to assemble to teach the multitude? On the other hand, if the example of assembling the multitudes together to teach them can be followed by dividing into classes, then we can likewise divide the communion assembly into classes and observe the example of assembling to break bread. If not, why not?

A "gathering together" is mentioned in 1 Corinthians 5:4. An "assembly" is spoken of in James 2:2. And we are charged not to forsake "the assembling of ourselves together" in Heb. 10:25. I realize that these passages do not prove that we should not have the classes. But they do show that the church was accustomed to assemble its multitudes to teach them. And there is absolutely no reference anywhere to a Sunday School. Now contrast this with the reports of our Sunday School brethren, and observe the difference. Through the press, over the radio, in the pulpit, and by the fireside, in fact, everywhere, the class advocates are pressing their system as the most effective method of teaching. But the apostles treated the subject with absolute silence in reporting their work. They showed that the church taught all of its assemblies by gathering the multitudes together, and not by dividing them into classes. And in regulating the teaching, they gave specific directions against the class system. These directions are found in 1 Corinthians 14. One thing is certain. The Bible was not written by Sunday School people.

"For this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as I teach everywhere in every church."
(1 Corinthians 4:17)

Yes, Paul had certain "ways" (plural) of teaching in the church. These ways were in Christ. But not one of these ways included the Sunday School, for he condemned it in 1 Corinthians 14. One way that Paul taught was by being one of a plurality of speakers who taught consecutively (Acts 11:26; 15:12-21). Another way was by doing all the preaching alone (Acts 20:7). Yet nowhere do we read of the Sunday School "way" except by way of condemnation.

TEACHING THE WORD (No. 5) **(Church Assemblies)**

We continue our line that in teaching, the church should assemble the multitude together and not divide into classes. This brings us to 1 Corinthians 14.

Good Order

"Let all things be done decently and in order."
(1 Corinthians, 14:40)

We must keep in mind that the Lord is legislating concerning the teaching of church assemblies in this passage. The good order which the Lord gave applied to:

1) Prophets.

"For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted."
(v31)

"One by one" means one at a time, or successively. God detailed these instructions to the prophets to eliminate confusion (v33). Instead of telling these prophets to form classes and go to separate rooms to avoid confusion, the Lord told them to speak one at a time that all in the assembly might learn and be comforted. While this verse applies to the prophets, yet it is an undeniable fact that a plurality of speakers talking simultaneously today would produce confusion the same as those prophets could have done. But somebody is ready to say, "Yes, but we eliminate the confusion by going to separate class rooms." But that does not meet the requirement. The Lord said to eliminate confusion by remaining in one assembly and permitting the prophets to speak "one by one." What right do we have to offer a substitute?

This regulation concerning good order also applied to:

2) Those who spoke in tongues.

"If any man speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret."
(v27)

"By course" means "in turn, one after another." Of course, this verse applied directly to the tongue speakers. But they were under the same order that the prophets were under so far as the elimination of confusion was concerned. Both were to speak "one by one" or "in turn." It is noticeable that they were not authorized to go to separate rooms to eliminate this confusion.

We are now prepared to show that this same order applies to:

3) All churches everywhere.

"For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints."
(v.33)

The word, "confusion," here must be taken in connection with that about which the Lord is speaking. It means "disturbance" arising from a plurality of speakers talking at the same time. God is not the author of such in any church. I regard this statement as an unimpeachable indictment of the class-method of teaching. And we cannot comply with this regulation by going to class rooms, for the Lord directed the prophets to speak "one by one" to an undivided assembly that "all may learn, and all may be comforted" (v31). How could all in one audience have learned from all the prophets had they been divided into separate class rooms? There would have been some prophets that some would not even have heard. And we must bear in mind that this order governed both the prophets and those who spoke in tongues, and applies with equal force to all congregations today, as God is not the author of confusion in any church assembly. This argument is absolutely unimpeachable and unanswerable. Of course, some may insist that the classes are not church assemblies, but we shall handle that more definitely later.

4) This good order also regulates the conduct of women in the assembly.

For we read:

"Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women, to speak in the church."
(vv34-35)

Here we pause to answer those three supposedly unanswerable questions that our Sunday School brethren put out on these verses. I have often wondered why they rarely give our full

answers to these question when they write and speak about them. Usually they garble our answers and in utter silence pass up the exact point that demolishes their position. They realize that their position looks a little better when they do this. But to the questions. "(1) Is 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 binding on the church today? (2) Will the Lord condemn those who violate this passage today? (3) Will the Lord condemn those who encourage women to violate this passage today?" They usually take the liberty to answer all three of these questions in the affirmative for us without any qualifications. Then they show that, if the passage applies, a man violates it every time he answers a woman's question in her home unless the woman is his wife. For the passage charges the women to "ask their husbands at home." So by suppressing a part of our answers, the Sunday School advocates apply the whole passage to the days of the apostles and pretend to have an unanswerable argument. But we shall not let them get by so easily. First, I shall answer their questions, then show that they do not even believe their own position. Our answer to these questions is that the latter part of verse 35 which says "for it is a shame for women to speak in the church" is certainly binding today. No doubt whatever about this. A child can see that the balance of the passage applies to the wives of those early prophetic teachers who had husbands that were capable of teaching them at home. Paul reasons from the particular to the general. First he enjoins silence on the wives of the prophets in particular, then gives a general law showing that it is shameful for women in general to speak in the church. The particular directions concerning the wives of the prophets do not apply today, but the general law concerning other women is applicable now.

But do our Sunday School brethren believe their position on this passage? Why certainly not, for they say that it is sinful for women to speak in their general assemblies. But we wonder how they discovered that such is sinful if 1 Corinthians 14:35 is not applicable today. How can they oppose a female ministry? Their interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-12 will not keep women out of the pulpit. Then why should they put up such a howl about the female ministry of the Holiness Church? The fact is that they know as well as we do that the latter part of 1 Corinthians 14:35 is applicable today, and that it is a part of the order governing church assemblies.

TEACHING THE WORD (No. 6)

Individual Work

Many profess to see no difference in teaching in church assemblies and in teaching as individuals in the home. Let us suppose a case for illustration. Timothy receives a letter from Paul. Immediately he concludes that it is sinful for women to teach anywhere. For did not Paul write him that "I suffer not a woman to teach"? While pondering on the question, he decides to visit Titus. In the meantime Titus has heard from Paul, and he has decided women may preach anywhere — even publicly in the church. For Paul had written him that women should be "teachers of good things." So, when the two young men meet, a heated argument results — one contending for unlimited rights on women teachers, the other denying the woman the

right to teach, even in the home. To settle the question, they decide to go to Corinth. When they arrive there, they discover that Paul has recently written to Corinth. This epistle offers a perfect solution of the question. Women were permitted to prophesy (1 Corinthians 11:5). But they were forbidden to do their prophesying in church assemblies (1 Corinthians 14:35). Timothy then understands that his epistle referred to women's speaking in the assembly, and Titus concludes that his epistle had reference to a woman's teaching individually away from the assembly. Thus, they both perceive the distinction in teaching as an individual, and in teaching in church assemblies. And with all the force of a demonstration, the Bible makes this distinction perfectly. As individuals, women could "teach good things" (Titus 2:3), "labor in the gospel" (Philippians 4:3), and "prophesy" (1 Corinthians 11:5). But they could not perform these duties by speaking audibly before a church assembly (1 Corinthians 14:35). This distinction is too plain to admit a quibble. But to make the point clearer we shall notice other examples.

1) Mary — Matthew 28:7.

When the angels told Mary and others "to go quickly and tell his disciples" that Christ had risen from the dead, he was authorizing them to speak merely as individuals in private. The church did not call any assembly or assemblies, large or small, to assist these women in performing this duty.

2) Anna — Luke 2:38.

"And she coming in that instant gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, (note the comma and break of thought) and spake of him to all of them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem."

Anna did not speak "of him" before a church assembly, as the church was not fully established at that time. But as she served God with "fastings and prayers" in the temple, she spoke as an individual in private. Notice verse 38. All that she did at "that instant" was to give thanks unto the Lord. She no doubt "spake of him" later at various intervals as she individually contacted them "that looked for redemption in Jerusalem." "All them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem" were not present when Christ was presented "to the Lord" (v22). Thus, her giving of thanks was in private as an individual, and not before the church assembly. Her speaking "of him" was also done individually as she contacted people in private. And certainly there were no other classes in session about her as we see in the Sunday School.

3) Aquila and Priscilla "expounded" unto Apollos "the way of God more perfectly" (Acts 18:26).

But did the church call this meeting and place a plurality of classes about them? Surely not. This is an example of individual work, and it cannot be used as proof for class assemblies that are convened by the church.

4) Where did Philip's daughters (Acts 21:9) prophesy?

The correct answer is that they prophesied as individuals away from the church assembly. If this passage and its contents should be combed for all time with a fine comb, we could never find a plurality of classes functioning simultaneously under church direction. It is a splendid example of individual work.

5) "And on the sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women that resorted thither." (Acts 16:13)

This passage is often used as proof for Sunday School classes. But please notice the difference. In the first place, Philippi was a mission point at this time, and no church was there to call this meeting. Second, these women being aliens were accustomed to "resort thither" without any other classes being present. Third, Paul and his company took advantage of that opportunity and "sat down and spake unto the women." Now, where are the plurality of classes convened by the church? To be honest we will have to confess that they are not there. This is an example of individual work, and even at that there is no hint about a plurality of classes.

Then how may we distinguish between individual work and the work that is done in church assemblies? To my mind the distinction is very easy. When a local congregation calls a group together, that group constitutes a church assembly, be it large or small. And this is precisely the way that the classes convene. The local congregation calls them for the specific purpose of teaching them the word of God. And any group convened in this manner, and for this purpose, constitutes the very assembly that is considered in 1 Corinthians 14:35. But if a sister teaches a group, where the church has not convened it, nor called a plurality of classes in session, she is within her rights.

TEACHING THE WORD (No. 7)

Some Private Events

Several years ago, when the Sunday School issue first arose, nobody dreamed that the classes were anything other than public work. Numbers of propositions, articles, and announcements twenty-five years ago boldly advertised the fact that the Sunday School was public. But suddenly without changing one iota of their practice, the class brethren began calling their system private work. Personally, I am not so much interested in making the distinction on the basis of public and private work as I am on the grounds of individual work and work done in church assemblies. But waiving all of that for the present, we want to study the Sunday School in connection with a number of private events mentioned in the Bible in order to see whether it is public or private. Of course I realize that the words "public" and "private" are relative terms. That which would be private under some conditions might be regarded as public under other conditions and vice versa. But as for the classes they bear all the marks of public work. Let us put them alongside of some private happenings in the Bible and see how they look.

1) "Then Joseph, her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily." (Matthew 1:19)

Do you suppose that Joseph "was minded" to announce this, and to invite all the women of Mary's age to attend? Remember that all the people of one particular mental status are invited to each class in the Sunday School.

2) "Then Herod, when he had privily called the wise men, inquired of them diligently what time the star appeared." (Matthew 2:7)

Did Herod publish his invitation to the public?

3) "And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world"? (Matthew 24:3).

Certainly, we can see that no invitation was extended to the public on this occasion.

4) "And he said unto them, Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest a while: for there were many coming and going, and they had no leisure so much as to eat. And they departed into a desert place by ship privately" (Mark 6:31-32).

We wonder if Christ would have helped the situation any had he invited the multitude to go along.

5) "And when he was come into the house, his disciples asked him privately, Why could not we cast him out?" (Mark 9:28)

Had the public been invited to this house?

6) "And he took them, and went aside privately into a desert place ..." (Luke 9:10)

It is true that the multitude soon followed Christ in this place, but his departure and going aside were private nevertheless. Later the multitude found him. Our class brethren often cite this verse to show the possibility of calling a class aside privately, and away from a multitude. In reply I will just say that nobody denies the possibility of such a thing. And the very fact that Jesus did this does not prove that Sunday School classes are private. For when these brethren send a class aside, they invite all of the same mental status to join that class, thus making it public. Jesus did not do this.

7) "And a certain man named Ananias, with Sapphira his wife, sold a possession, and kept back part of the price, and his wife being privy to it, and brought a certain part, and laid it at the apostles' feet." (Acts 5:1-2)

We wonder if Ananias and his wife kept this a secret between them by inviting the public to witness it?

8) "They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily?" (Acts 16:37)

Certainly those magistrates did not invite the public to witness their sending Paul and Silas away.

9) "Then the chief captain took him by the hand and went with him aside privately, and asked him, What is that thou hast to tell me? (Acts 23:19)

How many of the multitude were invited to listen in on this conversation between the chief captain and Paul's nephew? Does this in any way resemble the so-called privacy of the Sunday School classes?

10) Study the American Standard on Mark 4:34, 13:3, and Luke 10:23, and see if the privacy mentioned in these verses remotely resembles the situation in the classes where the public is invited.

11) Paul communicated the gospel unto certain men privately (Galatians 2:2),

And there is not one vestige of evidence that this was as open as the teaching in the Sunday School classes.

12) False teachers came in privily (Galatians 2:4, 2 Peter 2:1, and Jude 4).

Did they creep in as openly as the teaching is in the classes? In two of the citations mention is made of their coming "unawares."

I frankly admit that some of these examples represent a greater degree of privacy than is necessary even in house to house teaching. But one thing is outstanding. The Sunday School classes do not remotely approach any of the examples. And we all wonder how anybody can be so audacious as to call a meeting private when the public is invited to attend it.

TEACHING THE WORD (No. 8)

Considering Arguments

Many arguments made by our Sunday School friends are suppositional and conjectural.

1) One of them is that if a woman can teach one class as an individual in her home that she can teach one of a plurality of classes that are convened by the church. Their argument (?) runs like this: If a woman can teach in her home, can she teach under that tree that is between her home and the church building? And if she can teach there, is it not a fact that she can teach in the church building?

In answering this question let us place another one equally as weighty beside it. As an individual, this same woman can play a piano in her home, provided the songs are of good moral quality and are not used in praise of God. All class advocates admit this. Very well then, we shall move this piano right along with this sister's class. Just where will the Sunday School brethren draw the line on it? Can it be used in the Sunday School classes? Why not, per their argument? Does the church building make any difference? If it does not, then why not use instrumental music in the classes? I am astonished that these brethren cannot see that their whole stock of arguments was worn threadbare by the digressives fifty years ago. The fact is that a woman can teach a class and play a piano too in the church building under strictly individual circumstances. But when the church takes the class in hand, as is the case in the Sunday School, she has no right to do either. And one thing is certain, the Sunday School and instrumental music stand or fall on identically the same basis. I had much rather try to defend instrumental music. If I were going to change from my present position, I would at least be consistent and accept instrumental music. There is no sin in using instrumental music in the home, provided we do not use it in praise to God. So in all candor I want to ask my Sunday School brethren a question. Would it be wise to permit the regular use of instruments of music in church buildings even when the church does not take them over and religious songs are not used? Why be uneasy about such practice? In truth you know as well as we do that the church would put in its bid for the practice and take it over. Consequently, you reason that instruments of music should be kept away from church buildings. For the same reason we argue that the regular use of women teachers as individuals should be away from the church buildings. If they should start regular teaching purely from an individualistic standpoint in the church building, it would not be long before the church would want to organize a Sunday School out of the practice. And if any class advocates seek to capitalize on this, they open the doors for instrumental music in their own church buildings.

2) Another so-called argument that our class brethren often make is this: In a city where four congregations meet, they ask if we could not move these four congregations on to the same block. If we answer yes, they move them up another step under one roof, but in different rooms. Then with a twinkle of the eye they ask, "what about this?"

All we have to do with this argument (?) is to give them the- rope and let them hang themselves. So we just ask them to hold all four congregations in those four rooms one hour longer, until the Communion is over, and then ask them "what about that?" Like a flash they drop the argument, and inform us that it is wrong to divide the communion assembly into classes, and that all these congregations should either meet together or move further apart to observe the Lord's supper. Exactly so, and the same is true with the classes in our teaching services.

Can Women Sing?

Often we are asked, "How can women sing in the assemblies if it is a shame for them to speak there?" Well, of course, Sunday School brethren have no business asking this question, for they will not let their women speak at the communion assemblies, yet they allow them to sing there. They know there is a difference. When Paul said, "it is a shame for women to speak in the church" (1 Corinthians 14:35), he was not talking about singing. How do we know? Turn to Colossians 3:16-22 where he addresses "wives," "husbands," "children," "fathers," and "servants" and tells all of them to sing.

The Best Method

The principal plea for the class system is that it is the best method of teaching. This is indeed singular, for if I felt that way about it I would use it for every gathering of the church. But, of course, they will not do this, thus logically admitting that they use an inferior method in all other assemblies. But the Lord did not seem to regard the class method very highly, as he never used it. It is true that the Sunday School often draws large crowds. But why? It is because brethren work twice as hard through the Sunday School as they do through Scriptural ways. The same is true of any other unscriptural work. Before decrying the impotency of the "old ways," why not give them a trial and work at them as strenuously as you do with the classes? The truth is that the Lord's method, when put into faithful operation in the home and in church assemblies, will far outclass any method man has invented. There is not one reason for the Sunday School. All teachable persons can be handled more effectively without it.

TEACHING THE WORD (No. 9)

We continue with a consideration of the stock arguments usually made in favor of class teaching.

Eating At Home and Asking Husbands At Home

In 1 Corinthians 11:34 Paul says, "If any man hunger let him eat at home." And in 1 Corinthians 14:35 he charges certain women to "ask their husbands at home." The argument is made that if people can obey the injunction to "eat at home" by spreading their meals in the church houses and on the lawns that women can obey the precept by asking "their husbands at home" by speaking, inquiring, and teaching in and around the church premises. To which we reply that the requirements to "eat at home" and "ask husbands at home" could both have been obeyed on the church premises, provided in both cases the individuals had acted as agents of the home and had not called an assembly of the church for such purposes. I never hold meetings where the members spread their physical meals in the assembly of the church. Such would be a violation of 1 Corinthians 11:34. We always spread our meals as individuals, and women can speak there as individuals also. But in the Sunday School classes it is different, for the church

calls those assemblies to order, thus making them church assemblies. The man who makes the argument on the parallelism of the eating and the asking must put the two on a par. If the church calls one and not the other, the parallelism is lost. Logically, the man who makes this argument would favor church suppers and bazaars. For, if, according to this argument, women can speak in assemblies that are called to order by the church, they can likewise serve physical meals in church assemblies. But make both an individual affair, and the argument is gone. The difference is that the Sunday School is a church affair, but the eating is an individual work. However, we have already shown that the statement requiring women to "ask their husbands at home" applied to the wives of the prophets. But the balance of the verse showing that it is a "shame for women to speak in the church" is universal in its application, and is binding today.

Acts 5:25

"Then came one and told them, saying, Behold the men whom ye put in prison are standing in the temple, and teaching the people."

Here, our class brethren suppose they find a plurality of teachers addressing their separate classes simultaneously. Of course they cannot prove this, but for the sake of argument let us give the passage to them for the moment to see if they can save their sinking cause with it. Later, I shall give its true exposition. Now on the assumption that all these men are addressing separate classes at the same time we ask: Is this a church meeting? Did the church call these classes to order or were the men teaching only as individuals? Why, every vestige of proof shows conclusively that these men were acting only as individuals. In the first place the angel did not tell them (v20) to call a church assembly in the temple. In the second place the Jews in the temple were not members of the church, and neither had they been called together by the church. Therefore, if we should admit, contrary to the facts in the case, that these apostles were all speaking simultaneously as individuals, it would not help those that contend that the church should teach Sunday School classes. We must remember that a church assembly is one that is called to order by the church. The promiscuous meeting of people as individuals is not a church assembly. But the church does call the Sunday School classes to order. Analogous to this, some people think that because the Lord authorized the washing of feet in the home (1 Timothy 5:10) that such should be practiced in church assemblies.

But did the apostles speak at the same time in Acts 5:25? We shall see. To say that "they are teaching the people" does not necessarily mean that all are speaking simultaneously. For example, notice Acts 3:12-26 where Peter was preaching. But in Acts 4:1-2 the priests and captain were grieved because "they spoke" and "taught the people." "They spoke unto the people" as the priests and captain "came upon them," yet only one man (Peter) was speaking. This proves conclusively that when a plurality of speakers authorize one person to speak, and concur with his remarks, that it is proper to say "they spoke." Another example: The captain and the officers set these same apostles before the council, and questioned them about their preaching. "Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:27-29). Please notice that there is only one class (the council) here. Yet Peter and the other apostles preached "then." Did they all speak at once? Why, our class

brethren say that it would be wrong for a plurality of teachers to speak to one class simultaneously. They explain that one man spoke the sentiments of the others, and that the men spoke one at a time in this place. Exactly so, and the same is true of Acts 5:25.

Acts 5:25. "And it came to pass, that after three days they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions" (Luke 6:46). Please notice the similarity. The apostles when found were "teaching the people" (Acts 5:25). Jesus when found was "hearing them" — the doctors. Were all the doctors talking at the same time? No, no, for that most certainly would be a plurality of teachers over one class (Christ), Class advocates will not allow such. But by the same method that seeks to establish a plurality of teachers and classes functioning at the same time in Acts 5:25, we show a plurality of teachers simultaneously instructing one class in Acts 5:27-29 and Luke 6:46. Class advocates generally reject the latter as unscriptural, and say that in these passages the speakers evidently taught one at a time. Well, that is a pretty strong concession. The same thing can be said of Acts 5:25, and thus, they lose the passage entirely.

TEACHING THE WORD (No. 10)

1 Timothy 2:11-12

"Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence."

This passage has been subjected to a number of awkward and illogical interpretations by those who seek to use women as teachers in church assemblies. But regardless of interpretations we must ever keep in mind that wherever the passage applies there women must "be in silence." And Paul gives a universal reason for this by citing the conduct of Eve (v14). Certainly the passage does not apply to some locality exclusively, else Eve's actions would not have been cited. The very fact that Eve's conduct is given as the reason for the woman's silence and subjection leads us to the conclusion that the passage applies to all women. It is true that Eve's transgression (Genesis 3:16) placed all women under the jurisdiction of their husbands both in private and public life. But 1 Timothy 2:11-12 does not deal with the private side of life at all. The reason we know this to be true is that this passage enjoins silence on the woman. If the passage applies to women in their private homes, then they would have "to be in silence" there. Women have a God-given right to teach in their homes. And other passages (1 Peter 3:1) require them to be in subjection to the men everywhere.

But somebody is ready to ask: "What does the word 'silence' mean in 1 Timothy 2:11-12? Is it not from the Greek root rendered "quietness" in 2 Thessalonians 3:12?" Our reply is that the same root is employed in both passages. But the context shows a distinction in the meaning in the two places. In 2 Thessalonians 3:11-12 "quietness" is used in contrast to the "disorderly" conduct of "busybodies," and evidently means that one should not be a noisy trouble-maker.

But in 1 Timothy 2:11-12 "silence" is contrasted with teaching, and therein means that the woman should not speak or teach under the circumstances that Paul had in mind. The same root is used in Acts 22:3 where the multitude kept the "more silence" while Paul preached to them. Our class brethren often contend that "silence" in this place merely means "submission," and that the term does not bar a woman from teaching, but only requires her to be submissive in such teaching. Now, we know that this position will not work because "subjection" is mentioned in the passage. Certainly Paul did not say, "Let the women learn in submission with all subjection." We must keep in mind that submission is taken care of under the term "subjection." And as "silence" and "subjection" are both required and teaching is forbidden, we must conclude that the "silence" is not the "subjection" and that the woman is forbidden to do the teaching under consideration.

But our class brethren usually interpret 1 Timothy 2:12 to mean that the woman should not teach "over the man." They make the prepositional phrase, "over the man," modify both the preceding prohibitions concerning women. They claim two other passages are parallel in construction. (1) "And they called them, and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus" (Acts 4:18). I readily admit that the prepositional phrase, "in the name of Jesus," modifies both prohibitions in this passage. In other words the rulers forbade the apostles to speak in the name of Jesus, but sentences have different constructions. And the structure of 1 Timothy 2:12 is considerably different from that in Acts 4:18. A close study of the two passages will show that. (2) "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter" (Acts 8:21). Again I admit that "in this matter" explains that in which Simon had "neither part nor lot." But this is far from proving that "over the man" modifies the prohibition against woman's teaching in 1 Timothy 2:12. The structure of the two sentences is different.

However, contrary to the facts in the case, we shall give our class brethren their construction of 1 Timothy 2:12 and see how well they fare with it. So I am ready to ask, "How does a woman teach over the man?" Our Sunday School brethren reply that when the man gives the woman permission to teach that she is then under the subjection of the man, and is not teaching over him. Well, suppose the man gives her permission to evangelize publicly, what then? How would our class brethren put the female ministry out of the Holiness churches with this argument? A child can see that they are stranded here. The fact is that the responsibility of teaching church assemblies is a responsibility that belongs to men. They cannot shift this on to the shoulders of the woman without violating divine decrees. We might as well appoint female elders. For if the men give them that authority, would they be teaching "over the man" while exercising the duties of elders?

The conjunction "nor" in 1 Timothy 2:12 is from the Greek word "oude" which is the same word rendered "nor" in Acts 8:21. But our class brethren often cite Acts 4:18 where "mede" is used as parallel to 1 Timothy 2:12. So we shall study a few passages noticing the use of both words. These passages are similar, if not parallel, to 1 Timothy 2:12.

1) "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor (oude) to usurp authority **over the man**, but to be in silence" (1 Timothy 2:12).

"Over the man" modifies "teach," so we are told. Thus, women are only forbidden to teach "over the man." But "silence" in addition to "subjection" is also imposed on women in this passage.

2) "Thou shalt not curse the deaf, nor put a stumblingblock **before the blind**, ..." (Lev. 19:14)

Shall we say that the prepositional phrase, "before the blind," modifies the first prohibition? If so, the passage merely means, "Thou shall not curse the deaf before the blind." In other words it is perfectly all right to curse the deaf, provided it is not done before the blind.

3) "Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither (mede) cast ye your pearls **before swine** ..." (Matthew 7:6)

Now let us give this verse the same construction that our class brethren give 1 Timothy 2:12. Here is what we get. "Give not that which is holy unto dogs before swine." So, brethren, we must be sure that no hogs are around when we give that which is holy unto dogs.

4) "We behaved not ourselves disorderly among you; neither (oude) did we eat any man's bread **for naught**." (2 Thess. 3:7-8)

Now connecting the expression "for naught" back with Paul's first statement we hear him say, "we behaved not ourselves among you disorderly for naught." How about it, class brethren? Does this sound like Paul's teaching?

5) "... Be not highminded, nor (mede) trust in uncertain riches ..." (1 Timothy 6:17)

Does this mean to "be not highminded in uncertain riches"? Is high-mindedness permissible, provided it is not in connection with "uncertain riches?"

6) "Who did not sin, neither (oude) was guile found in his mouth" (1 Peter 2:22)

Does this mean merely that Christ "did no sin in his mouth"?

With this we leave 1 Timothy 2:11-12 with our readers. And while we recognize the fact that a prepositional phrase may modify even a series of preceding prohibitions, yet it is not true that "over the man" modifies the prohibition against women's teaching in this place. As surely as we take such a position, we force silence on women everywhere. For, wherever the passage applies, there women must "be in silence."

TEACHING THE WORD (No. 11)

I have received several letters of criticism from two brethren that believe in class work. I shall consider their criticisms in a sincere and impersonal manner.

Miracles Today?

After reading my article on "good order" as it applied to prophets, tongue-speakers, and all men in church assemblies (1 Corinthians 14:27, 31, 33), one brother declared that my position on these passages would force the existence of prophets and tongue-speakers in the church today. But I beg to dissent. Let us see. I reasoned from 1 Corinthians 14:33 that the church is under a rule today that eliminates confusion (disorder that arises from a plurality of teachers speaking simultaneously). I also showed that prophets and tongue-speakers were under the same order (verses 27, 31). The brother needs to brush up on his logic. The fact that God gave similar regulations on a specific point to both inspired and uninspired men falls far short of proving that inspired men were to continue on earth for the whole duration of the church.

Another brother asked me if I regarded the Law of Moses as binding on us today, since I cited Deuteronomy 31:12 and Nehemiah 8 in my treatise. I will just say here that if this brother will read the article carefully he will find the information he is seeking. I stated positively in that article that I did not regard these passages as binding on us today, but that I cited them to prove that the Jews knew how to teach their children effectively without dividing them into classes. In the face of this many brethren say that the only effective way to teach children today is by classifying them.

Making A Law Where God Has Made None?

Our class brethren usually charge that we make a law where God has made none. They insist that God does not require any particular method of teaching, but that we demand a specific method. I am perfectly willing to be placed on trial on the charge. I have always admitted that if God has made no law on this question that we stand one-hundred-percent to blame for the division on the issue. It is a very serious matter to make laws where God has made none. On the other hand, if God has made a regulation on an issue, those that ignore it are fully at fault. I always recognize these two points in discussing the Sunday School and cup questions. I believe that we have proved conclusively in other articles that God has made a law on the method of teaching. But let us give the class brethren their contention again and watch them flee from it. Now, brethren, are you really serious in your contention that God has not told us how to teach? Yes? Then pray tell us why do you brethren make a law requiring men to speak one at a time and women to keep silence in your general assemblies on Sunday mornings? Your interpretations of 1 Corinthians 14:35 and 1 Timothy 2:11-12 will not keep women out of the pulpit. According to the views of our Sunday School brethren they stand self-condemned for making two laws where God has made none. (1) They say that God does not require any specific method of teaching. Yet in their so-called general assemblies they demand that their

men speak one at a time. Is not this making a law where God has made none? (2) They generally contend that 1 Corinthians 14:35 and 1 Timothy 2:11-12 do not prohibit women from teaching in their general assemblies, yet they flatly refuse to permit women to enter their pulpits and teach in these assemblies. According to their logic is not this another law where God has made none? We believe that the Scriptures cited in these articles prove conclusively that God has legislated on the two points. But our class brethren stubbornly deny that the points have the force of law. Yet they make a law out of both points in their so-called general assemblies. Thus, according to their theory they make two laws where God has made none.

Test of Fellowship?

One brother has written me repeatedly demanding that I answer (1 Peter 3:15) with a direct "yes" or "no" as to whether we make the class-method of teaching a test of fellowship. I have explained my position to him, and answered his question. But still he insists that I have side-stepped the question and refused to answer. Of course, he wants me to answer with one of the words that he has suggested, but I reserve the right to answer all questions in the manner that I think they should be handled.

In considering the question of fellowship, there are some vital points to be kept distinctly in mind. First, there is the work itself. We should have no fellowship whatever with any unscriptural work (Ephesians 5:11). By this we understand that we should not attend the classes or contribute to their support. I have neither time nor money to give to a work that I believe to be unscriptural. Second, there are individuals that believe in the Sunday School and support it. What should be our attitude toward fellowshiping them? Here is where we need to exercise extreme caution before "rushing in where angels fear to tread." There are two classes of Sunday School brethren, and our fellowship of them should depend entirely on how far the individual under consideration has gone with the question. (1) I have no qualms whatever against fellowshiping a brother who believes in the Sunday School, provided he has never pressed the question or fostered the classes upon the church. (2) If the brother has pressed the question to a division of the church and will not repent, I cannot fellowship him. A great portion of them in this section of the country have either done this or lined up with others who have done so. Thus, we have reached a breach of fellowship with this class. This is my "answer," brethren, and I am sure it will meet the requirements of the Bible.

But turning the question back to our class brethren, we ask: "Do you make our opposition to the Sunday School a test of fellowship"? Answer honestly, brethren. Do we sin in opposing the classes? If we do not, then we are right. If we do, then will you fellowship us as such sinners? I am sure they will have some difficulty in answering these questions with a direct "yes" or "no."

CONCLUSION

To those brethren who believe in the Sunday School I direct this brief appeal. Please give up your classes and take a firm stand for the truth. In your present position you cannot consistently oppose instrumental music as your whole stock of arguments was worn threadbare by the Digressives years ago. And if you are expecting us to join you in your crusade against innovations, please forget it. If I ever turn in your direction (which I am not contemplating), I will just bring a piano along with me to be consistent. The very argument that you use against mechanical instruments of music boomerangs back upon your classes. Then let us give up both the classes and instruments of music and "with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

SUPPLEMENT

By Clovis T. Cook

Having been involved in the controversy over the class method of teaching for more than forty years, it is very likely, that I have heard all the old stock and trade arguments made by the class advocates. Realizing that all of these arguments have been successfully refuted, we are now seeing an effort to update their arguments by saying the word "teach" is a generic term and therefore leaves the method to us. Therefore, the class method is justified. To prove this they say that their classes are parallel with radio and television teaching, which is justified under generic authority. Of course, this argument proves nothing. Everything we do in the work and worship of the church, stands or fails upon its own merits. One does not justify a practice by showing that something is "just as scriptural as" something else.

The radio and television programs that we have are not a striking parallel with the class method of teaching. In the first place, the radio and television is not a method of teaching. The radio is an invention by which the human voice is projected by an electromagnetic wave of energy radiated from an antenna. This is no more a method of teaching than a public address system. The radio is not a method of teaching but a method of amplification of the teaching done by the human voice. It does not even remotely resemble the Sunday School or class method of teaching.

Those who advocate the classes are divided in opinion as to whether their classes are public or private; usually they think they are private. However, all admit that the teaching done by radio is public. Many of the class advocates will permit women to teach in their classes, but I have never heard one say that a woman could teach on the radio. They make a clear distinction between the two on this point. On this point we recently asked a written question in a public discussion: "May a woman teach on radio or television; what scripture forbids it if any?" The answer was "No," and he gave 1 Timothy 2:11-12. In this passage Paul forbids a woman to give

or deliver a public discourse, and the class advocates know that radio teaching is public. I ask: Where is the parallel? The word "parallel" means something "similar or corresponding, as in purpose, time, etc." I recognize no parallelism in this argument. What we are asked to believe is that because it violates no scripture to project the human voice by means of radio, therefore it is scriptural, when the Church comes together to be taught the word of God, to divide into classes, using women teachers in some of these classes. My friends, this argument will not stand in the light of God's word.