

Whitten, Lanier Debate

Between

D. J. WHITTEN, Stockdale, Texas

and

ROY H. LANIER, Abilene, Texas



SECOND EDITION

With Introduction by

D. J. WHITTEN



*THE DEBATE WHICH CONVERTED
HE MAN IN ERROR*

WHITTEN-LANIER DEBATE

----- 0-----

PROPOSITION NO. 1

The scriptures teach that when people come together to be taught by the church, they should remain in one group, and the teaching should be done by men only, one speaking at a time to the assembly.

Affirmative, D. J. Whitten.

Negative, Roy H. Lanier.

PROPOSITION NO. 2

The practice of arranging into groups the people who come together to be taught by the church, and using both men and women to teach these groups, is authorized by the scriptures.

Affirmative, Roy H. Lanier.

Negative, D. J. Whitten.

----- 0-----

PRICE ONE DOLLAR

----- 0-----

Order from
MRS. ROY H. LANIER
Station A
ABILENE, TEXAS

PREFACE

As the reader of the personal notes accompanying the pictures will observe, this written debate resulted from an oral discussion. Bro. Whitten realized he had not met the arguments in the oral debate, so sought opportunity for another debate. We corresponded continually for about two years covering practically every point of difference between us. Then we decided to write formal propositions and discuss them with the intention of publishing them. Two thousand copies were printed in small type and distributed. That edition has been exhausted for some time, and calls continue to come in for more, hence this edition in better type and on better paper.

Several months after publication of this first edition Bro. Whitten wrote me that he was convinced of his error. Let no one think he was not a representative man among those who oppose teaching of the Bible in groups, or that he had not the ability to make their arguments. He was among their best. However, he would refuse to make an argument after he was convinced it was not in harmony with the scriptures. This accounts for the absence of many stock arguments in the written debate which he used in the oral debate, and which many opponents of group teaching use today. Since he accepted the truth on this question he has discussed the question through the mail and orally with the strongest men on that side. He has converted some, and has silenced others. He has written a booklet of eighty-one pages on "Teaching The Word" in which he demonstrates his ability to meet every error taught on this subject and to set forth the teaching of the Bible on it.

We sincerely hope this edition will meet with favor, that it will enjoy a wide circulation, and that it will do much good.

ROY H. LANIER.



D. J. WHITTEN

FOREWORD

Brother Roy H. Lanier and I had an oral discussion on the class and women teaching question several years ago. Later, we decided to have a written discussion in order that brethren generally may have a chance to read the main arguments on both sides of the question. I have pur-

posely confined myself to the main points at issue. There have been many discussions on this question, but so many unimportant matters have entered in that the main issue has not been kept before the brethren.

We know that it is sinful for the church to be divided; also that the ones responsible for the division shall be judged accordingly. As far as I know, neither of us holds any ill feelings against the other. We have endeavored to manifest the spirit of Christ. The reader is asked to honestly and prayerfully consider what each has said and act according to his honest convictions. May the truth be victorious.



ROY H. LANIER

FOREWORD

It has been a genuine pleasure to me to discuss these matters with Brother Whitten. I have met a number of men in debate, but never have I met a man who is cleaner and more Christian in his conduct. In both the oral and written discussions there has not been a personal reference made which in the least reflected upon the others character or reputation. I hope I may be pardoned if I, one of the disputants in this discussion, recommend this course to all our brethren who discuss these issues.

I was somewhat disappointed that Bro. Whitten did

not make the usual stock arguments relied on by his brethren, as he did in the oral debate, so that their fallacy might be exposed. He pursued a much more cautious course in this written discussion than he did in the oral debate, which somewhat limits the field of study in the first half of this book.

It is our sincere wish that the publication and distribution of this discussion will do good, and only good; that brethren will be led to a clearer understanding of the issues between us, and to a better knowledge of the scriptures which are relied on to maintain the different positions. If it leads to further investigation and a greater appreciation of the word of God, I shall feel more than repaid for the time and effort consumed in producing my part of it.

INTRODUCTION

It is very hard for anyone to give up his early training. We hate to accept anything that might seem to prove that we have been at fault in our teaching and practice. For over twenty-five years I earnestly opposed class teaching. I went far and near to hear able men discuss the question. I also engaged in a number of oral and written discussions on the question, besides many private discussions. Little by little I saw that some of our arguments were failing to stand up, and at the same time I saw that we were wrong in some of our propositions. After reading and rereading my written debate with Bro. Lanier a number of times, I realized that my main arguments were inconclusive against class teaching. I shall never forget the sleepless hours I spent in trying to answer some of Bro. Lanier's arguments. I was heartsick and discouraged. I knew what it meant for me to surrender—I knew I would be disfellowshipped by my best friends in the church. My mental worry was great, but I had sought the truth in the hard way and was satisfied that I had found it. I had to make a decision between what I honestly believed to be the truth and the love and respect of many brethren that I had taught and baptized. I became perfectly reconciled to my fate and announced my change publicly. I have suffered for it, but *in peace of mind, and* steadfastness of purpose I have endeavored to lead others to see the truth.

In my long hard fight out of my misconceptions of what the Bible teaches on the question I was finally forced to settle down on I Cor. 14 as a foundation for my opposition to class teaching. It will be observed that in my written debate with Bro. Lanier this chapter was used for our battle ground. I labored hard to show that I Cor.

14 furnishes a complete and detailed rule to govern us in all of our teaching, when we come together for the purpose of teaching. Bro. Lanier called upon me to give this perfect and complete rule. I tried, but got into trouble. He showed me I could furnish no such rule about anything we do in our teaching services. I offered all the proof that in my mind was worthy of being offered, and yet he pointed out my complete failure. You may try, if you please, to find the details to be followed in any of our public assemblies and you will search in vain. We must derive authority for what we do from commands, examples, or some statement relative to what was done or should be done. To illustrate the truthfulness of these remarks I shall mention a few matters.

We are commanded to sing. We are commanded to sing spiritual songs, with the spirit and the understanding. We have no songs written in the New Testament; there is nothing said about our writing a song book, there is nothing said about notes to guide us in our singing. We derive authority for all these things from the command to sing. From this command we derive authority to learn to sing, to have a singing teacher, arrangements for this teaching, hence, a singing school, and many other things. The same is true of many other things we are commanded to do. We are commanded to pray everywhere. (I Tim. 2:8). But just how many prayers we should have in our public worship is a matter of our own judgment. We are not told to ask anyone to pray, or lead the public prayer, this is another matter left to our judgment. The same is true of the Lord's supper, contribution, and everything else.

The command to teach is no exception to the other matters mentioned. We have examples of public teaching, private teaching, and house to house teaching; but just

how we are to arrange to do all the teaching that is necessary to be done is a matter of judgment. In I Cor. 14 we have some general instructions given to govern us in our public assemblies of the whole church. (I Cor. 14:23). But even in this chapter the details are not given. Some of the commands given in this chapter must be understood and acted upon according to our judgment. For example, women are told to learn in silence in the church, "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," (I Cor. 14:35). Do you know any church that observes to the letter this command? I am sure no church does so. We believe that a woman may talk and ask questions at other places besides at her home. We are forced to exercise our judgment in this matter. We derive our authority from many examples and statements in the Bible for what we do about this matter. If we would be as reasonable about our teaching services we can also come to an agreement on this.

We have also a parallel passage to I Cor. 14:35 in I Cor. 11:34, "And if any man hunger, let him eat at home." Those who oppose class teaching and women teaching know how to explain this command so as to eat even in the church building on Lord's day. Yet the apostle limits the place of eating common meals to our homes, if we abide by the exact wording. But we know from what is said elsewhere in the New Testament that the apostle did not mean to prohibit us from eating at any place except at home. If we would only exercise the same judgment about class teaching and women teaching we can agree upon this subject also.

It is contended that when we come together an hour before the appointed time for our public worship and have

exhort to be honest and fair in their investigation of the subject, for it is truth that will count in life and eternity. If there ever was a time for the church to be united in every important thing pertaining to our work and worship it is now. We should cease to be contentious about matters which are to be determined only by the exercise of good judgment. May the day hasten when all strife and division among God's people may cease and fellowship among us be completely restored.

D. J. WHITTEN.

WHITTEN-LANIER DEBATE

WHITTEN'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

The scriptures teach that when people come together to be taught by the church they should remain in one group, and the teaching should be done by men only, one speaking at a time to the assembly.

Proposition Defined

I mean by the scriptures, the word of God, as contained in the book called the Bible. I mean by the word "teach" to make to know how; to show how, or to train. I mean by come together, as when people gather in one house, or in one location. I mean by the church, those who have been called out from the world and have obeyed the gospel of Christ. I mean by remaining in one group, one assembly. I mean by teaching being done by men only, that only men should engage in teaching when people come together to be taught by the church. I mean by one only speaking at a time, that only one speaker should speak at a time to those who have come together to be taught by the church.

The scriptures teach in three ways: by precept, example, and by necessary inference. A precept is something commanded. An example is that which is to be followed or imitated. An inference is a logical conclusion from given data, or premises. Some things are involved, or included in a command, yet not directly mentioned in the command. Jesus and the apostles did some things for us to follow or imitate. Such things are for our examples.

Some commands are of such nature that other things not mentioned naturally go with the commands. In such cases, we are governed by inferences.

Christ was a perfect teacher. He is the author and finisher of our faith, and did all things well. Whatever Jesus did, he did in the best way, and whatever he could have done, but did not do, was either wrong or unnecessary. Jesus could have arranged the people into different groups to teach them, if it had been necessary, but he did not so arrange the people to teach them; therefore, such was either wrong or unnecessary. In like manner, Jesus and the apostles could have used instrumental music in their worship, but they did not do so; therefore, such was either wrong or unnecessary. Christ and the apostles could have organized a missionary society for the church to have done missionary work through, but they did not do so; therefore, to do such was either wrong, or was not necessary. Thus we reason concerning things for which we do not have precept, example, or necessary inference.

Whatever was available and right in worshipping God and teaching the people, Christ and the apostles taught the church to do. Matt. 28:19,20; Acts 2:42. Whatever was necessary to have the people arranged into groups to teach them was available, but Christ and the apostles never so arranged the people to teach them; therefore, to do such was either wrong or unnecessary.

When Jesus saw the necessity of arranging the multitude into different groups to feed them loaves and fishes, he did so, and I am sure that if he had seen the need of arranging the people into different groups to teach them the word of God, he would have done so, but since he did not do this, such must have been wrong or unnecessary. If we say that the need existed, we infer that Jesus had more

interest in feeding people loaves and fishes than he did in teaching the word of God. We cannot contend that Christ and the apostles could not have made the necessary arrangements, to have the people taught in different groups on the grounds that they did not have rooms enough to do this group teaching in, for we know that when they wanted a room they found it. Besides, if the multitudes were gathered in places where there were no buildings to use, they could have grouped the people far enough apart that there could not have been any confusion. Christ and the apostles never arranged the people who came together to be taught into such groups to teach them; we, therefore, conclude that when the people come together to be taught by the church, they should remain in one group, or assembly, while being taught.

In I Cor. 14th chapter, we have instruction concerning how the church should teach so as to edify every member: "For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted." I Cor. 14:31. Paul is here speaking concerning how to teach in church gatherings. He says, "If therefore the whole church be assembled together," I Cor. 14:23. Again in I Cor. 14:34-5, "And as is the rule in all churches of the saints, women must keep quiet at gatherings of the church." In I Cor. 11:33, we have another passage, "Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, wait one for another." (Moffatt and others so translate.) From these different passages we learn that Paul was instructing the church concerning how they should conduct their worship, and teaching, in all church gatherings. Therefore, when people are called together by the church to be taught, the teaching should be done by the people remaining in one group, or assembly, and women should learn in silence: I Cor. 14:34-5; I Tim. 2:11,12.

The church at Corinth was a large congregation, and had in it all the different grades of minds found in any congregation today. This church needed special instruction concerning how they should conduct their worship and their teaching services. If different grades of minds and ages have anything to do with the need or necessity of having the people arranged into separate groups to teach them, then this church needed such arrangements. If great numbers have anything to do with the necessity for class teaching, then this church certainly needed such arrangement, for this was a large congregation. If having a mixed audience necessitates such group teaching, this congregation needed such teaching: I Cor. 14:23. If having qualified teachers qualifies a congregation for such group teaching, this church certainly was qualified, for this church had inspired teachers. If a desire to teach while another is teaching furnishes a reason for the class arrangement, then this church needed such arrangement, for Paul rebuked some for speaking while others were speaking. If having women in a congregation that desire to teach when people come together to be taught by the church necessitates having groups arranged for old women to teach, then this congregation needed such arrangement, for it seems that some of the women were anxious to teach in the church gatherings, I Cor. 14:34-5.

From the foregoing, we can see that if ever a congregation needed the people who come together to be taught by the church arranged into different groups to teach them, this congregation did. This was a large congregation; it had a mixed audience; it had inspired teachers; some wanted to speak while another was speaking, and women wanted to speak in the assembly; yet with all these existing conditions, the apostle did not instruct this church to ar-

range the people into separate groups for the purpose of teaching the word of God. We, therefore, conclude that when the people come together to be taught by the church, they should remain in one group while being taught, and women should learn in silence.

In reference to women teaching, Paul says, "As in all churches of the saints, let the women keep silence in the churches (assemblies) for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also sayeth the law. And if they would learn anything (by asking questions) let them ask their husbands (men) at home: for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church," I Cor. 14:34-5. Again, "Let a woman learn in quietness with all subjection, but I permit not a woman to teach, nor have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness," I Tim. 2:11-12. From these two passages we learn that women are not to speak as a teacher or ask questions in church gatherings. Elsewhere, women—old women—are commanded to teach young women to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, etc., Tit. 2:2-5. Also, young women are instructed to marry and bear children and guide the house, I Tim. 5:14. From a careful study of what old women are to teach the young women, we are forced to conclude that the nature of the things that old women are to teach the young women, and the things young women are to do, necessitates house to house teaching, or training. The old women are to train the young women how to cook, sew, and take care of babies, and all other things that pertain to home making. This cannot be done in the group teaching, as practiced by brethren on Lord's day morning when the people come together to be taught by the church. Women are to do their teaching strictly in private—*not* in meetings called by the church. I see

no conflict in what women are commanded to do and what they are commanded not to do. Women are to learn in silence in all church gatherings. Any gathering that can be called a church gathering is the place where women are not to teach; any gathering where people have come together to be taught by the church should remain in one group while the teaching is being done.

LANIER'S FIRST NEGATIVE

I take exception to your definition of the term "church" as not being' full enough. I grant it means what you say, but I contend the word means more, or is used in a sense not covered by your definition. In I Cor. 14:19, 23, 28, 33, 35 the word is used to include only those who are gathered in an assembly. To keep silent in the church does not mean one is to keep silent as "one called out"—not to speak in the capacity of one called out—but to keep silent in the assembly. The word is used in three distinct ways, Universal; Local, as including all God's children in a given locality; and the assembly, including that number gathered for worship.

I accept your statement as to the three ways of teaching, *command*, *example*, and *inference*, but must suggest that the inference must be both *logical* and *necessary* before it may become a test of fellowship between brethren. Women are commanded to teach. They are commanded to be silent in the assembly for worship. You therefore infer that they are to be silent before any and all groups where the word of God is being taught, regardless of where the group may be. I deny the necessity of your inference.

1. The word of God is to be taught, we are commanded to do it.
2. Different groups are to be taught different lessons from the word of God.
3. You infer that these groups can not be taught in the same building at the same time by different teachers when such accommodations are made that there is not confusion. I deny the necessity of your inference; I deny that it is logical.

You say, "that only men should engage in teaching when people come together to be taught by the church." This means that no woman can ever teach more than one

at a time unless she just happens to catch more than one in a crowd; if they are called together to be taught the woman can not teach, but if she happens to find them in a group, and they have gathered for another purpose, she can teach them. If they are gathered for a picnic she can teach them; but if they gathered to study the Bible a man will have to be called in, the woman must keep silent. To me this is absurd, but it is your position as stated in your definition. Do you mean to try to maintain this position?

You say, "Whatever Jesus did he did it in the best way, and whatever he could have done but did not do was either wrong or unnecessary." He extended an invitation for people to "come unto me," to be his disciples, (Matt. 11:28-30). Did he sing that invitation? When you extend the invitation, you sing an invitation song. Did Jesus do it that way? Remember that "whatever he did he did it in the best way," and any other way is wrong or unnecessary. But did the apostles ever sing an invitation song? You insist that I refrain from group teaching just because the Lord and his apostles never used the plan. Then why do you sing an invitation song, since they did not do it? But again, you can not prove that the apostles did not use some plan for group teaching. You simply *infer* that they did not. Different groups are to be taught different things, and some of these groups are to be taught by women. You infer that they must not be taught in the same house at the same time. Why the necessity of this inference? Do I not have a right to infer that they did teach the different groups at the same time—at least as much right as you have to infer that they did not? But you take a passage which you insist regulates the teachers of the whole church assembled and try to apply it to the teacher of groups.

You insist that if Jesus divided the people to feed them

bread he could have divided them to teach them. Yes, he could have done it. But who would have taught the other groups? The apostles did not know the nature of the kingdom; they did not know the entrance requirements; they did not know when it was to come, nor the duties of citizens in the kingdom. How could they have taught? Jesus was the only one qualified to teach. I Cor. 14 states that the prophets were to speak by two or three, and that in turn. But Jesus and the apostles did not observe that order either. None of the apostles taught the multitude after Jesus finished. So they did not follow the order for which you insist any more than they used group arrangement for which I contend. I have as much right to oppose your order from the example of Jesus as you have to oppose the group teaching plan. You lose there. You say, "the apostles never arranged the people into groups . . . to teach them." Where is your proof? You only *infer* they did not. Get this illustration: The Lord teaches salvation by faith; people today add to this and say, Salvation by faith only. Application: The apostles taught the church in one assembly; you say the apostles taught in one assembly only. By adding the word "only" you add to the word of God, bring confusion and division in the church.

As stated above, you infer that no two apostles ever taught at the same time in the same building. Your inference is wrong. In Acts 5:17-25 we learn the apostles were put in prison; the Lord delivered them; said to them, "Go, stand and speak in the temple . . . all the words of this life.¹" They went and one reported, "Behold, the men whom ye put in prison are in the temple standing and teaching the people." 1. We have men, plural, so more than one. 2. They are teaching, present tense; at the time of the report more

than one standing and teaching, and doing it at the same time. Common sense would teach us that all the men were not teaching the same people at the same time. So there were as many groups as there were apostles. Hence we have a number of groups being taught in the same house at the same time by the apostles.

I Cor. 14 was written to regulate some abuses in handling spiritual gifts, especially speaking with tongues and prophesying. Women were forbidden to ask questions while a revelation was in the process of being given; she was to wait until she got home and ask her husband. But to contend that this rule applies to all the teaching services of the church is absurd. To say that this rule applies in a group where women are teaching young women is absurd. But if a group of young women called together to be taught is a church assembly as you contend, the rule would have to apply. According to your position a group of women, where no men are Christians, could not even worship together. Certainly the Lord has not made any rule which would deny women the right of worship simply because no men are willing to conduct the worship.

You say, "The old women are to train the young women how to cook, sew, and take care of babies." Now, just where did you learn that? Is that a church duty or a home duty they have? If it is a home duty, mothers are all who are included, and they would be expected to teach only their daughters. If it is a church duty—if they are to teach these things as members of the church—then the church is turned into a school of industrial arts. But according to you they would have to teach the young women one at a time; they could not get two together for that would be a church gathering in which only men are allowed to teach.

Next, you say, "Women are to do their teaching strictly in private; not in meetings called by the church." But I notice you did not give any proof, not even a reference which might infer such a proposition. From that statement I infer that you think any gathering called by the church is public. But certainly the church can call a private meeting or gathering. The words "private" and "public" are relative terms. You can have a private meeting in a public place. But there is no statement in the New Testament that even suggests that a woman must teach in private. There is no statement to the effect that a woman must not teach in the church house. Your proposition makes it impossible for a woman ever to teach two or more in the house at any time. If she can not teach two in the church house, she can not teach two in the house she lives in; therefore, according to your position a woman can never meet two or more people anywhere on stated occasions and teach them the word of God.

You say that if ever a church needed to teach in groups, the church at Corinth did, yet you say that the apostles did not tell them to so teach. Where is your proof? You have none. Paul told the prophets how to conduct themselves when exercising the gift of prophecy, but do you intend to make that rule apply to every gathering of every nature called by the church? The church at Jerusalem had a business session in which Peter asked Sapphira a question and she answered. According to your position Peter made her violate Paul's instruction to Corinth. Paul had women helpers in his work who "labored in the gospel" (Rom. 16:12; Phs. 4:2-3); could he call them together and ask them questions? Could they tell him what they had done, and ask for advice in dealing with their problems? I main-

at a time, unless she just happened to find more than one in a crowd, or finds them gathered together at a picnic. In Titus two, Paul does not limit the number of the young women to be taught by the old woman. Neither do I. That is not the issue. Women are to do their teaching strictly in private meetings—not in meetings called by the church.

I have contended that whatever Christ did he did in the best way and whatever he could have done, but did not do, was either wrong or unnecessary. You try to make an exception. You say that Jesus extended an invitation for people to “come unto me” to be his disciples, Matt. 11:28-30. You ask, “Did he sing that invitation?” I know that Jesus and the apostles sang, but I do not know whether they sang invitation songs or not. Neither do I affirm that the Bible teaches that we should sing invitation songs. Neither would I insist on the church singing invitation songs to the division of the church. Would you? Now since you place the group teaching on a parallel with the invitation song, you certainly see who is responsible for the division over this question. I refrain from such group teaching, not just because Christ and the apostles did not do so, but because they did not only leave it off, but gave instructions how to teach when people come together to be taught by the church; that leaves no possible room for such arrangement. This I showed very plainly on page three, paragraph two, of my first affirmative. I have shown that if ever any church needed the group teaching arrangement, the church at Corinth did. I showed that every so-claimed need for such arrangement existed in this church, and yet the apostle left the arrangement entirely out. Have you disproved this? Certainly not, and you have no evidence whatever for the class arrangement. You ask, “Do I not have a right to infer that they did teach

in different groups at the same time—at least as much right as you have to infer that they did not?” I am willing to admit your class arrangement is right if you can prove the above statement. Can you do it? Let’s see who has the necessary and logical inference. In I Cor. 14:31, Paul admonishes the prophets to speak one by one. He gives his reasons: 1st, “That all may learn” 2nd, “The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets:” 3rd, “For God is not the author of confusion.” The apostle wanted all who *come* together to be taught to learn, and he commanded the prophets to speak one by one that all might learn. In order for all to learn according to your plan, those who come together to be taught by the church should be arranged into different groups and all be taught at the same time. In view of the scriptures cited, can that be done? Where is your inference coming from? Paul says “the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.” In other words, they do not all have to speak at the same time. Does this statement leave room for your inference? Again, “For God is not the author of confusion.” Paul’s plan to avoid confusion was for one to speak at a time to the entire audience, but your plan to avoid confusion is for the people to be arranged into different groups, and all be taught at the same time. Now, who has the necessary and logical inference? It is easy to see that you cannot find an inference to sustain your group teaching, while I have the plan that I am contending for clearly revealed, and very strongly inferred, that your plan is not only unnecessary and illogical, but wrong. Again, women are told to teach, but in church gatherings they are commanded to learn in silence. They are not even allowed to ask questions in such gatherings. Certainly you can see that when Paul commanded the women to ask their husbands at home, this left no room

for your class arrangement for women to teach when the people come together to be taught by the church. You have absolutely no inference for your class arrangement. One was to speak at a time, and women were to be silent.

Your reasons for Jesus not having the apostles to teach the people in groups will not stand. You say that they did not know the nature of the Kingdom; they did not know the entrance requirements; they did not know when it was to come; nor the duties of citizens in the Kingdom. You insist that Jesus was the only one qualified to teach these things. Did Jesus teach the people any of these things plainly? Certainly not. The time had not come for such revelation. He did not send the apostles forth two and two to preach that the kingdom of heaven was at hand and that men should repent. So your reasons are not logical. Jesus could have had the apostles to teach that they were able to teach, and he could have qualified them to teach anything. You insist that Jesus and the apostles did not observe the order given in I Cor. 14:34. How do you know that they did not, observe that order? If the apostles did not observe this order, why did Jesus send them forth two and two? Is this not an inference that two teachers were needed? So you lose again.

Your illustration is against you. You admit that Christ and the apostles sang songs in the assembly, but you say that they did not use instrumental music with their singing; so you add "sing only," and by adding the one word "only," you add to the word of God, and bring division and confusion in the church. If I am guilty of adding to the word of God because I contend that Christ and the apostles did not use the class arrangement to teach, you are equally guilty of adding to the word of God when you

say that the Lord and the apostles sang only. That that proves too much proves nothing.

You cite Acts 5:17-25 to prove that the apostles all taught in the temple at the same time. The apostles were reported to "be standing in the temple teaching" You reason, 1st: "We have men, plural—more than one;" 2nd: "They are in the temple, one house;" 3rd: "They are teaching, present tense, at the time of the report more than one standing in the temple and teaching and doing it at the same time." Now read the 27th-29th verses and you have the same apostles all before the council, and all speaking at the same time. "Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than man." See also verses 30-32. Here we have according to your reasoning all the apostles talking at the same time to the same group. We know that this is not true. You have strained your scripture badly to try to justify your practice. Such cannot be true. You have imagined too much.

I Cor. 14 has reference to church gatherings. Read again paragraph 3 on page 2 and 3 of my first affirmative, and read paragraph 2 on page four, and you will see that my position is that women are not to speak in church gatherings—gatherings called by the church.

On paragraph 2 on page three you are wrong again. Old women are to teach, train, young women to be "keepers at home." Is it not a Christian duty for Christian women to be keepers at home? Home-keeping certainly includes sewing, cooking and caring for babies. Old women cannot do such training in your class arrangement. The things old women are to train the young women to do necessitates home training. Unmarried women need such training also.

Yes, private meetings can be had in public places, but when you try to turn a public gathering into a number of private ones it is like turning a public dance into a number of private dances by having the people dance in different rooms in the same house. Such is absurd.

I agree with you that there is nothing about a woman's not speaking in a church house. I have no contention to make about the house, but my contention is concerning women teaching in meetings called by the church—public meetings. All the rule that is necessary to govern church meetings is found in I Cor. 14. Every need for edifying the church and teaching others is cared for without the slightest reference to the class arrangement.

Your business meeting where Peter asked Sapphira a question has nothing to do with our contention. We both believe that women may confess the Lord and their faults in the assembly. If I am wrong in so believing, so are you. Rom. 16:12; Phil. 4:2,3 does not conflict with my position. These women did not come to Paul and ask him questions in the church gatherings, I Cor. 14:34-5. We have no disagreement over meetings that are strictly private. You reason that women are to keep silent in only such meetings as where the church has come together to worship—the whole church. Do you think women may teach in protracted meetings where only a part of the church is present? Look out I You are about to go wild on this subject. You have not moved my affirmative. Try again.

LANIER'S SECOND NEGATIVE

I am sorry that you did not see fit to make a new argument in your second. Is it because you have no other arguments? I hope you will do better next time; your proposition certainly needs some more support. But I shall notice your remarks.

You say, "The public is invited" to classes which women teach. That statement is untrue. I challenge you to prove that any of my brethren ever invited the public to go into a class room where a woman was teaching. You should either prove it or retract it. The public is invited to the teaching service of the church, but not to a woman's class.

Your effort to put group teaching on the same basis as instrumental music is sadly lacking in strength. Instrumental music in worship is an added item, a thing the Lord did not command; neither is it a method or manner of doing what the Lord said do. But the grouping of people to teach is a manner, an arrangement, for doing what the Lord said do. The Lord said "teach." You contend for one arrangement, while I contend for another. The Lord said "sing," but when one plays an instrument he does something in addition, not a manner or method of doing what the Lord said do. But here is a parallel: The Lord sang, and told us to sing. He sang one part, what we call soprano, and all the others sang the same part. But you divide the crowd; one sings bass, one tenor, one alto and one soprano. You say, "Whatever Jesus did he did it in the best way, and whatever he could have done but did not do was either wrong or not necessary, ' ' and therefore should not be done now. Yet you arrange your songs and your singers into four parts, a thing he did not do. He did not

do it because it was in advance of the musical knowledge of his age. He did not institute methods and arrangements in the work and worship of the church in advance of his age. But he put his work and worship on such basis and on such principles as would allow the use of such methods and arrangements as the people advanced in the science of singing and teaching. He said "sing," and if all sang the melody, he was pleased. "When the science of music advanced to the use of four notes and two parts and the church made use of the advancement, he was pleased. And when the science had advanced to where we have seven notes and four parts, in some songs five parts, and the church uses that arrangement, he is pleased. He said "teach," and if all were taught in one group, he was pleased. When the science of teaching had advanced to where they were grouped according to age or attainment, and the church made use of that advancement, he was pleased. And until you get back to singing like Jesus did, you have no right to object to me using advanced methods of teaching, or arrangements for doing the teaching the Lord commanded.

According to your statement in pars. 3 and 10 a meeting is private if a woman calls it no matter if 500 young women attend it. But if "the church" calls the meeting it is public, even if only 10 attend, and she is not allowed to teach. That approaches the absurd. How does "the church" call a meeting? Isn't a woman a part of the church? Why is it a private meeting if a woman calls it, but a public meeting if an elder of the church calls it? Your proposition must be in bad shape to have to use such positions and arguments as that to support it. But you are on record as affirming that a woman cannot teach any number called together and supervised by the church. According to that it is impossible for the elders to have any

control or supervision over the teaching of women. What if two, or four, women call groups to the same house, at the same time, to teach them? The church has had nothing to do with calling them together; can four women teach four groups, in the same house at the same time? Please answer!

In par. 4 you contend that I should use the arrangement of I Cor. 14, teaching in one group. Very well. When you begin using the arrangement of that chapter you will have a right to demand that I do it; but not until then. Do you always have at least two and never more than three speakers in every service? Paul said, "Let the prophets speak by two or three." If the arrangement for the audience is binding today, so is the order of speakers binding today. Please give this attention! And you get yourself further in by trying to prove that Jesus observed this order of speaking by two in that he sent his disciples out in twos. What other preacher goes with you in your meetings?

In par. 7 you try to escape the force of my argument on Acts 7:17-25, and you made the very mistake I guarded against by calling attention to the tense of the verb. Luke records the fact years later that the "apostles said, We ought to obey" etc. From that record no order of their speaking can be determined; whether they all spoke at once, or one at a time, though we suppose they did it one at a time. But when it was reported that "the men are standing and teaching in the temple," the verb being present tense we are forced to conclude that all were standing at the time of the report, and all were teaching at the time. Were they all teaching the same people at the same time, or were they teaching different groups? If they were all teaching the same people they violated I Cor. 14; if they

did not violate I Cor. 14 we have an example of several groups being taught at the same time in the same building. I suggest that you consult a teacher of English grammar on the point.

In par. 10 you state, "All the rule that is necessary to govern church meetings is found in I Cor. 14. Every need for edifying the church and teaching others is cared for without the slightest reference to the class arrangement." The meeting in which Peter asked Sapphira a question was not governed by I Cor. 14. The teaching done in the temple in Acts 5:17-25 was not governed by I Cor. 14. The protracted meeting work you do is not governed by I Cor. 14, for you do not have two speakers which I Cor. 14:29 demands. The work of women in Titus 2 is "edifying the church and teaching others;" the work of women in Phil. 4, who labored with Paul in the gospel, and of those in Rom. 16 who labored much in the Lord, was a work of "teaching others," yet I Cor. 14 does not provide a rule for their work. It tells them where NOT to do their work, but it does not tell them where, when, nor whom to teach. But you say that it can all be done without reference to class arrangement, and yet Titus 2 tells women what class to teach. According to your position, women can have no part in church work; she must work independently and with individuals. But you state in par. 11, "These women did not come to Paul and ask him questions in the church gatherings" mentioned in I Cor. 14. That's my point exactly. They had gatherings for the edification of the church not mentioned or governed by I Cor. 14. Thanks.

Again in par. 4 you say, "In church gatherings they (women) are commanded to learn in silence." Then you define "church gatherings" to mean any number of people who gather, at the invitation of the church, for any pur-

pose. You say that if a meeting is “called by the church,” it is a meeting in which women are to keep silent. Your whole proposition rests upon this assumption for which you have given no proof at all. What does the term “the church” mean? Who calls the meeting, the elders? If the elders call a meeting, is that a meeting called by “the church?” In the next place I deny that I Cor. 14 was intended to govern all gatherings of church people who gather to be taught the gospel. You have made the assertion, but have never given any proof. I am demanding some proof in your next!

Again, I Cor. 14:34,35 is to be taken in a limited sense, which you must admit. It does not govern women in the song service. It does not keep women quiet when they are to confess their faults. Therefore it does not govern women, or is not applicable, during all of the service; or does not govern her during all the activities of the assembly under consideration. Why is she allowed to “teach in songs” in the assembly? Because she is not exercising dominion over men. Why is she allowed to confess her faults in the assembly? Because she is not exercising dominion over man, (I Tim. 2:11,12). Why is she not allowed to teach in the assembly? Because she would be exercising dominion over the man. She must not take that leading part in the presence of qualified men. But in gatherings of women, young women and children, the necessity for her silence no longer exists and she may speak. 1. She is commanded to teach, (Tit. 2). 2. She may teach any number of women, the place and time not legislated, (according to your statement; to which I agree). 3. It is a part of her church duty to do this teaching, for Paul was telling Titus how to “set in order the things wanting” in the church, (Ti. 1:5; 2:3,4). Therefore a group which she would call together, or which

the elders may invite and ask her to teach, would be a church gathering in the sense that the work being done is church work, a part of the teaching program of the church in the community. But since no men are present the restriction of I Cor. 14 would not apply.

Consider this supposed case: One of Philip's daughters began teaching some children Sunday afternoon; more came next time than she could handle in one room of her home; she asked her sister to take them in another room. Their older sisters came next Sunday and the third daughter was asked to teach them. The young women came next Sunday and the fourth daughter taught them in another room. The brothers got interested and came with their sisters and Philip taught them in another room. The mothers got interested in what their children were doing and came; Mrs. Philip taught them in another room at the same time the other groups were being taught. Some were converted and Philip baptized them. When the group teaching was over they met in the two large front rooms, the connecting dining room and had the Lord's supper. But they grew too large for Philip's home, so they built a house for their teaching and worship, a room for each group and auditorium for worship. Where is the sin in that situation? Where did they begin to violate I Cor. 14? I insist you answer.

Things we agree on: 1. A woman may teach in a house used by the church for worship. 2. The number she may teach is unlimited, if they be women and children. 3. No time is set for her to teach, as long as she does not conflict with worship. But we disagree on: 1. She cannot teach if the group is called by "the church." 2. She can not teach if her teaching is supervised by the elders of the

church. You are welcome to the credit for the disagreement.

FIVE QUESTIONS, ACCORDING TO AGREEMENT

1. Is it right for the local church to take on itself the obligation of teaching *children* under the age of accountability:

- a. Children of Christian parents;
- b. Children of alien parents?

2. In a community where there are ten or fifteen Christian women, but no men are members of the church, or, if so, they are unwilling to take the lead:

- a. Would it be right for those women to conduct the worship for themselves;
- b. Would it be right for them to carry on the worship if some alien men drop in occasionally?

3. Your proposition states that "when people come together to be taught . . . they should remain in one group."

Suppose they do not assemble and then go to different rooms; suppose they go directly from home to their separate class rooms in the church building, as many of our brethren do, where is the sin in that ?

4. I understand that, according to your proposition, if a woman calls a group together on her own responsibility, it is not a "church gathering" and therefore she may speak as I Cor. 14 does not apply to such private meetings. Now, if some men gather with that group, which is not called by the church, and therefore is not a "church gathering," may she speak before them ?

5. Please state when, where, and under what conditions Philip's daughters could teach more than one person at regular stated hours?

WHITTEN S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

I do not consider that you have overthrown my first affirmative. This being true, why should I offer more affirmative matter? To my mind you have failed to meet my arguments. I am waiting for you to disprove my arguments before I offer others. In your efforts to meet *my* arguments you have slightly changed my wording, and replied accordingly. I did not say the public is invited to the classes that the women teach. I said, "Women are to do their teaching strictly in private—not in meetings called by the church, and supervised by the Elders. The public is invited, hence these meetings are not strictly private." I did not say the public is invited into any certain class, but that the public is invited to these meetings. You know this is true, and you know that you turn this public meeting into what you call private groups. This is the issue. Meet it. I say again, you can no more turn this public meeting into a number of private groups, and make the teaching strictly private than you can turn a public dance into a number of private dances, by having the dancers dance in different rooms of the same house at the same time. Such approaches the absurd. If the public is invited to the dance, and the public comes, it does not change the dance from public to private, to have the dancers dance in different rooms in the same house at the same time.

You fail in your effort to make a difference in having instrumental music in the worship, and having the class arrangement. There is neither precept nor example for your class arrangement—you add this arrangement—with less evidence than there is for instrumental music in the worship. Instrumental music was used in the worship under the Law, and Paul makes mention of the instruments in

I Cor. 14:7. Your class arrangement is not even hinted at by any writer of the Old or New Testaments. Therefore, when you add the class arrangement, you add something with less evidence to support than there is to support instrumental music in the worship. Jesus and the apostles could have used both the class arrangement and instrumental music in the worship, but they did not use either; therefore, such was either wrong or was not necessary.

You fail on your singing argument. You say that Jesus sang soprano, and all the apostles sang the same part. How do you know that Jesus sang soprano? I will say he sang bass. You disprove it. You say that I divide the crowd to sing the four parts. This is not necessarily true. We do not divide the crowd into different rooms to sing these four parts, but if we did, we would have the same authority for so doing that you have for arranging the crowd into different rooms to teach; if not, why not? The four parts are not of man's origin. These different parts or voices are natural. Some have bass voices, others soprano, tenor, others alto. So you lose again. But if your contention is right, I am still in the clear. I have never contended for all these different parts to the division of the church. If we have no bass, that is all right, and if we have no alto, that does not bother me. I would not cause a division over a thing not essential. I accept whatever voices we have in the congregation. We have no restrictions on this point, but we have certain restrictions concerning who should teach, and how the teaching should be done: I Cor. 14:31-35; I Tim. 2:10-12. Your contention that we are left to conform to the advanced age in these things can be easily carried too far. How about the missionary society for the church to work through? How do you prove that the Lord will not approve of this modern development?

No meeting is private just because a woman calls it. If a woman calls the public, and the public comes, it would be a public meeting. The meetings you call for your group teaching are public meetings—the public is called and the public comes. If a person invites the public to a dance, and the public comes, is not this a public dance? Can this dance be turned into a number of private dances, by having the dancers dance in different rooms in the same house at the same time? Your position must be suffering, or you would not take positions that drive you into such predicaments. The only supervision an elder has over the teaching of the old women is general, such as they exercise over the private lives of the church in general.

You want to know if your women can call four groups into the same house and teach them at the same time in different rooms. I see no reason for such arrangement. Could these four women call four groups of sisters into the same house and observe the Lord's supper in these different rooms all at the same time? If not, why not?

In paragraph 2 on page four you want to know if we always observe the rule, "Let the prophets speak by two or three." Examine this verse in connection with the 31st. Paul says, "For ye may all prophesy one by one." Does Paul contradict himself? But, if we do not always conform to this rule, *it* does not by any means suggest your group arrangement, I have not contended two and two should always go together to preach, but it seems that the apostles practiced this to some extent.

You think I have failed to disprove your contention that all the apostles were standing in the temple at the same time. Note. "Then Peter and the other apostles answered." When did they answer! The word *then* is an adverb of time and denotes the time they answered. The

King James translators used the word “then” to denote the time when the apostles answered. So, according to your reasoning, all the apostles spoke at the same time to the same group; if not, all the apostles did not teach different groups at the same time in the temple. We are admonished to pray without ceasing, I Thes. 5:17, but that does not mean that there should not be an interval between prayers. The nature of prayer excludes such a position. The same is true concerning all the apostles teaching at the same time in the Temple. The nature of such audiences forbid such contention. There is but one way, such could have been true, and that does not suit your group teaching. The apostles could have been standing about in the temple and talking to those who chanced to be near them. There was no orderly arrangement such as you contend for. The people came and went to and from the Temple continually. Besides the witnesses you use to prove your position, was a betrayer of the apostles. Does your position demand such testimony?

You next refer to Acts 5, where Peter asked Sapphira a question, and she answered. I admit that women may answer such questions when they are confessing Christ or their sins. This meeting was not an orderly meeting. The people were coming and going continually. (See verses 5-7). The apostles taught daily in the Temple, and they often did in the market places. There were no orderly arrangements. We do the same on the streets, but you cannot compare this practice to an orderly meeting, such as when the people come together to be taught by the church. The Temple was a public place and both believers and unbelievers came and went continually. This was a daily routine.

In reference to women teaching, you say that they are

not told where, or when, to teach. Old women are commanded to teach young women, and young women are commanded to marry and bear children and guide the house, Titus 2-5 and I Tim. 5:14. Young women are taught to be "keepers at home." Such training necessitates home training. Do your old women teach the young women how to sew, cook, take care of babies, and such other things that will prepare them for home-keeping, in the class rooms? You know they do not. Such work is strictly private and naturally in homes.

You admit that women did not come to Paul in church gatherings, I Cor. 14:34-35, and ask him questions, and your practice of calling the public together and arranging them into different groups and having them all taught at the same time, and using some women teachers, is excluded by Paul's command for women to ask their questions at home. He makes no provision for your group arrangement before or after such gatherings. You are without any evidence to support your practice. If I Cor. 14 does not govern all public church gatherings, how can you prohibit women from speaking in mission meetings where only a few Christians are present? Meet this.

On page four *you* suppose a case. One class grows until one room will not hold the people; other rooms are used until all the rooms are filled, and four teachers teach at the same time in these four rooms. You want to know where such practice begins to violate I Cor. 14. I answer by giving another supposed case. Philip and family begin worshipping in one room of their house, and brethren continue to be added to the number until this room would not hold the people and the number continues to increase until all the rooms are full, and the supper is observed in all the different rooms, having a table and different loaves and cups

for each room. Where does this arrangement begin to violate I Cor. 11? When you answer this, you have my answer to your supposed case.

To save space, I will number the questions and answer accordingly. (1) a. The Church as an institution is not authorized to take the responsibility of teaching unaccountable children. All accountable persons are to be taught by the church. (1) b. There was no Levite present to stay the ark, and Uzza touched it and died, I Chro. 13:10. These things happened for our examples, I Cor. 10. (2) a. If there are ten or fifteen Christian women in one community, there will likely be some Christian *men* there too. Deny it. (2) b. No. Many men might drop in until the house is full and some might want to be baptized, and these women would have to call a man to baptize, or preach, and baptize. 3. Suppose all went to different rooms and observed the supper separately too. If a woman calls a public meeting, should she be silent? 4. Your meetings called for your group teachings are public—the public is invited. 5. Philip's daughters could have taught in their father's house, if the public was not called to be taught, or in other private meetings. The hour of day does not affect strictly private teaching. In your next, please try to meet my affirmative arguments on I Cor. 14. So far you have failed.

LANIER'S THIRD NEGATIVE

You have made but one argument. I think your brethren will be disappointed in your efforts. Is it possible that there is but one argument to be made in favor of your position? And that whole argument rests entirely upon an inference; we do not differ on what is commanded; we do not differ on any example found in the New Testament; we differ only on the inferences we draw. Is it possible that two groups of brethren can have no fellowship, and the brotherhood be put to shame, over a matter for which only one argument can be made, and that one argument rests wholly upon inferences? According to this discussion such must be the truth!

But you say that I have not met your one argument. We must let the readers answer that. You argue that Corinth had all the need for classes that exists today; that they did not teach in groups; and therefore we should not. You argue that women did not teach groups called out by the church, therefore they must not do it today. You have offered no proof that the Corinthian church did not teach different groups; you have offered no proof that women did not teach women and children called together by the church. You simply infer that since women were not allowed to speak in the general assembly that they must not speak to any group called by the church. So your position rests upon an inference. You infer that since prophets were told to speak one at a time to the whole assembly ⁴that all may learn“ what they had to say, there was to be no other teaching done by the church. You have offered no proof of these inferences.

You have made the assertion that I Cor. 14 governs all church assemblies, including any and all groups which may

be called together; but you gave no proof. I have shown that you do not follow the order given in the chapter in that you have only one speaker in your services, yet I Cor. 14:29 says, "Let the prophets speak by two or three." Until you follow your own "order of service" you should not insist that I do it. Furthermore I have shown that I Cor. 14 does not govern women in all their activities in the whole assembly. They are to sing, confess Christ, confess faults, and invite sinners to obey the gospel in the invitation song. If she can speak in all these ways in the public assembly, it is worse than foolish to say that I Cor. 14 provides a hard-and-fast order of procedure for all the teaching of the church. If you intend to try to stay with that position you ought to offer some proof instead of simply making the assertion, and then proceeding to prove your point upon an unproved assertion.

In your second, par. 2, you say, "Women are . . . not to do their teaching in meetings called by the church." And for this you gave no proof. But now read your definition for church in par. 1: "I used the word 'church' in my definition to denote who was to teach those who come together. These called out from the world, and have been baptized in the name of Christ are to do the teaching." Now we have it! The teaching is to be done by the "called out;" it is not to be done by women; therefore women are not among the "called out." But again. "Women are not to do their teaching in meetings called by the church;" but by "the church" you mean those baptized in the name of Christ. Women are baptized in the name of Christ; therefore she can not teach in a meeting which is called by herself, or any other woman who is a member of the church. I have challenged you to show how a woman can teach a group of young women regularly in the church house, her

home, or in any other place. You have made no attempt to answer. And now since you say she can not teach a group called by any one baptized in the name of Christ, you must admit that she can not teach a group which she calls together, for that will be a meeting called by "the church."

You contend that women are "to be silent in all church gatherings." But what is a church gathering? If a woman invites a group of young women to her home, or to the church house, Sunday, or any other day, to teach them, is that a church gathering? If the elders invite the group for the woman to teach, is that a church gathering? Then you must admit that the word "silent," as used in your statement, must be taken in a limited sense, for she can sing, etc. Putting I Cor. 14:34,35 and I Tim. 2:11,12 together I have proved that she is to be silent only when speaking will cause her to exercise dominion over man. To that argument you made no reply.

You still hold to the idea that a woman's teaching must be done "strictly in private." Where is your proof? And then define your word "private." You object to my group arrangement on the ground that I can not point to a New Testament church using the arrangement; you demand an example. Then you say that women are to teach "strictly in private." Well, I believe I'll just call on you for an example, or a command. Just give me an example of a woman obeying Titus 2:4 in her home, or the home of anyone else.

You say that my group arrangement is not hinted at in either testament. Titus 2 mentions four groups and tells what to teach them, and tells women to be teachers of one.

You still contend that I make no distinction between the use of Inst, music and the class arrangement. I have showed that music is an added item; a thing we are not told

to do; not a method or arrangement for doing a thing we are told to do. But the group arrangement is a way of doing what the Lord said do—teach. There is something wrong with a man who cannot see a difference there. But you reply by saying, “You have added an arrangement.” So it is the arrangement to which you object, and not the thing I do. Well you added an arrangement when you added the invitation song; but you see no harm in that. You have a different arrangement in your meetings (one man doing all the speaking instead of two), yet you see no harm in that. You say women are to teach “at home,” but that is your added arrangement, for Paul did not say, “At home.” And you have four-part arrangement of your song which is an addition to what Jesus and apostles had. But you affirm that Jesus sang bass and ask me to disprove it! That certainly is a wonderful argument. But at that it is about as good as any you have done thus far. By consulting any good reference work on the subject of “Music” you could have saved yourself from this embarrassment. But you say the “four parts of music are not of man’s origin, they are natural.” So the grouping of people is not of man’s making. Paul recognized different groups and commanded that they be taught different things. We simply arrange God’s groups to teach them.

You continue to hold to the mistake I warned against on Acts 5:25. You answer by using Luke’s statement made years later, “Then the apostles answered,” etc. From that statement no one can tell whether they talked at the same time or one at a time, or one made the statement and the balance sanctioned it. But when a man said, “They ARE standing and teaching in the temple,” we must conclude that they were all standing at once, and all teaching at once. But you chide me for using a report made by a “betraye

of the apostles.” Just leave off the “baby stuff” and answer the argument! But you say that they could have been talking to people grouped around them, but it was not orderly. What of it? Was it right because it was disorderly? Such seems to be your point. If you can’t do better than that this debate will get to be a profitless affair.

You say that old women are to teach *young women* how to sew, cook and care for babies. I have asked for proof, but you have given none. To teach people their duty along those lines is quite different from teaching how to do those things.

Yes, I supposed a case of Philip’s four daughters teaching in four different rooms at the same time. Your answer is suppose they had worship in four rooms at the same time. Are you getting to a point that you are afraid to answer an argument? To ask me a question similar to one I asked you is not answering mine. Suppose both are wrong? Now you tell me wherein the wrong is. You affirm that the situation I supposed is unscriptural, so you ought to be able to show where it departed from the scripture. And if you can’t tell where it began to violate I Cor. 14 you should not object to it.

Wherein is the sin of group teaching? 1. It is not in that women teach children and young women, for you admit that they should teach them. 2. It is not in that women teach more than one at a time, for you admit that a woman may teach any number. (Though I repeat that you refuse to describe the conditions under which she may do it regularly). 3. It is not that women teach in a house used by the church for worship, for you admit that a woman may teach young women in a house used for worship—as they did when worship was conducted in homes. Wherein is the

sin? According to you it is: 1. Because she teaches a group which has been called together by the church. 2. That her teaching is under the supervision of the elders. 3. Because she teaches her group while another group is being taught by another woman, or a man. (I challenge you to deny that you object to two women teaching two groups at the same time, regularly). 4. Because the public is invited. You admit that the public is not invited to her class; so your objection must be that other groups of the public are invited to other teachers at the same time her group is invited to her class. The public is invited; but the invitation is of such nature that each individual of the public is invited to his respective group. So only her group is invited to attend the woman's class. Can she invite a group to meet at any house regularly if the rest of the public is not invited to other classes at the same time? Now I suggest that you give some proof for these four objections, so your brethren will not be disappointed.

You ask, "If I Cor. 14 does not govern all public church gatherings, how can you prohibit women from speaking in mission meetings?" I answer, by the proper use of I Tim. 2:11,12. She is not to teach anywhere or anytime so as to exercise dominion over man. . . *I challenge you to define the words "public" and "private" so as to apply to this discussion.* You have hinged your part of the debate on the words, and yet you have no certain use to make of them, and I dare say you can not give a definition and stay with it. I insist you try it.

Let me repeat that asking me questions similar to questions I ask you is not answering my questions. You made a pitiful display of your weakness by doing that repeatedly in your last. I think you know that is not debating. I hope you will try to do better.

FIVE QUESTIONS—ACCORDING TO AGREEMENT

1. Who must call a meeting of any number of individuals for that gathering to be a “church gathering”?
2. You have said that a woman may teach a group of children or young women, if she does it privately, in her home. Can two women teach two groups in the same home at the same time, provided they do it privately?
3. You failed to answer No. 3 last time, so I am giving it to you again with some variations. Suppose that the people do not assemble, but go from home directly to their classes? Then suppose that no public invitation is made; the public is not invited. But the elders invite the children to her class, and the young women are invited by an elderly woman to her class? Wherein is the sin? It is no answer to say, Suppose they invite them to separate rooms for worship. Be a man (not a child at childish play) and answer the question.
4. Is the teaching commanded in Titus 2:4,5 a church duty, or a home duty? Does a woman do that teaching as a member of the church, under God’s constituted authority in the church; or does she do it as a home duty under the authority in the home, in subjection to her husband?
5. Is it possible to teach the book of Romans to an audience of children, young people, and old people?

WHITTEN'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

You say that I have made but one argument, and that you think my brethren will be disappointed in my efforts. I think you are wrong about my making just one argument. How many arguments have you made in trying to overthrow that one argument? If I have made only one argument, why has it been necessary for you to say so much in reply to it? No one will agree with you on this point. You insist that our difference is based on the inference we draw. I do not have to draw an inference to prove that our practice is right. I have shown by precept, example, and necessary inference that Christ and the apostles never arranged the public assemblies into different groups to teach the people, and that no woman ever taught any part of these assemblies when they came together to be taught. All the disfellowship has been caused by the introduction of this arrangement to teach. We are not responsible. Those who introduced the instruments of music, and the Missionary Society, charge those that oppose these things of causing a division over an inference.

You say that I have not offered any proof that the church at Corinth did not teach different groups. You say that I have not offered any proof that women did not teach women and children called together by the church. What do you call proof? You say that all that I have said about this is based upon an inference. I have shown that the church at Corinth had all the so-called needs for the group arrangement, and that this church had qualified teachers, and a mixed multitude to teach, yet the teaching was done without your group arrangement. The fact that women were commanded to keep silence in church gatherings, and were commanded to ask their questions at home, shows beyond a

shadow of doubt that there were no groups arranged of this assembly for women to ask questions. You have not disproved my arguments on I Cor. 14. Why don't you try to do so? Turn and read my first affirmative on page 3, paragraph 2 on I Cor. 14, and see if any reasonable attempt has been made to answer my argument on this chapter? I do not infer that because the prophets were commanded to speak one at a time that the church was to do no other teaching. You infer that I said such. The church went everywhere preaching the word; we are talking about the teaching to be done when the people came together to be taught by the church—the public assemblies. Please stay with the issue.

I have not said that I Cor. 14 governs all groups that may be called together. I Cor. 14 governs public gatherings of the church. Private groups are not the issue. I affirm that when the people come together to be taught by the church the teaching should be done by the people remaining in one body or assembly, and that the teaching should be done by men only. I have offered abundant proof to sustain this proposition, and you have failed to meet my arguments. We do follow the order given in I Cor. 14:31 generally, but you fail to harmonize verse 29 with verse 31. I have not said that I Cor. 14 governs women in all their activities in the public assembly. But this chapter does govern their speaking as prophets and asking questions in the public assemblies. I use I Cor. 14 concerning only the matters it treats upon.

You quibble over my definition of the word “church”. You waste this paragraph. My proposition has to do with public assemblies, and the fact that it states that men are to do the teaching of such assemblies excludes any reason for your quibble over my definition of the word “church.”

I am not denying that a woman can teach a private group of women. I Cor. 14:23-35 forever excludes any room for your group arrangement before or after the general assembly. The fact that women were to ask their questions at home, shows there were to be no other group arrangements. You waste this paragraph.

Yes, I hold to the idea that women must do their teaching strictly in private. You ask me where is your proof. Women are not to speak, teach, or ask questions in church gatherings, I Cor. 14:34-35. A private assembly is one to which everybody is not invited. A public assembly is one composed of any and all who wish to come. Women, however, are not to be teachers of men. I Tim. 2:11-12. She must do her teaching in homes or strictly private places. She is to teach women. I am not saying that women cannot in a private way speak to men concerning the Scriptures, but she should not set herself up as a teacher of men. I Tim. 2:12. Do I need to give an example of a woman obeying Titus 2:4 in her home, or in the home of anyone else to prove that women are to do their teaching strictly in private? Old women are commanded to teach young women to be keepers at home, etc. And young women are to marry, guide the house, bear children, etc. Do you think women are to teach in places not strictly private? They are not to teach men; they are not to ask questions in public assemblies; they are to learn in silence in the gatherings of the church. If I am not right in my conclusion, please point out wherein I am wrong.

Yes, instrumental music is an added item to the worship of the church, but so is the group teaching that you are contending for. You say that it is a thing we are not told to do; not a method or arrangement for doing anything we are told to do. You are wrong. We are told to

praise the Lord, and the harp and other instruments were commanded to be used to praise the Lord with, and in I Cor.14:7, Paul mentions the use of such instruments. Now please show where Paul ever mentioned your group arrangement to do anything. If you can do this, you will have a little proof for your group arrangement. You add the group arrangement with less evidence than there is for instrumental music to praise the Lord with. The reason I object to your group arrangement is because it is in opposition to the teaching of the scriptures. We are told how to teach an assembly, but we are told very little about singing. There are restrictions mentioned concerning teaching, but none concerning singing. We are to sing spiritual songs, but just how or what parts to sing are left entirely to us. The different voices are natural, and we allow the different voices to be exercised in the same assembly, and we do the same by our teaching. There is as much authority for arranging the different voices into different rooms to sing, as there is to arrange the different grades of minds into different rooms to teach them. You are inconsistent in your practice.

.....The fact that Luke used the statement, "Then Peter and the other apostles answered", years later had nothing to do with the time Peter and the apostles spoke. The adverb "*then*" denotes the time Peter and the apostles spoke regardless of how long after the matter was recorded. You say. "But when a man said, 'They are standing and teaching in the Temple,' we must conclude that all were standing at once, and all teaching at once." I have shown that the people were coming and going to and from the temple continually, and that this was not an orderly assembly. I have shown that it was possible that the man who made the report saw the apostles standing about, in the Temple

talking to those near them. This man could have stood there long enough to have heard the apostles talk one by one to the people. Suppose a man is being tried in court, and a man steps out of the court house and says to others about the man being tried, "He is now being questioned by the lawyers." Would this statement necessitate that all the lawyers were asking this man questions at the same time and that he was answering them all at the same time? But you say, we must conclude that they were all teaching at the same time. Because I call your attention, to the fact that you use an enemy of the apostles to prove your point, you call it "baby stuff." Then you chide me for saying that teaching done on this occasion was not in an orderly assembly. Do we observe any special order in our talking on the street, or in the market places? You know I have a point here, so meet it.

You call for proof that old women are to teach young women to sew, cook, and care for babies. You say, "to teach people their duty along those lines is quite different from teaching how to do these things." Have you gone back on your old position on the meaning of the word "*teach*" in this verse? In our previous discussions on this word, you have contended that the-word "*teach*" in Titus 2:4, means *to train*, and *to train* means to *show how*. I agreed with you because I thought you were right, and now you are trying to back out of your own definition. For an old woman to train younger women to be keepers at home, she must show them how to cook, sew, and care for children. The nature of home keeping necessitates that this training be done principally in homes. Meet it.

Because I supposed that Philip's four daughters had the Lord's supper in four rooms, as an answer to your supposed case of teaching in the four rooms at the same

time, you ask if I am afraid to answer an argument. Christ answered by asking a question. Was Jesus afraid to answer their questions? No, but he wanted to expose their position, and this is why I asked you a question. Are you, as they, afraid to answer? Your supposed case violates I Cor. 14:23-35, and my supposed case violates I Cor. 11:23-35. If you can see when and where my supposed case begins to violate I Cor. 11:23-35, you can also see where your supposed case begins to violate I Cor. 14:23-35. Both cases are far-fetched and unscriptural.

Objections. 1. I object because she teaches part of the public assembly. 2. Elders have no authority to have old women teach groups of young women called out from the public assembly of the church. 3. Arranging groups out of the public assembly of the church violates I Cor. 14:23-35. 4. I do not object to old women teaching private groups of young women. This is not the issue. You ask that I define public and private so as to apply to this discussion. A public gathering is one where all are invited. A private gathering is a gathering where only certain ones are invited. Your groups are composed of the public assembly of the church and others who may come.

It is not debating to suppose cases unlike anything in the Bible. You made a pitiful display of your weakness by doing that in your last reply. I hope you shall do better in your next.

Questions. 1. Any Christian may call a private or public gathering. 2. Mothers and fathers often teach their children in different places at the same time; this is private teaching. You suppose another case unlike anything in the Bible or seen among men, and want me to act like a man, and answer it. You do not want any child's play, yet you hand me a stick horse. My answer is "Your sup-

posed practice is unnecessary, and it might, be wrong. "It sounds like child's play to me. 4. It is individual Christian duty. It is to be done by the authority of Christ. No husband has the right to interfere with this command. 5. Yes, the Roman letter was written to a congregation composed of weak as well as strong Christians, and it was read to the public assembly, and both the weak and the strong were taught without the assembly being arranged into different groups in the same house and all taught at the same time.

LANIER'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

Since Bro. Whitten has seen fit to make but one argument, and has used the rest of his space replying to my negatives, I have been practically thrown into the affirmative. It has also resulted in a "re-hash" of material, a thing I dislike very much. But since he has made it unavoidable I will call attention to a number of statements wherein the weakness of his proposition is manifest.

In the first place his whole contention is built upon the false assumption that women are teaching in the assembly when they are teaching in their respective groups, who with others in the building, and still others who will come later, will form the assembly in which women are forbidden to exercise dominion over men. To me it is perfectly ridiculous to object to a woman teaching a group of young women or children just because that group will within *me hour* be a part of a worshipping assembly; and he has made no effort to justify such a position. When pressed he admits that a woman may teach a group of young women (but he has not admitted she may do it regularly), but adds, "1 Cor. 14:23-35 excludes any room for your group arrangement before or after the general assembly." Bro. Whitten, how long before or after the assembly may a woman teach a group of young women? One hour? One day! Three days? If a woman teaches a group at all, she teaches it before the general assembly. Now you must show how long before the assembly she is to teach for it to be Scriptural. The truth is you do not believe she can teach a group *regularly* at all. I challenge you to deny or admit the statement! And while I am on this, you say you do not object to women teaching private groups of young women—and again you do not add *regularly*—but do you object

to the teaching being done in the “*church house?*” I challenge you to say either yes or no. If you object to her teaching in the church house, you make a law where the Lord did not, and you condemn those who taught in their homes in which the church worshipped. But if you admit she can teach in the church house, you must point out how long before the assembly of the church the teaching must be done. And you know you can’t do it.

But he affirms that women must do their teaching “strictly in private” (for which he gave no proof), and I asked him to define “public” and “private.” He says, “A private assembly is one that everybody is not invited to. A public assembly is one composed of any and all who wish to come.” Now we have it! If everybody is not invited, a woman may teach. Bro. Whitten, if we invite only the church—outsiders are requested to stay away—may the woman teach? According to your definition she can, though the assembly be composed of both men and women. And according to your definition, women do no wrong when they teach a class, for none but her group are invited to attend. If men were to insist on attending her class the elders would escort them out of the room, and if necessary out of the house. So according to your own definition the teaching our women do is “strictly private.” The fact that they were in an assembly before, and will be in one afterwards, does not mean that she is doing such teaching as is forbidden in I Cor. 14 and I Tim. 2. If it is wrong for her to teach a group Sunday morning, because within *one hour* that group will be in the assembly, it would be wrong for her to teach that group on Saturday because within *one day* that group will be in the assembly. You resolve it simply into a matter of *time*. Again I ask, *how long?*

In the same connection you say, "The fact that women were to ask their questions at home, shows there were to be no other group arrangements." If so, the fact that they were to ask their *husbands* would prove that they could not ask any body else a question. Such reckless assertions should need no answer, but he made only one argument to which I have replied a number of times.

Again he says, "I have not said I Cor. 14 governs all groups that may be called together. I Cor. 14 governs public gatherings of the church. Private groups are not the issue." Then he says a private group is one to which everybody is not invited. A woman's class is a group to which all are not invited; it is therefore "strictly private." And since I Cor. 14 governs only the public gatherings of the church, it does not govern a woman's class. You have refuted your own proposition. That is the very thing I have been trying to get you to see for several years. But you admit that some groups can be called together that would not be governed by I Cor. 14. If a woman were to call a group of young women to meet her every Monday for Bible study, would that gathering be governed by I Cor. 14? If the elders of the church should announce publicly that all young women are requested to meet Sister Phoebe each Monday, would that be governed by I Cor. 14? If they decided more could attend at 10 a. m. Sunday, would I Cor. 14 govern the group? You know it would not; but you dare not admit it!

But you still insist that I Cor. 14 governs all public gatherings of the church. When you hold a meeting, you admit that is a public gathering of the church. But you do not follow the rule set forth in 1 Cor. 14:29 to have at least two and not more than three speakers. You slyly suggest that Jesus sent his disciples out by twos so as to

observe this order, but I think you will not really affirm it; and you know you do not observe it at any time. Yet you loudly affirm that I Cor. 14 governs all public gatherings of the church. You also say, "I only use I Cor. 14 concerning the matter it treats upon." Well, it certainly "treats upon" the number of men who speak. But you say I did not harmonize it with verse 31. You would put me in the affirmative again? But there certainly is nothing in verse 31 which says there can be less than two or more than three speakers. The truth is you do not know the teaching of I Cor. 14, and you have made it apply where Paul did not, and you have made it teach things Paul did not have in mind. Some of these I will bring out in my affirmation. But you say, "We do follow the order given in I Cor. 14:31 generally." *Generally!* why not universally? Where did you get the authority to follow an order *generally*, and ignore it occasionally? How do you think you can follow verse 31 and ignore verses 27 and 29? The truth is you do not follow I Cor. 14 at all on the number of speakers you have in service. If you have two, it is accidental and not because this passage demands it. If you wish to use more than three in one service, you do it without any regard for what this passage says. Why not learn that this chapter regulates the exercise of certain spiritual gifts by *men* in connection with the public worship of the church, but was denied *women* because it was during the public worship in which she would have exercised dominion over men, and save yourself a lot of embarrassment?

I asked, "Wherein is the sin of group teaching?" You replied, "I object because she teaches a part of the assembly." I deny that! She teaches that which may have been in an assembly, and which will afterward help form an assembly. But at the time she is teaching, the group is no

part of an assembly before or after her class period. Your whole contention has this as one of its main pillars—"She is teaching part of the assembly." I do not want to be unkind, but it appears to be nothing less than sheer ignorance that can not distinguish between teaching a group which will in one hour, or one day, help form a public assembly, and teaching in the assembly itself. She is not teaching an assembled church; she is not teaching a *part* of the assembled church; she is simply teaching a group which, with others, will in one hour, or more, assemble for worship. And it is in this assembly that the woman must not teach. But when you deny her the right to teach a group one hour before the assembly, you must explain why she may teach that group one day before the assembly. But whether the students and teachers assemble for a song and prayer before the classes is incidental, and has been left off by several churches. But even that is not the assembly of I Cor. 14. And she does not ever teach a *part* of that assembly, for when her teaching begins, the class is no longer in that assembly.

I asked, "Who must call a meeting of any number for that gathering to be a 'church gathering'?" You answer, "Any Christian can call a private or public gathering." That's no answer to my question! You have contended that women can not teach in *any church gathering*. You also said a "church gathering" is one called by the church. And you defined the church to be "those called out." So if a meeting is called by any of the "called out," it is a church gathering, and women can not speak in it. So if a woman invites a group of young women any where any time it would be a church gathering and she could not speak. That's what your foolish definitions got you into; and that is the reason I asked that question. And, by the

way, I am guessing that is the reason you gave such an answer to my question.

And again, I asked, "Can two women teach two groups in the same house at the same time?" To this you replied, "Mothers and fathers often teach their children in different places at the same time." I conclude from this you think "mother and father" are two women! This appears to me to be a wilful evasion, and I hope I do not misjudge. I did not ask if father and mother can teach in the home at the same time; every body knows they can. I asked, Can two women teach two separate groups at the same time in the same house? And can they do it regularly? I predict you will not answer. If you say they can, you are ruined on this proposition for all time to come; if you say they sin in so doing on any day in the week, you say that which all men know has no foundation in sense or scripture. Which horn of the dilemma do you choose?

You have been laboring all along to prove that the group arrangement is wrong, when you were supposed to be affirming that *men only* are to do *all* the teaching when people come together to be taught by the church. Since a woman is one "called out," so a part of the church, she can never teach people who *come together* to be taught. You have proved that men only are to teach in connection with public worship—a thing we all believe. Can young women gather any where at any time to be taught by the church? Can children gather to be taught by the church? Common sense tells they can. According to you they must be taught by men if they *gather*; but may be taught by women if they scatter. The thing you didn't prove is the thing stated in your proposition, that *men only* are to do all the teaching the church can do when people gather anywhere to be

taught. If young women gather every Sunday to be taught Titus 2:4,5, who shall do the teaching, a man or a woman? If you answer either way, you are sunk!

WHITTEN'S FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE—REJOINDER

In reply to Brother Lanier, my space is limited, and I shall be brief. In order that we might discuss the real issue, I have made but two main arguments in my affirmative. These arguments cover all the main points involved in this issue. Too many arguments result in nothing being proved or nothing disproved. My first affirmative has not been disproved. Some parts of it have not been replied to. Brother Lanier has not taken up my argument on I Cor. 14, in order and replied to it. He has chosen to make other negative, and affirmative arguments, rather than put in his time replying to my affirmatives. He complains about using my space in replying to his negative arguments. "What did he expect me to do about them? Brother Lanier dislikes a "re-hash" strongly.

Reader, turn and re-read my last affirmative, and see what he said about my argument on I Cor, 14. See what he said about my reply to his affirmative on Acts 5:25 and see what he said about my reply to his supposed case—Philip's four daughters teaching four groups at the same time in the same house and other matters. He accuses me of wilful evasion because I said in answer to the question, "Can two women teach two groups in the same house at the same time?" "Mothers and fathers often teach their children in different places at the same time." He misjudged me. I did not think that fathers and mothers both had to be women, but if I had said, "mothers and grandmothers often teach their children at the same time in the same house," how could that have helped his cause? "Why did he not ask, can a group that has come together to be taught by the church be arranged into two different groups,

and two women teach them? This is the issue he knows. Who is guilty of evasion? His question was not pertinent.

You say my whole contention is built upon the false assumption that women are teaching in the assembly when they are teaching their respective groups. This is not the issue. It is not whether these groups are being taught in the assembly or not, but have you authority to arrange those who come together to be taught by the church into such groups to teach them? It is not whether this can be done regularly or only once a week, but is such practice Scriptural? My argument on 1 Cor. 14 covers all this and you have not met it. Reader, read and see.

I defined a private assembly to be one where everybody is not invited. You insist that according to my definition, if only church members are present women may teach even though men are present, and is strictly private teaching. I did not say women may teach in all private assemblies. I had in mind such assemblies of the church where only certain ones are to be there, but I did not mean a semi-public assembly. Did you resort to trickery?

I do not contend that I Cor. 14:29 and 34 teach that no less than two or more than three speakers may speak at a meeting. Do these verses teach this? If so, we do not always conform to this rule. Scholars differ over the interpretation of these verses.

You insist that if women are to ask their husbands at home proves that there were no other arrangements for group teaching before or after this assembly, then women cannot ask any one a question but their husbands. The word *husband* comes from a Greek word which means man or men, and can be properly translated *men*. Ask your men

at home—the men of the church at Corinth. This forever sinks your whole theory of arranging the assembly into different groups for the purpose of teaching them the word of God.

LANIER'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

The practice of arranging into groups the people who come together to be taught by the church, and using both men and women to teach these groups is authorized by the scriptures.

I am happy to affirm the above proposition, which is intended to describe the usual practice of my brethren who conduct Bible-schools on Sunday morning before the hour of worship. In defining the terms I will be brief. By "arranging into groups," I mean classification according to the needs of the students. By "come together" I mean to come to one place—any place—church house, home or under a tree. By "to be taught" I mean for the purpose of receiving instruction, nurture, training; not to hear preaching. By "church" I mean the children of God in a community banded together for work and worship, under the leadership of qualified officers. By "authorized" I mean sanctioned either by a command, example or inference; or associated with a command as one of a number of ways of obeying the command. And by "scriptures" I mean the Bible as we use it.

The following things are to be understood: 1. My brethren do not believe in, nor do they operate a Sunday School organization. Any opposition from my opponent to a S. S. organization, such as the denominations operate, will be out of order. 2. We do not consider our class work as an organization adjunct to the church, or to the home; both institutions are complete as God gave them, and need no additions. 3. We do not accept our class work as a substitute for the teaching which parents should do in the home. And if such teaching is done in the classes as will discourage, rather than encourage, the parents, such

teaching should be discontinued. 4. We consider our class work as an orderly arrangement whereby the church can do the teaching which the Lord requires of it. It is not an added organization doing the work of the church; it is simply the church itself doing its work in an orderly way. 5. I am not contending that every church, regardless of size, physical equipment, and qualified teachers, must try to use the group arrangement; I am simply affirming that a church may arrange into groups those who gather to be taught, provided that church has the physical equipment and qualified teachers.

Next, let me set forth what I conceive to be my obligation in this debate. 1. To prove that the church has authority to recognize the various stages of physical, mental and spiritual development through which people pass, and to teach these various groups separately. 2. To prove that these groups may be taught simultaneously in the same building. And 3. That women may be used to teach some of these groups, even in the church house. If I can prove these three points I will have proved my proposition.

First, I affirm that the church has authority to recognize the various stages of physical, mental and spiritual development through which people pass, and to teach these different groups separately; and by "separately" I mean the church may teach one group without the other groups, or people not in that group, being present. I suppose Bro. Whitten admits that people pass through certain well defined stages of physical and mental development; and that all Christians begin as "babes in Christ" and grow to maturity. This growth is of God; God made us that way. And God made it the duty of the mature to teach the immature, Deut. 4:9,10; 6:4-9; Eph. 6:4. While in the spiritual realm there are babes and full grown, I Cor. 3:1-5;

Heb. 5:12-14; Eph. 4:14,15. Then Paul speaks of old men, young men, old women, young women, and children, Titus 2:1-6; CoL 3:20. And then there are the groups of fathers, mothers; husbands, wives; servants, masters, groups made because of relationships.

These various groups are to be taught different things. God is the author of the classification, so God has given the material to be taught the groups. Milk for the babes and meat for full-grown, Heb. 5:11-14. And Paul withheld certain teaching from the church because they were "not able to bear it," I Cor. 3:2. Old men are to be taught certain things, and old women other things; while young women are to be taught still different lessons, Titus 2. Children are to be taught obedience, while parents are to be taught kindness and patience, Eph. 6:1-4. Then again, the same words, phrases and methods used on one group can not be used on all other groups. Paul recognized that children think and speak as children, and that they differ from men, mature people, I Cor. 13:11; 14:20. This is a principle which my opponent fails to recognize, but which is fundamental in every school system in the land. He would not send his children to a school where, failing to recognize it, all were put in one big class and taught together. The beginners would be confused while the advanced pupils were learning; and the advanced would be idle while the beginners were learning. Another thing to remember is that all these groups are not to be taught by the same teachers. Young women are to have "aged women" as their trainers; and God has fitted women for teaching children, while he has forbidden her to teach man, I Tim. 2:11-12. So the various groups must have different teachers as well as different methods. These things being true, these groups must receive separate attention; they

WHITTEN-LANIER DEBATE

must be taught separately. There are but two ways of doing this. We may teach a group in the presence of, and while it is a part of, a public assembly. Or we may segregate the group to be taught. Both methods are used. We often teach deacons a lesson in the presence of the congregation; or give husbands and wives a lesson while speaking to a mixed audience. But everybody knows that such teaching is not as effective as group teaching can be. However, some teaching can not be done except in segregated groups or to individuals. Women can not teach while their groups form part of a public assembly, hence segregation of their groups is necessary. This being true the church has authority for recognizing these groups and teaching them separately.

There is no legislation as to how, where, or when these groups are to be taught. The obligation of teaching rests upon the church; it must edify itself, Eph. 4:12,16. And the command to teach (Matt. 28:20; 2 Tim. 2:2; Tit. 2:4) carries with it the authority to use any physical arrangement necessary for the most efficient and effective teaching. It is to be remembered that this is the duty of the church. I am not talking about the teaching that is the duty of the father in his home, or the teaching which a mother is expected to do in her home; I am affirming that the church is to edify itself, and that each member is to grow spiritually, through the teaching which the church is obligated to give these groups.

Not only is there no legislation as to how, where and when the groups are to be taught, but there is no example of a church carrying on its full program of teaching. Bro. Whitten, thinks we have such an example in I Cor. 14. But their full program of teaching is not set forth, for nothing is said about the teaching of young

women by "aged women." I Cor. 14 was written to regulate the use of spiritual gifts, speaking with tongues and prophecy, and was never intended to serve as a pattern for all the teaching service of the church. In his affirmation Bro. Whitten proved that a man may teach before the assembled church, and that a woman must not do that; he has proved that such an arrangement may be used. *But he certainly failed to prove that said arrangement is the only one the church is allowed to use.* He may contend that since it is the only one mentioned, it is the only one allowed. But since it does not take care of all the teaching program of the church (and it makes no provision for women teachers), it is evident that the arrangement for which he contends is not the only one the church is allowed to use. It is equally evident that if the women in the church at Corinth did their duty, and did not teach before the assembled church, the arrangement for which he contends is not the only arrangement used by the church at Corinth. Since there is neither legislation nor example as to the details of the teaching program of the church, we are left to teach these God-made groups as best we can.

My second proposition is that the church is authorized to teach two or more of these groups in the same house at the same time, provided the good order of I Cor. 14:40 is maintained.

That the church has the right to call in a group of young men for special study to prepare them for their duties in the church is conceded by all, because special groups are to be taught special lessons. But if the church has the right to call in, or segregate, one group for special study, it has the right to invite other groups that they may be taught what the Lord has especially for them. Common sense demands that we allow this conclusion. But if we al-

low that the church has the right to call in all the groups one by one for special training, we must also admit that the church has the right to call in all the groups at the same time, provided there is sufficient physical equipment and enough qualified teachers to care for them. Again common sense compels us to admit this. But do we have an example of a number of teachers in the same building at the same time? I have before given Acts 5:25 as such an example. I give it again. It was said of the apostles, "The men are standing and teaching in the temple." This is sufficient to prove that several persons taught in the same building at the same time.

But suppose we had no such example, would we be safe in concluding that it is right to teach several groups at the same time? We use so many modern developments in material and methods that one makes himself ridiculous to refuse to use one certain one. The Lord said, "Lay by in store," but he did not tell how. People can march up and lay their money on the table, but they make themselves ridiculous before the community and lose their influence. We partake of the bread, but whether to pass it in a plate, or to hand it around to each other (hand to hand without a plate) is not said. We conform to custom by passing it on a plate. We use song books with music, and four parts, but the apostles did not. Why? Custom dictates; we follow. We sing an invitation song while we exhort sinners to repent. Did the apostles? No one knows. Why do we? Because it is a good custom, we think. People who disregard what custom makes, or determines, as good order or procedure, lose their influence for good, and appear to be ridiculous before the community. The Lord has grouped us according to age, mental growth, relationships, and spiritual development, and has given the

material for each of these groups to be taught; and in some cases has determined the teacher for the groups. The whole world, practically, recognizes this grouping the Lord has made and teaches the Bible as well as other subjects accordingly. For one to conform to modern customs in the things mentioned above, but refuse to conform to this matter in spite of the example of the apostles, and that which common judgment demands, is to place himself before the community in a bad light and lose his influence for God and the church.

WHITTEN'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Brother Lanier begins his affirmative by saying, "I am happy to affirm the above proposition, which is intended to describe the usual practice of my brethren who conduct the Bible schools on Sunday morning before the hour of worship." On the same page he says, "My brethren do not believe in, nor do they operate a Sunday School organization. Any opposition by my opponent to a S. S. organization, such as the denominations operate will be out of order. We do not consider our class work as an organization adjunct to the church, or the home." On the same page he further says, "It is not an added organization doing the work of the church; it is simply the church itself doing its work in an orderly way." These quotations furnish the battle ground of this discussion.

First, what is an organization? "To furnish with organs; to endow with the capacity for the function of life. 2. To arrange or constitute its parts, each having a special function, act, office, or relation." Now, note the meaning of the word "school": A place for learned intercourse and instruction; an institution for learning; an educational establishment"—Webster. Brother Lanier calls his class arrangement a "Bible School on Sunday morning." A school is an institution for learning, and it would be impossible to have such an institution without its being organized, or having special functional parts. So you have admitted having "A Sunday morning Bible School," which is as much an organization as any denominational Sunday School. And this Sunday morning "Bible School" is organized to do the work of the church, for he says it is the church at work. This is exactly what the denominations and the Digressives say about their Sunday School work.

On page 1 he denies having an organized Sunday School. He has admitted having a "Sunday morning Bible School," and according to his admission, all it needs to be like what the denominations have is for it to be organized. If this Bible School taught Sunday morning before the hour of worship is not a Sunday School organization, I would like to see *one*. You call it a "Sunday morning Bible School," and the word "school" means an institution of learning. If one who has attended a denominational Sunday School should come to your Sunday morning "Bible School" and should be asked, "What have you attended?" the answer would be, "I have been to Sunday School." You say it is not like the organization the denominations have. It may differ in minor details, but not in nature and operation. It is a school taught on Sunday morning, and it has its special functional parts. If this is not a separate organization from the church what is it? You say it is taught before the hour of worship, it cannot be the church assembly, and since it is a "school"—an institution, and before the church assembly, it, therefore, is another institution. It is an adjunct to the church, doing the work of the church, for you say it is the church at work. If you say it is the church assembly, you have women speaking in the church, but if it is not the church assembly, it must be another institution—you call it a "school." The church cannot be "A Sunday morning Bible School," and if it is, women are speaking in the church. What will you do about it?

I can endorse most of what you say on page two. I agree that people pass through certain stages of physical and mental developments. I admit that all the different grades of people must be taught according to their individual needs. I agree that children think and act like chil-

dren; I also agree that some need milk and others meat, but all this falls short of proving that the class arrangement is the Scriptural way to take care of these different grades or stages of mental development. I have shown that the church at Corinth had all the different grades of minds in it, and had all the so-called needs for the class arrangement to teach, but such arrangement was not mentioned in Paul's instruction to this church concerning how to edify itself. All these different grades of minds were taught by one prophet speaking at a time, I Cor. 14:31. These people did not assemble and arrange themselves into different groups to be taught, and did not use both men and women teachers. The fact that women were commanded to ask their questions at home excludes the idea of this church having any such arrangement. This modern "Bible School" was unknown to Paul.

You cite the method used in public schools as an example of how to teach people the word of God. You say all the different grades are not put into the same class. Certainly not, but why not? Simply because the books used in such school are of human origin, and are arranged for worldly education. The Bible is not written like common school books and cannot be successfully taught as other books are taught.

You cannot successfully arrange people into different groups to teach them the word of God like you can to teach other books. In the Bible you find milk and meat in the same chapter, and many times in the same verse. You do not find a letter addressed to a church divided into different sections for certain classes of people. The letters are written to whole congregations, and were read to the whole assembly, and were read to the whole assembly as they were written. This fact proves that God did not intend

for people to be arranged into different groups to be taught when they assemble. God's ways are not our ways, neither are his thoughts our thoughts, Isa. 55:8.

On page three, paragraph one, you say, "There is no legislation as to how, where, or when these groups are to be taught." You cite Eph. 4:12-16; Matt. 28:20; II Tim. 2:2; Tit. 2:4, as proof that all these groups must be taught by the church. You therefore conclude, that the Bible School arrangement on Sunday morning before the hour of worship is the way to do this teaching. All of this teaching is to be done by the church, you say. But we have learned that this "Bible School" is another institution. Brother Lanier says, it is the church itself doing its work in an orderly way. But the digressive brethren say the same about the Missionary Society. They say that it is the church doing its work through the Missionary Society. Brother Lanier says it is the church doing this teaching through the "Bible School on Sunday morning." Certainly it is another organization adjunct to the church—it is destined to supplant, both home and church. The child says, "I have been to Sunday School;" parents say to the child, "Get ready and go to Sunday School." The church is left in the background!

Titus 2:4 has no reference to teaching to be done when the church assembles; it has reference to private teaching done in homes. To be keepers at home means to cook, sew, take care of babies, and the like. Old women could not do such training in your Sunday morning "Bible School." Such training necessitates private home training. I Cor. 14 does not deal with private teaching. I Cor. 14 furnishes instruction concerning how a church may edify itself when assembled. But the fact that this assembly was not arranged into different groups for the purpose of teaching these dif-

ferent groups shows that such was either unnecessary or was wrong. Women were commanded to ask their questions at home. This excludes the idea of this assembly's being arranged into different groups, before or after the hour of worship, if they had an hour of worship. This modern "Bible School" organization was not known of at this early date.

On page four you contend that if a church can call in a group of young men to receive special training, which common sense forces all to admit, then by the same authority the church may call in all the different groups and teach them at the same time in the house, if the church is equipped to take care of such work. To bolster up this contention you cite Acts 5:25, "The men are standing and teaching in the temple." I have taken this passage from you in my affirmatives, but I shall do so again. If verse 25 teaches that these apostles taught different groups at the same time in the Temple, verse 29 teaches that these same apostles all taught the same group at the same time. "Then, Peter and the other apostles answered and said." That that proves too much proves nothing. Your only example is worth less than nothing.

You say that we use so many modern developments in material and methods that one makes himself ridiculous to refuse one certain one. You mention some of these modern developments, song books, passing a plate, four parts in singing, and invitation songs. These are not parallel to teaching. Nothing particular is said about how to do these other things, but much is said about who and how to teach. But the Missionary Society is a modern development for the church to work through, and you make yourself ridiculous by refusing this certain one, and accepting the modern "Bible School on Sunday morning," before the hour of wor-

ship, an institution through which the church works! Jesus says, "That which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God," Luke 16:15. If we do not accept that which custom demands, we make ourselves ridiculous! I had rather be considered with the apostles, the filth and offscouring of all things, than to bow to a modern system that makes void the word of God.

Answer this negative argument. Because of the existing degree of physical and mental development, you contend there is a need for arranging those who come together to be taught into different groups, to be able to teach each group what it needs. Here is the argument. Old people and young people have different taste, or appreciation, for different kinds of songs; besides different voices are natural. Also, old people desire to pray for different blessings from what the young pray, for their conditions of life and circumstances demand this, as well as their mental development. Old people and young people have different degrees of appreciation and understanding concerning the Lord's supper. Therefore, since these different degrees exist concerning these acts of worship, there is as much, if not more, reason for arranging the people who come together on Lord's day morning to be taught into different groups to sing, pray, and eat the Lord's supper, as there is to be taught. If not, why not?

LANIER'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

I have defined my obligations in this debate as three-fold. The first is, To prove that the church has authority to recognize the various stages of physical, mental and spiritual development through which people pass, and to teach these various groups separately. I am glad Bro. Whitten concedes this point in his third paragraph. So that part needs no more proof. But he adds, "All this falls short of proving that the class arrangement is the Scriptural way to take care of these different grades." He agrees that we can teach one group at a time, but it is a sin to teach two in the same building at the same time. How one can be serious in such position is beyond me. He says, ¹¹¹ have shown that the church at Corinth had all these grades of mind . . . and all the needs for class arrangement, but such was not mentioned in Paul's instruction . . . concerning how to edify itself." But Bro. Whitten did not prove that Paul outlined a program of edification. He takes for granted that I Cor. 14 outlined the program of edification in the church at Corinth. I deny that it does and call on him for his proof. I made the argument that the full program of teaching is not set forth in I Cor. 14 because no provision is made for woman's part and he made no reply; I predict he will not. Again he says, "All these different grades of mind were taught by one prophet speaking at a time," but he gave no proof. He gave a reference, but the verse does not prove his proposition. *And I challenge him to prove it.* But the question is not, Did the church at Corinth use the class arrangement? The question is, "Does the Bible authorize the use of such?" The church at Corinth may not have sung the invitation song; may not have passed the bread on a plate; may not have passed a

collection plate, but we agreed that the Bible authorizes such.

I have stated that my brethren do not operate a S. S. organization, but Bro. Whitten says, "yes you do." Well, who is right? A modern S. S. is an organization which elects its own officers and maintains its organizations separate from the church to which it is an adjunct. We have no such organizations among us. Will he affirm we have? I said, "We consider our class work as an orderly arrangement whereby the church can do the teaching the Lord requires of it It is simply the church itself doing its work in an orderly way." But he is sure we have a modern S. S., and the church is doing its work through the S. S. He is so sure of it that he even puts the statement into my mouth as follows: "So Bro. L. says it is the church doing this teaching *through* the 'Bible School on Sunday morning'." Brother Whitten, there is no excuse for a false statement like that in a written debate. I have never said the church does its teaching *through* any organization, and I think you know it, I will expect you to retract that statement in your next.

Bro. Whitten says, "The Bible is not written like common school books, and can not be successfully taught like other books are taught. You can not successfully arrange people into different groups to teach them the word of God like you can teach other subjects." I hate to think Bro. Whitten does not know better than make such a statement. Doesn't he know his brethren taught the Bible in classes in old Gunter Bible College for years? I dare say there is not a scholar on earth that will agree with him. To say that one can teach a group of deacons their duty when they are in a mixed assembly better than he can teach them in a room to themselves is downright puerile.

Having noticed some things at random I return to my second proposition, that the church is authorized to teach two or more groups in the same house at the same time. If the reader will turn back to my first negative, my argument on Acts 5:25 will be found. I have argued that since a man said, "The men are standing and teaching in the temple," more than one man was standing, and more than one man was teaching at the time of the report. Bro. W. thinks he has found a parallel in verse 29, "Peter and the apostles answered and said." But the verb here is in the past tense, while the verb in verse 25 is present tense. In Bro. W's third affirmative he said, "The word *then* is an adverb of time, and denotes the time they answered." He will do well to stay out of the grammar. The word "then" in the A. V. is the translation of the Greek word "de," which is not an adverb, but a particle adversative and distinctive. In the Rev. Ver. the word "then" does not occur; it is "but." There is nothing in verse 29 that indicates the time they answered. But when the statement is made, "The men are teaching" we must conclude that all under consideration were teaching at the time of the report. So he has not "taken the passage away" from me yet.

But he argues that if we arrange for teaching we may arrange into groups for worship because of the degrees of mental ability, difference in desires, etc. The argument approaches the ridiculous, but since he made it I must notice it. Worship is an individual matter, and each one may exercise himself to the limit in singing, praying, or taking the Lord's supper, regardless of the ability or capacity of the one sitting beside him. But not so with teaching. A lesson being given in the language of grown men, and from their viewpoint, is beyond the grasp of

children of twelve. I challenged Bro. W. in our oral debate to ask a twelve year old child what she had learned from our debate; he refused, because he knew she had learned next to nothing, and could not, because it was being addressed to grown-ups.

We come to my third proposition: When the church arranges these God-made groups to teach them their special lessons, women may be used to teach some of the groups, even *in* the church house. That God intended for women to have part in the teaching program of the church is proved from Joel's prophecy, quoted by Peter, "I will pour forth my Spirit . . . and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy . . . On my handmaidens . . . will I pour forth of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy," (Acts 2:17,18). Peter said that was done on Pentecost. And Philip had four virgin daughters that prophesied, (Acts 21:9). And, Bro. W., they did not teach their daughters at home how to sew and care for babies. You can't use them in your set-up. Whenever you send them into some other home to teach, you are sunk; try it!

God not only qualified women to teach, but he commanded them to use those qualifications, (Tit. 3:4,4); they are to be teachers. Teachers are set in the church by divine authority, (I Cor. 12:28). So women are by divine authority set in the church as teachers. And when Paul told Titus to "set in order" the church in Crete he told him to have the old women to be teachers of the young. It is a part of God's arrangement for the growth of the church. And remember that this is not the teaching a mother is to do in her home with her own children; this is a part of the church program of building up itself.

Next, notice the purpose for which these teachers are set in the church. "And he gave some to be . . . teachers;

for the perfecting of the saints, that we be no longer children, but that we may grow up in him who is the head," (Eph. 4:11-16). So the teachers are for the "perfecting of the saints," that the saints may minister and build up the body of Christ. What does it mean to perfect the saints? I think Bro. Whitten's trouble is that he has little conception of a program for the perfecting of saints. To perfect the saints is to bring them to maturity, first in doctrine; that they may know the doctrines of the gospel, and second, to bring them to maturity in life—in their living among men. This means that they must be instructed and nurtured in, 1. Social life; 2. Amusements and recreation; 3. Business life; 4. Home relations; 5. Worship; and 6. Service. To contend that such a program can be carried on effectively without segregating the groups for such instruction and nurture is to display a degree of ignorance that is appalling. It will be noticed that this is spiritual edification; not training in industrial arts, as Bro. W. would have you believe. Paul says it is "unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ". Women are to teach young women as directed in Titus 2 to bring them to this fulness of Christ, and that can not mean "cooking, sewing and earing for babies"; such contention is absurd.

Next we have examples of women doing this kind of work. Women labored in the Lord, (Rom. 16:12); they labored in the gospel, Phil. 4:3). Notice the word "sunathelo", "to strive at the same time with another", (Thayer). These women strove at the same time with Paul in the gospel. When Paul labored in the gospel, he taught. Notice the use of the word with reference to elders, (1 Tim. 5:17). So when women labored in the gospel they taught. In doing this teaching commanded in Titus 2, more than chance

meetings were required. Regular periods of instruction and guidance. In verse 4 the word "teach" (train in Rev. Ver.) comes from a Greek word which means, "To make sober minded, to steady by exhortation and guidance", (Bagger). Thayer defines it, "Restore one to his senses, moderate, control, curb, discipline, to hold one to his duty". This is what the old women are to do for the young women, and to do this requires regular, systematic teaching, training. But Bro. W. contends that the teaching of Titus 2:4 is not to be done when the church comes together to be taught, but is to be done in the home. How does he know? Where is the teaching of verses 2, 3, and 9 to be done? Why say one is to be done at home and the rest at church?

Next, the question comes, How and where did these women do their work? Did they have church buildings then as we have them now? Or did they meet for worship and work in the homes? We do not know; and it makes no difference. Did they teach one person at a time, or did they teach several in a group? We do not know; and it makes no difference. If it were important, I am sure the Lord would have told us. Well, how can women today do this work? In two ways. They can go from house to house and teach one or two at a time. Or they can get all their pupils together and teach them all at once. Suppose a woman has thirty to teach. If she teaches them one at a time from house to house it would take her thirty hours a week to give them all a lesson. But if she calls them together she can do the work in one hour. I challenge Bro. W. to agree with me that a qualified woman can give that group of thirty spiritual edification regularly any day in the week. If she can do that, a man can teach a group of young men on any day, yes, even at the same hour the woman teaches her group; yes, even in the same house.

If they can do that any day in the week, they can do it from 10 to 11 a. m. Sunday in the church house. That is exactly what my brethren do under the supervision of the elders; and that is what Bro. W. denies is authorized by the scriptures. I Cor. 14 does not regulate this part of the teaching program of the church; neither does any other verse regulate it as to time and place. We are left to our good common sense to make the best use of the facilities we have in carrying on the work the Lord has made it our duty to do.

WHITTEN'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Brother Lanier says that I agree that we may teach one group at a time, but it is a sin to teach two in the same building at the same time. I have shown that Christ and the apostles taught all the different groups without the modern group arrangement, and that Paul's admonition to the church at Corinth concerning how to edify itself takes care of all the different grades of minds. Women were not to speak or ask questions in the assemblies, but Bro. Lanier insists that such may be done, provided these assemblies are arranged into different groups. The fact that Paul said that all may learn by one prophet speaking at a time, and women should ask their husbands (men) at home, does not satisfy him. He wants an itemized program that says we must not have group teaching when the people come together to be taught by the church. The digressives make the same demand concerning their music and societies. If you cannot find everything in detail, and the things they want named and condemned, they will not surrender. Bro. Lanier says that a full program is not given; therefore, groups may be arranged of the assembly for women and others to teach in the same building at the same time. I Cor. 14 comes nearer proving that we may have instrumental music in the worship than it does the assembly may be arranged into different groups and all taught in the same building at the same time. Here is my proof. "And even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped?" Here we have the instruments mentioned in connection with teaching, singing, and praying in the assembly, but you cannot find even a hint of your group arrangement

in this chapter or elsewhere in the N. T. You are forever sunk. All the different minds were represented in the church at Corinth, and Paul said, "Let the prophets speak one by one that all may learn." Women were told to ask their men at home. Suppose Paul had said, let the pipes and harps be played at home, would you insist that they can be used in the class rooms, just before the hour of worship?

I said, "So Bro. Lanier says, 'It is the church doing this teaching through the Bible School Sunday morning'." He says, "There is no excuse for a false statement like that in a written debate. I have never said the church does its teaching through any organization, and I think you know it." A black man was called a negro, and he got angry, and was asked, 'are you not a negro?' and he said, "yes, but I don't like the way he said it." You don't like the way I said it, but you have admitted it just the same. You have said that your brethren teach a "Bible School" on Sunday morning before the hour of worship. You have also said that the teaching is done in this "Bible School." I would like for you to explain the difference. Are you justified in saying that I made a false statement?

You say, "A modern S. S. is an organization separate from the church to which it is an adjunct." All Sunday Schools are modern. What difference would it make if the elders of a congregation should organize a Missionary Society, and what if it is maintained by the church? Would that keep it from being a separate institution from the church? No. The fact that it is an organization unknown to the N. T. is enough to prove that it is unscriptural. The same is true of your Sunday morning "Bible School." It is an organization through which the church works. It is as much a modern organization as the Missionary Society

is regardless of who organizes it or maintains it. You called it a "Bible School."

I said that the Bible cannot be arranged so as to be taught successfully like other books are taught. Brother Lanier calls this statement 'puerile.'⁵ Did he reply to my reasons for making this statement? He did not. I have contended that the Bible is not written as common school books is proof that it is not to be taught as school books are taught. In the same chapter, and many times, in the same verse, you find both milk and meat. The Bible is not written so as to be successfully divided into meat and milk. The letters to the churches were addressed to whole congregations, and not divided into different sections for babes and full grown persons. Elders, deacons and others were admonished in the same chapters. These letters were read to the public assemblies and all heard what was for them and what was for others also. The same was true concerning how to teach the assemblies. See I Cor. 23-21. Talk about "puerile!!!"

You have scuttled your only, so-called, example of group teaching in the N. T., by resorting to Greek, and rejecting the King James rendering of verse 29, of Acts 5, and I ask why? The authorized version is against you. I have examined several other translations and find that different words are used instead of the word "then" in the beginning of verse 29. Some omit the word, and begin with "Peter." The Analytical Greek Lexicon says on Page 85, "It may be variously rendered, but on the other hand, and also, now," etc. When scholars differ, we may also differ. But I have shown that the words, "The men are standing and teaching in the temple," do not necessarily prove that all these apostles taught at the same time in the Temple. The one who made this report could have heard

them speak in turn. The assembly was not an orderly assembly; people were going to and coming from the Temple continually. See Acts 5:5-7-25. They could have been teaching as they did in the market places, or as we do on the busy streets. A man is being tried in court, one steps out, and is asked, "Where is the man?" and he replies, "He is sitting in the court house being questioned by the lawyers." ' ' Would you think that all the lawyers were questioning him at the same time, and that he was answering them all at the same time? You are sunk again.

I admit that my negative argument is ridiculous, but not any more so than your arguments are to prove it Scriptural to arrange those who come together to be taught by the church into different groups to teach them the word of God. I have as many if not more, reasons for arranging the assembly into different groups to sing, pray and eat the Lord's Supper as you have to teach. You insist that "each one may exercise himself to the limit in these things regardless of the ability of the one sitting by, but not so with the teaching." How can each exercise himself to the limit regardless of the one sitting by? All do not appreciate the same kind of songs, and different voices are natural. All do not desire to pray for the same blessings. The old and the young do not always pray for the same blessings. All do not appreciate the Lord's Supper alike, and need different teaching at the Lord's table when they eat. If there are reasons for your groups to teach, there are more for these things. Puerile! Stick horse !

You refer to Acts 2:17,18; Joel 2:28; Acts 21:9, as proof that women taught at places besides in the home. I deny that Joel 2:28 was all fulfilled on the day of Pentecost in that great assembly. Did women prophesy in that assembly? Did old men dream dreams in that assembly?

Did the Spirit fall upon all flesh on the day of Pentecost? Philip's daughters certainly did not teach in the assemblies, and you cannot prove your contention that the assemblies were arranged into groups so they could teach. In your negative you had them teaching four groups at the same time in the same house, but that would not work—would it? Most of what you say on pages three and four have but very little bearing on the issue. Just because teachers were set in the church does not prove that women are to teach in the assembly—or any part of the assembly. It is said evangelists were set in the church. Does this prove that women may evangelize? The fact that teachers are for the perfecting of the saints, and the fact that people pass through six different stages of development, does not necessitate your group arrangement. All of this was done in the days of the apostles without the "Bible School before the hour of worship."

You deny that Titus 2:4 has reference to cooking, sewing, and caring for children. Old women were to train young women to be "keepers at home." To train means to show how, and this cannot be done by just words, and we know that keeping the home includes sewing, cooking, and caring for babies. Married women are to guide the house. I Tim. 5:14; old women were to train them how. This necessitates home training. Meet it. Verse 1-2 of Titus 2, shows that all old women were here under consideration. If all old sisters are faithful they are to be teachers of good things, and there are possibly as many old sisters in many congregations as there are young ones. So if they teach daily from house to house, and in their homes, they can do all the teaching required by the scriptures. I challenge you to deny this. The idea of one woman having to teach thirty hours a week to teach thirty is introduced. How about

thirty old women teaching night and day, as they did in the days of the apostles? Your group arrangement is child's play.

On page 4, you say old women strove at the same time with Paul in the gospel. This is true. In Acts 20:20, Paul says that he had taught the church at Ephesus publicly, and from house to house, and in verse 31 he says, he did this teaching night and day for three years. We agree that women did not teach publicly, but they strove at the same time with Paul in the gospel; therefore, they taught from house to house night and day. This is what I have contended for all the time.

QUESTIONS

1. Is a school an organization?
2. If it is taught on Sunday, is it a Sunday School?
3. If the church does the teaching in this school, is it not the church teaching through another institution?
4. Does the fact that Elders of a congregation organize this school by electing the different teachers to teach the different groups keep this school from being a separate institution from the church?
5. If we may arrange those who come together to be taught by the church into different groups to teach them, without precept or example of such being done in the New Testament, or even mentioned, why cannot we have instrumental music in the worship—a thing mentioned in connection with singing, praying and teaching? I Cor. 14:7.

LANIER'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Before noticing Bro. Whitten's reply to my last, I want to call attention to some things he should have replied to, but did not. He has been saying all along that I Cor. 14 sets forth a rule by which all church teaching is to be done. I denied that statement and called on him for proof. Did he give it? I predicted he would not even notice it, and sure enough he did not. Women have a part in the teaching program of the church, but I Cor. 14 does not regulate that. Will he notice the argument this time?

Again, he said different grades of mind were taught in the church at Corinth by one man speaking at a time to the whole church. In my last I denied the truthfulness of that statement and asked him to prove it—even challenged him to do so. I still demand that he either try to prove it or retract it. Will he notice it this time, or will he just let it slide by and hope we will forget all about it?

I did not say that the Holy Spirit was poured out on women so they could teach on the day of Pentecost, as Bro. W. tried to have me say. I said that in the prophecy made by Joel and quoted by Peter on Pentecost it is said that women shall prophesy. I also said that Philips four daughters prophesied. This is an instance of the fulfillment of that prophecy. I said Bro. W. can not use these young women in his set-up. Did he show where he can? Not a word in reply. Will he do it this time?

Again, I challenged Bro. W. to "agree with me that a qualified woman can give that group of thirty spiritual edification regularly any day in the week." Did he answer? He did not. Bro. W., can a woman teach any number of young women regularly anywhere any day in the week? I mean, can she give them spiritual edification? If you say

she can, I will put a group of boys in the same house at the same time, and you will make yourself ridiculous objecting to it. But if you say she can not, you make a law where the Lord did not see fit to make one. But it is time for you to say something on the question; what will it be ?

Now we notice some of his replies. When I showed that women taught with Paul as a part of the educational program of the church, he replied that Paul said he taught publicly and from house to house. He is sure that women did not teach publicly, so they must have taught from house to house, and adds, "This is what I have contended for all the time." Is it? How many did they teach at a time from house to house? Did they teach just one at a time? or did they teach groups from house to house? I am sure Bro. W. does not know, yet he will not allow women today to teach groups regularly, giving them spiritual instruction. He may allow old women to teach the young wives how to "cook, sew, and care for babies" from house to house, but that can hardly be classed as spiritual instruction. Bro. W., would you allow Philip's daughters, who were not old women and would not come under the classification in Titus 2, would you allow them to teach groups of women from house to house? I am sure you would not if one of the houses happened to be a church house. But you know that in those days they lived and met for worship a lot of times in the same house. Now if it was right for women to teach a group in the house in which they met for worship (even if it was one a family lived in), why is it wrong for a woman to do that today? Is that what you have been contending for all the time ?

But when Bro. W. sees that word "organize" he just knows there is something wrong. And he gets the dictionary to see if he can find where the word has an objection-

able definition. It does not matter if it has a definition which is not objectionable. Does he not know that it is perfectly right for the church to organize its forces for the accomplishment of its work? When we make plans for a meeting, we organize. We appoint one or more men to advertise, others are appointed to act as ushers to seat the crowds, some women are asked to arrange for the entertainment of the visiting preacher and singer, and other people are given still other duties to perform. In this way we organize our forces to do the work in the best way possible. Would Bro. W. say the church is holding a meeting *through* an organization? To be consistent he would have to do it. To organize, according to Webster, is to "systematize; to get into working order." And "organization" is "the act of arranging a systematic way for use or action." The fact that the church organizes, or arranges itself in a systematic way, for its teaching service does not mean that a separate institution has been formed, and that the church is doing its work through that institution.

Then he thinks he has found a real objection because I used the word "school." I called our group arrangement a "Bible school." He found where Webster says a school is an institution, so he is sure we have a separate institution through which the church does its work. Again he takes one definition from among many. I admit that the word is used to mean an institution, but that is not all it means. The very first definition given is "a place for instruction . . . a place for acquiring knowledge." So the place where the church organizes, "arranges itself systematically for action," is a Bible school, whether it has one teacher or a dozen. Bro. W. has the same problem. He goes to a place to hold a meeting; Sunday comes and the brethren say they will "have their lesson" before the sermon, and one Bro.

teaches the lesson to the whole assembly. That is a "one-teacher-Bible-school, "and being on Sunday, according to Bro. W., it would be a Sunday School. Any place where teaching and learning are done is a school, regardless of the number of teachers.

Now to my affirmation. I have shown that the church is authorized to give different God-made groups the special instruction and training intended for them. I have shown that it is permissible for the church to care for two or more of these groups in the same house at the same time. And I have shown that women are expected to take part in this work, and that Paul mentioned some who worked with him in such work. I continue the proof that women may teach classes as long as they do not go beyond Scriptural limitations.

God has set certain offices or functions in the church, as evangelists, elders, deacons, and teachers. Each of these call for definite arrangements to carry out the work expected. The evangelist must have an audience, whether it be one or a thousand. He may do his work from house to house, or he may do it before great assemblies. Elders must have an arrangement, so must deacons. Where there is no congregation, there can be no elders or deacons. This congregational arrangement is essential to the existence and work of elders and deacons. So with the office of teacher. Teachers are a group of qualified people for a special work, as much so as elders or evangelists. God set teachers in the church (I Cor. 12:28) the same as he did elders and evangelists. And that group of people called teachers must assume the responsibility of "perfecting the saints." Now this office or function calls for an arrangement. They can not teach without some arrangement. Women *can not* teach in the public assembly of the

church, (I Cor. 14:34). But she is commanded to teach, and we have examples where they did teach. So if she is to obey the command to teach, and is not allowed to teach before the mixed assembly, some arrangement must be made whereby she can contact those whom she is to teach. This means of contacting her pupils is the thing the Lord did not reveal. Conditions in one age or country might be such as to make impossible the means used in another age or country, hence no revealed arrangement. We are left to our best judgment. Bro. W. has not proved that women did all their teaching going from house to house and one individual at a time, and he can not prove it from the Bible. Evangelists are allowed to make whatever arrangements the age, country, and weather permit. Teachers are left as free to make their arrangements. Women teachers are limited however more than men. But just as long as they observe these limitations they are free to make any arrangement they choose.

The only limitation I know of may be expressed in this way: Women must not speak, teach, in any situation, or arrangement, wherein she exercises dominion over man. Paul said, "Let the women keep silence . . . It is not permitted to them to speak." Could they sing? Could they confess Christ? Yes. They might sing or take part in anything that did not cause them to exercise dominion over man. Again Paul says, "I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness," (I Tim. 2:12). If we take the first clause, "I permit not a woman to teach," alone, it contradicts Titus 2:3,4. The word "man" is the object of both verbs, "teach," and "have dominion over." She is not to teach man; she is not to have dominion over man. But is it a sin for a woman to teach a man? I think not. Priscilla took the lead in

teaching Apollos, (Acts 18:26). The sense is this: A woman must not teach men in such a way, or in such an arrangement, as to exercise dominion over him. In addressing a mixed assembly the speaker has dominion over the audience. A woman violates this teaching under such arrangement. If she undertook to teach a group of men she would violate it. But when she teaches children, young women or old women she does not violate it. So in order for her to do her teaching which she is commanded to do in the most efficient and effective way her group is segregated. In this way she obeys the command to teach, but does not violate I Cor. 14 or Titus 2.

Bro. W. contends that I Cor. 14 forbids women to teach in any gathering large or small, mixed or unmixed. My contention is that it forbids women speaking, teaching, in any assembly or arrangement wherein she exercises dominion over men. I Cor. 14:35 says, "It is shameful for a woman to speak in the church." Is it shameful for her to sing? to confess Christ? No! Why? Because in the doing of these things she does not exercise dominion over man. But in asking questions, directing the course of thought, and in teaching, she would exercise dominion over man; and that is what Paul called shameful. But in an arrangement made by the elders, where no men are present, a woman may teach her group without doing that which is shameful. And I challenge Bro. W. to show where there is any thing shameful about it. it is not enough for him to say that the church at Corinth had no such arrangement. In the first place he does not know that his statement is true. And in the next place, since God did not legislate the arrangement wherein women are to do their teaching, we should not.

And now, I am obligated to answer his five questions.

1. "Is a school an organization?" Well, that depends. What do you mean by school? And what by organization? Webster says a school is a place for acquiring knowledge. We look upon our city schools as being institutions. I have already defined what I call a Bible school as being a systematic arrangement for teaching the Bible. It is an organization in the sense that it is a systematic arrangement. It is not an organization in that it is a separate, corporate body.

2. "If it is taught on Sunday, is it a Sunday School?" Well, not necessarily; it might simply be a Sunday school.

3. "If the church does the teaching in this school, is it not the church teaching through another institution?" These three questions are tied together so as to form a catch argument. They are based on the assumption that our group arrangement is a separate corporate body as is the denominational Sunday School. The assumption is wrong. I have challenged Bro. W. to prove that we have such a corporate body and to date he has not attempted to do so other than through the definitions I have already noticed. I repeat, the orderly, systematic arrangement of the assembly for the purpose of teaching the Bible on Sunday is not a separate corporate body; the church is not teaching the Bible *through*, anything any more than Bro. W. is teaching the Bible *through* a one-teacher-school when he "hears the lesson" on Sunday morning.

4. This question is also based on the assumption mentioned above, but I may give it a one word answer by saying, No.

5. This question, If we may use the group arrangement for teaching, why may we not use instrumental music in worship?, has been answered a number of times already. One is the introduction of a separate item in the worship;

the other is an orderly arrangement for doing what the Lord said to do, choosing our arrangement in the absence of any arrangement given by inspiration for the complete teaching program of the church. And again I say that I Cor. 14 does not furnish a complete teaching program of the church for it does not tell how women are to do their teaching. Bro. W., where does the Bible reveal the method, or arrangement for the perfecting of the saints? Where is revealed the arrangement for women to do their teaching? Won't you please tell us? I fear you won't.

WHITTEN S THIRD NEGATIVE

I have never contended that I Cor. 14 furnishes us with a rule by which all the teaching of the church is to be done. You say that women have a part with the teaching program of the church, but that I Cor. 14 does not regulate that. If you mean by the expression, "church teaching," the teaching to be done when the church assembles to be taught, I say that I Cor. 14 furnishes us with a rule by which all teaching is to be done. If you mean by "church teaching" or "teaching program" the teaching to be done in other places, than when the people assemble in a public assembly, I will admit that I Cor. 14 does not furnish us a rule by which all such teaching is to be done. I Cor. 14 has to do with public assemblies of the church. It furnishes a rule by which all may learn and all be comforted, I Cor. 14:24-31. This includes all the unlearned, and all unbelievers, verse 24. To deny this is to deny a plain statement of Holy Writ. This chapter leaves no room for your groups.

You say, "I did not say the Holy Spirit was poured out on women so they could teach on the day of Pentecost." This is what you said, "I will pour forth of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy, and your sons and daughters shall prophesy. Acts 2:17-18; Peter said this was done on Pentecost." If you did not say that these women took part in teaching on Pentecost, then your language is meaningless to me. I showed that this could not have been true. I showed that nothing is said about Philip's daughters teaching in the assembly or teaching any part of an assembly.

I have shown that the thirty women should be taught by faithful old women, and that such should be done daily and not just one hour a week. I have shown that all old

women are to do this teaching, Titus 2:2-5. The number that these old sisters are to teach at one time is not revealed, but she is not to do this teaching when the church assembles. She has no authority to teach a part of the public assembly. This has been abundantly proven by the fact that women are to ask their questions at home. This excludes her from teaching any part of the public assembly. Meet it.

In your last, you contended that women strove at the same time with Paul in gospel teaching. I agreed with you, that Paul taught publicly, and from house to house, and that he did this teaching night and day. Since these women did not teach in public, then they strove with Paul in house to house teaching. This agrees with Titus 2:2-5, and you are down. I have no objection to women gathering in a private home, or in a private place, and have old women teach them, even daily. This has nothing to do with your practice. You have women teach a part of the public assembly. When old women are teaching daily in the homes of young women, they are to teach them "good things," Tit. 2:2-5. One of the things is "to be keepers at home." "This is part of the training old women are to give the young women and such training old must be done in the home principally. To be keepers at home includes cooking, sewing, and earing for babies. Meet it.

I gave the definition to the word "organize," and the word "school" to show that your objection to an organization is unfounded, especially as long as you have "A Sunday morning Bible School." I showed that according to your position that this "Bible School" is not the church assembly, and that if it was the church assembly, you have women teaching in it. I showed that it would not do to call the church a "Bible School," hence you have a separate in-

stitution through which the church does part of its teaching, and that it is as much a separate institution from the church as is the Missionary Society. Both are channels through which the church works. You have not disproved this. I have no objection to organizing. The better any body of people is organized, the better it can function. I object to your authority for arranging the assembly into groups to do this teaching. According to the definition given by you of the word "organize," you have no justifiable grounds to oppose the Missionary Society. Have you? Both are channels through which Christians work, and if one is right the other is also right, for neither is authorized by precept, example, or necessary inference.

In order to escape your predicament, you refer to the teaching done in the assembly—done by one speaking at a time to the whole assembly as a School. I prefer to call Bible things by Bible names—the assembly, or such gathering. Your group arrangement calls for another name. The practice is modern, and the name must be modern.

On page 3, Bro. L. says, "Women cannot teach in the public assembly of the church, I Cor. 14:34. But she is commanded to teach, and is not allowed to teach before a mixed assembly; some arrangement must be made whereby she is to contact those whom she is to teach." I have shown that the public assembly is not to be arranged into groups in order that women may teach on such occasions. The fact that women are to ask questions at home, shows that no other arrangement was permissible. Have you attempted to overthrow this? I contend that Tit. 2:1-5 has reference to personal teaching, and conduct. This teaching is to be done by all faithful old women. With a number of faithful old women teaching daily in the homes of young women of each congregation, every young woman can be

easily contacted and taught daily, and not just an hour a week. Old women are not to wait until the church comes together, and take a part of the assembly aside to do this teaching. The nature of the things to be taught necessitates house-to-house teaching. A farmer trains his boys how to be farmers by showing them how to harness the teams, set the plows and by letting them see him plow. The same must be done by the old women in training young women "to be keepers at home." Woman's work is mainly domestic. She is to guide the house, I Tim. 5:14; she is to be a keeper of the home, Tit. 2:5. Hence all old women are to be faithful, and teach, train young women in their homes how to live and to be good house keepers. Deny it ?

I agree with most of what you say about women teaching on page 4. However, you make one statement unfounded. You say that Priscilla took the lead in teaching Apollos. I do not see anything in Acts 18 to justify this statement. In Acts 18:2, Aquila, the man, is mentioned first, and in Acts 18:25, Aquila is again mentioned first. Since Aquila was the man, and since he is mentioned first it seems to that this fact shows that he took the lead. His wife could have merely given consent to what he said. This is the way you explained how all the apostles spoke to the council with Peter, Acts 5:29. Now, why not stand by it?

I have not said that a woman cannot speak to an assembly of women. The number has nothing to do with her teaching, as long as she does her teaching in private away from the public assembly. Women are not to come to the church assembly to teach, but are to learn in silence. She is to ask her questions at home. This shows that old women are not to be teachers of any part of the assembly. You miss again. Singing, and confessing Christ, are not the matters treated upon in I Cor. 14:34-5. The teaching re-

ferred to in Tit. 2:1-5, is not to be any more under the supervision of the elders than any other private work of Christians. All old men, and all old women, in general, are referred to; therefore, the teaching mentioned is to be done by all old women in general who are faithful, Titus 2:1-5.

I Cor. 14:7 mentions playing on pipes, and harps, in connection with teaching, singing and praying, and there is no mention of your group arrangement in this chapter or elsewhere in the N. T. This fact proves that there is more reason for having instrumental music in the assembly than there is for having your group arrangement. Disprove it, or give up your group arrangement.

Since there are different voices in an assembly, and different appreciation for different kinds of song, and different blessings desired by the old and the young, and all do not appreciate or understand the significance of the Lord's Supper alike, there is as much or more reason, for arranging the assembly into different groups for singing, praying and to eat the Lord's supper as there is to teach.

Your teaching children that they cannot get much of the teaching done in the public assembly causes them not to become interested in the public teaching and worship. They come to think the public meeting is not for them. In this way appreciation for the public worship is to a great extent supplanted by your group arrangement commonly called the Sunday School. This is shown by the fact that children are asked, "Where are you going?" They reply, "We are going to Sunday School." They are asked, "Where have you been?" and they say, "We have been to Sunday School." The church is robbed of its glory, and children are not brought up to appreciate the church teaching and worship.

I shall leave the first four answers to my questions as they stand, the reader can decide whether they are properly answered or not. The fifth answer involves you in more trouble. In speaking of instrumental music in the worship, you say, "One is the introduction of a separate item in the worship; the other is an orderly arrangement for doing what the Lord said do." The Lord has commanded us to praise him. In I Cor. 14:7, Paul mentions playing of pipes, and harps, in connection with singing and praying. Instrumental music was used under the old covenant to praise the Lord with, something the Lord has told us to do. Now what seems to be the added item? Instrumental music is mentioned in the N. T., but your group arrangement is not found in the N. T.

QUESTIONS

1. When you call your group arrangement before the hour of worship "A Bible School," do you mean the church?
2. If this "Bible School" should be called a Missionary Society, would that make it a different institution separate from the church?
3. If Christians teach through a Missionary Society, is this not a channel through which the church does its work?
4. Does not the denominational world refer to your "Bible School" as a "Sunday School?" Why do they?
5. Do you not teach children that they cannot get much out of the public teaching of the church?

LANIER'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Again I begin my work by calling attention to some replies which Bro. Whitten should have made, but did not. In ray last I called attention to the fact that Bro. W. said all grades of minds were taught at Corinth by one man speaking at a time. I denied the statement being true when he first made it; in my last I called attention to it and begged him to notice it—to give us proof for it. Again he failed to mention it. Will he do it again?

I made the argument in my last that teachers were a separate class, set in the church by the Lord for a specific duty (I Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11, 12), the “perfecting of the saints,” and that as evangelists are left free to make whatever arrangements are best suited to the country, climate, and other conditions, so teachers are left free to make whatever arrangements they think best suited for carrying out their work. Since there is no arrangement revealed, we are left to our best judgment. He did not make any reply to the argument. Will he try this time?

I next argued that women are limited in their teaching; that I Cor. 14 and I Tim. 2 forbid a woman to teach in such a way as to exercise dominion over man; and that as long as a woman observes this limitation she may teach anywhere at any time which does not conflict with the hour of worship. Did he attempt to answer this argument? Not one line on it. He picked up one or two statements I made in the course of the argument and made a weak reply to them, but so far as attempting to answer the point I made he did not. I predict he never will.

Bro. W. and those brethren with whom he is identified persist in a misrepresentation. It is a bit difficult to understand their motive in this matter. But their whole

contention rests upon it. They persist in saying that in our group arrangement women are teaching a part of the public assembly of the church. (See par. 3). In our group, or class, arrangement, people, church members and non-members, are invited to come to the church house to study the Bible. After that Bible study is over we insist that they stay for public worship. In this arrangement the church does a teaching work which cannot be done in the public assembly, for the different God-made groups are taught what they need in language they can understand. If there are ten groups present they can be taught by ten people in one hour what it would take ten hours for one man to teach them. But he objects by saying that a woman teaches a part of the assembly of the church. No, it is not yet a part of that assembly. They may in one hour form a part of that assembly, but they are not at the time she is teaching them. If she teaches a group of young women on Saturday she is teaching people who will in one day be part of the public assembly. It is as reasonable to object to one as to the other. But again he may object to my saying this is not the assembly of the church for worship because we sing and pray. People often gather for secular purposes but open the meeting with song and prayer. Bro. W. and his preacher brethren had a "Preachers' Meeting" in Abilene, Texas, not long ago. Were those gatherings church assemblies? If so, what church was it that assembled I am guessing those services were opened with song and prayer, but yet they were not for the same purpose for which the church assembles on Lord's day. They were meetings for teaching and mutual edification for mature people. Children would have been benefited *but little by attending*. So when the teachers of the church invite people to go to the church house Sunday morning for Bible

study, some of them are going for the meat of the gospel, some for the milk; some are seeking guidance in home building, while others are looking for help to develop into elders, deacons and teachers. It is proper for them to sing and pray to God as they go about this study, and it does not make it what is commonly called the Lord's day assembly for worship. But if Bro. W. admits that a woman is not teaching a part of the public assembly of the church he knows he will have no ground to stand on. But every discriminating reader will see the difference. How can one be teaching a part of an assembly when they are not assembled? Will you please answer that? It is not enough to say they have been, or will be, assembled. But he cried, We have no example of such arrangement. No, and we have no example of a "Preachers' Meeting," but he and his brethren had one; we have no example of an invitation song, but he and his brethren sing them; we have no example of individual communion cups, but some of his brethren use them—and I think he has and does occasionally.

He says, "I have no objection to women gathering in a private home, or in a private place, and have old women teach them, even daily." Fine. A room in a church house is a "private place"; will you allow that daily? I challenge you to say you will.

But he says, "The fact that women are to ask their questions at home shows that no other arrangement was permissible." In the first place all women were not commanded to ask questions at home. Women who had infidel husbands would not be expected to do so. Women who had ignorant husbands would not be expected to go home and ask their husbands. But he said in one of his affirmatives that the word "husband" in I Cor. 14 means "men."

There is not a translation on earth that so renders it, and yet he chides me for leaving the King James translation and using the Revised. And then he said "husband" not only meant "men," but the men of the church, so the women might ask any man who is a member of the church. If there was ever a wild interpretation of a passage, that's it. As if she was likely to find just any man of the church at her home. But he insisted that "all may learn" when one man addresses the whole assembly regardless of the subject or the manner in which it is handled. Bro. W., if all could learn in such an arrangement, why should any *woman* need to ask her husband anything at home? Please answer.

I made the statement that Priscilla took the lead in teaching Apollos because her name is mentioned first and gave the reference, Acts 18:26. He must have been nervous. He replied that Aquila was mentioned first in both places, Acts 18:2 and 18:26. The reader can see for himself which is right.

But he insists that all old women are commanded to teach in Titus 2:3,4. I deny it. Titus was to work toward the end that all might be able to teach, but there is such a thing as people being in the church a long time and still be such as need to be taught the "rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God," (Heb. 5:12). He still fails to understand that teachers were a class in the church for a special purpose, (Eph. 4:11). God miraculously qualified them for their work during the infancy of the church, Philip's daughters spoke by inspiration, and no doubt those women who labored with Paul in the gospel were so qualified. If God expected all old women to be teachers, why did he not qualify all for the work ?

Then he says we teach children that they can not get

much from a public service, and “in this way their appreciation for the public worship is to a great extent supplanted” by our group arrangement. A little observation will prove that those congregations that have the best Bible school work have the largest attendance of young people in their worship. I am willing to compare the number of young people in our Lord’s day assembly with the number that attends his assembly. His statement is positively untrue, and until he gives some proof, it can not be worth anything in this discussion.

In Eph. 4:11 we have five classes of church workers named, two of them being prophets and teachers. I Cor. 14 was written to correct some abuses in connection with the work of the prophets and to regulate them in their work. Their work differed from that of the teacher or the Lord would not have made two separate classes of workers. The prophet revealed the will of the Lord; the teacher expounded, illustrated, enforced what the prophet revealed. If one should read before the church the book of Romans and then enlarge upon it, illustrate and explain its meaning, we would have the work of the prophet and teacher set forth. In connection with the work of the prophet there was no occasion for questions or discussion on the part of the hearers. But in the teaching process questions and answers on the part of the hearers are almost a necessity. Both our Lord and his apostles used this method of teaching extensively (Matt. 21:24; 22:15-22; Acts 6:9; 17:17). Now, to take a rule given to govern prophets and make that rule apply to all the teaching which the church is to do is manifestly wrong. But Bro. W. bases his contention with reference to teachers solely on instructions written to prophets. He might as well say that evangelists are bound by what is written to elders. In the next place what Paul wrote

governed those prophets, and the women in their relation to them, in a mixed public assembly of the church for worship. To take a rule given to govern, them in such a meeting and make it apply in every other gathering and in every other relationship is evidently wrong. That class known as teachers whose work was to edify the church was not given any set form or arrangement for giving instruction. Bro. W. has not given a passage which reveals the teacher's arrangement. If Cor. 14 governs all teaching that was to be done by the church when it assembled, as Bro. W. contends, then I affirm that the prophets were to do all the teaching that was done, and the teachers had no part in the work. And since we have no prophets today, we have no instructions as to how the church is to be taught when it assembles. Bro. W., I Cor. 14 was written to prophets; where is the passage that tells that group known as teachers how to carry on their work?

Since women were to be teachers, and since teachers were a special group for a special work of perfecting the saints, and since no special arrangement has been revealed for doing their work, why should Bro. W. make such a law; or why should he take a law given to prophets and compel teachers to abide by it? Women were commanded to be silent in the presence of *men* while the men were exercising their spiritual gifts, for to do otherwise would be to exercise dominion over man, and that would be shameful. When a woman sings she does not have dominion; when she confesses her faults she does not have dominion over man, so she may speak in these ways, even in the assembly. And when she teaches a group of children or young women she does not have dominion over man; she is doing just what the Lord commanded her to do. But Bro. Whitten says they did not do such at Corinth. How does he know? He

does not know! Women taught somewhere besides in the mixed public assembly of the church for worship, but we do not know where. Since we do not know where, and since the Lord did not tell us where, we are left to use our best judgment. And Bro. W., nor any other human, has the right to make a law saying where she must do her teaching, and where she must not.

Let it be remembered that I am not obligated to prove that the women of the church at Corinth, or any other place, did their work in a group arrangement before the hour of worship; I am not obligated to prove that women *must* do their work in such arrangement today in order to be saved. It may be that conditions were such, or that customs were such, in the first century, in some places at least, that it would not have been practical for women to do their teaching in such an arrangement just before the hour of worship. But in this country, in this generation, under the prevailing customs, such an arrangement is the most practical and effective way for women to do their work. And since there is no set arrangement revealed in which teachers, men or women, are to do their work, I maintain the command to teach carries with it the authority to use whatever arrangement we choose so long as it does not violate any plain teaching of the Lord. And since this arrangement for teaching is not the assembly for worship spoken of in I Cor. 14, a woman who teaches a class in this service does not disobey the command to keep silent as given in I Cor. 14.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS BY NUMBER

1. I prefer to say the church is teaching all who will come. Some who come are church members and some are not.

2. To call the Bible school, or our arrangement for Bible study, a Missionary Society would not make it a separate institution from the church. It would be a misnomer, but it would not change its nature. I might call you a monkey, but that would not make you one.

3. No, it would simply be a channel through which those individual Christians taught. If the whole membership took part in the teaching I suppose you would say the church was teaching through the Missionary Society.

4. Yes, denominational people prefer to refer to our Bible school as a Sunday School, but it does not make it so. They call you "Reverend" and "Pastor" just because they are in the habit of calling their preacher such names. But that does not mean there is anything wrong with you.

5. I do not teach children that they cannot get much from the public teaching of the church. I urge them to attend every service of the church and get all the good they can. But I have enough good judgment to know that when I am teaching a lesson on "The Church in the Eternal Purpose of God," children from five to fifteen are not going to get the lesson. And there are many things which their lack of experience and maturity make it impossible for them to understand, which things must be taught mature people. Why not give the child a lesson it can get while giving this advanced *lesson to the* mature people?

WHITTEN'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

I have shown that I Cor. 14 contains instructions concerning how the church should be taught when it comes together, I Cor. 14:23. All grades of minds were included in this assembly. Paul affirms that the unbeliever and the unlearned can learn by the rule given in this chapter, verses 24-25. In verse 31, he says "For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted." This verse not only says that all can learn, but it shows that one was to speak at a time in order that all might learn. Every thing that is supposed to be taught when the people come together, to be taught by the church, can be taught by the rule given in I Cor. 14. Whatever other teaching was done, it was not done at this assembly. Much teaching was done daily from house to house, Acts 20:31; 5:41.

I am sure that this rule applied to those who had the special gift to teach, for those who prayed, spoke in tongues, and prophesied, observed this rule, I Cor. 14:15-16-14-27-31. It would be indeed, strange, if the teacher was to observe some other rule, not revealed. If the teacher were not to observe this rule, then he was not to exercise this gift when the church came together to be taught. But certainly this is not true, which will be proven later.

You say that a woman may teach anywhere at any time, just so she does not exercise dominion over the man. Then you assume, that since this is true, some arrangement can be made for women to teach when the church comes together to be taught. Paul says, "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" This language does not allow for your arrangement for women to teach, either before or after the so-called hour of worship. Your

whole contention is based upon an assumption. Suppose Paul had said, let your piper and harps be silent in the church? Would you contend that the church could come together before the hour of worship, and arrange the people into different groups, and sing and play harps and pipes? You know you would not. The pipes and harps are mentioned in connection with singing, praying, and prophesying, I Cor. 14:7; but your women teachers teaching a group in such connection is not mentioned. You are down.

I do not misrepresent your practice when I say your groups are a part of the assembly. You affirm this very practice. "The practice of arranging into groups, the people who come together to be taught by the church, and using both men and women to teach these groups is authorized by the Scriptures." This is your proposition. You have the people assembled, and then you arrange them into groups to teach them, using both men and women teachers. Hence, I do not misrepresent you when I say these groups are a part of the assembly. And this takes place Lord's day morning just before the hour of worship. You may teach people Saturday who will become a part of the assembly Lord's day morning, but this is not the issue. On Lord's day morning the people come together, and then you arrange them into these different groups to teach them, using both men and women teachers. Such practice is unscriptural. If the public should assemble at a certain house and dance in different rooms of this house for an hour, and then all dance in the same room, would you call the first dancing private, and the other public? You reason this way concerning your group teaching. The public is present, and you arrange the people into different rooms to teach them for an hour, and then you teach them all in one room.

The first you call private, and the second you call public. This exposes the weakness of your reasoning.

Yes, we had a "preachers' meeting," and if you furnish as much authority for your group arrangement as I can for the "preachers' meeting" I will accept it. In Acts 15, we have an example of preachers assembling to consider certain matters of importance to the church, and the speakers spoke one by one to the whole assembly. This is exactly the way we conducted our "preachers' meeting." Both old and young were taught together, and some of the young were baptized.

Women may be taught daily by old women in homes, and in such places as are strictly private, but this is not true when the public is present. The house has nothing to do with it, but the public being gathered together does.

The fact that some have unlearned husbands, and some infidel husbands, does not authorize your group arrangement. Yes, I said that the word "husband" comes from a Greek word which means "man," or "men." You did not deny it. But suppose the word "husband" here includes only married men, that does not allow single women to speak in the church. I Cor. 14:35 says, "For it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church." If I should not be right in saying that this word "husband" comes from a Greek word that means "man," or "men," I am sure a woman may ask her father, or an elder, or any Christian man a question at her home. This is in harmony with reason and revelation. So, you gain nothing whatever it means.

You ask, "If all could learn in such arrangement why should any woman need to ask her husband anything at home?" I answer, for the same reason that we preachers need to ask questions in the assembly some times. If I

should hear you preach, I might wish to ask you a question relative to what you preached. Just because I needed to ask you a question would not prove that I had not learned anything from your sermon, would it?

Brother Lanier took the position that Priscilla took the lead in the teaching of Apollos, and cited Acts 18:26 as proof, I replied that his statement was unfounded. I said that Aquila, the man, is mentioned first in Acts 18:2, and Acts 18:26, and this places man in the lead. He says that I must have been nervous. I see no excuse for such evasion. Reader, turn and read for yourself and be astonished. Why did not Brother Lanier acknowledge his mistake like a man?

He denies that all old Christian women are included in Titus 2:2-3. Both the aged men, and the aged women, are mentioned in general, and if this does not teach that all old Christian women are to be teachers of good things, then all old men are not to be "Grave, temperate, sound in the faith, in charity, in patience." This forever exposes your contention. God's plan is that all old Christian women be teachers of good things, and this you admit, and this proves my position. If old women do their duty, the young women will be taught daily.

I contend that you teach children that they can learn but little in *the* public assembly teaching, and that by so doing you cause them to disregard the teaching in the public assembly. You say this is untrue and demand the proof. You make the following statement on page two, in reference to the "preachers' meeting." "Children would have been benefited but little by attending." You know you teach this publicly and privately. Such teaching naturally causes children to think the public teaching is not for them, and you mislead them. This is shown by their attitude toward

the Sunday School. When asked, "here are you going?" they reply, "We are going to Sunday School." And as they return, they are asked, "Where have you been?" and they answer, "To Sunday School." In many places when the class teaching is over, the children are turned out to go home. When a child is taught that he cannot learn but little in the public assembly, and is put off somewhere else to be taught, he naturally loses interest in the other teaching.

On page three, paragraph 4, you say, "If one should read before the church the book of Romans and another enlarge upon it, illustrate and explain its meaning, we would have the work of the prophet and teacher set forth." This is exactly what we do in our teaching services. One reads a certain portion of the N. T. and others enlarge upon it, and explain and illustrate its meaning. In this way all learn. We read the letters to the church just as they are written, and explain verse by verse its meaning. Milk and meat are found in the same chapters, and hence the old and young all get their portion. The book is written in this manner, and the sensible and reasonable way to teach it is to teach it as it is written. Remember God's ways are not our ways. We are weak.

You say, "In connection with the work of the prophet there was no occasion for questions and answers on the part of the hearers. But in the teaching process, questions and answers on the part of the hearers, are almost a necessity." You have been contending that I Cor. 14 does not give a rule for the teacher to go by, and upon this assumption you contend that there were other arrangements for those who had this special gift to teach. You now say that in the work of a prophet there was no occasion for asking and answering questions, but in the teaching process questions and answers on the part of the hearers are almost a neces-

sity. Let's reason a little. Women were not to ask questions in the assembly of I Cor. 14. Now since there was no occasion for asking questions while the prophets were speaking, it follows that women were not to ask questions during the teaching process. Women were told to ask their questions at home; therefore, the question and answer method of teaching was used in this assembly, but women were not allowed to take part in it. Give it up. You're sunk.

I have shown that old women are to teach young women to be "keepers at home," and that young women are to marry, bear children and guide the house, I Tim. 5:14, and that all old Christian women should do this teaching. I have shown that the things to be taught necessitates house to house teaching. Women strove together with Paul in the gospel. Paul taught publicly, and from house to house, night and day, Acts 20:31. Women are not to teach in the public assembly; therefore, these women taught with Paul day and night from house to house. This is God's plan, and when it is carried out, young women will be taught, and children will not be neglected. The word "teach" used in Titus 2:2 means to show how, and this cannot be done by words only. Those old women went into the homes of young women—where they lived—and showed them how to be keepers at home—how to cook, sew, take care of children, and other things pertaining to woman's duty. Your Lord's day group teaching of women does not do this work and cannot do it.

The answers to my questions are before the reader. In answer to Q. 2, he says, "I might call you a monkey, but it would not make you one." If I possessed a long tail, and all the other characteristics of a monkey, and I did not know that I belonged to the monkey family, this would be

indeed strange. The same is true of your group arrangement. It has all the characteristics of a modern S. S. and if you do not know that it belongs to the S. S. family, that is indeed strange. The whole world calls it a Sunday School, and some who have it call it a S. S. In answer to Q. 5, you say, "I do not teach that they (children) cannot get much from the public teaching of the church." On page 2, line seven, you say, "Children would have been benefited but little by attending." (The preachers' meeting). So my charge is true. You discourage children from learning in the public meeting. Children learn their part in the public teaching of the church when it is carried out according to I Cor. 14:31. To deny this is to deny the word of God.

In conclusion, what has Bro. L. done about my proof, that there is as much need for arranging the assembly into different groups, to sing, pray, and eat the Lord's supper as there is for teaching? Nothing. What has he done about my proof that there is more authority for having instrumental music in the assembly, than there is for his group arrangement with women teachers? Nothing. A number of other things that I have offered have been treated the same way.

I have enjoyed this discussion, and all I ask is that the reader read it carefully, and prayerfully.

AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

If the reader will compare the King James and Revised Versions it will be seen that Priscilla is mentioned first in the Revised and Aquila is mentioned first in the King James, in Acts 18:26, also verse 18. The best Greek texts give this order and this has led scholars to the conclusion that Priscilla led in the matter of teaching Apollos. The point is of minor importance, but it is mentioned here because of the confusion in former articles.

I set out in my affirmative to show that the church has authority to recognize the various stages of physical, mental and spiritual development through which people pass, and to teach these various groups separately. I showed that God recognizes these groups in that he commands that special instruction be given them. I have also shown the impossibility of teaching all these groups at the same time. You may teach a group of children in the presence of mature people, but you cannot teach them both at the same time. Words and phrases which challenge the attention of mature people can not be understood by children. So even Bro. W. does not teach them all at the same time, though he may teach them in each other's presence.

Next I proved that the church has authority to teach these groups at the same time in the same building. If the church can teach young men the duties of elders; and if the church can train other young men to be teachers, which no one denies, it is worse than folly to say that the church can not teach both groups at the same time. We have the command to teach these two groups and nothing is said about when, where, or how that teaching is to be done. Hence we are left to our best judgment.

Next, I proved that qualified women may be used to

teach some of these God-made groups. It is even specified that women shall teach young women. It was found that God qualified women to prophesy and teach, and examples of women laboring in the gospel were given. The time, place, or arrangement for this teaching is not specified by the Lord, so we are left to use our best judgment. We agree that women are not to teach in mixed assemblies. And because she can not do this Bro. W. concludes that the home is the only other place where she is allowed to teach. But for this conclusion he has no foundation. He failed to prove whether the woman was to teach in her home or in the home of others. The fact that she can not speak in mixed assemblies is not because woman can not speak in the presence of men, for when she sings or confesses Christ she speaks in the presence of men. But she is not allowed to speak in mixed assemblies because in so doing she exercises dominion over man, which Paul forbids, (I Tim. 2:11,12). It was then shown that woman is set in the church as teacher, to carry on a part of the teaching program of the church in "perfecting the saints," and that this is spiritual edification, not training in industrial arts. Since she is to teach, and must not teach in mixed assemblies, she must segregate her groups. She may teach them in a house used for home purposes; or she may teach in a house used for both home and church purposes; or she may teach in a house used for church purposes only; and she may do that teaching any day in the week and every day in the week. To forbid her to do so is to make a law where the Lord made no law.

To all of this Bro. W. objects because we have no example of this whole procedure being carried on just like we do it. In other words our procedure is not minutely described in any one certain passage. There is no passage

that says one must believe, confess, repent and be baptized to be saved; neither is there any one passage where we have such an example. All those four steps are not mentioned in any one passage, but we know they are Scriptural. If there was a passage where our plan is minutely described from beginning to end there would be no room for debate. But when I prove that the church may teach these groups separately; that the church may teach two or more of these separate groups in the same house at the same time; and that women may take part in the teaching program of the church because they are commanded to do so, and we have examples in the New Testament that they did such work—when I prove these things it is sufficient to establish my proposition that the practice of arranging into groups the people who come together to be taught by the church, and using both men and women to teach these groups is authorized by the scriptures.

I trust that the reader of this discussion has read it with pleasure and profit.

AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

If the reader will compare the King James and Revised Versions it will be seen that Priscilla is mentioned first in the Revised and Aquila is mentioned first in the King James, in Acts 18:26, also verse 18. The best Greek texts give this order and this has led scholars to the conclusion that Priscilla led in the matter of teaching Apollos. The point is of minor importance, but it is mentioned here because of the confusion in former articles.

I set out in my affirmative to show that the church has authority to recognize the various stages of physical, mental and spiritual development through which people pass, and to teach these various groups separately. I showed that God recognizes these groups in that he commands that special instruction be given them. I have also shown the impossibility of teaching all these groups at the same time. You may teach a group of children in the presence of mature people, but you cannot teach them both at the same time. Words and phrases which challenge the attention of mature people can not be understood by children. So even Bro. W. does not teach them all at the same time, though he may teach them in each other's presence.

Next I proved that the church has authority to teach these groups at the same time in the same building. If the church can teach young men the duties of elders; and if the church can train other young men to be teachers, which no one denies, it is worse than folly to say that the church can not teach both groups at the same time. We have the command to teach these two groups and nothing is said about when, where, or how that teaching is to be done. Hence we are left to our best judgment.

Next, I proved that qualified women may be used to

teach some of these God-made groups. It is even specified that women shall teach young women. It was found that God qualified women to prophesy and teach, and examples of women laboring in the gospel were given. The time, place, or arrangement for this teaching is not specified by the Lord, so we are left to use our best judgment. We agree that women are not to teach in mixed assemblies. And because she can not do this Bro. W. concludes that the home is the only other place where she is allowed to teach. But for this conclusion he has no foundation. He failed to prove whether the woman was to teach in her home or in the home of others. The fact that she can not speak in mixed assemblies is not because woman can not speak in the presence of men, for when she sings or confesses Christ she speaks in the presence of men. But she is not allowed to speak in mixed assemblies because in so doing she exercises dominion over man, which Paul forbids, (I Tim. 2:11,12). It was then shown that woman is set in the church as teacher, to carry on a part of the teaching program of the church in "perfecting the saints," and that this is spiritual edification, not training in industrial arts. Since she is to teach, and must not teach in mixed assemblies, she must segregate her groups. She may teach them in a house used for home purposes; or she may teach in a house used for both home and church purposes; or she may teach in a house used for church purposes only; and she may do that teaching any day in the week and every day in the week. To forbid her to do so is to make a law where the Lord made no law.

To all of this Bro. W. objects because we have no example of this whole procedure being carried on just like we do it. In other words our procedure is not minutely described in any one certain passage. There is no passage

that says one must believe, confess, repent and be baptized to be saved; neither is there any one passage where we have such an example. All those four steps are not mentioned in any one passage, but we know they are Scriptural. If there was a passage where our plan is minutely described from beginning to end there would be no room for debate. But when I prove that the church may teach these groups separately; that the church may teach two or more of these separate groups in the same house at the same time; and that women may take part in the teaching program of the church because they are commanded to do so, and we have examples in the New Testament that they did such work—when I prove these things it is sufficient to establish my proposition that the practice of arranging into groups the people who come together to be taught by the church, and using both men and women to teach these groups is authorized by the scriptures.

I trust that the reader of this discussion has read it with pleasure and profit.