

9452 Valley View Street Apt. C
Cypress, California 90630
February 4, 1971

Send letter

Letter should be read
in other
letter to him
letter and what
would be best
about him

Marie Weiss,

We have read and discussed your open letter to Brother Myer. This letter is the result of a detailed research and extensive study.

First let us define "disorderly" and "unruly." According to Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament, the words "disorderly" and "unruly" come from the same Greek word meaning "Deviating from the prescribed order or rule" (page 83). We believe this not only means a false teacher, but any sinner.

You failed to mention some scriptures that tell us how to treat sinners. Galatians 6:1 reads, "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." James 5:19, 20 tells us, "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, rebuke and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." Again in 1 Thessalonians 5:14 we are instructed to "...warn them that are unruly..."

When a man sins, we do not immediately withdraw from them as your letter would have us to believe. First, we try to save their souls. Even the act of withdrawing from is for the purpose of saving souls. (II Thessalonians 3:14) My letter did not deal with a most difficult between spiritual erring brothers. Such a weak brother an errors will do

In Matthew 18:15-17 we are given an example as to how to handle a brother who has committed sins against us. We believe it is an excellent example as to the course of action we should take against any sinner. Only as a last resort are we to withdraw from them. The elders have been granted to project what & wanted with a 15 year old child to follow

You condemned Brothers Tant and Wallace for associating with the institutionalists. This would, of course, be wrong; however, we have heard that those who attended the meetings with the institutionalists did so to discuss the word of God and show them the errors of their way. If this was the purpose, they were merely acting according to the word of God. We, as Christians, cannot judge the motives of others. We also cannot tell from the quotations given whether or not they were taken out of context. Gods work says to "sow them" did mean to my good? How can't it when these people have been

You asked to be proven by scriptures "where the elders are to govern the church, make practically all the decisions, as well as to handle the problems of the church, and the congregation is left out of all of this." We will show you where the elders govern the church. In Acts 20:28, the word "feed" comes from the Greek word meaning, "To feed, to tend a flock, keep sheep; to rule, GOVERN" (emphasis mine Thayer's page 527). The dictionary definition of "govern" is, "To direct and control; to regulate by authority; to keep within the limits prescribed by law or sovereign will; to influence; to direct; to restrain; to keep in due subjection; to steer or regulate the course of." We believe that our elders rule in the same capacity as our elected officials in Washington. We elect them to office because they are better qualified to handle politics and are more knowing than we. They represent us and no example vote on issues for us, but there are still some issues that are brought to the people where church to be voted upon. By the same principles, we appoint elders to make some decisions concerning some things, but not ALL of them. We are given examples where the entire church met and made decisions. If the elders had to bring each matter before the congregation, problems would soon arise. One might complain that he did not get a say in the matter and another might say that the time chosen for the meeting was not convenient for him. Would those new in the church who didn't know much about the Bible be able to make a wise decision? Such confusion would contradict I Corinthians 14:33, 40.

Bevel and friend. I know all alone complaints without them but in conjunction with other Christians they do not deserve the illustrations interpretation as man always thinks. Bevin suggests

You quoted Matthew 20:20-28 as meaning that the elders are not to rule as Lords over the congregation. While what you say is true, these scriptures are not the ones that prove it. Matthew 20:20-28 is a lesson on humility; that we are all equal as Christians. He was not specifically talking about elders here. Who said he was? ^{He did not say they had merely to look after anyone who might be ungodly}

You stated "The rule of the elders is to see to it that the congregation does it all in accordance with the scriptures." How can the elders "see to it" if they have no more authority than to merely watch and set examples? We can prove by the scriptures that the elders have the authority to do more. We did not say they had merely to look after Council - until now. Big Job. ^{4 set example only. Then did it become law.}

Hebrews 13:17 instructs us to "obey" and "submit to" them that have the rule over us. "Obey" comes from the Greek word meaning "To listen to, obey, yield to, comply with." (Thayer's page 497) "Submit" comes from the Greek word meaning "To resist no longer, but to give way, yield; to yield to authority and admonition, to submit." (Thayer's page 638) How can one yield to and comply with someone who merely watches and sets an example? We did not say elders to watch only. If he sets example, then does he do this? Works - ^{all under} you good idea

Titus 1:5 states that elders were to be appointed or ordained. Ordained comes from the Greek word meaning "To appoint one to administer an office." (Thayer's page 314) "Administer" has the dictionary definition of "To manage or conduct as chief agent or directing and controlling official; to direct or superintend the execution of, as of laws." Elders ARE to do more than watch and set an example.

We are not suffering from spiritual malnutrition nor are we bored. We find plenty of personal work and study to do. ^{How many have personally taught & converted.} We need the saints are to judge the matters which come before the church. ^{Do they not have a man hired to do this work. Is this for the church?} You stated that I Corinthians 6:1-9 "definitely and unequivocally teach that the saints are to judge the matters which come before the church." We will agree that they are to judge some matters, but not all of them. This scripture gave us only one example of matters the church will judge. Bible didn't say none. It judges ^{of course} ~~judging~~ things

I Peter 5:1-5 tells the elders to feed or tend the flock exercising the oversight. The word "elders" comes from the Greek word meaning "Those who presided over the assemblies of churches." (Thayer's page 536) From my dictionary the verb "preside" means "To be set over others; to have the place of authority over others, as a chairman or director; usually denoting temporary superintendence and government, as at a public meeting; to exercise superintendence." Of course this does not mean to lord it over us, but we are to be in subjection to them in the same way that younger people are subject to the older people (I Peter 5:5).

Acts 11:27-30 tells us that relief was sent from every man by the hand of Barnabas and Saul TO THE ELDERS. Note that the relief was not sent to the CHURCH, but to the ELDERS. It was then up to the elders to see that the relief was distributed properly. If you will read the book of Acts carefully, you will find where those preaching went to and talked to the elders before addressing the rest of the church. So what

Matthew 18:15-18 does teach that this matter was brought before the church. However, the word "church" comes from the Greek word meaning "A company of Christians." (Thayer's page 196) This definition does not state THE NUMBER of Christians present, ^{in church} nor the SEX. It COULD have been ten male Christians just as much as it COULD have been the entire congregation. ^{Who would bring this matter to the church?}

Did you ever wonder why in Acts 6:1-6 the MEN were chosen and not the women to take care of this duty or business of the widows? Did it ever occur to you that maybe God intended the MEN to handle the business? We agree that the entire congregation chose these men as we choose the elders today; however, the fact remains--the MEN took care of the business of the church. Contradiction. ^{The whole church took care of the business here}

^{a. at Cor 5 & acts 1}

You are
use Phoebe or a woman
in giving every

"For your interpretation of Romans 16:1, 2, you said, "Here was a woman handling some of the business of the church. Furthermore, she was traveling to another congregation in this business." We do not agree with your interpretation. We see Phoebe as a woman who moved from one congregation to another and carried with her a letter of recommendation. Paul admonished the saints to assist her in whatever matter or affair she might have. Matter of fact, Phoebe could NOT have been sent to handle some business of the church or Paul would have stated, "Assist her in whatsoever matter she has." or words to that effect. But the Bible states "...assist her in whatsoever matter she MAY have..." (emphasis mine). This is clearly putting the matter in the future and the word "may" expresses the POSSIBILITY, not the fact of the existence of a matter. There is nothing said in these passages to indicate she was sent, whether she for a matter. ^{and it not does not}

The word "servant" in verse one of the above passage, comes from the Greek word meaning, "A deaconess, a woman to whom the care of either poor or sick women was entrusted. One who executes the commands of another, especially of a master; a servant, attendant, minister." (Thayer's page 138)

The congregation is to judge matters as in I Corinthians 5:1-8. The word "judge" comes from the Greek word meaning "To be of opinion, deem, think." (Thayer's page 360) We are not to make a decision, just give our opinions. The elders then make the decision based upon those opinions and we are to obey it. How can we obey the elders if there is nothing to obey? If elders merely watched, we could not obey them in this practice. ^{We can never come to agreement based on opinion — ff.}

We do not believe that you read the entire chapter of Acts 15. Verse 6 states that "The apostles and the elders were gathered together to consider of this matter." Here the entire congregation was not gathered together. True, the entire congregation RECEIVED them, but it was the elders and apostles that CONSIDERED the matter. The church is not mentioned again until the 2nd verse when they chose men to go to Antioch. Here is another case where just the apostles and elders (men only) met to handle a matter.

Trying to prove that the entire church was present by quoting verse 7 where Peter addressed them as Brethren is questionable. It is quite plain that the Brethren were the apostles and the elders. (verse 6) ^{who were the ministers}

In verse 12 where all the multitude kept silence, you are trying to say that this means the entire church. The word "multitude" comes from the Greek word meaning "The whole number, the assemblage." (Thayer's page 516) Since only the apostles and elders were present, it could have read, "Then all the elders and apostles kept silence." It could have but it didn't. ^{Don't believe that the elders & apostles would have made a mistake}

We also do not agree with your interpretation of verses 12 and 13. The question is what is the antecedent of "they"? It has to be Paul and Barnabas since they were the ones who had been talking. The multitude was already silent (verse 12). So the verse could read "And after Paul and Barnabas stopped talking, James answered,..."

We don't believe that the Bible teaches a woman cannot teach a man. We believe it teaches that she cannot teach a Christian man for it is at this time that the man participates in the business affairs of the church, etc. For her to hold a position of authority by supervising a class as a teacher, is usurping his authority. This would deal with the problem of her teaching boys or men not yet Christians. How can a woman, who is in subjection to her husband and he being the head of the wife (Ephesians 5:22), (Titus 2:5) be supervising a class? According to my dictionary, supervising requires oversight which is the job of the men. Therefore teaching Christian men is usurping his authority.

John 11:3 We have some brothers
herein the as men when it comes
to obeying gospel

We did not say the woman supervised

The class. . very often of subjection

want to
participate
if men pre-

Open the "Opinion" part of the paper
we don't write open
we give our opinion
for what we think
and we
think it is
what about
opinions. But this does not stop a woman from participating in class by offering her own
student to offer an opinion. The student does not become or take the place of the teacher; the student merely offers an opinion or states a finding. 1 Timothy 2:11,12 states that a woman is not to teach when she has dominion over a man. "Teach" comes from the Greek word meaning "To hold discourse with others in order to instruct them, deliver didactic discourses." (Thayer's page 144) My dictionary defines a "discourse" as "A running over a subject in speech; a sermon or other production." This stops a woman not only from preaching, but from teaching a subject in a speech as most teachers do. A woman is to learn in silence or quietness.

She cannot teach where she has dominion over the man. ("Dominion" comes from the Greek word meaning "In later Greek writing, one who does a thing himself, the author; one who acts on his own authority, autocratic, i.e. an absolute master; to govern one, exercise dominion over one." (Thayer's page 84) Since a teacher governs and controls the class, she cannot teach a man in a classroom situation by being the teacher. The Bible does not define or limit the woman or keep her from classroom et

You stated "In Acts 18:24-26, Priscilla taught and corrected a preacher." You are in error and had better read the scriptures again. The Bible teaches that Priscilla and Aquila took him aside from the rest of the congregation and declared the scriptures unto him more accurately. No doubt this made it a classroom-type situation who went in which she participated, but Aquila, being the man, conducted. So you are in error myself when you said that Priscilla taught a preacher. She did not do it alone, nor was it Aquila in front of a group of others as in a classroom full of people. It would seem that you purposely twisted the scriptures by leaving out an important part to make it fit your own personal belief and desire. It certainly makes one wonder if you are the president of the Women's Liberation Movement in Spring Valley.

We, too, believe that ministers are to establish churches everywhere. But Apollos, also being a minister (1 Corinthians 3:5) watered. Titus also watered (Titus 1:5). If all ministers established churches, who would water? They did both if you read in error

The elders or other members cannot prepare lessons weekly, as they have other jobs. It takes most men months to prepare a lesson because of the research involved. In addition, this is a full time job and requires a full time preacher. The full time preacher must feed his family also, so he is paid for watering. If he had to work somewhere else to support his family and preach too, his preaching would suffer and so would the congregation. This is hardly an answer to the paid preacher system. Would it hurt

it even that we believe II Thessalonians 3:7-10 and I Corinthians 9 both clearly state that Paul had a right to the pay (I Corinthians 9:18; II Thessalonians 3:9) but chose not to take it. There were those during this time that were preaching false doctrine for money. We do not believe the Bible teaches that watering preachers must starve.

We do not believe that prayer can bring forth miracles. If God allowed someone to live who was dying and whom the doctors had given up, then he is a respecter of persons because our grandmother and other loved ones have died. In the first place, we believe it is wrong to ask for such selfish things. We must ask if it be the Lord's will, for he knows what is best. Well if it was the Lord will be your grandmother to live

There are no miracles today like in the time of Elijah when he prayed it wouldn't rain. God does not talk directly to us as he did in that time. We believe you take answer some scriptures too literally when it is used somewhat figuratively. God does not meddle in our affairs. If he did, he would be blamed for the bad and troubles in our lives as well as the good. Now didn't you anything to prove this? Rom 13:

We don't believe baptism is a miracle. We do not SEE the dead being made spiritually alive, we see a body go into the water and come out of it. The fact that we have obeyed God's commandment and that we believe him when he says we are cleansed from our sins & other things. Don't you remember our parents say mortals & others? We had the power & it failed us & it's over.

But the body that went into the water came out of the water. And it went out of a "new" man. It must have been a change that cleanses is Christ's blood when he died on the cross, not our own. We don't have the power to save ourselves. Again you have taken the scriptures too literally. It was on

why do you argue "man" against the miracles?

How else? Take the scripture exactly as written. Do to the length of this letter, we will not comment on the Holy Spirit. We will hope, however, that the things we have written will make you re-evaluate your position and go back to the Bible for a lengthy study as I have done. Only in this way can one find the truth.

Well, if I made you study the Bible. The letter was not in vain. Only little by little guided by the Holy Spirit can come into an accord. Inasmuch as much of what is in this letter does not have scriptural basis it deserves so much time to王者 dictionary we believe that a further study of your Bible would be in order.

Was it the length of the letter of your letter that kept you from commenting on the Holy Spirit or lack of knowledge of this subject. Inasmuch as you had to rely so much on the dictionary and as little is said in dictaining it perhaps would be a good thing for you to do some more studying of scripture. If you try to answer an lesson on HE. I'm afraid王者 can't do it for you.

Your attitude towards prayer is an example of the antinomianist aspect of Paul's so called heresies. In Christian love, in church & Linda Garrett is part of Deck Garrett that the writer of the letter is all about

Gently Shirley
for 3 mo. is an
unpleasant time
in which short time
to cover the Bible
of all the
scriptures
been studying
of teaching
for me 30
you a belief
that I have
Kept a
quiet bed
that you
had to
by another from
your 3 m.
of absent

of words is a play
in semantics & which
is a play to cover up
lack of knowledge.

It is very evident from
your letter your knowledge
is limited & before you
accuse others of error &
try to teach them on
defining words (which anyone
even a child can do by using
a dictionary) is not teaching
the Bible. Nor is it of any
particular value in getting
an understanding of word of
God. God's command is to
study the word of God to
nibbly drink it. Employing
^{M Thayer} Thayer to get an understanding
of of scriptures is to fail to interpret
the word of God by confirming exegesis
by other scriptures