

Seek The Old Paths

"Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths...and walk therein."

(Jeremiah 6:16)

Vol. 5, No. 6

June 1994

Should Women Function As Translators In The Assembly?

Wayne Jackson

Our brethren who are working in foreign fields need to give this matter some protracted study. We do not question their motives. They are sincere and dedicated people... Still, we must be scriptural... The practice of using women translators in the public assembly should be reconsidered... Already we have heard of cases where women have taken the initiative to lead prayers and singing because they felt they were the best qualified.

With the fall of the iron curtain, thrilling evangelistic opportunities have opened up in Russia and Eastern Europe. Our hearts have been genuinely warmed as the news reached our ears that thousands have embraced the gospel of Christ and have organized congregations after the New Testament order. May Jehovah bless such efforts, and may we lend our support to these new kinsmen in the Lord.

Whenever the church is introduced into a new cultural environment, problems are bound to arise. Such were the circumstances during the first century, and it is no less true today. One difficulty that we are encountering in formerly communist nations has to do with the role of women. In those countries women have long been a force in the educational/industrial aspects of society. They have assumed a great variety of leading roles. Accordingly, it may be difficult for some of our new sisters to adjust to the idea that woman's public role in the church is limited. The divinely imposed restriction is grounded in spiritual principles that are universal and ageless, not in cultural peculiarities.

As our brothers have worked in Eastern Bloc countries in recent years, they occasionally have encountered situations in which no male was present to translate for the American preacher. Accord-

ingly, some have employed native women who, standing alongside the evangelist before the assembly, translates his message for the group. I have been told that on occasion a woman was selected to do the interpreting even when a qualified man was present. I have no doubt that those who are operating in this way are very sincere and honestly believe that they are not compromising the teaching of the Scriptures. But are they? Perhaps the pressing demands of these new opportunities caught us unprepared, without our having had the opportunity to study these matters as carefully as we might. This study is offered in the hope that we can calmly examine the biblical data and draw only such conclusions as are consistent with truth.

That women were employed as teachers of the gospel in the early church is beyond controversy. No one will dispute the fact that the Great Commission applies to women, who are required not only to submit to the gospel, but to proclaim it as well (Matt. 28:19,20). On the day of Pentecost, Peter hinted of woman's teaching role in the Christian economy (Acts 2:18). Priscilla, along with her husband Aquila, was involved in instructing the eloquent

(Continued on page 4)
WOMEN TRANSLATORS?...

 Guest Editorial...

The Silence Of 1 Corinthians 14:34-35

Charles A. Pledge

Paul wrote: "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church" (I Cor. 14:34-35).

In Vol. 9, Number 4 of the *Gospel Gleaner* a number of fine articles appeared in that special issue on **The Bible Role Of Women**. Among these articles was one on the above subject. The article was written by a faithful preacher of the gospel and had some good points. I believe, however, the author missed a basic point involved in the passage.

The author's basic premise was stated in syllogistic form with the major premise missing. I shall supply the major premise which was implied by his language even if the author did not intend to make the implication.

First, I shall quote the minor premise and conclusion stated by the author and then supply the major premise demanded by implication. He wrote: "Our meetings today are not identical to the meeting of 1 Corinthians 14; therefore, the restriction, 'not to speak' is not the same." His minor premise and conclusion are separated by a semi colon. Now, look at the whole syllogism demanded by implication.

Only those meetings identical with the meeting of 1 Corinthians 14 are governed by the restrictions and rules of 1 Corin-

thians 14.

Our meetings today are not identical to the meeting of 1 Corinthians 14.

Therefore, the restriction, "not to speak" is not the same (in our assemblies – C.P.).

That which proves too much proves nothing. The author's application proves too much. He wrote: "This Greek word *lalien*, does not allow for a woman to utter a sound, emit a voice; it does not allow singing or for a woman to confess audibly confess (sic) the Savior's name." He continues to point out that in "our assemblies" women may sing (speak) and confess their faith. If that word forbids the woman singing today, it would have done so in the first century. One must then assume either that this was not a worship assembly, or, somehow those women were allowed to sing, or that the women were not allowed to sing. Yet, the author uses a passage (v.26) regulating acts of worship to serve as a sacred principle applicable today in our assemblies. It was a worship assembly of the whole church (vs.23-26).

The author of the article creates a problem by apparently assuming that the basic definition of a word is the final rule of exegesis in a passage using that word. But that is not true. One must consider the syntax, the history, and the etymology along with other factors, not the least of which is the context, especially the immediate context.

The immediate context is the speaking portion of worship

wherein instruction of various types is involved, but limited strictly to speaking (vs.26-33). In that context, the woman is forbidden to utter a sound by speaking. That part of the worship is exclusively restricted to the males of the church.

The author of the article in question answered the objection that the use of the word forbids singing or confessing one's faith (two things commanded those qualified to obey the commandment). He correctly pointed out that the same word was used in regards to a prophet speaking in 14:28,30. Applying the author's logic and application, that prophet could not sing or lead brethren in prayer in that assembly. Why? Because he was forbidden to utter a sound or emit a voice. But, since the author restricts the word in a complete sense of worship to the women, he implies the man might sing and confess his faith in Christ. Concerning the men, he wrote, "Clearly these men were to exercise control and avoid confusion." For the men, the application of the word, according to the author, is to avoid confusion. But the same author argued that the use of the word forbade the woman to sing and confess her faith. Clearly two different objectives of the application of the same word.

Obviously too much is proved by the author in his article. The evident application of any passage is that when the universal conditions of the context are met, the universal applications are the same. The logical problem is assuming a single word governs the whole assembly (a general context) instead of the conditions of the context in which the word was uttered (the immediate context).

The assembly certainly had inspired men (possibly inspired women) in it. Our assemblies have no inspired individuals. In that respect, our assemblies are probably different than every

assembly of the whole church about which we read in the New Testament. But, because there is that basic difference, are we to assume that none of the specific statements restricting actions in those assemblies also restrict identical actions in our assemblies? If so, very few, if any, restrictive statements will be found.

On the other hand, laying aside the miraculous element, those statements dealing with actions that are universally possible, or permissible, must be regarded as universally binding. Otherwise, what about the authority involved in Ephesians 5:19 and Colossians 3:16? Both churches possessed individuals with miraculous gifts. In the miraculous element, our assemblies are not identical to theirs. But is that justifiable grounds for rejecting a passage that both restricts and regulates an act as being applicable today if that act could be performed universally?

Remember, if the conditions exist which a Scripture was uttered to regulate, that part which regulates the particular conditions continues to apply so long as the conditions exist. The women in the church assembly of 1 Corinthians were forbidden to speak, not solely, or even primarily, because they had husbands. Rather, the primary reason was because they had no authority from God to speak during that part (course) of worship (v.34). Notice the passage: "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience as also saith the law." Paul first said: "for it is not permitted unto them to speak...." An additional reason was because these women also had husbands and could ask them at home. But they were first women, then wives, as indicated by the absence of authority for women to speak. If the women could not

speak only because they had husbands, all women without husbands were left free to speak in those assemblies.

All who rely upon definitions of words as a primary means of identifying their use need also to look at the way the word is used in syntax, its context as well as historically, and etymologically. Definitions are important as given by dictionaries and sometimes by lexicons. That is perhaps a good starting place in an exegesis, not a stopping place upon which to rest a logical argument.

The author of the article insists that this is a special meeting. Yet the regulation of spiritual gifts in that context deals with the use of those gifts in acts of worship to God. Furthermore, these meetings were those meetings into which unbelievers might come (v.24). Special, restricted meetings of the church would not fit that category. Spiritual gifts were commonly used in regular assembly meetings in apostolic times.

Our worship is the same as in the days of the apostles if our worship is acceptable to God. Women are still under the same authority as in the days of the apostles. That authority is in the **word uttered** (Rom. 7:1-4; Heb. 7:12-14). If God does not give (by statement, implication, or example) the woman authority to speak during the speaking (instructive) portion of worship, then the woman today is not permitted to utter a voice at that time.

To equate the act of singing with that portion of worship because one objective of singing is to teach is faulty reasoning. A part of the animal is the foot just as a part of singing is to instruct. But instruction is not the whole of singing. To say that this foot I see is an animal would be as false as to equate singing with the exclusive act of instructing. The two are not the same. We

may instruct when we sing but we do not have to sing in order to instruct.

Prophesying (vs.29-30) was but one part of the activity in 1 Corinthians 14. Singing, teaching, and revelations were also a part (v.26). Earlier, prayer was also mentioned in the chapter. If *lalien* forbade the women to sing, it would also forbid the prophets to sing if the word is applied without distinction of context to the prophets as it was done to the women in the article.

We will agree, I believe, that the word *lalien* applied to the prophets has a very limited context in verses 28,30. Except a special distinction be found in the context of the chapter, what reason do we have to believe the word *lalien* as applied to women has a broad, general application? Does not consistency demand the same degree of application in one as in the other unless the context forbids such?

Yes, regulation of spiritual gifts was the primary consideration of the context of chapters 12-14, but not the only consideration. Let's be careful to see the whole picture. Women in 1 Corinthians 14 were not permitted to speak in the exclusively instructive portion of the assembly of the church, just as the prophets were not permitted to all speak at the same time. The same word governs both. What is fair and correct in application for one is fair and correct for the other.

After all is said regarding women speaking during the instructive part of the worship considered in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35, we still await a statement either explicit or implicit, or example from God which authorizes such to take place. Perhaps some more learned than this author might provide us with a passage.

7 West Colorado
Sheridan, WY 82801-5135

WOMEN TRANSLATORS?...

(Continued from page 1)

Apollos more accurately in the way of the Lord (Acts 18:26). The evangelist Philip had four daughters who prophesied (Acts 21:9). Women in the church at Corinth prophesied (I Cor. 11:5). Older Christian women were responsible to teach younger women the duties of domestic demeanor (Titus 2:3,4). Women taught.

While the foregoing passages indicate that women functioned as teachers in the primitive church, it is equally clear that their instructive capacity was restricted by additional inspired information. In I Corinthians 14 Paul required that women, in a certain sense, remain quiet in the church assembly (34). In the apostle's first letter to Timothy, he declared that the woman may not teach in a situation during which she acts as an authority-figure over the man (2:12). For a further discussion of this matter, see the author's article, "Woman's Role In The Church," *Christian Courier*, April 1993.

I Corinthians, chapter 14, has frequently presented a difficulty for Bible expositors. To what extent does it prohibit a woman speaking in a church assembly? Some focusing upon the term "silence" (*sigao* - vs. 34) contend that the assembly under consideration is one in which a woman could not utter a sound. It was, they allege, a unique first-century situation, hence the restriction of this passage really is not applicable today. These brethren, I believe, have overlooked an important point. The term "silence" of verse 34 is not employed absolutely, but relatively; i.e., it is qualified by the *context*. For example, in his discussion of the abuses of spiritual gifts, Paul says that the brother who has the gift of tongues should keep "silence" if there is no one to interpret for his alien audience (28). That obviously does not mean that he could not utter a word during the entire church service; rather, he was to keep silence insofar as the matter under consideration was concerned (cf. 30). Similarly, the woman's requirement to keep silence was not absolute. There was only a *certain sense* in which she was not to "speak." No one will argue that the women at Corinth were forbidden to sing, and yet singing is a form of speaking (see Eph. 5:19).

Some respond by suggesting that the assembly of this setting was not the public worship assembly. That does not seem to be true, however, since teaching, praying, and singing are all mentioned within the context (cf. 14:15). Furthermore, reference is made to "the whole church" being assembled (cf. 11:18,20) - with even unbelievers being present (23). It is obvious that this was a public assembly. But consider this - even if it could be established

that the meeting of I Corinthians 14 was not a public gathering, how would this alter the basic instruction? If the apostle forbade a woman to teach in this allegedly private situation, does it stand to reason that he would condone her serving as a teacher in a *public* gathering? Surely not. Moreover, even if one could somehow dispense with I Corinthians 14, he would still have to reckon with I Timothy 2:12, which disallows a woman to assume the role of a teacher in the assembly.

What then does the injunction regarding silence mean in the Corinthian context? Many scholars would argue that Paul is teaching these saints the very same truth that he later enunciated to Timothy. Here is an interpretive principle that is worthy of reflection. Whenever a biblical writer addresses the same topic in different places, and yet one context is clearer than the other, the more obscure should be viewed in light of the plainer. When I Corinthians 14:34ff and I Timothy 2:12ff are placed side-by-side, it is obvious that they deal with the same general theme. The Corinthian correspondence is the more difficult to comprehend due to its lack of details. Thus, let the apostle's more lucid instruction in his letter to Timothy bring the former passage into focus. There are striking similarities in the language.

I CORINTHIANS 14

Woman not to speak
Keep silence/subjection
As saith the law

I TIMOTHY 2

Woman not to teach
Be quiet/subjection
For Adam was first, etc.

A consideration of these parallels suggests that the *type of speaking* forbidden in the Corinthian letter was the same as the *authoritative teaching* prohibited in the epistle to Timothy. That being the case, it appears that Paul was cautioning the Corinthian women in two respects: First, some were to cease interrupting their husbands during the services (perhaps they were inquiring as to the meaning of certain oracles; they could satisfy their curiosity at home). Second, even if a woman possessed a spiritual gift, she could not publicly exercise it in the church assembly, for such violated her appointed role in the divine constitution of things, as evidenced by the order of creation, and as a consequence of her part in humanity's original transgression (cf. I Tim. 2:13-14).

Now to the issue at hand. Does standing before the assembly, translating a message from God, constitute a violation of I Corinthians 14? In this chapter, Paul discusses three spiritual gifts by which divine revelation was conveyed to the congregation. First, there was prophecy. This was the proclamation of truth to a group of the same language as the speaker. Second, there was the gift of speaking in a tongue. This involved the supernatural communica-

tion of revelation to an alien audience, the teacher having been granted the ability to converse in a language he had never learned naturally. Finally, there was the gift of interpretation (translation). This allowed a person with a language gift to convey a message (by means of an inspired translator) to an audience unable to discern the particular language gift which he possessed. What seems apparent from a consideration of all the details is this. Each of these persons addressing the congregation functioned in the capacity of a public teacher – whether by a message in the native dialect alone (as in prophecy), or by a message in a foreign language (the case of tongue-speaking), or by a message, a language, and a translation combined (the interpreter). There seems to be no difference, from the divine view-point, in the teaching role being exercised by these speakers. Yet, it is within this very context that the apostle plainly commands: “...let the women keep silence in the churches [assemblies]...”

If it was permissible for a woman to stand before the church and teach by means of the translation process, just because the message did not actually originate with her, but rather from a man ultimately, why did Paul not acknowledge that exception in his discussion?

DEFENSIVE ARGUMENTS

But some brethren – respectable brethren – believe the use of women translators is defensible. The following is a review of some of the arguments being offered in support of this practice.

(1) *The woman translator is merely serving as an instrument – much like an amplifier. She is not actually doing the teaching.* But the fact is, she is not a machine. She is a person, and she does not lose her feminine personhood just because the message does not emanate from her. Could a woman stand before an audience, receive her message from a distant place via electronic transmission, and preach the gospel to a mixed group? If not, what would be the objection? Here is an interesting question. Could a Christian woman memorize one of N. B. Hardeman’s famous tabernacle sermons, deliver it to the church and be justified on the ground that the material did not originate with her – that she was merely functioning as a “recording machine?”

Exactly what is “teaching?” Does it not involve communicating an understandable message? Two people stand before an audience – a man and a woman. He speaks in a language the people do not understand; she conveys the message in a language that is understood. Who is doing the teaching? Not the man alone. A mere sound does not teach. It was on the basis of this principle that Paul forbade tongue-speaking to an alien audience when no

translator was present. If the woman stops speaking, the teaching ceases. In concert, both are teaching. Paul attributes the *edification* to the *interpreter* (14:5,12,13,26-28). An interpreter *instructs* (cf. 19)

In logic there is a principle that states that things which are equal to each other are equal to the same thing. If it is the case that the man speaking to the assembly is preaching, and if it is likewise the case that the woman beside him is doing *exactly the same thing that he is doing*, then it logically follows that she is preaching as well. Or to make the point even stronger – if it is the case that the man who speaks to the audience is preaching (even though the group understands not a word he says), then surely it is the case that the woman who speaks beside him (with the assembly understanding every word she says) is similarly preaching.

(2) *The woman translator is not exercising authority over the audience.* But if it is the case that she is functioning in the role of a teacher of the group (as the paragraph above clearly indicates), then she *is* exercising the *type of authority* that is prohibited by I Timothy 2:12. The grammatical construction of this passage demonstrates that the position of a public teacher *is a role of authority*. Consider this analogy. The New Testament was originally written in Greek. It was the authoritative Word of God in that form. Does it lose that authority merely because it passes through the translation process? It does not. Similarly, a mere change of language does not alter the fact that both the original speaker and the translator are teaching in the same authoritative way.

(3) *If a translator is actually a teacher, when we hire a non-Christian translator (as has been the case in some mission situations), then we are hiring an unbeliever to preach the gospel.* This is a valid point. The question is – is either practice right? When Paul discussed a situation in the Corinthian assembly where someone had the gift of tongues, but no interpreter was present, he told the tongue-speaker to keep silent. He did not suggest that some unbeliever, who might be present (cf. 14:23,28), could be employed as the translator if he were qualified. When we go into a mission field, we need to go prepared to speak the gospel in the native language. Would it be permissible to go into a mission region, hire a non-Christian translator, leave with him printed materials, and tell him to do the teaching for us?

(4) *Though Paul’s restriction of a woman’s speaking in the church assembly would prohibit the “interpretation” of a language, it would not forbid simple translation. Interpretation and translation are different.* The Greek term *hermeneuo*, and its related forms, are used in two different senses in the New Testament. The word can denote an “explanation.” Following His resurrection, Jesus encountered two

disciples on the road to Emmaus. In the course of their conversation, the Lord "interpreted" (explained) to them the things that had been written concerning Himself in the law of Moses and the prophets (Luke 24:27). On the other hand, these kindred terms can have to do with the "translation" of words from one language into another. For instance, at Joppa there was a disciple whose name was Tabitha, which by "interpretation" (i.e., translation - from Aramaic to Greek) was rendered Dorcas (Acts 9:36). The context must determine whether an "explanation" or a "translation" is in view. Clearly, in I Corinthians 14 the gift of "interpretation" was the inspired ability to translate a divine message, initially given in a foreign tongue, into the vernacular of the audience. This is clearly evidenced by Paul's allusion to the many kinds of voices in the world (10), and his reference to the barbarian (a non-Greek-speaking person) in verse 11 (cf. Acts 28:2). I have discussed the nature of these tongues more fully in my tract, **Speaking in Tongues**. Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider note that: "Paul demands that tongue speakers express themselves in the assembly only when an *hermeneutes* is present and able to *translate* and make intelligible to the congregation what has been said in the tongues" (**Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament**, Eerdmans, 1991, vol. 2, p. 54). I have examined a number of language authorities on the use of "interpretation" in I Corinthians 14. Those who suggest that the term is employed of "explanation" invariably contend that the "tongues" of this chapter are "ecstatic utterances" - not human languages. And so, when the apostle enjoins a woman to silence, it is within a context that includes audible translation.

(5) *The context of I Corinthians 14, which forbade a woman to speak, dealt with the miraculous. It is thus not appropriate to introduce that situation as a precedent for the present circumstances.* The fact that the speaking in I Corinthians 14 was miraculous has nothing to do with the argument. A woman's silence is enjoined because of her gender, not the miraculous nature of what is done. Are we to believe that the apostle would forbid an *inspired* woman to exercise the gifts mentioned in chapter 14 (which included translation), and yet he would allow the practice for an *uninspired* woman of our day? Does that really ring true?

(6) *If we can utilize a woman to "sign" for the deaf, then we can employ a woman to translate for the preacher.* First, in some situations, "signing" may not be parallel to publicly preaching the word. A woman might sit silently, sign to a few nearby folks, and the arrangement be more comparable to an informal conversation. Second, if there is a parallel between public teaching (as in the translating procedure) and signing, and the former is shown to

be inappropriate, then signing should be limited to men. Two wrongs do not make a right. What if there were a congregation composed of those who can hear and those who are deaf. The only qualified preacher in that church is a deaf brother, and the only person qualified to interpret sign is a woman. Can the brother sign to one group while the sister audibly preaches to the remainder of the church? If those who are advancing this argument would object, they must analyze why such should not be done.

(7) *If we do not use women translators, many will be deprived of the gospel.* The same argument could be made regarding women preachers. Suppose there is a mission region ripe for the gospel, and the only available person to go is a woman. Can she preach, establish a church, and direct its worship simply because there is no man to carry on these functions? Again, we need to fully prepare to do the work upon which we have embarked. We must not compromise the truth in order that good may abound. Some are saying: "If there is no man to do the work, I don't see the harm in it." If it is *intrinsically right* for a woman to serve in this capacity, then it is right for her to do it regardless of whether there are qualified men to do the work.

(8) *When we engage in "part singing" within our assemblies, sometimes the women have parts where they alone are singing. This is comparable to the woman-translator circumstance.* The analogy is false. The woman who is singing has not assumed the "teacher" role over the male (as addressed in I Timothy 2:12). Paul did not forbid women to sing in his letter to Corinth, but *he did prohibit them from speaking in a context where translating was being discussed* (I Cor. 14:15,33,34). That aside, this is the very argument that some have used in defense of women preachers in general, and more recently it has been employed to justify women singing solos in the worship assembly.

(9) *The woman-translator is doing no more than the lady who comes to the front of the assembly and confesses Christ prior to baptism.* Surely this cannot be a serious argument. Suppose a woman responds to the invitation and states her desire to become a Christian. The preacher asks: "Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?" She responds: "I do, and with your permission, I have prepared a presentation - which will not take more than thirty minutes. It expresses the nature of biblical faith as I see it. May I speak to the church?" What do you suppose his response would be? There is a clear difference between making a simple confession of faith and functioning in the role of a teacher.

CONCLUSION

Our brethren who are working in foreign fields

need to give this matter some protracted study. We do not question their motives. They are sincere and dedicated people. We understand the situation of being caught in a novel arrangement without having had the opportunity to carefully analyze the circumstances and make a more deliberate decision. Still, we must be scriptural.

The practice of using women translators in the public assembly should be reconsidered for the following reason. (1) It is without scriptural authority. (2) It transgresses explicit apostolic instruction (I Cor. 14:33-34; I Tim. 2:12). (3) The practice will create dissension among sound brethren. (4) It is setting a precedent that will escalate and have long-range consequences in the mission field and at home. Already we have heard of cases where women have taken the initiative to lead prayers and singing because they felt they were the best qualified. May God help us to give serious and prayerful consideration to these matters.

*April 1994, Christian Courier
P.O. Box 55265
Stockton, CA 95205*

CONTRIBUTORS

Gary Wilder	\$5
Gary A. Johns	\$5
Percival Anderson	\$35
Anonymous	\$25
Don White	\$60
Edna Berry	\$20
Lenard Hogan	\$50
Verona Church of Christ	\$50
Central Academy Church of Christ	\$100
Leo Chaffin	\$15
Geneva Lancaster	\$5
Gail Jackson	\$12
Sue Hamilton	\$15
Bill Winemiller	\$25
Donna L. Lawter	\$15
Wanda Whitworth	\$20
Robert W. Heflin	\$25
Norman Thomas	\$25
Perry Sexton	\$15
Thomas Harvill	\$20

Ninth Annual **"SEEK THE OLD PATHS" LECTURESHIP** July 24 - 28, 1994 • Theme: "IMMORALITY"

SUNDAY, JULY 24

9:45	A Biblical Overview of Immorality.....	Ronnie Turner
10:35	Idolatry, Materialism, Selfishness.....	Jimmy Bates
7:00	Evil Companions	Wade Webster
8:00	Situation Ethics.....	Ed Casteel

MONDAY, JULY 25

9:00	Witchcraft	Richard Carlson
10:00	Bribery.....	Douglas Hoff
10:00	(Ladies Class) Love Your Husband and Children (Titus 2:4).....	Dana Hale
11:00	Drugs, Alcohol, Tobacco.....	Joe Nichols
1:30	Hatred, Jealousy, Strife, Envy, "Works of the Flesh"	Randy Kea
2:30	Lying, Deceit, Dishonesty	Jerry Joseph
3:30	Digression - Update '94	Wayne Coats
7:00	Nakedness.....	Gilbert Gough
8:00	Living Soberly, Righteously and Godly in the Midst of Immorality.....	Charles Blair

TUESDAY, JULY 26

9:00	Gambling.....	Tom Larkin
10:00	Evolution	Terry Joe Kee
10:00	(Ladies Class) The Virtuous Woman (Prov. 31)	Peggy Leonard
11:00	Elders Providing Moral Leadership Through Overseeing the Flock	Eddy Craft
1:30	Preachers Providing Moral Leadership Through Preaching and Teaching.....	Wayne Cox
2:30	Lasciviousness, Dancing.....	Virgil Hale
3:30	Digression - Update '94	Wayne Coats
7:00	There is an Absolute Standard of Morality.....	Charles Pledge
8:00	Fornication, Petting, Parking	Terry Joe Kee

WEDNESDAY, JULY 27

9:00	Parents Providing Moral Leadership and Training	Virgil Hale
10:00	Capital Punishment	Dan Sikes
10:00	(Ladies Class) For Such A Time As This.....	Sherran Upchurch
11:00	Adultery	Eddy Craft
1:30	Murder, Abortion, Euthanasia.....	Mark Bass
2:30	Sodomy/Homosexuality: Such Were Some of You.....	Windell Fikes
3:30	Digression - Update '94	Wayne Coats
7:00	Repent or Perish	Ken Burleson
8:00	Church Discipline of the Immoral.....	Charles Leonard

THURSDAY, JULY 28

9:00	Racism.....	Ken Burleson
10:00	Pornography: Movies, Videos, TV, Music, Magazines	Darrell Beard
10:00	(Ladies Class) Discreet, Chaste, Keepers at Home (Titus 2:5).....	Sue Case
11:00	Suicide, Assisted Suicide	Charles Blair
1:30	Profanity, Pure Speech.....	Daniel Coe
2:30	Medical Ethics	Richard Guill
3:30	Digression - Update '94	Wayne Coats
7:00	Suffering Persecution Because of Righteous Living	Garland M. Robinson
8:00	Refuse the Evil and Choose the Good.....	Sidney White

East Corinth Church of Christ

1801 Cruise St. / Corinth, MS 38834 / (601) 286-2040 or 286-6575
DAYS INN, ph: (800) 354-2525 / EXECUTIVE INN, ph: (800) 354-3932
ECONO LODGE, ph: (800) 424-6423

RV units may park on our property with water and electrical hook-ups provided (no sewer).
Please let us know in advance if you can. All lessons will be both audio and video taped.

MAKE YOUR PLANS NOW TO ATTEND

Page 7 includes the full schedule of this year's **Seek The Old Paths Lectureship** dealing with the subject of **Morality**. The church at East Corinth is again offering a free book of lesson outlines. To obtain your free copy, send us a self-addressed 6"x9" envelope with 66 cents postage affixed. The book will not be ready until the lectureship.



"I appreciate your dedication to stand for the unaltered truth" ...*Mt. Pleasant, TN*. "I have gotten a couple of S.T.O.P. and enjoy them. Bless you for your spreading the word" ...*Mt. Vernon, OH*.

"I recently picked up four

copies of S.T.O.P. and read all of them this morning. Your stand for truth thrills me to no end. I can only encourage you to continue the great work you are doing. We too are struggling with liberalism in churches around us. God bless all of you in your every effort for good. My prayers are with you" ...*Pottstown, PA*. "I picked some sample copies of S.T.O.P. I like it! We are living in a time when soundness seems outdated among some. Thank you for your good work" ...*Gallipolis, OH*. "I have just finished reading a copy of S.T.O.P. which I was given. As the editor, I wish to commend you for the firm stand for Truth in this publication. That I might become better acquainted with it, would you please place my name on your mailing list" ...*Fayetteville, NC*. "We enjoy S.T.O.P." ...*Finger, TN*. "Just a note to let you know I really do appreciate you and the work you are doing with S.T.O.P. I really enjoy the publication and your articles. In a world when many claim to be Christian but few are willing to stand and preach the whole counsel of God, it makes me feel good to know there are dedicated soldiers of Christ like yourself who will put on the whole armour of God and preach the whole counsel of God. God bless you. Thanks for all your help and concern you have given me. You and your family and all the brother and sisters in Christ at East Corinth will be in my prayers" ...*Duncanville, TX*. "I am sending a check for \$10 to help with the mailing expense. We enjoy reading S.T.O.P. and look forward to it. Keep up the good work" ...*Celina, TN*. "Keep up the good work" ...*Millington, TN*. "Thank you so very much for S.T.O.P. I appreciate your stance for the Truth and the work to make material available for others" ...*Talco, TX*. "Christian love and good wishes from "Bonnie Scotland." Please send me S.T.O.P. I know it will be sound and scholarly. God bless you and thank you for this great work which is a tremendous tool for us in the mission field" ...*East Kilbride, Scotland*. "I continue to enjoy and appreciate S.T.O.P. Keep up the good work" ...*Lucedale, MS*. "I have just finished reading your Feb. 94 issue entitled "Error From Jubilee Speakers." I appreciate your stand for the truth. I am an elder and would like to be added to your mailing list" ...*McMinnville, TN*. "I have enjoyed very much receiving S.T.O.P. I wanted to write and encourage the work there and also to ask that you continue to keep me on your mailing list. I preach at a small congregation and enjoy all outside material" ...*Nacogdoches, TX*. "I am writing this letter on behalf of all the elders of the Arlington Church of Christ. We want you to know that we are proud of the stand that you are taking for supporting the truth and exposing those who would preach another gospel. We request 100 copies of the Feb. 94 issue (Error From Jubilee Speakers) so that the information can be passed on to all the flock. Please accept the enclosed contribution of \$50 for the support of this good work" ...*McMinnville, TN*. "I am a young preacher in west Alabama. I have seen much of the work written in your paper reproduced in area bulletins. You are surely commended often for your faithful representation of God's Word through the printed page. You do a fine job! God bless your

many efforts for good" ...*Livingston, AL*. "Before I recently moved, I received your paper and enjoyed reading the articles in it. I have alerted others to this. Each of us would appreciate it if you could add our names to your list. Thank you for your efforts in glorifying God with the written Word. May God bless your work in His name" ...*Winfield, KS*. "I am enjoying your publication. With so much falling away within the church it's comforting to have a publication that stays with the truth" ...*Anadarko, OK*. "I am thankful for S.T.O.P. May God bless each and everyone who stand up for our Savior and the Truth" ...*Corinth, MS*. "The church now has some very serious problems and I appreciate those that are trying to solve them" ...*Abilene, TX*. "I was really interested in the articles you wrote on worship and your other articles. Keep up the good work you are doing" ...*Gainesboro, TN*. "I have been introduced to S.T.O.P. through my brother-in-law. The articles are very interesting and much needed. Please add me to your mailing list" ...*Saucier, MS*. "We enjoy your paper so very much and give them to our friends to read. Keep up the good work" ...*Cookeville, TN*. "I appreciate the strong stand you, the East Corinth church, and the paper is taking for the truth and against the mushrooming current errors which so many are teaching and practicing!" ...*Greeneville, TN*. "I am a new preacher in a very small congregation of the Lord's church. I have read S.T.O.P. more than once and have appreciated it. I am writing for you to put me on your mailing list" ...*Alsip, IL*. "Several weeks ago one of the members of the congregation gave me a copy of S.T.O.P. It is this type of publication the brotherhood is in dire need of especially in these troubled times in the church. I've celebrated my 85th birthday and in August will celebrate 57 years of preaching although not in full-time work since 1991. Keep up the good work and God bless you and your work" ...*McMinnville, TN*.

Seek The Old Paths is a monthly publication of the East Corinth Church of Christ and is under the oversight of its elders. It is mailed FREE upon request. Its primary purpose and goal in publication can be found in Jude 3; II Timothy 4:2; Titus 1:13; Titus 2:1; II Peter 1:12. All mail received may be published unless otherwise noted. Articles are also welcomed.

Editor: Garland M. Robinson
Associate Editor: Jimmy Bates

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
P A I D
Permit No. 253
Corinth, MS

EAST CORINTH CHURCH OF CHRIST
1801 CRUISE ST.
CORINTH, MS 38834-5108

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED