

The Grace of God



"For the grace of God has appeared, bringing salvation to all men, instructing us..." (Titus 2:11-12).

August 12, 2007 (Vol. 7)

Sunday Evening Lord's Supper

dwh

It can be difficult to immediately answer an argument you have not heard before. It can be helpful to take time to consider things carefully & compare them to the word of God. For these reasons, let us consider some arguments made in **opposition** to offering the Lord's Supper in the Sunday evening assembly.

(1) *"It is not just the manner, but the arrangement. It is not just in the assembly, but by the assembly. On Sunday night, is it right for a few to partake while others look on?"*

What distinction is intended by saying "not just the manner, but the arrangement"? Possibly "manner" refers to "examining oneself" (1 Cor. 11:28-32) and "arrangement" means when you "come together to eat" the memorial of Christ (1 Cor. 11:17, 20, 33). If this is so, then what in this creates a problem or objection to offering the Lord's Supper Sunday evening? Is it **in** the assembly? Yes. Do we examine **ourselves** while it is offered? Yes. So what is the problem? Perhaps the last statement provides clarification: "Is it right for a few to partake while others look on?"

This assumes that others are just looking on, rather than examining themselves. I don't typically look around during the Supper, but my impression is that everyone is quiet, respectful, praying, thinking; and that is what I do **both** in the morning **and** evening offering. So, when someone comes Sunday evening & asks to partake, are the rest of us "just looking on"? No. It is a **very** inaccurate assessment. This is in fact a **very uncharitable assumption**.

The second statement, about it not being just "in" but "by" the assembly, seems to be in the same train of reasoning as the one-container arguments. The concept projected by this distinction is that one person cannot commune alone, **therefore** it is sinful for one person to partake in the assembly Sunday evening. While it is not scriptural to take the Supper alone, is the one taking in the assembly on Sunday evening really doing it alone? I assert that he is **not** alone for he is **in the assembly!**

Furthermore, this idea fails to understand the nature of the Lord's Supper. Yes, we partake **in** the assembly, but is it partaken of **by** the assembly in the sense suggested by the argument? Let us ask: If my **brother** next to me does not partake properly, does that mean God rejects **my** proper reverence and worship & self-examination? No one doubts we participate together in various ways in worship, but does an individual's failure to worship properly in the assembly

automatically defile my worship? No, not automatically. It could, if I participated in joint sinful conduct (for example unauthorized instrumental music). But what of simply observing the Lord's Supper Sunday evening? Is **anything** about the way we do it unauthorized? The time (Sunday) is authorized (Acts 20:7). The "manner" (self-examination) is authorized (1 Cor. 11:28-32). The "arrangement" (when we assemble together) is authorized (1 Cor. 11:17, 20, 33). So, what is the difficulty? Where is a single violation of principle in offering this authorized memorial Sunday evening? I confess that I find none, save it be in the violation of someone's misunderstandings of the memorial of Christ.

But note further on this that when Paul was **at Ephesus** he wrote **to Corinth** and said: "The cup of blessing which **we** bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which **we** break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? seeing that **we**, who are many, are one bread, one body: for **we** are all partake of the one bread." (1 Cor. 10:16-17) Notice that Paul said "we". Each congregation did it in their respective assemblies on Sunday. Did they do it at the same moment on Sunday? No. And who will say that Corinth's time of assembly corresponded exactly with Ephesus' time? And if someone in one of the assemblies did not examine themselves properly, did that make void the worship by everyone else? No. So what is the difficulty? The difficulty lies in the misconception of what worship is in the assembly, as is noted in the next argument.

(2) *"If we sing Sunday evening, do you not have to sing with them?"*

While singing & the Supper are similar in that they are done **in** the assembly or **when** we come together; does that mean they are identical in every way? Consider giving (1 Cor. 16:1-4). It is also on the first day of the week and is to be done "as you have prospered". Now, if I give Sunday morning, and one of you was sick, then you come Sunday evening: Are you still commanded to give on the first day of the week? Yes, 1 Cor. 16 is still there. Have I done it yet? Yes. Have you done it yet? No, not yet. Are **you** still obligated to obey the command of the Lord? Yes. Can you choose to forgo the Lord's will because I already did it Sunday morning before you came? No. How would this excuse you?

Consider also, do **I** need to give **again** so that you can give properly? What logic is this? Sunday is **when** we give, but **how** do we give? "Let **each one** of you lay **him** by in store, as **he** may prosper" (16:2). Is not the how **individually** done? Yes, **in** the assembly. Yes it is giving **on** the first day of the week. Yes, we have fellowship when we do this. But do I have to give Sunday morning **and** Sunday evening in order for someone to give Sunday evening? If I don't, shall we forbid anyone from giving Sunday evening? When the Lord **authorized** giving on Sundays, how is it that we would **forbid** giving on Sunday? It is one thing to provide opportunity for someone **to fulfill** their obligations before God in a Sunday assembly; it is quite another to create a concept that makes **unscriptural** what the **Lord requires**. In fact, any "principle" that would picture **obedience to God** as unscriptural is itself unscriptural! For when we have authorized people on the authorized day in the authorized assembly observing the

authorized practice for the authorized purpose; we have people doing exactly what the Lord commands. Any valid reason for hindering obedience to **one** of God's commands is also a valid reason to hinder obedience to **all** His commands. If not, why not?

(3) "I don't see the scriptural authority for it." "Our situation is not specifically addressed by 1 Corinthians 11."

Here is the authority for our situation: First day of the week (Acts 20:7); "When we come together" (1 Cor. 11:33); Examine ourselves (1 Cor. 11:28-32). How does offering this Sunday morning & Sunday evening violate these principles? If we don't see scriptural authority for it in the above Scriptures, then we do not have authority for it **at any time** on Sunday, much less in **any** assembly. The above passages are specific as to the day (Sunday) and the time (when we assembly), but they are **general** in that it leaves many details up to us. We could offer it at the beginning of the am service, at the end, or **both** at the beginning and end! We could offer it Sunday morning, Sunday evening, or Sunday afternoon, **or all three**. Or we could have finished offering it Sunday morning & a brother who had a flat tire then walks in and asks to partake. All these instances fall **within** the authority revealed in God's word. Not a one of these violate a single God revealed, Holy Spirit inspired principle. It seems that we need to take a step back and re-learn the difference between specific and generic authority, as well as the **purpose** of the Lord's Supper!

And frankly, the **logical consequence** of saying that **no scriptural authority** is seen for the Sunday evening Supper is that all who do it are **sinning**. This may not be how far supporters of this error wish to apply it, but it is the **logical consequence** none-the-less. Apply it to anything you wish – if "I see no scriptural authority for electric lights, air-conditioning, carpet, padded pews, a projector, etc.," what am I saying? Is silence permission (Heb. 7:14)? No.

While not **specifically** itemized, the principles involved still apply so that the practice is either **permitted** or **forbidden**. If the Scriptures do not apply to our situation, then the Scriptures are incomplete. And I certainly do **not** accept this premise (2 Tim. 3:16-17; 2 Pet. 1:3).

(4) "I can't say it is a matter of faith. It is not the same as institutionalism."

If we cannot find clear authority for our position, then why do we have that position? If you cannot clearly establish how God's authority forbids the Lord's Supper **Sunday evening in the assembly** (in contrast to the general authority for **Sunday in the assembly**); then why make any distinction at all? To do so is to (at the least) create tension and concern over a distinction without a difference and (at worst) promote false doctrine and division.

The statement "I can't say it's a matter of faith" indicates that there are no further arguments available. If there were a clear, convincing argument to sustain the contention that the Sunday evening Supper is forbidden it would be searched out & used. But when someone who

defends a view tacitly admits that he himself can't outright prove it – it tells me that the position is unsustainable.

Also the statement that "it is not like institutionalism" reveals much. It admits the ability to see logical consequences, but (in this case) there is a desire to minimize or limit these consequences. It admits that Institutionalism is unauthorized and cannot be fellowshiped, but wishes to establish a distinction between **unauthorized** institutionalism and the "**unauthorized**" Sunday evening Lord's Supper. But when one says they see **no authority** for a practice & yet asserts that **we can remain in fellowship anyway**; then they have sunk their own boat. It is an odd (not to mention **unscriptural**) position to hold that something which is **unauthorized** should **not** hinder our fellowship (Rom. 16:17-18; 2 John 9-11; Gal. 1:9-11; etc.). If it is **unauthorized**, then it is **sinful**. If it is **sinful**, the faithful cannot continue in fellowship with those who practice it.

Finally, "But **let** a man prove himself, and so **let** him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup." (1 Cor. 11:28) When we can countermand what Paul said about letting a man eat the bread, then we can **also** countermand what he said about letting him examine himself. And, inadvertently, this is done. For when brethren discourage "let him eat" (because it is a "second offering" on Sunday) they also remove the occasion the Lord ordained for his self-examination. As Paul wrote: "For this cause many among you are weak and sickly, and not a few sleep. But if we discerned ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we may not be condemned with the world. Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, **wait** one for another." (1 Cor. 11:30-33) Wait means to **accept, look for, expect**. Do we do this? Do we accept, look for, and expect brethren **to come and partake**? Or do we fail to see the scriptural authority for this, too?

Brethren think (Mark 7:8-13)!

PEOPLE TO REMEMBER & PRAY FOR

Johanna Fletcher, Othena Kinnard (in Nashville), Wesley Geer, Mag Bumbalough, Thelma Cunningham, Mary Cox, Monie Petty, Dave Poteet (NHC 212), Dorris Williams, Robert & Betty England, Joe Smith, Mike Tenpenny, Thelma Klein, Nathan Hill, DeLeesa Price (expecting). Lydia Poe, Larry Bumbalough, Jake Hale, Joshua & Misty Poteet, Ed & Carolyn Williams, Kenley Streeval. Matthew Taylor (leukemia).

THINGS TO REMEMBER

- **Radio Program** - Every Sun. 2pm, AM 1050 WSMT
- **Door To Door** - Every Tuesday @ 6pm.
- **Home Bible Study** - Sat. Aug. 4th & 18th.
- **Ladies Class** - 2nd & Last Sunday Each Month.
- **Business Meeting** - Sun. July 29
- **GM** - Raymond Castillo, Oct.14-19, 2007.
- **GM** - Brian Yeager, April 13-18, 2008.
- **GM** - Lanny Smith, Oct.12-17, 2008.

<http://frontiernet.net/~nscoc>
nscoc@frontiernet.net

----- Original Message -----

From: [Brian A. Yeager](mailto:brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net)

To: 'North Sparta church of Christ'

Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2007 7:36 PM

Subject: Hey Bro.

Hey Douglas:

I received your bulletin just now and read through it on the second serving of the Lord's Supper. I have a couple of articles I am submitting to you for consideration.

http://www.wordsoftruth.net/wordsoftruthbulletin06_24_2007.html

http://www.wordsoftruth.net/wordsoftruthbulletin07_15_2007.html

Brotherly,

Brian A. Yeager
3917 Tierra Roman Dr.
El Paso, TX 79938
915-525-5794
brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net
www.wordsoftruth.net

June 24th, 2007

Words of Truth Weekly - Online Edition
The Frequency of the Lord's Supper Being Served

By: Brian A. Yeager

Paul wrote to a divided church of Christ in Corinth dealing with many issues there. One problem in Corinth was that the church had caused the Lord's Supper to be turned into a common meal wherein they even divided further into preferring one over the other in eating (I Corinthians 11:18-22). In Paul's inspired attempt to correct this particular problem in Corinth, we have instructions that help us understand how to partake of the Lord's Supper. Paul wrote: *"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. **For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come.** Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup"* (I Corinthians 11:23-28).

In the midst of Paul's writing we have a phrase that has caused some to

begin new practices with the Lord's Supper (verse 26 which is in bold in the above quote). Some have thought that this phrase allows us to partake of the Lord's Supper "as often as ye come together" (you'll note that I Corinthians 11:26 does not really mention the words "come together"). This has started a "Monday Night for the Master" partaking of the Lord's Supper at liberal congregations like one in the Dallas area. They have concluded that the first day of the week is just as good to partake as any other day of the week. Some argue that while Acts 20:7 limits us to the first day of the week, they think I Corinthians 11:26 authorizes many times upon that first day of the week. Where's the truth on these questions?

Stating What We Know is Right (I Corinthians 4:6)

In regards to the Lord's Supper we know many things. We know we are to use unleavened bread (Matthew 26:17; 26). We know we are to partake of the fruit of the vine which represents the blood of Christ (Matthew 26:27-28). We know that we can partake of the fruit of the vine by using multiple containers (Luke 22:17ff.). We know that the local church of Christ in Troas did the following: *"And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight"* (Acts 20:7). The church in Troas assembled together to partake of the Lord's Supper on the first day of the week. We see nothing in the text surrounding this event to even conclude that they came back a second time for a "make-up" serving of the Lord's Supper (Acts 20:7-12). This one example is all that we have telling us anything about a frequency of partaking of the Lord's Supper. If we follow this example, as we do here at Sunrise, a congregation would assemble on the first day of the week to partake of the Lord's Supper together.

When we take a step further into the text Paul wrote to Corinth, we find nothing different. For example, we find that the Lord's Supper is to be taken in an assembly together based on what Paul wrote to Corinth. In fact, Paul instructed the brethren in Corinth to wait on each other before partaking (I Corinthians 11:33). This sure gets away from the idea that some have of, "well they can just take it later at services tonight if they don't make it". Brethren, we ought to be communicating enough to know what may hinder another from being able to remember the Lord's death with the brethren by communing one with another in partaking of the Lord's Supper. If someone can't be there right now, we should tarry for them. This is commanded. Of course, that demands that we be not selfish with our scheduling. What do we think Paul teaches us about our attitudes towards one another when he writes Rome saying: *"Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honour preferring one another"* (Romans 12:10). These are the things we know.

Going Beyond What We Know

The congregation here at Sunrise has been criticized locally and elsewhere for assembling once on the first day of the week to partake of the Lord's Supper rather than twice. Men such as David Bonner, Don Martin, and boys like Joe Wright believe we are taking an opportunity away for people to partake. Well folks, these men are also criticizing churches such as the one that assembled in Troas. There is not one command, example, or implication that exists within the pages of inspiration telling us to assemble again on the first day of the week to offer again the Lord's Supper. So, if we have taken an opportunity away from people to partake of the Lord's Supper, it is an opportunity that men made without authority from the Lord in the first place. That is a good thing to take away (Mark 7:7-9). To be clear, we could assemble as often as desired for other purposes (Acts 2:42 and Acts 26-27; cf. Hebrews 3:13; 10:25), but not once do we see a second meeting on the first day of the week for the Lord's Supper in the Scriptures. Folks, going beyond what we know is not wise (Deuteronomy 4:2; 12:32, Proverbs 30:5-6, and Revelation 22:18-19).

Conclusion

It is good to review things and recall some familiar texts (II Peter 3:1-2). I often wondered why all of the fuss over following the pattern we do here to partake of the Lord's Supper. The battles often turn to the way you word something. Some don't like the idea of a second serving. Others don't like a second partaking. Some don't like both. Folks, we know for sure what the Lord approved of (Acts 20:7ff.). I can show someone what we do and know it is right. In Troas, the single assembly they had on the first day of the week was the time that they ate the bread and drank of the cup to show the Lord's death. Thus, I Corinthians 11:26 was fulfilled in Troas once on the first day of the week. Since we have nothing more to conclude a frequency from, we stick to what we know! To start the "well it doesn't say..." garbage is to deny II Timothy 3:16-17!

July 15th, 2007

"Let Me Tell You What I Believe"

By: Brian A. Yeager

In a context dealing with the conscience and liberties, Paul said: *"And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: **for whatsoever is not of faith is sin**"* (Romans 14:23). What Paul established is an important precedence. Paul established the principle that we must believe in what we do rather than doing things while doubting the validity of those actions. The faithful Christian understands that our faith does not come from our guidance (Proverbs 20:24), but through the word of God (Romans 10:17). Thus, when a Christian makes a statement of faith, they should be able to prove what they believe

through the word of God (I Corinthians 2:1-5, II Corinthians 2:17, and John 4:34; cf. Luke 4:16-21 and Proverbs 4:26-27). That being said, we must also acknowledge that some do try to use the word of God to establish their beliefs.

Sadly, they go to the Bible with a belief and they then twist the Scriptures to justify what they believe (II Peter 3:16-17). We must arrive at our beliefs through an honest look at the Scriptures.

Honesty in searching the Scriptures is not the most popular approach to Bible study. Such is evident by the many who care to run their ideas by men and the writings of men (commentaries, etc.) before they will accept what they have read in God's word as the truth. We are not to think beyond that which is written (I Corinthians 4:6), but many have become professionals in stating and trying to answer hypothetical questions which are not from inspiration. It is almost as though some find it too difficult to accept the simplicity that is in Christ (II Corinthians 11:3), so they try and make the truth more difficult than it is.

Questions arise that are intended to cause doubt and division (Matthew 22:1ff.).

These questions we are instructed of God to avoid (II Timothy 2:23 and Titus 3:9). However, some refuse to avoid them. They enjoy trying to answer everything to show that they are someone who knows something. In reality, we are nobodies who pale in comparison to the knowledge and wisdom of God (I Corinthians 1:25-31; 3:19-21). Thus, your thoughts on a subject matter are crap (dung as Paul would say – Philippians 3:8) to God!

Why do we believe in meeting on the first day of the week? Why do we believe in immersing folks for the remission of sins? Why do we believe there is no authority for mechanical instrumental music being used in song worship to God? Why do we believe the Old Testament was done away on the cross? Why do we believe the church of Christ is the body of Christ? Why do we believe in giving on the first day of the week? Why do some brethren meet more than just once a week? Folks, the questions are endless. If you believe it, why do you believe it? Is it because that's the way things have always been done?

The following of any and all traditions of men is wrong (Mark 7:1-9 and Colossians 2:8; 20-23). We condemn the denominational world for following the doctrines of men, but are we hypocrites in this condemnation? If we cannot answer the questions that started this paragraph with Scriptures, we are hypocrites. I know what I believe on those matters, for the Bible gives the answers. Notice them in order of the questions asked (Acts 20:7, Acts 2:38; 8:35-38, Matthew 26:30, Mark 14:26, Acts 16:25, Romans 15:9, I Corinthians 14:15, Ephesians 5:19, Colossians 3:16, Hebrews 2:12, James 5:13, Romans 7:1-6,

Ephesians 2:11-17, Colossians 2:14, Hebrews 9:15-17, Matthew 16:13-18, Ephesians 1:22-23; 4:4-6, Romans 16:16, I Corinthians 16:1-2, Acts 2:42-46, Acts 14:26-27, Hebrews 3:13; 10:25, and II Timothy 1:13). You see, if you believe it, you must be able to prove it. When someone asks "why do you believe _____", you should be able to open the Bible and let them read it

for themselves. If it takes fifteen minutes of your logic to explain what “you believe”, it is then more than God said!

Man has complicated that which is simple. For example, Don Martin wrote the following statement about meeting twice on the first day of the week for more people to be able to partake of the Lord’s Supper: “I, again, have more problems with not making use of the opportunity to meet Sunday night just so the “second serving” issue does not arise than I do with seeing a local church provide the circumstance for partaking during the evening service. Besides, having the arrangement for morning or evening observance means that more Christians have the ability to partake on the Lord’s Day” (<http://www.bibletruths.net/Archives/BTAR280.htm>). If a congregation meets just one time to avoid a controversy of a second serving of the Lord’s Supper, those brethren have erred. We cannot silence an issue by avoiding it (I Thessalonians 5:21 and I Peter 3:15).

However, the quote above is more about what Don Martin believes than what the word of God says. The whole idea of a make-up serving of the Lord’s Supper is false. If, as Don does in the above referenced article, someone appeals to Numbers chapter nine and the make-up of the Passover, why don’t they cut off the one that is clean and is not on a journey who misses the partaking of the Lord’s Supper (Numbers 9:13)? I know why, that doesn’t fit the traditional view (Matthew 15:3; 7-9). Don’s article covers more of the “I believe” than it does “God said”.

When Don Martin (and others) correctly write against the human organizations that have usurped the work of the local church and the individual Christian, Mental divorce, and other errors; he writes against the idea of human reasoning (“*Authority, Misunderstood Today?*”; Bible Matters List; 6/15/2007).

Don get’s it, but only on the matters that are a common practice or hobby horse for him! Otherwise, we read in **just one paragraph** of the same article referenced from his

website above (in regards to the second observation of the Lord’s Supper) the following statements: “I would prefer... I deem it sad and unwarranted... I have more concern... I, again, have more problems... I do...”. Who’s the standard when we speak in such terminology? Who’s Don Martin or Brian Yeager? We’re just men. What we think is irrelevant.

Conclusion

Jesus, had all authority in Heaven and earth (Matthew 28:18), but He was not an “I thinker”: “*Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory: but he that seeketh his glory that sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him*” (John 7:16-18). Until we are sure that what we do is because we believe it through the word of God, we ought not speak nor act! Just

because “good and faithful” brethren have always said something or done something, that does not mean that “good” people have not been very wrong (Matthew 7:21-23). Can you prove what you believe (Galatians 1:10-12)?

Hello brother Yeager,

8-10-07

Thank you for writing and pointing out the articles. I have read them. I was unaware that this was your view. If I may, I would like to see if I understand your points correctly & reply to them. If I anywhere misrepresent you, please do correct me.

In your article “The Frequency of the Lord’s Supper Being Served”, 2nd Paragraph you mention some that use 1 Cor. 11:26 as “authority” for the Supper on Mondays, etc. I’ve heard of some doing this, but not this particular argument to “support” the point. If 1 Cor. 11:26 was the only verse we had on the frequency, then we would in fact not have any problem with viewing this as authority to do it on any day of the week. But, we see contextually 1 Cor. 16:2 is the only day specified in the Corinthian letter as well as Acts 20:7 and Acts 2:42 (Pentecost, first day of the week). Thus, the whole counsel of God clarifies 1 Cor. 11:26 “as often as you eat” as effectively being a reference to Sunday participation. I believe we are in agreement on this point.

In the 3rd paragraph titled “**Stating What We Know is Right (I Corinthians 4:6)**” I find no difficulty with the first 6 sentences. But at the seventh sentence, you write: “We see nothing in the text surrounding this event to even conclude that they came back **a second time for a “make-up” serving** of the Lord’s Supper (Acts 20:7-12). This **one example** is **all** that we have telling us anything about a frequency of partaking of the Lord’s Supper. If we follow this example, as we do here at Sunrise, a congregation would assemble on the first day of the week to partake of the Lord’s Supper together.”

Bold is added by me for clarification. From this statement, it seems that you are asserting there is **no authority** for offering the Lord’s Supper “a second time” on Sunday. Am I correct in this assessment?

In the 4th paragraph, 3rd sentence, you write: “In fact, Paul instructed the brethren in Corinth to **wait on each other before partaking** (I Corinthians 11:33). **This sure gets away from the idea that some have of, “well they can just take it later at services tonight if they don’t make it”.**” Again, bold is mine for clarity. Do I understand you correctly in that you define “wait” as resulting in prohibiting brethren who assemble from partaking Sunday morning if they know someone will be able to come Sunday evening? That seems to logically follow from the way it is stated. If only one offering is permitted on Sunday in the assembly, and we must (time wise) wait for those who will come later; then we may only offer it later when they come. Of course, this would often

create the reverse dilemma; of some who come Sunday morning who cannot come Sunday evening. I am not sure how this really does what the word wait means. It is "ekdechomai" (Strong's # 1551) meaning "to accept from some source, i.e. (by implication) to await:--expect, look (tarry) for, wait (for)." Vine describes it as "for which see EXPECT, No. 1" (p. 193) and references John 5:3. "Wait" in John 5:3 carries the idea of expecting, looking (in this sense "waiting") for the stirring of the waters. Vine (p. 61) defines Expect No. 1 as "Lit. and primarily, to take or receive from (*ek*, from, *dechomai*, to receive), hence denotes to await, expect, the only sense of the word in the N.T.; it suggests a reaching out in readiness to receive something..." Other words are included, such as tarry, wait, look. But the word is defined as and primarily means a readiness to receive, an expectation.

Among the examples Vine refers to where the word is used is Acts 17:16, where Paul "waited for them at Athens". Does this waiting mean that he didn't do something until they came? Or does it mean he was expecting them, looking for them, ready to receive them? "Wait" in this sense is not inactivity. Other scriptures with this word indicate a similar point of "expectation" or a "desire to receive".

Thayer echoes the above, noting that it means (1) "to receive, accept" (2) "to look for, expect, wait for, await". In fact, Thayer commentates on how this word applies in 1 Cor. 11:33, saying: "wait for one another, sc. Until each shall have received his food". The idea is not that no one can partake until all partake. The idea is that we should expect others to come and partake, and make sure no one is excluded. We should be ready to receive them when they come, and not be selfish, not exclude them.

The Corinthians problem was not just turning things into a common meal (which was clearly wrong). But it was also the selfishness, the not providing for those who came later. Paul's assertion is that they should not create factions among themselves and exclude part of their number (the poorer brethren). In correcting their selfishness & social elitism & common meal foolishness, he tells them that they should examine themselves and judge themselves. And when they come together to eat (11:33) "wait one for another". In other words, expect the others to come, do not exclude them because of factiousness, selfishness, social status, or such. The idea is not prohibiting anyone from partaking, nor restricting observance to just once on Sunday - but rather the need to make provision for those who come later. It is a command to take thought for & provide for them. This affirms that we should receive & expect them to partake; but does not say one way or the other whether one offering or two or three is required.

If "wait" means we delay until all are present to partake who can come; then every congregation who has ever held a second service must repent. If that is the consequence, then so be it. But when we properly understand the word "wait" doesn't it seem odd that God would **condemn** making provision for

brethren to come Sunday evening, when Paul says we are to receive & expect them? I believe that the Sunday pm service fulfills the point Paul makes; without violating in any way the commandments of the Lord concerning Sunday observance of the Supper in the assembly.

I am not one to say that assembling once on Sunday is a sin in itself. Nor is it a sin, in itself, to not “extend the invitation” at the close of every service. Now some view this as just “church of Christ tradition”. But why would we not want to extend the invitation every time? Isn’t the point of our sermons to convict & convert? And isn’t the purpose of our Sunday assemblies to provide opportunity to do what the Lord commanded? Why move in a direction the hinders what the Lord wills for us to do?

In the 5th paragraph, titled “**Going Beyond What We Know**” you write: “The congregation here at Sunrise has been criticized locally and elsewhere for assembling **once** on the first day of the week to partake of the Lord’s Supper **rather than twice**. Men such as David Bonner, Don Martin, and boys like Joe Wright **believe we are taking an opportunity away for people to partake**. Well folks, these men are also criticizing churches such as the one that assembled in Troas. There is **not one command, example, or implication** that exists within the pages of inspiration telling us **to assemble again** on the first day of the week to offer again the Lord’s Supper. So, if we have taken an opportunity away from people to partake of the Lord’s Supper, it is an opportunity that men made without authority from the Lord in the first place.”

As I noted, I will not say it is a sin in itself to have only one service on Sunday. Nor do I believe it is a sin to have multiple services. But is it a sin to forbid multiple services? If God permits it, then for man to forbid it is to bind human opinion. I believe that God’s word commands us to assemble on the first day & to partake of the memorial. Such authority is specific in that it requires it on Sunday in the assembly. But it is **also generic** in that it does not specify “how many times” we can offer or provide for participation in the memorial of Christ. Just as God specifies the collection on Sunday (1 Cor. 16:1-4), but does not specify how many times we collect it on Sunday or what container we are to use to collect it; there are aspects of generic authority even in specific statements. God commanded Noah to build the ark of Gopher wood. How old should the gopher wood be? What tools should he use? Could he use help in building the ark? When God authorized the boat and the type of wood, then Noah **MUST** build and **MUST** use gopher – but many details within what was authorized were left to his discretion in fulfilling (but not changing) the command.

For offering the Lord’s Supper on Sunday in the assembly, we have authority, whether that be am, pm, noon or all three. They are all Sunday in the assembly. To bind a particular view that forbids what the Lord allows, is not an enviable position to be in. In fact, your argumentation asks for an itemization of what is established by generic authority. This is like asking for specific authority for

singing multiple songs, offering multiple prayers, using song books, copy machines, projectors, and such like.

Let me ask, do we ever read in the Bible of a congregation that ever owned its own building? Does this mean we never can own our own buildings? No, for this detail, while not specified, is yet authorized by general authority (Heb. 10:24).

What of the “fact” that we only read of the Lord’s Supper being taken while in an upper room? Is this a bindable detail? Or is it incidental? The fact is that we could assert that “There is not one command, example, or implication that exists within the pages of inspiration telling us to assemble **on the first floor** on the first day of the week to offer **on the first floor** the Lord’s Supper.” You would be hard pressed to provide a specific to support this. But, just with the “second offering” you could provide generic authority. And in fact, 1 Cor. 11:33 urges (nec. implies) making provision for those who could not be present earlier.

In the “**Conclusion**”, you wrote: “I often wondered why all of the fuss over following the pattern we do here to partake of the Lord’s Supper.” Perhaps it is because by the way you justify the practice you logically condemn brethren who do what is permitted. I do not know if you consistently apply it this way, and overtly say that brethren who observe the second offering are in sin. But either way, if you consider it unauthorized, it is therefore sinful. And if it is sinful, I would ask about whether you fellowship those who persist in practicing this “sin”? This congregation, in fact, has had to withstand the influence of a neighboring congregation who taught blatantly that it is a **sin** to have a “second offering”. If they had contented themselves to restrain their opinions and conscience, things would have been fine. But they assert that it is unauthorized; yet they wish to have fellowship anyway – which makes no sense Biblically. If it we are committing “sin” by doing what is “unauthorized”; why would they want to have fellowship anyway (2 Cor. 6:14-7:1)?

In your conclusion, you also wrote: “I can show someone what we do and know it is right. In Troas, the **single** assembly they had on the first day of the week was the time that they ate the bread and drank of the cup to show the Lord’s death. Thus, I Corinthians 11:26 was fulfilled in Troas **once** on the first day of the week.” I can show what we do as well. Sunday (Acts 20:7) in the assembly (1 Cor. 11:18), examining ourselves (11:28), **and** receiving / expecting those who come later in the day to partake (11:33). We both do the first three, but what of the fourth item? How do you provide for those who cannot come on time to the one scheduled Sunday offering? Or are some excused from obeying the Lord’s command to them to partake, if they were infirmed or hindered from attending the scheduled services? What of the Lord’s command to you to “wait” for them? How do you resolve this?

You add: "Since we have nothing more to conclude a frequency from, we stick to what we know! To start the "well it doesn't say..." garbage is to deny II Timothy 3:16-17!" I do not appeal to the silence of Scriptures for authority, I appeal to general authority. There is a difference between appealing to silence and generic authority. While neither will express a specific; the one forbids while the other grants authority. No specific authority exists for owning buildings, song books, projectors, offering the Supper a "second time", etc. But they are all authorized. That is a far cry from "it doesn't say not to" own buildings, song books, projectors, and offer the Supper a "second time".

I look forward to your reply, brother.

Respectfully,
Douglas

----- Original Message -----

From: [Brian A. Yeager](#)

To: 'NSCOC'

Sent: Friday, August 10, 2007 11:47 PM

Subject: RE: Hey Bro.

[Hey Douglas:](#)

[Thank you for your response. I will try to answer your questions quickly and clearly. Yes, stating that the "make-up" serving of the Lord's Supper is without authority is saying it is sinful and carries consequences of fellowship with it \(Colossians 3:17 and II John 9-11\). I am consistent in this manner.](#)

[If you will go back to your results for your word study a little on "tarry: ekdechomai" you will notice that what I said about "waiting" is straight down the line with the context, meaning of the word, and the translation of the word \(KJV, NKJV, ASV 1901\). If you use the book for Thayer's definition and you look to the exact usage in I Corinthians 11:33 you will see again, it is to wait to eat, as you partially noted. Here locally, we don't have brethren who forsake the Lord's Supper or services at all. If they are running late, we wait for them to partake. No faithful Christian would object to that. No, waiting does not tell us to do nothing. We would continue to worship God. However, we would wait to eat \(again, as Thayer does say\) for that person. Otherwise, when they partake later, it is merely leftovers of what has already been eaten. Ekdechomai is used eight times in the New Testament in various ways. From expecting \(Hebrews 10:13\) to waited \(I Peter 3:20\). Neither of those usages change the fact that I Corinthians 11:33 is telling us to wait for our brethren before eating.](#)

[Doug, brethren have used the Sunday evening service to allow people who work, are sick, etc. to "make up" the Lord's Supper for years. Saying that there is no buildings owned by brethren in the New Testament doesn't change the specifics of the Lord's Supper. There simply is no authority for it. There is authority to meet in a building \(I Corinthians 11:20\), but nothing about making up the Lord's Supper. If you want to study the issue of buildings, I'd be glad to in a separate discussion. If brethren are unable to make it at the most expedient time wherein brethren may "wait one for another" \(I](#)

Corinthians 11:33; ASV 1901) or “wait for one another” (NKJV), then they have not sinned. If they are willfully abandoning the time to assemble to remember the Lord’s death, they have sinned (Hebrews 10:25, etc.).

Instead of brethren trying to find ways to allow for folks to miss the memorial of our Lord’s death, we need to instruct them about priorities (Colossians 3:1-4). Here, we assemble on Sunday mornings because all can make it at that time. If that were to change, for reasons not carnal (even including changes of jobs in most cases – Luke 14:26-33), then we would do all possible to adjust as a congregation that we may partake according to the pattern. However, we would never think of offering a make-up because we never once read of that in the New Testament. Doug, if Acts 20:7 limits us to the first day of the week, then we know it must limit us to the pattern there too (II Timothy 1:13). The disciples came together to break bread. They did not come together again for those not there the first time nor did they have just certain one’s partaking. If there were no other text informing us of different meeting places of local churches (i.e. Philemon v.2), I would study further the upper room argument. There is nothing else in the New Testament to even hint at brethren assembling more than once on the first day of the week for the Lord’s Supper. To say that Troas doesn’t make the “how many times specific”, we’d also have to conclude that Troas doesn’t make the day specific either since no other text offers anything additional.

I do not want to argue with you. Traditions are hard to overcome. However, if you look at this without thinking about those who “have to work” or “ just can’t be there”, you will see that the New Testament simply does not authorize a make-up serving of the Lord’s Supper. If it’s not there, we cannot do it (Colossians 3:17). If the New Testament gives us all of the information we need to please God (II Timothy 3:16-17), we must conclude such is not pleasing to God. If we are to say it’s authorized, we have to prove a make-up is written. If it is authorized, all must then do it (I Corinthians 4:17). If it is not written Douglas, we both know it is “condemned” (II John 9). If you want to study the collection (I Corinthians 16:1ff.), let’s do that at another time.

It is late and I am tired. Sorry for any typos. I just didn’t want to not respond since I know I will be busy over the weekend. I am to be there with you in April. I’d love to study this through with you then. Just Bibles, no arguments or emotions. If we can study just for book, chapter, and verse; we’ll agree no doubt. I have confidence that you can reason through this. Just make a chart with three columns (command, example, or necessary conclusion) and see if you can fill in the blanks. I assure you, it is not possible on this issue.

Brotherly,

Brian A. Yeager
3917 Tierra Roman Dr.
El Paso, TX 79938
915-525-5794
brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net
www.wordsoftruth.net

Hello brother,

8-12-07

Thank you for replying. I appreciate your attempt to answer my questions, but see that most of my points were passed over. I will try to carefully follow your statements and examine them here.

You indicated that you do believe a "make-up" serving as without authority and that you accept that this means those who do it are sinful. You also acknowledge that this carries fellowship consequences. While I am grateful that you strive to be consistent, it is also sad that you bind your opinion on this matter. I know you do not see it as binding your opinion, but I am persuaded by the Word of God that it is just that.

As for the word study on "ekdechomai" what I said does not exclude "waiting", but includes the full meaning as I noted before. As you yourself indicated "waiting" does not mean inactivity. So, if you can **continue to worship** (prayers, singing, preaching) while "waiting" for others to come later on Sunday and that does **not** result in excluding them in violation of 1 Cor. 11's principles, then we can also **continue to worship** (giving & Lord's Supper) while "waiting" for others to come later on Sunday. The only difference is that you assert that we **sin** if our waiting involves offering the Supper more than once on Sunday. Logically, your arguments would also say we must refrain from the Supper until others come - so would be sinning if we partook when someone else was able & willing to come later in the day. I not sure you will affirm the later, but am sure that you affirm the first.

But such an application of the word of God, that results in condemning us for doing what the Lord authorizes (Sunday observance in the assembly, waiting for brethren) is a sad mistake, to put it gently. But again, I know that you view it as unauthorized.

As for it being "merely leftovers" - that is an emotional assertion. In fact, we would be vain to feel ourselves above receiving any "leftovers" or crumbs that fall from our Lord's Table. Please know that a "second" serving is (as we often say) is "left prepared", not "mere leftovers". Such an offering is a demonstration of our respect for the Lord's command that His people remember His body & blood on Sunday in the assembly. And being fully aware that some are at times hindered from the morning service but are able to get free Sunday evening, we have arranged things in harmony with the Lord's revealed will (Sunday in the assembly) to provide opportunity for them. Thus we "wait" (set aside time and opportunity) for our brethren to obey the Lord's command for them to eat. Brother, frankly the comment you make here disdains the authorized provision of the Lord's Supper on Sunday in the assembly, because it is a perceived "unauthorized second offering". You bind a specific detail that is not bound. It is truly sad when brethren inadvertently condemn what the Lord authorizes.

And if it is mere leftovers of what is already eaten, can we say the same for giving? You wish to separate this into separate discussion. I see no reason to. It is very parallel. Both are Sunday observances. Both are done in the assembly. Both are done involving specific comments of personal examination and preparation. Why should these be separated? Both are commands of the Lord. If it is a sin to offer the one a second time, it is also a sin to offer the other a second time. In fact, to be consistent, you must also say it is actually a **sin** for a Christian to take the Lord's Supper a second time and give money a second time on a single Sunday. Thus, logically, you must forbid all brethren

from giving twice or three times on Sunday. Such, logically, should be considered a sin by you - if your argumentation holds water.

You assert that we have authority for a building and reference 1 Cor. 11:33. I have read the verse but do not see "building" specified in the text. So, I take it you claim that the authority **to assemble** necessarily implies provisions for assembling (a place, lights, seats, etc). Fine. I assert the same concerning the Supper. Sunday is when we come together to eat (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:33). These verses specify the day of the week, not the hour of the day. These verses specify the occasion (assembly) not the frequency of the occasion. These specify the purpose "to eat", not the number of times we can gather on Sunday in the assembly for this purpose.

The fact is that Acts 20:7 also "specifies" an upper room. Your reference to Phile 3 "house" does not in anyway identify whether that house had multiple stories or not. Should we then bind this incidental statement of an upper room? If you can bind the incidental detail that only one assembly is noted in Acts 20:7 (when the clear point of the passage was in affirming the day and purpose of assembling), then why shouldn't we also bind an upper room? If we are to bind as specific an incidental detail (the alleged frequency on Sunday) when the text isn't even elaborating on this; then we may as well bind other incidental details as well.

For example, while we have principles on singing songs (Eph. 5:19); the only instances or examples we have is of **one song per song leader**.

"And when they had sung **an** hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives." (Mt 26:30; Mr 14:26) Only one song leader is seen here, and he sung one song.

Add to this 1 Cor. 14:26-32. Paul speaks of "each one" having "a psalm" and speaking over one another. Paul corrects this confusion by saying they should do it decently and in order (one at a time, max of 3 persons) in an assembly. He does not change or criticize the fact that each one had **one** psalm. Shall we regard these "specific" details as binding? If not, why not?

And, when you answer the "why not", you will answer yourself concerning the Sunday evening offering of the Supper. For if we can argue that Acts 20:7 is "singular" in reference to frequency on Sunday, then we can also argue the same singular "frequency" aspect regarding songs per song leader. Can you show me a **specific** where more than one song per song leader is authorized in a single assembly? I've looked, but the only "plural" passages do not specify that that is permissible in "one assembly". For example, Heb. 13:15's reference to continual praise does not specify how many songs per person any more than Acts 2:42 "continuing stedfastly... in the breaking of bread" specifies the number of times on Sunday. If you can take the incidental of Acts 20:7's "frequency on Sunday" as a binding specific, then I can take Mt 26:30 and 1 Cor. 14:26ff as an equally binding specific for singing. (I speak by way of making a point, I do not actually bind this.)

Again, you suggest making buildings a separate issue. I do not believe either of us have a problem with authority for buildings. Nor do I believe there is a need to separate it from our discussion. I assert that by the same manner in which we have authority for buildings, we have authority for additional offerings of the Supper or Giving (on Sunday, in the assembly). Or multiple songs per song leader, for that matter. Your attempt at

binding a specific that narrows the frequency on Sunday is binding an incidental. I know "first day of the week" is there. I know "when we were gathered together to break bread" is there. But where is this "only once on Sunday"? Where is the command, example or **necessary** inference? An **unnecessary** inference, a **possible** inference is **not** sufficient to sustain the point. And that is the best that Acts 20:7 offers for the "frequency on Sunday" position: a **possible** inference. This is why the point you affirm is in error.

I think we both agree that willfully abandoning the assembly or the Supper is a sin. But it is not a strong point to argue that because the "second offering" has been abused in such a manner then it rules out a "second offering". Abuse does not invalidate what is authorized by general authority. You insinuate: "[Instead of brethren trying to find ways to allow for folks to miss the memorial of our Lord's death...](#)" Brother, this assumption is neither charitable nor correct. You may know of some who have done this, but it is a very inappropriate assumption to assert this in a general way. I am not one to say that we can never understand people's motives - for men often betray themselves. But that is a far cry from making general assertions which are neither accurate nor proven. And again, even IF your assertion were true, such an abuse would not prove or disprove whether the act is itself authorized or not. It would only prove the error in motives of those you referred to.

You comment: "However, we would never think of offering a make-up because we never once read of that in the New Testament." "Wait for one another" (1 Cor. 11:33). You have a manner of doing this, but forbid us from doing it in another manner that violates your judgments and opinions concerning frequency. Effectively, you say we sin for providing opportunity to brethren to partake of the Supper because it wasn't at the "first and only" offering. But what you bind is read into the text, not proved from it. Just as those who teach "faith only" from passages that speak only of "faith"; you bind "only once on Sunday" from a passage that teaches only "Sunday".

Concerning Acts 20:7 you assert: "The disciples came together to break bread. They did not come together again for those not there the first time nor did they have just certain one's partaking." You assert as proven what is not the point of the text. Some assert that the thief on the cross was NOT baptized. Some, in reply, assert that he was. I can show that it is MUCH more likely that he was than that he wasn't, but I cannot prove either was absolutely that he was or was not. There is a very good **possibility** that he was. But such a plausible possibility does not give sufficient proof. The same is true of the "frequency on Sunday" argument from Acts 20:7. The clear purpose of the text is the first day of the week meeting for the purpose of the Supper. We can no more bind "frequency on Sunday" from this, than we can upper room, time of day, kind of lighting, length of Paul's speech, windows in the meeting room, or eating in the meeting house (see 20:11), etc.

You wrote: "There is nothing else in the New Testament to even hint at brethren assembling more than once on the first day of the week for the Lord's Supper." Thus, you forbid what is authorized by general authority. And so we should also say, "There is nothing else in the New Testament to even hint at brethren singing more than one song per song leader." And it would have to be just as binding.

You wrote: "To say that Troas doesn't make the "how many times specific", we'd also have to conclude that Troas doesn't make the day specific either since no other text offers anything additional." No one doubts that Acts 20:7 only mentions one assembly.

But is that detail incidental or binding? May I suggest reading Cogdill's Walking by Faith, chapter 5? I have also done a sermon on this point and it is accessible online, but Cogdill's material goes into more detail than I did in this sermon.

Power Point charts:

<http://s211290890.onlinehome.us/public/WBF/CHURCH%2005%20EXAMPLE%20BINDING.ppt>

MP3:

<http://s211290890.onlinehome.us/public/WBF/WBF05%20Example%20Binding.mp3>

You wrote: "I do not want to argue with you. Traditions are hard to overcome." Yes, brother, human traditions are hard to overcome. I do not want to argue with you either. I hope that we can discuss this in a reasonable fashion. It will, of course, have fellowship consequences if we are unable to resolve this. You believe we are in sin for practicing what is unauthorized. We believe you are in sin for binding what God has not bound. This is not an arrangement that can be passed over lightly. But that does not mean we have to be unkind or cease discussing things and trying to better understand each other's points.

You write: "However, if you look at this without thinking about those who "have to work" or "just can't be there", you will see that the New Testament simply does not authorize a make-up serving of the Lord's Supper." If I referenced such examples, they were merely applications of what I affirm is authorized by general authority. I tend to be very methodical in following the logic of points, attempting to show the consistency or inconsistency of things.

You add: "If it's not there, we cannot do it (Colossians 3:17). If the New Testament gives us all of the information we need to please God (II Timothy 3:16-17), we must conclude such is not pleasing to God. If we are to say it's authorized, we have to prove a make-up is written."

Do I have to **specifically** prove that a baptistery is authorized? What about a building to assemble in? How would I prove that by **specific** authority? How would I prove **specifically** that more than one song per song leader is authorized?

You add: "If it is authorized, all must then do it (I Corinthians 4:17)." Some things are commanded, some things are permitted, some things are forbidden. Commanded things, all must do. Permitted things, all may do. Forbidden things, none may do. Sunday in the assembly is commanded. Waiting for one another (not excluding brethren, be expecting them to partake & receiving them) is commanded. The details of how we arrange this beyond this is left to our discretion. Thus, I do not say it is sinful to offer the Supper only once on Sunday, as long as you are willing to at least try to give opportunity to those who may be hindered / late on Sunday. Nor is it sinful to offer it later in the evening services (Sunday, in the assembly). Nor is it sinful to have a third, fourth, etc. offering. I have no problem even with a case where we end services and someone then walks in (had a flat tire, for example) and asks to partake. We could resume services for long enough to receive & accept this sincere hindered brother on Sunday in the assembly. It is about fellowship, not frequency on Sunday.

You wrote: "If it is not written Douglas, we both know it is "condemned" (II John 9). If you want to study the collection (I Corinthians 16:1ff.), let's do that at another time."

If God is silent, then we should be silent. But God has spoken: Sunday, in the assembly. God has not detailed the frequency for us on Sunday in the assembly. It is therefore not I who violate (forbid or demand) a certain frequency on Sunday; but you, my brother, who forbids more than once on Sunday,

Again, I appreciate your detailed response. I may have repeated some of the points in my earlier letter in this one, but I frankly did not compare the two. I simply aimed at replying to what you wrote in this latest e-mail. Don't worry about typos, I am notoriously fallible in this regard.

I also trust that you can reason through this. From what I have seen, you seem to be a very logical person. And as for a chart with three columns (command, example, or necessary conclusion) and filling in the blanks, you wrote: "I assure you, it is not possible on this issue." Let us see:

COMMAND	EXAMPLE	NEC. INFERENCE
"When you come together..." "Do this in remembrance..." "As often as you eat..." (1 Cor. 11:18, 24-26)		When? Time not specified. "When" & "As often as". What? Eat & drink. Why? Memorial. How? In assembly Frequency on Sunday? Not specified.
	Give every 1 st day of the week (1 Cor. 16:2)	Only other reference to "when" assemble in 1 st Corinthian is Sunday. Thus we can only rightly conclude that this day would be acceptable.
	"Upon the first day of the week when we were gathered together to break bread" (Acts 20:7)	When? Upon the first day. What? Eat. Why? Nec. Imp. - memorial of Christ, not a common meal. How? Gathered together. Frequency on Sunday? While only one assembly is referenced here, there is no indication of a binding purpose any more than "upper room", etc.
"When ye come together to eat, wait one for another" (1 Cor. 11:33)		When? Time not specified (see above). What? To eat. Why? Context: memorial of Christ. How? In assembly ("wait one for another"). Frequency on Sunday? Not

		specified.
	“Continued stedfastly... in breaking of bread...” (Acts 2:42)	<p>When? Only time indicated was Pentecost (1st day of the week) (Acts 2:1).</p> <p>What? Break bread.</p> <p>Why? Context: memorial of Christ, not common meal.</p> <p>How? Context of the church: “added together” (2:41).</p> <p>Frequency on Sunday? Not specified.</p>

CONCLUSIONS:

1. We see that observing this memorial is required. “This do”
2. It is required on Sunday, a day that is repeatedly associated with it & the only day associated with it.
3. It must be in the assembly, when gathered, wait for one another (don’t exclude, but accept into fellowship).
4. As for any “frequency on Sunday” aspect, Does the text say: “Upon the first day of the week, in the evening, in an upper room, and only once, when we were gathered together to break bread” (Acts 20:7)? Such would be a purposeful statement, binding all these details. As it is, the statement of purpose in Acts 20:7 only binds Sunday assembly observance, not frequency on Sunday, etc. There is a difference between incidental and bindable details.

Thus, the details God reveals are specific regarding day of the week (Sunday), the purpose (memorial)& the occasion (assembly). We should include the manner (self-inspection) (1 Cor. 11:27-32). We should include the emblems (Matt. 26:17, 26-29; 1 Cor. 11:23-25). But they are not specific regarding ‘frequency on Sunday’ anymore than they are specific regarding the number of cups (at most 13? Luke 22:17) or the upper room (Mark 14:15; Lk. 22:12; Acts 1:13; Acts 20:9). We agree upon unleavened bread & grape juice; but what of the grain used in the bread? Or the color of the grape juice? We could go on and on, binding details that are not identified as relevant or required by the commands, examples & **necessary** inferences relating to the Supper. **Possible** inferences prove authority for nothing.

Well, I will continue to review what you have written and think on it. I look forward to your reply and considerations.

For the Truth,
Douglas

----- Original Message -----

From: [Brian A. Yeager](#)

To: 'NSCOC'

Sent: Monday, August 13, 2007 3:51 PM

Subject: RE: Hey Bro.

[Douglas:](#)

It appears as though you have a lot more time to spend on this than I do. Further, it appears you are missing the point. I am not trying to miss answering anything you have said. I have preached long enough, and have learned many times through, how often truth gets hidden in argumentation. With the liberals, instead of giving authority for the “fellowship hall” they will ask where the authority is for a water fountain. I do not waste my time in those arguments (II Timothy 2:23). If you want to study authority for the meeting house, what kind of bread, the color of the juice, song leaders, multiple songs, etc., we can do that separate from this study. I do not have Roy Cogdill’s material. His Cogdill foundation and fellowship with the promoters of FC and other sinful ventures left his credibility less than desirable. I do not consult what others think. In fact, I have studied and learned almost everything I teach and preach on my own. I studied my way out of liberalism (same time and study that lead me away from the second offering and other errors of “tradition”). The recommendation I made to you about making a chart was obviously not clear enough.

Here is a quick sample of what you should do for all that you teach and practice. If you cannot fill in the three columns, then the subject matter of expediencies on that matter are null and void.

Practice Conclusion	Command	Example	Necessary
1. Singing in the assembly 14:15	Ephesians 5:19		I Corinthians
2. Supporting preachers 11:8	I Corinthians 9:14	Philippians 4:15-16	II Corinthians
3. Baptizing folks to be saved	Mark 16:15-16	Acts 8:25-39	Galatians 3:27
4. Withdrawing from wayward	II Thessalonians 3:6	I Corinthians 5	Matthew 18:15-17
5. Make up serving of L.S.			
6. Partaking of L.S. TOGETHER 11:18; 20 [same assembly]	I Corinthians 11:33	Acts 20:7	I Corinthians

There you go. It’s that simple. If you have to beat around ten bushes and pose thirty arguments to cloud the point, truth is not achieved. Study from this standpoint. Anybody can make and answer arguments all day. Only those who have the truth can support it with Scriptures. I am not interested in an ongoing written discussion. I don’t have the time. You should be able to see this clearly and simply on your own. If not, we can study in person together on this or any other matters. However, I want to remind you, when I study or teach I do not deal in arguments. Truth is attainable only through the word of God, not my understanding of things (Proverbs 14:12; 21:2; cf. II Timothy 1:13, II Timothy 3:16-17, and John 5:39).

Brotherly,

Brian A. Yeager
 3917 Tierra Roman Dr.
 El Paso, TX 79938
 915-525-5794
brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net
www.wordsoftruth.net

----- Original Message -----

From: [Brian A. Yeager](#)

To: 'NSCOC'

Sent: Monday, August 13, 2007 5:06 PM

Subject: RE: Hey Bro. (Addendum)

Douglas:

It just dawned on me that you are confusing necessary inferences with expediencies. The two are not the same. Matthew 22:31-32 is an example of a necessary inference. I skimmed through your long answer earlier and missed this: "You assert that we have authority for a building and reference 1 Cor. 11:33. I have read the verse but do not see "building" specified in the text. So, I take it you claim that the authority to assemble necessarily implies provisions for assembling (a place, lights, seats, etc). Fine. I assert the same concerning the Supper. Sunday is when we come together to eat (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:33). These verses specify the day of the week, not the hour of the day. These verses specify the occasion (assembly) not the frequency of the occasion. These specify the purpose "to eat", not the number of times we can gather on Sunday in the assembly for this purpose."

First, it was I Corinthians 11:20 I referenced to the building question. It is not implied, but stated that the brethren came together in one place. Therefore, it is expedient to have a facility that is large enough and located expediently for all to come together in one place to fulfill passages such as Acts 20:7; I Corinthians 11:18ff., etc. A place is specified. It is up to what is expedient to choose that place.

Secondly, no, I do not claim that authority to assemble implies provisions. I say it is specific in "one place". Examples authorize us to meet in public (Acts 2:42-46), in homes (Philemon v.2), in a building (Acts 20:7), etc. Examples even show us that expediencies to carry out those commands are authorized [i.e. lights] (Acts 20:8).

Thirdly, you have asserted something that is not there. Douglas, if the local church was to sit back and serve a few who missed an earlier serving the text would not specify that the practice is to be accomplished "together" (Acts 20:7; I Corinthians 11:33). You even defeat your arguments when you write "Sunday is when we come together to eat (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:33)". Having a second or third service wherein a few eat, is not coming together to eat. Most are actually coming together to watch. Furthermore, it is left over's. If my family comes together to eat at 5:00 and I am not there until 9:00, I will not be coming together to eat dinner with my family. Come on, you know that was not an "emotional" argument. I am one of the least "emotional" folks you will ever meet.

On a fourth point, Acts 20:7 as well as I Corinthians 11:33 show that the Lord's Supper was taken in one assembly. Otherwise, it would not be observed "together". Again, try to work through the chart below, with a proper understanding of what a necessary inference is, and find the authority for the make-up serving. Again, if Acts 20:7 limits us on the first day of the week, it must also limit us on the times per that first day of the week because nothing else authorizes further observations of the Lord's death in the local assembly on the first day of the week. To say that it was incidental that Troas met once on the first day of the week, you must also leave open the door to say it was incidental they met on the first day of the week.

Before you throw any arguments back. Just simply understand the points. Arguments will get us nowhere. Expediencies are not specified. If they were, they would be commands, examples, or necessary conclusions. Necessary inferences are conclusions that are arrived at by reading the text (i.e. they were not meeting in a home in Acts 20:7ff.). You cannot read anything about the L.S. and conclude they had a make-up. If God wanted a make-up (as He did the Passover- Numbers 9), He would have said so and would have told us how to do it (II Timothy 3:16-17). The local church has the authorized means to choose an expedient time to assemble on the first day of the week to carry out this action.

Finally Doug, in what you wrote you said: "We can no more bind "frequency on Sunday" from this, than we can upper room, time of day, kind of lighting, length of Paul's speech, windows in the meeting room, or **eating in the meeting house** (see 20:11), etc". Some of the points you have made are true, only because we can prove brethren met in other places and at different times. However, I am concerned that you are saying there was eating in the meeting house in verse 11. Have you considered that Acts 20:7 tell us what was going to happen while the actual events are concluded through verse 11? If verse 11 is a common meal with the brethren there, then such is not only authorized, but by example would be just as binding as verse 7. Have you considered that the eating in verse 11 is the partaking of the L.S.?

That'll be all from me for now. I have much to do. I hope this will clear up some things for you to take a fresh look at the subject matter.

Brotherly,

Brian A. Yeager
3917 Tierra Roman Dr.
El Paso, TX 79938
915-525-5794
brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net
www.wordsoftruth.net

Hello brother Yeager,

8-16-07

You began your first of two replies by saying: "It appears as though you have a lot more time to spend on this than I do."

- (1) This is merely an unnecessary jab (2 Tim. 2:24-26). Such a retort is more in line with bullying than with gentle reasoning & teaching.
- (2) Also, should I ever be "too busy" to care for a brother's soul or for his influence upon the congregation here? Forgive me this wrong (2 Cor. 12:13).
- (3) As for argumentation obscuring truth, would that also apply to your comments about irrelevant things like how much time I have? Or does it only apply to my sincere attempts to address your mistaken doctrinal position with scripture?

You argue: "With the liberals, instead of giving authority for the "fellowship hall" they will ask where the authority is for a water fountain. I do not waste my time in those arguments (II Timothy 2:23)."

Yes, liberals tend to observe the "passover" on arguments they cannot answer. But, unlike liberals, I gave general authority for Sunday observance of the Supper in the assembly. I highlighted how that authority does **not** specify frequency on Sunday. I identified how binding a **possible** inference ("frequency" on Sunday from Acts 20:7) is an **unnecessary** inference.

Regarding authority for owning the meeting house, kind of grain in the bread, color of the juice, # of songs per song leader, etc., you wish to separate these into another study, but give no valid reason why these are not parallel to my point. They are parallel in that they are **unspecified**, but **authorized** details. Dismissal is not a sufficient refutation.

Regarding Cogdill's material, you surely do not have to read it or anyone else's material in order to know the truth. And I am well aware of several inconsistencies in Cogdill's teaching and practice. None-the-less, his article on "When is a NT example binding" is something worth considering since not all details in NT examples are bindable. Also, while we are not to stick our fingers to the wind, that does not mean we should never consider what others say (Prov. 12:15; 19:20; 24:6). Even if this particular article contains error, there is much to be learned from how to refute a false position.

You write: "In fact, I have studied and learned almost everything I teach and preach on my own. I studied my way out of liberalism (same time and study that lead me away from the second offering and other errors of "tradition")." I too could mention my accomplishments (how much study I have done from an early age, the countries I have gone to, how I have led my mother away from fellowship in liberal practices, etc). I could boast of many things, but it is not expedient to boast (2 Cor. 12:1), save in our weaknesses (12:9-10). If we glorify ourselves, then our glorying is vain: "He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord" (1 Cor. 1:31).

The chart you make on commands, examples & inferences is clear, but incorrect. You wrote "make up serving of the L.S." under the practice, as if it is going to be **specifically** authorized or itemized by scripture. Evidently what I wrote was not clear enough in explaining that **unspecified** expedients are **not** going to be specifically itemized, but are still authorized by **general** authority. This is how offering the Supper Sunday evening is authorized - by generic authority. Thus, for you to require a specific permission, when general permission is given; is to require something beyond what God requires. The chart should be amended as follows:

Practice	Command	Example	Necessary Conclusion
1. Singing to one another	Eph. 5:19		I Corinthians 14:15
2. Supporting preachers	I Cor. 9:14	Phil. 4:15-16	II Corinthians 11:8
3. Baptizing folks to be saved	Mark 16:15-16	Acts 8:25-39	Galatians 3:27
4. Withdrawing from wayward	II Thess. 3:6	I Cor. 5	Matthew 18:15-17
5. L.S.together on Sunday	1 Cor. 11:33	Acts 20:7	I Corinthians 11:18; 20

Add to this another column: "Expediencies."

1. Song books, # of songs per song leader, # of song leaders.
2. Sending supporting by check, money order, cash, direct deposit, in person, by mail, etc.
3. River, fountain, pool baptistery, etc.
4. How many times you announce the marking publicly, whether to place it in the bulletin as well, whether to just tell them by word of mouth that they are marked or to also use a letter, etc.
5. Specific time to offer it on Sunday and the # of times to offer it on Sunday

All of these items are expedients, many of which are unspecified (never mentioned). But just because they are not specified does not mean they are any less authorized.

You add: "Only those who have the truth can support it with Scriptures." Amen.
General authority is sufficient authority.

You add: "I am not interested in an ongoing written discussion. I don't have the time." That is a shame. For if you refuse to even discuss this, then we will have no more room to seek resolution of our differences. Are you not supposed to demonstrate, as a preacher, "all longsuffering and teaching" (2 Tim. 4:2)? How will ending our discussion without carefully answering one another's points promote unity in the Truth? How will this show your concern for my soul, or the souls of the brethren here who you believe to be in sin? If you plan to come for a meeting here, will you simply agree to "not talk about it"? Or will you then find the time then to preach your views?

You add: "You should be able to see this clearly and simply on your own." If I assert the same of you (and I do), what would your reply be? Mine is Rom. 10:14, 2 Tim. 4:1-2, Titus 2:15, etc.

You wrote: "However, I want to remind you, when I study or teach I do not deal in arguments. Truth is attainable only through the word of God, not my understanding of things (Proverbs 14:12; 21:2; cf. II Timothy 1:13, II Timothy 3:16-17, and John 5:39)."

Evidently I am not clear on what you mean by arguments, for what I have expressed is "a reason given in proof or rebuttal: discourse intended to persuade; a coherent series of statements leading from a premise to a conclusion". I have not wrangled or quarreled. You assert that the pm LS is a sin and attempt to support your point from Scripture. I am rebutting this and stating the authority for it from Scripture. If this is not something you care to engage in, then why preach at all? And how could you - since it constantly involves refuting false ideas and pointing out correct ideas (2 Cor. 10:5)?

In your addendum, you indicate that I am confusing necessary inferences with expedencies. If I did not express it clearly, I apologize. But I believe that I did distinguish between these things. In fact, I was analyzing your statement and making a distinction which you did not. Consider again what the very quote from me that you refer to (bold added): "You assert that we have authority for a **building** and reference 1 Cor. 11:33. I have read the verse but **do not see "building" specified in the text.** So, I take it you claim that the authority to assemble **necessarily implies provisions for assembling** (a place, lights, seats, etc). **Fine. I assert the same concerning the Supper. Sunday is when we come together to eat (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:33). These verses specify the day of the week, not the hour of the day. These verses specify the occasion (assembly) not the frequency of the occasion. These specify the**

purpose “to eat”, not the number of times we can gather on Sunday in the assembly for this purpose.”

I wrote that the passage (properly 1 Cor. 11:20) does not mention a “building”, but you made that application from this text. Since a building is not specifically identified here you obviously accept the idea that it necessarily implies providing a place to assemble. If not, then why did you refer to this passage as authority for a building? Again, a **building** is not specified here but **assembling** is specified. You did not distinguish between the necessary implication & the expedient, I did. And based upon your pattern of logic here, I equally assert that we may no more **bind** the **unspecified** “frequency on Sunday” than any other **unspecified expedient** (type of building, lights, etc).

In order for anything to be an expedient, it must first be authorized. Since assembling authorizes a place; then we could assemble in a park, by a river, under a tree, in a home, in the civic center, in a rented or owned building, use lights, seats, etc. In other words, if you grant that the expedient of a building is authorized by 1 Cor. 11:20 (even though it is not specified in this verse); then you also must grant that other expedients for assembling are authorized (or as I described them “authority to assemble necessarily implies **provisions** for assembling”).

Furthermore, while we read of some expedients for assembling in the Bible, we never once read of a building **owned** by the congregation. If you assert (by the generic authority to “assemble” 1 Cor. 11:20) that we may own a building, then by the same stroke of generic authority (LS Sunday, when come together, Acts 20:7) I assert we may offer the supper as many times as is necessary **on Sunday, when we come together** in order to provide opportunity for brethren to obey the Lord’s command.

You wrote: “It is not implied, but stated that the brethren came together in one place. Therefore, it is expedient to have a facility that is large enough and located expediently for all to come together in one place to fulfill passages such as Acts 20:7; I Corinthians 11:18ff., etc. A place is specified. It is up to what is expedient to choose that place.”

You assert that what is stated is “brethren came together in one place”. Then assert that a place is **specified**. Are you confusing necessary inference with expedients? Or are you simply connecting the dots and **making application** for what is authorized by **general** authority? “Place” is **not** stated or specified in 11:20, but is necessarily implied by “assemble together”. It may be stated elsewhere, even in the same context, but in the passage you mentioned it is **not** specifically mentioned. And even if it were not applied to any kind meeting place elsewhere, this would be sufficient authority for obtaining a “place” to assemble. But the fact remains, never once does a passage necessarily imply that a congregation **owned** a building for worship. Should we forbid this as sinful? According to your logic, it would seem we should.

You then write: “Secondly, no, I do not claim that authority to assemble implies provisions.” Then why did you cite 1 Cor. 11:20 as authority for a **building**? Yes, other examples show churches assembling in various locations, but you referred to 1 Cor. 11:20 as authority for a building (and were correct in doing so, just as we use Heb. 10:25 for the same point). But if you do **not** accept that it necessarily implies provisions for assembling (place, chairs, lights, etc), why did you apply it to a building which is not specifically mentioned in the verse?

Note especially: “Thirdly, you have asserted something that is not there. Douglas, if the local church was to sit back and serve a few who missed an earlier serving the text would not specify that the practice is to be accomplished “together” (Acts 20:7; I Corinthians 11:33).”

(1) Your statement is contradictory. You assert that they “sit back” then say they “serve”. Which is it? “Sit back” indicates inactivity, a lack of participation & fellowship. But “serve” indicates activity and fellowship. The assertion of inactivity is what you made previously of just “watching” others partake. I refuted this in a previous letter by showing that it is an inaccurate assessment of what actually takes place.

(2) Neither Acts 20:7 or 1 Cor. 11:33 specify “frequency” on Sunday. “Together” demands that we assemble to partake, but does not necessarily imply that we **only do it once**. Such is an **unnecessary** conclusion.

(3) Consider also that this argument is very much like the one cup argument, that we must all partake “together” or the supper is somehow invalidated. Consider 1 Cor. 10:16-17. Paul at Ephesus wrote to Corinth and said “we” partake of one bread. Corinth & Ephesus were separate congregations with **separate assemblies**; yet Paul says there was fellowship together. If Paul can have communion with brethren who partake **at a different time and different place** (but both were in an assembly on Sunday) then we can have communion with brethren who partake **at a different time in the same place** (but both in an assembly on Sunday). If this is not the case, then Paul was mistaken about his fellowship with the brethren at Corinth while he was at Ephesus. Whatever it means to gather together to partake, it evidently does **not** require “only one offering” in order for us to have fellowship together and with the Lord.

You assert: “You even defeat your arguments when you write ‘Sunday is when **we come together to eat**’ (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:33)’. Having a second or third service wherein a few eat, is not coming together to eat. Most are actually coming together to watch.” I have already answered this before. I understand that you believe this, but it would be beneficial to address my rebuttal rather than just reaffirm that it is just “watching” when it is not true. You read into this phrase (“come together”) a time or “frequency” element that is **not** bound by God (as 1 Cor. 10:16-17 shows).

You add: “Furthermore, it is left over’s. If my family comes together to eat at 5:00 and I am not there until 9:00, I will not be coming together to eat dinner with my family. Come on, you know that was not an “emotional” argument. I am one of the least “emotional” folks you will ever meet.”

You assert that it is “left overs”, but I denied it and explained why. Yet you reaffirm it without addressing my arguments. In reply to your “family” argument:

“Then came she and worshipped him, saying, Lord, help me. But he answered and said, It is not meet to take the **children's bread**, and to cast it to dogs. And she said, Truth, Lord: **yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table**. Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that very hour.” (Matt. 15:25-28)

If **dogs** may partake of **crumbs** from the **children's bread** which accidentally "**fall**" from the **master's table** then **brethren** may partake of what is **purposefully prepared** for them from the **Lord's table** (on the authorized day, in the authorized assembly).

And what is more, if my family should **assemble again** while I eat, do we not have participation **together** when they take the time & consideration to be with me in this fashion? Would this **not** fulfill 1 Cor. 11:33's meaning of "wait for one another"? Does "wait" merely mean take it at the "**same time**"? Or does it mean "accept" and "receive" one another? Do all have to partake at the **same** time & in the **same** single assembly in order to have fellowship (1 Cor. 10:16-17)? **No**. Since the definition of "wait" is primarily acceptance (i.e. fellowship) and 1 Cor. 10:16-17 refutes the "same time" idea - how can you continue to assert it?

You wrote: "On a fourth point, Acts 20:7 as well as I Corinthians 11:33 show that the Lord's Supper was taken in one assembly. Otherwise, it would not be observed "together". "

The fact that it was taken "when ye come together" is obvious, but you fail to distinguish between what is bound in these passages and what is incidental. If "together" binds only one offering on Sunday, then it also binds only one assembly on Sunday. Should we now apologize to the no-Bible-class brethren? For they also assert that "together" means one assembly. And to be honest, we do not find a **specific** command, example or necessary inference that expressly says multiple classes are permissible anymore than we find a passage that expressly says multiple offerings are permissible. If general authority is not sufficient for the "second offering", then it is not sufficient for a number of other practices.

You wrote: "Again, if Acts 20:7 limits us on the first day of the week, it must also limit us on the times per that first day of the week because nothing else authorizes further observations of the Lord's death in the local assembly on the first day of the week."

And if it limits us on the times per that first day of the week for the Supper, it also limits us on the times per first day of the week assembly. Thus, by your logic, a second assembly should also be sinful. And a divided assembly should be sinful, since we are to be "together". Yet, while Acts 20:7 clearly identifies the first day of the week gathering for the purpose of eating the supper; it does not identify or emphasize frequency of offerings on Sunday, frequency of assemblies on Sunday or such. In other details you admit incidentals exist. The difficulty is that here you take what is not emphasized in the text and bind it as if it is equal to what is clearly highlighted in the text. If we may do this with one incidental item, then we can & must do it with all incidental items. So we must also bind one assembly on Sunday, no separate classes, etc. If not, why not? Can you locate a specific exception to these?

You wrote: "To say that it was incidental that Troas met once on the first day of the week, you must also leave open the door to say it was incidental they met on the first day of the week." No sir. Look at Acts 20:7. Clear purpose is identifiable with the day of the week and the purpose of gathering. No such emphasis is given to the "frequency on Sunday" here or anywhere. If the Lord wanted to bind "frequency of offering the Supper on Sunday" He would have identified it in a way that either commanded it, showed an approved apostolic example, or **necessarily** implied a **single** observance. Just recording one instance of observance does not necessitate that every incidental detail is

bound. Nowhere does this example or any other passage **necessarily** imply a **single** offering the Supper on Sunday as the only valid way to fulfill the observance of the supper. General authority authorizes the day and the assembly. It does not bind frequency on that day.

Compare John 13:8-17. An example is given of Jesus wearing a towel & washing the apostles' feet. Is wearing a towel & washing feet bound or incidental? Context clues emphasize the principles behind it (humility & service) rather than the act itself. Thus that actual deed of towel wearing & foot washing is not bound. It is incidental and Jesus could have used **any number** of methods to demonstrate humility & service. But the humility & service is bound. In like manner, Acts 20:7 emphasizes the day and purpose of gathering, but does **not** emphasize the frequency on Sunday. So, day & purpose are bound, but "frequency on Sunday" is incidental and can be done **any number** of times as is necessary to accomplish what is bound by the Lord.

And what of the example of Paul toward Titus? He directed Titus to appoint elders in "every city" (1:5). Evidently, they did not establish more than one church per city. Do you ever read of more than one? I don't. So are we sinning if we have more than one congregation in a city? Is the number of congregations in a city bound? Or is it incidental? If a city has two sound congregations, are they automatically in sin because of this? If not, why not? There is no specific exception to this passage...And all the other examples only show one congregation per city... And what of the modes of travel? Jesus said "Go", and they went by walking, by boats, but chariot, and perhaps some other examples. They didn't use planes or cars or other more modern things. Should we condemn those who use them - since there is no specific mention of them?

You advised me: "Before you throw any arguments back. Just simply understand the points. Arguments will get us nowhere." I would urge the same, brother. And I deny that I am throwing arguments, I am appealing to scripture and reason (Cp. Acts 17:2).

You add: "Expediencies are not specified. If they were, they would be commands, examples, or necessary conclusions." **Exactly my point.** This is why your request for a command, example or necessary inference that **specifies** multiple offerings on Sunday is missing the point. All the authority that exists authorizes gathering on Sunday to partake. In none of these passages is "frequency on Sunday" ever anything more than an incidental. Thus, for you to bind a frequency is to bind what God has not bound.

You add: "Necessary inferences are conclusions that are arrived at by reading the text (i.e. they were not meeting in a home in Acts 20:7ff.)." A necessary inference is a conclusion **demand**ed by the text. A **possible** conclusion is not a **necessary** one. As I will show, it is a **necessary** conclusion that they were in someone's home.

In any text, we take words in their normal sense unless the context demands otherwise. Certainly Acts 20:7 "break bread" is in the context of a religious assembly - thus it has the special meaning of the Lord's Supper, rather than a common meal. But does that necessarily imply that 20:11 is also the Lord's Supper? The context is that the assembly was **disrupted** by Eutychus' fall. Since (according to you) there can only be **one** occasion per Sunday in which brethren gather together to eat the Lord's Supper, and that gathering had been halted - then Acts 20:11 could not possibly be the Lord's Supper... If it was, then you have a **second** attempt at gathering for that purpose **on the same day**... which you do not believe. So, if you assert that it was anything other than a

common meal, **you** will need to explain how their “**second assembly for the purpose of partaking**” is authorized.

Besides this, Acts 20:7 identifies “we” were gathered and 20:11 identifies “he” had gone up and eaten (Paul). Did Paul eat the Lord’s Supper alone?

Add to this Acts 20:7b, that Eutychus’ fall happened **after midnight**. It was now **Monday** morning when Paul raised him and then went up and “broke bread” (20:11). Are you prepared to authorize the Lord’s Supper on Monday?

The first point shows that your assumption of the LS in v. 11 is incorrect. The latter 2 points show why the place where they were must have been someone’s home; unless we are willing to argue that they had a pantry at the church building. Just as you have mistakenly assumed the LS in v.11, you have mistakenly assumed “frequency on Sunday” is bound.

You wrote: “You cannot read anything about the L.S. and conclude they had a make-up.” If Acts 20:11 is what you assert, then it is the very “second chance” offering you are looking for. But again, general authority is sufficient to permit a “second offering” ; for while you bind an incidental (“frequency on Sunday”), God has not bound it.

You add: “If God wanted a make-up (as He did the Passover- Numbers 9), He would have said so and would have told us how to do it (II Timothy 3:16-17). The local church has the authorized means to choose an expedient time to assemble on the first day of the week to carry out this action.”

If someone came for the Passover on the authorized day, but later in that day than others; would they need specific permission for a “make-up”? No. For that day, the whole day, was authorized already. The reason the **exception** to the Passover is rightly considered a “make-up” was because it was seeking permission to observe the Passover on **another** day. Such an observance would be an additional observance and a violation of what God authorized, unless specific permission was granted by God. But to make this parallel to a “second offering” of the LS **on Sunday** evening is a mistake. For we are not seeking permission to observe the **first day of the week** Supper on **another day**. In fact, it is the **same day** as is **already authorized**. How could someone who came to the Passover feast **on the authorized day** be said to be taking a “make-up” feast? If he partook of it the **next** day or **next** week, **next** month, etc. - it would then be an **unauthorized** “make-up” (unless God granted an exception). And only because God authorized an exception was there justification for the one in the next month. But eating the Passover **on the authorized day** would not be considered a “make-up” anymore than partaking of the Lord’s Supper **on the authorized day** is to be considered a “make-up”.

I wrote “We can no more bind “frequency on Sunday” from this, than we can upper room, time of day, kind of lighting, length of Paul’s speech, windows in the meeting room, or **eating in the meeting house** (see 20:11), etc”. You replied: “Some of the points you have made are true, **only because we can prove brethren met in other places and at different times.**”

This highlighted portion misses the significance of general authority. As I noted in a previous letter, all the authority we have on singing is generic concerning “number of

songs per song leader”, except for Matt. 26:30, Mark. 14:26 and 1 Cor. 14:26-32). Ephesians 5:19, for example, simply says “speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs...” Plural is used here, but no reference is made to how many song leaders and how many assemblies. This is, therefore, a generic passage. But Mark 14:26 shows the Lord sang one hymn in one assembly. And 1 Cor. 14 indicates that it is permissible to sing one song per song leader, with a maximum of 3 song leaders per assembly. So, Ephesians 5:19’s plural songs would fit neatly with 1 Cor. 14 if we use one song per leader, max 3 leaders per assembly. All would harmonize with no contradictions. Thus, can you find for me one **specific** exception to this pattern? Can you find **specific** authority to sing **more than one song** per song leader or **more than 3** leaders per assembly? No, you cannot.

This argument is just as valid as your argument for “frequency on Sunday”. The only way to disprove this argument on “frequency of songs” is to show that the major premise (number of songs per leader) is not bound because it is only incidentally mentioned. The fact that something is mentioned, and mentioned with no apparent specific rebuttal, does not automatically mean it is bound. This is why the assumption of “only one offering of the Supper on Sunday” is a fallacious premise. You assume that because no one can specifically disprove your assertion, that this means your assertion is true. But you fail to see that you must first prove that “frequency” on Sunday is bound, and is not incidental. Just asserting it from the text is no more valid than my asserting one song per leader, max 3 leaders per assembly. And being able to reason logically from the first assumed fact does not prove the first assumed fact to be bound by God.

I don’t know if you realize this or will agree, but the effect of your assertion is this very thing. That is why you seek a specific permission for a “second” offering. You demand specific authority for what God has already authorized **generally**.

Please consider the following syllogism:

- (1) Major Premise: Anything not specifically authorized is sinful.
- (2) Minor Premise: A “second offering” or “make-up” of the Lord’s Supper in any Sunday assembly is not specifically authorized.
- (3) Conclusion: Therefore, a “second offering” or “make-up” of the Lord’s Supper in any Sunday assembly is sinful.

Your minor premise and conclusion **must** begin somewhere. Since you demand a specific permission for what is authorized generically, the only way to sustain your minor premise is to affirm the major premise noted above. Now, I don’t think that you will accept that major premise; and if not, then your conclusion must also fail.

No scripture binds a specific “frequency” on Sunday. Nor will you accept this alternative premise to sustain your conclusion. So, how can you sustain your conclusion? Or will you accept this major premise?

I appreciate you replying. I do hope that we can resolve this Scripturally, without personal aspersions or rancor. My sole aim is to abide in the Truth and to encourage the same in my brethren. I trust that you will agree with these goals.

As for the time I take in replying, please consider that it is due to my earnest care for the Truth, for your soul and for your influence. I have no desire to have fellowship end between brethren. But in caring for what pleases the Lord and is good for the brethren here, I cannot overlook the difference we have on this issue. I guess I could just blink at it, pretend it wasn't there. Or just write you off and not attempt to discuss it. But I do not think that either of those avenues are scriptural. So, I ask your patient consideration of my rebuttals.

Your servant & brother in Christ,
Douglas

From: NSCOC
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2007 5:31 PM
To: Brian A. Yeager
Subject: Re: Hey Bro. (Addendum)

Please note the attachment.

In Him,
-Douglas

----- Original Message -----

From: [Brian A. Yeager](#)
To: 'NSCOC'
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2007 6:56 PM
Subject: RE: Hey Bro. (Addendum)

Douglas:

This is nine stinking pages again. Do you do a local work? You think that saying I don't have the time to spend on this is a jab at you. No, it's the truth. To assert that I am failing in II Timothy 4:2 is a joke. If you want to study this come on down and study it or we can study it face to face in April (believe me, I plan to educate you well then anyway – that is unless you run and cancel the meeting). It's not like there are a lot of Scriptures to go over here. I have many, many, many, many, more things on my plate than you do. That is evident in how much you have written. That is not a slap, just a statement of obvious fact. Man, I don't have the time to respond point by point to a nine page document that will only result in another nine page document.

Then to sit and listen to a read a fellow claim I was violating I Corinthians 1:31, who's throwing jabs now, Doug? Douglas, I don't know you. However, you obviously write as a student of debaters. You probably think that debates actually solve problems. You probably sit back and read what you write and say "huh, I go him here." If in this venue you want this discussion, you'll have to find someone else. I do not believe in fighting

unarmed men. That is not a jab, just the truth. I believe arguments and the answering of such are like urinating in the west Texas wind. I think Paul agrees (Titus 3:9).

I skimmed through what you wrote (still haven't read what you wrote the first time through either). It is typical arguments made for things unauthorized by all in error. Here is my answer... "In order for anything to be an expedient, it must first be authorized" (Douglas you authored this statement and I agree). The Lord's Supper is not an expedient. The expedients involved in the Lord's Supper no more authorize a second serving on the first day of the week as they do on Monday. Here you go, fill in the Scriptures:

A Make-UP Serving of the Lord's Supper: _____

A Serving of the Lord's Supper Wherein All Christians Are Not Partaking:

Scriptures Showing Any Congregation That Served the Supper
Twice: _____

You see Douglas, if you cannot provide answers here, we have no discussion. Now I have to go and teach our Thursday evening class. You see, we meet more than Sunday and once during the week. These things keep me busy. A study of something the Scriptures are silent on, that is a waste of time. Douglas, I just noticed that you ended with a Syllogism. Have you ever read Thomas Warren's debates... That is what you sound like. If $A + B = C$ you must affirm one part and all to conclude. When you can write someone else's position and put it into a silly gism, then I suppose you are a honest and rightful teacher. Your response caused me to lose respect for you.

Again,

Brian A. Yeager
3917 Tierra Roman Dr.
El Paso, TX 79938
915-525-5794
brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net
www.wordsoftruth.net

On 8-25-07 Brian Yeager called Doug Hill's residence. Yeager indicated that he had listened to the sermon presented at N. Sparta (8-19-07) on the Sunday evening Lord's Supper.

PPT <http://s211290890.onlinehome.us/public/L/LSpmUnauth2.ppt>
MP3 Part 1 <http://s211290890.onlinehome.us/public/L/LSpmUnauthA.mp3>
MP3 Part 2 <http://s211290890.onlinehome.us/public/L/LSpmUnauthB.mp3>

Yeager then asserted that this lesson was very carnal. I replied that his written comments were carnal, especially in light of the fact that I had tried to calmly discuss the matter with him as brethren should. Yeager then went on to say, "Well, if you weren't such an ass..." At which point I asked him what he just said. He repeated it. I informed

him that the Lord would judge him and that I did not care to continue the conversation;
then I hung up.

Sunday, 8-26-07, the men here had a business meeting and we unanimously agreed
that the invitation extended to Brian Yeager for a gospel meeting here should be
withdrawn.

North Sparta church of Christ

*359 North Spring Street • Sparta, TN 38583
931-836-3321 • NSCOC@Frontiernet.net*

To Brian A. Yeager,
3917 Tierra Roman Dr.
El Paso, TX 79938
915-525-5794

8-26-07

The men here have considered your position on the Sunday evening Lord's Supper. We have agreed that since you bind what God has not bound (1 Cor. 4:6), and have expressed a contentious attitude (Titus 3:10-11); that we can no longer extend an invitation to you for a gospel meeting.

Even so, we pray that you will come to understand the difference between what God binds by general authority (Sunday observance in the assembly, Acts 20:7) and binding incidental details ("frequency on Sunday"). We also pray that you will learn to have a more humble and less haughty attitude toward brethren who earnestly try to discuss the scriptures with you (Gal. 5:13-15; 2 Tim. 2:24-26). Such a demeanor does not serve you well nor the Lord that you claim to follow.

As it is written: "If any man teacheth a different doctrine, and consenteth not to sound words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is puffed up, knowing nothing, but doting about questionings and disputes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, wranglings of men corrupted in mind and bereft of the truth, supposing that godliness is a way of gain." (1 Tim. 6:3-5) In light of the fact that you "teach a different doctrine" and "consent not sound words", we withdraw our invitation (2 John 9-11)).

Praying fervently for your repentance,
The Lord's people at North Sparta.

(Signed by the 11 men present for this meeting.)

Douglas:

You don't have to share this. I already have the addresses, email, and phone numbers of many members there. Some already have this letter. I hope they will talk with you and have you correct the errors of your ways. You need to repent and apologize to the brethren in Cookeville too for your lies about them and Rodney!

Sadly, I can see from how you have dealt with this and what others in your area say about you, that you likely have them in your pocket. I hope you are going to repent quickly and accept some help in learning much that you are extremely ignorant about so that you do not continue to mislead the people you are teaching (II Timothy 3:13). **Yes, you're still an ass** (go ahead, hang up and take the computer off the hook)! By the way, did you know that the book of Psalms is a SONG BOOK? I just thought you should know since you loudly proclaimed on a recorded sermon that there was no such thing in the Scriptures ;). That is just one of many, many, stupid things you said on "tape"!

Sincerely,

Brian A. Yeager
3917 Tierra Roman Dr.
El Paso, TX 79938
915-525-5794
brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net
www.wordsoftruth.net

From: Brian A. Yeager [mailto:brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net]
Sent: Monday, August 27, 2007 11:07 PM
To: 'brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net'
Subject: To the North Sparta Members...

Brian A. Yeager
3917 Tierra Roman Dr.
El Paso, TX 79938
915-525-5794
brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net
www.wordsoftruth.net

8/27/2007

Dear Brethren:

Solomon, by way of inspiration, wrote: "*He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him*" (Proverbs 18:13). Have you brethren considered that Douglas Hill has planned and followed through with, a goal of getting the meeting I have scheduled with you canceled simply because I suggested to him that he needs to study the make-up serving of the Lord's Supper? It is not the meeting that I am concerned with, but the ungodly way Douglas has carried out his plan (Psalms 37:12) and your souls that are now caught in the balance (Isaiah 9:16; cf. Ephesians 5:11). If you will read through **all of the correspondence**, ask yourself if he was writing to me or setting up a defense for down the road.

I believe with all confidence that you have been persuaded of a decision that comes through a lack of facts. You folks simply have not heard or considered the whole story. For one, **I have had to read a letter online** before I even had the courtesy of receiving it personally marking me and canceling a meeting: (<http://s211290890.onlinehome.us/public/L/LSpm%20Brian%20Yeager.pdf>). Marking someone is a serious matter with eternal consequences (I Timothy 1:19-20). You, brethren, made some charges against me that are **far from the truth** (Proverbs 21:28). These need dealt with (Proverbs 19:5). For one, I do not bind what God has not bound. A congregation only has authority to assemble to partake of the Lord's Supper TOGETHER (Acts 20:7, I Corinthians 11:18; 20; 33). That is God's law, not mine. You cannot make-up the Lord's Supper because such an action violates the pattern (II Timothy 1:13) indicated of partaking together when assembling for that purpose (cf. Acts 20:7ff.). This "binding where God has not bound" charge is the same "instrumental music" folks make to faithful saints who appeal to the silence of the Scriptures. Folks, consider who you sound like. It is not me who is thinking beyond that which is written (I Corinthians 4:6).

Secondly, the letter that is supposed to be from the men of the congregation there said: “We also pray that you will learn to have a more humble and less haughty attitude toward brethren who earnestly try to discuss the scriptures with you (Gal. 5:13-15; 2 Tim. 2:24-26). Such a demeanor does not serve you well nor the Lord that you claim to follow.” Would you brethren care to be specific here? If you go back to the correspondence on your own website, you will see that it was I who wrote Douglas about his views in the first place (8/8/2007). I sent him articles for consideration, **not contention**. I responded to his questions after he read my articles and **I asked that we study in person** while indicating that my time was really short (8/10/2007). I did the same again after he sent nine pages, for the first time, which was nothing but rambling (8/13/2007). I then wrote again and said my time was short for the third time (8/13/2007). Douglas sent another nine pages of ignorance (a biblical charge for those who may not understand direct speech - Acts 17:23 and Galatians 3:1; cf. II Timothy 2:23). It was obvious that his intentions were to cause strife and have the meeting canceled for fear that you brethren might actually be taught something he cannot answer. If you will study a little about Diotrephes you’ll find a striking similarity in him and Douglas (III John 9-11). Read Matthew chapters 21-23 and you will see that I was more longsuffering, kind, gentle, and patient than Jesus was when facing utter stupidity like this. I can show many more examples that, if nothing else, prove I was too kind for too long (i.e. Titus 3:9-10). Study your Bible, not your self-appointed apostle who is leading you way down the wrong path. There is a godly time to be filled with indignation (Jeremiah 15:17), and I am there with this ridiculous garbage.

Finally, you stated in your letter that has been posted on the “World Wide Web”: “Praying fervently for your repentance”. If you believe I am lost and in need of repentance, then surely you will agree that a face to face study ought to occur **right away** (James 5:19-20 and Proverbs 27:1). I will not be of any expense to you to come and study with you. As soon as you say come, I will be there in about three days to study, just from the Scriptures (I Peter 4:11). I assure you that Douglas is very incapable of teaching and understanding this or any other issue related to the application of Bible Authority and he knows it. Such is why it took him 18 pages to say nothing about why you have the evening make-up there. This is the reason he doesn’t understand why I said: “you’re an ass” (Jeremiah 2:23-24 and Hosea 8:7-8). If Douglas refuses a discussion, and he will, my contact information is above. We will not banter back and forth in emails and arguments, but will get down to what God actually has said about this or any other matter in a real Bible study. Folks, you have wronged me in this matter. I am asking that we meet to scripturally resolve it (Galatians 6:1)!

Brotherly,

Brian A. Yeager

----- Original Message -----

From: [Brian A. Yeager](mailto:brian.a.yeager@wordsoftruth.net)

To: 'NSCOC'

Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2007 6:04 PM

Subject: FW: To the North Sparta Members...

Douglas:

You don't have to share this. I already have the addresses, email, and phone numbers of many members there. Some already have this letter. I hope they will talk with you and have you correct the errors of your ways. You need to repent and apologize to the brethren in Cookeville too for your lies about them and Rodney!

Sadly, I can see from how you have dealt with this and what others in your area say about you, that you likely have them in your pocket. I hope you are going to repent quickly and accept some help in learning much that you are extremely ignorant about so that you do not continue to mislead the people you are teaching (II Timothy 3:13). **Yes, you're still an ass** (go ahead, hang up and take the computer off the hook)! By the way, did you know that the book of Psalms is a SONG BOOK? I just thought you should know since you loudly proclaimed on a recorded sermon that there was no such thing in the Scriptures ;). That is just one of many, many, stupid things you said on "tape"!

Sincerely,

Brian A. Yeager

3917 Tierra Roman Dr.

El Paso, TX 79938

915-525-5794

brianyeager@wordsoftruth.net

www.wordsoftruth.net

Dear brethren,

8-28-07

If you have read the "discussion" between Mr. Yeager and myself, then you will easily see the difference in attitude and content. Mr. Yeager has given sufficient evidence to be classified with those in 1 Tim. 6:3-5, and has been so identified by North Sparta. I simply wanted to include his latest letters as documentation of things he said to me on the phone. I will also simply note replies here concerning his latest two letters.

Mr. Yeager writes that it is a shame for one to answer before he hears (Prov. 18:13). If Mr. Yeager would kindly apply this to himself, it would be helpful. In my letters, I addressed his doctrines. In his letters, he tends to pass over most of my rebuttals and opt for personal attacks and character assassination.

Mr. Yeager asserts that I have acted ungodly and carried out a "plan" to cancel his meeting. Let it be known that I was the one who first suggested that he come for a meeting. I was completely unaware of his doctrine on the Lord's Supper & of his caustic & belligerent attitude. As can be readily seen in the letters, I attempted to discuss this with him privately first.

When this did not work, I brought the matter to the men of this congregation, so that they may decide for themselves what to do in this case. The men unanimously agreed.

As for Mr. Yeager's allegation that I have violated Psalm 37:12, let's just read it. "The wicked plotteth against the just, And gnasheth upon him with his teeth." In all the above exchanges, who more closely fits with "plotting" and "gnashing" upon someone with their teeth? Not content with this, now Mr. Yeager attempts to stir up strife and turmoil in the congregation here. Such only gives further evidence that the congregation was correct in marking him as a factious man (Titus 3:10-11).

As for Mr. Yeager's concern that he first read of our letter online, while we are bound by God's word to identify false teachers, the specific method is not bound. We have pursued a reasonable course to inform him personally (regular mail), as well as a way to help distance our selves from him and his doctrinal position. It just so happens that Mr. Yeager found the time read the online post before he received it by regular mail.

As for the accuracy of the charge, there is no doubt that Mr. Yeager denies being a false teacher. I have allowed Mr. Yeager to speak for himself, hence the entire "discussion" is available.

Mr. Yeager asserts "For one, I do not bind what God has not bound. A congregation only has authority to assemble to partake of the Lord's Supper TOGETHER (Acts 20:7, I Corinthians 11:18; 20: 33). That is God's law, not mine. You cannot make-up the Lord's Supper because such an action violates the pattern (II Timothy 1:13) indicated of partaking together when assembling for that purpose (cf. Acts 20:7ff.)." He denies binding what God has not bound, then proceeds to do that very thing. His argument on "together" mistakes "when" for "how". Read the verses that he refers to (Acts 20:7, 1 Cor. 11:18, 20, 33). The context clearly identifies the "together" as "when", not "how". The Supper is therefore to be taken "when" we assemble. But if we wish to know "how" it is taken, we find that it is individually or distributively taken (1 Cor. 11:24-31). If this is not correct, then we must apologize to the one cup brethren and the no-Bible-class brethren; for they hold similar argument concerning the meaning of "together".

The truth is that Mr. Yeager errs in the same way they do. The similarity between them is that they all demand a specific permission for things that are already authorized by general authority. In doing this they forbid and condemn as sinful those who are not sinning. Even though this has all been addressed above, Mr. Yeager continues to pass over my rebuttals and simply repeat his arguments.

Mr. Yeager graciously assumes my motives when he says: "It was obvious that his intentions were to cause strife and have the meeting canceled for fear that you brethren might actually be taught something he cannot answer." He then humbly asserts: "...you will see that I was more longsuffering, kind, gentle, and patient than Jesus was when facing utter stupidity like this." Mr. Yeager evidently fails to see how his own words condemn him, as he continues: "I can show many more examples that, if nothing else, prove I was too kind for too long (i.e. Titus 3:9-10)." Yes, Mr. Yeager's problem is that he is too kind and too patient. He has verily spotted the problem (Prov. 26:4-5).

Mr. Yeager suggests that there is now an urgent need to meet face to face. It is a wonder that while Mr. Yeager previously and repeatedly declared how little time he has to waste on this matter, he now has sufficient time to come for an actual visit. But, considering that he has been marked for his doctrine and attitude, who of us can rightly receive him (2 John 9-11)?

Mr. Yeager has kindly documented his previous comments to me on the telephone, when he says: "This is the reason he doesn't understand why I said: 'you're an ass' (Jeremiah 2:23-24 and Hosea 8:7-8)." Is Mr. Yeager unable to perceive that "donkey" and "mule" express the Biblical point without the modern corrupt meaning that "ass" does (Eph. 4:29)? It is truly remarkable that Mr. Yeager would attempt to use these illustrations as justification for his language (Prov. 10:31-32).

Mr. Yeager kindly reports concerning his peaceable & pure conduct: “You don’t have to share this. I already have the addresses, email, and phone numbers of many members there. Some already have this letter. I hope they will talk with you and have you correct the errors of your ways. You need to repent and apologize to the brethren in Cookeville too for your lies about them and Rodney!” It is amazing that a man who refuses to reply to refutations of his views and who has declared that he has so little time to spend on this matter, has enough time to do all this (Prov. 6:19).

Mr. Yeager also offers a kind assessment of the brethren here: “Sadly, I can see from how you have dealt with this and what others in your area say about you, that you likely have them in your pocket.”

Mr. Yeager then repeats his telephone performance by saying: “**Yes, you’re still an ass** (go ahead, hang up and take the computer off the hook)!”

And finally, Mr. Yeager takes the time to actually reply to one of my arguments. He says: “By the way, did you know that the book of Psalms is a SONG BOOK? I just thought you should know since you loudly proclaimed on a recorded sermon that there was no such thing in the Scriptures ;). That is just one of many, many, stupid things you said on ‘tape’!”

I am sure that Mr. Yeager knows that the Psalms were originally written on scrolls, without four part harmony, and without shaped notes. Our modern format was not used in Bible times. If you will review the argument I made in my sermon, you will readily see that I did not say there were “no scrolls of songs” in the Bible. I said we do not read of “song books” in the Bible like the ones we use today. If observing the Supper Sunday evening in the assembly requires **specific** permission (when **general** authority already permits it), then we must equally demand **specific** authority for modern song **books**, four part harmony, etc. If Mr. Yeager can exclude what is generally authorized, should we not try to be consistent in applying this to other things? So, either Mr. Yeager must forbid what is **generally** authorized by God **or** he must also demand that our modern format be **specifically** permitted. If he grants general authority, then he grants **the principle** by which the “second offering” is permitted (Sunday, in the assembly). If he does not, then Mr. Yeager needs to repent of the “sin” of using **unspecified** things like our modern song books.

In closing, consider Paul’s words: “But not even Titus who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised: and that because of the false brethren privily brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage: to whom we gave place in the way of subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.” (Gal. 2:3-5)

In Paul’s day, there were those who bound what God did not bind. So it is in our day. The solution is to recognize that those who do this forfeit their claim of brotherhood, because they are not following Christ, but blazing their own trail. We must not give way to such people “no not for an hour”, that the truth may remain with us.

In Him,
Douglas