

Our purpose is to “earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints,” and to “prove all things; hold fast that which is good.”

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

“To continue speaking the truth in love,” “endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace,” “keeping the ordinance as delivered.”

“Thus saith the Lord, ‘stand ye in the ways, and see and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest of your souls.’ (Jer. 6:16) “And they that be of Thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The Repairer of the Breach, The Restorer of Paths to Dwell in.” (Isa. 58:12).

VOL. LXXXVIII

LEBANON, MISSOURI • JANUARY 2016

NO. 1

WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE?

By *JOHNNY ELMORE*

On occasions, I have been asked if I don't think God could have used evolution to bring human beings into existence. This is called “theistic evolution.” Some view it as a position between that of the absolute evolutionist and the creationist. Of course, if evolution has not occurred, then it is not necessary to deal with the question of theistic evolution.

Let me state unequivocally that I do not accept the theory of evolution. There are too many problems connected with it for me to accept it in any form. One of the greatest problems is that the evolutionist has no information or evidence about the beginning of life on earth. It is difficult for me to understand why men would subscribe to a theory that cannot be demonstrated or proved, but I personally believe that it is all due to a rejection of our benevolent Jehovah God.

All Bible-believers should be concerned about the negative effects of the general acceptance of the theory of evolution. Some of the most obvious trends are these: (1) the trend toward materialism with less and less emphasis upon spiritual concerns; (2) the trend away from the morality of the Bible and toward a greater degree of permissiveness; (3) the trend toward more and more crime until crime is presently rising faster than the population is growing; (4) the trend away from respect for all forms of authority, including that of parents, teachers, church leaders, and leaders of government;

(5) the trend toward less and less self-discipline, and (6) the trend toward atheism and the loss of religious faith.

It is my conviction that the widespread teaching and general acceptance of the theory of evolution is responsible in a major way for these trends. After all, if men are taught for several generations by men who are supposed to be leaders of thought that men descended from beasts, is it any wonder that men and women would come to behave like beasts?

What do you believe? Do you believe that man evolved from cold, dead matter, or do you believe that man exists because God created him? Look at these syllogisms:

Thinking beings cannot come from non-thinking beings. But, thinking beings exist. Therefore, thinking beings have always existed. Note again:

Something cannot come from nothing. But, something exists. Therefore, something has always existed.

Christians believe that something that has always existed is that self-existent, eternal God who created the heaven and the earth. Christians believe the statement in Genesis 1:27, “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. We believe Jesus when he said: “Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female” (Matthew 19:4). Jesus did not believe that Adam and Eve “evolved” from some lower form of life but that God “made them at the beginning.”

Brethren please note: We will be out of the Country for a while and Bro. Ronny Wade will be handling the paper in our absence. Until February 15 please send all material intended for publication to Ronny F. Wade, P.O. Box 14352, Springfield, MO 65814. rfwade@mchsi.com

CONTENTS

Vol. LXXXVIII No. 1



ADVOCATE

What do you Believe..... 1

Editorial 2

Querist Column..... 3

Announcements 3

Alleged Authority 4

Our Departed..... 9

FROM THE FIELDS 10

THE BACK PAGE..... 12

PUBLISHER

Don L. King
1147 Sherry Way, Livermore, CA 94550
Fax 925-454-8995

ASSISTANT PUBLISHER

Ronny F. Wade
P.O. Box 14352 Springfield, MO 65814

EDITORIAL STAFF

Bennie Cryer	Greg Gay
Billy Dickinson	Carl Johnson
Jerry Dickinson	Doug Hawkins
Johnny Elmore	Kevin Presley

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE WEBSITE:

www.oldpathsadvocate.org
Rick Martin, Website Publisher
Terry Studdard, Website Asst. Publisher
Brandon Steward, Webmaster

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Single Subscription One Year..... \$15.00
Also On The Internet
Published Monthly by **Old Paths Advocate**, Lebanon, MO
A.C. Brockman, 2033 King James, Lebanon, MO 65536
periodical postage paid at Lebanon, MO 65536
Send Form 3579 to **Old Paths Advocate**
1147 Sherry Way, Livermore, CA 94550.

All articles published in **Old Paths Advocate** contain the view of the writer and do not necessarily reflect the views of the editors and publishers. If you have any questions, please direct them to the author listed at the heading of the article.

Editorial

BIBLE STUDY OR A CLASS?

By Don L King

To thoroughly deal with the matter at hand is much too large for a short editorial, but it must be mentioned and perhaps more completely dealt with later. We would welcome writing from others about this.

Brethren, in a few places, have been known to cancel midweek services in favor of what they call "Bible Study." We don't mean to imply this is happening in more than a few instances, but we don't like to hear of this sort of thing at all. To cancel the normal midweek services and gather at the building or somewhere else and allow the women to participate in "Bible Study" is a serious matter. We believe they may not be aware of what they are really allowing to take place. Hence this editorial.

Our assumption is that some do not recognize what it takes to form an assembly. An assembly involves a coming together. Paul said, "If therefore the whole church be come together into one place,..." (1 Corinthians 14:23) He mentions the church coming together again in verse 26. When brethren of the church arrange a time and place for the members to come together, that coming together is an assembly of the church. Thayer says the meaning of "come together" is properly, or literally, "a gathering of citizens called out from their homes into some public place; an assembly;"(pages 195-196)

The point is that when the people are gathered together for the express purpose of rendering spiritual service an assembly has been formed and 1 Corinthians 14 regulates that assembly. What are the regulations given by inspiration? See 1 Corinthians 14:34, 35: "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." He wrote in 1 Timothy 2:11, 12, "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence."

We assume brethren believe that if they don't consider the gathering an assembly of the church, but only Bible study, then they are free to do as they please and no scripture regulates it. Is that the case? Not at all! Just because we don't call our gathering an assembly doesn't prove it isn't one. When the church calls the people together anywhere for the purpose of spiritual service an assembly has been formed and the women

continued on page eight

QUERIST COLUMN

By RONNY F. WADE

Question: Is silent prayer scriptural? Can we pray, not moving our lips, and expect God to hear us?

Answer: Yes, I believe silent prayer is scriptural and that God hears such prayers. In 1 Samuel 1:12-13 we read of the prayer of Hannah "And it happened, as she continued praying before the Lord, that Eli watched her mouth. Now Hannah spoke in her heart; only her lips moved, but her voice was not heard, Therefore Eli thought she was drunk."

This good woman poured out her heart, silently to the Lord. The Lord heard her prayer and according to verse 20 she gave birth to a son. It was probably a rare thing to see a woman offering prayer without audible words. Such prayer is a lifting up of the mind to God in actual or virtual supplication for what we need and desire. Desire is the soul of prayer. It arises from and is proportionate to the sense of need. The intensity of prayer is not always manifested by audible words; silence may actually increase the fervor of ones petition. Chapman in the Pulpit Commentary says "Prayer, though not in form of set phrase, is true worship when characterized by the features seen in that of the sorrowful woman: such as longing of the heart for a definite object, intense fervor of spirit, reverent submission to the will of God, profound regard in what is sought for the Divine glory, and directed to the source of all power through the mercy-seat of Christ." Prayers in the public assemblies of the church are, of course, audible since they are offered in behalf of the assembled church. Individually, however, one may pray silently whenever and wherever he may choose.

Question: Why do we worship on Sunday instead of on the Sabbath?

Answer: We have the only "time example" of when Christians are to worship given in Acts 20:7, on the first day of the week or Sunday. In 1 Corinthians 16:1-2 the apostle Paul commands that we take a collection, on the first day of the week, an order which he also gave to the churches of Galatia. According to Luke 24 Jesus rose from the grave on the first day of the week. In Acts 2 the first gospel sermon was preached on that day, and the church began on the same day. Since the beginning of the church, Christians have set aside the first day as a day of worship, and have a definite obligation to assemble with the saints for that purpose Hebrews 10:25. Why the "first day" and not the "seventh or Sabbath?" The Sabbath became law in Exodus 20. It was to remind the Jews that they were "resting" from Egyptian bondage

Deuteronomy 5:13-15. They were to rest, like God had previously rested on the seventh day after the creation of the world Ex. 20:11. It served as a sign between God and His nation Exodus 31:16-17. What would the reminder of Egyptian bondage have to do with us today? We were in bondage to sin, not Egypt. Our Lord conquered sin when He rose from the dead on the first day of the week. The Jews remembered deliverance from slavery on Saturday, we remember Christ who delivered us from sin on Sunday or the first day of the week. The Lord's Day is often mistakenly referred to as "the Christian Sabbath." The scriptures never refer to the first day of the week that way. In fact in Colossians 2:16-17 Paul wrote "Therefore no one is to act as your judge in regard to food or drink or in respect to a festival or a new moon or a Sabbath day, things which are a shadow of what is to come; but the substance belongs to Christ." The law, of which the Sabbath was a part, was nailed to the cross Colossians 2:14 'having wiped out the handwriting of requirements that was against us, which was contrary to us. And He has taken it out of the way, having nailed it to the cross.' Since the law which contained the Sabbath command has been abolished so also has the Sabbath observance itself. Today we follow the commands of the new covenant scriptures which enjoin upon us the duty of gathering together with other Christians to remember the death of our Lord on the first day of the week Hebrews 10:25, Acts 20:7. (Send all questions to Ronny F. Wade 2254 E. Raynell St. Springfield, MO 65804 or rfwade@mchsi.com)

Announcements

CARNAL WARFARE

We have received the following announcement From Andrew T. Pamplin 206 Old Camargo Rd. Fayetteville, TN. 37334. Although I am registered for selective service, I am a conscientious objector because of my faith in Jesus Christ. I know that I shouldn't engage in carnal warfare because 2 Corinthians 10:4 reads: "For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds." Also in Matthew 26:52 Jesus said that all who "... take the sword shall perish with the sword." I also recognize that we don't war according to the flesh even though we walk in the flesh, as stated in 2 Corinthians 10:3. Therefore, I believe carnal warfare is wrong. Since I am a Christian, I fight a spiritual war rather than a carnal one. Also, I am to love my neighbor as myself and believe that killing is wrong even if it is for the Country in which I live. I hope there will never again be a draft so I may live peacefully. However, I will obey God rather than men - Andrew T. Pamplin

ALLEGED AUTHORITY FOR MULTI-CUP COMMUNION

By Andrew Richardson

What authority do men have to use multiple cups of fruit of the vine during their congregation's observance of the Lord's supper? We all can surely agree that the Lord gets to decide how it must be observed; after all, it's His memorial, right? We do not have to swim the Atlantic to know that the manner in which Jesus performed the communion, in its institution, is the manner in which He desires it to be performed by us. Yes, He left us His example, and when He did so, He commanded, "This do in remembrance of me" (Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24-25). Jesus declared that if we're going to worship God, it "must" be in "spirit and truth" (John 4:23-24), and the word of God is truth (John 17:17); thus we must worship Him as His word dictates. Communion is an act of worship that must be performed faithfully to the scriptures. Paul praised the Corinthians for keeping the ordinances just as they were delivered (1 Cor. 11:2). He delivered to them the ordinance of the Lord's supper by giving them the example of Christ (vv. 23-25) in which one cup of fruit of the vine was used. Again, Paul has commanded to "hold the traditions" as they have been taught by his word or epistles (2 Thess. 2:15). It is a matter of reading plain English to know that Jesus used one cup of juice and commanded the assembled disciples to drink from that cup. Matthew tells us that He "took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it" (Matt. 26:27). The English Standard Version renders it clearer: "And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, saying, 'Drink of it, all of you...'" Mark informs us that He "took the cup... gave it to them," and they "all drank of it" (Mark 14:23). Luke says He "took the cup," saying "Take this, and divide it among yourselves," and that He said, "This cup is the new testament in my blood" (Luke 22:17,20), and Paul, consistent with their testimony, chronicles Jesus taking, "the cup," saying, "This cup is the new testament..." (1 Cor. 11:25) It's not rocket science!

Nevertheless, those who advocate individual-cup communion have presented alleged authority for their practice. Wayne Jackson, a writer and editor of the Christian Courier, offers some of the most common arguments in defense of this man-made tradition in an article he entitles, "Do the Scriptures Authorize Multiple Cups?"

Metonymy

Jackson begins with:

"When the New Testament speaks of the 'cup,' in the observing of the communion, it is not the literal container that is under consideration; rather, it is the contents, i.e., the fruit of the vine, that is in view. There is a common

figure of speech in the Bible called metonymy. The term means 'a change in name.' This figure is employed when one thing stands for another. One form of metonymy is where the container is put for its contents. This means that even though the container is mentioned, only the contents are actually under consideration"

His argument is this: the "cup" is used figuratively (a metonymy) in which the container is named to refer to its contents, the fruit of the vine; therefore, the cup itself means absolutely nothing to us. This is exactly what Jackson means, for he says, "it is the fruit of the vine that is in view," and "only the contents are actually under consideration." However, this is an irrelevant point, because the fact still remains that the fruit of the vine (which Jackson says is "in view") is in the cup (which is named) that Jesus picks up and incorporates into the observance. Regardless of whether the cup is named to suggest its contents or not, the reality of what Jesus does has not changed, and thus Jackson's argument goes nowhere. Jesus took a cup containing the juice of the grape, gave it to the disciples and told them to drink of it. When a congregation employs more than one cup, they violate the divine pattern of Christ; yes, they disobey the command to hold the ordinances as they are taught. Communion with multiple cups is not the ordinance Christ delivered to His apostles, and it is not what Paul delivered to the Corinthians. We do not get to decide how many cups to use -as insignificant as we presume to believe it is (Num. 24:13). It's Jesus' decision! He is the head of the church (Col. 1:18; 2:10) and has all authority (Matt. 28:18; Eph. 1:20-22); thus multiple communion cups must be authorized by Him (Col. 3:17). We are not allowed to add to that which is specified in the example because we must keep this ordinance as it is delivered. (See also Deut. 4:2; 12:32; Josh. 1:7) Our role is to do as we are told. The metonymy argument is a diversion; we focus our attention on an elaborate argument built upon grammar and figures of speech rather than simply reading what Christ did, adhering to His commands, and mirroring His model. Figures of speech do not change reality - calling the cup a metonymy will not cause the literal cup that Christ held in His hand to disappear.

A closer look at some examples of a metonymy in the communion passages will bring us right back to the same place-the fruit of the vine ("in view") is in one literal cup, and we must accept the divine pattern. In 1 Corinthians 10:21, Paul tells us that we cannot "Drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils." It is obvious that Paul does not suggest that we literally consume the container, so the language must be figurative, i.e., a metonymy. A person drinks a cup by drinking the liquid inside of the cup! (Remember when I said it's not rocket science!) Notice, however, that this involves the container. You cannot "drink a cup" unless the liquid you're drinking is in a cup, nor can you call the liquid by the cup's name unless it is in that cup. If I spill grape

juice on my shirt, I cannot sensibly say, "Oh, I got cup on my shirt!" The point is this: all Paul means by saying, "Drink the cup," is drink out of the cup. But did I really need to say all this? Isn't it true that you, the reader, really knew this basic, simple, natural, and logical truth? I have no doubt that you are well aware of what it means to "drink a cup." Nevertheless, Paul himself proves this to be what he means: in I Corinthians 11:26-27, Paul uses the same figurative language (drinking the cup), but in verse twenty-eight, he says it in its literal form: "...let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." Yes, indeed, he simply means drink of (or out of) the cup. Jackson makes much more out of a metonymy than he should.

There is another problem with Jackson's statement. He leaves the reader with the impression that the cup is always used as a metonymy - that it's always merely a reference to its contents. This, however, is not the case. Though the "cup" does suggest its contents in some instances, it also (as we would naturally expect) has reference to the actual cup. When the gospel writers inform us of what Christ took with His hand, they tell us it was a "cup." Would Jackson believe they were being figurative here? Are they not just describing Jesus' action? Indeed they are, and nobody unwilling to forfeit their credibility as a reasonable and honest person can deny that Christ took a literal cup of fruit of the vine. If the phrase "he took the cup" is figurative, then how would it be written for us to understand it to be literal? Jackson then says:

"It is quite obvious that the 'fruit of the vine' is the 'this,' which is the 'it,' which, in fact, is the 'cup.' Underline these various terms and the connection between them will be quite apparent."

Again, this is all irrelevant. Metonymy or no metonymy, Christ still took a cup of fruit of the vine, and this is the divine ordinance to which we must hold (2 Thess. 2:15). Jackson is taking us into a bunch of nothingness. Nevertheless, let's understand his argument here. His reasoning goes like this: the word "this" in "this is my blood" (Matt. 26:28) refers to the fruit of the vine in the cup, and grammatically belongs to the word "cup" (v. 27); therefore, "the cup" is really a reference to the fruit of the vine. So, what is Jackson really trying to say here? The cup doesn't exist? Or what? Is he trying to say Jesus took grape juice in the palm of His hand? He is adamant about the fruit of the vine being "in view" by the word "cup," so does he believe there is no cup? Is the fruit of the vine contained inside of the fruit of the vine? I will repeat it again: Jackson's point is to no avail. The truth is, at risk of redundancy, that the juice, which Jesus said represented His blood (v. 28), was in the cup He took (v. 27), and it was this cup from which He said, "Drink of it, all of you." It isn't any more complicated than that.

As inconsequential as Jackson's argument may be, is it correct? No, the "cup" in "He took the cup," refers to the actual cup, and the statement, "This is my blood," is in regard to the fruit of the vine it contained. This logic is easily realized in considering other examples similar to the account of the Lord's supper. Take this scripture for example:

"And being in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, as he sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard very precious; and she brake the box, and poured it on his head" (Mark 14:3).

Here, the word "it," which refers to the oil, grammatically belongs to "box", so according to Jackson's analysis, "box" refers to the oil. Does that make any sense? No, because oil isn't something that can be "broken." You see (very naturally) that the box means and refers to the literal box, while its pronoun ("it") refers to the oil which is revealed earlier in context. Likewise, the "cup" means just what it says - a cup - and its pronoun in verse twenty-eight refers to the fruit of the vine. One more example:

Bill opened the bottle and said, "This is going to taste great! No wine tastes better than this." Jackson's rationale would conclude that because "this" refers to the wine, then the "bottle" is the wine also, but it is apparent that "bottle" refers to the actual container - because it is "opened" - and its pronoun, "this," refers to the wine which it contains.

Since much of this discussion centers around grammar and language, I thought I would contact some men who are well-studied in the field of the English language to get their evaluation of the passages in question and also concerning metonymy usage. I present my questions and their responses for your consideration:

Concerning Matthew 26:27-28, I asked Terrell Tebbetts, Professor of English, of Lyon College of Batesville, AR, the following four questions:

1. In verse 27, strictly according to grammar, is the word "cup" being used literally; that is, does it mean and refer to a literal drinking vessel?

"I understand 'cup' to be used literally, not figuratively, in that verse." T.T.

2. In the command, "Drink ye all of it," is Jesus commanding them to drink out of and from a literal drinking vessel?

"Yes." T.T.

3. If the word "cup" is the proper antecedent of the word "this" in verse 28, does "this" refer by metonymy to the contents of the cup?

“Yes.” T.T.

4. For the metonymy in verse 28 to exist, must the contents being suggested necessarily be contained in the cup that is named?

“Yes.” T.T.

Also, I sent the following question to English Professor, Steven Justice:

“Can a pronoun be figurative while having its antecedent used literally? Example:

Take the kettle off the stove when it boils.”

Justice’s answer:

“Yes it can. Notice that you could rephrase your example sentence ‘Take the kettle off the stove when the kettle boils’; in this case, the second instance of ‘kettle’ would be used metonymically. The pronoun is as much a metonymy in your example as the second instance of the noun is in the rephrased version. I hope this helps.” Steven Justice, Professor of English, Berkeley University

Justice says it’s the “pronoun” which is a metonymy; in other words, the pronoun “it” refers to the contents of the kettle, but the word “kettle” itself means the literal container. The example says that the actual, physical kettle is to be taken off the stove when its contents boil. Also notice that in Justice’s rephrased example that the word “kettle” is used twice, but he says it’s the “second instance” that is used metonymically. Even if a noun is used more than once in the same sentence, each case must be judged separately (including pronouns). Jackson’s logic, that if “this” refers to the contents, then “cup” must refer to the contents also, is wrong.

Let’s take a deeper look at the underlying Greek and its grammar. I reached Dr. Gary T. Medors, Professor of the Greek New Testament at Grand Rapids Theological Seminary, about the quantity of items Jesus used. According to his examination, he says:

“The Greek terms for bread and cup in the two passages are all in the singular. It seems clear that Jesus worked from one loaf and one cup in this event. This seems confirmed since ‘all’ were to eat/ drink from these singular items. Further research about the supper and its procedures would require looking at Jewish sources since the passover Jesus celebrated had standard traditional procedures.”

Also, I asked Dr. David A. Waite, Expert of New Testament Greek and English Translations, and Director of the Dean Burgon Society, the following questions

concerning Matthew 26:7-29 and Mark 14:23-25:

1. “He took the cup (poterion)...” Did Jesus take a literal cup or drinking vessel?

“I believe this is what it means. DAW”

2. “...gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of (ek) it (autos)...” Did Jesus hand them a literal cup?

“I believe this is what it means. DAW”

3. Did Jesus command all of them to literally drink OUT OF the very same drinking vessel He handed them?

“I believe this is what it means. DAW”

4. “...and they all drank of (ek) it...” Did they all literally drink OUT OF that very same drinking vessel?

“I believe this is what it means. DAW”

Divide it among yourselves

Jackson continues on:

“That the ‘cup’ is not the container is even more vividly depicted in Luke’s record. He states that Jesus ‘received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves.. .’ (Luke. 22:17). The Greek word for ‘divide’ is diameizo, which means to ‘divide up’ or to ‘separate into parts’ (cf. Mt. 27:35).”

If this is what Jackson believes, then the question is this: does his congregation follow this method? Do they begin with a cup of fruit of the vine and then “divide” that cup by pouring it into others? Most assemblies that use individual cups do not do this; they begin from the get-go with multiple containers.

Clearly, no matter how you dice it, those who observe the multi-cup tradition do not accept any significance in the pattern that Christ presented. They do not consider there to be any importance in how He did it. Simply put, they do not keep the ordinances as they are delivered, neither do they hold the traditions as they have been taught by the epistle, nor do they obey the command to all drink from one cup.

It is true that a cup can be divided by pouring it into other containers, but is that what Christ intended by His command? It is what He meant by His words that matters. Before He gave it to them, He said, “This cup is the new testament in my blood” (1 Cor. 11:25). We do not need an English professor to tell us how many cups of juice Jesus had in mind by that statement; He did not say “these cups.” So, was “this cup” not divided among the twelve by the act of drinking?

“And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it” (Mark 14:23).

Considering that a cup, by definition, is a drinking vessel, this is the most reasonable conclusion. If Jesus had intended to have the disciples drink from their own cups, why on earth did He hand them His? Moreover, if there were other cups sitting on the table, how much more significant does it become that He did so? Did He give them His cup just to have them use their own cups anyway? The “cup” is mentioned twelve times in the communion scriptures and never in the plural form. Isn’t the Holy Spirit trying to tell us something about the quantity? Outside of the communion context, the scriptures do present instances of multiple cups, such as in Mark 7:4,8. So, it’s no question that when the authors have more than one cup in mind they know how to write it as such. Note that the New American Standard Version, Good News Bible, New Living Translation, God’s Word Translation, Weymouth New Testament, and the World English Bible, among others, render this verse using “share,” rather than “divide.” (Note: The various Bible versions were cited for comparison only and not because this author believes they are reliable translations as a whole.)

Jackson listed a legitimate definition of “diemerizo,” but there are others that he did not list. Various definitions for “diemerizo,” according to lexicons, are to divide into apposing parts, to be at variance, in dissention, to cleave asunder, cut in pieces, to share, and distribute, etc. The honest approach is to search for the intent of Jesus in His command and then decide what definition or definitions match closest to it.

Arndt and Gingrich Greek - English Lexicon (from of Walter Bauer’s 5th edition):

(diemerizo)

Share with someone Lk. 22:17 (p.186)

Notice here that Arndt and Gingrich give “share with someone” as the meaning of “divide” in Luke 22:17. This lexicon, of course, is not the final authority, but according to the context, the intent of Christ, and the harmony of the other gospel accounts of communion, “share” is closest to the correct idea. This harmonizes with Matthew, Mark, and the whole context of the communion. After all, we read of how the apostles responded to the command: “he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it” (Mark 14:23).

The Corinthian-Ephesian Argument

Jackson explains further:

“That the term ‘cup’ is not to be pressed as a container is evident from Paul’s use of the term in one of his

epistles. During the apostle’s three and one-half year residence in Ephesus (Acts 19:1ff), he penned a letter to the saints in Corinth, across the Aegean Sea some 250 miles to the west. Therein he said: ‘The cup [singular] of blessing which we [plural] bless..’ (1 Cor. 10:16). Note the terms ‘cup’ and ‘we.’ It is obvious that ‘cup’ cannot refer to a container, as evidenced by the fact that Paul in Ephesus, and his brethren at Corinth, were sharing (note the ‘we’) the same ‘cup,’ i.e., a common substance (fruit of the vine), which reflects a spiritual idea, namely the blood of Christ, not a common container.”

In other words, Jackson says the “cup” cannot mean an actual physical cup since Paul and the Corinthians were too far apart to bless the same literal cup. It’s understood that the two assemblies were not blessing the same cup, but neither were they blessing the same fruit of the vine; each congregation had its own! So, what’s good for the goose is good for the gander. In whatever sense the fruit of the vine is being blessed by both congregations, the cup that contains it can be blessed in the same. So, Jackson’s argument that Paul’s statement forces the “cup” to mean only the contents hits a dead end. Once again, Jackson has failed to abolish the most important fact- the cup from which Jesus commanded the assembled to drink was an actual cup. It was a literal cup containing literal fruit of the vine, and each assembly’s observance of communion must adhere to that command. When Paul says, “the cup of blessing,” he is indeed referring to an actual cup -the cup of fruit of the vine that is blessed during communion. The two congregations were performing the same act-blessing the “cup of blessing,” but they were doing so in two separate occurrences. If Wayne Jackson raises his children in his house and I raise my children in my house, then I can sensibly say, “The house in which we live is where our children are raised.” This language does not force the word “house” to be figurative, nor does it mean both Jackson and I live in the same house. However, if I were to say, “Wayne Jackson bought a house and gave it to his children,” then this would refer to a single house, and likewise, when we are told, “... He took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, saying, “Drink of it, all of you,” only one cup is meant.

In correcting the Corinthians on communion (their attitude and form), Paul offers them the example (the same one we find in the gospels) of Jesus as the solution (1 Cor. 11:24-25). In it, Paul chronicles one cup: “After the same manner also he took the cup”..., and “this cup is the new testament in my blood.” Nothing in it allows the idea that multiple cups of juice were employed by Christ and the disciples. (Again notice the contrast between this and Mark 7:4,8) For Paul, this example was the solution to their problem. It is the solution to our disagreements as well; let’s follow it and end our divisions. Next, Jackson says:

“Moreover, in the context just cited, just as Paul uses

'cup' figuratively, so also does he employ the term 'table' symbolically (1 Cor. 10:21). It is no more logical to press the idea that 'cup,' i.e., container, has some mystical meaning, than it is to insist that 'table' has a spiritual significance."

Jackson's argument that the cup is here "figurative" (metonymy) has not been proven, but even if it is, the act that Jesus took a literal cup containing literal fruit of the vine still remains. Also, if it were true that the cup has no spiritual significance, this does not negate the fact that we still must follow the example.

We must still worship in "truth." We must still hold the traditions as they are taught in the epistles. Additionally, when there is a command involving an object, that action must be performed regardless of whether the object has spiritual significance or not. The upper room in which Jesus instructed the disciples to prepare the Passover (Mark 14:15) had no spiritual significance, but was required by His command. Concerning the cup of fruit of the vine Christ gave them, the command was 'Drink of it, all of you...' When we assemble to commemorate the death of Christ, we must follow this example and obey the command. As far as the cup by itself, i.e., the container alone, having any spiritual significance, it is the cup with its contents that has significance. Jackson would deny this, but let Christ have the final say: "This cup is the new testament in my blood..."

What about the "Lord's table"? In context, Paul was teaching that Christians cannot be in union with Jesus while partaking in idolatry. The "cup of the Lord," "cup of the devils," "Lord's table," and "table of devils," are terms used in explaining this contradictory fellowship. To partake with the Lord is to partake at His "table" (Luke 22:30). When a congregation assembles to break bread in remembrance of Christ, the cup of juice which they bless is the "cup of the Lord." When we drink of it, we drink with the Lord (Matt. 26:29). The literalness or figurativeness of the "Lord's table" has no effect on the fact that the cup which Jesus took in the institution of His memorial was real.

SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE IN UNITY

Having said this, there is a spiritual significance Jackson has missed by looking only at the "container" - the unity of the assembly partaking of the symbolic blood of Christ from the common cup. The very word communion presses a unity and joint-participation which is forfeited in the use of multiple cups of fruit of the vine. Those who think like Jackson have taken an act designed to be a "communion" and have made it an act of individualism. Instead of coming together to drink of one common cup, they come together to drink of their own individual cups. Thus they have defeated the need to come together at all for the event.

Jackson concludes:

"A reasonable interpretation of the scriptural data relative to the Lord's supper would indicate that the

use of multiple containers in the distribution of the fruit of the vine is an optional expediency which may be employed at the discretion of the worshippers..."

What Jackson calls a "reasonable interpretation of the scriptural data" is actually just sophistry and a misunderstanding of grammar. What he calls an "optional expediency" is really an unlawful expediency. He presents multiple cups as an aid rather than an addition, but in another article he authored, Jackson accurately defines the difference between the two:

"An addition occurs when a particular action has been altered, or the fundamental composition or substance of a thing has been changed. An aid alters nothing; it merely facilitates the implementation of the action or substance, without changing anything" (Aid or Addition - What is the difference?).

According to his own words, Jackson has added to the Lord's divine example. He says an addition is when a "particular action has been altered." What was the action of Jesus? "He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them..." Jackson's assembly takes cups and distributes them. The quantity of cups is specified in the passages, and those akin to Jackson's modus operandi have added to the number decided by Jesus.

At the end of the day all the points Jackson lists fall short in providing the justification he needs. The individual-cup communion is an anti-scriptural tradition that violates the divine pattern of Christ. The Biblical authors, moved by the Holy Spirit, wanted us to know that it was a cup of fruit of the vine that Jesus used. Since He commanded the disciples to all drink out of it, they found it necessary that we should know such; otherwise, how could we follow the example and obey the command? Yes, they have not failed at delivering us "all instruction in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3:16), and "all things that pertain to life and godliness" (2 Pet. 1:3).



EDITORIAL . . . continued from page two

must remain silent. Someone may object: "But this gathering is private." Is it really? Think about this: when the church agrees and arranges a time and place for brethren to assemble how can that be private? Will an outsider be turned away? Just because it may be in a private home doesn't mean the gathering is private. Keep in mind that the church may gather for worship in a private dwelling, and often did so in New Testament times, but the public was certainly invited and often attended. Many of our brethren in the Philippines meet for public worship in private homes out of necessity. However, the public is certainly invited and encouraged to attend. Most of the cases we have heard about in the USA, the gatherings for "Bible Study" were planned by

the church, the time set by the church, and the gathering for Bible Study was often announced before the assembly at an earlier time. It often is also announced in church bulletins. Our digressive brethren often claim their Bible Classes are private; but the public is invited by their signs, and in their church bulletins, the time shown, and everyone is urged to attend.

No one denies there is a place where women may teach, and where they may teach they may teach anyone. She may teach a woman privately and informally (Titus 2:3-5). However, this passage doesn't authorize a formal Bible study class for her to do so. Very likely, the teaching she may do according to this passage is by her daily example, her life, before the younger women. She may also teach a child as did Lois and Eunice in the teaching of the child Timothy (2 Timothy 1:3-5; 2 Timothy 3:15). Timothy was not taught in a Bible class, but at home and in private by his loving mother and grandmother. A woman may even teach a man privately and informally as did Aquila and his wife Priscilla. This couple took Apollos aside, in a private and informal manner, and "expounded unto him the way of the Lord more perfectly." This event took place in Ephesus and they did not organize a "Bible Study." The church did not arrange anything. This couple just quietly took him aside informally and taught him privately. Women can do a wonderful work at home and in private. In fact, we're living in a time when this tremendous responsibility has largely gone lacking. There can be but little doubt we have young people adrift in a world of sin today who might have been strong church members if only their loving mothers had taught them at home. Folks may just get caught up in the busy schedule of life and the children pay a terrible price.

Obviously, there is nothing wrong with brethren having a private Bible study with someone. This often takes place and is a valuable tool for converting the lost. However, such studies normally take place at home or in a private place, the public is not invited nor are they announced at the services of the church. Such studies are not advertised in any way because they are truly private and informal. We don't want to be misunderstood. These studies are not wrong and not under question in this editorial. However, when the public services are set aside in favor of a gathering where the women are participating in an activity where the public knows about it, the time and place arranged by the church, what happens is not a study but a Bible class. That is unscriptural and needs to end.

We are convinced that the little used practice of congregations abandoning some church services in favor of structuring a place and time for women to participate cannot be found in the Scriptures. May the Lord bless us all that we do not fall prey to the wiles of

the Devil. He never sleeps and he never stops the efforts to pull the faithful away from the pattern shown in the Bible. Think on these things. DLK

Our Departed

Darrell Ray Gould-of Ada, OK was born June 17, 1936. He departed this life on Oct. 29, 2015. Darrell is survived by his wife Rosa of the home, two daughters Tern Phillips and her husband Jim and Dahlra Campbell and her husband Clayton both of Ada. A son, Troy Gould and his wife Doris of Bo Ko She, OK. Darrell also leaves 11 grandchildren and 23 great grandchildren plus a host of brothers and sisters in Christ and personal friends. The best way that I can explain Darrell is that he was part of a dying breed. A man's man, lively and full of fun who worked in the pipe line business and lived a rough and tumble life until he met "Sweet" Rosa! He was 17 years old and Rosa was 18 when they were married. He would tell you himself that Rosa saved his soul and probably his life thus she was always "Sweet" Rosa to Darrell. On the exterior Darrell was loud, often offensive with his humor, but under the surface he was a tender hearted, caring man who worried that someone would not understand his rough nature-their feelings would be hurt and they would be offended. As quick as he was to speak out he was just as quick to apologize if he thought someone was hurt. Darrell was trying. Darrell and Rosa were certainly "old school" when it came to their marriage. When they said "I do" to "in sickness and in health until death us do part" they meant it. I have never seen a more devoted wife than Rosa. She literally sat by his side for almost two years when Darrell got sick. It was a long hard struggle for them both but Sweet Rosa was there to bring him through. No more carrying around an oxygen tank, no more struggling for his next breath, no more broken bones. "We sorrow not as others who have no hope." It was an honor for me to reminisce with some personal stories and what I hope were words of encouragement at the funeral of one of my all time best friends and brother in Christ - Darrell Gould. Joe Hisle

Bob Keesee was born October 24, 1936 and departed this life November 30, 2015 after a long battle with cancer. Those who knew Bob know that there will never be another like him. His smile and joy for life permeated his personality. As a child I remember thrilling to his singing and guitar playing and as an adult I thoroughly enjoyed just being around and visiting with him and my Aunt Wanda. I know I speak for the family when I say that Uncle Bob will be sorely missed. But even beyond the family, the church and brotherhood will miss this great man. For as long as I can remember Bob was

the main leader at the Gentry Street Church of Christ in Henryetta, Oklahoma. Through good times and bad Uncle Bob was a fixture at that congregation and stood faithfully even as others departed from the faith. Whether gospel meetings in the area that I held or bigger meetings in our brotherhood, Bob and Wanda were always present. He leaves in his passing my dear Aunt Wanda and their two daughters (Karen and Lisa) and a host of kindred and friends. I was honored to conduct Bob's service and share memories and God's Word with the large crowd, that gathered. Please keep my Aunt Wanda in your prayers and also pray for the congregation at Henryetta. <http://www.rogersfuneralhomeinc.com/obituaries/Robert-Keese-2/>
Mike Criswell

Pate, Christine, was born January 22, 1921 to Cyrus and Nanny Burkett near Kinston, AL. She died November 10th at Bryant, AL. She was joined in marriage to Ray Pate February 7, 1942. To this union one son (Larry), was born, who with his wife diligently cared for her until her death. Along with Larry and Linda she left to mourn her passing, two granddaughters Kim and husband Tim, and Christy and husband Scott. Four great grandchildren, a host of family, friends and fellow Christians also share in sorrow. She was preceded in death by her parents; two sisters Leville (husband Edison) Thompson and Margaret (husband Gene) Cumba. She obeyed the Gospel as a teenager near Earlytown, Al, being baptized into Christ by Clovis Cook in Flat Creek. Along with her father, mother and sisters they began meeting in their home in Florida. As the church grew they became what is now the Longwood Congregation. Christine was devoted to the Lord, her family and in serving her brethren and sisters. It was my pleasure to spend many weeks in the Pate home where hospitality reigned with joy and laughter being very much a part of life. Thank God for women like her who taught younger women the virtues of Christ by her behavior (Tit. 2:3-5). Barney Owens

Sister Roberta Cromer passed from this life on October 4, 2015 at the exact age of 91 having been born on October 4, 1924. She lived a full life as the wife of a very faithful man and member of the Walnut Grove congregation. She and brother Ed Cromer were married on July 4, 1940. She raised five children and gave herself to serve the Church and her family her whole adult life. She will be missed. Many of us who preach the gospel have enjoyed her hospitality and kindness through the years. Sister Roberta epitomized her generation perfectly - faithful, kind, honest, industrious, and humble. Only the Lord knows for certain, but surely she will be among those Saints who go marching in. May the Lord bless her family to continue to live by what they've seen in their mother and grandmother. Doug Hawkins

Field Reports

Don L. King, 1147 Sherry Way, Livermore, CA 94550, oldpaths December 15- The old year is about finished and a new one is on the horizon. I hear people say this all the time but it seems just yesterday we were saying this about 2015. Job said of his days: "My days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle,..." (Job 7:6) So much remains to be done and we pray the Lord will give us time to accomplish what He needs us to do. The church in Livermore continues in peace for which we are grateful. Last weekend we enjoyed hearing Cole and Greg Branch on a Saturday and Sunday. Both did very well and we are the better for having heard them. Our trip to the Philippines is drawing near and while we are away Bro. Ronny Wade will handle the publishing of the OPA, our thanks to him for his faithful help. Be sure to send him all materials intended for publication until after February 15. You may then resume sending to me in CA. His address is on the front page of this issue as well as on page 2 under his name. Preachers, please send us reports and articles for the paper as often as possible. May the Lord bless us all in 2016.

Douglas T. Hawkins 409 Worthington Pl Richmond, KY 40475 (859) 353-2538 douglast69@bellsouth.net December 1, 2015: Another year winds its way down and I hope that our service in the Kingdom has been what we hoped for at the beginning of the year. Paul's words about it being "high time to awake out of sleep" remain true and as we age and as time continues to pass those words sound more loudly and clearly. Truly, our salvation is nearer than when we believed. At this reading (if the Lord Wills and our plans hold true), I will have been with the brethren at Brazil, IN the first weekend in December. I've held a couple of meetings with these brethren in years past and each time I've been there, Lori and I have been expecting. They've been humoring me about whether I should attempt another visit or not. Well, I'll do what I can to grow the church one way or another. I'm looking forward to meetings in 2016. I plan to be with the congregations at Ada, OK (Young people's meeting); Blanchester, OH; Weatherford, TX; San Antonio, TX; Piedmont, AL; Livermore, CA; Neosho, MO; and Longwood, FL. My brethren have been very good to me and I thank God for you. I thank God that he allows us to labor together and to encourage one another in the faith. May God bless you in His service.

Johnny Elmore, 419 K SW, Ardmore, OK 73401 Johnnyelmore@gmail.com, December 9 -- since last report, it was my privilege to speak in a gospel meeting September 30-October 4 at Turlock, CA. I was happy to be accompanied by Matthew Barnes, a young gospel preacher from Grapevine, TX. We enjoyed staying with

Richard and Glenda DeGough, who are friends of long standing. It was so good to see so many friends who came to the meeting. Many thanks to Rod Nelson who drove us to and from the airport. My next meeting was at Glendale, AZ October 15-18, where Art Lynch has done a good work in establishing a congregation there. My conviction is that we will continue to hear good things about his efforts there. I enjoyed attending some of the study at Shreveport, LA, accompanied by John Skinner of our congregation. It was a joy to be there and hear some of our younger brethren speak. I held a meeting at Paris, TX October 4-8. As always in the past, it was good to be there in the fellowship of this congregation. Last Sunday, I spoke at Ada, OK. I look forward to the preacher's study at Grapevine, TX December 21-24 and the New Year meeting in Oklahoma City, December 27-31. It has been a busy year for me and I am so very thankful to be used to preach the gospel. I can hope that some good was done by my efforts.

Billy D. Dickinson, 2850 N. Oakland, Springfield, MO65803, bddickinson@juno.com, Dec. 12-- At this writing we are a little less than three weeks away from the new year. As I reflect upon the last twelve months, 2015 has been a hard year for my family in some ways, but the blessings of God have also been abundantly apparent. My wife, Judy, had surgery back in February to reverse a colostomy, getting the year off to a rough start, but that is behind her now. In fact, she suffered no setbacks from either of the two surgeries and we have so much to be thankful for. Not long after that, my mother fell and broke her hip in March and, due to age and other health issues, my parents moved to an assisted living facility in Midlothian, TX. They are content with this new arrangement, receiving good care and worshiping at the Cleburne congregation, and this has turned out to be a great decision for them. Incidentally, my meeting at Cleburne back in July was most enjoyable and productive. This is where Melvin Blalock lives and labors, someone who has been a dear friend for many years, and it was thrilling to see how the church there is growing. At the end of the meeting there was a family who took their stand with the congregation in regard to scriptural worship. I am now looking forward to my meeting schedule for 2016: March 2-6 at Buffalo, MO; April 15-17 at Texarkana, TX; June 17-19 at Pleasant Hill, MO; July 27-31 at Fort Worth, TX (Fossil Creek); Sept. 14-18 at Fieldstone, MO. Before I end this report, I want to express my appreciation for the work that Don King and Ronny Wade do every month in publishing the OPA. Those of us who are contributing editors are responsible for writing articles and sending them in quarterly (at least), but their work is continuous on almost a daily basis, My prayer is that the Lord will bless us all in 2016

Darrell Crawford 208 E Baldwin Rd Unit S, Panama City, FL. 32405 bugz1955@hotmail.com December 3rd, 2015 It seems as though the year has just started, and now we are preparing for the annual New Year's meeting in Dothan, Al. The Lord has been good to us here in this part of the country, another year and still no hurricanes or tropical storms! The church here is growing spiritually, for this we are most thankful to our Lord. We also can see some physical growth on the horizon, again to God be the glory. Recently we were privileged to be at Pansey, Alabama and at Grapevine, Texas to worship to speak at both congregations. We also were able to attend the 17th annual preachers study at the Queensborough congregation in Shreveport, La. and are continuing to do whatever we can for the church to spread the gospel in our community. Please continue to pray for the work here and for our health as well, we are both continuing to have some health issues. I am still available for a few meetings if anyone happens to have any openings. Preaching the gospel is what I have always wanted to do since I was a child. The Lord has surely blessed in that way. May our Lord continue to bless His church everywhere.

Greg Gay, November 18, 2015. It has been some time since my last report. In July, Cassie and I travelled to Alaska with her dad, Ervin Baker and one of our grandsons, Alex Gay. We were with the brethren near Seattle the first Sunday of our journey and enjoyed our brief visit with all who were there. The next Lord's Day we were with the brethren in Kenai, AK. What a delightful day! All gathered for a meal at the Charles Daniel home and enjoyed a great afternoon. We were in Alaska nearly two weeks, stayed in five different places, and drove over 1,300 miles, but only saw a tiny piece of this beautiful and vast part of God's creation! We brought home many special memories, beautiful pictures, and some great salmon and halibut. Most recently, we enjoyed being with the Green Oaks congregation in Arlington, TX the first week of November. I appreciate their present faithfulness and their wisdom in the past in standing up for the truth and refusing to go along with the error that swept through this region like a storm in the last decade. It was wonderful to see the many who came from near and far to attend the meeting including preachers Melvin Blalock and Clint De France. Green Oaks is blessed to have very capable leadership and preachers Joe Norton and Nathan Battey who both work ably in the congregation. Joe and Jo Ann Norton were our excellent hosts for our time there. Our work continues with the 64th St. congregation in Sacramento. We did a mailing in August to the leads generated in the area by the TV program and had over 20 respond with an interest in the materials we offered. Other recent month's preaching opportunities have included Ada, OK plus Clovis, Yuba City and Redding in California. 1820 Casterbridge Dr., Roseville, CA papagreg@aol.com

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE (USPS 407-560)

If the date near your name and address reads 01-16 your subscription expires with this issue. Please renew promptly. DLK
Send all subscriptions to: Matt Martin @
1000 Stonecroft Ln., Woodstock, GA 30188

THE BACK PAGE...

NEVER TRUST A SHORT MAN

By *CARL M. JOHNSON*

Darrell Gould married my sister Rosa in 1954 when they both were about 18 years-old and I was about 6 years-old. For as long as I can remember Darrell always had an affinity for things that were big. He bought the biggest tractor he could get. He wanted his tomatoes to be bigger than the neighbors' tomatoes. He was a hunter and fisherman and he was always looking to catch the biggest fish and to shoot the biggest deer. He saw a giant buck that he named "Old Big One" on his property south of Ada, and he stalked it until he bagged it one night. He went to North Dakota to hunt elk and bagged one with the "biggest rack of antlers on record."

Darrell also liked big and tall people. In his prime he stood 6'2" and weighed up to 240 pounds. In high school I grew to be 6' 1" which is two inches taller than my two older brothers and Darrell used to razz them about being "muffets" (his expression for short people). One day I walked into his office downtown while he was on the phone with Rosa and he laughed and told her, "I better go, your GIANT brother just walked in."

One of Darrell's favorite sayings was, "Never trust a short man." I do not think he was actually prejudiced against short people. He was given to exaggeration and he would often embellish a story or make a radical statement just to startle the listener.

Legendary entertainer Jack Benny portrayed himself as being stingy and he built a career upon that image. Yet, in reality it is reported that he was very charitable with his money.

The same was true of Darrell. He would usually have a glint in his eye and a mischievous grin on his face when he emphatically uttered the words, "Never trust a short man." It was done to perpetuate the persona he had cultivated about big things being the only good things. Years ago, a preacher made the observation in one of his sermons that the Apostle Paul may have stood only 4'6". After services Darrell had a forlorn expression on his face and he told me as he walked by, "I wish he hadn't said that about Paul being a short man. I'm not sure I think as much of him now as I did before."

The Bible does not mention anything specifically about Paul's physical characteristics. However, there is an uninspired document dating from the middle of the second century called "The Acts of Paul and Thecla," that claims to know. According to the document, Onesiphorus is waiting to receive Paul in Iconium. Onesiphorus does not know what Paul looks like, but is given a description by Titus to look for a man who is "small in size (short), bald-headed, bandy-legged (bow-legged), with eyebrows meeting, and a rather long nose" (Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. 8, p.487).

According to authorities, the average height of Semitic men in the First Century was 5'2". If the above document can be believed and Paul was considered a short man, some authorities conclude he may have been only 4' 6" or 4' 8".

Darrell grew up rough and tough while working for his father who was a foreman for Park Hill Pipeline. When he was 12 years-old he began driving a truck and he developed into an expert crane operator. Eventually, the pipeline job brought him through Ada where he met my sister and they married after a whirlwind courtship. He had no real spiritual moorings at the time, but he had a tender heart. He attended worship with Rosa, fell in love with the preaching of the gospel, and was baptized into Christ by Lynwood Smith.

At that point he began an incredible spiritual journey. He was an early riser and would begin his day in his office alone by listening to a chapter of the audio Bible and spending quiet time in prayer. He was one of our most faithful members. He never missed a service if he was physically able to attend. He contributed liberally to the church as he prospered financially. He waited on the table and worded prayers in public. He was hospitable. He enjoyed keeping preachers and young people during gospel meetings.

As he grew spiritually Darrell changed his perspective of the apostle Paul. Paul may have been a short man physically, but he stood tall spiritually--a giant!

Three years ago at Thanksgiving Darrell weighed about 240 pounds. Nephew Steve Morgan observed, "Darrell is amazing. He is 76 years-old, but he looks and works like he is 55!"

It was right after that Thanksgiving that Darrell began his three-year battle with the disease that took his life on October 29. When he died he weighed about 120 pounds. He still stood tall spiritually, however, as he anticipated with peace and confidence the crown of righteousness reserved in heaven (2 Tim. 4:8). cmjthebackpage@gmail.com