

~~xxxxxx~~ people should share in the exercise of power. Now this the Scripture does not anywhere specifically discuss, as a matter of a problem. But the ~~Scripture~~ Scripture ~~is~~ is one, God's Word is a unit. God is One. He applies conditions differently in different situations. But His principles are one, His Word is one, His authority is one. And the ~~question~~ question how many people should exercise power, ~~if~~ if you simply take the ~~Acts~~ Acts and the epistles, you can find there no evidence that I know of, of any time when any one ~~indiv~~ individual had the right to act authoritatively. Unless it would be, of course, an apostle acting as an apostle. And even then it is questionable how much an apostle did as an ~~indiv~~ individual as an authority. It is questionable. But as to established routine in the church, there is no evidence in the Acts or the epistles of any church which had one minister. Which had one man who had an authoritativaive position different from that of any other in the particular church. There is no such evidence in the Acts or in the ~~epistles~~ epistles. Absolutely none. And there is evidence that the churches had elders or bishops. Whichever you call them. But every time they are spoken of, it is a group. It is never an individual. The evidence is strong for a group eldership. And non-existent for an individual ministry in a church, as ~~far~~ far as the ~~Acts~~ Acts and epistles are concerned.

Now, if we had nothing else except Acts or the ~~epistles~~ epistles, we might be justified in asking the question, is it then wrong to have a minister, a pastor, a teaching elder, who is the ~~official~~ official leader of a church. We might be justified to ask that question, if we had nothing but ~~the~~ the Acts and the epistles. But the Acts and the epistles are only a part of the Scriptures. You go on to Revelation and you find there letters wrtten there to the seven churches, and these letters are addresssed to the angels of the churches. And ~~the~~ the ~~word~~ word angel literally is a messenger. And there are those who say, this is ~~xxxxxxx~~ evidence of a minister in the churdh, who is here called the angel or the messenger. It may be, but it is not sufficient evidence to build an idea of ch. govt. on, certainly. Because it is not explicit enough or clear enough. It may be addressed to a guardian ange~~t~~, rather than to a man